1. Roll Call

Members present: David Ahrens (arrived during item #3), Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz (arrived during item #7), Robin Schmidt, Patrick Stern

Members absent: Mark Clear, Paul Lawrence, Jerry Mandli, Chris Schmidt

MPO Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

2. Approval of February 4, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Minihan, seconded by Stern, to approve the February 4, 2015 meeting minutes. Motion carried with Kamp and King abstaining.

3. Communications

- Letter from WisDOT approving TIP Amendment No. 1 for the Stoughton Road resurfacing project.

Schaefer also reported that the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission was awarded the APA Healthy Communities grant, though for a little less money than was requested. As part of that project, MPO staff will be working with CARPC and other grant partners to refine the Active Living Places index. Grant activities also include outreach/education activities related to this tool.

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

None


Schaefer said the draft map was sent out for review and comment from local officials. Tom Wilson sent a note saying the Westport Town Board did not have an objection to including the additional area in the County Highway K corridor as part of the urban area. MPO staff also corresponded with City of Fitchburg staff and met with City of Madison staff. Based on the meeting with Madison staff one change is being proposed to classify the segment of Pflaum Road between Vondron and Stoughton Road as a minor arterial. He noted that both Fitchburg and Madison planned to maintain their own maps with some differences because the maps are referenced in their subdivision regulations and used for other purposes.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Golden, to approve Resolution TPB No. 101. Motion carried.

6. Resolution TPB No. 102 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program

Schaefer explained that WisDOT and the Federal Highway Administration are now requiring MPOs that are carrying over funding and associated work activities to the following year to approve an amendment to their work programs to reflect the continuation of work activities. In the future, such amendments would be done prior to the end of the year rather than retroactively as in this case. Schaefer said the carryover funding being requested ($170,000) will actually be a little less than the amount shown in the attached budget table. Most of it is for completion of the ITS Plan.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Kamp, to approve Amendment #2 to the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program. Motion carried.
7. **Letter of Support for the State Smart Transportation Initiative’s Pursuit of Grant Funding for Project to Develop Measures to Assess Equity in Transportation System Investments**

Schaefer said the State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI) is housed at UW-Madison and provides technical assistance, primarily to state departments of transportation. SSTI staff recently met with City of Madison and MPO staff about a project idea for which they plan to seek grant funding. The project is to develop measures for equity in transportation investments. SSTI would like to work with the City of Madison and the MPO on the project, if funded, and is seeking a letter of support. The goal is to develop a tool that could then be used by other regions. Schaefer said incorporating equity into its plans and programs is an MPO goal, however it is complicated and there aren’t many good analysis tools available. He said he thought the MPO would benefit from the project if it was funded. He referred to the materials in the packet that provide a little more information on the project. He said a draft letter of support was in the packet. It added it could be signed by Matano as the board chair.

R. Schmidt commented that she thought it would be better for the letter to be signed by the MPO chair. She asked how the MPO would use the information. Schaefer said the idea is to measure multi-modal accessibility to various destinations for different population groups. The MPO could measure existing conditions and the impact of its plans. The tool could also potentially be used to measure the impact of specific projects and incorporated into the project scoring of applications the MPO does. Gust added that the tool could lead to a change in the way projects are scored in terms of the equity criterion. Golden agreed with that, noting the scoring for equity now is more subjective. He also said that based on the assessment of current conditions certain projects could be prioritized for funding in a particular program cycle. Kamp said Metro and other transportation providers could also benefit from the tool to quantify equity issues. He asked if there were examples of where this has been implemented successfully. Schaefer said there aren’t any comprehensive multi-modal examples, but the Twin Cities MPO developed a tool focused on transit accessibility.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Golden, to approve the letter of support for the SSTI grant project, but with Board Chair Matano as the signatory. Motion carried.

8. **Presentation on the Draft Bicycle Transportation Plan Recommendations**

Schaefer said MPO staff recently met with the plan advisory committees to review draft recommendations and the draft facility plan maps. Changes were made in response to the comments received. Staff is now getting ready to initiate more extensive public outreach on the plan.

