

**Madison Area Transportation Planning Board  
October 4, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

---

**1. Roll Call**

**Members present:** Mark Clear, Ken Golden, Chuck Kamp, Jerry Mandli, Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz (arrived during Item #5), Larry Palm, Robin Schmidt, Bruce Stravinski

**Members absent:** David Ahrens, Steve Flottmeyer, Steve King, Steve Stocker

**MPO staff present:** Philip Gritzmacher, Bill Schaefer

**City of Verona officials present:** Jon Hochkammer, Jeff Mikorski, Adam Sayre

**2. Approval of September 6, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

Moved by Clear, seconded by Minihan, to approve the September 6, 2017 meeting minutes. Motion carried with Kamp abstaining.

**3. Communications**

None

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

None

**5. Presentation on City of Verona Land Use & Transportation Plans and Projects**

Adam Sayre, City Planning Director, provided a presentation on recent and future land use and transportation projects in the City of Verona. During the discussion of bicycle projects, there were questions regarding the potential future paving of the Military Ridge Trail through the city. Sayre said that the city has offered in the past to pave and maintain the trail, but has not been given approval to do so by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. He said the issue was that snowmobiles used it in the winter and their fees went towards funding the bridges on the trail. They would have to agree and thus far have been unwilling to do so. Snowmobiles have not been allowed to operate on the paved part of the trail east of Old County Road PB, likely leading to their resistance to paving the rest of the trail.

Following the presentation, Schmidt asked how the community was handling the increasing aging population in the region. Mayor Hochkammer responded, saying that Verona had the highest percentage of people aged 60 and older per capita in the county and, as a result, the city has exempted senior housing from the multi-family housing building caps within the community. He said that the community has also made investments in both of their senior centers in recent years. Further, the city has been investing in shuttle buses for seniors. Golden asked if the restriction on multi-family housing made it difficult for lower income residents to find housing. Hochkammer responded by saying that Verona has been rated as the friendliest city for families in Dane County as well as the second most affordable city in terms of property taxes, which is part of affordability.

Stravinski commented that the community that he represents, Village of Windsor, shares some of the same development pressures that Verona does. He asked if Verona has been approached to build mixed-use developments and if the community has had problems with ground-floor business vacancy in these developments similar to what he has observed in Windsor. Hochkammer said that Verona has been approached to build a number of these types of mixed-use developments as they are exempt from the multi-family housing cap. Sayre added that the community has been very deliberate on the siting of mixed-use building to avoid this issue – focusing on areas with ample foot and vehicular traffic, mostly in the downtown area. He said that in areas in which mixed-use has been approved outside of downtown, office/retail vacancies have led developers to request conversion of the vacant units into apartments. Hochkammer elaborated that another approach that they have utilized is requiring a phased approach to development, requiring the commercial and retail developments to occur before multi-family is approved.

**6. Presentation on Request for Potential Interstate 94 Interchange Near Milwaukee Street, East of Sprecher Road**

Trowbridge provided a presentation on a potential Interstate 94 interchange on the far east side of Madison. He explained that developers that own land in the area are requesting a study of the potential interchange in an effort to make development of the planned commercial lands in the Sprecher neighborhood and the Northeast neighborhood area more viable, particularly at the densities envisioned in the plans. He said much of the commercial development was unlikely to happen without the interchange.

Golden asked if the city had analyzed the traffic impacts of an interchange on the Milwaukee Street corridor. Trowbridge said that the city was sensitive to this issue and the need to consider the impacts. Schaefer explained that this concern was raised by staff and is one of the primary drivers of the interchange design option that would only provide access to County Highway T. Trowbridge went on to explain that this design for the interchange would be similar to that of the Monona Drive/Beltline interchange, but noted that developers of lands south of the interchange wouldn't favor that option. Schaefer noted that FHWA was generally opposed to such an interchange for the interstate. Golden asked if the concerns about impacts to the Badger interchange and Milwaukee Street traffic impacts were reasons why Gaston Road is also being considered for the interchange. Trowbridge said yes and that was a possibility, but would require working with Cottage Grove since the area is not currently in the City of Madison. Matano asked if Cottage Grove had a boundary agreement with the Madison, and Trowbridge said no. Clear asked if the interchange would have an impact on the Fire Department closest to the potential interchange. Trowbridge said that it could, but it had not yet been investigated. He said that is something that should be considered during the study though.

