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

March 5, 2014 6:30 p.m.
Madison Water Utility
119 E. Olin Avenue, Room A-B

AGENDA

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of February 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes
3. Communications
4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)
5. Resolution TPB No. 87 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area & Dane County
   - Military Ridge PNR Lot (near USH 18/151/Verona Ave.), Reconstruct and expand [Move const. up to 2014]
   - Lower Yahara River Trail Phase 1 (Lussier Ctr to McDaniel Park in McFarland), Construct Path [Move const. funding back to 2015]
   - Interstate 39/90/94 (Hoepker Rd. Bridge), Bridge Rehab. – Deck Overlay [Remove federal funds, reduce cost]
   - USH 51/Stoughton Road (Buckeye Rd. Intersection), Interim improvements [Increase cost, reduce federal funding]
   - USH 51/Stoughton Road (Buckeye Rd. Intersection), Interim improvements [Increase cost, reduce federal funding]
   - USH 51/Main St in Stoughton (RR Crossing), Replace rail warning devices [NEW, Const. in 2017]
   - STH 69 (New Glarus to Valley Road in T.Verona), Reconstruction [NEW, Const. in 2018]
   - CTH B in T. Pleasant Springs (RR Crossing), Replace rail warning devices [NEW, Const. in 2017]
   - CTH N in T. Dunkirk (RR Crossing), Replace rail warning devices [NEW, Const. in 2017]
   - Williams Point Dr. in T. Pleasant Springs (RR Crossing), Replace rail warning devices [NEW, Const. in 2017]
6. Consideration of Appointments to the MPO Technical and Policy Advisory Committees for the Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County
7. Review and Discussion on Preliminary Draft of Revised Policies and Scoring Criteria for STP Urban Projects
8. Brief Update on Follow Up Activities from the Madison Transit Corridor (BRT) Study
9. Brief Update on Dane County Bicycle Wayfinding Project and Potential MPO Role as Project Manager
10. Discussion on WisDOT Plans for Verona Road (USH 18/151) and Corridor Studies of Stoughton Road (USH 51), USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton), and the Beltline (USH 12/14/18/151)
11. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB:
    - USH 51/Stoughton Road (USH 12/18 to IH 39/90/94) Corridor EIS Study
    - USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor EIS Study
    - Beltline (USH 14 to CTH N) Corridor EIS Study
    - Interstate 39/90/94 (Madison to Wisconsin Dells) Corridor EIS Study
    - City of Madison Sustainable Transportation Master Plan
12. Discussion of Future Work Items:
    - Public Participation Plan Update
    - Roadway Functional Classification Update
    - Transportation Alternatives Program Application Cycle for 2014-2018 Projects
    - Revisions to STP Urban Project Scoring Criteria
    - Regional ITS Strategic Plan
    - Bicycle Transportation Plan Update
13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

14. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, April 2 at 6:30 p.m.**
Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B

If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations to access this meeting, contact the Planning & Development Dept. at (608) 266-4635 or TTY/TEXTNET (866) 704-2318.

*Please do so at least 48 hours prior to the meeting so that proper arrangements can be made.*

Si Ud. necesita un intérprete, materiales en formatos alternos, o acomodaciones para poder venir a esta reunión, por favor haga contacto con el Department of Planning & Development (el departamento de planificación y desarrollo) al (608)-266-4635, o TTY/TEXTNET (886)-704-2318.

*Por favor avisenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.*
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)  
February 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

**Members present:** David Ahrens, Judd Blau, Mark Clear, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Steve King, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item #5), Al Matano, Mark Opitz, Chris Schmidt, Robin Schmidt

**Members absent:** Chuck Kamp, Paul Lawrence, Ed Minihan

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

2. Approval of November 13, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Moved by R. Schmidt seconded by Opitz, to approve the November 13, 2013 meeting minutes. Motion carried with King abstaining.

3. Communications

- WisDOT letter approving the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- MPO letter of comment signed by Chair Matano on Wisconsin Rail Plan 2030.
- WisDOT SW Region letter and attached Frequently Asked Questions document regarding the STH 138 (Oregon to Stoughton) Corridor study.

Schaefer said the STH 138 study is a safety and operations study looking at access management and safety issues, but not capacity expansion. The STH 138 corridor was considered as an alternative to USH 51 for a capacity expansion as part of the USH 51 study, but was rejected. R. Schmidt asked if this was related to the planned new Wal-Mart. Gust said no, that traffic is increasing on STH 138 and the purpose of this study is to develop a plan for maintaining mobility in the existing corridor. Schaefer said a roundabout is already planned for construction at the STH 138/USH 51 intersection near the Wal-Mart location. Gust added the developer was building another roundabout to serve the development.

Matano mentioned the letter from Mayor Soglin to WisDOT regarding the Stoughton Road study that was also at members’ places. Schaefer said he had distributed that as an informational item related to item #12.