Golden asked how the MPO’s bicycle plan related to local bicycle plans. Schaefer said the MPO plan obviously governs in terms of federal funding. To the extent consistent with MPO policies, the MPO plan attempts to incorporate facility recommendations in local plans. The MPO plan attempts to stitch the local plans together and supplement them to the extent feasible. Golden asked if the plan was “leading or following,” and Matano and Schaefer said both. Schaefer said that in terms of policies, design guidelines, etc., the plan was “leading” and also adding new or revised facility plan recommendations based on those guidelines. Cechvala added the plan also prioritizes projects for funding from a regional standpoint. Schaefer added the facility planning is an iterative process. Recommendations from local plans completed later will be incorporated into future MPO plans. The MPO can support those local planning efforts.

Cechvala provided a presentation, reviewing the planning process, vision and goals, and highlighting some of the more significant recommendations related to the seven “Es” (education, encouragement, engineering, etc.).

There was a discussion about the effort the MPO is assisting with for the county and multiple communities to apply for bike friendly status. There was also discussion about the provision of wide paved shoulders for bicyclists in rural areas. R. Schmidt commented on the county policy on shoulder paving. She said sometimes it is not done due to costs because of needed right of way, grading, etc. Gust said the state law (TRANS 75) requires ped/bike accommodations for projects with federal or state funding with limited exceptions, although that has been proposed for repeal in the Governor’s budget bill. Golden asked that the issue of chip sealing
roads be addressed in the plan. Cechvala noted WisDOT has a rural bicycle facilities guide that provides some guidelines on paved shoulders for bicyclists. Ahrens expressed a general concern about the cost of implementing some of the recommendations given finite budgets. Discussion ensued about this. R. Schmidt said the recommendations could justify pursuit of additional funding. Matano said it is a bicycle plan with recommendations to be implemented over time as budgets permit. Golden agreed and said projects are prioritized as part of the annual budgeting process.

Cechvala presented the priority path projects. Golden asked why on-street facilities weren’t included. Schaefer said those are shown as needs but not prioritized because those are typically done as part of street reconstruction projects and depend upon that schedule. Golden asked about prioritizing small projects. Schaefer said the MPO is prioritizing projects from a regional standpoint for regional funding. Smaller projects are prioritized by local communities and funded through the local budget process. Golden said that should be explicit in the plan. Discussion followed about the recommendation to develop an interconnected bike network to provide alternatives to high-volume, high-speed arterial streets and how that would be accomplished. Schaefer said the parallel route could be a local street, perhaps with some bike priority treatment. Opitz suggested the facilities plan map include high priority local street connections. Schaefer said the functional class map, which wasn’t in the packet, is intended to highlight those as high priority routes. Opitz also suggested the map show programmed on-street facilities as well as paths, and Schaefer agreed that was a good idea.

Cechvala reviewed the next steps, including planned outreach activities. He said staff would utilize events such as the Fitchburg bike hub grand opening to get the word out about the plan. In response to a question from Golden, Schaefer said the MPO would attempt to coordinate outreach activities with the City of Madison’s transportation plan. He said the MPO could mention and provide a link to the city plan on its website to reduce confusion. Cechvala noted MPO and city staff have been working closely together to ensure consistency between the plans. Schaefer said staff was seeking approval from the board to initiate public outreach by posting the draft recommendations on the MPO website.

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Golden to move forward with the public participation plan outlined for the draft Bicycle Transportation Plan, with the stipulation that MPO staff work with City of Madison staff to coordinate efforts. Motion carried.

9. **Letter of Support for Additional Funding in 2016 for the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission to Allow Completion of an Update to its Land Use Plan**

Schaefer said the item was requested by Golden. Golden provided some background information. He said the last regional land use plan was the Vision 2020 plan completed in 1997. It was the only time a combined land use and transportation plan had been done. He said he asked that the item be on the agenda because the county only provided enough money to CARPC this year to do a values survey, not initiate a process to update the land use plan, and that was only because the City of Madison appropriated $60,000 in one-time funding for the survey. He said he realized there are competing priorities for funds, but he wanted the MPO to express to the county the importance of linking land use and transportation planning and urge the county to try to find the one-time funding necessary to conduct such a planning effort. Minihan agreed with Golden.

