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

May 1, 2013
7 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. Approval of April 3, 2013 Meeting Minutes
4. Communications
5. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)
6. Presentation on Epic Campus Growth Plans and Related Transportation Issues (Epic Staff)
7. Presentation on City of Verona Land Use & Transportation Plans, Studies, and Projects (City of Verona Staff)
8. Presentation on the Madison Area TPB (MPO) for City of Verona Officials

9. Resolution TPB No. 75 Approving Amendment #3 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County
   - Cannonball Trail – Phases 2 & 4 (Military Ridge Trail to UW Arboretum), Trail in RR corridor [Const. delayed to 2014]
   - SW Sun Prairie Connector Path (USH 151 to Hoepker Rd.), New path [Const. delayed to 2014]
   - Union Cab, Accessible Vans & Accessible Private Taxi Service [Add federal transit funding]
   - Dane County Mobility Management Program [Add federal transit funding]
   - Mineral Point Rd. (Midvale Blvd. intersection), Add turn lanes & other safety improvements [NEW, Const. in 2015]
   - STH 19 (Bridges over Token Creek), Bridge replacement [Add funding for traffic mitigation in 2013]
   - USH 51 (STH 138 to Town Rd., Quam Dr. to CTH B), Pavement replacement [Const. advanced to 2013, Cost reduced]
   - USH 12/18 (I-39/90 to CTH N), Design for reconstruction, access modifications [PE funding delayed to 2014]
   - Park St/USH 151 (Rail crossing), Replace RR crossing and gates [Const. delayed to 2014]
   - USH 14 (CTH KP to Westview Ct.), Reconst.CTH P intersection, replace pavement [Utility, PE funding changes in ‘13]

10. Consideration of Appointment to the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee

11. Brief Report on the Madison Area Transit Corridor (BRT) Study

12. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Other Projects 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 Wisconsin Dells) Corridor EIS Study

13. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   - Metro Bus Size Study
   - Public Participation Plan Update
   - Roadway Functional Classification Update
   - Consideration of Revision to Structure of MPO Board and TCC
   - Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan Update
   - Transportation Alternatives and STP-Urban Project Selection Criteria
   - MPO Funding and Contracting Issues
14. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

15. Adjournment

Next MPO Meetings:

**Saturday, May 4 at 10 a.m.**
Epic, 1979 Milky Way, Verona
Tour of Epic campus (no official business will be conducted)

**Wednesday, June 5 at 7 p.m.**
Madison Water Utility, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room 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:* Mark Clear, Ken Dahl, Ken Golden, Steve King, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item 5), Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Chris Schmidt, Robin Schmidt

*Members absent:* Jeff Gust, Chuck Kamp, Paul Lawrence

*MPO Staff present:* Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

*Others present in an official capacity:* Jeff Berens, Michael Hoelker (both WisDOT SW Region Staff)

2. **Approval of March 6, 2013 Meeting Minutes**

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Minihan, to approve the March 6, 2013 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. **Communications**

- Letter from WisDOT approving amendment #2 to the 2013-2017 TIP;
- Newsletter from WisDOT regarding the USH 51 (Stoughton Road) study and public meeting.

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

None

5. **Presentation on the Stoughton Road/USH 51 (Terminal Dr. to STH 19) Study (WisDOT SW Region Staff)**

Jeff Berens, Project Manager, WisDOT SW Region, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the study, which covered past studies on the corridor, the project purpose and need, safety and operations conditions, study schedule, and details about the improvement alternatives for the different sections of the corridor. He said that from 2007 to 2011 there was on average more than a crash a day on the corridor with most occurring at the signalized intersections. There were also ten fatalities. The current study was approved as a major project in the fall of 2011 and this last EIS phase of the study was initiated after that. The major project designation was required to conduct the EIS and look at major capacity expansion alternatives. There are three general alternatives or levels of improvement: (1) a TSM alternative that keeps most intersections at grade; (2) an enhanced expressway, which adds interchanges at some intersections; and (3) a full freeway conversion. The recommended alternative includes a mix of the alternatives for the different sections of the corridor. He said a public informational meeting was held the week before and the draft recommended alternative presented. That alternative could change over the next few months as input is received. The schedule was to complete a draft EIS in the next few months and have a public hearing in late August. After that a preferred alternative would be selected and another public meeting held. A final EIS would then be completed in the summer of 2014.

Berens then reviewed the engineering designs and some conceptual drawings of the improvement alternatives starting at the south end of the corridor.

Golden asked how the issue of segmentation of the corridor was handled given the other study of USH 51 from McFarland to Stoughton. Berens said the issue was addressed early on and it was agreed they were independent. Hoelker said the traffic volumes change significantly at the Beltline, and all of the alternatives for the south end of the corridor have at-grade intersections through McFarland. Golden asked about the development assumptions for the different roadway alternatives. Schaefer respond that the growth assumptions were based on local development plans, but there weren’t separate assumptions for the different alternatives. There was a panel convened to discuss the issue and the conclusion was that expanding USH 51 to Stoughton would not have a large impact on the rate or type of development in the Stoughton area or other...
areas in the corridor. Minihan added that the towns in the corridor were not planning any for development. Berens said the first and recommended alternative for the Beltline to Broadway section included a diverging diamond interchange and an “echelon” for the westbound Broadway and southbound USH 51 to westbound Beltline movements. Asked if people using the park-and-ride facility could access that, Berens said yes from the eastern end of the facility or they could travel through the intersection. A staged approach was planned with a free flow flyover ramp to/from the Beltline to the west added later when needed. Opitz commented that the diverging diamond interchange appeared to be problematic for pedestrians. Hoelker responded that it was safer because while there are more crossings they are shorter and through the middle of the interchange they are separated by a barrier. At some crossings with free flow traffic a pedestrian signal might be required. A video was shown of a diverging diamond interchange.

