AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of March 4, 2015 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Presentation on the Interstate 39/90/94 (Madison to Portage) EIS Study

6. Update on the Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan

7. Continued Review and Discussion of Draft STP Urban Project Scoring Criteria and Program Policies

8. Letter of Response to WisDOT Regarding Invitation to Participate in the Environmental Review Process for the Interstate 39/90 and Beltline Interchange Study

9. Letter to County Executive Regarding the MPO’s Support of Integrated Land Use and Transportation Planning by the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) and MPO

10. Appointments of MPO Board Representatives to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Intergovernmental Oversight Committee

11. Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

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

13. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   - Revised STP Urban Program Policies and Project Scoring Criteria
   - Public Participation Plan Update
   - Metro Transit On-Board Survey
   - Regional ITS Strategic Plan
   - Bicycle Transportation Plan
   - Dane County Bicycle Wayfinding Plan

14. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

15. Adjournment
Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, May 6 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 avísenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.*
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
March 4, 2015 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: David Ahrens (arrived during item #3), Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz (arrived during item #7), Robin Schmidt, Patrick Stern

Members absent: Mark Clear, Paul Lawrence, Jerry Mandli, Chris Schmidt

MPO Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

2. Approval of February 4, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Minihan, seconded by Stern, to approve the February 4, 2015 meeting minutes. Motion carried with Kamp and King abstaining.

3. Communications

• Letter from WisDOT approving TIP Amendment No. 1 for the Stoughton Road resurfacing project.

Schaefer also reported that the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission was awarded the APA Healthy Communities grant, though for a little less money than was requested. As part of that project, MPO staff will be working with CARPC and other grant partners to refine the Active Living Places index. Grant activities also include outreach/education activities related to this tool.

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

None


Schaefer said the draft map was sent out for review and comment from local officials. Tom Wilson sent a note saying the Westport Town Board did not have an objection to including the additional area in the County Highway K corridor as part of the urban area. MPO staff also corresponded with City of Fitchburg staff and met with City of Madison staff. Based on the meeting with Madison staff one change is being proposed to classify the segment of Pflaum Road between Vondron and Stoughton Road as a minor arterial. He noted that both Fitchburg and Madison planned to maintain their own maps with some differences because the maps are referenced in their subdivision regulations and used for other purposes.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Golden, to approve Resolution TPB No. 101. Motion carried.

6. Resolution TPB No. 102 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program

Schaefer explained that WisDOT and the Federal Highway Administration are now requiring MPOs that are carrying over funding and associated work activities to the following year to approve an amendment to their work programs to reflect the continuation of work activities. In the future, such amendments would be done prior to the end of the year rather than retroactively as in this case. Schaefer said the carryover funding being requested ($170,000) will actually be a little less than the amount shown in the attached budget table. Most of it is for completion of the ITS Plan.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Kamp, to approve Amendment #2 to the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program. Motion carried.
7. **Letter of Support for the State Smart Transportation Initiative’s Pursuit of Grant Funding for Project to Develop Measures to Assess Equity in Transportation System Investments**

Schaefer said the State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI) is housed at UW-Madison and provides technical assistance, primarily to state departments of transportation. SSTI staff recently met with City of Madison and MPO staff about a project idea for which they plan to seek grant funding. The project is to develop measures for equity in transportation investments. SSTI would like to work with the City of Madison and the MPO on the project, if funded, and is seeking a letter of support. The goal is to develop a tool that could then be used by other regions. Schaefer said incorporating equity into its plans and programs is an MPO goal, however it is complicated and there aren’t many good analysis tools available. He said he thought the MPO would benefit from the project if it was funded. He referred to the materials in the packet that provide a little more information on the project. He said a draft letter of support was in the packet. It added it could be signed by Matano as the board chair.

R. Schmidt commented that she thought it would be better for the letter to be signed by the MPO chair. She asked how the MPO would use the information. Schaefer said the idea is to measure multi-modal accessibility to various destinations for different population groups. The MPO could measure existing conditions and the impact of its plans. The tool could also potentially be used to measure the impact of specific projects and incorporated into the project scoring of applications the MPO does. Gust added that the tool could lead to a change in the way projects are scored in terms of the equity criterion. Golden agreed with that, noting the scoring for equity now is more subjective. He also said that based on the assessment of current conditions certain projects could be prioritized for funding in a particular program cycle. Kamp said Metro and other transportation providers could also benefit from the tool to quantify equity issues. He asked if there were examples of where this has been implemented successfully. Schaefer said there aren’t any comprehensive multi-modal examples, but the Twin Cities MPO developed a tool focused on transit accessibility.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Golden, to approve the letter of support for the SSTI grant project, but with Board Chair Matano as the signatory. Motion carried.

8. **Presentation on the Draft Bicycle Transportation Plan Recommendations**

Schaefer said MPO staff recently met with the plan advisory committees to review draft recommendations and the draft facility plan maps. Changes were made in response to the comments received. Staff is now getting ready to initiate more extensive public outreach on the plan.

Golden asked how the MPO’s bicycle plan related to local bicycle plans. Schaefer said the MPO plan obviously governs in terms of federal funding. To the extent consistent with MPO policies, the MPO plan attempts to incorporate facility recommendations in local plans. The MPO plan attempts to stitch the local plans together and supplement them to the extent feasible. Golden asked if the plan was “leading or following,” and Matano and Schaefer said both. Schaefer said that in terms of policies, design guidelines, etc. the plan was “leading” and also adding new or revised facility plan recommendations based on those guidelines. Cechvala added the plan also prioritizes projects for funding from a regional standpoint. Schaefer added the facility planning is an iterative process. Recommendations from local plans completed later will be incorporated into future MPO plans. The MPO can support those local planning efforts.

Cechvala provided a presentation, reviewing the planning process, vision and goals, and highlighting some of the more significant recommendations related to the seven “Es” (education, encouragement, engineering, etc.).

There was a discussion about the effort the MPO is assisting with for the county and multiple communities to apply for bike friendly status. There was also discussion about the provision of wide paved shoulders for bicyclists in rural areas. R. Schmidt commented on the county policy on shoulder paving. She said sometimes it is not done due to costs because of needed right of way, grading, etc. Gust said the state law (TRANS 75) requires ped/bike accommodations for projects with federal or state funding with limited exceptions, although that has been proposed for repeal in the Governor’s budget bill. Golden asked that the issue of chip sealing
roads be addressed in the plan. Cechvala noted WisDOT has a rural bicycle facilities guide that provides some guidelines on paved shoulders for bicyclists. Ahrens expressed a general concern about the cost of implementing some of the recommendations given finite budgets. Discussion ensued about this. R. Schmidt said the recommendations could justify pursuit of additional funding. Matano said it is a bicycle plan with recommendations to be implemented over time as budgets permit. Golden agreed and said projects are prioritized as part of the annual budgeting process.

Cechvala presented the priority path projects. Golden asked why on-street facilities weren’t included. Schaefer said those are shown as needs but not prioritized because those are typically done as part of street reconstruction projects and depend upon that schedule. Golden asked about prioritizing small projects. Schaefer said the MPO is prioritizing projects from a regional standpoint for regional funding. Smaller projects are prioritized by local communities and funded through the local budget process. Golden said that should be explicit in the plan. Discussion followed about the recommendation to develop an interconnected bike network to provide alternatives to high-volume, high-speed arterial streets and how that would be accomplished. Schaefer said the parallel route could be a local street, perhaps with some bike priority treatment. Opitz suggested the facilities plan map include high priority local street connections. Schaefer said the functional class map, which wasn’t in the packet, is intended to highlight those as high priority routes. Opitz also suggested the map show programmed on-street facilities as well as paths, and Schaefer agreed that was a good idea.

Cechvala reviewed the next steps, including planned outreach activities. He said staff would utilize events such as the Fitchburg bike hub grand opening to get the word out about the plan. In response to a question from Golden, Schaefer said the MPO would attempt to coordinate outreach activities with the City of Madison’s transportation plan. He said the MPO could mention and provide a link to the city plan on its website to reduce confusion. Cechvala noted MPO and city staff have been working closely together to ensure consistency between the plans. Schaefer said staff was seeking approval from the board to initiate public outreach by posting the draft recommendations on the MPO website.

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Golden to move forward with the public participation plan outlined for the draft Bicycle Transportation Plan, with the stipulation that MPO staff work with City of Madison staff to coordinate efforts. Motion carried.

9. Letter of Support for Additional Funding in 2016 for the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission to Allow Completion of an Update to its Land Use Plan

Schaefer said the item was requested by Golden. Golden provided some background information. He said the last regional land use plan was the Vision 2020 plan completed in 1997. It was the only time a combined land use and transportation plan had been done. He said he asked that the item be on the agenda because the county only provided enough money to CARPC this year to do a values survey, not initiate a process to update the land use plan, and that was only because the City of Madison appropriated $60,000 in one-time funding for the survey. He said he realized there are competing priorities for funds, but he wanted the MPO to express to the county the importance of linking land use and transportation planning and urge the county to try to find the one-time funding necessary to conduct such a planning effort. Minihan agreed with Golden.

