

**Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
April 3, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

1. Roll Call

Members present: Kelly Danner, Paul Esser, Steve Flottmeyer, Ken Golden, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item #5, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Larry Palm, Bruce Stravinski

Members absent: David Ahrens, Allen Arntsen, Doug Wood, Zach Wood

MPO staff present: Bill Schaefer, Ben Lyman

Others present in an official capacity: Chris Petykowski (City of Madison Engineering), Steve Steinhoff (Capital Area Regional Planning Commission)

Schaefer introduced new MATPB Transportation Planner Lyman to the Board.

2. Approval of March 6, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Esser, seconded by Minihan, to approve the March 6, 2019 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

Schaefer followed up on previous communications regarding FHWA staff investigation into WisDOT changing use of federal funds on projects to STBG Urban without approval by the MPO through the TIP amendment process. This also called into question whether WisDOT was providing large MPOs the correct amount of STBG Urban funds per federal law. MATPB staff have a meeting scheduled with FHWA staff later in April on the issue. Schaefer will keep the board apprised of the FHWA investigation.

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

None

5. Presentation on Design Alternatives for University Avenue (Shorewood Blvd. to University Bay Dr.) and Gammon Road (Beltline to Mineral Point Rd. including West Towne Path) Reconstruction Projects

Schaefer noted that the MPO was funding both projects, which are in the design process now. He said the Gammon Road project was further along in the process, while the University Avenue project design was still preliminary with some details not yet worked out. A public information meeting would be held in the next few weeks. Petykowski presented first on the University Avenue reconstruction project. In addition to roadway re-design, he explained the major stormwater facility component of the project to address flooding in the area. He said a sidewalk would be added on the north side of University Avenue and east side of University Bay Drive. The Village of Shorewood Hills will construct a new path along the rail corridor filling in the current gap. A ped/bike under- or overpass is planned to connect to the path.

Opitz expressed concern about the lack of bicycle accommodations on the south side of the street where there were existing businesses and likely redevelopment in the future. Petykowski responded that the design focus had been on providing safe pedestrian crossings and access. There was limited space for adding pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Opitz said he understood, but asked that alternatives be considered such as widening the sidewalk on the south side. Petykowski agreed that was worth looking at, and suggested that perhaps that was more of a priority than the sidewalk on the north side along the rail corridor.

Golden asked if the traffic volume on University Bay Drive merits having the southbound right-turn slip lane as he finds right-turn slip lanes to be hostile to pedestrians. He also noted that in his experience the complaints

regarding University Avenue are commonly the Ridge St. and University Bay/Farley intersections where the traffic signal does not provide adequate time for pedestrian crossings and queued vehicle movements. Petykowski responded that the slip lane is intended to improve the pedestrian crossing by reducing the number of lanes that need to be crossed at a time. He noted that a number of studies support the use of this design to improve pedestrian safety. He referred to the Williamson/Blair/John Nolen project currently underway where the crossing would be raised to a “table top” and the refuge made as large as possible to make it more inviting to pedestrians. Golden reiterated that due to the turning radius of the slip lane, it can be difficult for the pedestrian to see oncoming cars, and difficult for cars to see pedestrians.

Golden asked if BRT were implemented whether any of the project would need to be re-reconstructed to accommodate it. Petykowski stated that city staff and project consultants were working with the BRT design staff to accommodate BRT in the corridor as part of the project. He noted several bus stops will be relocated and other design features added to accommodate BRT queue bypass lanes and stations. Golden asked if they had considered center-running BRT in this corridor, and Petykowski stated there was not enough right of way for it. Schaefer reiterated the coordination occurring between the two project design teams and that planned features such as far side stops and queue bypasses would help both standard Metro operations and BRT.

Danner stated that she represents residents in this area and that there will be significant interest in the pedestrian crossing improvements, mentioning the pedestrian fatality at Ridge Street. Petykowski discussed planned changes to the signal timing to provide pedestrians extra crossing time and an all-red phase to provide pedestrians a head start prior to vehicle movements. Opitz asked about the design of the under- or over-pass crossing of University Bay Drive and staff preference between the two designs. Petykowski discussed grade change requirements and depth/height requirements for the two, indicating a preference for the underpass if engineering issues could be worked out. Staff plan to take these plans to the public for feedback within a month.

