MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

November 1, 2017  119 E. Olin Avenue, Conference Rooms A-B  6:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of October 4, 2017 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Resolution TPB No. 133 Approving the 2018 MATPB Unified Planning Work Program

6. Resolution TPB No. 134 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with Dane County for MATPB to Provide Specialized Transportation Coordination Services to Dane County in 2018

7. Resolution TPB No. 135 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for MATPB to Provide Transportation Planning Work Activities to CARPC in 2018

8. Resolution TPB No. 136 Adopting Highway Safety Improvement Program Performance Measure Targets

9. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Corridor Feasibility Analysis and Phase 1 Project Corridor Identification

10. Presentation on Study of Dane County Crashes Involving Bicyclists and Pedestrians

11. Discussion and Potential Action on Letter of Comment Regarding Planned Move of One of the WisDOT Department of Motor Vehicles’ Madison Service Centers

12. Status Report on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB:
   - USH 51/Stoughton Road (USH 12/18 to I-39/90/94) Corridor EIS Study
   - USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor EIS Study
   - Beltline (USH 14 to CTH N) Corridor EIS Study
   - Interstate 39/90/Beltline Interchange EIS Study
   - Other WisDOT Corridor Studies

13. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   - Title VI Non-Discrimination Program/Limited English Proficiency Plan
   - Madison Area Household Travel Mail Survey to Supplement National Household Travel Survey
   - AirSage Origin/Destination Data Analysis
   - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Implementation Planning
   - Metro Bus Stop Improvement Study
   - Low Stress Bikeway Network Analysis
   - Local Arterial Roadway Corridor/Intersection and Pedestrian/Bicycle Crash Studies
Strategic Plan for Enhancements to Travel Model and Other Planning Analysis Tools
MPO Website Redesign and Reorganization
Implementation of Public Participation Plan Evaluation Recommendations

14. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

15. Adjournment

Next MPO Board Meeting:

Wednesday, December 6, 2017 at 6:30 p.m.
Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Avenue, Rooms A-B

If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations to access this meeting, contact the Madison Planning & Development Dept. at (608) 266-4635 or TTY/TEXTNET (866) 704-2318. Please do so at least 48 hours prior to the meeting so that proper arrangements can be made.

Si Ud. necesita un intérprete, materiales en formatos alternos, o acomodaciones para poder venir a esta reunión, por favor haga contacto con el Madison Department of Planning & Development (el departamento de planificación y desarrollo) al (608)-266-4635, o TTY/TEXTNET (886)-704-2318.
Por favor avisenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.
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 subidize 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.

Straviniski 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 Opitz 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.

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.
October 6, 2017

The Honorable Elaine L. Chao, Secretary
US Department of Transportation
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

RE: Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO) support for TIGER IX Grant Application for Madison Metro Satellite Bus Garage and 5 All-Electric Articulated Buses

Dear Secretary Chao:

As chair of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), I am writing to offer the MPO’s endorsement of Metro Transit’s TIGER IX grant application. The project will enable Metro to expand its fleet and pursue comprehensive service improvements and expansion needed to serve the growing metropolitan area.

This project is backed by more than 10 years of planning, starting with a 2005 study recommending a capacity expansion of Metro’s bus facilities to accommodate at least 285 buses. While this project is focused on near-term construction of a satellite bus garage, the mid- and long-range goals of the project are service expansion and development of a next generation transit system whose components include: 50% of the fleet converted to all-electric, zero emission buses by 2035; a new facility that meets the highest standards for energy efficiency; and the introduction of Bus Rapid Transit by 2023. The goal of these investments is to increase ridership by 30% by 2035. The planned service improvements, which are dependent upon this satellite bus garage and fleet expansion project, will enable Metro to serve the growing metropolitan area and to target underserved neighborhoods where workers can benefit from faster, more efficient transportation options connecting to employment and services.

The satellite garage project, fleet expansion, and comprehensive system improvement plan are identified as high priorities in the MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2050 for the Madison Metropolitan Area (http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/RegionalTransportationPlan2050.cfm). The plan also recommends expanding the use of low or no emission vehicles with a goal of ultimately a fully emission-free fleet. A bus size study in 2014 recommended use of articulated buses – part of this application – for several routes. Analysis conducted as part of development of the RTP showed that implementation of the BRT system and other complementary service improvements would significantly reduce travel times and greatly increase job accessibility by transit. These changes would be a vast improvement over present conditions in which buses on several core routes are routinely overcrowded, some peripheral neighborhoods suffer from long travel times, and other neighborhoods and surrounding communities lack any service at all, but have requested it.

This application is Madison’s third to the TIGER program for funds to support the planned satellite garage and bus expansion project. The project continues to advance, is now truly shovel-ready, and enjoys the support of a broad network of neighboring communities, key employers, and institutions. On behalf of the MATPB, I urge you to fund this project, which promises to be a cost-effective investment in the...
Madison area’s multi-modal transportation network and one that will help Madison continue to be a competitive place to live and do business.

