AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of March 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Presentation on Proposed Revised Design for CTH M/CTH PD Intersection
   (City of Madison Engineering Staff)

6. Presentation on South Capitol TOD District Planning Study
   (City of Madison Planning Staff)

7. Resolution TPB No. 88 Approving Amendment #3 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for
   the Madison Area & Dane County
   • YWCA JobRide Program [Add carryover federal JARC and state funding]

8. Letter of Support for WisDOT/WSOR/WRRTC Application for USDOT TIGER VI Federal Grant for Wisconsin
   Southern Freight Rail Service Improvement Project

9. Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program
   (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

10. Continued Review and Discussion on Preliminary Draft of Revised Policies and Scoring Criteria for STP Urban
    Projects

11. Discussion and Consideration of Possible Letter to WisDOT on Plans for Verona Road (USH 18/151) and
    Corridor Studies of Stoughton Road (USH 51), USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton), and the Beltline (USH
    12/14/18/151)

12. 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

13. 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

14. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings
15. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, May 7 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.*
1. Roll Call

*Members present:* David Ahrens, Mark Clear, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Paul Lawrence, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item #3), Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Chris Schmidt (arrived during item #3), Robin Schmidt

*Members absent:* Judd Blau, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust

*MPO Staff present:* Bill Schaefer, David Kanning

2. Approval of February 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Clear, to approve the February 5, 2014 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

Schaefer summarized an email message dated March 4, 2013 from WisDOT’s Statewide Multi-Modal Programs Manager, which was distributed at the meeting. The message stated that the Madison Area TPB (MPO) will not receive any new Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding for programming during the current cycle due to policies WisDOT decided to use to administer the program similar to those applied for the STP Urban and other local programs. He said each MPO’s sub-allocation of funding was adjusted to reflect projects approved in the last funding cycle, but not scheduled to be completed until SFY 2015 or later. The MPO’s sub-allocation for 2015-2018 is $2.4 million, but the projects in the queue exceed that, primarily due to the $3.2 million Lower Yahara Trail project. Schaefer commented that he didn’t think it was fair to count these against the MPO’s sub-allocation because these projects were approved as part of a statewide competitive process prior to MPOs’ receiving a sub-allocation. Also, WisDOT created the shortfall of funding by re-allocating one half of the TAP funding for roadway projects. He said he was also unhappy about the timing of the announcement. He said communities within the Madison MPO area would still be eligible to compete for the statewide funding program.

Clear asked if any other communities were negatively affected by the policy change. Schaefer said that Appleton and Milwaukee will also see a reduction in funding for the current cycle. Clear asked if a legislative action produced this change in funding. Schaefer said that this was a policy change initiated by WisDOT. Clear suggested that the MPO board might draft a letter to the Madison area legislative delegation regarding this matter. R. Schmidt commented on the lack of transparency with how this change was implemented and indicated that WisDOT needs to provide written guidelines that outline the changes. Schaefer agreed and noted that WisDOT has indicated it would provide written guidelines pertaining to the STP-Urban program, but has yet to do so.

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

None

5. Resolution TPB No. 87 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area & Dane County

Schaefer described the project revisions and new projects requested by WisDOT for the amendment. He noted that the Military Ridge Park & Ride lot project would now be constructed in 2014 in order to be done for the Verona Road/Beltline interchange construction project. The Lower Yahara River Trail project has been delayed from 2014 to 2015-'16. The Hoepker Road Bridge project over the Interstate was changed from a bridge deck replacement to a bridge deck overlay since the bridge would be replaced within ten years or so. R.
Schmidt asked if the bike lanes were eliminated, and Schaefer confirmed that. Schaefer reported on the other project revisions and the four new rail warning device projects, including one in downtown Stoughton. Schaefer said the STH 69 project was removed from the TIP amendment since WisDOT now planned to use only state funding for the design. Construction is not scheduled until 2018.

Moved by Minihan, seconded by King, to approve revised Amendment #2 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area and Dane County, which drops the STH 69 project. Motion carried.

6. Consideration of Appointments to the MPO Technical and Policy Advisory Committees for the Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Matano said that he wanted to postpone the item due to procedural issues with how the citizen advisory committee member list was generated. Matano explained that he thought the board charged him with forming the committee. Schaefer said it was his understanding that staff was to recruit members as well. He explained that he sent a note to technical committee members asking for names of alders or residents that might be interested in serving on the committee. The response was overwhelming and a great list was generated with persons from various communities, ages, and backgrounds, including a business representative from the CUNA Green Team. Schaefer said there were 22 potential committee members are on the list, but it should be pared down by the board because that number would be unwieldy for getting input at meetings.

Opitz commented that he didn’t think the committee size was an issue. He asked Matano if he had a concern with persons on the list. Matano said no, that his concern was about the process. R. Schmidt moved, Lawrence seconded, to postpone the item. Opitz said that he understood Matano’s concern, but didn’t see a reason to postpone the item. Clear asked if the committees would be formally constituted with quorum requirements. Schaefer said that for advisory committees the meeting agendas are posted, but if a quorum were not present staff would still review information but not seek any action or formal recommendation. Following further discussion, the motion to postpone was withdrawn.

Opitz moved, Minihan seconded, to approve the appointments to the advisory committees for the bicycle plan. Motion carried.

7. Review and Discussion on Preliminary Draft of Revised Policies and Scoring Criteria for STP Urban Projects

Schaefer introduced the item and advised the members that it was still a work in progress. He said staff reviewed the document with the technical committee at its last meeting, and they had concerns with how the projects would be scored using the various criteria. They were interested in seeing how the new criteria would be applied for some example projects. Schaefer said the current project scoring criteria dated to the late 1990s following the passage of ISTEA, and that a comprehensive update has never been done. He noted that board members have made comments or suggestions about the criteria at various meetings. He said it was important to update the criteria to reflect changes in federal emphasis areas such as environmental justice and public health and reflect revisions to MPO policies such as those related to sustainability. Schaefer said that MPO staff researched project scoring systems used by other MPOs across the country. The proposed system uses a 100-point scale similar to that developed for the Transportation Alternatives Program criteria. Schaefer indicated that the new criteria categories and their different weights were similar to the current scoring system. The most significant change is the tailoring of criteria to the project type. The categories are the same for each project type, but each project type has unique evaluation criteria tailored to the type of project. The category weights also vary slightly between project types.

Schaefer reviewed the program objectives. He mentioned that Golden, who couldn’t make the meeting, suggested revising the first objective to eliminate “cost effective” or add other objectives. Schaefer said he didn’t intend for that to mean that cost effectiveness was most important, but said he would drop the words since the issue is covered in the criteria. He said that nearly every project type eligible for federal funding
would be accepted, but that alternative sources of funding for some projects would be considered. Schaefer reviewed the draft policies covering eligible project and cost categories, minimum/maximum project cost amounts, project funding, and the screening criteria. He noted that Golden suggested removing the reference to intercity bus facilities. He said the language was taken from the statute, but he would delete the reference. Golden also suggested adding low income transportation service program, but that wasn’t an eligible project category under federal law. Schaefer said the eligible cost categories were the same. No change was being recommended. Golden suggested adding bus garage/storage facilities to the transit facility examples, and Schaefer said that was fine. A sliding scale cost share formula for small projects was being proposed similar to that for TAP projects. Schaefer said Golden suggested possibly varying the cost share based on project score, but he was not comfortable with that given the subjectivity in scoring. Schaefer then reviewed the project screening criteria. Regarding the financial requirements, he said staff might need to develop guidance on how project costs should be calculated so that all applications are consistent.

Schaefer described the set of project categories and evaluation criteria for roadway projects. The project categories are (1) Importance to Regional Transportation System, (2) System Preservation, (3) Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management, (4) Safety Enhancement, (5) Enhancement of Multi-Modal options, (6) Supports Transportation Efficient Land Use, Livability, and Economic Prosperity, (7) Timely Implementation and Complexity of Project, (8) Cost Benefit, and (9) Environment, Public Health, and Environmental Justice. These project categories are the same for each project type.

Schaefer said the technical committee wanted to know how the individual criteria within each category would be used in calculating the category scores. Clear asked if the technical committee wanted each criterion to have a percentage, and Schaefer affirmed. Matano said there is some subjectivity to the scoring as currently proposed. This could be of some benefit, since a project that would appear to meet certain criteria may fall short in other ways. Regarding the importance to the regional system, Schaefer said Golden suggested adding whether the roadway was a transit route. He said that was a good suggestion. Clear asked if a criterion could be added that addresses availability of alternatives. Schaefer said that was a good idea as well. R. Schmidt asked if that meant the available points for another criterion needed to be reduced. Clear said he was not necessarily arguing for a system that assigns points to each criterion. Regarding system preservation, Schaefer noted that the feasibility of the life cycle cost criterion needed to be studied further. He mentioned that Golden suggested the Environment, Public Health and Environmental Justice category be split into three categories with a 5% weight each.

