

**Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
March 30, 2017 Joint Meeting with CARPC Minutes**

1. Roll Call

Members present: David Ahrens, Mark Clear, Steve Flottmeyer (left at 7:30 pm), Ken Golden, Tim Gruber, Chuck Kamp, Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Steve Stocker

Members absent: Steve King, Jerry Mandli, Robin Schmidt

MPO staff present: Colleen Hoesly, Bill Schaefer

City of Madison Planning staff present: Heather Stouder

CARPC members present (not including those also on MPO Board): Steve Arnold, Brad Cantrell, Lauren Cnare, Mark Geller, Kris Hampton, Peter McKeever, Larry Palm, David Pfeiffer

CARPC staff present: Steve Steinhoff, Mike Rupiper, Sean Higgins

2. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)

Jon Becker, representing CRANES, addressed the group about the state of climate change planning in Dane County. He noted that Dane County would soon convene a Council on Climate, and detailed the reductions that the City of Madison had endorsed. He mentioned that the Madison Area Bus Advocates (MABA) is now a partner organization of CRANES. They will be advocating for an intermodal facility. He asked if CARPC or the MPO would consider conducting a free fare transit feasibility study.

3. Presentation on the MPO and its Planning Responsibilities and Update on Regional Transportation Plan 2050

Schaefer gave an overview of the role and planning responsibilities of the MPO and provided an update on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Golden inquired if the forecasted household growth map reflected the infill or more peripheral development growth scenario developed as part of the City of Madison's *Madison in Motion* plan. Schaefer responded that the forecast used for the RTP more or less split the difference between the two scenarios in terms of the amount of infill/redevelopment versus peripheral development. This was based on more recent trends over the past 15 years. It was still ambitious, but more realistic. There were other differences as well with the RTP scenario, such as more employment forecast for the isthmus area.

Hampton asked, in terms of congested roadways, what the MPO does to try to reduce or at least hold constant the level of congestion. Schaefer responded that a lot of the congestion is caused by non-recurring incidents, such as crashes, weather, and special events. Improving operations through things like better or traffic responsive signal timing and incidence management can help minimize the impact of incidents. In some corridors, minor capacity increases can be achieved through intersection or interchange reconfiguration or things such as adding auxiliary lanes, like on the Beltline. In constrained areas such as the Isthmus where capacity expansion is not an option strategies must also focus on making it more convenient to use travel options other than driving alone. Matano clarified that the MPO does not initiate projects; it is up to the implementing agency, but the MPO provides recommendations and approves any projects that utilize federal funding. Hampton also asked if the MPO provides input to communities to help them plan their roadway network and future growth. Schaefer stated that the MPO is more involved in identifying regional facility needs and challenges. The MPO does provide input into various corridor studies around the region, but there is always the

opportunity to do more to assist communities in transportation planning and evaluating the transportation impacts of their land use plans.

4. Presentation on CARPC and its Planning Responsibilities and Update on A Greater Madison Vision

Steinhoff gave an overview of the roles and responsibilities of CARPC and provided a status update on its A Greater Madison Vision plan.

Regarding the goals that comprise A Greater Madison Vision, Flottmeyer asked if there is one goal in particular that CARPC is focusing on. Steinhoff explained that the goals within the plan were synthesized from the goals in all of the local and regional plans, and distilled into general categories, the top including housing choice, economic prosperity, and improving the function of natural systems.

Gruber asked how frequently urban service area amendments are either approved or rejected. Steinhoff replied that there was one declined in 2015, but all have been approved since then. Steinhoff explained that CARPC has changed the process for reviewing urban service area amendment applications.

5. Overview of Land Use and Transportation Interconnection

Schaefer gave an overview of the interaction between land use and transportation.

