

**Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)  
July 7, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

---

**1. Roll Call**

**Members present:** Eileen Bruskevitz, Joe Chase, Mark Clear, Duane Hinz, Steve King, Jerry Mandli (arrived at item #6), Al Matano, Mark Opitz, Steve Ritt, Chris Schmidt, John Vesperman (arrived at item #6 and left after item #11)

**Members absent:** Brett Hulsey, Chuck Kamp, Paul Skidmore

**Staff present:** Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

**2. Approval of June 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Clear, to approve the June meeting minutes. Motion carried with King abstaining.

**3. Communications**

Schaefer said the following communications was in the packet:

- Letter from WisDOT Secretary Busalacchi approving Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program.

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

None

**5. Election of Officers**

[Note: This item was initially deferred and taken up after item #11.]

As current Chair, Matano asked Opitz to take over for the election of Chair. Opitz asked for nominations. King nominated Matano for re-election as Chair. There were no other nominations and thus Matano was elected Chair. Matano resumed duties as Chair, and asked for nominations for Vice-Chair. Schmidt nominated King. Bruskevitz asked if there were any requirements regarding who can be officers, and Schaefer said no. Opitz asked King where his aldermanic district was located, and King said the far southwest side at the border of Verona and Fitchburg. Matano nominated Chase. There were no other nominations. Opitz commented that he asked King about the location of his district because he was interested in geographic diversity. Schaefer noted that the re-designation agreement recommends that the appointing authorities consider geographic diversity in making their appointments. It was decided to conduct the vote by ballot. Chase was elected Vice-Chair.

**6. Consideration of Recommendation Regarding the MPO's Representative to the City of Madison's Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee**

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Ave., Madison, registered to speak. He said at the last City of Madison Long Range Transportation Planning Committee (LRTPC) meeting it was agreed that the LRTPC would be the lead committee and single point of contact for the high speed rail project. WisDOT staff agreed to provide regular status reports to the committee. He said he supported having MPO representatives on the LRTPC.

Schaefer explained that the MPO has two representatives on the City of Madison's Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee. The representatives must be City of Madison appointees. The current MPO representatives are Steve King and Chris Schmidt. Paul Skidmore is also on the committee, but represents the City's Ped/Bike/Motor Vehicle Commission. Schmidt's appointment expired on April 30, 2010 because his MPO appointment had expired then before he was re-appointed. Schmidt indicated he was interested in being re-appointed.

Moved by Opitz, seconded by King, to recommend to City of Madison Mayor Cieslewicz that Chris Schmidt be re-appointed as an MPO representative to the City's Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee. Motion carried.

**7. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 40 Regarding Amendment #5 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County**

Schaefer said the amendment was for a local safety project on CTH PB at the Sunset Drive intersection that was approved by WisDOT. The amendment is needed to allow preliminary engineering to start this year. Construction is programmed for 2012. Clear asked if the project affected the funding or timing for any other projects, and Schaefer said no.

Moved by Bruskevitz, seconded by Ritt, to approve Resolution TPB No. 40 regarding Amendment #5 to the 2010-2014 TIP. Motion carried.

**8. Review of Preliminary Draft Listing and Ranking of Candidate Projects for STP Urban Funding for 2011-2015**

Schaefer said that he wanted to provide the Board with a first look at the new 2011-2015 listings. He distributed two different versions – an approved funding scenario and another alternative scenario that was put together based on feedback from a recent intergovernmental meeting regarding the University Avenue reconstruction project. He said the estimated cost for that project had increased substantially following the preliminary engineering. As a result there is interest in exploring possible changes to the schedule of other projects in order to increase the amount of Federal funding for the University Avenue project. Schaefer said the process is that MPO staff would review a preliminary draft version of the project listings with the MPO's Technical Coordinating Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee next month and review the draft with the Board at its next meeting. A revised draft would be included in the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Board approves the listings as part of approval of the TIP and that action is expected at the October meeting. A hearing on the TIP will be held at the September meeting.