R. Schmidt understood and supported the desire to link transportation and land use planning, but said there were some fundamental issues/concerns that some members of the county board have with CARPC. She said she needed more information before she could support sending the letter as written. She said she could support a letter simply expressing the MPO’s desire to better link the activities, but was concerned about requesting funding for CARPC. Matano commented that the letter doesn’t mention the funding amount and the county also provides significant funding for CARPC. He expressed some concern about the responsiveness of CARPC. He said he had heard complaints that CARPC hadn’t made adequate process on completing future urban development analysis (FUDA) plans.
Golden said the funding would be for the plan, not CARPC, and he thought it was preferable not to mention a specific funding amount. It would be a multi-year effort and even limited funding was better than none. He said he didn’t think CARPC was unresponsive, but that CARPC was a creature of its membership of the county and all municipalities in the county. He noted it was unfortunate that the past state budget bill put CARPC under the levy limit. Stern said he was supportive of integrated planning, but thought it would be better to have one agency do both. He said the issue was complicated and said it was up to the county whether to provide funding to CARPC for the plan. Opitz said CARPC prepared a successful FUDA plan for the Middleton/Westport/Waunakee area. Schaefer added that one was done for Stoughton and DeForest, and work was begun on a plan for Sun Prairie and East Madison. Opitz said nothing could be done at this point about the splitting of the land use and transportation planning functions between two agencies. He said he was receptive to the idea of sending a letter, but open to changes to make sure it sets the right tone.

R. Schmidt suggested removing the reference to county funding, but simply saying the MPO supports an integrated land use and transportation plan, and recognizes that there may be obstacles to doing this but hopes the county will support these efforts.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Opitz, to approve the letter of support for CARPC funding.

Discussion followed on whom to send the letter to and potential edits to the last paragraph requesting funding. No action was taken on this motion.

Moved by Golden, seconded by R. Schmidt, to defer this item until the April meeting. Motion carried.

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

Schaefer noted that WisDOT was working to coordinate planning on the Stoughton Road study with the Beltline/Interstate interchange area study. Work on the Beltline study is now focused on analyzing the impact of local roadway improvements within the Beltline corridor. The EIS phase of the Interstate study is is just getting started with a joint policy/technical committee meeting scheduled in the next couple of weeks. He said there was an open house tomorrow night on the Interstate project (Beltline to county line), and he'd forward a link to any materials made available from that meeting to board members.

Opitz asked if it would be appropriate to include the State Highway 19 study that WisDOT is working on to the list of studies. He said there was a recent meeting in Waunakee. Gust said it would be appropriate, but noted it is only a corridor preservation study. Gust mentioned the other similar studies, the Highway 12 freeway conversion study and the STH 138 corridor preservation study. Schaefer said he’d add an item for other WisDOT studies.

11. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer reported that the STP-Urban program policies and project scoring criteria work group met to review the roadway project criteria. Staff was in the process of making changes based on the comments and another meeting was scheduled to review the revised draft and other project criteria. The item will be on the board’s next meeting agenda for an update with action at the May or June meeting. The consultants for the Metro on board survey completed the initial on-to-off count survey. This will be used to expand the full survey sample up to the complete system ridership. The full survey started today and will hopefully be completed before UW’s spring break. An update on regional ITS plan will be provided next month. Finally, the county issued the RFP for the Dane County Bicycle Wayfinding Plan, and proposals are due later this month.

12. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

After brief discussion board members agreed to keep the 6:30 starting time for meetings. Schaefer also mentioned the email he sent to members regarding the plan for the MPO e-newsletter. He said he had not heard from anyone regarding concerns so staff was planning to move forward.
The next meeting will be held Wednesday, April 1, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

13. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by R. Schmidt to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM.
March 11, 2015

Chuck Kamp
Transit General Manager
Madison Metro
1245 East Washington Avenue, Suite 201
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Program Management Plan

Dear Mr. Kamp:

We have reviewed Madison Metro’s Program Management Plan (PMP) for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310) submitted on February 1, 2014, and have approved it on the basis that it addresses the basic requirements provided in FTA Circulars 9070.1G. Madison Metro is the designated recipient for the Section 5310 Program for the Madison Urbanized Area. An approved PMP remains valid until FTA approves a later plan submitted by the designated recipient, or an FTA designated recipient management review results in a specific request to the designated recipient by FTA for a revised PMP, or FTA announces significant new program documentation requirements.

FTA strongly encourages the designated recipient to issue timely revisions to the PMP, particularly when information helpful to minority applicants, subrecipients, and third party contractors is involved. When the designated recipient proposes major changes to the PMP, the designated recipient should give an opportunity to comment at the minimum to potential subrecipients of assistance, potential service providers, other designated recipient agencies and representatives of other funding sources, and any relevant designated recipient associations and professional organizations.

If revisions are substantive, but not pervasive, the designated recipient may submit changes and additions in the form of page changes which can be approved by FTA and incorporated into the PMP on file. If the designated recipient changes the PMP significantly, however, the designated recipient should submit the entire revised plan to FTA for approval. The designated recipient is responsible for ensuring that FTA has a complete copy of the current PMP. The designated recipient may submit minor changes and technical corrections to FTA to update the approved plan, without the need for additional FTA approval.
If you have any questions or need further assistance regarding this matter, please contact Lisa Joiner of my staff. You can reach her by telephone at (312) 353-2791 or by email at lisa.joiner@dot.gov.

Sincerely,

Jay Ciavarella
Director, Office of Program Management & Oversight

cc: Bill Schaefer
Transportation Planning Manager
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (Madison MPO)
121 South Pinckney Street, #400
Madison, WI 53703
Re:
Update on the Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan

Staff Comments on Item:
The MPO is working with the City of Madison Traffic Engineering Division to prepare a regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan. HNTB has been hired to prepare the plan. ITS involves the application of a broad range of advanced technologies and management strategies to increase the safety and efficiency of the transportation system. It includes technologies such as advanced traffic signal systems and real time transit schedule information and operational strategies such as multi-agency data sharing/management.

The ITS plan will identify high priority projects and the cost to implement them. Just as importantly, it will also define the roles and responsibilities of the agencies involved in planning, designing, and maintaining these systems as well as responder agencies. It will establish a framework for ongoing, coordinated multi-agency efforts to ensure that ITS strategies implemented are integrated and complementary. This will ensure that ITS projects are cost effective and eligible for federal funding.

Two workshops have been held with staff from agencies involved in traffic management, construction/maintenance, transit operations, law enforcement and emergency management. The first focused on user needs and the second on the role of the different agencies in providing transportation/ITS services and/or using the services. These services include traffic and public transit management, maintenance/construction management, traveler information, data management and communications, and emergency management.

A draft list of user needs has been prepared. Work is ongoing to develop and document the ITS inventory. A draft vision statement and set of goals has been prepared. Work to develop the associated objectives and performance measures is ongoing as well as work on the “concept of operations”, the topic of the second workshop. Staff wanted to provide an update on these activities. More information will be provided at future meetings. The project is scheduled to be completed by the end of the summer.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. None. Brief presentation will be provided at the meeting.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For information purposes only.
Re:
Continued Review and Discussion of Draft STP Urban Project Scoring Criteria and Program Policies

Staff Comments on Item:
MPO staff has been working on a comprehensive revision of the MPO’s STP Urban project scoring criteria. This effort is also offering an opportunity to revisit the MPO’s policies with respect to the program as well. A workgroup has been set up to work with staff on the project scoring criteria. It includes four members of the MPO technical committee (Madison City Engineer Rob Phillips, Dane County Public Works Ass’t Commissioner Pam Dunphy, City of Middleton Public Works Director Shawn Stauske, City of Stoughton Planning Director Rodney Scheel) and Ken Golden from the MPO board.

The workgroup has met twice. As a result of those meetings, a revised draft of the roadway project scoring criteria has been prepared and is attached. The workgroup briefly discussed but did not get into the details on the scoring criteria for other projects or the three main program policy issues. A document highlighting those policy issues is also attached. Another workgroup meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 30 prior to the board meeting. MPO staff will also be reviewing the roadway project criteria and policy options issues with the MPO technical committee at its meeting on March 25. Staff will report on discussions from those meetings at the board meeting.

The goal is to have the board approve new policies and new project scoring criteria at either its May or more likely June meeting in order to use for the 2016-2020 program application cycle. Project applications for this program cycle are due in June.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. STP Urban program policy options document
2. Revised draft of roadway project scoring criteria

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For discussion purposes only at this time.
STP Urban Program Policy Options
For Discussion

1. Project Cost Share

In order to stretch the limited STP-Urban funding available over a greater number of projects, the MPO instituted a 50% cost share policy\(^1\).

