AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of June 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Election of Officers

6. Consideration of Recommendation Regarding the MPO’s Representative to the City of Madison’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee

7. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 40 Regarding Amendment #5 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County
   - CTH PB (Sunset Drive intersection), Reconstruct intersection to improve safety
   - Interstate 39/90 (STH 59 to CTH AB), Improve paved shoulders on the median side


10. Consideration of Recommendation Regarding Sending Letter Requesting Financial Support for Work of the MPO

11. Review and Discussion of the Federal Certification Review Report Recommendations and MPO Staff Responses

12. Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA)

13. Update on the Milwaukee-Madison Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project

14. Discussion of MPO Policy Board Meeting Schedule

15. Discussion of MPO Policy Board Meeting Notices and Packets

16. 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
   - USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor Study
   - North Mendota Parkway Study

17. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   - Transit Development Plan (TDP) and RTA Service Scenarios
   - 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program
     - Scoring and Ranking of FY 2011-2014 SMIP Applications
   - MPO Congestion Management Process
   - Regional Transportation Plan Update
   - Revisions to MPO Operating Rules and Procedures
18. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

19. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, August 4 at 7 p.m.**
Madison Water Utility, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B
If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations to access this meeting, contact the Planning & Development Dept. at (608) 266-4635 or TTY/TEXTNET (866) 704-2318.

*Please do so at least 48 hours prior to the meeting so that proper arrangements can be made.*

Si Ud. necesita un intérprete, materiales en formatos alternos, o acomodaciones para poder venir a esta reunión, por favor haga contacto con el Department of Planning & Development (el departamento de planificación y desarrollo) al (608)-266-4635, o TTY/TEXTNET (886)-704-2318.

*Por favor avisenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.*
1. **Roll Call**

   **Members present:** Al Matano, Joe Chase, Chuck Kamp, Chris Schmidt, Duane Hinz, Steve Ritt, Eileen Bruskewitz, Jerry Mandli, John Vesperman, Mark Clear, Mark Opitz, Brett Hulsey, Paul Skidmore (left after item #6)

   **Members absent:** Steve King

   **Staff present:** Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

2. **Approval of May 5, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

   Moved by Kamp, seconded by Opitz, to approve May meeting minutes. Motion carried with Ritt and Hulsey abstaining.

3. **Communications**

   Schaefer said the following two communications were in the packet:
   - Email from City of Madison resident indicating a desire to have the downtown intercity train station also incorporate an intercity bus station.
   - Email from Village of Oregon resident regarding concerns about trains interfering with commuter traffic at rail crossings.

   Schaefer said the following additional communications were at members’ places:
   - Letter from WisDOT Secretary Busalacchi approving Amendment #3 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program.
   - Email from Village of Waunakee resident urging reconsideration of the downtown station for intercity rail service.
   - Letter from Dane County Executive Falk confirming the appointments of Al Matano and Brett Hulsey to the MPO Policy Board.
   - Letter from City of Madison resident suggesting that bus only lanes be considered for more streets and referencing an article on the bus rapid transit system in Bogota, Columbia.
   - Email from City of Sun Prairie resident expressing concern about the impacts of the intercity rail service on the condo development she lives in and requesting more information on the project.

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

   None

5. **Public Hearing on Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County**

   Donna Brown with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) provided a power point presentation with background information on the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative, recent efforts to begin implementing it, and the Milwaukee-Madison rail service project. She reviewed past activities related to the Milwaukee-Madison project, including the Environmental Assessment in 2001 and signing of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in 2004. She then reviewed the project elements, activities this year to date, and planned schedule of activities over the next two years leading to implementation of service in 2013. These include a stations environmental document and preliminary engineering process, a corridor design process, and development of a corridor management plan. The public involvement opportunities for each were summarized.

   The following persons registered to speak on the item:
   - Gary Werner, 2302 Lakeland Ave., Madison, representing CRANES said that CRANES supports the amendment to the TIP for the inter-city passenger rail project, which is consistent with the MPO’s adopted long-range transportation plan. It makes sense to have as many transportation options as possible and to have passenger rail linking the largest city in the state with the state capitol. CRANES supports the downtown station site. To make rail successful it is important for the train to stop as close to passengers’ destinations as possible. The downtown
   -
site eliminates the need for a mode change for many people to reach their destination and also connects well to existing urban transportation options. The downtown location is closest to the large employment centers of the central business district, hospitals, University of Wisconsin and other college campuses, and state offices. In addition, non-work destinations such as Camp Randall, the Kohl Center, Capitol Square, State Street, and UW campus activities are all within walking distance or easily accessible via a short local bus ride. CRANES supports steps to make the transportation system less auto dependent. Access to the train station should be as convenient by other modes as by auto. CRANES urges WisDOT, the City of Madison, and the MPO to work with the City’s committees to make the train station truly multi-modal with convenient access to local and intercity bus service, secure bicycle parking, and good pedestrian access as well as auto parking. He said public input regarding the design, location, and rail station functions would be critical for both the acceptance and trust of the citizens that will be using the station and living and working nearby. He urged all bodies to hold frequent and early meetings to answer questions, receive comments, and outline the process. CRANES also urges those involved with the location, design, and construction of the rail station to make it as energy neutral and green as possible (e.g., increased rain water capture or reuse).

Judy Siegfried, 2206 West Lawn Ave., Madison, said she was a strong supporter and consistent user of inter-city rail and local and inter-city buses to access this continental rail network. She said she had long advocated for the return of Madison area passenger rail service. She asked the MPO Board to show restraint in releasing the funds for the project, particularly for the stations. She expressed frustration at the lack of information and opportunity for citizens to comment on the station location. She said her opinion was that the station location will not serve the region well and provide good multi-modal connections. She was also concerned about the cost. She commented on the Midwest regional nature of the service and the commitment to fast, efficient service. She praised WisDOT for its work on the project and securing the federal funding. She commented that the Madison station is supposed to serve the entire metro area, yet no other local unit of government had a say in the station location. She said that given the planned extension to the Twin Cities the downtown station shouldn’t be made the primary station unless funding is committed to a second station on the route. She expressed concern about the multi-modal connections and the difficulty in getting to the downtown station. She urged keeping the inter-city framework in mind and being certain of what is being funded and the implications before the funding is released for final station design.

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Ave., Madison, said he didn’t understand why the MPO was not involved in the station location decision since it is the entity in charge of metropolitan transportation planning. He proposed that the MPO should only approve a sufficient amount of the $25 million for the environmental study and preliminary designs for the stations to allow the environmental assessment and some initial planning, but not the final designs. WisDOT should come back to the MPO later with some cost numbers and drawings so the MPO understands what it is approving. He also said the rail corridor extension for the downtown station should be included as part of the station cost. He commented on the need for the station design to address access to local and inter-city bus service and bicycles. He said the station should also include sufficient amenities, including taxi and rental car service, food service, and lodging for travelers. He noted the station criteria included in the resolution adopted by the Madison Common Council. Issues that need to be addressed include the cost of parking and traffic impacts. He expressed concern about the downtown station cost compared to the federal funding that has been allocated for it. He wondered where the additional money would come from. He commented on the nature of the service and that it isn’t just commuter service between Madison and Milwaukee. He also said the downtown location means a commitment to having a second station on the route for the trains going on to the Twin Cities when that service is added.

Dick Rhody, 1506 Clarmar Dr., Sun Prairie, said that he and his wife Dori purchased the land that their house is on from a farmer back in about 1985. There was a rail line running through it, but at that time it really wasn’t used. They built their house in 1990 and were provided with a crossing of the rail line for their driveway at the south end of Clarmar Drive. He said they were assured that they would not be landlocked and would continue to have the rail crossing. He said he was concerned about the loss of the crossing and access to their home. He said he was opposed to the project and suggested use of the median of the interstate if passenger rail service was to be implemented.

Bill Richardson, 2040 Allen Blvd., Middleton, said he represented himself and a group called the Great Train Robbery. He opposed the TIP amendment for the inter-city rail project. He read a quote from a speech by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Administrator about the use of Bus Rapid Transit as a cost effective alternative to rail service. He expressed concern about the maintenance and operating costs for the rail service. He noted that the travel speeds mentioned won’t occur until 2016 after the positive train control system is installed. He didn’t think the service would be competitive enough with the car to attract enough riders. He said he would
support the improvements if they were for freight rail because that would help the economy. He suggested a statewide referendum on support for the project.

Carson Young, 54 Merlham Dr., Madison, said he was an engineer before starting his own business. He has talked with many people with technical expertise and said the rail service would need to be subsidized by taxpayers unless it could be developed as an integrated transportation system with autos, airplanes, and buses. He suggested use of train cars that could be separated with one-half going to downtown and the one-half to the airport. The same thing could be done in Milwaukee.