Berens reviewed the Pflaum and Buckeye Road area alternatives. He said Alternative B is the recommended alternative, a split diamond interchange (south ramps at Pflaum and north ramps at Buckeye) with the streets connected by one-way frontage roads. With this alternative Stoughton Road would be dropped down about twenty feet with retaining walls. Three street crossings are planned along with some slip ramps for additional access. A third lane would be added in both directions on Stoughton Road. Golden commented on the high cost of depressing Stoughton Road. At Highway 30 and Lexington and Commercial Avenue, Alternative A is the recommended alternative, converting the interchange to a diverging diamond interchange with improvements to the Lexington/Commercial intersection. Alternative C, a longer term one, would take USH 51 over Highway 30, the rail line, and Lexington and Commercial. Schaefer asked about the planned Goodman path and Hoelker said they still needed to work out a grade separated crossing for the path under the recommended alternative. At East Washington Avenue and Pierstorff, the recommended alternative is either B or C and they are similar. Alternative B includes a single-point interchange at East Washington Avenue with East Washington Avenue raised and Stoughton Road lowered. He said because of drainage issues, Stoughton Road would go up and over Anderson and Kinsman. Access to Anderson would be via a collector street system and slips ramps. There would be no direct access to Kinsman. He noted the high level of relocations with the alternative. He reviewed the access issues in the area to/from East Washington. Alternative C is similar, but with the north end of the split diamond interchange at Kinsman instead of Anderson. It also includes the Lien Road extension, but that could be part of Alternative B as well. It would require about ten residential relocations. All of the alternatives would add a lane on Stoughton Road in both directions between East Washington Avenue and Rieder Road. Matano asked if there was a recommended alternative, and Berens said either B or C.

Further north, Berens said that only right ins and outs would be allowed at Hanson Road because the intersection is in the airport flight path. Golden asked if there were options for relocating the intersection, and Hoelker said no. He added the industrial area there would have good access via the planned interchange at Hoepker Road. Another option is a “Texas U Turn” north of Hanson. For the Hoepker Road area, Berens said the recommended alternative is B, a diamond interchange at Hoepker with CTH CV becoming an overpass of USH 51 and connected with Anderson Road. As with Alternative A, the the access points at the truck stops would be removed. There would be a right-in/right-out from East Metro with a connection to Pepsi Way up to Highway 19. Berens said WisDOT staff had been working with the local municipalities to provide pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along with corridor, including several new ped/bike overpasses of Stoughton Road. The costs for construction and real estate range from $215 to $875 million depending on level of improvements. He said no funding was programmed now for construction. Once the EIS was approved, the project would compete with others for Majors program funding. The earliest construction of the preferred alternative could begin is 2020.

Golden asked if WisDOT had considered moving to an urban boulevard type cross section rather a freeway approach. He said right now the traffic volumes are similar to volumes on East Washington Avenue. He added that he realized the development in the corridor was mostly industrial now, but that could perhaps change. Berens said some have advocated for that in the past, but it is an important regional route and trucking route. Hoelker added that most people using Stoughton Road either originate or are destined for a location in the corridor. He also said that an urban boulevard couldn’t handle the anticipated future traffic as...
evidenced by the traffic operations analysis. Opitz asked if WisDOT was concerned about traffic diversion to the Interstate under this scenario. Berens said the traffic that might divert has already done so because of the congestion and safety issues on Stoughton Road. Golden mentioned that some of the cost of the roadway improvement could be assessed to property owners if an urban cross-section was built. He said the main state highway through Brookfield was an example of this. He asked if WisDOT would evaluate this if a formal request was made by the MPO and/or one or more municipalities. Berens said it would create diversion to both the Interstate and local streets and wouldn’t meet the purpose and need for the study. Hoelker added the issue wasn’t as much the speeds, but the at-grade intersections. In that sense, they have looked at the concept, which is the low-build alternative. Minihan asked about signage, and Berens said the issue had come up given the reduced visibility of the businesses. WisDOT would be working with the municipalities on a signage plan.

6. Resolution TPB No. 73 Approving the 2010 Urban Area and Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries for the Madison Urban Area

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Avenue, Madison, registered to speak. He expressed support for including the Village of Oregon in the MPO planning area. He noted the new planning area would otherwise be contiguous to Fitchburg. He also mentioned that the village’s water system was tied to the urban area.

Minihan commented that the village has a planned industrial park along USH 14 at the City of Fitchburg border. He said it didn’t make sense for Oregon to not be in the planning area. Matano noted the email communication with the village administrator in the packet reflecting the misunderstanding by the village that the choice was theirs whether to be in the planning area or not.

Schaefer said he talked with the village administrator. Originally the issue was going to be referred back to the village plan commission, but the village board decided not to. The board didn’t see the benefit to being included in the planning area. Schaefer said his recommendation was not to include the village since it isn’t in the urban area. The MPO would still plan for Oregon as well as the rest of the county. There aren’t any major projects planned in Oregon in the near future and therefore no real practical impact either way. However, he said it was more of a policy issue for the board to decide. He said he did talk to FHWA staff to make sure it wouldn’t violate any federal rules to include Oregon in the planning area. FHWA staff recommended against it, but said it would not violate any federal rules because village officials were consulted.

Golden noted the population table that was distributed and said that inclusion of Oregon would actually make a stronger case for changing the board structure, which is ironic. R. Schmidt asked if there was something that could be offered to only communities in the planning area. Schaefer responded that one benefit is the eligibility for funding under the new Transportation Alternatives program. Minihan said he didn’t view including Oregon as bullying, but simply including them in the planning process. Matano said he didn’t see any harm to the village to include it in the planning area. The board is just approving a rational map from a planning perspective. Opitz said he was sensitive to the wishes of the village, but added that there was no cost to the village to be included in the planning area. Golden said he had changed his mind and supported inclusion of the village. Mandli said the rationale is a good one that the village is contiguous to the rest of the planning area. Clear agreed, saying it was a data driven decision based on geography and commuting patterns.

