AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of November 13, 2013 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Resolution TPB No. 85 Approving the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Program for the Madison Urbanized Area

6. Resolution TPB No. 86 Approving Amendment #1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area & Dane County
   - S. Beltline (Beltline Bridges over Park St. and RR, Rimrock Road Bridge over Beltline), Paint Bridge Girders Interstate [Add const. funding in 2017]
   - 39/90/94 (STH 19 & CP Rail Overpass Structures), Replace Bridge Decks [Increase const. funding, move to 2016]
   - CTH P (Bridge over Black Earth Creek), Bridge Replacement [Revise scope to include concrete panels at RR crossing, increase state and local funding]
   - E. Johnson Street (Butler St. to Baldwin St.), Reconstruction [Increase STP Urban const. funding]
   - Mineral Point Road (Midvale Blvd. Intersection), Recondition, Add EB & WB Turn Lanes, Signals [Minor project scope change]
   - Dane County Mobility Management Program [Cont. federal funding (s. 5310) in 2014]
   - Metro Transit Paratransit Eligibility Assessment Program [NEW project with federal s. 5310 funding in 2014]


8. Consideration of Appointments to the MPO Advisory Committee for the Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

9. Presentation on Madison Metro Bus Size Study

10. Review and Discussion on Draft Scope of Work for Regional Intelligent Transportation System Strategic Plan

11. Review and Discussion on Draft Roadway Functional Classification Map and Associated Changes to the Madison Urbanized Area Boundary

12. Discussion on WisDOT Plans for Verona Road (USH 18/151) and Corridor Studies of Stoughton Road (USH 51) and USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)

13. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB:
   - USH 51/Stoughton Road (USH 12/18 to IH 39/90/94) Corridor EIS Study
   - USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor EIS Study
   - Beltline (USH 14 to CTH N) Corridor EIS Study
   - Interstate 39/90/94 (Madison to Wisconsin Dells) Corridor EIS Study
   - City of Madison Sustainable Transportation Master Plan

14. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   - Public Participation Plan Update
• Roadway Functional Classification Update
• Transportation Alternatives Program Application Cycle for 2014-2018 Projects
• Revisions to STP Urban Project Scoring Criteria
• Regional ITS Strategic Plan
• Bicycle Transportation Plan Update

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

16. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, March 5 at 7 p.m.**
Madison Water Utility Building, 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.*
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
November 13, 2013 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: Judd Blau, Mark Clear, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Chuck Kamp, Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Robin Schmidt

Members absent: David Ahrens, Steve King, Paul Lawrence, Jerry Mandli, Chris Schmidt

MPO Staff present: Bill Schaefer, David Kanning

2. Approval of October 2, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Opitz, seconded by R. Schmidt, to approve the October 2, 2013 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

- Letter from Larry Barta, WisDOT SW Region, regarding the Coordination Plan for the Beltline Study, included as part of item #11.
- Email sent from Golden regarding items #10 and #11 and Minihan’s email response to the information provided by staff in response to Golden’s request.
- Letter from WisDOT (not distributed) regarding a public informational meeting on Tuesday, Nov. 19 at 5:00 PM at McFarland High School regarding the USH 12/18 (Interstate to CTH N) freeway conversion study. Schaefer said the recommendation is to construct an interchange at CTH AB, which would be relocated to the east with a frontage road to the south connecting Millpond Road to CTH AB. Bridges would be constructed at Vilas Road and Femrite/Siggelkow. Gust explained they had separated out this project from the Interstate project.

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

None


Royce Williams, Madison, representing Madison Area Bus Advocates and ProRail, registered to speak. He commented on the importance of getting an intercity bus terminal built in Madison because of the level of bus service and the desire of UW-Madison to get the buses off Langdon Street. The current stop on University Avenue interferes with Metro buses. He noted that a location had been recommended near the Kohl Center and a design layout was being done as part of the South Capitol TOD District Planning Study, but understood that it would become a city planning issue after that. He wanted to see it listed in the TIP or at least the MPO work program to highlight the priority of the issue.

In response to a question by Opitz, Schaefer clarified the recommended location and said the property was owned by the Boldt Company, which is proposing a mixed use development that would include the bus station. He said it will go through the development review process if advanced, but the issues of who will pay for it and whether the bus companies agree to lease space there remain. Williams said he wasn’t sure if the proposed site was big enough.

Schaefer noted that a change/correction sheet listing changes being made to the draft document was included in the packet. The changes are in response to comments from WisDOT and FHWA. One significant change was to add introductory language on page 5 indicating the work program was developed with input from state agencies, local officials, and others and also referencing the MPO’s self-certification that all federal
requirements are being met, including Title VI. The other major change was to include in the report and budget table a breakdown of staff hours by MPO versus non-MPO staff.

Moved by Blau, seconded by Golden to approve the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program and the 2014-2016 Overall Program Design Report. Motion carried.

6. **Resolution TPB No. 81 Regarding Agreement for Specialized Transportation Coordination Services with Dane County in 2014**

   Moved by Opitz, seconded by R. Schmidt, to adopt Resolution TPB No. 81 regarding the agreement for specialized transportation coordination services with Dane County in 2014. Motion carried.

7. **Resolution TPB No. 82 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) to Provide Transportation Planning Work Activities to CARPC in 2014**

   Moved by Blau, seconded by Golden, to authorize the City of Madison to enter into an agreement with CARPC for the Madison Area TPB to provide transportation planning work activities to CARPC in 2014. Motion carried.

8. **Resolution TPB No. 83 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for CARPC to Provide Population and Employment Forecasting Services Utilizing Pass-Through Funding from WisDOT**

   Moved by Opitz, seconded by Clear, to authorize the City of Madison to enter into an agreement with CARPC for CARPC to provide population and employment forecasting services utilizing pass-through funding from WisDOT. Motion carried.

9. **Resolution TPB No. 84 Supporting Metro Transit as the Designated Recipient of Funding for the Federal Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program for the Madison Urbanized Area**

   Schaefer provided some background on the issue. The Madison urbanized area will now receive a direction allocation of funding under the new consolidated Section 5310 program. There needs to be a designated recipient (DR) of the funds just like Metro is the DR for the Section 5307 urban transit formula funds. It made the most sense for Metro to be the DR for these funds because of their experience and expertise in administering FTA grants. The role of the DR is to apply for grants on behalf of the sub-recipients, provide reports, and ensure all federal requirements are met. The MPO’s role will be to select the projects for funding. The MPO will also take the lead in preparing the required program management plan that outlines how the program will be administered. The resolution supports Metro as the DR for the funds. The next steps are for the Governor to officially designate Metro as the DR and then for the MPO to approve the program management plan and the projects to be funded in 2014. The City of Madison will also need to approve the plan and an application to FTA for funding for the projects. The plan is to not go through a competitive process for the funds for next year because there hasn’t been a large demand for the funds and because of time constraints. Two projects would be continued. The first is the county’s mobility management program, which has received federal funding in the past with the old New Freedom program funds. The other project is to continue Metro’s pilot program to conduct in-person paratransit eligibility assessments.

   R. Schmidt asked if Monona Lift received federal funding or qualified for funding. Schaefer said Monona received state operating assistance for the service. Monona is eligible for the Section 5307 funding, but it would just substitute for the state funding so it wouldn’t be a benefit to the region. Kamp added the same was true for the Sun Prairie and Stoughton shared-ride taxi systems. Blau asked if the Governor would accept the recommendation, and Schaefer said yes. It is considered a local decision. Schaefer said he was sure the City of Madison would support the arrangement. He noted that Metro can use up to 10% of the funds for
administrative costs and Metro is also receiving funding for its project. Kamp agreed, saying the funding to hire a person to conduct the in-person assessments was in the city’s budget. He said the assessments would likely lead to more persons using the regular bus, which would save money, though the primary purpose is more accurate certification.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Clear to support Metro Transit as the designated recipient of funding for the federal Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program for the Madison urbanized area. Motion carried.

10. Continued Discussion and Possible Decision Item: Recommendation Regarding Potential Revision to MPO Board Structure and Membership Due to Expanded Metropolitan Planning Area and New Public Transportation Provider Representative Requirement

Schaefer said there was discussion on the issue a couple meetings ago, but the matter was deferred until the FTA released its guidance on the requirement for transit provider representation on MPO boards. That guidance was published. It says the transit representative can be an elected official or a member of the board of directors, which would be the Madison Transit & Parking Commission, or a staff person such as the General Manager. The guidance says that MPOs are not required to undertake a redesignation process to change the structure of their boards to meet this requirement. However, the redesignation agreement creating the Madison MPO says that if any changes are made to the board structure, the same process must be used except the Governor doesn’t need to sign off on it. This process requires that local units of government making up at least 75% of the population adopt resolutions in support of the change. Schaefer suggested the board make a recommendation on a change in the board structure and communicate that to local units of government in the planning area to gauge support for it before adopting a resolution making the change.

R. Schmidt asked if it mattered who appointed the transit agency representative. Schaefer said the guidance recommends that the process for designating the transit agency representative be spelled out in the MPO’s three-party agreement with the state and transit operator. It is supposed to be an automatic appointment. Schaefer said language could be added to require the City of Madison Mayor to appoint a person meeting the transit representative requirement or the transit agency representative could be spelled out with the Madison Mayor only appointing five persons. Clear suggested the City of Madison pass a resolution requiring that one of the mayor’s appointments be the transit general manager as a way to avoid the MPO having to go through the elaborate process of making a change to the redesignation agreement. Schaefer said he thought that might work. Blau asked if the transit agency representative was a recommendation or requirement, and Schaefer said a requirement. Gust commented that the city resolution could be worded to provide the mayor flexibility in whom to appoint to represent the transit agency. Golden supported Clear’s idea as the simplest way to address the issue. He noted that if an RTA was created, a change to the redesignation agreement would be needed anyway. He said he thought it should be left open to allow flexibility for the mayor in making the appointment. Schaefer pointed out that the approach makes sense only if the board does not want to make any other changes.

R. Schmidt moved, Clear seconded, to request staff to draft a city resolution that would require the Madison Mayor to appoint a representative for the transit agency that meets the federal requirements and have the resolution referred to the MPO. Golden added that it should note the city is the owner of the transit system. Matano noted the FTA guidance was just that and not a regulation. Blau said he opposed the motion because it kept the board essentially the same and didn’t address the fact that the small cities and villages were now underrepresented on the board. Golden said that was a different issue than the transit representation issue and required further discussion after a vote on this motion. If it was decided to make a change, this motion would then need to be revisited. Motion carried.

Blau said he supported one of the scenarios that added another small city/village representative. R. Schmidt said she represented the City of Monona on the Dane County Board and thus had a dual role representing the city and the county. Blau said it wasn’t the same because the appointment is from the county and there is no requirement that the county appoint a person from a small city/village. Clear said the county could be asked to
specify that one or more of the appointments must be a person who represents a small city/village. Golden commented that the county’s representation on the board is somewhat arbitrary. He said Blau’s perspective is how the cities/villages have always understood the issue dating back to the prior redesignation—that the County Executive’s appointments are county representatives regardless of where they live. Historically, for both the RPC and MPO it has been accepted that representation should be proportional to population for Madison, the small cities/villages, and the towns. Minihan commented that the Village of Oregon did not want to be in the MPO planning area. R. Schmidt commented that she didn’t think the MPO board’s decisions have been detrimental to the small cities/villages and therefore didn’t see an urgent need to go through the cumbersome process to change the board composition. If a change was necessary anyway, she said she would be more supportive.

Following further discussion about the scenarios, Blau moved, Golden seconded, to recommend scenario 4, adding a transit and a small cities/villages representative to increase the board size to sixteen. Clear commented that having 16 board members might be a little unwieldy. Motion failed with Gust abstaining. Clear moved, Opitz seconded, to recommend a modified version of scenario 2 with the cities/villages having an additional appointment, increasing the board to 15 members. Motion failed with Gust abstaining. Opitz suggested reaffirming the earlier motion to have the City of Madison adopt a resolution requiring the mayor to appoint a transit agency representative with no change to the board structure. Kamp suggested having the item on a future agenda with the modified scenarios discussed added so board members could see how the representation percentages work out. Minihan agreed. Opitz moved to recommend scenario 2 as is. Motion failed for lack of a second. Blau moved, Opitz seconded, to recommend scenario 6. Motion failed.

11. Letter of Comment on Draft Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement on the Beltline (USH 14 to CTH N) Planning and Environmental Linkages Corridor Study Process

Matano said he overheard Golden mention a concern about the way the process had gone at the Beltline Policy Advisory Committee meeting. Golden agreed. He said he thought the policy committee should include representatives from business, a civic improvement organization (specifically Downtown Madison Inc.), and institutions of higher learning. Schaefer said DMI was on the committee and WisDOT consultants were in the process of expanding the membership on the committee. Golden said the coordination plan document was good, but he was concerned that enough time be allocated for the different comment points. That didn’t happen at the committee meeting and members asked for another meeting to develop the strategies to be evaluated. Matano suggested a motion to approve staff’s revised letter, but add some language regarding Golden’s concerns about the need for adequate time for committee member and public input.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Minihan, to send revised letter of comment on the Coordination Plan with additional edits—to be made by Matano—regarding the need to provide adequate time for policy committee and public involvement at each of the comment points. Motion carried.

12. Report on Update of the Roadway Functional Classification Map

Schaefer reported that MPO staff was continuing to work with WisDOT staff on the map and obtain input from local community staff. He said he distributed the latest version of the map to the MPO’s technical committee for its meeting the following week. He said he wanted the committee to endorse a final draft pending traffic counts and forecasts (for planned collectors) that need to be done next year. The map would then be approved. Some technical corrections will need to be made to the urban area boundary as well. Staff will review a final draft map with the board, probably at its next meeting.

13. Update on Transportation Alternatives Program Application Cycle for 2014-2018 Projects

Schaefer explained that the Transportation Alternatives program consolidated the former Safe Routes to School and Enhancements programs and also the state’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Program that were all part of the state’s multi-modal improvement program. WisDOT will continue to administer the new program, but under the new federal law one-half of the federal funding must be allocated to the large MPOs.
He said we would select the projects to be funded with the MPO allocation. WisDOT will select projects to be funded with the statewide allocation, but communities within the large MPO areas will be eligible for those funds and WisDOT will consider the MPOs’ ranking of projects. WisDOT has set up a two-phase process for the statewide funds with a pre-scoping application first. Full applications for both the MPO and state funds will be due in late March. Schaefer said staff had prepared draft policies and criteria for scoring the projects and would be reviewing that with the MPO’s technical and citizen advisory committees next week. A revised draft would then be reviewed with the board at the next meeting.

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

Schaefer mentioned the email he forward board members about the special presentation to all City of Madison transportation committees and the MPO on the Stoughton Road EIS study. A presentation could also be arranged for the MPO. Either way, it will be a future agenda item. He said some final environmental and design issues were being worked out and a draft EIS document would probably be available in January. Gust added that WisDOT and the City of Madison had agreed to jointly fund a planning study to address business access and potential redevelopment issues in the East Washington Avenue intersection area. Schaefer said the first phase of the Interstate study was evaluating potential new interchanges and crossings. Screening criteria and a final list of potential interchanges and crossings to evaluate had been finalized.

Golden recommended that WisDOT staff or its consultants provide a presentation to the board soon on all of the data that has been collected for the Beltline study. He mentioned the different strategies to be evaluated, including a new north and south corridor, and the potential land use impacts.

15. Discussion of Future Work Items

None.

16. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, December 4, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Rooms A-B.

17. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by R. Schmidt, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:45 PM.
January 16, 2014

George R. Poirier  
Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
525 Junction Road, 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 60606-5232

Dear Mr. Poirier and Ms. Simon:

Under the authority delegated to me by Governor Scott Walker, I am hereby approving the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County. The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) will reflect by reference the 2014-2017 federal aid projects covered by this approval in our 2014-2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) subject to the understandings I have indicated below.

The TIP, which was adopted by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) in Resolution TPB No. 78 on October 2, 2013, represents a cooperative effort between the MPO, local communities, the Madison transit operator, and WisDOT, and is designed to meet the objectives and recommendations of the 2035 regional transportation system plan. A copy of the resolution approving the TIP is attached.

Based on our review, we believe that the TIP fulfills the federal transportation and planning requirements (Title 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135 and their implementing regulations 23 CFR 450 as amended by MAP-21, SAFETEA-LU, ISTEA, and TEA-21) with respect to the inclusion of: 1) a four-year priority list of projects; 2) a financial plan that reflects federal, state and local resources that are reasonably expected to be available during this program period; and 3) both transit and highway projects to be funded with Federal Transit Act and Title 23 funds. Opportunities for public review and comment on the proposed TIP were provided through a public meeting and legal notice requesting citizen input.
In accordance with 23 CFR 450.334, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) hereby certifies that the metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the State and its urbanized areas, and is being carried out in accordance with the following requirements:

(1) 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135, 49 U.S.C. 5303 and 5304, and this part;
(2) In non-attainment and maintenance areas, sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506 (c) and (d)) and 40 CFR part 93;
(3) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d–1) and 49 CFR part 21;
(4) 49 U.S.C. 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
(5) Sections 1101(b) of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) (P.L. 112-141), and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the US DOT funded projects;
(6) 23 CFR part 230, regarding implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
(7) The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) and 49 CFR parts 27, 37, and 38;
(8) The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
(9) Section 324 of title 23 U.S.C., regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and

I look forward to your timely action on this matter.

Sincerely,

Mark Gottlieb, P.E.
Secretary

cc: William Schaefer, MPO
Dwight McComb, FHWA
Alexis Kuklenksi, FHWA
Chris Berti, FTA
Jeff Gust, WisDOT Southwest Region
Sandy Beaupré, WisDOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
January 29, 2014

Mr. Mark Gottlieb, WisDOT Secretary
c/o WisDOT Division of Transportation Investment Management
Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
P.O. Box 7913
Madison, WI 53707-7913

RE: Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO) Comments on the Wisconsin Rail Plan 2030

Dear Mr. Gottlieb:

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the Draft Wisconsin Rail Plan 2030. Overall, it is an excellent plan with some good information and recommendations to provide the framework for improving the state’s rail network. The plan acknowledges the important role of the rail system in maintaining and improving the state’s economy, improving the efficiency of the overall transportation system, and supporting livable communities. The plan continues to recommend working to implement the Midwest Regional Rail System, including service to the City of Madison. The plan also recommends continuing to upgrade rail infrastructure and street crossings to accommodate higher speeds and modern, heavier railcars. These recommendations are both included in the MPO’s 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update.

The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO) offers the following comments. They are organized by those related to passenger rail and those related to freight rail.

**Passenger Rail and Commuter Rail**

The MPO notes that in 2010 plans were in place to provide rail service to Madison that was then expected to be in place by calendar year 2013. When then Governor-elect Walker chose to reject federal funds appropriated for the project, plans for the project came to a halt. In the rail plan, service to Madison is listed as being a "Future Alignment or Connection," timed to appear in the "long range plan (2030 horizon)." The MPO strongly believes that this project should be reactivated for implementation in a much more immediate time frame. See: "Map 6.5. Wisconsin 2030 Potential Intercity Rail System," "Long Range Plan (2030 Horizon), p. 6-37, and item P-8 in "Long Range Rail Investment Program - Passenger Rail" in Appendix 10-B: "Long Range Rail Program Narrative Spreadsheets."

Plans that were in place and funded in calendar year 2010 called for service from Chicago to Madison via Milwaukee and Watertown, with two stations in Madison. One station would have served trains travelling through to Minneapolis, while a spur would have provided intercity passenger rail access to downtown Madison. The MPO notes, and the plan should acknowledge, the challenge of serving Madison on the Chicago-Milwaukee-St. Paul route and the rationale for a separate station in north Madison for that service. The MPO looks forward to working with the Wisconsin Department of transportation to determine the appropriate location for an intermodal terminal as well as a station for through service to Minneapolis.

The MPO supports the 110 mph “emerging high speed rail” approach to developing intercity passenger rail. It is suggested that a map showing where speeds are restricted by curves, yards, slow zones, etc. be added as this would aid in future planning.
The plan should recognize the need for a thruway connection to Madison from the eastbound Empire Builder train. Thruway service could be provided by Jefferson Lines in La Crosse, Badger Bus in Milwaukee, Greyhound in Tomah/Wisconsin Dells, or Lamers in Portage/Columbus. Challenges include lining up schedules (Lamers) and service locations (Jefferson, Greyhound, and Badger Bus). Current trip planning through Amtrak routes passengers through Chicago. This service could provide interim access of Madison residents to intercity rail services, as well as supplement rail service to Madison when that service is provided.

The information on the Madison area’s Transport 2020 project (page 7-7) is noted with interest. In 2009, the focus of the Transport 2020 committee was to prepare a New Starts application to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). In discussions with the FTA, local officials were advised that the project needed a governing body as well as a source of local funding. To that end, a regional transit authority was established under the authority of state statutes. When the statutory authority was repealed in 2011, the effort to implement the findings of the Transport 2020 study became inactive.

The MPO still sees high capacity transit as an important component of its long range transportation and land use strategy. A recent study of bus rapid transit has provided another option that the region may pursue to serve its transportation needs. The MPO looks forward to working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to identify appropriate routes and levels of service. This could include service in existing rail corridors, as originally envisioned in Transport 2020.

**Freight Rail**

The MPO supports public acquisition of the former Chicago and North Western track in the Madison area currently owned by the UP. Records also show small segments of privately owned track in south Madison and on the CP spur between Madison and Portage.

The Long-Range Rail Investment Program projects listed in Appendix 10-B should include track rehabilitation from Madison to the West to Prairie du Chien. This would have many benefits, including creation of a viable east-west route through southern Wisconsin opening up markets for grain farmers and aggregate companies. Watco Companies, Iowa County, and the Wisconsin River Rail Transit Commission led an effort over the past couple of years to obtain federal TIGER grant funding for a project to improve the track and crossings of this line between Middleton and Lone Rock. While unsuccessful, the application had the support and matching funding commitment by WisDOT as well as the support of the MPO and numerous local jurisdictions in the corridor.

The table titled “Long Range Rail Investment Program: Rail-Highway Interface Projects” (short term), starting on page 6 of Appendix 10B, should be updated to include all WisDOT-sponsored crossing signal/gate replacement projects that have been constructed, or will be constructed, during the 2010-2015 timeframe in Dane County. The most recent projects are listed in the “2014-2018 Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)”. The 2014-2018 TIP is available at [http://madisonareampo.org/planning/improvementprogram.cfm#FinalTIP](http://madisonareampo.org/planning/improvementprogram.cfm#FinalTIP).

The plan should reflect the planned reopening of the former Chicago and North Western rail line from Madison to Oregon in the inventory maps or planned projects in Appendix 10-B, whichever is deemed appropriate.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Alfred Matano, Chair
Re: Resolution TPB No. 85 Approving the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Program for the Madison Urbanized Area

Staff Comments on Item:

The current federal transportation authorization bill, MAP-21, combined two previous Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs to create the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310). In large urban areas over 200,000 in population such as Madison, a recipient of the Section 5310 funds must be designated by the state and local officials. It was agreed that it made the most sense for Metro Transit to be the designated recipient (DR) of funds, but to have the MPO, as the regional planning agency, prioritize and select the projects for funding. MPO staff also agreed to prepare the required Program Management Plan (PMP). Metro Transit’s DR responsibilities include applying to FTA for the program grants on behalf of itself and/or other grant sub-recipients and handling all aspects of grant administration, including reporting to the FTA. The MPO endorsed this approach at its last meeting and the Governor officially designated Metro as the DR on December 9, 2013 (see Appendix A of the PMP).

The purpose of the PMP is to identify the policies and procedures for administering the Section 5310 program in the Madison area, including the division of responsibilities between Metro and the MPO, in accordance with FTA guidelines. Among topics covered is the project selection criteria and process. As previously mentioned, it was decided to continue ongoing Dane County and Metro Transit projects in 2014 and not conduct a competitive process due to timing issues with the transition to local administration of the new program and the lack of interest by other eligible recipients. The MPO will send out a notice later this year to gauge interest before deciding on an approach for selecting the 2015 projects. The PMP also addresses compliance by sub-recipients of funding with FTA requirements such as a Title VI plan, maintenance (for vehicles, facilities, and other capital assets), and project monitoring and reporting. The PMP document incorporates comments received by Metro Transit and WisDOT staff. A few minor changes were made to the draft distributed prior to the January meeting. The main changes were to add a couple of items to the quarterly reports required for subrecipients and also add a note that Metro will submit an annual report to FTA.

The City of Madison will also need to adopt a resolution approving the PMP as well as the application to FTA for the project funding in 2014.

Materials Presented on Item:

1. Resolution TPB No. 85 Approving the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale: Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 85

Adopting the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Madison Urbanized Area’s Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) – An MPO adopted Resolution TPB No. 84 on November 13, 2013, supporting designation of the City of Madison – Metro Transit as the recipient for federal Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program funds with the Madison Area TPB responsible for preparing a Program Management Plan (PMP) in coordination with Metro Transit, prioritizing and selecting projects for Section 5310 program funding, and preparing the annual Program of Projects (POP) as part of the Transportation Improvement Program process; and

WHEREAS, Governor Walker designated the City of Madison – Metro Transit as the recipient of Section 5310 Program funds for the Madison Urbanized Area via letter to the Federal Transit Administration on December 9, 2013; and

WHEREAS, a Program Management Plan that describes policies and procedures for administering the Section 5310 program in the Madison area, including the division of responsibilities between Metro Transit and the Madison Area TPB, is required to be on file with the Federal Transit Administration; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB has prepared a Program Management Plan for the Madison Urbanized Area in coordination with Metro Transit and with input from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation Bureau of Transit:

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – an MPO approves the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Madison Urban Area’s Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program, dated February 2014, which fulfills the requirement of the Program Management Plan.

Date Adopted   Al Matano, Chair,
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan

for the Madison Urbanized Area’s Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

and

City of Madison, Metro Transit

February 2014
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1. Introduction

Mobility Programs for Seniors and People with Disabilities under SAFETEA-LU

Under the previous federal transportation authorization legislation – the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) – there were two programs that were designed to enhance mobility for seniors and people with disabilities.

These programs were:

Transportation for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310), which provided federal funds to help private non-profit agencies purchase vehicles and other capital items to transport seniors and people with disabilities. In Dane County, past funding was used to purchase vans for non-profit organizations used for transportation for seniors.

New Freedom Program (Section 5317), which provided federal funds to expand transportation mobility options for people with disabilities. MPOs in large urbanized areas exceeding 200,000 in population such as Madison (called Transportation Management Areas or TMAs) received a direct allocation of funding under the program. These funds were also distributed by WisDOT through a competitive application process coordinated with the MPO, and the funds could be used by private non-profit agencies, state and local governments, and public and private transportation operators for capital purchases and operating expenses associated with new services that went beyond the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Currently, Section 5317 funds are used to fund mobility management services for Dane County specialized transportation services and for funding new accessible vans and training and financial incentives for Union Cab drivers providing accessible cab rides.

Consolidation of Programs under MAP-21

In July of 2012, a new federal transportation authorization bill was signed into law. The new law – Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) – combined the two programs (Transportation for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities and New Freedom Program) to create the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310 program). This new program continues to enhance mobility for seniors and people with disabilities, and the activities that were eligible for funds under the former New Freedom Program are now eligible for Section 5310 funding.

Under SAFETEA-LU and previous legislation, Section 5310 program funds were apportioned to states for distribution to subrecipients. Another significant change instituted by MAP-21 is that Section 5310 program funds are apportioned to rural, small urban, and large urban areas. In large MPO areas (TMAs) such as Madison, the designated recipient must be designated by the state and responsible local officials. As a result, a local administration process needed to be developed by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to allow the funds associated with the new program to be distributed in the Madison area.

Although MAP-21 consolidated the former Section 5310 and 5317 programs, it specifies that at least 55% of program funds be used for traditional capital projects for seniors and people with disabilities, including mobility management. The remaining funds (up to 45%) may be used for similar projects with fewer restrictions.
Purpose of the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan

The Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan (PMRCP) is designed to identify the policies and procedures for administering the Section 5310 program in the Madison Urbanized Area. These policies and procedures are based on program requirements issued by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Proposed Circular FTA C 9070.1G Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program Guidance and Application Instructions provides guidance for Section 5310 projects. It covers project requirements, administration procedures, and other relevant components of the federal Section 5310 program. The PMRCP serves as a local companion to FTA C 9070.1G, describing the roles and mechanisms for carrying out policies and procedures in the Madison Urbanized Area, satisfying the FTA requirement for a Program Management Plan.

Summary of Roles and Responsibilities for Section 5310 Program in the Madison Urban Area

The City of Madison – Metro Transit (Metro Transit) is the largest provider of public transportation in Dane County and the second largest public transit agency in Wisconsin. Metro Transit will be the direct recipient for Section 5310 program funds. Metro Transit is also the designated recipient for other federal funds, such as Urban Area Formula (Section 5307) grants, and has the legal, financial, and staffing capabilities to receive and administer federal funds. As the designated recipient, Metro Transit is responsible for administering grant agreements, applying for federal funds, and satisfying documentation and reporting requirements.

The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) serves as the MPO for Madison Urbanized Area in central Dane County. With a population of about 407,000, the Madison Urban Area is a Transportation Management Area (TMA) as determined by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and FTA. The MPO’s role in the Section 5310 program is to select and prioritize projects for funding and prepare and maintain the PMRCP in cooperation with Metro Transit.
2. Summary of the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program

According to the FTA, the purpose of the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program is to:

...Enhance mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities by providing funds for programs to serve the special needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit services.

– FTA Section 5310 Fact Sheet

Designated Recipient

The governor of each state or an official designee must designate a public entity to be the recipient for Section 5310 funds. The designated agency must have the requisite legal, financial, and staffing capabilities to receive and administer federal funds under this program. In many cases it is appropriate for the DR for the Section 5310 program to be the same as the DR for Urbanized Area Formula (Section 5307) funds. Alternatively, the DR for the former Section 5317 program, the MPO, the state, or another public agency may be a preferred choice based on local circumstances. Up to 10% of the recipient’s total fiscal year apportionment may be used to fund program administration costs.

The DR is primarily responsible for applying to FTA for Section 5310 grants on behalf of itself and/or subrecipient(s). In addition, the DR is responsible for the development of a Program of Projects (POP) which identifies the subrecipients and projects for which the recipient is applying for financial assistance. In the Madison Urbanized Area, the MPO will prepare the POP for submission to the FTA by the DR. In addition, the DR manages all aspects of grant distribution, including reporting to the FTA.

Based on conversations with WisDOT, Metro Transit, and others, the most appropriate DR in the Madison Urbanized Area is Metro Transit because of Metro staff’s experience with similar federal funding programs, including the Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307) and Bus and Bus Facilities Program (Section 5339). The State of Wisconsin designated Metro Transit as the recipient of Section 5310 program funds for the Madison Urbanized Area via a letter from the Governor to FTA, dated December 9, 2013. The process for selecting projects is described in Section 4.

