

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
October 3, 2007 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: Tom Clauder, Joe Clausius, Ken Harwood, Duane Hinz, Brett Hulsey, Jerry Mandli, Al Matano, Mark Opitz, Satya Rhodes-Conway, Paul Skidmore, John Vesperman, Robbie Webber

Members absent: Eileen Bruskewitz, Chuck Kamp

Staff present: Bob McDonald, Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

2. Approval of September 5, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Webber, to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

- Letter from John Alley, Chief, Public & Specialized Transit Section, WisDOT, to Bob McDonald regarding the request that WisDOT become the designated recipient of funding appropriated to the Madison Urbanized Area under the JARC and New Freedom programs. McDonald explained that the letter indicated MPO staff needed to send a letter to the Governor requesting that he notify FTA that WisDOT would be the recipient of funding.
- Letter from Bob McDonald to Governor Doyle requesting that he designate WisDOT as the recipient of JARC and New Freedom funding appropriated to the Madison Urbanized Area (Attached is the letter that was sent to all chief elected officials in the MPO planning area and Dane Co. Executive Falk regarding this topic). McDonald said the official designation had not occurred yet, but staff will notify the Board when that happens.
- Letter from Alan Harvey, Chair, Town of Windsor to Bob McDonald regarding the Draft 2008-2012 TIP, and Letter from Bob McDonald responding to the letter. Harvey suggested modifying the listing for the USH 51 (STH 19 to CTH V) project to reflect the provision in the state legislative bill to reconstruct and expand the roadway to a four-lane expressway rather than the interim improvements shown. Staff responded that we were aware of the legislative bill, but that the TIP must be financially constrained and the bill provides no actual funding for the project. When funding is committed, the TIP would be amended to reflect that.

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

None

5. Consideration of Madison Area TPB Appointments to Special Committees

Matano said that there are six committees with three of them having two appointments.

Madison Long-Range Transportation Commission (2 Appointments)

Matano said Rhodes-Conway expressed an interest in serving on this committee. McDonald clarified that Webber was previously the other appointment and she confirmed that she was interested in remaining on the commission. Appointees would be Webber and Rhodes-Conway.

Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force (2 Appointments)

Opitz and Hulsey both expressed interest in this committee. Matano said that he had been one of the appointees and was hoping to remain on the committee. Hulsey said it would be good to have someone from outside Madison on the committee, so he deferred to Opitz. Appointees would be Matano and Opitz.

Metro Ad-Hoc Long-Range Transit Planning Committee (1 Appointment)

In response to a question by Hulsey, Rhodes-Conway explained that the Mayor created the committee at the request of the City's Transit and Parking Commission. The committee is tasked with looking at the long-term financial health of the Metro system and actions needed to improve the Metro transit system in the long-term. The committee is about half way through the process and will have an interim report available soon. They have had trouble making quorum and desperately need an MPO appointment to help with that. Hulsey expressed interest in being appointed.

North Mendota Parkway Implementation Oversight Committee (2 Appointments)

McDonald explained that much of the committee's work was already finished. The focus of efforts now was on implementing some of the recommendations from the study report, including officially mapping a North Mendota E-Way and Parkway. The committee recently met again for the first time since hiring a consultant to conduct an environmental study in order to do the official mapping. Hinz and Clausius expressed interest in being appointed.

USH 51 North (South Beltline to I90/94) Policy Advisory Committee (1 Appointment)

USH 51 South (McFarland to Stoughton) Policy Advisory Committee (1 Appointment)

Matano provided some information on the USH 51 South study for which he has been the MPO appointment. He said the capacity of the corridor was not an issue in the short-term. The problems were at the intersections. In the long-term, the committee is looking at taking advantage of the existing capacity of USH 14 and possibly expanding STH 138 rather than USH 51, which McDonald suggested. Matano asked if any one was interested in replacing him as the MPO appointment to this committee and Harwood said he was, but would not be able to make the next meeting. Matano said he would attend the upcoming meeting and appoint him at the November meeting. Clauder expressed interest in being appointed to the USH 51 North study committee.

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Rhodes-Conway, to approve appointments. Motion carried.