R. Schmidt asked if the concept of sustainability could be incorporated into the project categories in a more visible way. Clear said that sustainability was already built into categories such as Environment, Public Health and Environmental Justice, and Schaefer agreed, mentioning the Efficient Land Use/Livability category as another example. Schaefer reviewed some of the differences in the criteria for transit and ITS projects. For a number of the categories, the criteria were the same.

Schaefer said that the new criteria would help applicants understand more precisely how we score and rank projects. Clear added that this would help applicants know what kind of projects the board would like to see. Schaefer said that MPO staff, at the request of technical committee members, will score and rank some old projects with the existing and proposed criteria for comparison purposes and share the results. He said the technical committee was also interested in when the new scoring system would take effect if it was approved. Schaefer said that this would be a function of when the proposed changes could be finalized and approved by the board.

Schaefer described the rationale for assigning different percentage weights to the various project categories, according to each project type. Clear asked if there was a way to be more explicit about encouraging alternative or innovative projects that would help delay the need for a roadway capacity expansion or reconstruction project. Schaefer said that is partially addressed by the life cycle criterion. He said that it might be possible to give credit for communities that have travel demand management programs.
8. **Brief Update on Follow-up Activities from the Madison Transit Corridor (BRT) Study**

Schaefer said that staff was making some progress with moving the BRT study forward. Kamp added that the FTA is now more supportive of using the leftover Transport 2020 Study funds for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). The Mayor, MPO, City Planning and Metro Transit have all been involved, and there is a plan for moving forward. Schaefer and Kamp said that momentum is building for BRT. Schaefer said David Trowbridge from City Planning was working with the county and WisDOT to get agreement to use some of the Transport 2020 funding for an on-board transit passenger survey and for some transit modeling work. Kamp said that FTA asked for regular conference call meetings to monitor progress and to provide technical support.

9. **Brief Update on Dane County Bicycle Wayfinding Project and Potential MPO Role as Project Manager**

Schaefer stated that Dane County included in the 2014 budget a $175,000 bicycle wayfinding project. Because of time constraints, Chris James from Dane County Parks asked if MPO staff could serve as project manager for the project. Schaefer said that the county offered to pay the MPO to cover the staff time. Schaefer said staff had discussed entering into a purchase of service contract with the county that would cover the local share cost since the MPO had sufficient funding. This would leave more money for implementation. Schaefer said the goal of the project is to partner with municipalities to produce guidelines for uniform signage, including destination information and mileage markers, and to potentially develop a mobile application for way finding. Funding that is left over from the planning and design phase of the study will be used for sign manufacturing and installation.

Opitz noted that Middleton’s wayfinding project had been on hold, and that he was anxious for this project to move forward. Schaefer said that Renee Callaway would be the project manager. She was waiting to get everything worked out with the county before proceeding. The first task would be to develop a scope of work to include in the RFP. Schaefer said he confirmed with FHWA and WisDOT that a work program amendment would not be required since the work fell within general work activities included in the program and we were only seeking to recoup the local share costs for the work.

Opitz mentioned that Fitchburg was moving forward with their signage program and not waiting for the new guidelines. R. Schmidt commented that Monona had installed new signage for the lake loop. Opitz said that the Middleton tourism board would like its signs to incorporate QR technology to show what destinations are nearby. He noted that he likes Madison’s street signage template for trail junctions. Matano added that signage is needed along portions of the Capital City Trail. R. Schmidt asked if there would be communication with the communities regarding the sign program. Schaefer said yes and that an advisory committee would be set up as well.

10. **Discussion on WisDOT Plans for Verona Road (USH 18/151) and Corridor Studies of Stoughton Road (USH 51), USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton), and the Beltline (USH 12/14/18/151)**

Matano said he would like the MPO board to be more proactive in communicating policy recommendations to WisDOT on these projects. He added that it always seemed to be too early or too late to comment on individual studies. The collective impact of the capacity expansion projects being studied, including USH 51, the Beltline and Verona Road, would be significant. Clear shared the concern about the timing of input and the impact of that as evidenced by the Stoughton Road capacity expansion project study. Minihan said he was concerned with safety issues on USH 51. He was frustrated by how long the study has been going on. He said town officials have asked WisDOT to address the immediate safety concerns rather than focusing solely on long-term improvements being studies in the EIS. He said the money used for the study could have been used for safety improvements. Schaefer said there is an incentive for WisDOT region offices to plan for large projects that are eligible for funding under the Majors program, a statewide, competitive program.

Minihan said that he received news that the Stoughton Road study was delayed until August 2015. Schaefer said that the schedule for the final EIS and Record of Decision was delayed until then, but the draft EIS would be available before then. Ahrens commented that constituents tell him that the condition of Stoughton Road is
very bad, especially the southern section. Schaefer said that learned at a meeting earlier in the week that a resurfacing project was being planned for 2015 on the worst sections of Stoughton Road. Matano offered to draft a comment letter to WisDOT reflecting the discussion.

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

Schaefer said that a progress meeting was recently held on the Beltline Study. The results of travel demand modeling of a North Mendota Parkway were shared. The modeling indicated that the parkway would not have a significant impact on isthmus or Beltline traffic. He also reported on a progress meeting for the Interstate study. At the meeting, WisDOT reviewed results of the initial screening of potential new interchanges. Many were eliminated from further consideration because they would negatively impact Interstate traffic operations. Interchanges to be carried forward for further study include Cuba Valley Road in DeForest, Hoepker/Hanson Road, and Milwaukee Street extended/Gaston Road (with I-94). Clear asked why the interchanges were being considered. Schaefer said that several communities have asked WisDOT about the feasibility of constructing various interchanges at different times. FHWA asked WisDOT to conduct a comprehensive system-wide study of all potential future interchanges rather than conducting studies of individual locations. The next phase of the study will examine capacity expansion of the interstate between Madison and Portage.

12. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer said that he would like to get the RFP for the ITS Plan published by early April.

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Schaefer said at the next meeting City of Madison Traffic Engineering staff will present changes to the design for the CTH M/CTH PD intersection. Dave Trowbridge with City of Madison Planning will make a presentation on the South Capitol Transit Oriented Development District study. Clear announced that a public meeting would be held on March 11 regarding the possible reduction of Gammon Road to three lanes – two two travel lanes and one center turn lane – north of Tree Lane. Schaefer said MPO staff prepared a traffic forecast for the city under the lane reduction scenario. Future year traffic was predicted to decrease by 4,000 – 6,000 with the lane reduction scenario between Tree Lane and South Avenue. Traffic would increase by around 1,000 on Westfield Road with other traffic diverted to the Beltline and other routes. The model produced different results for the lane reduction scenario between Old Sauk Road and Tree Lane. The traffic diversions off of Gammon Road were less for this scenario.

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, April 2, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Rooms A-B.

14. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Clear, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:20 PM.
March 13, 2014

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

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

Dear Mr. Poirier and Ms. Simon:

Under the authority delegated to me by Governor Scott Walker, I am hereby approving the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board's Amendment #1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Urban Area with the exception of the Interstate 39/90/94 Bridge Deck Replacement project (TIP 111-09-005). The amendment was approved and adopted by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board on February 5, 2014. We will reflect by reference the 2014-2017 federal aid projects covered by this approval in our 2014-2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

The increase cost estimate for the I-39/90/94 Bridge Deck Replacement project exceeded the MPO’s dollar threshold for Minor Amendments. The attached project listing is the original MPO approved listing, which includes the excepted Bridge Deck Replacement project (TIP 111-09-005). Attached fiscal constraint tables (B-2 and C1) have been administratively modified to restore funding for the Bridge Deck Replacement project to original 2014-2018 TIP amounts. The increased cost estimate for the Bridge Deck Replacement project will be addressed in a future Major TIP Amendment or annual TIP submittal.

Copies of TIP Amendment #1 and Resolution TPB Number 86 for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board have been sent to the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration, respectively. This TIP amendment represents a comprehensive, continuous, and cooperative effort between the MPO, local communities, affected transit operators, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and is designed to meet the objectives of Title 23 USC 134 and 135 and their implementing regulations 23 CFR 450 and the 2035 regional transportation system plan.

