AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of April 2, 2008 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

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

5. Consideration of Citizen Appointment to the Madison Area TPB Citizen Advisory Committee

6. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 14, Regarding Amendment #2 of the 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Area
   - Add two specific JARC grant projects in the Transit Capital section: (1) Commuter Bus Service from Madison to Verona and Epic Systems; (2) Southwestern WI Community Action Program – Auto Loan Program for Low-Income Persons
   - Revise existing Job Access and Reverse Commute Program in the Transit Capital Section project description to state various other projects to be determined and deleting the 2008 funding

7. Consideration of Letter of Comment to WisDOT Regarding Proposed Interchange on USH 14 With a Relocated Lacy Road and Other Associated Roadway Improvements

8. Consideration of Scoring and Ranking of Candidate Statewide Multimodal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement (TE) Projects for FY 2010-2011

9. Continued Review and Discussion on the Selection Process for Surface Transportation Program (STP) – Urban Transportation Projects

10. Status Report by TPB Board Members on Projects Potentially Involving the TPB:
    - Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force
    - USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor Study
    - North Mendota Parkway Implementation Oversight Committee
    - USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)

11. Discussion of Future Work Items:
    - Continued Discussion of Selection Process for STP Urban Projects
    - Verona Road/West Beltline Interim Improvements
    - Dane County Clean Air Coalition
    - Restructure of the Citizen Advisory Committee
    - Ped/Bike Safety Education Program
Re:
Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 14 Regarding Amendment #2 to the 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County Area.

Staff Comments on Item:
This TIP amendment is required to add two grant projects under the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program. The TIP currently only has a general “placeholder” listing for the JARC Program. Under SAFETEA-LU, the Madison Urban Area now receives a direct allocation of funding under this FTA program. WisDOT, which is still administering the program for the Madison area, sent out a request for project applications under the program last fall and no applications were received for the Madison area. Since then, WisDOT and MPO staff worked to identify two projects for funding in 2008, and applications for these projects have been received by WisDOT. The first is a continuation of funding to support the Metro commuter bus service from the West Transfer Point to the City of Verona and the Epic Systems campus. The second project would provide funding to the Southwestern Wisconsin Community Action Program (CAP) to start an auto loan program called Work-n-Wheels to help income eligible persons in obtaining a dependable vehicle for work. Southwestern WI CAP has implemented the program in other area counties with funding through Wisconsin Employment Transportation Assistance Program, which includes funding from the JARC program.

Materials Presented on Item:
Resolution TPB No. 14

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends adoption of Resolution TPB No. 14.
Resolution TPB No. 14

Amendment #2 to the 2008–2012 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) approved the 2008–2012 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on November 7, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB approved Amendment #1 to the 2008–2012 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County on March 5, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area transportation projects and some transportation planning activities to be undertaken using Federal funding in 2008–2011 must be included in the 2008–2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, another TIP amendment has been requested to add two projects to be funded with FFY 2006 Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (JARC) funds; and

WHEREAS, the Madison urban area now receives a direct allocation of JARC funds and if the FFY 2006 funds are not spent, the funds will lapse; and

WHEREAS, the two proposed JARC 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 #2 to the 2008–2012 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, adding the following two projects and revising the existing general JARC program project (with costs in $000s):

1. Add the following two specific JARC grant projects in the Transit Capital section on page 27:
   (a) City of Verona; Commuter Bus Service from Madison to Verona and Epic Systems;
       $73 (Fed-Sec. 5316), $18 (State), $68 (Local-Verona), $159 (Total) in 2008;
       and
   (b) Southwestern WI Community Action Program; Auto Loan Program for Low-Income Persons;
       $54 (Fed-Sec. 5316), $54 (Local-SWCAP), $108 (Total) in 2008.

2. Revise existing Q. Job Access and Reverse Commute Program in the Transit Capital section on page 27, changing the project description to state Various other projects to be determined and deleting the 2008 funding.

____________________________    ______________________________________
Date Adopted         Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
12. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

13. Adjournment

______________________

Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, July 2 at 7 p.m.**
Madison Water Utility, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B

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

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

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

*Por favor avisenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.*
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
April 2, 2008 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: Tom Clauder, Joe Clausius, Ken Harwood, Duane Hinz, Brett Hulsey, Chuck Kamp, Jerry Mandli, Al Matano, John Vesperman, Robbie Webber

Members absent: Eileen Bruskewitz, Mark Opitz, Satya Rhodes-Conway, Paul Skidmore

Staff present: Bob McDonald, Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

2. Approval of March 5, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Harwood, seconded by Hinz, to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

None

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

None

5. Consideration of MPO Appointment to Madison’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission

Matano recommended reappointment of Rhodes-Conway to the position. Moved by Webber, seconded by Clauder. Motion carried.

6. Presentation on the Beltline Safety and Operations Study by Larry Barta, WisDOT Southwest Region

McDonald said there are many ongoing projects and corridor studies in the MPO area, and staff is scheduling presentations on these to get all of the Board members up to speed on them, particularly since many of the members are new. The presentation tonight is on the Beltline study, which is focusing on safety and traffic operations issues, particularly at the interchange areas. He introduced Larry Barta with WisDOT, the project manager.