6. Consideration of Operating Rules and Procedures for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board

McDonald referenced the draft document included in the mailing. The previous rules have been updated to reflect the current appointment structure and process, the addition of a Citizen Advisory Committee, and an update in the rules for reconsideration of an agenda item. He handed out an addition/correction sheet that adds a footnote regarding the requirements for board appointments who are not elected officials. Matano suggested that under Section II – Meetings, subsection B(1) be changed to simply state that the Board shall meet once a month at a time and place to be determined by the Manager rather than specify a specific day/time, which is subject to change.

Moved by Hulsey, seconded by Harwood, to approve the operating rules and procedures with the change suggested by Matano. Motion carried.

7. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 8 Regarding the 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Area

McDonald reminded the Board that approval of the draft TIP includes approval of the staff's recommendation to change the cost sharing policy for major STP – Urban projects from 80/20 to 50/50. For information purposes, staff included in the packet an alternative priority listing of STP – Urban projects showing how the funding allocation would work out if the MPO kept the 80/20 cost share policy. Schaefer then reviewed some of the more significant proposed changes and additions to the draft TIP, which were listed in an updated Addition/Correction sheet that was handed out. In terms of the STP Urban projects, the two changes were a revised lower cost estimate for the first phase of the Monona Drive project and the deletion of the CTH CV resurfacing project. The cost change for the Monona Drive project doesn't affect the STP- Urban funding allocation, because of the shortfall of

funding that year. The CTH CV project was dropped because of interim improvements to the roadway that have already been done. Among the new projects are some additional Beltline ramp improvements in addition to the ones already in the draft TIP and a resurfacing project on the Beltline from Old Sauk Road to Gammon Road. The ramp improvements are all coming out of a TSM/Safety study for the Beltline that WisDOT has been undertaking. Webber asked if all of the work was on the ramps themselves or if any of the work included the intersecting streets, thereby impacting bicyclists and pedestrians. Schaefer responded that the work was on the ramps. Vesperman added that in some cases the work would affect the intersection (e.g., adding additional turn lanes to the ramps), but WisDOT is trying to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in the improvements. In the case of Fish Hatchery Road, the free flow ramps will be replaced with signals, which will improve conditions for bicyclists. Hulsey asked if the addition of the Brayton parking ramp included redevelopment on the site. Schaefer said he thought it did, and Larry Nelson confirmed that the State and City Parking Utility are involved in discussions regarding development opportunities on the block.

Larry Nelson, City of Madison Engineer, registered to speak on this item, supporting approval. He said that prior to ISTEA when the MPO received only around \$900,000 per year, the required cost share was 50% and they were able to fund one project per year at the most. We now have more money, but the projects are more expensive and so the MPO is still only able to fund one or maybe two projects per year. The purpose of returning to the 50/50 cost share policy is to spread the money out over more projects. Federal funding increases aren't keeping pace with the increases in project costs and State funding isn't as plentiful as it used to be. He said there are many miles of arterial streets that are nearing or have exceeded their pavement life expectancy (e.g., Packers Ave/STH 113). Part of the reason for the increases in project costs is we are now including bike lanes and streetscape enhancements that help sell the projects. It's going to be a real challenge to keep up that standard, and it is going to require that local municipalities increase their level of funding back to what they used to spend. Hulsey asked Nelson if the City had data on the condition of local roadways and Nelson said yes. He said they are struggling to maintain their benchmark standards on arterial streets. He also asked about the state road aids formula and Nelson said it was based on road and lane miles.

Moved by Hulsey, seconded by Webber, to approve the draft TIP as amended by the Addition/Correction sheet dated 10/3/07 and with the 50/50 cost share policy for STP – Urban projects for discussion purposes.

Mandli explained the county's opposition to the change in the cost share policy to 50/50. Local governments have other ways of raising revenue for road projects such as special assessments and impact fees. The county must rely on the property tax. If the local share for major projects is increased, the county will have less funding for other smaller projects. It also makes it difficult to cover the cost in cases where the project bid comes in significantly higher than the estimated cost, particularly for multi-jurisdictional projects. The project may need to be delayed. He wondered whether projects in areas where MPOs have a 50% cost share policy include just the basic features versus special streetscape treatments, etc.