Thank you for your consideration for your consideration of this application.

Sincerely,

Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board

Cc: Dave Ross, WisDOT Secretary
    Chuck Kamp, Metro Transit General Manager
    Paul Soglin, City of Madison Mayor
Date: October 12, 2017

To: Mary Forlenza, Federal Highway Administration

From: Donna Brown-Martin, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Subject: Amendment to the 2017 Unified Planning Work Program for the Sheboygan Metropolitan Planning Area

In accordance with FHWA rule regarding the reporting of changes made to work programs, please accept the following as notification of such changes to the 2017 Madison Metropolitan Planning Area Transportation Planning Work Program.

The Bureau of Planning and Economic Development Section within the Division of Transportation Investment Management recommends approval of the enclosed request by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board for work activity and budget adjustments to the overall work program.

This approval will extend the period of eligibility to complete these 2017 UPWP activities until May 31, 2018. The requested work activities to be completed in 2018 are estimated in the amount of $44,000. These work activities will be reimbursed at the current 2017 UPWP Federal, State and Local allocation percentages. Any 2017 UPWP funding not expended and requested by May 31, 2017 will not be eligible for reimbursement. Total reimbursements for 2017 UPWP activities are limited to the approved 2017 UPWP funding allocation of $927,002.

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation asks for your approval to proceed with this request. Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donna Brown-Martin, Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
Division of Transportation Investment Management, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Approved: [Signature]

FHWA Division 10-12-17 Date

Cc via email: William Schaefer, Director, Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Charles Wade, Planning Section Chief - BPED
Steve Flottemeyer, Planning Chief, WisDOT Southwest Region
Diane Paoni, WisDOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 133 Approving the 2018 Unified Planning Work Program

Staff Comments on Item: A notice and summary of the draft 2018 Unified Planning Work Program was distributed to all local units of government within the MPO planning area and appropriate agencies, committees, and commissions for review and comment. Comments from FHWA and WisDOT staff were incorporated into the draft document. No comments were received on the draft work program from local officials or the public. There are no proposed changes to the draft document.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 133
   [Note: The Draft 2018 Unified Planning Work Program was distributed in the October meeting packet. It is also posted on the MPO website here.]

Staff Recommendation/Rationale: Staff recommends approval of Resolution TPB No. 133 approving the Work Program without change from the draft document, dated October 2017. The 2018 Unified Planning Work Program is the basis for MPO contracts with local units of government and with state and federal agencies for 2018 planning activities and funding.

You may want to bring your draft copy of the 2018 Unified Planning Work Program dated October 2017 to the meeting for reference.
Resolution TPB No. 133
Approving the 2018 Unified Planning Work Program

WHEREAS a Unified Planning Work Program is a requirement for receiving various federal and state planning financial assistance; and

WHEREAS the 2018 Unified Planning Work Program for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) is annually updated, and is the first year of the 2018-2020 Overall Program Design Report; and

WHEREAS separate grant applications will be required to apply for the 2018 programmed planning grant funds, including applications to the Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Dane County, and various local governmental units; and

WHEREAS the City of Madison is the administrative and fiscal agent for the MATPB and is a legally constituted entity under the laws of the State of Wisconsin and able to receive these funds:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATPB approves the 2018 Unified Planning Work Program dated November 2017, which reflects the draft Work Program document dated October 2017 without change; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Transportation Planning Manager of the MATPB is authorized and directed to submit necessary applications to appropriate state, local, and federal departments for planning activities indicated for 2018 and to execute appropriate agreements and contracts with said agencies on behalf of the MATPB; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Transportation Planning Manager of the MATPB is authorized to file appropriate supporting documents and requisitions and to perform other duties and acts, which may be required as part of these planning grant contracts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the planning agency agrees to abide by all the provisions, terms, and conditions of said contracts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.334(a) the MATPB hereby certifies that the metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:

1. 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303, and this subpart;
2. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 USC 2000d-1) and 49 CFR part 21;
3. 49 USC 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, ex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Section 1101(b) of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (Pub. L. 114-357) and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the US DOT funded projects;
5. 23 CFR part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
7. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
8. Section 324 of title 23, U.S.C regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and

Date Adopted ___________________________ Al Matano, Chair
Re:
Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 134 Authorizing City of Madison to Enter into Agreement with Dane County for MATPB to Provide Specialized Transportation Coordination Services in 2018

Staff Comments on Item:
It is proposed that the MPO continue to provide staff assistance to Dane County for specialized transportation planning and coordination services as provided in previous years.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 134
2. Description of scope of work for proposed County funding of MPO planning and coordination services and Metro Transit’s promotion and transit information services.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 134
Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with Dane County for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board to Provide Specialized Transportation Coordination Services in 2018

WHEREAS, the staff of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) – An MPO has historically provided assistance to Dane County for specialized transportation planning and coordination services; and

WHEREAS, the County is requesting that the MATPB continue this assistance of planning and coordination services; and

WHEREAS, the County has budgeted $5,000 for this service for the year 2018; and

WHEREAS, this service is included in the MPO’s adopted 2018 Unified Planning Work Program; and

WHEREAS, the County requests that this agreement be part of Metro Transit’s service agreement and contract for transit information, promotion efforts, and operations, since the contracting agent for both Metro Transit and the MATPB is the City of Madison:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATPB agrees to have MATPB staff provide this service to Dane County in 2018 and authorizes the City of Madison on behalf of the MATPB to execute the agreement and contract to provide this service.

