AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of July 6, 2016 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

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

   Note: Action on the 2017-2021 TIP by the MPO is anticipated Wednesday, October 5 at 6:30 p.m. in Room A-B of the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Avenue. Written comments on the TIP are invited through Friday, September 23, and should be sent to the MPO offices at 121 S. Pinckney St., Suite 400, Madison, WI 53703 or e-mailed to mpo@cityofmadison.com.

6. Election of Officers

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

   - Interstate 39/90/94 (River Road Bridge), Bridge Deck Overlay [Const. advanced to 2017 w/ revised cost]
   - STH 19 (USH 12 to Dorn Drive), Pavement Resurfacing [NEW, Construction in 2016]
   - DeForest North Business Park Roadway Improvements [NEW, Const. in 2016 w/ State TEA Grant funding]

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


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

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

   - Coordination Meeting with WisDOT
   - Next Series of Public Meetings
   - Public Involvement Activities – Budgeting Tool

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

13. 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
14. Discussion of Future Work Items:
- Transit Ridership Modeling Improvement Project and Model Auto Speed Calibration Project
- Regional Transportation Plan 2050
- 2007-2011 Transportation Improvement Program
- Section 5310 E/D Transportation Grant Program Applications for 2016
- 2017 Budget and Work Program
- Household Travel Mail Survey to Supplement National Survey
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Implementation Planning
- MPO Website Redesign and Reorganization
- Modifications to Technical Committee Membership/Voting Structure and MPO Operating Rules

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

16. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, October 5 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 avisenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.
1. **Roll Call**

   **Members present:** David Ahrens, Mark Clear (arrived during item #5), Steve Flottmeyer, Ken Golden, Tim Gruber, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item #5), Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Robin Schmidt, Patrick Stern, Steve Stocker

   **Members absent:** None

   **MPO Staff present:** David Kanning, Bill Schaefer

2. **Approval of April 6, 2016 Meeting Minutes**

   Moved by Kamp, seconded by Opitz, to approve the April 6, 2016 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. **Communications**

   - Letter from WisDOT approving Amendment No. 3 to the 2016-2020 TIP.
   - Letter from WisDOT SW Region seeking input on the coordination plan and impact analysis methodology that was developed for the I-39/90 (USH 12/18 interchange to Portage) Major EIS Study
   - Letter from WisDOT SW Region seeking comment on the draft purpose and need statement for the I-39/90 (USH 12/18 interchange to Portage) Major EIS Study. Schaefer said that staff has prepared a draft comment letter in response, which is agenda item No. 8.
   - Newsletter update from WisDOT SW Region on the USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor Study. Schaefer said there is a new recommended alternative for the corridor, a hybrid between the four-lane expressway build alternative and the no-build alternative. Final completion of the EIS is on hold until funding for the recommended alternative is available. As such, the next public meeting isn’t scheduled until the fall of 2017. Matano asked if the section on the west side of Stoughton proposed for expansion to four lanes will have an urban cross-section. Schaefer said yes, an urban cross section with bike lanes.
   - Newsletter update from WisDOT SW Region on the I-39/90 (S. Beltline to Rock County Line) reconstruction and expansion project. Schaefer said various interchanges are currently under construction, including the USH 51 interchange east of Stoughton and the CTH N interchange.

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

   None

5. **Presentation on the City of Madison’s Madison in Motion Sustainable Transportation Plan and Other Transportation Planning Efforts**

   David Trowbridge, City of Madison Principal Planner, provided presentations on the City of Madison’s Madison in Motion plan and other transportation planning efforts. Trowbridge said that two development scenarios were developed to go along with two transportation improvement scenarios for evaluation. Scenario A reflected the type of development Madison has been experiencing between 1990 and 2010 with 70% of new population in peripheral areas and 30% in infill/redevelopment areas. Scenario B reflected a reversal of that with 70% infill/redevelopment. Achieving Scenario B would likely require subsidizing some redevelopment with density incentives or other measures. He described the major plan themes and then highlighted some of the public transit, bicycle, and roadway recommendations.
Asked about the term “local bus coordination,” Trowbridge said that referred to changes to local bus service to complement and reduce duplication with BRT. Stern asked if having articulated buses is a significant component of BRT, and Kamp responded yes since articulated buses can accommodate more passengers and in conjunction with off-board fare collection reduce boarding times due to more doors. Stern asked if there has been controversy in any communities with how BRT infrastructure has affected the built or natural environment. Kamp said that these issues are primarily local. The second phase of BRT implementation in Eugene Oregon was controversial because trees had to be removed. There were also issues in the Twin Cities with how a new BRT station would affect Garrison Keillor’s coffee shop and library. Golden said that in addition to BRT the recent bus size study found articulated buses and smaller buses made sense for some local bus service routes. Trowbridge said that small buses could be a solution to getting people in outlying areas to BRT stations.

Golden asked Trowbridge to discuss the “park once” idea in the plan. Trowbridge said this means parking your car once, perhaps at a park-and-ride or other “free parking” area, and then using other modes such as your personal bicycle or a BCycle to make short trips. Stern asked how these kinds of trips can be surveyed. Trowbridge said that knowledge of these trips is mostly anecdotal. Stern asked if these kinds of trips will be studied further, and Trowbridge said a survey might be done.