Barta provided a power point presentation on the study. The project limits run from USH 14 in Middleton to CTH N east of the Interstate. The study objectives are to identify existing and future safety and operational issues, develop and prioritize solutions that reduce crashes and extend the useful life of the Beltline without adding mainline capacity, and to increase interchange capacity/efficiency. He noted the Beltline’s importance as part of the State’s backbone system and only continuous east-west route south of the downtown Isthmus. He showed a graphic indicating that despite the regional importance of the route, a high percentage of trips are “local.” In response to a question from Webber, he said “local” in the context of this facility meant that the trip origins and destinations were within the metropolitan or central county area. Barta reviewed crash statistics from 2000-2004, high crash rate segments compared to other urban freeways in the state, traffic volume data, and traffic forecasts by segment. The majority of segments are projected to operate at Level of Service (LOS) E or F by 2030 with a lot of stop-and-go traffic, increasing to the traffic diversion to the local street network that is already occurring during peak periods. He also showed a table ranking the interchange (merge/diverge) areas in terms of crash rate compared to other interchanges on the State’s backbone system, this time not distinguishing urban from rural. The top two crash locations on the Beltline—Fish Hatchery Road Eastbound and Park Street Eastbound Weave—are also the top two in the entire state. The movements were broken down by weave, merge, and diverge. Webber asked if the diverge movement crash would involve a vehicle being rear-
ended. Barta said yes and in large part that relates to the need for more ramp space. He showed a chart illustrating the analysis done for each segment, looking at the physical condition (pavement, bridges), roadway geometry (how well it meets current freeway standards), crash experience, and traffic operations.

WisDOT is looking at low-cost short-term solutions that can be easily implemented and might handle traffic for another 6-8 years and higher cost, mid-term solutions that might improve operations another 5+ years beyond that. For the mid-term solutions they want to make sure the improvements are compatible with any longer term solutions. The focus of short- and mid-term solutions is two fold: (1) reduce crashes by eliminating ramp back-ups into the mainline roadway, eliminating weave conflicts, and fixing geometric deficiencies; and (2) increasing interchange capacity by adding and extending ramp turn lanes, lengthening ramp merge/diverge areas, and improving side road intersections, typically adding turn lanes. The ramp backups are, in large part, because enough traffic can’t get through the intersection in the signal time. Adding turn lanes on the ramps allows more vehicles to get through in a cycle. Lengthening the ramp merge lanes provides more space for vehicle conflicts to get worked out without resulting in slow downs or crashes on the mainline. Another issue in some locations is the side road and ramp intersections are too close together, reducing the ability of the signals to work well. Webber commented that adding turn lanes makes it more difficult for pedestrians to cross the intersections. Barta said WisDOT is also trying to make improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists where they can do so.

Barta reviewed projects in the different interchange areas. The short-term projects are already programmed for construction in late 2008. He reviewed those first. At both Old Sauk and Mineral Point Roads, the improvements involved adding and lengthening turn lanes on the ramps and at the intersection. Also, the eastbound third lane on Mineral Point Road will be extended from the southbound ramp to Tree Lane with the bike lane reconstructed. At Seminole Highway, signals and left turn lanes will be added with to both ramp intersections to improve traffic flow through the intersection. The capacity of the westbound off-ramp will be increased. Bike lanes will be retained and bus stop improvements made. Turn lanes will be added on the westbound off-ramps at Park Street and Rimrock Road. Part of the reason for the needed off-ramp capacity at Rimrock Road and other locations is the interchanges function as escape routes when there is a crash or incident on the Beltline. Turn lanes are also being added to both ramps at Stoughton Road. The eastbound off-ramp is particularly problematic because of the heavy eastbound-to-northbound traffic movement. The separate Stoughton Road study is looking at longer term solutions for that interchange.

Barta next reviewed the mid-term projects. At Fish Hatchery Road, in 2009 the southbound-to-eastbound loop on-ramp will be removed. A traffic signal will then be added at the south ramp intersection and left turn lanes added. Deceleration lanes will be created for eastbound traffic entering the loop off-ramp to head north. WisDOT was going to add turn lane capacity to the westbound off-ramp, but now will have funding to make longer term improvements in 2012 that will involve realigning the off-ramp to the south. The 2012 improvements will remove the northbound to westbound loop on-ramp and realigning the westbound on-ramp to create a diamond interchange for the two ramps. The frontage road will need to be moved as a result, requiring the acquisition of two businesses. The bridge over the Beltline will be reconstructed and widened. Total cost is estimated at $6.4 million. At Park Street, similar improvements will be made to address the same eastbound weave problem with construction sometime between 2010-12. The eastbound to northbound loop off-ramp will be removed and a full signal added at the intersection south of the Beltline by splitting the eastbound to southbound ramp. By eliminating the loop ramp, the northbound to eastbound on-ramp can be relocated to provide more distance for vehicles to increase their speed before entering the Beltline. An auxiliary lane between Rimrock and Park Street will be added in both directions, which is effective in improving the weave. Total cost for this work is estimated at $6.7 million. The interchange with the Interstate has been studied as part of the Interstate expansion study from Madison to the Illinois State line. Sub-standard features
include the left exit ramps and the two loop ramps. The proposal is to separate out the through traffic from the turning traffic with a collector/distributor system. The work is not programmed and needs approval from the Transportation Projects Commission as a majors project.

In terms of next steps, Barta said the report for this phase of the study will be finished, prioritizing the alternatives, including auxiliary lanes on the West side and ramp meters. WisDOT will then need to begin programming the projects as funding becomes available. A third phase of the study will then be initiated looking at construction of additional grade-separated crossings. Some of these were already given an initial look as part of the Verona Road/West Beltline EIS. The reason is that a substantial amount of the traffic traveling through the interchange areas is simply crossing, but not getting on the Beltline. Neighborhood impacts must be considered, however, and it will be difficult at this point to add any.

7. Consideration of Letter of Response Regarding Invitation to Become a Participating Agency on the USH 151/Verona Road Corridor Study

McDonald said that SAFETEA-LU is now requiring that for any Federally funded project potential participating agencies, including environmental agencies and the MPO, must sign off on the EIS. The MPO is in fact already a participating agency because the MPO reviews the plans and comments on EISs. However, the acknowledgement must be in writing. Included in the packet is a draft letter accepting the invitation to become a participating agency in the development of the Supplemental DEIS for the study focusing on short-term improvements to Verona Road and possible modifications to long-term alternatives evaluated in the DEIS. Moved by Harwood, seconded by Kamp to approve release of the letter. Motion passed.