It was previously discussed and proposed to continue the 50% cost share requirement for all projects costing $600,000 or more. A standard 20% local cost share would be applied for small non-infrastructure projects not exceeding $300,000, and a sliding scale for cost share would 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>

The following total project cost minimums were discussed:

- Roadway Infrastructure Projects: $500,000
- Transit and Independent Pedestrian/Bicycle Infrastructure Projects: $300,000\(^2\)
- Transit Vehicle, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and other Capital Purchase Projects: $125,000
- Non-Infrastructure Projects (e.g., TDM, Carpool, etc): $75,000

With the new WisDOT policy guidance that will be issued on the STP Urban program, it is likely that there will be much less flexibility in moving funding around between projects once they are approved as they move through the design process and probably no flexibility to add funding to projects once they are let. Given this, it is worth considering a change to a 60% cost share policy in order to maintain a minimum 50% federal share even if the project cost increases.

The sliding scale for cost share could still be used. Especially if the cost share isn’t increased to 60%, the scale could be changed to provide for a greater than minimum cost for projects up to a higher cost (e.g., $750,000 to $1 million) since the minimum cost for roadway projects is $500,000.

\(^1\) Very low cost projects such as the MPO Rideshare Program and City of Madison Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety Education Program were exempted from this and funded at 80%.

\(^2\) WisDOT instituted a policy of a $300,000 minimum project cost for the Transportation Alternatives program. Since WisDOT administers the STP Urban program for the MPO, they would probably want to maintain that same policy for bike/ped projects funded through the STP Urban program. Given the additional costs for federally funded projects, it makes sense.
This policy, and in particular the details of any sliding scale for cost share, becomes an even more important issue if the MPO chooses to set aside a portion of funding for lower cost projects (see #2).

2. Possible Funding Set Aside for Smaller Projects

Concern was expressed when the first draft of the new project evaluation/scoring criteria was reviewed that the criteria favor projects in the City of Madison and the other larger cities. Staff does not believe the proposed new criteria represent a major change from the old criteria in terms of how different projects will rank. Consistent with MPO policy, the priority is to fund projects that will provide significant benefits to the regional transportation system. For roadway projects, that generally means those on the designated arterial system.

At the same time, some level of geographic equity in terms of projects funded is important while still being consistent with the overall objective to fund the highest priority projects that will help achieve the goals and policy objectives for the regional transportation system. An option to help achieve some geographic equity is to set aside a certain percentage of funds (e.g., 5-10%) for each five-year program period for smaller, lower cost projects (e.g., $1 million or less). These smaller projects might not otherwise compete well with larger projects that have greater regional benefits. The workgroup set up to work with staff on the new project criteria and policies expressed support of this.

Given the reduced flexibility to change the construction schedule for projects with the new WisDOT policy and the possible loss of funding in the case of projects needing to be delayed, including some smaller, presumably less complicated projects might also help to ensure the MPO doesn’t lose any funding. Adding some smaller projects in the mix would make it easier to allocate a more consistent level of funding from year to year. Also, it seems less likely that issues would come up with these projects, requiring a delay. These projects might also have more flexibility in scheduling.

If implemented, it is recommended that maximum flexibility being provided to the MPO to permit funding of smaller projects up to the full set aside amount, but not require the entire amount of the set aside to be used. This would the MPO to only fund projects deemed worthy based on the need and benefits. A minimum project score could be required, but without any experience using the new scoring system staff doesn’t recommend that at this time.

3. Extent of PE/Environmental Study Required At Time of Application

With the new WisDOT policy limiting flexibility to make changes to the approved schedule and funding of projects, projects – at least those involving complete reconstruction versus simple pavement replacement – will need to be further along in the development process at the time of application than they often have been in the past. This is also necessary for the projects to be properly scored under the proposed new criteria, some of which are fairly detailed design oriented.

The current project scoring criteria and the first draft of the revised criteria included a scoring category of Timely Implementation/Complexity of Project. More points would be would awarded for projects that are further along in environmental review/design and those with more complicated issues that have been identified and addressed. The project criteria workgroup is recommending that this criterion be changed to a screening criterion. Screening criteria are those that must be met in order for the project application to be accepted and scored.
The level of project development required should depend upon the year in which funding is being requested (or designated as advanceable to) and the type of project. Going forward, almost all projects will be programmed in the outer two years of the 5-year TIP period because all funds must be programmed with each program cycle. It will be advantageous, however, for applicants to have their projects ready to proceed earlier than scheduled if a project in one of the first three years is delayed for some reason. It would be nice to have some of these “advanceable” projects in the queue at all times in case a project is delayed to ensure the MPO does not lose any funding. WisDOT is not going to allow funding to be carried over from one program cycle to the next.

According to WisDOT guidance, applicants should plan for 2 years for design for simple resurfacing and pavement replacement projects, but 4-5 years for reconstruction projects depending upon the scope and cost. Given these timelines, staff recommends that some design work (30% ?) be required to be done for reconstruction projects and that these projects only be programmed for the two out years (4 and 5). For resurfacing/pavement replacement projects, some design work should probably only required if the applicant is seeking funding within the first three years or wants the project to be designated as advanceable within that time period. Further discussion is needed on defining the level of environmental review and design work needed for reconstruction projects depending upon the scope, whether right of way acquisition is required, etc.
### Evaluation Criteria – Roadway Projects

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance to Regional Transportation System – 20 Points Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Roadway Functional Class:** The Madison Area TPB Functional Classification System map assigns the following functional classifications to roadways within the urban area: Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, and Collector. The functional classification defines the role the roadway plays (mobility, connectivity, accessibility) in serving travel needs through the regional network. See link to map below. [http://www.madisonareampo.org/maps/documents/FunctionalClassesDaneCountyCurrentRds.pdf] | 1 – 5 | Principal Arterial: 5 Points  
Minor Arterial: 3 Points  
Collector: 1 Point |
| **Traffic Volume:** The Annual Average Weekday Traffic volume (AAWT) of the functionally classified roadway. [Note: If only Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume available, an adjustment will be made to convert to AAWT.] | 1 – 4 | >25,000 AAWT: 4 Points;  
18,000 – 25,000 AAWT: 3 points  
12,000 – 18,000 AAWT: 2 Points;  
< 12,000 AAWT: 1 Point |
| **Length of Route:** The entire route’s length in relation to the scale of the regional roadway system. | 1 – 3 | >5 Miles: 3 Points  
2 – 5 Miles: 2 Points  
<2 Miles: 1 Point |
| **System Continuity:** The ability of a project to complete a key roadway system corridor or fill a gap, providing improved connectivity/mobility at a regional as well as local scale.  
**Availability/Spacing of Alternate Routes:** Availability and spacing of alternate routes within the general corridor. | 0 – 3 | Completes key corridor; lack of good parallel arterial routes: 3 Points  
Completes corridor; adequate parallel routes: 2 Points  
Completes large segment of corridor; good parallel routes: 1 Point  
Completes only small part of a corridor; good parallel routes: 0 Points |
| **Transit Route:** The project is located on a mainline bus route. [Note: Year-round public service only. Excludes school routes. Buses that use corridor but do not make stops are counted as 25% of a bus.] | 0 – 3 | 4+ peak, 2+ off-peak, 2+ weekends: 3 Points  
2+ peak, 1+ off-peak/weekend: 2 Points  
Weekday peak period service only: 1 Point  
Not on bus route: 0 Points |
| **Freight Route:** The project is located on a designated freight route. [Note: “Key” locations are those serving industrial parks and other locations with relatively high truck volumes.] | 0 – 2 | Freight Route: 2 Points if key location, 1 point otherwise  
Non-Freight Route: 0 Points |
## 2. System Preservation – 15 Points Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition: The current average weighted (by segment length) pavement condition for the candidate roadway project.</td>
<td>0 – 12</td>
<td>See table below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Note: Calculation: (The PASER rating for segment “s”) * (length of segment “s” / total project length) for all segments. Sum all.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rating/Points Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. PASER Rating</th>
<th>Points (PP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>11 – 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7</td>
<td>10 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Other Roadway Infrastructure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the project repairs, improves (e.g., brings up to design standard), replaces or provides (1) sidewalks/and or curb ramps, (2) curb and gutter and/or (3) storm water facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project incorporates all three types of infrastructure improvements: 3 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>Project incorporates two types of infrastructure improvements: 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project incorporates one type of infrastructure improvement: 1 Point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management (TSM) – 12 Points Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation/TSM</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(See tables below, which show the points that will be awarded based on the existing traffic congestion and the extent to which the project will reduce congestion/ improve traffic operations.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The extent to which the project reduces intersection delay 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).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project improves roadway access management (e.g., addition of a median) in a manner that significantly improves the capacity of the roadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Planning Level Arterial/Collector Roadway Design Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Facility Type</th>
<th>Design Capacity (vehicles per 24 hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Lane</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Lane Undivided</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Lane Divided</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### V/C Ratio Points Table for Corridor Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>Points (CE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65 – 0.79</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8 – 0.99</td>
<td>3 – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 1.19</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1.2</td>
<td>7 – 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOS Points Table for Intersection Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Points (CE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤20</td>
<td>A – B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20–35</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35–55</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3 – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;55–80</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7 – 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Safety Enhancement – 10 Points Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Crash Rate** | 0 – 4 | Crash rate is > 20% higher than the Madison urban area average: 3 – 4 Points  
Crash rate is within 20% of the Madison urban area average: 1 – 2 Points  
Crash rate is >20% lower than the Madison urban area average, or no crash history: 0 Points |
| **Potential Crash Reduction Impact of the Proposed Roadway Improvement(s)** | 0 – 6 | High CMF: 5 - 6 Points  
Medium CMF: 3 - 4 Points  
Low CMF: 1 - 2 Points  
Project does not include a safety countermeasure: 0 Points |

- **Crash Rate**
  - The crash rate relative to the recent 5-year average Madison urban area crash rate for an urban street.