Board members discussed parking cost and requirements in Madison and whether fully automated parking systems could be used to fulfill parking requirements for new development projects. Golden said that fully automated parking facilities could not be used to fulfill parking requirements. Stern said a development plan that proposed that wasn’t approved due to concerns with the system, and suggested that the plan address this issue. Ahrens asked if a metric has evolved that addresses how many parking spaces for new projects should be reserved for electric vehicle charging or for car sharing. King said that this is a discussion the Plan Commission will likely have in the future. Schmidt asked Trowbridge if he thought Madison’s required parking rates are on the high or low end. Trowbridge said that he thinks the required parking rates are low in Madison. There are also less parking facilities in the downtown area when compared to other cities, like Milwaukee. Madison’s price for parking is much higher than many medium-sized cities. The board discussed parking challenges and opportunities in the City of Madison. Stern said that the developer of a new multi-family project on the isthmus is having trouble getting tenants since it was developed without parking facilities. The millennials who want to live there want a place to park their vehicle. Trowbridge added that parking for residents in the Tenny-Lapham neighborhood is challenging when there are special events. Providing additional public parking facilities may be a solution to this issue. The board discussed the future of the Alliant Energy Center and its potential as a future transportation hub with shared-use parking. Trowbridge said that the Alliant Energy Center has been identified as a planned activity center in the Madison in Motion Plan.

6. **Resolution TPB No. 117 Approving Amendment #3 to the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County**

Schaefer presented Amendment No. 3 to the 2016-2020 TIP. It will increase the funding amounts for Metro Transit’s capital and capital maintenance projects to reflect both the agency’s 2015 and 2016 grants. Metro Transit didn’t receive its 2015 funding last year due to a change in FTA’s grants system. The amendment will also update the listing for the county’s Glacial Drumlin Trail project to extend design through 2018 and add local construction funding in 2019. The board discussed issues related to the acquisition of property for the trail. Matano asked if the route had been finalized, and Schaefer said yes, that was the issue that delayed design work being done since they acquired property prior to the environmental study being completed.

Schaefer described the other projects that are part of the amendment request. The Beltline bridge girder painting project will be advanced to 2017 and the Interstate 39/90 expansion project will be revised to include funding in 2016 for reconstruction of the CTH N interchange area. The amendment will revise the local utilities and street construction funding for the Lacy Road and Buckeye Road projects that have STP-Urban funding. Lastly, Commerce Park Drive will be extended and a new Sub-Zero Parkway will be added to
accommodate an expansion of Sub-Zero’s manufacturing facility in the City of Fitchburg. This new project received a $1 million Transportation Economic Assistance (TEA) grant from the state.

Moved by Schmidt, seconded by Stern, to approve Amendment No. 3 to the 2016-2020 TIP. Motion carried.

7. **Resolution TPB No. 118 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2015 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget**

Schaefer described the purpose of the amendment, which is to increase the amount of carryover funding from last year to this year to cover the cost of origin-destination (O-D) data that the MPO will be purchasing, and to extend the period within which the MPO has to spend the funds. The O-D data is being purchased from a company called AirSage, which has developed an approach for converting cellular data into aggregate O-D flows by general trip purpose. This data will be used to supplement the data that will be collected from about 900 households in Dane County as part of the National Household Survey (NHTS) during the same time period. The AirSage data will be collected for both weekdays and weekends in July and October. Asked if the data will be available to all municipalities in Dane County, Schaefer said that the data will be collected within the county as well as corridors leading into the county.

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

8. **Response to Request for Comments on the Project Purpose and Need for the Interstate 39/90/94 (Madison to Portage) Corridor EIS Study**

Schaefer said that WisDOT is seeking comments on the draft Purpose and Need Statement for the Interstate 39/90/94 Study. The Study includes several crossing routes and some interchange areas, including the triangle created by STH 19, USH 51 and Interstate 39/90/94. An earlier phase of the study examined potential new interchanges and other grade-separated crossings. Some of those are being carried forward for further study as part of the EIS phase of the study. One of the first steps for an EIS is to establish the purpose and need of the project, which drives the recommendations that will come out of the study. The document, which was included in the packet, addresses traffic operations, safety issues, substandard geometrics and bridges, and the pavement.

Schaefer described the draft comment letter that he prepared in response. He said staff is primarily concerned with the traffic operations analysis, which uses the goal of Level of Service C at the 30th highest hour (of the year) volumes, FHWA’s standard policy for the Interstate system. Staff questions whether the 30th highest hour is the appropriate threshold due to the unique peaking characteristics of the roadway due to recreational traffic. By using the 30th highest hour, the roadway would be designed so people aren’t delayed during these few peak times. The analysis shows that delays would only increase by five to ten minutes by 2050 if additional travel lanes weren’t provided. Other concerns were that the report does not describe how the the need for crossings will be addressed, nor does it provide information on how cost-benefit will be analyzed.

