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

February 6, 2013
Madison Water Utility
119 E. Olin Avenue, Room A-B
7 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of January 16, 2013 Meeting Minutes
3. Communications
4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)
7. Resolution TPB No. 71 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter Into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for CARPC to Provide Year 2040 Population and Employment Projections by Urban Service Area Utilizing Pass-Through Funding from WisDOT and Approving an Amendment to the 2013 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget Adding this Funding and Activity
8. Consideration of Potentially Submitting Letter of Interest to Apply for Funding to Utilize INVEST, the FHWA Sustainable Highways Self-Evaluation Tool
9. Update on Transit Corridor (BRT) Study and Related Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Market Study
10. Brief Presentation on Scope of Work for South Capitol TOD District Planning Study
12. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Other Projects 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
13. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   - 2013-2017 Transit Development Plan
   - Transit Corridor (BRT) Study
   - Metro Bus Size Study
   - Designation of New MPO Urban and Planning Areas
   - Public Participation Plan Update
   - MPO Funding and Contracting Issues
14. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings
15. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

   Wednesday, March 6 at 7 p.m.
If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations to access this meeting, contact the Planning & Development Dept. at (608) 266-4635 or TTY/TEXTNET (866) 704-2318. Please do so at least 48 hours prior to the meeting so that proper arrangements can be made.

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

Por favor avisenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)  
January 16, 2013 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

   Members present: Mark Clear, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Jerry Mandli, Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Robin Schmidt

   Members absent: Ken Dahl, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Paul Lawrence, Chris Schmidt

   MPO Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

2. Approval of November 7, 2012 Meeting Minutes

   Moved by Minihan, seconded by R. Schmidt, to approve the November 7, 2012 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

   - Letter from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) staff on behalf of USDOT approving the Madison Area TPB (MPO) Work Program. [In packet]
   - Letter from WisDOT also approving the MPO Work Program and FHWA and WisDOT funding for 2013, also referencing the MPO’s FTA and STP-Urban funding. [Handed out]

   Schaefer noted that the FTA funding is approved later in the year.

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

   None

5. Resolution TPB No. 70 Regarding Amendment #1 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area and Dane County

   Schaefer said the requested TIP amendment included minor changes to a number of projects, mostly relatively small changes in cost/funding or the schedule. For a couple projects, the scope was modified. The only new projects were three minor WisDOT projects for signing and pavement marking on various state highways. Schaefer noted the project changes were listed on the agenda and in the resolution. The attached project listings provide more detailed information. Some of project revisions could have been handled by a simple administrative modification, but were included in the amendment since that was already being processed.

   Matano lamented the delay in the Lower Yahara River Trail Phase 1 project. Schaefer said construction would start in 2014, but now not finish until 2015. Minihan provided some historical information on the Dyerson Road Bridge (over the Yahara River). The project to replace the bridge is being delayed to 2014 or 2015. He said the reason for the delay was the bids came in very high due to the uncertainty about the cost given the type of structure. R. Schmidt asked if there was a common reason for delays in projects. Schaefer said he didn’t think so. There are many reasons for project delays, including environmental or real estate acquisition issues, changes in the scope of the project, budget issues, and others. Mandli mentioned archaeological investigations as another reason for delays. Matano said he thought the delay for the bicycle trail project was engineering issues as it is a challenging project close to the rail corridor with a new bridge over Mud Lake.

   Moved by Kamp, seconded by Opitz, to approve Resolution TPB No. 70 Regarding Amendment #1 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Area & Dane County. Motion carried.
6. Presentation on Service Change and Other Recommendations in the Draft 2013-2017 Transit Development Plan

Schaefer said the draft Transit Development Plan (TDP) report was almost finished. A preliminary draft report and executive summary were reviewed with the TDP committee at its last meeting. A revised executive summary incorporating comments from the committee was handed out. Schaefer reviewed the summary, which explains the scope of the TDP, lists goals that guided the TDP, mentions some of the significant issues facing the transit system, provides background information on current transit services and Metro costs and revenues, and highlights some of the key recommendations. One of the key issues addressed besides improvements to the fixed-route system is bus stop spacing in the central Madison area. An analysis was done of bus stop spacing and the TDP recommends Metro implement a stop consolidation program. It is pointed out that implementation of all or most of the service change recommendations within the 5+ year period would likely require a new funding source. The TDP is adopted by both the City of Madison as the major transit operator and the MPO. The complete draft report will be distributed to the MPO Board before the next meeting for approval to release for public comment. The city approval process will be initiated then as well. The schedule calls for city approval in late March and MPO approval in early April.

Cechvala reviewed some of the more significant recommendations in the full draft report. Under Facilities Development, recommendations included developing a more comprehensive bus stop inventory and using that to help prioritize improvements. He elaborated on the bus stop consolidation recommendation. Schaefer pointed out that the timing of the issue was good with the planned Johnson Street reconstruction project where this could be implemented. Stops enhancements, including curb extensions, could be used to offset the negative reaction of closing some stops. Matano suggested re-ordering the recommendations in that section to correspond with the presentation and Cechvala agreed. Opitz suggested including the addition of real-time information to additional high ridership stops to the recommendation on improving schedule information and moving that to Passenger Information and Marketing. It was agreed to do so. Kamp said Metro has received requests for real-time bus arrival times on the UW campus even though most of the students have smart phones. Longer range planning recommendations included increasing the capacity of the bus garage, planning for implementation of all of the service change recommendations within the 5+ year period would likely require a new funding source. The TDP is adopted by both the City of Madison as the major transit operator and the MPO. The complete draft report will be distributed to the MPO Board before the next meeting for approval to release for public comment. The city approval process will be initiated then as well. The schedule calls for city approval in late March and MPO approval in early April.

Cechvala reviewed some of the more significant recommendations in the full draft report. Under Facilities Development, recommendations included developing a more comprehensive bus stop inventory and using that to help prioritize improvements. He elaborated on the bus stop consolidation recommendation. Schaefer pointed out that the timing of the issue was good with the planned Johnson Street reconstruction project where this could be implemented. Stops enhancements, including curb extensions, could be used to offset the negative reaction of closing some stops. Matano suggested re-ordering the recommendations in that section to correspond with the presentation and Cechvala agreed. Opitz suggested including the addition of real-time information to additional high ridership stops to the recommendation on improving schedule information and moving that to Passenger Information and Marketing. It was agreed to do so. Kamp said Metro has received requests for real-time bus arrival times on the UW campus even though most of the students have smart phones. Longer range planning recommendations included increasing the capacity of the bus garage, planning for implementation of all of the service change recommendations within the 5+ year period would likely require a new funding source. The TDP is adopted by both the City of Madison as the major transit operator and the MPO. The complete draft report will be distributed to the MPO Board before the next meeting for approval to release for public comment. The city approval process will be initiated then as well. The schedule calls for city approval in late March and MPO approval in early April.

Cechvala finished reviewing the general recommendations, which included continuing efforts to reach agreement on a new finance and governance structure, such as an RTA, for regional transit service. Kamp mentioned that all of Metro’s peer systems that are used by WisDOT for comparison purposes are either regional transit authorities or regional transit districts. The current structure of a municipal system contracting with local partners requires spending much time on micro-budget issues. Having a regional funding structure encourages regional planning and regional operations coordination. Cechvala reviewed some of the specific service improvement recommendations. He said the proposed suburban commuter express service routes were refined, working with local staff. Other recommendations included establishing an express stop pattern for commuter routes on East Washington and University Avenue and improving service frequency between the West Transfer Point and the Square. Matano asked about the division of labor between the MPO and Metro, noting the specific nature of the service recommendations. Schaefer said the MPO is the lead agency on the TDP, but works closely with Metro staff. The TDP provides the framework and then Metro uses that as a guide for making decisions on annual service changes. This TDP also provides an excellent framework for an RTA plan if another RTA is created. Kamp agreed, noting that when the former RTA was meeting there was a desire for summary information, but also a desire for information on specific route improvements that would
be implemented if the RTA was funded. Schaefer mentioned that an appendix will be included with more detailed information on the service recommendations. Kamp commented on how much Metro staff enjoyed working with MPO staff on the TDP and the good working relationship. Mandli mentioned that the Wisconsin Commission on Transportation Policy and Finance report recommends passage of RTA enabling legislation. One of the reasons was the many comments from young people who wanted more transportation options.

7. Update on Designation of 2010 Adjusted Madison Urban Area and MPO Planning Area Boundaries

Schaefer said MPO staff had worked with WisDOT staff to develop a preliminary draft map of the new 2010 urban area and MPO planning area boundaries, and staff was in the process of getting feedback from local staff. After each decennial census, MPOs are responsible for working with the state and local officials to set new boundaries for the urban area and planning area. The planning area boundary is the area within which the federal metropolitan transportation planning requirements apply. For example, federally funded projects must be in the MPO long-range transportation plan and approved by the MPO for inclusion in the TIP. The urban area boundary must include the census-defined urbanized area, but expands on that to smooth out irregular boundary lines, provide for continuity of transportation routes, and include areas expected to develop in the next ten years. The urban area boundary has significance for transportation planning and funding. It affects the functional classification of roadways and their eligibility for federal funding. For example, projects must be in the urban area to be eligible for STP-Urban funding. Therefore, it is advantageous to include potential collector streets in the developed area and planned collectors in developing areas.