Eligible Subrecipients

Eligible subrecipients are entities that are allowed to apply for and receive funds through the Section 5310 program. The eligible subrecipients for this program are:

• State or local government authorities
  - To be eligible for “traditional 5310 capital projects”, a state or local government authority must be approved by WisDOT to coordinate services for seniors and individuals with disabilities or certify that there are no non-profit organizations readily available in the area to provide the service.
• Private non-profit organizations
• Operators of public transportation that receive a grant indirectly through a recipient
  - Not eligible for “traditional 5310 capital projects”
Eligible Activities

According to FTA requirements, at least 55% of the Section 5310 funding apportionment must be used for capital expenses for public transportation projects that are planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities (“traditional Section 5310 capital projects”). It is not sufficient that seniors and individuals with disabilities are merely included (or assumed to be included) among the people who will benefit from the project. Mobility management expenses, previously eligible under Section 5317, are eligible and qualify for this traditional Section 5310 project requirement.

The remaining 45 percent of the funds may be used for operating or capital expenses associated with:

- Public transportation projects that exceed the requirements of the ADA
- Public transportation projects that improve access to fixed route transit service and decrease reliance by individuals with disabilities on complementary paratransit
- Alternatives to public transportation that assist seniors and individuals with disabilities

Before a project can be awarded funds, the project must be certified by the DR that it is included in a locally developed coordinated public transit – human services transportation plan. The 2013 Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County, prepared and published by the MPO, serves as this document.

Section 5310 Program Goals and Objectives

The following principles from the 2013 Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County summarize the goals and objectives for the use of Section 5310 program funds in the Madison Urban Area.

Independence – Promote and maintain the independence of older adults, people with disabilities, and others with limited resources, by encouraging and supporting the use of transportation options that foster independence; provide training and resources to allow transit-dependent people the greatest possible access to the community.

Accessibility – Eliminate geographical inequity in availability of transportation options; provide access to transportation services throughout Dane County that are open to seniors and people with disabilities and not limited to a specific group of clients or customers; connect communities and their residents to transportation services that are integrated and open to the general public.

Efficiency – Develop cost effective solutions and avoid duplication; seek out cost-sharing opportunities and partnerships to extend the usefulness of transportation resources; evaluate services based on productivity and measures of cost effectiveness that exemplify good stewardship of public resources.

Resourcefulness – Use a mix of resources (human, monetary, equipment, contractual) to create and sustain services that meet different transportation needs; apply innovative thinking and cultivate community relationships to address issues.

Funding priorities and project selection criteria are listed in Section 4, Project Selection Criteria and Process.
**Funding for Projects and Program Administration**

Section 5310 program funds will be awarded on an annual cycle.

The Section 5310 program can generally fund up to 80% of a project’s capital costs (in some limited cases up to 90%) and up to 50% of a project’s operating costs. Administrative costs (up to 10% of the federal apportionment) are funded at 100% federal share. The remaining costs can be covered by:

- Other federal (non-DOT) transportation funding sources
- State and local funding sources
- Private funding sources

It is the responsibility of the subrecipient to secure and administer funds outside the 5310 program.

Metro Transit and the MPO are eligible to be reimbursed for Section 5310 administrative costs. Subrecipients will not be reimbursed for administrative costs related to application development, program reporting, or other activities. The administrative costs will be used for activities described in Section 3, Roles and Responsibilities.
3. Roles and Responsibilities

Although Metro Transit is the DR for the Madison Urbanized Area’s Section 5310 program, the program is co-administered by Metro Transit and the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO). Metro Transit may apply for funding for projects it conducts; therefore, in this document the word “subrecipient” applies to Metro Transit as well as other entities. Each entity’s administrative roles and responsibilities are summarized below.

**Metro Transit Roles and Responsibilities**

- Develop, execute, manage, and amend grant agreements with subrecipients
- Apply for federal funds on behalf of eligible subrecipients as identified by the MPO and manage the program’s federal grants
- Complete program grant reporting to the FTA on a quarterly and annual basis
- Work with subrecipients and WisDOT to procure capital items and ensure compliance with all applicable state and federal requirements
- Process payments, draw down federal funds, complete financial audits, and complete grant closeouts
- Collect and maintain financial reports, operating statistics, and vehicle data from subrecipients
- Monitor subrecipient compliance with federal requirements (Section 504, ADA, etc.)
- Conduct on-site inspections of subrecipient projects, if needed
- Amend Metro Transit’s Title VI Plan, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goals, and other applicable documents to include the Section 5310 program
- Review subrecipients’ Title VI, EEO, and DBE programs
- Investigate and address Title VI, EEO, and DBE complaints
- Monitor subrecipients’ adherence to maintenance plans and safety standards
- Participate in the roles and responsibilities of eligible subrecipients for project applications on behalf of Metro Transit

**MPO Roles and Responsibilities**

- Develop and revise the program’s PMRCP
- Develop and approve the annual Program of Projects (POP) as part of the Transportation Improvement Program process
- Develop and revise the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County
- Notify eligible subrecipients of application cycles; distribute project application materials\(^1\)
- Determine subrecipient and project eligibility; maintain a list of eligible subrecipients
- Provide technical assistance to eligible subrecipients
- Develop and conduct the project selection process, which includes:
  - Develop the application form to distribute to eligible subrecipients

---

\(^1\) Not applicable unless the MPO uses a competitive selection process and solicits project applications.
- Release a solicitation for project applications to eligible subrecipients \(^1\)
- Develop project selection criteria \(^1\)
- Receive and review project applications from subrecipients
- Present project funding recommendations to the program’s advisory committee (the MPO Technical Coordinating Committee) and to the program’s decision-making body (MPO Board). Utilize the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) process in the MPO’s Public Participation Plan for providing the public and private transportation providers with notice and an opportunity to comment on projects selected for funding.
- Notify successful subrecipients of their award amounts and reporting requirements

- Ensure compliance with Section 5310 program requirement that at least 55% of the federal funding apportionment is used for “traditional 5310 capital projects”
- Provide demographic data to help subrecipients comply with Title VI requirements.

**Subrecipient Roles and Responsibilities**

- Inform MPO staff of intention to apply for Section 5310 program funds, complete and submit application(s) and/or provide project description(s) and funding information, provide follow-up information, and participate in interviews and/or on-site visits if conducted
- Work with Metro Transit and WisDOT to procure capital items; assure the procurement regulations are met
- Develop and maintain a Maintenance Plan to be held on file with Metro Transit
- Inspect, insure, and maintain all vehicles funded through the program
- Complete and submit acceptance certifications to Metro Transit upon vehicle delivery
- Deliver the project as described in the grant project application, including local management and administration
- Provide financial management of the project, including provision of non-Section 5310 funds and assurance that Section 5310 funds are used for the project identified in the project application
- Submit financial reports, operating statistics, and vehicle data to Metro Transit
- Maintain a Title VI plan and comply with federal Title VI requirements
- Submit to on-site inspections as requested by Metro Transit and the Wisconsin State Patrol
- Comply with private sector participation requirements in Section 5
- Maintain a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) profile and provide the DUNS number to Metro Transit. DUNS numbers can be requested at no charge at www.dnb.com.
- Comply with all additional applicable state and federal requirements

\(^1\) Not applicable unless the MPO uses a competitive selection process and solicits project applications.
4. Project Selection Criteria and Process

**Project Planning and Coordination**

Medium-range planning for Section 5310 program projects is included in the five-year Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County, completed by the MPO. This planning process is conducted within the framework of the MPO’s long range transportation plan (currently the Regional Transportation Plan Update 2035) and the Transit Development Plan for the Madison Urban Area.

Program funding for 2014 will be used primarily to maintain and continue two existing programs, Dane County’s mobility management services and Metro Transit’s in-person eligibility assessment program for paratransit. Dane County’s mobility management program has been supported with federal New Freedom program (now consolidated into the new 5310 program) funding in the past, while Metro’s in-person assessment program was initiated as a pilot program with local funding. In the future, a competitive process may be used to select and prioritize projects. In that case, the MPO will solicit project applications from eligible subrecipients. The MPO will make the decision on if and when to transition to a competitive process.

**Project Application Process**

The application process will be led by the MPO. Specific tasks, deadlines, and meeting dates will be identified in the materials that are distributed to eligible subrecipients as appropriate.

- MPO staff informs eligible subrecipients of upcoming application cycle
  - MPO staff will inform some or all eligible subrecipients on its eligible subrecipient list based on transportation needs and whether or not a competitive process is used.
- Eligible subrecipients notify MPO staff of intention to apply
- MPO staff distributes application materials to interested eligible subrecipients
- Completed applications are due to MPO staff
- MPO staff prepares a draft POP, which is presented to the MPO board following a notice and comment period
- MPO board approves project recommendations with any changes as part of approval of the TIP or a TIP amendment
- MPO staff notifies applicants of the MPO board’s action
- Applicants work with Metro Transit to develop project agreements
- Metro Transit applies to the FTA for funding for the projects on behalf of the subrecipients

Applicants that are approved for capital funds should contact Metro Transit as soon as possible to begin the procurement process. Applicants that are approved for operating funds should contact Metro Transit as soon as possible to develop project agreements.
**Project Selection Criteria**

The projects that receive funds through the Madison Urbanized Area’s Section 5310 program are selected by the MPO based on the extent to which they fulfill the general funding priorities and address specific service needs identified in the coordinated public transit – human services transportation plan, including:

1. **Maintain existing service levels of viable operations**

   Priority #1 supports existing transportation services and projects that:
   - Have shown to be effective in meeting transportation needs of seniors, people with disabilities, and those with limited income
   - Require ongoing capital and operating assistance to maintain the current level of service
   - Continue to demonstrate effective transportation operations within the county’s coordinated network

2. **Respond to growth within existing services by allowing for measured increases where demand shows an unmet need within the current limits of the service**

   Priority #2 supports existing and new services and projects that:
   - Require capital and operating assistance to meet growing demand for the service(s) within present boundaries
   - Are able to improve efficiency and functionality by building on existing infrastructure
   - Allow for growth, but not automatically extend new service without a careful evaluation of transportation needs across populations and jurisdictions

3. **Respond to emerging community needs by taking action on opportunities to coordinate and expand service, creating new partnerships and reacting to newly identified transportation needs and gaps**

   Priority #3 supports projects that:
   - Are under development and bring new resources
   - Address identified transportation needs and gaps and/or focus on an underserved group of individuals
   - Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall system
   - Provide an added benefit to the transportation services network and riders
   - Are innovative in their approach in reaching out to new riders or geographic areas

Additionally, the MPO will select and prioritize projects based on their ability to satisfy the Section 5310 Program Goals and Objectives described in Section 2: independence, accessibility, efficiency, and resourcefulness.

If the MPO decides to administer a competitive process for Section 5310 program funds, a more specific set of project scoring and selection criteria, based on the framework above, will be developed and included in the solicitation for project applications.
Annual Program of Projects Development, Approval, and Amendment Process

The MPO is responsible for developing and amending the Program of Projects (POP) since it has the responsibility for selecting the projects and prepares the five-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The POP must be consistent with the TIP and the federal share cannot exceed the annual allocation of Section 5310 program funds; however, it may include projects that do not yet have completed and accepted project applications. The requirements for the POP include:

- The total number of subrecipients
- Identification of each subrecipient, including whether they are governmental authorities, private non-profit agencies, or Indian tribal governments or tribal transit agencies
- A description of each project
- The total project cost and the federal share
- Whether each project is a capital or an operating expense and whether or not it meets the requirements for a “traditional Section 5310 capital” project

The applications received from eligible subrecipients are reviewed by MPO staff. Following this review, staff prioritizes the projects and develops a draft POP. The draft POP and a description of any projects not selected for funding are presented to the MPO’s advisory committees (Technical Coordinating Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee).

Following review and a recommendation by the MPO advisory committees, the MPO Policy Board may approve the project recommendations (with or without modifications), or direct staff to develop alternative proposals. Once the MPO Policy Board approves funding recommendations, applicants are notified of the action by MPO staff. The approved POP is then forwarded to Metro Transit, which forwards it to the FTA and carries it out.

Amendments to the POP are conducted as needed using the same process.
5. Private Sector Participation

The FTA requires that local recipients provide private for-profit transit and paratransit operators a fair and timely opportunity to participate to the maximum extent feasible in the planning and provision of proposed transportation services. Therefore, each applicant for funds from the Madison Urbanized Area’s Section 5310 program must make efforts to comply with this policy and provide documentation of these efforts in its application.

Applicants who utilize in-house resources or other methods to deliver projects must demonstrate that they made reasonable efforts to include participation by private for-profit operators if applicable.
6. Civil Rights

Recipients of the Madison Urban Area’s Section 5310 program funds are required to meet civil rights requirements under Title VI, as well as Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) regulations.

The MPO maintains a record of funding requests for the Section 5310 Program received from private non-profit organizations, state or local governmental authorities, and Indian tribes. The record identifies those applicants that would use grant program funds to provide assistance to predominantly minority and low income populations. The record shall also indicate which applications were rejected and accepted for funding.

Metro Transit, as a City of Madison utility, utilizes the City of Madison Department of Civil Rights to oversee civil rights issues. Metro Transit will be the liaison between subrecipients, the City of Madison Department of Civil Rights, and the FTA.

Title VI

The elements of a Title VI Program are determined by FTA Circular 4702.1B (Appendix A) and include, but are not limited to:

- Title VI notice to the public, including a list of locations where the notice is posted
- Title VI complaint procedures (i.e., instructions to the public regarding how to file a Title VI discrimination complaint) and Title VI complaint form
- List of transit-related Title VI investigations, complaints, and lawsuits
- Public participation plan, including information about outreach methods to engage minority and limited English proficient populations (LEP), as well as a summary of outreach efforts made since the last Title VI Program submission
- Language Assistance Plan for providing language assistance to persons with limited English proficiency
- A table depicting the membership of non-elected committees and councils, the membership of which is selected by the recipient, broken down by race, and a description of the process the agency uses to encourage the participation of minorities on such committees
- A Title VI equity analysis if the recipient has constructed a facility, such as a vehicle storage facility, maintenance facility, operation center, etc.
- A copy of board meeting minutes, resolution, or other appropriate documentation showing the board of directors or appropriate governing entity or official(s) responsible for policy decisions reviewed and approved the Title VI Program.

Metro Transit prepares a Title VI Program Update for submission to the FTA every three years.

Section 5310 Program subrecipients must submit their Title VI Programs to Metro Transit. Metro will develop a schedule that outlines the frequency with which subrecipients must submit their Title VI programs. A subrecipient’s Title VI program must be approved by the subrecipient’s appropriate governing entity or official(s) responsible for policy decisions (e.g., board of directors, mayor, tribal executive, city administrator, etc.). Subrecipients must submit a copy of the board resolution, meeting minutes, or similar documentation as evidence of approval.
Contractors and subcontractors are not required to submit a Title VI report. However, they are responsible for complying with the Title VI Program of the recipient with whom they are contracting. Recipients and subrecipients are responsible for ensuring that their contractors are complying with their Title VI Program and Title VI regulations.

Metro Transit, the MPO, and WisDOT are available to assist subrecipients with Title VI compliance. Metro Transit will provide sample notifications, forms, and program language to subrecipients upon request. The MPO will provide demographic data to assist subrecipients in conducting their analysis and subsequently developing their Title VI Program.

Metro Transit, in coordination with the City of Madison Department of Civil Rights, oversees subrecipient compliance with Title VI as follows:

- **Grant Agreements** – Through annual grant agreements, the subrecipient agrees to comply with applicable civil rights statutes and regulations, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO), and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE). As subrecipients to Metro Transit, Section 5310 Program subrecipients must comply with the FTA’s Annual List of Certifications and Assurances signed annually by Metro Transit.