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Golden, to approve the 2010 Urban Area and Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries for the Madison Urban Area with the inclusion of the Oregon area shown on the attached map. Motion carried.


Schaefer the TDP recommendations were presented to the Board at an earlier meeting. The draft report was released for review and comment after the February meeting. MPO staff led the TDP through the City of Madison approval process since the city adopts the TDP as well as the major transit operator. The Madison Common Council adopted the TDP recommendations with some minor changes recommended by the city’s
Transit & Parking Commission (TPC). MPO staff supported those changes, which were included in the packet. Golden commended MPO staff on the process and product, and said the TPC demonstrated a real commitment to use the TDP as a decision making guide. Schaefer added that Metro is planning a series of service improvements for the fall, which are consistent with and draw from the analysis done as part of the plan.

Moved by Mandli, seconded by Golden, to adopt the recommendations of the 2013-2017 Transit Development Plan for the Madison Urban Area. Motion carried.

8. Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer said MPO staff seeks approval of the TIP process and schedule each year. The planned process is the same as previous years, except that staff will not be holding the two informational meetings as in past years. The turnout for the meetings has been very low, and staff will instead offer to meet with people individually. The request for projects and STP-Urban applications will be sent out later this week. A draft TIP will be released in August with a hearing in September and approval of the final TIP in October.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by King to approve the schedule for the 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County. Motion carried.

9. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Other Projects Involving the TPB

Schaefer said the draft EIS document for the USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) study was expected to be released by May. A kick-off staff level meeting for the Beltline study was recently held. Meetings of the technical and policy committees will be held in the next few months. The first phase of the Interstate study looking at potential new interchanges and crossings was underway. MPO staff was working with WisDOT and its consultants on the growth allocations to be used for traffic forecasting. A new travel model was being developed for the Interstate and Beltline studies.

Opitz commented that for the Beltline study he would like WisDOT to look at alternative routes that take local traffic off of the Beltline. Schaefer said that WisDOT would be doing this. Opitz said he wanted to make sure the Pleasant View Road corridor was considered. Schaefer said it would be since it is a recommended project in the MPO’s long-range transportation plan. Opitz said he didn’t think WisDOT was including the corridor as part of the study area.

10. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer said the BRT study was wrapping up. A public meeting to present the study findings was scheduled for April 15. Meetings have been or would be scheduled with the City of Madison and Fitchburg Common Councils. Work on the Metro bus size study was continuing. Some passenger loading survey work still needed to be completed. Staff completed an initial review for the roadway functional classification update and would be meeting with WisDOT staff in two weeks to review MPO suggested changes. MPO staff will also be working close with local staff on that. With the new planning area approved, the board will now need to consider possible revisions to its structure. Schaefer said he would probably put that on the agenda for the June meeting to start the discussion. Work would also be starting now on the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan update.

Mandli commented that the functional classification update should consider the impact on maintenance policies and funding. Schaefer said WisDOT had adopted criteria that are used for the functional classification. R. Schmidt asked whether the MPO wanted to discuss or submit comments on the transportation items in the state budget. Schaefer said he could ask WisDOT staff to provide a presentation on the budget if there was interest in that. Golden commented that it would be more effective for an association of MPOs to provide comments.
11. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Matano said he had asked a friend of his who is an Epic employee and new City of Verona Alder to provide a tour of the Epic campus the Saturday before or after the next boarding meeting. Only self guided tours are generally available on weekends. After some discussion, it agreed to plan the tour for Saturday, May 4 from 10 a.m. to noon.

Schaefer mentioned that due to a City of Madison budget meeting, the MPO Board meeting in November would need to be rescheduled for the second Wednesday. That conflicts with the Madison Transit & Parking Commission. He suggested scheduling the meeting for downtown, and it was agreed to do so.

The next meeting will be held May 1, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at Verona City Hall, 111 Lincoln Street, Verona.

12. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by King, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 PM.
Michael,

This note is to follow up my phone call letting you know that the MPO Policy Board approved new Madison Urban Area and Metropolitan Planning Area boundaries at its meeting this past Wednesday night. The board voted to approve the version that includes the Village of Oregon in the planning area boundary (see attached map). The board was made aware of the village’s preference not to be included in the boundary because of the lack of a perceived benefit. However, the board felt that from a regional transportation planning perspective it made sense to include the village and the village would not be harmed or negatively impacted by inclusion in the MPO. For example, there is no requirement that the village financially support the MPO. Even though the village is not part of the Census defined urbanized area, it is clearly part of the metropolitan area as evidenced by the fact that almost ½ of village residents work in the City of Madison and less than 20% work in the village, according to the most recent Census commuting data.

One result of the village’s inclusion in the MPO area is that the Village President has a vote in appointing the non-Madison cities and villages’ representative to the MPO Board. In fact, I have already sent a letter and email to Mr. Staton along with the other chief elected officials seeking candidates for the two appointments that are up at the end of this month. The MPO Board will be considering a possible change to the board structure/representation in the near future as a result of the expanded planning boundary, which also includes the Villages of Cross Plains and DeForest.

If the village board were interested, I would be happy to attend a future meeting of the board to provide information on the MPO and its responsibilities and what it means for the village to be part of the MPO planning area.

