AGENDA

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of August 4, 2010 Meeting Minutes
3. Communications
4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)
5. Public Hearing on Draft 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County
   Note: Action on the 2011-2015 TIP by the MPO is anticipated Wednesday, October 6 at 7:00 p.m. in Room A-B of the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Avenue. Written comments on the TIP are invited through Wednesday, September 15, and should be sent to the MPO offices at 121 S. Pinckney St., Suite 400, Madison, WI 53703 or e-mailed to wschaefer@cityofmadison.com.
6. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 43 Regarding Amendment #7 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County
   • Four new projects to upgrade guardrail end treatments on West Beltline/USH 12/18 (USH 18/151 to I-39/90), Interstate 39/90 (Lien Rd. to CTH B), USH 18/151 (West Beltline to County Line), and USH 151 (I-39/90/94 to County Line)
7. Consideration of Scoring and Ranking of Candidate Statewide Multi-modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement (TE) & Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Program (BPFP) Projects for FYs 2012-2014
8. Update on the Milwaukee-Madison Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project and Madison Station
9. Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA)
10. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Projects Potentially Involving the TPB:
    • USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor Study
    • USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor Study
11. Discussion of Future Work Items:
    • Approval of 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program
    • 2011 Work Program and Budget
    • Transit Development Plan (TDP) and RTA Service Scenarios
    • MPO Congestion Management Process
    • Regional Transportation Plan Update
    • Revisions to MPO Operating Rules and Procedures
12. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings
13. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting: Wednesday, October 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.
1. Roll Call

Members present: Eileen Bruskewitz, Joe Chase, Mark Clear (arrived at item #9), Duane Hinz, Brett Hulsey (arrived at item #9), Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Jerry Mandli (arrived at item #5), Al Matano, Mark Opitz (arrived at item #5), Steve Ritt, Chris Schmidt, Paul Skidmore John Vesperman (arrived at item #5).

Members absent: None

Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

2. Approval of July 7, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Ritt, seconded by Schmidt, to approve the July meeting minutes. Motion carried with Kamp abstaining.

3. Communications

None.

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

None.

5. Update on the Milwaukee-Madison Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project and Madison Station

Donna Brown from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) provided an update on project activities, including those related to the Madison station. She said that since the June MPO Board meeting WisDOT had held several public information meetings and conducted outreach to a number of communities with additional meetings scheduled over the course of the next month. The cooperative agreements with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) have been completed for both the stations and corridor teams and both sets of consultants have started work. An environmental assessment was being done for the Madison station. At the most recent public meeting on the station, WisDOT outlined the purpose and need and some schematics on the train platforms. At the next meeting in late August or early September additional schematics and a conceptual design will be presented. WisDOT also hopes to have some draft cost estimates. The draft station plan is expected to be completed by October. WisDOT is meeting with communities and neighborhoods along the corridor. WisDOT will be initiating public information meetings on the corridor later in August, including one in Sun Prairie. She mentioned that construction on the land bridges east of Sun Prairie to Watertown would be starting this fall. She said a crossing diagnostic team was in the process of looking at and compiling initial information about the crossings along the corridor. That work was finishing up and after that staff would be meeting with community leaders. Regarding the schedule for the stations, a draft environmental document will be completed in October with a preferred alternative to present to the public in February 2011 and a finding of no significant impact in April 2011. Information was being put together on the corridor management plan and that should be available at the end of August.

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Ave., Madison, registered to speak. He said many people are viewing the service as commuter service when in fact it is part of the Midwest regional rail network. He handed out a brochure showing a map of the whole system. He said it was his understanding the City of Madison would be responsible for the operating costs of the station and that parking and traffic circulation are big issues.

Ritt asked Brown how WisDOT would respond if Brookfield decided not to cooperate on construction and operation of a station. Brown said there are also questions about the Oconomowoc station. She said
she doubted that both stations would be eliminated, but discussions were ongoing. Bruskewitz asked about the public meeting in Madison, and Brown said about 165 attended the last meeting and 225 attended the first two meetings. Schaefer asked if there were themes from the comments at the meetings. Brown said the public wanted a facility that would be inviting and people were very concerned about connections with inter-city buses. People were also concerned about parking and traffic circulation. She said a parking and traffic impact analysis would be conducted. People also commented on the need to coordinate with downtown area development plans. Bruskewitz asked about the number of tracks, and Brown said there would be two tracks in the station area. She said WisDOT was working to make sure that commuter rail could be accommodated in the future if implemented. Matano commented that many people think Wilson Street should be converted to two-way traffic.