Golden said that he liked the tone of the letter. He offered some editorial suggestions and asked if examples could be provided relating to barriers and crossings. Opitz and Clear expressed support for Golden’s comments. Kamp described the transit service improvements that would be necessary to design for the 30th highest hour to show the difficulty of accommodating extreme peak demand. Schmidt suggested that the letter be crafted using bullet points to describe primary concerns and suggestions. Gruber asked if the MPO has a recommendation for which level of service the Interstate should be designed for. Schaefer said the general policy is to try to achieve LOS D. It is the combination of LOS C at the 30th highest hour volume that is the issue. Schaefer said that he suggested in the letter having LOS tables produced for K100 and K250 projected volumes to provide a more complete picture of traffic operations.

Schaefer said that it was his understanding prior to receiving the draft Purpose and Need Statement that the design hour volume would be determined later in the study. However, the document appears to indicate that it has already been decided to use the 30th highest hour. Schaefer asked Flottmeyer if he wanted to provide any input, but Flottmeyer said he didn’t directly work with the individuals involved in the study. Schaefer
explained that he realizes corridor improvements are needed, but that he questions why it was selected for a major study since it is working well from both an operations and safety standpoint.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Opitz, to approve the letter with the edits suggested by Golden and others. Motion carried with Flottmeyer voting no.

9. Update on Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2050

Schaefer provided an update on the Regional Transportation Plan. Staff is currently working on the analysis of the existing transportation system and the assessment of future needs to accommodate the forecast year 2050 growth. Some changes to the traffic zone level growth forecasts were made to reflect the new redevelopment plan for the Judge Doyle Square site and to reflect recently prepared development assumptions for the E. Washington Avenue Corridor (Capitol East District) prepared as part of a project to develop a model to estimate future parking needs. The transit/mode choice component of the model is also being updated in preparation for the next phase of the BRT Study. As a result of that work, it was discovered that the auto speeds in the model were too high in the urban area. As such, work is being done to recalibrate the auto speeds. These projects will be completed over the next month. Staff will conduct model runs in preparation for the series of public meetings schedules for the fall.

Other work underway includes the identification of major pedestrian and bicycle facility improvement needs, identification of intersections with high motor vehicle crash rates, and identification of currently congested corridors and intersections based on travel time data.

Schaefer said that staff has completed a performance measures report and a draft goals and policies statement. The seven goals are the over-arching statements we are trying to achieve. The policies are approaches or methods that are recommended for the MPO to use such as in our project scoring criteria or for implementing agencies to use to achieve the goals. Specific recommendations and general strategies will be developed to implement the goals and policies. The performance measures are key metrics to help in determining whether the region is making progress in meeting the goals. Schaefer said the measures were organized by the goals rather than by mode of transportation as in the past since the purpose of the plan is to integrate all of the modes. He said the land use related policies are consistent with those of the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission’s (CARPC), and this will be noted. CARPC will be updating their policies as part of initial work on the regional land use plan update. He asked for comments on the goals and policies document.

Schmidt questioned the use of the phrase “support personal prosperity” in one of the goals. Schaefer said that the transportation system can support personal prosperity by providing affordable, convenient transportation options for people to access jobs and services. Concern about this issue was one of the key themes that came out of the values and priorities study. Golden commented that he liked the format of the document and said it was easy to read and digest. He suggested possibly adding the concept of considering second-story residential uses above commercial uses to policy 2.5. He also suggested including definitions of terms like “transit-supportive land use” and “context-sensitive transportation facility design.” He recommended separating out the point about supporting tourism in policy 3.3 in another policy. Schaefer said staff would make that change. He also said that key terms would be defined and illustrated in the plan report.

Schaefer briefly reviewed the plan report outline, pointing out the planned section that will include maps of different areas highlighting improvement needs covering safety, congestion, and bicycle/pedestrian connectivity issues, among others.

10. Presentation on Transportation Performance Measures Report

Schaefer provided a presentation on the final draft Transportation Performance Measures Report. He reviewed and commented on the different measures, noting that they will evolve to some extent over time as new data becomes available. Federal measures related to pavement condition and congestion/reliability are being finalized now. Targets will be set in the future for those federal measures and others as part of the federally mandated process.
Matano noted that we haven’t heard anything about ozone non-attainment for a while. Schaefer said the region continues to meet the standard, but that it was recently made a bit more stringent. King asked what constitutes a medical facility. Schaefer said the hospitals and larger clinics were included. Golden said that it might be useful to share the minutes of the Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee meeting with the board as members had some good comments. Schaefer said changes were made in response to the comments as noted in the cover memo on this item. Kamp said that overcrowded buses and low gas prices were among likely factors in why transit ridership was down in 2015. Schaefer said that the ability to track bus passenger loads and compare loads with service levels will be an important performance measure in the future.

Clear praised the format and layout of the report. He asked if the target audience for this is the general public. Schaefer said that is correct. Clear recommended moving the data source and terminology text to the appendix to make the presentation more effective. Schmidt asked about measures to determine the reduction in environmental impacts from the transportation system. She asked if carbon reduction could be measured rather than air quality. Schaefer said that greenhouse gas emissions from cars are directly related to vehicle miles of travel so that is indirectly addressed. Transportation is only part of the picture and weather patterns also affect ozone levels in particular. Mandli asked the source of the data on fatality rates. Schaefer said the data was obtained from the UW TOPS Lab and came directly from MV400 crash reports. Mandli said that the Dane County Traffic Safety Committee uses a Google crash map that was developed by the UW TOPS Lab to analyze crashes on a quarterly basis. Thirty people from law enforcement agencies and fire departments in the county attend the meetings. Schaefer asked who staffed the group, and Mandli said it was someone from the Sherriff’s office. Schaefer said that he would like to obtain more information from the staff since the MPO is conducting a corridor level safety analysis for the regional transpiration plan.

