AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of September 7, 2016 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Election of Officers

6. Resolution TPB No. 120 Adopting 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County
   - Addition/Change Sheet, dated 9/28/16
   - Section 5310 (Enhanced E/D Transportation) Program of Projects for 2017

7. Review Preliminary Travel Forecast Modeling Runs for the Regional Transportation Plan 2050

8. Update on Other Regional Transportation Plan 2050 Activities
   - Coordination Meeting with WisDOT
   - Upcoming Series of Public Meetings
   - Other Public Engagement Activities – Online Community Mapping and Budgeting Tools

9. Update on Project to Conduct Household Travel Mail Survey to Supplement the National Household Travel Survey


11. Review and Recommendation on Draft 2017 MPO Budget

12. Status Report on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB:
   - USH 51/Stoughton Road (USH 12/18 to IH 39/90/94) Corridor EIS Study
   - USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor EIS Study
   - Beltline (USH 14 to CTH N) Corridor EIS Study
   - Interstate 39/90/94 (Madison to Portage) Corridor EIS Study
   - Interstate 39/90/Beltline Interchange EIS Study
   - Other WisDOT Corridor Studies
   - City of Madison Madison in Motion Transportation Master Plan

13. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   - Regional Transportation Plan 2050
   - Household Travel Mail Survey to Supplement National Survey
   - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Implementation Planning
- Modifications to Technical Committee Membership and MPO Operating Rules
- MPO Website Redesign and Reorganization

14. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

15. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, November 2 at 6:30 p.m.**
Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Rooms A-B

If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations to access this meeting, contact the 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 Department of Planning & Development (el departamento de planificación y desarrollo) al (608)-266-4635, o TTY/TEXTNET (886)-704-2318.
*Por favor avísenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.*
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
September 7, 2016 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: David Ahrens, Mark Clear, Ken Golden, Tim Gruber, Steve King, Al Matano, Mark Opitz, Steve Stocker

Members absent: Steve Flottmeyer, Chuck Kamp, Jerry Mandli, Ed Minihan, Robin Schmidt, Patrick Stern

MPO Staff present: Mike Cechvala, Bill Schaefer

2. Approval of July 6, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Stocker, seconded by King, to approve the July 6, 2016 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

- Letter from WisDOT, also signed by the FHWA, approving the Work Program amendment related to carryover funding from 2015
- Letters from WisDOT and FTA approving TIP Amendment 3.

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

None

5. Public Hearing on the Draft 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Matano welcomed members of the public in attendance. There were no registrants to speak.

Schaefer reviewed the STBG (formerly STP) – Urban projects. He noted the schedule changes to three projects: CTH M was delayed with the start of construction now in late 2017 (SFY 2018) and mostly 2018-’19. That pushed back the schedules for the Buckeye Road and Cottage Grove Road projects a year to 2019 and 2020 respectively due to the unavailability of STBG funding statewide in SFY 2018. Schaefer mentioned that the MPO last year conditionally approved funding for the next application cycle two projects: first phase of Pleasant View Road in the City of Middleton and second phase of Atwood Avenue from Walter Street to Cottage Grove Road.

In response to a question from Stocker, Schaefer clarified that the Metro buses being funded were replacement buses. Regarding the CTH M project, Golden commented that he would prefer to see the MPO funding projects within communities versus those connecting communities. He said if the project scoring criteria award higher points for projects with high traffic volumes due to traffic from rural areas or outer area communities, then something is wrong with the criteria. He noted that Monroe Street would have been a good project, but the city of Madison did not apply for funding for it. Schaefer responded that the criteria do award more points for projects serving existing development and redevelopment areas rather than planned development. More points are also awarded for projects serving regional and mixed-use centers. He noted that the MPO has funded many projects serving developed areas, including Johnson Street and University Avenue. He said that when the CTH M project was first approved it was anticipated development of the new UW Research Park and Pioneer neighborhood would start sooner. Clear noted that close to 10,000 people work at Epic in west Verona and many more jobs will eventually be in University Research Park Phase II.

Schaefer reviewed other major projects in the draft TIP, including state and locally roadway and bicycle projects. Opitz said that as part of the locally funded University Avenue pavement replacement project in Middleton bike lanes are planned to be added from Allen Blvd. to Branch Street by narrowing the median, but
there has been some opposition to that. He said there is not sufficient room to add bike lanes west of Branch Street. In response to a question, Schaefer said that the Capital City and Glacial Drumlin Trail connector will be outside the railroad right-of-way. He said the primary Metro projects are new large and small buses; Metro did not receive the TIGER grant for the satellite bus garage. The plan is to incorporate that as part of a potential Small Starts BRT project if TIGER application is unsuccessful again next year.

Matano closed the public hearing.

6. Election of Officers

Matano asked Schaefer to temporarily chair the board during this item. Clear commented that it might be appropriate to defer election of officers until the next meeting when there is a fuller slate of members. Matano agreed. Schaefer said that officers serve until they are replaced or reappointed.

Golden moved, Clear seconded, to defer the election of officers to the next meeting with Matano remaining chair. Motion carried.

7. Resolution TPB No. 119 Approving Amendment #4 to the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Moved by Golden, seconded by Clear, to approve the amendment. Motion carried.

8. Appointment to the MPO Advisory Committee for the Regional Transportation Plan 2050 for the Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County

Moved by Golden, seconded by Opitz, to approve replacing Andrew Disch with Chad Lawler on the committee. Motion carried.


Schaefer said that staff is making progress on the long range plan. Work is mostly focused now on existing and future needs analysis, but for the transit and bicycle components work is further along due to previous studies and planning work. Cechvala provided a presentation showing the draft transit recommendations, including the bus rapid transit (BRT) system, new transit service, frequency improvements in central Madison, and a regional express commuter network.

Golden commented that it may be worth looking into where employees of Mendota Mental Health and the Central Wisconsin Center are living. A fast route could attract some use. Matano asked if Cross Plains was considered for the regional express network. Cechvala responded it is probably a bit too small, but worth thinking about. Opitz said that the USH 14 corridor is heavily traveled and there might be a park-and-ride possibility in Cross Plains. Gruber asked about the time frame for BRT. Cechvala said that the City of Madison is interested in moving forward on a first segment soon through a Small Starts grant. For expansion beyond the initial segment, it may depend on additional funding such as through a regional transit authority. Certainly the full system could be in place by 2050, if not before, if a dedicated transit funding source were in place and there was support for it.

Golden said he read an article recently about Uber replacing transit systems. Cechvala said that some agencies are looking to replace low-use routes with alternative transit concepts like point-deviation or shared-ride systems like Uber. It’s a little bit unclear what kind of changes autonomous vehicles will bring. The transit experts in the industry today do not think that Uber and similar companies are really a threat to traditional transit with higher productivity because the cost per ride is too high. Golden said the paratransit vehicles could also be potentially used for public service when space is available.