Date Adopted _____________________ Al Matano, Chair
Schedule A: Scope

Public Transit Services. Dane County will fund the following public transit services of the City of Madison to be provided by Metro Transit.

1. Assistance to Customer Service Center (CSC)

   The major area-wide information point for transit has been Metro’s Customer Service Center, which provides information on routes, schedules, etc., for those who telephone and responds to E-mail questions regarding routes and schedules. CSC representatives also provide paratransit ride scheduling, transportation referrals, and ridesharing (266-RIDE) referrals for vanpool and carpool services. Representatives utilize Teleinterpreters for interpretation services when callers who speak only foreign languages contact the CSC.

2. Transit Information/Promotion Assistance

   Provide assistance to Metro Transit for transit information and promotion costs including:
   - Creating “How to Ride” demonstration videos for distribution online and DVD.
   - Creating alternate language formats including Spanish and Hmong of video and print materials.
   - Printing Ride Guides, System Maps and schedules.
   - Promoting new Commute Card pass and existing prepaid fares such as 31-Day, 31-Day Senior/Disabled, and 2-4-6 Weekend & Holiday Passes.
   - Promoting Park & Ride lots, commuter routes and routes to outlying parts of the Madison urban area (such as Fitchburg and Middleton routes).
   - Creating other promotional materials, including public information to increase awareness of Metro.

   Overall transit information/promotion program is to be approved by County Public Works & Transportation Committee prior to release of funds.

3. Contribution Toward Operating Costs of Metro Transit

   During 2018 Metro Transit plans to continue to focus on employee pass programs (such as the UW and St. Mary’s employee passes) and the Commuter Choice Benefit program to attract more county and regional use. Additional plans, in 2018, include continuing bus stop sign replacement program and installing maps and schedule information in Metro shelters to make riding Metro easier. This funding will assist Metro with some local share costs of this effort.
**Specialized Transportation and Public Transit.** Dane County will fund the following specialized transportation planning and coordination services of the City of Madison to be provided by Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) staff.

1) Providing technical assistance to the Dane County Specialized Transportation Commission, as needed.

2) Providing technical assistance to the Adult Community Services Division of the Department of Human Services in planning, coordinating and evaluating their specialized transportation services.

3) Assisting in monitoring and collecting data on the operations of specialized transportation providers, and collecting and analyzing data on the location of elderly and persons with disabilities from the American Community Survey and other sources.

4) Assisting implementation of the 2013 Dane County Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan recommendations, and updating the plan.

5) Working with Metro Transit to implement the Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility for E/D Persons) Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan, including project scoring and selection by the MPO and administration of the program by Metro.

6) Coordinating various projects with county agencies and service providers, both public and private, to make Dane County's specialized transportation services more cost-effective.

**Schedule B: Payments**

a. Upon receipt of invoice from the City of Madison, payment will be rendered as follows:

Payment in full for Mass Transit Services ($19,300 to Metro Transit)

1. Assistance for Customer Service Center
2. Transit Info/Promotion Assistance (following committee approval)

b. Upon receipt of invoices from the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, payment will be rendered as follows:

Payment for Specialized Transit Coordination ($5,000 to Madison Area Transportation Planning Board)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule C: Reports**

Narrative progress reports will be provided by MATPB staff to County staff quarterly.
Re:
Resolution No. 135 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for MATPB to Provide Transportation Planning Work Activities to CARPC in 2018

Staff Comments on Item:
CARPC is requesting around $11,000 in federal planning funds from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation for transportation planning activities for areas in Dane County outside of the Madison Metropolitan Area. A total of $5,457 of this amount will be set aside for MPO planning services.

CARPC is requesting that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, as the MPO for the region, provide these services in a similar manner as in previous years.

These services are to consist primarily of conducting analyses of the impact of proposed Urban Service Area amendments in the county on the multi-modal transportation system, including an assessment of the capacity to handle the traffic to be generated, ability to serve the development with public transit, accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, other design issues, and overall consistency with the goals, policies, and recommendations in the Regional Transportation Plan 2050.