11. Appointment of MPO Representative to the Policy Advisory Committee for the Interstate 39/90/94 (Madison to Portage) Corridor EIS Study

Schaefer said that Patrick Stern had expressed in serving on the committee at the last meeting, but said he couldn’t make day meetings. Schaefer said he corresponded with WisDOT staff who said the policy committee might be changed to evenings. Matano said that he would talk to Steve Stocker in case Stern declines the nomination.

Moved by Schmidt, seconded by Golden, to appoint Patrick Stern to the committee. Motion carried.

12. Status Report on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB

None

13. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer said that the transit/mode choice and auto speed calibration modeling projects would be completed in about a month. Staff is currently assembling the draft 2017-2021 TIP. MPO staff will be working with the City of Madison’s IT department to redesign the MPO website. City of Madison department websites are being redesigned, in part to make them responsive to the type of technology (phone/tablet vs. computer) that accesses it. He said staff will work with the IT department to ensure the site reflects the independence of the MPO. The timeline has been delayed because we lost our staff person, Jeff Greger, who would have been in charge of this effort. Jeff took a position with City Planning.

Schaefer said staff will be making some minor modifications to the MPO’s operating rules. One change will be to add language stating that agendas for all official advisory committee meetings will be posted with the city and county clerks’ offices. Another issue that had been raised is whether votes should be recorded in the minutes. Golden said that members who vote “no” generally want to have their vote recorded, and that this doesn’t need to be in the rules. Opitz said that board members generally want their names to be recorded when they abstain from a vote as well. Schaefer said that we do record the names of members who abstain.
Matano said that he will call a roll call vote if more than one member votes “no” so the names of all members who vote “no” can then be recorded. If one person vote’s “no”, he or she can state their preference for how the vote should recorded.

Schafer reported that the Village of DeForest no longer has a staff engineer or a staff planner. They will use consultants for those services. As such, the voting structure of the technical committee needs to be modified.

14. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings
The next meeting will be held Wednesday, August 3, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

15. Adjournment
Moved by King, seconded by Gruber, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM.
Date: July 15, 2016

To: Dwight McComb, Federal Highway Administration

From: Donna Brown-Martin, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Subject: Amendment to the 2015 Unified Planning Work Program for the Madison 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 Madison Area Transportation Planning Board’s 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area.

The Bureau of Planning and Economic Development Section, recommends approval of the enclosed request by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board for work activity and budget adjustments to the overall work program. A copy of the proposed Work Program amendment is attached.

The requested carryover, estimated in the amount of $153,490 will be allocated at the current 2015 UPWP Federal, State and Local percentages. This approval will extend the period of eligibility to complete these 2015 UPWP activities until December 31, 2016. Any 2015 UPWP carryover funding not expended and requested by December 31, 2016 will not be eligible for reimbursement. Total reimbursements for 2015 UPWP activities are limited to the approved 2015 UPWP funding allocation of $880,282.

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

Sincerely,

Donna Brown-Martin, Director
Bureau of Planning & Economic Development
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Cc via email: William Schaefer, Director, Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Jennifer Sarnecki, Planning Section Chief - BPED
Steve Flottmeyer, Planning Chief, WisDOT Southwest Region
Diane Paoni, WisDOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development

Approved:

[Signature]
FHWA Division Date

8/12/16
July 19, 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 July 6, 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 117 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
July 22, 2016

Mr. Mark Gottlieb, P.E.
Secretary
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
4802 Sheboygan Avenue, Room 120B
P.O Box 7910
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7910

RE: Amendment to the FY 2016 – 2019 Wisconsin State Transportation Improvement Program

Dear Mr. Gottlieb:

Your letters dated June 6, June 24, and July 19, 2016 requested the following amendment approvals to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-2019 Wisconsin State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):

**June 6, 2016 Request:** Section 5310 Projects for the LaCrosse Urbanized Area

**June 24, 2016 Request:** Section 5307 Projects for the Green Bay Urbanized Area

- The only projects that are approved in this amendment request are the following:
  - 158-16-107 Bobcat with Snow Plow or Blower
  - 158-16-113 Walk Behind Floor Scrubber
  - 158-16-114 Diesel Particulate Filter Cleaning Equipment
  - 158-16-116 Moving Exhaust System in Garage
- The remaining projects included in the June 24, 2016 request for the Green Bay Urbanized Area are for the Section 5339 Discretionary Program. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has not made a decision on which agencies will receive funding for this program. Green Bay Metro can amend projects into the STIP if they are selected to receive Section 5339 Discretionary funding.

**July 19, 2016 Request:** Section 5307 Project for the Madison Urbanized Area
The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) finds that the above STIP is the result of a transportation planning process that substantially complies with the requirements of 23 CFR 450. A conformity analysis was not required, since all of the projects to be funded in the amendment are exempt from air quality conformity. In accordance with 23 CFR 450.220, FTA approves this STIP amendment for the above-mentioned requests. If you have any questions concerning this action, please contact me at (312) 353-2639.

Sincerely,

Bill Wheeler
Community Planner

Enclosure

Ec:  Dwight McComb, FHWA-Wisconsin
     James Kuehn, Wisconsin DOT
     Ian Ritz, Wisconsin DOT
     Scott Korth, Madison Metro
     Patricia Kiewiz, Green Bay Metro
Re:
Public Hearing on the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Staff Comments on Item:
The complete draft TIP was released on August 5 for public review and comment. All board members received a copy of the draft TIP. It is also on the MPO’s website at this link.

Comments on the draft TIP will be accepted until September 23 and action anticipated at the board’s October 5 meeting.

Applications for STP (now STBG) – Urban projects were not accepted this year. The schedule for some of the approved projects has changed. The large CTH M (S. Pleasant View Road) project was delayed with the start date in fall 2017 (State Fiscal Year 2018) and most construction in 2018-2019. This resulted in the Buckeye Road (CTH AB) project being pushed back from 2018 to 2019 and the Cottage Grove Road (CTH BB) project being pushed back from 2018 to 2020 due to lack of available STP – Urban funding statewide. Environmental and design work is being done on those projects and they will be advanceable if funding becomes available. Attached is a table listing the approved STP Urban projects with the current schedule.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Approved STP Urban Priority Project Listings

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For review and discussion purposes only at this time. Action is anticipated at the board’s October meeting.
### Approved Priority Projects (2017-2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Construction/ Project Calendar Year</th>
<th>State Fiscal Year (Funding)</th>
<th>Total Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent (Fed $)</th>
<th>Federal Funds Currently Approved (thousands)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO Rideshare Program</td>
<td>5992-08-20,30-32</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
<td>$439</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$351</td>
<td>Ongoing support per MPO policy. 3% annual increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Ped/Bike Safety Education Program</td>
<td>5992-08-29,33-35</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
<td>$378</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>Ongoing support per MPO policy. 3% annual increase. Includes 2019 funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit Bus Replacements (Up to 7)</td>
<td>5992-10-00</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,640</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$820</td>
<td>Continuing project: 12 buses ($4,920 total cost) in 2015 (SFY 2016), 5 in 2016 ($2,050), 4 in 2017 ($1,640).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH M (Cross Country Rd. to 2.500' N of CTH PD) AND CTH M (2.500' N of CTH PD to 1,000 S of Valley View Road)</td>
<td>5992-09-81, 82</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$37,270</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$17,451</td>
<td>Includes path, underpasses. Cost est. higher due to new CTH PD intersection design and other items. $1,184 short of 50% funding due to higher cost estimate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee Rd./CTH PD (Menier Way to Maple Grove Rd.)</td>
<td>5992-09-30, 31, 32</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$12,160</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
<td>Includes ped/bike overpass, but city may apply for TAP funding. Project $663 short of 50% funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacy Rd. (City Hall to Syene Rd.)</td>
<td>5849-00-09, 11, 12</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$6,139</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$2,854</td>
<td>Includes roundabout at Fahey Glen. $216 short of 50% funding due to higher cost est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Rd./CTH AB (Monona Dr. to Stoughton Rd./USH 51)</td>
<td>5992-09-40, 41, 42, 43</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1,184</td>
<td>$145 short of 50% funding based on current cost estimate for project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Johnson St. (Baldwin St. to First St.) Phase 2</td>
<td>5992-09-09, 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$4,860</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$2,622</td>
<td>$294 short of 60% funding due to higher cost estimate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Ave. (Allen/CTH Q to Univ Bay) Adaptive Signal System</td>
<td>6992-10-10, 11</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$456</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$319</td>
<td>To be coordinated w/ Verona Rd/CTH PD interch project. Includes ped/bike underpass for Badger State Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee Rd./CTH PD (Commerce Park Dr to Seminole Hwy.)</td>
<td>5649-02-01, -02</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$5,809</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,485</td>
<td>To be coordinated w/ Verona Rd/CTH PD interch project. Includes ped/bike underpass for Badger State Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Point Rd. (USH 12 to High Point Rd.)</td>
<td>5992-10-19, 20</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,330</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood Ave. (Fair Oaks Ave. to Walter St.) Phase 1</td>
<td>5992-10-15, 16</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$5,360</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,216</td>
<td>Phase 1 of project. Includes ped/bike path, bridge over Starkweather Creek, and ped/bike crossing imp.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Grove Rd/CTH BB (North Star Dr to Sprecher Rd)</td>
<td>5992-09-25, 26, 27</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$5,750</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
<td>To be coordinated w/ I-39/90 bridge project, if possible. Advanceable to 2018 if funding available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **$42,669** | **$15.5 million estimated to be available for this program cycle.** |

### Candidate Future Projects (2021-2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Construction/ Project Calendar Year</th>
<th>State Fiscal Year (Funding)</th>
<th>Total Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent (Fed $)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant View Rd. (USH 14 to Greenway Blvd.) Phase 1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$17,120</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood Ave. (Walter St to Cottage Grove Rd.) Phase 2</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$3,432</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | | | **$20.5 million estimated to be available for this program cycle.** |
**Re:**

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

---

**Staff Comments on Item:**

The amendment to the TIP will add two projects and advance construction for a third one. The two new projects are: (1) STH 19 (USH 12 to Dorn Drive) Pavement Resurfacing project west of Waunakee, which is federally funded; and (2) roadway improvements within the DeForest North Business Park, funded in part with a state Transportation Economic Assistance grant. Construction for the Interstate 39/90/94 (River Road Bridge), Bridge Deck Overlay project is being advanced from 2020 to 2017 with funding obligated in 2016.