Schaefer said that WisDOT drafted some guidelines for setting the urban area boundaries. One of them was to generally include all of an incorporated area with limited exceptions – Fitchburg as a former town being one exception. Another was to maintain continuity of streets in either being in or out of the urban area, but not going back and forth. As a result of these and other guidelines the proposed urban area is fairly large and does include some areas that probably won’t develop even in ten years. He reviewed some specific examples such as the CTH T corridor. Mandli commented that by being in the urban area he thought roadway projects would be required to follow a more strict design standard. Schaefer said the higher design standard and more involved environmental review process applied if there was federal funding regardless of whether the project was in the urban area.

Schaefer said the planning area was set to include areas anticipated to develop within the 20+ year planning period and important transportation routes. He pointed out that the Village of Oregon is shown as a potential addition to the planning area even though the village isn’t in the urban area. He said it made sense from a planning perspective to include Oregon because the boundary is so close and Stoughton is in. However, projects in Oregon wouldn’t be eligible for STP-Urban funding. If included, the village would have a voice in representation on the MPO Board. Clear asked if the village had an opinion, and Schaefer said he didn’t know, but would be contacting village staff and officials to see. Opitz commented that if Oregon were added it would make sense to include all of the City of Fitchburg. Schaefer agreed. He said the boundaries were drawn using census geography for ease of data collection. The planning area uses traffic analysis zones, which follow census geography and major roadways.

Kamp asked if staff could calculate the increase in acreage in the 2010 urbanized area compared to the 2000 area and also the percentage of the urbanized area that is served by Metro or another transit system. He also asked for information on the number of new municipalities that were either in or partially in the new proposed planning area. Schaefer said that information could be provided.

Schaefer said the map would be reviewed with the MPO technical committee, and a revised version would be presented to the board at the next meeting for approval to release for comment and review. Action on the boundaries would then be scheduled for March. The map would then be sent to WisDOT and FHWA for their approval. After that the functional classification of the roadways will be updated.
8. Update on Transit Corridor (BRT) Study and Related TOD Market Study

Schaefer said the consultant team was in the process preparing the cost and ridership estimates and other information. MPO staff has been working with them on things such as the bus operating plan and transit signal priority analysis. Preliminary results will be presented to the study committee on January 31. Complete results will be presented to the committee and to the MPO Board on March 6. A second public information meeting is scheduled for April 11 and the final report would be finished later that month. Schaefer handed out and reviewed with the board an informal outline of the report. The report would be 40-60 pages with technical appendices. The goal of the document is to provide objective information to the public and decision-makers about the feasibility of BRT and identify next steps for further dialogue and planning and potential implementation of a starter line. It will be pointed out that the system studied is a long-range plan and wouldn’t be built all at once.

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

Schaefer said he didn’t have much to report on the EIS studies. The Stoughton Road study was the one moving along pretty quickly with development of revised improvement alternatives for different segments of the corridor. A public meeting would be scheduled in the next couple of months and he said he’d arrange a presentation to the MPO Board at one of the next couple of meetings.

10. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer mentioned that the Metro bus size study was getting started. MPO staff was providing information to the consultant that had been selected. A kickoff meeting of the study committee was scheduled for the following week. Other items had either been covered or there wasn’t anything new to report.

11. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

R. Schmidt announced that the next meeting of the new County Transit Subcommittee was scheduled for January 23, and the focus of the meeting would be to discuss the current funding structure for transit.

Schaefer announced that a new planner/travel modeler had been hired. His name was David Kanning and he had a land use planning background, but was shifting to transportation planning and was in the process of obtaining a master’s degree in Engineering. He said Jill Replinger, the staff graphic designer/planning technician, was retiring February 1 and so that position would need to be filled.

The next meeting will be held February 6, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

12. Adjournment

Moved by King, seconded by Clear, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 PM.
January 23, 2013

George R. Poirier  Marisol Simon
Division Administrator  Regional Administrator
Federal Highway Administration  Federal Transit Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation  U.S. Department of Transportation
525 Junction Rd. Suite 8000  200 W. Adams Street, Suite 2410
Madison, Wisconsin 53717  Chicago, Illinois 60606-5232

Dear Mr. Poirier and Ms. Simon:

Under the authority delegated to me by Governor Scott Walker, I am hereby approving the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County. The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) will reflect by reference the 2013-2016 federal aid projects covered by this approval in our 2013-2016 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) subject to the understandings I have indicated below.

The TIP, which was adopted by the Madison TPB in Resolution TPB Number 66 on October 3, 2012, represents a cooperative effort between the MPO, local communities, the Madison transit operator, and WisDOT, and is designed to meet the objectives and recommendations of the 2035 regional transportation system plan. A copy of the resolution approving the TIP is attached.

Based on our review, we believe that the TIP fulfills the federal transportation and planning requirements (Title 23 USC 134 and 135 and their implementing regulations 23 CFR 450 as amended by MAP-21, SAFETEA-LU, ISTEA and TEA-21) with respect to the inclusion of: 1) a four-year priority list of projects; 2) a financial plan that reflects federal, state and local resources that are reasonably expected to be available during this program period; and 3) both transit and highway projects to be funded with Federal Transit Act and Title 23 funds. In addition, opportunities for public review and comment on the proposed TIP were provided through a public meeting and one legal notice requesting citizen input and comments on the TIP.
In accordance with 23 CFR 450.334, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) hereby certifies that the metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the State and its urbanized areas, and is being carried out in accordance with the following requirements:

(1) 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135, 49 U.S.C. 5303 and 5304, and this part;
(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d–1) and 49 CFR 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) (P.L. 112-141), and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the US DOT funded projects;
(5) 23 CFR part 230, regarding implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
(7) In non-attainment and maintenance areas, sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506 (c) and (d)) and 40 CFR part 93;
(8) 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;
(9) Section 324 of title 23 U.S.C., regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and

I look forward to your timely action on this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mark Gottlieb, P.E.
Secretary

cc: William Schaefer, MPO
    Dwight McComb, FHWA
    Alexis Kuklenski, FHWA
    Chris Betch, FTA
    Jeff Gust, WisDOT Southwest Region
    Sandy Beaupré, WisDOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
Mr Schaefer
My name is Ron Wolfe. I am interested in efforts to encourage development and use of public transit in South-central WI. I was disappointed that precious efforts to form a RTA set boundaries that were the same as those of the MPO. I have come to realize that a majority of people, especially career politicians do not think long term when it comes to transit and see no need to include communities that are not contiguous to Madison in any "regional" plan.
I assume, therefore, that when the time comes to restart serious negotiations about regional transit, the same decision will be made to exclude areas outside the MPO. My problem is that I live in a development just west of the MPO boundary along HWY 12. I see the new MPO map extends west to encompass the village Cross Plains extending along Otto Kerl rd to K. Is there some reason that it goes back through Ashton to Hwy 12 rather than going up CR P to Springfield Corners?
I live in the Hickory Highlands sub division SW of the intersection of HWY 12 and Kickaboo Rd.
I am current President of the ProRail organization and I am involved in efforts to get the city to consider an area bounded by W.Washington, Bedford st, Frances St and the RR tracks for future development as a multimodal terminal that would serve the county as well as the city of Madison.
Living outside the MPO does not exactly make me irrelevant, but it does limit my eligibility to serve on committees that influence decisions related to regional public transit.

Is there any possibility of including the Hickory Highlands sub division in the MPO?

Ron Wolfe
Sent from my iPad
Re:
Consideration of Release of Draft 2010 Adjusted Madison Urban Area and MPO Planning Area Boundary Map for Public Review and Comment

Staff Comments on Item:
Federal law requires that MPOs and State and local officials cooperatively set new urban area and planning area boundaries following the decennial Census and release of the Census-defined urbanized areas. These boundaries must then be submitted to the State and FHWA for approval. MPO staff reviewed the important transportation planning and funding implications of the boundaries at the last meeting.

MPO staff worked with WisDOT staff to put together a preliminary draft map of the proposed 2010 Madison urban area and MPO planning area boundaries, which was reviewed with the MPO Board at its last meeting. Since then staff has reviewed the map with the MPO technical committee and has been working with local staff to incorporate their comments (e.g., on areas likely to develop in the next 10 years). A revised map has been prepared reflecting comments received to date. A meeting has been set up with Village of Oregon staff and officials to talk with them about the issue of including Oregon in the planning area.

Staff is seeking approval of the Board to release the draft map for public review and comment at this time. Further changes will be considered based on any additional comments received. Because Oregon staff and officials have yet to weigh in on the issue of including the village in the planning area, it is proposed that the Oregon area be shown as a potential addition in the draft to be sent out for review. Alternatively, the Board could wait until the March meeting to release the draft map with action then expected at the April meeting. However, that is the latest date for the Board to approve the new boundaries as WisDOT and FHWA need to approve the map (following MPO approval) by May.