Stocker said that Sun Prairie recently held a transportation summit and there is support for adding bus transit service in the near future. Cechvala said that he and Schaefer were at the summit and we will be keeping tabs on recommendations that come out of that planning effort. The barrier is mainly funding. Schaefer said that
Sun Prairie could seek expanded state operating funding, which is now used for the shared-ride system to cover bus service. At MPO staff’s urging, the city notified WisDOT of its intent to possibly apply for additional funding next year. Matano commented that the point-deviation route concept shown from the South Transfer Point to West Towne would be a good candidate for a small bus, and the concept could serve some of the communities that couldn’t support fixed route bus service. He commented that the support for transit in Sun Prairie was refreshing and in contrast to years ago during the Transport 2020 commuter rail planning process.

Golden said that he would like to see all-day bus service extended into McFarland. Opitz said he would like to see new bus service on the north side of Middleton and would send provide more detailed comments to staff.

10. Review Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Needs Analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan 2050

Cechvala reviewed the pedestrian and bicycle facility needs analysis and recommendations for the long range plan.

Golden asked if a neighborhood sidewalks project would qualify for STP-Urban funding. Schaefer said yes, but it would need to cover a large area. In most cases, sidewalk improvements are completed as part of a street reconstruction project. Golden said the MPO should make this known to communities. Schaefer said that Madison and many other communities special assess adjacent properties for sidewalks, which makes such projects controversial, but some such as Sun Prairie do not.

11. Brief Update on Other Regional Transportation Plan 2050 Work Activities

Schaefer said staff is scheduling a second round of public meetings in mid-October with these maps and others materials to get more input from folks. Dates will be finalized this week but it looks like the Madison meeting will be on Thursday, October 13th and the other two meetings will be in Middleton and Fitchburg on Wednesday October 19th and Thursday October 20th.

[Note: At this point in the meeting, Stocker had to leave resulting in quorum being lost.]

12. Update on Project to Conduct Household Travel Mail Survey to Supplement the National Household Travel Survey

Deferred due to lack of quorum.

13. Status Report on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB

Deferred due to lack of quorum.

14. Discussion of Future Work Items

Deferred due to lack of quorum.

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, October 5, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

16. Adjournment

Moved by King, seconded by Opitz, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM.
September 15, 2016

Michael Davies  
Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
525 Junction Rd. Suite 8000  
Madison, Wisconsin 53717

Marisol Simon  
Regional Administrator  
Federal Transit Administration  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
200 W. Adams Street, Suite 320  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Davies and Ms. Simon:

Under the authority delegated to me by Governor Scott Walker, I am hereby approving the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board’s Amendment to the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Urban Area. The amendment was approved and adopted by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board on September 7, 2016. We will reflect by reference the 2016-2019 federal aid projects covered by this approval in our 2016-2019 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Copies of the TIP Amendment and Resolution TPB Number 119 for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board are enclosed. This TIP amendment represents a comprehensive, continuous, and cooperative effort between the MPO, local communities, affected transit operators, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and is designed to meet the objectives of Title 23 USC 134 and 135 and their implementing regulations 23 CFR 450 and the 2035 regional transportation system plan.

We have determined that the proposed amendment: 1) is consistent with the adopted 2035 Regional Transportation System Plan, 2) conforms to state and national air quality standards as required by the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and 3) ensures that the TIP remains fiscally constrained in that federal funding resources are sufficient to support the new or modified projects.

Sincerely,

Mark Gottlieb, P.E.  
Secretary

cc: William Schaefer, MPO  
William Wheeler, FTA  
Dwight McComb, FHWA  
Mary Forlenza, FHWA  
Stephen Flottmeyer, WisDOT SW Region  
Donna Brown-Martin, WisDOT BPED
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 120 Adopting the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Staff Comments on Item:
Staff has prepared the attached Addition/Change Sheet, dated 9/28/16, that lists proposed changes to the draft TIP.

Two relatively small cost/funding changes are proposed for the STBG (formerly STP) Urban funded Lacy Road and CTH M projects. The final cost estimate for Lacy Road came in much lower than originally estimated in large part because of a change in scope of the project to eliminate reconstruction of the Syene Road intersection, the east end of the project. That will be done later as part of a planned reconstruction of Syene Road. Because of this, staff is recommending that the federal funding for Lacy Road be reduced from $2,854,000 to $2,540,103. This is still 7.5% more than a 50% match (MPO’s policy at the time), which should ensure a minimum of 50% funding even if the project cost increases when it is let. Based on the estimate, it would cover 53.75%. The remaining funding ($313,897) would be transferred to the CTH M (S Pleasant View Road) project, which is over $1 million short of 50% funding due to cost estimate increases for that project. With the increase, federal funding would cover 47.7% of the cost ($37.3 million) for that project. This staff recommendation will be discussed with the MPO technical committee at their meeting on 9/28/16. A note is also being added to the Buckeye Road project to indicate it is advanceable to 2018 if funding becomes available, as mentioned at the last meeting.

Also attached is a table and descriptions of the projects proposed to be funded with the MPO’s allocation of Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Persons with Disabilities Program funding. With some carryover funding, the MPO is able to fund all four project applications.

The other changes are based on revisions to costs and scheduling for two projects provided by WisDOT staff and other changes to locally funded projects (included for informational purposes) based on the City of Madison’s Executive Capital Budget and information provided by the Village of DeForest. The village’s letter of comment is attached.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 120 Adopting the 2017-2021 TIP
2. Addition/Correction Sheet dated 9/28/16
3. Section 5310 Program of Projects table and project descriptions
4. TIP Comment Letter from Village of DeForest

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends adoption of Resolution TPB No. 120 approving the draft TIP with the changes listed in the Addition/Correction Sheet dated 9/28/16.
Resolution TPB No. 120

Adopting the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

WHEREAS, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (Pub. L. 114-357) and U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations (23 C.F.R. Parts 450 and 500, 49 C.F.R. Part 613) require that the designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for each urbanized area develop, in cooperation with the State, local officials, and any affected transit operator, a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the area for which it is designated; and

WHEREAS, the FAST Act and U.S. DOT regulations require that the TIP be updated at least once every two years and be approved by the designated metropolitan planning organization and the Governor; and

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

WHEREAS, working with local units of government, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Metro Transit, and other implementing agencies, the MATPB has prepared a coordinated, comprehensive listing of transportation improvement projects proposed to be implemented over the next five years, including a priority list of proposed federally supported projects to be undertaken in 2017-2020; and

WHEREAS, this listing of capital and non-capital transportation improvement projects relates to all modes of surface transportation, including public transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, roadways, and other transportation improvements; and

WHEREAS, while official air quality non-attainment designations are not applicable in this region, the adopted Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update, Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County and Transportation Improvement Program continue to be consistent with the Wisconsin Air Quality State Implementation Plan to improve air quality in the area; and

WHEREAS, in developing the TIP, the MATPB has provided local officials, citizens, affected public agencies, private transit providers, and other interested parties with reasonable notice of and an opportunity to participate and comment on the proposed program, including holding a public hearing on the draft TIP on September 7; and

WHEREAS, the draft TIP has been published and made available for public review, including in an electronically accessible format on the MATPB’s Website; and

