1. Roll Call

**Members present:** David Ahrens, Mark Clear, Steve Flottmeyer (arrived during Item 5), Ken Golden (left during Item 11), Steve King, Al Matano, Mark Opitz, Robin Schmidt, Bruce Stravinski

**Members absent:** Chuck Kamp, Jerry Mandli, Ed Minihan, Larry Palm, Steve Stocker

**MPO staff present:** Philip Gritzmacher, Bill Schaefer

**Others present:** Heather Stouder, Forbes McIntosh, Dana Ldzinski

2. Approval of April 5, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Golden, seconded by Opitz, to approve the April 5, 2017 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

Schaefer presented three items under communications. The first was a City of Madison resolution requesting that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) study an urban boulevard option for the Stoughton Road corridor. The second was a letter from MATPB to the State Senate Committee on Transportation and Veterans Affairs chairs requesting the consideration of regional transit/transportation authority enabling legislation. The third was a letter from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration regarding the upcoming MPO Certification Review. The letter stated the review will occur on August 1-3, 2017 and a public listening session was tentatively set for the night of August 2nd before the MPO board meeting. Schaefer said that FHWA and FTA mentioned that they would be willing to accommodate one-on-one meetings with board members or local officials, should they desire one.

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

None

5. Resolution TPB No. 128 Approving Amendment #3 to the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer explained that the TIP amendment adds a rail crossing improvement project on Stoughton Road (USH 51) south of State Highway 30 and three maintenance projects on the Beltline between Fish Hatchery Road and the Interstate and on US Highway 151 at two locations between the East Towne Mall and Main Street in Sun Prairie. The amendment also two transit projects funded through the Wisconsin Employment Transportation Assistance Program (WETAP). The first is the YWCA job ride program and the second is a project by Forward Service Corporation to run a vanpool program to serve low-income workers and a vehicle repair loan program. Both are continuing projects, but will now have some federal as well as state funding due to a change in how WETAP projects are funded.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Clear, to approve Resolution TPB No. 128 approving amendment #3 to the 2017-2021 TIP. Motion carried.

6. Resolution TPB No. 129 Creating a Joint Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – An MPO and Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) Coordinating Workgroup

Schaefer said the resolution stemmed from the joint meeting held in March. He said Larry Palm, Chair of CARPC and new MATPB board member, drafted a resolution for CARPC, which was approved. Schaefer said he used that as the template for the MPO resolution, making a few corrections and edits. Schaefer asked Golden if he wanted to share the discussion from the CARPC meeting. Golden said that the conversation
moved quickly to technical conversations of what would need to happen to merge CARPC and MATPB. He then mentioned some of the issues, including the need for changes in both organizations’ voting structures to ensure rural voices do not have outsized influence in MPO business and ensuring MPO representation does not have influence in land use issues outside of the MPO planning area.

Schmidt asked how other MPOs are associated with their respective RPCs. Golden said that he believed that MATPB was one of the only MPOs in the state that was not a part of its RPC. Gritzmacher replied that while some MPOs are part of RPCs, many throughout the state were independent, including the Green Bay and Wausau MPOs. He then stated that the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (ECWRPC) was most similar to what was being suggested. ECWRPC has multiple policy boards with some that have overlapping membership.

Schaefer said that he believed that, while there was a lot of support at the joint meeting for a potential future merger of the organization, he believed that the organizations needed to take a look at the advantages and disadvantages of a merger and take an incremental approach to any action. He explained that the CARPC/MPO separation was complicated and had negative consequences for MPO staff who had to reapply for their jobs and lost benefits during the process. Matano agreed with Schaefer, explaining that he and Palm had discussed the need for short, medium, and long term goals for any CARPC/MATPB actions. In the short term, the organizations should involve one other when discussing their respective planning areas. In the long term, the organizations might be merged; however, there would be many small steps between now and then.