6. **Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 41 Regarding Amendment #6 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County**

Schaefer said WisDOT requested the amendment to allow design to start on the planned expansion of the USH 18/151 (Military Ridge) park-and-ride lot. Construction isn’t currently programmed until 2018, but it is on the advanceable list. Vesperman commented that he thinks construction will actually be done well before then.

Moved by Bruskewitz, seconded by Ritt, to adopt Resolution TPB No. 41, Amendment #6 to the 2010-2014 TIP. Motion carried.


Schaefer said staff reviewed a couple of different scenarios for the listings at the Board’s last meeting. A preliminary draft of the listings was included in the packet. Since that time, MPO staff convened its annual interagency project coordination meeting with WisDOT, County and City of Madison staff to review the listings and multi-jurisdictional projects. The listings were also reviewed with the MPO’s Technical Coordinating Committee. Schaefer distributed a slightly modified version and said that since that time there has been some additional discussion amongst City of Madison and County staff on the timing of the joint city and county projects. The first change from the earlier draft is that the University Avenue project has been pushed back to 2012 as there seems to be general agreement that it won’t be able to be constructed in 2011. This doesn’t change the funding situation. There is still insufficient funding to cover the full 50% share for the project even after delaying Fish Hatchery Road and Johnson Street. There isn’t sufficient funding to cover the 50% share for the CTH M (Cross Country to CTH PD) project either, but the shortfall is less. He said there is also a possibility the Mineral Point Rd./CTH M intersection project might not get started next year, but the current plan is to do the bridge work next year and the rest in 2012. The second change is that the Allen Boulevard resurfacing project is shown as being done in 2014 rather than 2015 because there is sufficient funding to do the project that year as requested. Schaefer said staff is proposing to include the new version in the draft TIP for review and comment. He said county staff had some concern about whether the CTH M (Cross Country to CTH PD) project could be ready for construction in 2013 due to environmental and real estate acquisition issues, but it is still programmed for 2013.

Ritt commented on the long-standing congestion and safety issues on CTH M and the need to improve the roadway as soon as possible. He said that the county has been an impediment to getting the project done. Mandli responded that county staff didn’t think the designs would be ready to go and was concerned about creating a false expectation regarding the timing of the project. He said the project was a complex one. He mentioned the county’s opposition to the change in the cost share policy for STP Urban projects from 80/20 to 50/50, partly because the county could not charge impact fees or special assessments to help cover the cost of roadway improvements. Ritt said the expectation has already been created about the timing of the project, which is long overdue. Mandli said the environmental and design process must still be completed and it was better to be realistic in budgeting
for these projects. Bruskewitz asked Mandli how much money the county borrowed for these large projects on an annual basis and Mandli said $2-5 million. Bruskewitz responded that the county would need to borrow more money to fund the projects as currently scheduled. Schaefer said that with University Avenue being pushed back to 2012, it gives the MPO another year to see how things are going on CTH M before deciding on how much funding to allocate for the University Avenue project. If CTH M were to be delayed until 2014, additional funding could be allocated towards University Avenue.

Schaefer said the other consideration besides whether CTH M can be delivered on time is the timing of other work being done on the southwest side, particularly the Verona Road/West Beltline interchange project programmed for 2014. Alternate routes needed to be provided during construction. He said a suggestion had been made to possibly delay work on the final segment of CTH M (north of CTH PD to Valley View) from 2014 to 2015 to avoid a conflict with the interchange project. CTH PD would then need to be pushed back to 2016. That would allow Johnson Street to be done in 2014 and Cottage Grove Road to be done in 2015 when the Interstate bridge work is now planned. Vesperman said WisDOT’s strategy for traffic operations during the Verona Road/Beltline interchange reconstruction has been to get the interchange work done on Park Street and Fish Hatchery Road and the CTH PD/Verona Road intersection done prior to 2013-’14 to have those relief corridors. He said WisDOT was less concerned about having the CTH M work going on at the same time than it was about work on Fish Hatchery Road and Park Street because CTH M is only two lanes now and there are other local street routes in the corridor. He said WisDOT preferred that the Fish Hatchery Road pavement replacement work be done in 2012 at the same time as the interchange work if at all possible.

Schaefer noted that he reviewed the listings with the MPO’s Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and the CAC voted to recommend that the MPO allocate an unspecified amount of funding in 2012 for multi-modal transportation connections associated with the inter-city rail station. He said there obviously were no cost estimates for these improvements at this time. It is also not known how much of these costs the City of Madison would be required to cover.

8. **Consideration of Release of Draft 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County for Public Review and Comment**

Schaefer said staff was seeking approval to release the full draft TIP along with the STP Urban listings for review and comment. He noted that a public information meeting was scheduled on August 18 and the public hearing would be held at the Board’s September 1 meeting. He said staff didn’t have a complete draft of the document yet for the Board’s review, but that it represents a coordinated listing of all of the projects submitted by WisDOT, Dane County, and the local units of government. Bruskewitz asked if many municipalities submit comments on the draft TIP, and Schaefer said mostly staff submits changes to project costs, timing, etc. based on local capital budgets. Some members of the public also submit comments on specific projects.

