

**Greater Madison MPO  
Technical Coordinating Committee  
Meeting Minutes**

***April 27, 2022***

*Virtual Meeting via Zoom*

***2:00 p.m.***

**1. Roll Call**

***Members present:*** Batuzich, Brown, Bruun (for Stephany), Clark (arrived during item 3), Dunphy, Hall, Hessling (arrived during item 3), Holt, Koprowski, Larson, McFadden (for Balke, arrived during item 3), Paoni, Petykowski (for Phillips), Scheel, Semmann (arrived during item 3), Stauske, Stouder, Tao

***Members absent:*** Cruz, Hedgepeth, Wheeler, Violante

***MPO Staff present:*** Schaefer, Lyman, Hoesly

***Other staff present:*** J. Blau (Village of DeForest), T. Vieth (City of Sun Prairie), M. Zhang and B. Porter (WisDOT Traffic Forecasting)

**2. Approval of February 23, 2022 Meeting Minutes**

Tao moved, Brown seconded, to approve the February 23, 2022 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

**3. Review and Recommendation on Draft Connect Greater Madison: Regional Transportation Plan 2050**

Schaefer discussed the RTP update schedule, including the draft review and public engagement process, and noted that public comments are still being received and that MPO staff have not finished documenting the additions and changes that will be made to the draft RTP before it is finalized. He then reviewed some remaining sections of the report that had not been reviewed before with the committee, identifying some of the significant changes to the previous RTP made in the update, and noting the relationship between CARPC's Regional Development Framework and the RTP update.

Koprowski asked if the MPO was still on track to "unfreeze" the TIP in mid-June. Schaefer said the plan was for MPO board approval at May meeting, and the TIP could then be amended at that meeting.

Lyman then discussed the public comments submitted on the RTP update maps and document, and the MPO's comment review process. Schaefer indicated staff was looking for a recommendation from the committee.

Tao moved, Brown seconded, to recommend approval of the RTP update document to the MPO Policy Board. Motion carried.

**4. Review and Recommendation on STBG Urban Project Scoring and Funding Alternatives for Supplemental FFY 2022 Infrastructure Bill Allocation**

Schaefer reviewed STBG Urban project applications and scoring for the supplemental FFY 2022 allocation. Sun Prairie submitted two applications and DeForest one. Funding needs to be obligated

by this fall. Due to the short timeline, potential applicants were advised to submit simple projects, and ideally projects that were already moving forward.

The MPO also received requests from the Village of Shorewood Hills and the City of Madison to provide additional FFY 2022 funding for the University Avenue project, which is under-funded. The City of Madison acknowledged in its request that it would be equitable to also provide additional funding for the Pleasant View Road project, which is also under-funded.

With an estimated total of \$2,123,215 in funding available, the MPO will present three funding scenarios to the Policy Board:

1. Fund only new projects.
2. Fund only the previously approved projects.
3. Fund the highest ranked new project (N Thompson Rd.) and award the rest to the already approved projects.

Stauske asked why the North Thompson Rd. and O'Keefe Ave. projects scored better than the N Main St. project. Schaefer replied that their somewhat scores were largely due to their high safety scores. They received points for safety because in adding the bike lanes, traffic lane widths would be reduced—which would be expected to reduce speeds and enhance safety. The N. Thompson Rd. project also includes installation of pedestrian signals and speed radar signs. Stauske asked why the North Main St project had been recommended for funding, but O'Keefe was not. Schaefer explained that due to the amount of available funding and the fact that funded projects must receive a minimum of 50% project funding, it would not be possible to fund the O'Keefe project in addition to the North Thompson Rd. project.

Stauske asked how the scores of the new applicant projects compared to the scores of the previously approved projects that were requesting additional funding. Schaefer said that he was not certain about the exact scores, but the previously approved projects had received much higher scores. That is to be expected given the nature of the new projects, which are simple maintenance projects. These were the only types of projects that could be funded given the short timeline so it was not a fair comparison. Stauske noted that because the aim of the funding seems to be to support new projects, funding only the new projects seems most appropriate.

Dunphy said she had inquired about getting additional funding for CTH M and had been told that it would not be eligible. Schaefer said that that is because the CTH M project is scheduled for 2023, making it ineligible for the FFY 2022 funding. Dunphy continued that she agreed with Stauske that it seems like the funding should go towards new projects, and questioned whether it was appropriate to award it to projects previously selected for funding. Schaefer replied that the MPO's policy and federal rules allow the funding to go towards the previously awarded projects as well as new projects.

Tao suggested that the committee might just want to leave it up to the board, without making a recommendation. Stauske replied that he would like to offer a recommendation to the Board if the committee can come to agreement. Schaefer said that he can convey the sentiments of the committee members to the board whether or not the committee makes a recommendation.

Tao asked Schaefer to provide the scores of the previously selected projects to the Board, along with the scores of the current project applicants. Schaefer said that he would do so. Stauske agreed and said that the board should also be made aware of the guidance that was offered to applicants for the additional FFY 2022 projects.