Clear asked if in practice whether transportation decisions drive land use decisions or vice-versa, or whether it was more complex than that. Schaefer replied that his overall sense is that it is land use development that is driving transportation decisions. Developers consider a wide variety of factors, with transportation being just one consideration. There are exceptions such as a new high capacity transit improvement such as BRT that could potentially drive redevelopment around the stations. Arnold gave an example of how the Verona Road/McKee Road interchange in Fitchburg will affect development as peak capacity of the interchange will control how much development can occur in the interchange quadrants. Kamp said in the case of Epic in Verona he believed that if Metro was not facing a capacity issue currently with the inability to add any new peak period buses that instead of carrying around 2% of Epic's workforce he could see it as being a much higher percentage using transit, having impacts on roadway capacity and land use decisions.

6. Overview of Current Practices of Land Use and Transportation Planning Integration Between MPO and CARPC

Steinhoff provided an overview of past and current efforts to integrate land use planning by CARPC with transportation planning by the MPO.

Golden inquired if either the MPO or CARPC felt that anything had been lost as a result of dissolving into two separate boards. Schaefer replied that there has been some impacts such as the timing of major planning documents not being in sync, however much of that would have been dictated based upon federal timing requirements for many of the documents. Had the two agencies still been combined there probably would have been more involvement by MPO staff in some CARPC planning initiatives, such as with FUDA plans. On the other hand, MPO has closer working relationships with City of Madison planning staff and has been more involved in city planning efforts such as peripheral development plans. Golden also inquired as to whether the MPO lost any connections with suburban communities by being City of Madison staff. Schaefer said he did not believe so. He said MPO staff were seen as objective, and the fact the office is physically separated helps drive home the point that the staff report to the MPO board and not the Madison Mayor and Common Council.

Clear asked if there is a typical model for the integration of land use and transportation planning organizations. Schaefer replied that it is more typical for the two functions to be combined in one agency. Clear followed up by asking if the region was losing out on grant funding as a result of the separated functions, citing Metro's failed TIGER grant applications as an example, due to possibly being viewed as inefficient. Schaefer replied CARPC was successful in getting the Sustainable Communities Grant and Plan for Health grants, which both had a land use and transportation integration component. Schaefer stated that he didn't believe that having two separate agencies had an impact on transportation project specific grants. Steinhoff replied that there are not many regional land use or transportation planning grants out there, that the Sustainable Communities grants was really one of those once-in-a-generation federal investments in regional planning that the region was fortunate enough to get.

During a round-robin discussion, the majority consensus of the combined board members was that MATPB and CARPC would benefit from merging the two organizations together, citing benefits such as cost savings, reduction in duplication of efforts, data sharing, and enhanced public visibility. Cnare, Clear, and Matano cautioned that a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis should be done first before seriously pursuing a merger. Cnare stating that the collaboration that will hopefully be achieved as part of the Greater Madison Vision process would be a good starting point to build upon when it is completed. Minihan expressed that on a staff level he believed the two organizations collaborated well together. Several members expressed that economic development and the Madison Metro Sewerage District (MMSD) should also be included as part of the discussion. Palm suggested a joint committee should be created to keep the discussion going. Matano noted that just having the joint meeting was a step in the direction, and that regional cooperation comes from little steps.

7. Discussion on Additional Methods for Planning Integration

Arnold reiterated that MMSD should be brought into the conversation. He encouraged the group to also consider regional tax base sharing. He cited the Portland regional agency as a structure to consider, where the organization would have their own elected officials, rather than board members/commissioners appointed by other elected officials. He also urged the importance of education of the public about the connection between planning and the long term maintenance of public infrastructure and services.

Pfeiffer noted a step to consider for the future would be reaching out to surrounding counties.

8. Discussion of Next Steps for Continuing Planning Integration Efforts

McKeever said he liked the idea of creating a joint committee, but emphasized that a joint meeting of the full boards of the MPO and CARPC should meet on an annual or semi-annual basis. Golden wanted each board to stay engaged and informed as to the actions of the other board, and suggested including members of both organizations on agenda distribution lists. He also suggested that if members of one board attended a meeting of the other board they should be allowed to sit at the table, and participate in the discussion.

Minihan indicated support for the idea of including MMSD in future discussions as well. Steinhoff suggested that inviting MSD to give a presentation to a future meeting between the two boards would be a good agenda item.

Palm emphasized that creating positive relationships and facilitating collegial conversations is key to building regional collaboration.

9. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Kamp, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.