- **Review of Subrecipient’s Title VI Program** – Metro Transit reviews the contents of Title VI Program materials as submitted by subrecipients, including public notification language, LEP, complaint procedures and complaint form, and public participation and outreach. Metro provides sample materials and technical assistance to subrecipients in developing a compliant Title VI Program.

- **Investigation and Monitoring of Title VI Complaints (or potential complaints and/or lawsuits)** – As part of its annual application, Metro Transit requires subrecipients to report any Title VI complaints or lawsuits. Subrecipients may contact Metro Transit at any time during the year to report Title VI complaints, potential complaints, and/or lawsuits. Metro Transit may also receive complaints regarding subrecipients or their contractors directly from the public. When a complaint is determined to be a civil rights issue, Metro Transit staff will consult with the City of Madison Department of Civil Rights office as appropriate.

- **On-Site Visits** – Metro Transit and/or City of Madison Civil Rights Department staff may conduct on-site visits as necessary to monitor subrecipient compliance. During on-site visits, staff will verify the location of the public notification language as stated in the subrecipient’s Title VI Program. During this time, staff may also discuss with the subrecipient any new or potential opportunities for public participation and public outreach that may present themselves since the previous submission of the subrecipient’s Title VI Program.

### Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)

The objectives of the US Department of Transportation’s (DOT’s) DBE regulations, as specified in 49 CFR Part 26, are to:

- Ensure nondiscrimination in the award and administration of DOT-assisted contracts
- Create a level playing field on which DBEs can compete fairly for DOT-assisted contracts
- Ensure that the DBE Program is narrowly tailored in accordance with applicable law
- Ensure that only firms that fully meet 49 CFR Part 26 eligibility standards are permitted to participate as DBEs
- Help remove barriers to the participation of DBEs in DOT assisted contracts
- Assist the development of firms that can compete successfully in the market place outside the DBE Program
Metro Transit has developed and administers its DBE Program Plan. The plan outlines policies and procedures established to satisfy the DBE requirements. Metro Transit's DBE Program Plan is on file with the FTA. Any plan updates with significant changes are submitted to FTA. All DBE submissions to the FTA, including the DBE Program Plan and all required reporting, are completed by Metro Transit staff.

Metro Transit staff works closely with subrecipients to address DBE requirements. In goal setting, three-year goals are established based on anticipated FTA-funded contracting opportunities by both subrecipients and Metro Transit. Contract-specific goals may also be established, and these goals may require a greater amount of subrecipient technical assistance from Metro Transit and/or the MPO. Work with subrecipients also includes the ongoing collection of data for contract monitoring and reporting on FTA-funded contracts.

Prior to awarding Section 5310 Program funds, subrecipients may be asked to identify potential contracting and procurement opportunities and Metro Transit staff works with subrecipients to identify potential DBE participation. Metro Transit staff also ensures that subrecipients use appropriate DBE contract language in their solicitations. WisDOT's Office of Business Opportunity and Equity Compliance (OBOEC) provides assistance to potential DBEs to become certified and maintains the Unified Certification Program Directory. Subrecipients must report to Metro Transit as required on DBE goal achievement on all FTA-funded contracting.

**Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)**

Metro Transit and Section 5310 Program subrecipients must ensure that no person in the United States shall on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability be excluded from participating in, or denied the benefits of, or be subject to, discrimination in employment under any project, program, or activity receiving federal financial assistance under the federal transit laws.

Each Section 5310 Program contract between Metro Transit and a subrecipient for the provision of FTA funding shall contain language that requires the subrecipient to comply with FTA regulations related to EEO. In addition, private providers under contract with subrecipients are required to comply with these regulations.

If a subrecipient’s transit-related staff reaches 15 or more and/or the dollar threshold for capital, operating, or planning assistance is met, Metro Transit will require the subrecipient to submit a formal Affirmative Action (AA) / EEO Plan to Metro Transit for review and approval. Metro will withhold the approval of future grants until it receives the AA / EEO Plan from the subrecipient. The Equal Employment Opportunity Act by definition explicitly exempts Indian tribes from its provisions.

**Assurances**

Metro Transit annually signs the FTA Annual List of Certifications and Assurances for Federal Transit Administration Grants and Cooperative Agreements, which binds Metro Transit to all civil rights requirements.

Through annual grant agreements, subrecipients agree to comply with all applicable civil rights statutes and regulations. These include Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Equal Employment Opportunity, and Americans with Disabilities Act. As subrecipients to Metro Transit, Section 5310 Program subrecipients must comply with the FTA’s Annual List of Certifications and Assurances as stated in their grant agreements with Metro Transit.
7. Maintenance

Consistent with federal requirements, each subrecipient must maintain its facilities (and substantial facility components), vehicles, and other substantial assets.

Subrecipients are required to develop maintenance plans covering their federally-funded vehicles and facilities and to provide Metro Transit with a copy of their plan(s). Subrecipients must maintain all federally-funded property in good operating order and maintain ADA accessibility features.

Subrecipients are expected to develop their own maintenance plans, although WisDOT provides extensive written guidance on developing maintenance plans as well as sample plans upon request. Once adopted, subrecipients are monitored for adherence to the plans by Metro Transit staff for compliance during on-site visits.

Metro Transit requires subrecipients to design and operate maintenance programs that include:

- Preventative maintenance practices and schedules for vehicles
- Preventative maintenance practices for accessibility equipment
- Preventative maintenance practices for facilities
- A system for recording maintenance and repair activities
- A process for authorizing and controlling maintenance activities and costs
- Quality control for outsourced maintenance
- A procedure for pursuing warranty recoveries

Metro Transit must have an up-to-date maintenance plan on file from Section 5310 program subrecipients prior to applying for grants from the FTA. Subrecipients will not be required to resubmit maintenance plans with each application cycle, but are required to submit updated plans when necessary, e.g., when they have acquired new vehicles or other substantial assets not addressed in previously submitted plans or when the plan on file is out-of-date.

All transit vehicles are required to meet safety standards and undergo inspections based on program and/or vehicle capacity. WisDOT and Metro Transit require that all vehicles purchased with Section 5310 program funds be registered as human service vehicles (HSVs) or municipal vehicles, and be plated accordingly. All vehicles are considered HSVs and are subject to annual HSV inspections conducted by the Wisconsin State Patrol per Wisconsin State Statutes Section 110.05 and Wisconsin Administrative Code Trans 301. Upon request, State Patrol also will conduct initial inspections right after vehicle delivery. These inspections cover the integrity of vehicle safety and mechanical features.

Wisconsin Administrative Code Trans 301 addresses equipment and safety standards for HSVs. It adopts all federal regulations from 49 CFR 393 (Parts and Accessories Necessary for Safe Operation), 49 CFR 571 (Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards), and 36 CFR 1192 (Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] Accessibility Guidelines for Transportation Vehicles). Trans 301 also provides additional equipment standards and requirements and provides inspection and enforcement standards.
8. Section 5310 Program Management

Vehicle Procurement

Although Metro Transit is the DR for the Madison Urban Area’s Section 5310 Program, all procurement activities are handled by the WisDOT Bureau of Transit through its statewide procurement process. Subrecipients will work with Metro Transit and WisDOT to arrange procurement of vehicles that meet the needs of the project. All grant agreements require subrecipients to comply with all relevant federal procurement laws and regulations and submit all third party contracts to Metro Transit for review.

WisDOT Transit procedures require staff to review all federally funded third party contracts to ensure federal contract clauses are included. WisDOT provides toolkits for assisting subrecipients with common procurements. Technical assistance for federal procurements is available from transit project managers or a WisDOT designated agent (e.g. a contractor). WisDOT maintains a subrecipient procurement assistance web page that contains links to:

- The WisDOT procurement manual.
- FTA-compliant toolkits for micro and small purchases.
- FTA-compliant toolkit for shared-ride taxi requests for proposals.
- System for Award Management (SAM).

WisDOT also has a toolkit for procuring architecture and engineering services according to Brooks Act requirements, and WisDOT Transit provides opportunities for training on federal procurement regulations.

Buy America and Pre-award and Post-delivery Reviews

WisDOT’s HSV procurement solicitations detail federal Buy America requirements and impose Buy America pre-award certification requirements on all vendors submitting bids. For each vehicle type a vendor bids on, it must submit a “Certification of Compliance with 49 U.S.C. 5323(j).” If a vendor is unsure whether an offered vehicle is compliant with Buy America requirements, it may submit a “Certification of Non-Compliance with 49 U.S.C. 5323(j)” with its bid; however, it must provide documentation of an FTA-approved exception before WisDOT will consider the bid.

In addition to the pre-award certification, the solicitations require bidders to provide certification and a detailed list of all major vehicle components and subassemblies and their respective calculated percentages of total manufacturer’s cost made in the United States. WisDOT reviews the Buy America information submitted by bidders and provides a pre-award certification.

For each delivered FTA-funded vehicle, Metro Transit requires the vehicle recipient to complete a post-delivery Buy America compliance certification that declares it has received and reviewed appropriate Buy America documentation. Metro will not pay the vendor until it receives this certification.

WisDOT’s procurement manual details Buy America requirements and provides instructions for completing pre-award and post-delivery certifications for FTA subrecipients conducting their own procurements. Metro Transit, with WisDOT’s assistance, provides technical support to subrecipients needing assistance with this or other aspects of their procurements.
Financial Management

Metro Transit is responsible for managing grants, contracts, and interagency agreements to ensure that expenditures comply with federal rules and regulations for all FTA grant programs. Financial management responsibilities include:

- Investigating and resolving accounting problems to ensure compliance with state and federal rules.
- Managing the documentation associated with individual grants, contracts, and interagency agreements.
- Submitting federal financial reports.
- Rectifying and closing out FTA grants when projects are completed.

Metro Transit uses the Electronic Clearing House Operation System (ECHO Web) process to request FTA grant awards so that transactions are processed in a timely manner and accounts are balanced and documented.

Metro Transit maintains records for vehicles, facilities, and other substantial assets purchased with Section 5310 Program funds. Metro Transit ensures that all equipment used by subrecipients that is purchased with federal funds through the Section 5310 Program is used for the program or project for which it was acquired. Records are updated and appropriate equipment use is assured through reporting by subrecipients and on-site reviews. See Section 9, Project Monitoring and Reporting.

Disposition of Assets

In the event that a subrecipient no longer needs equipment purchased with federal funds through the Section 5310 Program and useful life remains, the equipment is transferred in accordance with Metro Transit, WisDOT, and FTA requirements and guidelines.

In the event a vehicle or other substantial asset has reached the end of its useful life, the subrecipient must receive approval from Metro Transit to dispose of the asset.

Accounting Systems

Subrecipients establish a set of accounts in which all transit-related costs, revenues, and operating sources are recorded and clearly identified, easily traced, and substantially documented. Accounting practices and records must be in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

Metro Transit uses the same accounting system for the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program that it uses for its other state and federal grant programs.

Metro uses the information contained in the quarterly reports to monitor subrecipients’ fiscal and operational activities. Requests for reimbursement are approved by Metro Transit before being processed for payment.
9. Project Monitoring and Reporting

The goal for monitoring and reporting for Section 5310 program funds is to ensure effective use of program funds, provide useful information for the planning and prioritization of future projects, and fulfill federal requirements without placing an excessive burden on the designated recipient or subrecipients.

**Metro Transit Reporting**

Metro Transit will submit required Section 5310 reports to the FTA by October 31 of each year, covering a 12-month period ending on September 30, as well as quarterly reports, as required by the FTA. Subrecipients are required to submit required information to Metro Transit so that Metro Transit can consolidate the information to include in the report to the FTA. Metro Transit will act as a liaison between the FTA and subrecipients during audits. Annual reports filed by Metro Transit will include:

- An updated POP (prepared by the MPO)
- Civil rights compliance issues (such as Title VI, EEO, or DBE complaints)
- A milestone activity report
- A Federal Financial Report
- Program measures, including:
  - Gaps in service filled by Section 5310 projects
  - Ridership
  - Physical improvements (such as sidewalks, transportation facilities, or technology)

In addition, Metro will fulfill National Transit Database (NTD) reporting requirements.

**Reporting Requirements for Subrecipients**

**Quarterly Reports.** Quarterly reports are due to Metro Transit 10 business days following the end of each quarterly period – January 1 through March 31, April 1 through June 30, July 1 through September 30, and October 1 through December 31. The following data must be submitted to Metro Transit on a quarterly basis for each vehicle, transportation program, or other service funded through the Madison Urbanized Area’s Section 5310 program:

- A narrative describing accomplishments and/or problems and changes to milestones and budgets
- A copy of all recorded civil rights or Title VI complaints
- The actual or estimated number of one-way unlinked passenger trips (if applicable), and the categorical purpose of each trip (if known, optional)
- The actual or estimated statistics related to delivering mobility management, fixed-route orientation, client eligibility, or similar services; such as contacts through call centers, website visits, and training sessions
- The number of individual clients served
- Physical improvements completed (such as sidewalks, transportation facilities, or technology)
- Quarterly revenues and sources of revenue for the project

(continued next page)
• Quarterly capital and operating costs (separated)
• Quarterly actual or estimated vehicle revenue miles (required) and hours (if known)
• Fleet summary including year, mileage, make/model, and relevant features
• Inventory of related facilities

**Annual Reports.** Metro Transit will submit required annual Section 5310 reports to the FTA by October 31 of each year, covering a 12-month period ending on September 30. Metro Transit will be responsible for consolidating this data from monthly reports and may request additional information from subrecipients.

**National Transit Database (NTD) Reporting.** Subrecipients must provide Metro Transit with information necessary for Metro Transit to file annual NTD reports. The necessary information, which commonly includes vehicle miles and hours, passenger trips, and financial information, will vary depending on the project and subrecipients must coordinate with Metro Transit to determine what is necessary. NTD information is due to Metro Transit by March 15 annually.

Metro Transit will use these reports to monitor subrecipient fiscal and operational management and to satisfy federal reporting requirements.

Metro Transit will schedule on-site visits with subrecipients on a triennial cycle to review operations and maintenance records. In addition, to improve subrecipient monitoring procedures, Metro staff may request and review supporting documentation, including local match documentation, for one subrecipient’s reimbursement request per quarter. Selection of the reimbursement request will be based on either a risk assessment or random selection.

**Section 504 and ADA Reporting**

The annual Federal Certifications and Assurances for FTA Assistance, which is signed by all subrecipients, contains the ADA certification. Metro Transit staff verifies compliance with Section 504 and ADA requirements while reviewing annual grant applications and during on-site visits.
10. Other Provisions

Environmental Protection

Most projects and activities funded through the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program do not involve significant environmental impacts. Typically, projects are considered categorical exclusions because they are types of projects that have been “categorically” (i.e., previously) excluded in regulations from the requirements to conduct environmental reviews and prepare environmental documentation.

FTA classifies categorical exclusions (CE) into two groups:

- CE under 23 CFR 771.117(c) – activities and projects which have very limited or no environmental effects at all (e.g., planning studies, preliminary design work, program administration, operating assistance and the purchase of transit vehicles).
- CE under 23 CFR 771.117(d) – activities and projects involving construction and/or have a greater potential for off-site environmental impacts (e.g., construction of transit facilities, parking, etc.). These projects may be designated CE after review of documentation. In order to receive a documented CE, a subrecipient must complete a CE checklist, including an Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis. WisDOT will first review the completed checklist before sending it to FTA, which has final authority to grant the CE. For a copy of the checklist and more detail on the review process, see the WisDOT Transit Procedures and Oversight Manual.