The new projects are consistent with the MPO’s regional transportation plan and the amendment will not affect the timing of any other programmed projects in the TIP.

---

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Resolution TPB No. 119 Approving Amendment #4 to the 2016-2020 TIP (including attachments)

---

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 119

Amendment No. 4 to the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) – An MPO approved the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on October 7, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the MATPB previously adopted TPB Resolutions No. 115-117 approving Amendments No. 1-3 to the 2016-2020 TIP respectively; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area transportation projects and some transportation planning activities to be undertaken using Federal funding in 2016–2019 must be included in the effective TIP; and

WHEREAS, an amendment has been requested by WisDOT Southwest Region to revise the project listing for the I-39/90/94 (River Road Bridge) concrete bridge deck overlay project, increasing federal and state construction funding, advancing construction to 2017 with funding obligation in 2016; and

WHEREAS, the amendment also adds a state highway maintenance project on STH 19 from USH 12 to Dorn Drive; and

WHEREAS, the amendment also reflects the addition of one state and locally funded project to reconstruct a portion of Grinde Road and to extend Burton Boulevard and Yahara Road in the Village of DeForest North Business Park; and

WHEREAS, the TIP amendment will not affect the timing of any other programmed projects in the TIP and the TIP remains financially constrained as shown in the attached revised TIP financial table (Table B-2); and

WHEREAS, the MPO’s public participation procedures for minor TIP amendments such as this have been followed, including listing the projects on the MATPB meeting agenda; and

WHEREAS, the new and revised projects are consistent with the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, the currently adopted long-range regional transportation plan for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area TPB approves Amendment No. 4 to the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, adding the following new projects and revising the Interstate bridge project as described below and shown on the attached project listing table:

1. REVISE the I-39/90/94 (River Road Bridge) concrete bridge deck overlay project on page 27 of the Street/Roadway Projects section, increasing federal and state construction funding, advancing construction to 2017 with funding obligated in 2016.

2. ADD the STH 19 (USH 12 to Dorn Drive) Mill & Overlay and Pavement Resurfacing project to page 30 of the Street/Roadway Projects section.

3. ADD the DeForest North Business Park transportation project to page 44 of the Street/Roadway Projects section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Jurisdiction/Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost/Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2018</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2019</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2020</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISDOT</td>
<td>UTH 12 to Dom Drive</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S290-01-04/74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mill and Overlay Pavement</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S290-01-04 previously authorized State funded. Construction project advanced from CY 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement Resurfacing (4.57 miles)</td>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSTATE 39/90/94</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1011-04-09, -79, -96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation - Concrete Deck</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design $ obligated in 2011. Const. funding to be obligated in 2016, Construction in 2016, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VILLAGE OF DEFOREST</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ID # 6592-00-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension of existing Burton Boulevard, Yahara Road and reconstruction of a portion of Grinde Road.</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village of DeForest is coordinating this Construction project - LLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Economic Assistance Grant (TEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-2
Summary of Federal Funds Programmed ($000s) and Those Available in Year of Expenditure Dollars in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Expenditures</th>
<th>Estimated Available Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>National Highway Performance Program</td>
<td>36,974</td>
<td>25,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Madison Urban Area</td>
<td>18,772</td>
<td>10,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Flexible</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Enhancements/Alternatives</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
<td>11,298</td>
<td>14,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5339 Bus &amp; Bus Facilities</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5337 State of Good Repair</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5310 E/D Enhanced Mobility Program</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5314 NRP, Sec. 5339 Alt. Analysis Program &amp; TIGER**</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fifth year of funding (2020) is informational only.
** Carryover funding. Includes new TIGER VI Planning Grant for Urban Footprint Tool, Scenario Planning.

**Note:**
All state roadway projects using applicable funding sources (e.g., NHPP, STP State Flexible, BR) are programmed through 2020. Local BR, STP (BR), and STP Rural projects are programmed through 2018. HSIP (other than annual small HES program) projects are programmed through 2020. Local Enhancement/TAP projects are programmed through 2018. Local STP Urban (Madison Urban Area) projects are programmed through 2020. Transit funding is not yet programmed and is based on needs and anticipated future funding levels (See also Table B-4 Metro Transit System Projected Expenses and Revenues). Programmed transit funding for 2015 excludes carryover projects for which the Federal funding is already obligated (except for the Alternatives Analysis and TIGER funding). Roadway and transit inflation rate @ 2.3% per year applied to both expenses and revenues, except for STP-Urban program. The Interstate 39/90 (S. Beltline to Rock County Line) Reconstruction and Capacity Expansion project is not included in table since project is primarily located in Rock County and outer Dane County.
## Staff Comments on Item:

An advisory committee has been created to help oversee development of the update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The committee is providing overall direction for the plan and reviewing and providing feedback on plan materials prior to taking the materials to the general public for comment via the website and public meetings.

