Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
March 6, 2013 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: Ken Dahl, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Paul Lawrence, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item 5), Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz (arrived during item 5), Chris Schmidt, Robin Schmidt

Members absent: Mark Clear

MPO Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

Others present in an official capacity: Chris Petykowski (City of Madison Engineering), Joe Kern (SRF Consulting)

2. Approval of February 6, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Dahl, to approve the February 6, 2013 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

- Letter from WisDOT approving Amendment 1 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Schaefer said he also received some e-mails related to item 6, the new MPO boundaries, but would mention those when that item was taken up.

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

None

5. Presentation on the Madison Area Transit Corridor (Bus Rapid Transit) Study (SRF Consulting Group)

[Note: A change in the order of the agenda was approved with item 7 being taken up before item 5]

Schaefer said that the study was wrapping up. The consultants presented the results of their analysis, including cost and ridership estimates, at two study committee meetings, including one earlier today. MPO staff were reviewing an initial draft report now and would provide the consultants with comments. A revised draft report would then be distributed to the committee for review prior to releasing it for public review. A public informational meeting was scheduled for Monday evening, April 15. He introduced Joe Kern, the project manager with SRF Consulting.

Kern provided a PowerPoint presentation on the study. The presentation included background information (study purpose, goals, process) and information, maps, and graphics showing the elements of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), specific design components of the proposed Madison area system, and results of the analysis, including travel times, capital and operating costs, ridership estimates, and how the system performed against the goals developed for the study. Kern said that based on BRT systems studied and implemented elsewhere in the country, there was good potential for successful implementation of BRT in the Madison area. Kern outlined some of the next steps, including further community engagement, addressing some of the detailed design issues for each corridor, consideration of BRT supportive policies, and working on funding options.

R. Schmidt asked how BRT systems in other areas were funded. Kern said typically some of the capital funding has come from the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) New Starts or Small Starts programs. The programs are competitive with systems competing nationwide. R. Schmidt asked if the systems had Regional Transit Authorities (RTAs) to provide local funding, and Kern said all or most did. In response to a question on Transit Signal Priority (TSP), Kern said that TSP was an important factor in keeping the buses on time and
improving travel times. The cost of TSP at the intersections where it was identified as having potential was part of the capital cost estimate. Gust asked if City of Madison Traffic Engineering staff were involved in the TSP analysis, and Kern said yes. He emphasized that further detailed analysis would be required before it was implemented. As part of the discussion of the runningway improvements assumed for the two different BRT alternatives, Kamp asked if there was a FTA guideline for the percent of a BRT corridor that had to be on a guideway or exclusive transit lane. Kern said at least 50% for the New Starts program. In response to a question from R. Schmidt about BRT travel times, Schaefer said some of the time savings in some corridors was from not having to wait at the transfer point. Kern added that TSP, fewer stops, and off-board fare collection were other features that speeded up the buses. In response to a question from Golden, it was clarified that travel times were strictly in-vehicle times. R. Schmidt asked if there was a difference in travel time between the fixed guideway and corridor BRT options. Kern said it was assumed the speed would be similar. R. Schmidt commented that park-and-ride options should be built into the BRT system, and Kern agreed. Dahl asked if other corridors were identified for future long-term expansion. Kern said some possible extensions were identified, but not studied. Dahl asked if special event and other non-work trips were considered. Kern said the main focus was on regular trips, but those trips would certainly help build the case in Madison due to the number of such events in the downtown/campus area. Golden mentioned some suggestions the committee made for revisions to the presentation. Kamp commented that Mayor Soglin had asked what it would take to double ridership. BRT is one of the things that would help the transit system move in that direction. It addresses complaints about overcrowding on buses and long travel times. Kamp added that all of Metro’s peer systems around the country are RTAs.

6. Resolution TPB No. 72 Approving the 2010 Urban Area and Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries for the Madison Urban Area

Schaefer reviewed a final proposed map of the MPO boundaries. He said no changes were proposed to the draft urban area boundary. He reviewed two expansions of the planning area proposed based on comments received from local staff. The first was on the Southwest side west and north of the Epic campus. The other was north of Waunakee, which the village has identified as a potential long-term growth area. Schaefer said with regard to the issue of including the Village of Oregon in the planning area, he had met with village staff and officials to discuss the issue. The village plan commission and board subsequently discussed it and the board voted to not be included in the planning area. Based on the fact that Oregon is not in the urban area boundary and the village’s preference was not to be included, staff was recommending not including Oregon in the MPO planning area.

Royce Williams, City of Madison, registered to speak. He said he felt the Village of Oregon should be included in the planning area. He said it didn’t make sense for Oregon to not be included in the urban area. It was only because the Census Bureau doesn’t consider commuting patterns and other similar factors.

Opitz suggested that all of the City of Fitchburg be included in the planning area boundary even if Oregon was excluded. Schaefer said the reason for using CTH M as the boundary was that the planning area was supposed to include areas planned for development and important regional roadways, but he said the boundary could be drawn along the city limits since it was such a small additional area.

R. Schmidt moved, Golden seconded, to approve the MPO boundaries as recommended by staff. King moved, Opitz seconded, to amend the motion to include the Oregon area in the planning area.

King said it made sense from a regional transportation planning perspective to include Oregon. Minihan agreed. R. Schmidt asked why the village didn’t want to be included in the MPO area, and Schaefer said he didn’t know for sure. Golden said he agreed that from a planning perspective it made sense to include Oregon, but felt that the board should respect the wishes of the village in this case. Kamp agreed with Golden. Opitz said more than one half of Oregon residents commute into Madison. Schaefer noted that the same issue occurred with the Village of DeForest after the 2000 Census and it was decided to not include the village at that time. Schaefer suggested the board could delay action until next month in order allow for further
discussion with village staff and officials. Gust suggested sending a letter inviting village representatives to
the next meeting and indicating the board’s preference to include the village for planning purposes.