Webber commented that if we go with a 50/50 policy, it probably will increase property taxes regardless of the jurisdiction, but more projects are going to get *some* funding. The 80/20 policy will result in less projects getting funded, which will also make some people unhappy. Harwood commented that he is still concerned that CTH M is below the funding cutoff line and not programmed. During peak periods, one has to wait 3-4 traffic light cycles to get through an intersection, which must be Level of Service F. The first phase of the new UW Research Park will be built soon and Epic keeps adding employees, which will make the situation worse. McDonald responded that under the 80/20 policy CTH M gets pushed further out, while under the 50/50 scenario the Cross Country to CTH PD segment would be funded in 2013. Clauder commented that staff's notes indicate the 50/50 policy may result in a more careful examination of project costs, but we are doing that now. Projects are getting pushed back because of a lack of funding. He thinks the 50/50 policy will hurt the smaller

communities, because they have smaller budgets than the City of Madison. Other maintenance projects will need to be pushed back. Opitz responded that his understanding is that under the 80/20 policy, the smaller cities will be waiting longer and may never get some of their projects funded, so maintenance projects will still need to be delayed. This is because the Madison projects tend to be higher scoring, since these roadways generally carry more traffic. However, he said he understands the county's situation, and it isn't an easy decision. He just thinks the 50/50 policy will allow more projects to receive some funding and therefore address more needs. Hulsey said he's a little conflicted on the issue, because for years he's been saying that the cost share policy for roadway projects should be the same as transit which is about 50/50. However, he has been waiting for the University Avenue project to receive funding and it would be nice if it received 80% vs. 50% federal funding. He said we obviously do need more money. Vesperman asked if there was an analysis done on the impact of changing the policy from 80/20 to 50/50. McDonald said yes, that the TIP shows the ramification of changing to a 50/50 policy although the impact on project timing is greater after 2012.

Rhodes-Conway commented that there isn't enough funding to address all of the needs and this underlying problem isn't addressed by changing the cost share policy. Regarding this problem, the MPO will have the opportunity to discuss priorities in the future (e.g., fixing existing roads vs. building new ones). She thinks being able to fund more projects is better and the 50/50 policy will do that. She is sympathetic to the problem of finding the 50% match, but perhaps this could be addressed by looking at the priority list. Mandli responded that going to 50/50 wouldn't necessarily get more projects done overall because there would be less money to spend on other local projects. Webber added that she doesn't see this as a Madison versus small cities issue. Everyone must decide what the chances are of a project in their community being funded under the different scenarios. Personally, she thinks providing some Federal funds to more projects is fair. Opitz wondered which policy would result in the least amount of friction between communities fighting for the limited funds. McDonald said that most of the jurisdictions have representatives on the TCC and they recommended the 50/50 policy because they figured 50% is better than nothing.

Moved by Mandli, seconded by Hulsey, to keep the cost share policy for major STP – Urban projects at 80/20. Motion carried.

Matano said the motion on the table now was the draft TIP as amended, but with the current 80/20 cost share policy. Nelson commented that the priority listings with the 80/20 cost share policy were incorrect because the highest scoring project in 2011 (the first phase of the Mineral Point Road/CTH M/Junction interchange) didn't receive full 80% funding, but the University Avenue reconstruction project did. Schaefer said Nelson was correct. MPO staff had shown it this way in the draft listings in order to allow both projects to move forward that year. McDonald said staff would need to revise the listings to reflect 80% funding going to the highest scoring project. Rhodes-Conway then asked whether it was critical for the Board to approve the TIP or if action could be delay until the next meeting so everyone understood the ramifications of the 80/20 policy on the timing of projects. McDonald said the TIP could be approved next month. Nelson commented that the City of Madison was not looking at the cost share policy from a parochial interest. The 80/20 policy will actually result in more funding going to Madison projects. The 50/50 policy was suggested to spread the funding around, which would improve relationships with the other communities. McDonald added that because the costs of projects exceed our allocation, we are not able to fully fund many projects at 80/20 anyway.

