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

Madison Water Utility
119 E. Olin Avenue, Conference Rooms A-B
6:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of September 2, 2015 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Presentation on Proposed Design for the Lacy Road (City Hall to Syene Rd.) Reconstruction Project (City of Fitchburg Staff)

6. Resolution TPB No. 109 Adopting the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County
   • Addition/Correction Sheet, dated 9/30/15
   • STP Urban Project Priority Listings, dated 9/23/15
   • Section 5310 (Enhanced E/D Transportation) Program of Projects for 2016


8. Review and Recommendation of Draft 2016 MPO Budget

9. Presentation on the Metro Transit On Board Passenger Survey Results

10. Report on Dane County Transit Listening Sessions

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

12. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   • Transit Related Travel Model Improvements
   • Regional ITS Strategic Plan
   • Public Values Study
   • Regional Transportation Plan 2050
   • Dane County Bicycle Wayfinding Plan
   • 2016 Work Program

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

14. Adjournment
Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, November 4 at 6:30 p.m.**
Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Conference Rooms A-B

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

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

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

Por favor avísenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
September 2, 2015 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call
   - **Members present:** Mark Clear, Ken Golden, Chuck Kamp, Jerry Mandli (left after item #10), Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz (arrived during item #7), Chris Schmidt, Robin Schmidt
   - **Members absent:** David Ahrens, Jeff Gust, Steve King, Jason Kramar, Patrick Stern
   - **MPO Staff present:** Bill Schaefer, David Kanning
   - **Others present in an official capacity:** Steve Cyra, HNTB; Diane Paoni, WisDOT

2. Approval of August 5, 2015 Meeting Minutes
   Moved by Golden, seconded by Kamp, to approve the August 5, 2015 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications
   - Letter from City of Madison and City of Verona engineers withdrawing the application for STP-Urban funding for the CTH PD (CTH M to Nine Mound Rd.) capacity expansion project. Schaefer said the City of Verona plans to wait until adjacent land development occurs prior to reconstructing the roadway.
   - Letter from WisDOT approving TIP amendment #3 adopted by the Board at their last meeting.

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

5. Public Hearing on the Draft 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County
   Matano opened the hearing. No members of the public were in attendance. The hearing was closed.

6. Public Hearing on the Draft MPO Public Participation Plan
   Matano opened the hearing. No members of the public were in attendance. Matano closed the hearing.

7. Presentation on Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan (HNTB Staff, Project Consultant)
   Schaefer introduced Steve Cyra from HNTB. Cyra provided a PowerPoint presentation on the ITS plan scope, process, and draft project recommendations. He explained how ITS supports traffic management, real-time traveler information, traffic incident management, traffic and transit management/operations, and performance measurement. He described the purpose of the plan, and explained the process by which the plan has been developed. He reviewed the ITS plan vision, goals and objectives. He said the implementation chapter with the recommended strategies and projects was being finalized now. That would be reviewed with the project advisory committee. He explained the process for generating the draft project recommendations and provided examples of key recommended projects covering all of the strategies.

   R. Schmidt asked if the plan will address police and fire radio system inter-operability. Cyra said the plan will not specifically address this issue, but that ITS will help support communication between responders and also traffic management agencies. Golden asked how the ITS process will address travel demand management. Cyra said that users of the transportation system will be able to make travel adjustments based upon current travel demand information. Schaefer added that information on transit and vehicle time travel times will allow
people to potentially avoid peak congestion, use alternative routes, or take a different mode. ITS can also facilitate ridesharing. Also, historical travel information can be used to estimate when congested and non-congested time periods will occur. Board members asked about funding sources. Golden asked if the area might be eligible for Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ) program funding in the future. Schaefer said that Dane County has never been out of compliance with air quality standards and therefore isn’t currently eligible for funding. Depending upon the outcome of the new air quality standard setting process, it is possible Dane County could reach the threshold, but it is unlikely. Mandli mentioned the Clean Air Action Coalition that was established for a while to help ensure the region remained in compliance.

Cyra said that having a strategic plan will position the region to take advantage of federal funding opportunities for projects. The plan will also help the region prepare for emerging technologies, such as connected and autonomous vehicles. He said it is likely that funding for transportation systems management operations will be available in the future. Adopting and deploying a strategic plan will give Dane County a leg-up on securing future funding.

The Board discussed the recommendation for a system to provide parking location, availability, and pricing information to drivers. Schaefer mentioned that signs could be placed around the outer loop, which provides access to most of the city parking garages. Golden asked where the traffic operations center would be located, and who would operate it. Cyra said a lot of detailed planning will be needed prior to opening the center. The center would likely be operated out of the City of Madison Traffic Engineering office, but could include law enforcement or other responder agency employees. Golden asked how the center would be funded. Schaefer said that STP-Urban or local funding would be likely sources, possibly a federal grant. He noted that City of Madison Traffic Engineering operates almost all of the signals in the metropolitan area with suburban communities contracting with the city for signal operation and maintenance. Golden asked if other units of government who would benefit from the operations center would contribute to the local share. Cyra and Schaefer said some of the cost could be charged back to other units of government that benefit. R. Schmidt asked for clarification on “floating bicycle lanes”. Schaefer said the City of Madison currently has a floating bicycle lane on Doty Street due to the peak period parking restriction, and explained how it works. Schaefer said he believes the floating bicycle lane will be expanded as part of the Doty Street reconstruction project.

The Board discussed transit travel delay. Kamp said the most frequent comment made during the preparation of Metro Transit’s long-range plan seven years ago was the desire to reduce travel time. Cyra said he has worked on BRT transit signal priority projects in other parts of the country, and there are examples of where it works well. Schaefer said that intersection delay and boarding time are the most significant causes of delay for transit. Regarding the recommendation for a smart card for transit and parking, Kamp said that Metro met with six vendors before replacing their fare boxes. One vendor was from Japan and discussed how banks viewed transit as a vital way to travel and worked with transit agencies to allow use of one card for fares and to conduct monetary transactions. Schaefer noted that unfortunately Metro’s new fareboxes do not currently have the ability to communicate with the City’s new parking system. System compatibility might have been addressed had an ITS Plan previously been in place. Kamp said funding is an issue with technology competing with the need for buses and other basic capital needs. He said system compatibility technology is desired, but research is needed to determine how to purchase, implement, maintain and operate such a system. He added that technological enhancements, such as apps that provide estimated real-time arrival information, are transforming the transit business. Clear said that Chicago has already implemented a system that integrates public transit and parking. Kamp affirmed, and said a debit card that is integrated with your bank account can be used for transit fare and public parking purchases. Cyra said there are opportunities for integration of these systems in Madison. Schaefer added that bike-sharing is another travel mode that could be linked.

8. **Election of Officers**

   Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Kamp to nominate Al Matano as Chair. Moved by Opitz, seconded by Golden, to close nominations and cast unanimous ballot for Matano. Motion carried.
Moved by R. Schmidt to nominate Steve King as Vice Chair. Moved by Golden, seconded by R. Schmidt, to close nominations and cast a unanimous ballot for King. Motion carried.

9. Resolution TPB No. 107 Adopting the Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer reviewed a revised addition/revision document outlining the proposed changes to the Bicycle Transportation Plan. Schaefer said some changes were added were in response to recommendations made by the City of Madison Long Range Transportation Planning Committee and comments by Robbie Webber. He reviewed those additions along with the other significant changes. These included a recommendation to consider alternatives to trail fees for paths used for transportation purposes, a new recommendation to facilitate use of cargo bicycles used by businesses for making deliveries, and the addition of two paths identified as part of the Beltline study. In addition, some “best management practices” language was added regarding eliminating or minimizing impacts to environmentally sensitive areas from planned trails. This was in response to comments provided by CARPC staff.

Moved by Mandli, seconded by Golden, to adopt the resolution with the changes in the addition/revision sheet dated 9/2/15. Motion carried.

10. Review of Work Plan and Schedule for Regional Transportation Plan 2050

Schaefer said that the major staff effort will shift to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) now that the Bicycle and ITS Plans are being completed. He said the RTP must be completed by March 2017, but the schedule calls for completion by the end of next year. Schaefer summarized the work plan schedule and tasks. Public participation efforts include an interactive webpage, the public values survey, and three sets of meetings with the first in mid-November. A draft of the household, population, and employment forecasts to be used for travel modeling has been completed with some final refinements to be made based on the final CARPC urban service area employment forecasts and input from local planners and officials. Travel model work includes the work to be done by a consultant on the mode choice component of the travel demand model. The improvements are primarily needed for the next phase of the BRT study, but will also be useful for the RTP. The MPO will be able to use some of the modeling work that has been completed for the Beltline study. In terms of other analysis, Schaefer mentioned the new software acquired that allows calculation and mapping of accessibility to jobs and other destinations by different modes. Other tasks include a financial analysis since the plan must be fiscally constrained. He said a plan advisory committee will be set up. The MPO can also make use of the steering committee that CARPC is setting up for the values survey and regional visioning process.