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

Sincerely,

Mark Gottlieb, P.E.
Secretary

cc: William Schaefer, MPO; Dwight McComb, FHWA; Chris Bvertch, FTA;
Jeff Gust, WisDOT SW Region; John Nordbo, WisDOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
March 13, 2014

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

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

Dear Mr. Poirier and Ms. Simon:

Under the authority delegated to me by Governor Scott Walker, I am hereby approving the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board’s Amendment #2 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Urban Area. The amendment was approved and adopted by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board on March 5, 2014. We will reflect by reference the 2014-2017 federal aid projects covered by this approval in our 2014-2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Copies of TIP Amendment #2 and Resolution TPB Number 87 for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board have been sent to the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration, respectively. This TIP amendment represents a comprehensive, continuous, and cooperative effort between the MPO, local communities, affected transit operators, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and is designed to meet the objectives of Title 23 USC 134 and 135 and their implementing regulations 23 CFR 450 and the 2035 regional transportation system plan.

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

Sincerely,

Mark Gottlieb, P.E.  
Secretary

cc: William Schaefer, MPO  
Dwight McComb, FHWA  
Chris Berte, FTA  
Jeff Gust, WisDOT SW Region  
John Nordbo, WisDOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
Greetings Bill,

We appreciate the concerns you have expressed and thank you for your ongoing efforts to promote the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) on behalf of the Madison urbanized area.

WisDOT would violate existing state statute if it were to disregard previously awarded projects when calculating TAP sub-allocations. Effective July 1, 2013, state statute eliminated WisDOT’s state spending authority within the previous 214 (Transportation Enhancements (TE)), 215 (Bicycle-Pedestrian Facilities Program (BPFP)), and 217 (Safe Routes to School (SRTS)) programs. In order for any of these previously awarded projects to get delivered, WisDOT had to assign a state spending authority under TAP. In addition to this state spending authority issue, as stated in the attached email, WisDOT as a federal steward of federal monies must spend down federal funds each year or risk losing the funds altogether. As an example, a SRTS project awarded SAFETEA-LU funds in 2010 is not guaranteed those specific SAFETEA-LU funds if the project schedule changes. WisDOT has financially committed to that project, but it has authority at the federal and state level to assign a different ‘color’ (MAP-21) of funds to that committed project.

With respect to your questions 1 through 5:

1. WisDOT will award its first TAP projects in June 2014, shortly before the start of state fiscal year (SFY) 2015. This is the primary reason that TAP TMA sub-allocations were calculated starting in 2015. Furthermore, TAP TMA sub-allocations for 2013 and 2014 were allocated toward 2013 and 2014 projects approved in previous SRTS, BPFP, and TE funding cycles.

2. When WisDOT solicits TAP projects again in calendar year 2015, it will calculate TMA TAP sub-allocations for the SFY 2016-2020 award cycle. The department anticipates that federally mandated sub-allocations for 2016-2020, less the amount of currently scheduled projects, will constitute TMA funds available for the next TAP award cycle. As with the STP-Urban Program, the TAP Program is fiscally
constrained; WisDOT does not significantly over program as it is against state policy and FHWA rules.

3. TAP projects for which all phases are authorized for receipt of federal funds and assigned schedule dates that fall before the next TAP award cycle will not impact Madison’s funds available.

4. The attached email, which Madison MPO staff received earlier this week, explicitly states that “local units of government within jurisdiction of a TMA remain eligible to compete for the statewide competitive award process administered by WisDOT.”

5. WisDOT is happy to provide a list of outstanding projects that are drawing down Madison’s available TAP funds. Madison MPO had not previously requested this information – had they done so, as several other TMAs have, WisDOT would have promptly provided such documentation. This project list is not a general statement about prior funding commitments, but a specific list of projects with schedule dates and federal funding amounts that clearly demonstrates how the Madison TMA TAP sub-allocation is getting spent down. WisDOT will forward this list to Renee Callaway no later than Monday, March 17th.

Donna Brown-Martin, WisDOT Director of the Bureau of Transit, Local Roads, Railroads and Harbors will also be following up with you by phone this week.

Kind Regards,

Tressie K. Kamp

--
Statewide Multi-Modal Programs Manager
WisDOT-Bureau of Transit, Local Roads, Railroads & Harbors
4802 Sheboygan Ave., Room 951, Madison, WI 53707
Phone: (608) 266-3973 / Fax: (608) 266-0658
tressie.kamp@dot.wi.gov
WisDOT Programs for Local Government Website
*Please consider the environment before printing this email*

Kind Regards,

Tressie K. Kamp

From: Schaefer, William [mailto:WSchaefer@cityofmadison.com]
Tressie et al,

 Needless to say, we were shocked and upset to get this email about WisDOT’s approach to the MPOs’ allocations of TAP funds, especially given the “11th hour” timing and after Mary Forlenza specifically stated to my face last summer that WisDOT would not take this approach. We DO have a major concern about this. Why wasn’t this reviewed with MPO staff at the last MPO Directors meeting when we could have had a chance to respond and ask questions? You are essentially creating this policy and applying it retroactively to affect our sub-allocation of funds before MPOs even had this sub-allocation. The projects approved in the last cycle were approved under a statewide discretionary application cycle with SAFETEA-LU funds and should not count against our sub-allocation of TAP funds under MAP-21. We are not receiving our federally mandated allocation of TAP funds because of projects approved in the prior cycle with EN, SRTS funds. This policy should be effective going forward with this application cycle, not applied retroactively. We understand you are over-programmed from the last cycle, but a major reason for that is WisDOT diverted TAP funds to other programs. MPOs should not be penalized for that.

Other questions:
1. Under MAP-21, MPOs were given a sub-allocation of funding starting in FFY 2013 so why does the calculation of MPO allocations start in 2015?

2. Under this policy, when the next application cycle is done, what happens to the MPOs allocation for 2015-2016 (or before)? Is that all made available then at that time?

3. When do projects need to be completed or federal funding committed to not count against the MPO allocation next time? (We have the same question with the STP Urban program and have not received an answer to that or any other questions).

4. Will WisDOT seek and consider MPO ranking of projects in selecting projects for funding with the statewide pool as was done before MPOs had a sub-allocation of funding?

5. As with STP Urban program, we are seeking something in writing that more fully explains all of these things rather than general statements about accounting for prior commitments being necessary for program management. Will you do this and when?
Greetings,

Attached please find the final 2014-2018 Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) sub-allocations for metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) >200K.

WisDOT calculated sub-allocations in accordance with the below-listed policies and procedures. These policies are consistent with the final MPO/Transportation Management Area (TMA) allocations for the 2013-2018 STP-Urban, STP-Rural, and Local Bridge improvement programs.

- Federal sub-allocations were adjusted to reflect all projects currently scheduled in state fiscal year 2015 and beyond within each TMA. WisDOT approved currently scheduled projects in previous Safe Routes to School (SRTS), Transportation Enhancement (TE), and Bicycle-Pedestrian Facilities Program (BPFP) award cycles.

- Accounting for prior yet undelivered funding commitments as new programs are solicited and approved is a key component to statewide local program...
WisDOT cannot significantly over-program; it’s against state policy and FHWA rules. The established programming process, or any process, cannot trump the reality of the annual budget. As stewards of federal and state monies, WisDOT can’t spend beyond the department’s state and federal authority. In addition, federal funds get spent each year or the state loses them.

Please also review the following TAP-specific funds available notes:

- TMAs that are not receiving funds to schedule new projects are still receiving federally-mandated TAP sub-allocations for projects awarded in previous SRTS, TE, and BPFP funding cycles;
- Local units of government within jurisdiction of a TMA remain eligible to compete for the statewide competitive award process administered by WisDOT; and
- WisDOT Division of Transportation Investment Management (DTIM) anticipates soliciting TAP projects for the SFY 2016-2020 award cycle in fall of calendar year 2015. At this time, DTIM will re-analyze funds available for TAP projects with TMA jurisdictions. TMAs will have additional funds available in this upcoming award cycle, assuming that project sponsors do not re-schedule existing projects in SFY 2018 and beyond.

Please reply to this email with any questions or concerns.

Kind Regards,

Tressie K. Kamp
--
Statewide Multi-Modal Programs Manager
WisDOT-Bureau of Transit, Local Roads, Railroads & Harbors
4802 Sheboygan Ave., Room 951, Madison, WI 53707
Phone: (608) 266-3973 / Fax: (608) 266-0658
tressie.kamp@dot.wi.gov

WisDOT Programs for Local Government Website
*Please consider the environment before printing this email*
**Re:**

Presentation on Proposed Revised Design for CTH M/CTH PD Intersection

---

**Staff Comments on Item:**

The reconstruction of the southern segment of CTH M between Flagstone Drive and Cross Country Road is scheduled for 2015-‘16. It is a joint City of Madison, City of Verona, and Dane County project, with the City of Madison serving as the lead agency. It includes the reconstruction of the CTH M/CTH PD intersection. The project is being partially funded with STP Urban funds through the MPO.