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

None

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

Schaefer provided some background on the issue. The Madison area receives a direct allocation of funding under the Section 5310 program. The MPO approved a resolution in November that recommended Metro be the designated recipient of the funds, but that the MPO prepare the program management plan and select projects for funding. The program management plan documents this division of responsibilities between Metro and the MPO for administering this program. It also covers other topics such as the process for selecting projects and compliance by the sub-recipients of funding with federal requirements. Schaefer noted it was decided to continue to fund the two current projects this year and consider implementing a competitive process for project selection next year. The two continuing projects are Dane County’s mobility management program and Metro’s in-person paratransit eligibility assessment program. Schaefer said MPO staff worked closely with Metro staff in developing the document and also received comments from WisDOT. Following MPO approval, the plan will be submitted to FTA. The City of Madison will also need to approve the plan and the application to FTA for funding the 2014 projects.
R. Schmidt asked whether the Dane County Specialized Transportation Commission would have an opportunity for input. Schaefer said the commission could be informed of the document, but didn’t have a role other than approving the county’s application for funding. The City of Madison needed to approve the plan because of Metro’s role as the designated recipient of funding. Cechvala added that the proposed arrangement for administration of the program and the decision not to pursue a competitive project selection process was discussed with the commission and the committee that oversaw development of the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Plan. R. Schmidt suggested putting it on the agenda for a future commission meeting.

Schaefer mentioned that former Supervisor Tom Stoebig, who was on that committee, suggested coordinating the paratransit eligibility assessments and the mobility training programs with the county’s Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC). Golden said he discussed this issue with Crystal Martin, Metro’s Paratransit Manager, when the ADRC was opening. The conclusion was there would be no efficiencies with the center doing the assessments because the evaluation is so different than the other evaluations and resource connection work that the ADRC performs. He said Cashin and Martin work closely together so he felt if there was an efficiency and customer convenience from having the ADRC involved that would have been pursued.

Golden commented that there was an inconsistency in the document between the eligible Section 5310 activities and the program goals. The goals reference transit dependent persons and not just elderly and those with disabilities. Schaefer agreed. He said the goals and objectives were taken from the coordination plan, which was more inclusive. He said they needed to be modified to be consistent with the eligible program activities.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Golden to approve the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Program for the Madison Urbanized Area with modification recommended by Golden to the program goals and objectives to make them consistent with the eligible projects under the Section 5310 program. Motion carried.

6. Resolution TPB No. 86 Approving Amendment #1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area and Dane County

Schaefer reviewed the projects included in the TIP amendment, explaining the reasons for the proposed cost/funding and/or schedule changes. He said the change in the project scope for the City of Madison Mineral Point Road/Midvale intersection project was just a change to the description from reconstruction to recondition with no cost change. The increase in STP-Urban funding for the East Johnson reconstruction project was the result of negotiations with WisDOT regarding the MPO’s funding allocation. The allocation was originally reduced to account for the MPO planning program project, but that was deleted due to the increase in Planning funds. WisDOT agreed to credit the MPO this funding, but required it be spent this fiscal year. Therefore, East Johnson was the only project the funding could be used for. It is above and beyond the funding currently shown in the TIP. He said the amendment also adds the Dane County and Metro Section 5310 projects just discussed. He referred to the Program of Projects document in the packet that provides more information about the different components of the two projects. That document gets submitted to FTA with the application for funding.

Golden said he understood the funding for Union Cab’s accessible taxi service had to be dropped because it wasn’t eligible for funding because it wasn’t a shared ride service. He asked if that would impact the company’s ability or intention of continuing to provide the service. If so, the Madison Transit & Parking Commission might need to address this issue in order to maintain compliance with the ADA. Schaefer said staff would follow up and send a communication to the TPC if there was a threat to the continued provision of that service. Golden also mentioned the possible neighborhood concerns regarding the Mineral Point/Midvale intersection project. C. Schmidt said the preliminary design doesn’t involve taking any land or moving sidewalks and has support of the neighborhood.
Moved by Golden, seconded by C. Schmidt to approve Amendment #1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area and Dane County. Motion carried.


Schaefer said the Transportation Alternatives program was a new program that consolidated the former Enhancements and Safe Routes to School programs. Larger MPOs such as Madison receive a direct sub-allocation of funding. There is a separate pot of money that WisDOT will administer that is available for projects anywhere in the state. The larger MPOs can develop their own policies and project selection criteria. However, WisDOT is requiring consistency for some policies such as the minimum project cost since they will be administering the program for all projects. Staff has prepared a draft document that outlines the proposed policies and criteria for the MPO to use in selecting projects for funding. The policies noted are those that differ from the ones that WisDOT will be using. The document reflects changes recommended by the MPO’s technical and citizen advisory committees. Schaefer reviewed the draft document.

Golden complimented staff on the document. He suggested changing the title of the Cost Effectiveness category to Cost Benefit because that is more accurate based on the description. Golden also suggested consideration of awarding bonus points for cases where community participation added value or reduced the cost of a project such as providing landscaping for a path. Blau said he liked the concept, but did not see it as practical because of the difficulty of planning such an effort at the time of project application. It would be easy for communities to say they would do that. Matano said there could be a requirement for a formal “friends” group or neighborhood association. R. Schmidt commented that she like the concept, but thought it should be part of the Cost Benefit criterion. Schaefer said he agreed with Blau on the difficulty of organizing such a commitment at the time of project application, but if included he preferred it be part of the Cost Benefit criterion. Schaefer mentioned another situation where a community had already built part of a project and was only asking for funds to complete it. He thought credit should be given for that as well. C. Schmidt said he also liked the idea, but it ran counter to the goal of targeting projects in environmental justice areas since they typically don’t have the capacity to organize these efforts.

Moved by Blau, seconded by Golden, to amend the Cost Effectiveness category by renaming it Cost Benefit, and to add a criterion under it for in-kind or other local contributions to a project. Motion carried.

Moved by Golden, seconded by R. Schmidt to approve as amended. Motion carried.

