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

Sun Prairie City Hall
300 E. Main Street, Community Room
6:30 p.m.

OUTREACH MEETING AGENDA

1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Approval of May 6, 2015 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Presentation and Discussion on City of Sun Prairie Land Use & Transportation Plans, Projects, and Issues (Scott Kugler, City of Sun Prairie Planning Director)

6. Recommendation Regarding the MPO’s Representative to the City of Madison’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee

7. Update on Joint CARPC and MPO Values and Priorities Research and Survey Project

8. Brief Presentation on Sustainable Communities Indicators Progress

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

10. Discussion of Future Work Items:
    - Public Participation Plan Update
    - Metro Transit On-Board Survey and Transit Related Travel Model Improvements
    - Regional ITS Strategic Plan
    - Bicycle Transportation Plan
    - Dane County Bicycle Wayfinding Plan
    - 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program
    - Regional Transportation Plan 2050

11. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

12. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:
   
   Wednesday, July 1 at 6:30 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)
May 6, 2015 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call
   
   **Members present:** David Ahrens, Mark Clear, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Chuck Kamp, Steve King (arrived during item #3), Al Matano, Ed Minihan (arrived during item #6), Mark Opitz, Chris Schmidt, Robin Schmidt, Patrick Stern (arrived during item #3)

   **Members absent:** Paul Lawrence, Jerry Mandli

   **MPO Staff present:** Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

2. Approval of April 1, 2015 Meeting Minutes
   
   Moved by Kamp, seconded by Golden, to approve the April 1, 2015 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

   - Flyer regarding local officials meeting on the USH 12 freeway conversion study from Middleton to STH 19 West.
     
     Schaefer noted the meeting occurred last week, but staff could provide the materials to the board or schedule a presentation by WisDOT staff on the project to the board. There was general agreement to include a presentation on the project as a future agenda item. Gust stated that the study was conceptual and no funding for a freeway conversion is currently available. The study would be used to reserve right of way.

   - Letter of comment from the Association of MPOs (AMPO) and other local organizations to Congressional Transportation Committee members regarding the reauthorization of the federal transportation bill. The letter urges for the sub-allocation of more funding to the MPOs under the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP).

   - Fliers regarding CARPC-hosted presentations by Robert Grow from Envision Utah on how the Madison region can forge a regional vision and strategy for growth. Schaefer and several board members plan to attend.

   - Letter from Mayor Soglin responding to the letter from the MATPB to him, the County Executive, and others regarding support for integrated regional land use and transportation planning.

     Golden commented that some have raised concerns about how well CARPC was doing in terms of working with communities on future urban development planning. The separation of the MPO from CARPC has led to a lack of communication between the two agencies. He said a tremendous amount of future urban development planning had been done when CARPC had extra staff from the Sustainable Communities grant. He suggested CARPC staff be invited to provide a presentation on their work at a future meeting, which would be timely given the work to begin on the regional transportation plan update.

4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)
   
   None.

5. Resolution TPB No. 103 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area & Dane County

   Moved by Opitz, seconded by Clear, to approve Amendment #2 to the 2015-2019 TIP for the Madison Area & Dane County. Motion carried.

Schaefer reviewed the proposed final draft of the document outlining the selection process, policies, and scoring criteria for STP Urban projects, focusing on changes made to the program objectives and policies from earlier drafts. He mentioned the new “project management” section that indicates the MPO reserves the right to withdraw approval of a project if the sponsor is not meeting the schedule and MPO funding may be jeopardized. This is in response to new WisDOT policies, including the prohibition on carrying over funding from one program cycle to the next. Schaefer said this policy will probably need to be invoked for the CTH PD reconstruction project west of CTH M. No progress has been made on this joint Madison and Verona project due to boundary agreement negotiations and other issues. It is probably not possible at this point for the project to be completed in 2018 as scheduled. Schaefer said he has had discussions with staff about this. If this is required, Verona could apply for funding in the upcoming program cycle for projects in 2019 or 2020.

Gust mentioned that there is also a “ten-year rule” that requires projects to be initiated within that time frame or the federal funding will be lost, including any funding already spent. He said FHWA also imposes an “end date” by which the project must be completed and the funds drawn down, typically 3 years from the anticipated end of construction. Both rules have potential exceptions like environmental constraints that caused a delay, but they are not easy to obtain.

Schaefer described two new project screening criteria, one related to bus purchase projects requiring a maximum 17% spare ratio. Matano asked for a definition of “spare ratio”. Schaefer and Kamp said the spare ratio was how many extra buses the agency has beyond what it needs for peak period service. Extra buses are needed for both corrective and routine preventive maintenance. Clear asked what Metro’s current spare ratio was, and Kamp said 20%. Metro uses a maximum of 178 buses during the peak. Twenty percent of that is 214, the current fleet size. Kamp stated that he would prefer to not reduce the spare ratio, referring to the 17% goal in the draft criteria. Schaefer said when the criterion was discussed with Metro staff they indicated the ratio was 17%. He said the reason for the criterion was to reflect a policy to use STP Urban funding for bus acquisition only when absolutely necessary given the other capital funding sources available to Metro. Schaefer noted Metro cannot exceed 20% per FTA regulations. Kamp clarified that the percentage is based on the peak schedule, not the entire fleet, which is a common mistake.

Kamp moved, Opitz seconded, to change the maximum spare ratio to 20% calculated based on the peak operating requirement.

Golden stated that Metro has two separate fleets, one for paratransit and one for fixed route, and also may have large, articulated buses in the future. He wondered how that would affect the spare ratio. Kamp said the ratio is calculated strictly for the fixed-route fleet, but didn’t know how acquisition of larger buses would affect it. In response to a question by Stern, it was clarified that the difference between 17% and 20% was five buses for Metro.

R. Schmidt noted the requirement that roadway projects be consistent with the State’s pedestrian/bicycle accommodations law, and wondered if that should be modified in case the state eliminates the law. Matano suggested referencing the law “as it read on January 1, 2015.” Golden agreed that was a good way to handle the issue. Stern said other options were to change the policy to something more specific about such accommodations rather than referencing state law or amend the policy if the state law was later repealed. There was discussion about these options. Clear noted that adopting similar language would be cumbersome since the law is long with an associated administrative rule. Gust stated that there have been one or two cases where he thought the law’s exceptions weren’t flexible enough due to the requirement that the on-street accommodations must account for at least 20% of the total project cost. He referred to a case with the STH 113 (Northport Drive) project where they used an off-street accommodation for a short segment, but said this was done before the law passed and wouldn’t have been allowed. Stern said there were some roads in
Fitchburg where bike lanes might not be feasible due to wetlands and restricted right of way. Gust responded that those would probably meet the 20% requirement.