**7. Resolution TPB No. 131 Adopting 2018-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County**

Matano opened the item with public comment. Matano first called Jenny Brendler of Community Living Connections to testify in support of organization's Section 5310 application submittal.

Brendler opened by thanking the board for reviewing the grant application. She said that the organization submitted the application in anticipation of the transition to Family Care and its impact to paratransit service in the area. She said that because of the reduction in paratransit funding, "leave attended" services may be discontinued. This change would mean that some of their clients with disabilities would no longer be able to take the service and would be required to find alternative transportation services which could be very costly. She went on to explain that "door-to-door" service may also be limited, which would also shift clients to other services. She then said that while options such as Union Cab are available for clients, such options can be cost primitive when compared to the non-profit's operating the service themselves. For urgent on-demand services, options are limited without the non-profit having its own vehicle. Lastly, she said that organization had received a 5310 grant for a minibus for operation in Stoughton a few years ago. Since receiving the bus, individuals they work with have had their mobility and independence greatly enhanced. She said that clients have been able to participate in the community as a result of having the vehicle.

Golden asked what population the organization serves. Brendler said that the organization serves adults with developmental disabilities. Golden asked if the organization intends on being a Family Care provider for the two Managed Care Organizations (MCOs) that will be serving people in Dane County. Brendler said that they do intend on being a provider and to serve everyone, regardless of the program that they choose. Golden asked if Brendler knew the proportion of clients that the organization served outside of the paratransit service area. She said that she did not know an exact number, but that 1/3 of the population they serve lives in Stoughton and that a number of clients participate in activities outside of Madison, and thus outside of the paratransit service area. She offered to attempt to quantify this number if it was requested.

Matano called on Jane Betzig with the Dane County Department of Human Services to testify in support of their application.

Betzig said that she runs a one-call information center and administers two travel training programs. She said that the call center has been around for six years and has been very successful with an anticipated 4,000 interactions through the call center in 2017. She explained that the call center anticipates an increase in the call volume in the coming year, with an anticipated 60,000 rides going through the call center directly in 2018. She said that she was surprised to see

that the agency did not receive their entire 5310 request. She said that the money cut from the project – around \$7,000 – is needed to sustain the program.

Betzig provided information on how the transition to Family Care would impact the call center. She anticipated that an additional 90,000 rides would be authorized for MCOs following the transition. She explained that the expansion was the reason for the increase in administrative costs in the submittal and that the expansion required additional oversight. She said that she expected the 2019 request to be smaller than the 2018 request since this expansion would be complete at that time. She said the reduced funding would likely have to be taken out of the part of the project that conducts travel training because the call center has a fixed-cost associated with running it and it is anticipated to expand. She requested that the funding be restored to the project to ensure that cuts do not take place.

Golden began by saying that while call center is a very worthwhile endeavor, he had questions about the Mobility Training and Bus Buddy programs. He asked about the target populations for the programs and what proportion of the population served would be enrolled in Family Care. Betzig said that the Bus Buddy program is aimed primarily at elderly bus riders and she did not believe that population was necessarily served by Family Care. She then explained that the Mobility Training program consists of one-on-one training with developmentally disabled people, some of which may be in Family Care. Golden then asked if the participants of the Mobility Training and Bus Buddy programs were within the metro paratransit area. Betzig said that they were.

Matano called on Gary Johnson and Suzanne Hanson, representing MARC Incorporated. They indicated their support of the submitted project application, but did not wish to speak.

