

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
May 5, 2010 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: Paul Skidmore, Robin Schmidt, Al Matano, Steve King, Joe Chase, Chuck Kamp, Chris Schmidt, Duane Hinz, Eileen Bruskevitz, Jerry Mandli (arrived at item #3), John Vesperman (arrived at item #3), Mark Clear (arrived at item #5), Mark Opitz (arrived at item #5)

Members absent: None

Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

2. Approval of March 3, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Skidmore, seconded by Bruskevitz, to approve March meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

Schaefer said the following three communications were in the packet:

- Letter to the MPO Board from Connie Roderick who resides in a neighborhood adjacent to Verona Road urging further investigation of the “south reliever” as an alternative to the Verona Road project. Attachments included information on studies related to the health impacts from motor vehicle traffic and a previous letter written to Larry Barta, the WisDOT SW Region project manager.
- Letter to WisDOT copied to MPO from Martha Cristensen urging consideration of a bypass as an alternative to the Verona Road project.
- Email from JoAnn Tiedemann suggesting that the MMSD’s administration building on Dayton Street be considered as a potential location for the intercity passenger rail terminal.

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

None

5. Presentation by FHWA Staff on Findings and Recommendations of the 2009 Planning Certification Review of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process for the Madison Area TPB

Schaefer said that a copy of the planning certification review report was at members’ places. Dave Jolicoeur with the Federal Highway Administration provided some background information and reviewed the report. He said that as part of the process U.S. DOT staff met with MPO staff and staff of other agencies partners such as WisDOT and Metro Transit last summer. A brief presentation to the Board was made at that time on the purpose of the certification review. The first task was to review the findings from the previous report. For Madison, the items identified in the 2005 report have been largely addressed. The major item was the corrective action related to the MPO Policy Board structure. The recommendations have all been addressed with perhaps the exception of the Congestion Management System as it was known then. SAFETEA-LU, the current federal transportation legislation, placed additional emphasis on congestion management and changed the name to Congestion Management Process to reflect the iterative nature of the planning process. With respect to the findings of the current review, four commendations have been issued in the report noting exemplary practices of the MPO and its planning partners. The first is to WisDOT SW Region for their presentations to the MPO Policy Board and Technical Coordinating Committee on major corridor studies and projects. The other three are for the MPO. The first one is for going beyond the traditional MPO role with their efforts to provide analyses of the traffic impacts of proposed neighborhood development plans for local communities in the metropolitan area. The second is for the effort in

compiling and considering environmental impacts of the regional transportation plan and presenting that information visually to the decision makers and public. The third one is for the MPO's support and active participation in the efforts of the Clean Air Coalition to improve air quality for residents of Dane County. Jolicoeur then reviewed the recommendations for continuing quality improvements and enhancements in the planning process. Among them was a recommendation for the MPO to conduct and document an evaluation of the agency's public outreach techniques and changes to the public participation plan as a result of the evaluation. One corrective action was issued for the Congestion Management Process. The Madison MPO has a process, but the key missing component is a process for the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of implemented strategies, including providing the results of that evaluation to the decision makers and to the public. MPO staff has already begun work to enhance this process to bring it into compliance. The deadline for addressing this corrective action is December 31, 2011 and FHWA staff is confident the MPO will be able to have the enhanced process in place by then. Overall, Jolicoeur said U.S. DOT staff was very satisfied with the quality of work by both staff and the policy board. He said he wanted to recognize MPO staff again for the professionalism, cooperation, and courtesy they extended to U.S. DOT staff during the review activities.

Kamp asked if U.S. DOT staff had any information from conducting certification reviews on how RTAs get integrated into the MPO planning process. Jolicoeur said FHWA staff didn't, but perhaps FTA staff did because they are more regional. Schaefer offered to send an email to Bill Wheeler with FTA's Chicago office regarding this issue. Kamp asked if a community's efforts at implementing transit pass programs is something that is considered as part of the congestion management process. Jolicoeur said that is a potential strategy and one of things perhaps missing is feedback on its effectiveness. Kamp asked if Madison's transit system performance is compared to other communities. Jolicoeur responded that U.S. DOT staff is focused on the process of identifying and evaluating the effectiveness of strategies such as transit pass programs. Schaefer added that MPO staff planned to look at individual corridors and identify appropriate strategies for each and what agency is responsible for implementing them. Some strategies such as this and other TDM programs apply area-wide. The evaluation process will be difficult because there are so many factors influencing traffic and congestion. He said that even though the CMP requirement applies to all MPOs in areas over 200,000 in population it is geared more to the very large metropolitan areas. The Madison MPO doesn't have engineering expertise on staff and will be relying on assistance from staff of partner agencies to meet this requirement. The MPO will play more of a coordinating role and plans to set up a technical committee to guide the process. Hopefully, the end result will be an improvement to the transportation planning process.