WHEREAS, the MATPB’s public involvement process for development of the TIP is also used by the City of Madison (Metro Transit) to satisfy the public participation requirements for development of the Program of Projects required under the Federal Transit Administration's Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATPB approves the 2017–2021 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, which incorporates the changes to the Draft TIP, dated August 2016, listed in the Addition/Change Sheet, dated September 28, 2016, and provides specific approval of the listed 2017-2020 projects, including the Priority Surface Transportation Program (STP) — Urban Projects for 2017-2020; and

1 The Governor has delegated TIP approval authority to the WisDOT Secretary.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that project notification and review procedures (in accordance with the successor rules to the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95) are hereby being met, unless otherwise specifically noted, for all 2017 through 2020 listed projects utilizing federal funding (many of which had earlier received favorable A-95 reviews);

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATPB and WisDOT agree that the first year of the TIP constitutes an “agreed to” list of projects for project selection purposes and no further project selection action is required for WisDOT or Metro Transit, the major transit operator, to proceed with federal funding commitment; and, even though a new TIP has been developed and approved by the MATPB, WisDOT can continue to seek federal funding commitment for projects in the previous TIP until a new State TIP (STIP) has been jointly approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that projects from the second, third, or fourth year of the TIP may be advanced by WisDOT or Metro Transit for federal funding commitment without further project selection action by the MPO, and concerning federal funding sources for projects in the TIP WisDOT may interchange eligible FHWA funding program sources without necessitating a TIP amendment, subject to the expedited project selection procedures outlined in the TIP; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that financial capacity assessment regulations have been met as set forth in UMTA Circular 7008.1, dated March 30, 1987, and financial capacity exists to undertake the programmed projects; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATPB certifies that the federal metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the metropolitan area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable federal requirements, including:

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 U.S.C. 2000d-1) and 49 C.F.R. Part 21;
3. 49 U.S.C. 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Sections 1101(b) of the FAST Act (Pub. L. 114-357) and 49 C.F.R. Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in U.S. DOT funded projects;
5. 23 C.F.R. 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. 23 U.S.C. 324 regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and
9. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) and 49 C.F.R. 27 regarding discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATPB certifies that all of the listed federally funded and regionally significant projects in the TIP are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update, Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County, the currently adopted regional transportation plan, and additional sub-element plans incorporated as part of the plan.

Date Adopted ___________________________  Al Matano, Chair
Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
2017-2021
Transportation Improvement Program
For the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County Area
(Project costs in $000s)

ADDITION/CHANGE SHEET

STBG (formerly STP) Urban Priority Projects

Page 6/29: REVISE the cost/funding for the Lacy Road (Fitchburg City Hall to Syene Road) Reconstruction project as follows: $2,854 $2,540 (Const., Fed-STP-Urban), $3,179 $2,186 (Const., F), $834 $954 (Utility, F), $6,867 5,680 (Total) in 2017.

Page 6/30: REVISE the Buckeye Road (CTH AB) (Monona Drive to Stoughton Road/USH 51) Reconstruction project, adding the following note: “Advanceable to 2018 if funding becomes available”.


Parking Facilities Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

Page 11: ADD the following project sponsored by the City of Madison: Capitol East District Parking Structure. Construct parking garage at the intersection of Main Street and Livingston Street. $6,000 (M), $6,000 (Total) in 2017.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

Page 14: REVISE the Cannonball Trail (Military Ridge Extension) (Fish Hatchery Road to Wingra Path) project, delaying construction until 2020.

Page 15: REMOVE the local funding from the Goodman Path (Segment 1) (RR corridor to Milwaukee Street at St. Paul Avenue) extension project and add comment, “Timing uncertain.”

REMOVE the local funding from the Goodman Path (Segment 2, Phase 2) (Powers Avenue to Webb Avenue) extension project and add comment, “Timing uncertain.”

Page 17: REVISE the West Beltline Path (Gammon Road to Grand Canyon/Struck Street Underpass) project, moving construction funding from 2020 to 2019, while keeping construction in 2020, and increasing the total cost to $2,809 with additional local funding.

Transit Capital Projects

Page 19: DELETE the Metro Transit Electric Bus Purchase project.

REVISE the Metro Transit Satellite Bus Garage Construction project, moving construction funds from 2017-2019 to 2018-2020. Metro Transit will seek federal TIGER discretionary grant funding. Project not currently programmed.

ADD the Bus Rapid Transit project for which federal Small Starts discretionary grant funding will be sought. Project not currently programmed.
REVISE the 2017 funding for the Paratransit Eligibility Determinations & Path of Travel Supports Program to add programmed federal funding as follows: $76 (Fed-Sec. 5310), $98 (M), $98 $95 (Total).

REVISE the 2017 funding for Dane County’s Mobility Management Program to add programmed federal funding as follows: : $112 (Fed-Sec. 5310), $175 $28 (DC), $475 $140 (Total).

Page 20: ADD the following Dane County-sponsored project: Focused Transportation for People with Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities. $36 (Fed-Sec. 5310), $10 (DC), $46 (Total) in 2017.

ADD the following project sponsored by the City of Stoughton:
Purchase of two Accessible Minivans for the Shared Ride Taxi System. $54 (Fed-Sec. 5310), $13 (ST), $67 (Total) in 2017.

Street/Roadway Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area


Page 26: ADD the following WisDOT-sponsored project:
USH 151 (East Springs Drive to Main Street) Roadway Maintenance. Project programmed for 2022, with possible advancement to 2017.

Page 32: REVISE the Monroe Street Odana to Regent Street) reconstruction/resurfacing project, changing the project scope from a resurfacing project (Odana Street to Leonard Street) and a reconstruction project (Leonard Street to Regent Street) to a resurfacing project for both segments, delaying construction from 2018 to 2020, and revising the project cost as follows:
Odana Road to Leonard Street: $150 (PE., M), $150 (Total) in 2017, $5,155 (Const., M), $5,155 (Total) in 2018
Leonard Street to Regent Street: $150 (PE., M), $150 (Total) in 2017, $5,205 (Const., M), $5,205 (Total) in 2018
Odana Street to Regent Street: $300 (PE, M), $300 (Total) in 2017, $14,910 (Const., M), $14,910 (Total) in 2020

Page 33: REVISE the Outer Capitol Loop South (Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. to South Webster Street) reconstruction project, delaying construction from 2018 to 2019, and revising the project cost as follows: $160 (PE, M), $1,620 (Const., M), $1,780 (Total) in 2018, $160 (PE, M), $1,845 (Const., M), $2,005 (Total) in 2019.

Page 34: REVISE the West Washington Avenue (Regent Street to Bedford Street) pavement replacement project, delaying construction from 2018 to 2019, and revising the project cost as follows: $180 (PE, M), $1,770 (Const., M), $1,950 (Total) in 2018, $180 (PE, M), $2,145 (Const., M), $2,325 (Total) in 2019.

REVISE the Wilson Street (Franklin Street to Blount Street) Pavement Replacement Project, advancing construction from 2018 to 2017 with an increase in total cost to $2,105.