Chuck Kamp requested data on the Census urbanized area, which is provided below. Also, attached please find two tables with information on the 2010 population by municipality within the proposed MPO planning area (one without and one with the Oregon area addition).

Census Urbanized Area (UA) and Population
2000: 120 square miles and 327,800 population
2010: 158 square miles and 401,700 population

Number/Percent of UA Persons within Metro and Monona Transit Service Area: 241,300 (60%)
Additional Number/Percent of Persons within Sun Prairie & Stoughton Taxi Service Area: 41,700 (10%)

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Revised draft map of the 2010 adjusted Madison urban area and MPO planning area boundaries
2. Tables with 2010 Census population by municipality within the proposed MPO planning area boundary

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Approve draft map of 2010 Madison urban area and MPO planning area boundaries for review and comment.
# 2010 Census Population of the DRAFT Metropolitan Planning Area w/o Oregon Addition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Population Within Planning Area</th>
<th>% of Population Within Planning Area</th>
<th>% of Total Planning Area Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Madison</td>
<td>233,209</td>
<td>233,209</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fitchburg</td>
<td>25,260</td>
<td>25,203</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Middleton</td>
<td>17,442</td>
<td>17,442</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Monona</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stoughton</td>
<td>12,611</td>
<td>12,611</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sun Prairie</td>
<td>29,364</td>
<td>29,364</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Verona</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Cities Total</td>
<td>102,829</td>
<td>102,772</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Cottage Grove</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Cross Plains</strong></td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. DeForest</strong></td>
<td>8,936</td>
<td>8,936</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Maple Bluff</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. McFarland</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Shorewood Hills</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Waunakee</td>
<td>12,097</td>
<td>12,097</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages Total</td>
<td>41,449</td>
<td>41,449</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Berry</strong></td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Blooming Grove</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Bristol</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Burke</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Cottage Grove</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>3,173</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Cross Plains</strong></td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Dunkirk</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Dunn</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Madison</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Middleton</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Pleasant Springs</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Rutland</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Springfield</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sun Prairie</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Verona</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Vienna</strong></td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Westport</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Windsor</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>4,853</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns Total</td>
<td>58,310</td>
<td>46,028</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for MPO Planning Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>423,458</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # of Municipalities: 32 (New ones vs. 2000 in bold)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Population Within Planning Area</th>
<th>% of Population Within Planning Area</th>
<th>% of Total Planning Area Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Madison</td>
<td>233,209</td>
<td>233,209</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fitchburg</td>
<td>25,260</td>
<td>25,260</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Middleton</td>
<td>17,442</td>
<td>17,442</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Monona</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stoughton</td>
<td>12,611</td>
<td>12,611</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sun Prairie</td>
<td>29,364</td>
<td>29,364</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Verona</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Cities Total</td>
<td>102,829</td>
<td>102,829</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Cottage Grove</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Cross Plains</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DeForest</td>
<td>8,936</td>
<td>8,936</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Maple Bluff</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. McFarland</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Oregon</td>
<td>9,231</td>
<td>9,231</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Shorewood Hills</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Waunakee</td>
<td>12,097</td>
<td>12,097</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages Total</td>
<td>50,680</td>
<td>50,680</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Berry</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Blooming Grove</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Bristol</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Burke</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Cottage Grove</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>3,173</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Cross Plains</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Dunkirk</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Dunn</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Madison</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Middleton</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Oregon</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Pleasant Springs</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Rutland</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Springfield</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sun Prairie</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Verona</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Vienna</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Westport</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Windsor</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>4,853</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns Total</td>
<td>61,494</td>
<td>47,815</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for MPO Planning Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>434,533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # of Municipalities: 34 (New ones vs. 2000 in bold)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Comments on Item:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Transit Development Plan (TDP) is a five-year strategic plan designed to identify the near-term future direction of the transit system. The MPO is responsible for preparing the TDP with assistance from Metro Transit staff. The TDP is intended to guide the planning activities, service and facility improvements, and budgets of Metro Transit and other transit providers. The focus of the TDP is on fixed-route service improvements, but the TDP also covers other issues such as vehicle acquisition and other capital improvements, marketing and customer information programs, paratransit service, and the coordination of transit and land use planning. The TDP is developed within the overall framework of the long-range regional transportation plan and is adopted by the MPO. The TDP is also adopted by the City of Madison as the major transit operator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO staff provided a presentation on the recommendations in the draft TDP report at the last MPO Board meeting and also reviewed a preliminary draft of the Executive Summary. MPO staff has finished a complete draft of the report incorporating all comments received to date, including some comments made at the 1/11/13 TDP Review Group meeting and those made at the last board meeting. MPO staff is now ready to initiate the process for public review and comment and adoption by the City of Madison and the MPO. City approval will occur first so MPO action isn’t anticipated until the April meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials Presented on Item:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A link to the Final Draft TDP Report will be sent out Friday or Monday before the meeting.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The Transit Development Plan (TDP) is a short- to medium-range strategic plan intended to identify transit needs and proposed improvements for a five-year planning horizon. The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for developing and maintaining the TDP. The MPO works in cooperation with the City of Madison – Metro Transit (Metro) and other transit providers, funding partners, and jurisdictions in the Madison area. The TDP is developed within the overall framework of the long-range regional transportation plan. The TDP recommendations are approved by the MPO and the City of Madison as the major transit operator.

The following goals were developed to guide preparation of the TDP and ongoing service planning:

1. Meet people’s daily mobility needs.
2. Increase transit ridership to manage congestion in constrained travel corridors.
3. Increase transit’s mode share to achieve sustainability goals and reduce climate change.
4. Provide cost efficient and effective transit service.
5. Provide reliable transit service that is convenient, comfortable, and affordable.
6. Provide for the safety and security of transit passengers, operators, and facilities.
7. Maximize connections to other transportation modes, including intercity rail and bus lines.
8. Provide transportation that is accessible to all.
9. Support land use development that maximizes the safety and efficiency of the transportation system.

Metro Transit’s ridership increased 30% between 2005 and 2011, while annual service hours increased only 5% from 364,500 to 383,100. This ridership increase is a positive development; however, overloading and crowded buses have become a problem during peak periods and occasionally at other times. Metro’s bus storage and maintenance facility on East Washington Avenue has reached its capacity and expanding the bus fleet to provide additional service is impossible without expanding storage space. Another continuing challenge is the need to provide new service or faster, more effective service to growing peripheral employment centers and neighborhoods and suburban communities. Funding is a major challenge, given the lack of a dedicated funding source for transit, reduced state operating assistance, reduced federal capital funding, and tight local budgets. Many of the service recommendations in this TDP will not be possible without a new funding source and/or the state covering the share of operating costs it did in the 1990s. The TDP makes recommendations intended to address these issues and other service and capital needs in order to continue to maintain, improve, and expand transit in the Madison region.

Key TDP study areas include:

- Fixed Route Service Improvements

A detailed analysis of Metro’s operating characteristics and ridership patterns was completed. This information is useful to determine where and how riders are using the system as well as how it is performing. The results are new, updated Transit Service Planning/Design Guidelines and Performance Standards as well as a set of recommendations for potential service changes and expansions. These recommendations range from immediate service changes moving towards implementation to longer term concepts to address needs of the system.
Bus Stop Spacing

Many of Madison’s transit corridors (Johnson and Gorham Streets, Jenifer Street, Monroe Street) have bus stops every block – this condition has not substantially changed since these corridors were served by streetcars in the early twentieth century. While closely spaced bus stops are convenient for riders in these corridors, they result in delay for all riders along the line. A bus stop consolidation program is recommended to achieve a more balanced approach to bus stop placement while meeting the needs of riders with mobility limitations and maintaining or providing stops near high ridership generating land uses.

Besides the TDP, there are several other ongoing studies related to public transportation. The TDP references these studies and to the extent possible incorporates their findings and recommendations. These include the Metro Maintenance Facility study, Bus Rapid Transit study, Metro Bus Size study, and an update to the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County. Other related studies to be initiated in 2013 include planning for a new inter-city bus terminal and the City of Madison’s Transportation Master Plan.

Summary of Current Transit Services

Metro Transit, which is owned by the City of Madison, is the major operator, providing fixed-route and paratransit service. Metro operates under the oversight of the Mayor of Madison, the Common Council, and the city’s Transit and Parking Commission. Metro Transit contracts with other communities, UW-Madison, and the Madison Metropolitan School District to provide service. Some other communities, including Monona, Stoughton, and Sun Prairie, provide transit or shared-ride taxi service available to the general public.

Metro Transit Fixed-Route – In 2011, Metro operated 61 regular fixed-route bus routes – 17 full time, 9 weekday only, 18 peak only, 6 mid-day only, 6 weekend only, and 5 campus circulators. In addition, it provides supplemental school service targeted towards middle- and high-school students.

