

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
June 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: Al Matano, Joe Chase, Chuck Kamp, Chris Schmidt, Duane Hinz, Steve Ritt, Eileen Bruskevitz, Jerry Mandli, John Vesperman, Mark Clear, Mark Opitz, Brett Hulsey, Paul Skidmore (left after item #6)

Members absent: Steve King

Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

2. Approval of May 5, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Kamp, seconded by Opitz, to approve May meeting minutes. Motion carried with Ritt and Hulsey abstaining.

3. Communications

Schaefer said the following two communications were in the packet:

- Email from City of Madison resident indicating a desire to have the downtown intercity train station also incorporate an intercity bus station.
- Email from Village of Oregon resident regarding concerns about trains interfering with commuter traffic at rail crossings.

Schaefer said the following additional communications were at members' places:

- Letter from WisDOT Secretary Busalacchi approving Amendment #3 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program.
- Email from Village of Waunakee resident urging reconsideration of the downtown station for intercity rail service.
- Letter from Dane County Executive Falk confirming the appointments of Al Matano and Brett Hulsey to the MPO Policy Board.
- Letter from City of Madison resident suggesting that bus only lanes be considered for more streets and referencing an article on the bus rapid transit system in Bogota, Columbia.
- Email from City of Sun Prairie resident expressing concern about the impacts of the intercity rail service on the condo development she lives in and requesting more information on the project.

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

None

5. Public Hearing on Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Donna Brown with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) provided a power point presentation with background information on the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative, recent efforts to begin implementing it, and the Milwaukee-Madison rail service project. She reviewed past activities related to the Milwaukee-Madison project, including the Environmental Assessment in 2001 and signing of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in 2004. She then reviewed the project elements, activities this year to date, and planned schedule of activities over the next two years leading to implementation of service in 2013. These include a stations environmental document and preliminary engineering process, a corridor design process, and development of a corridor management plan. The public involvement opportunities for each were summarized.

The following persons registered to speak on the item:

Gary Werner, 2302 Lakeland Ave., Madison, representing CRANES said that CRANES supports the amendment to the TIP for the inter-city passenger rail project, which is consistent with the MPO's adopted long-range transportation plan. It makes sense to have as many transportation options as possible and to have passenger rail linking the largest city in the state with the state capitol. CRANES supports the downtown station site. To make rail successful it is important for the train to stop as close to passengers' destinations as possible. The downtown

site eliminates the need for a mode change for many people to reach their destination and also connects well to existing urban transportation options. The downtown location is closest to the large employment centers of the central business district, hospitals, University of Wisconsin and other college campuses, and state offices. In addition, non-work destinations such as Camp Randall, the Kohl Center, Capitol Square, State Street, and UW campus activities are all within walking distance or easily accessible via a short local bus ride. CRANES supports steps to make the transportation system less auto dependent. Access to the train station should be as convenient by other modes as by auto. CRANES urges WisDOT, the City of Madison, and the MPO to work with the City's committees to make the train station truly multi-modal with convenient access to local and intercity bus service, secure bicycle parking, and good pedestrian access as well as auto parking. He said public input regarding the design, location, and rail station functions would be critical for both the acceptance and trust of the citizens that will be using the station and living and working nearby. He urged all bodies to hold frequent and early meetings to answer questions, receive comments, and outline the process. CRANES also urges those involved with the location, design, and construction of the rail station to make it as energy neutral and green as possible (e.g., increased rain water capture or reuse).

Judy Siegfried, 2206 West Lawn Ave., Madison, said she was a strong supporter and consistent user of inter-city rail and local and inter-city buses to access this continental rail network. She said she had long advocated for the return of Madison area passenger rail service. She asked the MPO Board to show restraint in releasing the funds for the project, particularly for the stations. She expressed frustration at the lack of information and opportunity for citizens to comment on the station location. She said her opinion was that the station location will not serve the region well and provide good multi-modal connections. She was also concerned about the cost. She commented on the Midwest regional nature of the service and the commitment to fast, efficient service. She praised WisDOT for its work on the project and securing the federal funding. She commented that the Madison station is supposed to serve the entire metro area, yet no other local unit of government had a say in the station location. She said that given the planned extension to the Twin Cities the downtown station shouldn't be made the primary station unless funding is committed to a second station on the route. She expressed concern about the multi-modal connections and the difficulty in getting to the downtown station. She urged keeping the inter-city framework in mind and being certain of what is being funded and the implications before the funding is released for final station design.