Golden moved, King seconded, to change the language to read “statutes and administrative rules as they read” followed by the date the MPO adopts the document, with possible editorial revisions from Schaefer.

King suggested that the board convert the two motions on the floor to one motion to approve with the two changes. There was unanimous consent.

Golden commented that with the change to use of different scoring criteria for the different project types and not directly comparing scores of different types of projects he thought the board would be more engaged in the project scoring and selection process.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Stern, to adopt TPB Resolution No. 104 approving the Selection Process for STP Urban Projects document with the following changes: (1) modify screening criteria #4 related to bus purchase projects to state “the transit agency shall maintain a maximum spare ratio of 20% of the maximum vehicles operated in peak service.”; and (2) modify screening criteria #3 to state that “all roadway projects must at a minimum comply with the State of Wisconsin’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations law and regulations in effect on May 2015.” Motion carried.

7. Letter of Support for City of Madison/Metro Transit TIGER 7 Application for Funding to Design and Construct a Satellite Bus Garage Facility

Matano commented that it was a well-written letter. Kamp said that Metro had received letters of support from the City of Middleton, a joint letter from the City of Verona and Epic, Downtown Madison, Inc., and others. He appreciated that WisDOT Secretary Gottlieb’s name was on the letter. It may help the WisDOT letter come soon. Golden suggested to ask Shorewood Hills for a letter of support. Kamp said Metro did. R. Schmidt stated that a letter of support from the Dane County Board was on the agenda for next week’s Public Works committee meeting. Opitz clarified that Middleton’s support was in the form of a resolution.

Moved by Opitz, seconded by R. Schmidt, to approve sending the support letter. Motion carried.

8. Presentation Providing Update on the Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan

Schaefer provided a short PowerPoint presentation on the ongoing ITS plan that explained why the plan was being done and the definition of ITS, and summarized the results of the ITS needs workshop. The plan vision statement, goals, objectives, and draft performance measures were reviewed, along with the schedule for completing the project. Schaefer said the plan consultant would provide a presentation to the board later this summer.

R. Schmidt asked where the funding would come from for implementing the recommended ITS projects. Schaefer said that there isn’t any special federal funding program for ITS projects at this time. Some areas such as Milwaukee have access to federal Congestion Mitigation - Air Quality (CMAQ) funding, but the Madison area does not since it has always been in compliance with federal air quality standards. He said the MPO’s STP Urban funding was an option for local projects or possibly a federal discretionary grant such as the TIGER program. Otherwise, it would be local funding.

Golden said that the word “environment” only appeared once in the vision statement and goals. There are many potential positive impacts to the environment from fuel and time savings. An example was the ramp metering on the Beltline. He suggested emphasizing that more. Schaefer said that was a good comment and that is one of the major benefits of ITS.
9. Appointments of MPO Board Representatives to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Intergovernmental Oversight Committee

Matano stated that there are more people who wanted to be on the committee than there are seats. He said he decided to appoint himself and Mark Opitz on the theory that Ken Golden and Robin Schmidt, who also expressed interest, could be appointed by other appointing authorities such as the Madison Mayor and Dane County Executive.

10. Discussion Regarding Participation with CARPC on Project to Conduct a Regional Values and Priorities Survey

Schaefer said he had included money in the budget this year for a random public survey to support the update to the regional transportation plan. CARPC had budgeted for a values and priorities survey to use as a first step in updating the regional land use plan. MPO and CARPC staff have recently talked about collaborating and including transportation related questions in with the other questions on the values survey. Schaefer explained the benefits of the values based approach, which has been used in a number of other urban areas. He referenced the survey report for Orlando that was included in the packet. Schaefer said he wanted to make sure that the board was comfortable with collaborating on this joint survey. He said the MPO would cover around one-third of the cost.

Ahrens asked what the anticipated cost was for the survey. Schaefer said that CARPC has had discussions with the consultant, Heart+Mind Strategies, that has done these types of surveys. They provided a cost estimate of $90,000, but this includes some qualitative research with a group of residents to identify key challenges facing the region and an understanding of values, priorities, and potential solutions to issues identified.

Golden said that the City of Madison was providing the other funding for the survey. He participated on some conference calls with Steve Steinhoff from CARPC and Robert Grow, who will be in Madison next week, and this was the methodology that Envision Utah used in their process. He said he was impressed with the process. Clear said he did not have a problem with doing the survey with CARPC, but raised a concern that political foes will use the results against us because it will demonstrate that Dane County is different than the rest of the state and needs to be managed differently. R. Schmidt stated that she likes the idea of combining these efforts, but wondered if it would minimize the transportation issues because of the other issues like affordable housing and human services. Golden responded that in Utah the values survey placed a high priority on air quality, which led to their long-term transportation plan including a commitment to build 140 miles of rail in fourteen years, and they did it. Stern said he had similar concerns. Schaefer said he would make sure that transportation issues were adequately addressed and said the benefit of a joint survey is that it ties transportation issues to many of the other issues such as access to jobs and amenities and quality of life. There was general agreement to pursue the joint survey with CARPC.

11. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB

Schaefer said the current schedule calls for the Stoughton Road (USH 51) study draft EIS to be released in August. He said he would contact WisDOT staff about providing a presentation on the recommended alternative at that time. He said WisDOT staff had been working with the City of Madison on plans for access and redevelopment of the East Washington Avenue intersection area and also doing outreach to environmental justice groups in the corridor. Beltline study work was ongoing to develop and analyze alternatives for Beltline improvements, including interchanges and crossings of the Beltline. MPO staff has been involved in meetings to discuss ped/bike crossing issues. Regarding the Interstate-Beltline Interchange EIS study, this was separated out from the larger Interstate reconstruction and expansion project from Madison south to the state line. A coordination meeting was held and WisDOT is still in the early stages of that study.
Schaefer said that for the City of Madison’s Sustainable Transportation Master Plan packages of projects are being developed and cost out to evaluate based on the goals identified for the plan.

12. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer said he hoped to have a draft update of the public participation plan to review at the next meeting. The surveying work for the Metro on-board survey was completed and consultants are now tabulating the data. The consultants exceeded the target number of surveys by a large margin. An RFP was issued for the transit related travel model improvements work and the proposals are due June 4. The survey and this modeling work is being done in preparation for continued study of BRT.

Schaefer mentioned the new bicycle plan webpage and interactive mapping tool to provide comments. He said the MPO had received quite a few posts and staff were in the process of setting up some meetings in June. The bicycle wayfinding plan consultant was selected by the committee and there are negotiations going on right now regarding the scope of work and associated budget. The requests for projects and STP Urban applications went out for the TIP update. Regarding the regional transportation plan update, Schaefer said staff received a draft of employment forecasts at the county level and the urban service area level that CARPC prepared. A write up will be provided. Schaefer said he had some concerns about the forecasts and a meeting was scheduled to discuss. He said he planned to have CARPC staff come to a future board meeting to review their population and employment forecasts.

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Schaefer reported that the MPO Board appointments process was still ongoing. King, Golden, Kamp, and Mandli were either reappointed or are in the process of being reappointed. For the cities and villages appointments, there are four candidates for three slots, including the one to finish Paul Lawrence’s term. In addition to Opitz and Stern, the other candidates are Jim Schuler, Village President of Maple Bluff; and Jason Kramar, DeForest Village Trustee.

Matano asked if he should look into having a meeting in another community. Schaefer said that was a good idea. Golden mentioned that CARPC had done this with success in the past in a format where the main agenda item was a presentation by local staff and officials on current local issues and projects. It was noted the MPO had done the same thing in the past. Matano suggested Sun Prairie, Fitchburg, and Middleton as possible locations. Schaefer said the next meeting would be a good one to do as an outreach meeting.

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, June 3, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B, or another location to be determined.

14. Adjournment

Moved by Clear, seconded by R. Schmidt, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.
The Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Southwest Region is conducting a planning study of the US 12 corridor located between the Parmenter Street interchange north of Middleton to WIS 19 West in the Town of Springfield.

WisDOT will hold a Public Involvement Meeting on Thursday, June 4, 2015 from 7:00pm to 9:00pm and would greatly appreciate your attendance. A short presentation will be given at 7:15pm at the Middleton High School in the Student Center. Come discuss the study, provide background information on the alternatives, engage with the study team, and be a part of the study process.

Why is US 12 being studied?

As growth and development occur throughout the region and State, WisDOT anticipates that traffic along US 12 will steadily increase. With increased traffic volumes, the functional capacities of existing at-grade intersections will deteriorate leading to decreased safety for the traveling public. The purpose of the study is to conceptualize the conversion of US 12 from the Parmenter Interchange to WIS 19 West (Town of Springfield) from an expressway to a freeway. The study will take into account impacts of existing and future land uses, as well as access to the local transportation network.

There are no immediate construction plans or construction funds associated with this study. This study will outline improvement alternatives that, if funded, would be constructed over the coming decades. Even though the actual improvements may be years away, developing a long-term vision will allow WisDOT and local communities to collectively plan for transportation and land use systems that are compatible with each other for the foreseeable future. The end product is an official map to reserve the right-of-way associated with the preferred alternative(s).

Meeting Information

Public Involvement Meeting
Thursday, June 4, 2015
7:00 - 9:00pm
(7:15 Presentation)

Middleton High School
Student Center
2100 Bristol Street

Contact Information

Tom Koprowski
WisDOT Study Manager
Thomas.Koprowski@dot.wi.gov
608-246-3869

Wisconsin DOT SW Region
2101 Wright Street
Madison, WI 53704
US 12 Freeway Conversion Study
Parmenter Interchange to
Wis 19 West
Town of Springfield, Dane County
Who is conducting the study?
The Wisconsin Department of Transportation – SW Region is initiating the study. WisDOT has hired the consulting firm MSA Professional Services (MSA) to assist them with their efforts. The consulting firm Kjohnson Engineers (KJ) will be working with MSA to complete the study activities.

What does the USH 12 Freeway Conversion Study involve? The most important thing to know is that the USH 12 Freeway Conversion Study is just that, a study. There is no immediate construction planned on USH 12, and no funding allocations have been committed beyond the study phases.

The purpose of study is to conceptualize the conversion of USH 12 from the City of Middleton to STH 19 West into a freeway, taking into account impacts on existing and future land uses, as well as access to the local transportation network. The study will develop strategies and recommendations that integrate land use and transportation systems, so that USH 12 operates well into the future. This will allow both WisDOT and the local communities involved to adequately plan for future land use and local transportation network needs.

What are the limits of the study?
The study limits extend from approximately one mile south of County K in the City of Middleton to STH 19 West in the Town of Springfield, a distance of approximately 6 miles. The study passes through the northernmost portion of the City of Middleton and the Town of Springfield in Dane County.

The USH 12 corridor appears to be operating well in this area. Why are additional studies necessary?
USH 12 serves regional truck and automobile traffic, in addition to providing access to local communities and important connections to other major roadways such as STH 19, USH 14, and the beltline. As development occurs both within and outside of the corridor, the potential travel demands on the corridor will increase. Experience around the state has demonstrated that capacity and safety problems will result if a long-range plan is not developed and implemented. The most important aspect of this study is how to assure the functional integrity of this important arterial into future years.

What types of long-term improvements will the study consider?
The study will include the development of strategies to preserve functionality and increase safety along the corridor, and will examine the feasibility of the conversion of this portion of USH 12 into a limited access freeway.
Recommended long-term strategies include the development of interchanges and the elimination of selected at-grade intersections to safely accommodate increasing traffic in the corridor.