Golden moved, Opitz seconded, to table the item and direct staff to send a letter to the village expressing the
desirability from a transportation planning perspective of including Oregon in the planning area and inviting
Oregon officials to the next meeting to discuss the issue. Motion carried.

7. Resolution TPB No. 73 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement
Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer said the amendment contained mostly minor schedule, cost/funding, and/or scope changes to some
WisDOT projects. However, it also included a revision to the Mineral Point Road/CTH S (Junction/CTH M)
intersection area reconstruction and expansion project increasing the amount of Federal STP-Urban funding
for the estimated $19 million project by $5 million. He said the WisDOT Local Program Manager had
contacted him the previous week and said a unique situation had arisen and additional Federal funding was
available for the project and the funding would not count against the MPO’s normal allocation. Several
projects around the state with STP funding were delayed late in the fiscal year. WisDOT was therefore
looking for projects that would be let in the next few weeks so the money could be obligated by the end of
this state fiscal year ending June 31. Schaefer said he checked to make sure the MPO’s TIP amendment
procedures allowed the project revision to be handled as a minor amendment without a 30-day
notice/comment period and public hearing. The procedures did allow this because the project scope wasn’t
being changed and the additional funding did not affect the schedule or funding for other STP-Urban projects.
The other STP-Urban project scheduled for construction this year is the final phase of the Monona Drive
reconstruction. However, the additional funding couldn’t be applied to this project because it had already been
let. Schaefer said he contacted City of Monona staff to explain the situation. He reviewed the other project
changes included in the amendment, which included adding ITS equipment to projects on the Beltline and
Interstate and revising the Madison Area School District’s continuing Safe Routes to School project to show
that it now had programmed funding.

King asked if the additional funding would affect the timetable for the project, and Schaefer said no. It was
scheduled for letting in April. Golden asked who the beneficiary of this additional funding would be. Schaefer
said primarily the City of Madison as the city is the project sponsor and is providing most of the local share
funding, but the city needed to work out with the county if this would affect the county’s share of funding
based on the county’s cost sharing policy. Petykowski with the city’s engineering department added that land
owners being assessed for part of the local share cost would also benefit. He said the city and county were still
working out the details of the cost sharing agreement. Gust added that the project funding agreement with
WiSDOT was changed to an 80/20 cap so that if the let cost came in less than the estimate the local share
would be further decreased. With the new funding, 68% was covered with federal dollars.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Golden, to approve Resolution TPB No. 73 Approving Amendment #2 to
the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County.
Motion carried.


Schaefer said a notice regarding the availability of the draft Transit Development Plan (TDP) was sent out to
a large list of persons, committees, and organizations. The TDP was going through the City of Madison
approval process now. Presentations had been made to the city’s Long-Range Transportation Planning
Committee and the Common Council and it was on the agenda of the Transit & Parking Commission (TPC)
for next week. The presentation had been received favorably. Schaefer said the TDP would likely be on the
MPO Board agenda for action at the next meeting. Golden added the TDP would also be on the agenda for the
Contracted Services Oversight Subcommittee of the TPC.
9. **Brief Update on the Madison Area TPB Federal Planning Funding Allocation for 2014**

Schaefer reported that all MPOs in the state would be receiving a significant increase in Federal Planning funds in 2014. FHWA and WisDOT are working with the MPOs now to review and revise the formula for allocation of funding to the different MPOs so it is uncertain at this time how much additional funding we might receive. However, that will be worked out over the next few months. The additional funding will free up the STP-Urban funding that is now used to support the planning program and probably the funding we receive from Metro Transit as well. Schaefer said he would keep the board updated on the issue.

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

Schaefer said WisDOT SW Region staff would be making a presentation at the next meeting on the Stoughton Road study. A public information meeting on the different improvement alternatives and traffic operations analysis results was scheduled for March 19 at LaFollette High School. Gust added that the alternatives included some new innovative design concepts. Gust also said that a kickoff meeting on the Beltline study would be scheduled soon. Schaefer said there wasn’t anything new to report on the other major WisDOT studies.

11. **Discussion of Future Work Items**

Royce Williams, Madison, commented that the City of Madison had approved the next phase of the Judge Doyle Square study, which would be looking at intercity bus terminal sites. He wanted that to be added to the list. Schaefer said the MPO would follow and participate in that planning effort, but this item was for projects led by the MPO. Golden asked if the terminal would be competitive for MPO funding and Schaefer said he wasn’t sure.

Schaefer said survey work counting passenger loads was being conducted this week for the Metro bus size study. Work on the public participation plan update had thus far focused on revisions to the TIP amendment procedures. Two items not listed were consideration of changes to the MPO Board and technical committee structures following approval of the new MPO boundaries and the update of the roadway functional classification system.

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

Schaefer said that the May meeting would be in Verona. Verona staff preferred the meeting be at city hall, but there would be a presentation on Epic growth plans and related transportation issues. An Epic tour could be arranged, but would need to be scheduled for the Saturday before or after the meeting. A majority of board members expressed interest in the tour so Schaefer said he would try to schedule that. Schaefer also announced that some board members’ terms were up on April 30 and he would be contacting the appointing authorities in early April.

Golden asked that updated commute maps be sent out to board members, and Schaefer said he’d do that.

The next meeting will be held April 3, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

13. **Adjournment**

Moved by King, seconded by Lawrence, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:10 PM.