Palm asked how right-turns onto University Bay Drive from westbound Campus Drive would affect the bus bypass lane. Petykowski stated that the bus would likely be given an advance signal, allowing it to clear the intersection before right turns from traffic lanes would be permitted. Schaefer described the plans for eastbound bus traffic with a far side stop that transitioned into a bus lane on Campus Drive crossing in front of traffic heading onto Old University Avenue.

Petykowski then presented on the Gammon Road reconstruction project design, which includes extension of the Beltline corridor path west and a ped/bike underpass of Gammon Road. He noted the MPO funded both the road and bike projects. A path will be added on the west side of Gammon Road up to Mineral Point Road. The roadway configuration will only undergo minor changes such as extending the northbound double left into the mall.

Palm noted that northbound bicyclists would still need to cross Mineral Point Road to reach the high school east of Gammon Road, and Petykowski concurred. Minihan asked if cameras were typically installed in underpasses. Petykowski said yes and that cameras would be installed in the proposed underpass. Opitz asked why the sidewalk on the west side of Gammon Road under the Beltline wasn't being widened as part of the project. Petykowski explained that the project had originally been programmed to include the portion of Gammon Road under the Beltline, and that plans had been developed to extend the multi-use path further south. However, WisDOT has not scheduled that project, which would include reconstructing of the ramps. Therefore, that part of the project would need to wait.

6. Presentation on A Greater Madison Vision Survey Results

Steinhoff provided a presentation on the A Greater Madison Vision Survey results, which included a review of the survey, a detailed analysis of the results, and key findings related to growth strategies that were a high priority.

Golden suggested that the MPO extract transportation planning related results from AGMV for use in future plans and implementation strategies. He requested that staff think about how to accomplish this. Palm stated

that this is an input process, which can be used for other engagements. The question is how to repeat this process on a schedule, how to build upon this dataset, and how to utilize this data to inform plans. Golden stated that this data can inform which questions to ask in the future, and Palm concurred. Opitz requested more information about reported support for transit between constituencies, and which communities are more or less supportive of transit. Palm mentioned that the AGMV website will be populated with various ways for the public to drill down into the data. Opitz questioned if there was the ability to split results by zip code into finer-grained geographies. Steinhoff stated that respondents self-reported whether they lived in urban, suburban, or rural areas so results could also be filtered by that. Stravinski asked about area specific survey results. Steinhoff stated that he would be happy to come to communities and present both overall survey results and community- or area-specific results.

7. Resolution TPB No. 152 Approving Amendment #2 to 2018 MATPB Work Program Extending Period for Use of Funds Through August

Opitz moved, Kamp seconded, to approve Resolution No. 152 amending the 2018 MATPB Work Program. Motion carried.

8. Resolution TPB No. 153 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Schaefer described the projects included in the proposed amendment.

Moved by Esser, seconded by Danner, to approve Resolution TPB No. 153 amending the TIP. Motion carried.

9. Approval of Public Involvement Effort and Schedule for Preparing 2020-2024 Transportation Improvement Program

Stravinski discussed the issue of jurisdictional transfer of county highways. He mentioned a recent presentation on the topic that pointed out 80-90% of county revenue comes from city and village residents while only 22% of county highways are in cities and villages. He commented that the MPO should not approve any new multi-jurisdictional projects unless future jurisdiction and maintenance had been worked out. Schaefer noted that a policy was added to the MPO's STBG Urban program process document that requires an MOU on future jurisdiction and maintenance within one year of approval for multi-jurisdictional projects. He said technical committee members felt it would be difficult if this was required at the time of application.

Moved by Kamp, seconded by Golden, to approve the TIP public involvement effort and schedule. Motion carried.

10. Status Report on Capital Area RPC Activities

Palm discussed CARPC work that was beginning on the land use plan update and the effort to utilize the AGMV data for the update. Minihan said that the next meeting would be held in the Town of Dunn. He then mentioned damages to roads and other infrastructure caused by flooding last year, and how flooding continues to be a problem for the community. Schaefer discussed the timeline for the CARPC and MPO staff co-location and the planned location at 100 State Street.

11. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Palm noted the board would need to elect a Chair at its next meeting. Schaefer noted that the June meeting would need to be rescheduled. Several board members stated that they would not be able to attend the scheduled May meeting so Schaefer said he would plan to reschedule that meeting as well. Schaefer said he would send out an email to poll members on alternative dates for the meetings.

12. Adjournment

Moved by Esser, seconded by Stravinski, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:55 PM.