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

Schaefer said an update to the comprehensive regional bicycle transportation plan completed in 2000 was underway. Updates have been made to bikeways component of the plan as part of regional transportation plan updates, but a comprehensive update is needed. An advisory committee is being created to oversee the effort. It consists mostly of staff, but also includes some policy representatives as well. Clear and Matano both volunteered to represent the board and Opitz is on the committee as the City of Middleton representative. Schaefer said a kickoff meeting of the committee was already held, but staff was seeking any input on the committee makeup and approval of the membership.

Blau commented on the lack of any representatives from some of the smaller communities. Schaefer said he had sought volunteers from all of the communities represented on the MPO’s technical committee. There would also be other opportunities for input. Matano commented that he didn’t like the committee being made up of mostly staff persons given the large bicycling community with many knowledgeable individuals. Golden suggested creating a separate citizen or policy advisory committee. Clear said some of the people on the current list might wish to serve on the other committee.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Clear to approve the committee but ask staff to create draft list of members for a second policy advisory committee. Motion withdrawn.
Moved by Clear, seconded by Golden, to defer the item to the next meeting.

9. Presentation on Madison Metro Bus Size Study

Cechvala provided some history on the project. Metro Transit received a grant to hire a consultant to conduct the study. MPO staff agreed to serve as project manager, in part to ensure an objective analysis since Metro staff had previously stated they didn’t think it made sense to utilize small buses. Nelson\Nygaard from Seattle was hired and the study is now wrapping up. The study report will be going through the city committees and some opportunities will be provided for comments, including posting fliers on the buses. Cechvala provided information on the vehicles that were considered and the analysis conducted, which included a peak passenger loading survey, use of an annualized cost and fuel use model to determine the cost of using different sized buses, and a facilities review that looked at necessary modifications to the bus garage, transfer points, and other bus stops with larger buses. He reviewed the routes that were candidates for use of larger and smaller buses. Most of the routes that were candidates for large buses are in the BRT corridors with the exception of some Middleton routes and Route 38, but those are commuter routes that only operate during peak periods. The two routes that were the strongest candidates for use of larger buses all day were Routes 2 and 80, the main UW campus route. If all of the routes were included, a total of 40 large buses might be needed, including spares. On the other hand, only about 5-6 small buses could be employed with the current route system, perhaps double if at route changes were made. However, the changes would increase transfers.

Cechvala reviewed the cost impact estimates showing the annualized capital and operating cost. Even with just the 13 large bus scenario (Routes 2 and 80), the cost is significant at about $650,000. He then went over the main conclusions. Metro should continue planning for diversification of the fleet in the future, particularly the addition of larger buses. However, a new satellite bus garage facility will be needed first with the current one over capacity. Also, the decision on whether to move forward with bus rapid transit and the timeframe for that will have a significant impact on this issue.

R. Schmidt asked what weight was placed in the analysis on buses that were more than half empty. Cechvala said the focus was on the maximum load point. For consideration of a small bus, it was decided that no more than 10% of the trips should overload a small bus. Golden commented that the fleet diversification issue raises a whole host of other issues. For example, related to the bus garage there is the issue of whether to have one or two garages and where to locate a second garage if that is the decision. Creation on an RTA might result in additional regional bus service, which impacts fleet decisions. There are also major fiscal issues. He said it was still good to have a plan even though some of things will impact it in the future. Ahrens asked if the potential additional ridership and revenue from use of larger buses was considered. Cechvala said that particularly in the case of the UW campus route, the capacity is limiting ridership. However, the potential increased ridership and revenue was not evaluated since it would be very difficult to predict. In the case of the campus route, it is free so there would be no additional passenger revenue.

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

Schaefer said staff was working on putting together the RFP to hire a consultant to prepare a regional ITS plan. The MPO will be working closely with the City of Madison Traffic Engineering Division and Parking Utility, which are covering half of the local share cost for the project. He said ITS covers a broad range of advanced technologies and other operations management techniques to improve the safety and efficiency of the transportation system. This plan will be multi-modal and complement the plan WisDOT has already put together for the freeway system. Schaefer referred to the draft scope of work for the study. He said it would be comprehensive, starting with development of ITS goals, an inventory, and identification of needs, followed by development of a implementation or deployment plan prioritizing projects.

Golden asked if it was intended to implement the Congestion Management Process, and Schaefer said yes. Gust commented that it was a good idea. He has found it very helpful for the state system to have a plan so ITS components can be incorporated into projects. Mandli commented on the need to work out relationships
between local agencies and WisDOT. Schaefer agreed that was an important part of the study, including communication of information on incidents and other things.

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

Schaefer noted the draft map was in the packet. It is a joint WisDOT and MPO effort with WisDOT taking the lead. WisDOT has developed classification criteria consistent with FHWA guidelines. The system is designed to classify the network in terms of the function of a roadway in providing mobility, connectivity, and accessibility. Criteria included traffic volumes, land uses that are served, and spacing of the different types of facilities. He said one of the issues is that the system doesn’t account for the current land use in a corridor or the community context. For instance, there are some roadways that are proposed to be reclassified to minor arterials that go through mostly single-family residential areas. He highlighted a couple of those.

Schaefer said the answer to that is to have a supplemental classification system that accounts for that. Schaefer said MPO staff has taken the lead in getting input from local staff. There is general agreement or at least acceptance of the current version of the proposed draft map.