How does this project relate to the North Mendota Parkway project between USH 12 north of Middleton and IH90/94? The North Mendota Parkway Study was conducted by local governments under the umbrella of Dane County. Although the two studies are unrelated, the ramifications of the North Mendota Parkway have impacted the recommended strategies of the USH 12 Corridor Study through close coordination by both study teams over the years.
## Re:
Recommendation Regarding the MPO’s Representative to the City of Madison’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee

### Staff Comments on Item:
The composition of the City of Madison Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee includes two members from the MPO Policy Board who are City of Madison Mayor appointees. While the City of Madison Mayor makes the appointments, the MPO Policy Board makes a recommendation on them. The current MPO Board members on the committee are Steve King and Chris Schmidt. Steve King’s appointment expired on April 30. The Board needs to make a recommendation to either reappoint him or appointment someone else. Steve has indicated that he is interested in being re-appointed.

### Materials Presented on Item:
None

### Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
N/A
Re:
Update on Joint CARPC and MPO Values and Priorities Research and Survey Project

Staff Comments on Item:
MPO staff discussed with the board at its last meeting working with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) on a project to hire a consultant to conduct research and a survey on regional values and priorities. The results will be used to support the MPO’s regional transportation plan update as well as CARPC’s future regional land use plan update.

Since then, MPO and CARPC staff had a conference call with the consultant to obtain more information on the process. It is a two-phase process with a quantitative survey preceded by qualitative research to discover the attributes and benefits relevant to quality of life in Madison. The preferred format for the qualitative research is two brainstorming sessions – one with public residents and the other with regional stakeholders. The second phase is an online quantitative scientific survey of representative residents with questions developed in part from the first research phase. A special section of the survey could be devoted to key transportation questions. The goal of the survey is to identify the values and priorities underlying the issues, attributes, and themes that can be used to guide public engagement and communications. Also, Robert Grow from Envision Utah provided presentations on how Salt Lake City and other regions used this process to develop broad agreement on regional strategies for growth (see attached blog post on the presentations by Steve Steinhoff from CARPC). Based on this information, staff is excited about the process and thinks it will be very valuable.

The current plan is to use the summer plan for and recruit key stakeholders to participate in the brainstorming sessions, conduct the sessions in September, and then conduct the online survey following those sessions in late September and October. An agreement with CARPC will be needed to work with them and cost share on the survey.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. [CRSC blog post](#) on the Robert Grow presentations about using a values study to build consensus on regional growth strategies.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For information only at this time.
Robert Grow, President and CEO of Envision Utah, spoke to approximately 150 people in Madison earlier this month about achieving quality growth. Speaking at three different venues May 14 and 15, Mr. Grow described how Salt Lake City and other regions forged broad agreement on regional strategies for growth based on shared values.

Events were hosted by the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) and co-sponsored by the Madison Region Economic Partnership (MadREP), the Dane County Cities and Villages Association, and Sustain Dane. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is available on CARPC’s homepage.

Grow noted that the Madison area is likely poised for strong growth given its assets and amenities. Leaders in Salt Lake City, facing a similar growth forecast 20 years ago, brought together a wide range of area stakeholders from business, government and community organizations to manage growth in a way that aligns with regional values, and strengthens communities.

Mr. Grow, as a prominent business and community leader, spearheaded the
effort to build consensus by conducting a “values study.” He drew on market research methods, adapting them for regional visioning purposes, to identify common core values. The study linked values to community attributes and people’s experiences and feelings. For example, the attribute of traffic congestion was experienced as stealing time away from important activities such as time with family, resulting in frustration and decrease in peace of mind and happiness.

The attributes of our communities directly impact our personal values and are inextricably connected to how we feel.

A resulting “values map” showed groupings of experiences, feelings and values across the population. These maps proved indispensable tools for communicating with and engaging citizens in their broader regional visioning process; and for implementing the vision. This values-based process of regional visioning has been duplicated in regions across the country.

Values study information was used to engage citizens in exploring alternative growth scenarios. Scenarios describe options for how growth can occur and estimate the outcomes, such as traffic congestion, infrastructure tax burden, and land consumption, of those different choices. Residents in Salt Lake City region identified a more compact growth pattern with mixed-use centers along transit corridors as the option most inline with their shared values.

Implementing that shared vision led to six goals and 42 strategies that have generated real results. They developed hundreds fewer square miles of land than anticipated based on previous trends. Through
more housing choices and transit oriented development they reduced average lot sizes 22%, from .32 to .25 acres. Per capita water consumption dropped by 25%. Vehicle miles traveled per person fell, compared to trend projections of significant increases. Public transportation replaced 120,000 car trips daily. Annual tons of air pollution emissions were cut in half. And they saved billions in infrastructure costs. Certainly there were many factors that contributed to these trends, but their Quality Growth Strategy likely played a significant role.

Other regions and states employing this values-based visioning approach include Austin, Los Angeles, central Florida, Omaha, Wyoming, Louisiana, and Hawaii.
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Re:
Brief Presentation on Sustainable Communities Indicators Progress

**Staff Comments on Item:**

The Capital Region Sustainable Communities (CRSC) consortium was formed to carry out the activities of the federal Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant. These included the Bus Rapid Transit study, associated transit-oriented development (TOD) market study, planning for sustainable growth, and other projects related to local healthy food, equity, and green business development, and green infrastructure.

The CRSC consortium also developed a vision for the region and developed goals, priority challenges, and indicators of success. CARPC staff put together a Framework for Change report that presents data on the identified indicators of success. These indicators or measures are related to the identified priority challenges. MPO staff assisted with the transportation related indicators. The indicators are intended to be used over the next few years on a trial basis, evaluating their effectiveness for guiding actions and influencing change with adjustments made to improve them in the future.

The MPO can incorporate these indicators into a more comprehensive set of transportation system performance indicators for its regional transportation planning efforts.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Selected pages from Report – *Framework for Change: Trial Indicators for a Healthy and Flourishing Place for All.*

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

For information only.
Capital Region Sustainable Communities

Framework for Change
Trial Indicators for a Healthy and Flourishing Place for All
Framework for Change
Trial Indicators for a Healthy and Flourishing Place for All

Published May, 2015

Funding

Staff Acknowledgment page
## Framework for Change

**Trial Indicators for a Healthy and Flourishing Place for All**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework for Change</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Indicators for a Healthy and Flourishing Place for All</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenges</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Potential Indicators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Ecosystems</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Reduce stormwater run-off into lakes and streams</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Protect drinking water (groundwater) supply and quality</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Preserve and enhance sensitive natural areas</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Competitiveness</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Sustain strong economy</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Choice</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Meet demand for diverse housing choices</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Ensure housing affordability to all income levels</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficient, Effective Transportation</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Connect the region with an effective transit and shared ride system</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Increase opportunities for active transportation</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Minimize transport costs while ensuring quality service</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Food and Farms</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Protect economic viability of agriculture; protect region's rural character and cultural history</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Ensure access to all to healthy fresh food</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Align government, business and non-profit around regional vision and growth strategy</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Challenge: Community elected and appointed officials reflect community demographics</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEXT STEPS</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Region Sustainable Communities are governments, businesses and non-profits working together for a healthy and flourishing place for all.