R. Schmidt commented that it was difficult to listen to the presentation while reading the report. Schaefer said he could put it on the agenda for the next meeting for discussion after members have had time to read the report. R. Schmidt asked about the process for discussing and developing a procedure for responding to the recommendations in the report. Schaefer said staff would be addressing the recommendations over time and using the report in developing the work program activities. In response to Schmidt's request, Schaefer said he would put together a summary of the recommendations and how and when staff planned to respond to them. He also said that the congestion management process work would be guided by a subcommittee of the technical committee and presented to the MPO Board after first reviewing with the technical committee.

6. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 38 Regarding Amendment #3 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer said the amendment was for maintenance work on three segments of the Interstate from CTH B north to CTH V. For the first segment from CTH B to Lien Road the resurfacing was already programmed, but the scope was changed to add paving of the shoulders and some storm water facility work. It was programmed for construction in 2013. The resurfacing for the other segments was not yet programmed, but the amendment was needed to allow design work to start. Matano asked about the

reconstruction and expansion project for the Interstate. Vesperman said WisDOT was completing the environmental study now. After that was done, the project would need to be enumerated by the State Projects Commission and then funding obtained. The resurfacing is needed until the reconstruction project is done sometime in the future.

Moved by Bruskwitz, seconded by R. Schmidt, to approve Resolution TPB No. 38, Amendment #3 to the 2010-2014 TIP. Motion carried.

7. Discussion and Potential Consideration of Comments on the Milwaukee-Madison High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project and Potential Madison Station Location(s)

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Avenue, Madison registered to speak. He said his group Pro Rail had been working to get rail service back to Madison for 25 years. He said the MPO should be involved in the discussions on the Madison station location decision, not just the Governor and WisDOT. It is a regional versus commuter service and many will be coming from outside Madison. He said it wasn't clear if there was a commitment to make the rail station an intermodal station. The downtown stations would be very expensive and a decision shouldn't be made until the total costs and cost to the city are known. He suggested the Board not approve the funding for construction of the station before this information is available. Schaefer clarified that the TIP amendment for the project would not be adding the construction funding. That would be added as part of the 2011-2015 TIP.

Schaefer noted there have been a number of newspaper articles on the project. Included in the meeting packet was a City of Madison resolution that listed the criteria the city thought should be used to select the station location and based on the criteria indicating the airport was least desired. The packet also included a letter of comment from Downtown Madison, Inc. also favoring a non-airport location. Schaefer said the MPO's long-range regional transportation plan recommends implementing intercity passenger rail service and recommends continuing to pursue a downtown station site in addition to one at the airport. Schaefer said he had been attempting to get information from WisDOT on the process for deciding on the station location without success. WisDOT staff has been continuing to meet with Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) staff to work out all of the details regarding project management, etc. so the federal funding can be released and the engineering design work started for the rail corridor infrastructure improvements and stations. WisDOT staff said they hoped that the agreement with FRA would be completed soon. WisDOT also said a decision on the Madison station would be made soon, but wouldn't provide information on what decision would be made. WisDOT also said they had been coordinating with the City of Madison. More details will be provided by WisDOT staff at the Board's June meeting when a public hearing will be held on a TIP amendment for the project to add funding for the engineering design work and some initial rail infrastructure improvements this year. He said the Board may want to provide some comments to WisDOT on the Madison station location now rather than waiting until the June meeting. He said the information isn't available to comment on what is the best station location. There are feasibility and cost issues with all three non-airport locations. Some analysis on station locations was done as part of the environmental assessment approved back in 2004, but he said he thought further analysis of the different locations would be part of the process this year. Discussion followed. It was noted the Board could comment that all of the impacts of the various station locations should be considered. Schaefer said the Board could comment on the criteria like the City of Madison did.