Skidmore said he was concerned that because the STP Urban listings were in early draft form, including them in the draft TIP might give the impression they were final. Schaefer said the draft TIP, including the listings, is clearly noted as draft for review. It had to be released now to give sufficient time for public comment. Skidmore suggested marking the STP Urban listings as “Review Draft” and Schaefer said staff could do that.

Opitz moved, Kamp seconded to approve release of the draft 2011-2015. Motion carried.

9. **Consideration of Entering into Regional Partnership for Sustainable Communities Consortium to Apply for HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant**

Schaefer said the materials on the item were emailed out to members along with the revised agenda. They included a brief outline and a longer outline of the draft grant application and a draft memorandum of understanding between the consortium partners. He said the application was due August 23 and the scope of grant project activities was still being refined. He noted the list of partners
in the draft application and said the MPO and City of Madison were required partners. The Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) has been in discussions with other municipalities, nonprofit organizations, and the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) about participating in the project. He said he thought the RTA was interested in becoming a partner, and thought the project would benefit the work being done in developing the transit service improvement plan for the RTA. Schaefer said it would be a three-year project starting at the beginning of 2011. There are a number of aspects to the project, but the MPO would be involved primarily in a proposed transit corridors study evaluating what corridors make the most sense for enhanced transit service (express bus, BRT, rail) and how those services might be integrated with the existing bus transfer point transit system. The study would also look at the potential for redevelopment and transit-oriented development within the corridors. Schaefer said he told CARPC staff the first priorities for the MPO had to be the interim update of the regional transportation plan and the congestion management plan, but the MPO could devote some staff resources to the project. He said the project would be helpful in enhancing the transit element of the long-range plan, which currently focuses mainly on the Transport 2020 study.

Steve Steinhoff with CARPC staff said that the region was eligible for up to $2 million in funding over the three years of the project. The planning boundary for the project would be the MPO planning area. For this grant program, the planning area needed to either be the MPO area or the 4-county Metropolitan Statistical Area. The grant program is a partnership of HUD, U.S. DOT, and EPA, but HUD is the lead agency. The category of funding being sought is for implementing regional plans for sustainable development. He said although there isn’t a single regional plan for sustainable development there are many adopted plans that many sustainability elements that match well with the program’s livability principles. He elaborated a little more on the transit corridors and TOD study, indicating they would focus in on some key nodes along the transit corridors for possible TOD, particularly low-income areas. He said the program has a strong emphasis on social equity and participation of low-income and minority populations in meeting the goals of improving employment connections for these groups. Another component of the project is helping communities prepare detailed preservation and development plans that fit in with CARPC’s future urban development planning process. A third component is looking at “catalytic” projects or development projects that contain a lot of the sustainability elements that have already been planned but need some additional assistance in terms of pre-development costs to implement. The Cities of Madison and Fitchburg are two communities that CARPC staff has been talking with about potential catalytic projects.

Kamp asked if MPO staffing weren’t an issue wouldn’t the MPO typically be doing the transit corridors study. Schaefer said that CARPC staff was taking the lead in terms of the overall project, but the MPO would be the lead agency for that aspect of the overall project. In response to a question, Steinhoff mentioned some of the non-profit organizations that CARPC has had discussions with about being partners in the project. Steinhoff said there was a 20% match, but it could be provided through in kind staff services. Bruskewitz asked about benefits for the towns, and Steinhoff said the preservation and development planning would be done on a multi-jurisdictional basis. One of the areas would include Middleton, Waunakee, and the Town of Westport. One of the components of that planning would be identifying agricultural enterprise areas and one aspect of that is looking at the feasibility for a local food processing plant.

Hulsey moved, King seconded to approve the MPO entering into the consortium to apply for the grant. Motion carried with Clear abstaining because he missed most of the discussion.

10. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 42 Approving Amendment to the 2010 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget

Schaefer said the amendment would shift about $55,000 in funding from salaries of MPO staff to consulting services to hiring consultants to assist with the congestion management plan. An amendment to the City of Madison Planning Division budget would also need to be approved by the Madison Common Council.
Bruskewitz asked if a committee would be created for the project. Schaefer responded that a staff committee would be created as a sub-committee of the MPO Technical Coordinating Committee to oversee the project and deal with ongoing monitoring and implementation of the plan. Hulsey asked if the plan was intended to alleviate congestion. Schaefer said it was a congestion management plan that would focus on short-term issues such as problem intersections and TSM strategies. A multi-modal approach would be used looking at the level of service for transit users and pedestrians and bicyclists as well as motorists. Schaefer said FHWA emphasized the need for developing a system for monitoring the effectiveness of projects such as the Beltline ramp meters, interchange improvements, etc. The product would be a report that identifies existing congestion problems, recommendations for dealing with them, and a method of ongoing monitoring. In terms of the state roadways, it will be mostly documenting the issues and recommendations from the recent and ongoing corridor studies. He said he hopes the consultant will help in refining the scope of the work and what is doable given the resources the MPO and agency partners have.

Bruskewitz moved, Hinz seconded, to approve the Resolution TPB No. 42 amending the 2010 Work Program and budget. Motion carried

11. Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA)

Opitz said there had been one RTA Board meeting since the last MPO meeting. He said he couldn’t attend, but the Board was briefed on Fitchburg’s transit plan. The Board also discussed public outreach and approved creation of a citizen advisory committee. He said a committee was actively meeting to develop bylaws. The next meeting was scheduled for August 25 in Shorewood Hills. Schaefer added that MPO and Metro staff were continuing to work on developing transit service improvement concepts as part of the TDP. Staff was also meeting with staff and officials from some of the communities. Metro staff attended a meeting of the Fitchburg Transit Commission and both Metro and MPO staff attended a meeting of the Stoughton Public Works Committee and also met with Sun Prairie staff and officials.

12. Continued Discussion of MPO Policy Board Meeting Schedule and Location

Matano asked about changing the MPO Board meeting schedule and location and the consensus was to keep both the same. Schaefer said he was considering moving the next meeting to the City-County Building due to the hearing on the TIP. He didn’t know how many people would attend. Typically, less than ten people attend, but there was a big turnout for the TIP amendment hearing on the inter-city rail project. The Board voted to have the meeting at the Water Utility Building.

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

• USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor Study
• USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor Study

Vesperman said the project manager was promoted and WisDOT was in the process of filling the position. He didn’t have anything new to report on the studies.

14. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer said that in addition to the hearing on the TIP the main agenda item at the next meeting would be consideration of the scoring/ranking and priority listing of the Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program projects. He also mentioned that staff would be starting to work on the 2011 work program.

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

The next meeting is scheduled for September 1, 2010 at the Madison Water Utility at 7 p.m.

16. Adjournment

Opitz moved, Clear seconded, to adjourn. Motion carried.
Re: Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 43 Regarding Amendment #7 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Comments on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT SW Region staff have requested this TIP amendment to add four new projects to upgrade guardrail end treatments on the following state highways: West Beltline/USH 12/18 (USH 18/151 to I-39/90); Interstate 39/90 (Lien Rd. to CTH B); USH 18/151 (West Beltline to County Line); and USH 151 (I-39/90/94 to County Line). WisDOT is also adding a project to upgrade guardrail end treatments on Interstate 39/90 (STH 106 to Illinois State Line) outside the MPO planning area, which is being added to the TIP for informational purposes. The guardrail projects are needed to meet Federal safety standards. They will be funded with Federal IM and NHS funds or Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds, and will not affect the funding or schedule of any currently programmed state projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Presented on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resolution TPB No. 43 Regarding Amendment #7 to the 2010-2014 TIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommends adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution TPB No. 43
Amendment #7 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program
for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) approved the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on October 7, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB has approved six previous amendments to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on December 22, 2009, March 3, 2010, May 5, 2010, June 2, 2010, July 7, 2010, and August 4, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area transportation projects and some transportation planning activities to be undertaken using Federal funding in 2010–2013 must be included in the 2010-2014 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) Southwest Region has requested an amendment to add four new projects to upgrade guardrail end treatments on the following state highways: West Beltline/USH 12/18 (USH 18/151 to I-39/90); Interstate 39/90 (Lien Rd. to CTH B); USH 18/151 (West Beltline to County Line); and USH 151 (I-39/90/94 to County Line); and

WHEREAS, WisDOT is also adding a project to upgrade guardrail end treatments on Interstate 39/90 (STH 106 to Illinois State Line) outside the MPO planning area, which is being added to the TIP for informational purposes; and

WHEREAS, the guardrail projects are needed to meet Federal safety standards and will be funded with Federal IM and NHS funds or Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds, and will not affect the timing of any currently programmed state projects (see attached revised fiscal restraint Table B-2); and

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

WHEREAS, the projects are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan 2030 for the Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County, the adopted long-range regional transportation plan for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area TPB approves Amendment #7 to the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County adding the guardrail projects to the Streets/Roadways section as shown on the attached table.