The CRSC consortium came together in 2011 to carry out the work of a federal Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant. Grant funding advanced projects for local healthy food, equity and community building, green business development, green infrastructure, and planning for sustainable urban growth.

In addition to these projects, CRSC members forged agreement first on a vision for the region. Building from this vision, consortium members developed goals, priority challenges, and indicators of success.

This paper presents this framework and indicator data. This is not a comprehensive indicator report that seeks to cover all aspects of sustainable communities. Rather, it focuses on measures related to priority challenges identified by the CRSC consortium during 2011 through 2013.

The consortium elected to focus on a manageable number of challenges that most relate to shared goals, that can be influenced by communities in the region, and that require a coordinated regional approach to influence change. The indicators are intended to be used over the next few years as a trial basis, evaluating their effectiveness for guiding actions and influencing change, and making adjustments to improve them based on this experience.
Vision

The CRSC vision is a healthy and flourishing place for all.¹ This vision is characterized by the following “building blocks:”

- Healthy Ecosystems
- Economic Competitiveness
- Housing Choice
- Efficient Effective Transportation
- Healthy Food and Farms
- Excellent Educational Opportunities
- Vibrant Culture
- Efficient Utilities and Services
- Regional Collaboration

Goals

CRSC approved broad goals² related to many of the building blocks above. The goals, for each building block, are:

- **Healthy Ecosystems**
  Preserve, restore and enhance the region’s land, air, and water resources and interconnected ecological system

- **Economic Competitiveness**
  Leverage assets to ensure ample and sustainable education, employment, business and investment opportunities

- **Housing Choice**
  A diverse supply of high quality, safe, affordable, sustainable housing and neighborhoods integrated with existing communities

- **Efficient, Effective Transportation**
  Safe, efficient, affordable, sustainable, and interconnected transportation choices

- **Healthy Food and Farms**
  Support, enhance and benefit from food and fiber production, processing, and distribution sectors that are productive, profitable and sustainable

- **Efficient Utilities and Services**
  Community members have access to safe, efficient public services and facilities using environmentally sound infrastructure and resources

- **Vibrant Culture**
  Strengthen our history, diversity, civic life, community character, and native ecosystems and historical landscapes

- **Regional Collaboration**
  Governments, business and non-profits work together to identify and implement shared goals

¹ An initial “definition of sustainability” was approved by CRSC in 2011. The shorter purpose statement was developed during a “Strategic Blueprint” session October 2013.

² Approved by CRSC as draft goals July 2012.
Priority Challenges

From the building blocks and goals, CRSC members identified and prioritized challenges currently facing the region. To prioritize challenges, members applied the criteria of relevant, regional and controllable. Members identified challenges most relevant to vision and goals, that require a regional response, and that local actions can control or influence.

Healthy Ecosystems

- Reduce stormwater run-off into lakes and streams to improve water quality
- Protect drinking water (groundwater) supply and quality
- Preserve and enhance sensitive open space corridors

Economic Competitiveness

- Sustain strong economy
- Ensure equitable access

Housing Choice

- Meet shifting demand for diverse housing choices
- Ensure housing affordability to all income levels

Efficient, Effective Transportation

- Connect the region with an effective transit and shared ride system
- Increase opportunities for active transportation
- Minimize transport costs while ensuring quality service

Healthy Food and Farms

- Protect economic viability of agriculture
- Ensure access for all to healthy fresh food

Regional Collaboration

- Align government, business and non-profit around regional vision and growth strategy
- Community elected and appointed officials reflect community demographics
Indicators

Indicators can tell us whether we are meeting challenges and fulfilling our goals and vision. They provide information on the state of, or change in, people, places, or systems.

CRSC worked with the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, to identify indicators. Professor James LaGro and students identified best practices and evaluated a broad range of indicators.³

Working with CRSC members, they selected SMART indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY CHALLENGES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEALTHY ECOSYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reduce stormwater run-off into lakes and streams to improve water quality | 1. Phosphorus levels in Yahara lakes and streams  
2. Chloride levels in Yahara lakes  
3. Number of public beach closings in Yahara lakes |
| Protect drinking water (groundwater) supply and quality | 4. Percent of private wells with nitrate-nitrogen levels above the drinking water standard for infants |
| Preserve and enhance sensitive open space corridors | 5. Open space corridor acreage lost over time |
| ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS |            |
| Sustain strong economy | 6. Employment growth in target sectors  
7. Number of small businesses  
8. Strength of flagship businesses  
9. Number of patents awarded  
10. Median household income |
| Ensure equitable access | 11. Percent of children achieving 3rd grade reading proficiency (by race/ethnicity)  
12. Percent of students graduating on time (by race/ethnicity)  
13. Percent of children living in poverty (by race/ethnicity)  
14. Unemployment rate (by race/ethnicity) |

### Other Potential Indicators

As mentioned above, this report identifies indicators most aligned with priority regional challenges, but it is not a comprehensive list of sustainability indicators. There are other potential indicators of sustainability that are important and could be added at some point in time. These include indicators related to: energy efficiency, renewable energy, toxic emissions, population of native and/or threatened species, and number of farmers markets or community supported agriculture farms.