ADD the following City of Madison-sponsored project:
Wilson Street (Hamilton to Martin Luther King Junior Blvd.) Concrete Replacement Project. $1,493 (M), $1,500 (Total) in 2017.
ADD the following City of Madison-sponsored project:
Wilson Street (Martin Luther King Junior Blvd. to King Street) Concrete Replacement Project.
$1,493 (M), $1,200 (Total) in 2019.

Page 38: ADD the following project sponsored by the Village of DeForest:
CTH V (North Street) (North Towne Road to Main Street) Reconstruction to Urban Cross Section
with Side Path on North Side, Sidewalk on South Side. $130 (PE, DeF/DC), $130 (Total) in 2019,
$2,321 (Const., DeF/DC) in 2020.

ADD the following project sponsored by the Village of DeForest:
Innovation Bridge over Yahara River and Street Connection to Gray Road. Construct bridge over
the Yahara River and provide street connection to Gray Road. $__ (DeF), $__ (Total) in 2017.
**Section 5310 Program of Projects for the Madison Urbanized Area - 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Service Area Urban/Rural</th>
<th>Sub Type</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Description/ALI</th>
<th>FTA Amount</th>
<th>Local Amount</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Coordination Plan Page</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison - Metro Transit</td>
<td>Madison Area</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>In-Person Paratransit Eligibility Assessments and Transit Orientation</td>
<td>$75,600</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County DHS</td>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>One-Call Center, Mobility Training, and Bus Buddy Program</td>
<td>$112,100</td>
<td>$28,310</td>
<td>$140,410</td>
<td>32, 34, 37</td>
<td>14f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County TIP</td>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Focused transportation for people with intellectual disabilities</td>
<td>$35,950</td>
<td>$9,590</td>
<td>$45,540</td>
<td>32, 34, 37</td>
<td>14f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Minivan - Side Entry (5/1) Minivan - Rear Entry (4/2)</td>
<td>$53,600</td>
<td>$13,400</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Service Area Urban/Rural</th>
<th>Sub Type</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Description/ALI</th>
<th>FTA Amount</th>
<th>Local Amount</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Coordination Plan Page</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison - Metro Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Grant Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

| | | | | | $304,750 | $70,200 | $374,950 | | |

**Category A Projects** - Certified as having met federal requirements and approved for funding.

**Category B Projects** - Pending federal requirements and/or pending approval for funding.

---

1. DR - Direct Recipient, PNP - Private Non-Profit, LG - Local Government, PO - Private Operator receiving indirect funds
2. Project type defined in FTA C 9070.1G:
   - 12 - Administration expenses
   - 14a - Rolling stock and related activities (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14b - Passenger facilities (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14c - Support facilities and equipment (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14d - Lease of equipment (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14e - Acquisition of transportation services under a contract, lease, or other arrangement, including user-side subsidies (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14f - Support for mobility management and coordination programs (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 15a - Public transportation projects (capital and operating) planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities
   - 15b - Public transportation projects that exceed the requirements of the ADA
   - 15c - Public transportation projects that improve access to fixed route service and decrease reliance by individuals with disabilities on ADA complementary paratransit service
   - 15d - Alternatives to public transportation that assist seniors and individuals with disabilities with transportation

All projects are within Dane County, Madison, WI; Wisconsin Congressional District 2; and consistent with the [2013 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County](#).
Section 5310 Program of Projects for the Madison Urbanized Area – 2016
Project Descriptions

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>Metro Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Paratransit Eligibility and Mobility Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project funds one full-time Paratransit Eligibility and Mobility Coordinator (PED & MC) staff position. PED & MC duties include: conduct in-person ADA paratransit eligibility determinations (IPAs) and transit orientations (TOs); refer candidates for travel training (TTRs) to Dane County’s Bus Buddy program and follow up; and field work performing path-of-travel assessments (PTAs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>Dane County Department of Human Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>One-Call Center, Mobility Training, and Bus Buddy Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project has three components:

1. The Call Center (CC) is staffed by certified mobility managers and provides information to callers about services covering all available transportation modes including public transit, human services transportation and volunteer driver programs, and ride-sharing. Services provided by the CC include personalized identification of transportation options based on program-specific eligibility criteria; introduction and detailed referral to public transit, individual and group ride services; eligibility determination and ride authorization for specialized transportation; enrollment in mobility training programs; and follow-up assistance in maintaining mobility.

2. The Travel Training (TT) program is staffed by certified occupational therapists to provide instruction in the skills necessary to access fixed-route transit service to individuals who are currently or potentially eligible for paratransit. If the client successfully migrates a minimum number of trips from paratransit to fixed-route, Metro Transit provides a no-cost transit pass.

3. The Bus Buddy (BB) program utilizes qualified volunteers to train and accompany passengers on fixed-route public transit to familiarize them with the service. The BB program also offers group transit-familiarization trips that include training on using Metro Transit maps, timetables, and website. Participants receive a 10-ride senior/disabled fare card upon completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>Dane County Department of Human Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Focused Transportation for People with Intellectual / Developmental Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dane County will begin a new mobility management program in 2017 that will focus on improving transportation options for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. The program will use the Design Thinking process highlighted by the National Center for Mobility Management (NCMM) to identify needs and recommend specific solutions. The program will reduce reliance on paratransit, lowering long-term costs for Metro Transit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>City of Stoughton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Minivan - Side Entry (5/1) and Minivan - Rear Entry (4/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Sun Prairie offers a share-ride taxi program open to the residents of Stoughton through a contract with a private taxi service provider. The City of Stoughton currently owns two accessible minivans; each will be retired at the end of 2016. About 30,000 rides per year are taken on the taxi system, the majority of whom are seniors or people with disabilities. The shared-ride taxi system is important to the community and is used for important trips to and from work, shopping, entertainment, medical appointments, and education.
September 14, 2016

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
121 S. Pinckney St., Suite 400
Madison, WI 53703
Sent via email to mpo@cityofmadison.com

Dear Board Members:

On behalf of the Village of DeForest, I would like to offer the following comments on the Draft 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County Area for the Board’s consideration.

The draft TIP lists as a project: “CTH CV, from CTH V to Vinburn Rd., reconstruct to urban cross-section w/ bike lanes. Joint project with Village of DeForest. Agreement needed on local share funding. (Construction year not specified).” This project is actually scheduled to be completed in 2017 as a joint effort between Dane County and the Village. Please update this listing accordingly.

The Village and County are also planning to undertake the reconstruction of CTH V (North Street), between North Towne Road and Main Street in 2019-20. This project is not yet listed in the draft TIP; please consider adding. The draft TIP does list the following related project: “New 4,500’ path on north side of North St. ROW connecting with existing paths on Main and Stevenson Streets and planned path across USH 51 to soccer complex. May seek Federal Transportation Alternatives Program. Not programmed.” I believe this path project was added to the TIP around five years ago, in conjunction with the Village’s attempt to secure grant funding. A segment of that path was built with the Highway 51 reconstruction project, from the Linde Fields soccer complex to just east of Stokely Drive. Also, the North Street bridge over the Yahara River, currently being reconstructed, will include path accommodations. The Village now intends to complete the rest of this path with the 2019-2020 CTH V reconstruction project. So, please consider folding this listed path project within the broader CTH V reconstruction listing I am advising.

Since the early 2000s, the Village and developer of the large Conservancy Place development west of the Yahara River in DeForest have planned for a river bridge at Innovation Drive. The bridge is planned to connect to a small segment of Innovation Drive east of the River. Then, per the Official Maps of both Windsor and DeForest, Gray Road may be realigned to the north to enable this route to serve as an important east-west collector route through the two villages. DeForest will in September apply to the DNR and Army Corps for required environmental approvals. Assuming such approvals, the bridge is scheduled to be constructed in 2017, entirely with local funds (Developer). We would appreciate it if the TIP were to list the bridge and Innovation Drive/Gray Road connection projects.
Finally, we also do not see mention of the so-called “DeForest South Roadway Loop” in the TIP (see attached graphic). Parts of this conceptual business and community access loop are already constructed. Other parts, including a viable long-term access plan near the current Highway 51/Metro Drive/Williamsburg Way intersection, will require further investigation, design, and expense. A couple of years ago, we interacted with Bill Schaefer about this concept, and how it might be positioned for state or federal funding for more detailed planning, design, and/or construction. He suggested that the Village include it in the DeForest Comprehensive Plan, which we did in 2015, and then request its inclusion in the MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan. I see that the MPO is also engaged in a process right now to update the RTP. We, therefore, take this opportunity to request that the “DeForest South Roadway Loop” be listed within the RTP.

Please contact me or our Village Planning Consultant Mark Roffers (mark@mdroffers.com or 770-0338) if either of us can help explain or interact on these requests. We thank the Board and its staff for the consideration.

Sincerely,

Kelli Bialkowski
Director of Public Services

CC: Amy Anderson-Schwepppe, Village of Windsor
    Brenda Ayres, Town of Burke

Attachment: Highway 19/51 Conceptual Traffic Circulation Map
Re:
Review Preliminary Travel Forecast Modeling Runs for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2050

**Staff Comments on Item:**
MPO staff recently received the final travel model files from the consultant that incorporate the new mode choice/transit related improvements and the recalibration of the auto speeds in the model. Staff is now in the process of running different future transportation project scenarios with the model, analyzing the results, and preparing maps that show traffic congestion levels. This information will be presented at the next series of public meetings on the RTP in mid-October.

The first scenario completed includes existing (built since 2010 model base year) and programmed capacity change projects, new collector streets to be built as part of new development, and the draft planned future transit system with BRT. Attached are some maps showing the assumed future growth, existing congestion levels, the projects in this first scenario, and the resulting future congestion levels. Results from this and other modeling scenarios will be presented at the meeting.

**Materials Presented on Item:**
1. Maps showing the household and employment growth used for travel forecasting, existing congestion levels, programmed projects and new collectors, draft planned future transit system, and future congestion levels under that first scenario.

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**
For informational purposes only.
HOUSEHOLD CHANGE
by Transportation Analysis Zone, 2010 - 2050
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EMPLOYMENT CHANGE
by Transportation Analysis Zone, 2010 - 2050
Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

Employment Change Per Acre
- 0 - 0.5
- 0.6 - 2
- 3 - 4
- 5 - 8
- 9 - 14
- 15 - 25
- 26 - 44
- 45 - 157

Isthmus 9,622
Verona 12,965
Sun Prairie 3,806
DeForest 3,436
Waunakee 1,703
Middleton 3,837
Madison 46,254
Oregon 650
Stoughton 180
Cottage Grove 1,662
Fitchburg 5,802
Public Transit

Current Transit Service
Existing Local Frequent Service *
Future Local Frequent Service *
New All-Day Service
Planned Bus Rapid Transit System

Planned Regional Commuter Service

* Frequent local service is local bus service about every 15 minutes or better throughout the majority of the weekday service day, or about from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm.
Re:
Update on Project to Conduct Household Travel Mail Survey to Supplement the National Household Travel Survey

Staff Comments on Item:
The MPO is partnering with the City of Madison Planning to hire the University of Wisconsin Survey Center to conduct a household travel mail survey to supplement the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) that is going on now. Because the NHTS data is critical for developing the regional travel forecast models, WisDOT purchased an extra sample for all urban areas in the state as was done in 2001. However, even this added sample size (total of 982 households countywide) doesn’t provide a sufficient number of samples of bicycle and transit trips. It also doesn’t provide a sufficient number of samples to cross tabulate the surveys by household demographics or geographic area. This supplemental survey will be sent to 3,000 households in the Madison urban area, which the survey center estimates will result in an additional 1,000-1,200 completed surveys. Areas with higher rates of bicycling and transit use and with certain demographics will be over-sampled relative to population. See attached draft cost proposal from the survey center for details regarding the administration of the survey. The surveys will be sent out in two groups – one this fall and one in the spring.

The NHTS consists of two parts: (1) a travel log where members of the household keep track of all of their trips for up to a week; and (2) a series of questions about the household, general travel patterns, travel attitudes, etc. For the supplemental survey, we will be using a somewhat smaller subset of the same questions and a few from other states that we liked, which will be reformatted for a mail vs. phone/web survey.

In addition to use for the regional travel model, both the MPO and City of Madison plan to use the survey data for ongoing transportation system performance monitoring programs. This 2016-'17 data will serve as baseline data and the intent is to conduct a similar survey every 7 years or so in conjunction with the NHTS to track changes in travel patterns over time across different demographic groups and geographies. This will allow evaluation of the impact of transportation facility investments and policies.

The project and funding for the survey is included in the MPO’s 2016 Work Program. A Work Program amendment will be needed to transfer funding ($25,000) that had been allocated to travel modeling support (and won’t be needed) to this project and to carry over some of the funding into 2017. A small amount of funding may also need to be transferred from staff cost savings to the project. The MPO has been short a staff person since June. A city of Madison resolution has been adopted approving the contract, which was required because it is more than $25,000 and an RFP process was not used.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Cost estimate for the mail survey prepared by the UW Survey Center
2. Draft survey questionnaire

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For review and discussion purposes only. Project is part of the approved work program.
Madison Household Travel Mail Survey
UWSC Cost Estimate
Revised August 23, 2016

For more information please contact:

Kelly Elver, Project Management Director
(608) 262-7360 kelver@ssc.wisc.edu

John Stevenson, Associate Director
(608) 262-9032 stevenso@ssc.wisc.edu

Dr. Nora Cate Schaeffer, Director
(608) 262-2182 schaeffe@ssc.wisc.edu
COST PROPOSAL FOR:
City of Madison Household Travel ABS Mail Survey

CLIENT

Milena Bernardinello, MS, MSUP
Healthy Community Planner - City of Madison
Tel: 608-267-1994
Email: MBernardinello@cityofmadison.com

1] Project Description

The UW Survey Center (UWSC) will conduct a random mail survey with households (HH) residing in Madison and some adjacent municipalities within the MPO boundaries. The surveys will take place in the fall of 2016, and again in the spring of 2017. Sample geographic strata are yet to be determined. UWSC will work with the client to develop a sampling plan, then UWSC will purchase sample from a sample vendor to obtain address based sample lists and telephone numbers when available for households in these areas of Madison. The client will supply survey content based on the National Household Travel Survey. An abbreviated version of the national survey will be conducted in Madison, focusing on one travel day for household members, and including a subset of other travel related questions chosen from the NHTS by the client. Unlike the national survey, all data for the Madison version would be collected by mail, with prompter calls placed by UWSC professional telephone interviewers before the first survey packet mailing, and before the final survey packet mailing, to encourage participation and answer questions respondents may have.