Schaefer then reviewed the two versions of the listings, starting with the approved funding scenario. Given the increased estimated cost for the University Avenue (Segoe to Allen Blvd.) project in 2011 and the County Trunk Highway (CTH) M (Cross Country to McKee Rd.) project in 2013, the approved Federal funding falls well short of the full 50% maximum under the MPO's policy. He said that 2013 is the year when funding is tight. He said it is also possible that the MPO's allocation may decrease somewhat from the current \$6.34 million, which would make things worse. If the funding isn't increased for any projects and no projects are delayed there would be enough funding in 2015 to fund three new projects. The highest scoring projects are the reconstruction and expansion of McKee Road (CTH PD) (Maple Grove to CTH M), resurfacing of Allen Blvd. (CTH Q), and reconstruction and expansion of Cottage Grove Rd. (CTH BB) (Interstate 39/90 to Sprecher). He said the Cottage Grove Road project needs to be coordinated with WisDOT's project to add a structure to the Cottage Grove Road Bridge over the Interstate to accommodate four travel lanes. Pedestrian and bicycle accommodations were added a few years ago, but there wasn't sufficient funding at the time to expand the bridge to four lanes. Schaefer then reviewed the alternative scenario, which involves postponing the Fish Hatchery Road pavement replacement project two years from 2012 to 2014 and the E. Johnson Street reconstruction project from 2014 to 2015. This would also require delaying one or more projects from 2015 to 2016. The funding made available by delaying those projects would be allocated proportionately to the University Avenue and CTH M (Cross Country to McKee Rd.) projects. There would still not be sufficient funding to cover 50% of the cost of the projects, but the funding shortfall for both would be much less. The Cottage Grove Road project is the one shown as being delayed from 2015 to 2016 under this scenario.

Opitz said he would like to hear some discussion, but liked the alternative scenario which allows increasing funding for the University Avenue and CTH M projects. He asked about the number of Middleton projects submitted. Schaefer said he talked with Middleton staff to explain the process and suggested that the city might want to focus on a smaller number of projects with the best chance of

receiving funding. In some cases, Middleton's projects are competing against each other. Opitz also asked why the pedestrian/bicycle safety education project was ranked higher than other projects with higher scores such as in 2012. Schaefer said it was because the MPO has a long standing policy to provide some funding to support that program regardless of how it scores compared to other projects. Also, in many cases there isn't sufficient funding available to fund the higher scoring project and that is the case in 2012. Opitz suggested perhaps not assigning a score or rank to the project or including a note regarding the policy. In response to a question regarding the University Avenue cost estimate, Schaefer said it did not reflect a change in the scope of the project. Vesperman asked if the additional cost for the University Avenue (Segoe to Shorewood Blvd.) project under construction now would affect the available funding. Schaefer responded that this segment of University Avenue was mostly funded with stimulus funding. The additional cost beyond that is being funded with additional STP and local funding at 80/20, but this doesn't affect the MPO's annual allocation. Also, the Nine Mound Road project in the City of Verona, which had stimulus funding, came in under the cost estimate and the City of Verona has agreed to release \$230,000 in funding that will be transferred to the University Avenue project.

There was some discussion about possible reasons for the increase in the cost estimate for the University Avenue project, which includes both bike lanes and a bike path on the north side. It was clarified the project at this point does not include replacing the pedestrian underpass at Spring Harbor Drive with an ADA compliant one. Clear said the underpass was put in before there was a traffic signal at the intersection. Constructing a new ADA compliant underpass would require significant grading work to provide minimum clearances. The plan is to include some enhanced crosswalk features. There was also discussion about the addition of the median, but with accommodations and signal phasing for a U-turn rather than a left-turn from some side streets. Vesperman commented that delaying the work on Fish Hatchery Road would have a potential benefit in that the work would not coincide with the work on the Beltline interchange in 2012. Ritt commented that the local units of government may not want to provide the additional local funds. Schaefer said the local project sponsor could decide to delay the project until there is sufficient funding to cover the full 50% cost. Schaefer noted the need for an agreement on sharing of the local cost for University Avenue and a number of other projects. That agreement is necessary before the Board approves a project for the following year. Vesperman said WisDOT designs projects to be put on an advanceable list if extra funding becomes available, and that is worth discussing for the STP-Urban program. He also mentioned there are real estate and other issues that could potentially push back University Avenue to 2012.

## **9. Review and Discussion of Federal Law and Rules Regarding MPOs and the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process and the Madison Area TPB's Operating Rules and Procedures**

Schaefer said the Board had asked for information on the MPO's authority and responsibilities during the discussion regarding the hiring of the MPO planning manager at the May meeting. Schaefer said he provided Board members with the relevant documents. The MPO's authority and responsibilities come from Federal law and regulations regarding MPOs and the MPO planning process, the MPO re-designation agreement, and to a lesser extent the MPO's operating rules and procedures. The Federal laws and regulations address the MPO's planning responsibilities, the composition of the MPO Board, the re-designation process, etc. Schaefer highlighted a couple of things in the re-designation agreement. First, the agreement outlines a process for making minor changes in the composition of the MPO Board without going through a formal re-designation. The agreement also states that the City of Madison will provide the staff for the MPO that the City is responsible for providing the local match funding contribution, but that other units of government are strongly encouraged to make appropriate contributions to cover a share of the cost proportionate to their population. In response to a question, Schaefer said that three suburban communities provide their proportionate share of the local cost in support of the MPO: City of Fitchburg, City of Monona, and Village of McFarland. He said a formal letter was sent out by the Madison Mayor when the MPO was first re-designated asking for a contribution, but no formal request has been made since then. Only informal requests have been made via staff.