Metro’s fixed-route transit service is grouped into four categories: core routes, peripheral routes, commuter routes, and circulator routes. Core routes, like Metro Routes 2, 4, and 6 operate at relatively high frequencies throughout the day and connect transfer points. Peripheral routes like Routes 13 and 32 provide service coverage and connect neighborhoods. Commuter routes like Routes 38 and 75 provide weekday peak-period service from residential areas to education and employment centers – primarily UW-Madison and the Madison CBD. Circulator routes like Routes 10 and 80 operate shorter routes within the geographical confines of major activity centers, or between an activity center and a nearby residential area.

Metro has four major transfer points, which were opened in July 1998 to implement Metro’s route restructuring that decentralized the system, which was previously centered on transfers at the Capitol Square. A fifth minor transfer point was added in the City of Middleton in 2007 as part of the service restructuring in that community. The transfer point system substantially reduces travel times in outer Madison neighborhoods by providing cross-town service and eliminating many arduous transfers at the Capitol Square. Most routes continue to be oriented to serve the Madison CBD and UW-Madison campus, where about 70% of weekday transit trips are oriented. Pulse scheduling is used to provide timed transfers generally at 0 and 30 minutes past the hour.

In 2011, Metro Transit provided 1,275 daily service hours on weekdays while school was in session. A total of 508 service hours were provided on Saturdays and 451 hours were provided on Sundays. Fixed-route bus service provided about 383,000 annual revenue hours of service and served 14.9 million one-way unlinked passenger trips with an operating expense of about $42 million.

The City of Monona contracts with a private provider for weekday commuter service to central Madison and limited point deviation service. The weekday peak period service area for the Metro and Monona transit systems is 62 square miles. The 2010 population within the service area was approximately 235,100 persons. This includes 85% of the City of Madison’s population, 70% of the Middleton population, and 51% of the Fitchburg population. Figure 1 shows the weekday service area and Metro Transit boardings by intersection.

Metro Transit Paratransit – Paratransit service is provided by Metro on a demand-responsive, advance reservation basis within ¾ mile of fixed-route all-day transit service (excluding peak-only commuter routes), as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. The service, which is for persons unable to use the regular fixed routes, is available during the same span as the fixed-route service that it supplements. Service is provided with a combination of Metro’s fleet of 20 cutaway vans and contracted service from several private operators.

Monona Transit – The City of Monona provides public transportation service within its city limits and to central Madison. The service consists of one peak period fixed route called Monona Express and one point deviation mid-day route called Monona Lift. Monona Express operates in a counter-clockwise loop around Lake Monona in the...
Metro Transit collected $11.7 million in fares in 2011, covering 28% of its operating budget. Local funding sources include the City of Madison, partnering entities that contract with Metro for service in their jurisdiction, and Dane County, which provides mostly pass-through federal and state funding for paratransit service. State operating assistance funding constitutes the largest share of Metro’s overall budget although the percentage has been declining since the mid-1990s. Federal capital grants from the Federal Transit Administration make up most of the remainder of Metro’s funding other than a small amount of non-passenger revenue, mostly from advertising on the buses.

More than half of Metro’s budget is spent on fixed-route transit operations, including transit operator wages, supervision, fuel, vehicle maintenance, and other expenses. On average, Metro paid about $93 per revenue hour for fixed-route bus service, including operations and vehicle maintenance, and $110 per revenue hour, including administration and non-vehicle maintenance.

**Specialized Transportation Services** – Several programs are available throughout the Madison area and Dane County that provide specialized transit service to meet the needs of people that are low-income, elderly, and/or have a disability. Most of this service is administered by the Adult Community Services Division of the Dane County Department of Human Services (DCDHS) and is accessible, routed group ride or demand-response service with specific requirements for eligibility and trip purposes. The YWCA provides a JobRide service, which operates 24 hours per day and provides rides for low-income people to and from work where other transit options are not available.

**Figure 2**

In 2011, Metro Paratransit provided about 269,000 one-way trips at an operating expense of $6.8 million, which included both directly operated transit and purchased transit.
Metro Transit System Characteristics and Performance

Metro Transit’s fixed-route ridership has improved substantially since the late 1990’s, growing from 10 million rides per year to 15 million. Substantial increases in service levels accompanied the transfer point restructure in 1998; however, service levels dropped in the early 2000’s and have since increased slightly. Since 2005, ridership has been increasing at about 4.5% per year while service levels have been increasing at about 0.8% per year. These trends can be seen in Figure 3.

Metro’s service consists of routes with mostly 30- to 60-minute headways that overlap on many shared corridors, resulting in some areas with regular 15-minute service or better. Buses are generally scheduled to arrive at offset times to avoid duplication and the bunching of buses. The average weekday productivity for the data set analyzed (October, 2011) was about 48 boardings per scheduled weekday revenue service hour for Routes 1-85; almost 60,000 daily boardings. Saturday and Sunday productivity was about 37 and 26 boardings per revenue service hour, respectively. Throughout the year, ridership peaks in the winter months when school is in session. July ridership dipped to a low of about 830,000 boardings to a high of 1,510,000 in October. Annually, 75% of Metro’s 14.9 million fixed-route boardings occurred on main line routes, 18% occurred on UW campus circulators, and 7% occurred on supplemental school service.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Characteristics</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Levels and Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue Vehicle Hours</td>
<td>365,547</td>
<td>367,083</td>
<td>366,774</td>
<td>372,134</td>
<td>381,768</td>
<td>383,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue Vehicle Miles</td>
<td>4,703,901</td>
<td>4,717,515</td>
<td>4,707,127</td>
<td>4,709,101</td>
<td>5,566,675</td>
<td>4,818,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passenger Trips</td>
<td>12,034,468</td>
<td>12,672,265</td>
<td>13,433,221</td>
<td>13,588,426</td>
<td>13,623,461</td>
<td>14,923,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$35,143,898</td>
<td>$36,199,459</td>
<td>$39,237,204</td>
<td>$40,547,797</td>
<td>$40,434,049</td>
<td>$42,090,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Revenue Vehicle Hour</td>
<td>$96.14</td>
<td>$98.61</td>
<td>$106.98</td>
<td>$108.96</td>
<td>$105.91</td>
<td>$109.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Revenue Vehicle Mile</td>
<td>$7.47</td>
<td>$7.67</td>
<td>$8.34</td>
<td>$8.61</td>
<td>$7.26</td>
<td>$8.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Passenger</td>
<td>$2.92</td>
<td>$2.86</td>
<td>$2.92</td>
<td>$2.98</td>
<td>$2.97</td>
<td>$2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fare Revenue *</td>
<td>$7,912,169</td>
<td>$8,721,876</td>
<td>$9,083,451</td>
<td>$9,992,237</td>
<td>$10,737,634</td>
<td>$11,712,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per Passenger</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td>$0.79</td>
<td>$0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total fare revenue includes revenue from unlimited ride passes.
Routing to be Determined

Express Bus Routes

Madison Urban Area

Dane County, Wisconsin

Existing or Planned Park and Ride

Existing Metro Bus Route (2012)

Existing Express Route*

* all other colors are Planned Routes
Key Recommendations

The TDP recommends service and facility improvements and planning activities to take place between 2013 and 2017. Some actions – particularly long range items like expanding the Metro Transit maintenance facility and implementing bus rapid transit – will likely extend beyond the traditional limits of the TDP planning horizon; however, specific activities are necessary within the next five years to eventually achieve those outcomes.

The majority of the recommendations are targeted towards Metro Transit's fixed-route system, which constitutes the bulk of public transportation in the region. A total of 33 recommendations are included related to service planning, facilities, and other aspects of the transit service in the Madison area. In addition, new, updated Transit Planning Guidelines and Performance Standards were developed to guide annual service changes.

The following are some of the key recommendations:

► Improve the utility of existing transit service by improving the directness and frequency of routes where appropriate.

The TDP presents potential future service change concepts that have been identified by Metro staff, MPO staff, and others to improve service and reduce overcrowding. They range from small adjustments and extensions to more systematic changes that involve restructuring several different routes. Potential service changes are presented in three categories – Priority 1 (short term, 1-3 years), Priority 2 (medium term, 3-5 years), and Priority 3 (long term, new service as development and funding allow). These recommendations, shown in Section IV – Transit Development Plan, include new service, route extensions, frequency improvements, express service, and route changes. A new funding source would likely be necessary to implement all or most of these improvements.

► Extend service to areas that are currently unserved by transit, including new commuter express service.

Planning work for a network of regional express bus service primarily serving Dane County communities that are currently unserved by transit was refined. This service would be designed to serve home-based work trips during the conventional weekday commuting hours. The routes are primarily designed to serve trips to the Madison CBD and UW Campus areas, but would also serve reverse commutes to employment areas in suburban communities.

► Adopt a bus stop consolidation program to remove or relocate excessive bus stops in central Madison, particularly on the Jenifer Street, Johnson Street, Gorham Street, and Monroe Street corridors.