Ahrens asked about the significance of the functional classification. Schaefer said it is used for planning purposes such as in the regional travel model. It could also affect the design of the roadway if federal funding were used for a project. While the criteria would generally be the same for a collector and an arterial, an exception would be more difficult to get for an arterial. Schaefer said the City of Madison classified some streets differently because they use theirs for some policy purposes such as eligibility for traffic calming devices. He added that it is unlikely federal funding would be used for the roadways mentioned. The classification also has potential funding implications.

Schaefer highlighted a couple of significant classification changes that will require an expansion of the urban area boundary. The first is the proposed upgrade of Pleasant View Road north of Mineral Point to a principal arterial. The second is CTH K (CTH M to USH 12), which is also proposed to be upgraded to a principal arterial. CTH K is currently shown as a collector because it is outside the urban area and thus requires use of different criteria for rural areas. The traffic volume on the roadway is very high, about 13,000, so even though the roadway is not in an urban developed area it is being used for urban commuter traffic. Schaefer said that MPO action on the functional classification map and urban area boundary changes wouldn’t occur for a few months because of required traffic counts and forecasts needed for some of the proposed new collectors. However, he wanted to review the map with the board now to ensure there were no concerns.

Opitz said he supported the change for CTH K. He said it recognizes the travel patterns out there today. Blau agreed, saying he avoids CTH K because of the high traffic volumes. Gust mentioned the programmed project to add a dual left at the CTH K/USH 12 intersection. Golden suggested consideration of a STP Urban funding set aside for critical sidewalk improvements due to the fact it is so difficult politically to get them done due to local assessment policies. Blau said Deforest pays for 100% of sidewalk improvements.

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

Matano said he asked staff to put this item on the agenda to allow board discussion of these projects and their cumulative impact rather than just taking them up one by one. He said there wasn’t time tonight, but hoped the board could have this discussion at a future meeting. The Beltline study was also supposed to be included. Further discussion was deferred.

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

Schaefer reported that the consultant for the Beltline study was working to model the traffic impacts of the major roadway and transit strategies developed. For the Interstate 39/90 study, the consultant was analyzing the traffic impacts of the potential interchange locations and results from that would be available soon.
Regarding the City of Madison Transportation Master Plan, there was a kick-off meeting in December that several board members attended. A second land use visioning meeting is planned for the spring. MPO staff has been working with City of Madison staff to develop a bicycle facility geodatabase for the plan. MPO staff would maintain the database and expand it countywide. MPO staff also completed an update of the sidewalk inventory for the City of Madison as well as other communities in the county.

14. Discussion of Future Work Items

Gust mentioned that he heard the City of Madison was no longer interested in hosting the server for the MPO’s online rideshare program. He wanted to be sure the program would be maintained. Schaefer said it would continue. A meeting has been set up to discuss the issue and the possibility of the state hosting the server for our program as well as the one for the rest of the state.

Schaefer mentioned that staff was working on revisions to the MPO’s STP-Urban project scoring criteria. A preliminary draft would be reviewed with the technical committee at their next meeting and then reviewed with the board. The goal was to finalize the changes for the next cycle of applications this summer.

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Schaefer said he wanted to verify with the board that the 7 p.m. meeting time was still the most convenient for everyone. The 7 p.m. time was set to avoid meeting conflicts of members who are no longer on the board. Ahrens said that was the City of Madison’s Board of Public Works, but that was usually over by 6 p.m. After some discussion, there was consensus to move up the meeting time to 6:30 p.m.

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, March 5, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Rooms A-B.

16. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by R. Schmidt to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 PM.
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 87 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Staff Comments on Item:
The Wisconsin Department of Transportation SW Region has requested a TIP amendment to add four OCR rail warning device projects and the STH 69 (New Glarus to Verona) reconstruction project and to make changes in the scope, schedule, and/or cost/funding of three state highway projects. An amendment is also needed to change the construction schedule for Dane County Park’s Lower Yahara River Trail project and WisDOT’s Military Ridge PNR Lot project. More detail on the projects is included in the resolution and project listings for the amendment.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 87 Approving Amendment #2 to the 2014-2018 TIP (including attachments)

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 87

Amendment No. 2 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

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

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB adopted TPB Resolution No. 86 on February 5, 2014, approving Amendment No. 1; and

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

WHEREAS, an amendment has been requested by WisDOT Southwest Region to add OCR rail-warning device projects on one state highway, two county trunk highways, and local one collector roadway in the Madison Metropolitan Planning area and to also add the STH 69 (New Glarus to Verona) reconstruction project; and

WHEREAS, an amendment is also needed to change the scope, timing, and/or cost/funding of three state highway projects; and

WHEREAS, an amendment is also needed to change the construction schedule for Dane County’s Lower Yahara River Trail project and WisDOT’s Military Ridge Park & Ride lot project; and

WHEREAS, the TIP amendment will not affect the timing of any other programmed projects in the TIP and the TIP remains financially constrained as shown in the attached revised TIP financial tables (Table B-2 and Table C-1); and

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

WHEREAS, the projects are consistent with the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, the adopted long-range regional transportation plan for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area TPB approves Amendment No. 2 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, making the following project revisions and additions as shown on the attached project listings table:

1. **REVISE** the cost/funding and timing for the Military Ridge Park & Ride Lot (Near USH 18-151/Verona Avenue) Interchange Reconstruction and Expansion project on page 17 of the Parking Facilities section, advancing construction to 2014 and adding a Utility component.

2. **REVISE** the timing for the Lower Yahara River Trail Phase 1 Construction project on page 19 of the Pedestrian/Bicycle Projects section, delaying construction funding until 2015.