C. Schmidt moved, King seconded, to express support for City of Madison Resolution #17784 and the DMI letter.

R. Schmidt commented that she thought it was more appropriate for the MPO as a regional body to encourage WisDOT to coordinate with the MPO on the station location. It was suggested this request should be in addition to endorsing the City of Madison comments. Mandli commented that the resolution was much more specific than the Board needed to be. Schaefer suggested just referring to criteria and not the resolution. He also noted that the resolution was modified at the council meetings with two Be It Resolved clauses added and the minutes with that language was at members' places. Matano commented on the additional travel to downtown and the time required with the Monona

Terrace and Kohl Center stations versus the Yahara Station. R. Schmidt suggested utilizing some of the language from the city resolution with some editing with the key part stating that “the MPO strongly urges WisDOT to coordinate the station site selection with elected officials and the MPO Policy Board to leverage local knowledge and expertise to create the most successful station possible.” Schaefer clarified that the MPO would be sending comments, not passing a resolution. Kamp clarified with R. Schmidt that the language about the station criteria would not be included. R. Schmidt said she thought that was too specific without the Board having an opportunity to thoroughly discuss the issue. Asked if the point about an intermodal station was included, R. Schmidt she would support including it. Schaefer said he would send an email to the Board with language to review before sending out the letter. R. Schmidt reviewed her suggested language with the edit to the fourth Whereas clause in the city resolution.

It was agreed that R. Schmidt’s suggested comments was a friendly amendment to the original motion by C. Schmidt. Motion carried for staff to draft a letter of comment reflecting the Board discussion.

[Ed. Note: Following the press conference by the Governor the next day announcing that Monona Terrace was chosen as the station location, Schaefer and Board Chair Matano agreed that sending out the letter of comment was pointless.]

8. Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA) and Discussion of the MPO’s Role in Assisting the RTA in Implementing its Goals

Schaefer said he put the agenda and materials for the second RTA Board in the meeting packet. At the meeting, the RTA Board created two committees. The first one is for developing bylaws and operating rules and procedures and the second is for developing a plan for transit services. MPO staff provided a presentation to the RTA Board on the MPO and its responsibilities, in particular its transit planning responsibilities as they relate to Metro Transit. A copy of the presentation is at members’ places. Schaefer said the MPO’s relationship with the new RTA would be similar to the current relationship with Metro if RTA takes over as the major transit provider. It would be different if the RTA becomes just a funding agency. In either case, it would likely be spelled out in a planning agreement similar to the one the MPO has now with Metro Transit and WisDOT. The MPO will always have the responsibility of preparing the long-range transportation plan with a transit element. The MPO also now has lead responsibility for the transit development plan, but that could change in the future.

Bruskewitz suggested the MPO recommend to the RTA’s bylaws committee that something about the relationship with the MPO be included in their bylaws to formalize it. Opitz, who is on the RTA Board, said he thought that was a good suggestion. He said the members of the committees are in the process of being appointed. He complimented Schaefer on the power point presentation he gave to the RTA Board. Bruskewitz also suggested that the RTA note in its meeting notices that a quorum of the MPO Board might be present.

9. Review and Discussion of Draft Outline of Enhanced Congestion Management Process for the Madison Metropolitan Area

Schaefer said MPO staff was in the early stages of working on the enhanced congestion management process and had been gathering data and researching what other MPOs had done. The outline in the meeting packet was put together to summarize the federal requirements and the initial thoughts of staff on the approach that would be taken to meet them. It identifies the network that will be analyzed and performance measures that will be used for both reoccurring and non-reoccurring congestion. For the latter, crash data will be analyzed. Level of service measures for transit and pedestrians and bicyclists will also be used, reflecting a multi-modal approach. The outline lists the various strategies that will be considered, which are outlined in the long-range transportation plan. An analysis will be done of each congested corridor to identify the most appropriate strategies. All of the data and analysis from recent and ongoing state highway corridor studies will be incorporated. For local streets, the approach is more reactive in terms of operational issues. Hopefully, this process will allow a more proactive approach.

The last piece is the monitoring and evaluation of strategies that have been implemented. Schaefer said many of the details still need to be worked out, but it would be done through a cooperative process with the MPO's partner agencies.

Vesperman noted that WisDOT had conducted an analysis of the ramp meters on the Beltline. R. Schmidt asked how this work would be coordinated with the RTA's work in developing transit solutions for the region. Schaefer said this process highlights the congested corridors and transit and ped/bike improvements are one strategy for managing that congestion, especially for those corridors where a vehicle capacity expansion is not feasible. R. Schmidt suggested briefing the RTA on the congestion management process as the work proceeds and making sure there was good communication between the agencies. Kamp mentioned other plans that could be referenced such as Metro's Ad Hoc Long-Range Transit Planning Committee report.