Other services to be provided include providing staff support for CARPC’s work to undertake a regional visioning process and develop a regional growth strategy leading to adoption of an updated regional land use plan in order to ensure consistency between the regional transportation and land use plans. This activity is included in the adopted 2018 Unified Planning Work Program of the MPO.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 135
2. Draft agreement between City of Madison and CARPC for MPO to provide planning services

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 135

Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board to Provide Transportation Planning Work Activities to CARPC in 2018

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison Metropolitan Area with responsibilities to perform metropolitan transportation planning and programming activities; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) is the regional land use planning and area-wide water quality management planning agency for the Dane County region with responsibilities that include preparing a master plan for the physical development of the region; and

WHEREAS, CARPC is in need of services to conduct transportation planning for areas in Dane County, particularly outside of the Madison Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, CARPC is requesting federal funding from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation for transportation planning activities for areas in Dane County outside of the Madison Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, CARPC is also requesting that the MATPB, as the MPO for the region, provide these services in a similar manner to previous years; and

WHEREAS, these services are to consist of (1) conducting analyses of the impact of proposed Urban Service Area amendments on the multi-modal transportation system, including capacity to handle the traffic to be generated, ability to serve the development with public transit, accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, other design issues, and the overall consistency with the goals, policies, and recommendations in the Regional Transportation Plan; and (2) participate in and support CARPC’s efforts to undertake a regional visioning process and develop a growth strategy leading to adoption of an updated regional land use Plan in order to ensure consistency between the regional transportation and land use plans; and

WHEREAS, the MATPB will bill CARPC on a quarterly basis for the cost of these services not to exceed $5,457 for calendar year 2018; and

WHEREAS, this work activity is included in the adopted 2018 Unified Planning Work Program of the MATPB:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATPB authorizes the City of Madison to enter into an agreement with CARPC for the MATPB to provide these transportation planning work activities to CARPC in calendar year 2018 with CARPC providing for the reimbursement of staff services for an amount not to exceed $5,457.

Date Adopted

Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
AGREEMENT BETWEEN
CITY OF MADISON ON BEHALF OF THE MADISON AREA TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING BOARD AND THE
CAPITAL AREA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SERVICES

Parties: This agreement is by and between the City of Madison, hereafter “City,” and Capital Area Regional Planning Commission, hereafter “CARPC.”

Term: The term of this agreement is January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018.

Scope of Services: The City will provide transportation planning services to CARPC. These services will be provided by City staff to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) – An MPO. These planning services will consist of: (1) conducting analyses of the impact of proposed Urban Service Area amendments in the county on the multi-modal transportation system, including an assessment of the capacity to handle the traffic to be generated, ability to serve the development with public transit, accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, other design issues, and overall consistency with the goals, policies, and recommendations in the Regional Transportation Plan; and (2) providing staff support for CARPC’s work to undertake a regional visioning process and develop growth strategy leading to an updated land use plan in order to ensure consistency between the regional transportation and land use plans.

Payment: The City of Madison will bill CARPC on a quarterly basis for the cost of providing the transportation planning services. A progress report on planning services provided will be submitted with the quarterly invoice. The total cost of these services will not exceed $5,457 for calendar year 2018.

Non-Discrimination: During the term of this agreement, the parties agree to abide by their respective policies of non-discrimination and affirmative action. Further, the parties agree that this agreement does not subject either party to the other’s jurisdiction for the determination of such matters.

Liability: CARPC shall be responsible for injuries, claims and losses arising from or caused by the acts or omissions of its officers, employees, agencies, boards, commissions and representatives. City shall be responsible for injuries, claims and losses arising from or caused by the acts or omissions of its officers, employees, agencies, boards, commissions and representatives. The obligations of the parties under this paragraph shall survive the expiration or termination of this agreement.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the parties have caused this agreement to be executed by individuals and officers duly authorized on the dates noted below.
Re:
Resolution No. 136 Adopting Highway Safety Improvement Program Performance Measure Targets

Staff Comments on Item:
Under the new federal transportation performance management framework established by the two most recent federal transportation bills, MAP-21 and the FAST Act, the FHWA has finalized six interrelated performance rulemakings to address national goals, including:

- Improving safety;
- Maintaining infrastructure condition;
- Reducing traffic congestion;
- Improving the efficiency of the system and freight movement; and
- Protecting the environment.

The rules establish national performance measures and the methodology for calculating the measures, including data source(s). State departments of transportation (DOTs) and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) are required to establish targets for the measures according to a timeline based on when the different rules were finalized and then to track and report on progress toward meeting the targets. New and amended long-range plans and TIPs will need to document the strategies and investments planned and programmed to be used to achieve the targets.

The first federal performance measures to be finalized were those related to safety. The five Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) measures are the number and rate of fatalities and serious injuries and the number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. State DOTs and MPOs must establish calendar year 2018 targets for each of the five HSIP measures. Based primarily on an analysis of historical data WisDOT established state numerical targets, which represent a 2% reduction in the number and rate of fatalities and a 5% reduction in the number and rate of serious injuries and number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries compared to the 2012-2016 average numbers.