Golden said the plan needs to include something about what local units of government have collectively planned for land use. Schaefer said the growth forecasts are based on local land use plans. MPO staff developed a composite map of local land use plans and met with and received feedback from local planners and officials in allocating the growth for the model. Golden asked if the composite land use plan would be included in the RTP, and Schaefer confirmed that it would be. Golden asked how inconsistencies in local land use plans along shared municipal borders would be addressed. Schaefer said in those few cases where there are inconsistencies the city or village plan has been used since development would likely occur upon annexation. Minihan commented that there are some land use plan conflicts between the Town of Dunn, Village of Oregon, Village of McFarland, City of Fitchburg, and City of Stoughton at common borders. Schaefer pointed out that local plans typically cover a much greater area than will be developed over the planning period. Control totals are used for allocating growth. Golden asked if local land use plans will be evaluated based upon their compatibility with the goals and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan. Schaefer said local plans are generally consistent with transportation related land use goals to one degree or another, but the MPO doesn’t have jurisdiction over land use. He said the MPO can participate in CARPC’s planned regional visioning and growth strategy development process. Revisions to growth assumptions and analysis of the impact can be made as part of that process with later revisions to the RTP if necessary.
Golden said that a serious consideration of land use is needed for the RTP, even though this is not a combined land use and transportation plan. He suggested that the plan address and explain issues like conflicting land uses. Schaefer noted that CARPC has developed land use plans through the FUDA process in which multiple municipalities were involved. One such plan was developed for the Middleton-Waunakee-Westport area. The draft growth forecasts reflect those plans. There are other areas where that process hasn’t taken place. Golden said that the City of Verona, the Town of Verona and the City of Madison likely have different visions for future development along their common borders. Golden asked how the results of the values survey will be reflected in the plan. Schaefer said the values survey will help lay the foundation for the planning process, starting with the goals.

Golden praised R. Schmidt for her leadership and work on the transit listening sessions, which had excellent attendance and well received. He suggested reserving a section of the RTP for visionary ideas even if they are beyond our ability to fund at this time. Schaefer said that the MPO will actively seek public input and can include “illustrative” projects.

11. Resolution TPB No. 108 Adopting the MPO Public Participation Plan

Schaefer said all MPOs are required to maintain and regularly update a documented Public Participation Plan. The plan focuses on the RTP and TIP public involvement processes, but applies to all planning efforts. The plan includes goals and strategies that will be used, including some the MPO has already started implementing such as the e-newsletter, Facebook page, and Spanish page on the website. Schaefer said he was open to comments and suggestions from the board. Golden said he understood the difficulty in engaging citizens in long-range transportation planning efforts, but the plan needs to describe the methods to be employed to reach certain populations, including low-income people and those with disabilities. It is important to go to them as they won’t show up at a public meeting, but we need to engage them if the plan is going to reflect what the public thinks. Golden suggested a supplemental effort to identify methods or strategies to addresses these issues. Schaefer said a variety of public participation opportunities will be provided for the RTP, including the public values survey being led by CARPC. Schaefer said that achieving high levels of public participation is more of a challenge for long-range planning compared to current planning. Kamp suggested developing a list of stakeholders to include in outreach efforts, and said Metro Transit staff would be happy to assist with public participation outreach efforts. He suggested sharing public participation event outcomes with the Wisconsin State Journal editorial board.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Golden, to adopt the plan with the one addition in the change/correction sheet dated September 2015. Motion carried.

12. Recommendation Regarding Appointment of MPO Board Representative to CARPC Steering Committee for the Public Values Survey and Development of Regional Vision and Growth Strategy

Moved by Minihan, seconded by Opitz, to recommend Robin Schmidt for appointment to the CARPC Steering Committee. Motion carried.

13. Report on Dane County Transit Subcommittee’s Transit Listening Sessions (Robin Schmidt, Chair, Transit Subcommittee)

R. Schmidt reported on the transit listening session, including format and level of attendance. Listening sessions were held in Middleton, DeForest, Sun Prairie, McFarland and Fitchburg. Attendance ranged from nearly 20 in DeForest to about 35 at the Fitchburg and Sun Prairie sessions. A brief presentation by MPO staff on current transit services was provided at each listening session followed by small group discussions. The small groups answered the following questions: What are the benefits of transit to you and your community? What are the transit needs? Should Dane County help support transit, and if so, how should it be funded?

R. Schmidt said attendees included local leaders, individuals interested in transit, and people who were frustrated at not having better transit options. She said she has written a draft report that summarizes the
information generated from each session and is currently working on a report that provides an overall summary of the sessions with key themes from each location. After the report is completed, the Transit Subcommittee will review and approve it. Copies will then be sent to the Dane County Public Works and Transportation Committee. The report will be used during this year’s and future county budget discussions to help determine how it can help support public transit in the greater metropolitan area. The board commended R. Schmidt on her work. Schaefer said he was impressed by the wide cross section of people who attended. R. Schmidt said that the meetings also attracted businesses, including the company that makes American Girl dolls.

Matano said that he organized a Committee of the Whole informational presentation on Metro Transit and BRT and before the last County Board meeting. Kamp and Mike Chehvala provided the presentation, which was very well received. Matano said he prepared a two-page document that summarizes bus rapid transit, and that he’d send it to the board members.

14. Status Report on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB

Schaefer said policy and technical advisory committee meetings for the Beltline study are scheduled for mid-September. An update from those meetings will be provided at the next policy board meeting. Matano added that Midvale/Verona Road has been closed at the Beltline for interchange construction.

15. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer said staff will present the findings of the Metro Transit on-board survey at the next policy board meeting. The City of Madison Common Council must adopt a resolution approving the consultant contract for improvements to the mode choice component of the travel demand model, but work will start after that.

Schaefer said four Section 5310 elderly/disabled transit grant applications were received before the August 31 deadline. Metro Transit and Dane County submitted applications to continue funding for their programs. The City of Sun Prairie submitted an application to purchase accessible vans for their shared ride taxi system. Colonial Club of Sun Prairie is requesting a bus to transport people to and from their facility. A committee made up of MPO staff and representatives from WisDOT Transit will review the applications. Staff has enough money to fund all of the projects if they meet program requirements.

Schaefer said that he will review the work program and budget at the next board meeting. The Regional Plan update is the most significant component of the work program.

16. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Matano mentioned that he is still interested in scheduling a meeting in a different community. Schaefer said that would be a good opportunity for public outreach on the RTP. The Board discussed various locations where the meeting could be held. Minihan said the Town of Dunn is completing restoration on the Dyreson Road-Yahara River bridge that was constructed in 1898. A horse-drawn vehicle will be the first to cross the bridge after it is completed this month or in early October. Members of the board will be notified when more details are known. Minihan discussed some of the archaeological and historical history near the site.

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, October 7, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

17. Adjournment

Moved by Golden, seconded by Opitz, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:41 PM.
September 21, 2015

Bill Schaefer, Transportation Planning Manager
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – An MPO
121 S. Pinckney St., #400
Madison, WI 53703

Dear Mr. Schaefer:

In July 2013 the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducted a review of the metropolitan transportation planning process carried out by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB), the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison, Wisconsin Urbanized Area.

The basis for this review lies in United States Code 23 USC § 134 and 49 U.S.C 5303 which requires a review of the transportation planning process for all urbanized areas with populations greater than 200,000 at least every four years. The objective of the certification review is to determine whether the metropolitan transportation planning process meets the Federal transportation planning requirements outlined in 23 CFR Part 450, and to assure an adequate process exists to ensure conformity of plans and programs to Federal air quality requirements in accordance with procedures contained in 50 CFR Part 51.

Based on the review conducted and ongoing oversight by FHWA and FTA, the Madison Area TPB metropolitan transportation planning process is certified as meeting the Federal transportation planning requirements. The final certification review report is forthcoming, and will document the evaluation of the MPO’s planning practices and include specific findings and recommendations based on the Federal requirements.

If you have any questions regarding the certification review process, please contact Dwight McComb (FHWA) at 608-829-7518 or Christopher Betch (FTA) at 312-353-3853.