Bill Schaefer, Transportation Planning Manager
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO
121 S. Pinckney St., #400
Madison, WI 53703
PH: (608) 266-9115
FAX: (608) 261-9967
Email: wschaefer@cityofmadison.com
www.MadisonAreaMPO.org
Hi Bill,

You raise a very good question regarding the eligibility of Section 5303 funds to promote the MPO’s alternative transportation program. My understanding from your email and our conversation is that the proposed use of the Section 5303 funds would be to support the salary of a staff person with the primary responsibility of promoting, educating, and marketing the MPO’s rideshare program that promotes the carpool, vanpool, transit, walking and bicycling programs. The opinion I received from our legal office is that the funding support of a staff person to perform the above activities (primarily promotion and marketing) does not fall under the planning category and therefore is not an eligible expense under the Section 5303 program.

If a staff person were to perform activities on the planning, development, or operation of the rideshare program, the costs associated with these types of planning activities would be eligible under the Section 5303 program. The distinction being that the role of promoting and marketing the MPO rideshare program is not a planning activity and therefore not an eligible expense whereas the role of planning the service or conducting studies on the rideshare program would be an eligible expense. I hope this helps. Please let me know if you have any further questions. Thanks

Victor
FTA Office of Planning and Environment
202.366.2996

Hi Victor,

I received your phone message following up on our conversation yesterday. The question for which I am seeking guidance on is whether FHWA/FTA Section 5303 Federal Planning funds can be used for staffing costs to administer the MPO’s program to promote alternative transportation. Historically, there has been a fairly heavy focus on ridesharing (vanpools and carpools) – the name of the program is Rideshare Etc. – but the program promotes transit and walking/bicycling as well. We work closely with Metro Transit and other agencies to coordinate efforts. See link to the MPO website and the actual program website where people can register below.

The MPO has been using STP-Urban funding to support these activities. We have a planner who spends about 3/4s of her time on this. We have the opportunity to receive an increase in 5303 funds next year. Replacing the STP-Urban funding with Planning funds for this work is one of the options we are exploring for use of some of the additional funds we will be getting. We would like to know if that would be
permissible for some or all of these activities. The funding would be used to support funding of the staff person. Thank you for having your legal counsel look into this.

http://www.madisonareampo.org/trends/tdmrideshare.cfm
http://www.rideshareetc.org/rp/service.asp?Authenticated=False
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 75 Approving Amendment No. 3 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Staff Comments on Item:
WisDOT SW Region staff requested an amendment to the 2013-2017 TIP to make some minor project scope, cost, and schedule changes to currently programmed projects. The amendment is also needed to: (1) add an intersection safety improvement project in the City of Madison that was recently awarded funding; (2) reflect the delay in construction for two federally funded trail projects; and (3) reflect the now programmed federal funding for two continuing specialized transportation projects sponsored by Union Cab and Dane County.

The projects are listed and changes summarized under the TIP amendment item on the agenda as well in the resolution. A table listing the projects with the detailed revisions is attached to the resolution.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 75 with attached tables

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Approve Resolution TPB No. 75 regarding Amendment No. 3 to the 2013-2017 TIP.
Resolution TPB No. 75
Amendment No. 3 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) approved the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on October 3, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB adopted TPB Resolution No. 70 on January 16, 2013, approving Amendment No. 1 to the 2013-2017 TIP, and adopted TPB Resolution No. 73 on March 6, 2013 approving Amendment No. 2 to the TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area transportation projects and some transportation planning activities to be undertaken using Federal funding in 2013–2016 must be included in the effective TIP; and

WHEREAS, a third amendment has been requested by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) Southwest Region to reflect minor changes to the scope, timing, and/or cost and funding of several state highway projects and to add a new intersection safety improvement project in the City of Madison; and

WHEREAS, the amendment is also needed to reflect the programming of federal New Freedom program funding for continuing projects sponsored by Union Cab of Madison and Dane County; and

WHEREAS, the amendment is also needed to reflect a delay in the timing of construction of two trail projects; 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 tables (Table B-2 and Table C-1); and

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

WHEREAS, the projects are consistent with the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, the 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. 3 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, making the following project revisions and addition as shown on the attached project listings table:

1. **REVISE** the timing and cost of the Cannonball Trail project (Military Ridge Trail Extension – Phases 2 and 4), delaying construction from 2013 to 2014, and reducing the local share cost.

2. **REVISE** the timing of the SW Sun Prairie to Madison Connector Path project, delaying construction from 2013 to 2014.
3. **REVISE** the listing for Union Cab of Madison in the Transit Capital section, amending the 2013 funding amount for the purchase of accessible vans and showing the federal funding as now programmed.

4. **REVISE** the listing for Union Cab of Madison in the Transit Operating section, amending the 2013 funding amount for accessible private taxi service and showing the federal funding as now programmed.

5. **REVISE** the listing for Dane County’s Mobility Management Program project in the Transit Capital section, revising the 2013 funding amount and showing the federal funding as now programmed.

6. **REVISE** the scope and cost/funding of the STH 19 (Token Creek) bridge project, adding a traffic mitigation construction phase in 2013.

7. **REVISE** the limits and timing of the USH 51 (STH 138 to Town Rd. and Quam Dr. to CTH B) pavement replacement project, removing the section from STH 138 to Roby Rd. (which will be done in 2015 as a separate project), advancing construction from 2014 to 2013, and reducing the cost/funding.

8. **REVISE** the timing of the USH 12/18 (I-39 to CTH N) potential freeway conversion project, delaying the design phase from 2013 to 2014, with construction anticipated in 2019.

9. **REVISE** the timing of the Park Street (USH 151) project, delaying construction funding obligation from 2013 to 2014 and construction to 2015.

10. **ADD** an intersection safety improvement project for the purpose of reconstructing the intersection of Mineral Point Road and Midvale Boulevard, adding turn bays for east and west bound traffic and installing overhead traffic signals on all travel lanes.