The packet mailed to participants will include a 20 page survey, along with 4 logs to be used by up to 4 family members to record detailed information regarding all the places they traveled on the designated date. The sample size for initial contacts is estimated at 3,000, with approximately 1,500 administered in the fall, and 1,500 in the spring. These proportions may be modified in the course of development.

Sample

The Address Based Sampling (ABS) technique for recruitment of a random sample for a mail survey has become possible over the past decade thanks to the Delivery Sequence files now maintained electronically by the US Postal Service of nearly every physical address in the United States. This list has become increasingly accurate in recent years, and now that most states require every dwelling to have a street address on file for emergency services locating purposes, the sample frame available through use of the USPS Delivery Sequence files is estimated to cover >95% of WI residents. Sample can be selected and stratified by zip code, Census tract, or Census block group. Three or four different strata will be identified and defined by client. ABS sample can then be ordered to represent these strata.

ABS sample will be purchased by the UWSC from a professional sample provider (SSI or MSG). UWSC and the client will craft a cover letter that requests participation of any adult in the household who is knowledgeable about the household’s travel habits. Logs will be included in the mailing for up to 4 family members including children age 12 and over, to keep track of their travel behavior on the designated travel day. Family members will be encouraged to give their log to the main adult participant for return mailing to UWSC. UWSC trained data entry staff will enter the data from both the logs and the questionnaire, and surveys and logs will be tracked and final information regarding data returned by each participating household supplied to the client at the conclusion of the project.
Mail Survey Protocol: 5 Contacts
The Survey Center would implement the following 5 contact protocol:

1. **Initial prompter call** - telephone call to all households for which a telephone number is available from the sampling vendor. We estimate this will be approximately 50% of the sampled households.
2. **Initial full mailing** – Mailing sent to all sample members would include cover letter, a 20 page survey, 4 one page travel logs, $5 cash pre-incentive and first class postage paid return envelope.
3. **Postcard reminder** – Approximately 3-5 days after the initial full mailing, all sample members would receive a follow-up reminder/thanks postcard.
4. **Second reminder call** – Approximate 3-4 weeks after initial full mailing, a second telephone call would be placed to sample members with an available telephone number that had not yet returned a survey.
5. **Second full mailing** – Approximate 3-4 days after the reminder telephone calls are placed, a second and final full mailing would be sent to sample members that had not yet returned a survey (no incentive).

Incentives
The estimates below presume UWSC will obtain and administer a token $5 pre-incentive in the first full mailing of the mail survey. This small token pre-incentive has been shown to be a cost effective way to improve response rates, and reduce the overall number of mailings required to obtain a response. The cover letter mailed to respondents will also promise a $20 post-incentive to households that return the survey packet with at least the survey and one travel log completed. UWSC would mail a $20 check to each participating household within 2 weeks of receipt of packet from participants.

2] DETAILED PROJECT NOTES

For purposes of developing this cost statement, the following assumptions have been made:
1. UWSC will purchase sample including addresses and telephone numbers for all respondents from MSG or Survey Sampling International Inc.
2. Client will provide UWSC with final versions of roughly 20 page instrument in an electronic format.
3. UWSC will provide assistance with question wording, order, and format the survey using templates we’ve developed based on best practices, and the conduct of hundreds of paper surveys.
4. All mailings will be sent first class. UWSC will personalize the respondent letters. Outgoing postage estimated at $1.47 for the 20 page survey and 4 one page logs.
5. We estimate a 35% to 45% response rate, though it is difficult to know how many of this sample population will be within the desired demographic, and how complete their materials will be when returned to us. Included in the project costs listed below are all printing, postal costs, and supply expenditures necessary for completion of the project.
6. This proposal includes time for UWSC staff to assist with data file manipulation to match it to the format of data files prepared by the national survey, and to help with basic weighting issues.
7. This cost proposal does not include the cost of preparing a written, analytical discussion of the survey’s findings.
8. Respondents will receive a $5 cash incentive in their first full mailing packet and a $20 check sent after completed survey and log(s) are returned. UWSC will be responsible for obtaining and administering these incentives.
3] DELIVERABLES:

At the end of each data collection, UWSC will deliver:

1. Cleaned datasets provided, in the medium of client's choice (e.g. SPSS, STATA, SAS).
2. Codebook with percentages and absolute number frequency distributions of every coded variable.
3. The verbatim responses to all open-ended questions (including "other specify" type open-ends).
4. A final sample disposition and response rate report
5. Sample weights

4] PROJECT BUDGET

- Initial sample =3,000 households
- Estimated number of completed surveys = ~1,050 to 1,200
- Includes 20 page survey, 4 one page logs, and a $5 pre-incentive*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$40,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$10,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and services, printing, postage</td>
<td>$28,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,501</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead @ 15%</td>
<td>$11,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives 3,000 @ $5 pre-incentive and</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~1200@ $20 post-incentive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,426</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Funding will be coming to UWSC from the city of Madison, and as such, the project is subject to University of Wisconsin overhead charges of 15%.

* We have included an advance phone call to all households with a telephone number available from the sampling firm, and a prompter phone call to be made to non-responding households with telephone numbers available before the final survey mailing for each of the survey administrations.

This proposal assumes the entire project would take place in Fiscal Year 2017 (July 2016 through June of 2017). If the entire project is moved to a subsequent fiscal year, a 3% charge will be added per year.