Schmidt asked how much funding flexibility there was for the projects. Schaefer said that the recommended allocation of funding includes about \$100,000 in carryover money from previous cycles in addition to the allocation from this cycle. All of the available funding was committed so to fully fund the Dane County mobility management project funding would need to be reduced from another project. He said the reason this project was selected for reduced funding was the large amount of time allocated to supervision as well as having mostly in-kind match. He explained that the reduction had nothing to do with the merits of the project and that the MPO has fully funded the project every year. He explained that this funding allocation is still more than they received in the previous year. Gritzmacher added that the carry over funding is a conservative estimate and that the exact amount of funding will not be known until the end of the year. Schmidt asked if staff had been able to identify projects that might be under budget. Gritzmacher said that Dane County's 2017 project was one of those projects and asked Betzig if any funding would be relinquished. Betzig said that some, but not much, funding may be left over at the end of the year, but that it was difficult to estimate an amount at this time. She said that she would attempt to get the information to MPO staff. Schmidt then recommended that the board amend the TIP to move carryover funding to the Dane County project once the availability of such funding was known.

Golden referred the board to the minutes from the previous board meeting. He pointed out a section in which he had stated that he was concerned about using the 5310 funds wisely. He expressed concern that providing 5310 funding to Family Care providers would end up subsidizing the Family Care program and thus the State. Golden then explained his experience working with and for the Family Care program. Referring back to the minutes, Golden highlighted a section that said, "Matano recommended that Golden meet with MPO staff to discuss his concerns with some of the applications in more depth." He said he was provided the application materials and reviewed them completely prior to the meeting. He said that he believed all of the proposals were worthy – even the non-eligible Union Cab submittal. He said that he agreed with staff that the Options in Community Living application should not be funded based on the low quality of the application which failed to demonstrate a need, even though he felt they were one of the best service providers in Dane County.

Golden explained that he noticed an intermingling of Family Care populations in each of the applications and recommended to the board the same thing that he recommended to staff – temporarily removing the 5310 projects from the TIP and holding a bidder's conference for the applicants to discuss this Family Care connection to the applications. Clear asked Golden to clarify his concerns regarding subsidizing Family Care. He said that he understood not wanting to subsidize the state, but felt that if the local community did not do so, often no one else will. Golden said that he did not know how to handle purchasing vehicles for providers that were going to serve a 100% Family Care population, some of whom were outside of the paratransit service area. He said that the board should have a feeling for the population that would be served that is not eligible for Family Care or paratransit service. He explained that he

would like to ask this sort of question at a bidder's conference. He went on to explain that this process would have to determine the percentage of clients served by Family Care and the percentage not – a percentage that could be used to allocate funding. He expressed a desire for the process not to be overly technical, so as not to spend too much in staff time on the process. Golden continued by explaining that, after reviewing the applications, he believed that many of the applications involved funding things that should be funded via the MCOs, and thus, Family Care. He said that he believed that staff did not believe it was worth the effort, but that the worst thing that could happen would be a delay in the decision.

Schmidt said that she understood Golden's feeling on the issue – Family Care has a responsibility to provide these services and should be paying for them; however, because this is a transition, she believed it would be best to implement Golden's suggestion after the transition was complete and data about the programs was readily available.

Gritzmacher said that he wanted to explain a few things based on the discussion. He said that he wanted to make clear that the program is not local, but rather a Federal Transit Administration program that is administered by DOTs and MPOs. He said that other MPOs were not using Family Care as part of their scoring criteria, and that Dane County is one of the last counties to make the transition. He said that while MPO staff agreed that there might be merit in having a conference, staff did not believe it was appropriate to change the application criteria at this time, especially considering that some applicants are reliant on 5310 decisions as part of their budgeting process. He went on to say that staff has had discussions about revising the 5310 criteria and that it may be something brought forward next year. Gritzmacher went on to explain that while Family Care may cover the cost of providing the service, it doesn't necessarily cover the capital costs associated with that service. He used the Community Living Connections project to highlight this point – stating that the non-profit's website is currently advertising for drivers with a personal vehicle that they could use for business purposes. Lastly, he said that \$100,000 of the available funding would lapse next year, so it is important to consider the implications of not awarding funding to the projects.