3. **REVISE** the scope and cost/funding for the Interstate 39/90/94 (Hoepker Road Bridge) Bridge Rehabilitation project on page 33 of the Street/Roadway Projects section, modifying it to a deck...
overlay (vs. deck replacement) project, substituting additional state funding for federal NHPP funding, and revising the project cost.

4. **REVISE** the cost/funding of the USH 51 (Stoughton Road) (Buckeye Road Intersection) Intersection Improvement project on page 36, removing the Safety funding, increasing the federal NHPP and state funding, and revising the project cost.

5. **ADD** the USH 51 (East Main Street in Stoughton) Rail Warning Device replacement project to page 36.

6. **REVISE** the cost/funding of the USH 51 (Stoughton Road) (Pflaum Road Intersection) Intersection Improvement project on page 36, removing the Safety funding, increasing the federal NHPP and state funding, and revising the project cost.

7. **ADD** the STH 69 Roadway Reconstruction (New Glarus-Verona) project to page 38.

8. **ADD** the CTH B (Town of Pleasant Springs) Rail Warning Device Replacement project to page 38.

9. **ADD** the CTH N (Town of Dunkirk) Rail Warning Device Replacement project to page 39.

10. **ADD** the Williams Point Drive (Town of Pleasant Springs) Rail Warning Device Replacement project to page 40.

____________________________________________________________________________________

Date Adopted

Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction/ Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost/ Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2014</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2015</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2018</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKING FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DANE COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY RIDGE PARK &amp; RIDE LOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1206-07-08, -20, -48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT NEW</td>
<td>LOWER YAHARA RIVER TRAIL</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5992-08-84, -85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STREET/ROADWAY PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT NEW</td>
<td>INTERSTATE 39/90/94</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1011-04-01, -79, -80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT NEW</td>
<td>USH 51 (STOUGHTON RD)</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5410-02-02, -72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New NEW</td>
<td>USH 51 (E Main ST)</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1009-91-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT NEW</td>
<td>USH 51 (STOUGHTON RD)</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5410-02-01, -71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New NEW</td>
<td>STH 69</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1693-05-02-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New NEW</td>
<td>CTH B</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1009-91-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MADISON METROPOLITAN AREA**

**PARKING FACILITIES**

**DANE COUNTY**

- MILITARY RIDGE PARK & RIDE LOT
  - Near USH 18-151/Verona Ave.
  - Interchange
  - Reconstruction and expansion

**PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE PROJECTS**

- WisDOT
  - LOWER YAHARA RIVER TRAIL
    - Phase 1
    - McDaniel Park in Village of McFarland to Capital City Trail at the Lussier Family Heritage Center
    - Construct trail consisting of combination of paved path and boardwalk adjacent to the rail line, including two bridges (2.6 mi.)

**STREET/ROADWAY PROJECTS**

- WisDOT
  - INTERSTATE 39/90/94
    - Hoepker Road Bridge
    - Bridge rehabilitation - Replace Bridge Deck
    - Deck Overlay
    - Bicycle accommodation on shoulders (B-13-0100)

- WisDOT
  - USH 51 (STOUGHTON RD)
    - Buckeye Rd. Intersection
    - Interim intersection improvement
    - Diamond grind pavement, Install signal heads over USH 51 traffic lanes mounted on monotube arms, and move detection loops further back on USH 51.

- New
  - USH 51 (E Main ST)
    - City of Stoughton RR Crossing (#391684C)
    - Replace OCR rail warning devices.

- WisDOT
  - USH 51 (STOUGHTON RD)
    - Pflaum Rd. Intersection
    - Interim intersection improvements
    - Diamond grind pavement, Install signal heads over USH 51 traffic lanes mounted on monotube arms, and move detection loops further back on USH 51.

- New
  - STH 69
    - New Glarus - Verona
    - CTH D to Valley Road
    - Reconstruct Roadway (8.66 mi.)

- New
  - CTH B
    - Town of Pleasant Springs
    - RR Crossing (#391688E)
    - Replace OCR rail warning devices.