If we have made any errors in our description of the study, or if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact John Stevenson (262-9032, stevenso@ssc.wisc.edu), or Kelly Elver (262-7360, kelver@ssc.wisc.edu) . We would be happy to make revisions or additional cost breakdowns. Thank you for contacting the UW Survey Center for this important research. We look forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

John Stevenson
Associate Director

Kelly Elver
Project Management Director
1. Generally, how far do you travel from your home to shop for your typical household needs such as groceries, clothing, or other household supplies?
   - Less than a mile
   - Between 1 to 5 miles
   - Between 5 to 10 miles
   - Between 10 to 15 miles
   - More than 15 miles

2. Do you own or rent your home?
   - Own
   - Rent
   - Some other arrangement

3. How many years have you lived in your current home? Please round up to the next full year. For example, if you have lived in your home less than a year, please enter 1, if between 1 and 2 years, enter 2, etc.
   [ ] Years lived in home

4. Which of the following are the top three reasons you chose your current home location? Please select up to 3 of the following:
   - Cost or price of home
   - Home size and characteristics
   - Neighborhood characteristics
   - School district or system
   - Convenient to work
   - Convenient to school
   - Convenient to retail, such as shopping, entertainment and restaurants
   - Close to friends and family
   - Close to public transportation
   - Close to scenic locations, such as lakes or golf courses
5. **The next question asks for information about each person who lives in your household.** Please do not include anyone who usually lives somewhere else, or is just visiting, such as a college student usually away at school. Be sure to include children or extended family living in your household. Please enter your name first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Do they drive?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (You)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **How often do you use each of the following to get from place to place?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>A few times a week</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>A few times a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Personal vehicle such as a car, truck or van</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Taxi, limo or rideshare such as Uber or Lyft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Rental car, including Zipcar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Motorcycle or Moped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Paratransit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The price of gas affects the number of places I go.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Getting from place to place costs too much.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I walk to places to save money.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I bike to places to save money.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. I use public transportation to save money.

8. During most of last week, which one of the following best describes your primary activity? Were you...
   - working
   - going to school ➔ Go to question 18 on page 4
   - temporarily absent from a job or business
   - looking for work or unemployed
   - a homemaker
   - retired
   - something else ➔ Go to question 25 on page 6

9. If you are working, do you currently have more than one job?
   We mean more than one employer, not just more than one job site.
   - Yes
   - No

10. For this study, we define working full-time as working at least 35 hours per week.
    Do you currently work full-time or part-time?
    - Full-time
    - Part-time

11. Do you usually work from home?
    - Yes ➔ Go to question 14
    - No

12. What is the business name of your primary workplace?
    Business Name

13. What is the address or nearest cross street of your primary workplace?
    Address
    City
    State
    Zip
14. Which one of the following best describes your primary job?
- Sales or service
- Clerical or administrative support
- Manufacturing, construction, maintenance or farming
- Professional, managerial, or technical
- Something else

15. Last week, how did you usually get to your primary job? If you used more than one mode of transportation, please select the one used for most of the distance.
- Walk
- Bicycle
- Personal vehicle such as a car, truck or van
- Taxi or limo, including Uber or Lyft
- Rental car, including Zipcar
- Motorcycle or Moped
- School bus
- City bus
- Paratransit
- Something else

16. What time do you usually arrive at your primary job, for example 8:15 AM? Please enter time and circle AM or PM.

17. At your primary job, do you have the ability to set or change your own start time?
- Yes
- No

If you were primarily working last week, please go to question 25 on page 6.

18. Are you currently a student as your primary activity?
- Yes
- No

19. What is your current grade level?
- Kindergarten thru 12th grade, including GED
- Vocational, technical or trade school
- Part-time college or university
- Full-time college or university
- Other
20. What type of school do you attend?
- Public or private school
- Home schooled
- Other

21. What is the name of your school?

School Name

22. What is the address or nearest cross street of your school?

Address

City

State

Zip

23. Which one of the following best describes how you \textit{usually} get to school?
- Walk
- Bicycle
- Personal vehicle such as a car, truck or van
- Taxi or Limo, including Uber or Lyft
- Rental car, including Zipcar
- Motor Cycle or Moped
- School bus
- City bus
- Paratransit
- Something else

24. Which one of the following best describes how you \textit{usually} leave school?
- Walk
- Bicycle
- Personal vehicle such as a car, truck or van
- Taxi or Limo, including Uber or Lyft
- Rental car, including Zipcar
- Motor Cycle or Moped
- School bus
- City bus
- Paratransit
- Something else
The next questions are about different types of transportation you use.

25. In the past 7 days, how many times did you take a walk outside, including walks to exercise, go somewhere, or to walk the dog? Examples might include walking to a friend’s house, walking around the neighborhood, or walking to the store.

   □ Times Walking

If you did NOT take any walks in the past 7 days, please go to question 27.

26. If you took walks in the past 7 days, how many of these walks were strictly to exercise?

   □ Times Walking to Exercise

27. The city of Madison would like to know the top 3 reasons that keep you from walking, or walking more often, to your destinations? Please select up to 3 of the following.

   □ Health issues
   □ No one to walk with
   □ No nearby paths or trails
   □ No sidewalks or the sidewalks are too narrow or in poor condition
   □ Your destinations are too far to travel to by walking
   □ Safety concerns due to crime
   □ Safety concerns due to too much traffic
   □ Air quality
   □ Street crossings are unsafe
   □ No shops or other conveniences nearby
   □ You prefer to drive

28. How many bicycles are owned, or available for regular use by the people who currently live in your household?

   □ Bicycles

29. Which one location is your top priority for where Madison should focus pedestrian and bicycle investments?

   ○ Schools
   ○ Parks, trails, or cultural sites
   ○ Residential neighborhoods
   ○ Shopping or restaurants
   ○ Offices or industry
   ○ This is not important to me
30. When was your most recent bicycle trip?

- During the last 30 days
- 1 to 3 months ago
- 3 to 6 months ago
- 6 to 9 months ago
- 9 to 12 months ago
- Over 12 months ago
- Never
- Don’t know

Go to question 32

31. If you bicycled in the past 30 days, how many of these bicycle rides were strictly to exercise?

Times Bicycling to Exercise

32. The city of Madison would like to know the top 3 reasons that keep you from biking, or biking more often, to your destinations? Please select up to 3 of the following.

- Health issues
- Do not own a bicycle
- No one to bike with
- No nearby paths or trails
- Not enough bike lanes
- No sidewalks or the sidewalks are too narrow or in poor condition
- Your destinations are too far to travel to by biking
- Safety concerns due to crime
- Safety concerns due to too much traffic
- Air quality
- Street crossings are unsafe

33. What were your reasons for your two most recent bicycle trips? Please select up to 2 of the following.

- Work
- School, daycare or a religious activity
- Medical or dental services
- Shopping or errands
- Social or recreational
- Personal family business or obligations
- Transport someone
- Meals
- Other
34. How many vehicles, including cars, trucks, SUV’s, vans, motorcycles, and mopeds are owned, leased or available for regular use by the people who currently live in your household?

Vehicles

35. If you reported owning any vehicles, how does your travel change when you must pay for parking? Please check all that apply.

- Use a city bus more
- Use a bicycle more
- Use a moped or motorcycle more
- Walk more
- Carpool with others more
- Make fewer trips
- Something else
- Increased parking costs do not impact your travel

36. In the past 30 days, about how many days have you used city bus transportation?

Days Using City Bus

37. What are the top 3 reasons that keep you from taking the city bus, or taking the city bus more, to your destinations? Please select up to 3 of the following.

- Service is not frequent enough
- Service does not run early or late enough
- Service is not reliable
- Service is too expensive
- No stops near your destination
- Street crossings are unsafe
- Weather
- Safety concerns
- You prefer to drive
- Something else

38. For your public transit system to be a good option for your daily travel, which 3 of the following would need to be true? Please select up to 3 of the following.