11. **REVISE** the cost/funding of the USH 14 (CTH KP to Westview Ct.) intersection improvement project, adding a utility project and removing a design project with revised funding for those and the R/R crossing gates & signals in 2013.

Date Adopted ____________________________

Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Jurisdiction/ Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost/ Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2013</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2014</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2015</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF FITCHBURG</td>
<td>CANNONBALL TRAIL</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-11-018</td>
<td>(Military Ridge Extension)</td>
<td>ROW CONTST</td>
<td></td>
<td>494</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military Ridge Trail near Verona Rd/McKee Rd.</td>
<td>Intersection to east limits of UW Arboretum and Phase 1 path (2.3 miles). Construct new path in former rail corridor</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SUN PRAIRIE</td>
<td>SW SUN PRAIRIE TO MADISON CONNECTOR PATH</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-11-020</td>
<td>USH 151 Underpass to Hoepker Rd.</td>
<td>ROW CONTST</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of planned-north-south path in CTH C corridor</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TRANSIT CAPITAL PROJECTS**         |                     |            | Fed | State | Local | Total | Fed | State | Local | Total | Fed | State | Local | Total |                      |
| UNION CAB OF MADISON                 | ACCESSIBLE VANS     | Cap        | 69  | 17   | 86   |      |      |      |      | 69  | 17   | 86   |      |      |                      |
|                                      |                     | TOTAL      | 69  | 17   | 86   |      |      |      |      | 69  | 17   | 86   |      |      |                      |
| DANE COUNTY                           | MOBILITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM | Cap | 58  | 14   | 72   |      |      |      |      | 58  | 14   | 72   |      |      |                      |
|                                      |                     | TOTAL      | 58  | 14   | 72   |      |      |      |      | 58  | 14   | 72   |      |      |                      |

| **TRANSIT OPERATING**                |                     |            | Fed | State | Local | Total | Fed | State | Local | Total | Fed | State | Local | Total |                      |
| UNION CAB OF MADISON                 | ACCESSIBLE PRIVATE TAXI SERVICE | Oper | 26  | 26   | 52   |      |      |      |      | 26  | 26   | 52   |      |      |                      |
|                                      |                     | TOTAL      | 26  | 26   | 52   |      |      |      |      | 26  | 26   | 52   |      |      |                      |

<p>| <strong>STREET/Roadway projects</strong>          |                     |            | Fed | State | Local | Total | Fed | State | Local | Total | Fed | State | Local | Total |                      |
| CITY OF MADISON NEW                  | MINERAL POINT ROAD  | PE         | Continuing | 95  | 10   | 105  |      |      |      |      | 974 | 108  | 1,082 |      |      |                      |
| 111-13-015                           | Midvale Boulevard Intersection | ROW CONTST |            | 95  | 10   | 105  |      |      |      |      | 974 | 108  | 1,082 |      |      |                      |
|                                     | Reconstruct, add turn bays for EB and WB direction, overhead signals on all travel lanes on Mineral Point Rd. and Midvale Blvd. and grade changes northbound on Midvale Blvd. as it approaches Fitch Street. | TOTAL | 95  | 10   | 105  |      |      |      |      | 974 | 108  | 1,082 |      |      |                      |
| WisDOT                               | STH 19              | PE         | 2,181 |      |      |      | 2,181 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                      |
| (111-07-012)                         | Bridges over Token Creek Bridge Replacement (B-13-0478, -0479) with traffic mitigation during construction. | ROW CONTST | 2,181 |      |      |      | 2,181 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                      |
|                                     | TOTAL | 2,181 |      |      |      |      | 2,181 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                      |
| WisDOT                               | USH 51              | PE         | 3,766 |      |      |      | 3,766 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                      |
| (111-11-032)                         | STH 138 to Towne Rd. and Quam Drive to CTH B Pavement Replacement | ROW CONTST | 3,766 |      |      |      | 3,766 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                      |
|                                     | TOTAL | 3,766 |      |      |      |      | 3,766 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Jurisdiction/Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost/Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2013</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2014</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2015</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WisDOT</strong></td>
<td>USH 12/18 I-39 TO CTH N</td>
<td>PE ROW CONST</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final design, reconstruction, and access modifications for potential freeway conversion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WisDOT</strong></td>
<td>USH 151 (PARK STREET)</td>
<td>PE ROW CONST</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCR rail-highway crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace WISOR crossing signals &amp; gates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111-11-015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WisDOT</strong></td>
<td>USH 14 CTH KP to Washtenaw Ct.</td>
<td>PE ROW UTL RR CONST</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct CTH P intersection in the Village of Cross Plains and remove and replace existing pavement. Also replace WISOR RR crossing gates &amp; signals (391767R &amp; 391766J) (1.05 miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-2
#### Summary of Federal Funds Programmed ($000s) and Those Available in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

#### 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

<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>Interstate Highway Maintenance</td>
<td>13,573</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Highway System</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>44,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>17,078</td>
<td>3,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Urban Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Program**</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program***</td>
<td>8,134</td>
<td>7,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5339 Bus &amp; Bus Capital (MAP-21 Program)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Section 5309 Discretionary Capital Grants***</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5316 JARC &amp; Section 5317 New Freedom Program</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5314 NRP &amp; Section 5339 Alt. Analysis Program***</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fifth year of funding (2017) is informational only.

** Statewide discretionary programs for which projects haven't been selected beyond 2012-'13. Funding for later years not yet programmed.

*** Section 5309 discretionary grant reflects 2012 funding. For others, excludes carryover funding from previous year grants.