Matano stated that he had talked with Golden about the issue outside of the meeting and thought it would be fair to delay action a month to determine whether or not the award money should be modified in any way. Golden said that he wanted to respond to a few concerns. He said that, in response to Schmidt's concerns, reducing funding would not result in people not being served, because the county's Community Integration program would sue Family Care. He said that he was troubled by Gritzmacher's example that Family Care may not cover the cost of a vehicle procurement and said that it should cover that cost as well.

Schaefer added that this was the first application cycle in which all projects could not be funded. He said that if the MPO doesn't fund some of these projects there is a question concerning what project the funds could be spent on. He cautioned that the MPO cannot create projects nor should it make decisions based on information outside the application process and not related to the approved scoring criteria. He finished by stating that the criteria could be revised for the next application cycle.

Gritzmacher said that he was not trying to make any point with the example he provided other than that the non-profit may have trouble procuring the vehicle if Family Care does not provide funding. He went on to say that the 5310 program is not Madison specific, but rather, available nationwide. He said that MATPB's criteria mirror those of WisDOT and the other MPO's throughout the state and that adding additional layers of complexity would make it more onerous for MATPB's applicants than other applicants around the state. Schaefer noted that if a decision was not made tonight as part of approval of the TIP, then January was the next time the TIP could be amended with some or all of the projects added. That was problematic for applicants – particularly Metro and Dane County – which are finalizing their budgets soon.

Golden asked why the TIP could not be amended until January. Schaefer said that once the TIP is approved by the MPO it must first be approved by WisDOT and incorporated into the State TIP before being amended. Golden said that staff could just wait until January to submit the revision to WisDOT. He suggested it was a minor administrative problem.

Golden moved to amend the resolution to remove the 5310 projects from the TIP. Matano asked if there was a second. Hearing none, Matano seconded for the purposes of discussion.

Golden expressed disappointment in the board, and said that the MPO will be subsidizing a state-federal program. Clear said that while he appreciates where Golden is coming from, he was worried more about a loss of services than a duplication of funding. He said that it's not worth the possibility of losing services simply to make a point. He said that

Golden may be right, but that he wasn't willing to risk the loss of services trying to figure that out. Palm said that he was not as worried about duplication of services as he was in ensuring that the funding that is allocated to the MPO is used for its intended purposes. He expressed his concerns about receiving more applications than submittals and what that means for future cycles. He said that he felt like he did not know enough to co-sponsor the amendment and felt that the board was being placed under intense pressure to make a decision. He went on to say he felt it was inappropriate for staff to comment on the types of things the board should consider in making its funding decisions.

Stravinski said that he disagreed with Palm and said he appreciates anything staff can add to further understanding of the process. He said he could take it or leave it, but it was good to have the information. He then asked if the board could ask surplus funding to be returned at the end of the year and that Family Care fund projects prior to 5310 funding projects. Clear said that this was a good concept, but the duplication was of funding sources, not of dollars. He said that the only way to test Golden's theory that service would not be reduced would be to remove the funding and see if the services get funded by the state. He said he was unwilling to take that risk.

Matano said that the consensus of the board seemed clear. He said the board sent Golden to work with staff as an expert to get answers to his questions and that did not occur.