8. Consideration of Press Release, Citizen Participation Effort, and Generalized Schedule for Preparing the 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Area

McDonald said that it’s that time of year when we start the TIP process. A draft schedule and press release have been prepared. The schedule includes meeting dates and the steps for adoption of the TIP. McDonald said staff would like to make one change to the Citizen Participation Schedule, adding item #11, which notes the November 3 deadline for submittal of the TIP to WisDOT for inclusion in the State TIP. Moved by Kamp, seconded by Clausius to approve the schedule and press release. Motion carried.

9. Consideration of Letter of Transmittal Requesting Projects for the STP-Urban Funding and TIP Update

McDonald said this is the letter sent out to all units of government within Dane County requesting projects to be submitted for inclusion in the TIP and to units in the MPO planning area requesting applications for STP-Urban projects. There is a typo in the Re: line. The date should be June 9. Schaefer also noted that staff plan to add a sentence at the top of page 2 (after it says forms are included in the mailing) to say that the forms will also be available on the MPO’s website for filling out electronically. Along with the letter are the project listing form and the STP-Urban project application form. The STP-Urban project application form has been revised and expanded to ask for more information to help in scoring and ranking the projects. Staff has been working on the revised form with the TCC, and previously discussed this with the Board. Moved by Kamp, seconded by Webber, to approve letter with the changes. Motion carried.

10. Overview of Selection Process for Surface Transportation Program (STP) – Urban Transportation Projects

McDonald said the Board had requested that staff review with them how projects are scored and ranked. There is a paper that describes the process, which is included in the TIP. Staff planned to provide an overview of the process tonight and then have more discussion and review some example projects at the
following meeting. Schaefer then reviewed the paper. The introduction includes background information, including other Federal funding programs. This helps show how the STP-Urban program fits in with all the other programs as it is only a small piece of the overall Federal funding “pie.” One of the goals of the TIP process is to maximize funding that comes to the region from all funding sources. The STP Urban funds are part of the overall surface transportation program. States receive an allocation of STP funding based upon lane miles of roadway, estimated VMT, etc. Ten percent of the STP funding must be set aside for the Local Transportation Enhancement Program, which is the primarily source of funding for independent bicycle projects. The remainder of the funding is then distributed among the different areas of the state. As an urban area with over 200,000 in population, the Madison area receives a direct allocation of funds. The list of projects eligible for funding under the STP is extensive and includes just about any type of capital project. One limitation for roadway projects is the roadway must be local and on the Federal aid system, which includes those classified as regional arterials and urban or major rural collectors. The classification of the roadways is done periodically by the MPO in cooperation with FHWA, WisDOT, and local units of government. McDonald added that this is quite a lengthy process. Other eligible projects include pedestrian and bicycle projects, transit capital projects, ITS, TDM, etc. Some non-infrastructure projects such as bicycle education are eligible as well. Hulsey asked if the current $6 million allocation to the Madison area under SAFETEA-LU is in jeopardy. McDonald said the future allocation is uncertain because SAFETEA-LU expires in 2009. In the past the allocation was cut, but WisDOT utilized other funds to prevent the program allocation from being reduced.

Schaefer highlighted the SAFETEA-LU, RTP, and TIP goals and objectives for the TIP process, and the process used to develop the prioritized listing of STP-Urban projects. He then went over the project criteria. There are two types: (1) initial screening criteria that projects must meet before staff will score and rank them; and (2) scoring criteria. The screening criteria are that the project must be in the RTP (or for a smaller project consistent with the plan), be consistent with SAFETEA-LU goals (including public participation in developing the project), and have reasonable cost estimates with a local commitment of funds. McDonald said staff check this by seeing if the project is in the local unit of government’s capital improvement program. Schaefer then went over the scoring criteria and how each is typically applied to roadway and other projects. Some such as Congestion Prevention and the five criteria under External Impacts only apply to TDM and TSM type projects. This is why, for example, the ridesharing program scores well. There are two criteria that address Congestion Relief, one that focuses on existing congestion and another that address future and/or latent demand.

Schaefer said that at the next meeting staff will go over the scoring of some example projects from the current listings and perhaps some already completed projects. This will help give the Board members an idea of how certain projects shake out in terms of the scoring. Harwood said he was concerned that the traffic projections don’t take into account recent or changed development circumstances, and wondered if there was an opportunity to reevaluate those projects. McDonald responded that the criterion on page 8 under VI (Land Use and Transportation System Change Interrelationship) addresses this. Perhaps even more important, the RTP is updated every five years and as part of that process staff compares recent development activity with the RTP forecasts to see where changes might need to be made in the land use assumptions. That work has actually already begun. Schaefer said that updated forecasts for particular areas are being done regularly as communities ask MPO staff to prepare forecasts for new or revised neighborhood plans. If new information was available related to a project, staff would re-score the project based on that. McDonald added as part of the analysis done for neighborhood plans a build out scenario is assumed along with the official year 2030 forecast. This allows staff to see how traffic might grow if growth trends shift within the metropolitan area. Hinz asked about the TCC review of the scoring of projects, and McDonald said staff review the draft scoring and ranking of projects with the TCC, which then makes a recommendation on the project listings. Kamp asked if staff had researched the criteria that other MPOs use. McDonald said this has been done in the past and there are wide
variations in the criteria that different MPOs use. For smallers MPOs, their criteria tend to not be as multi-modal.

11. Status Report by TPB Board Members on Projects Potentially Involving the TPB:

- **Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force**
  McDonald said that the New Starts application to FTA is ready or just about ready and would probably be submitted in the near future. Some changes to the supporting technical data will need to be made. For example, an on-board survey is being conducted to gather O-D and other data to make sure that the transit/mode choice model is accurately calibrated.