Schaefer then reviewed a memo that MPO staff prepared with suggestions for possible changes to the operating rules and procedures. Most of the suggested changes are to document existing practices and policies. Staff was looking for some initial feedback and would then prepare a draft showing the proposed changes. Schaefer highlighted some of the suggested changes and additions. It is suggested that language be added stating that the City of Madison is the fiscal and administrative agent for the MPO and is responsible for providing staff services, and that the MPO staff reports to the MPO Policy Board and is directed by MPO policies and approved documents. It is also suggested that language be added about the MPO Planning Manager, including how the position fits within the City staff structure and the Manager's responsibilities. Language could be added about the MPO's desired role in hiring/firing of the Manager, however the re-designation agreement controls. An alternative would be to work out an agreement with the City that addresses the issue.

Bruskewitz asked about the timing of the next re-designation. Schaefer said there is no schedule for re-designation. The substantial change in the Board structure required to comply with federal law necessitated the last re-designation. A minor change could be made to the Board structure without a formal re-designation.

Regarding the work program and budget, Schaefer said language could be added documenting the existing process where the MPO and Planning Division budgets are developed concurrently. Bruskewitz said that the process for seeking contributions from other communities might also be addressed. He said the procedure that has been developed for nominating and voting on the city/village and town representatives should be outlined. One issue with the procedure is that the voting is not confidential. However, the only alternative would be to have a meeting with a ballot vote. A procedure for removing appointees before their term is up should be spelled out. Schaefer reviewed a few suggestions related to the Board officers, including their duties, the timing of elections, and the process for filling a vacancy. It was noted that some committees elect a secretary even though staff perform the typical functions. He said another issue to be addressed is whether a simple majority or some type of super majority vote is needed for the Board to initiate the process for a change in composition to the Board. He also mentioned the need to expressly allow participation in Board meetings via conference call. He suggested it be limited to emergency meetings only (e.g., TIP amendments). It was suggested that another possible restriction would be to limit the number of members participating by phone. He said other issues to address are joint meetings with other boards or committees and the Technical Coordinating Committee membership and voting procedures. Schaefer said he would prepare a revised draft based on the comments tonight. Matano suggested adding language regarding how vacancies in appointments are handled, and Schaefer said he would add that.

#### **10. Consideration of Recommendation Regarding Sending Letter Requesting Financial Support for Work of the MPO**

Schaefer said he was looking for a recommendation from the Board on whether a formal letter requesting financial support should be sent out for next year's budget. He said he discussed the issue with Brad Murphy, and Murphy thought that if the letter is sent out it would be more appropriate if it came from the MPO Board Chair or staff on behalf of the MPO rather than from the Madison Mayor. Schaefer said the dollar amounts are not very large, but he thought communities that contribute some funding would feel more ownership of the MPO. He said many local officials aren't aware that the MPO agreement recommends that other communities contribute to the funding and that three communities have been contributing in the past. It will be a tight budget year so it won't be an easy sell. The letter would ask communities to set aside the estimated amount as their local budget is prepared. In response to a question, Schaefer said he would reference the language in the agreement that communities are "strongly encouraged" to contribute funding and note those communities that have been contributing. Schaefer asked whether the Board thought the request should be based on the 2000 Census population number or the 2009 population estimates. Ritt responded that it should be based on the 2000 population since that is what the three communities that have been contributing have based their contributions on. Others agreed. Mandli mentioned that Dane County contributes funding, and Schaefer said that was for specialized transportation coordination services. It was mentioned that staff raises might be a sensitive

issue. Schaefer said some staff may qualify for step increases, but there would be no cost of living increases in 2011. Chase suggested mentioning that this isn't a new policy or request, but that it was an oversight that the request letter had not been sent out in the past. The consensus of the Board was to have staff send out the letter.

#### **11. Review and Discussion of the Federal Certification Review Report Recommendations and MPO Staff Responses**

Schaefer said that after the presentation on the Federal certification review report the Board requested information on how and when staff planned to respond to the recommendations. Schaefer said staff prepared a table with the recommendations and the proposed actions to implement them for review by the Board. Schaefer said staff would provide an annual update on the progress in implementing the actions. He mentioned that with regard to the congestion management process staff was considering hiring a consultant to assist with the project using salary savings from being short-staffed. He said that would require a work program and budget amendment. Staff needed to calculate how much money might be available to shift to consultant services. Due to the work finishing up the TDP and the RTA work, he said it would be helpful to have some assistance with the congestion management plan. Bruskewitz asked if a motion was needed, and Schaefer said he would seek action from the Board at a future meeting, probably the August meeting.