**Comments**

- Construction funding obligated in 2014.
- Construction anticipated to be completed in 2017.
- Construction funding obligated in 2014.
- Construction anticipated to be completed in 2017.
- Construction funding obligated in 2010.
- Construction anticipated to be completed in 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Jurisdiction/Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost/Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2014</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2015</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2018</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td>Fed State Local Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-14-017</td>
<td>Williams Point Drive</td>
<td>RR Crossing (#391693B) Replace OCR rail warning devices.</td>
<td>PE ROW TOTAL</td>
<td>131 70 202</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1009-91-84 Construction funding obligated in 2014. Construction anticipated to be completed in 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-2
Summary of Federal Funds Programmed ($000s) and Those Available in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area
2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Expenditures</th>
<th>Estimated Available Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>National Highway Performance Program</td>
<td>50,353</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Madison Urban Area</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>5,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Flexible</td>
<td>8,633</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Enhancements/Alternatives**</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>3,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>2,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>6,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5339 Bus &amp; Bus Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5337 State of Good Repair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5314 NRP &amp; Section 5339 Alt. Analysis Program**</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors &amp; Persons w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: All state roadway projects using applicable funding sources (e.g., NHPP, STP State Flexible, BR) are programmed through 2018. Local BR and STP Rural projects are programmed through 2014. HSIP (other than annual small HES program) projects are programmed through 2015. SRTS projects are carryover from 2013. Local Enhancement/TA projects are programmed through 2014. Local STP Urban (Madison Urban Area) projects are programmed through 2018. Transit funding is not yet programmed and is based on needs and anticipated future funding levels (See also Table C-4 Metro Transit System Projected Expenses and Revenues on page C-8). Programmed transit funding for 2014 excludes carryover projects for which the Federal funding is already obligated (except for the Alternatives Analysis and TIGER funding).
Table C-1
Projected Expenses and Revenues of Transportation Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area
in Year of Expenditure Dollars\(^1\)
2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Construction, Maintenance, etc.</td>
<td>109,495</td>
<td>10,097</td>
<td>54,800</td>
<td>55,652</td>
<td>31,036</td>
<td>261,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>5,647</td>
<td>9,128</td>
<td>7,695</td>
<td>7,674</td>
<td>33,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP TE/TA and STP Rural</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>6,679</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>116,949</td>
<td>23,248</td>
<td>64,159</td>
<td>63,584</td>
<td>38,952</td>
<td>306,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dane County &amp; Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>52,134</td>
<td>53,437</td>
<td>54,773</td>
<td>56,143</td>
<td>57,546</td>
<td>274,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Construction</td>
<td>45,098</td>
<td>46,225</td>
<td>47,381</td>
<td>48,566</td>
<td>49,780</td>
<td>237,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Related Facilities</td>
<td>10,564</td>
<td>10,828</td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>11,376</td>
<td>11,661</td>
<td>55,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>107,796</td>
<td>110,491</td>
<td>113,253</td>
<td>116,085</td>
<td>118,987</td>
<td>566,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenses</td>
<td>16,568</td>
<td>16,982</td>
<td>17,407</td>
<td>17,842</td>
<td>18,288</td>
<td>87,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>48,996</td>
<td>50,221</td>
<td>51,476</td>
<td>52,763</td>
<td>54,082</td>
<td>257,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>67,400</td>
<td>67,203</td>
<td>68,883</td>
<td>70,605</td>
<td>72,370</td>
<td>344,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Expenses</strong></td>
<td>292,145</td>
<td>200,942</td>
<td>246,295</td>
<td>250,274</td>
<td>230,309</td>
<td>1,218,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Projected Revenues ($000s)\(^2\) |      |      |      |      |      |                        |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|                        |
| **State and Federal**     |      |      |      |      |      |                        |
| Highway Construction, Maintenance, etc. | 58,784 | 60,254 | 61,760 | 63,304 | 64,887 | 308,988 |
| STP Urban (Madison Urban Area) | 6,163 | 6,592 | 6,741 | 6,909 | 7,082 | 33,487 |
| STP TE, STP Rural & SRTS | 3,324 | 3,407 | 3,492 | 3,580 | 3,669 | 17,472 |
| Other State | 8,789 | 9,009 | 9,234 | 9,465 | 9,701 | 46,198 |
| **Subtotal** | 77,060 | 79,261 | 81,227 | 83,258 | 85,339 | 406,145 |
| **Dane County & Communities** |      |      |      |      |      |                        |
| Street Operations and Maintenance | 52,134 | 53,437 | 54,773 | 56,143 | 57,546 | 274,033 |
| Street Construction | 45,098 | 46,225 | 47,381 | 48,566 | 49,780 | 237,050 |
| Street-Related Facilities | 10,564 | 10,828 | 11,099 | 11,376 | 11,661 | 55,528 |
| **Subtotal** | 107,796 | 110,491 | 113,253 | 116,085 | 118,987 | 566,611 |
| **Metro Transit** |      |      |      |      |      |                        |
| Capital Expenses | 16,568 | 16,982 | 17,407 | 17,842 | 18,288 | 87,087 |
| Operating Expenses | 48,996 | 50,221 | 51,476 | 52,763 | 54,082 | 257,539 |
| **Subtotal** | 65,564 | 67,203 | 68,883 | 70,605 | 72,370 | 344,626 |
| **Total Projected Revenues** | 250,420 | 256,955 | 263,363 | 269,947 | 276,696 | 1,317,382 |

---

\(^1\) Roadway and transit inflation rate @ 2.5% per year applied to both expenses and revenues.

\(^2\) State and Federal highway and Metro Transit revenue estimates based upon spending levels from 2007-2011 (adjusted for inflation to 2014 dollars) with annual averages estimated and then projected for each funding source. Local revenues assumed to continue at annual averages expended in the past (adjusted for inflation).

\(^3\) Highway construction, maintenance expenses excludes projects (e.g., I-39/90 expansion) that are mostly outside Dane County and for which fiscal constraint is being handled at the state level.
Re: Consideration of Appointments to the MPO Technical and Policy Advisory Committees for the Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Comments on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MPO staff has begun work to prepare an update the regional Bicycle Transportation Plan completed back in 2000. Updates have been made since that time to the bikeways (off-street paths and routes) component of the plan as part of the MPO’s updates to its Regional Transportation Plan, but a comprehensive update to the bicycle plan is needed.  

Staff developed a list of proposed advisory committee members and reviewed that with the board at the last meeting. The board suggested creating separate technical and policy/citizen advisory committees. Staff sent out an email to MPO technical committee members seeking suggestions for residents or alders from their communities who would be good candidates for the policy committee. This generated many names. Staff also added a few other candidates to the list. The goal was to get a broad cross section of people of different ages, backgrounds, etc. and from different communities in the Madison area. Al Matano indicated that he was recruiting members for the policy committee as well, but hasn’t provided staff with any names yet. Staff also contacted some of those on the original list to get their preference on what committee they would like to participate on. The Land Use Manager for the Town of Dunn was added to the technical committee to have someone representing towns. Janine Glaeser, a project manager for the City of Monona, has also been added. 