Lance Green, 186 Dixon St., Madison, said he’d lived on Madison’s East side for 30 years and worked close to the proposed station location. He supported the TIP amendment for the project, and said development of inter-city rail was essential for moving people in a more cost-effective and energy-efficient way. However, he said he was concerned about the long-term implications of the station location decision. He was concerned about the extra travel time for those trains going on to the Twin Cities. He was also concerned about how the station would interface with local transit improvements being planned by the regional transit authority and other transportation modes as well as the traffic impacts to John Nolen Drive and Wilson Street. He urged reconsideration of the station location.

Ron Wolfe, 5601 Dahmen Dr., Waunakee, said he was representing himself and Pro Rail, the local arm of the Wisconsin Association of Rail Passengers. He said the station is a regional one serving south central Madison, not just Madison. The initial study done by HNTB back in 2001 projected that 60% of the passengers using the station would be coming from outside Madison. That made the airport seem like a good location since people from the West side could travel north around the lake rather than traveling through downtown. He opposed the downtown station location and also didn’t like that the decision was made without any public input. He questioned the model used that predicted higher ridership for the downtown station location, and asked that the assumptions that went into the analysis be made public. He said Amtrak’s Empire Builder train service could come through Madison if the station was at the airport, which would benefit the Madison area.

Hans Noeldner, 133 W. Lincoln St., Oregon, said he agreed with the comments made by Gary Werner. He supported rail transportation because it is more energy efficient. He noted the recent oil spill and the need to reduce the country’s reliance on oil. He was disappointed in the lack of public input, but supported the downtown station location. He said it is a good location for those driving as well as for those coming by other modes. He thought the downtown location was good for business, tourism, and for people visiting family and friends. He said the noise and safety impacts were overblown. He said as a bicyclist he’d rather wait for one train to cross the road than many cars.

Robbie Webber, 2613 Stevens St., Madison, supported the TIP amendment and Werner’s comments. She said we cannot continue to depend on driving as our primary mode of transportation. It took 50-60 years to build the auto-oriented transportation system and will take about that long to achieve a more balanced system with alternatives to driving. She said it was important that the rail system goes from city center to city center because that is where most people are and will be going. This is a social and economic justice issue, because not everybody has a car. We need to locate our major transportation hubs such as this in locations that people can get to by local transit, walking, biking, and getting a ride from somebody. She supported the downtown location, but also could have supported the Yahara station. She opposed the airport location. In response to comments by others, she said the comments by the FTA Administrator were made in reference to local rail versus bus transit, not inter-city transit. In response to comments by others, she said buses get stuck in traffic, but trains don’t. The travel time comparison to driving needs to factor that and the time to park and walk to one’s destination. Driving is the most dangerous method of transportation. She said driving was subsidized too and more people could be moved faster and cheaper with trains than with roads. She also commented on the idea of a statewide referendum, suggesting that people in other parts of the state wouldn’t have supported the Marquette interchange project in Milwaukee.

Bob Schaefer, 6 Cottonwood Cir., Madison, commented on the definition of high-speed rail, which is speeds of 150 mph or greater. He said nothing in the U.S. qualifies as high-speed rail. He said the problem with the passenger rail service is that it is being built on a freight rail system and will therefore never fit the definition of high-speed. He commented that the best location in terms of travel time would have been the Hoepker Road station north of the airport because the train wouldn’t have traveled through the city at all. He suggested the station location was driven by the desire to use the federal funding to improve the tracks to make it less expensive to implement commuter rail. He questioned the ability to run both commuter and inter-city trains in the corridor. He also suggested that the reconstruction of the Lien Road/N. Thompson/Zeier Road intersection should have provided for a grade-separated rail crossing.
Caryl Terrell, 19 Red Maple Trl., Madison, representing Sierra Club-John Muir Chapter’s Global Warming Solutions Team, said the group supported the TIP amendment and the vision for the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative of a regional rail system that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. She mentioned some of the steps needed to get to the stage that things are at today, including legislative hearings regarding support of the initiative. She mentioned the great success of the current Hiawatha service between Milwaukee and Chicago. She said the public has many questions and ideas for how to make the project successful and the way to allow that process to transpire is to approve the TIP amendment.

Jim Sampson, 937 Waban Hill, Madison, commented that the projected 110 mph top speed was not high-speed rail and it shouldn’t be called that. He said he wasn’t sure whether he supported the service or not, but was concerned about the need for accurate information. For example, the initial speeds would be lower. He expressed concern over the lack of public input on the station location and the traffic congestion from the downtown location. He also commented on the need to be sure the service was designed to be successful from the beginning.

Opitz asked Donna Brown to discuss the environmental study process back in the early 2000s and the planning process since then. He commented that this work laid the groundwork for the project and the decision on the station location. Brown said WisDOT Southwest Region staff was very involved in the analysis done then and there was considerable public involvement during the environmental study. The study looked at potential station locations in Madison and elsewhere in the corridor to Milwaukee. The analysis looked at traffic, environmental, and other impacts. The focus was on utilizing the existing freight rail line. Following the issuance of the FONSI in 2004, planning and discussions with communities continued. Opitz asked Brown about WisDOT’s commitment to supporting development of an inter-modal station in Madison. Brown said WisDOT was very committed to working with the City of Madison to look at multi-modal connections, including pedestrian access to the facility, planning for the potential for commuter rail, inter-city bus service, and taxi connections. Bruskewitz commented on the lack of public input on the station location decision and asked if WisDOT could share information that was used to select the Monona Terrace station and rule out the others. Brown agreed to provide information on the analysis and evaluation of the station locations, including the assumptions used. Hulsey said the potential for a train station at Monona Terrace was discussed early on as part of the planning for the facility. Clear noted that the decision now for WisDOT was the exact location for the downtown station—the Dept. of Administration building or 1 W. Wilson—and asked Brown how that decision would be made and what

6. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 39 Regarding Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Hulsey commented that Madison was the only capitol in the Midwest that does not have train service. He said train service between Madison and Chicago existed back in 1950 and the travel time was 2 hours and 12 minutes. He mentioned the large sums of money spent to expand the capacity of Chicago’s O’Hare airport and that around 40% of the flights to/from O’Hare were 300 miles or less. High-speed train service could replace some of those flights. He said implementation of the train service was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. He mentioned the many jobs that would be created. He also compared the cost to the high cost of major roadway projects such as the Verona Road/West Beltline interchange. He urged support of the TIP amendment for the project.

Moved by Hulsey, seconded by Kamp, to approve Resolution TPB No. 39, Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 TIP.

Pete Carnes, Monona, said he had grave concerns whether the rail service would be cost effective given the existing inter-city bus service, but at the same time he noted the need for the U.S. to reduce its energy use. He said that if it is done it should be done right and suggested an alternative route using tracks coming in from Cottage Grove rather than Sun Prairie. He suggested building a new rail line from the southeast side connecting to the rail line that crosses Mud Lake and runs up and through the isthmus.

Tim Wong, 161 Jackson St., Madison, said he lived on the East side near the tracks. He said the new service will allow quiet zones due to the upgraded crossings. He opposed the airport location because he didn’t drive and it wasn’t convenient to get there without a car. He supported the TIP amendment to allow the process to move forward. While he said he could have supported the Yahara station too, he supported the downtown station. He mentioned the neighborhood concerns about possible street closings and said the association had forwarded its concerns to WisDOT. He said the cost needed to be considered in the context of what major highway projects cost such as the widening of the Interstate between Madison and Beloit. This is projected to cost $1 billion. He said he didn’t believe that 60% of passengers would come from outside Madison. He also didn’t think the traffic impacts would be a major concern and noted the traffic volumes today on the surrounding streets.

Caryl Terrell, 19 Red Maple Trl., Madison, representing Sierra Club-John Muir Chapter’s Global Warming Solutions Team, said the group supported the TIP amendment and the vision for the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative of a regional rail system that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. She mentioned some of the steps needed to get to the stage that things are at today, including legislative hearings regarding support of the initiative. She mentioned the great success of the current Hiawatha service between Milwaukee and Chicago. She said the public has many questions and ideas for how to make the project successful and the way to allow that process to transpire is to approve the TIP amendment.