- **USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor Study**
  McDonald mentioned that public meetings have been scheduled to present the final alternatives for the three levels of potential improvements for each segment of the roadway between the Beltline and the Interstate.

- **North Mendota Parkway Implementation Oversight Committee**
  McDonald said another meeting is being set up to review potential roadway corridor alignments. At the last meeting, staff reviewed the maps of the environmental resources in the corridor and the committee discussed the boundaries of the planned E-Way. They still need to consider how the E-Way and the roadway will be integrated. Both will be officially mapped after the conclusion of the study.

- **USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)**
  McDonald reported that an engineering team had completed a value engineering study, and the consultants had presented their recommendations, which included adding some sub-alternatives. The consultants are now trying to decide how to fold these in to the study.

12. Discussion of Future Work Items:

- **Continued Discussion of Selection Process for STP Urban Projects**
  McDonald said staff would review the scoring of some example projects at the next meeting.

- **Verona Road/West Beltline Interim Improvements**
  McDonald stated that WisDOT and the consultants were working on the southern segment of Verona Road (Williamsburg Way/CTH PD), looking at different alternatives as part of the Supplemental DEIS. Some public meetings and presentation for the Board will be scheduled in the future on these.

- **Dane County Clean Air Coalition**
  McDonald said that he would be scheduling a presentation by the staff person for the coalition to discuss what the coalition is doing and provide data on the county’s air quality designation status.

- **Restructure of the Citizen Advisory Committee**
  Ongoing.

- **Ped/Bike Safety Education Program**
  McDonald said a presentation would be scheduled on this program, which is partially funded with STP-Urban funds.

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

McDonald indicated that he wasn’t sure if the next meeting would be held at the Water Utility or in the MMB.

Webber requested that staff post the MPO Board meeting packet on the MPO website for members of the public to access. She said this would have been helpful for the power point presentation, for example. McDonald said staff could do this.

14. Adjournment

Moved by Webber, seconded by Clausius, to adjourn. Motion carried.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of Letter of Comment to WisDOT Regarding Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange on USH 14 With a Relocated Lacy road and Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Roadway Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Comments on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT is requesting the Board to provide preliminary comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the effects of the project, including an assessment of how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the project relates to the agency’s area of expertise. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments are being requested prior to the release of a draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment (EA) document and the holding of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public information meeting. The preliminary comments are to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included into the information presented at the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information meeting to be held this summer. Comments are due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by June 30, 2008. The Board can make final comments on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project following the release of the EA and reviewing comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>made at the public information meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Presented on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WisDOT’s Letter of Request for Madison Area TPB Comment (May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Draft Letter of Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommends approval of draft letter of comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 15, 2008

Mike Rampetsreiter  
Project Engineer  
WisDOT SW Region-Madison Office  
2101 Wright Street  
Madison, WI 53704

Re: Request for Madison Area Transportation Planning Board Comment  
Project ID 5155-02-80  
USH 14-Lacy Road Interchange  
City of Fitchburg  
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Rampetsreiter:

Your letter of May 7, 2008, requests the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board provide preliminary comments on the effects of the proposed USH 14-Lacy Road Interchange project, including an assessment of how the project relates to the agency’s area of expertise.

In terms of expertise, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison Urban Area. As the MPO, it is the policy body responsible for cooperative, comprehensive regional transportation planning and decision making for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area. Primary responsibilities include preparing and maintaining a long-range, multi-modal Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the metropolitan area, and preparing a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to provide for transportation investments to meet metropolitan transportation needs. Federal regulations require the TIP to include all regionally significant projects to be funded with Federal funds as well as all regionally significant projects to be funded with non-Federal funds. Projects contained in the TIP must be consistent with the approved Regional Transportation Plan.

The Policy Board has reviewed the materials sent with your letter and concur that the project is identified in the Regional Transportation Plan 2030 (Figure 41, page 135, and Table 24, page 136) as an anticipated surface transportation improvement activity and is therefore consistent with that plan. The project is also identified in the 2008-2012 TIP (page 40) as a regionally significant project to be constructed in 2009 with local funds.

The Board would like to note that, while Lacy Road is functionally classed as an urban collector today, it is an important East-West travel corridor that nearly traverses the full width of the City of Fitchburg and that its importance is likely to increase to the status of a minor arterial as the city grows. It is therefore, extremely important that the relocated portion of Lacy Road be maintained as the main travel corridor as shown on the official map. It is also extremely important that the relocated Lacy Road be connected to CTH
MM through the proposed USH 14 interchange (as shown on the official map), because of its functional class designation, and to accommodate the removal of the southbound on-ramp and northbound off-ramp at McCoy Road.

The Board would like further note that the proposed project will correct a safety problem at the intersection of McCoy Road and CTH MM. During a.m. peak hours, eastbound McCoy Road traffic stacks up from the CTH MM intersection past the northbound off ramp of the McCoy Road interchange forcing backups on the ramp to the live lanes on northbound USH 14.

Because of the early stages of development of this project, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board may wish to make additional comments on this project following the release of the draft Environmental Assessment document and completion of the public information meeting.

If you have any questions concerning the Board’s preliminary comments, please do not hesitate to contact Transportation Planning Manager, Robert McDonald, at rmcdonald@cityofmadison.com or 266-4518.

Sincerely,

Al Matano
MPO Chair

cc: Jennifer Grimes, WisDOT SW Region Environmental Coordinator
    Paul Woodard, City of Fitchburg DPW
    KL Engineering, Inc.
May 7, 2008

Robert McDonald
Transportation Planning Manager
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
121 S. Pinckney Street
Suite 400
Madison, WI 53703

Reference: Request for Madison Area Transportation Planning Board Comment
Project ID 5155-02-80
USH 14 – Lacy Road Interchange
City of Fitchburg
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. McDonald:

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and the City of Fitchburg propose to construct an interchange on USH 14 and connecting local roads, approximately 3,200 feet north of the existing Lacy Road overpass. No federal funds will be used for the project; the project is being funded by the City of Fitchburg and WisDOT. The purpose of this letter is to request the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board’s written comments about the project.