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Ave., Madison, said he didn't understand why the MPO was not involved in the station location decision since it is the entity in charge of metropolitan transportation planning. He proposed that the MPO should only approve a sufficient amount of the \$25 million for the environmental study and preliminary designs for the stations to allow the environmental assessment and some initial planning, but not the final designs. WisDOT should come back to the MPO later with some cost numbers and drawings so the MPO understands what it is approving. He also said the rail corridor extension for the downtown station should be included as part of the station cost. He commented on the need for the station design to address access to local and inter-city bus service and bicycles. He said the station should also include sufficient amenities, including taxi and rental car service, food service, and lodging for travelers. He noted the station criteria included in the resolution adopted by the Madison Common Council. Issues that need to be addressed include the cost of parking and traffic impacts. He expressed concern about the downtown station cost compared to the federal funding that has been allocated for it. He wondered where the additional money would come from. He commented on the nature of the service and that it isn't just commuter service between Madison and Milwaukee. He also said the downtown location means a commitment to having a second station on the route for the trains going on to the Twin Cities when that service is added.

Dick Rhody, 1506 Clarmar Dr., Sun Prairie, said that he and his wife Dori purchased the land that their house is on from a farmer back in about 1985. There was a rail line running through it, but at that time it really wasn't used. They built their house in 1990 and were provided with a crossing of the rail line for their driveway at the south end of Clarmar Drive. He said they were assured that they would not be landlocked and would continue to have the rail crossing. He said he was concerned about the loss of the crossing and access to their home. He said he was opposed to the project and suggested use of the median of the interstate if passenger rail service was to be implemented.

Bill Richardson, 2040 Allen Blvd., Middleton, said he represented himself and a group called the Great Train Robbery. He opposed the TIP amendment for the inter-city rail project. He read a quote from a speech by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Administrator about the use of Bus Rapid Transit as a cost effective alternative to rail service. He expressed concern about the maintenance and operating costs for the rail service. He noted that the travel speeds mentioned won't occur until 2016 after the positive train control system is installed. He didn't think the service would be competitive enough with the car to attract enough riders. He said he would

support the improvements if they were for freight rail because that would help the economy. He suggested a statewide referendum on support for the project.

Carson Young, 54 Merlham Dr., Madison, said he was an engineer before starting his own business. He has talked with many people with technical expertise and said the rail service would need to be subsidized by taxpayers unless it could be developed as an integrated transportation system with autos, airplanes, and buses. He suggested use of train cars that could be separated with one-half going to downtown and the one-half to the airport. The same thing could be done in Milwaukee.

Lance Green, 186 Dixon St., Madison, said he'd lived on Madison's East side for 30 years and worked close to the proposed station location. He supported the TIP amendment for the project, and said development of inter-city rail was essential for moving people in a more cost-effective and energy-efficient way. However, he said he was concerned about the long-term implications of the station location decision. He was concerned about the extra travel time for those trains going on to the Twin Cities. He was also concerned about how the station would interface with local transit improvements being planned by the regional transit authority and other transportation modes as well as the traffic impacts to John Nolen Drive and Wilson Street. He urged reconsideration of the station location.

Ron Wolfe, 5601 Dahmen Dr., Waunakee, said he was representing himself and Pro Rail, the local arm of the Wisconsin Association of Rail Passengers. He said the station is a regional one serving south central Madison, not just Madison. The initial study done by HNTB back in 2001 projected that 60% of the passengers using the station would be coming from outside Madison. That made the airport seem like a good location since people from the West side could travel north around the lake rather than traveling through downtown. He opposed the downtown station location and also didn't like that the decision was made without any public input. He questioned the model used that predicted higher ridership for the downtown station location, and asked that the assumptions that went into the analysis be made public. He said Amtrak's Empire Builder train service could come through Madison if the station was at the airport, which would benefit the Madison area.

Hans Noeldner, 133 W. Lincoln St., Oregon, said he agreed with the comments made by Gary Werner. He supported rail transportation because it is more energy efficient. He noted the recent oil spill and the need to reduce the country's reliance on oil. He was disappointed in the lack of public input, but supported the downtown station location. He said it is a good location for those driving as well as for those coming by other modes. He thought the downtown location was good for business, tourism, and for people visiting family and friends. He said the noise and safety impacts were overblown. He said as a bicyclist he'd rather wait for one train to cross the road than many cars.

Robbie Webber, 2613 Stevens St., Madison, supported the TIP amendment and Werner's comments. She said we cannot continue to depend on driving as our primary mode of transportation. It took 50-60 years to build the auto-oriented transportation system and will take about that long to achieve a more balanced system with alternatives to driving. She said it was important that the rail system goes from city center to city center because that is where most people are and will be going. This is a social and economic justice issue, because not everybody has a car. We need to locate our major transportation hubs such as this in locations that people can get to by local transit, walking, biking, and getting a ride from somebody. She supported the downtown location, but also could have supported the Yahara station. She opposed the airport location. In response to comments by others, she said the comments by the FTA Administrator were made in reference to local rail versus bus transit, not inter-city transit. In response to comments by others, she said buses get stuck in traffic, but trains don't. The travel time comparison to driving needs to factor that and the time to park and walk to one's destination. Driving is the most dangerous method of transportation. She said driving was subsidized too and more people could be moved faster and cheaper with trains than with roads. She also commented on the idea of a statewide referendum, suggesting that people in other parts of the state wouldn't have supported the Marquette interchange project in Milwaukee.

Bob Schaefer, 6 Cottonwood Cir., Madison, commented on the definition of high-speed rail, which is speeds of 150 mph or greater. He said nothing in the U.S. qualifies as high-speed rail. He said the problem with the passenger rail service is that it is being built on a freight rail system and will therefore never fit the definition of high-speed. He commented that the best location in terms of travel time would have been the Hoepker Road station north of the airport because the train wouldn't have traveled through the city at all. He suggested the station location was driven by the desire to use the federal funding to improve the tracks to make it less expensive to implement commuter rail. He questioned the ability to run both commuter and inter-city trains in the corridor. He also suggested that the reconstruction of the Lien Road/N. Thompson/Zeier Road intersection should have provided for a grade-separated rail crossing.

Caryl Terrell, 19 Red Maple Trl., Madison, representing Sierra Club-John Muir Chapter's Global Warming Solutions Team, said the group supported the TIP amendment and the vision for the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative of a regional rail system that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. She mentioned some of the steps needed to get to the stage that things are at today, including legislative hearings regarding support of the initiative. She mentioned the great success of the current Hiawatha service between Milwaukee and Chicago. She said the public has many questions and ideas for how to make the project successful and the way to allow that process to transpire is to approve the TIP amendment.

Tim Wong, 161 Jackson St., Madison, said he lived on the East side near the tracks. He said the new service will allow quiet zones due to the upgraded crossings. He opposed the airport location because he didn't drive and it wasn't convenient to get there without a car. He supported the TIP amendment to allow the process to move forward. While he said he could have supported the Yahara station too, he supported the downtown station. He mentioned the neighborhood concerns about possible street closings and said the association had forwarded its concerns to WisDOT. He said the cost needed to be considered in the context of what major highway projects cost such as the widening of the Interstate between Madison and Beloit. This is projected to cost \$1 billion. He said he didn't believe that 60% of passengers would come from outside Madison. He also didn't think the traffic impacts would be a major concern and noted the traffic volumes today on the surrounding streets.

Pete Carnes, Monona, said he had grave concerns whether the rail service would be cost effective given the existing inter-city bus service, but at the same time he noted the need for the U.S. to reduce its energy use. He said that if it is done it should be done right and suggested an alternative route using tracks coming in from Cottage Grove rather than Sun Prairie. He suggested building a new rail line from the southeast side connecting to the rail line that crosses Mud Lake and runs up and through the isthmus.