### Progress

The following table summarizes the measurable trends we can observe in the region by tracking the indicators.
## INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTHY ECOSYSTEMS</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Phosphorus levels in Yahara lakes and streams</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chloride levels in Yahara lakes</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of public beach closings in Yahara lakes</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percent of private wells with nitrate-nitrogen levels above the drinking water standard for infants</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Natural areas lost</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Employment growth in target sectors</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of small businesses</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Strength of flagship businesses</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of patents awarded</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Median household income</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Percent of children achieving 3rd grade reading proficiency (by race/ethnicity)</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Percent of students graduating on time (by race/ethnicity)</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Percent of children living in poverty (by race/ethnicity)</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Unemployment rate (by race/ethnicity)</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Yellow" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSING CHOICE</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Range of housing types built</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Percent of residential development built in already developed location</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Affordable housing supply gap</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Housing cost burden</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFICIENT EFFECTIVE TRANSPORTATION</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Shared ridership</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Average vehicle miles traveled per person</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Percent of commuters walking and biking to work</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Dane County Active Living Index</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Average annual transportation costs per household</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Average annual housing plus transportation costs per household</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Yellow" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTHY FOOD AND FARMS</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Percent of total farmland in contiguous blocks greater than 500 acres</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Percent of land in county that is farmland or forest</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Percent of region’s total land area in farm and forest/ acres lost to development per year</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Yellow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Number of food deserts</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL COLLABORATION</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. A regionally adopted vision and strategy for growth</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Number of intergovernmental agreements in effect</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Percent elected and appointed women and persons of color compared to percent in community</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes**

The long-term goal of tracking these indicators is to identify and strive toward measurable goals on each metric. In the meantime, this effort merely presents trend direction.

Some desired directions or outcomes are purposefully vague to account for the difficulties in establishing baselines for certain measures, especially with regard to farmland loss. In those cases, the progress symbol will be either a question mark or a “yellow light.”
Efficient, Effective Transportation

An efficient and effective transportation system gets people where they need to go, on time, while minimizing public and private costs. Such transportation systems provide a variety of travel options, including private motor vehicles, transit, shared rides, walking, biking and other active modes.

Regions with diverse and accessible transportation options will see significantly improved public health outcomes for their citizens. Todd Litman of the Victoria Transport Policy Institute researched the relatedness of transport options and usage to common diseases and maladies. With this comparison, he wrote, “Transport activity affects five of these health risks, including the three largest, which cause more than 60% of total potential years of life lost.”

Priority Challenge: Connect the region with an effective transit and shared ride system

As metropolitan regions grow, adding more and more road lanes becomes practically difficult (lack of space) and expensive, and it negatively affects quality of life and the environment. To handle increasing travel demand, growing regions need to provide a range of transportation options, including expanded transit, to reduce congestion and promote healthy communities. In addition, as cities and villages within metro regions become increasingly inter-connected, a regional transit system becomes an important part of the mix.

Indicator: Shared ridership

Takeaway – Shared ridership – transit and car pooling – is an important measure of how balanced the regional transportation system is. Greater shared use increases roadway capacities, reduces emissions and meets important transportation needs for those with limited or no access to cars. Ridership on Madison Metro has increased significantly to record levels in recent decades. The percent of commuters taking transit to work has increased but is still relatively low, at 6 percent. Carpooling is 8 percent in 2013, after a brief rise from 9 to 11 percent in 2006-8. The portion of people driving alone to work has decreased slightly from 75 to 72 percent.

What is it? Shared ridership includes transit and car pooling. This indicator includes measures of the percent of people commuting to work by transit and car pooling, and the number of transit rides annually, during the school year and during the summer.

Work commutes are one reason to travel but only represent a minority of all trips. Total transit ridership is a measure that captures all trips. Measuring transit trips taken during specific seasons can provide an idea of how ridership differs by season: school year (Sept-May), Summer (Jun-Aug) and Winter (Jan-May). Summer is non-peak transit season, and looking at this measure will give an idea of

---

Litman, Todd, Evaluating Public Transportation Health Benefits, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 31 August 2014.
ridership during the season when weather conditions are better for people to walk or bike. School year ridership, in comparison to summer, can provide an idea of how many people are using transit during the peak ridership time frame.

Why is it important? Shared ridership makes more efficient use of roads, reducing roadway congestion as well as household and business transportation costs. It is also an affordable way for residents who don’t have access to a car, including low-income, elderly and disable populations, to get where they need to go. For students and other residents who aren’t able to drive or don’t have access to a car, other modes of transportation are especially important. It improves air quality by reducing CO2 emissions and congestion.\(^5\)

The percent of commuters taking transit to work gives us a measure of how balanced the transportation system is. Higher percentages of commuters taking transit increases roadway capacity and reduces the need for roadway expansions. Measures of transit ridership tells us how well used the transit system is overall and over time.

Where do the data come from? Commuting data come from the US Census, American Community Survey. Transit ridership comes from Madison Metro.

What does it tell us? In 2013, 6 percent of commuters rode transit, up from 4.5 percent in 2006. The portion car pooling was 9 percent in 2006, increased to 11 percent in 2007 and 2008, before dropping to 8 percent in 2013. Those driving to work alone fell slightly from 2006-13, from 75 to 72 percent.

From an equity perspective, some minority groups rely, to a much greater extent than White commuters, on means other than driving alone to get to work. Twenty five percent of African Americans commuters, and 28 percent of Asians, took transit or walked or bicycled to work in 2010-2012 – compared to 13 percent of Whites and 14 percent of Hispanic commuters. This gap has widened considerably since 2005 (in 2005 12% of Blacks and 11% of Whites walked, biked or bused to work).

Annual Metro Transit ridership was just over 15 million in 2013. This was a record level and a large increase from just over 10 million in 1997. Daily ridership during school year and summer were also up – from about 45,000 to 60,00, and from about 27,000 to 35,000, respectively – showing that both students and non-students are both riding the bus in greater numbers.

We also know, however, that Madison Metro is reaching or exceeding capacity on a number of heavily used bus routes. The ability to add buses is limited because, for some routes, the maximum number of buses per hour are already operating during peak periods. The ability to add more or longer buses is also limited by bus storage capacity, which is also at peak.

http://www.sustainablecommunities.gov/public-transportation-ridership
Indicator: Average vehicle miles traveled per person

Takeaway – Minimizing unnecessary use of automobiles saves money and helps the environment. Dane County’s per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has dropped slightly from its peak nearly ten years ago even as the regional economy has grown significantly.

What is it? Vehicle miles traveled per person, measured by the total number of miles traveled in a region divided by the region’s population (either total or age sixteen and older), indicates an area’s overall mobility as well as the deterioration of roads, traffic congestion, vehicular CO2 emissions, and overall land use. ¹

Why is it important? If a regional transit and shared ride system is successful, it will enable some people, who so desire, to replace car trips with transit or shared rides. This replacement should help to reduce the average vehicle miles traveled per person in the region. This indicator will also be affected by, and is a measure of, success in providing other non-automobile forms of transportation such as walking and bicycling (see below).

Conversely, VMT is also indicative of an area’s overall economic activity, where greater VMT generally indicates higher activity levels. It is important to consider that changes in VMT may stem from multiple sources and reflect social, economic, and political factors such as population age distribution, land use density, infill development, and transportation costs such as gas prices or bus fares. ²

Where do the data come from? Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

What does it tell us? In 2013, the average person aged 16 and up in Dane County logged 11,730 miles. This represents a drop of around 500 miles from the previous year and a significant drop from 13,680 miles per year in 2005. This trend resembles trends in peer counties around the region and country. In comparing Dane County to the counties that are home to Des Moines, IA, Ann Arbor, MI, and Knoxville, TN, the Madison area has consistently higher per capita VMT than Ann Arbor and Des Moines but lower VMT than Knoxville. All counties in this comparison recorded a decline in per capita VMT since 2005.

Potential Indicator: Number of park and ride parking lots and spaces. Parking facilities along transit lines enable people to park and ride the rest of the way to their destination. Parking lots can also be served by shared ride services such as van pools. They can save commuters money and reduce congestion and pollution.

### Baseline Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Desired Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuters taking transit(^1)</td>
<td>6.0% (2013)</td>
<td>Measurement of transit commutes</td>
<td>Up from 4.5 percent in 2006</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Daily Ridership(^2)</td>
<td>34,807 (2013)</td>
<td>Measurement of popularity of public transit during non-peak ridership season.</td>
<td>Up from approx. 27,000 in 2006</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per person(^3)</td>
<td>11,730 (2013)</td>
<td>Total Dane County VMT divided by total population. Measurement of automobile usage.</td>
<td>Down from 13,680 in 2005</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1-American Community Survey, 2-Madison Metro, 3-WisDOT

### Status and Trends: Transportation Choice

Walking, Transit, Biking, Carpooling to Work Trends: 2006-2013

![Dane County Means of Transportation to Work](image)

- **Walked**
- **Bicycled**
- **Took Public Transportation**
- **Carpooled**
- **Drove Alone**
Madison Metro Trends: 1997-2013

Priority Challenge: Increase opportunities for active transportation

Encouraging pedestrian and bicycle transportation and easy access to recreational opportunities helps to make the healthy choice the easy choice. Access to places designed for physical activity is correlated with greater physical activity.\textsuperscript{53} Expanding the variety of options and opportunities for physical activity to be incorporated into one’s daily life will result in positive impacts on public health, equity, and environmental sustainability within a community.\textsuperscript{54}


**Indicator: Percent of commuters walking or biking to work**

**Takeaway** – Countywide, the percent of workers commuting by bike rose from 2000 to 2013, while the percent walking to work remained about the same. A large portion of this increase in biking was driven by increases in bike commuting in the City of Madison.

**What is it?** A measure of the percent of people who travel to work by walking or bicycling.

**Why is it important?** The portion of people who walk or bike to work is an indicator of how friendly our streets and communities are to such active transportation. Higher rates of walk and bike commutes translates into health, infrastructure and cost benefits.

**Where do the data come from?** U.S. Census, American Community Survey

**What does it tell us?** In 2013, 6.2 percent of Dane County commuters walked and 2.9 percent rode a bicycle to work. These numbers were higher in the City of Madison, where larger portions of the city are walkable and bikable. In Madison, 10.9 percent of commuters walked to work and 4.8 percent biked in 2013. Compared to 2000, when 1.7 percent of commuters biked, the portion of commuters biking to work increased at the county level. The data show no significant change between 2000 and 2013 walking share.

**Indicator: Dane County Active Living Index**

**Takeaway** – The central portions of our cities and villages are more conducive to walking and – in Madison – to transit. Bicycle paths and routes offer opportunities for physical activity in other areas. There is significant room for improvement in most areas.

**What is it?** A measure of how conducive our communities are to active transportation: walking, biking and transit access. The AL Index combines measures of walkability with measures of access to bike facilities and transit service. Walkability measures are based on presence of sidewalks, density of street intersections, and distances to needed destinations. Bike and transit access is measured by proximity to primary bicycle networks, and proximity to bus stops combined with levels of bus service at those stops.

**Why is it important?** Active transportation increases physical activity as part of daily routines. Greater physical activity is an important ingredient to lower rates of obesity and related diseases. It also reduces pollution and lowers transportation costs. An objective measure of how friendly our communities and streets are for active transportation enables communities to better identify and reduce physical barriers to active transportation.

**Where do the data come from?** The AL Index was created by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board using data from a variety of sources including the Dane County Land Use Inventory, InfoUSA, and Madison Metro.

---

55 Primary networks are off-road paths, bicycle boulevards, and low-volume residential streets frequently used by bicyclists.
What does it tell us? Central Madison scores high for active living due to concentration of destinations, walkable street networks, extensive bicycle infrastructure, and frequent bus service. Central areas of many other cities and villages score high for walkability due to concentrations of destinations and a grid street pattern. Bike paths and routes throughout the region offer access to physical activity where walking is less favorable.

Baseline Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Desired Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuters Walking and Biking to Work¹</td>
<td>6.2%-walk 2.9%-bike</td>
<td>Measurement of walk and bike commutes.</td>
<td>Walk - flat</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2013)</td>
<td>Bike - up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Living Index²</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Measure of extent to which the built environment is conducive to active transportation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1-American Community Survey, 2-Madison Area Transportation Planning Board

Priority Challenge: Minimize transport costs while ensuring quality service

Transportation is a growing portion of the average household’s budget, while, as noted above, average household incomes are declining. In addition to straining household budgets, government spending on transportation infrastructure represents a significant portion of taxpayer supported spending. A balanced transportation system that offers less expensive travel and infrastructure options can minimize costs while providing quality options for reaching destinations in a timely fashion.

Indicator: Average annual transportation costs per household

Takeaway – Transportation costs consume about a fourth of the average Dane County household’s budget and represent a growing burden.