Date Adopted
______________________________
Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction/ Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost/ Type</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2010</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2011</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2012</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2013</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2014</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WisDOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. BELTLINE USH 12/14/18/151</td>
<td>PE ROW CONST</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verona Road (USH 18/151) to Interstate 39/90 Upgrade guardrail and treatments (9.59 mi.)</td>
<td>TOTAL NHS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSTATE 39/90</td>
<td>PE ROW CONST</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lien Road to CTH B Upgrade guardrail and treatments (16.13 mi.)</td>
<td>TOTAL NHS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USH 18/151</td>
<td>PE ROW CONST</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Beltline (USH 12/14) to USH 151 in Iowa County Upgrade guardrail end treatments (38.51 mi.)</td>
<td>TOTAL NHS</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSTATE 39/90/94</td>
<td>PE ROW CONST</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interstate 39/90/94 to Fond du Lac Cty. Line Upgrade guardrail end treatments (48.33 mi.)</td>
<td>TOTAL NHS</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WisDOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSTATE 39/90</td>
<td>PE ROW CONST</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STH 106 to Illinois State Line Upgrade guardrail and treatments (28.37 mi.)</td>
<td>TOTAL NHS</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STREET/ROADWAY PROJECTS**

**MADISON METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA**

**OUTER COUNTY AREA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Expenditures 2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014*</th>
<th>Estimated Available Funding 2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>Interstate Highway Maintenance</td>
<td>34,330</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>19,184</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>34,330</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>15,296</td>
<td>19,184</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Highway System</td>
<td>7,926</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>18,583</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td>41,145</td>
<td>7,926</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>18,583</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td>41,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>14,153</td>
<td>10,591</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>14,153</td>
<td>10,591</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>6,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Urban Area**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,754</td>
<td>10,939</td>
<td>6,687</td>
<td>7,506</td>
<td>6,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>6,068</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>18,209</td>
<td>19,828</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>6,068</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>18,209</td>
<td>19,828</td>
<td>2,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>4,399</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>4,399</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Program***</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program****</td>
<td>17,870</td>
<td>7,327</td>
<td>7,403</td>
<td>7,476</td>
<td>7,551</td>
<td>17,870</td>
<td>7,327</td>
<td>7,403</td>
<td>7,476</td>
<td>7,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 5309 Fixed Guideways****</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5309 Discretionary Capital Grants***</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section # TIGGER (ARRA)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5316 JARC &amp; Section 5317 New Freedom Program</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5314 NRP &amp; Section 5339 Alt. Analysis Program</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fifth year of funding (2014) is informational only.
** 2010 funding includes special allocation of $1,609,000 for the Woodland Drive reconstruction and path project, special allocation of $986,000 for University Ave. (Shorewood to Segoe) reconstruction project, and $9,802,000 in ARRA funding.
*** Discretionary program for which projects have not been selected. Funding estimated, but not programmed.
**** 2010 funding includes ARRA funding ($9,502 in UAFP and $243,000 in Fixed Guideways).

Note: All state roadway projects using applicable funding sources (e.g., IM, NHS, STP State Flexible, BR) are programmed through 2014. Local BR and STP Rural projects are programmed through 2012. HSIP (other than annual small HES program) projects are programmed through 2012. SRTS projects are not programmed. Local Enhancement projects are programmed through 2011. Local STP Urban (Madison Urban Area) projects are programmed through 2014. Transit funding is not yet programmed and is based on needs and anticipated future funding levels (See also Table C-4 Metro Transit System Projected Expenses and Revenues on page C-8). Programmed transit funding for 2010 includes carryover projects for which the Federal funding is already obligated.
Re:
Consideration of Scoring and Ranking of Candidate Statewide Multi-modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement (TE) & Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Program (BPFP) Projects for FYs 2012-2014

Staff Comments on Item:
WisDOT requests that MPOs rank candidate SMIP projects located within their planning boundaries. The MPO rankings are factored into the SMIP Project Review Committee’s ranking of all projects statewide, which are then forwarded to the WisDOT Secretary for final approval.

MPO staff has scored and ranked the candidate projects based on the MPO’s adopted SMIP scoring criteria. Due to the abbreviated schedule for review and submission of the MPO’s ranking of projects to WisDOT, staff was not able to review the draft scoring and ranking of the SMIP projects with the MPO’s Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). However, MPO staff sent the project rankings to TCC and CAC members to solicit individual comments. MPO staff also reviewed the rankings with the City of Madison’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee as part of a presentation on the draft TIP. The few comments received thus far have been supportive of the draft rankings, particularly the top two projects. MPO staff will report on any additional comments that are received at the meeting.