- **Potential Crash Reduction Impact of the Proposed Roadway Improvement(s)**
  - Extent to which the project addresses documented safety concerns and the estimated impact the improvement(s) will have in reducing motorist, bicyclist, and/or pedestrian crashes based on crash modification factor (CMF) of the countermeasure(s).
  
  [Note: See http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/. In the future, the MPO hopes to create a table of the top most common countermeasures and the CMFs that will be used for them. Examples include: add a median; remove or relocate access points; modify intersection skew angle; add raised median w/ crosswalk; and add a bike lane.]
### 5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options – 8 Points Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extent to which the project repairs, improves (e.g., brings up to or beyond the minimum design standard), replaces, or provides new (1) sidewalks and/or curb ramps, (2) pedestrian street crossing facilities (e.g., pedestrian refuge islands, mid-block crossing), and/or (3) traffic signals (e.g., pedestrian countdown, HAWK beacon).</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>Project incorporates all three types of improvements: 3 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project incorporates two types of improvements: 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project incorporates one type of improvement: 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project incorporates no pedestrian facility improvements: 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Bicycle Facilities** | | |
| • Extent to which the project repairs, improves (e.g., brings up to or beyond the minimum design standard), replaces, or provides new on-street and/or off-street bicycle facilities. | 0 – 3 | Project provides on-street bike facility exceeding design standards, premium facility, or off-street facility (in addition to on-street, e.g., separated crossing or side path where appropriate): 3 Points |
| | | Project provides on-street bike facility meeting design standards or a non-bike facility improvement (e.g., wide curb lane, sharrows): 1 – 2 Points |
| | | No additional/replacement or improved accommodations for bicyclists: 0 Points |

| **Transit Facilities/Route** | | |
| • 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. | 0 – 2 | Project accommodates and provides significant benefits to transit (e.g., bus lanes or other priority treatment): 2 Points |
| • The project is located on a bus route and will improve transit as well as motor vehicle operations. | | Project is located on a bus route and provides some benefits (e.g., improved traffic flow or enhanced bus stops): 1 Point |
| | | Project is not located on a bus route: 0 Points |
### 6. Supports Transportation Efficient Land Use, Livability, and Economic Prosperity – 10 Points Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistency with Regional and Local Land Use Policies/Plans</strong></td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>Maximum points are achieved if project is fully consistent with both regional policies and all applicable local land use/economic development plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project is consistent with regional land use policies and the community’s comprehensive plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project is consistent with a local economic development/revitalization plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supports Regional Center, Mixed-Use Center, and/or Redevelopment Area</strong></td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project is located within or serves an existing or planned mixed-use or regional employment/activity center. [Note: See map of existing and planned centers based primarily on employment, page 23 of the Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update. Map of mixed-use centers to be prepared.]</td>
<td>Project serves an existing regional mixed-use or employment center or redevelopment area: 3 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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). [Targeted infill/redevelopment areas will be based on local plans.]</td>
<td>Project serves an existing local mixed-use or employment center: 2 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project serves a planned regional or mixed-use center: 1 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project does not serve an existing or planned mixed-use or employment center: 0 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Design</strong></td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
<td>Fully supports land use/design context and vision for the corridor/area and all modes: 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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.</td>
<td>Generally supportive of context and all modes: 1 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent with context; pedestrian intolerant: 0 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Environment– 8 Points Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Alternative Modes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extent to which project enhancements to alternative</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation options are likely to be used based on existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and estimated future transit ridership and bicycling and walking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levels, and extent to which this is likely to result in a shift to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these modes and reduced vehicle trips/VMT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Minimizes Environmental Impact Through Design and/or Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project adequately addresses environmental impacts (e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacts to air/water quality, open space, historic structures,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal habitats, etc.) and will include mitigation and restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures, when necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project improves the environment or minimizes the</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental impact of the facility above and beyond current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design standards (i.e., use of recycled materials, LED roadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or traffic signal lights, innovative storm water treatment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of native vegetation, air quality benefit, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Environmental Justice and Public Health– 7 Points Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Justice</strong></td>
<td>-5 – 4</td>
<td>Maximum points will be awarded for projects located in and directly benefiting an EJ area. [Note: Up to five points may be subtracted if a project creates significant adverse human health, environmental, social, or economic impacts on environmental justice population groups and fails to avoid or mitigate unavoidable impacts.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project is located within or directly benefits a MPO-defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental justice area, providing improved multi-modal access/mobility and/or otherwise improving the area’s livability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Note: See maps in Attachment D – Environmental Justice Analysis of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health/Health Equity</strong></td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>Maximum points awarded to projects that provide significant public health benefits to areas where residents have health outcome disparities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The public health benefits of the project positively affect residents in areas with health outcome disparities. [Note: See map at the following link of areas with high or moderate rates of asthma, childhood obesity, and/or adult diabetes.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9. Cost Benefit – 10 Points Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost/benefit ratio</td>
<td>0 – 7</td>
<td>Maximum points for high/moderate scoring projects (based on other criteria) with moderate/low relative cost per mile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project based on the other criteria as compared to the cost of the project on a per mile basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Efficiency/Leverage of Additional Funding</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>Maximum points for projects that achieve cost efficiencies and/or leverage additional funding or improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment (beyond the required local match), which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transportation system improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project is coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in a cost savings or efficiencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re:
Letter of Response to WisDOT Regarding Invitation to Participate in the Environmental Review Process for the Interstate 39/90 and Beltline Interchange Study

Staff Comments on Item:
WisDOT is formally inviting the MPO to become a participating agency in the Interstate 39/90 and Beltline Interchange study. This interchange is part of the overall project to reconstruct and expand I-39/90 from the Illinois state line to Madison. This interchange and the I-43 interchange were separated out from the environmental document for the I-39/90 project. An EIS is now being initiated for the Beltline interchange to address changes in the limits of the project (see map attached to WisDOT letter), impacts of improvements in the project area, and changes in the design of the interchange. The invitation is pursuant to MAP-21, the federal transportation legislation, which requires early involvement of all federal and other agencies in environmental review to avoid potential conflicts and ensure project development reflects environmental values.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. WisDOT letter with invitation to become a participating agency in the study
2. Draft response letter

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval.
March 4, 2015

William Schaefer
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
121 S. Pickney St Suite 400
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Agency Meeting Invite and Invitation to Become a Participating Agency

WisDOT Project ID 1007-10-02
I-39/90
Madison Beltline Interchange EIS
Dane County

Dear William Schaefer:

Introduction
This letter provides an introduction to the Madison Beltline Interchange (BIC) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Dane County, Wisconsin. An invitation to the Agency Coordination Meeting is outlined below as well as an invitation to become a Participating Agency. A project location map is attached and summary of requested actions is provided at the end of the letter.

Invitation to Attend Agency Coordination Meeting
You are invited to an Agency Coordination Meeting being held:

Agency Coordination Meeting
March 16, 2015
2 P.M. to 4 P.M.
Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT)
Southwest Region Office
Dane and Columbia Conference Rooms
2101 Wright Street
Madison, WI 53704

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the BIC Purpose and Need and establish your representative agency’s level of involvement. Arrangements for calling in to the meeting can be made upon request.

If you agree to participate in the BIC EIS, please let us know by April 16, 2015.

I-39/90 and US 12/18 Interchange (Beltline Interchange)
The I-39/90 and US 12/18 Interchange (Beltline Interchange) is located in Dane County, WI. The BIC Project is part of an overall project led by the WisDOT to reconstruct and expand I-39/90 in south-central Wisconsin. The overall I-39/90 Project extends approximately 45 miles along I-39/90 from the Illinois state line to the I-39/90/94/US 30 interchange (Badger Interchange) in Madison. The proposed improvements for I-39/90 include reconstruction of the existing freeway lanes and the addition of a third lane in each direction to create
a six-lane divided highway. Interchanges and grade separated crossings will be constructed to address roadway and capacity deficiencies.