Sincerely yours,

George R. Poitier
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

Sincerely yours,

Marisol R. Simón
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration

cc: Dwight McComb, FHWA
Christopher Betch, FTA
Re:
Presentation on the Proposed Design for the Lacy Road (City Hall to Syene Rd.) Reconstruction Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Comments on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Lacy Road reconstruction project has been approved for STP Urban funding by the MPO as part of the 2014-2018 program cycle. It is currently scheduled for construction in 2017. The City of Fitchburg has been working with its consultants on the design for the project, and has also been engaging the public in this process. The City of Fitchburg is currently proposing a cross-section that includes two 10-foot travel lanes, bike lanes, and a 10-foot shared-use path on the south side of the roadway. Sidewalk on the north side was originally proposed, but the city is now proposing to omit the sidewalk as a result of the public involvement process due to the impact on existing landscaping and mature trees along the road and other concerns. At the time of development of the vacant land located on the north side of Lacy Road, the City would require sidewalk to be constructed as part of those public improvements – or with development of that land – and begin to develop that pedestrian accommodation on the north side – especially in the areas that would benefit from it the most (adjacent to that newly developed area).

Because removal of the sidewalk from the project is a deviation from what the City originally proposed and would not be fully compliant with the MPO’s complete streets policy, MPO staff suggested that City of Fitchburg provide a presentation on the project to the board to explain the reasons for the change to the recommended typical cross-section. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Presented on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation is for informational purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 109 Adopting the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Staff Comments on Item:
Staff has prepared an Addition/Correction Sheet, dated 9/30/15, that lists proposed changes to the draft TIP along with a final STP Urban priority project listings table that reflects some minor changes to the one provided to the board at the last meeting. WisDOT agreed to allocate sufficient funding for this program cycle to cover the full estimated cost of all of the new projects in 2019 and 2020.

Most of the other changes are based on revisions to project costs and scheduling provided by WisDOT staff and those reflected in the City of Madison’s Executive Capital Budget. The sheet also includes the addition of a number of bicycle trail projects for which county PARC & Ride program funding has been requested. Decisions on projects that will be funded won’t be made by the county until later this year. Finally, the list includes the four projects for which Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility for E/D Persons) program funding is being proposed (see table and project descriptions).

The MPO’s Technical Coordinating Committee is meeting on September 30 to review and make a recommendation on approval of the draft TIP with the changes listed in the addition/correction sheet. There was not a quorum at the MPO’s Citizen Advisory Committee meeting.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 109 Adopting the 2016-2020 TIP
2. Addition/Correction Sheet dated 9/30/15
3. Draft STP Urban Priority Project Listings, dated 9/30/15
4. Section 5310 Program of Projects table and project descriptions

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends adoption of Resolution TPB No. 109 approving the draft TIP with the changes listed in the Addition/Correction Sheet dated 9/30/15.
Resolution TPB No.109

Adopting the 2016-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

WHEREAS, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) (23 U.S.C. 104, 134) and U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations (23 C.F.R. Parts 450 and 500, 49 C.F.R. Part 613) require that the designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for each urbanized area develop, in cooperation with the State, local officials, and any affected transit operator, a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the area for which it is designated; and

WHEREAS, MAP-21 and U.S. DOT regulations require that the TIP be updated at least once every two years and be approved by the designated metropolitan planning organization and the Governor1; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB) is the designated MPO for the Madison, Wisconsin Metropolitan Area with responsibilities to perform metropolitan transportation planning; and

WHEREAS, working with local units of government, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Metro Transit, and other implementing agencies, the MATPB has prepared a coordinated, comprehensive listing of transportation improvement projects proposed to be implemented over the next five years, including a priority list of proposed federally supported projects to be undertaken in 2016-2019; and

WHEREAS, this listing of capital and non-capital transportation improvement projects relates to all modes of surface transportation, including public transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, roadways, and other transportation improvements; and

WHEREAS, while official air quality non-attainment designations are not applicable in this region, the adopted Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update, Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County and Transportation Improvement Program continue to be consistent with the Wisconsin Air Quality State Implementation Plan to improve air quality in the area; and

WHEREAS, in developing the TIP, the MATPB has provided local officials, citizens, affected public agencies, private transit providers, and other interested parties with reasonable notice of and an opportunity to participate and comment on the proposed program, including holding a public hearing on the draft TIP on September 2; and

WHEREAS, the draft TIP has been published and made available for public review, including in an electronically accessible format on the MATPB’s Website; and

WHEREAS, the MATPB’s public involvement process for development of the TIP is also used by the City of Madison (Metro Transit) to satisfy the public participation requirements for development of the Program of Projects required under the Federal Transit Administration's Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATPB approves the 2016–2020 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, which incorporates the changes to the Draft TIP, dated August 2015, listed in the Addition/Change Sheet, dated September 30, 2015, and provides specific approval of the listed 2016-2019 projects, including the Priority Surface Transportation Program (STP)—Urban Projects for 2016-2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that project notification and review procedures (in accordance with the successor rules to the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95) are hereby being met, unless

---

1 The Governor has delegated TIP approval authority to the WisDOT Secretary.
otherwise specifically noted, for all 2016 through 2019 listed projects utilizing federal funding (many of which had earlier received favorable A-95 reviews);

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the MATPB and WisDOT agree that the first year of the TIP constitutes an “agreed to” list of projects for project selection purposes and no further project selection action is required for WisDOT or Metro Transit, the major transit operator, to proceed with federal funding commitment; and, even though a new TIP has been developed and approved by the MATPB, WisDOT can continue to seek federal funding commitment for projects in the previous TIP until a new State TIP (STIP) has been jointly approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA); and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that projects from the second, third, or fourth year of the TIP may be advanced by WisDOT or Metro Transit for federal funding commitment without further project selection action by the MPO, and concerning federal funding sources for projects in the TIP WisDOT may interchange eligible FHWA funding program sources without necessitating a TIP amendment, subject to the expedited project selection procedures outlined in the TIP; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that financial capacity assessment regulations have been met as set forth in UMTA Circular 7008.1, dated March 30, 1987, and financial capacity exists to undertake the programmed projects; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the MATPB certifies that the federal metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the metropolitan area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable federal requirements, including:

1. 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303, and this subpart;
2. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1) and 49 C.F.R. Part 21;
3. 49 U.S.C. 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Sections 1101(b) of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21 (Pub. L. 112-141) and 49 C.F.R. Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in U.S. DOT funded projects;
5. 23 C.F.R. Part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
7. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
8. 23 U.S.C. 324 regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and
9. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) and 49 C.F.R. 27 regarding discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the MATPB certifies that all of the listed federally funded and regionally significant projects in the TIP are consistent with the *Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update, Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County*, the adopted regional transportation plan, and additional sub-element plans incorporated as part of the plan.

____________________________   _________________________________
Date Adopted        Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
2016-2020
Transportation Improvement Program
For the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County Area
(Project costs in $000s)

ADDITION/CHANGE SHEET

STP-Urban Priority Projects

Page 7: **REVISE** the cost/funding and schedule for the STP-Urban projects as shown in the attached priority project listings table, dated September 30, 2015.

Parking Projects

Page 13: **DELETE** funding for the State Street Campus-Lake Street Parking Garage project.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

Page 18: **ADD** the following Madison-sponsored project:
State Street Improvements (700/800 Block), Add landscaping and public art. $500 (Const., M), $500 (Total) in 2016.

Page 19: **ADD** the following City of Stoughton-sponsored project for which Dane County PARC program funding is being sought: Amundson Park/Lower Yahara River Trail Extension.

**ADD** the following City of Sun Prairie-sponsored project for which Dane County PARC program funding is being sought: Windsor Street Trail.

Page 20: **ADD** the following Village of Cross Plains-sponsored project for which Dane County PARC program funding is being sought: Zander Park/Good Neighbor Trail.

**ADD** the following Village of McFarland-sponsored project for which Dane County PARC program funding is being sought: Lower Yahara River Trail Expansion

**ADD** the following Village of Shorewood Hills-sponsored project for which Dane County PARC program funding is being sought: University Avenue Trail Extension

Pedestrian/Bicycle Projects outside the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

Page 20: **ADD** the following Village of Belleville-sponsored project for which Dane County PARC program funding is being sought: Badger State Trail Link

**ADD** the following Village of Cambridge-sponsored project for which Dane County PARC program funding is being sought: Camrock Park to Glacial Drumlin Trail Link

**ADD** the following Village of Mazomanie-sponsored project for which Dane County PARC program funding is being sought: Lake Marion Trail

Transit Capital Projects

Page 21: **REVISE** the 2016 funding for D. Paratransit Eligibility & Mobility Coordinator Program (previously named Paratransit Eligibility Determinations & Path of Travel Supports) to add programmed federal funding as follows: $76 (Fed-Sec. 5310), $91 $19 (M), $91 $95 (Total).
REVISE the 2016 funding for Dane County’s Mobility Management Program to add programmed federal funding as follows: $136 (Fed-Sec. 5310), $169 $34(DC), $169 $170 (Total).