City of Madison staff has been working with the consultant on finalizing the design for the project. The traffic operations analysis showed that the previously recommended roundabout design for the CTH M/CTH PD intersection would fail in the evening peak period, resulting in unacceptable queuing and delays. As a result, a new split grade intersection design has been developed for the intersection that accommodates the forecast future year traffic without having to build an interchange or very large intersection with triple left turns from EB CTH PD to NB CTH M. The design also accommodates the planned grade-separated crossings for the multi-use path at this intersection. See attached exhibit.

A public information meeting was recently held on the project and the new intersection design was received positively. The local review and approval processes for the project are underway. Since the project is being funded with STP Urban funds, MPO staff asked City of Madison Engineering staff to provide a presentation to the board on the proposed new design.

---

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Graphic of new proposed CTH M/CTH PD intersection design

---

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

For discussion purposes only at this time.
WESTBOUND UNDERPASS
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 88 Approving Amendment #3 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Staff Comments on Item:
The Wisconsin Department of Transportation Bureau of Local Roads and Transit has requested a TIP amendment to add carryover federal Job Access & Reverse Commute (JARC) and state funding for the YWCA’s JobRide program. The program, which provides an important niche service, provides employment and employment-related transportation for low-income persons for trips not served by Metro Transit.

On a related note, MPO and Metro Transit staff have been working with YWCA on a plan for the City of Madison (Metro Transit) to potentially apply for STP Urban funding on behalf of the YWCA to purchase vans in 2015 to be used for this service. The vans would be leased to YWCA and YWCA would cover the local share cost for the vans either up front or as part of the lease payment. Metro has provided information to YWCA on the federal requirements that would apply as a funding sub-recipient, including implementation of a driver alcohol and drug testing program and a vehicle maintenance program.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 88 Approving Amendment #3 to the 2014-2018 TIP (including attachments)

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 88

Amendment No. 3 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) – An MPO approved the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on October 2, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB adopted TPB Resolution No. 86 on February 5, 2014, approving Amendment No. 1 to the 2014-2018 TIP, and adopted TPB Resolution No. 87 on March 5, 2014 approving Amendment No. 2 to the TIP; and

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

WHEREAS, an amendment has been requested by WisDOT Bureau of Transit and Local Roads to reflect the programming of carryover federal Job Access & Reverse Commute funding and state funding for YWCA (YW Transit) to continue its JobRide program providing employment and employment related transportation for low-income persons for trips not served by Metro Transit; and

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

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

WHEREAS, the project is 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, the 2014-2018 Transit Development Plan for the Madison Urban Area, and the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area TPB approves Amendment No. 3 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, making the following project revision as shown on the attached project listing table:

1. REVISE the listing for YW Transit in the Transit Operating section on page 30, adding federal and state funding to the program with a local share.

_______________________    ______________________________________
Date Adopted         Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
### PROJECT LISTINGS FOR AMENDMENT NO. 3 TO THE 2014-2018 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

(Cost in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction/ Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost/ Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2014</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2015</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2018</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YW TRANSIT</td>
<td>JOB RIDE PROGRAM</td>
<td>Oper</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>409</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>Funding Source</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Expenditures</th>
<th>Estimated Available Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Highway Administration</strong></td>
<td>National Highway Performance Program</td>
<td>50,353 6,868 14,600 13,177 7,721</td>
<td>50,353 6,868 14,600 13,177 7,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>601 1,072 1,132 0 0</td>
<td>601 1,072 1,132 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>3,217 5,509 8,688 7,146 6,952</td>
<td>6,163 9,378 10,270 7,998 7,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Urban Area</td>
<td>7,606 0 0 190 5,058</td>
<td>7,606 0 0 190 5,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>1,910 3,296 0 0 0</td>
<td>1,910 3,296 unknown unknown unknown unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>4,731 2,198 0 0 2,358</td>
<td>4,731 2,198 0 0 2,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Transit Administration</strong></td>
<td>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
<td>6,938 6,816 7,026 6,447 7,317</td>
<td>6,938 6,816 7,026 6,447 7,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5339 Bus &amp; Bus Facilities</td>
<td>0 816 841 866 892</td>
<td>0 816 841 866 892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5337 State of Good Repair</td>
<td>0 519 534 550 567</td>
<td>0 519 534 550 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5314 NRP &amp; Section 5339 Alt. Analysis Program**</td>
<td>1,747 164 0 0 0</td>
<td>1,747 164 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5316 JARC Program</td>
<td>57 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>57 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors &amp; Persons w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>248 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>263 unknown unknown unknown 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).
Re:
Letter of Support for WisDOT/WSOR/WRRTC Application for USDOT TIGER VI Federal Grant for Wisconsin Southern Freight Rail Service Improvement Project

**Staff Comments on Item:**

Ken Lucht, Manager of Community Development for Wisconsin & Southern Railroad Co./Watco Companies, contacted MPO staff to see if the MPO would be willing to once again provide a letter of support for the USDOT TIGER Grant Program application for track improvements on the Prairie Subdivision between Madison and Prairie du Chien. WisDOT is the primary project sponsor this time with WSOR/Watco, the Wisconsin River Rail Transit Commission (WRRTC), and Iowa County also sponsors. The TIGER VI applications are due April 28.

The application is for $12 million, matched by $13 million in state and WSOR funding, for rehabilitation of 35.5 miles of track between Madison and Spring Green. The project includes new welded rail and ties and reconstruction of at-grade public (52), private (31), and pedestrian/bicycle (9) crossings. It also includes reconstruction of 21 industry switches. The limits of the project are somewhat different this time. The track from Broom Street in Madison to Middleton is proposed to be added and the western terminus shortened from Lone Rock to Spring Green. With the track improvements in Madison the project will reduce vehicular delays at over a dozen public crossings and significantly reduce the frequency of signal malfunctions.

The project would provide environmental, economic, and transportation benefits to the greater region. It is consistent with the freight goals/policy objectives in the MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan and the recommendation to implement projects to improve the safety and efficiency of goods movement.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Copy of power point presentation with information on the project, including funding and benefits.
2. Draft letter of support for the project.

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

Staff recommends sending a letter of support for the grant application.
Wisconsin Southern Freight Rail Service Improvement Project

TIGER VI Federal Grant Program
March 2014

Moving the Economy Forward by Rail!
What is TIGER?

- **Acronym** – *Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery*
- Federal program administered through the U.S. DOT
- $600M for public works projects enhancing transportation facilities leading to job growth
- Application: $12M grant for a railroad capital rehabilitation project, matched by $13.2M by State and WSOR for a total of $25.2 million project in Southern Wisconsin
- **Sponsors:** WisDOT/Iowa County/WRRTC
WSOR Map & Proposed Investment Location

Wisconsin & Southern Railroad
P.O. Box 90229
Milwaukee, WI 53209-0229
telephone: 414-438-8820

$25.2M Track Rehabilitation Investment

KEY:
- WSOR owned or leased
- WSOR trackage rights
Project Description

- Located on WSOR’s Prairie Subdivision
  - Madison, WI to Spring Green, WI
- Rehabilitation to 35.5 miles of track
  - Milepost 138.37 to Milepost 173.9
- New ties
- New welded rail
- New at-grade public railroad crossings
- Reconstruction of industry switches
Project Scope

- Replace 85 lb. and 90 lb. deteriorated jointed rail with 115 lb. continuous welded rail
- Install 21,300 ties or 600 ties per mile
- Reconstruction of 52 at-grade public crossings, 31 private and 9 bike/pedestrian crossings
- Replace 2 Barrier Gates with Standard Gates
- Reconstruction of 21 existing industry switches
## The Wisconsin Southern Freight Rail Service Improvement Project:
Moving the Economy Forward by Rail!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses of Funds (Components, Locations and Characteristics)</th>
<th>Sources of Funds</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Non-Federal Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIGER VI Grant Funds</td>
<td>State of Wisconsin FRPP Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Tie Replacement</td>
<td>$1,104,469</td>
<td>$975,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Grade Crossing Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$2,146,573</td>
<td>$1,896,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout Replacement</td>
<td>$702,722</td>
<td>$620,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Replacements</td>
<td>$7,753,211</td>
<td>$6,848,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing</td>
<td>$245,576</td>
<td>$216,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,953,000</td>
<td>$10,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As %</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Federal Match - $13,280,500 - 52.6%
Strategic Benefits

- **Environmental**
  - Better fuel efficiency
  - Lower emissions through operational efficiency and highway traffic diversion
  - Diminished derailment risk and thereby reduced risk of environmental contamination

- **Economic**
  - Bringing freight costs down through operational efficiency
  - Creating competitive wage jobs through industry investments

- **Public**
  - Highway traffic relief
  - Reduced delays & signal malfunctions at public crossings
  - Improved safety
  - Estimate of 60,000 trucks that will be removed from southern Wisconsin roads because of this project
Operational Benefits

- Removal of slow orders and decreased transit time
- Improved infrastructure
- Allows 286,000 lb. loads (industry standard) to be sustained
- Reduced fuel consumption
- Reduced crew costs
- Reduced locomotive costs
- Reduced car hire costs
- Improved safety and reduced derailment costs
What Can You Do?

