1. Roll Call

   **Members present:** Eileen Bruskewitz (arrived at Item #8), Mark Clear, Ken Dahl, Ken Golden, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Al Matano (Chair), Mark Opitz, Paul Skidmore, John Vesperman

   **Members absent:** Jerry Mandli, Steve Ritt, Chris Schmidt

   **Staff present:** Bill Schaefer, Meredith Krejny

2. Approval of May 4, 2011 Meeting Minutes

   Moved by Skidmore, seconded by Kamp, to approve the May 4, 2011 meeting minutes. Motion carried with Dahl abstaining.

3. Communications

   Schaefer said there was one communication in the packet, a letter from WisDOT approving TIP Amendment #3 to the 2011 – 2015 TIP.

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

   None

5. Election of Officers

   Following some discussion, Clear moved, Golden seconded, to table the item until Bruskewitz arrived to the meeting. Motion to table carried. Following item #8, Golden moved, Clear seconded, to take up the item. Motion carried.

   Moved by Skidmore, seconded by Dahl, to nominate Matano for Chair. There were no other nominations. Moved by Skidmore, seconded by Golden, to close nominations and to cast unanimous ballot for Matano for Chair. Motion carried.

   Moved by Opitz, seconded by Kamp, to nominate King for Vice Chair. There were no other nominations. Moved by Opitz, seconded by Kamp, to close nominations and cast unanimous ballot for King for Vice Chair. Motion carried.

6. Recommendation Regarding the MPO’s Representatives to the City of Madison’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee

   Schaefer explained that the MPO Board was responsible for making a recommendation to the City of Madison Mayor regarding the appointment of two City of Madison-appointed MPO members to serve as MPO representatives to the City of Madison Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee (LRTPC). Currently, those representatives are King and Schmidt. King said both he and Schmidt were interested in continuing to serve on the LRTPC.

   Moved by Opitz, seconded by Kamp, to recommend that Schmidt and King continue to represent the MPO on the LRTPC. Motion carried.

7. Resolution TPB No. 52 Regarding Amendment #4 to the 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

   Schaefer reviewed the projects included in the amendment. He said the Interstate 39/90 (Beltline to County Line) reconstruction and expansion project, which had been approved as part of amendment #3, was included due to revised costs and funding for the design and program control projects. New
roadway projects included two pavement replacement projects on USH 51 and construction of a roundabout at the CTH MM and M intersection to go with the roundabouts being installed at the USH 14 and CTH MM interchange ramp terminals. The transit projects included a planning project for Metro to conduct a fleet analysis and four intercity bus service projects. Schaefer said the Metro planning project was a pass-through grant from WisDOT to examine whether Metro should add different sized vehicles—both smaller ones for low ridership routes and times and larger ones for heavy use areas such as the UW campus. Kamp added that the mix of vehicles was discussed several years ago as part of the city’s Ad Hoc Long-Range Transit Planning Committee study. In response to a question from Golden, Kamp said the study would consider the related facility, staffing, and peak hour implications of operating different sized buses, as well as potential maneuverability issues. In response to a question regarding where the intercity buses would stop, Kamp indicated he wasn’t sure, but said a requirement of the grant was that the bus companies coordinate with the local transit agencies and on parking. WisDOT staff would be providing a presentation on the service to the City’s Transit & Parking Commission. Schaefer added that he thought the buses would stop at the Memorial Union because he had heard they worked out the schedules with UW Transportation Services staff. He didn’t know if there would be other stops.

Moved by King, seconded by Skidmore, to approve Resolution TPB No. 52 regarding amendment #4 to the 2011-2015 TIP. Motion carried.

8. Review of Preliminary Draft Listing and Ranking of Candidate Projects for STP Urban Funding for 2012-2016

Schaefer said that staff had prepared an initial draft of the STP Urban priority project listings and the scoring and ranking table for the projects. Staff provided an initial presentation of the draft listings to the MPO’s technical committee at its June meeting. Just as last year, the cost estimates for a number of projects had increased. That combined with the reduction in the MPO’s funding starting in 2013 resulted in shortfalls in funding for several projects. He said there was some discussion at the technical committee meeting about potentially delaying one or more projects in order to fully fund all or most of the projects. Since most of the projects were either City of Madison projects or joint city/county projects, it would be up to the city and county to agree on any such change to the schedule for those projects. Schaefer said staff would review a final draft of the listings again at the board’s next meeting, which would go into the draft TIP. The public hearing on the TIP would be in September and the board would then approve the final listings as part of action on the TIP at the October meeting. Schaefer then proceeded to review the project listings for 2012-2016. He described the projects, noted any changes in project cost estimates and scope, and also mentioned the new project applications. The new projects were the reconstruction of the CTH M and Verona Avenue intersection, reconstruction of CTH Q from STH 113 to south of Woodland Drive, and a pavement replacement project on Gammon Road near the Beltline. He said these were the highest scoring projects below the funding cutoff line in 2016. Schaefer also mentioned the separate projects scoring table that indicates how each project was scored on the different criteria. He said an explanation of the criteria was in Appendix A of the TIP.

