1. Roll Call

   Members present: David Ahrens, Judd Blau, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Steve King, Paul Lawrence (arrived during item #5), Jerry Mandli (arrived during item #5), Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz (arrived during item #5), Chris Schmidt

   Members absent: Mark Clear, Chuck Kamp, Robin Schmidt

   MPO Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

2. Approval of August 7, 2013 Meeting Minutes

   Moved by Ahrens, seconded by Golden, to approve the August 7, 2013 meeting minutes. Motion carried with King abstaining.

3. Communications

   None

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

   None

5. Public Hearing on Draft 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

   Matano opened the public hearing. There were no members of the public in attendance. Schaefer reported on a meeting he and Gust had the previous week with WisDOT Central Office staff in charge of overseeing local programs. The purpose of the meeting was to review how the MPO’s allocation of STP Urban funding was calculated and to discuss an apparent change in how the program would be administered at the state level. Schaefer explained that in the past the MPO has received an annual allocation of funds from WisDOT with leftover funds carried over to the following year. The balance for any year could never fall below zero. The programming of projects for the first two or three years has always been very firm with commitments for outer year projects not as firm, since other projects that score higher could be submitted at a later date.

   WisDOT Central Office staff said the MPO needs to operate on a program cycle basis. With this new method, projects must be programmed within a five-year time frame. If priorities change, funding for a project can be substituted for another project, but only once. Instead of an annual allocation, a five-year amount will be provided. Every two years, the program will be “refreshed,” and a new 5-year allocation of funding provided with projects scheduled but not yet completed subtracted from the allocation. This is how the allocation the MPO received for 2014-2018 was calculated. Schaefer said that with this change, it makes sense to request STP-Urban project applications every two years instead of every year, but the MPO will need to transition to that. He said the MPO would seek applications again next year. He explained that the new process creates some challenges and raises a number of questions, which need to be answered. One of the challenges stems from the fact that design work for projects is typically not done until 1-2 years before construction. This makes it difficult to estimate costs and in some cases score and rank projects. Schaefer explained that WisDOT was implementing these changes to ensure the program was fiscally constrained on a statewide basis from year to year. WisDOT manages the program statewide to ensure that unspent money in one or more areas is shifted to construction-ready projects in other areas of the state. The new approach creates some flexibility in terms of the scheduling of projects with the potential to accelerate projects if they are ready.
Ahrens asked if money is moving from year to year. Schaefer said the MPO will be given a total amount of funding for the 5-year period. Projects will be programmed with that funding, but there will be flexibility in the scheduling of them. It will need to be worked out statewide. Golden asked if the new policy was in writing, and Schaefer said no. Golden it sounded like rule-making. Schaefer said it was program administration. Gust added that the policy was difficult to understand and follow. Golden asked if STP-Urban priority projects could receive extra contingency funding so that unspent funds from those projects could be given to construction-ready projects in the queue that were not funded. Schaefer said he would prefer to program funding for projects based on the best cost estimates available and adjust funding amounts or substitute projects as necessary. Gust said he presented this idea at the meeting, but that WisDOT Central Office staff did not like it. Golden asked how this aligned with the state’s biannual budget. Schaefer said the programming cycle is designed to align with the spending authority provided in the state budget. Gust explained that WisDOT over-programmed slightly on a statewide basis in the past because some projects were always dropped or delayed. WisDOT says it can’t do this anymore, but rather the program needs to be fiscally constrained in each calendar year.

Golden asked if unspent money from one fiscal year could be spent in the following fiscal year. Gust said he didn’t think so. Golden said this wasn’t fair since WisDOT can carry over funding. Gust said unspent money from one MPO could be shifted to another MPO that had a construction-ready project. This is a reason to have more projects ready to go. Golden questioned whether WisDOT’s mandate should be subject to administrative rule making. Schaefer said he didn’t think so, but FHWA had to sign off on it as they oversee WisDOT’s administration of the funding programs. Golden asked why the system is being changed if it isn’t broken. Schaefer said there have been issues with other MPOs in the state not delivering projects on time.

Gust said MAP-21 requires a demonstration of fiscal constraint each year, so that might be a reason for the change. Gust said WisDOT Region and MPO staff have asked for the policy in writing.