The Beltline Interchange was previously included in the I-39/90 Environmental Assessment (EA) from the Illinois state line to US 12/18 in Madison which received a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on October 1, 2010. FHWA and WisDOT's Central Office Environmental Document and Process Section (ED&PS) determined that a Re-evaluation of the original EA/FONSI would be required for the I-39/90 mainline and separate, stand-alone EA's would be required for the system interchanges with I-43/81 at Beloit in Rock County and with US 12/18 (Beltline) at Madison in Dane County. The EA Re-evaluation & Supplementation of the Environmental Assessment document was prepared and was signed by FHWA with an effective date of October 30, 2014. The document reaffirms FHWA's October 1, 2010 FONSI for this corridor project. An agency scoping letter for the BIC EA was sent to you in December 2013, with follow-up resource agency meetings held in March 2014 and November 2014 discussing the purpose and need, range of alternatives, and progress of the project.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is now being initiated for the Beltline Interchange to address changes in the limits of the project in this area, impacts, and changes in design of the interchange. The EIS is a full disclosure document that details how the project was developed. It includes project purpose and need, alternatives considered, description of the affected environment, environmental consequences of the proposed action, and the results of coordination with agencies and the public. The EIS also demonstrates compliance with other applicable environmental laws and regulations, and is made available for review by agencies and the public. The EIS process includes a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the EIS, Draft EIS, Final EIS, and Record of Decision (ROD).

Invitation to Become a Participating Agency
WisDOT is formally inviting you to become a Participating Agency with the FHWA in the development of this BIC EIS.

This invitation is pursuant to Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) (Sec. 1320), which states that all Federal agencies with relevant jurisdiction in environmental review should cooperate with each other and other agencies on environmental review and future project delivery activities at the earliest practicable time. By doing this, delays and duplication will be avoided later in the process. Cooperation also heads off potential conflicts and ensures that planning and future project development decisions reflect environmental values. Agency advice and technical assistance on environmental matters during the BIC EIS are expected to help in all these ways. It is anticipated that participation will include attending approximately three meetings over a one-year period, with the associated review of meeting materials, culminating with review of the Draft EIS (DEIS).

Participating Agency: Participating agencies include federal, state or local agencies that have an interest in the project. These agencies agree to identify issues of concern regarding the project's potential impacts, and provide meaningful and timely input on purpose and need, alternatives analysis methodologies, and range of alternatives.

Please respond to this invitation using the contact information at the end of this letter.

Request to Confirm Contact Information
With your response, please also confirm the following contact information for your agency is accurate, or provide corrected contact information.
Summary of Requested Items

1. Provide a written response accepting or declining the invitation to become a Participating Agency.

2. If you agree to participate, provide confirmation or correction for contact information for your agency.

3. If you agree to participate and want to call in to the Agency Coordination Meeting, please contact the WisDOT project manager, Craig Pringle, at his contact information below.

Your letter or email response may be sent to:

Craig Pringle
WisDOT Project Manager
Southwest Region Project Field Office
111 Interstate Blvd.
Edgerton, WI 53534
(608) 884-7132
Craig.Prinlege@dot.wi.gov

If you would like to discuss the BIC EIS in more detail, or if you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Craig Pringle
WisDOT Project Manager

cc: Jenny Grimes, WisDOT I-39 Management Team, Environmental Coordinator
    Lisa Dreifuerst, Dane Partners, Consultant Project Manager
    Darren Fortney, Dane Partners, Consultant Public Involvement Lead
April 2, 2015

Mr. Craig Pringle, WisDOT Project Manager
Southwest Region Project Field Office
111 Interstate Blvd.
Edgerton, WI 53534

Re: Invitation to Participate in the Environmental Review Process
WisDOT Project I.D. 1007-10-02
I-39/90 & Madison Beltline Interchange EIS
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Pringle:

In response to your letter of March 4, 2015, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) accepts the invitation to be a participating agency in the review and development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project referenced above. The MPO does not have special technical expertise on environmental matters, but as the policy body responsible for coordinated regional transportation planning and decision making the MPO has a strong interest in this project. The MPO Board understands its role in the development of this project to include the following:

- Provide input on defining the purpose and need, determining the range of alternatives to be considered, and the methodologies and level of detail required in the alternatives analysis.
- Participate in agency coordination meetings.
- Provide timely review and comment on information being prepared for the environmental document to reflect the view and concerns of our agency on alternatives considered, anticipated impacts, mitigation, and other environmental aspects.

The contact person for the MPO is William Schaefer and his email address is wschaefer@cityofmadison.com. The mailing address is below.

Sincerely,

Al Matano
Chair, Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Re:
Letter to County Executive Regarding the MPO’s Support of Integrated Land Use and Transportation Planning by the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) and MPO

Staff Comments on Item:
Ken Golden, who serves on CARPC’s policy board, requested that this item be put on the March meeting agenda. CARPC unsuccessfully sought to obtain sufficient additional funding through the county levy this year to allow the agency to begin an update to its regional land use plan. The plan was last updated in 1997 when the MPO function was still with the RPC. That plan, titled Vision 2020, was the last integrated regional land use and transportation plan. CARPC’s budget in 2015 only allows the agency to conduct a public values survey as a first step in beginning work on the land use plan update.

Given the necessary timeline for completing the MPO’s transportation plan (adoption by November 2016), it will not be possible to prepare an integrated land use and transportation plan in cooperation with CARPC. However, if CARPC was able to begin work on the land use plan update in 2016 any work that CARPC completed next year (e.g., updated goals and policies, etc.) could perhaps be incorporated into the MPO’s plan. In addition, the MPO could provide assistance to CARPC with its land use plan (e.g., evaluating the transportation impacts of different land use scenario) and integrate that plan into the MPO’s next transportation plan update.

MPO staff prepared a draft letter to facilitate discussion on the item at the last meeting. After some discussion, it was agreed to defer the item until this meeting. Robin Schmidt offered to provide some suggested edits to the letter prepared by staff. An edited letter is attached.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Revised draft letter of support for integrated regional land use and transportation planning

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
N/A
Dear Community Leaders:

On behalf of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), we are writing to express support for integrated regional land use and transportation planning and to request your consideration of future financial support for an integrated planning effort.

As you know, the Madison Area TPB (MPO) is the designated policy body responsible for cooperative, comprehensive regional transportation planning and decision making for the Madison Metropolitan Area. Among the responsibilities of the Madison Area TPB is preparation of the regional transportation plan to guide transportation investments. The regional transportation plan is a federal requirement, among others, for receiving federal transportation funding for projects. The MPO’s official jurisdiction is somewhat less than the whole county, but the MPO has always planned for the entire county dating back to the days when the MPO function resided with the RPC. The MPO must of course also consider travel from/to outside the county.

The MPO must update the regional or metropolitan transportation plan every five years. Since the MPO function was split from the Regional Planning Commission, the MPO has updated the transportation plan twice – a major update in 2006 (with a 2030 plan horizon year) and a minor update in 2012 (2035 plan horizon). The MPO has started work on the next major update (2050 plan horizon year), which must be adopted by late 2016. For the past two plan updates, the MPO has continued to coordinate with Capitol Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) to the extent possible. For example, the MPO has used the same county population forecast (from the state DOA) and used CARPC’s urban service area and rural area population and household forecasts. CARPC and MPO staff also worked together to prepare corresponding employment forecasts as the basis for the allocation of future households, population, and employment to small traffic zones that serves as a key input to the MPO’s travel forecasting model. To allocate future growth to the traffic zones, MPO staff created a composite map of local land use plans and relied on that and the regional land use policies in the old Vision 2020 Plan adopted by the
former Dane County RPC in 1997 in the absence of an updated regional land use plan. The same approach is planned for the 2050 plan.

Given the fundamental connection between land use and transportation (e.g., land development creates demand for travel, which generates need for new transportation facilities and services, which in turn affects development patterns), it would be optimal for the MPO and CARPC to prepare an integrated land use and transportation plan as a joint effort. This would allow for the consideration of the impact of the region’s land use pattern on traffic and availability of transportation options and the impact of transportation investment decisions on land use as part of the planning process.

Given that the MPO must complete its regional transportation plan by November 2016, preparation of an integrated land use and transportation plan in cooperation with CARPC is not possible this time. We note that land use planning completed by CARPC in 2016 could be incorporated into the MPO’s plan. In addition, the MPO could partner with CARPC in its land use planning efforts (e.g., evaluating the transportation impacts of different land use scenario) and integrate the results of those efforts into the MPO’s next transportation plan update.