The project proposes to construct:
• a diamond interchange with relocated Lacy Road and USH 14, north of the existing Lacy Road overpass,
• a relocated Lacy Road,
• an extension of East Cheryl Parkway, and
• removal of the southbound on ramp and northbound off ramp at McCoy Road.

The attached maps show the project location and the general project footprint.

The City of Fitchburg officially mapped the location of the interchange and local roads in a resolution dated November 15, 2004, a copy of the resolution is attached. The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board’s Regional Transportation Plan 2030 identifies construction of the project as an Anticipated Surface Transportation Improvement Activity.

In January 2006, a WisDOT representative met with a WDNR representative at the project site to perform a wetland determination and evaluate natural resource aspects of the project. Notes from that site visit are attached. The proposed project construction for which WisDOT and the City of Fitchburg are responsible avoids the wetlands that were reviewed during the site visit.
The portion of the project that will be designed and constructed by a developer (noted in orange on the attached project footprint maps) will require a crossing of Swan Creek and possible wetland impacts. The potential impact area is noted in green. The developer will be responsible for applicable permit requests pertaining to work in the waterway and/or wetland impacts.

The Environmental Assessment will address the entire project footprint, which includes the area designed and constructed by WisDOT and the City of Fitchburg (noted in blue and yellow) as well as the area designed and constructed by a developer (noted in orange). Therefore, we request that your agency address the entire project footprint when responding in writing to this letter.

We are requesting that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board provide comment on the effects of the project, including an assessment of how the project relates to the agency's area of expertise.

Upon completion of your review of the project, please forward your written comments to me. A Public Information Meeting (PIM) for the project will be held this summer; an invitation for the PIM will be sent to you. The Environmental Assessment for the project is scheduled for draft submittal in December 2008. We would like to incorporate your agency’s preliminary comments into the information we present at the summer 2008 PIM. Therefore, we ask that you submit your written comments by June 30, 2008. Please contact me should you have questions or require additional information.

My contact information is:
  Mike Rampetsreiter, P.E.
  WisDOT SW Region – Madison
  2101 Wright Street
  Madison, Wisconsin 53704
  Phone: 608-246-7917
  E-mail: michael.rampetsreiter@dot.state.wi.us

KL Engineering is a consulting firm working with WisDOT on this project. Should I be unavailable and you have questions, you can also contact Scott Cramer, the environmental specialist with KL Engineering for this project. His phone is 608-663-1218, and his e-mail is scramer@klengineering.com.

Sincerely,

   Mike Rampetsreiter, P.E.
   WisDOT Project Engineer

Enclosures as stated

cc:   Mike Rampetsreiter, WisDOT SW Region Project Manager (project file)
      Jennifer Grimes, WisDOT SW Region Environmental Coordinator
      Paul Woodard, City of Fitchburg DPW
      KL Engineering, Inc. project file
Project Footprint
WisDOT ID 5155-02-80
USH 14 / Lacy Road Interchange
City of Fitchburg
Dane County

Project proposes to remove the USH 14 ramps (northbound off and southbound on) at McCoy Road after construction of Lacy Road interchange.

Legend:
- Designed and constructed by developer
  - Length of Lacy/Cheryl road work = 6,200 feet
  - Area impacted by Lacy/Cheryl road work (300 foot corridor) = approx. 40 acres
- Construction will require crossing Swan Creek and possible wetland impacts
- Designed and constructed by WisDOT / Fitchburg
  - Total Length of Ramps = 7,800 feet
  - Area impacted by ramps = approx. 20 acres
  - Length of Lacy roadwork = 1,500 feet
  - Area impacted by Lacy road work (300 foot corridor) = approx. 40 acres
Project Footprint (Approximate)
WisDOT ID 5155-02-80
USH 14 / Lacy Road Interchange
City of Fitchburg
Dane County

Project proposes to remove the USH 14 ramps (northbound off and southbound on) at McCoy Road after construction of Lacy Road interchange.

- Designed and constructed by developer
  - Length of Lacy/Cheryl road work = 6,200 feet
  - Area impacted by Lacy/Cheryl road work (300 foot corridor) = approx. 40 acres
- Construction will require crossing Swan Creek and possible wetland impacts

- Designed and constructed by WisDOT / Fitchburg
  - Total Length of Ramps = 7800 feet
  - Area impacted by ramps = approx. 20 acres
  - Length of Lacy roadwork = 1,500 feet
  - Area impacted by Lacy road work (300 foot corridor) = approx. 40 acres
RESOLUTION R-87-04
AMENDING THE OFFICIAL MAP TO ADD
EAST CHERYL PARKWAY EXTENDED EAST OF SYENE ROAD
TO AN INTERCHANGE CONNECTION WITH USH 14
CITY OF FITCHBURG, WISCONSIN

WHEREAS, the City of Fitchburg has held numerous public meetings and hearings on
the Nine Springs Neighborhood Plan and the Green Tech Village Plan; and

WHEREAS, on December 8, 1998 the Common Council adopted the Nine Springs
Neighborhood Plan which showed an interchange with USH 14; and

WHEREAS, on January 14, 2003 the Common Council adopted the Green Tech Village
Plan which also showed an interchange at USH 14; and

WHEREAS, it is in the public interest to amend the official map to include the East
Cheryl Parkway extended, and USH 14 interchange with Lacy Road; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, East Cheryl Parkway extension, and
the USH 14 interchange as depicted in Exhibit A be added by amendment to the City’s Official
Map.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to
Representatives Sondy Pope-Roberts & Terese Berceau, Senators Fred Risser & Jon Erpenbach,
to the DOT Secretary Frank Busalacchi, and to the Governor.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Fitchburg this 11th day of Dec.,
2004.