Schaefer offered to answer questions about the STP Urban projects and review the TIP project maps. Ahrens asked for more information on how projects are scored and rated. Schaefer explained that the MPO scores and ranks projects for STP-Urban funding. For other projects, the MPO role is assisting with coordination between implementing agencies and ensuring the projects are consistent with the MPO Regional Transportation Plan. Under MAP-21, the MPO will also be prioritizing projects for the new Transportation Alternatives (TA) program for pedestrian/bicycle projects. Schaefer said the MPO’s scoring system for STP-Urban projects is included in Appendix A of the TIP. A separate scoring system will be used for the TA projects. There was further discussion about the scoring criteria. Schaefer said staff was in the process of reviewing and making suggestions for refinements to the criteria. Ahrens said he did not see a criterion related road infrastructure conditions. Schaefer said system preservation projects receive points. There is also a cost effectiveness criterion. Applicants are requested to provide information on pavement condition, but it doesn’t really get factored into the scoring process. He said that is worth considering as a potential change. Gust said that the life cycle of the road should be considered, rather than only the road pavement condition. King said that he did not believe rating the condition of a road would have made a difference in how projects have been prioritized in the past. Schaefer said the economic development impact is another criterion that has been mentioned. Ahrens supported adding that. Schaefer said that the rating system address land use and transportation coordination, but doesn’t give more points for projects in redevelopment areas vs. Greenfield development areas.

Schaefer highlighted some of the major TIP projects shown on the maps. The Board discussed the Cottage Grove Road project. Golden asked if the MPO would lose funding if the Cottage Grove Road project is delayed due to the Interstate bridge project being delayed under the new policy. Schaefer said yes and that is an issue that was raised with WisDOT. Their response was that another project could be substituted. Other projects were discussed. Schaefer mentioned that there was sufficient STP Urban funding in 2018 to fund another project, and that he planned to recommend funding reconstruction of Buckeye Road/CTH AB (Monona Drive to Stoughton Road). The Verona Avenue and CTH M/Main Street intersection project scored slightly higher, but the project was still very uncertain at this point in time.
Golden asked if additional crossings of the Beltline were still being considered by WisDOT. Gust said there were plans to move forward on some of the highest rated ones, but that the community wasn’t interested due to neighbor/business opposition. They will be reexamined with the new Beltline study. Opitz asked about the Beltline project in Middleton. Schaefer said the Beltline would be resurfaced in 2014 north of Old Sauk Road. Gust said the pavement was falling apart so the project was moved up. Matano asked about the timing of the USH 14 reconfiguration project south of Oregon. Schaefer said that project was delayed outside the five-year TIP period. Matano said he was concerned because between Oregon and Brooklyn there would only be one crossing. Gust said there is a good parallel route that would have more access points. Schaefer highlighted the bicycle projects and the transit projects. Golden asked if Metro planned to purchase diesel or hybrid buses, and Ahrens said they planned to purchase two hybrid and 18 diesel buses. The bus purchase schedule goes back to 15 buses per year in 2015 if funding is available. Schaefer explained that Metro Transit had lost a significant amount of capital funding compared to what it was receiving several years ago. As a result, he said Metro might be applying for STP Urban funding in the future.

6. Consideration of Changes to MPO Technical Coordinating Committee Membership and Voting Structure Due to Expanded Metropolitan Planning Area

Schaefer said the MPO is required to consider changes to the technical committee structure as well as the policy board in light of the expanded MPO planning area. At its last meeting, the technical committee recommended adding the Village of DeForest and Village of Cottage Grove Public Works Directors. As part of the recommended alternative, the Dane County Airport and WisDOT Transit Bureau representatives would be removed, since they did not show interest in attending meetings. MPO staff will continue to coordinate with them as needed. Schaefer said the committee was expanded when the MPO Policy Board was restructured last time. In order to keep a relative balance between the City of Madison representatives and the representatives from the suburban communities, the suburban community representatives were paired for voting purposes. If both are present, they each receive a half vote. Currently, there are three City of Madison representatives—Planning, Engineering, Traffic Engineering—and there are a total of four votes for the eight suburban community representatives. Adding the two additional suburban community representatives makes it five versus three City of Madison and two Dane County representatives. These are in addition to the WisDOT representatives. Schaefer said this wasn’t seen as a significant issue because the technical committee is only advisory and mainly operates on a consensus basis.

Minihan asked if a town representative could be considered since a significant portion of Dane County’s population lives in towns. Schaefer said a town representative could be added, but that would create an odd number of members and attendant proportional voting issues. Opitz asked if the Village of Oregon would be interested in order to create an even number of members. Schaefer said the Oregon Public Works director declined, but he would pursue other options.

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Lawrence, to approve the two deletions and two additions to the Technical Coordinating Committee membership/voting structure. Motion carried.