Note:
- All state roadway projects using applicable funding sources (e.g., IM, NHS, STP State Flexible, BR) are programmed through 2017. Local BR and STP Rural projects are programmed through 2014. HSIP (other than annual small HES program) projects are programmed through 2015. SRTS and Local Enhancement projects are programmed through 2013 and 2014 respectively. Local STP Urban (Madison Urban Area) projects are programmed through 2017. Transit funding is not yet programmed and is based on needs and anticipated future funding levels (See also Table C-4 Metro Transit System Projected Expenses and Revenues on page C-8). Programmed transit funding for 2013 excludes carryover projects for which the Federal funding is already obligated (except for the Section 5309 discretionary grant).
### Table C-1

**Projected Expenses and Revenues of Transportation Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area**

*in Year of Expenditure Dollars\(^1\)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Expenses ($000s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Construction, Maintenance, etc.</td>
<td>34,372</td>
<td>98,500</td>
<td>21,390</td>
<td>16,807</td>
<td>80,711</td>
<td>251,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)(^3)</td>
<td>17,078</td>
<td>3,307</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>9,488</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>42,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP TE, STP Rural &amp; SRTS</td>
<td>5,594</td>
<td>4,083</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>57,694</td>
<td>106,528</td>
<td>28,165</td>
<td>26,535</td>
<td>87,502</td>
<td>306,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dane County &amp; Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>50,714</td>
<td>52,134</td>
<td>53,594</td>
<td>55,094</td>
<td>56,637</td>
<td>268,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Construction</td>
<td>43,870</td>
<td>45,098</td>
<td>46,361</td>
<td>47,659</td>
<td>48,994</td>
<td>231,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Related Facilities</td>
<td>10,276</td>
<td>10,564</td>
<td>10,860</td>
<td>11,164</td>
<td>11,476</td>
<td>54,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>104,860</td>
<td>107,796</td>
<td>110,814</td>
<td>113,917</td>
<td>117,107</td>
<td>554,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenses</td>
<td>16,117</td>
<td>16,568</td>
<td>17,032</td>
<td>17,509</td>
<td>17,999</td>
<td>85,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>47,661</td>
<td>48,996</td>
<td>50,367</td>
<td>51,778</td>
<td>53,227</td>
<td>252,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>63,778</td>
<td>65,564</td>
<td>67,400</td>
<td>69,287</td>
<td>71,227</td>
<td>337,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Expenses</strong></td>
<td>226,332</td>
<td>279,887</td>
<td>206,379</td>
<td>209,739</td>
<td>275,835</td>
<td>1,198,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Revenues ($000s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Construction, Maintenance, etc.</td>
<td>57,183</td>
<td>58,784</td>
<td>60,430</td>
<td>62,122</td>
<td>63,862</td>
<td>302,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)(^3)</td>
<td>17,238</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>6,367</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>42,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP TE, STP Rural &amp; SRTS</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>17,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>8,789</td>
<td>9,036</td>
<td>9,288</td>
<td>9,549</td>
<td>45,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>86,204</td>
<td>76,922</td>
<td>79,076</td>
<td>81,290</td>
<td>83,566</td>
<td>407,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dane County &amp; Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>50,714</td>
<td>52,134</td>
<td>53,594</td>
<td>55,094</td>
<td>56,637</td>
<td>268,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Construction</td>
<td>43,870</td>
<td>45,098</td>
<td>46,361</td>
<td>47,659</td>
<td>48,994</td>
<td>231,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Related Facilities</td>
<td>10,276</td>
<td>10,564</td>
<td>10,860</td>
<td>11,164</td>
<td>11,476</td>
<td>54,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>104,860</td>
<td>107,796</td>
<td>110,814</td>
<td>113,917</td>
<td>117,107</td>
<td>554,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenses</td>
<td>16,117</td>
<td>16,568</td>
<td>17,032</td>
<td>17,509</td>
<td>17,999</td>
<td>85,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>47,661</td>
<td>48,996</td>
<td>50,367</td>
<td>51,778</td>
<td>53,227</td>
<td>252,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>63,778</td>
<td>65,564</td>
<td>67,400</td>
<td>69,287</td>
<td>71,227</td>
<td>337,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Revenues</strong></td>
<td>254,842</td>
<td>250,282</td>
<td>257,290</td>
<td>264,494</td>
<td>271,900</td>
<td>1,298,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Roadway and transit inflation rate @ 2.8% per year applied to both expenses and revenues.

\(^2\) State and Federal highway and Metro Transit revenue estimates based upon spending levels from 2007-2011 (adjusted for inflation to 2013 dollars) with annual averages estimated and then projected for eaching funding source. Local revenues assumed to continue at annual averages expended in the past (adjusted for inflation).

\(^3\) 2013 STP-Urban funding includes carryover funding plus $5,000 one-time award of funding beyond the regular allocation.
Re:
Consideration of Appointment to the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee

**Staff Comments on Item:**

MPO staff received a communication from an individual, Emmet Fisher, who is interested in joining the Citizen Advisory Committee. See attached email communication. MPO staff has been interested in expanding the membership of the committee for a while now, but hasn’t had the time to recruit new members. Mr. Fisher is a beginning farmer who also works at the Farley Center for Peace, Justice, and Sustainability near Verona and a local cheese making dairy farm. There are currently no committee members who reside in a rural area and so I think Mr. Fisher would be a nice addition to the committee, given his interest in transportation planning and the interface between urban centers and the rural working landscape around them. The current committee membership and charge are attached.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Email communication with prospective committee member
2. MPO Citizen Advisory Committee member lists
3. MPO Citizen Advisory Committee charge

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

Staff recommends appointment of Emmet Fisher to the Citizen Advisory Committee.
Hi Bill:

I'm a young beginning farmer in Mt Horeb. I grew up in West Central WI, on a small vegetable farm.

I've been interested in transportation planning for some time; in high school I read *Suburban Nation* by Andres Duany which piqued my interest. I studied environmental policy in college and interned at the Asheville Design Center and for the City of Asheville Transit Department in Asheville, NC.