ADD the following project sponsored by Colonial Club of Sun Prairie: Accessible passenger bus to provide rides to older adults to the senior center for center services and activities; $43 (Fed-Sec. 5310), $11 (CC), $54 (Total) in 2016.

REVISE the 2016 funding for Sun Prairie’s accessible mini-van for its shared-ride taxi service operated by Running, Inc. to add programmed federal funding as follows: $26 (Fed-Sec. 5310), $38 $7 (SP), $38 $33 (Total).

Street/Roadway Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

Page 25: REVISE the schedule and funding for the S. Beltline (Yahara River Bridges) Bridge Deck Overlay project (TIP project #111-13-001), continuing preliminary engineering in 2019 and 2020, delaying construction from 2018-2020 to 2020-2021, and revising the construction funding as follows:
$4,400 (Fed-NHPP), $1,100 (State), $5,500 (Total) in 2019, $1,481 (Fed-NHPP), $370 (State), $1,851 (Total) in 2018 2020.

DELETE the W. Beltline (USH 12) (Airport Rd. to Parmenter Street) Reconstruction and Auxiliary Lane project.

Page 26: REVISE the schedule and funding for the Interstate 39/90 (South Beltline to Rock County Line) Reconstruction and Expansion project (TIP project #111-11-029), delaying completion of the project from 2021 to 2023, and revising the funding as follows:

Page 27: REVISE the schedule and funding for the Interstate 39/90/94 (STH 19 & CP Rail Overpass Structures), Replace Bridge Decks project (TIP project # 111-09-005), delaying completion from 2017 to 2018, and revising funding as follows:

REVISE the schedule for the Interstate 39/90/94 (River Road Bridge), Bridge Rehabilitation and Concrete Deck Overlay project (TIP project # 111-14-005), continuing Preliminary Engineering in 2018, delaying construction from 2018 to 2020, and revising the construction funding schedule as follows: $297 (Fed-NHPP), $32 (State), $329 (Total) in 2017 2019, $75 (State), $75 (Total) in 2018 2020.

REVISE the schedule and funding for the USH 14 (STH 138 to STH 92), Construct Four-Lane Divided Highway on New Alignment project (TIP project # 111-15-005), delaying construction completion from 2021 to 2023, and revising the funding as follows:
$1,000 (ROW, State), $1,000 (Total) in 2017 2018, $600 (ROW, State), $600 (Total) in 2019, $4,361 (Const., Fed-FLX), $1,090 (Const., State), $700 (ROW, State), $6,151 (Total) in 2019 2020, $3,335 (Const., Fed-FLX), $834 (Const., State), $4,169 (Total) in 2020.
Page 28: **REVISE** funding for the USH 18/151 (Verona Road) (Raymond Road to McKee Road/CTH PD), Reconstruction with new interchanges and pavement replacement/traffic signal upgrade project (TIP project #111-10-016), continuing preliminary engineering in 2016 and 2017, and revising construction funding as follows:

$7,619 $1,875 (Fed-NHPP), $15,957 $7,468 (State), $3,637 $3,740 (F), $27,213 $13,083 (Total) in 2016, $9,682 $5,692 (Fed-NHPP), $27,396 $22,994 (State), $190 $233 (F), $47,268 $28,919 (Total) in 2017, $3,724 (Fed-NHPP), $355 $15,249 (State), $355 $18,973 (Total) in 2018, $3,510 (Fed-NHPP), $14,038 (State), $17,548 (Total) in 2019.

**REVISE** the 2016 construction funding for the USH 51/Stoughton Road (Broadway Street to Milwaukee Street). Pavement Resurfacing project (TIP project #111-15-009) as follows: $4,178 $1,561 (Fed-NHPP), $295 $390 (State), $4,473 $1,951 (Total).

**REVISE** the schedule for the USH 51 (STH 138 Intersection) Recon;ect Intersection with Roundabout project (TIP project #111-10-011), continuing preliminary engineering in 2019, and moving construction funding from 2019 to 2020.

Page 29: **REVISE** the schedule for the USH 151 (Approximately 800 feet north of American Parkway) Dual Ramp Bridge Painting project (TIP project #111-14-007), continuing preliminary engineering in 2018 and 2019, and moving construction funding from 2018 to 2020.

**REVISE** the funding and schedule for the USH 151 (Main Street to CTH VV) Resurfacing and Bridge Deck Overlay project (TIP project #111-12-016), delaying construction from 2017 to 2018, and revising the construction funding as follows: $48 (Fed-NHPP), $12 (State), $60 (Total) in 2016, $9,328 $9,376 (Fed-NHPP), $2,332 2,344 (State), $11,660 11,720 (Total) in 2017.

**REVISE** the funding and schedule for the STH 19 (Broadway Drive Intersection) Reconstruction and Signal Upgrade project (TIP project #111-14-008), advancing ROW acquisition from 2017 to 2016, delaying construction from 2018 to 2019, and revising the construction funding as follows: $1,008 $1,331 (Fed-SAF MS30), $112 $148 (State), $1,120 $1,479 (Total) in 2018 2019.

**REVISE** the funding and schedule for the STH 19 (River Road to Interstate 39/90) Bridge Replacement project (TIP project #111-12-024), delaying ROW acquisition from 2016 to 2017, delaying construction from 2019 to 2020, and revising funding as follows: $5,058 $5,510 (Const., Fed-NHPP), $1,264 $1,377 (Const., State), $70 (UTIL, State), $6,392 $6,957 (Total) in 2018 2019.

Page 38: **REVISE** the scope, funding and schedule for the combined Monroe Street (Odana Rd. to Leonard Street) resurfacing project and Monroe Street (Leonard to Regent) reconstruction project sponsored by City of Madison, changing the project scope to a pavement repair project (Odana Rd. to Regent St.), advancing construction from 2017 to 2016, and revising the project cost as follows: $926 (PE, M), $200 (Const., M), $926 $200 (Total) in 2016, $9,520 (Const., M), $9,520 (Total) in 2017.

**Street/Roadway Projects outside of the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area**

Page 39: **REVISE** the schedule for the USH 14 (Walter Road to CTH KP) Reconstruction project, moving construction and utility funding from 2018 to 2020.
Page 47: **REVISE** the schedule for the USH 18/151 (W. County Line to Town Hall Road) Resurfacing project, continuing preliminary engineering in 2018, delaying construction from 2019 to 2020, and moving construction funding from 2018 to 2019.

Page 48: **REVISE** the schedule for the STH 69 (STH 92 to CTH D) Reconstruction project, continuing preliminary engineering in 2017 and moving construction funding from 2017 to 2018.

**REVISE** the schedule for the STH 134 (USH 12/18 to CTH O) Reconditioning project, continuing preliminary engineering in 2017 and moving construction funding from 2016 to 2018.