Because the MPO is only a regional transportation planning agency and must rely on CARPC for regional land use planning, the MPO urges you as community leaders to help ensure that transportation and land use planning are integrated efforts. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Al Matano
MPO Board Chair

Cc: Kamran Mesbah, Deputy Director, CARPC
    City of Madison Alders
    Dane County Board Supervisors
Re: Appointments of MPO Board Representatives to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Intergovernmental Oversight Committee

Staff Comments on Item:
The process has started to reconstitute the former Transport 2020 Implementation Committee (to now be called the BRT Intergovernmental Oversight Committee) to oversee the next project development phase of study of BRT, including development of a recommended start-up system. Following the MPO led BRT feasibility study and the MPO’s resolution recommending moving BRT to the next phase of study, the City of Madison adopted a resolution accepting the study, endorsing BRT, authorizing moving forward to project development, and recommending reconstituting the intergovernmental committee (see attached resolution).

The former committee was formed pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement between WisDOT, Dane County, and the City of Madison to develop transit system improvements and advance transit capital projects through the NEPA and FTA New Starts process using Federal and state (WisDOT) funding (see attached agreement). The intergovernmental agreement forming this consortium was amended last year to allow hiring of consultants to conduct the on-board Metro survey and make improvements to the mode choice/transit components of the MPO’s regional travel model in preparation for the project development phase of BRT (see attached addendum #1 to the agreement). The MPO is leading this work. In accordance with the intergovernmental agreement, Dave Trowbridge from City of Madison Planning will serve as the BRT study project administrator. However, MPO staff will be very involved and provide technical assistance.

The intergovernmental agreement spells out the composition of the intergovernmental project oversight committee, which makes recommendations to the units of government and other participating entities. The MPO has two (2) of the 14 total representatives on the committee. Per the agreement, the MPO representatives are to be appointed by the MPO chair and “the MPO chair is encouraged to appoint members representing communities located along the study corridor.” While the chair is to make the appointments the item is on the agenda for discussion and input by the board.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. City of Madison resolution accepting the Madison BRT study report.
2. City of Madison resolution accepting Madison BRT study report and recommending reconstituting an intergovernmental committee to oversee BRT start-up system project development.
3. Intergovernmental agreement between WisDOT, Dane County, and City of Madison for the former Transport 2020 study, and recent Addendum #1 to the agreement.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
N/A
Title: To accept the Madison Transit Corridor (BRT) Study Report, endorsing BRT as a high-capacity transit concept that could help the City achieve its long-term strategic transportation planning and urban development goals the recommendations contained in the Report as a conceptual component of the City's strategy for addressing future transportation system planning and development, and to authorize moving forward to the next phase of project development, environmental evaluation and project implementation.

Body

WHEREAS the City of Madison's population and economy is growing, and in order to help facilitate this growth and ensure a high quality of life, the City has identified a need for a comprehensive transportation system strategy that integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., auto, bicycle, public transportation, pedestrian, high-capacity transit, etc.), and identifies how those modes interconnect and work together; and,

WHEREAS the City of Madison is currently in the process of developing Madison in Motion, its Sustainable Madison Transportation Master Plan; Madison in Motion will guide transportation decisions in the City of Madison, in order to help make Madison a more walkable, bikeable and livable city; and,

WHEREAS the Madison in Motion/Sustainable Madison Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee is in agreement that a Bus Rapid Transit system, as a component of a comprehensive multi-modal transportation system, is consistent with Madison in Motion's project goals and mission; and,

WHEREAS The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, the MPO's current long-range transportation system plan, recommends planning for and implementing a high-capacity rapid transit service and for local units of government to reach agreement on the appropriate technology and routing for such service; and,

WHEREAS the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - an MPO recently completed and adopted the Madison Transit Corridor Study: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in the Madison Area (the “BRT Study”); and,

WHEREAS the BRT Study identified corridors and segments to carry forward into detailed analysis in four corridors, each arranged around the Capitol Square and oriented towards North, Northeast, South, and West Madison; and several alternative routings along the main corridors, as well as potential future extensions to Sun Prairie, Monona/East Madison, Middleton, Fitchburg, Southwest Madison and Verona were considered; and,

WHEREAS the BRT Study concluded that the BRT system that was evaluated demonstrated strong ridership potential and would favorably compete with other BRT systems throughout the U.S.; and,

WHEREAS a bus rapid transit project must contain, at a minimum: substantial transit stations, traffic signal priority, low-floor vehicles, special branding of service, frequent peak and off-peak service, and service offered at least 14 hours per day in order to qualify for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts program; and,
WHEREAS the BRT Study identified the necessary next steps for advancing a BRT start-up system toward project development, including soliciting broader stakeholder and public input, identification of service and design details, identification of a BRT start-up project and the submission of an application for funding under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts program, and more detailed design and environmental analysis (as components of the federally-required project development process); and,

WHEREAS the next steps in the BRT project development/implementation process of the Start-Up System will include environmental documentation as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a more detailed analysis of alternative routes and alignments, further refinement of the BRT operating plans, identification of potential solutions to transit vehicle storage and maintenance facility needs, preparation of a detailed economic impact evaluation, further evaluation of the funding and management mechanisms under which the system will operate, and further evaluation of community and neighborhood impacts, including mitigation measures; and,

WHEREAS the BRT project development/implementation process will evaluate the governance structure for operating the system and will evaluate funding sources for the proposed system, including levels of participation by participating units of government and other entities;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and Common Council accepts the Madison Transit Corridor (BRT) Study Report, endorses BRT as a high-capacity transit concept that could help the City achieve its long-term strategic transportation planning and urban development goals the recommendations contained in the Report as a conceptual component of the City’s strategy for addressing future transportation system planning and development, and authorizes moving forward to the next phase of project development, environmental evaluation and project implementation; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the BRT project development/implementation process will address how paratransit services may be enhanced and/or integrated with BRT service, will revisit the analysis of the BRT corridors and specifically address equity issues (in terms of travel time savings, job connectivity, access to low-income populations and redevelopment) and will address any federal Title VI issues pertaining to the project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor and Common Council recommend that the City of Madison, Dane County, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - an MPO, the University of Wisconsin, and other local units of government and agencies (including those communities that currently contract for Metro Transit services, such as Fitchburg, Middleton, Verona, Shorewood Hills and the Town of Madison) work cooperatively to take all necessary steps toward BRT project development and implementation, in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations; and,

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor and Common Council recommend that an intergovernmental committee (the BRT Intergovernmental Oversight Committee) be reconstituted to oversee and manage BRT start-up system project development (this regional advisory committee currently exists, having been previously established and formerly referred to as the Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force); and,

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the composition of the BRT Intergovernmental Oversight Committee should reflect the composition of the Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force (which includes representatives of the City of Madison, Dane County, the State of Wisconsin, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO, and other local units of government and agencies); and,

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the City of Madison, Planning Division will continue to provide staff administration and management of the project, including coordination and communications among the Federal Transit Administration and other participating entities.

Sponsors: Paul R. Soglin, Denise DeMarb, Chris Schmidt, John Strasser, Maurice S. Cheeks, Lauren Cnare, Michael E. Verveer, Marsha A. Rummel, Larry Palm, Joseph R. Clausius, David Ahrens, Ledell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ver.</th>
<th>Action By</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMMON COUNCIL</td>
<td>Adopt Substitute</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)</td>
<td>Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMMON COUNCIL</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMMON COUNCIL</td>
<td>Add Referral(s)</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION</td>
<td>Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION</td>
<td>Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN COMMISSION</td>
<td>Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)</td>
<td>Refer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adoption of the Resolution will not commit the City of Madison to additional expenditures at this time, but may represent an initial step toward ultimately significant potential impacts on future City capital and operating expenses.

The Resolution authorizes advancement toward BRT system project development, environmental evaluation and project implementation. City planning staff estimate that the project development process may be initiated over the next several months, then require two years to complete - at an estimated cost of approximately $2-2.5 million. Detailed funding sources for the project development work are yet to be determined but will likely be funded by a combination of federal, state and local sources. Federal grant funds allocated to this project (WI-39-0001, WI-26-0012 and WI-39-0002) have been secured and will be used. Any City of Madison expenditures to fund BRT system project development will require future Council approval.

The Resolution also provides for the creation of a “BRT Intergovernmental Oversight Committee” to review, evaluate, and develop recommendations on various project elements. Staff resources from the Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development, Metro Transit, Traffic Engineering, City Engineering, and the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) may be necessary to provide support for future planning and/or project development work on a BRT start-up system.

Any future expenditure associated with implementation of a BRT start-up system will require further Council approval.

To accept the Madison Transit Corridor (BRT) Study Report, endorsing BRT as a high-capacity transit concept that could help the City achieve its long-term strategic transportation planning and urban development goals as well as the recommendations contained in the Report as a conceptual component of the City’s strategy for addressing future transportation system planning and development, and to authorize moving forward to the next phase of project development, environmental evaluation and project implementation.