10. Status Report on Efforts to Locate an Interim Intercity Bus Station in the City of Madison for Greyhound Bus Company

Schaefer said this was an issue that the MPO couldn't have much impact on, but it was of interest and he asked Kamp to provide a report. Kamp said Greyhound Bus Co. is temporarily using Huxley Street by the North Transfer Point for passenger pick up and drop off. Greyhound is continuing to look for a permanent site with office space for ticketing, packaging, and restroom facilities. The company is working with the city on that. He noted there is a need to look at how the City of Madison handles intercity busses.

11. Status Report on MPO Policy Board Appointments

Schaefer reported that Mark Clear, Chris Schmidt, and Paul Skidmore were all reappointed by Madison Mayor Cieslewicz. There are three nominees for one appointment by the cities and villages. They are Steve Arnold, a City of Fitchburg Alder; Ross Scovotti, a City of Stoughton Alder; and Steve Ritt, a City of Verona Alder. Schaefer said it was first thought that Mark Opitz would need to step down from the MPO Board because he is no longer an elected official. However, in discussing it with FHWA staff it was agreed that his transit, pedestrian/bicycle, and city airport planning responsibilities qualified him to continue to serve at least for the remainder of his term as someone "administering a major mode of transportation." There are two nominees for the towns' appointment. Eileen Bruskevitz has been nominated for re-appointment again and Don Lund, a member of the Town of Pleasant Springs Board, has also been nominated. Schaefer said he hadn't heard from County Executive Falk or her staff yet. Al Matano and Robin Schmidt's appointments are up.

Clear asked about the appointment process for the city and village appointments. Schaefer said it is by majority vote of the chief elected officials of those communities. The process is done via mail and email, first getting nominations and then sending out an email with information on the nominees asking for the officials to vote.

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

Matano asked Vice-Chair R. Schmidt to lead discussion on this item. Schaefer pointed out that a memo from Brad Murphy, who was out of town and couldn't make the meeting, was at members' places. The memo says that the first round of interviews is scheduled for this Thursday and Friday and it indicates who is on the interview panel and that there would likely be a final round of interviews with the top candidates.

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Avenue, Madison, registered to comment. He expressed his concern again about the hiring process. He said he thought the MPO Board had the authority to hire the MPO Director. He suggested that the Board send a letter to Madison Mayor Cieslewicz telling him that the MPO should have final approval of the new Director. He also suggested the MPO Board create bylaws that address this issue for the future.

Skidmore asked Schaefer about the Board's hiring authority. He mentioned that he sits on the 911 Center Board. The County Executive viewed the Center Board as only advisory and the County Court ruled otherwise. Schaefer said the MPO re-designation agreement simply says that the City of Madison will provide staff services to the MPO. Federal law and the metropolitan planning regulations do not address this issue. Schaefer said that as Bob McDonald explained at a prior meeting there is a dual responsibility with respect to hiring the Director and the budget. The MPO Board sets policy and approves the work program, but the City of Madison is the fiscal and administrative agent for the MPO and provides the staff. Skidmore asked if there was a contract between the MPO and the city. Schaefer said no, that the city agreed to provide staff services when the MPO agreement was signed. Schaefer said he didn't know whether adoption of bylaws by the MPO would carry any weight. It would need to be addressed as part of an agreement with the city. Bruskewitz said she recalled that MPOs were organized differently around the state and asked about the MPO's bylaws. Schaefer said the MPO has operating rules and procedures, but doesn't really have bylaws. Schaefer said he did a quick Internet search of MPOs around the country and most don't have bylaws. The one MPO that did have bylaws was staffed by the city and its bylaws did not address the Director hiring process. Bruskewitz asked about the funding of the MPO and noted that the county and other communities contribute to the local share funding. Schaefer said the county contracts with the MPO for specialized transportation services so that is different. Some communities voluntarily contribute, but the City of Madison is responsible for providing the local match funding. Bruskewitz said the MPO has to claim its role or place and there are different methods to do that, but perhaps now is the time. Skidmore asked staff to provide information on the MPO's authority and rules at the next meeting. He mentioned possibly seeking assistance from the City Attorney. Kamp asked for information on how the funding for the MPO breaks out between federal, state, and local funding and how the local funding breaks out. Kamp commented that he was glad Royce raised the issue, but he was comfortable that there are two Board members on the interview panel for the Director position. He said it might make sense to appoint a subgroup of the Board to look at the issues comprehensively in terms funding, governance structure, and staff support.