Schaefer asked what level of effort MPO staff should dedicate to this effort, explaining that the effort was not included in the MPO work program. Further, he said that CARPC staff is currently working on their regional visioning process and was quite busy as a result. Matano said that he believed the effort would be board member-driven. Schaefer and Matano said that the workgroup was still in need of members with an MPO-only perspective. Joint CARPC/MATPB members were expected to be a part of the workgroup.

Moved by Clear, seconded by King to approve creating a joint MPO-CARPC work group. Motion carried.

7. Recommendation to the City of Madison Mayor Regarding Appointment of MPO Representative to the City’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee

Schaefer explained that that City of Madison’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee (LRTPC) contains two members from the MPO Policy Board. Although these members are appointed by the mayor, the MPO policy board recommends members from the board. He said that Matano and Golden were already on the committee and could not be appointed as MPO representatives. The MPO representatives that need to be replaced and/or reappointed are Steve King and Tim Gruber. Steve King has expressed interest in being reappointed and Larry Palm is interested in being appointed to replace Gruber.

Moved by Clear, seconded by Golden, to recommend that Steve King and Larry Palm be appointed MPO representatives to the City of Madison Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee. Motion carried.

8. Appointments to the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Schaefer said that the membership of the CAC was down to five members due to members resigning for a variety of reasons. Because of this, he has been recruiting additional members. Schaefer said that he recruited three members from the Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee for the CAC - Rod Clark, Chad Lawler, and Tom Wilson. An email was sent out to local elected officials within the region. He said that he received interest from two alders – JoAnna Richard from Middleton and Doug Wood from Monona. Schaefer said the makeup and use of the committee is addressed in the Public Participation Evaluation, and whether or not to target the appointment of elected officials to the committee is an issue worth discussing. Another issue is the lack of diversity – geographic, gender, and ethnic – on the committee. He said that one of the major issues facing the committee is thinking about how to use it more effectively.
Golden commented that he believed the committee was lacking a university perspective and that the MPO would be well served to have some sort of UW input, either on the technical committee or on the CAC.

Moved by Schmidt, seconded by Opitz, to approve the appointments to the CAC. Motion carried.


Gritzmacher gave a presentation on the Public Participation Plan (PPP) Evaluation, which reviewed the public participation efforts of the recently completed Regional Transportation Plan. The presentation began with an overview of the PPP, moved onto a review of the RTP public participation process, and then offered recommendations to improve the process. It was recommended that the MPO seek to gain more control over its social media and web presence. He explained that the MPO currently operates under the City of Madison’s social media and web guidelines, meaning that the MPO does not have full control of its Facebook page, or the ability to create websites without going through City IT. He said that this led to the MPO contracting out for the RTP website at a cost far higher than if MPO staff were to create the site themselves.

King asked if the City of Madison’s Imagine Madison web presence was operating under the same set of guidelines. Stouder explained that it was, and that as a result, the Planning Division had limited control over the Facebook page due to IT restrictions. Golden said that he believed that the MPO should have control over its web presence and that the MPO ostensibly contracts with the City for its infrastructure and payroll and is not a City agency. Clear said that he agreed.

Gritzmacher said another recommendation was to consider changing the MPO’s name and logo to make the organization more recognizable to the general public. Golden said that he agreed, and believed that the name of the organization should not mention “Madison” and should have “transportation” in it. Schaefer said that he believed the concept that the agency does transportation planning could be conveyed in the MPO’s logo. Matano agreed, saying that he didn’t believe it was necessarily important to have “transportation” in the name, and that having “MPO” was more important, so that those who know what an MPO is know that MATPB is an MPO. Gritzmacher agreed, explaining that many MPOs do not have transportation in their name, are named after the major community they represent, and convey transportation through logo iconography.

Golden said that he believed a new logo for the MPO would be appropriate. He said that MPO staff should reach out to the University of Wisconsin Madison and Madison College to see if any instructors would be willing to have a design competition as a component of one of their courses. Gritzmacher offered examples of logos from a number of other MPOs.

Gritzmacher said another recommended was to set public participation goals for each phase of the involvement process and attempt to reach higher levels of engagement based on the International Association for Public Participation’s Public Participation Spectrum. Schmidt said that she believed it was important to be sure that the MPO clearly articulates an outcome for public participation activities that clearly states the role of the public in the process. Gritzmacher agreed saying that “informing” can occur remotely, while engaging is best in person. Ahrens recommended utilizing technology to increase participation, specifically tablets and voting software. He said that Imagine Madison and the City of Madison Parks department have had good success engaging citizenry using these techniques.

Gritzmacher discussed a final major recommendation to find new ways to interact with difficult to reach stakeholder groups, such as low-income and minority populations. He said that having focus groups, workshops, or innovative technologies in tandem with advertising in neighborhoods may be more effective at reaching the groups than hosting involvement meetings near or in the neighborhoods.

Schaefer explained that no action was necessary at this time, but that the Board could follow up on recommendations at future meetings.
10. Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2018-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Golden, to approve the effort and schedule. Motion carried.


Schafer gave a presentation on the Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidelines for STBG Urban Projects. During the presentation Ahrens, King, and Schaefer engaged in a conversation regarding the effectiveness and fairness of the existing evaluation criteria. Schaefer explained that some factors were not included in the scoring criteria to allow the staff and board to use best judgment for project selection. Factors such as the availability of other funds for a project could be considered, but are not formally codified in the existing system. He said that bicycle and transit funding are a good example of this – both modes have dedicated funding programs outside of STBG.

Golden said that he served on the committee that created the evaluation criteria. He said that the reason different criteria were developed for each major type of project is that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to create all-encompassing criteria that fairly ranked projects across modes. He provided examples of the difficulty of comparing transit projects with roadway and bicycle projects. He explained that this split allows for other funding availability to be considered when selecting projects. Schaefer added that the new policies and process allows the board to award projects based on other factors, such as a community never having received STBG funding in the past.

Schmidt asked Schaefer for an assessment of the scoring system. Schaefer said that he believed it was working; however, it had only been used through one round of projects. Schmidt then asked if the system was effective at meeting equity goals. Schaefer said that that was difficult to assess because of the small amount of funding available to the program. He explained that roughly $7 million was available annually, and that only a limited number of projects could be funded. Schmidt added equity considerations may be limited by the kinds of projects that are submitted for funding. Schaefer agreed.

Golden made note of the policy that bicycle trail resurfacing could not be funded through STBG. He asked why this was the case. Schaefer said that the policy prioritized use of the limited amount of funding for construction of new facilities versus maintenance of facilities, which arguably should be a local responsibility. The same policy applied to Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) projects. Golden said that we fund roadway maintenance projects and therefore felt we should also fund bike path maintenance projects.

12. Report on City of Madison Resolution to Create a City Transportation Department and Establish a City Transportation Policy and Planning Board and City Transportation Commission

King said that the ordinance creating the City Transportation Department was going to be referred back to the ad hoc committee. Clear recommended referring the item to the next board meeting as a result.

13. Status Report on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB

Item deferred.

14. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schafer provided an update on the status of the Household Travel Mail Survey. He said that the second wave of surveys was just released and that responses were already coming back. He said that the survey should be completed by the end of June and that data should be available by the end of summer or early fall. Schaefer said that MPO staff has been analyzing AirSage origin-destination data. Staff found some inconsistencies in the data set and was working with the firm to address the issues. He said that MPO, Metro, and City Planning Staff continued to work on completing the Request for Proposals for the next phase of the
Bus Rapid Transit Study. Lastly, he said that MPO staff was gathering data for a low-stress bicycle network study as well for a bicycle and pedestrian crash study.

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Schaefer said that the next outreach meeting is scheduled to occur in Verona for the October board meeting. He explained that a variety of conflicts, including the MPO certification review, the Transportation Improvement Program public hearing, and holidays caused the meeting to be delayed.

The next meeting of the MPO Board is scheduled for Wednesday, July 5, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility, 119 E. Olin Avenue, Rooms A-B. Schaefer said it might be cancelled.

16. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by King, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:34 PM.