#### **12. Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA)**

Opitz said the RTA Board was meeting once or twice a month and that three subcommittees had been created that were meeting frequently as well. He said there was some press coverage about the timing of the referendum after Mayor Cieslewicz expressed interest in having it conducted this fall. He said the issue had not been formally discussed by the RTA Board. Many are skeptical that there is enough time to hold the referendum in the fall. He said the Dane County Clerk's office has raised concerns about the mechanics of holding the election because the boundaries of the RTA split some voting wards in outlying areas. They aren't sure whether they can get it all set up in time for finalizing the election question, which must be done by September. He said a second issue is that the plan for transit service improvements doesn't exist. The RTA's Plan for Transit Subcommittee has been meeting, but is still in the information gathering stage. At the last meeting, a presentation was provided by the UW-Madison Transportation Services Director. He said it would be very problematic to have a referendum question on the November ballot, but the RTA Board was still diligently moving forward. It was pointed out that the RTA Board made a commitment to have the transit plan in place prior to holding the referendum. Opitz said he understood the desire to hold the referendum this fall since the next regularly scheduled fall election wouldn't be until 2012. Clear commented that spring of 2011 was probably the earliest the referendum could be held. Schmidt commented that he wished the County Clerk's office had started working on the issue sooner. Opitz responded that the RTA Board didn't have its first meeting until March, partly due to scheduling issues, but he also wondered why the issue hadn't been addressed already. Bruskewitz said the Clerk's office had met with all of the affected towns about the issue, but was never directed by the RTA Board to deal with it. She asked if the referendum timing was on the next meeting agenda for the RTA Board, and Opitz said he didn't know, but thought they couldn't really address it at this point since they weren't anywhere near ready.

#### **13. Update on the Milwaukee-Madison Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project**

Schaefer said there were a couple of workshops held on the station location, and following those WisDOT announced that the State Department of Administration building was selected as the station location. Another workshop is planned for late July to review more details about the station design, multi-modal connections, etc. He said Donna Brown from WisDOT would be at the Board's August meeting to provide an update and report on the July workshop results.

#### **14. Discussion of MPO Policy Board Meeting Schedule**

Schaefer said there had been some interest in revisiting the meeting schedule, but it was decided to wait until all of the new appointments had been made to discuss whether the Board wanted to change the first

Wednesday of the month at 7 p.m. date/time. Matano said that he had looked into getting a room on the third floor of the City-County Building. Schaefer responded that the Board had recently discussed the meeting location and the consensus was to keep it at the Water Utility unless there was a hearing or issue where a large public turnout was expected. He said he should have anticipated the large turnout at the last meeting on the TIP amendment and moved it downtown. Matano noted the transit service wasn't convenient. It was decided to discuss the issue further at the next meeting.

**15. Discussion of MPO Policy Board Meeting Notices and Packets**

Schaefer said he put this item on the agenda after Hulsey requested that he be sent the meeting packet via email rather than receiving a hard copy. He said he wondered if anyone else preferred to just get the electronic packet as well. Staff posts the entire packet on the website and so he would just send a link to the packet. He said staff typically brings one or two extra copies of the packet to the meeting in case anyone forgets their packet. He also asked whether the Board would like to receive an email notice about upcoming meetings as a reminder. Interest was expressed in getting an email notice of the meeting as soon as the packet was posted on the website. It was noted that a request for absence notifications could be made at the same time. Clear cautioned members not to send a reply to all because of the concern about an open meetings law violation if there was discussion about an issue. He said it is a standard disclaimer that City staff always includes in emails to entire committees. Clear, Ritt, and Mandli said they would like to just receive the notice with the link to the packet and didn't want a hard copy. Bruskevitz said she didn't need to receive a copy in the mail, but would like one at the meeting. Opitz cautioned against customized requests. He said he likes to have the paper copy at the meeting and appreciated the tabs for agenda items with materials. Schaefer said he would continue to bring a couple of extra copies, but would assume that for those who prefer to receive it electronically they will bring their computer or print out what they want to have a hard copy of.

**16. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Projects Potentially Involving the TPB:**

- **USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor Study**
- **USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)**
- **North Mendota Parkway Study**

Schaefer said he didn't have anything new to report on these studies. He said Vesperman could report on the USH 51 studies at the next meeting.

**17. Discussion of Future Work Items:**

- **Transit Development Plan (TDP) and RTA Service Scenarios**
- **2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program**

Schaefer said applications for SMIP/Transportation Enhancement projects were due August 2 and that staff would review and seek action from the MPO Board on the draft scoring and ranking of the applications at the September meeting.

- **MPO Congestion Management Process**
- **Regional Transportation Plan Update**
- **Revisions to MPO Operating Rules and Procedures**

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

The next meeting is scheduled for August 4, 2010 at the Madison Water Utility at 7 p.m.

**19. Adjournment**

Opitz moved, Clear seconded, to adjourn. Motion carried.