

**Minutes of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Regional Transportation Plan 2050 Advisory Committee**

City-County Building, Room 103A

January 31, 2017

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

11:00 a.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: Flottmeyer, Sarnecki, D. Beck (for Kamp), Hilbert, Doyle, Lobdell, Chenoweth, Halverson (for Little), Larson, Hicks, Wilson, Schmitz*

Members Absent: Esser, Clark, Porterfield, Lerner, Golden, Lawler

Others Present: W. Schaefer, D. Kanning, B. Zellers, U. Martin, D. McAuliffe

* Arrived during Item No. 4

2. Introductions

Members and staff were introduced.

3. Approval of October 6, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Lobdell, seconded by Hilbert, to approve the October 2016 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

4. Review Facility Plan Maps and Draft Recommendations for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2050

Schaefer reviewed the Major Roadway and High Capacity Transit Improvements and Studies Map. He explained the importance of this map because all major capacity expansion projects must be specifically identified and included in the fiscally constrained plan. Schaefer said that WisDOT and MPO staff would be meeting to discuss how to address the ongoing major corridor studies in the plan. Stoughton Road could potentially be added, but he said the Beltline and Interstate would likely remain as just studies in the plan with recommendation to implement the preferred alternative that comes out of the studies. The scope of those projects has yet to be determined and demonstrating available funding for them is also an issue. Wilson reported that the reconstruction and expansion of CTH Q, between Woodland Drive and Meffert Road had been moved up and had already been completed. and can be removed from the map.

Schaefer also briefly reviewed the Planned Roadway Functional Classification, Transit, Park and Ride, and Major Bicycle Projects maps with the committee. Hilbert suggested identifying intersections, such as the intersection of University Avenue and Allen Boulevard, where additional infrastructure work is needed to ensure safe and convenient bikeway connectivity. Schaefer said that staff would look at trying to add that to the map, using information from the bicycle plan. Doyle offered to provide a copy of Verona's recently adopted ped/bike study. Lobdell said that Fitchburg would likely adopt an update to its ped/bike plan next month. Schaefer said staff would review the plans and incorporate as needed in the regional plan.

Schaefer reviewed the draft recommendations with the committee. The draft recommendations are grouped under the following categories: Land Use and Transportation Integration, Streets/Roadways, Public Transit, Specialized Transit, Bicycles, Pedestrians, Transportation System Management (TSM and Operations and ITS, Travel Demand Management (TDM), Freight, Rail, Air, and Parking. He noted the correction to be made for timeline for intercity bus terminal, changing to 5-15 years.

5. Review Financial Analysis for the RTP 2050

Schaefer provided an overview of the Financial Capacity Analysis. Federal transportation planning rules require that regional transportation plans include a financial capacity analysis to demonstrate that the plan is fiscally constrained. He said projecting revenues and costs, including roadway preservation costs, was a very difficult task. However, the details were less important than the picture that the analysis paints. For example, local roadway conditions are steadily declining and more funding will be needed for preservation. Staff also calculated the capital and operating costs of implementing the transit plan, illustrating the gap in funding. For the roadway preservation analysis, he said that staff attempted to use a tool employed by the MPO in the Milwaukee area to forecast future arterial roadway construction/maintenance costs, but the results were not reasonable. Staff ended up using a more simplified method based on the trend in roadway conditions and current spending. Schaefer mentioned the state transportation solvency study report just released and some of the findings of that. He said a conclusion will be added to the analysis summarizing the findings.

6. Brief Review of Draft Scope of Work Outline for the Next Phase of Study of Bus Rapid Transit

Schaefer said that the MPO, City of Madison, and Metro Transit staff are working together to develop a request for proposals to hire a consultant that would assist in the next phase of the BRT study, which is to identify the details of the project, including the preferred corridor, station locations, and information about the roadway improvements that would be made in that corridor to accommodate BRT service. Schaefer briefly presented the outline of the scope, which identifies the project timeline and major tasks. He noted that substantial public involvement will be needed. Lobdell asked if there is a deadline for receiving federal construction funding. Schaefer said that applications for federal construction funding can be filed each year, but must be submitted during the summer/fall. The current schedule calls for completing the alternatives analysis study this year and design in 2018 with an application for funding in fall of that year. If the next study is delayed much longer, the schedule would need to be pushed back a year. He said the City of Madison has already committed to paying the local share cost for the BRT project and satellite bus garage (which is needed regardless of whether BRT is implemented) if the city is successful in securing federal funding.

7. Brief Review of Schedule for Completing RTP

Schaefer said that most of the draft plan report chapters will be ready and posted in the next 2-3 weeks. Final public information meetings will be scheduled in very late February or early March. The plan will need to be adopted in April. He suggested a meeting in mid-March following the public meetings. Staff could review any changes to the recommendations, comments received, etc. In the meantime, he encouraged committee members to review the draft chapters and provide comments once they are available. Committee members said electronic versions were preferable to hard copy. Lobdell asked if the MPO would be looking for resolutions from local governments supporting the plan. Schaefer said that wasn't necessary, but that the communities should just be made aware of the plan and its recommendations.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.