A bus stop consolidation program is recommended based on the analysis of bus stop spacing along central Madison transit corridors. This project will include a detailed stop-by-stop analysis and engage the public as well as staff and policy makers in order to minimize the impacts to transit users with limited mobility. The results of the analysis in the TDP show that a significant number of bus stops in central Madison could be removed in these and other corridors without reducing service area coverage. This would have several major benefits for Metro, transit users, and the environment, including faster service; improved reliability; and reduced fuel use, emissions, and maintenance costs.

► Develop concepts for bus rapid transit (BRT) and plan for its implementation in the next five to ten years pending the outcome of the Transit Corridor Study (BRT Study).

The Transit Corridor Study, led by the MPO, and funded through the Capital Region Sustainable Communities grant, will be completed in 2013. It will likely recommend four corridors for bus rapid transit development: University Avenue to West Towne, Park Street to Fitchburg, East Washington Avenue to East Towne, and Sherman Avenue to north Madison. A map showing the full system included in the study is shown in Figure 5. Staff and policy makers will continue to collaborate to move this project towards fruition.
Figure 5

For more information contact:

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
A Metropolitan Planning Organization

121 S. Pinckney Street, Suite 400
Madison, WI 53703
Phone (608) 266-4336 Fax (608) 261-9967
www.MadisonAreaMPO.org

The preparation of this report has been financed in part by funds from the Federal Transit Administration and U.S. Department of Transportation, under the Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f) of Title 23, U.S. Code, and by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

Draft 2013-2017 TPD Executive Summary

February 2013
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 71 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter Into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission for the Provision of Population and Employment Projections by Urban Service Area Utilizing Pass-Through Funding from WisDOT and Approving an Amendment to the 2013 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget Adding this Funding and Activity

Staff Comments on Item:
To ensure consistency between regional land use and transportation planning, the MPO relies on CARPC for urban service area (USA) and rural area population forecasts that are used as a starting point for preparing the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level growth allocations that serve as a key input to the regional travel model. CARPC uses the population forecasts to estimate future land demand for its sewer service area planning and approval process. In 2013 CARPC will be updating the methodology it utilizes to prepare its USA and rural population forecasts following the release by the Wisconsin Department of Administration of updated 2040 county population forecasts. CARPC will also be developing a methodology for preparing USA level employment forecasts, which will be added as part of the methodology for calculating land demand.

Because the USA level population and employment forecasts prepared by CARPC are used by the MPO for preparing TAZ level growth allocations as part of the regional traffic forecasting process, WisDOT has agreed to provide $12,200 in FHWA Planning funds to CARPC to support this work. However, the funding must come through the MPO. An agreement has been prepared for the MPO to contract with CARPC for its work to develop 2040 population and employment forecasts by urban service area, utilizing the WisDOT pass-through funding. CARPC has agreed to cover the local share cost. The MPO must also revise its work program to include this activity and funding. Even though the MPO is more than a year away from beginning the process to update the regional transportation plan, the revised forecasts will be used in the meantime to prepare growth allocations for traffic forecasting for WisDOT’s Beltline study.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 71 with work program and budget revision sheet
2. Copy of Draft Agreement with CARPC

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval of Resolution TPB No. 71.
Resolution TPB No. 71

Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for CARPC to Provide Population and Employment Forecasting Services to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board and Approving an Amendment to the 2013 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget Adding This Activity and Funding

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

WHEREAS, in order to ensure coordination of regional land use and transportation planning the Madison Area TPB relies on the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) to provide population and employment projections for urban service areas in order to allocate future growth to smaller areas for regional travel forecasting as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) has agreed to provide the Madison Area TPB with an additional Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) planning grant to cover the $15,260 cost of these population and employment forecasting services by CARPC and CARPC has agreed to cover the $3,052 in local match funding required for the grant; and

WHEREAS, these services are to consist of developing a revised methodology for allocating county-wide Year 2040 population projections (provided by the Wisconsin Department of Administration) to the urban service areas and rural area of the county, and preparing or obtaining county-wide Year 2040 employment projections and developing a methodology for allocating the employment to the urban service areas and rural area of the county; and

WHEREAS, CARPC will invoice the City of Madison on a monthly basis for the total cost of these services not to exceed $15,260, but will only charge the City for 80% of the cost in order to cover the required local match to the FHWA planning funds; and

WHEREAS, preparation and adoption of a Unified Planning Work Program is a requirement for receiving various Federal and state planning financial assistance; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Planning Work Program for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is annually updated, and the 2013 Work Program dated November 2012 was approved on November 7, 2012; and

WHEREAS, planning grants for 2013 planning activities have been received, including funds from FHWA, Federal Transit Administration, WisDOT, Dane County, and various local governmental units; and

WHEREAS, the additional FHWA planning funds and associated work activity by CARPC for the Madison Area TPB must be added to the 2013 Unified Planning Work Program of the Madison Area TPB;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) authorizes the City of Madison to enter into an agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for CARPC to provide population and employment forecasting services to the
Madison Area TPB utilizing a FHWA planning grant from WisDOT of $12,208 on the condition that CARPC cover the $3,052 required local match for the grant; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Madison Area TPB approves an Amendment to the 2013 Unified Planning Work Program and the 2013-2015 Overall Program Design Report dated November 2012 adding the population and employment projection work by CARPC to Work Element 2812 (CARPC) and adding $15,260 to the Work Program budget as outlined on the attached Revision Sheet and Budget Table, dated February 2013; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the MPO Transportation Planning Manager is authorized and directed to submit the work program and budget amendment to WisDOT and FHWA for approval and execute necessary contracts on behalf of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the MPO Transportation Planning Manager of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board is authorized to file appropriate supporting documents and requisitions and to perform other duties and acts that may be required as part of this contract; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the planning agency agrees to abide by all the provisions, terms, and conditions of said contract; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.334(a) the Madison Area Transportation Board hereby certifies that the metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:

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 USC 2000d-1) and 49 CFR part 21;
3. 49 USC 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, ex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Sections 1101(b) of the SAFETEA-LU (Pub. L. 109-59) and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the US DOT funded projects;
5. 23 CFR 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. Section 324 of title 23, U.S.C regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and

Date Adopted       Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
1. Page 35: Work Element 2812, Capital Area RPC

Add the following paragraph:

The MPO will also contract with CARPC for CARPC to provide population and employment forecasting services. These services will consist of developing a methodology for allocating county-wide Year 2040 population projections (provided by the Wisconsin Department of Administration) to the urban service areas and rural area of the county; and preparing or obtaining county-wide Year 2040 employment projections and developing a methodology to allocating the employment to the urban service areas and rural area of the county. The urban service area level population and employment projections will be used by MPO staff for allocating future growth to its traffic analysis zones for regional traffic forecasting purposes as part of the next major update of the MPO’s long-range transportation plan. The projections will also be used by MPO staff and WisDOT staff and their consultants to allocate future Year 2050 growth for traffic forecasting for the Planning and Environmental Linkages Study of the Beltline (see also Work Elements 2120 and 2520).

2. Page 38: Modify the Budget and Work Program Table by adding the $15,260 for CARPC forecasting services as shown on the attached revised table.
### Proposed 2013 Madison Area Transportation Planning Board Budget and Work Program Elements

**February 6, 2013**

**REVISED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>WDOT &amp; PERCENT</th>
<th>PERSON MONTHS</th>
<th>FHWA PL FUNDS</th>
<th>WDOT Local</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>OTHER PROGRAMS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Non - Local</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2100 MULTI-MODAL SYSTEM WIDE PLNG.</td>
<td>Surveillance activities</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>57.872</td>
<td>6.004</td>
<td>8.464</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>72.471</td>
<td>9.769</td>
<td>82.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 TRANSP. SYST. MNGMT. ELEM. (TSM)</td>
<td>100% LR</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>32.869</td>
<td>3.410</td>
<td>4.807</td>
<td>4.112</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>45.562</td>
<td>5.838</td>
<td>51.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220 Short range transit planning</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>14.602</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>72.471</td>
<td>9.769</td>
<td>82.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 2013 Cost (excludes modeling proj - encumbered funding from 2012)**: $366,383

---

**Notes:**

1. FHWA PL (80%), WisDOT (8.3%), MPO (11.7%) and FTA PL (80%), WisDOT (10%), MPO (10%)
2. STP Urban Rideshare (80%) / MPO (20%)
3. Redshere Advertising: WisDOT, WisDOA, UW, DANE CTY., MPO
4. Dane County
5. LR = Long Range; SR = Short Range, AD = Administration; TIP = TIP
6. Capital Area Regional Planning Commission
AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CITY OF MADISON AND THE
CAPITAL AREA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTING SERVICES

**Parties:** This agreement is by and between the City of Madison, hereafter “City,” and Capital Area Regional Planning Commission, hereafter “CARPC.”

**Term:** The term of this agreement is January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013.

**Scope of Services:** CARPC will provide population and employment forecasting services to the City staff for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB). Specifically, these services will consist of developing a methodology for allocating county-wide Year 2040 population projections (provided by the Wisconsin Department of Administration) to the urban service areas and rural area of the county; and preparing or obtaining county-wide Year 2040 employment projections and developing a methodology to allocating the employment to the urban service areas and rural area of the county. The population and employment projections are used by the City staff to the TPB for further allocating the growth to small traffic analysis zones used for regional traffic forecasting purposes.

**Payment:** CARPC will invoice the City of Madison on a monthly basis for the cost of providing the population and employment forecasting services, but will only charge the City for 80% of the cost. The remaining 20% of the cost—which constitutes the local match to the Federal planning funds that the City will be receive from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation for the services—will be covered by CARPC. The total cost of these services will not exceed $15,260 (and the 80% billed to the City will not exceed $12,208) for calendar year 2013.

**Non-Discrimination:** During the term of this agreement, the parties agree to abide by their respective policies of non-discrimination and affirmative action. Further, the parties agree that this agreement does not subject either party to the other’s jurisdiction for the determination of such matters.

**Liability:** CARPC shall be responsible for injuries, claims and losses arising from or caused by the acts or omissions of its officers, employees, agencies, boards, commissions and representatives. City shall be responsible for injuries, claims and losses arising from or caused by the acts or omissions of its officers, employees, agencies, boards, commissions and representatives. The obligations of the parties under this paragraph shall survive the expiration or termination of this agreement.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the parties have caused this agreement to be executed by individuals and officers duly authorized on the dates noted below.
CAPITAL AREA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

By:_________________________________
   Kamran Mesbah
   Deputy Director

Date:_________________________________

CITY OF MADISON

By:_________________________________
   Paul Soglin
   Mayor

Date:_________________________________

By:_________________________________
   Maribeth Witzel-Behl
   City Clerk

Date:_________________________________

Countersigned:

By:_________________________________
   David Schmiedicke
   City Finance Director

Date:_________________________________

Approved as to Form:

By:_________________________________
   Michael May
   City Attorney

Date:_________________________________
Re:
Consideration of Potentially Submitting Letter of Interest to Apply for Funding to Utilize INVEST, the FHWA Sustainable Highways Self-Evaluation Tool

Staff Comments on Item:
Lisa MacKinnon, Dane County’s Sustainability Coordinator, passed on information yesterday about the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) solicitation to State DOTs, MPOs, and local governments for letters of interest to apply for funding to implement INVEST (Infrastructure Voluntary Evaluation Sustainability Tool). FHWA describes it as “web-based collection of voluntary best practices, called criteria, designed to help transportation agencies integrate sustainable practices into their projects, plans, and operating and maintenance programs.” Al Matano asked that the item be placed on the agenda.

The INVEST tool is available for agencies to use for free, but FHWA is offering funding to agencies for staff time or to hire a consultant to utilize INVEST in order to establish a broader collection of case studies and best practices in improving highway sustainability that can be shared with others and to help identify ways to improve the tool. The tool can be used for transportation system planning, project development, and reviewing operations and maintenance programs. The purpose of the tool is to help transportation agencies gauge their performance in adopting sustainability practices and identify solutions to allow incorporation of sustainability into planning or project decisions or operations and maintenance programs. There is a 100% non-federal match required for funding received. In-kind contributions can be counted towards the match. Initial letters of interest are due February 15.

The System Planning module of the tool would be the one the MPO could potentially use. The project development and operations/maintenance modules would be more applicable for WisDOT or local agencies that design and implement roadway projects. Because the MPO won’t be starting the major update of the regional transportation plan until next year, staff couldn’t make use of the tool at this time. The MPO also does not have the funding or staff time available in the work program this year to provide the required funding match. MPO staff need to learn more about the tool, but it could perhaps be helpful to inform the regional transportation plan update when work on that begins next year.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Solicitation for INVEST Implementation Projects

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends that further research be done on the tool and that consideration be given to using the tool for the next update to the regional transportation plan.
Solicitation for INVEST Implementation Projects

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is seeking to partner with State departments of transportation (DOTs), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), Federal lands, and local governments on utilizing INVEST 1.0, FHWA’s voluntary self-assessment tool, to assess and enhance the sustainability of their projects and programs.

Background

INVEST (Infrastructure Voluntary Evaluation Sustainability Tool) is a practical, web-based, collection of voluntary best practices and criteria designed to help transportation agencies integrate sustainable practices into their projects, plans, and programs. INVEST helps transportation agencies improve investment decisions while considering limited resources by addressing the sustainability triple bottom line -- enhancing economic, social, and environmental outcomes.

INVEST 1.0 is the result of a collaborative, multi-phased effort. FHWA developed the contents with input from and in cooperation with state and local transportation agency officials and professional organizations such as AASHTO, AMPO and ASCE. The tool was piloted across the country in 2011 and improved to reflect lessons learned. FHWA formally launched INVEST 1.0 in October 2012. FHWA is now partnering with agencies across the country to utilize INVEST 1.0 as part of their efforts to improve the sustainability of their programs and projects.

By offering transportation agencies a collection of best practices, INVEST serves two purposes. First, it enables transportation agencies to gauge their performance in adopting sustainability practices. Second, and more importantly, it helps agencies identify workable solutions that allow them to further incorporate sustainability into pending planning or project decisions, or to identify potential changes to business processes. Many of the best practices presented by INVEST save money as well as improve sustainability. For example, items such as quality construction, designing pavement for long life, life cycle concepts, recycled materials, and improved safety can all show overall lower cost as well as benefits to society.

Description of Opportunity

FHWA’s ultimate goal is to improve the sustainability triple bottom line – social, economic, and environmental outcomes – of highway programs and projects. To further this goal, FHWA is seeking implementation of INVEST 1.0 at DOTs, MPOs, Federal lands, and local governments to assess and improve sustainability outcomes. FHWA seeks to establish a broader collection of case studies and best practices in evaluating and improving highway sustainability. These examples can be shared with other agencies interested in how sustainability can be integrated into their projects and programs. Finally, FHWA seeks the continuous improvement of the INVEST tool and requests feedback on further enhancement of the tool. FHWA would like to work in partnership with a set of transportation agencies on gathering lessons learned from implementing INVEST 1.0. A limited pool of funding is available to assist in these activities. In addition to the agencies that receive implementation funding, it is
anticipated that many agencies will choose to implement INVEST without need for additional funding, as the tool is free and easy to use.

**Eligible Activities**

State DOTs, MPOs, and other transportation agencies may take a variety of approaches. Eligible approaches include:

- Utilizing INVEST to assess and improve the sustainability of specific transportation projects under development, or learn from projects already completed.
- Utilizing INVEST to assess and improve the sustainability of a set of transportation projects.
- Utilizing INVEST to conduct a programmatic evaluation of agency planning and/or construction practices and opportunities for sustainability improvements.
- Utilizing INVEST to review operations and maintenance programs at the district or statewide level.
- Utilizing INVEST to inform the update of the MPO’s long range transportation plan.
- Utilizing INVEST to improve the statewide transportation planning process.

Funding may be used for staff or consultant time to use the tool, to conduct additional analyses, to develop reports on lessons learned, to identify changes that can be made to projects or processes, to develop cost estimates for improved practices, to estimate benefits of improved practices, and to develop and evaluate action plans to implement these changes.

Assessing the sustainability of current action is only the first step of the process. Making changes to improve sustainability is the desired result. As such, FHWA is interested in projects that utilize INVEST to assess the sustainability of current practice, identify opportunities for improvement, and implement improvements. Projects should also quantify as best as possible costs and cost savings as well as benefits to environmental, economic, and social outcomes.

**Final Product**

Each INVEST implementation project should result in a final report that details the work performed, parties involved, roles and responsibilities, issues encountered, lessons learned, sustainability improvements identified, sustainability improvements implemented, analyses of costs and benefits of implementing particular sustainability best practices, recommendations for future action, and recommendations on improving INVEST and adding to the state of the practice. The final report should be in a form that is sharable with other agencies, and may be posted to the FHWA website.

**Funding**

Multiple awards of approximately $25,000 to $150,000 are anticipated, though projects may be larger or smaller depending on the context, scope, and approach. By Federal statute, a 100% non-Federal match (50-50 cost share) is required. In-kind contributions such as staffing can be counted towards the match requirement.
Process

Agencies interested in the funding opportunity are asked to submit a four to five page letter of interest to the respective FHWA division office. Division offices will review and send letters forward to headquarters.

Projects will be selected based on the following criteria:

- Demonstrated interest and support. For instance, support from senior management, past work in this area, support from local elected officials, public support, etc.
- Impact on decision-making. How the results of the INVEST evaluation will lead to implementation of sustainability best practices. How INVEST results will influence pending planning or project decisions.
- Availability of local match and necessary staffing and resources.
- Willingness and plans to provide case studies and lessons learned to share with others as well as providing feedback to improve INVEST 1.0.
- Diversity of project types. INVEST has three modules: System Planning, Project Development, and Operations and Maintenance. In addition, the project development module has six different scorecards based on project type (basic and extended) and location (urban and rural), as well as separate scorecards for paving projects and a custom scorecard. FHWA would like to see examples of INVEST implementation for a broad range of project types.