7. Continued Discussion on Potential Revision to MPO Board Structure and Membership Due to Expanded Metropolitan Planning Area

Matano distributed a memo on the item before the meeting. Ahrens asked if the Metro Transit General Manager had always been an appointee of the Mayor. Schaefer said yes, but the appointment is not required. Schaefer said guidance from FTA on the issue of transit agency representation on the board was expected in October. The structure may need to be changed to specifically designate the Metro General Manager as the MPO representative. Opitz said he hadn’t read Matano’s entire memo, but had a preference for scenario two (eliminate Madison rep, add Metro rep) or four (add small cities/villages rep and Metro rep), which leaves the County Executive appointments as is, and gives preference to specifically adding a Metro member. Opitz said he is a former County Board member and does not see a need to dilute the County Executive’s participation in membership on this body. Golden said that Metro’s local share funding is made up of 23% non-Madison
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funding. It is owned by Madison, but is more of a metropolitan system. This argues for Metro having an independent representative on the MPO rather than being a City of Madison appointment.

Matano said he would like to get away from the idea of a one-person, one-vote concept. He mentioned that the proportional representation percentages exclude the county and WisDOT representatives. All in all, he prefers that no changes be made to the structure as outlined in his memo. Blau said he would prefer at-large representation for the entire populace for the small city/village representatives. Lawrence expressed support for keeping the board structure the same. After further discussion, Ahrens said he would like to postpone this item until after the federal rules or guidelines about the transit representative are published. Golden said he would prefer to take action tonight. Others noted the item was listed for discussion only. There was consensus by the board to postpone further discussion or action on the item until the FTA guidance on transit agency representation was released.

8. Update on Roadway Functional Classification Update
Moved by Golden, seconded by Lawrence, to defer the item. Motion carried.

Schaefer introduced the item and said that Cechvala would give a brief update on the draft plan. Board action on the plan would be sought at the next meeting. Cechvala said the draft plan was completed and a public participation meeting held the previous meeting. A meeting of the county coordination team was held at the beginning of the process. This meeting was the second meeting, but other persons were invited as well. After good discussion, the coordination team approved the plan with some minor changes. MPO staff will seek MPO Board approval with those revisions at the October meeting. The Dane County Specialized Transportation Commission will also be asked to adopt it.

10. Brief Update on South Capitol District Planning Study
Schaefer said this is a City of Madison study funded by a TIGER grant for the south side of the Capitol Square. The purpose of the study is to look at various transportation improvements, including a better connection from downtown to the lakeshore, improvements to the lakeshore path, and improvements to the John Nolen/Blair/Willy/Wilson Street intersection. The study is also looking at potential locations and a design for an intercity bus station. A workshop was recently held to receive comments from the public. Consultants will work on some different design options to address those issues. Dave Trowbridge, project manager, will provide an update to the Board in the future. Matano said a preferred location for the intercity bus terminal had been selected – a site next to the Kohl Center. Schaefer said that site was clearly the most logical one.

11. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Other Projects Involving the TPB
Matano said there are five Beltline study meetings in the coming months. Gust and Ahrens said two of them were this week. The Board discussed the location and times of the upcoming meetings. Golden said he is on the study policy advisory committee, and urged the MPO and City of Madison to be very involved in the study. Gust added that the first phase of the study was looking at broad strategies both in and outside the Beltline corridor. In response to a comment by Golden, Gust said transit would be an alternative considered. Golden asked if WisDOT would recommend transit funding. Gust said no.

Ahrens asked Gust when the Stoughton Road/USH 51 draft EIS document would be released. Gust said it was still being written, but might be released in November or December. The USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) study draft EIS could be released in October. Schaefer said he recently learned from Dave Trowbridge that there are plans for the City of Madison to conduct a study of some access issues around the East Washington Avenue intersection area as well as other areas where there are business access/relocation issues. This would
be a planning study that goes beyond the EIS. Gust added that it would address how planned redevelopment could be coordinated with access and frontage roads, etc. Schaefer said it would somehow be incorporated back into the EIS later. The City needs more time to resolve those issues with the businesses.

12. Discussion of Future Work Items
Schaefer said progress had been made on the Public Participation Plan update. The 2014 work program and budget are being prepared and a presentation on the draft work program would be provided at the next meeting. Regarding the bus size study, Cechvala said the study was moving forward, but was a little behind schedule for various reasons. Good information will come out of the study committee meeting this Friday. Schaefer said the draft report will likely be completed in a couple months. We will have a presentation on that and the findings and the recommendations from that study.

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings
Gust said additional information about the Beltline study, including meeting dates, is available at www.madisonbeltline.dot.wi.gov.

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, October 2, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

14. Adjournment
Moved by King, seconded by Ahrens, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:58 PM.