Materials Presented on Item:
2. Draft table with the scores, rank, and priority of the candidate SMIP projects by jurisdiction.
3. Draft table listing the candidate SMIP projects in priority order with a running total of estimated costs and the requested federal funding amount.
4. Map showing location of candidate SMIP projects in relation to the existing bicycle path network.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval. The ranking of the top three projects is consistent with the rankings for the TE (ARRA) project applications approved by the MPO last year.
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – An MPO
Scoring and Ranking Criteria
For
Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP) Projects

The Federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 established a Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program to fund projects that expand transportation choices and enhance the transportation experience. Funding for the TE Program comes from a 10% set aside of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. The TE Program has been continued in subsequent Federal transportation authorization legislation, including most recently the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (SAFETEA-LU) adopted in 2005. There are fourteen (14) categories of projects eligible for funding under the TE Program, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure projects, safety education for pedestrians and bicyclists, historic preservation, and streetscape/scenic beautification projects.

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) has a Statewide Multi-modal Improvement Program (SMIP) using the TE Program funds and other Federal and State funding allocated to its State Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Program (BPFP). The 2009-2011 State Biennial Budget added $2.5 million in State funds per year to the BPFP in addition to the $2.72 million in Federal funding that had been allocated for the program for a total of $5.22 million annually. This funding supplements the available $6.25 million in TE Program funding annually. BPFP projects generally have the same guidelines as TE projects, except that pedestrian-only and streetscaping projects are not eligible for BPFP funding. Also, state agencies are not eligible applicants for BPFP funds.

The SMIP program is a statewide discretionary program. One of the requirements is that all of Wisconsin’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) submit to WisDOT a ranking of applications, in order of priority, from within the metropolitan planning areas they serve. The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board is the designated MPO for the Madison urban area. The SMIP program review committee, appointed by WisDOT, factors the MPO rankings into its recommendations to WisDOT on projects to be funded.

The following is a description of the criteria and the scoring process that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board uses to evaluate and rank projects applying for SMIP/TE funding. The criteria were derived from MPO-approved criteria used to evaluate Surface Transportation Program (STP) – Urban projects in the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County.

A. Process

Each project is evaluated according to the six criteria described below. A high score is equivalent to a score of six (6) points, a medium score is equivalent to four (4) points, a low score is equivalent to two (2) points, and a zero (0) implies no points for that particular factor or criteria. A total of thirty-six (36) base points is available under the first six criteria. Each project is then ranked according to the total number of points it receives with the highest score ranked as number one.

B. Scoring Criteria

1. **Enhances Mobility and Safety:** The extent to which travel (non-auto) is accommodated or provided for, taking into consideration existing pedestrian and bicycling conditions and facilities and whether reasonably direct alternative suitable and safe routes exist within a corridor. Examples of a high score would include providing ped/bike crossings of major barriers at key locations in the regional system; completing key links of interconnection in the regional system; improving connections between major origins and destinations; and completing major corridors in the regional system. (High = 6 points; medium = 4 points; low = 2 points)
2. **Favorable Impacts (Number of People Affected).** The project has a major positive impact to the region and affects a large number of people. The more people favorably impacted, the higher the score. Examples include: a ped/bike project affecting the region with high forecast use would receive a high score; a project affecting a large area of a particular jurisdiction would get a medium score; and a project affecting a localized or neighborhood area primarily would get a lower score. (High = 6 points; medium = 4 points; low = 2 points)

3. **Improves Quality of Life.** The degree to which a project improves the pedestrian or bicyclist’s experience, provides walking and bicycling opportunities in areas of natural, cultural, or historic interest, and contributes to the overall quality of life in an area. For example, a separate path or trail in a scenic area that is also a major travel corridor equals 6 points; marked street route equals 4 points; and shoulder paving in mixed traffic equals 2 points.

4. **Key System Element.** Degree of ped/bike importance to the regional system. For example, a multi-use path or over/underpass project on the identified regional bikeway system in the MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan 2030 would receive a high score. A project providing an important connection to the regional bikeway system would receive a medium score. A local neighborhood path project would receive a lower score. (High = 6 points; medium = 4 points; low = 2 points)

5. **Probability of Project Proceeding.** The greater the extent of planning and design work and existing financial commitment and the sooner a project is scheduled, the higher the probability of the project being constructed. Projects that have significant unresolved environmental or engineering feasibility issues will receive a lower score. For example, a number “1” local ranked project scheduled in the first year that has been the subject of extensive planning and design efforts receives a high score. An existing financial commitment (e.g., completion of an earlier phase of a project) is also important. (High = 6 points; medium = 4 points; low = 2 points)