Even if a project is determined to be a CE, there may be other relevant state and federal environmental protection requirements that must be satisfied (depending on the project’s type and location).

For projects with environmental impacts that are determined not to be a CE, FTA requires the preparation of an environmental assessment (EA) for public comment and FTA review. In the unlikely event that significant environmental impacts are identified with a project, an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required.

School Transportation

Consistent with federal laws, Section 5310 program funds may not be used for exclusive school bus service. The Federal Certifications and Assurances for FTA grants require the subrecipient to certify compliance with each annual sub-grant agreement.

Metro Transit oversees compliance with the prohibition by monitoring route schedules submitted with application materials, on websites, and/or in promotional materials with route schedules. Metro staff also looks for signs that might indicate exclusive school bus service (e.g., a school route only) during vehicle inspections.

Drug and Alcohol Testing

Subrecipients that receive Section 5310 program funds are not subject to FTA’s drug and alcohol testing rules. However, these subrecipients must comply with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) rule for employees who hold commercial driver’s licenses (49 CFR Part 382).
### Staff Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO) Staff</td>
<td>Mike Cechvala</td>
<td>(608) 266-4518</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcechvala@cityofmadison.com">mcechvala@cityofmadison.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td>Scott Korth</td>
<td>(608) 266-6538</td>
<td><a href="mailto:skorth@cityofmadison.com">skorth@cityofmadison.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT)</td>
<td>Judy Foss</td>
<td>(608) 266-8968</td>
<td><a href="mailto:judy.foss@dot.wi.gov">judy.foss@dot.wi.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A – Recipient Designation Letter

SCOTT WALKER
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
STATE OF WISCONSIN

P.O. BOX 7863
MADISON, WI 53707

December 9, 2013

Ms. Marisol Simon
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration, Region V
200 West Adams Street, Suite 320
Chicago, IL 60606

Dear Ms. Simon:

I am pleased to notify you that pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Section 5310 I have appointed the
following entities as Designated Recipients of Federal Transit Administration formula funds for
the Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Recipient</th>
<th>TMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Transit</td>
<td>Appleton, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay Metro</td>
<td>Green Bay, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Metro</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached are the resolutions from each area’s planning commission, identifying these entities as
the Designated Recipients of 5310 funds for their respective TMA.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact John Alley, transit section chief, Wisconsin
Department of Transportation, at (608) 266-0189.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Governor Scott Walker

Enclosures
Appendix B – MPO Board Resolution

To be amended following adoption.
Appendix C – References

- **Fact Sheet - Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Section 5310** (FTA)
- **Proposed Circular FTA C 9070.1G Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program Guidance and Application Instructions** (FTA)
- **Transit Procurement Procedures** (WisDOT), includes links to:
  - Procurement Manual (WisDOT)
  - Best Practices Procurement Manual (FTA)
  - Toolkits and other resources for procurement and contracting
- **Americans with Disabilities Act** (US Department of Justice)
- **Fiscal Year 2013 Annual List of Certifications and Assurances for FTA Grants and Cooperative Agreements** (FTA)
- **Circular FTA 4702.1B Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients** (FTA)
- **Wisconsin State Statutes** (Legislative Reference Bureau)
- **Wisconsin Administrative Code** (Legislative Reference Bureau)
- Wisconsin state-wide **Elderly and Disabled Transportation Capital Assistance** (WisDOT)
- **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964** (US Department of Justice)
- **49 CFR Part 26 Sample Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program** (US DOT)
- **ECHO-Web User Manual** (FTA)
Appendix D – Index of Program Management Plan Requirements

Proposed Circular FTA C 9070.1G Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program Guidance and Application Instructions specifies that the Project Management Plan should address the following topics. The reference page numbers of the topics are shown at the right.

a. Program Goals and Objectives .................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................. 4
b. Roles and Responsibilities ................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................. 5
c. Coordination ............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................. 8
d. Eligible Subrecipients ......................................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 3
e. Local Share and Local Funding Requirements ........................................................................................................................................................................... 4
f. Project Selection Criteria and Method of Distributing Funds ........................................................................................................................................................................... 8
g. Annual Program of Projects Development and Approval Process ........................................................................................................................................................................ 9
h. State Administration, Planning and Technical Assistance (use of administrative costs) ........................................................................................................................................................................ 5
i. Transfer of Funds (applies to State Management Plans) ................................................................................................................................................................................ N/A
j. Private Sector Participation ......................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 10
k. Civil Rights ......................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 11
l. Section 504 and ADA Reporting ....................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 15
m. Program Measures (method for collecting and reporting data) ........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................ 25
n. Program Management ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 15
o. Other Provisions ................................................................................................................................................................................................................................. 19

Appendix E – Acronyms and Abbreviations

FTA – Federal Transit Administration
ECHO Web – Electronic Clearing House Operation
LEP – Limited English Proficiency
MAP-21 – Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
MATPB – Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – a Metropolitan Planning Organization
Metro Transit – the City of Madison – Metro Transit
MPO – Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – a Metropolitan Planning Organization
PMRCP – Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan
NTD – National Transit Database
POP – Program of Projects
SAFESEA-LU – Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users
WisDOT – Wisconsin Department of Transportation
TEAM – Transportation Electronic Award and Management (online web reporting for the FTA)
TIP – Transportation Improvement Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolution TPB No. 86 Approving Amendment #1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area &amp; Dane County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Comments on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Wisconsin Department of Transportation SW Region requested a TIP amendment to make funding/cost estimate and/or schedule changes to two WisDOT maintenance projects and a Dane County bridge replacement project on CTH P in the Village of Cross Plains. The amendment is also needed for two City of Madison sponsored roadway projects and to program the Dane County and Metro Transit Section 5310 program projects for 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first City of Madison roadway project revision adds $107,000 in federal STP Urban funding for the E. Johnson (N. Butler to Baldwin St.) reconstruction project in 2014. This funding is above and beyond the funding allocation currently shown in the TIP and therefore does not affect the funding or timing of other STP Urban funded projects. This is funding that had originally been programmed for MPO planning support. That project was deleted as part of the 2014-2018 TIP update because of the increase in federal Planning funds the MPO received. WisDOT was originally going to deduct this from our allocation of funding, but agreed not to do so as long as the funding was used by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2014 (June 2014). Because E. Johnson Street is the only major project programmed for 2014, it is the only one the funding could be used for. The second Madison project is a safety project for the Mineral Point Road/Midvale Blvd. intersection. The terminology for the scope of the project was changed from a reconstruct to a recondition. It also includes the addition of EB and WB turn lanes and overhead signals and a grade change on NB Midvale Blvd. |

As has been discussed with the board, it was decided not to undertake a competitive process for the projects to be funded in 2014 through the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program, but rather continue the Dane County mobility management project and the Metro Transit pilot paratransit eligibility assessment project (which did not previously have federal funding). The project to support Union Cab’s accessible private taxicab service, which was funded with former New Freedom program funds, cannot be funded with Section 5310 program funding because Union Cab does not operate as a shared ride service. The TIP amendment adds programmed federal funding for the Dane County project and adds the Metro Transit project with federal funding. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Presented on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resolution TPB No. 86 Approving Amendment #1 to the 2014-2018 TIP (including attachments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Section 5310 Program of Projects to be sent to FTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommends approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution TPB No. 86
Amendment No. 1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB approved the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on October 2, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area transportation projects and some transportation planning activities to be undertaken using Federal funding in 2014–2017 must be included in the effective TIP; and

WHEREAS, an amendment has been requested by WisDOT Southwest Region to reflect minor changes to the scope, timing, and/or cost and funding of two state highway projects and one highway project in Dane County; and

WHEREAS, an amendment is also needed to make revisions to two arterial roadway projects in the City of Madison, including adding STP-Urban funding for the E. Johnson Street reconstruction project; and

WHEREAS, an amendment is also needed to program federal transit funding in 2014 for Dane County’s mobility management project and the City of Madison/Metro Transit’s in-person paratransit eligibility assessment project in accordance with the approved Program Management Plan for the Section 5310 Program; 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. 1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, making the following project revisions and additions as shown on the attached project listings table:

1. **REVISE** the project description and cost/funding for Dane County’s Mobility Management Program project on page 27 of the Transit Capital section, adding programmed federal Section 5310 funds.

2. **ADD** the City of Madison/Metro Transit’s Paratransit Eligibility Determinations & Path of Travel Supports project to page 27 of the Transit Capital section.

3. **REVISE** the S. Beltline Bridges painting project on page 31, adding construction funding in 2017 with actual construction in 2018.

4. **REVISE** the timing and cost/funding for the Interstate 39/90/94 (STH 19 & CP Rail Overpass Structures) Bridge Deck Replacement project on page 33, adding ROW funding to 2015,
delaying the obligation of anticipated construction funding to 2016, delaying construction to 2017, and revising the project cost.

5. **REVISE** the scope and cost/funding of the CTH P (Bridge over Black Earth Creek) Bridge Replacement project on page 41, replacing the specified wood panels with concrete panels for the RR crossing, and revising the project cost.

6. **REVISE** funding for the E. Johnson Street Reconstruction project on page 45, increasing the amount of STP-Urban funding by $107,000 in 2014.

7. **REVISE** the terminology for the scope of the Mineral Point Road (Midvale Boulevard Intersection) project on page 46, modifying it to a reconditioning project (vs. reconstruction project).

____________________________________
Date Adopted

____________________________________
Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
### MOBILITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Continue mobility management program, including one-call transportation information line, mobility training program, and bus buddy program. Training program assists eligible passengers of Metro paratransit and county programs to use mainline transit. Bus buddy program assigns volunteers to help persons become familiar with these services. Seeking continued Federal funding. Federal funding not yet programmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARATRANSIT ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS & PATH OF TRAVEL SUPPORTS

Project provides funding for mobility specialist to perform ADA supplementary paratransit eligibility determinations, interviews and functional testing (IPA), transit orientation, and paths of travel assessments to/from residence and bus stops. Also provides some funding for bus pads, etc. to make stops accessible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S. BELTLINE (USH 12/18)

Beltline Bridge over Park St. (B-13-0016 & 0191), Rimrock Road Bridge over Beltline (B-13-0310), and Beltline Bridge over CMSTPP RR (B-13-0260). Paint bridge girders. Design $ obligated in 2013. Const. funding anticipated to be obligated in 2017. Construction in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CTH P

Bridge over Black Earth Creek. Bridge replacement (B-13-0339), install concrete panels for RIP crossing (in Village of Cross Plains). Design $ obligated in 2011. Estimate to remain as is. To be coordinated w/WisDOT USH 11/CB P intersection project. BR $601,000/NHPP $73,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. JOHNSON STREET

Segment 1, Butler Street to Baldwin Street, Reconstruction of roadway with bike lanes (1.06 mi.). Design $ obligated in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MINERAL POINT ROAD

Midvale Boulevard Intersection, Reconstructing add turn bays for EB & WB direction, overhead signals on all travel lanes on Mineral Point Rd. and Midvale Blvd., and grade changes NB on Midvale Blvd. as it approaches Felton Place. Design $ obligated in 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<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 the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area
2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>National Highway Performance Program</td>
<td>49,509</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>26,814</td>
<td>13,177</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>49,509</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>26,814</td>
<td>13,177</td>
<td>7,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Madison Urban Area</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>5,509</td>
<td>8,688</td>
<td>7,146</td>
<td>6,952</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>9,378</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>7,998</td>
<td>7,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Flexible</td>
<td>7,606</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5,058</td>
<td>7,606</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Enhancements/Alternatives**</td>
<td>5,206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,206</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>7,026</td>
<td>6,447</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>7,026</td>
<td>6,447</td>
<td>7,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5339 Bus &amp; Bus Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5337 State of Good Repair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5314 NRP &amp; Section 5339 Alt. Analysis Program**</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors &amp; Persons w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fifth year of funding (2018) is informational only.
** Carryover funding. For others, excludes carryover funding from previous year grants.

Note: All state roadway projects using applicable funding sources (e.g., NHPP, STP State Flexible, BR) are programmed through 2018. Local BR and STP Rural projects are programmed through 2014. HSIP (other than annual small HES program) projects are programmed through 2015. SRTS projects are carryover from 2013. Local Enhancement/TA projects are programmed through 2014. Local STP Urban (Madison Urban Area) projects are programmed through 2018. 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 2014 excludes carryover projects for which the Federal funding is already obligated (except for the Alternatives Analysis and TIGER funding).
## Table C-1
Projected Expenses and Revenues of Transportation Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area
in Year of Expenditure Dollars\(^1\)

### Projected Expenses ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>105,827</td>
<td>12,362</td>
<td>54,878</td>
<td>55,652</td>
<td>20,642</td>
<td>249,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>5,647</td>
<td>9,128</td>
<td>7,695</td>
<td>7,674</td>
<td>33,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP TE/TA and STP Rural</td>
<td>5,206</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>116,577</td>
<td>22,134</td>
<td>64,237</td>
<td>63,584</td>
<td>28,559</td>
<td>295,091</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>52,134</td>
<td>53,437</td>
<td>54,773</td>
<td>56,143</td>
<td>57,546</td>
<td>274,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Construction</td>
<td>45,098</td>
<td>46,225</td>
<td>47,381</td>
<td>48,566</td>
<td>49,780</td>
<td>237,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Related Facilities</td>
<td>10,564</td>
<td>10,828</td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>11,376</td>
<td>11,661</td>
<td>55,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>107,796</td>
<td>110,491</td>
<td>113,253</td>
<td>116,085</td>
<td>118,987</td>
<td>566,611</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>16,568</td>
<td>16,982</td>
<td>17,407</td>
<td>17,842</td>
<td>18,288</td>
<td>87,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>48,996</td>
<td>50,221</td>
<td>51,476</td>
<td>52,763</td>
<td>54,082</td>
<td>257,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>67,400</td>
<td>67,203</td>
<td>68,883</td>
<td>70,605</td>
<td>72,370</td>
<td>344,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Expenses</strong></td>
<td>291,773</td>
<td>199,828</td>
<td>246,374</td>
<td>250,274</td>
<td>219,916</td>
<td>1,206,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Revenues ($000s)\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>58,784</td>
<td>60,254</td>
<td>61,760</td>
<td>63,304</td>
<td>64,887</td>
<td>308,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,592</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>6,909</td>
<td>7,082</td>
<td>33,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP TE, STP Rural &amp; SRTS</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>3,407</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>17,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State</td>
<td>8,789</td>
<td>9,009</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td>9,465</td>
<td>9,701</td>
<td>46,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>77,060</td>
<td>79,261</td>
<td>81,227</td>
<td>83,258</td>
<td>85,339</td>
<td>406,145</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>52,134</td>
<td>53,437</td>
<td>54,773</td>
<td>56,143</td>
<td>57,546</td>
<td>274,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Construction</td>
<td>45,098</td>
<td>46,225</td>
<td>47,381</td>
<td>48,566</td>
<td>49,780</td>
<td>237,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Related Facilities</td>
<td>10,564</td>
<td>10,828</td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>11,376</td>
<td>11,661</td>
<td>55,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>107,796</td>
<td>110,491</td>
<td>113,253</td>
<td>116,085</td>
<td>118,987</td>
<td>566,611</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>16,568</td>
<td>16,982</td>
<td>17,407</td>
<td>17,842</td>
<td>18,288</td>
<td>87,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>48,996</td>
<td>50,221</td>
<td>51,476</td>
<td>52,763</td>
<td>54,082</td>
<td>257,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>65,564</td>
<td>67,203</td>
<td>68,883</td>
<td>70,605</td>
<td>72,370</td>
<td>344,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Revenues</strong></td>
<td>250,420</td>
<td>256,955</td>
<td>263,363</td>
<td>269,947</td>
<td>276,696</td>
<td>1,317,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Roadway and transit inflation rate @ 2.5% 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 2014 dollars) with annual averages estimated and then projected for each funding source. Local revenues assumed to continue at annual averages expended in the past (adjusted for inflation).