Approved By: ________________________
Thomas Clauder, Mayor

Attested By: ________________________
Karen A. Peters, City Clerk

As Amended by
Common Council 12/14/04
Field Review Notes
January 6, 2006

Project: USH 14 Interchange
City of Fitchburg
Dane County, Wisconsin

Location: Northwest quadrant of USH 14 and Lacy Road Overpass

Attendees: Cathy Bleser, WDNR; Scott Cramer, KL Engineering

Regarding: WDNR Review and Comments for Project

Observations of Proposed Interchange Layout

- Cathy Bleser (CB) and Scott Cramer (SC) walked through wetland complex in the northwest quadrant of UWH 14-Lacy Road overpass. The area shown as wetland on the attached map supplied by City of Fitchburg was generally confirmed during our walk through.

- CB and SC placed flags along the apparent north and east boundaries of this wetland complex. The boundary was identified mainly by vegetation and topography. Soil samples were not collected.

- CB stated that WDNR would likely prefer a road that borders this wetland complex. This road would serve as a barrier between the wetland and any development that occurs and would limit runoff into the wetland that may contain fertilizer, contaminants, pet waste, etc.

- The east edge of the wetland apparently extends into or near the USH 14 right-of-way. Hummock sedge (Carex stricta) is present along a majority of the right-of-way; this is an obligate (OBL) species that almost always occurs in wetlands under natural conditions.

- Reed canary grass is heavily present along the north border of the wetland complex. This is a facultative wetland (FACW) species that usually occurs in wetlands.

- Isolated upland areas occur within the wetland complex. These upland areas were not defined (flagged) during the field review.
Proposed interchange to be constructed approximately 3,200 feet north of existing Lacy Road.
Re:

Consideration of Scoring and Ranking of Candidate Statewide Multi-modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement (TE) Projects for FYs 2010-'11

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, which are then forwarded to the WisDOT Secretary for final approval. MPO staff scored and ranked the candidate projects based on the MPO’s adopted SMIP scoring criteria, which emphasize improving mobility and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians and providing “alternative” transportation options for work, school, and shopping (vs. purely recreational) trips. Staff reviewed the draft SMIP project scoring and rankings with the MPO’s Citizen Advisory Committee on May 20 and will be reviewing them with the MPO’s Technical Coordinating Committee on May 28. Staff will report on the comments and recommendations of the committees. The MPO must provide WisDOT with its ranking of the projects after the June meeting.

Materials Presented on Item:


2. Table with the scores, rank, and priority of the candidate SMIP projects by jurisdiction.

3. Table listing the candidate SMIP projects in priority order with a running total of estimated costs.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:

Recommend approval
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – An MPO
Scoring and Ranking Criteria
For
Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement 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 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 created the Statewide Multi-modal Improvement Program (SMIP) using the TE Program funds and other Federal funding. The other funding used to come from the STP – Discretionary Program and was to be used for projects that foster alternatives to single-occupant vehicle trips, such as transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and transportation demand management (TDM) projects. The funding for STP-D program had been removed, but was restored in the 2007-2009 State Biennial Budget and moved to a new Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Program (BPFP). A total of about $18 million ($12.5 in TE funds and $5.44 in BPFP funds) is available primarily for fiscal years (FYS) 2010 and 2011.

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 urban 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 used to evaluate and rank projects applying for SMIP/TE funding. The criteria were derived from MPO-approved criteria used to evaluate STP Urban projects in the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area and 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. Each project is then ranked according to the total number of points it receives with the highest score ranked as number one.

B. 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 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, 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. High degree equals 6 points; medium degree equals 4 points, and low degree equals 2 points.

5. **Probability of Project Proceeding.** The higher the local ranking, the greater the extent of planning and existing financial commitment, and the sooner a project is scheduled, the higher the probability of the project being constructed. For example, a number “1” local ranked project scheduled in the first year that has been the subject of extensive planning 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 Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Costs in $000s</th>
<th>Enhances Mobility/Safety</th>
<th>Impact - Lg. # People</th>
<th>Improvs. Environ. Qual. Life</th>
<th>Key System/Site</th>
<th>Prob. Proj. Proceeding</th>
<th>Local Ranking</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009 FY 2010 FY 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fitchburg</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 Badger State Trail - Surfacing of Northern Segment</td>
<td>50 P.E.</td>
<td>1,040 Const.</td>
<td>4 4 6 6 6 6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Completes construction of northern 6 miles of trail, paving 10-ft. wide path from Purcell Rd north to Lovell Ln, connecting to SW Path, Capital City Trail (CCT), and planned Cannonball Trail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 2 Fitchburg Bicycle Hub (Trailhead Facility)</td>
<td>25 P.E.</td>
<td>175 Const.</td>
<td>2 4 6 4 4 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facility to be located in Dawley Conservancy Park off Seminole Hwy w/ connection to CCT; Includes expanding parking lot, shelter w/ tables, restroom, racks, kiosk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 3 Starkweather Creek (W Branch) Path Final Phase</td>
<td>120 P.E.*</td>
<td>2,640 Const.#</td>
<td>6 6 4 6 6 6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final phase of 2.5 mi. path connecting the Capital City Trail (E Isthmus segment) with MATC Truax campus; extends from Commercial Ave. to north of Aberg Ave. w/ ped/bike bridge. Earlier segments, including ped/bike bridge over E Wash. Ave. under construction now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 4 Cannonball Trail Phases I &amp; II (Military Ridge Trail Extension)</td>
<td>100 P.E.#</td>
<td>170 P.E.#</td>
<td>4 4 6 6 6 4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1st two phases of 4-phase project connecting Military Ridge Trail, SW Path, planned Badger State Trail to Fish Hatchery Rd.; WisDNR and Cities of Madison and Fitchburg have acquired the ROW w/ state grant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Monona</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 Monona Dr. Streetscape &amp; Ped/Bike Enhancements</td>
<td>266 Const.</td>
<td>2 2 4 2 6 6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Grant would cover portion of streetscape enhancements in conjunction with 1st phase reconstruct. of the street, including colored crosswalks, bike racks, landscaping, period lighting, and street trees/landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stoughton</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 6 Main St. Streetscape Enhancements</td>
<td>30 P.E.</td>
<td>170 Const.</td>
<td>42 P.E.</td>
<td>1,158 Const.</td>
<td>2 2 4 6 6 6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project includes reconstruction and streetscaping improvements for Main St. from Fifth St. to the RR. Enhancements include historic replica lighting, sidewalks, and colored, brick patterned crosswalks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sun Prairie</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 7 Sun Prairie Path (3 Segments)</td>
<td>36 P.E.</td>
<td>275 Const.</td>
<td>4 2 4 6 6 6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction of 3 path segments - one between the USH 151 underpass E of Reiner Rd. and Hoeprker Rd. and the other two along STH 19 filling gaps in path connecting residential areas &amp; schools, commercial area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Parks</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 8 Lower Yahara River Trail (Phase I)</td>
<td>150 P.E.#</td>
<td>2,715#</td>
<td>6 4 6 6 6 6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project involves construction of 1 mi. trail adj. To RR line from McDaniel Park in McFarland to Lake Farm Cty. Park, linking to CCT. Trail includes floating &amp; engineered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMIP Project Scoring and Ranking Table