Jim Sampson, 937 Waban Hill, Madison, commented that the projected 110 mph top speed was not high-speed rail and it shouldn't be called that. He said he wasn't sure whether he supported the service or not, but was concerned about the need for accurate information. For example, the initial speeds would be lower. He expressed concern over the lack of public input on the station location and the traffic congestion from the downtown location. He also commented on the need to be sure the service was designed to be successful from the beginning.

6. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 39 Regarding Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Hulsey commented that Madison was the only capitol in the Midwest that does not have train service. He said train service between Madison and Chicago existed back in 1950 and the travel time was 2 hours and 12 minutes. He mentioned the large sums of money spent to expand the capacity of Chicago's O'Hare airport and that around 40% of the flights to/from O'Hare were 300 miles or less. High-speed train service could replace some of those flights. He said implementation of the train service was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. He mentioned the many jobs that would be created. He also compared the cost to the high cost of major roadway projects such as the Verona Road/West Beltline interchange. He urged support of the TIP amendment for the project.

Moved by Hulsey, seconded by Kamp, to approve Resolution TPB No. 39, Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 TIP.

Opitz asked Donna Brown to discuss the environmental study process back in the early 2000s and the planning process since then. He commented that this work laid the groundwork for the project and the decision on the station location. Brown said WisDOT Southwest Region staff was very involved in the analysis done then and there was considerable public involvement during the environmental study. The study looked at potential station locations in Madison and elsewhere in the corridor to Milwaukee. The analysis looked at traffic, environmental, and other impacts. The focus was on utilizing the existing freight rail line. Following the issuance of the FONSI in 2004, planning and discussions with communities continued. Opitz asked Brown about WisDOT's commitment to supporting development of an inter-modal station in Madison. Brown said WisDOT was very committed to working with the City of Madison to look at multi-modal connections, including pedestrian access to the facility, planning for the potential for commuter rail, inter-city bus service, and taxi connections.

Bruskewitz commented on the lack of public input on the station location decision and asked if WisDOT could share information that was used to select the Monona Terrace station and rule out the others. Brown agreed to provide information on the analysis and evaluation of the station locations, including the assumptions used.

Hulsey said the potential for a train station at Monona Terrace was discussed early on as part of the planning for the facility. Clear noted that the decision now for WisDOT was the exact location for the downtown station—the Dept. of Administration building or 1 W. Wilson—and asked Brown how that decision would be made and what

role the MPO would have. Clear clarified for members of the public that the MPO had no role in selecting the downtown station location. Brown responded that the MPO would have input on the exact location and design of the downtown station. She said WisDOT would be holding community workshops and discussions on the issue and addressing the traffic impacts and connections to other transportation modes.

Ritt asked Brown where on WisDOT's website information on the operational costs of the overall project could be found. Brown said that information was included in the service operation plan included in the application submitted to FRA for the grant funding, which is on the website. Ritt said that information was needed to make an informed decision on the project. C. Schmidt asked if both options were being considered for the rail corridor to use between Blair Street and the Yahara River. Brown said this was analyzed, but she didn't recall the conclusions. She said she would get the information. C. Schmidt also asked whether full grade separation had been considered for some crossings. Brown said the diagnostic team would be analyzing the crossings, but that full grade separation was not being considered due to the high cost. Vesperman said that some cost figures might be available from the prior study. Brown agreed to see if any information was available from the earlier environmental assessment (EA). Bruskewitz asked about ventilation concerns with Monona Terrace station, and Brown said that would be in the EA as well. Bruskewitz requested that all of the older documents be put on the website.

Matano said he was a long time supporter of inter-city rail service to Madison, but was dismayed at the lack of any opportunity for input by the MPO and public on the station location decision. He said he was considering recommending postponement of the action on the TIP amendment. He thought the downtown station location was wrong because of the extra travel time and the difficulty of providing multi-modal connections. There isn't room for an inter-city bus station. There is also more community disruption due to the increased street crossings and it negatively impacts the planned central park. He said he favored the Yahara station, which is still relatively close to downtown. He suggested that WisDOT reconsider the station location, saying that WisDOT would need to do that anyway to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. He also commented on the cost issue, noting the high cost of highway projects. Vesperman reiterated that the environmental study and preliminary design process for the station would address the issues raised about parking, transit connections, traffic impacts, etc. Chase also expressed frustration about the process and the inability to obtain information from WisDOT. He said the 2001 EA study was done many years ago and most local officials don't have any knowledge of that. He expressed support for postponement of the TIP amendment given the lack of information. Skidmore agreed, saying it was appropriate due to the lack of information.