- April 28th Application Deadline
- Accepting Letters of Support by April 21st

Thank you!
April 3, 2014

The Honorable Secretary Anthony Foxx  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO) Support for TIGER VI Grant Application for Wisconsin Southern Freight Service Improvement Project

Dear Secretary Foxx:

As chair of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), I am writing to offer the MPO’s enthusiastic endorsement of a TIGER VI grant application which is before your agency. The proposal will substantially improve freight rail service in southwestern Wisconsin.

The application seeks grant funds under the 2014 National Infrastructure Investments (TIGER VI) program for the “Wisconsin Southern Freight Rail Service Improvement Project: Moving the Economy Forward by Rail!” The project will rehabilitate 35.5 miles of track on an important freight rail corridor in Dane and Iowa counties between the City of Madison and the Village of Spring Green. The applicants are the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Iowa County, Wisconsin River Rail Transit Commission, Wisconsin & Southern Railroad Co. (WSOR), and Watco Companies. The project is located on the WSOR network, a Class II regional railroad. The right-of-way and the infrastructure of the WSOR are owned by the State of Wisconsin and the counties as members of regional Rail Transit Commissions.

The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison Urban Area has adopted the name Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB). On behalf of that agency, I am writing to express the organization’s support for the joint application. The Madison Area TPB is the designated policy body responsible for cooperative, comprehensive regional transportation planning and decision making for the Madison Metropolitan Area. The project furthers the goals and policy objectives of the MPO’s long-range Regional Transportation Plan to maintain railways in a manner that promotes safety and increases efficiency and to develop the infrastructure needed to accommodate freight movement to meet the needs of the regional economy. It also furthers the policy objectives of minimizing energy consumption and improving the efficiency of the transportation system.

Dane County is the hub for WSOR’s network. One of every three of WSOR's rail customers are located in the City of Madison. WSOR estimates that it serves around 4,500 jobs by rail dependent industries in the county. In addition to the economic benefits of improving the freight rail network, this project will reduce truck traffic on the region’s roadways, improve safety, and lower air emissions through operational
efficiency and highway traffic diversion. It is estimated that 60,000 trucks will be removed from southern Wisconsin roads because of the project.

The publicly owned rail line in this corridor is largely in poor condition. It was acquired since the 1970s during the restructuring of our national rail system. Much of it was installed in the early part of the twentieth century. The project area has numerous train speed restrictions. If this investment does not occur, these speed restrictions are expected to grow to cover the entire segment within two years. In addition, freight car weight restrictions will also be applied. Railroad maintenance and operating costs will increase substantially, service to existing shippers will suffer and new shippers will be discouraged from locating on the line.

The proposed project will address the problems through several upgrades. Brand new modern welded rail, crossties, and new switches for sidings and shipper spurs will be installed. The line will be surfaced and tamped with new granite ballast. Fifty-two (52) at-grade public crossings will be reconstructed along with 31 private crossings and nine bicycle/pedestrian crossings. This will result in reduced delays, particularly in the Madison area. The benefits of this investment will accrue for many decades, during which the operating and maintenance costs will be substantially reduced for the railroad. Trains pulling the industry standard 286,000 pound freight cars will be able to travel at speeds up to 40 miles per hour. This will reduce costs and improve service for the shippers on the line and support regional economic development goals by attracting new shippers. It will be especially valuable to the shippers of heavy bulk agricultural and mineral goods.

The State of Wisconsin conducts substantial regular investment in its rail system through its own funds. Nonetheless, the system suffers from a massive backlog of deferred capital investment. There are many competing priorities facing the state in this time of economic challenge. The state has offered a very substantial $10.6 million non-federal match for this broadly-supported $25 million project, in spite of substantial fiscal pressures. WSOR is also contributing $2.7 million on matching funds.

For all of these reasons, the MPO is pleased to support and endorse this joint application for TIGER funds. A TIGER VI grant will enable this important link in the regional freight rail transport system to be improved, creating a viable east-west transportation route across southern Wisconsin.

Thank you for your consideration of this application.

Sincerely,

Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board

Cc: Mark Gottlieb, WisDOT Secretary
    Joe Parisi, Dane County Executive
Re:

Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

**Staff Comments on Item:**

The TIP is updated annually. The public participation effort and schedule follow the same format and timeline approved by the MPO Board last year and generally the same as in previous years before that. This includes reviewing the draft STP-Urban priority project listings and draft TIP with the MPO advisory committees, a public hearing at the Board’s September meeting, and final action at the Board’s October meeting. Prior to last year, MPO staff held two informational meetings as well. However, very few people, if any, attended these meetings and therefore it is proposed that MPO staff simply offer to meet with people individually. Staff is seeking approval for the effort and schedule this year.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Outline of Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2015-2019 TIP

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

Staff recommends approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deadline/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Notice to Local Units of Government and General Public</td>
<td>Request for Proposed Projects with Federal or State Funds and Project Submittal Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Projects due to MPO</td>
<td>Deadline for Project Submittals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Preliminary Review #1 by MPO, TCC, CAC</td>
<td>Preliminary Review of Scored Projects for STP Urban Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Print, distribute Draft TIP for Comments</td>
<td>Preliminary Listing of All Projects in TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Send out email notice of availability of Draft TIP</td>
<td>Preliminary Listing of All Projects in TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Preliminary Review #2 by MPO, TCC, CAC</td>
<td>Preliminary Review of All Projects in TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Public Hearing before MPO on Draft TIP</td>
<td>Testimony and Comments Formally Received by MPO on Draft TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Recommendations by TCC &amp; CAC</td>
<td>Final Comments to MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Action by MPO</td>
<td>Final Action by MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Submittal of Complete Final TIP Report with Appendices to WisDOT</td>
<td>Submittal to WisDOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Public Participation Process April 2, 2014
Re: Continued Review and Discussion on Preliminary Draft of Revised Policies and Scoring Criteria for STP Urban projects.

Staff Comments on Item:
As previously noted, a comprehensive review and revision of the MPO’s STP Urban project scoring criteria has not been done since the criteria were first developed and adopted in the late-1990s. Staff thought it was appropriate to reexamine both the program policies and scoring criteria in light of changes to federal law and emphasis areas (e.g., livability/sustainability, public health, environmental justice) and MPO policies.

Staff researched project scoring systems used by other MPOs across the country and developed a first draft of a revised project scoring system. While the scale is different, the scoring categories and the relative weighting of the categories are not all that different from the current system (see table comparing the current and proposed new project scoring system). One significant difference with the proposed new system is that while the categories are the same for all projects, specific criteria have been developed that are tailored to the different types of major projects. Also, there are minor changes in the category weights depending on the different type of project (see the table). For independent pedestrian/bicycle projects, staff is initially proposing to use the TAP criteria, but we may need to “translate” that into the STP Urban project scoring categories to provide for a more “apples to apples” comparison of scores.

Staff reviewed the draft document with the MPO technical committee at its February meeting and reported on their initial comments at the last board meeting. The March technical committee meeting was cancelled. Staff will be reviewing the document with the MPO citizen advisory committee at its March 26 meeting, and will report on their comments at the meeting. Staff has made some relatively minor changes to the initial draft in response to comments by the board. Those are shown in the attached revised draft. Staff is still working on additional potential changes in response to the technical committee comments.

Materials Presented on Item:
2. Table comparing current and proposed new STP Urban project scoring system.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale: For review and discussion only at this time.
A. Introduction

The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) – An MPO scores, ranks, and selects projects from applicants requesting STP-Urban funding using a set of approved screening and scoring criteria. These criteria were most recently used to evaluate projects for the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and are outlined in Appendix A-1 of that document.

The MPO has not undertaken a comprehensive review of its STP – Urban project scoring criteria since first developed and adopted in the mid-1990s. Given changes in federal transportation law and emphasis areas as well as changes to MPO policies, it is appropriate to reexamine both the program policies and project scoring criteria to ensure that they are fully consistent with MAP-21, the current transportation legislation, and MPO goals and policy objectives outlined in the regional transportation plan. Staff is proposing some changes to the project scoring process based on this examination and research on project scoring systems used by other MPOs across the country.