Tim Wong, 161 Jackson St., Madison, said he lived on the East side near the tracks. He said the new service will allow quiet zones due to the upgraded crossings. He opposed the airport location because he didn’t drive and it wasn’t convenient to get there without a car. He supported the TIP amendment to allow the process to move forward. While he said he could have supported the Yahara station too, he supported the downtown station. He mentioned the neighborhood concerns about possible street closings and said the association had forwarded its concerns to WisDOT. He said the cost needed to be considered in the context of what major highway projects cost such as the widening of the Interstate between Madison and Beloit. This is projected to cost $1 billion. He said he didn’t believe that 60% of passengers would come from outside Madison. He also didn’t think the traffic impacts would be a major concern and noted the traffic volumes today on the surrounding streets.

Pete Carnes, Monona, said he had grave concerns whether the rail service would be cost effective given the existing inter-city bus service, but at the same time he noted the need for the U.S. to reduce its energy use. He said that if it is done it should be done right and suggested an alternative route using tracks coming in from Cottage Grove rather than Sun Prairie. He suggested building a new rail line from the southeast side connecting to the rail line that crosses Mud Lake and runs up and through the isthmus.

Tim Wong, 161 Jackson St., Madison, said he lived on the East side near the tracks. He said the new service will allow quiet zones due to the upgraded crossings. He opposed the airport location because he didn’t drive and it wasn’t convenient to get there without a car. He supported the TIP amendment to allow the process to move forward. While he said he could have supported the Yahara station too, he supported the downtown station. He mentioned the neighborhood concerns about possible street closings and said the association had forwarded its concerns to WisDOT. He said the cost needed to be considered in the context of what major highway projects cost such as the widening of the Interstate between Madison and Beloit. This is projected to cost $1 billion. He said he didn’t believe that 60% of passengers would come from outside Madison. He also didn’t think the traffic impacts would be a major concern and noted the traffic volumes today on the surrounding streets.

Pete Carnes, Monona, said he had grave concerns whether the rail service would be cost effective given the existing inter-city bus service, but at the same time he noted the need for the U.S. to reduce its energy use. He said that if it is done it should be done right and suggested an alternative route using tracks coming in from Cottage Grove rather than Sun Prairie. He suggested building a new rail line from the southeast side connecting to the rail line that crosses Mud Lake and runs up and through the isthmus.
role the MPO would have. Clear clarified for members of the public that the MPO had no role in selecti
downtown station location. Brown responded that the MPO would have input on the exact location and design of the
downtown station. She said WisDOT would be holding community workshops and discussions on the issue and addressing the traffic impacts and connections to other transportation modes.

Ritt asked Brown where on WisDOT’s website information on the operational costs of the overall project could be found. Brown said that information was included in the service operation plan included in the application submitted to FRA for the grant funding, which is on the website. Ritt said that information was needed to make an informed decision on the project. C. Schmidt asked if both options were being considered for the rail corridor to use between Blair Street and the Yahara River. Brown said this was analyzed, but she didn’t recall the conclusions. She said she would get the information. C. Schmidt also asked whether full grade separation had been considered for some crossings. Brown said the diagnostic team would be analyzing the crossings, but that full grade separation was not being considered due to the high cost. Vesperman said that some cost figures might be available from the prior study. Brown agreed to see if any information was available from the earlier environmental assessment (EA). Bruskewitz asked about ventilation concerns with Monona Terrace station, and Brown said that would be in the EA as well. Bruskewitz requested that all of the older documents be put on the website.

Matano said he was a long time supporter of inter-city rail service to Madison, but was dismayed at the lack of any opportunity for input by the MPO and public on the station location decision. He said he was considering recommending postponement of the action on the TIP amendment. He thought the downtown station location was wrong because of the extra travel time and the difficulty of providing multi-modal connections. There isn’t room for an inter-city bus station. There is also more community disruption due to the increased street crossings and it negatively impacts the planned central park. He said he favored the Yahara station, which is still relatively close to downtown. He suggested that WisDOT reconsider the station location, saying that WisDOT would need to do that anyway to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. He also commented on the cost issue, noting the high cost of highway projects. Vesperman reiterated that the environmental study and preliminary design process for the station would address the issues raised about parking, transit connections, traffic impacts, etc.

Chase also expressed frustration about the process and the inability to obtain information from WisDOT. He said the 2001 EA study was done many years ago and most local officials don’t have any knowledge of that. He expressed support for postponement of the TIP amendment given the lack of information. Skidmore agreed, saying it was appropriate due to the lack of information.

Moved by Chase, seconded by Skidmore, to postpone consideration of the TIP amendment until the July meeting.

Hulsey asked Brown if postponement would jeopardize the necessary timeline for completion of the process, and Brown said it would. Hulsey said approving the TIP amendment would allow the public outreach process to proceed. Vesperman commented on the lengthy study and public outreach process in the past. He said he and Brown and her colleagues were willing to meet with Sun Prairie officials. Chase said he had been told by Chris Klein, Executive Assistant to the WisDOT Secretary, that staff couldn’t meet with them until the consultants were hired. He said relying on studies from 2001-2004 wasn’t sufficient. Vesperman noted the long time studies such as this take and that discussions on the project had continued since then. Brown said that up until the last couple of weeks WisDOT staff had not met with any communities. She said WisDOT didn’t have the staff resources to do so and that the efforts had been focused on working with FRA to get a project agreement so FRA would release the funding. The recent meetings with communities for which stations are planned were required to meet expectations of FRA. Clear commented that the MPO’s role was to approve the federal funding, and many of the issues raised concern details about the project that are beyond the purview of the MPO. Matano disagreed. Hinz asked about the next steps in the process. Brown said the TIP amendment includes $25 million for an environmental assessment, preliminary engineering, and final design of the train stations, including the Madison station. That work would be started in June. A draft EA would be completed in the fall when preliminary engineering would be started. The next decision is finalizing the exact location of the Madison station. Ritt clarified that the amendment approves the $25 million for the station study/design and $75 million for some initial rail infrastructure improvements. Funding for construction would be approved later. He said Board members needed to decide whether they had enough information to approve the initial $100 million. Vesperman commented that the MPO had to approve use of FHWA and FTA funds, but he wasn’t sure if that was the case for FRA funds. C. Schmidt expressed concern that the effort to postpone action was due to frustration about the lack of input on the station location decision. While he shared the frustration he thought the process needed to move forward. Opitz asked about the process for approving other projects funded with stimulus funds. Schaefer said the MPO approved TIP amendments for those projects. He added that it was his understanding that this project did need to be in the MPO’s TIP even though it involved FRA funding. WisDOT staff seemed to agree...
with this. Clear asked again about the level of detail appropriate for the MPO in reviewing the projects. Schaefer said the design details would be worked out as part of the EA and design process. He agreed that the MPO typically does not review all of the design details of the projects for which it approves funding for in the TIP. In this case the station location and multi-modal connections are certainly issues that are regional in significance, but not the type of fencing in the corridor.

Matano commented that the station location decision has been made. Brown agreed and said she understood the frustration, but that the decision would not be re-visited. She said WisDOT was now seeking input from the MPO and others on the exact location, traffic operations, and connectivity to the rest of the transportation system. Bruskewitz asked what happens if it turns out the downtown station won’t work. Brown said WisDOT would then need to look at other alternatives, but at this point those are not on the table.

Hulsey moved, Kamp seconded, to call the question on the motion to postpone action on the TIP amendment. Motion to call the question carried. Motion to postpone action on the TIP amendment failed with Matano abstaining.

Bruskewitz commented on the long-term impacts in terms of the operating funding needed, and her concerns about whether there was sufficient population to support the service. She mentioned the speech by the FTA Administrator and the estimated deferred maintenance for the nation’s transit systems. Because of her concerns about the long-term costs, she said she would be voting no. C. Schmidt commented on how long rail infrastructure lasts and said it was a good investment. Hulsey commented on the many state workers that travel between Madison and Milwaukee who will be able to ride the train. He mentioned the oil spill and that if Wisconsin doesn’t spend the $800 million it will go to another state. He also mentioned the jobs the project will create.

Ritt moved, Kamp seconded, to call the question on the main motion to approve the TIP amendment. Motion failed.

Opitz commented that transportation and housing policies over the last 60 years have led to the lack of transportation choices we have today. There has been considerable government intervention, including funding of the interstate system, and there is a role for government now to make investments like improved intercity rail service to chart our future. There are many people who can’t drive now and will be more in the future with the changing demographics and they lack transportation choices. He said he isn’t anti-car, but that this is a reasonable investment and said he’ll support the motion.

Motion to approve Resolution TPB No. 39, Amendment #4 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program, carried.