The MATPB must now establish targets for each of the five HSIP performance measures by either agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of WisDOT’s HSIP targets or by committing to quantifiable HSIP targets for the Metropolitan Planning Area. Staff is recommending that the MATPB simply agree to supporting the state targets. Unlike the case with state DOTs there are no funding implications at the MPO level if the MPO chooses to set different targets and progress is not achieved towards meeting them. In fact, there may be more of a chance of receiving additional HSIP project funding if the MATPB supports the state targets and the number or rate of Dane County crashes increases. Also, if the MATPB establishes its own targets for the Madison metro area, in order to calculate crash rates MPO staff will need to calculate VMT for the metro area based on the county VMT estimate developed by WisDOT. This would be a fairly time-consuming exercise with no real benefit. Because MATPB doesn’t directly control the programming of HSIP projects nor most other projects, staff believes the primary value for MATPB in the new performance management process is in the reporting and analysis of trends rather than in setting targets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Presented on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resolution TPB No. 136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommends approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution TPB No. 136

Adoption of Highway Safety Improvement Program Performance Measure Targets

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) established five national performance measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) within the National Performance Management Measures: Highway Safety Improvement Program; Final (23 CFR 490, Subpart B); and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) established statewide calendar year 2018 targets for each of the five HSIP performance measures in accordance with 23 CFR 490.209 as follows;

- Number of fatalities – 556 (2% reduction from 2012-'16 average)
- Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled – 0.917 (2% reduction from 2012-'16 average)
- Number of serious injuries – 3,023 (5% reduction from 2012-'16 average)
- Rate of serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled – 4.997 (5% reduction from 2012-'16 average)
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries – 343 (5% reduction from 2012-'16 average); and

WHEREAS, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) must also annually establish calendar year targets for each of the five HSIP performance measures starting in 2018 by either agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of WisDOT’s HSIP targets or by committing to quantifiable HSIP targets for the Metropolitan Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) intends to continue to track the HSIP performance measures for Dane County and report on these measures annually as part of its Performance Measures report, but has decided for various reasons to support the state HSIP performance measure targets rather than develop its own targets:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATPB agrees to plan and program projects within the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area so that the projects contribute toward the accomplishment of WisDOT’s calendar year 2018 HSIP targets for all five of the following performance measures:

- Number of fatalities,
- Rate of fatalities,
- Number of serious injuries,
- Rate of serious injuries, and
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

Date Adopted Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Re:
Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Feasibility Analysis and Phase 1 Project Corridor Identification

**Staff Comments on Item:**
The MATPB Regional Transportation 2050 recommends completing project planning leading to an initial Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project and future expansion of the BRT network to fulfill the system vision. The next step in the planning process is to identify the first corridor(s) to implement the service and then conduct pre-project development to identify the scope of the initial project, including routing, termini, station locations, transit priority treatments, etc. An interagency (MPO, Metro, City of Madison Planning and Traffic Engineering) staff team conducted a feasibility analysis of the different corridors. Criteria considered included: ridership; rider origins/destinations; existing land use; redevelopment potential; technical readiness; capital and operating cost considerations; and equity. Based on that analysis, it is being recommended that a Phase 1 project be developed within the east-west corridor. A city of Madison resolution will be introduced on October 31 supporting this recommendation. If adopted, the next step would be a subsequent city resolution to approve issuing an RFP to hire a consultant to assist staff in conducting a study to develop the scope for the project and then apply to FTA to enter into project development under the Small Starts program to complete more detailed planning and design.

**Materials Presented on Item:**
1. Powerpoint presentation slides
2. BRT corridor feasibility – staff analysis summary
3. City of Madison resolution

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**
For information and discussion purposes at this time.
BRT Corridor Selection
Corridor Feasibility Analysis and Phase 1 Corridor Identification
Presentation Overview

1. BRT System Vision
2. Corridor Selection Considerations
3. Staff Recommendations
4. Next Steps
1. BRT System Vision
The Madison Area BRT system vision consists of five corridors. Any phase one project must include the Central Corridor – the corridor that links UW campus to downtown. Each corridor has multiple possible “end-of-line” stops that merit consideration for the initial project.
2. Corridor Selection Considerations
The main factors staff considered in determining the feasibility of the corridors for a Phase One project included:

- **Existing Transit Ridership**: How strong is the existing ridership in the corridor relative to the corridor’s length?
- **Origins & Destinations**: Where are existing transit riders going to and/or coming from?
- **Equity**: Would the corridor further Madison’s vision of being an equitable community?
- **Existing & Future Land Use**: How does BRT serve and enhance the existing and future planned land uses in the corridor?
- **Development Potential**: What is the capacity for and likelihood of redevelopment of major opportunity sites in the different corridors?
- **Job Density**: How many jobs are located along the corridor relative to other corridors?
- **Destination Density**: How many destinations are located along the corridor, including regional attractors?
- **Capital & Operating Costs**: Could the corridor be built within the anticipated Phase one budget of $50-55 million?
- **Technical Readiness**: Does it appear that the corridor could be built within the expected timeframe and project budget and in coordination with other efforts?
Existing Transit Ridership

Highest transit ridership occurs, unsurprisingly, in the UW campus and downtown areas. Additionally, the East and West Towne malls, Madison College, Hilldale/Hill Farms, and high schools are popular destinations. There is a noticeable concentration of ridership along the University Ave. and East Isthmus corridors.
Origins & Destinations

Highest origin/destination areas include downtown and the UW campus areas, along with areas along University Avenue through Hill Farms, East Isthmus, E. Washington Ave. out to East Towne, Park Street south of Erin St., and Mineral Point Rd. out to West Towne.
Equity

EJ populations have origins/destinations concentrated more on the periphery of the Madison area.