Overall, the proposed changes are relatively minor from the standpoint of the categories of criteria used and the weighting of those categories in the scoring system. See attached table, which compares the proposed new and current categories and scoring weights. The most significant proposed change is that while the same categories are used for all projects specific criteria have been developed within those categories tailored to the different major types of potential projects (roadway, transit, ITS). It is proposed that independent pedestrian/bicycle projects be scored using the same criteria developed for those projects for the Transportation Alternatives Program. In addition, it is proposed that the scoring weights for the different categories be adjusted somewhat for the different project types to better fit the project. The main difference is in the weight assigned to System Preservation and Congestion Mitigation/TSM for capacity expansion versus maintenance type projects. Previously, all project types were scored using the same more general project criteria and weights.

The different criteria and weights were developed to reflect the relevance and significance of each category for the particular project type. The scoring system scale will be the same for all projects, regardless of project type, with all capable of earning up to 100 points. This will permit a general comparison of the strength of the applications across the project categories.

This document outlines the proposed new draft policies and criteria for use in the evaluation of project applications by local units of government requesting STP-Urban funds.

B. Madison Area Transportation Planning Board Objectives and Policies for the STP-Urban Program

Objectives

The Madison Area TPB will accept applications for most types of projects under the STP program. However, in an effort to maximize federal funding to the region and balance the needs of the different modes of transportation, the availability of alternative federal sources of funding
for certain types of projects (e.g., Transportation Alternatives Program for bicycle projects, Highway Safety Improvement Program for certain safety projects, and FTA transit formula programs for transit projects) will be considered in making project funding decisions (see Project Funding section).

The specific objectives of the Madison Area TPB’s TIP process for the STP-Urban program are to:

1) Fund the highest priority, most cost effective projects that will help achieve the goals and policy objectives for the regional transportation system as outlined in the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County.

Among the key goals are to achieve a transportation system that is balanced; accessible; efficient; safe; reliable; equitable; environmentally responsible; and supportive of compact, transportation efficient patterns of development; and that promotes economic prosperity of the region and fosters health and community vitality.

2) Evaluate candidate projects fairly, using appropriate criteria reflective of these goals and policy objectives, which are consistently applied.

3) Use performance-based standards to evaluate projects, where feasible.

4) Utilize STP-Urban funds for projects of high priority not covered by other funding sources.

5) Maximize the amount of discretionary federal and state funding to the Madison metropolitan area, including NHPP and STP-Flexible funds for roadway projects and Transportation Alternatives Program funds for pedestrian and bicycle projects.

6) Utilize STP-Urban funds on projects that have demonstrated local support and commitment and will be ready to proceed when scheduled.

7) Utilize STP-Urban funds on larger-sized projects with significant beneficial impacts to the regional transportation system to ensure efficient utilization of both local and state administrative resources given the extensive requirements for federally funded projects.

Policies

- **Eligible Project Categories:**
  The Madison Area TPB will accept, score and rank applications for most types of projects eligible for funding under the STP program, as listed below:

  1. Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, and operational improvements for roadways functionally classified as arterials or collectors, and bridges on roadways of all functional classifications, including improvements necessary to accommodate other modes of transportation and drainage systems for roadway runoff

  2. Capital costs for transit projects, including vehicles and facilities that are used to provide intercity passenger bus service

  3. Multi-use paths, modification of public sidewalks to comply with ADA, and carpool projects

  4. Roadway and transit safety infrastructure improvements, including projects related to intersections that have disproportionately high crash rates and/or high levels of congestion

  5. Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs
6. Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements
7. Surface transportation planning programs
8. Transportation enhancement activities
9. Transportation demand management (TDM) programs

Federally eligible projects for which the Madison Area TPB will not utilize its STP-Urban funds include environmental mitigation efforts, environmental restoration and pollution abatement, and recreational trails (see 23 U.S.C. Section 133 (b) for the complete list of eligible project activities).

- **Eligible Cost Categories:**
  The following are eligible costs for roadway projects under federal law and Madison Area TPB policy:

  1. Street/roadway construction*
  2. Drainage systems needed to carry storm water runoff from street/roadway**
  3. Sidewalks***
  4. Multi-use path in corridor (where appropriate)
  5. Transit facilities (e.g., bus pad, bus pull-out, bench or shelter, park-and-ride lot, bus garage/storage facility)
  6. Standard streetscape items (lighting, colored crosswalks, etc.)
  7. Signs and signals (where warrants are met)
  8. Standard landscaping items (street trees, plants, etc.)

  * The needs of bicyclists and pedestrians must be considered for all roadway projects per federal, state, and MPO policy.
  ** Expansion of storm water system for future/planned development is not an eligible cost, but the local unit of government can fund the difference with 100% local funds.
  *** Local units of government may only assess for the 50% local match.

Utilities (e.g., water, sewer) are not an eligible roadway project cost per federal law. Real estate acquisition, engineering/design, and compensable utility relocation are eligible costs per federal law, but not eligible under Madison Area TPB policy in order to stretch the limited available federal funding. An exception for design is the required WisDOT design review.

- **Minimum/Maximum Project Cost Amounts:**
  In order to ensure efficient utilization of state and local administrative resources given the significant additional requirements for federal projects and to fund projects with significant beneficial impacts, the Madison Area TPB will apply the following total project cost minimums to STP-Urban projects:

  - Roadway Infrastructure Projects: $500,000
  - Transit and Pedestrian/Bicycle Infrastructure Projects: $300,000
  - Transit Vehicle, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and other Capital Purchase Projects: $125,000
  - Non-Infrastructure Projects (e.g., TDM, Carpool, etc): $75,000

There is no maximum project cost amount, but segmentation of projects over $12 million is encouraged.
• **Project Funding:**
  Per long-standing policy, the City of Madison’s pedestrian/bicycle safety education program and the Madison Area TPB Rideshare/TDM program will continue to receive an “off-the-top” allocation of total STP-Urban funding. The allocations for these programs will be based on a 3% annual inflationary increase from 2014 levels. No “off-the-top” allocation of funding will be provided for any other project at this time. Also, no set percentage or sub-allocation of funds will be directed toward particular types of projects.

The Madison Area TPB will utilize the project scores and ranking by project category as the primary basis for awarding project funding. Final decisions on the award of funding, including the distribution of funding between the different project types, will be based on the MPO’s STP-Urban program objectives outlined above.

• **Cost Share:**
  In order to stretch the limited STP-Urban funding available over a greater number of projects, the required local cost share for all roadway projects and other projects costing $600,000 or more shall be 50%. The standard 20% local cost share will be applied for small non-infrastructure projects not exceeding $300,000. A sliding scale for cost share will be used for projects costing between $300,000 and $600,000 as outlined below.

Formula for computing the federal share:

\[
P = \text{Federal participation percentage (round to zero decimal places)}
\]

\[
X = \text{Project cost}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Federal Share (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 - $600,000</td>
<td>( P = 80 - \frac{X-300,000}{10,000} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $600,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Screening Criteria:**
  a. Consistency Requirements
     1. All projects must be included in or consistent with the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, including the Congestion Management Process (CMP), and separate mode-specific elements of the plan, such as the five-year Transit Development Plan and the Bicycle Transportation Plan.

     2. All major roadway and transit capacity expansion projects must be listed by reference in the financially constrained 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update.

     3. All roadway projects must be consistent with the State of Wisconsin’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations law. The law requires the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities for projects receiving state or federal funds, with certain limited exemptions. See Subsection 84.01(35) of the Wisconsin Statutes and Chapter Trans 75 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

  b. Financial Requirements
All projects must include reasonable, accurate cost estimates that are supported by an itemized project budget. Larger projects with construction proposed to be done in phases throughout multiple years should have a reasonable project phasing schedule. All sources of funding in addition to the requested STP-Urban funds should be identified. All projects must have a reasonable expectation of being funded by the project sponsor.

C. Evaluation Criteria – Roadway Projects

[Note: The criteria within each category are used to calculate category scores. The categories are weighted as indicated by the percentage with a maximum total score of 100 points.]

1. Importance to Regional Transportation System – 15%
   - Measure of Function: The Madison Area TPB Functional Classification System map assigns the following functional classifications to roadways within the urban area: Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, and Urban Collector. The functional classification defines the role the roadway plays (mobility, connectivity, accessibility) in serving travel needs through the network. [Add link to map]
   - Measure of Volume: The Annual Average Weekday Traffic volume (AAWT) or Annual Average Daily Traffic volume (if AAWT not available) of the functionally classified roadway.
   - Length of Route: The route’s length in relation to the scale of the regional transportation system.
   - System Continuity: The ability of a project to complete a key transportation system corridor or fill a gap, providing improved connectivity at a regional as well as local scale.
   - Spacing/availability of alternate routes within the general corridor.
   - Freight Route: The project is located on a designated truck route, as identified on the Freight Facilities and Service map in the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update, or improves the freight system and freight movements.
   - Transit Route: The project is located on a major transit route.