7. **Consideration of Revision to the Madison Area TPB’s Scoring Criteria for Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement (TE) Projects**

Schaefer explained that WisDOT has a Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP) that includes or encompasses funding from the Federal Transportation Enhancements Program as well as federal and state funding for the new Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Program. The SMIP program is a statewide discretionary grant program, but for projects within MPO areas WisDOT asks MPOs to prioritize the projects. These MPO rankings are then considered by the state committee that makes the decisions on what projects statewide receive funding. Schaefer said the Madison Area TPB has SMIP project scoring criteria, which were included in the packet. He said there was discussion after the last SMIP funding cycle about adding a criterion related to local financial commitment. There were two City of Madison projects and a Dane County Parks project where a 50% local funding share was proposed rather than the minimum 20%. He said it was a strategic decision on the part of the city and county because the projects had a high cost and they felt the greater local match would increase their chances of receiving funding. There was discussion that perhaps projects with a higher local funding commitment should receive additional points in the scoring criteria. The reasoning is the same as why the MPO’s local funding match policy was changed to 50% for STP-Urban projects: an increased local financial commitment would spread the limited federal funding further and allow more projects to be funded. There is a difference in this case because SMIP is a statewide discretionary program. There is no guarantee that if the MPO added a new criteria encouraging applicants within the Madison area to increase the local funding commitment for projects that the Madison area would get more projects funded in any particular grant cycle. Schaefer said over time he thought it would result in more area projects being funded because the state committee considers geographic equity in terms of funding, not the number of projects. The MPO’s Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) discussed the issue last week. There were concerns by some members that the new criterion wouldn’t guarantee more Madison area...
projects would be funded. There was also a concern that communities wouldn’t know ahead of time the score of their project and whether it would be necessary to provide additional local funding to bump the score up. Some staff were uncomfortable about having to make a recommendation to local officials from a strategic point of view on whether or not to provide more local funding. Ultimately, the TCC recommended that the new criterion related to local financial commitment not be added. They did recommend the other editorial changes. Schaefer said he didn’t have a chance to review the issue with the Citizen Advisory Committee. The information was sent out to the members, but he said he didn’t get any feedback.

In response to a question regarding the available funding, Schaefer said it had been about $9 million per year statewide. It would be a little higher for this next cycle, but overall it isn’t much money compared to the demand for projects. Mandli passed out a letter signed by him and County Executive Chief of Staff Topf Wells opposing the amendment to the criteria. He said the county was concerned the added criterion would require additional local funds without any guarantee the additional federal funds would come back to the Madison area. In response to a question from Clear, Mandli said the county was also concerned that it might result in a project receiving a lower priority than what the state might give it and result in the project not receiving funding.

Moved by Matano, seconded by Opitz, to recommend against adding the criterion related to local financial commitment (#7) to the MPO’s SMIP scoring criteria, but in favor of making the other editorial changes. Motion carried.

   
   Item deferred.

9. **Review and Discussion of the Federal Certification Review Report Recommendations and MPO Staff Responses**
   
   Item deferred.

10. **Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA)**
    
    Item deferred.

11. **Status Report on MPO Policy Board Appointments**
    
    Item covered as part of roll call and introductions.

12. **Status Report on Hiring of New MPO Transportation Planning Manager**
    
    Schaefer reported that final interviews for the position were scheduled for the week of June 14, and a decision would be made soon thereafter. He said that Al Matano would be involved in the final interviews.

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
    - USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)
    - North Mendota Parkway Study
    
    Item deferred.

14. **Discussion of Future Work Items:**
    
    - Transit Development Plan (TDP), including RTA Service Scenarios
    - 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program
    - MPO Congestion Management Process
    - Regional Transportation Plan Update
    - Revisions to MPO Operating Rules and Procedures
    
    Item deferred.
15. **Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings.**
   The next meeting is scheduled for July 7, 2010 at the Madison Water Utility at 7 p.m.

16. **Adjournment**
   Clear moved, Hinz seconded, to adjourn. Motion carried.
June 10, 2010

George R. Poirier
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
525 Junction Rd. Suite 8000
Madison, Wisconsin 53717

Marisol Simon
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
200 W. Adams Street, Suite 2410
Chicago, Illinois 60606-5232

Mr. Poirier and Ms. Simon:

Under the authority delegated to me by Governor Jim Doyle, I am hereby approving the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board's amendment to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Urban Area. The amendment was approved and adopted by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board on June 2, 2010. We will reflect by reference the 2010-2013 federal aid projects covered by this approval in our 2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

A copy of TIP Amendment #4 and Resolution Number 39 for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board were recently sent to the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration respectively. This TIP amendment represents a comprehensive, continuous, and cooperative effort between the MPO, local communities, affected transit operators, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and is designed to meet the objectives of Title 23 USC 134 and 135 and their implementing regulations 23 CFR 450 and the 2030 regional transportation system plan.

We have determined that: 1) the proposed amendment is consistent with the adopted 2030 Regional Transportation System Plan and the TIP: 2) remains fiscally constrained in that federal funding resources are sufficient to support the new or modified projects and 3) conforms to state and national air quality standards as required by the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Busalacchi
Secretary

Enclosure

Re:
Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 40 Regarding Amendment #5 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

**Staff Comments on Item:**
WisDOT SW Region staff have requested this TIP amendment for a local safety project on County Trunk Highway (CTH) PB in the Town of Verona that was approved by WisDOT for Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funding. The project involves reconstructing the CTH PB and Sunset Drive intersection to add turn lanes on CTH PB and improve the intersection geometry. The amendment is needed to allow preliminary engineering to start this year. Construction is programmed for 2012.

WisDOT has also informed the MPO of a new roadway maintenance project on Interstate 39/90 from STH 59 to CTH AB outside the MPO Planning Area, which involves improving the paved shoulders on the median side. This has been included as part of the TIP amendment for public information purposes.

**Materials Presented on Item:**
1. Resolution TPB No. 40 Regarding Amendment #5 to the 2010-2014 TIP

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**
Staff recommends adoption.
WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) approved the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on October 7, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB has approved four previous amendments to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on December 22, 2009, March 3, 2010, May 5, 2010, and June 2, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area transportation projects and some transportation planning activities to be undertaken using Federal funding in 2010–2013 must be included in the 2010-2014 TIP; and

WHEREAS, an amendment to the TIP has been requested for a local safety project on County Trunk Highway (CTH) PB that was approved by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) for federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funding, which involves reconstructing the CTH PB and Sunset Drive intersection to add turn lanes on CTH PB and improve the intersection geometry; and

WHEREAS, WisDOT has also informed the MPO of a new roadway maintenance project on Interstate 39/90 from STH 59 to CTH AB outside the MPO Planning Area, which involves improving the paved shoulders on the median side that is being added to the TIP for public information purposes; and

WHEREAS, the MPO’s public participation procedures for minor TIP amendments such as this have been followed, including listing the projects on the Madison Area TPB meeting agenda; and

WHEREAS, the projects are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan 2030 for the Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County, the adopted long-range regional transportation plan for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area TPB approves Amendment #5 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County adding the CTH PB project to the Streets section at page 50 and adding the Interstate maintenance project to the Outer Area Streets section at page 51 as shown on the attached table.

Date Adopted

Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
## PROJECT LISTINGS FOR AMENDMENT #5 TO THE 2010-2014 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

### STREET/ROADWAY PROJECTS

#### MADISON METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Jurisdiction/Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Cost/Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2010</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2011</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2012</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2013</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2014</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OF VERONA</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-10-030</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>SAF (LS30) TV</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OUTER AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>INTERSTATE 39/90</th>
<th>Cost/Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2010</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2011</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2012</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2013</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2014</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway maintenance</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve paved shoulders on the median side (18.2 mi.)</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**MADISON METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA**

- **Verona**
  - **Project Description**: Sunset Drive Intersection
  - **Project Sponsor**: Town of CTH PB
  - **Comments**: Reconstruction intersection to improve safety, adding turn lanes and improving the intersection geometry
  - **Costs**:
    - **PE**: 23
    - **ROW**: 2
    - **Const**: 25
  - **Total Costs**:
    - **SAF (LS30) TV**: 181

**OUTER AREA**

- **Project Sponsor**: WisDOT
  - **Interstate 39/90**
  - **Project Description**: Roadway maintenance
  - **Comments**: Improve paved shoulders on the median side (18.2 mi.)
  - **Costs**:
    - **PE**: 135
    - **ROW**: 1,418
    - **Const**: 158
    - **IM**: 1,711
  - **Total Costs**:
    - **SAF (LS30) TV**: 1,711

---

**Comments**

- **5658-00-03, -73**
- **1001-06-30, -60**
- Part in Rock County
Re:
Review of Preliminary Draft Listing and Ranking of Candidate Projects for STP Urban Funding for 2011-2015

Staff Comments on Item:
Each year as part of the annual process to update the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), it is the responsibility of the MPO to score, rank, and prioritize candidate projects for Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) - Urban funding.