One of the appointees, Andrew Disch, Director of Government Relations and Advocacy for the Madison Area Builders Association (MABA), is leaving MABA to take another position. His replacement, Chad Lawler, is interested in being appointed to take Andrew’s place on the committee. Mr. Lawler has over two years experience in government relations and has also been a practicing attorney for four years.

## Materials Presented on Item:

1. None

## Staff Recommendation/Rationale:

Staff recommends approval of the appointment of Mr. Lawler to committee to replace Mr. Disch.
### Re:
Review Draft Transit System Network Recommendations for the Regional Transportation Plan 2050

### Staff Comments on Item:
For the most part, we are still in the analysis and needs identification stage of the regional transportation plan update. However, due to having fairly recently completed the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) feasibility study and the Transit Development Plan, we are further along with respect to transit. The attached map illustrates the draft planned future regional transit service network, including BRT, corridors with frequent local service (15 minutes or better throughout the day), new all day service serving existing and planned neighborhoods, and planned commuter service. We may also include a transit “vision” map in the plan that shows potential BRT extensions.

### Materials Presented on Item:
1. Map and brief write up on the draft planned regional transit service network

### Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For information and discussion purposes only at this time.
Future Planned Regional Transit Service Network

Public Transit

- Local Transit Service with BRT
- 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.
Future Planned Regional Transit Network

Figure 2 shows the future planned regional transit network, including the local transit network, enhanced service, and anticipated new service in developing neighborhoods and communities that are currently unserved by public transit. These public transit improvements focus on introducing and improving transit service. Facilities, technology, funding, and other needs are addressed elsewhere in the plan. The service improvements identified include:

**Bus rapid transit** - Fast, frequent, high capacity service serving as the core of the transit system operating in dense, mixed use urban corridors. BRT implementation will include a restructure of local service to improve connections and reduce duplication with BRT. BRT will reduce travel times and make riding the bus easier and more attractive, attracting new riders and improving service for existing riders, including low-income individuals with very long commutes and in some cases multiple transfers.

**New all-day service** in developing peripheral neighborhoods. Some of these neighborhoods currently have limited service, for instance during weekday peak periods only. Developed urban areas need regular access to the regional transit system for their daily needs.

**Frequency improvements** in dense urban neighborhoods in central Madison, particularly during the mid day, evening, and weekend, are needed to relieve capacity problems, improve ridership, and support growth. The “frequent service network”, or streets with service about every 15 minutes throughout most of the weekday service day, could grow to include Monroe Street, Regent Street, Atwood Avenue, and other streets. In addition, weekend and evening service levels could be brought up to a level of service similar to the weekday mid day.

**New regional express service** between Madison and its suburbs will give commuters alternatives to a drive-alone commute and open opportunities to employment for people without regular access to an auto.

**Alternative transit service models** like point-deviation routes and shared-ride taxi will help solve the last-mile problem and provide more attractive and cost-effective service to low-income riders.
Re:
Review Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Needs Analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan 2050

Staff Comments on Item:

With the completion of the Bicycle Transportation Plan, we are in good shape with respect to the planned bikeway network. That plan included a planned network of primary and secondary routes, a comprehensive facilities network plan, and a set of regional priority paths. For the RTP update, we are adding the attached map, which highlights key gaps and barriers in the network serving existing urban areas (vs. serving planned neighborhoods). For the on-street corridors, the new facilities could include a side path in some cases in conjunction with an on-street facility. Implementation of some these improvements will be dependent upon competing interests such as parking, pedestrian space, etc.

For the regional pedestrian network along arterial and collector streets, an analysis has been done to identify and prioritize the addition of sidewalks on streets with either no sidewalk or sidewalk on only one side. These gaps in the network were prioritized as either Tier 1 or 2 based on an analysis of pedestrian demand. This was based on the pedestrian accessibility of areas to walking destinations such as schools, parks, shops, etc. and population density. It is recognized that in most cases sidewalks will be added as part of a street reconstruction project, but the attached map highlights those that are most important. A more qualitative analysis has also been done to identify those intersections that could use pedestrian crossing improvements. A pedestrian facilities “toolbox” will be included in the plan that shows these types of improvements (median refuge islands, special signals, crosswalk treatments, etc.).

These draft maps are being reviewed with the MPO’s technical committee this week. Revisions will be made based on comments received.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Map and brief write up on gaps and barriers in the regional bikeway network in urban areas
2. Map and brief write up on regional pedestrian network improvement needs

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For information and discussion purposes only at this time.
Bikeway Gaps and Barriers

On Street Corridors
Off Street Corridors

Existing Roads
Existing Shared-Use Paths

Bicycle gaps and barriers on this map represent corridors where bicycle travel is difficult or bicycle facilities are discontinuous. Retrofitting these corridors and crossings may or may not be feasible.
Regional Bikeway Network Gaps and Barriers in Urban Areas

Figure Y.Y shows major gaps and barriers in the urban bikeway system. On-street corridors, depicted in blue, are generally urban collector and arterial streets that lack appropriate bicycle facilities. These corridors were selected based on analysis of the bicycle route classification in the Bicycle Transportation Plan and their potential to improve connectivity within and between neighborhoods. Off-street corridors, in green, represent planned shared-use paths in developed areas that similarly improve connectivity.