2. System Preservation – 5% (Capacity Expansion Projects) and 15% (Preservation Projects)
   - The project will help preserve the viability of existing transportation infrastructure.
   - The current pavement condition for the candidate roadway project.
   - Life cycle cost to maintain the roadway segment or bridge. Projects should be in the optimal time of the life cycle, but not beyond the end of the life cycle for maintenance to be cost effective. [Question: is this workable?]

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management – 15% (Capacity Expansion Projects) and 5% (Preservation Projects)
   - Level of existing traffic congestion and extent to which the project improves travel times or traffic flow conditions by (a) providing additional motor vehicle capacity; and/or (b) providing transit and/or non-motorized facility improvements, increasing the attractiveness of those modes of transportation.
     [Note: The level of traffic congestion will be measured based on the best data available, including volume-to-capacity ratio (using AAWT and planning level capacities in the regional travel model), intersection Level of Service during the peak periods, and congested travel speeds.]
   - The project reduces intersection delay and increases the Level of Service (LOS) through improved traffic signal operations (better coordination and/or signal equipment upgrades,
including responsive signal controls) and/or through intersection design changes (e.g.,
addition or lengthening of turn bays).

- The project improves roadway access management (e.g., addition of a median) in a
  manner that significantly improves the capacity of the roadway.
- The project includes ITS strategies, other than traffic signal operations. This category
  includes all project elements with a primary purpose of providing technological
  enhancements that improve the efficiency and/or safety of the existing transportation
  system. Projects could include variable message signs, cameras, speed estimates, parking
  availability data, traffic counting systems, and other “intelligent” data and reporting
  mechanisms that make the transportation system more efficient for every mode.
- The project provides or improves an alternative or parallel route to an existing congested
  roadway or intersection, thereby improving the operational performance/efficiency of that
  congested facility.

4. Safety Enhancement – 10%

- The project is located on a roadway segment with a history of motor vehicle, bicycle,
  and/or pedestrian crashes, and the project addresses the safety problem(s) or issue(s).
- The project addresses documented safety concerns that are not necessarily reflected in a
  crash rate (e.g., substandard geometry of a roadway; poor structural conditions posing
  hazards, inadequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities).
- The project reduces conflicts between the different modes of transportation.
- The project identifies and addresses safety issues for all modes (e.g., rail crossings,
  pedestrian/bicycle crossings).
- The project improves safety through roadway access management (e.g., addition of a
  median, relocation of access points that are located too close to roadway intersections,
  removal of driveway access points, etc.).

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options – 10%

- The project provides new on-street and/or off-street pedestrian and bicycle facilities or
  enhances existing facilities (e.g., widening bike lane, pedestrian crossing improvements,
  etc.).
- The project is located on a bus route and will improve transit as well as motor vehicle
  operations.
- The project includes a bus lane or other transit improvements (e.g., bus queue jump at
  intersection, transit signal priority) and/or amenities (e.g., bus stop improvements) to
  improve transit travel time, reliability, and/or attractiveness.
- The project is located on a bus route and will improve transit as well as motor vehicle
  operations.


- The project is consistent with regional land use policies and the community’s
  comprehensive plan.
- The project is consistent with a local economic development/revitalization plan.
- The project is located within or serves an existing or planned mixed-use or regional
  employment center.

---

1 All roadway projects must be consistent with the State of Wisconsin’s Pedestrian and Bicycle
Accommodations law. The law requires the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities for projects
receiving state or federal funds, with certain limited exemptions. See Subsection 84.01(35) of the
Wisconsin Statutes and Chapter Trans 75 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code
• The project is located within or serves and improves multi-modal accessibility and connectivity to a targeted infill/redevelopment area, such as a Tax Incremental District (TID).
• The project incorporates context sensitive design that considers not only access for alternative modes of transportation, but also the environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historic, community, and preservation impacts of the street project.

7. Timely Implementation and Complexity of Project – 10%
• The project has approval of the local policy body and a commitment of financial resources to provide the local matching funds (i.e., included in the approved capital budget/plan, project application approved by resolution).
• Extent to which environmental review and documentation has been completed.
• Extent to which planning and preliminary engineering design work has been completed. Completion of preliminary design is not required, but project should be well beyond the conceptual level with some level of design work completed.
• Does the project involve a railroad crossing, real estate acquisition, or other issues that add complexity or potential delay? To what extent have these issues been identified and addressed? Projects must be implemented in a timely manner, and not face any significant political or logistical roadblocks from a preliminary view.
• The project was developed through multi-jurisdictional collaboration and/or successfully addresses unusually difficult planning/engineering issues.
• The project could be coordinated with another project, making it more cost effective or reducing community impacts, or a delay in the project would be otherwise problematic.

8. Cost Benefit – 10%
• This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project, including number of people affected, based on the other criteria compared to the cost of the project.
• Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system.
• The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment, which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transportation system improvements.
• The project is coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in a cost savings or efficiencies.

9. Environment, Public Health, and Environmental Justice – 10%
• Extent to which project enhancements to alternative transportation options are likely to be used based on existing and estimated future transit ridership and bicycling and walking levels, and extent to which this is likely to result in a shift to these modes and reduced vehicle trips/VMT.
• The project adequately addresses environmental impacts (e.g., impacts to air/water quality, open space, historic structures, animal habitats, etc.) and will include mitigation and restoration measures, when necessary.
• The project improves the environment or minimizes the environmental impact of the facility above and beyond current design standards (i.e., use of recycled materials, innovative storm water treatment, use of native vegetation, air quality benefit, etc.).
• The project provides public health benefits (e.g., provides community/social space or improved access to parks/open space, improves access to health care or other services, healthy food resources, etc., provides opportunities for physical activity, improves safety, etc.).
D. Evaluation Criteria – Transit Projects

1. Importance to Regional Transportation System – 15%
   - The vehicles or facilities will serve or be located in a high density area with a large generation of trips from a high proportion of the community (e.g., regional employment/activity center, major hospital, etc.).
   - Number of weekly bus trips and service hours/miles affected by the project (both current and anticipated future, if new service planned).
   - Number of passenger boardings per day on route(s) affected by the project (both current and anticipated future boardings, if new service planned).
   - The vehicles or facilities will increase the service area to existing transit-supportive development.

2. System Preservation – 5% (Capacity Expansion/New Facility Projects) and 15% (Vehicle/Facility Replacement Projects)
   - For bus purchase projects, extent to which the buses being replaced have reached the minimum total life cycle replacement age and mileage (see FTA Report No. VA-26-7229-07.1 (April 2007)).
   - For bus purchase projects, the number of years the buses being replaced has exceeded their useful life according to FTA policy (12 years or 500,000 miles for standard, heavy-duty 40-foot bus).
   - For bus purchase projects, the buses are needed to maintain an acceptable spare ratio.
   - The project will help maintain the reliability of transit service that is convenient, comfortable, and affordable.
   - The project will preserve the viability of existing transit facilities.

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management – 15% (Capacity Expansion/New Facility Projects) and 5% (Vehicle/Facility Replacement Projects)
   - Level of existing congestion (for all transportation modes) in the affected corridor(s) and extent to which the project reduces or helps manage congestion improves motor vehicle and/or transit travel times by providing transit improvements that increase its attractiveness.
   [Note: The level of traffic congestion will be measured based on the best data available, including volume-to-capacity ratio (using AAWT and planning level capacities in the regional travel model), intersection Level of Service during the peak periods, and congested travel speeds. Pedestrian/bicycle congestion affecting transit travel times will be based on available counts.]
   - The project provides or enables provision of additional transit capacity (e.g., through expansion of fleet) in corridors where demand for transit service routinely approaches or exceeds capacity during peak periods.
   - The project improves the operational performance/efficiency of existing transit route(s) (e.g., decrease in travel times, increase in on-time performance). Examples include transit runningway improvement such as addition of bus lane, consolidation of bus stops,
relocation of bus stops from near-side of intersection to far-side, and construction of bus bulb-outs.

- The project implements ITS strategies that improve the operational efficiency, attractiveness, or safety of transit service. Examples include transit signal priority, dynamic message signs that display real-time bus schedule information, smart phone-enabled customer information systems, fare collection systems, passenger counting systems, and other data and reporting mechanisms that make or can be used to make the transportation system more efficient.

4. Safety Enhancement – 10%

- The project identifies and addresses safety issues relating to reported transit vehicle crashes.
- The project reduces traffic conflicts between transit vehicles and other modes.
- The project addresses safety or security concerns that may not be reflected in crash rates or security incidents (e.g., installation of cameras at transit facilities or on buses).