Moved by Hulsey, seconded by Opitz, to postpone action on the TIP until the November meeting. Motion carried.

Hulsey requested that at a future meeting a report be provided on the pedestrian/bicycle safety education work that is partially funded with STP Urban funds. McDonald agreed to do this and

suggested perhaps having the City of Madison staff person who does this work come and give a presentation to the Board.

8. Review of Draft Supplement to the Regional Transportation Plan 2030 and Release for Public Hearing on November 7, 2007.

McDonald said that the regional transportation plan approved in November 2006 was adopted under TEA-21, the previous federal legislation. The subsequent legislation, SAFETEA-LU, was passed while we were in the middle of the process and the corresponding regulations were not published until early this year. There were some additional procedures and requirements that needed to be completed to make the plan fully compliant with SAFETEA-LU. One of these was conducting an environmental consultation process, which was facilitated for all MPOs in the state by FHWA Wisconsin Division staff. We have now completed a draft plan supplement that includes amendments to make the plan fully compliant, and staff is seeking the Board's approval to release the draft and schedule a public hearing on it. Because of the late hour, Schaefer suggested postponing a presentation on the supplement until the November meeting when the hearing would be held as long as the Board was comfortable with releasing the document without it. It was agreed to do so. Matano said Hulsey, who had to leave early, had one comment. He said he didn't see an analysis of air pollution issues. Schaefer responded that an air quality analysis was done as part of the original full plan document using the regional travel model and WisDNR's emissions model, and it is referenced in the supplement. The analysis showed that implementation of the plan would result in a small reduction in VOC, NOx, and CO emissions compared to the "existing plus committed projects" scenario.

Moved by Harwood, seconded by Skidmore, to approve release of the plan supplement for public hearing, seconded by Skidmore. Motion carried.

9. Review of Draft 2008 Unified Planning Work Program and the 2008-2010 Overall Program Report

McDonald said preparation of the work program is a requirement for receiving federal funding. He highlighted some of the major work activities and reviewed the budget and how the different activities are allocated to the different funding sources. Work activities include assistance with WisDOT's Corridors 2030 Plan, census data collection and analysis related to travel modeling, assistance with the ongoing corridor/area studies, implementation efforts for the regional transportation plan and development of performance measures for the plan, and updating of the transit development plan. Action on the work program is needed at the next meeting.

10. Review and Recommendation of Draft 2008 MPO Budget

McDonald said that normally he brings a draft budget to the Board for their recommendation in the summer, but was not able to because the new MPO Board was not fully formed yet. Since the City staffs the MPO, it becomes part of City of Madison's Planning Department's budget. He then explained some of the line items in the budget such as purchased services and inter-department charges. He said federal funding has been flat, so he's had to absorb cost increases through cuts in some areas and seeking additional local funding. Some of the other communities in the MPO planning area contribute funds. He said that with the redesignation of the MPO he had been asked to send out a letter to all units of government again requesting their participation in funding the local share of the MPO based on population.

Moved by Webber, seconded by Clausius, to recommend approval of the budget. Motion carried.

11. Status Report by TPB Board Members on Projects Potentially Involving the TPB:

- **Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force**
Matano said that this was covered during discussion of appointments.
- **USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor Study**
Vesperman said public meetings on the study are scheduled for October 16 and 18, and passed out an informational handout on them.
- **North Mendota Parkway Implementation Oversight Committee**
Matano said that this was covered during discussion of appointments.
- **USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)**
Vesperman said that public meetings for this study are scheduled for January 2008.

12. Discussion of Future Work Items:

- **Approval of Supplement to the Regional Transportation Plan 2030 to make it SAFETEA-LU Compliant**
- **Approval of the Draft 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
- **Approval of the Draft 2008 Unified Planning Work Program**
Matano said that these first three items were covered in this meeting.
- **Restructure of the Citizen Advisory Committee**
McDonald said that this would be an ongoing effort. Staff is getting names of people who have expressed an interest of serving on this committee.

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

The next meeting will be at the Warner Park Community Center on November 7th at 7:00.

14. Adjournment