

**Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)  
June 19, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

---

**1. Roll Call**

**Members present:** Samba Baldeh, Kelly Danner, Paul Esser, Grant Foster, Ken Golden, Patrick Heck, Tom Lynch, Jerry Mandli, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Bruce Stravinski, Mike Tierney, Doug Wood

**Members absent:** Steve Flottmeyer

**MPO staff present:** Bill Schaefer, Ben Lyman

**Others present in an official capacity:**

Diane Paoni (WisDOT Planning), Michael Hoelker (WisDOT SW Region), Dave Trowbridge (City of Madison Transportation)

**2. Approval of May 15, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

Esser moved, Golden seconded, to approve the May 15, 2019 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

**3. Communications**

- Memo from WisDOT regarding issuance of Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the programmed improvements to the Beltline-Interstate interchange.
- Letter from William Schaefer, MATPB Planning Manager, to WisDOT regarding Administrative Modification No. 3 to 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Emails from Harald Kliems, Liz Jesse, and Jim Wilson regarding proposed major Amendment #3 to the 2019-2023 TIP, registering in opposition to Beltline Dynamic Part-Time Shoulder Use (DPTSU).

Schaefer noted the comments were related to item #5. He clarified that the Beltline project in the TIP amendment was a maintenance project and did not incorporate DPTSU at this time. If WisDOT decides to move forward with it, the project scope and cost will be revised as part of the annual TIP update.

Golden requested that the emails be brought back to the board as part of consideration of the 2020-2024 TIP this fall if WisDOT moves forward with DPTSU.

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

None

**5. Public Hearing on Amendment #3 to the 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County**

There were no public comments on this item other than the emails listed under item #3, Communications.

**6. Presentation on East-West Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Study**

Dave Trowbridge presented on the status of the East-West Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Study, including public engagement efforts, project priorities, and routing options. The routing alternatives and their tradeoffs (Odana or Mineral Point) at the west end of the corridor were discussed, as were the alternatives between routing on the Capitol Square, Capitol Loop, or the south-side of the Loop. In particular, parking removal on Doty and Wilson Streets, business loading, paratransit loading, and police loading were all raised as potential conflicts with routing on Doty and Wilson. At the ends of the corridor, Lynch suggested the potential to add “BRT Light” service to Sun Prairie and/or Middleton. Esser and Opitz, respectively, endorsed BRT-Light service to their communities but stated that having a successful initial BRT route was the most important first step in connecting communities throughout the region.

Trowbridge continued his presentation with a discussion of runningway options and the project development process. Schaefer noted that the Regional Transportation Plan would need to be updated to include BRT as a project in the financially constrained plan. Lynch stated that there is \$80 million total included in the city budget for BRT. In response to a question from Opitz, he discussed two types of transit signal priority treatments: signal priority where a green phase is extended or red phase shortened to keep the bus moving, and queue jumps to give buses a head start around queued traffic after a red phase. He said a queue jump was going to be tested at the East Washington & Fourth St. intersection. Danner asked about potential bike/bus conflicts with bus queue jumps. Trowbridge acknowledged that was a concern, which would need to be considered in the design.

**7. Resolution TPB #154 Approving Amendment #3 to the 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metro Area & Dane County**

Schaefer explained that WisDOT requested a TIP amendment to revise two major projects – the Beltline (Whitney Way to Interstate 39/90) resurfacing project, adding maintenance work in 2021, and the Interstate 39/90 expansion project, adding funding for the Beltline-Interstate interchange reconstruction. He said other new and revised projects are part of the amendment as well, including some that were added after the notice for the hearing on the TIP amendment. He reviewed the other projects that are part of the amendment, including planned safety improvements at the Mill Pond Road and CTH AB intersections with USH 12/18.

Lynch stated that the City of Madison has concerns regarding the proposed R Cut or J Turn treatments at the USH 12/18 intersections. Although WisDOT, Dane County, Ho-Chunk, and City of Madison staff all agree that the Mill Pond Road intersection needs to be re-designed, there is no consensus on the right treatment for the intersection. City of Madison staff want a higher level of improvement than is proposed in the TIP amendment project description. He said the traffic analysis for the Ho-Chunk development showed it would generate 18,000 cars a day, which is 3.5 times the amount that a R Cut intersection can handle according to FHWA standards. Heck asked about the timing of intersection projects in relation to proposed expansion of the Ho-Chunk property. Lynch responded that the Ho-Chunk project had its own process to go through for approval and would likely be 4-10 years out, but that the subject USH 12 intersection is the second most dangerous intersection in the city and needs to be fixed whether the Ho-Chunk casino expansion goes forward or not. Lynch said the city wants to see the right fix to the intersection.