6. **Local Ranking.** Rank given by municipality. Depends on how many projects submitted in a given year and the number of years before a project is scheduled for construction. Approach is the same as in criteria #5 above. (High = 6 points; medium = 4 points; low = 2 points)
## Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO
### Scoring and Ranking of Candidate FY 2011-1014 Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement & BFP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Costs in $000s</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FYs 2013-'14</th>
<th>Enhances Mobility/Safety</th>
<th>Key System/Site</th>
<th>Proj. Proceeding</th>
<th>Local Ranking</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Fitchburg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 1 Cannonball Path Phases 2 and 4</td>
<td>600 Const.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 3 Cannonball Path Phase 3 - Beltline Ped/Bike Overpass</td>
<td>274 P.E.¹</td>
<td>3,648 Const.²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 4 Starkweather Creek (E Branch) Path Phase 1</td>
<td>92 P.E.¹</td>
<td>1,225 Const.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Middleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 5 University Avenue/USH 14 Ped/Bike Overpass</td>
<td>228 P.E.</td>
<td>202 Const.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Project UA 1 Cannonball Path Phases 2 and 4: 2.3 mile path connecting the Military Ridge Trail to the SW Commuter Path, new Badger State Trail, and the existing Capital City Trail (E-Way Segment). Provides more direct connection from SW into Madison; also addresses safety issue with current path crossing of CTH PD at USH 18/151 (Verona Road).

2. Project UA 2 Fitchburg Bicycle Hub (Trailhead Facility): Facility to be located in Dawley Conservancy Park off Seminole Hwy. w/ connection to CCT and five other major paths. Parking lot to be expanded. Amenities shelter w/ tables, restroom, drinking fountain, & kiosk.

3. Project UA 3 Cannonball Path Phase 3 - Beltline Ped/Bike Overpass: 3,300' path, including bridge over Beltline, in former rail corridor from Greenway View (end of Phase 1 path) to Fish Hatchery Rd. Provides alt., safe crossing of Beltline and connects neighborhoods south of Beltline to employment, other destinations in central Madison.

4. Project UA 4 Starkweather Creek (E Branch) Path Phase 1: 1 mile path in rail corridor and adjacent public lands from intersection of existing Isthmus, W Branch paths near Dixon St. to Marsh View path. Includes new grade-separated crossing of rail line at western terminus to be constructed with HSR project. Planned ext. to NE.

5. Project UA 5 University Avenue/USH 14 Ped/Bike Overpass: Ped/bike overpass of USH 14/University Ave. is planned w/ connecting paths to Pheas. Branch ($ Fork) path to north and planned path extension in rail corridor to south. Project would fund design for bridge, both paths, and construction of south path from planned PNR lot under Beltline to Elmwood Ave., downtown area. Bridge and north path would be funded through TIF or other grant.
### Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO
### Scoring and Ranking of Candidate FY 2011-1014 Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement & BPFPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Costs in $000s</th>
<th>Description/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Sun Prairie</strong>&lt;br&gt;UA 6 SW Sun Prairie/Madison Connector Path</td>
<td>32 P.E. 210 Const.</td>
<td>4,400' path from the existing ped/bike underpass of USH 151 north to Hoepker Road. Connects to existing Madison bikeway network and planned south/north path west of CTH C.&lt;br&gt;Includes 1 mi. of bridging and boardwalk adjacent to rail corridor along shore of Lake Waubesa and another 1.6 mi. paved path through Lake Farm Cty. Park, connecting McFarland and SE Cty. to the Capital City Trail and into central Madison area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dane County Parks</strong>&lt;br&gt;UA 7 Lower Yahara River Trail Phase 1</td>
<td>3,271 Const. 487 Const.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Middleton</strong>&lt;br&gt;UA 8 West Old Sauk Road Bicycle Accommodations</td>
<td>295 Const.</td>
<td>Project involves reconditioning and expanding a 1-mile segment of the road between Timber Ln. and Swoboda Rd. in order to add bicycle accommodations. TE funding would cover cost to expand road to 28' rather than 24'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:**
- **High = 6**
- **Medium = 4**
- **Low = 2**

---

1. 100% locally funded
2. Seeking $2,006 (55%) in federal funding; City of Madison anticipates that federal appropriation originally directed to Starkweather (E Branch) Creek path will be reauthorized for use on this project.
## SMIP Project Priority Table