3 Highways construction, maintenance expenses excludes projects (e.g., I-39/90 expansion) that are mostly outside Dane County and for which fiscal constraint is being handled at the state level.
### Section 5310 Program of Projects for the Madison Urbanized Area - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Sub Type ¹</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Description/ALI</th>
<th>FTA Amount</th>
<th>Local Amount</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Coordination Plan Page</th>
<th>Project Type ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category A Projects</strong> - Certified as having met federal requirements and approved for funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td>Madison Metro Service Area</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Paratransit Eligibility Determinations and Mobility Specialist</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td>Madison Metro Service Area</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Accessible Bus Stop and Path of Travel Supports</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Department of Human Services</td>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>One-Call Transportation Information Line (Mobility Management)</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>14f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Department of Human Services</td>
<td>Madison Metro Service Area</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Bus Buddy Program</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
<td>$31,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>14e, 14f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Department of Human Services</td>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Mobility Training Program</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$18,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>14f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Grant Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$247,500</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$307,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Sub Type ¹</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Description/ALI</th>
<th>FTA Amount</th>
<th>Local Amount</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Coordination Plan Page</th>
<th>Project Type ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. DR - Direct Recipient, PNP - Private Non-Profit, SG - State Government, LG - Local Government, PO - Private Operator receiving indirect funds
2. Project type defined in FTA C 9070.1G:

- 12 - Administration expenses
- 14a - Rolling stock and related activities (meeting the 55% requirement)
- 14b - Passenger facilities (meeting the 55% requirement)
- 14c - Support facilities and equipment (meeting the 55% requirement)
- 14d - Lease of equipment (meeting the 55% requirement)
- 14e - Acquisition of transportation services under a contract, lease, or other arrangement, including user-side subsidies (meeting the 55% requirement)
- 14f - Support for mobility management and coordination programs (meeting the 55% requirement)
- 15a - Public transportation projects (capital and operating) planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities
- 15b - Public transportation projects that exceed the requirements of the ADA
- 15c - Public transportation projects that improve access to fixed route service and decrease reliance by individuals with disabilities on ADA complementary paratransit service
- 15d - Alternatives to public transportation that assist seniors and individuals with disabilities with transportation
### Project Descriptions

#### Madison Area Transportation Planning Board

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

This project funds a staff position to perform ADA complementary paratransit eligibility determinations, interviews and functional testing (IPA), transit orientation, and path of travel assessments to/from residences and bus stops. The position requires National Transit Institute training on Comprehensive ADA Paratransit Eligibility Determinations. Staff person arranges interviews, transportation, conducts and documents interviews, conducts and documents physical and cognitive assessments as necessary, maintains eligibility records and schedules, and participates in appeals panels. Position is responsible for assessing all new applicants plus current customers to re-evaluate. Staff will refer candidates for travel training and assess path of travel to fixed route bus stops for path modifications and supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>Metro Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Accessible Bus Stop and Path of Travel Supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project is the purchase and installation of bus pads, benches, leaning poles, audible signals, curb cuts, sidewalk replacements or other supports to make bus stops accessible to applicants for ADA Complementary Paratransit Service with Madison Metro. In consideration of applicants that would be able to use the fixed route service if these supports were in place, the Paratransit Eligibility and Mobility Specialist may assess the applicant’s path of travel and refer appropriate projects for installation. Once installed, these supports will make it possible for the applicant to use fixed route services and decrease reliance on paratransit services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>Dane County Department of Human Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>One-Call Transportation Information Line (Mobility Management)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anyone may call the Transportation Information Line for detailed information, referrals to transportation programs or providers, eligibility determination, ride authorization, or other services. Information on all available transportation resources is provided, including both county-funded and other programs. There is no charge for services.
Subrecipient:  Dane County Department of Human Services  
Project:  Bus Buddy Program

Persons unfamiliar with Metro Transit routes, shared-ride taxi transit programs, or county-funded group ride programs are assigned a volunteer Bus Buddy for route familiarization and other support while learning to use the service. There is no fare while participating in the program. Service is coordinated through the Transportation Information Line. Service area is all of Dane County.

Subrecipient:  Dane County Department of Human Services  
Project:  Mobility Training Program

Eligible passengers of ADA complementary paratransit or other specialized transportation services receive training to permit them to use mainline transit. Training is provided by Certified Occupational Therapists. There is no fare during training, and if upon graduation, the rider migrates a sufficient number of trips from paratransit to fixed-route services, Metro Transit will provide a free commuter bus pass. Service is coordinated through the Transportation Information Line. Service area is Metro Transit’s paratransit area.
Re: Consideration of Draft Policies and Project Scoring Criteria for 2014-2018 Transportation Alternatives Program Applications

Staff Comments on Item: The new federal transportation authorization bill, MAP-21, created the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), which incorporates the former Transportation Enhancements and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs. TAP allocates funds for “alternative transportation” projects that expand travel choice, strengthen the local economy, improve quality of life, and protect the environment. As with the former TE program, it is expected that most TAP funding will be used for off-street facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians.

MAP-21 mandates that one half of the TAP funding allocated to each state be sub-allocated to large MPOs serving urban areas with populations over 200,000 such as Madison. In Wisconsin, the large MPOs will select the projects to be funded with this urban area sub-allocation of funding, but WisDOT will continue to administer the TAP program. WisDOT will also select the projects to be funded with the remaining federal TAP funding and the state Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Program funding. WisDOT is allowing local communities within the large urban areas to apply for funding from the statewide pot of money, but has indicated it may limit its funding of projects in these areas in order to award projects in a geographically equitable manner.

The large MPOs are free to use their own criteria to score and select projects for funding. The large MPOs may also, in some cases, use different policies (e.g., cost share, types of projects to be funded, eligible project costs, etc.). In some cases, however, MPOs must follow WisDOT policies (e.g., minimum project cost) because WisDOT is administering the program.

MPO staff developed a draft document with proposed policies and TAP project scoring criteria for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects and SRTS non-infrastructure projects. Staff reviewed the draft twice with the MPO's technical and citizen advisory committees and has made changes in response to their comments. The one additional change from the version previously distributed is that the required cost share is proposed to be based on an exact sliding scale according to a formula rather set within $50,000 project cost increments. Both committees recommended approval of the policies and criteria with this final change. Staff is now seeking MPO Board approval so that the policies and criteria can be included with or made available with the full application materials in late February.

Pre-scoping applications for the statewide funding were due December 13. A total of 15 applications were submitted for projects in the Madison urban area. WisDOT identified issues with four of these. MPO staff is in the process of assisting project sponsors in addressing the issues so that they will be able to submit full applications. WisDOT will invite successful pre-scoping applicants to submit full applications by February 21. Full applications for both the statewide and MPO funding will be due on March 28 (see attached schedule).

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Final draft MPO policies and criteria for scoring Transportation Alternatives Program projects, dated 1/23/14.
2. WisDOT schedule for the SFY 2014-2018 TAP Project Funding Cycle

Staff Recommendation/Rationale: Staff recommends approval subject to any modifications the board might suggest. The document has been thoroughly vetted, however, by both of the MPO advisory committees.
The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), established the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) to “provide[s] for a variety of alternative transportation projects, including many that were previously eligible activities under separately funded programs.”

TAP incorporates the following three WisDOT multi-modal transportation improvement programs:
- Safe Routes to School (SRTS);
- Transportation Enhancements (TE); and
- Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Program (BPFP).

WisDOT previously administered these programs as three distinct federal funding categories based upon the statutory requirements of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), as well as previous federal transportation legislation. Beginning with the state fiscal year (SFY) 2014-2018 award cycle, WisDOT is merging previously distinct programs to streamline the application process and align multi-modal program administration with other federal transportation improvement programs.

The 2013-2015 State Biennial Budget allocated $7,951,800 in SFY 2014 and $8,049,300 in SFY 2014 to the Transportation Alternatives Program. Federal law mandates that WisDOT distribute approximately half of Wisconsin’s federally allocated Transportation Alternative Program funds to metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) serving larger urban areas with a population over 200,000, called Transportation Management Areas (TMAs). The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is the MPO for the Madison urban area. The Madison Area TPB’s annual suballocation for FY 2013 is $588,740. With this application cycle, projects are being programmed out through 2018 under the assumption that state budget authority and federal funding levels will be similar in future.

The following is a description of the policies and criteria for ranking projects that the Madison Area TPB will use to select TAP projects. The policies listed below are those that differ from the policies that WisDOT will use for projects approved with the statewide funding. WisDOT has not yet published its project scoring criteria. WisDOT’s policies and procedures that project sponsors must follow are available at http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/localgov/aid/tap.htm.

A. Madison Area Transportation Planning Board Policies

- **Eligible Project Categories:**
  The Madison Area TPB will accept projects within only the following federally eligible Transportation Alternatives Program categories:
  - Construction of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation;
  - Construction of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers;
Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users; and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects.

- **Pre-Scoping Application:**
  WisDOT requires applicants to complete a pre-scoping application before filling out a full application. Only selected applicants will be given approval to complete a full application. The Madison Area TPB will review the pre-scoping applications, but all sponsors with eligible projects will be invited to complete a full application.

- **Eligible Project Costs:**
  For infrastructure projects, funding will only be awarded for construction. Design, right of way, and utilities costs will not be eligible expenses for TAP funds awarded by the Madison Area TPB.

- **Cost Share**
  In order to stretch the limited funding available, projects will be required to provide a larger local match than the required 20% minimum. A sliding scale between 80/20 and 50/50 will be used, calculated by the formula below with all projects costing over $600,000 requiring a 50% local share.

  Formula for computing the federal share:

  \[
  P = \frac{80 - ((X - 300,000)/10,000)}{100}
  \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Federal Share (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 - $600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $600,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Criteria - Bicycle/Pedestrian Infrastructure Projects**

1. **Enhances Mobility and Connectivity – 20%**
   - Degree of importance to the regional pedestrian/bicycle system (i.e., located on the regional bikeway system or providing an important connection to this system). [Note: The MPO’s 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County includes a regional bikeway system plan map and a list and map of some of the higher priority projects on the regional system.] For a small local infrastructure improvement, degree of importance to neighborhood or school area pedestrian/bike connections.
   - Project provides a new bicycle and pedestrian link where other suitable alternatives do not currently exist.
   - The project provides a missing link that would connect a neighborhood, employers or other services to a route or facility that already exists.
   - The project is an extension of a current bicycle and/or pedestrian facility, facilitating increased usage.
   - The project eliminates a barrier to use of a facility such as providing a new crossing of a major highway or improving an existing crossing.
2. **Usage and Accessibility – 20%**
   - High estimated usage based on significant population user pool and/or employment located within 0.5 mile, location within the overall pedestrian/bicycle facility network, and other factors listed below.
   - Important link in increasing walking and bicycling access to jobs, shopping, parks, schools or other services.
   - Provides connections to transit stops and/or connectivity for users from/to public transportation.
   - Improves quality of life by providing walking and/or bicycling opportunities in areas of natural, cultural or historic interest, thereby improving the pedestrian and/or bicycle experience.
   - Facility will be maintained for year round usage.
   - The project improves pedestrian/bicycle access for environmental justice areas. [Note: These include areas with concentrations of low income and minority populations and households with no motor vehicle available. See maps in Appendix E – EJ Analysis of the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County.]
   - The project is located in an area with health disparities and limited access to active transportation options.

3. **Safety – 20%**
   - The project is located in an area with a history of bicycle/pedestrian crashes or an area with documented safety concerns, and the project addresses the safety problem(s) or issue(s).

4. **Project Readiness and Constructability – 15%**
   - The project is ready to move forward. [Note: TAP projects are required to begin within 4 years of project award and be completed within six years.]
   - Is there engineering feasibility, real estate, environmental, railroad, or funding issues that need to be resolved? These issues make it more likely that projects cannot meet the required WisDOT timelines.
   - Has the project sponsor received similar funding in the past and, if so, have they successfully completed their prior projects?
   - Does the project have the necessary financial commitment and local support that it can begin to move forward immediately?
   - Project ranking given by municipality (if submitting multiple projects).

5. **Cost Effectiveness -15%**
   - Takes into account the overall benefits of the project based on the other criteria compared to the cost of the project.
   - Maximizes use of available federal funds.

6. **Congestion Management – 5%**
   - The project will increase the attractiveness of pedestrian/bicycle travel in a corridor or area with significant peak period traffic congestion.
   - The project will increase access to transit stops in a corridor or area with significant peak period traffic congestion.
[Note: See *Congestion Management Process for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area* for information on congested travel corridors and their traffic, transit, pedestrian/bicycle facility characteristics.]

7. **Opportunity/Risk – 5%**
   - Is there a risk of a lost opportunity or loss of other funding if not selected in the current program cycle?
   - If funded now the project could be done more cost effectively because it can be built at the same time as another project in the same corridor.

C. **Criteria - Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Projects**

1. **Scope of Audience/Reach/Impact - 45%**
   - The project will reach a broad audience and a large portion of students within a school district would be impacted by the programming or activities.
   - The program or activities adds value to other improvements or programs that are happening in the community or school.
   - Project is likely to increase the number of children walking and bicycling to school safely and ensure that infrastructure that is added is being used.

2. **Health, Safety and Environmental Justice – 35%**
   - The program or activities is/are located at schools with a high rate of students eligible for free and reduced lunches.
   - The program or activities foster(s) improved childhood health, reduced childhood obesity and encourages a healthy and active lifestyle.
   - The program or activities increase(s) bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic safety.

3. **Project Readiness – 15%**
   - Project is ready to move forward. [Note: TAP projects are required to begin within 4 years of project award and be completed within six years.]
   - Has the project sponsor received similar funding in the past and, if so, have they successfully completed their prior projects?
   - Does the project have the necessary financial commitment and local support that it can begin to move forward immediately?
   - Project ranking given by sponsor (if submitting multiple projects).

