AGENDA

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) – An MPO Citizen Advisory Committee

January 15, 2020 MATPB Office Conference Room, 100 State St., Suite 400 6:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of November 20, 2019 Meeting Minutes

3. Staff Reports
   - MPO Board Approval of RTP and TIP Amendments for Beltline Shoulder Running Project
   - Amendment #2 to the 2020-2024 TIP
   - Amendment to Section 5310 Program Management Plan
   - MATPB Work Program Amendment to Share in Cost of Fly Dane 2020 Project
   - Submission of Federal Safety Grant Application with City of Madison and UW TOPS Lab

4. Presentation and Discussion Related to Rebranding Project for MATPB and Rideshare Etc. Program

5. Presentation on Summary Findings from the National and Local Household Travel Surveys

6. Committee Member Reports

7. Next Scheduled Meeting Date
   - Wednesday, March 18, 2020 (need to reschedule – March 25 or April 15?)

8. Adjournment
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

November 20, 2019 Madison Municipal Building, 215 MLK Jr Blvd, Rm 013 6:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: P. Caravello, R. Clark, C. Clow, D. Krause, B. Preboski, J. Rider, S. Schmitz, R. Williams

Members Absent: M. Jones, C. Lawler, E. Sullivan, T. Wilson
Staff Present: W. Schaefer, Z. Brucaya

2. Approval of September 18, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Krause moved, Caravello seconded, to approve the September 18, 2019 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Staff Reports

- **Adoption of Annual HSIP and TAM Performance Measure Targets**
  HSIP stands for Highway Safety Improvement Program and TAM stands for Transit Asset Management. These are categories with associated federal measures for which MPOs and State DOTs must set and annually update targets. In the past, MATPB has chosen to support WisDOT’s targets, and to track local data and trends and take other actions to help WisDOT meet those targets. MATPB may set its own aspirational safety targets in 2020 to support the City of Madison’s new Vision Zero initiative, which will seek to achieve zero traffic-related deaths and serious injuries.

- **MPO and TDM Program Rebranding Project**
  MATPB received nine proposals in October, met with three firms, and selected the winning firm last week. The project will be ongoing through the spring and will seek input from the CAC. The details of engagement are to be determined, but will involve gaining input from the MATPB board and committees, general public, local officials and other stakeholders. The process will involve developing a new logo and name, and also grounding these in a new mission and vision to better convey MATPB’s purpose and goals.

- **East-West BRT Study**
  Schaefer reported that the East-West BRT study is wrapping up. The City of Madison approved a budget that includes funding for the satellite bus facility, which is critical for BRT. Specific routing through the downtown and on the west side still needs to be worked out. Williams expressed desire for more information related to ridership estimates; how BRT buses will interact with regular buses; and the specific benefits of BRT overall. Schaefer noted that detailed technical memos with much of this information are available on the project website, [www.madisonBRT.com](http://www.madisonBRT.com). Discussion of the BRT project will continue at the CAC, as there will be a more detailed design phase occurring next year after the city has requested entry into the FTA Small Starts grant process this winter.

Schaefer provided background on the program. MATPB receives an annual allocation funding, now about $500,000, and uses it to fund pedestrian and bicycle projects. For the upcoming cycle, MATPB has about $1.15 million total available. He said that proposed revisions to the scoring criteria are primarily the result of switching “project readiness” from a scoring criterion to a screening criterion, and reallocating the 15% of points it represented. The justification is that a project should not be considered for funding unless it is likely to be ready to move forward. Proposed revisions include allocating additional points to sections for, “enhances mobility and connectivity,” and “usage and accessibility.” The largest amount of additional points (8%), went to supporting environmental justice and health equity. “Facility maintenance” was removed from scoring criteria language and will be indicated as an expectation for communities (i.e., another screening criterion). Crash history was combined with safety and accessibility, and language about improving perceived safety was added. An example of how perceived safety could be measured is the number of complaints received. There are separate scoring criteria for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) non-infrastructure projects. SRTS infrastructure projects are scored under the regular project scoring criteria. Proposed scoring revisions for non-infrastructure projects include reallocating 20% of points from “project readiness” and “opportunity/risk,” to “scope of audience/reach/impact” (5%), and “health, safety and environmental justice” (15%). Overall policy language revisions include clarifying that MATPB will fund enhancements to existing facilities in addition to new construction, and that MATPB will fund wayfinding projects that advance the Dane County wayfinding plan. Staff also created a short supplemental application form with additional questions to those covered by the WisDOT application.

Caravello asked about the meaning of “project readiness.” Schaefer explained that the language is general, but indicates that the project has gone beyond conceptual design, to a higher level of design and engineering. Clark noted that the DOT uses a 30% design standard to indicate that everything has been investigated and that a project has a good handle on the preliminary costs, schedule, design, and permission needs. Schaefer indicated that MATPB will consider adding this language. Krause asked how to respond to questions regarding improving bike safety on S. Park Street, real or perceived. Rider indicated that the City of Madison is aware that S. Park Street is a major barrier and has regular discussions regarding budget and opportunities to make improvements, especially as related to the future addition of BRT and eventual road reconstruction. Krause asked who funded the bike roundabout at Dunn’s Marsh; Schaefer said the county.