An interagency staff meeting will be scheduled to review the STP-Urban and other TIP project submittals and resolve any issues/discrepancies in the cost, cost sharing, and timing of the projects. MPO staff will review the preliminary draft STP-Urban priority listings with the Technical Coordinating Committee at its July 28 meeting. A final draft version will then be reviewed with the MPO Board at its August 4 meeting prior to release of the Draft 2011-2015 TIP.

A public hearing regarding the draft STP-Urban priority listings and the Draft 2011-2015 TIP is scheduled for the September 1 MPO Board meeting. MPO Board approval of the listings and the 2011-2015 TIP is anticipated at the October 6 meeting.

Materials Presented on Item:
None.

[Note: The Preliminary Draft 2011-2015 Priority STP-Urban Project Listings for the Madison Urban Area and the Preliminary Draft STP-Urban Projects Scoring and Ranking Table will be distributed at the meeting for review.]

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For information and discussion purposes only at this time
### Re:
Review and Discussion of Federal Law and Rules Regarding MPOs and the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process and the Madison Area TPB’s Operating Rules and Procedures

### Staff Comments on Item:
The MPO Policy Board requested information on its authority and responsibilities at the May meeting while discussing the issue of the process for hiring the new MPO Transportation Planning Manager. Interest was expressed in considering additions or changes to the MPO’s operating rules and procedures to address this and other issues.

The MPO’s authority is derived from Federal law and regulations on MPOs and the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process, the Agreement Redesignating the MPO for the Madison Urban Area, and the MPO’s Operating Rules and Procedures. These documents were all included in the packet for the June meeting. Only the Redesignation Agreement and current MPO operating rules and procedures have been included this time. The Federal law and regulations related to metropolitan transportation planning address the designation of MPOs, the Policy Board structure, and the transportation planning process requirements, which most of you are very familiar with. You may still want to bring your copy of these materials from the last meeting. Also included is the MPO staff memo that was prepared outlining potential issues to address with additions and revisions to the MPO operating rules to guide discussion at the meeting.

### Materials Presented on Item:
1. Agreement Redesignating the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Madison Urbanized Area, effective May 2, 2007
3. Memo from MPO staff to MPO Policy Board regarding additions and revisions to the MPO’s Operating Rules and Procedures

### Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For information and discussion only at this meeting
AN AGREEMENT REDESIGNATING THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
FOR THE MADISON URBANIZED AREA

A. Introduction

The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison Urbanized Area is charged, under Title 23 U.S.C., Section 134, as the organization responsible for cooperative transportation planning and decision making for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area. The Metropolitan Planning Area consists of the City of Madison, the Madison Urbanized Area, and all or portions of the contiguous villages, cities and towns which are or are likely to become urbanized within a 20 year period as shown on the attached map and agreed to by the MPO and the Governor.

The responsibilities of the Metropolitan Planning Organization include:

1. Carrying out a cooperative, continuous and comprehensive planning process for
   making transportation investment decisions in the metropolitan area with program
   oversight from the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit
   Administration and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

2. Preparing and maintaining a long-range multi-modal transportation plan.

3. Preparing and implementing an annual work program.

4. Preparing a transportation improvement program to provide for transportation
   investments to meet metropolitan transportation needs.

5. Establishing operating rules and procedures.

6. Other duties as required to comply with State and Federal regulations.

Federal law allows for the redesignation of the Metropolitan Planning Organization by agreement between the Governor and units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the population within the MPO Planning Area, including the largest incorporated city. The Madison Area MPO was created through an agreement between the Governor and the City of Madison, effective November 29, 1999, redesignating the MPO for the Madison Urbanized Area in accordance with this Federal law. The Madison Area MPO assumed the responsibility to conduct transportation planning and programming from the previous MPO, the Dane County Regional Planning Commission (DCRPC), following the DCRPC’s reorganization.

During the federal re-certification process of the Madison Area MPO in 2005-2006, it was determined that the Madison Area MPO policy board structure and membership was not in compliance with federal requirements and that the MPO would have to go through the redesignation process to effect the necessary changes to bring the Board into compliance. On June 7, 2006, the Madison Area MPO Policy Board took the first step in the process and approved changes to the structure and membership of the Board to bring the Board into compliance with federal requirements. The revised structure is described below. To
complete the process, this agreement needs to be approved by the Governor and those units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the population within the MPO Planning Area, including the largest incorporated city. The MPO Board also approved, on August 2, 2006, to change its name to the “Madison Area Transportation Planning Board” with the subheading “A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)”. This name change was motivated by a desire to better describe the Board’s functions and becomes effective on the effective date of the signing of this agreement.

B. Composition of the MPO Policy Board
The members of the Metropolitan Planning Organization are appointed by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, City of Madison, Dane County, small villages and cities and towns within the Metropolitan Planning Area in recognition of their respective roles as the owners and operators of the major modes of transportation serving the Metropolitan Planning Area. Each appointee to the Policy Board shall reside within the Metropolitan Planning Area and shall serve until their successor is appointed. The Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board for the Madison Urbanized Area and Madison Metropolitan Planning Area shall consist of the following members:

1. City of Madison. As the owner and operator of the Madison Metro Transit System and the corporate entity responsible for the maintenance and improvement of streets, highways, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the City, six (6) members of the policy board shall be appointed by the Mayor of the City of Madison. Appointees serve a period of two (2) years. Three of the six initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2008. The remaining three initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2009. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two years. In addition, a minimum of two-thirds or four (4) of the six appointees must be elected officials.

2. Dane County. As the owner and operator of the Dane County Airport and as the unit of government responsible for the maintenance and improvement of County highways, and administration of specialized transportation services for the elderly and persons with disabilities, three (3) members of the policy board shall be appointed by the Dane County Executive. Appointees serve a period of two (2) years. Two of the three initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2008. The remaining initial appointment shall serve through April 30, 2009. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two years. In addition, a minimum of two-thirds or two (2) of the three appointees must be elected officials.

3. Other Cities and Villages. Three (3) members of the policy board shall be appointed by a simple majority vote of the chief elected officials of the cities and villages within the Metropolitan Planning Area other than Madison. Appointees serve a period of two (2) years. One of the three initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2008. The remaining two initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2009. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two years. In
addition, a minimum of two-thirds or two (2) of the three appointees must be elected officials.

4. **Towns.** One (1) member of the policy board shall be appointed by a simple majority vote of the Chairpersons of the towns with land area within the Metropolitan Planning Area. Appointee serves a period of two (2) years. The initial appointment shall serve through April 30, 2008. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two years. In addition, the appointee must be an elected official.

5. **State of Wisconsin.** One (1) member shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation. Appointee serves a two-year term. The initial appointment shall serve through April 30, 2009. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two years.

In addition, all appointments must be in accord with Title 23, United States Code, Section 134, Paragraph (d)(2) that indicates the voting membership of the MPO Policy Board shall consist of:

a. Local elected officials;

b. Officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area; and

c. Appropriate State officials.

Note: Current appointments on the MPO Board that are not in accord with the above conditions will cease to serve on the MPO Board after April 30, 2007 and the positions will become vacant until filled.

When each of the appointing authorities is making an appointment under condition (b) above, the MPO also accepts members in good standing that come from local boards and commissions with a focus on transportation or land use, including mayoral representatives, or representatives of the chief executive officer of any city or village in the MPO Planning area with said focus.

Policy board members representing any local government jurisdiction or collective group of local government jurisdictions (such as Cities and Villages or Towns) must be selected by the elected officials of the local government jurisdiction(s) they represent.

When making an appointment, each of the appointing authorities is encouraged to keep in mind the MPO's commitment to meeting the transportation needs of all citizens, particularly those who have traditionally been under-represented in the transportation planning process and whose reliance on public transportation is high. These groups include transit-dependent, low-income and minority populations, and persons with disabilities. Each of the appointing authorities is also encouraged to consider the desirability of
maintaining geographic balance within the municipality or among municipalities of board members appointed.

C. Future Changes to the Policy Board Composition

The composition of the Madison Area MPO Policy Board will be reviewed periodically to ensure appropriate representation on the MPO Board.

Revising the composition of the Policy Board (e.g. adding membership, changing the number or requirements of members appointed by each appointing authority) or expansion of the metropolitan planning area boundary does not necessarily require redesignation of the MPO. A change to the Madison Area MPO Policy Board can be made following the notification of the appointing authorities, all the local units of government in the MPO Planning Area, a public hearing on the proposed changes, and ratification by those units of government with 75 percent of the population in the planning area, including the City of Madison as the largest incorporated city.