4. **Opportunity/Risk – 5%**
   - Is there a risk of a lost opportunity or a successful program not continuing if not funded at current time?
## WisDOT Schedule
### State Fiscal Year 2014-2018
### Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Schedule

October 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Be Completed</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WisDOT publishes final TAP guidelines, pre-scoping application, and TAP timeline available on WisDOT TAP website.</td>
<td>10-31-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WisDOT Regions work with locals to develop TAP project applications for 2014-2018 program cycle.</td>
<td>November-December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WisDOT receives 2014-2018 program cycle project pre-scoping applications from locals.</td>
<td>12-13-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TAP Selection Committees review pre-scoping applications and invite successful applicants to submit additional TAP application documentation.</td>
<td>December 2013-February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WisDOT invites successful pre-scoping applicants to submit additional TAP application documentation.</td>
<td>2-21-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regions receive 2014-2018 program cycle comprehensive TAP applications from locals.</td>
<td>3-28-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WisDOT approves SFY 2014-2018 TAP projects.</td>
<td>5-30-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Governor’s Letter notifies locals of approved projects; WisDOT notifies locals of unfunded projects.</td>
<td>6-13-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WisDOT publishes approved project list on WisDOT TAP web site.</td>
<td>6-13-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re: Consideration of Appointments to the MPO Advisory Committee for the Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

**Staff Comments on Item:**

MPO staff has begun work to prepare an update the regional Bicycle Transportation Plan completed back in 2000. Updates have been made since that time to the bikeways (off-street paths and routes) component of the plan as part of the MPO’s updates to its Regional Transportation Plan, but a comprehensive update to the bicycle plan is needed. A committee is being formed to guide the planning process and help the MPO connect with other related planning efforts going on, including the City of Madison’s Sustainable Transportation Master Plan. The committee includes mostly staff persons, but also some policy makers, including a representative from Madison’s Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission. A kickoff meeting has been scheduled for January 30. It is suggested that a member of the MPO Board serve on the committee. Both Mark Clear and Al Matano have expressed interest. Staff is looking for the board to appoint a member to the committee and approve the rest of the committee appointments.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Draft list of proposed bicycle plan advisory committee members

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:** Staff recommends approval.
## Bicycle Transportation Plan

**Madison Urban Area and Dane County**

**Advisory Committee**

**DRAFT 1/30/14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO Staff</td>
<td>Mike Cechvala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Chuck Strawser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Sarah Gaskell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>Michelle Brokaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Parks</td>
<td>Chris James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Highways</td>
<td>Pam Dunphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Engineering</td>
<td>Anthony Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Traffic Engineering</td>
<td>Arthur Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Long Range Transportation Planning Committee</td>
<td>Robbie Webber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission</td>
<td>Lydia Maurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fitchburg</td>
<td>Ahnaray Bizjak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Middleton</td>
<td>Mark Opitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sun Prairie</td>
<td>Tim Semmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Mike Rewey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re:  Presentation on Madison Metro Bus Size Study

Staff Comments on Item:

Metro Transit has been asked numerous times whether or not it would be preferable to use a variety of different bus sizes and types to more appropriately meet the travel demands. The 2008 Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad-Hoc Committee final report recommended that Metro hire a consultant to review whether a more diversified fleet should be used. Issues identified to be considered include peak period capacity requirements, purchase costs, fuel and parts costs, life-cycle costing, fuel options (diesel, hybrid, etc.), ridership and fuel costs projections, school supplemental service needs for older buses, current garage limitations, interlining, and federal spare ratio requirements. It was recommended that the study be led by the MPO to ensure an independent, objective study. Metro received a grant from WisDOT to conduct the study and asked the MPO to serve as project manager overseeing the technical analysis. An advisory committee was set up to oversee the study. Nelson/Nygaard was hired to conduct the study.

The study is nearing completion and a draft report has been prepared. MPO and Metro staff will be presenting the study conclusions to the Madison Transit & Parking Commission and providing an opportunity for current bus riders and the general public to comment. The study’s main conclusions/recommendations are (1) there is a substantial need to invest bus vehicle capacity and Metro should plan for the eventual inclusion of articulated buses into the fleet with the timing dependent upon the outcome of bus rapid transit and expansion of Metro’s bus storage and maintenance facilities; and (2) small buses have limited potential due to strong ridership on most routes during peak periods, even in the periphery, and Metro should not incorporate small buses into the fleet at this time. In the future, there may be an increased role for small buses if Metro expands service into areas/communities not currently served.

MPO staff will provide a presentation on the study. MPO action on the study report is not anticipated.

Materials Presented on Item:

1. Executive Summary of the Draft Madison Bus Size Study report

Staff Recommendation/Rationale: For discussion purposes only.
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF STUDY

Historically, Metro Transit has used only one bus size to meet the transit needs of the Madison area. Metro currently operates a fleet of 208 standard 40-foot transit buses with about 35 to 40 seats. This study conducted a detailed analysis of Metro bus routes to determine whether some routes might be better-suited to smaller or larger vehicles based on rider demand. Metro has made extensive use of non-scheduled extra buses and has recently moved to perimeter, or center-facing seats, on all new bus acquisitions as a way increase standing space to help relieve overcrowding on busy routes. One of the key issues explored in this study was if the introduction of larger buses could offset the use of extra buses thus freeing equipment and service hours for new service. The study assessed the financial and operational impacts that could result from developing a transit fleet which features varied bus sizes and seating capacity. Finally the study makes recommendations on how Madison should proceed in future vehicle acquisitions to implement the study findings.

BUS FLEET MAKE-UP CONSIDERATIONS AND OPTIONS

Within the transit industry, conventional wisdom once held that maintaining a uniform fleet promotes efficiency, but the evolving industry trend is moving in a direction that suggests it may be more efficient to operate with a more varied fleet tailored to meet the specific transit needs of the area being served. On high demand routes, larger capacity vehicles can move more passengers with marginal increases in acquisition and operating cost, or, in some cases, provide the same capacity with greater efficiency, using one bus in place of two buses, for example. At the other end of the
spectrum, on low demand routes, increasing fuel and maintenance costs have offset the value of uniformity when operating buses with smaller passenger capacity. For example, small buses use about 10% less fuel than a standard transit bus. The overarching consideration in any bus purchase and deployment decision must present a balance that is driven by the transit riding needs of the community, the characteristics of the transit network, service quality, and financial objectives. In other words, there are no easy answers.

The essential tenant of transit fleet acquisition and sizing is that the fleet be designed to the needs of the service area at peak times of the day, such as the morning and afternoon rush hour. However, even with the introduction of more vehicle choices and sizes, it makes no financial sense to maintain a bus fleet that has some vehicles that are only used in off-peak conditions, but not in peak conditions. Generally, if a bus is in the fleet, it must be usable at peak times or it presents an unnecessary financial drain on the system.

In the large bus world there are three choices: articulated buses with typical seated capacity of around 60 people, motor coaches with capacities of around 55 people and double-decker buses with capacities of around 70 people. A typical “standard” transit bus seats around 40 people. Due to the service characteristics and the facility characteristics of Madison, only articulated buses have been considered as feasible additions to the Metro bus fleet.

In the small bus world there are many, many choices and types of buses, each with an application that is better for some things and not so appropriate for others. Some smaller buses are built on light truck chassis with seating capacities of 15 to 30 people, such as vehicles currently in use for Monona Transit service and Metro+Plus paratransit service. These are great vehicles for applications where they are only used a few times a day or have limited stops, but most often have been found to wear out quickly when subjected to the rigors of urban transit service. Medium duty truck chassis have also been crafted into buses with seating capacity in the 20 to 35 passenger range. These vehicles are better suited for more rigorous use than those built on light duty chassis, but they are also more expensive and often not well suited to urban transit operations. For this reason, it is common in the transit industry to have separate fleets of light-duty paratransit vehicles and heavy-duty vehicles intended for use on fixed-routes.

The third type of small bus is essentially a shortened 30 to 35-foot version of a standard 40-foot transit bus built on a heavy duty bus chassis. The seating capacity is normally 25 to 30 people. These buses are designed specifically to meet the daily rigors of urban transit service. For that reason, only 30-foot heavy duty transit buses were considered for this study. Metro Transit does not currently offer any services that would be appropriate for light- or medium-duty transit vehicles that are not designed to withstand the rigors of frequent-stop, all-day transit service. However, the small heavy duty bus also costs more than the other two small bus options and represents only a small difference in purchase price when compared to a standard forty foot transit bus. The concept of using the same vehicle for low-ridership, peripheral fixed-route service and paratransit service with a hybrid medium-duty vehicle surfaced in the conduct of the study and may be a worthwhile concept for staff to investigate in the future, but was not within the scope of this investigation.
Figure 1: Bus Types

**Light-Duty Small Bus**
*Typical Uses:* Demand Response service  
*Length:* 16 to 28 ft  
*Seats:* 10 to 22

**Medium-Duty Small Bus**
*Typical Uses:* Demand Response and Low demand fixed-route services  
*Length:* 25 to 35 ft  
*Seats:* 20 to 30

**Heavy-Duty Small Bus**
*Typical Uses:* Low demand fixed-route services  
*Length:* 30 ft  
*Seats:* 22 to 30

**Standard Bus**
*Typical Uses:*  
*Length:* 40 ft  
*Seats:* 34 to 38
### Articulated Bus

**Typical Uses:**
- **Length:** 60 ft
- **Seats:** 50 to 54

![Articulated Bus Image](image)

### Over-the-Road Coach

**Typical Uses:**
- **Length:** 40 to 45 ft
- **Seats:** 50 to 55

![Over-the-Road Coach Image](image)

### Double-Decker Bus

**Typical Uses:**
- **Length:** 42 ft
- **Seats:** 77

![Double-Decker Bus Image](image)

---

**UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS OF MADISON**

Madison has a unique geographical and land use setting that significantly increases the complexity of transit service design and decisions on how best to meet consumer needs and operate efficiently. The constrained isthmus at the center of the major employment area, joined immediately to the west by a major university, means that buses carrying workers and students have to traverse many of the same pathways to reach customer destinations. For example, a state worker who resides in Middleton is very likely to be joined by students and staff headed for the University of Wisconsin – Madison (UW). While at the outer ends of the route the bus is not at capacity, as it nears the western end of the UW it will have attracted many more people with destinations both at the UW and in downtown Madison. From a customer perspective, being able to board the bus in Middleton and remain on-board all the way to their ultimate destination is far more convenient than getting on one bus in Middleton and then transferring to another at some...
point closer to the center of Madison. It is this very characteristic that has contributed to the complexity of the Metro system and the practicality of maintaining a uniform bus fleet.

This ridership characteristic also contributes to the public perception that Metro operates “big empty buses.” The buses pick up passengers as they traverse along a route, rather than picking up a full capacity load at the beginning of the route and carrying that load to the other end of the route. At the outer ends of the route, people can readily observe buses that are well below capacity, even on Metro’s busiest routes. For those individuals who do not have an opportunity to observe that very same bus as it approaches UW or downtown Madison with a standing load, it is easy to understand their perception that the bus is under-utilized. This very same situation occurs in communities all over North America, but the unique geography of Madison and how Metro has adapted transit services to that geography contributes to the perception.

Several times in the study, questions were raised concerning changes to the basic design of transit services in Madison and how that might influence the need, or desirability, of a bus fleet of mixed size. In the final analysis, the priority service and network design criterion must be how best to meet the transit needs of the area. The vehicle size component must be based on that service design rather than forcing a service design to accommodate a particular vehicle size.

What We Found

Based on data collected on Metro Transit buses (described later) a number of routes appear to be strong candidates to switch from using standard buses to large buses and a small number of routes are candidates to switch from standard buses to small buses.

Small Buses - With today’s transit system, routes 13, 17, 34, 39, and 52 could operate with small buses, which would require the purchase of six small buses. However, there are several other routes that may be suitable for small buses. Route 31 is new, so additional data must be collected to determine the potential suitability of using a smaller bus. There are other routes that would require restructuring, in some cases by separating the central Madison part of the route from the peripheral tail. It is uncertain if such a restructure is desirable from a rider perspective and efficient from an operating perspective. These routes include Routes 44/48, 73, and 74 west of the Middleton Transfer Point. If all of these possibilities aligned, Metro could deploy a fleet of up to thirteen small buses.

The assimilation of small buses into the Metro fleet is possible under today’s conditions. But there are a limited number of routes where they are an appropriate “fit” in terms of capacity versus demand.

The perceived benefit, helping to dispel the common “big empty bus” perception, and the real benefit of contributing to a modest decrease in greenhouse gas emissions, are likely to outweigh the financial benefit. It appears the introduction of ten small buses will slightly increase system costs by about $40,000 per year.

Large Buses – The use of large buses shows significant promise to reduce overcrowding in Madison. The analysis shows potential for up to 48 standard buses to be upgraded to larger 60-foot articulated buses, (40 buses in service, 8 for spares). Routes 80 and 84 present the most
immediate potential need and application. In addition, routes 2, 15, 28/56/57, 37/38, 44/48, 71/74, and 72 demonstrate a need for increased capacity that could be provided by use of larger capacity buses.

There are three substantive issues that must be resolved before moving ahead with a large bus acquisition. First, the current bus storage and maintenance capacity of Metro must be addressed. Current maintenance facilities do not have enough capacity to accommodate articulated buses. In particular, the bus garage does not have enough storage capacity and, to a lesser degree, enough maintenance capacity, to accommodate any number of articulated buses. The options to resolve this limitation include: increasing the size of the current bus garage, acquiring additional bus storage and maintenance capacity in another location, and/or reducing the total fleet size (currently 208 forty foot buses) until the new fleet make up could be accommodated. It should be noted that the current number of buses is just adequate to provide the current level of service. Therefore, reducing the fleet size would mean some reduction of service.

Second, the introduction of large buses will increase Metro’s operating and capital costs. A new financial plan must be assembled to ensure the new bus capacity is financially sustainable. Third, there are locations, in particular the transfer centers, where the additional length of articulated buses must be accounted for by some combination of changing operating practices, e.g. reducing the amount of pulse scheduling, or facility and/or bus stop modifications.

**HOW THE STUDY WAS CONDUCTED**

Early in the study, several locations near downtown Madison, near the UW and at transfer points were identified as likely points of peak loading for peripheral service. Buses were observed at each of these locations during peak hours within two different sets of dates. The end result was that about 20 to 60 individual trips were observed for each route and the number of passengers on-board was recorded at each location. Using this method, the study team was able to ascertain the maximum number of people on the bus on each trip during peak hours. Other than Route 80, observations were not made during the mid-day, evening, or weekend because fleet mix and size is determined based on demand during the peak periods (see BUS FLEET MAKE-UP CONSIDERATIONS AND OPTIONS above).

That collected data was then used make an initial bus size determination by applying size criteria to the percentage of trips that would be overloaded at the maximum observed load (see Figure 2). The size criteria include not having more than 20% of trips beyond a “comfortable full load” for a standard bus or more than 10% of trips beyond a comfortable full load for a small bus (see Figure 3). The more stringent criterion of exceeding the comfortable load on a small bus is based on not
having a second door for passengers to exit, as more than a few standees will cause significant circulation problems.

Figure 2: Maximum Load Selection

![Diagram showing maximum load selection](image)

Figure 3: Bus Size Decision Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Default size: Standard</th>
<th>20% or more of peak trips overload Standard?</th>
<th>Change bus size to Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or more of peak trips overload Small?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Change bus size to Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comfortable loads were defined as a bus having a few more people than seats – 30 passengers for a 30-foot bus and 40 passengers for a 40-foot bus. In most cases, these loads would have a few empty seats and five to ten standees. The bus is “full” but passengers can generally circulate. More people could physically fit on the bus, but when loads approach 50 or more for a 40-foot bus, conditions are cramped and uncomfortable for standees. Bus load examples are displayed below in Figure 4.

The sizing criteria also take into account the fact that loads vary on a daily basis. One day a particular trip approaching downtown may be well above the maximum capacity, but the day after the bus may only have a fully seated load. Using this methodology means that a significant number of trips would need to be regularly overloaded before a bus size is increased; it is not designed to accommodate the “peak of the peak” loads, which would result in an excessive vehicle size for all but a handful of trips.
Figure 4: Bus Load Examples

Seated Load

Standing Load

Crush Load
Conclusions and Recommendations

Small buses may be worth considering for a handful of routes in the Metro system. If a decision is reached to include small buses in the fleet, it is recommended there be at least ten buses as that is a desirable minimum number to efficiently manage in the facility and to maintain. A smaller number could be acquired and deployed, but the lack of efficiency would very likely outweigh any real or perceived benefits. If the current route system were extensively restructured, a more substantial fleet of small buses could be deployed while maintaining customer-friendly capacity on lower demand routes. The trade-off is that some riders would need to transfer, thereby losing their one-seat commute of today.

The deployment of ten small buses is unlikely to create a financial benefit to Metro. In fact, the inclusion of small buses could create a slight increase system costs due to the logistics of moving buses on the periphery of the area into and out of service. Based on industry research and life cycle cost evaluation, any cost savings from the introduction of small buses will be marginal. This is primarily due to the fact that the vast majority of bus operating costs are invested in the bus operator and the labor needed to maintain the bus. In Madison these costs remain a constant regardless of vehicle size.