Foster asked how much of the cost for the Beltline project was related to making the highway suitable for hard shoulder running. Hoelker described the various aspects of the project and explained why the maintenance work was needed with or without potential shoulder running. He clarified that there might be a small amount of funding included in the cost estimate now due to the potential for shoulder running in the future, but that the difference in cost was negligible. He noted that if WisDOT decided to move forward with hard shoulder running there would be opportunities for input, including an informational meeting this summer.

Wood moved, Golden seconded, to approve Resolution TPB #154 for purposes of discussion. Golden and Wood expressed concern that the 5<sup>th</sup> Whereas clause related to DPTSU inferred that the MPO was approving that project, and asked Schaefer if it was problematic to remove that. Schaefer said no, it was included for informational purposes. Wood moved, Golden seconded, to amend the motion to remove the 5<sup>th</sup> Whereas clause. Motion to amend carried. Lynch moved, Golden seconded, to amend the 7<sup>th</sup> Whereas clause to delete the words “creating a J Turn at the intersections” from the second bullet and modify the project descriptions for the USH 12 (Millpond Rd. and CTH AB Intersections) projects to replace “Construct J Turn at Intersection to Improve Safety” with “Safety Improvements”. Motion to amend carried. Motion to approve Resolution TPB #154 Approving Amendment #3 to the 2019-2023 TIP with the two amendments carried.

**8. Resolution TPB #155 Approving the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County**

Lyman gave an overview of the Coordinated Plan timeline and changes made to the Draft 2019-2023 Plan based on public comments and input received at the June 4, 2019 Public Participation and Local Coordination Meeting. In Chapter 4, Service Needs were revised from being composed of three categories based on service types to six categories based on identified gaps in service: Coverage Area, Service Hours, Travel Times, Reliability, Scheduling, and Other Service Needs. In Chapter 5, Priority Strategies to Address Needs had a new strategy, “Investigate feasibility of creating county-wide driver training opportunities” added.

Golden commented that the draft plan navigates around Family Care, but doesn’t directly address the issue of cost shifting by Managed Care Organizations (MCO) for trips serving the Family Care population. Lyman responded that staff had heard that certain types of trips were not being provided to this population, and that some transportation providers were overwhelmed by the number of Family Care trips they were asked to provide. He added these trips were not coordinated as well as paratransit trips used to be, and were therefore operated less efficiently, often with only one rider in the vehicle. Golden reiterated that Section 5310 program and local funds should not be used to subsidize the state’s Family Care program. He said he wouldn’t request changes to the draft plan, but wanted his concern documented in the minutes. Schaefer added that it was very difficult to determine if an agency applying for funds for a vehicle was providing trips that should be provided by the MCO. Golden said that information should be teased out from the applicant.

Golden moved, Danner seconded, to approve Resolution TPB #155 Approving the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County. Motion carried.

**9. Resolution TPB #156 Amending the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Program for the Madison Urbanized Area**

Lyman gave an overview of the existing scoring criteria for the Section 5310 program and the proposed revised scoring criteria. He stated that the proposed new scoring criteria was developed through reviewing other MPOs’ criteria and was based on the experience of previous evaluators. The criteria are also designed to more closely align with the goals and priorities included in the Coordinated Plan. Lyman pointed out the one change to the application scoring criteria based on input received at the June 4, 2019 Public Participation and Local Coordination Meeting. He also mentioned a new opportunity for applicants to submit questions or receive feedback on their application. Golden commented that any advice provided to an applicant, if general in nature, should be provided to others. Lyman agreed.

Esser moved, Minihan seconded, to approve Resolution TPB #156 Amending the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Program for the Madison Urbanized Area. Motion carried.