McFadden asked Schaefer to confirm that the new projects would be able to meet all of the Federal requirements if they were to receive funding. Schaefer said WisDOT and MPO staff met with local staff and were confident they would be able to get the projects done. Petykowski asked whether the previously funded projects could receive the available funding if they were not initially selected and the selected projects are unable to meet the funding requirements. Schaefer confirmed that they could. Petykowski reiterated the hardship faced by Shorewood Hills in funding the University Ave. project. He noted that they had been good partners to the city and had handled the project well, including both sidewalks and the bike/pedestrian bridge.

Stauske noted that the committee would not be making a recommendation and asked Schaefer to share the committee's comments with the Board.

## **5. Presentation on City of Sun Prairie Vision Zero Initiative**

Brown gave a presentation on the City of Sun Prairie's Vision Zero efforts, the initial impetus for which was the surge in serious crashes in 2020. He said the city has already completed several short term projects as part of their Vision Zero initiative, including adding new signage, implementing speed limit reductions, and installing pedestrian safety improvements at high-risk locations. The city is also pursuing longer-term solutions with new traffic safety plans and public engagement efforts, and is integrating findings from these efforts into the city's capital improvement plan. Recent crash statistics indicate that efforts undertaken thus far may already be reducing serious crashes in the city.

Stauske asked how Sun Prairie prioritizes safety projects. Brown said the projects thus far have come from consultant-led project studies, but that public feedback was used to select projects from among those that had been studied. He said Sun Prairie has been trying to make use of that public feedback in a visible way to promote continued public engagement. Vieth added that the City has made efforts to ensure that all of the different neighborhoods were equitably addressed and has also relied on data about pedestrian and vehicle volumes as well as information from studies, such as rankings of different locations by economic loss or safety. Vieth continued that the city is not sure what level of funding will be needed to support these efforts going forward and that the funding levels will be adjusted as needed.

Tao complimented Brown and Vieth on Sun Prairie's efforts and indicated that he would like to collaborate on these issues in the future. Schaefer suggested that, at a future meeting, Tao could share information on the City of Madison's Vision Zero efforts, including the Safe Streets Program.

Hoesly noted that she had spoken with McFadden about the MPO's intersection safety study, and that she is planning to reach out to other communities about how they can use that tool and that the MPO is looking at setting up a training, hopefully in May. Hoesly asked if Sun Prairie is planning to join the Vision Zero Network. Brown said he thought it is a desire of Sun Prairie, but it has not been stated as a formal goal.

## **6. Committee Member Reports**

Stauske noted that the Pleasant View Road project letting has been pushed back from May to September due to a railroad OCR delay. Instead of finishing in early or mid-2024, it will probably be pushed to the end of 2024.

Tao noted that Madison has been officially accepted into the Vision Zero Network. He said that Vision Zero removed enforcement as a component of their framework, but that Madison insists that

enforcement must be a part of the solution even though the city recognizes the equity issues associated with enforcement and is trying to be mindful of that. He said that the Vision Zero Network really liked Madison's plan—despite the inclusion of enforcement—and suggested it could be a model for other cities. A USDOT Deputy Secretary publicly recognized Madison's Vision Zero plan, and it has also been recognized by the National League of Cities. He said that he is hoping the city will be able to both increase its investments in safety improvements going forward and secure additional grant funding to support these efforts.

## **7. Staff Report**

Schaefer reported on the following:

- TAP projects approved
  - Safe Routes to School (Madison), two BCycle projects (Madison and Fitchburg), Rusk Road path connecting to Beltline bike/pedestrian overpass (Madison), and another path project (Sun Prairie). These projects have not been officially approved by WisDOT but they will be soon. The MPO is hoping that the funding for the BCycle projects can be obligated this fall.
- Supplemental local program application solicitations (STBG Urban, TAP, Carbon Reduction)
- Request for 2023-2027 project listings for TIP update
- Census Bureau release of final urban area criteria for 2020
  - The bureau did not make the change to their methodology, regarding “jumps” over undeveloped areas, which the MPO had requested. It is uncertain how the Madison urbanized area will change as a result, but some MPO communities (Cross Plains, Cottage Grove, and Stoughton) may no longer be included. They could remain within the planning area, but the MPO would have to decide whether they would remain eligible for funding through the MPO.
- Federal certification review
  - The MPO was recertified and received a number of commendations.
- Scheduling intersection safety tool training
- Other
  - We will have a new Board member since Dorothy Krause is no longer an elected official in Fitchburg (she is now a Dane County Supervisor), and had to be replaced. Phil Caravello, an alder in the City of Stoughton, was appointed based on a vote by the mayors and village presidents and will be taking her place on the Board.
  - Alder Doug Wood (Monona) has been re-appointed for another term.

## **8. Next Meeting Dates**

The next scheduled meetings are May 25, 2022 and June 22, 2022.

## **9. Adjournment**

Brown moved, Scheel seconded, to adjourn. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

*Minutes recorded by Holloway and Schaefer.*