A few years later, as I return to farming and rural communities, I am especially interested in how urban centers interface with the rural working and wild landscape around them. I am currently working for the Farley Center in Verona, with an office also on South Park St next to the transfer station. I am the farm manager for our incubator farm in Verona, which offers farmland to Madison farmers and specifically reaches out to immigrants and minority farmers. I also coordinate a Land Link program matching farmers that live in Madison with farmland as close to town as possible—a program that depends a lot on regional land use and transportation planning.

In addition to my work at the Farley Center, my wife and I are starting a small CSA farm and I am working for a local cheese making dairy.

Please let me know how I can be of service.

Thanks,
Emmet Fisher

On Fri, Apr 12, 2013 at 9:10 AM, Schaefer, William <WSchaefer@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Hi Emmet,

Thanks for your interest in the MPO and specifically serving on our Citizen Advisory Committee. The first thing to do would be to provide me with a little bit of background information on yourself. I am looking to recruit a few additional members for the committee, but we seek to get a good cross section of the community representing different perspectives, interests, organizations, etc.
Hello:

I'm wondering how I can become involved with the citizen advisory committee for the Transportation planning board.

Thanks,

Emmet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred Bartol</td>
<td>Dane Alliance for Rational Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronn Ferrell</td>
<td>Dane Co. Supervisor, 15th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristel Gjerde</td>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Hull</td>
<td>Realtor; City of Madison Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delora Newton</td>
<td>Greater Madison Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rider</td>
<td>Sierra Club – Four Lakes Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Rylander</td>
<td>Traffic Engineering Consultant; Member, City of Middleton Public Works Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Stoebig</td>
<td>Former Dane Co. Supervisor, 17th District; AARP-Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Williams</td>
<td>ProRail; Madison Area Bus Advocates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – An MPO
Citizen Advisory Committee

A. General Purpose

1. To provide advice to the MPO Policy Board and its staff in matters related to MPO planning activities.

2. To provide advice to the MPO, in particular, on: (a) preparation and implementation of the Long-Range Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area; (b) transportation project priorities as part of the Transportation Improvement Program; and (c) other transportation studies and programs.

3. To provide a “sounding board” for reactions to possible transportation planning policy issues.

4. To provide liaison with various other public and/or private interest groups.

5. To provide for a means of feedback on citizen relations to MPO planning issues, and to relate this to possible future shifts in planning policy directions.

B. Committee Authority

The committee is advisory to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board.

C. Member Appointments and Terms

The MPO Policy Board shall approve all appointments to the committee. The Board shall reaffirm appointments every two years, beginning July 1, 2009.

D. Committee Membership

1. The committee is to be broad-based with representatives of various public and/or private interest groups (e.g., the various transportation modes, environment, business/economic development, and minority, low-income, and elderly populations), the transportation industry, persons with transportation planning expertise, elected and non-elected local officials, and local citizens.

2. The number of committee members shall not exceed the number of persons on the MPO Policy Board (currently 14).

3. A change in the membership on the committee can only be made with the approval of the MPO Policy Board.
4. Members shall identify their relevant affiliations and this information shall be provided to the MPO Policy Board and posted on the MPO’s website.

E. Interaction with the MPO Policy Board

1. Committee meeting minutes will be provided to the MPO Policy Board as part of its meeting packet, if available. MPO Policy Board meeting minutes will be provided to the committee as part of its meeting packet, if available.

2. The committee may provide written and/or oral reports to the MPO Policy Board on the discussions and recommendations of the committee, as needed. The committee shall select a member to provide the report, which will be placed on the MPO Board’s meeting agenda.

3. The MPO Policy Board may select one of its members to serve as a liaison between the Board and the committee. This Board member may attend committee meetings and will otherwise facilitate communications between the committee and the Board.
**Re:**
Brief Report on the Madison Area Transit Corridor (BRT) Study

**Staff Comments on Item:**
The BRT study is just about completed. MPO staff submitted mostly editorial comments to the consultant on the draft report based in part on comments received by study committee members. The consultant is in the process of making those changes. The draft report and appendices have been posted on the MPO website along with the PowerPoint presentation from the April 15 public meeting. The public meeting went well with over 60 attendees. A survey was available at the meeting and online for people to respond to the BRT system proposal. The consultant is in the process of tabulating the results. The study also received some good press coverage. See attached articles. Presentations on the study are scheduled for the Madison Common Council on April 30 and CARPC on May 9. A presentation for the Fitchburg Common Council may also be scheduled.

**Materials Presented on Item:**
1. WSJ article on the BRT study prior to the public meeting
2. Wisconsin Reporter article on the study after the public meeting

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**
For information and discussion only
Bus rapid transit plan greeted favorably by Madison officials, despite high price tag

APRIL 11, 2013 7:00 AM • DEAN MOSIMAN
WISCONSIN STATE JOURNAL
DMOSIMAN@MADISON.COM | 608-252-6141

Enthusiasm is high for a new model of speedy bus service for Madison — but so is the potential price tag.

A bus rapid transit, or BRT, system covering roughly 21 miles would increase capacity for often crowded Metro Transit, cut travel times and boost economic development, a new draft study says.

But the system would cost between $138 million and $192 million for bigger and snazzier buses, a bus storage facility, passenger stations and street improvements, and another $9.8 million annually to run it, the study says.

The system might also affect some current service levels, current traffic and parking patterns, and require relocation of some Metro transfer stations.

Mayor Paul Soglin and others were mostly encouraged by the study, despite costs and other challenges.

"I think it's possible," Soglin said, adding that the big impediment is the state's unwillingness to create a regional transit authority that could generate revenue, including new taxes.