The draft list of prospective policy committee members is quite large and should probably be culled down a bit to get to a manageable number, especially if others are added. Those not appointed to the committee can still be included on meeting notices and invited to attend and participate. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Presented on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Draft lists of proposed policy and technical advisory committee members for the bicycle plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommends approval with any additions/deletions suggested by the board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Policy Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg City Alder</td>
<td>Steve Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona City Alder</td>
<td>Mike Bare or Elizabeth Doyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sun Prairie Resident</td>
<td>Al Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers and Trails Task Force Committee (City of Stoughton)</td>
<td>Joni Dean or Nancy Hagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Resident</td>
<td>Grant Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI Bike Subcommittee</td>
<td>Peter Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Policy Board</td>
<td>Al Matano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission</td>
<td>Lydia Maurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McFarland Resident</td>
<td>Rob Mecum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Resident, former City Engineer</td>
<td>Larry Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Trails Council</td>
<td>Joel Patenaude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Resident, former WisDOT SW Region Planning Chief</td>
<td>Mike Rewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Middleton Resident</td>
<td>Greg Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Resident</td>
<td>Jon Standridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Obesity Prevention Collaborative</td>
<td>Julia Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNA Green Team</td>
<td>Candace Stohs-Krause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Long Range Transportation Planning Committee</td>
<td>Robbie Webber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Technical Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO Policy Board</td>
<td>Mark Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison Bike/Ped Coordinator</td>
<td>Chuck Strawser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Sarah Gaskell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT SW Region Multimodal Coordinator</td>
<td>Michelle Brokaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Parks Dept.</td>
<td>Chris James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Highway &amp; Transp. Dept.</td>
<td>Pam Dunphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Engineering</td>
<td>Anthony Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Traffic Engineering – Ped/Bike Coordinator</td>
<td>Arthur Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fitchburg</td>
<td>Ahnaray Bizjak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Middleton</td>
<td>Mark Opitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sun Prairie</td>
<td>Tim Semmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Monona</td>
<td>Janine Glaeser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Dunn</td>
<td>Erica Schmitz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Comments on Item:

A comprehensive review and revision of the MPO’s STP Urban project scoring criteria has not been done since the criteria were first developed and adopted in the late-1990s following the passage of ISTEA. Staff thought it was appropriate to reexamine both the program policies and scoring criteria in light of changes to federal law and emphasis areas (e.g., livability/sustainability, public health, environmental justice) and MPO policies. MPO board members have also commented at various times on the desire to incorporate some additional criteria such as economic development impact.

Staff researched project scoring systems used by other MPOs across the country and has developed a first draft of a revised project scoring system. It should be viewed as a work in progress. The system uses a 100-point scale similar to what was developed for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) criteria. While the scale is different, the scoring categories and the relative weighting of the categories are not all that different from the current system (see table comparing the current and proposed new project scoring system). One significant difference with the proposed new system is that while the categories are the same for all projects, specific criteria have been developed that are tailored to the different types of major projects. Also, there are minor changes in the category weights depending on the different type of project (see the table). For independent pedestrian/bicycle projects, staff is initially proposing to use the TAP criteria, but we may need to “translate” that into the STP Urban project scoring categories to provide for a more “apples to apples” comparison of scores.

Staff reviewed the draft document with the MPO technical committee at its meeting this week, and will report on that discussion. They requested that staff score some different types of projects with the new criteria to see how it works and staff intend to do that. They also raised the issue of when the new scoring system would be used and that is something that will need to be discussed. That depends in part on how long it takes to finalize the new scoring system.

Materials Presented on Item:

2. Table comparing current and proposed new STP Urban project scoring system.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale: For review and discussion only at this time.
Madison Area Transportation Board – An MPO
DRAFT Policy and Ranking Criteria
For
STP - Urban Projects

A. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

Objectives

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Policies**

- **Eligible Project Categories:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Formula for computing the federal share:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. Evaluation Criteria – Roadway Projects

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

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

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

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management – 15% (Capacity Expansion Projects) and 5% (Preservation Projects)
   - Level of existing traffic congestion and extent to which the project improves travel times or traffic flow conditions by (a) providing additional motor vehicle capacity; and/or (b) providing transit and/or non-motorized facility improvements, increasing the attractiveness of those modes of transportation.
     [Note: The level of traffic congestion will be measured based on the best data available, including volume-to-capacity ratio (using AAWT and planning level capacities in the regional travel model), intersection Level of Service during the peak periods, and congested travel speeds.]
   - The project reduces intersection delay and increases the Level of Service (LOS) through improved traffic signal operations (better coordination and/or signal equipment upgrades, including responsive signal controls) and/or through intersection design changes (e.g., addition or lengthening of turn bays).
   - The project improves roadway access management (e.g., addition of a median) in a manner that significantly improves the capacity of the roadway.
The project includes ITS strategies, other than traffic signal operations. This category includes all project elements with a primary purpose of providing technological enhancements that improve the efficiency and/or safety of the existing transportation system. Projects could include variable message signs, cameras, speed estimates, parking availability data, traffic counting systems, and other “intelligent” data and reporting mechanisms that make the transportation system more efficient for every mode.

The project provides or improves an alternative or parallel route to an existing congested roadway or intersection, thereby improving the operational performance/efficiency of that congested facility.