After selection, the recipient will participate in a conference call with FHWA to discuss the project. FHWA will provide feedback on the draft work plan, the goals of the project and any additional assistance/resources that FHWA may have available. A revised work plan should be submitted and approved by FHWA before commencing work.

Submitting a letter of interest is not a guarantee of funding.

In addition to the agencies that receive implementation funding, it is anticipated that many agencies will choose to implement INVEST without need for additional funding, as the tool is free and easy to use.

Timeline

Letters of interest will be received and funding allocated on a rolling basis and as funding is available. FHWA is targeting the month of March to fund several projects; letters of interest received by February 15 will be considered for the round of funding targeted for March. Letters of interest are however welcome after that date as well. There is not a set timeframe for project completion. Some projects may be quick turn-around, with timelines as short as one month, while others may take 18 to 24 months because of the stage of the plan update cycle or the project development process.

Required Contents for Letters of Interest

The letter of interest must be no longer than five pages and must include the following elements:
• Description of agency interest in using INVEST, goals for sustainability, and management support for the effort.

• Description of the proposed effort. This section should include the purpose and a detailed description of the effort to be funded. It should explain plans to conduct the INVEST evaluation and use the results. It should also include the phases of work, budget, work products, and timing. If contractor assistance is planned to support the effort, that support and estimated level of effort should be included.

• Impact on decision-making. This section should describe how the results of the INVEST evaluation will lead to implementation of sustainability best practices.

• Collaboration. This section should describe plans to provide feedback for improving the tool, case studies, and, lessons learned.

• Description of dedicated staffing/resources. This section should fully describe the funding and assets that will be dedicated to the project, and demonstrate how the non-Federal match requirement will be met.

Contacts

• Tina Hodges, Office of Natural Environment, 202-366-4287, Tina.Hodges@dot.gov
• Rob Hyman, Office of Natural Environment, 202-366-5843, Robert.Hyman@dot.gov

Resources

Please visit https://www.sustainablehighways.org/ to learn more about INVEST 1.0, watch a recording of the launch, browse the criteria, and view videos and case studies of State DOTs and MPOs that have used INVEST.

Please visit http://www.sustainablehighways.dot.gov/ to learn about FHWA’s Sustainable Highways Initiative, hear news of FHWA sustainability activities, and view sustainability-related publications and resources.

An online demo will be available via webinar on Friday, February 1 at 2pm EST. A recording of the demo will be posted on the website shortly thereafter. Information on how to connect to the webinar will soon be available at http://www.sustainablehighways.dot.gov/. 
**Staff Comments on Item:**

The City of Madison is getting ready to start the next phase of the “Judge Doyle Square” planning project, which received Federal TIGER grant funding in 2010 as part of the Stimulus bill. The focus at the time was to plan for a multi-modal terminal for the planned intercity rail station. Even without the rail station there are other multi-modal transportation opportunities in the larger area south of the Capitol Square. The first phase of the study focused on redevelopment plans for the two-block area, including the existing Government East parking garage and the Madison Municipal Building. The City will be sending out a Request for Qualifications to developers to prepare redevelopment concepts for the area soon. This next phase of the project is a planning study looking at the larger area and even beyond that to look at potential locations for an inter-city bus terminal. The study will include a circulation and traffic operations analysis of Wilson Street and some challenging intersections, including the Wilson/Blair/Williamson/John Nolen Drive. The potential for a ped/bike bridge connecting Wilson Street to the lakeshore and possible locations would also be studied. A consultant team led by Kimley-Horn will be hired to conduct the study, which Dave Trowbridge is managing for the city.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Map of the TOD District Study Area illustrating the scope of work tasks

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

For information purposes only
Re:
Brief Presentation on Wisconsin Commission on Transportation Finance and Policy Report

Staff Comments on Item:
As part of the last state biennial budget the state Legislature created the Commission on Transportation Finance and Policy to develop proposed policy changes and financing options to balance projected transportation needs with revenues over the next 10 years. Chaired by the non-voting WisDOT Secretary, the Commission brought in guest speakers and held meetings, listening sessions, and focus groups across the state to review current revenue and travel trends and better understand transportation facility needs.

Four transportation investment scenarios were developed with the projected 10-year cost and funding gap based on current expenditures calculated for each. The Commission then developed program and funding recommendations to maintain existing conditions of the transportation network and existing congestion levels through the 10-year period to 2023. The revenue raising recommendations, which have been the focus of the media coverage on the Commission report, include: (a) raising the state gas tax by 5 cents a gallon; (b) adopting a new mileage-based registration fee for cars and trucks of one cent per mile; (c) increasing annual registration fees for commercial vehicles by 73%; (d) increasing the 8-year driver’s license fee by $20; and (e) eliminating the sales tax exemption on the trade-in value of a vehicle. Among the other recommendations is supporting legislation to allow creation of regional transportation authorities to raise funds through a ½ cent sales tax with voter approval (up to 25% could be spent on roadways vs. transit).

It is uncertain whether the state Legislature will implement any of the Commission recommendations, but staff thought the report would be of interest to the board.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Executive Summary of the Commission on Transportation Finance and Policy Report
   [The following is a link to more information on the work of the Commission, including the full report: http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/about/tfp/]

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For information purposes only
Executive summary

Wisconsin faces a daunting challenge when it comes to meeting the growing needs of its multimodal transportation network. The state’s roads, bridges, railways, harbors, airports and transit facilities are getting older and more congested. A growing segment of the population is aging and increasingly dependent on public transit services. Wisconsin’s economic future and the safety of all of its residents and visitors depend on a quality transportation network that can efficiently move people to jobs, raw materials to factories, finished products to markets, and tourists to their destinations.

At the same time, the state’s decades-old transportation funding model is not keeping pace with current or future needs. The state has chosen to address its transportation funding shortfall with increased debt through bond issuance—a path that is unsustainable over the long term.

To address this challenge, the Legislature, as part of the 2011–13 state biennial budget, created the 10-member Wisconsin Transportation Finance and Policy Commission. The Commission is comprised of a cross-section of citizen members from across the state, chaired by the non-voting Secretary of the Department of Transportation. The Commission held over a dozen public meetings and several public listening sessions and focus group meetings to examine issues related to the future of transportation finance and policy in Wisconsin, among them:

- state highway programs;
- local road, bridge and aid programs, including bicycle-pedestrian facilities and transit;
- freight and multimodal programs, including airports, harbors, and railroads;
- Transportation Fund revenue projections and debt service; and
- revenue and finance alternatives.

The Commission’s overall goal was to develop policy changes and financing options to balance projected transportation needs with revenues over the next 10 years.
Current revenue and travel trends

Over the past year, the Commission has developed an understanding of the state’s transportation programs and services and how Wisconsin funds its entire multimodal transportation network. A narrow funding base—primarily, motor fuel taxes and vehicle registration fees—funds the transportation network and its maintenance needs, as well as the operations of the Divisions of Motor Vehicles and State Patrol.

Improvements in motor vehicle fuel economy and the increasing popularity of hybrid and electric vehicles are decreasing state and federal motor fuel tax collections. Additionally, since 2002, the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has been essentially flat on a statewide basis. Statewide VMT has declined over three percent from its peak in 2004, yet many urban areas of the state are experiencing congestion. The result is increasing transportation needs and decreasing revenues to address them.

The federal motor fuel tax (unchanged since 1993) is 18.4 cents per gallon, and the state motor fuel tax is 30.9 cents per gallon.1 The last time the Legislature voted to increase the state motor fuel tax was in 1997. Since 2006 when motor fuel tax indexing was repealed, inflation has reduced the buying power of the state motor fuel tax by nearly 13 percent.

The state’s decision to issue bonds to address the loss of revenues led to debt service payments of $762 million in the 2011-13 biennium. Assuming a similar level of bonding over the next 10 years, debt service will consume one-quarter of all state transportation revenues by FY 2023.

1 An additional 2.0 cents per gallon goes to the Petroleum Inspection Fund.
Review of transportation needs—four scenarios

The Commission scrutinized current state transportation investments to gain a better understanding of how transportation assets and projects are currently managed and how overall performance is measured. To better understand potential needs of the transportation network in the future, the Commission considered four scenarios that define how the network would function at different investment levels.

The four needs analyses—from system disinvestment to multimodal enhancements—allowed commissioners to consider the funding levels needed to address specific condition goals for the transportation network over the next 10 years. The four scenarios gave the Commission a common perspective from which to develop recommendations. All scenarios assumed a total of about $25 billion in state and federal transportation revenues over the decade.