R. Schmidt understood and supported the desire to link transportation and land use planning, but said there were some fundamental issues/concerns that some members of the county board have with CARPC. She said she needed more information before she could support sending the letter as written. She said she could support a letter simply expressing the MPO’s desire to better link the activities, but was concerned about requesting funding for CARPC. Matano commented that the letter doesn’t mention the funding amount and the county also provides significant funding for CARPC. He expressed some concern about the responsiveness of CARPC. He said he had heard complaints that CARPC hadn’t made adequate process on completing future urban development analysis (FUDA) plans.
Golden said the funding would be for the plan, not CARPC, and he thought it was preferable not to mention a specific funding amount. It would be a multi-year effort and even limited funding was better than none. He said he didn’t think CARPC was unresponsive, but that CARPC was a creature of its membership of the county and all municipalities in the county. He noted it was unfortunate that the past state budget bill put CARPC under the levy limit. Stern said he was supportive of integrated planning, but thought it would be better to have one agency do both. He said the issue was complicated and said it was up to the county whether to provide funding to CARPC for the plan. Opitz said CARPC prepared a successful FUDA plan for the Middleton/Westport/Waunakee area. Schaefer added that one was done for Stoughton and DeForest, and work was begun on a plan for Sun Prairie and East Madison. Opitz said nothing could be done at this point about the splitting of the land use and transportation planning functions between two agencies. He said he was receptive to the idea of sending a letter, but open to changes to make sure it sets the right tone.

R. Schmidt suggested removing the reference to county funding, but simply saying the MPO supports an integrated land use and transportation plan, and recognizes that there may be obstacles to doing this but hopes the county will support these efforts.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Opitz, to approve the letter of support for CARPC funding.

Discussion followed on whom to send the letter to and potential edits to the last paragraph requesting funding. No action was taken on this motion.

Moved by Golden, seconded by R. Schmidt, to defer this item until the April meeting. Motion carried.

10. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB

Schaefer noted that WisDOT was working to coordinate planning on the Stoughton Road study with the Beltline/Interstate interchange area study. Work on the Beltline study is now focused on analyzing the impact of local roadway improvements within the Beltline corridor. The EIS phase of the Interstate study is just getting started with a joint policy/technical committee meeting scheduled in the next couple of weeks. He said there was an open house tomorrow night on the Interstate project (Beltline to county line), and he’d forward a link to any materials made available from that meeting to board members.

Opitz asked if it would be appropriate to include the State Highway 19 study that WisDOT is working on to the list of studies. He said there was a recent meeting in Waunakee. Gust said it would be appropriate, but noted it is only a corridor preservation study. Gust mentioned the other similar studies, the Highway 12 freeway conversion study and the STH 138 corridor preservation study. Schaefer said he’d add an item for other WisDOT studies.

11. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer reported that the STP-Urban program policies and project scoring criteria work group met to review the roadway project criteria. Staff was in the process of making changes based on the comments and another meeting was scheduled to review the revised draft and other project criteria. The item will be on the board’s next meeting agenda for an update with action at the May or June meeting. The consultants for the Metro on board survey completed the initial on-to-off count survey. This will be used to expand the full survey sample up to the complete system ridership. The full survey started today and will hopefully be completed before UW’s spring break. An update on regional ITS plan will be provided next month. Finally, the county issued the RFP for the Dane County Bicycle Wayfinding Plan, and proposals are due later this month.

12. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

After brief discussion board members agreed to keep the 6:30 starting time for meetings. Schaefer also mentioned the email he sent to members regarding the plan for the MPO e-newsletter. He said he had not heard from anyone regarding concerns so staff was planning to move forward.
The next meeting will be held Wednesday, April 1, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

13. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by R. Schmidt to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM.