

**Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
Technical Coordinating Committee
January 24, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

1. Roll Call

Members present: Coville, Dryer, Katherine Holt (for Sayre), Larson, Urvashi Martin (for Trowbridge), Greggar Petersen (for Dunphy), Phillips, Koprowski, Kugler (arrived during #3), Scheel, Anderson Scheweppe, Stauske, Stephany, Gus VanderWegen (for Balke), Violante (arrived during #3)

Members absent: Batuzich, Beck, Even, Hall, Paoni, Wheeler

MPO Staff present: Schaefer, Holloway

Others present: Michelle Brokaw (WisDOT), David Hungness (SRF)

2. Approval of September 27, 2017, Meeting Minutes

Moved by Stauske, seconded by Scheel, to approve the September 27, 2017 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Review MATPB Policies and Criteria for STBG Transportation Alternatives Set Aside Projects

Schaefer reviewed MATPB policies and project scoring criteria for STBG Transportation Alternatives set aside projects. He said the current policies and criteria were last revised just two years ago so staff wasn't planning to make any major changes, but wanted to see the committee had any suggestions or concerns. He asked the group about their thoughts regarding the eligibility of path reconstruction versus new path projects. Phillips noted that the scoring criteria will naturally favor new projects unless a reconstruction project was addressing major design deficiencies. Since it is beneficial for MATPB to spend all available funding, reconstruction projects should remain eligible so that they could be funded in the absence of other higher-scoring projects. There was no opposition from other committee members. Phillips asked if the criteria seemed to work well, and Schaefer said yes although the experience was limited. He said there are the usual difficulties in quantifying certain criteria, but no easy solutions to that. There were no other comments or concerns expressed.

4. Presentation on Defining and Mapping the Low Stress Bicycle Network

Schaefer provided a presentation, describing the MATPB's effort to define and map the low traffic stress (LTS) bicycle network, using a recently developed methodology. He explained the rationale and benefits of the methodology versus bicycle level of service, which was used for the MATPB bicycle plan. He also explained the different uses for defining and mapping the bicycle network by LTS.

Stauske asked if MATPB planned to incorporate the LTS analysis and mapped network into the scoring criteria for Transportation Alternatives projects. Schaefer replied that the analysis would likely be used as a tool for scoring projects under the Enhances Mobility and Connectivity and Increases Accessibility criteria. Phillips asked whether the MATPB had developed the LTS rating system. Schaefer replied that an Engineering professor at Northeastern University developed the system, but that MATPB staff made some minor adjustments to adapt the methodology to our available data and account for somewhat unique situations in our community. Dryer commented on the lack of empirical research behind the methodology and expressed concern it would be used to trigger new requirements for street projects. Dryer suggested that the width of the motor vehicle lane

adjacent to the bike lane should be taken into account because narrower lanes – which some advocate for to slow down traffic – result in drivers impinging on the adjacent bicycle facility.

Phillips suggested that intersections with one-way streets should be treated differently than those with two-way streets because one-way streets are generally easier to cross at unsignalized intersections. Schaefer said that was a good point and that staff would look at how these streets were differentiated in the scoring for those intersections. Petersen asked how a low-stress street or path with high-stress crossings would be displayed on an LTS map. Schaefer replied that the road segments abutting the high-stress crossing would be shown in a different color, denoting higher stress. That would be factored into any analysis of connectivity or accessibility using the network. Phillips noted that medians reduce the stress of crossing streets. Schaefer agreed and said he believed medians were factored into the calculation of crossing LTS, but staff would check on that. Phillips asked how RFBs would be treated and what the LTS would be for the path crossing West Washington Avenue. Schaefer said that RFBs are treated the same way as regular traffic signals. He said the West Washington crossing would probably be LTS 3.

Scheel asked if the LTS scoring criteria was a MATPB policy document. Schaefer replied that it is not in the sense that projects would be required to meet a certain LTS, but the analysis will be incorporated into MATPB planning and project prioritization activities, such as scoring projects for funding. Phillips asked if MATPB had looked into other bicycle network rating systems. Schaefer replied that while there are probably a number of locally developed approaches that have been used in different areas, the only two widely recognized and used systems are Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS), which MATPB has used in the past, and Bicycle LTS. Phillips asked what the schedule was for MATPB's LTS network to be made public. Schaefer said that a draft map would be available within a month or so.