WHEREAS the City of Madison's population and economy is growing, and in order to help facilitate this growth and ensure a high quality of life, the City has identified a need for a comprehensive transportation system strategy that integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., auto, bicycle, public transportation, pedestrian, high-capacity transit, etc.), and identifies how those modes interconnect and work together; and,

WHEREAS the City of Madison is currently in the process of developing Madison in Motion, its Sustainable Madison Transportation Master Plan; Madison in Motion will guide transportation decisions in the City of Madison, in order to help make Madison a more walkable, bikeable and livable city; and,

WHEREAS the Madison in Motion/Sustainable Madison Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee is in agreement that a Bus Rapid Transit system, as a component of a comprehensive multi-modal transportation system, is consistent with Madison in Motion’s project goals and mission; and,

WHEREAS The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, the MPO’s current long-range transportation system plan, recommends planning for and implementing a high-capacity rapid transit service and for local units of government to reach agreement on the appropriate technology and routing for such service; and,

WHEREAS the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - an MPO recently completed and adopted the Madison Transit Corridor Study: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in the Madison Area (the “BRT Study”); and,

WHEREAS the BRT Study identified corridors and segments to carry forward into detailed analysis in four corridors, each arranged around the Capitol Square and oriented towards North, Northeast, South, and West
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into, by and between the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (hereinafter, “WisDOT”), the County of Dane (hereafter referred to as "COUNTY"), and the City of Madison (hereafter, "CITY"),

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS WisDOT, whose address is c/o Office of the Secretary, P. O. Box 7910, Madison, WI 53707-7910; COUNTY, whose address is c/o County Clerk, 112 City-County Building, 210 M. L. King, Jr., Blvd., Madison, WI 53709; and CITY, whose address is c/o City Clerk, 103 City-County Building, 210 M. L. King, Jr., Blvd., Madison, WI 53709, jointly desire to obtain and provide the major funding for and

WHEREAS section 85.022, Wis. Stats., provides for WisDOT participation in

the funding of such services; and

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above premises and the mutual covenants of the parties hereinafter set forth, the receipt and sufficiency of which is acknowledged by each party for itself, WisDOT, COUNTY and CITY do agree as follows:

1. WisDOT, COUNTY and CITY agree to form a consortium (hereinafter referred to as “CONSORTIUM” or “the Consortium”) to purchase the services of a consultant to provide the work (“the Work Plan”) described in Appendix A of the Contract, attached as Exhibit A, entered into between the CONSORTIUM and HTNB (hereafter called “CONSULTANT” or “the Consultant”). The Work Plan will identify transit system improvements in the City of Madison and Dane County and advance necessary transit capital projects in the study area through the NEPA process. The end products of the Work Plan will include the deliverables described in Appendix A of Exhibit A.

2. The term of this Agreement shall commence as of the date by which all parties hereto have executed this Agreement and shall end as of the date by which the CONSORTIUM’s Contract with the CONSULTANT ends, unless sooner agreed to by the parties or unless otherwise terminated pursuant to other provisions of this Agreement. It is anticipated that the Work Plan will be completed over a two-year period consisting of calendar years 2006 and 2007 and in two phases (Phase One and Phase Two), with work not to proceed on Phase Two until satisfactory completion of all deliverables in Phase One, as determined by the Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force (“ITF”) and formal approval from the Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”) to enter PE. The parties anticipate that Phase One will be completed in CY 2006 and Phase Two, subject to funding, will be done in CY 2007 or early CY 2008.

3. The amount of funds to be provided by WisDOT under this Agreement shall not exceed $2,000,000 to match federal appropriations, which amount represents 50% of the entire cost of the PE/DEIS/FEIS process.

4. CONSORTIUM appoints the CITY to act as the agent for the CONSORTIUM insofar as administration of the contract with the CONSULTANT is concerned. The authority of CITY is expressed in the Contract with the CONSULTANT and shall be exercised in compliance therewith. For this purpose, David Trowbridge shall be designated
Project Administrator. The duties of Project Administrator shall include primary staff support for consultant/task force coordination; scheduling of meetings; coordination of public notification; contract compliance/monitoring; communication among the ITF and the Interagency Staff Technical Advisory Committee (“TAC”) and other CONSORTIUM representatives; disbursement of contract payments. All communications between CONSULTANT and CONSORTIUM shall be through the Project Administrator.

In cases where communication is required between the CONSULTANT and the CONSORTIUM, such as further information, approval of proposed work, and like matters, such communications from the CONSULTANT to the Project Administrator shall be forwarded directly to the respective CONSORTIUM representatives as follows:

For the City: David M. Trowbridge, Transportation Planner  
City of Madison, Planning & Development  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., Rm. LL-100  
Madison, WI 53710  
(608) 267-1148 (direct), (608) 267-8739 (fax)  
dtrowbridge@ci.madison.wi.us

For the County: Jerry Mandli, Commissioner  
Dane County Highway and Transportation  
2302 Fish Hatchery Road  
Madison, WI 53713-2495  
(608) 266-4039 (direct); (608) 266-4269 (fax)  
mandli@co.dane.wi.us

For WisDOT: Douglas Dalton, Chief, Planning Section  
Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
4802 Sheboygan Avenue, Room 901  
Madison, WI 53707-7913  
(608) 266-3662 (direct); (608) 267-0294 (fax)  
douglas.dalton@dot.state.wi.us

CITY shall maintain all books, documents, papers, accounting records and other evidence pertaining to costs incurred in connection with activities performed under this Agreement. CITY’s records shall distinguish between a party’s in-kind contributions and direct expenditures.

5. The CITY agrees that WisDOT, COUNTY and their respective designees shall have access at any time to and the right to examine, excerpt, transcribe, and copy either on or off CITY’s premises any directly pertinent books, documents, papers, records, and computer files. Alternatively, the CITY may provide copies of the files or such computer printouts as may be requested by WisDOT or COUNTY. Such material shall be retained for three years by the CITY following completion of the study. This provision shall also apply in the event of termination of this Agreement. Any charges for copies provided by the CITY of books, documents, papers, records, computer files, or computer printouts shall not exceed the actual costs thereof to the CITY.
6. In its role as agent for the CONSORTIUM in the administration of the Contract with the CONSULTANT, the City is responsible for the disbursement of payments due and owing to CONSULTANT. (See fee estimate attached hereto as Exhibit A, Appendix B.)

7.A. The parties agree to establish a Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force (the “ITF”). The ITF will provide broad policy oversight for the Work Plan to ensure that the CONSULTANT is adequately addressing the range of issues, policy choices and other study elements identified by the sponsoring communities and agencies (Consortium and University of Wisconsin) and included in the scope of services required to be performed by the CONSULTANT. The ITF is not intended to replace the standing policy bodies of the City of Madison, Dane County, or other participating units of government. Rather, the ITF may make recommendations to the policy bodies of the units of government participating in the Work Plan. Recommendations to be made by the ITF will address the Request for CONSULTANT Proposals, selection of the CONSULTANT, and development of the CONSULTANT’s Scope of Work/Services.

The ITF shall be composed of four (4) persons appointed by the Mayor of Madison, four (4) persons appointed by the Dane County Executive, one (1) person appointed jointly by the Mayor of Madison and the Dane County Executive, one (1) person appointed by the governor of the State of Wisconsin, one (1) person appointed by the secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, one (1) person appointed by the director of WisDOT, Southwest Region, one (1) person appointed by the chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, and two (2) representatives of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) appointed by the chair of that organization. The chair of the MPO is encouraged to appoint members representing communities located along the study corridor. All policy issues, requests for changes and/or clarification, which cannot be addressed and acted on by the CONSORTIUM representatives, shall initially be brought to the ITF to be decided by consensus. In the event consensus cannot be reached, the matter will be referred to the Mayor, County Executive and Secretary of WisDOT and decided as provided in 7C below.

7B. The parties further agree to the creation of an Inter-agency Staff Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC will provide technical assistance to the CONSULTANT and will be responsible for ensuring that the technical content of the Work Plan is of high professional quality and satisfies the requirements of the Scope of Services. The TAC will also assist in ensuring that appropriate policy bodies and agencies are kept adequately informed regarding the conduct, progress, and findings of the Work Plan. The TAC membership will be made up of designated technical staff representatives from the sponsoring communities and agencies, other communities within the study area, and other agencies involved in transportation planning in Dane County and the Madison metropolitan area. Membership on the TAC shall be limited to the technical staff who have an expertise in transportation, public works, transit, land use, or other fields directly related to commuter rail or any other transportation alternatives that might be considered.

7C. On other than routine administrative matters and other matters decided by consensus of the ITF pursuant to 7A above, the authority of the CONSORTIUM in the administration and oversight of the contract with the CONSULTANT shall be exercised jointly by the mayor, the county executive and the secretary of WisDOT with all decisions being made by consensus.
8. No party to this Agreement shall assign or transfer any interest or obligation in this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other parties.