What is it? The average amount spent by all households on transportation costs including automobile (gas, maintenance, depreciation, parking and insurance) and transit.

Why is it important? Higher transportation costs reduce the money available to families for housing, education, food, medical and other life needs and desires.

Where do the data come from? Center for Neighborhood Technology and the US Census, American Community Survey.

What does it tell us? Dane County households spent an average of $12,847 per year on transportation in the period 2009 to 2013. This represented roughly 25 percent of the typical Dane County household’s income. The amount of money and percent of income decreased from the 2005-2009 average.
**Indicator: Average annual housing plus transportation costs per household**

Affordable and convenient housing and transportation increases mobility and lowers the combined costs of housing and transportation. This affordability is essential to enhance quality of life and increase access to opportunity for all people of all ages, incomes, races, ethnicities, and abilities. The percent of income spent on Housing + Transportation gives a picture of the full costs associated with living in a certain unit and its location. It adds the traditional cost of rents or mortgage to the cost of traveling to daily destinations, which should not exceed 45% of the total income for individuals.\(^{56}\)

**Takeaway** – The typical Dane County household spends half of their income for housing plus transportation; higher than the “affordable” level of 45 percent. This number is roughly level since 2009, but transportation’s share of that 50 percent has shrunk, while housing’s share has grown.

**What is it?** A measure of the percent of typical Dane County households spend on the combined costs of housing and transportation.

**Why is it important?** Transportation and housing costs both depend on location; they respond in opposite ways to distance from employment and activity centers. Land and housing costs typically decrease with distance from centers, while transportation costs increase. Housing close to centers can cost more but yield lower transportation costs. Looking at the combined costs of housing and transportation takes into account this trade-off. The Housing + Transportation Affordability Index expands the view of affordability from the traditional measurement of 30 percent of income spent on housing.

**Where do the data come from?** Center for Neighborhood Technology drawing on data from US Census, American Community Survey

**What does it tell us?** In 2013, the typical Dane County household spent nearly half of its income on housing plus transportation. To be considered affordable, no more than 45% on income should be spent on housing and transportation.\(^{57}\) Areas in the county where typical households (with incomes at the county median) would be likely to meet this affordability threshold are primarily in portions of the City of Madison. Areas where a moderate income household (80% of median income) could likely meet this threshold are limited to only a few small areas in Madison. Although the data products used in the Center for Neighborhood Technology include overlapping years that make comparisons difficult, in the 5-year period from 2005 to 2009, 24.5% of the average household’s income went to transportation. With total housing plus transportation costs at 49.9% in that period, essentially unchanged from 2013, this may signify a decline in average annual transportation costs and an increase the average annual housing costs for the typical household.

The updated 2013 “H+T” numbers are combined with data on percent nonwhite population at the block group level in the second map on page 44. This equity analysis shows that among neighborhoods that are at least 15 percent nonwhite (which are mostly in the northeast, south, and far west of the central urban area), the vast majority are cost-burdened by housing plus transportation costs. Some of the neighborhoods with the most challenges, however, especially on the northeast and south sides, are not H+T cost-burdened.


\(^{57}\) [http://htaindex.cnt.org/about.php](http://htaindex.cnt.org/about.php)
Baseline Measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Desired Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Transportation Costs</td>
<td>21% (2009-2013)</td>
<td>Percent of income for a typical Dane County household (income of $60,694; 2.35 persons; 1.22 workers) spent on transportation</td>
<td>Down</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing + Transportation as % of Total Income</td>
<td>50% (2009-2013)</td>
<td>Percent of income for a typical Dane County household (income of $60,694; 2.35 persons; 1.22 workers) spent on transportation and housing</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1,2-Center for Neighborhood Technology

Status and Trends: Transportation Affordability

![Graph showing Housing Plus Transportation Costs for the Average Dane County Household]

![Map showing Housing + Transportation Costs as Percent of Income Area Median Income Dane County 2009]
Dane County Block Groups by Percent Nonwhite and Housing Plus Transportation Cost

Sources: 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Center for Neighborhood Technology's H+T Index Background Data (based on 2013 ACS)
Strategies/Actions

Many actions can be taken to improve transportation services and their affordability. The whole region stands to benefit from the increased use of a broader range of transportation options. Higher numbers of pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit users decreases VMT, which in turn reduces traffic congestion, pollution, and road deterioration. More affordable transportation may also result in increased saving or spending in other areas.

Future road construction should provide for alternative modes of transportation that encourage use by all types of users. Private efforts to provide affordable transportation, such as the B-Cycle bike share program, can also be an important part of the mix.

Regional high-capacity transit can help transport more residents and visitors along busy corridors, lower household transportation costs, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Madison has an award-winning bus system that provides efficient transit along and around the isthmus, and serves many areas in and around Madison. The region has an opportunity to build on this success by providing Bus Rapid Transit, or BRT, and express bus. These can be augmented with increased park and ride and shared-ride services such as van pools. A recent Study found that BRT could serve 15,000 – 20,000 riders a day over coming decades while reducing travel times from 19% to 42%.

Increasing residential and job density through infill development, especially around transit centers, can incentivize alternative modes of transit and bolster public transit ridership, which in turn should reduce costs.

The continued financial support of public transit will also help increase affordability of these services. Support comes from federal funding and Metro Transit’s funding for low-income users, which decreases costs for users who may have fewer transportation alternatives.58

To increase the accessibility and affordability of transportation choices the following strategies and actions can be taken:

- Encourage ongoing development of Complete Streets
- Expand transportation routes, times and options
  - Future additions of new transit options such as BRT and LRT
  - Ongoing maintenance and development of the bike path network
    - Adding amenities along the path network to increase attractiveness of biking
  - Increasing routes to school during the school year at peak times
- Expand transportation programs
  - Commuter Card Program (businesses/organizations can provide public transit to employees or members at a subsidized rate)59
  - Employer Tax Incentives
  - Unlimited ride pass program (ex: UW Madison)
- Promote and market transportation choices so people are aware of the options
- Encourage collaboration between systems for increased coverage of the area
- Transportation Demand Management strategies to increase transportation system efficiency

59 http://www.madisonareampo.org/trends/publictransit.cfm