Concentrations of low income residents live south of the Beltline, along Park St., along E. Washington Ave, and on North side. Many of the low income areas downtown are student housing areas. Minority residents live in many of the same areas.
EJ populations have origins/destinations concentrated more on the periphery of the Madison area.

Concentrations of low income residents live south of the Beltline, along Park St., along E. Washington Ave, and on North side. Many of the low income areas downtown are student housing areas. Minority residents live in many of the same areas.
Land use along the east and west corridors consists of higher density employment, retail, residential, and institutional uses. These corridors have the most growth potential.

The north and south corridors are lower density, but have nodes of higher intensity use. These corridors have long-term economic development potential, but not at same scale.
Sites along each of the corridors were examined for redevelopment potential. While sites are available along all corridors outside of the central downtown area, sites on the west and east lines offer more redevelopment potential due to larger parcel sizes.
Job Density

Job concentrations are found downtown, on UW campus, UW Research Park, the malls, and along University Ave., East Washington Ave, and Park Street.

The “core” of employment lies between Hill Farms to the west and the First St./East Washington intersection to the east.
Destination Density

Travel destination density is highest in the downtown, Hilldale, S. Park Street, and E. Washington Ave. areas. UW Research Park, Darbo/Worthington, East and West Towne Malls, and Warner Park area also contain significant densities of destinations.

Destinations include community gardens, community and senior centers, government agencies grocery stores, hospitals and clinics, libraries, parks, theaters, cinemas, sporting venues, and retail centers. Note – malls and other regional centers were considered as “1 retail center” for this analysis.
Capital & Operating Costs

The east and west corridors are least expensive in terms of capital and operating costs, since the roads have been recently reconstructed and service levels are already high, reducing net added operating costs. The south corridor is potentially most expensive if median-running option chosen and/or local funding used to reconstruct roadway (if done before WisDOT programs reconstruction project).

Costs from 2013 BRT Study

- **East Corridor**
  - Cap - $28 million or $6.5 million per mile (including overlapping segment)
  - Op – Very high cost, since service would be completely new

- **West Corridor**
  - Cap - $37-38 million, depending on alignment or roughly $4.5 million per mile.
  - Op – low cost, mostly service replacement

- **Central Corridor**
  - Cap - $24 million or <$4 million per mile (including overlapping segment)
  - Op - Moderate cost increase due to increase in frequency rather than service replacement

- **South Corridor**
  - Cap - $30 - $55 million or $5.5 - 10 million per mile. Additional $15 million if street reconstructed with local funding
  - Op – Would require significant service restructuring. Increases to operating costs likely.

- **North Corridor**
  - Cap - $37 million or $6.5 million per mile (including overlapping segment)
  - Op – low cost, mostly service replacement
Technical Readiness

- The north and south corridors have significant hurdles to overcome before implementation.
- Feasibility of Yahara River bus-way bridge is major question; also would need WSOR cooperation and an EIS.
- North Transfer Point relocation costly and requires private property acquisition.
- Park Street, a state connecting highway, is in poor condition and should be rebuilt with BRT project. State has not scheduled project.
- South Transfer Point requires expansion, private property acquisition.
3. Staff Recommendations
Staff team from Metro, MPO, and City of Madison developed a consensus that technical readiness issues eliminated both the South and North corridors from Phase One project consideration.

Selection of East/West corridor supported by other selection criteria: existing ridership and transit travel patterns, land uses, density, cost, redevelopment potential, and equity.

Staff recommends proceeding with study to develop scope of initial project within the East/West corridor.
Recommended Madison Area Bus Rapid Transit System

Phase One Corridor within which project will be identified
4. Next Steps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline/Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions/Comments?

If you have any questions please don’t hesitate to contact me at:

Philip Gritzmacher
PGritzmacher@CityofMadison.com
608-243-0182
**BRT Planning: Staff Team Evaluation**

- Oct. 13, 2017 -

**BRT Corridor: Staff Evaluation** (Metro Transit, Traffic Engineering, Planning, MPO)

- **Red highlighted text:** Serious technical, engineering/design or funding/scheduling challenges

Central (Park St – Webster)

- Existing ridership – **6,906** (Park St to Webster)

- Central area BRT service will be a component of any Phase 1 start-up project.