BRT is a high-frequency, high-capacity, limited-stop service with unique branding that can run on city streets or dedicated lanes, or even in a rail corridor.

The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board is using part of a $2 million federal grant to evaluate plans for BRT. The draft study offers the first in-depth look at how BRT might operate in corridors along East Washington, Sherman and University avenues, South Park Street and Fish Hatchery Road.

The study will be discussed at a public meeting on Monday.

Current system 'unsustainable'

Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp said the city has seen significant increases in bus ridership through the decade and is already dealing with crowded buses on routes around Downtown, UW-Madison and Madison Area Technical College.

The current system and bus garage are "unsustainable" over the long term, Kamp said.

The BRT system outlined in the study would increase capacity on the busiest corridors between 60 percent and nearly 300 percent, cut travel times 19 percent to 42 percent and be a catalyst for development, he said.

The system favorably contrasts with a rail option from Sun Prairie to Middleton because it adds transit service where the most potential riders live and creates redevelopment opportunities where they make the most sense for the city, said Ken Golden, a member of the transportation planning board and city Transit and Parking Commission.

Royce Williams, a board member with Madison Area Bus Advocates, said his group sees positive elements but wants to ensure BRT wouldn't undermine existing bus service and would be coordinated with the development of a new intercity bus terminal.

Many changes needed

BRT routes, the study shows, could be a mix of dedicated lanes in the median, painted lanes along the curb where parking would be eliminated, and buses mixing with traffic. The best candidates for dedicated lanes are the South and West corridors, it says.

The city would relocate the West and North transfer points and expand the South transfer point. BRT could affect existing service on roughly 20 routes.

Metro would use 60-foot-long buses that bend at the center and have low floors, three doors, on-board bike storage, Wi-Fi and technology to extend green lights.

The system would have small, medium and large BRT stations with shelters, paved platforms, benches, lighting, special markings, and for the larger facilities, ticket vending, real-time bus information, bike racks and perhaps heating.

Delora Newton, vice president of the Greater Madison Chamber of Commerce, and Susan Schmitz, president of Downtown Madison Inc., both were encouraged by the study's findings.

The city and partners could begin with a modest piece of the full system and expect to get substantial federal support for capital costs, officials said.

But operational costs would be harder to cover without new revenues from a source such as a state-authorized regional transit authority, which has the power to tax, they said.

"This is so important for our city," Schmitz said. "We can't stop planning and being ready for this."

**HIGHLIGHTS | Bus Rapid Transit system**

**Route miles:** 21-22

**Buses:** 60 feet long, high-capacity

**Stations:** 50-52, many with shelters, platforms, maps and schedules

**Weekday ridership:** 15,500
Capital cost: $138 million to $192 million

Annual operating cost: $9.8 million

If you go

What: The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, Metro Transit and the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission are sponsoring a public information meeting on a draft study on bus rapid transit.

When: 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. Monday.

Where: Madison Senior Center, 330 W. Mifflin St.
Mayor wants Madisonians to enjoy that ‘special feeling’ on $138 million ‘rapid’ bus fleet

By M.D. Kittle / April 16, 2013 / 3 Comments

By Ryan Ekvall | Wisconsin Reporter

MADISON – Bus Rapid Transit (http://www.madisonareampo.org/brt.cfm) is the new light rail and Madison Mayor Paul Soglin (www.cityofmadison.com/mayor) wants to bring the $138 million-plus transit expansion to Madtown.

“BRT is an idea whose time has come,” Soglin told a group about 50 people who gathered Monday evening at the Madison Senior Center for the unveiling of the bus rapid transit study. “We have to build public support for it and get folks to embrace this ride.”

Essentially, BRT is higher frequency, higher capacity buses running fewer dedicated routes with fewer stops. It also comes with swankier bus stops, pre-pay boarding and some BRT-only lanes.

The “articulated buses” hold about 35 more passengers than current buses, include onboard WiFi connection and have a distinct look.
“We don’t brag about the size of our automobile,” Soglin said of Madisonians. “We brag about riding the bus.”

Soglin mostly drives his city-issued car to work, but sometimes takes the bus.

“It has something the private car doesn’t have. It has intimacy, that special feeling when you share a moment with others,” the Madison mayor said in his impromptu ode to the city bus.

BRT is sold as a less expensive alternative to light rail, but just as cool. Proponents say it will decrease congestion on major bus lines, speed up travel time and encourage business expansion along the corridor.

Although BRT may cost less than light rail, it still comes at a price tag of $138 million to $193 million in initial costs for about 22 miles of service. The taxpayer costs include $60 million in infrastructure, $40 million for 34 new buses and $30 million for a new bus facility.

“The big elephant in the room is funding,” said SRF Consulting Group’s Joe Kern, who presented the study Monday. “We didn’t address that.”

SRF Consulting just conducted the technical aspect of BRT for the study, looking primarily at the cost, benefits and feasibility in Madison.

Kern did say the federal government (read taxpayers) offers competitive grants for up to 50 percent funding of the initial costs.

BRT would cost Madison area taxpayers an additional $10 million annually in operating and maintenance costs, a 20 percent increase from current levels.

The planners say transit times on the RBT corridors could be reduced 19 percent to 42 percent from current bus routes. For example, the ride from Capitol Square to the East Towne Mall would be reduced from 32 to 26 minutes. However, the study failed to account for Madison’s famous bicycle traffic. The BRT buses would run primarily on lanes that would share road space with bicyclists and right-turning vehicles.

Buses stuck behind a bike could only travel as fast as the biker could pedal.

Contact Ekvall at rekvall@wisconsinreporter.com

Please, feel free to "steal our stuff"! Just remember to credit Watchdog.org. Find out more

M.D. Kittle
Watchdog In Your State
Arkansas
Nebraska