Page 50: **REVISE** the schedule for the Elder Lane (Maunesha River Bridge) Bridge Replacement project, continuing construction in 2016.
### Approved Priority Projects (2016-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Construction/Project Calendar Year</th>
<th>State Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent (Fed $)</th>
<th>Federal Funds Currently Approved (thousands)</th>
<th>Proposed Federal Funds (thousands)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO Rideshare Program</td>
<td>5992-08-20,30-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>Ongoing support per MPO policy. 3% annual increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Ped/Bike Safety Education Program</td>
<td>5992-08-29,33-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>$366</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$293</td>
<td>$293</td>
<td>Ongoing support per MPO policy. 3% annual increase. Includes 2019 funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit Bus Replacements (Up to 7)</td>
<td>5992-10-00</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>$3,690</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1,845</td>
<td>$1,845</td>
<td>Continuing project: 12 buses ($4,920 total cost) in 2015 (SFY 2016), 5 in 2016 ($2,050), 4 in 2017 ($1,640).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA JobRide Program Van Replacements (6)</td>
<td>5992-10-01</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>Continuing project: 3 vans in ($75) in 2015 (SFY 2016), 3 vans ($90) in 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH M (Cross Country Rd. to 2,500' N of CTH PD) AND CTH M (2,500' N of CTH PD to 1,000 S of Valley View Road)</td>
<td>5992-09-82</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$35,800</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$14,700</td>
<td>$17,451</td>
<td>With additional funding, still $449 short of 50% funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee Rd./CTH PD (Mariner Way to Maple Grove Rd.)</td>
<td>5992-09-31</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$13,485</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
<td>$6,405</td>
<td>Includes ped/bike overpass, but city may apply for TAP funding. Project $663 short of 50% funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacy Rd. (City Hall to Syene Rd.)</td>
<td>8483-00-11</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,854</td>
<td>Includes roundabout at Fahey Glen. Despite additional funding, still $139 short of 50% funding due to higher cost est.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Priority Projects (2019-2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Construction/Project Calendar Year</th>
<th>State Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent (Fed $)</th>
<th>Federal Funds Currently Approved (thousands)</th>
<th>Proposed Federal Funds (thousands)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO Rideshare Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>Ongoing support per MPO policy. 3% annual increase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Ped/Bike Safety Education Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>Ongoing support per MPO policy. 3% annual increase. Includes 2021 funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Johnson St. (Baldwin St. to First St.) Phase 2</td>
<td>5992-09-14</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$4,370</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$2,622</td>
<td>$2,622</td>
<td>Advanceable to FY 2018 if funding becomes available due to project let savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee Rd./CTH PD (Commerse Park Dr to Seminole Hwy.)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$5,809</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,485</td>
<td>$3,485</td>
<td>To be coordinated w/Verona Rd/CTH PD interch project. Includes ped/bike underpass for Badger State Trail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Point Rd. (US 12 to Highland Rd.)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,330</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$798</td>
<td>$798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood Ave. (Fair Oaks Ave. to Walter St.) Phase 1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$5,360</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,216</td>
<td>$3,216</td>
<td>Phase 1 of project. Includes ped/bike path, bridge over Starkweather Creek, and ped/bike crossing imp. a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Grove Rd./CTH BB (North Star Dr to Sprecher Rd)</td>
<td>5992-09-26</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$5,750</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
<td>To be coordinated w/I-39/90 bridge project, if possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Candidate Future Projects (2021-2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Construction/Project Calendar Year</th>
<th>State Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent (Fed $)</th>
<th>Federal Funds Currently Approved (thousands)</th>
<th>Proposed Federal Funds (thousands)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant View Rd. (USH 14 to Greenway Blvd.) Phase 1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$17,120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$14,229</td>
<td>$14,229</td>
<td>MPO conditional commitment to funding pending progress on design work in 2015-'16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood Ave. (Walter St. to Cottage Grove Rd.) Phase 2</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$3,432</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,432</td>
<td>$3,432</td>
<td>MPO conditional commitment to funding pending progress on design work for both project phases in 2015-'16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Point Rd./CTH S (Pleasant View Rd. to Veritas Dr.)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$5,360</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$5,360</td>
<td>$5,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haspel Dr. (USH 61 to I-39/90)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprecher Rd. (Milwaukee St. to CTH T)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL of $15.5 million estimated to be available for this program cycle.
### Section 5310 Program of Projects for the Madison Urbanized Area - 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Service Area Urban/Rural</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Description/ALI</th>
<th>FTA Amount</th>
<th>Local Amount</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Coordination Plan</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison - Metro Transit</td>
<td>Madison Area</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>DR Capital</td>
<td>Paratransit Eligibility and Mobility Coordinator Program</td>
<td>$75,600</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Department of Human Services</td>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>LG Capital</td>
<td>One-Call Center and Mobility Training</td>
<td>$136,300</td>
<td>$34,397</td>
<td>$170,697</td>
<td>32, 34, 37</td>
<td>14f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sun Prairie</td>
<td>Sun Prairie</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>LG Capital</td>
<td>Minivan - Rear Entry (4/2)</td>
<td>$26,400</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Club</td>
<td>Sun Prairie</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>PNP Capital</td>
<td>Medium Bus - Gas (11/2)</td>
<td>$43,200</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
<td>14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison - Metro Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR Grant Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,579</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$309,079</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,697</strong></td>
<td><strong>$379,776</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category A Projects** - Certified as having met federal requirements and approved for funding.

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

---

1 DR - Direct Recipient, PNP - Private Non-Profit, LG - Local Government, PO - Private Operator receiving indirect funds

2 Project type defined in FTA C 9070.1G:
   - 12 - Administration expenses
   - 14a - Rolling stock and related activities (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14b - Passenger facilities (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14c - Support facilities and equipment (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14d - Lease of equipment (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14e - Acquisition of transportation services under a contract, lease, or other arrangement, including user-side subsidies (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 14f - Support for mobility management and coordination programs (meeting the 55% requirement)
   - 15a - Public transportation projects (capital and operating) planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities
   - 15b - Public transportation projects that exceed the requirements of the ADA
   - 15c - Public transportation projects that improve access to fixed route service and decrease reliance by individuals with disabilities on ADA complementary paratransit service
   - 15d - Alternatives to public transportation that assist seniors and individuals with disabilities with transportation

All projects are within Dane County, Madison, WI; Wisconsin Congressional District 2; and consistent with the [2013 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County](#).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>Metro Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Paratransit Eligibility and Mobility Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project funds one full-time Paratransit Eligibility and Mobility Coordinator (PED & MC) staff position. PED & MC duties include: conduct in-person ADA paratransit eligibility determinations (IPAs) and transit orientations (TOs); refer candidates for travel training (TTRs) to Dane County’s Bus Buddy program and follow up; and field work performing path-of-travel assessments (PTAs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>Dane County Department of Human Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>One-Call Center and Mobility Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project has three components:

1. The Call Center (CC) is staffed by certified mobility managers and provides information to callers about services covering all available transportation modes including public transit, human services transportation and volunteer driver programs, vehicle purchase and repair loans, and ride-sharing. Services provided by the CC include personalized identification of transportation options based on program-specific eligibility criteria; introduction and detailed referral to public transit, individual and group ride services; eligibility determination and ride authorization for specialized transportation; enrollment in mobility training programs; and follow-up assistance in maintaining mobility.

2. The Travel Training (TT) program is staffed by certified occupational therapists to provide instruction in the skills necessary to access fixed-route transit service to individuals who are currently or potentially eligible for paratransit. If the client successfully migrates a minimum number of trips from paratransit to fixed-route, Metro Transit provides a no-cost transit pass.

3. The Bus Buddy (BB) program utilizes qualified volunteers to train and accompany passengers on fixed-route public transit to familiarize them with the service. The BB program also offers group transit-familiarization trips that include training on using Metro Transit maps, timetables, and website. Participants receive a 10-ride senior/disabled fare card upon completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subrecipient:</th>
<th>City of Sun Prairie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Minivan – Rear Entry (4/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Sun Prairie offers a share-ride taxi program open to the residents of Sun Prairie through a contract with Running, Inc. The City of Sun Prairie currently owns 3 accessible vehicles and leases them to Running Inc. The ridership of seniors and people with disabilities has increased steadily, with continued growth predicted. This wheelchair-accessible minivan replaces an existing vehicle to improve the availability to service to seniors and people with disabilities.
Colonial Club is a senior center in northeast Dane County that has been providing activities and services to adults over the age of 55 since 1969. The mission is to enhance the well being and independence of older adults. All programs and services have a shared goal to keep people in their own homes for as long as safely possible. In addition to on-site congregate meals, they provide home-delivered meals to residents in Sun Prairie, Cottage Grove, Deerfield, Marshall, Medina, Bristol, and Burke. The center also provides an adult day center, a supportive home care program, case management, transportation services, and social, educational, and recreational opportunities in collaboration with a variety of local organizations. The minibus will support the continued provision of rides for participants of these activities.
Re:

Staff Comments on Item:
A draft of the 2016 Unified Planning Work Program has been prepared and will be made available to all local units of government within the MPO planning area and appropriate agencies, committees, and commissions for review and comment. MPO staff met with WisDOT Central Office and Southwest Region Office staff and FHWA staff on September 24 to review and discuss the draft work program. The draft document reflects their comments.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. [Draft 2016 Work Program Report](#)

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Informational at this time. Action by the Board is expected at the November 4 meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re:</th>
<th>Review and Recommendation of Proposed Draft 2016 MPO Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Comments on Item:</strong></td>
<td>The overall budget for 2016 is slightly less than in 2015. There is an increase in staff costs of $88,700 due to having an additional transportation planner for the full year and step and cost of living increases for existing staff. This is offset by a reduction in supplies and purchased services. Purchased services includes consulting services (travel modeling support), travel data, and computer software. A new office lease was negotiated, which provided savings of almost $10,000. Anticipated carryover funding for travel data and software is not included in the 2016 budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials Presented on Item:</strong></td>
<td>Table reflecting the estimated budgets for 2015 and 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</strong></td>
<td>Recommend Draft 2016 Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITY OF MADISON PLANNING DIVISION