D. Metropolitan Planning Organization Staff

1. Location. MPO staff will be provided by the City of Madison.

2. Matching Contribution. The City of Madison shall be responsible for providing the local matching contributions. Other units of government within the MPO Planning Area are strongly encouraged to make proportionate contributions to cover a share of local costs in support of the MPO. It is recommended that contributions be based on their proportionate share of the population within the MPO Planning Area.

E. Effective Date and Conditions of the Agreement

1. This agreement takes effect immediately after obtaining signatures of approval by the Governor and representatives of units of government with 75 percent of the population in the MPO Planning Area, including Madison as the largest incorporated city.

2. This agreement supercedes and voids the redesignation agreement entered into by the Governor and City of Madison dated November 29, 1999.

F. Non-Discrimination

In the performance of the services under this Agreement, the parties agree not to discriminate against any employee or applicant because of race, religion, marital status, age, color, sex, handicap, national origin, or ancestry, income level, or source of income, arrest record or conviction record, less than honorable discharge, physical appearance, sexual orientation, political beliefs, or student status. The parties further agree not to discriminate against any subcontractor or person who offers to subcontract on this contract because of race, religion, color, age, disability, sex or national origin.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be executed by individuals and officers duly authorized on the dates noted below.

STATE OF WISCONSIN:

By: [Signature]

Jim Doyle, Governor

Date: 5/2/07

CITY:

CITY OF MADISON, a Wisconsin Municipal Corporation

By: [Signature]

David C. Belenson, Mayor

Date: 2-5-07

By: [Signature]

Maribeth Witzel-Behl, City Clerk

Date: January 31, 2007

COUNTERSIGNED:

[Signature]

Dean Brasser, City Comptroller

Date: 2/1/07

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signature]

Michael May, City Attorney

Date: 2/6/07

NOTE:
The following additional municipalities signed the agreement:

City of Fitchburg
City of Middleton
City of Monona
City of Stoughton
City of Verona
Village of McFarland
Town of Burke
Town of Pleasant Springs
Town of Rutland
The following operating rules and procedures are adopted by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), to facilitate the performance of its transportation planning and programming responsibilities.  

The responsibilities of the Metropolitan Planning Organization include:
1. Carrying out a cooperative, continuous and comprehensive planning process for making transportation investment decisions in the metropolitan area with program oversight from the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.
2. Preparing and maintaining a long-range multi-modal transportation plan.
3. Preparing and implementing an annual work program.
4. Preparing a transportation improvement program to provide for transportation investments to meet metropolitan transportation needs.
5. Other duties as required to comply with State and Federal regulations.

SECTION I – MEMBERSHIP AND OFFICERS

A. Membership
The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board consists of fourteen (14) members appointed by the local units of government within the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area, Dane County, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. Each appointee to the MPO Policy Board must reside within the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area and shall serve until their successor is appointed.

The appointments to the MPO Policy Board are made as follows:

- The Mayor of the City of Madison appoints six (6) members. Appointees serve a period of two (2) years. Three of the six initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2008. The remaining three initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2009. Subsequent
appointments shall be for a period of two years. In addition, a minimum of two-thirds or four (4) of the six appointees must be elected officials. 3

- The Dane County Executive appoints three (3) members. Appointees serve a period of two (2) years. Two of the three initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2008. The remaining initial appointment shall serve through April 30, 2009. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two years. In addition, a minimum of two-thirds or two (2) of the three appointees must be elected officials. 3

- Three (3) members of the policy board shall be appointed by a simple majority vote of the chief elected officials of the cities and villages within the Metropolitan Planning Area other than Madison. Appointees serve a period of two (2) years. One of the three initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2008. The remaining two initial appointments shall serve through April 30, 2009. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two years. In addition, a minimum of two-thirds or two (2) of the three appointees must be elected officials. 3

- One (1) member of the policy board shall be appointed by a simple majority vote of the Chairpersons of the towns with land area within the Metropolitan Planning Area. Appointee serves a period of two (2) years. The initial appointment shall serve through April 30, 2008. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two (2) years. In addition, the appointee must be an elected official.

- One (1) member shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation. Appointee serves a two-year term. The initial appointment shall serve through April 30, 2009. Subsequent appointments shall be for a period of two years.

The City of Madison is responsible for providing staff for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board. The Transportation Planning Manager with the Transportation Planning Services Section of the City of Madison Planning Unit in the Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development (hereinafter referred to as the “MPO Transportation Planning Manager”) shall be the chief staff person for the MPO Policy Board. The Administrative Clerk with the Transportation Planning Services Section (hereinafter referred to as the “MPO Recording Secretary”) shall record all meetings.

B. Officers
The MPO Policy Board shall choose from among their members a Chair. The Chair shall preside at all meetings; appoint MPO representatives to study committees and MPO subcommittees, as may be required, with confirmation by the Board; and perform such other duties as may be agreed to by the Board.

---

3 Appointments that are not elected officials must be officials of public agencies who administer or operate major modes of transportation in the Metropolitan Planning Area including members from local boards and commissions with a focus on transportation or land use. Appointments can also be appropriate state officials.
The Board shall choose from among their members a Vice-Chair, who in the absence of the Chair shall preside at meetings.

The terms for the Chair and Vice Chair shall be one year, unless extended by a majority vote of the Board. Election of the Chair and Vice Chair shall generally take place at the June meeting.

C. Subcommittees of the MPO Policy Board
Subcommittees may be appointed by the Chair with confirmation by the Board to consider such matters and perform such tasks as are referred to them by the Policy Board. Such subcommittees may include MPO Technical Coordinating Committee members, local officials, public citizens, and others in addition to MPO Board members.

D. MPO Technical Coordinating Committee
The MPO Policy Board shall establish an intergovernmental Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) with staff from local units of government in the metropolitan area and various agencies or facets of transportation planning to assist in carrying out its responsibilities. The TCC shall review, coordinate, and advise on all transportation planning matters.

E. MPO Citizen Advisory Committee
The MPO Policy Board shall establish a Citizen Advisory Committee with representatives of various public and/or private interest groups, the transportation industry, and local citizens to provide a broader base of review of the MPO’s programs and plans.

SECTION II – MEETINGS

A. Public Notice, Accessibility, and Conduct
All meetings shall be publicly noticed, located in a place that is accessible to all persons, and conducted in conformance with Sections 19.81 to 19.98 of the Wisconsin Statutes, which set forth the public policy and requirements for open meetings of governmental bodies. Accommodations will be made for persons with disabilities if the attendee gives advance notice of a need for an interpreter, materials in alternate forms, or other accommodations to access the meeting.

B. Meetings
(1) Regular Meetings – The MPO Policy Board shall generally meet once a month at a location to be determined by the MPO Transportation Planning Manager.

When there are insufficient agenda items for a meeting, no meeting will be held. If the regular meeting date is a holiday, the meeting will be rescheduled or cancelled. However, a special meeting may be called in lieu of the regular meeting.

(2) Special Meetings – Special meetings may be called at any time by the Chair. The Chair shall set the date and time of the special meeting. In the absence of a Board Chair, the Vice Chair may call a special meeting.
C. Agenda
Meeting agendas shall be prepared by the MPO Transportation Planning Manager in consultation with the Chair. Items for the agenda, accompanying information, and written communications intended for consideration as part of an agenda item should be received by the MPO Transportation Planning Manager no later than ten (10) days prior to the scheduled meeting. However, written communications received after this deadline will be reported and provided to the Board at the meeting.

All agendas and accompanying information packets shall be mailed to Board members no later than seven (7) days in advance of the scheduled meeting. A mailing list for the agendas and minutes based on requests for same will be maintained by the MPO Recording Secretary.

Order of Business for Meetings

- Roll Call
- Approval of Minutes
- Communications
- Public Comment
  (Note: This item is intended to offer the public an opportunity to comment on an issue that is not on the agenda, such as introducing an issue that the person would like the MPO Policy Board to consider at a future meeting.)
- Public Hearing
  (Note: A set time is to be noticed)
- Items for Action
  (Note: In general, items for action are to be presented to MPO Policy Board members with a staff report that includes a cover sheet with staff comments and recommendation/rationale, a copy of any applicable resolution, and any other accompanying materials to assist members in considering the item.)
- Items for Discussion
- Status Report on Projects Potentially Involving the MPO
- Discussion of Future Work Items
- Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings
- Adjournment

The Board may alter the above order of the agenda items at the meeting.