### Project Priority Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UA 3 Cannonball Path (Phase 3) - Beltline Ped/Bike Overpass</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>3,922</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>2,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UA 7 Lower Yahara River Trail (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3,271</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>7,680</td>
<td>5,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UA 1 Cannonball Path (Phases 2 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>5,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UA 4 Starkweather Creek (E Branch) Path Phase 1</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>9,597</td>
<td>6,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UA 5 Rail Corridor Path, PE for USH 14 Ped/Bike Overpass</td>
<td>8,946</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>10,027</td>
<td>6,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UA 6 SW Sun Prairie/Madison Connector Path</td>
<td>8,954</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>10,269</td>
<td>7,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UA 7 West Old Sauk Road Bicycle Accommodations</td>
<td>9,249</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>10,564</td>
<td>7,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UA 2 Fitchburg Bicycle Hub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10,814</td>
<td>7,446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outer Dane County Area Projects - Not Ranked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project/Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Fed. Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA 1</td>
<td>Black Earth Creek Greenway Project Streetscaping &amp; Sidwalk</td>
<td>$643</td>
<td>$514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA 2</td>
<td>North Street (V. DeForest) Bike/Ped Path</td>
<td>$466</td>
<td>$373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA 3</td>
<td>V. Mazomanie Path - Downtown to Lake Marion</td>
<td>$365</td>
<td>$292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: $1,474 | $1,179

**Note:**
A total of $34.41 million in federal/state funding under the Transportation Enhancement (TE) and Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Programs is available statewide for FYs 2011-2014. A small amount of that will be needed to cover costs from the federal stimulus (ARRA) TE projects, but there should be more than $30 million available.
### Re:
Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA)

### Staff Comments on Item:
The next meeting of the RTA Board is scheduled for Wednesday, August 25. The agenda is attached. At the most recent meeting of the RTA’s Plan for Transit Committee, RTA Board Chair Dick Wagner reviewed a draft set of principles he prepared as a starting point for creation of the transit plan. That document is also attached.

### Materials Presented on Item:
1. Agenda for the August 25, 2010 RTA Board Meeting
2. Draft principles for the regional transit plan

### Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
For information and discussion only
AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JULY 14, 2010 RTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

3. REPORT FROM STAFF AND BOARD MEMBERS
   i. Bylaws and Agreements Committee Work
   ii. Plan for Transit Committee Work
   iii. RTA Advisory Committee Update
   iv. Report of RTA Chair

4. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS
   i. Update of High Speed Passenger Rail Planning Activities Wisconsin Department of Transportation)
   ii. Update on Referendum efforts
   iii. Overview of Shorewood Hills Comprehensive Plan (Transportation Chapter)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT (Note: Three Minutes Maximum per Person)²

6. DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY RTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
   i. Adoption of RTA Bylaws
   ii. Discussion of Transit Plan Elements

7. ADJOURNMENT
If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations to access this service, activity or program, please contact the City of Madison, Planning Division at (608) 266-4635, TTY/TEXTNET (866) 704-2318. Please do so at least 48 hours prior to the meeting so that the proper arrangements can be made.

This is an opportunity for the public to comment; time of commentary is limited to three minutes per person.
Plan

1. Adopt Principles or Goals for Transit Plan
2. Create RTA Advisory Committee
3. Visit Communities in RTA region
   (Note already Madison, Middleton, Fitchburg and Shorewood scheduled)
   On the list
   Monona
   Sun Prairie
   Stoughton
   McFarland
   Verona
   Cottage Grove
   Waunakee
4. Create Transit Service Models: maps and technologies
5. Create Financial Plan noting Economic Benefits
6. Draft and Schedule Referendum
Principles for Transit Plan (Draft for Discussion Aug. 17, 2010)

Expand Transit to a truly regional service using existing providers and selected new providers where needed.

Provide financially secure base for existing transit service and remove present transit costs from property tax being paid by citizens of Madison, Middleton, Fitchburg, Shorewood Hills, Town of Madison, Monona, Sun Prairie, Stoughton and Dane County (within RTA for elderly and specialized services).

Elements of regional service in the future will include express bus service from many parts of the region for prime commute times and may include Sun Prairie, Fitchburg, Stoughton, Middleton, Verona, Cottage Grove, Waunakee, and McFarland.

Elements of regional service will include park and ride lots to access express routes and park and ride lots to access other mid-region locations for transit to reduce core congestion trips yet riders can chain errands with their overall trip.

Elements of regional service will include improved elderly and specialized transit for the RTA area.

Elements of regional service may include new types of service to be determined by the RTA like Bus Rapid Transit and Commuter Rail as analysis of their feasibility continues.

Elements of regional service will include a comprehensive fare system permitting differential rates and easy transfers across providers.

Elements of regional service will include commitment to green technologies with expansion of bus service by hybrid vehicles and other green options as they are developed.

Elements of regional service may include as communities express interest in better intra-service connectivity like shared taxi service used by some communities (at present Stoughton and Sun Prairie) or local circulators combined with express service.

Elements of regional service will include participation in a multi-mode transit hub for the region to be developed to accommodate regular mainline bus connections, express bus connections, and possibly BRT buses and commuter rail with inter city bus and rail service.