➢ SCENARIO ONE—DISINVESTMENT: Scenario One holds transportation expenditures at current levels over the next 10 years, resulting in a 15.7 percent reduction in purchasing power. This scenario envisions significant deterioration of the state transportation network. The condition of state and local highway pavements and bridges deteriorate. Planned major highway projects are delayed several years. Funding for transit, rail, harbors and airports is inadequate to maintain current conditions and service levels.
  » Projected 10-year cost: $27 billion
  » Funding gap: $2 billion

➢ SCENARIO TWO—PRESTATION: Scenario Two preserves existing transportation services and the physical condition of the network at current levels over the next decade. This scenario does not address traffic congestion issues, resulting in a 50 percent increase in congested roadway miles.
  » Projected 10-year cost: $30.8 billion
  » Funding gap: $5.8 billion

➢ SCENARIO THREE—CAPACITY MANAGEMENT: Scenario Three keeps transportation services, conditions, and traffic congestion at current levels and allows highway maintenance and operations services to keep pace with needs. Funding for other transportation modes keeps pace with inflation.
  » Projected 10-year cost: $40.3 billion
  » Funding gap: $15.3 billion

➢ SCENARIO FOUR—MULTIMODAL ENHANCEMENTS: In addition to meeting the goals noted in Scenario Three, this scenario addresses basic needs of the state’s public transit, airport, freight rail and commercial port systems.
  » Projected 10-year cost: $42.1 billion
  » Funding gap: $17.1 billion
The consequences of no action

The four scenarios provide a sobering assessment of transportation conditions under various investment levels. In light of our uncertain economic climate, commissioners carefully considered the impact of a “no funding increase” approach as described in Scenario One. While they found the consequences of failing to address the state's transportation needs to be substantial, they also realize the Legislature, the Governor, and the people of Wisconsin will ultimately determine the investment priorities for the state.

Over the next 10 years, the State Highway Rehabilitation Program will need to fund major rehabilitation projects on a large portion of the state trunk highway system. The Major Highway Development Program will fund other high-cost rehabilitation and large capacity projects to address safety concerns and meet economic goals. Twelve major highway projects are scheduled for construction in future years. The current estimated cost to complete these projects is $3.1 billion.

Southeast Wisconsin has some of the busiest highways and most complex infrastructure in the state. While progress has been made through improvements to the Marquette Interchange and the I-94 corridor between Milwaukee and Chicago, funding projects under the Southeast Wisconsin Freeway Megaprojects Program will require an estimated $300 million annually for the next 20 years.

Without additional highway funding:

► The percentage of the state highway system in poor or worse condition will increase from 20 percent in 2014 to 42 percent in 2023.

► Planned major highway projects, which have already been identified as necessary to enhance safety and support economic growth, will be delayed six years, resulting in a 22 percent increase in congested state highway miles.

Through a unique and valuable partnership, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation contracts with counties to handle routine maintenance of the state trunk highway system, including mowing and snow and ice removal. The costs associated with maintenance and traffic operations continue to grow.

Without additional maintenance and traffic operations funding:

► Investments in traveler warning and road weather management systems will be reduced, routine maintenance will be deferred, and roads will remain snow-covered and slippery for longer time periods after major storms, creating additional safety problems.

► Deferred routine maintenance will lead to higher repair costs in the future.

Mobility takes many forms. For increasing numbers of Wisconsinites who cannot, should not, or choose not to drive, transit is their link to jobs, medical appointments, family and friends, shopping and culture.
Without additional transit funding, unless local governments can increase their funding share:

✓ Routes will be cut and fares will increase; aging buses and bus facilities will become unsafe or go out of service; and the state’s transit-dependent population will be isolated in their homes, with people unable to get to jobs or school.

Without local revenue options for transit services:

✓ Local governments will continue to rely on the property tax to fund their local transit share.

The Federal Aviation Administration is implementing the Next Generation Air Transportation System, NextGen, a 10-year federal initiative to move the nation’s air traffic control system from ground-based radar to a modern satellite-based system. This vital safety improvement will require a state and federal funding partnership.

Without additional aeronautics funding:

✓ The state will be unable to match federal funding for safety upgrades necessary to comply with NextGen.

Wisconsin’s 29 commercial ports and harbors are the state’s most direct link to world markets. Water transportation is a fuel-efficient way to move bulk commodities.

Without increased harbor investment:

✓ Conditions at Wisconsin’s commercial ports will continue to deteriorate.
  The state’s ability to attract and retain industries that rely on efficient bulk freight movement will be negatively impacted by decaying and inefficient harbor infrastructure and a lack of coordinated harbor plans.

✓ The potential of the state’s commercial ports as a source of economic development will remain underutilized as the pace of needed investment slows.

Commissioners view freight rail as having two components—preservation and acquisition. While the overwhelming majority of freight rail in Wisconsin occurs on tracks owned and cars operated by one of the private Class I railroads, the state owns and operates a small but important segment of the freight rail network. Commissioners support an emphasis on upgrading existing state-owned lines, and they also recognize the need to acquire lines that would otherwise be abandoned in order to preserve a mobility option for those lines in the future.

Without increased freight rail investment:

✓ The state’s rail system will continue to operate at speeds of less than 20 miles per hour and be unable to support current and future car load weights.

✓ Line abandonments could cut off access to the national rail network for many carload rail shippers and dozens of communities.
Bicycle and pedestrian facilities help create an integrated, balanced transportation network. Investing in these facilities supports efficient land use, improves commuting options for Wisconsin residents, and improves roadway safety for all users.

Without increased funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities:

> People will not feel safe while biking and walking, and commuters will not experience the modal choice that these facilities offer.

**Recommendations and impacts on motorists**

After careful consideration of the impact of a “do nothing” approach, the Commission developed its program and funding recommendations to assure an acceptable condition level for the transportation network. These recommendations are not a wish list—they essentially fund programs to maintain condition and congestion levels that exist today through 2023. The Commission believes the economic and safety impacts of this investment will justify the underlying tax and fee increases needed to improve the state’s multimodal transportation network over the next 10 years.

To maintain a safe and efficient system, the Commission recommends the following increased investments on an annual basis:

- State highway rehabilitation, maintenance and modernization: $387.1 million
- Local highways and bridges: $40.0 million
- Public transit: $36.3 million
- Airports, rails, harbors, bicycle and pedestrian facilities: $16.1 million

Commissioners were committed to developing a plan that balanced expenditures and revenues. They began with evaluating the impact of existing motor fuel taxes and registration fees on vehicle owners. In Wisconsin, the owner of a 2010 mid-size sedan with a fuel efficiency of 22 miles per gallon who drives 12,000 miles a year currently pays about $254 annually in state motor fuel taxes and vehicle registration fees.

A similar comparison shows vehicle owners in surrounding states currently pay higher motor fuel tax and vehicle registration fees on an annual basis: $318 in Illinois, $416 in Iowa, $352 in Michigan, and $470 in Minnesota. Comparatively speaking, Wisconsinites enjoy a relative bargain with access to the state’s 114,600 miles of federal, state and local roadways for under a dollar a day.
Mindful of the factors creating a growing imbalance between transportation needs and revenues, commissioners considered a full range of revenue options, noting the advantages and disadvantages of each. For example, while tolls raise significant transportation revenues in some states, commissioners deemed tolls unworkable in Wisconsin at this time due primarily to federal tolling restrictions.

The Commission’s preferred transportation revenue plan puts the state on course to support economic growth and public safety over the next 10 years. It accounts for needed investments in the multimodal transportation network and addresses the declining revenue generation of the current transportation funding model.

The Commission offers the following recommendations to raise the revenues required to preserve and improve the transportation network:

- Raise the state motor fuel tax by five cents per gallon.
- Adopt a new mileage-based registration fee for passenger cars and light trucks of approximately one cent per mile travelled.
- Increase annual registration fees for commercial vehicles by 73 percent.
- Increase the fee for an eight-year driver license by $20.
- Eliminate the sales tax exemption on the trade-in value of a vehicle.

Under the Commission’s recommendations, fuel taxes and registration fees for the owner of a typical passenger vehicle will increase by approximately $120 annually—just 33 cents per day.
In addition, the Commission offers the following recommendations and findings to address policy issues related to transportation funding and finance in Wisconsin:

- The Commission supports legislation to allow regional transportation authorities to raise funds through a one-half-cent maximum sales tax, with voter approval, for transportation purposes.
- The Commission supports legislation to authorize a maximum one-half-percent local option sales tax, for transportation purposes, in counties with populations less than 100,000.
- The Commission supports capping debt service payments for transportation projects at a manageable level compared with annual transportation revenues.
- The Commission supports indexing the state motor fuel tax and/or vehicle registration fees to provide inflationary adjustments over time.
- The Commission supports the proposed state constitutional amendment to protect the integrity of Wisconsin's Transportation Fund.
- The Commission found that current federal regulations on tolling create an obstacle to its implementation in Wisconsin. The Commission encourages the Wisconsin Congressional Delegation to support federal legislation that allows states more flexibility to toll on the National Highway System.

The Commission's report highlights the importance of a safe, efficient multimodal transportation system to address the basic mobility needs of Wisconsin residents, young and old. It represents the minimal level of investment needed to keep Wisconsin moving. The challenges before us are clear—as are the consequences of failing to address this major public policy issue. Wisconsin's economic future, personal mobility and the safety of its residents are all at stake.