Transportation Planning Services

Draft (9/9/15) MPO Version (2.5% COL increase)

### Purchased Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Regular</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Equip. Repairs &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contracts (Software, etc.)</td>
<td>25,751</td>
<td>13,520</td>
<td>MPO share of cost; WisDOT now contracting agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Rental</td>
<td>51,512</td>
<td>42,804</td>
<td>New lease w/ negotiated lower rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Travel</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services General</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising (Hearing notices, jobs, misc.)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising - T.V./Radio (Ridesharing)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>MPO share is $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Modeling assistance, RTP website, travel data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretors</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>AMPO membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Purchased Services:** 243,638 2015 157,849 2016

### Supplies/Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Office Supplies</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription &amp; Books</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction Copier/Fast Copy</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Greater use of electronic documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Equipment (File cabinet, chair, etc.)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Chair, desk in 2015 for new office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Supplies</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Consolidated computer costs into one line item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers &amp; Computing Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Software</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Publications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Covered under 55130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Supplies/Equipment:** 12,875 2015 9,200 2016

### Inter-departmental Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMB Charges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting/Comptroller</td>
<td>17,870</td>
<td>17,870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Fund Inter-D</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Comp</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Inter-departmental Charges:** 20,840 2015 20,840 2016

### Fixed Asset Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plotter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fixed Asset Expenditures:** 0 2015 0 2016

### Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>FTE 2015</th>
<th>FTE 2016</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>FTE inc. from new MPO planner being on staff for full year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (33.14%)</td>
<td>191,299</td>
<td>213,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Benefits (11.34%)</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>776,896</strong></td>
<td><strong>865,558</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total:** 1,054,249 2015 1,053,447 2016

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>1,054,249</td>
<td>1,053,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Billings/Revenues</td>
<td>$910,586</td>
<td>$898,337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>$143,663</td>
<td>$155,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumed Cash Budget for City of Madison:** 143,663 2015 155,110 2016

**Minimum match required for federal and state grants:** 154,761 2015 155,361 2016

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Year 2015</th>
<th>Year 2015</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA Section 5303</td>
<td>$727,926</td>
<td>$724,781</td>
<td>Includes $20,55K carryover PL $ for staff, excludes carryover $ for consultant services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT Match</td>
<td>$47,020</td>
<td>$48,392</td>
<td>Includes $1,37K carryover for staff, excludes carryover $ for consultant services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Match</td>
<td>$134,961</td>
<td>$134,961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$909,907</strong></td>
<td><strong>$908,134</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP Urban Rideshare</td>
<td>$79,200</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Match</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$102,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare Advertising</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>TDM agency partners share of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT Rideshare License Reimbursement</td>
<td>$12,876</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>WisDOT now pays and bills MPO for 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area NPC</td>
<td>$9,701</td>
<td>$9,701</td>
<td>MPO PL contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Support (Fitchburg, McFarland, Monona, Middleton)</td>
<td>$16,863</td>
<td>$16,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,564</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal &amp; State</td>
<td>$854,146</td>
<td>$854,773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Match</td>
<td>$154,761</td>
<td>$155,361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$56,440</td>
<td>$43,564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,065,347</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,053,698</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Totals</td>
<td>$1,065,347</td>
<td>$1,053,698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interagency Revenues</td>
<td>$910,586</td>
<td>$898,337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re:
Presentation on the Metro Transit On-Board Passenger Survey Results

**Staff Comments on Item:**

The MPO led a project to hire a consultant to conduct a survey of Metro Transit passengers. The survey provided information on passenger origin/destination and boarding/alighting locations, mode of access, transfers, trip purpose, fare category, demographics, and opinions on Metro. The results will be used to update the mode choice and transit components of the MPO’s regional travel model needed for further Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) planning. They will also be helpful for general service planning and for Title VI planning. The consultant has provided a final draft database and draft survey report. MPO staff is still in the process of reviewing and correcting some of the survey records, but preliminary results are now available.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. PowerPoint presentation slides on the Metro Transit survey results

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

For informational purposes only.
Metro Transit On-Board Survey

Spring 2015
Project Background

- On-board surveys generally completed every five years
  - Last survey was done in 2008
- To be used for updating mode choice component of travel demand model
  - Needed for BRT planning
- Assists Metro with Title VI planning
- Data used for general planning purposes and information
Project Details

- Project led by Cambridge Systematics
  - Dikita hired as sub-consultant
  - Assistance from UW TOPS lab

- Conducted February through April 2015
  - Avoided spring break and other holidays

- Routes 1-75
  - Did not include UW circulator routes, supplemental school day service, or paratransit

- Weekdays 6:00 am to 9:00 pm

- Sample of trips distributed throughout the day
Improvements to 2008 Survey

- Span expanded to 9:00 pm
- Use of tablet personal interviews on select trips
- College/university question added
- Spreadsheet tool to easily filter and cross-tabulate results
- Web application to trouble-shoot records
Survey Methods

- **Tablet Personal Interview**
  - Individuals randomly approached
    + More accurate data, reduced bias
    - Expensive and time consuming, problems on crowded buses, lack of paper trail makes for more difficult error checking
    1,874 valid surveys

- **Paper Survey**
  - Pen and paper handed to everyone onboard
    + More surveys for lower cost, better in crowded conditions
    - Some sampling bias according to FTA, some incomplete or questionable data
    4,028 valid surveys
Survey Methods

- On-to-off survey
  - Card only, no questions
  - Near 100% compliance
- Boarding/alighting counts
  - Manual counts
- Used for survey expansion
Tablet Personal Interview

Where did you BOARD route 2-WT or 2-NT?

2-WT - E MIFFLIN & N PINCKNEY (WB)
2-WT - W MIFFLIN & N CARROLL (WB)
2-WT - STATE & W DAYTON (WB)
2-WT - STATE & W JOHNSON (WB)
2-WT - STATE & W GORHAM (WB)
2-WT - W GORHAM & N BASSETT (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & N FRANCES (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & N LAKE (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & N PARK (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & N MILLS (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & N ORCHARD (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & N RANDALL (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & N BREEZE (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & PRINCETON (WB)
2-WT - UNIV AVE & FOREST (WB)

The board location is not in this list. I want to enter it by:

- Intersection
- Landmark

Wisconsin DMV - Hill Farms
4802 Sheboygan Avenue

City: Madison
St: WI
Zip: 53705
PAPER SURVEY

Dear Rider,

Thank you for taking the time to answer questions about your bus ride experience and how you use the service. The information you provide is very important and will be used to improve connections to bus service in the future. If possible, please complete this survey on the bus and attach it to the survey box. If you are unable to do so, please complete the survey as soon as possible and return it to the mailing label visible and stamp it into any available USB. You may also scan the QR code at the end of this survey or go to the following website to complete the survey: www.311.org/2073 and scan.

1. What is the ROUTE NUMBER?
2. What time did you get on this ROUTE?
3. Where did you BEGIN this one-way trip?
4. How would you describe the FRMT bus stop at the beginning of this trip?
5. Did you transfer or change to another ROUTE at any point?
6. At what bus stop did you get on this ROUTE?
7. What is your age?
8. What is your gender?
9. Are you employed?
10. Do you have a valid driver’s license?

WHAT DO YOU THINK?
Circle HOW YOU RATE Metro service overall.
1. Cleanliness of bus
2. Residential safety rating
3. Personal safety at bus stops
4. Delays at bus stops
5. Convenience of service
6. Driver courtesy
7. Time waiting for bus
8. Time on route
9. Cost of bus service
10. Overall satisfaction

Comments on Metro service:

Please provide your e-mail address if you would like to participate in future Metro Transit research studies. Your e-mail information will be kept confidential.