May 12, 2008 Draft
# Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO
## Scoring and Ranking of Candidate Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement Projects

### Project Description

**UA = Madison Urban Area**

### Costs in $000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Costs in $000s</th>
<th>Enhances Mobility/Safety</th>
<th>Impact - Lg. # People</th>
<th>Improv. Env. Qual. Life</th>
<th>Key System/Site</th>
<th>Prob. Proj. Proceeding</th>
<th>Local Ranking</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dane County Parks (cont.)</strong>&lt;br&gt;UA 9 Ped. Walkway Under USH 51 at Babcock Park (in McFarland)</td>
<td>8 P.E. 120 Const.</td>
<td>6 2 6 2 6 4</td>
<td>26 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>boardwalk &amp; 2 bridges. Will eventually extend to Stghtn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village of Maple Bluff</strong>&lt;br&gt;UA 10 Gateway Streetscaping &amp; Pedestrian Amenities</td>
<td>165 P.E. 1,098 Const.</td>
<td>2 2 4 2 6 6</td>
<td>22 6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Project includes street &amp; bridge reconstruction, realignment, RR crossing improvements, bike lanes, side path &amp; intersection improvements. Federal earmark of funds ($2 mil) already received for project in SAFETEA-LU.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village of Waunakee</strong>&lt;br&gt;UA 11 Woodland Dr &amp; Mill Rd Reconstruction w/ Side Path</td>
<td>411 P.E. 347 Const.</td>
<td>4 2 4 4 6 6</td>
<td>26 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project involves construction of 5 ft. wide path under USH 51 bridge over Yahara River, providing safe crossing of highway for walkers and boaters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Score: High = 6  Medium = 4  Low = 2

* 100% locally funded
# 50% funding match proposed

Note: The City of Middleton applied for a $50,000 planning project for development of a master plan and design of an 8 mile trail between the two communities generally paralleling USH 14. Per direction from WisDOT, this project was not scored and ranked as planning and design projects are considered separately from infrastructure projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Costs in $000s</th>
<th>Enhances Mobility/Safety</th>
<th>Impacts Env Quality/Life</th>
<th>Key System/Site</th>
<th>Prob. Proj. Proceeding</th>
<th>Local Ranking</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA = Madison Urban Area</td>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO
Scoring and Ranking of Candidate Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP)/Transportation Enhancement Projects

SMIP Project Scoring and Ranking Table
May 12, 2008 Draft
### Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO

#### Priority Ranking of Candidate SMIP/Transportation Enhancement Projects in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area

Running Total of Costs by Priority and Year

(Costs in 000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA 3</td>
<td>Starkweather Creek (W Branch) Path (Final Phase)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 1</td>
<td>Badger State Trail - Surfacing on Northern Segment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>2,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 8</td>
<td>Lower Yahara River Trail (Phase I)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>6,715</td>
<td>3,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 4</td>
<td>Cannonball Trail (Phases I &amp; II)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>8,985</td>
<td>4,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 7</td>
<td>Sun Prairie Path (3 Segments)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>3,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 2</td>
<td>Fitchburg Bicycle Hub</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9,496</td>
<td>5,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 9</td>
<td>Pedestrian Walkway under USH 51 @ Babcock Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9,624</td>
<td>5,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 11</td>
<td>Woodland Dr &amp; Mill Rd Reconstruction w/ Side Path</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>10,971</td>
<td>6,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 5</td>
<td>Monona Dr. Streetscape &amp; Ped/Bike Enhancements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>11,237</td>
<td>6,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 6</td>
<td>Stoughton Main St. Streetscape Enhancements</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>12,637</td>
<td>7,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA 10</td>
<td>Maple Bluff Gateway Streetscaping &amp; Ped. Amenities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>8,692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning and Outer Dane County Area Projects - Not Ranked**

- PL 1 Middleton - Cross Plains Trail Plan/Design
  - Cost: $50
- OA 1 Cam-Rock Trail to Glacial Drumlin Trail Connector (Phase I)
  - Cost: $635
- **Total Cost:** $685
### Staff Comments on Item:

Board members requested a review of the selection process/criteria for STP Urban Projects that has been used since May 1993 and revised in September 2001. Minor editorial edits were done in July 2007. Staff provided a general overview at the April meeting of the Board.