5. Review Draft Recommendations and Executive Summary Report on the Study of Dane County Crashes Involving Bicyclists and Pedestrians

Holloway reviewed changes and additions made to the crash study in response to feedback received at the TCC meeting on September 27, 2017 and summarized the study's recommendations.

VanderWegen suggested that Figure 8 in the draft executive summary be revised to show the fraction of crashes resulting in no citation that are hit and run crashes. Dryer said that he would provide some comments on the summary report and recommendations. He questioned why the recommendations focused on just City of Madison and not the county or state. Phillips noted that Table 3 in the report was still confusing. It needs to be made more clear that the population, annual crashes, bicycle commuting percentage, and crash rate per 100,000 population all refer to the City of Madison, rather than to Dane County. Holloway said he would revise the table.

6. Committee Member Reports

Phillips provided the following updates on active and planned future projects:

Active projects

- CTH PD (Meriter Way to Maple Grove Rd) was completed.
- CTH M (Valley View to Cross Country) project construction is underway and will go through Oct 2019.
- Buckeye Rd. (Monona Dr to Stoughton Rd) project environmental document and DSR signed. Real Estate acquisition has started. Construction is in 2019.
- E. Johnson St. (Baldwin to First) project environmental document signed and DSR expected to be signed within a week. The real estate appraisers are ready. Construction is in 2019.

- Cottage Grove Rd. (North Star to Sprecher) project environmental document expected soon. The state law change may affect final sidewalk and bike lane configuration. Construction is in 2020.
- Gammon Rd. reconstruction and West Towne path underpass. Project in preliminary design. Construction 2020.

Future Projects

- Mineral Point Rd. (US 12 to High Point Rd) project design being done in house. Preliminary design has started.
- Atwood Ave. (Fair Oaks to Cottage Grove Rd) project preliminary design has started; currently in alternative analysis phase. One public meeting has been held.
- Pleasant View Rd. (US 14 to Mineral Point Rd) project preliminary design has begun; public meeting scheduled in spring 2018.
- University Ave. (Shorewood blvd to U Bay Dr) contract is being signed, and design will begin in March.

Stauske reported that the Park Street and N. High Point Rd. resurfacing projects will be completed in 2018 and the city was preparing for them.

Martin mentioned that City of Madison Planning was now in the final phase 4 of the comprehensive plan update. Work was initiated on the Milwaukee Street Area Plan, including the Voight farm. An RFP to hire a consultant for the next phase of the BRT study would be posted in early February.

Anderson Schweppe said Windsor officials are working with the county on the CTH CV reconstruction project scheduled for 2020 construction.

Holt said the city was working with the Verona school district to get their project going to build a new high school.

Scheel reported the city was working with the county on a resurfacing project on CTH N (Veterans Rd.) from USH 51 to Dunkirk Ave. scheduled for construction in 2018.

Coville said the village was working with city of Madison on the Siggelkow Road project from Marsh Road to Terminal Drive. The bids on the CTH MN project were due next week.

Petersen mentioned projects the county was working on, including CTH P reconstruction through Cross Plains to CTH K, CTH Q resurfacing from Meffert to Oncken Rd., and CTH PQ in Cambridge. He said the county would also be starting a study of CTH M from CTH Q to STH 113 with an RFP going out in about a month. Schaefer asked if a study committee would be created and Petersen said no.

Stephany said Monona was working on designing the infrastructure for the Yahara Commons redevelopment project. The city is also working with the city of Madison on the Bridge Road construction, which will commence in 2019.

Larson reported that the village was planning a path project through the village to link the Glacial Drumlin trailhead with the trail the county will be constructing to connect to the Capital City Trail.

Kugler reported that Sun Prairie was working on project to reconstruct Thompson Drive and another to expand Reiner Road to a 4-lane divided cross-section to the rail line. They are also conducting traffic study on Main Street.

7. Staff Report

Schaefer reported on the creation of a MPO-CARPC workgroup to look at short- and long-term options for better integrating the planning efforts of the two agencies, including a potential merger. A short-term effort is looking into possible co-location of staff. Schaefer said that a draft report was just

completed on the federal certification review completed last summer. Staff have been working on a Metro bus stop improvement study.

8. Next Scheduled Meeting Dates

The next scheduled meeting dates are February 28 and March 28. Schaefer said that the February meeting would likely be cancelled.

9. Adjournment

Scheel moved, Dryer seconded, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer and Bill Holloway.