Limit space. Please refer to mailing label and save securely.
Information Collected

- Origin, boarding and alighting locations, destination
- Mode of access (walk, bike, drive, etc.)
- Route, transfers, trip purpose, etc.
- Fare category (cash, pass, 10-ride card, etc.)
- Demographics (age, race, income, etc.)
- Opinions and comments on Metro Transit
Survey Expansion

- 5,914 surveys expanded to represent weekday ridership of about 45,000 unlinked trips (boardings)

- Weights for each survey based on:
  - Flows between groups of bus stops
    From on-to-off survey
  - Bus stop boardings and alightings
    From boarding/alighting counts
  - Route/direction/time-of-day
    From on-to-off survey and boarding/alighting counts
Survey Expansion

- Boarding weights
  - Designed to reflect actual daily boardings, matching farebox records

- Trip weights
  - Account for transfers
  - Take into account likely interline transfers
  - Rides with transfers in theory have a higher likelihood of being surveyed, but also a higher likelihood of being surveyed multiple times and refusing
Trip Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB Work</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB University</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB School</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB Medical</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB Shop</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB Social</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB Other</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Home Based</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB: Home Based
Boarding weighted estimates
Trip Purpose, Peak Periods

- HB Work: 55.8%
- HB University: 16.2%
- Other: 28.0%

Trip Purpose, Off Peak

- HB Work: 29.7%
- HB University: 26.4%
- Other: 43.9%

Boarding weighted estimates
Transit Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit Access, Car is Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fare Type

- No answer: 1.8%
- Cash: 9.2%
- Pass: 60.5%
- 10-Ride: 6.8%
- 31-Day: 10.9%
- 31-Day Low Income: 3.8%
- EZ Rider: 3.0%
- Other: 4.0%

Boarding weighted estimates
Fare Type *

Cash: 13.8%
Pass: 41.8%
Other/NA: 44.5%

Fare Type, HH Income < $35K *

Cash: 17.0%
Pass: 29.4%
Other/NA: 53.5%

*Not including college/university students
Trip weighted estimates
Number of Transfers *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Transfers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Transfers - Minorities *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Transfers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trip weighted estimates
*Not including college/university students
Frequency of Use

No answer: 2.7%
Less than once per week: 9.5%
1-2 per week: 12.7%
3-4 per week: 23.4%
5+ per week: 51.7%
Household Income *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15K</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-35K</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-50K</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75K</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100K</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100K or more</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not including college/university students
Boarding weighted estimates
*Not including college/university students or no-answers for HH income
Geography

- **Origin** – **Boarding** – **Alighting** – **Destination**
- Geocoding and data cleaning currently in progress by MPO staff
- Calibration of regional travel model
Metro Transit On-Board Survey

Mike Cechvala
mcechvala@cityofmadison.com
608 266-4518
### Re:
Report on Dane County Transit Listening Sessions

### Staff Comments on Item:
The Dane County Transit Subcommittee, with support from the MPO and Metro Transit, hosted a series of transit listening sessions in five suburban communities. The sessions included a facilitated discussion on how transit would benefit the community, the most important transit needs, and funding sources the county should consider if the county were to contribute to transit funding. A report was prepared summarizing the comments received. The subcommittee approved the report, and discussed principles that should guide the county in considering its role in transit, specific facilities and services the county might support, and funding sources to consider. A summary of the report from the listening sessions and the minutes from the subcommittee discussion are attached.

### Materials Presented on Item:
1. Report Summary from the listening sessions
2. Minutes from 9-21-15 County Transit Subcommittee discussing the report

### Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For informational purposes only.
Dane County Transit Listening Sessions

Report to the Dane County Public Works and Transportation Committee

September 2015

Background:
The Dane County Transit Subcommittee, with support from the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Metro Transit, recently hosted a series of Transit Listening Sessions in 5 transit “corridors” throughout the greater metropolitan area. Local elected officials, transit-related committees, interest groups and the public were invited to participate in these sessions. The local newspapers each helped announce the listening sessions. The 5 sessions (and number of participants) included:

- Monona/McFarland/Stoughton (31)
- Sun Prairie/East Madison (36)
- DeForest/Waunakee/Westport/Windsor (18)
- Middleton/Cross Plains/Springfield Corners (26)
- Fitchburg/Oregon/Verona (33)

At each listening session, staff from the MPO presented a transit primer to the audience, who sat at tables in groups of 5 – 6 persons/table. At the conclusion of the presentation, a designated “table host” at each table facilitated discussion by the participants on three questions:

1. How does or could public transit benefit you and/or your community?
2. What do you think are the most important public transit needs in your community?
3. With respect to transit funding:
   a. What transit service(s), equipment and/or facilities should the county consider funding?
   b. What new or existing sources of funds should the county consider using if they decide to contribute to transit funding?

Each comment was noted by the facilitator for inclusion in Attachment 1: Transit Listening Session Summary. In addition, after each table discussed these questions for approximately 45 minutes, the table host reported out to the whole group the highlights of their discussion. This information is presented to the Dane County Public Works and Transportation Committee for future consideration.

Highlights
The following highlights summarize areas where there were similar suggestions at multiple tables and locations. In addition, several unique ideas for the Public Works and Transportation Committee to consider are also noted below.

1. Benefits of Transit:
Many comments revolved around the environmental benefits (global warming, dependency on oil, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions), the benefits to those who cannot drive (seniors, disabled, youth), the benefits of not having to drive (multi-tasking/working/reading while commuting, connecting workers to jobs, increased economic activity along areas served by transit and reduced congestion), and cost savings of car ownership, for maintenance, insurance and other associated costs for single or multiple car ownership.
2. **Transit Needs:**
There were many transit needs identified, many specific to the transit corridors associated with each session. Some of the common themes included:

- Increased routes/frequency of buses
- Greater travel speeds to get to your location
- Intermodal connections – bus/bike/etc.
- More park and ride facilities to help outlying areas connect with Madison
- Integrated/Regional Transit Authority – for funding and coordination the system as a whole
- Greater service to seniors for medical appointments, groceries, library and social connectivity
- Access to employers during off-peak times
- Access to the airport
- Bus Rapid Transit

3. **Funding**
There were many creative ideas for ways to fund transit needs in Dane County. Almost all recognized that to increase transit services would mean increased costs to the community. Options for how to pay can be categorized three ways:

- private/public partnerships (employee based);
- tax increases using existing authorities (vehicle registration fees);
- tax increases where existing authority does not exist (sales tax; gas tax)
- seek additional federal funding; and
- innovative fees/taxes for which statutory authority would need to be established prior to being implemented (“sin tax”, soda tax).

**Corridor-specific highlights:**

1. **McFarland/Monona/Stoughton**
Participants noted the lack of medical facilities in these communities and the access to medical facilities is a problem for those who cannot drive. In addition, in this corridor, McFarland serves as a “pass-through” community and as such, a park and ride facility in McFarland would not only serve residents from McFarland, but from Stoughton as well. There was discussion of McFarland serving as a transit hub instead of a choke point for commuters to Madison. The participants also noted the need for “express service” to make the commuter bus a faster way to get to Madison central rather than driving. Multi-modal transit needs came up often as well – connecting people with bikes/buses so that they can access bike trails as well as buses. Lastly, circulator routes within McFarland were also discussed.

2. **Sun Prairie/East Madison**
Themes that resulted from discussions at this listening session include the need for private/public partnerships to work together, especially in areas of new development (Costco/Cabela’s/Marcus Cinema/Woodman’s). A circulator route within Sun Prairie was also discussed as a way to let younger students get to various places within Sun Prairie. There was general agreement that the shared-ride taxi was too expensive and not a viable option for many who were on limited incomes. Many noted that the lack of information about the shared-ride taxi resulted in lower participation. Connections to Madison were noted, including links to the BRT system once it is further developed.

3. **Deforest/Waunakee/Westport/Windsor**
Participants in this session noted that it was not likely that there would be great community support for a bus line to run to DeForest. However, they did note that a park and ride and/or other linkage to Metro Transit would be used. Commuter vans seemed to be better options for the demographics and needs within these communities. It was noted that there is limited access to taxi’s within this
community for going to medical appointments, especially for elderly individuals, and that the assisted living facilities had their own transportation available to their residents for some travel/shopping opportunities.

4. Middleton/Cross Plains/Springfield Corners
Middleton highlights included the need for reverse commuter options, as many facilities in Middleton rely on workers from the greater Madison area. The lack of frequency of service was highlighted as a concern (including Sunday service). In addition, the need for circulator service was also noted by participants. Connection to the BRT system was raised as a need, to ensure timely transfers to the greater Madison area. The participants also noted the rail line as a potentially viable option for moving people from the Middleton area to downtown Madison.

5. Fitchburg/Oregon/Verona
Participants at the Fitchburg listening session noted that while several areas of Fitchburg are served by Metro Transit, they are isolated from the other parts for which there is no service. Transit along the east-west corridor of Fitchburg is non-existent, and transit to public facilities is lacking in frequency and geographic area within the greater Fitchburg community. Participants from Oregon and Brooklyn noted either very limited or no connections to transit services for the greater Madison area. They noted that transit needed to be cross-jurisdictional in terms of access and routes. Several noted that there is no taxi service in Oregon and connections to the greater Madison area are needed for those who are without vehicles.