D. Public Comment
Persons wishing to speak on an agenda item must register and give the registration form to the MPO Recording Secretary, preferably before the item comes up on the agenda. The time limit for comments on items for which a public hearing has not been scheduled is three (3) minutes per person, unless waived by a 2/3s majority vote of the members present. Questions of the speaker may occur following the speaker’s presentation, unless questioning is anticipated to last longer than three minutes. Then questions will be held until after all public comments on the item.
E. Attendance
Board members are to inform the MPO Recording Secretary in advance if they are not able to attend a meeting. Board roster attendance information shall be provided to Board members on a quarterly basis. The Chair may remind Board members of their responsibility to attend and participate in Board meetings in the event of poor attendance. If the problem persists, the Board may authorize the Chair to send a letter to the appointing authority or authorities informing them of the Board member’s poor attendance.

F. Motions
Motions shall be restated by the Chair before a vote is taken. The name of the maker of the motion and the person seconding it shall be recorded. A motion made at the following meeting to reconsider an item may be made, but if notice of reconsideration has not been published, the motion is to be referred to the next meeting so that adequate public notice can be provided.

G. Parliamentary Procedure
Board meetings shall be governed by *Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised* unless otherwise provided for herein.

H. Quorum
A majority of the Board or eight (8) members shall constitute a quorum for the conducting of business and taking of official action. Whenever a quorum is not present within fifteen (15) minutes of the scheduled beginning meeting time, the Chair shall adjourn the meeting without taking any other action to a time and date selected by the Chair. In the event that a Board member has notified MPO staff or Board member(s) that he/she will be more than fifteen (15) minutes late, the Board may decide to wait for a longer period of time to convene the meeting.

I. Reports
The Board may ask for reports and recommendations, if any, from staff and the MPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) on any matters before it. [See Agenda regarding staff reports to accompany agenda items and Subsection D of Section I regarding the TCC.]

J. Voting
Voting shall be by voice. Only whether the motion or resolution passed or failed shall be recorded, unless a roll call is requested or a member requests that the votes cast be recorded by number and/or name. All persons will be assumed voting in the affirmative unless they verbally cast a “no” vote or indicate at the time of the vote that they wish to abstain. If there is any question, the Chair will restate the votes cast for record purposes.
[Note: It is advisable that members who abstain from voting indicate their reason(s) for doing so. If a member abstains from voting due to a conflict of interest, he/she should not participate in the discussion.]

A motion for reconsideration of any agenda item from a previous meeting may only be made by a member who was present at that meeting and voted on the prevailing side or who is recorded as an excused absence. All members who are in attendance at the meeting where reconsideration is being considered may vote on the issue.
SECTION III – PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Board shall schedule and hold public hearings on all items required by law (e.g., Regional Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program) and may hold public hearings on any other matters.

A. Public Notice and Comments
Reasonable effort shall be made to notify affected local units of government and the general public of hearings through posting and mailing of notices, through the news media, and other means.

Persons wishing to speak at a hearing must register and give the registration form to the MPO Recording Secretary, preferably before the start of the hearing. The time limit for comments at a public hearing is five (5) minutes per person, unless waived by a two-thirds majority vote of the members present. Questions of the speaker may occur following the speaker’s presentation, unless questioning is anticipated to last longer than three (3) minutes. Then questions will be held until after all public comments are completed.

B. Conduct and Record of Hearing
At the beginning of the hearing, the Chair shall briefly identify the subject(s) under consideration and instruct the public on how the hearing will proceed. MPO staff may give a brief presentation on the subject, if deemed appropriate. A record of the names, addresses, and positions of those appearing shall be made. If questions by the public are permitted, they shall be directed to the Chair. Any member of the Board may question a speaker on his/her statements.

SECTION IV – MISCELLANEOUS

No member of the MPO Policy Board shall take any action, which may be interpreted as representing the view of the MPO Policy Board as a whole unless he/she has been authorized to do so by the Board as a body or by the Chair.

Suspension/Amendment to Rules: The Board may suspend or amend these rules and procedures by a two-thirds vote of the total membership (10 members).

MPO Board members shall be governed by the Code of Ethics of their appointing governmental bodies. In the event that the appointing governmental body does not have a Code of Ethics, the Board member shall simply strive to maintain high moral and ethical standards, including avoidance of conflicts between their personal interests and their public responsibilities as Board members.
Memorandum

To: Madison Area Transportation Planning Board Members
From: Bill Schaefer
Date: May 24, 2010
Re: Additions and Revisions to MPO’s Operating Rules and Procedures

The MPO Policy Board expressed an interest in reviewing and considering additions or changes to the MPO’s Operating Rules and Procedures at the last meeting while discussing the issue of the hiring of the new MPO Transportation Planning Manager.

The following is a list of potential issues to address and, in some cases, some suggested language for additions and revisions to the document to help guide discussion of the Board:

1. MPO Staff

The current document has a paragraph that says the City of Madison is responsible for providing staff for the MPO. The Transportation Planning Manager, who heads the Transportation Planning Services Section of the City’s Planning Division, is the chief staff person for the MPO Board.

It is recommended that a separate section be added to the document that addresses the MPO staff. The following is some proposed draft language:

The City of Madison is the fiscal and administrative agent for the Madison Area TPB (MPO) and is responsible for providing staff services to the agency. The Madison Area TPB staff reports to the MPO Policy Board and is directed by MPO policies and approved documents.

The Transportation Planning Manager for the Transportation Planning Services Section of the City of Madison’s Planning Division within the City’s Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development shall be the MPO Director. The MPO Director shall be responsible for direction of all administrative and operational functions of the Madison Area TPB, including supervision of the TPB staff.
The MPO Director shall be responsible for preparing agendas, supporting documentation, information and technical support for TPB meetings, as well as transmitting notice of all official actions taken by the TPB to its constituent members, WisDOT, FHWA, and FTA.

The document could also address the MPO Board’s desired role in hiring/firing of the MPO Director. Because the MPO Redesignation Agreement says the City of Madison provides the MPO staff and doesn’t address the Board’s role, this would only serve as a statement of the Board’s desires. Alternatively, an agreement would need to be entered into with the City that addresses this issue.

2. **MPO Work Program and Budget**

A section might be added that addresses the approval of the MPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and budget by the Board and the relationship to the City’s Planning Division budget. The language could simply document the existing process whereby the MPO Board reviews and approves the UPWP and budget together. It would be noted that the Policy Board’s preparation and review of the budget occurs along the same general timeline as the City’s budget and staff work to ensure that they are consistent.

3. **MPO Policy Board**

(a) **Authority**

It is recommended that a statement be added indicating that the MPO has authority and responsibilities granted under the Redesignation Agreement and applicable State and Federal laws and regulations, including but not limited to 23 U.S.C. 134 and 23 C.F.R. Section 450. It might also be mentioned here that the City of Madison is the MPO’s fiscal and administrative agent.

(b) **Procedure for Nomination and Voting for City/Village and Town Appointments**

The procedure for the chief elected officials of the city and villages and towns to nominate and vote on their appointments might be added to the document. The procedure that has been developed—doing it via email following an initial letter—works fine. However, it does not provide confidentiality of the votes. If this is a concern, the only alternative would be to schedule a meeting to conduct the vote.

(c) **Changing Appointments**

MPO Policy Board members may be removed and a new appointment made by the appointing authorities at any time. This should be noted.

Also, a procedure for the cities and villages and the towns to make a change in an appointment before the appointee’s term is up might be outlined. How would the process be initiated?
(d) **Officers**

It is recommended that language be added regarding the duties of the Chair indicating that the Chair act as official signatory for MPO resolutions and other documents. The Vice-Chair should have the same duty in the absence of the Chair.

It is recommended that the meeting when the election of the officers generally occurs be changed from June to July, August, or September because of the timing of the new appointments each year.

It is recommended that the procedure for filling a vacancy in either office be added. Should the selection of the new officer occur at the next meeting? If there is a vacancy with the Chair, does the Vice Chair become Chair? If so, does he/she serve only the remainder of the term?

Language might added either here or under MPO Staff saying that the MPO Director shall be Secretary of the TPB and shall have the responsibility for preparing agendas and packet materials, posting meeting notices, and maintaining accurate records of all TPB meetings.

(e) **Changes to the Policy Board Composition**

The Redesignation Agreement addresses this issue (see Section C, page 4), requiring a public hearing and ratification by units of government with 75% of the planning area population. It is recommended that language be added indicating whether the vote by the Policy Board to submit a change to the local units of government for ratification is a simple majority vote or something more than that.

(f) **Attendance**

It is recommended that absences be categorized as either excused or unexcused. To be excused, the Board member must notify the MPO Director or Secretary at least three (3) days in advance or the absence must be one of an unavoidable nature. It is also recommended that the report on attendance (which hasn’t been done regularly) be made to the Board on a biennial or annual basis or upon request.