A contravening consideration is that introduction of a reasonable number of small buses may assist in improving the public perception of the “big empty buses” operating outside the urban core and that smaller buses use less fuel, and, therefore, emit fewer greenhouse gases (GHG’s). While the integration and deployment discussed in this study is focused on peak periods, deployment of a fleet that emits fewer GHG’s in off-peak time periods could contribute to measureable reductions in transit generated GHG’s while maintaining, or even improving, community mobility. This is essentially a double win for environmental sustainability.

There are significant opportunities to introduce large buses, but they come at a cost. Route 80/84 and University Avenue corridor routes such as Route 2 are the highest priority because reports indicate that they serve the most crowded areas and have consistent all-day service with significant loads occurring throughout the day. It will be a policy decision to determine if, and to what extent, standard-sized buses are replaced with articulated buses given Metro’s budgetary constraints and limitations of the maintenance garage’s capacity. The current garage has no capacity to absorb any articulated buses.

Large buses will end up costing Metro more to acquire and operate as part of the fleet. How much, exactly, depends on a number of factors. In the maximum deployment where articulated buses are substituted for standard buses on a one for one basis where peak overcrowding indicates the extra capacity would be utilized, a total of 40 articulated buses would be required, plus 8 additional as spares for a total of 48. Total costs of the system would increase by $1.8 million per year, for both operating and capital. In some cases, by maintaining the level of capacity on a route, measured by the number of seats delivered in the peak hours, it may be possible to reduce the number of peak trips based on the higher capacity of each bus. In these cases, the cost of providing service during peak periods could be reduced, but the higher operating cost of the large buses throughout the day would more than offset that cost savings. In this scenario the other significant consideration is that the frequency of service on some of Madison’s busiest routes would be reduced. That is a trade-off that must be considered.

Overall, the recommendation is one of caution. There are significant issues in front of Metro that must be answered before moving to diversify the bus fleet. The first issue is a decision on funding and construction of an additional, or replacement, operating base that can be designed in such a
way as to service large numbers of articulated buses. The second of these issues is a decision on the future of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in Madison. Many of the potential routes for articulated buses are key corridors under consideration for development of BRT. This needs to be understood in terms of the potential impacts on how articulated buses are deployed. Given that a bus, once acquired, stays with a system from 12 to 15 years, a good view of the future is important before Metro begins acquiring a large number of articulated buses, and a future financial plan should be established that sets future funding priorities of the agency. For example, if articulated buses are to be deployed in the bus fleet, it is more important that Metro expands and improves the maintenance and operating facility than implementing BRT service. Even with priorities established, the more significant question becomes “where do the funds come from to finance these projects?”

Another set of considerations lies ahead as Madison launches the effort to construct a “transportation master plan.” This plan will consider the application of all modes and their related infrastructure requirements. Given the magnitude and longevity of the capital funding decisions confronting Madison Metro, it would be appropriate to fully understand the direction of the city moving into the future before large and long-lived capital decisions are approached.

Finally, there is the issue of funding priorities. Certainly the transportation master plan will assist the City in making priority choices, but the availability of funding is also to be considered. State funds are not available for transit capital projects, and federal funds have decreased since new federal legislation was enacted. It is very likely, for instance, that Metro could be faced with the choice of replacing three older standard length coaches with three new standard length coaches or two articulated coaches, for about the same total amount of funding. The trade-off is maintaining the same number of buses in the fleet and reducing the average age of the fleet (and therefore lowering maintenance costs) versus introducing larger buses, but at the cost of deciding how to provide an equivalent level of service. That financial trade-off illustration is still not complete as the very same dollars would also be needed to construct a new or expanded maintenance facility that would allow introduction of articulated buses in the fleet. How much funding is available and establishing priorities for that funding will ultimately determine how much and how quickly Metro’s fleet diversifies.

**What Does This Mean for Riders and the Public?**

On balance the vast majority of riders would notice little, or no, difference in their transit trips if the fleet is diversified besides the noticeably different layout of the vehicles. But, as noted throughout this section and the following report, some adaptations would be necessary to capitalize on the diversification of the bus fleet and some riders would notice the differences. Some riders may need to transfer in place of today’s one seat ride, while some riders will have a seat where today they stand. Some riders will see “extra” buses disappear from their routes, while others may see some reductions in the frequency of peak period service. In the core of the system the differences may be unnoticeable since today riders in some corridors have bus choices that occur as frequently as every three minutes. With larger buses extensively deployed the choices may occur every four minutes. The trade-off is that these same riders will see fewer instances where they are passed up at a stop because the bus is already beyond it maximum passenger capacity.

Overall, the system would experience an increase in operating costs if the fleet is diversified. While the amount of that increase may vary, it is unavoidable. In the long term, is fleet diversification positive or negative for riders? No one can fully forecast the future, but transit
agencies throughout the US operate diversified fleets. There is no overall assessment to label their experience as positive or negative. The one universal finding is that fleet diversity has allowed systems to be more flexible in meeting the inevitable variety of needs within the communities they serve.

Aside from these more technical and financial considerations there are the considerations related to public opinion. Regardless of the outcome of this study, public perception will persist that Metro is operating too many “big empty buses” and may not be making the best use of public funds. This is a very common public perception for transit agencies, but may manifest itself differently in Madison than in other communities. To gain more public confidence that Metro should be making investments in new maintenance facilities, or BRT, or larger capacity buses it may also be necessary for Metro to make investments in and deploy smaller buses. Even if the financial results are close to neutral, there may be value in presenting a new dynamic to the community in terms of matching capacity and demand. Such a move could help improve public support for the system.
Re: Review and Discussion on Draft Scope of Work for Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan

Staff Comments on Item:
The MPO, in partnership with the City of Madison Traffic Engineering Division/Parking Utility, will be hiring a consultant to prepare a regional ITS Strategic Plan. ITS involves application of a broad range of advanced technologies and management techniques to relieve congestion (particularly from incidents or special events), improve safety, enhance productivity, and achieve other transportation system goals. Examples include advanced traffic signal systems that can modify signal timings at intersections in response to traffic conditions and the automated vehicle location (AVL) system Metro currently uses to track a transit vehicle’s location in real-time and compare against the schedule. The MPO is particularly interested in the ability of ITS applications that can provide data needed to implement its Congestion Management Process and move to more performance-based transportation planning.

The ITS Plan will build upon the work already completed by WisDOT to identify and begin installation of ITS infrastructure for the freeway system. The plan will include an inventory analysis, needs assessment, and deployment plan. Functional areas to be addressed include: traffic operations/management, public transit management, parking management, incident management, ITS infrastructure for bicyclists, communications, and data collection. The plan will establish a framework for ongoing, coordinated multi-agency efforts to ensure that ITS strategies implemented are integrated and complementary. This will ensure that ITS projects are cost effective and eligible for federal funding.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Preliminary draft scope of work for the ITS Plan RFP, dated 1/30/14.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale: For discussion purposes only.
Intelligent Transportation Systems Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area

SCOPE OF WORK

PURPOSE

The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the City of Madison Traffic Engineering (TE) Division/Parking Utility are seeking proposals from qualified consultants to assist MPO and City of Madison TE staff in developing a Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area. The Regional ITS Plan is intended to supplement the Wisconsin Department of Transportation’s (WisDOT) Traffic Operations Infrastructure Plan (TOIP) for the freeway system and to further develop and refine the Wisconsin Statewide ITS Architecture for the Madison area (Link to the TOIP is here http://www.topslab.wisc.edu/its/toip/ and link to the Statewide ITS Architecture is here http://www.topslab.wisc.edu/its/architecture/).

The Regional ITS Plan is to be developed within the framework of the MPO’s 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update and Congestion Management Process (CMP) and designed to implement policy objectives and recommendations of the RTP and to assist in implementing the CMP. (Link to the CMP is here: http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/documents/CMP_11_Final_Report_Web.pdf)

The planning effort will be guided by a staff advisory committee consisting of the MPO’s Congestion Management Committee – a subcommittee of the MPO’s Technical Coordinating Committee – and other ITS stakeholders. The MPO’s Congestion Management Committee includes representatives from WisDOT Southwest Region, WisDOT Bureau of Planning, Federal Highway Administration, City of Madison Traffic Engineering Division, Metro Transit, and Dane County Public Works, Highway & Transportation Department. Other ITS stakeholders anticipated to be involved include: WisDOT Bureau of Traffic Operations/State Traffic Operations Center; Wisconsin and Dane County Emergency Management; Dane County Sheriff’s Dept.; Dane County Public Safety Communications (911) Center; local police departments; UW-Madison Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory; and other local public works departments. The final product will be an ITS Plan report to be adopted by the MPO as a supplement to the MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Background

   Madison area fastest growing in the state
   Unique geographic constraints
   Numerous special events
   Limited opportunities for roadway capacity expansion
   Increased emphasis on performance based planning and congestion management

2. Project Description

   The project involves development of a Regional ITS Strategic Plan for the Madison, Wisconsin Metropolitan Area that creates a road map for implementation of an integrated system of ITS strategies to enhance the efficiency and safety of the transportation system and achieve other identified regional transportation goals. The plan will build off of the work already completed by
WisDOT focused primarily on the freeway system (Interstate 39/90 and 94 and Beltline (USH 12/14/18/151) in the Madison area). The plan will help establish the need for ITS investments in the region, identify relative priorities to direct ITS investment, and identify specific projects to be deployed to meet identified needs. It will also establish a framework for ongoing, coordinated multi-agency efforts to ensure ITS strategies implemented in the region are integrated and complementary. This coordination will ensure that ITS projects in the region are cost effective and also eligible for federal funding.

It is expected that the consultant will attend and make presentations at 5-6 meetings of the study oversight committee and MPO Technical Coordinating Committee, conduct 2 or more workshops with ITS stakeholders in the region, and make a presentation at 2 or more meetings of the MPO Policy Board and City of Madison transportation committees.

3. Scope of Services

The scope of services involves the following tasks, although proposers are free to suggest modifications or additions to this scope based on their experience with similar projects in other areas:

Task 1: Develop an ITS Strategic Plan vision, goals/objectives, and performance measures that build off of the measures in the MPO’s Congestion Management Process.

Task 2: Conduct an Existing Conditions/Inventory analysis describing and mapping existing City of Madison, Metro Transit, WisDOT, and other agency ITS infrastructure as well as the planned ITS elements by these agencies.

Task 3: Conduct a Needs Assessment to identify potential uses for ITS technology by the various agencies.

The ITS needs should be categorized by functional area. These should include, but not be limited to: traffic operations/management, incident management, public transit management, parking management, infrastructure for bicyclists, safety, communications, and data collection.

Task 4: Develop a Regional ITS Architecture that is consistent with the Wisconsin Statewide ITS Architecture, but updates and further refines the architecture for the Madison area.

The Regional ITS Architecture should be developed in close cooperation with WisDOT and with stakeholder input. The use of the architecture as part of the planning and project development and implementation process should be addressed. The maintenance of it and future updates should also be addressed.

Task 5: Develop an ITS Operational Concept that provides a framework to foster ITS integration and improve inter-agency communication, cooperation, coordination, and commitment.

As with the Architecture, the Operational Concept should be developed in close cooperation with ITS stakeholders, defining roles and responsibilities for operations as well as planning, construction, and maintenance. It should address facilities (i.e., operations center) and staffing. It should be written in non-technical terms that allow stakeholders to understand it and achieve buy-in.
Task 6: Develop an ITS Implementation Plan, which establishes planned ITS project and strategy deployment for the different agencies in the region in near, mid-term, and long-term periods.

For each of the projects included in the deployment plan, the plan should include a project description, capital and O&M cost, primary implementing agency, expected benefits, and other comments or considerations for the project.

The deployment plan should address how the plan can be used to support the federal ITS architecture conformity and systems engineering requirements. It should also address considerations such as the need for inter-agency agreements, funding sources, operations and maintenance of ITS applications (including staffing and facility space issues), and the process for maintaining and updating the plan. It is anticipated that the MPO will be responsible for leading that process in coordination with the City of Madison TE Division and WisDOT.

4. Project Deliverables

The primary deliverable for this project shall consist of a report or reports that document the analysis, planning process, and different components of the ITS Plan. An executive summary should be included. In addition, two PowerPoint presentations summarizing the ITS Plan shall also be provided to assist in educating and informing key audiences. One should be an “executive summary” and the other a more technical version.

All final products shall be submitted electronically, in a format agreed to by the City and the consultant, so that all text and graphics can be independently edited. All work materials generated, including but not limited to data analysis, photographs/illustrations, meeting notes, and the report document will be the sole property of the City of Madison for use as the City deems appropriate.
Re: Review and Discussion on Draft Roadway Functional Classification Map and Associated Changes to the Madison Urbanized Area Boundary

### Staff Comments on Item:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) asks states to work with MPOs to update the functional classification of all public roadways in accord with federal regulations following the decennial Census and update of the urbanized areas. The last time this was done was in 2004. As part of the reclassification of the roadways, some minor adjustments will need to be made to the Madison urban area boundary approved last year by the MPO. This same thing happened last time. The roadway functional classification has both planning/design and funding implications.

WisDOT has primary responsibility for completing the functional classification for roadways, but must work with MPOs in the larger urban areas. WisDOT has adopted Functional Classification Criteria based on FHWA guidelines to guide the process. The functional classification system groups roadways by the character of service they provide – mobility, connectivity, accessibility – within the overall roadway system and was developed for transportation planning purposes. It describes generally how traffic flows through the roadway network. The primary criteria include: (1) traffic volumes; (2) land uses served by the roadway; and (3) spacing between routes, which varies by type of area (CBD, urban, etc.). System continuity is considered. There are also target ranges for the percentage of roadway miles within each category (principal arterial, minor arterial, collector). Other criteria that may be considered include average trip length on a facility and the level of access control.

WisDOT and MPO staff have worked to prepare a draft map, incorporating comments received from local planning and engineering staff. MPO staff has taken the lead in working with local government staff, including obtaining information on the timing of planned new or realigned streets. The map has been revised several times and reviewed with the MPO’s technical committee at multiple meetings. At this point, there is general agreement or at least acceptance by WisDOT, MPO, and local staff regarding the draft map.

Since the last MPO Board meeting, MPO staff met one last time with City of Madison staff to review the map. Three additional minor changes were made by WisDOT as a result of those discussions: (1) keeping Prairie Road between Raymond and Hammersly as a collector; (2) classifying Westin Rd. between Maple Grove and Manchester as a collector; and (3) classifying W. Gilman St. (Wisconsin to University Ave.) as a local street. As a result of discussions with Middleton and Westport staff, one additional change is shown. The urban area boundary is proposed to be extended on the northwest side north to CTH K and west to CTH Q. This allows CTH K to be classified using urban area versus rural area criteria and upgraded from a collector to a principal arterial, which makes more sense. The attached map shows this proposed adjustment to the urban area boundary along with others that need to be made in conjunction with the new functional classification map. The other significant adjustment to the urban area is the extension west to Twin Valley Road between USH 14 and Blackhawk Road. This is necessary to allow the proposed upgrade of Pleasant View Road (north of Mineral Point) to a principal arterial. It is needed to meet the principal arterial spacing criteria.

Final action by the MPO must wait for traffic counts to be taken on some newly designated collector streets next spring and for forecasts to be done for some planned collectors. Following MPO action, the map will also need to be approved by WisDOT and FWHA.

### Materials Presented on Item:

1. Draft roadway functional classification map showing proposed urban area changes as well

### Staff Recommendation/Rationale:

For information and discussion purposes only at this time.