**10. Review of Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) – Urban Applications for the 2020-2025 Program Cycle**

Schaefer referenced the project summaries provided in the packet and a table handed out showing the estimated costs for the approved projects and new projects seeking funding. He pointed out that there was a total of \$69.7 million in requested project funds, but only an estimated \$21.7 in funding available. That meant the MPO will have some difficult decisions as to what projects to fund, and also may need to suggested changes in limits or scope for projects that are funded. He reviewed the timeline for the MPO to select the projects and approve funding for them as part of approval of the TIP. He then reviewed each of the project applications and provided some thoughts by staff on some of them. He said the applications and limited funding available compared to the requests raised some policy issues that the board will need to wrestle with. He said he was interested in any initial feedback by the board on these policy issues, which include:

- The MPO made a commitment to fund the Pleasant View Road project this application cycle, but that commitment was only for the segment from USH 14 to Greenway Blvd. The first phase is now proposed to extend south to Timber Wolf Trail. This, along with the extensive earthwork and retaining walls needed to address sight distance issues in the area around the golf course, has led to a substantial increase in the estimated Phase 1 project cost. Given the funding squeeze, the MPO will need to decide whether to fund just the original planned segment or the longer segment. Schaefer said he also had some questions regarding the design and planned to set up a meeting to discuss those with local staff and their consultant.
- The MPO approved funding for the University Ave. (Shorewood Blvd. to University Bay Dr.) project in the last cycle, however the City of Madison has requested roughly \$10 million in additional funding, most of which is to cover a proposed storm sewer interceptor added to the project at a cost of \$12 million. The interceptor is designed to address a major flooding issue in the corridor. The policy question is whether it is appropriate or fair to use MPO funds to cover costs for a storm sewer system, which accommodates drainage from a much larger area than the project area.
- The MPO has adopted a policy setting a goal of allocating up to 10% of STBG funding over time for “small” projects in order to spread the funding around to smaller communities that otherwise wouldn’t have a project that could compete with the larger projects. The Exchange Street project is not a regionally important one and won’t score that well because of this, but qualifies as a small project. The City of Madison’s ITS projects also qualify as small projects, but the policy was really intended to benefit smaller communities. The policy question is whether to fund the Exchange Street project under the small project policy.

Lynch asked for clarification on the timeframe for STBG Urban projects and funding. Schaefer explained that WisDOT had added an extra year to this program’s funding cycle so that the MPO is receiving essentially three years worth of funding to program for projects in 2023-2025. About \$24.2 million in funding has been committed to projects in 2020-2022 with another \$21.7 million available for new projects. Wood asked if the MPO board would receive complete scoring sheets for the projects to review prior to voting on the competing projects, and Schaefer responded that they would and went on to describe the scoring process. Wood concurred that the MPO had committed to funding the Pleasant View Road project, but not the expanded project limits. Wood asked whether the storm water facilities for the University Avenue project were eligible for federal funding, and Schaefer said yes, noting that sanitary sewer and water facilities are not. Wood commented that he didn’t think it was appropriate for the MPO to use its funding for storm water facilities that were designed to drain an area larger than the roadway corridor. Danner asked if there would be an MPO board member on the evaluation team for either the STBG Urban or 5310 applications, to which Schaefer replied that there had not historically been a board member on either project evaluation team.

Golden stated that there was a study conducted roughly ten years ago related to how to address flooding in the University Avenue area. He suggested that the MPO could pay for some of the storm water facility costs, but that it would not be fair for the MPO to pay for all of those costs with STBG funds; he suggested that the affected communities should pay their share of the costs for the storm water facilities. Lynch stated that the referenced study was conducted by Strand Associates. At the time the Village of Shorewood Hills was not supportive of the study recommendations, including the interceptor, but the study had been updated and the village appeared to be more interested in solving the storm water problem now.

## **11. Brief Update on MATPB Intersection Screening Analysis**

Schaefer stated that staff had corrected an error with the entering intersection traffic volumes discovered since the study was presented to the board, and that update tables listing the top high crash intersections were in the packet. Community specific data will be provided to local staff and MPO staff would be meeting with City of Madison staff to discuss the data and study. MPO staff will prepare a report on the study and that will be presented to the board when finished.

**12. Status Report on Capital Area RPC Activities**

Opitz requested an email update on this item rather than a verbal update at the meeting.

**13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings**

The next meeting will be August 7.

**14. Adjournment**

Wood moved, Minihan seconded, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.