North

- Existing ridership - **2,628** Blair St. to Northport Dr. (including ridership Blair to Dickinson, which is common to North and East corridors)

- Requires a new busway/bridge to connect East Washington Ave. to Sherman Ave. (including relocated NTP to Sherman Ave).
- Requires bridge over Yahara River, requiring coordination with WSOR and extensive environmental study; technical feasibility of bridge uncertain. Busway along RR corridor would impact Yahara River Bike Path.
- Parking removed on E Wash between Square and Yahara River.
- Significant Increase to operating cost, as service would be completely new due to new alignment.
- Areas of Land Use Change (from Comp Plan): 288 acres

South

- Existing ridership – **2,665** University Ave to Caddis Bend

- Park St is state connecting highway; WisDOT responsible for street reconstruction and also must approve of cross section. Project not in WisDOT 6-year budget, but reconstruction should be done as part of BRT project because pavement is distressed - in fair-to poor condition throughout corridor.
- Would require parking removal for side running or median option
- If local funding needed for street reconstruction, add up to $15 million, increasing cost per mile to between $10-13 million per mile.
- Side running would require parking removal and bus lanes added between W Wash and railroad. Existing bus lanes south of railroad, some parking removal required.
- Park Street Volume-to-Capacity ratio 0.94-1.5; roadway capacity is constrained.
- South Transfer Point is over capacity; expansion for BRT would require RE acquisition.
- Increases to operating costs, as a Park St. corridor service does not currently exist. Routes 4, 5, 13 do not cover entire corridor, meaning they could not be replaced.
- Areas of Land Use Change (from Comp Plan): 247 acres
East

- Existing ridership – \textbf{2,460} Blair to East Towne (including ridership Blair to Dickinson, which is common to North and East corridors)

- East Towne terminal is located on private property and may need to be expanded.
- Parking removed on E Wash between Square and Hwy 30 (removal of parking and curb extensions at intersections).
- Relatively low infrastructure needs (East Washington pavement in very good condition due to recent reconstruction).
- Areas of Land Use Change (from Comp Plan): 591 acres

West

- Existing ridership - \textbf{9,484} Park St. to Junction Rd. (assuming Mineral Point Road alignment)

- Relocated West Transfer Point required if Mineral Point Road route chosen.
- Intersection improvements required at University Bay Drive.
- Little impact to bicyclists, pedestrians, and parking.
- Mostly replacing, organizing existing service so little to no impact on vehicle operations other than TSP and possible intersection priority treatments (e.g., Campus/Johnson, Campus/U Bay Dr).
- Areas of Land Use Change (from Comp Plan): 745 acres

- Consultations with transit officials in Minneapolis and Grand Rapids, MI: Successful Phase 1 Small Starts application dependent upon clear system vision, local funding commitment and technical readiness.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Staff Team Recommendation for Phase 1 Route: East-West corridor (termini TBD)}
\end{center}

- Staff Team Rationale for East-West: Highest ridership, serves RESJ populations and destinations, technical readiness and complexity, capital and operating cost considerations, highest redevelopment impact potential, traffic capacity considerations

\begin{center}
\textbf{Planning Resources Available}
\end{center}

- Transport 2020 funds (federal/state funds) to be used for BRT Project Development, FTA Small Starts Application and NEPA completion.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Grant} & \textbf{Description} & \textbf{Federal} & \textbf{State} & \textbf{Total} \\
\hline
WI-26-0012: & 2006 Section 5314—Transport 2020 Alternative Analysis & \$860,750 & \$860,750 & \$1,721,500 \\
WI-39-0002: & 2007 Section 5339—Transport 2020 Alternative Analysis & \$140,984 & \$140,984 & \$281,968 \\
\hline
\textbf{Total} & \textbf{\$1,001,734} & \textbf{\$1,001,734} & \textbf{\$2,003,468} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
In addition to those federal/state funds, there is another $532,500 federal grant that does not yet have any committed match. If the City is able to secure $532,500 non-federal funds to match, we would have $3,068,468 total funding for BRT implementation.

2018 BRT Planning Process Recommended

- In order to advance the recommended BRT Phase 1 system, an extensive planning process is recommended. Professional planning and project development consultant services will be solicited. The procurement process will begin in the first quarter of 2018, and it is anticipated that this work will be completed in 12-18 months. The scope of this detailed planning effort is anticipated to include numerous elements, including, but not limited to:

BRT Project Development (FTA Small Starts Application)

- Planning/project development of high-capacity BRT Phase 1 corridor
  - Develop operating plan alternatives
  - Prepare ridership estimates
  - Preparation of FTA Small Start Application
- Development of capital and operating costs for Phase 1 BRT corridor
  - BRT corridor: infrastructure and facilities
  - park-and-ride facilities and other transfer facilities/opportunities
  - local Metro bus improvements to support the BRT service
  - shuttle and/or circulator services
  - bus/transit system maintenance facility
- Traffic Impact Analysis for Phase 1 corridor (incl. downtown/UW Campus street circulation analysis)
- Financial Plan (incl. capital and operating budget plan)
- Public Outreach/Participation Plan
Fiscal Note
FISCAL NOTE PENDING

Title
Supporting the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Inter-Agency Staff Team recommendation to proceed with a Phase 1 Project Development in an East-West corridor, directly serving the UW Campus and Madison's Central Business District (CBD).