Hinz said he was asked to participate on the interview panel primarily because of his education, experience, and past employment with the City of Madison Planning Department and Transportation Department as Parking Manager and secondarily because he was on the MPO Board. He said he was not representing the MPO per se. Matano said he recently spoke with Ken Golden, who was the former Chair of the MPO, about the hiring process and Golden was somewhat horrified that Matano as Chair was not involved at all in the process. Golden thought it was ironic that the re-designation was done to ensure adequate representation by all units of government, yet the hiring process was being done as if the MPO was a city agency. Matano said it makes sense for the City to provide the human resources function, but he thought the Board would have directed the process after that. Perhaps that can be rectified for the future. Schmidt said he had worked early on try to make sure the MPO had a voice in the process. When he discussed with Brad Murphy the makeup of the interview panel, Murphy presented it to him that Hinz and Opitz were representing the MPO. Schmidt and Skidmore commented that the MPO didn't have any power with regard to hiring and funding unless provided by the City. Skidmore said he thought Matano should have been on the interview panel. He said the MPO needed to figure out what its authority was. He always thought the MPO was an independent body. Opitz said the discussion has been good and the Board should discuss its role, procedures, bylaws, etc. at the next meeting. Opitz said he was asked to serve on the interview panel primarily because of his position as a staff planner with a non-Madison community. Murphy said he wanted to get different perspectives represented. Opitz said he also had other perspectives as well as an MPO and RTA Board member. He said the panel was a good one and would help ensure a fair process for ranking the candidates even though he also thought Matano should be on it. Skidmore said he wanted to emphasize that his comments are related to the process and that he has a great deal of respect for the Board and the staff. King commented that the objective was to obtain the best, most qualified Transportation Planning Manager to serve the Board. The Board is a policy body, not a technical body, and there shouldn't be a policy test for the manager. The objective was to get the right person and he thought Murphy had selected four people who are excellently qualified to evaluate the candidates and assist in selecting the

person to be hired to provide staff services to the Board. The Board can address the process later for the future. He said that while Hinz and Opitz are not representing the Board per se, they will help ensure the Board gets the best candidate.

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**

Vesperman said WisDOT was in the process of trying to finalize the planning study and the recommendations.

- **USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)**

Vesperman said WisDOT was doing some survey work and finishing up the environmental documentation.

- **North Mendota Parkway Study**

Schaefer asked Opitz to report on the county resolution he had introduced before leaving the Board. Opitz said the resolution endorses the work of the North Mendota Parkway Implementation Oversight Committee. The committee made recommendations to with respect to mapping of a transportation corridor and an environmental or E-way. The resolution endorses these recommendations with one minor modification that has been agreed to by all of the communities involved. It also asks WisDOT to assist with additional study of the western portion of the corridor and where it would intersect U.S. Highway 12. The resolution has been recommended for approval by three committees, including Public Works and Transportation, and is on the Board's agenda for the following night. Cranes, a coalition of environmental organizations, has expressed some concerns and asked for re-referral of the resolution for consideration of some changes. Bruskevitz commented that she hoped her colleagues on the Board would support it.

14. Discussion of Future Work Items:

- **2010 TIP Amendment for High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project**

Schaefer noted the public hearing for the amendment will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

- **Transit Development Plan (TDP), including RTA Service Scenarios**

Schaefer said work was continuing on the scenarios. The next TDP committee meeting was May 13.

- **MPO Congestion Management Process**

This was addressed earlier in the meeting.

- **2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program**

Schaefer said applications for STP-Urban projects and the TIP project listings are due in early June. Staff would review the preliminary scoring and ranking of the STP-Urban projects at the July meeting.

- **Five-year Interim Update of the Regional Transportation Plan**

- **Revisions to MPO Operating Rules and Procedures**

Schaefer said he had this on the list because of the issue about board members participating in meetings via conference call. He said he planned to make some other minor changes at the same time. Schaefer said it isn't on the list, but the election of Board officers is typically done at the July meeting assuming all of the new appointments have been made.

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 2, 2010 at the Madison Water Utility at 7 p.m.

16. Adjournment

Opitz moved, R. Schmidt seconded, to adjourn. Motion carried.