Conclusion:
The Transit Subcommittee believes that the participants in these listening sessions brought forth benefits, needs and funding options for the County to consider when assessing their role in supporting transit in the County.

Each of the transit corridors had a mixture of representation including local elected officials as well as citizens and business leaders and unique ideas/options for enhancing the transit system in the greater Madison area. The overwhelming conclusion is that the County should support transit in both monetary and perhaps in a coordinative way.

The details presented in Attachment 1 should help drive County discussions during the upcoming budget cycle as well as beyond.

The Transit Subcommittee hopes this report helps move the county forward in supporting transit in a meaningful way in the future.
A. Call To Order

Staff Present: Dave Trowbridge (City of Madison), Bill Schaefer (MPO) and Drew Beck (Metro Transit)
Public Present: Bruce Wilson (Madison Area Bus Advocates) and Don Ferber (Four Lakes Sierra Club)

Present: 4 - KEN GOLDEN, ROBIN SCHMIDT, JERRY DERR, and STEVE HINIKER

Excused: 6 - MATT VELDRAN, KYLE RICHMOND, DELORA NEWTON, CHUCK KAMP, CARL DUROCHER, and JON HOCHKAMMER

B. Consideration of Minutes

1. 2015 MIN-328 MINUTES FROM PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION TRANSIT COMMITTEE-AUGUST 5, 2015

Attachments: 2015 MIN-328

A motion was made by SCHMIDT, seconded by HINIKER, that the Minutes be approved. The motion carried by a voice vote. 3-0 (Jerry DERR abstained)

C. Action Items

1. 2015 ACT-234 TRANSIT LISTENING SESSION REPORT

Attachments: 2015 ACT-234

Supervisor Schmidt gave an overview of report as drafted and sought comments/asked for other needed clarifications to the report. One edit was suggested to specify “lack of Sunday transit service” in the section summarizing the Middleton area discussion. A motion was made by HINIKER, seconded by DERR, that the Action Item be approved unanimously with edit on item 4 Middleton to say "lack of Sunday transit service." The motion carried by a voice vote. 4-0.
Discussion: Could Dane County help to provide services or capital assistances? Or does Dane County have funding resources to use toward this project?

Ken Golden facilitated a discussion on three areas, to further refine the information obtained during the transit listening sessions. The group did not discuss for the purpose of reaching consensus, but rather brought their individual expertise/perspective to the information already gathered from the listening sessions:

- The philosophical principals on the county role in transit
- Specific transit needs the county could support
- Funding sources the county could consider

Philosophy/broader Vision discussion:

- Getting the public to know transportation funding is important but a big job;
- Look at both long range and short range issues. Long range - a lot of planning going on in the city (Madison in Motion, etc.), and MPO is doing a long range transportation plan – County efforts need to mesh with the groups already working on these issues;
- Continue to engage the communities from the listening session and beyond to confirm need and who is ready to get on board;
- Be sure to have transit integrated with land use planning, etc;
- Costs are being incurred now and we should quantify those so we can help balance out costs;
- Funding is going to be an issue with communities, whatever is proposed needs to be fair and equitable system,
- There is also a statewide discussion on funding transportation going on through the Transportation Development Association which will be addressing funding – can’t continue to borrow for transportation infrastructure;
- Need to separate out capital and operating funds/expenditures,
- Don’t leave Madison out of the picture just because Madison robustly funds transit already;
- Need to address vulnerable populations - isolated, disabilities, under-represented;
- County should be guided by environmental considerations - look for ways to accomplish vehicle trip reduction;
- County needs to think of roads and transit together.
- Certain fairness to having the county be the ideal overseer for all given the regional nature of transit/transportation;
- Whatever the county does, it needs to fit in/dovetail with other efforts and not duplicate efforts;
- Focus on transit, although transit does interact with roads - but this needs to strengthen the region - that’s a major issue with the current system (cities vs cities, etc.);
- We don’t have the tools to do what's necessary in terms of coordinated/integrated regional transit;
- Too much property tax money is being spent on roads and we are short changing communities for roads and transit.
- Focus on transit but keep in mind about how it fits in with roads.
- Funds collected for transit should not be funding roads, but should focus this on transit - fundamentally wrong to pay for roads when we pay a gas tax;
- Transit is a resource issue – we’re way past our ability to meet current needs, let alone future needs;
- Need to be sure that communities that have already invested in transit aren’t penalized for their investments;
- Leveraging is important from state level important and want to leverage available funding;
- incentivize local municipalities that work together;
- This is really about shared values - economic opportunities, environment, this is
important for many and how do our efforts play a role in these shared values and invest
in the region and not competing for tax base and jobs;
• Groups are working with the state DOT about transportation funding – it’s a
resource issue and how to share those resources;
• MPO funds can’t be used for operating, only for capital;
• County would need a process for setting priorities

Specific transit needs the county could support

• Park and Ride facilities
  □ Facilitating longer distance travel - park and ride facilities, parking lots, garages
  Ensure park and ride facilities are in area where there is already existing bus service
  □ Need to intercept commuters and incentivize ridership – park and ride facilities can help with this;
  □ Support further evaluation of park and ride facilities;
  □ DOT has park and ride ideas for them funding along a state route. Work with DOT on those locations;
  □ Park and ride needs to have express service associated with it;
  Prioritize funding working with Metro transit;
  □ Owl Creek neighborhood is good example of where you could put a park and ride to serve Stoughton/McFarland; increased ridership could justify greater service to this area of lower income/more transit dependent residents.
• Support capital projects in concert with Metro because borrowing for capital projects is not constrained by levy limits
• Support a cooperative governance approach to transit with the county taking the lead
  □ County could fund a metro area transit forum
  □ Vet regional discussion
  □ Educate public on transit/transportation costs
  □ Bring local community leaders together to identify transit project/discuss transit needs;
  □ Have shared governance;
  □ Create integrated transit system with the county a part of it
• Establish cost-share funds as incentives for municipalities and others to support regional transit
  □ Shared ride taxI - study to see role it might play for some areas and populations;
  □ County buy vans with direct service to parking stressed areas;
  □ County established Vanpool, modeled after the program run by state; County could provide free parking; ridership fees pay for cost of vehicles;
• Need to focus on where the demand is now for various projects, where there is community support for - use data and build support;
  □ Partnerships with businesses/support millenial workforce
  □ Partnerships with businesses/support non-traditional workers
• Bus storage and maintenance - the county could provide capital funds for the Metro bus garage if grant doesn't come through;
• Health care is one driver of transit needs – especially for the elderly
  □ partnerships and transit focused on meeting senior needs;
  □ Incentivize businesses and retirement centers where planning or have mass transit;
• County could use AEC campus as park and ride and partner with Metro for a circulator route between the AEC campus and downtown/UW campus;
• The county could join with Metro and pay a percentage of expanded service anywhere (with-in and outside of Madison), in a way that lets communities gradually get fully vetted in transit (reduce the initial costs but with assurance that partnership would continue with declining percentage over a number of years to help municipalities phase in expanded transit.
Funding sources the county could consider:

• County could set aside capitol funds for transit, similar to the SMART fund for Sustainability, that would be competitively awarded to capitol transit projects
• Take a small, fixed % of county road budget (currently $5 million) and specify those funds be used for transit-related capital projects – then increase the road budget back to the $5 million – holding harmless the road budget;
• Longer term - Use the increased increment of county revenues along BRT route calculated and devote to transit
• Future funding/state authority needed: local sales tax option, local optional gas tax
• Vehicle Registration Fee – if kept modest and dedicated to transit/transportation projects and sunset with state RTA authority

Caution: Don’t tax ourselves locally to solve the state’s transportation problem - ok if done as an offset, but the state needs to honor their commitment to road infrastructure throughout the state
• Ken Golden referred to the paper he wrote when the transit subcommittee was first formed (attached but not discussed in detail by the subcommittee during this meeting).

D. Presentations

E. Reports to Committee

F. Future Meeting Items and Dates

G. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda

H. Such Other Business as Allowed by Law

I. Adjourn

Minutes respectfully submitted by Robin SCHMIDT

A motion was made by HINIKER, seconded by DERR, that the information discussed above by the Transit Subcommittee be forward with the Final Transit Listening Session Report to the Public Works Highway and Transportation committee at their October 6, 2015 meeting be approved. The motion carried by a voice vote unanimously.4-0.