Kamp said that he respectfully disagreed with Matano's assessment. He said that he was in the interesting position of being on the board, while spending most of his time with staff. He said that he has had communications with Golden and MPO staff about the process. He agreed with staff's assessment that it would be inappropriate to change the 5310 scoring criteria now and that was an adequate answer for the board. He said he believed staff tried to communicate appropriately with the board member and that 2018 was the appropriate time to make changes to the scoring criteria, if needed. He went on to say that the FTA does pay close attention to changes in funding processes. If Metro had a pre-bidders conference for a procurement without including information about it in the RFP, it would risk running afoul of following that process properly. Changes to the process at this point would lead to FTA saying that it was inappropriate to make the changes at this time. He then said that Metro would work with the MPO and Dane County to solve the \$7,000 funding gap for the county's mobility management project. Kamp went on to express that he was not shirking his responsibilities as a board member by not seconding the motion, but that he did not do so because of his professional opinion that it was inappropriate to change the process at this point. He said that he valued Golden's experience and input, including all of the work he did to obtain the MA waiver funding for paratransit services, but disagreed with him on this issue. He concluded by saying that he is a pragmatic person and that regardless of whether or not Metro is subsidizing Family Care, he has a legal obligation to provide services under the Americans with Disabilities Act to provide paratransit service and that these discussions do not trump those obligations.

Golden moved to withdraw the amendment to remove the 5310 projects from the TIP. There were no objections.

Mandli requested clarification on the dates in the TIP, saying that dates in the resolution cover a four-year time period, while the TIP says it covers a five-year time period. Schaefer said that the final year is deemed by USDOT and WisDOT as illustrative and for information only, which is why the fifth year is left out of the resolution.

Mandli then asked about the future candidate projects for STBG-Urban funding. Schaefer said that a slightly revised version of STBG-Urban priority projects table was handed out. There are no changes to the proposed projects and funding. The change is simply to the comments related to the two candidate future projects, University Avenue and Pleasant View Road, which are being conditionally approved for funding in the next program cycle. He went on to say that both of the projects were scheduled to be constructed sometime between 2021-2023. The draft TIP stated that University Avenue would be done in 2022 and Pleasant View Road in 2023. He said that he had forwarded information from Optiz about the Pleasant View Road project design process and timeline to share with the board.

Optiz explained that the design and environmental review process for the Pleasant View Road process was delayed because Middleton and Madison weren't able to get the design contract underway until recently. He asked Strand, the project manager, to provide a statement about the delay and a realistic timeline for the project, which was what Schaefer provided to board members. He said that Middleton staff was concerned that project design was underway without a clear funding commitment. He explained that the local share funding for the project is planned to be funded with TIF money, and that the expenditure period has an end date of 2025. If the project slips beyond then, the city will be unable to fund the local share cost of the project. He said Strand felt the project could be ready for construction in 2021 and that is what the city is planning on, but he agreed with the plan to postpone scheduling of the project and the University Avenue project until the next funding cycle in 2019.

Schmidt returned to the 5310 project funding, saying that she hoped Metro and MPO staff would continue to work on fully funding the Dane County project.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Clear, to adopt resolution TPB No. 131. Motion carried with Golden abstaining.

**8. Resolution TPB No. 132 Approving Amendment to the 2017 MATPB Work Program and Budget**

Schaefer explained that the work program amendment was to carry over to 2018 some of the funding for the project to develop a strategic plan to improve the regional travel demand model and develop other planning analysis tools with the help of a consultant, Fehr & Peers, and to revise the schedule for completing the work.

Moved by Clear, seconded by Opitz, to adopt resolution TPB No. 132. Motion carried.

**9. Review of Draft 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Schaefer said that the draft UPWP was ready. With the board's blessing tonight, it will be sent out for review and comment.

**10. Review and Recommendation on Draft 2018 MPO Budget**

Moved by Mandli, seconded by Kamp, to recommend approval of the 2018 MPO budget. Motion carried.

**11. Letter of Support for City of Madison/Metro Transit TIGER Grant Application for Funding to Construct Satellite Bus Garage**

Moved by Mandli, seconded by Palm, to approve sending the support letter.

**12. Status Report on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB**

Deferred.

**13. Discussion of Future Work Items**

Deferred.

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

The next meeting of the MPO Board will be held Wednesday, November 1, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility, 119 E. Olin Avenue, Rooms A-B.

**15. Adjournment**

Moved by Clear, seconded by Opitz, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 PM.