9. In the event that the governing body of any party shall fail to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the party's obligations under this Agreement, this Agreement shall be automatically terminated as of the date funds are no longer available.

10. Each party agrees to secure at its own expense all personnel necessary to carry out the party's obligations under this Agreement. Such personnel shall not be deemed to be employees of any other party nor shall they or any of them have or be deemed to have any direct contractual relationship with any other party.

11. Notices to a party shall be deemed delivered as of the date of postmark if deposited in a United States mailbox, first class postage attached, addressed to a party's address as set forth above. It shall be the duty of a party changing its address to notify the other party in writing within a reasonable time.

12. All parties shall abide by their respective affirmative action policies and procedures during the term of this Agreement and any amendment, deletion, addition or modification of policies existing at the inception of this Agreement shall not be effective as against a party's obligations under this section unless approved by the other parties in writing.

13. In all solicitations for employment placed on a party's behalf during the term of this Agreement, the party shall include a statement to the effect that the party is an "Equal Opportunity Employer."

14. Each party shall be responsible for the acts and omissions of the party and its officers, employees and agents, other than the CONSULTANT.

15. Each party warrants that the persons executing this Agreement on its behalf are authorized to do so.

16. It is expressly understood and agreed to by the parties hereto that in the event of any disagreement or controversy between the parties, Wisconsin law shall be controlling.

17. This Agreement is intended to be an agreement solely between the parties hereto and for their benefit only. No part of this Agreement shall be construed to add to, supplement, amend, abridge or repeal duties, rights, benefits or privileges of any third party or parties, including but not limited to employees of any of the parties.

18. The entire agreement of the parties is contained herein and this Agreement supercedes any and all oral agreements and negotiations between the parties relating to the subject matter hereof. The parties expressly agree that this Agreement shall not be amended in any fashion except in writing, executed by all parties.

19. The parties may evidence their agreement to the foregoing upon one or several counterparts of this instrument, which together shall constitute a single instrument.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, WisDOT, COUNTY and CITY, by their respective authorized agents, have caused this Agreement to be executed, effective as of the date by which representatives of all parties hereto have affixed their respective signatures, as indicated below.

FOR WisDOT:

Date Signed: __________

FRANK BUSALACCHI, SECRETARY
Department of Transportation

FOR CITY:

Date Signed: __________

DAVID J. CIESLEWICZ, Mayor

Date Signed: __________

RAY FISCHER, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

__________________________
Dean Brasser, City Comptroller
Michael P. May, City Attorney

Date: ________________  Date: ________________

__________________________
Kevin Houlihan, Risk Manager

FOR COUNTY:

Date Signed: __________

__________________________
KATHLEEN M. FALK, County Executive

Date Signed: __________

__________________________
ROBERT OHLSEN, County Clerk
ADDENDUM #1 TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

This Addendum to the Intergovernmental Agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (“WisDOT”), the County of Dane ("COUNTY"), and the City of Madison ("CITY"), dated March 6, 2006 ("Agreement") is made effective as of the date of the last executed signature. Capitalized terms used and not defined in this Addendum shall have the respective meanings set forth in the Agreement.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, WisDOT, COUNTY and CITY formed a Madison Area Inter-Governmental Transportation Consortium ("CONSORTIUM") in the Agreement which authorized the procurement of certain transportation services by the CONSULTANT;

WHEREAS, additional technical services are required in order to complete the Work Plan set forth in Exhibit A of the Agreement;

WHEREAS, the CONSULTANT is unable to provide the necessary additional technical services, and the CONSORTIUM wishes to procure such services;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above premises and the mutual covenants of the parties hereinafter set forth, the receipt and sufficiency of which is acknowledged by each party for itself, WisDOT, COUNTY and CITY do agree to supplement the Agreement as follows:

1. Additional Services. The CONSORTIUM agrees to select a mutually agreeable vendor to provide the following services: (a) an on-board Metro Transit survey and (b) travel demand forecasting (mode choice/transit) model development/refinement work ("Services"). Once selected, the Consortium shall execute a contract with the vendor containing terms and conditions that are mutually acceptable to WisDOT, COUNTY and the CITY (the “New Vendor Contract”).

2. Administration of New Vendor Contract. The CONSORTIUM agrees that the CITY shall administer the New Vendor Contract in accordance with the same terms and conditions that applied to the administration of Exhibit A in the Agreement.

3. No Cost. The CONSORTIUM agrees that no additional financial obligation beyond what the parties have already contributed shall be incurred by WisDOT, COUNTY or CITY as a result of this Addendum. A portion of the funding for the CONSULTANT’S Work Plan shall be used to cover the cost of the Services.
4. **Term.** The parties agree to amend the first sentence of Section 2 of the Agreement so as to extend the term of the Agreement, as follows:

“The term of this Agreement shall commence as of the date by which all parties hereto have executed this Agreement and shall end as of the date by which the continue until both the New Vendor Contract under Addendum #1 and the CONSORTIUM’S Contract with the Consultant terminate, or another date mutually agreed in writing by the parties, ends, unless sooner agreed to by the parties or unless otherwise terminated pursuant to other provisions of this Agreement.”

5. **Authorization.** Each party warrants that the person(s) executing this Addendum on its behalf are authorized to do so.

6. **Full Force and Effect.** Except as set forth herein, the terms and conditions of the Agreement remain in full force and effect. If any inconsistency or ambiguity exists between Addendum and the Agreement, the terms of this Addendum shall control.

7. **Counterparts, Electronic Delivery.** This Addendum may be signed in counterparts, each of which shall be taken together as a whole to comprise a single document. Signatures on this Addendum may be exchanged between the parties by facsimile, electronic scanned copy (.pdf) or similar technology and shall be as valid as original. Executed copies or counterparts of this Addendum may be delivered by facsimile or email and upon receipt will be deemed original and binding upon the parties hereto, whether or not a hard copy is also delivered. Copies of this Addendum, fully executed, shall be as valid as an original.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, WisDOT, COUNTY and CITY, by their respective authorized agents, have caused this Addendum to the Agreement to be executed, effective as of the date by which representatives of all parties hereto have affixed their respective signatures, as indicated below.

FOR WisDOT:

Date Signed: ________

Sandra K. Beaupre'
Director, Planning and Economic Development
FOR CITY:

Date Signed: ______ Paul Soglin, Mayor

Date Signed: ______ Maribeth Witzel-Behl, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

__________________________ Michael P. May, City Attorney
David P. Schmiedicke,
Finance Director

__________________________
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**Re:**

Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2016-2020 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. This includes reviewing the draft recommended STP-Urban projects and funding 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. Staff is seeking approval for the effort and schedule this year.

Because the MPO is in the process of making revisions to the STP-Urban program policies and project scoring criteria, the timeline for requesting STP-Urban applications and deadline for submission of applications and TIP projects may be pushed back 2-3 weeks. If so, this would eliminate the first preliminary review of the draft scoring and recommended funding of STP-Urban projects in late June with the MPO’s technical committee and MPO Board in early July. MPO staff will be discussing this issue with the technical committee at its March 25 meeting. A revised schedule might be provided at the meeting.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Outline of Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2016-2020 TIP

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

Staff recommends approval.
**Citizen Participation Effort and Generalized Schedule for Preparing the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County**

1. **Notice to Local Units of Government and General Public**
   - Request for Proposed Projects with Federal or State Funds and Project Submittal Deadline
   - **April for Release of Notice**
   - **Tuesday, April 6, 2015**

2. **Projects due to MPO**
   - Deadline for Project Submittals
   - **Early June**
   - **By Monday, June 8, 2015**

3. **Preliminary Review #1 by MPO, TCC, CAC**
   - Preliminary Review of Scored Projects for STP Urban Funding
   - **End of June through mid-July**

4. **Print, distribute Draft TIP for Comments**
   - Preliminary Listing of All Projects in TIP
   - **End of July or first part of August**
   - **By Friday, August 7, 2015**

5. **Send out email notice of availability of Draft TIP**
   - Preliminary Listing of All Projects in TIP
   - **Early August**
   - **By Tuesday, August 11, 2015**

6. **Review #2 by MPO, TCC, CAC**
   - Preliminary Review of All Projects in TIP
   - **During August and September**

7. **Public Hearing before MPO on Draft TIP**
   - Testimony and Comments Formally Received by MPO on Draft TIP
   - **Beginning of September**
   - **Wednesday, September 2, 2015**

8. **Recommendations by TCC & CAC**
   - Final Comments to MPO
   - **Mid- to late September**
   - **September 16 and 30, 2015**

9. **Action by MPO**
   - Final Action by MPO
   - **Beginning of October**
   - **Wednesday, October 7, 2015**

10. **Submittal of Complete Final TIP Report with Appendices to WisDOT**
    - Submittal to WisDOT for approval, incorporation into State TIP
    - **End of October or early November**

---

*TIP Public Participation Process*  
*April 1, 2015*