4. **Meetings**

(a) **Public Notice**

The current practice of noticing Policy Board meetings with both the Dane County and City of Madison Clerks might be noted. Also, it should be noted that agendas and meeting packets will be posted on the MPO’s website within three (3) days of the date such agenda and packet are mailed.

(b) **Participation by telephone, conference call, or teleconference**
Language should be added permitting this for at least special meetings. It should be required that the conduct of the meeting occur in a designated public place. The public notice for the meeting shall indicate those members that will be participating this way. A roll call vote will be conducted so the vote of each member can be acknowledged and recorded.

(c) Joint Meetings

Language specifically allowing joint meetings with other agencies and committees or commissions on items of mutual interest might be added.

5. Procedure for Amending Rules

The formal procedure for amending the rules might be noted, although this would be pretty straightforward.

6. Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)

The membership and voting for the TCC might be spelled out in the rules.
Re:
Consideration of Recommendation Regarding Sending Letter Requesting Financial Support for Work of the MPO

Staff Comments on Item:
The 2007 MPO Redesignation provides that the City of Madison shall be responsible for providing the local matching contributions for the Federal and State funding the MPO receives. However, the agreement also states that other units of government within the MPO Planning Area are strongly encouraged to make proportionate contributions based on population to cover a share of local costs in support of the MPO. Following the prior November 1999 redesignation agreement, the City of Madison sent a letter to all local units of government in the MPO Planning Area at the time requesting their participation in financially supporting the MPO. Since that time MPO staff has informally discussed with staff of other communities the issue, but another formal request for financial support has never been made. The Cities of Monona and Fitchburg and the Village of McFarland provided financial support for the MPO in 2010 based on their proportionate share of the population in 2000.

MPO staff is seeking a recommendation from the Board whether it would like to recommend to City of Madison Mayor Cieslewicz that a letter be sent to all communities in the MPO Planning Area requesting financial support of the MPO. The proportionate share could be based either on the 2000 Census population or the January 1, 2009 population estimate for the communities. Attached is a table showing the population distribution of the municipalities in the MPO planning area and the estimated proportionate share of the required local match funding for the MPO based upon the 2010 budget.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Table with 2000 population and January 1, 2009 population estimate of municipalities in the MPO planning area and the estimated proportionate share of local match funding for the MPO based on the 2010 budget.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
The amount of funding involved is small. However, a request for financial support would ensure that all communities are aware of the recommendation in the MPO agreement that all communities support the MPO and let them know the communities that are currently supporting the MPO. Increased support from other communities would be more equitable and perhaps help communities feel more “ownership” in the MPO. It is up to the Board and the City of Madison to decide whether to make the request for financial support.
### 2000 Census Population and January 1, 2009 Population Estimate of the Madison Area MPO Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within MPO Planning Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within MPO Planning Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Madison</td>
<td>208,054</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>227,700</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>$58,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fitchburg</td>
<td>20,324</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>23,520</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$6,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Middleton</td>
<td>15,770</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>17,020</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>$4,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Monona</td>
<td>8,018</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8,228</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>$2,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stoughton</td>
<td>12,354</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>$3,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sun Prairie</td>
<td>20,369</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>$6,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Verona</td>
<td>7,052</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>$2,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Cities Total</td>
<td>83,887</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>97,978</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>$25,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Cottage Grove</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$1,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Maple Bluff</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. McFarland</td>
<td>6,416</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7,368</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>$1,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Shorewood Hills</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Waunakee</td>
<td>8,995</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>11,170</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>$2,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages Total</td>
<td>22,560</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>27,165</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>$6,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Blooming Grove</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Bristol (part) (49.7%)</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Burke</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>$802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Cottage Grove (part) (59.0%)</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>$596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Dunkirk (part) (64.0%)</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Dunn (part) (69.8%)</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Madison</td>
<td>7,005</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Middleton</td>
<td>4,594</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5,645</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Pleasant Springs (part) (44.0%)</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Rutland (part) (14.5%)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>$74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Springfield (part) (34.6%)</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sun Prairie (part) (65.2%)</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Verona (part) (77.8%)</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Westport (part) (98.4%)</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3,767</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>$965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Windsor (part) (8.6%)</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns Total</td>
<td>35,746</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>36,729</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$9,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for MPO Planning Area</td>
<td>350,247</td>
<td></td>
<td>389,572</td>
<td></td>
<td>$99,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Population estimate from Wisconsin Dept. of Administration Demographic Services Center
2. For towns partially within MPO planning area, same percentage used as 2000 to determine percentage of 2009 population within the MPO planning area because small area pop. estimates unavailable at this time.
Re:
Review and Discussion of the Federal Certification Review Report Recommendations and MPO Staff Responses

**Staff Comments on Item:**
At the May meeting the MPO Policy Board asked for information on how MPO staff planned to respond to the corrective action and recommendations from the 2009 Federal Certification Review. Staff has provided some initial information on proposed actions to respond to the recommendations. MPO staff will provide an update on the progress on the proposed actions at the beginning of next year.

**Materials Presented on Item:**
1. Table listing Certification Review Corrective Action/Recommendations and Proposed Actions by the MPO in response.

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**
For discussion purposes only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrective Action/Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultivate relationship with WisDOT STOC and get engaged in the evacuation planning effort for the Madison metropolitan area;</td>
<td>• MPO staff will make contacts with appropriate WisDOT STOC staff as part of work on the Congestion Management Process. MPO staff will review the Dane County/Madison Metro Area Evacuation Plan, particularly the transportation needs, and also get information on and follow work of the City of Madison’s Emergency Response Planning Team. Information on the plan and implementation efforts will be included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2035.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult with WisDOT BPED, Dane County, and the City of Madison on security and emergency related plans or plan elements and incorporate the appropriate features into the metropolitan transportation plan.</td>
<td>• MPO staff will gather information on security and emergency planning efforts, including work of the Dane County Emergency Planning Committee, and incorporate into the RTP 2035.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to work with WisDOT to develop and document solid methodologies for reasonable available estimates and inflation rates for project costs.</td>
<td>• MPO staff will work with WisDOT and FHWA to address the fiscal constraint requirement for the TIP and RTP 2035.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion Management Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance and refine the Madison CMP to further function as a mechanism to identify and prioritize a program of projects to implement the congestion management strategies;</td>
<td>• Some initial research and data collection has been completed and an outline prepared indicating how the CWP will be enhanced. A CMP committee will be created in the next 2-3 months to oversee and assist with the efforts. A number of potential committee members have already been identified. MPO staff is considering hiring a consultant to provide assistance with the project using salary savings from being short-staffed this year. A budget and work program amendment would be required to do this. The work will be completed and the CMP approved by the Board by November 2011 at the latest when the RTP 2035 must also be approved. Documentation of the enhanced CMP will probably be included as part of the RTP 2035 report. A separate summary document will also be prepared to assist in education of policy makers and the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify implementation details of the CMP, including facilities, schedule, responsible agencies, funding sources for given strategies, and timely evaluation and assessment.</td>
<td>• The CMP report will include this information. It will be organized by corridor with appropriate strategies, responsible agencies, schedule, etc. identified for each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIP Development and Project Selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Redemonstrate fiscal constraint with TIP amendment submittals;</td>
<td>• MPO staff will work with WisDOT and FHWA to comply with this requirement. A revised version of one of the financial tables from the TIP (either B-1 or C-1) may need to be included with the TIP amendment resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Action/Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure agency requesting TIP amendment accompanies the request with a statement identifying the source of additional funding and identifying any impact on the funding or schedule of previously programmed projects.</td>
<td>• MPO staff has already been doing this as part of recent TIP amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and document a public participation evaluation methodology for use in assessing and improving public participation in the planning process. Documentation should include specific public participation objectives and corresponding measures and procedures to guide evaluation and refinement of techniques.</td>
<td>• An evaluation methodology will be developed and reviewed with the Board by the end of this year. The methodology will be used to assess the public participation process in 2011 for the RTP 2035. The written assessment and any recommendations for changes to the MPO’s public participation plan will be reviewed with the Board in early 2012 following completion of the RTP 2035.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freight</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to work to cultivate stronger relationships with freight community in the MPO area.</td>
<td>• MPO staff will work with WisDOT staff to identify contacts and seek their input as part of the work on the RTP 2036 in 2011. Another attempt might be made to organize a meeting with freight community stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Forecasting Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure complete documentation of travel forecasting methods, assumptions, and travel demand model are compiled in one central location and/or document.</td>
<td>• MPO staff is putting together in a file all of the technical memos and other documents regarding the calibration of the MPO’s travel model. MPO staff also plans to ensure that the consultant contract for work on the model as part of the next major RTP update include a requirement to prepare a report documenting the enhancements and calibration of the model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>