- Close to work and home
- Close to non-work destinations and home
- Fits your schedule
- Faster than driving
- Reasonable in cost
- Consistently on time
39. In the past 30 days, how many times have you purchased a ride with a smartphone rideshare app like Uber or Lyft?

[ ] Times Using a Rideshare App

40. In the past 30 days, how many times have you used a car sharing service where a car can be rented by the hour, like Zipcar?

[ ] Times Using a Car Share Service

The next questions are about your personal health.

41. Do you have a condition or disability that makes it difficult for you to travel outside of the home?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No → Go to question 44

42. How long have you had this condition or disability?

[ ] 6 months or less
[ ] More than 6 months
[ ] Your whole life

43. Do you use any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. White Cane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Seeing-eye dog or other K-9 assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Crutches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Motorized or manual wheelchair or scooter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Something else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Because of your age or your overall health, have you had to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. …reduce your day-to-day travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. …ask others for rides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. …limit your driving to daytime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. …give up driving altogether?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. …use the bus less frequently?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. …use special transportation services such as Dial-A-Ride?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. …use a reduced fare taxi?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45. Would you say that in general, your health is…
   - Excellent
   - Very good
   - Good
   - Fair
   - Poor

46. Which one of the following statements best describes how physically active you are in a typical week?
   - You do some vigorous physical activity
   - You do some light or moderate physical activity ➔ Go to question 48
   - You rarely or never do any physical activity ➔ Go to question 49

47. During a typical week, how many times do you do vigorous physical activity for more than 30 minutes?
   Times doing vigorous physical activity

48. During a typical week, how many times do you do light or moderate physical activity for more than 30 minutes?
   Times doing light or moderate physical activity

If you reported having one or more school age children in your household, please answer the following question. If you do not have children of this age in your household, please go to question 50.

49. Which of the following are the top three reasons that would influence your decision to allow your child or children to walk or bike to school? Please select up to 3 of the following:
   - Crossing guards present
   - Presence of adult chaperones or supervision
   - Sidewalk and crosswalks are located along the route
   - School participates in a Safe Routes to Schools program
   - Education and training is provided for children, parents and others
   - School is located within neighborhood
   - Distance between home and school

Finally, we have some questions about your background.

50. Are you Hispanic or Latino?
   - Yes
   - No
51. Check all of the following that describe your race:

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Other: Please tell us: 

52. Were you born in the United States?

- Yes Go to question 54
- No

53. How long ago did you come to live in the United States?

- Less than 5 years ago
- 5 to 10 years ago
- More than 10 years ago

52. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Some high school
- High school graduate or the equivalent
- Some college
- Associate’s degree or a 2-year college degree
- Bachelor’s degree or a 4-year college degree
- Graduate degree or professional degree

54. Including all sources, such as income from a business or farm, Social Security, pensions, dividends, interest, rent, and income from any other household members, what is your current total annual household income before taxes?

- Less than $15,000
- $15,000 to $34,999
- $35,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $74,999
- $75,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 or more

55. The city of Madison may conduct an additional survey about this topic in the next few years. Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up survey in the future?

- Yes
- No

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire!
Please place it in the stamped envelope provided and return it as soon as possible.
Re:

Staff Comments on Item:
A draft of the 2017 Unified Planning Work Program has been prepared and will be made available to all local units of government within the MPO planning area and appropriate agencies, committees, and commissions for review and comment. MPO staff met with WisDOT Central Office and Southwest Region Office staff and FHWA staff to review and discuss the draft work program. The draft document reflects their comments.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Draft 2017 Work Program Report

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Informational at this time. Action by the Board is expected at the November 2 meeting.
Re:
Review and Recommendation of Proposed Draft 2017 MPO Budget

Staff Comments on Item:
The overall budget for 2017 is slightly more (0.3%) than in 2016. Small increases in staff costs, purchased services (rent, consultant services), and accounting services are partially offset by a reduced budget for supplies/equipment (printing, postage). For staff, the increase in salaries was partially offset by lower benefit costs. The MPO’s federal Planning funding increased over 5%, reducing the city’s required contribution which had been more than minimum required match. Anticipated carryover funding ($50,000) to complete the household travel survey to supplement the National Household Travel Survey is not included in the 2017 budget.

Materials Presented on Item:
Table reflecting the estimated budgets for 2016 and 2017.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Recommend Draft 2017 Budget
## Purchased Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54120</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>IP phones less expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54230</td>
<td>General Equip. Repairs &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54230</td>
<td>Property Rental</td>
<td>42,804</td>
<td>43,874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54515</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54520</td>
<td>Conferences and Training/Travel</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54810</td>
<td>Other Services General</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54650</td>
<td>Advertising Services</td>
<td>15,250</td>
<td>15,250</td>
<td>Rideshare adv (MPO cost $3K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54645</td>
<td>Consulting Services and Software/Data</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>Travel modeling support, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54686</td>
<td>Interpreters/Signing Services</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54535</td>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>AMPO, APA dues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54688</td>
<td>Transcription Services</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54690</td>
<td>Catering Vending Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>144,479</strong></td>
<td><strong>146,599</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Supplies/Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53110</td>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53165</td>
<td>Subscription &amp; Books</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53120</td>
<td>Reproduction Copier/Printing</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Greater use of electronic documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53150</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53130</td>
<td>Office Furniture</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53140</td>
<td>Computer Hardware/Supplies</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53145</td>
<td>Computer Software Licenses &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>20,870</td>
<td>21,196</td>
<td>Traffic manag &amp; Rideshare software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,046</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Inter-departmental Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Services/Comptroller</td>
<td>17,870</td>
<td>18,684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57175 Insurance Fund Inter-D</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57176 Workers Comp</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,848</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fixed Asset Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58505</td>
<td>Plotter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Fixed Asset</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>650,995</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (32.195%) in 2017</td>
<td>213,950</td>
<td>209,918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Benefits (11.34%)</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>865,567</strong></td>
<td><strong>867,951</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total | 1,060,950 | 1,064,444 |

## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>1,060,950</td>
<td>1,064,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Billings/Revenues</td>
<td>$878,384</td>
<td>$921,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>Year 2016</td>
<td>Year 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA</td>
<td>$704,226</td>
<td>$741,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT Match</td>
<td>$47,020</td>
<td>$47,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Match</td>
<td>$129,036</td>
<td>$138,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$880,282</td>
<td>$927,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Urban Rideshare</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Match</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare Advertising</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area RPC</td>
<td>$9,701</td>
<td>$9,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Support (Fitchburg, McFarland, Monona)</td>
<td>$18,837</td>
<td>$18,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Traffic Engineering</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$45,538</td>
<td>$49,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal &amp; State</td>
<td>$832,846</td>
<td>$872,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Match</td>
<td>$149,436</td>
<td>$159,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$45,538</td>
<td>$49,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,027,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,081,041</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Totals</td>
<td>$1,027,820</td>
<td>$1,081,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interagency Revenues</td>
<td>$878,384</td>
<td>$921,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>