Body
WHEREAS the City of Madison's population and economy is growing, and in order to help facilitate this growth and ensure a high quality of life, the City has identified a need for a comprehensive transportation system strategy that integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., auto, bicycle, public transportation, pedestrian, high-capacity transit, etc.), and identifies how those modes interconnect and work together; and,

WHEREAS Madison in Motion, the City of Madison's long-range transportation system plan, policy framework and guide for future transportation investments long-range transportation system plan, recommends planning for and implementing a high-capacity rapid transit service, and to take all necessary steps toward BRT project development and service implementation, in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations; and,

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Plan for the Metropolitan Area (2050), the MPO's current long-range transportation system plan, recommends planning for and implementing a high-capacity rapid transit service and for local units of government to reach agreement on the appropriate technology and routing for such service; and,

WHEREAS the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, in 2013, completed and adopted the Madison Transit Corridor Study: Bus Rapid Transit in the Madison Area (the "BRT Study"); and,

WHEREAS the BRT Study identified corridors and segments to carry forward into detailed analysis in four corridors, each arranged around the Capitol Square and oriented towards North, Northeast, South, and West...
WHEREAS the BRT Study concluded that the BRT system that was evaluated demonstrated strong ridership potential and would favorably compete with other BRT systems throughout the U.S.; and,

WHEREAS City of Madison Resolution ID 35566 (adopted 12-19-14) resolved that the Mayor and Common Council accepted the MPO’s BRT Study Report, endorsed BRT as a high-capacity transit concept that could help the City achieve its long-term strategic transportation planning and urban development goals, and authorized moving forward to the next phase of project development, environmental evaluation and project implementation; and,

WHEREAS recent Metro Transit surveys have indicated that the highest number of complaints from customers about current Metro services are overcrowded buses and long travel times, and that low-income persons and persons of color are affected more by long travel times; and that Bus Rapid Transit will directly improve these service conditions; and,

WHEREAS a City staff evaluation team conducted an analysis of the MPO’s 2013 BRT Study Report in an effort to identify the first corridor(s) to implement the new service; and,

WHEREAS the City staff evaluation team considered a variety of criteria to help inform their recommendation of the first phase of service - including corridor ridership, how well the corridor will serve Racial Equity & Social Justice (RESJ) populations, technical readiness/complexity, capital and operating cost considerations, redevelopment impacts and traffic capacity constraints; and,

WHEREAS the City staff evaluation team concluded that, based on the evaluation criteria noted above, a Phase 1 corridor project should be developed and that the Phase 1 service should be provided to the UW-Madison Campus and central core of the City utilizing an initial east to west corridor; and,

WHEREAS the next steps in the Phase 1 BRT corridor project include a more detailed evaluation of potential routes and street alignments (in particular, a thorough evaluation of BRT routes through the downtown core and potential impacts on traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists), station locations, further refinement of the BRT operating plans and Metro route modifications, identification of potential solutions to transit vehicle storage and maintenance facility needs, evaluation of community and neighborhood impacts (including mitigation measures) and the submission of an application for funding under the Federal Transit Administration Small Starts program; and,

WHEREAS Metro Transit is completing design for a satellite maintenance facility in order to accommodate BRT articulated buses and applying for TIGER grant; and if the TIGER grant application is not successful, the plan is to seek partial funding for the maintenance facility as part of the Phase 1 BRT corridor project.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Common Council supports the Bus Rapid Transit Inter-Agency Staff Team recommendation to proceed with a Phase 1 Project Development in an East-West corridor, directly serving the UW Campus and Madison’s Central Business District.
**Re:**
Presentation on Study of Dane County Crashes Involving Bicyclists and Pedestrians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Comments on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO staff conducted a study of crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians from 2011-2015. Part of the reason for doing the study was to follow up on a study done by City of Madison Traffic Engineering staff in 1992 that focused on bicycle crashes that occurred from 1987-1991. The overall goals of the study include: (1) better understanding the circumstances leading to these crashes; (2) assessing the change in the types of bicycle crashes occurring in the city compared to the earlier study and overall change in bicyclist safety; and (3) creating a baseline of bicyclist and pedestrian crash statistics against which to assess changes in the future. Understanding the common circumstances behind these crashes will help improve the effectiveness of safety education and enforcement efforts and also help planners and engineers in prioritizing investments and making decisions about facility design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff has collected all of the data, categorized the crashes, and is now in the process of finishing up the analysis and writing a report on the study. Staff will present on the key findings of the study at the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Presented on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (Powerpoint presentation slides will be handed out at meeting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For information purposes only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>