Moved by Chase, seconded by Skidmore, to postpone consideration of the TIP amendment until the July meeting.

Hulsey asked Brown if postponement would jeopardize the necessary timeline for completion of the process, and Brown said it would. Hulsey said approving the TIP amendment would allow the public outreach process to proceed. Vesperman commented on the lengthy study and public outreach process in the past. He said he and Brown and her colleagues were willing to meet with Sun Prairie officials. Chase said he had been told by Chris Klein, Executive Assistant to the WisDOT Secretary, that staff couldn't meet with them until the consultants were hired. He said relying on studies from 2001-2004 wasn't sufficient. Vesperman noted the long time studies such as this take and that discussions on the project had continued since then. Brown said that up until the last couple of weeks WisDOT staff had not met with any communities. She said WisDOT didn't have the staff resources to do so and that the efforts had been focused on working with FRA to get a project agreement so FRA would release the funding. The recent meetings with communities for which stations are planned were required to meet expectations of FRA. Clear commented that the MPO's role was to approve the federal funding, and many of the issues raised concern details about the project that are beyond the purview of the MPO. Matano disagreed. Hinz asked about the next steps in the process. Brown said the TIP amendment includes \$25 million for an environmental assessment, preliminary engineering, and final design of the train stations, including the Madison station. That work would be started in June. A draft EA would be completed in the fall when preliminary engineering would be started. The next decision is finalizing the exact location of the Madison station. Ritt clarified that the amendment approves the \$25 million for the station study/design and \$75 million for some initial rail infrastructure improvements. Funding for construction would be approved later. He said Board members needed to decide whether they had enough information to approve the initial \$100 million. Vesperman commented that the MPO had to approve use of FHWA and FTA funds, but he wasn't sure if that was the case for FRA funds. C. Schmidt expressed concern that the effort to postpone action was due to frustration about the lack of input on the station location decision. While he shared the frustration he thought the process needed to move forward. Opitz asked about the process for approving other projects funded with stimulus funds. Schaefer said the MPO approved TIP amendments for those projects. He added that it was his understanding that this project did need to be in the MPO's TIP even though it involved FRA funding. WisDOT staff seemed to agree

with this. Clear asked again about the level of detail appropriate for the MPO in reviewing the projects. Schaefer said the design details would be worked out as part of the EA and design process. He agreed that the MPO typically does not review all of the design details of the projects for which it approves funding for in the TIP. In this case the station location and multi-modal connections are certainly issues that are regional in significance, but not the type of fencing in the corridor.

Matano commented that the station location decision has been made. Brown agreed and said she understood the frustration, but that the decision would not be re-visited. She said WisDOT was now seeking input from the MPO and others on the exact location, traffic operations, and connectivity to the rest of the transportation system. Bruskevitz asked what happens if it turns out the downtown station won't work. Brown said WisDOT would then need to look at other alternatives, but at this point those are not on the table.

Hulsey moved, Kamp seconded, to call the question on the motion to postpone action on the TIP amendment. Motion to call the question carried. Motion to postpone action on the TIP amendment failed with Matano abstaining.

Bruskevitz commented on the long-term impacts in terms of the operating funding needed, and her concerns about whether there was sufficient population to support the service. She mentioned the speech by the FTA Administrator and the estimated deferred maintenance for the nation's transit systems. Because of her concerns about the long-term costs, she said she would be voting no. C. Schmidt commented on how long rail infrastructure lasts and said it was a good investment. Hulsey commented on the many state workers that travel between Madison and Milwaukee who will be able to ride the train. He mentioned the oil spill and that if Wisconsin doesn't spend the \$800 million it will go to another state. He also mentioned the jobs the project will create.

Ritt moved, Kamp seconded, to call the question on the main motion to approve the TIP amendment. Motion failed.