Opitz asked if the Degree of Multi-Modal Use criterion evaluated use after the project improvement (e.g., addition of bike lanes) because he noticed many of the projects ranked low. Schaefer said yes. He said the amount of use was relative to other areas and acknowledged that it was in most cases a qualitative judgment due to the lack of data on pedestrians and bicyclists. Golden asked about the Supports Compact Land Use criterion under the External Impacts category. He pointed out the high densities planned for the Pioneer Neighborhood and said the CTH M project would support this. He wondered why the project didn’t receive points under this criterion. Schaefer said that only TSM and TDM projects have historically been given points under the External Impacts category. He explained that the CTH M project had the highest score for Land Use and Transportation System Change Inter-relationship for the reason that Golden noted. While the roadway project would enable the higher densities, Schaefer said he didn’t think it promoted higher densities by itself. Golden also asked about the Air Pollution criterion under the same category. Schaefer said one could certainly argue the
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roadway project would improve air quality in the short-term by reducing congestion, but there would also be much more traffic. Again, staff has only given points under the External Impacts criteria for TDM and TSM projects, but perhaps that is something that could be revisited in the future. Golden commented that he thought the prospect of receiving MPO funding for a roadway project would be a powerful inducement for communities to plan for higher density development.


Schaefer said that the schedule had been to present the draft CMP report to the board at this meeting, but it had taken longer than expected to complete the draft report. He said a Congestion Management Committee meeting was scheduled for the following week to review the draft report and discuss the transportation system performance measure targets and the monitoring plan. A presentation to the technical committee was scheduled for July 27. Staff would also review it with the citizen advisory committee. The presentation to the board was now scheduled for the August meeting. The draft report would then be released for public review and comment. Schaefer said the draft report would be sent out before the next meeting to allow the board time to review it. The hearing would be held in September with adoption then or at the October meeting.

Schaefer said a brief progress report was included in the packet, which included an outline of the report. Schaefer said he had pushed for the report to include a corridors analysis section that included information on current performance, issues, problems, and programmed or planned improvements for each congested corridor. Ideally, applicable short- and long-term strategies would also be listed for each. He pointed out the different corridor areas. He also pointed out the different performance measures and said the Congestion Management Committee would be discussing those and the appropriate targets for each.

10. Status Report on the Regional Transportation Plan Update

Schaefer provided an update on progress with the plan update. He said most of the travel modeling work had been completed, but just needed a bit more analysis and review with the consultant. Staff had also completed work on the revenue side for the financial analysis. This involved calculating programmed federal and state funding and local government spending over the past five years (excluding one-time stimulus funding) and projecting that out over the plan period. He said MPO staff was working with WisDOT SW Region and local staff to develop project lists and costs, particularly for major preservation projects. Work had also started on developing a transit corridors map that would support the planned transit corridors/TOD study to be done next year as part of the Sustainable Communities project. A minor update of the bikeway plan was also underway. Schaefer said most of the background data was collected and that part of the report written up. He said staff just completed creation of 2010 population and employment density maps. New Census 2010 data was also collected and a map created showing areas with concentrations of minority and Hispanic populations. This was needed for the environmental justice analyses to be done for the plan and TIPs. He mentioned that the percentage increase in minority and Hispanic populations from 2000 to 2010 was quite high. Bruskewitz asked for a copy of the maps, and Schaefer said he’d send her page-size versions. Schaefer said the employment database still needed some work, but was sufficient for mapping purposes.

11. 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) Corridor Study**

Vesperman said that for the first study staff had been concentrating their efforts on the Broadway intersection where two clinics were being built. He said three levels of alternative improvements had been developed, and those hadn’t changed much. A report was being prepared outlining them. He said there had also been a request by a property owner/developer for a land purchase or swap that impacted the planned park-and-ride (PNR) lot expansion design. That project was ready for letting next week. He
said WisDOT staff was considering this request, but had made it clear that visibility was a big issue for the PNR lot. He said the most WisDOT would be willing to delay the project would be six months, building it in the spring instead of fall. King commented on the desirability of moving forward with the project as soon as possible. Dahl asked how many spaces were being added, and Vesperman said 100 long-term spaces.

Vesperman said the second study was proceeding as an EIS and that the alternatives were being reduced for further more detailed analysis. The draft EIS would be completed in about a year with a final EIS in spring of 2013. Schaefer said he participated in a panel evaluating indirect and cumulative impacts of the project.

Schaefer asked if the board should appoint a representative to the policy advisory committee for the northern study. Vesperman said he didn’t think it was necessary, but that instead staff could provide another presentation to the board before the study was completed. He mentioned some of the improvements being considered such as half-diamond interchanges at the Buckeye and Pflaum intersections, which have very high crash rates.

12. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   
   - 2012-2016 Transportation Improvement Program
   - MPO Congestion Management Process (CMP)
   - Regional Transportation Plan Update
   - Transit Development Plan (TDP)

   Schaefer said the items had all been covered, except for the TDP. He said work on that would be started again towards the end of the year after the CMP and RTP update were completed. Much of the work on it had already been completed.

   He also provided an update on the MPO staff situation. He introduced Meredith Krejny, the new administrative staff person who had been hired. He said the new planner/travel modeler would be starting July 20. His name was Nick Vanderzwan. For the other planner position, interviews would he held in two weeks.

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

   Schaefer asked if the board wanted to have some future meetings at different locations around the area as an outreach tool. He said the September meeting would need to be at the Water Utility or downtown because of the hearing on the TIP, but the August meeting could be held elsewhere. He said the board had done that in the past and usually included a presentation by local planning staff on local issues as part of the agenda. Clear said he thought it was important for the board to get around the area. Middleton was suggested for the August meeting. That meeting is scheduled for August 3, 2011.

14. Adjournment

   Moved by Clear, seconded by Skidmore, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.