4. Safety Enhancement – 10%
   • The project is located on a roadway segment with a history of motor vehicle, bicycle, and/or pedestrian crashes, and the project addresses the safety problem(s) or issue(s).
   • The project addresses documented safety concerns that are not necessarily reflected in a crash rate (e.g., substandard geometry of a roadway; poor structural conditions posing hazards, inadequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities).
   • The project reduces conflicts between the different modes of transportation.
   • The project identifies and addresses safety issues for all modes (e.g., rail crossings, pedestrian/bicycle crossings).
   • The project improves safety through roadway access management (e.g., addition of a median, relocation of access points that are located too close to roadway intersections, removal of driveway access points, etc.).

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options – 10%
   • The project provides new on-street and/or off-street pedestrian and bicycle facilities or enhances existing facilities (e.g., widening bike lane, pedestrian crossing improvements, etc.).
   • The project is located on a bus route and will improve transit as well as motor vehicle operations.
   • The project includes a bus lane or other transit improvements (e.g., bus queue jump at intersection, transit signal priority) and/or amenities (e.g., bus stop improvements) to improve transit travel time, reliability, and/or attractiveness.

   • The project is consistent with regional land use policies and the community’s comprehensive plan.
   • The project is consistent with a local economic development/revitalization plan.
   • The project is located within or serves an existing or planned mixed-use or regional employment center.
   • The project is located within or serves and improves multi-modal accessibility and connectivity to a targeted infill/redevelopment area, such as a Tax Incremental District (TID).
   • The project incorporates context sensitive design that considers not only access for alternative modes of transportation, but also the environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historic, community, and preservation impacts of the street project.

---

1 All roadway projects must be consistent with the State of Wisconsin’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations law. The law requires the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities for projects receiving state or federal funds, with certain limited exemptions. See Subsection 84.01(35) of the Wisconsin Statutes and Chapter Trans 75 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code
7. **Timely Implementation and Complexity of Project – 10%**

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

8. **Cost Benefit – 10%**

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

9. **Environment, Public Health, and Environmental Justice – 10%**

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

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

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

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

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management – 15% (Capacity Expansion/New Facility Projects) and 5% (Vehicle/Facility Replacement Projects)
   - Level of existing congestion (for all transportation modes) in the affected corridor(s) and extent to which the project improves motor vehicle and/or transit travel times by providing transit improvements that increase its attractiveness. [Note: The level of traffic congestion will be measured based on the best data available, including volume-to-capacity ratio (using AAWT and planning level capacities in the regional travel model), intersection Level of Service during the peak periods, and congested travel speeds. Pedestrian/bicycle congestion affecting transit travel times will be based on available counts.]
   - The project provides or enables provision of additional transit capacity (e.g., through expansion of fleet) in corridors where demand for transit service routinely approaches or exceeds capacity during peak periods.
   - The project improves the operational performance/efficiency of existing transit route(s) (e.g., decrease in travel times, increase in on-time performance). Examples include transit runningway improvement such as addition of bus lane, consolidation of bus stops, relocation of bus stops from near-side of intersection to far-side, and construction of bus bulb-outs.
The project implements ITS strategies that improve the operational efficiency, attractiveness, or safety of transit service. Examples include transit signal priority, dynamic message signs that display real-time bus schedule information, smart phone-enabled customer information systems, fare collection systems, passenger counting systems, and other data and reporting mechanisms that make or can be used to make the transportation system more efficient.

4. Safety Enhancement – 10%
- The project identifies and addresses safety issues relating to reported transit vehicle crashes.
- The project reduces traffic conflicts between transit vehicles and other modes.
- The project addresses safety or security concerns that may not be reflected in crash rates or security incidents (e.g., installation of cameras at transit facilities or on buses).

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options – 15%
- The project includes transit runningway improvements (e.g., bus lane), or other transit improvements (e.g., in-lane bus stops, bus queue jump at intersection, transit signal priority) and/or amenities (e.g., Wi-fi on buses) that reduce transit travel times, improve on-time performance, and/or otherwise increase the attractiveness of transit and non-motorized transportation modes.
- The project purchases new vehicles that increase the attractiveness of transit.
- The project improves connections between transit and other modes of transportation (e.g., increases opportunities for bicycle storage on buses or at major bus stops/stations, park-and-ride lot/facility).
- The project enhances onboard passenger accommodations.
- The project enhances transfer station or bus stop facilities/amenities.

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

7. Timely Implementation – 10%
- The project has approval of the local policy body and a commitment of financial resources to provide the local matching funds (i.e., included in the approved capital budget).
- For vehicle purchase, the project is part of or can easily be incorporated into a bus procurement contract.
- Extent to which any necessary environmental review and documentation has been completed. Alternatively, the project has been categorically excluded from such requirement.
- For infrastructure projects, extent to which planning and preliminary engineering design work has been completed. Completion of preliminary design is not required, but project should be well beyond the conceptual level with some level of design work completed.
• For infrastructure projects, does the project involve a railroad crossing, real estate acquisition, or other issues that add complexity or potential delay? To what extent have these issues been identified and addressed? Projects must be implemented in a timely manner, and not face any significant political or logistical roadblocks from a preliminary view.
• The project was developed through multi-jurisdictional collaboration and/or successfully addresses unusually difficult planning/engineering issues.

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

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

E. Evaluation Criteria – Independent ITS Projects

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Use Transportation Alternatives Program criteria?