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options – 15%

- The project includes transit runningway improvements (e.g., bus lane), or other transit improvements (e.g., in-lane bus stops, bus queue jump at intersection, transit signal priority) and/or amenities (e.g., Wi-fi on buses) that reduce transit travel times, improve on-time performance, and/or otherwise increase the attractiveness of transit and non-motorized transportation modes.
- The project purchases new vehicles that increase the attractiveness of transit.
- The project improves connections between transit and other modes of transportation (e.g., increases opportunities for bicycle storage on buses or at major bus stops/stations, park-and-ride lot/facility).
- The project enhances onboard passenger accommodations.
- The project enhances transfer station or bus stop facilities/amenities.


- The project is consistent with/supports regional land use policies and local land use plans.
- The project is consistent with/supports a local economic development/revitalization plan.
- The project is located within or serves an existing or planned mixed-use or regional employment center.
- The project is located within or serves and improves accessibility and connectivity to a targeted infill/redevelopment area, such as a Tax Incremental District (TID).
- The project serves transit-supportive development and/or schools, services, or shopping areas.

7. Timely Implementation – 10%

- The project has approval of the local policy body and a commitment of financial resources to provide the local matching funds (i.e., included in the approved capital budget).
- For vehicle purchase, the project is part of or can easily be incorporated into a bus procurement contract.
- Extent to which any necessary environmental review and documentation has been completed. Alternatively, the project has been categorically excluded from such requirement.
• For infrastructure projects, extent to which planning and preliminary engineering design work has been completed. Completion of preliminary design is not required, but project should be well beyond the conceptual level with some level of design work completed.
• For infrastructure projects, does the project involve a railroad crossing, real estate acquisition, or other issues that add complexity or potential delay? To what extent have these issues been identified and addressed? Projects must be implemented in a timely manner, and not face any significant political or logistical roadblocks from a preliminary view.
• The project was developed through multi-jurisdictional collaboration and/or successfully addresses unusually difficult planning/engineering issues.

8. Cost Benefit – 10%
• This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project, including number of people affected, based on the other criteria compared to the cost of the project.
• Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system.
• The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment, which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transit system improvements.
• The project could be coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in a cost savings or efficiencies, or a delay would be otherwise problematic.

9. Environment, Public Health, and Environmental Justice – 10%
• Extent to which project is likely to result in increased transit ridership and reduced vehicle trips/VMT.
• The project adequately addresses environmental impacts (e.g., impacts to air/water quality, open space, historic structures, animal habitats, etc.) and will include mitigation and restoration measures, when necessary.
• The project improves the environment or minimizes the environmental impact of the facility above and beyond current design standards (i.e., use of recycled materials, innovative storm water treatment, use of native vegetation, air quality benefit, etc.).
• For bus purchase projects, buses to be acquired are low emission vehicles (e.g., diesel hybrid electric).
• The project provides public health benefits (e.g., provides community/social space or improved access to parks/open space, improves access to health care or other services, healthy food resources, etc., provides opportunities for physical activity, improves safety, etc.).
• The project improves accessibility for disabled persons through enhanced paratransit service and/or upgrades to existing fixed-route buses or bus stops.
• The project is located in or will result in improved transit service within a MPO-defined environmental justice area and provides improved multi-modal access/mobility and/or otherwise improves livability of the area.

E. Evaluation Criteria – Independent ITS Projects

1. Importance to Regional Transportation System – 15%
• The project is identified as a high priority in the Regional ITS Deployment Plan (to be developed in 2014-'15).
• For roadway ITS projects, the functional classification, traffic volume(s), and length of route(s) of the roadway(s) the project is located on or would benefit.
• For roadway ITS projects, whether the project is located on or would benefit a designated regional or local truck route, as identified on the Freight Facilities and Service map in the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update, or improves the freight system and freight movements.
• The project is located in or will serve a high density area with a large generation of trips from a high proportion of the community (e.g., regional employment/activity center).
• For transit ITS projects, number of bus trips and passenger boardings in the areas or corridors where the project will be implemented.

2. System Preservation – 5%
• The project will help preserve the viability of existing transportation infrastructure.

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management – 15%
• Level of existing traffic congestion in the affected corridor(s) or area(s) and extent to which the project improves travel times or traffic flow conditions.
• The project reduces intersection delay and increases the Level of Service (LOS) through improved traffic signal operations or other strategies.
• The project will reduce congestion caused by incidents and special events through improved traffic control operations, real-time information systems (travel time, transit service, parking availability), or other strategies.
• The project increases the attractiveness of transit, ridesharing, bicycling, and/or walking in congested areas or corridors through enhanced signal operations (e.g., transit signal priority, adding detection for bicyclists), real-time information systems, speed estimate signs, or other strategies.
• The project provides data that will assist in identifying and addressing congested problem areas or intersections for all transportation modes.

4. Safety Enhancement – 15%
• The project is located on a roadway segment with a history of motor vehicle, bicycle, and/or pedestrian crashes, and the project addresses the safety problem(s) or issue(s).
• The project addresses safety concerns that are not necessarily reflected in a crash rate, and would improve or eliminate the safety concern.
• The project improves traffic incident management, reducing the threat of secondary crashes.
• The project helps identify and manage hazardous roadway conditions from weather events or other causes through real-time information systems or other strategies.
• The project improves emergency management communications by coordinating interagency communication system and real-time traveler information systems for incidents, special events, evacuations, major route closings, re-routings, or other restrictions.

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options – 10%
• The project includes ITS infrastructure that will improve transit travel times, reliability and/or otherwise increase the attractiveness of transit (e.g., transit signal priority, real-time information systems, fare collection systems, etc.).
• The project includes ITS infrastructure that will increase the convenience and attractiveness of bicycling and walking (e.g., pedestrian signals or warning lights, pedestrian and bicyclist detection devices).
• The project includes ITS infrastructure that will improve data collection for alternative transportation modes needed for planning and project design purposes.
6. **Supports Transportation Efficient Land Use, Livability, and Economic Prosperity – 10%**
   - The project is located within or serves an existing or planned mixed-use or regional employment center.
   - The project is located within or improves multi-modal transportation to/from or within a targeted infill/redevelopment area such as a Tax Incremental District (TID).
   - The project improves the reliability and predictability of travel and freight delivery times through traffic surveillance and control and incident management systems.

7. **Timely Implementation – 10%**
   - The project has approval of the local policy body and a commitment of financial resources to provide the local matching funds (i.e., included in the approved capital budget).
   - The project is based on a systems engineering analysis that meets federal requirements.
   - Extent to which the project has been developed and designed, reducing uncertainty in project cost and schedule estimates.
   - Extent to which key stakeholders have been involved in the project development process.
   - Does the project involve any technical or political issues that could complicate things and delay the procurement for the project?
   - Is the procurement approach suitable for the project?
   - The project was developed through multi-jurisdictional collaboration and/or successfully addresses difficult technical issues.

8. **Cost Benefit – 10%**
   - This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project, including number of people affected, based on the other criteria compared to the cost of the project.
   - Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system.
   - The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment, which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transportation system improvements.
   - The project could be coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in a cost savings or efficiencies, or a delay would be otherwise problematic.

9. **Environment, Public Health, and Environmental Justice – 10%**
   - Extent to which project enhancements to transit and other alternative transportation options are likely to be used based on existing and estimated future transit ridership and bicycling and walking levels, and extent to which this is likely to result in a shift to these modes and reduced vehicle trips/VMT.
   - Extent to which the project will reduce non-recurring congestion caused by incidents and special events, thereby improving air quality.
   - The project is located within a MPO-defined environmental justice area and provides improved multi-modal access/mobility and/or otherwise improves livability of the area.
   - Extent to which the project improves safety for all modes of transportation.
   - Extent to which the project increases the attractiveness of active transportation modes.
Comparison of Current and Proposed Revised STP Urban Project Scoring System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category - New (Current)</th>
<th>Current All Projects</th>
<th>Proposed New Scoring System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway (CE)</td>
<td>Roadway (Maint)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit (New/CE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit (Repl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ped/Bike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Weight (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Importance to Regional Transportation System (Consistency - Key System Element)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 System Preservation (Preserves Existing System)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Congestion Mitigation &amp; TSM (Congestion Relief)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Safety Enhancement (Safety &amp; Security)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Enhancement of Multi-modal Options (Multi-modal)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Timely Implementation (Complexity of Project Preparation)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cost Effectiveness (Cost Effective/Life Cycle Cost)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Environment, Public Health, and Environmental Justice (Degree of Multi-modal Use)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Use Transportation Alternatives Program criteria?