Opitz commented that transportation and housing policies over the last 60 years have led to the lack of transportation choices we have today. There has been considerable government intervention, including funding of the interstate system, and there is a role for government now to make investments like improved intercity rail service to chart our future. There are many people who can't drive now and will be more in the future with the changing demographics and they lack transportation choices. He said he isn't anti-car, but that this is a reasonable investment and said he'll support the motion.

Motion to approve Resolution TPB No. 39, Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program, carried.

7. Consideration of Revision to the Madison Area TPB's Scoring Criteria for Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement (TE) Projects

Schaefer explained that WisDOT has a Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP) that includes or encompasses funding from the Federal Transportation Enhancements Program as well as federal and state funding for the new Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Program. The SMIP program is a statewide discretionary grant program, but for projects within MPO areas WisDOT asks MPOs to prioritize the projects. These MPO rankings are then considered by the state committee that makes the decisions on what projects statewide receive funding. Schaefer said the Madison Area TPB has SMIP project scoring criteria, which were included in the packet. He said there was discussion after the last SMIP funding cycle about adding a criterion related to local financial commitment. There were two City of Madison projects and a Dane County Parks project where a 50% local funding share was proposed rather than the minimum 20%. He said it was a strategic decision on the part of the city and county because the projects had a high cost and they felt the greater local match would increase their chances of receiving funding. There was discussion that perhaps projects with a higher local funding commitment should receive additional points in the scoring criteria. The reasoning is the same as why the MPO's local funding match policy was changed to 50% for STP-Urban projects: an increased local financial commitment would spread the limited federal funding further and allow more projects to be funded. There is a difference in this case because SMIP is a statewide discretionary program. There is no guarantee that if the MPO added a new criteria encouraging applicants within the Madison area to increase the local funding commitment for projects that the Madison area would get more projects funded in any particular grant cycle. Schaefer said over time he thought it would result in more area projects being funded because the state committee considers geographic equity in terms of funding, not the number of projects. The MPO's Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) discussed the issue last week. There were concerns by some members that the new criterion wouldn't guarantee more Madison area

projects would be funded. There was also a concern that communities wouldn't know ahead of time the score of their project and whether it would be necessary to provide additional local funding to bump the score up. Some staff were uncomfortable about having to make a recommendation to local officials from a strategic point of view on whether or not to provide more local funding. Ultimately, the TCC recommended that the new criterion related to local financial commitment not be added. They did recommend the other editorial changes. Schaefer said he didn't have a chance to review the issue with the Citizen Advisory Committee. The information was sent out to the members, but he said he didn't get any feedback.

In response to a question regarding the available funding, Schaefer said it had been about \$9 million per year statewide. It would be a little higher for this next cycle, but overall it isn't much money compared to the demand for projects. Mandli passed out a letter signed by him and County Executive Chief of Staff Topf Wells opposing the amendment to the criteria. He said the county was concerned the added criterion would require additional local funds without any guarantee the additional federal funds would come back to the Madison area. In response to a question from Clear, Mandli said the county was also concerned that it might result in a project receiving a lower priority than what the state might give it and result in the project not receiving funding.

Moved by Matano, seconded by Opitz, to recommend against adding the criterion related to local financial commitment (#7) to the MPO's SMIP scoring criteria, but in favor of making the other editorial changes. Motion carried.

8. 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

Item deferred.

9. Review and Discussion of the Federal Certification Review Report Recommendations and MPO Staff Responses

Item deferred.

10. Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA)

Item deferred.

11. Status Report on MPO Policy Board Appointments

Item covered as part of roll call and introductions.

12. Status Report on Hiring of New MPO Transportation Planning Manager

Schaefer reported that final interviews for the position were scheduled for the week of June 14, and a decision would be made soon thereafter. He said that Al Matano would be involved in the final interviews.

13. 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**

Item deferred.

14. Discussion of Future Work Items:

- **Transit Development Plan (TDP), including RTA Service Scenarios**
- **2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program**
- **MPO Congestion Management Process**
- **Regional Transportation Plan Update**
- **Revisions to MPO Operating Rules and Procedures**

Item deferred.

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings.

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

16. Adjournment

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