Schaefer said the proposed revisions were reviewed and recommended for approval by the MPO’s technical committee and will be brought to the board in December. Project applications are due in late January.

Rider moved, Clark seconded, to recommend adoption of the revisions to the TAP scoring criteria to the board. Motion carried.
5. **Review of Second Round Section 5310 Program (Enhanced Services for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) 2020 Grant Project Applications**

Schaefer explained that MATPB receives about $300,000 per year in funding under the program. After the first round of applications were reviewed and approved this summer, MATPB had over $100,000 left. At the request of the board, staff reached out again to potential project sponsors for a second round and received four additional applications totaling over $200,000 – three to purchase accessible vans and one to create a technology platform to share rides. The review committee included Rod Clark, a representative from the WisDOT Transit Bureau, and Ben Lyman from MATPB staff.

Clark noted there was some disagreement amongst committee members about how to rank applications directly related to the limited information provided, which is a function of applicants who are inexperienced at grant writing. Schaefer noted that it may be helpful to discuss ways in which the application process can limit these issues in the future. Clark suggested providing training materials and a mechanism for sending applications back for revisions based on staff feedback. He also suggested following up to ensure that organizations are meeting the terms of their grant agreement and noting this if they apply for additional funding. Clow noted that McFarland has allowed people to contact staff with an idea, to ask whether it would qualify, and to receive application tips. Schaefer agreed that given how difficult it has been to get applicants, an earlier start and more iterative process may be helpful—possibly a pre-application review deadline or mandatory notice of intent. Clow said that a notice of intent may be too formal, as applicants are interested in knowing whether it is worth it to apply before they put too much work into an application. Preboski asked whether it is possible to reduce vehicle purchasing costs with a single buyer, and Clark noted that WisDOT includes purchases in a single bid list to streamline the purchasing process. Krause has talked with the Fitchburg Senior Center about getting vans because there is no bus service, but was told that the city will need to fund a driver, because volunteers are not allowed. Clark said that volunteers can drive under certain circumstances, based on the type of license needed and the associated liability insurance.


Schaefer said WisDOT was studying the feasibility of using the Beltline’s shoulders as travel lanes for peak travel periods (Dynamic Part-Time Shoulder Use) and will make a decision soon on whether to move forward with the project. There was a hearing at the last MATPB board meeting and staff received around ten comments expressing concern, including both emails and comments made at the meeting. The board deferred action and requested more information from WisDOT and MATPB. The two main comments relate to: 1) concern over induced travel demand; and 2) desire to restrict the lane to bus and carpool use only (HOV lane), if it is opened for use.

Williams asked whether signage is included in the project. Schaefer noted that signage, software, and detection (e.g., additional cameras) are the main costs, totaling around $15 million. There will also be an ongoing operating costs to actively manage the lanes. Schaefer reported that the MPO’s technical committee recommended that the board approve the RTP and TIP amendments to allow the project to move forward. Clark asked about concerns from law enforcement. Schaefer said that the emergency response community is now largely comfortable
with the plan. Krause expressed discomfort with reducing lanes by one foot and the potential for more side-swipes as people weave.

Clow moved, Clark seconded, to recommend board approval of the RTP and TIP amendments to add the project. Motion carried.

7. **Presentation on Annual Transportation Performance Measures Report**

Schaefer reviewed a presentation on the Transportation Performance Measures Report. This is the fourth annual report that MATPB has produced to demonstrate whether progress is being made related to RTP goals.

Williams inquired why inter-city bus trip data is not included. Schaefer noted that information about inter-city bus trips is not readily available and that this report focuses on metrics that are easily tracked over a long period of time. The measures included in the report can’t capture everything, but other data is obviously considered for planning purposes.

8. **Committee Member Reports**

Krause mentioned that a re-alignment of the Capital City Trail roadway crossing at McCoy Road and Syene Road is being proposed. This is where Sheri Maples was killed. It would be on county land, but may involve a DNR conversation due to wetland adjacency.

9. **Next Scheduled Meeting Date**

The next meeting will be Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at the new MATPB office location at 100 State Street, Ste. 400.

10. **Adjournment**

Preboski moved, Rider seconded, to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

*Minutes were recorded by W. Schaefer and Z. Brucaya.*
Questions for MATPB Rebranding Discussion

Audience
1. How do you think the MPO is currently perceived by the general public? By member community staff and officials?

Challenges and Opportunities
2. What is the unique value that the MPO brings to the region?
3. What opportunities do you see that could benefit the MPO’s presence in the region?
4. What challenges do you see the MPO facing in public perception, communication, and/or outreach?

Identity
5. What qualities or services do you most want people to associate with the MPO?
6. What is the future we are working toward?
7. Name a descriptor you want people to think when they first encounter the MPO?