These on-street and off-street corridors were given some review and new or improved bicycle facilities are likely feasible in the corridors. However, implementing improvements will be dependent on competing interests and limited funding. Potential improvements are described in the Bicycle Transportation Plan. On-street corridors identified on the map could be addressed with parallel off-street facilities in conjunction with on-street bike lanes or other treatments.

The corridors shown in the Bicycle Gaps and Barriers map are exclusively in existing, urbanized neighborhoods. This work extends bikeway planning completed in the Bicycle Transportation Plan, which identified bikeway facility needs throughout the county to serve both existing and planned development. The Bicycle Transportation Plan further identified a network of regional priority shared-use paths connecting Madison with communities around Dane County.
Regional Pedestrian Network Improvement Needs

Sidewalk Needs *
- No Sidewalk - Tier 1
- Sidewalk One Side Only - Tier 1
- No Sidewalk - Tier 2
- Sidewalk One Side Only - Tier 2

Street Crossing Needs
- Spot Intersection Potential Improvements

Walk Access Score **
Weighted by population to reflect pedestrian travel demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted by Population Score</th>
<th>20 - 30</th>
<th>30 - 40</th>
<th>40 - 55</th>
<th>55 - 70</th>
<th>70 - 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Sidewalk Notes:
Sidewalk condition is only shown for urban collector and arterial roads where a sidewalk is expected. Ramps, frontage roads, and similar roads where sidewalk is not expected are not shown.
High priority corridors include urbanized streets with higher traffic speeds and volumes and a higher concentration of destinations.

** Walk Access Score Notes:
The Walk Access Score is based on the number of destinations reachable within a 60 minute walk. Destinations are weighted with a target number per category. The score is calculated using a distance decay function where the value of a destination is based on distance from the origin. The further a destination is from the origin, the less affect it has on the Walk Access Score.

Prepared by staff to the:

See Inset
Regional Pedestrian Network Improvement Needs

Figure X.x shows urban arterial and collector streets with missing sidewalks. Local streets, as well as rural roads, freeways, freeway ramps, some frontage roads, and other streets where sidewalk is not present but also not expected or only expected on one side are not shown on the map. Roads with no sidewalk are shown in red and roads with sidewalk on one side only are shown in blue.

The MPO maintains a county-wide database using the following codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 *</td>
<td>No SW – Urban</td>
<td>Urban streets with no sidewalk or path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 *</td>
<td>One SW – Urban</td>
<td>Urban streets with sidewalk or path on one side only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both SW – Urban</td>
<td>Urban streets with sidewalk or path on both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No SW – Not Expected</td>
<td>Urban streets with no sidewalk, but sidewalk is not expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>One SW – Not Expected</td>
<td>Urban streets with SW / path on one side only, but SW is not expected on both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>No SW – Rural</td>
<td>Rural streets and highways with no sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>One SW – Rural</td>
<td>Rural streets and highways with sidewalk or path on one side only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Both SW – Rural</td>
<td>Rural streets and highways with sidewalk or path on both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unevaluated</td>
<td>Sidewalk status is unknown or does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Collector and arterial streets with this code are shown in Figure X.x with a red (no sidewalk) or blue (sidewalk on one side only) line.

The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board supports a “complete streets” policy that includes providing sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities such as crosswalks and signals along all urban streets. Every trip begins and ends with at least a short walk; public transit in particular is integrated with walking. Walking also includes getting around with wheelchairs and other mobility assistance devices and thus walking routes should be ADA-compliant.

The regional pedestrian network is an interconnected system of pedestrian routes (sidewalks and paths) along arterial and collector streets and major shared-use paths. It links mixed-use and other high pedestrian demand areas and provides access to destinations including public transit stops, schools, jobs, services, retail, and parks. The network should be complete, direct, safe, comfortable, accessible, and enjoyable.

Roadways with missing sidewalks are classified as Tier 1 and Tier 2 using the qualitative analysis described below.

**Tier 1 roadways** show a demonstrated need for adding sidewalks. They generally have higher traffic speeds and volumes, destinations like jobs or retail or higher density residential development on a side of the street that is missing sidewalks, and/or present a barrier for people walking between neighborhoods.

**Tier 2 roadways** are other collector and arterial streets in urbanized areas that should be retrofitted with sidewalks in most cases, but they do not share the characteristics of the Tier 1 roadways. In many cases they are in lower density residential neighborhoods, industrial areas, or have sidewalk on one side in a configuration that does not require pedestrians to cross the street to access most destinations.

**Spot Intersection Potential Improvements** consist of intersections, crossings, and other locations that are particularly problematic for pedestrians. These locations which have been identified are shown as green dots. Many of these areas of concerns can be remedied by improved modern pedestrian facilities and new crossing improvements.
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 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 introduced to approve the contract, which is 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

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>Amount</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~1200@ $20 post-incentive</td>
<td>$ 39,000</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