### Materials Presented on Item:

Paper describing the process and criteria used to score and rank projects for STP Urban funding.

### Staff Recommendation/Rationale:

Informational at this time.
Selection Process for Surface Transportation Program (STP) - Urban Transportation Projects

1.1 Introduction

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), signed into law in 1998, authorizes the federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit through FY 2003, and guides federal-aid to states and urban areas for these programs. TEA-21 continues and improves upon the policy and planning framework and funding programs established under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. This planning and programming framework provides local governments, in cooperation with the State and transit operators, the responsibility for determining the best mix of transportation investments to meet identified metropolitan transportation needs. It also provides flexibility in the use of Federal funds for these investments. TEA-21 continues to place emphasis on facilitating access and mobility for people and goods, while at the same time minimizing environmental impacts of the transportation system and enhancing communities. The Act also continues ISTEA’s focus on multi-modal transportation projects and consistency of transportation planning with land use planning.

Under the metropolitan planning provisions of TEA-21, the Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for developing, in cooperation with the State and affected transit operators, a long-range transportation plan and a transportation improvement program (TIP) for the metropolitan area. The TIP must be consistent with the long-range plan, include all transportation projects in the metropolitan area that are proposed for federal funding, and cover at least three years of programming. For coordination and public information purposes, the Madison Area MPO includes all significant projects within the county, even if no federal funding is involved. The Madison Area MPO also prepares a five-year TIP.

TEA-21 provides two primary federal-aid transit funding programs: Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program (formerly Sec. 9), providing formula block grant appropriations for capital expenses; and Section 5309 Capital Program (formerly Sec. 3), providing discretionary grants for capital projects. TEA-21 eliminated operating assistance as an eligible expense for larger urbanized areas (population of 200,000 or more) such as Madison under the Section 5307 Program. However, many costs formerly funded with operating assistance are now eligible capital items under the category of “preventive maintenance.”

TEA-21 provides four primary federal-aid highway construction programs: National Highway System (NHS); Interstate System/Interstate Maintenance (IM); Surface Transportation Program (STP); and Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (BR). The STP provides flexible funding that may be used for a wide variety of projects, including arterial and collector roadway improvements, bridge projects, transit capital projects, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. A portion of STP funds, called STP-Urban, is designated for urbanized areas. Large urbanized areas (population over 200,000) such as Madison receive a direct apportionment of funds. In addition, federal rules provide MPOs for these areas with the responsibility to coordinate and approve priority project listings for use of these STP-Urban funds. Under ISTEA, the Madison Urban Area received $3.6 million per year of STP-Urban funds. Under TEA-21, the amount will increase to almost $5 million in 2002.
1.2 TEA-21, Dane County Land Use & Transportation Plan, and TIP Goals

The goal of TEA-21 is to “encourage and promote the safe and efficient management, operation, and development of surface transportation systems that will serve the mobility needs of people and freight and foster economic growth and development within and through urbanized areas, while minimizing transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollution.”

The overall goal of the transportation plan element of the Vision 2020 Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan is to “provide an integrated, all-mode transportation system which offers the efficient, effective, and safe movement of people and goods, and provides mode choice wherever possible while enhancing and, where relevant, preserving the character and livability of the neighborhoods and residential areas where transportation facilities are located.”

The goal of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is to select, and to program for funding, the best and most cost-effective eligible transportation projects that serve regional transportation needs, whether they be on the state highway, local arterial, transit, bikeway, or pedestrian systems. The use of the criteria and ranking system to select projects, described below, is not an end in itself. Rather, the process is to be used as a guide to assess a project’s contribution to the overall program, and to overall transportation and land use plans, including the respective policies, goals, and objectives of these plans.

Consistency with the provisions of TEA-21 and goals and objectives of the Vision 2020 Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan, as well as maximizing the total amount of funding to the Dane County region are key considerations.

1.3 Objectives

Within this context, the specific objectives of the TIP process for the STP-Urban program are to:

1) Fund the most cost-effective projects that will relieve congestion, maintain and enhance the existing infrastructure of the transportation system, decrease air pollution, and increase mobility and fuel efficiency.

2) Fund projects that develop a transportation system, which is compatible with existing environmental features and which minimizes negative environmental impacts.

3) Promote transportation projects supportive of energy conservation measures.

4) Seek transportation projects, which are integrated, multi-modal, efficient and effective in moving goods and people, and compatible with desired patterns of area wide development.

5) Use the flexibility provided by TEA-21 to the region’s best advantage.

6) Evaluate candidate projects fairly, using appropriate evaluation criteria, which are consistently applied.

7) Maximize the amount of discretionary funding to the Dane County region, such as Section 5307 (former Sec. 9) and Section 5309 (former Sec. 3) funding for transit projects, NHS and STP-
Flexible funds for roadway projects; and Transportation Enhancement and STP-Flexible funds for pedestrian and bicycle projects.

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

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

10) Use funds on projects that are ready to proceed.

11) Use funds on larger-sized projects due to extensive federal rules and regulations that must be followed.

1.4 Process

MPO staff seeks requests for projects to be funded with STP-Urban funds in the spring of each year. Requests are taken for projects to be implemented within the five-year period of the TIP. Project requests are generally due in mid-June. MPO staff scores and ranks the projects by year according to the criteria outlined in Section 1.5 below. If the STP-Urban funding allocation is greater than the total cost of projects to be funded in a given year, the remaining allocation is carried over to the following year. If the total cost of projects for which STP-Urban funds are requested is greater than the allocation, including any carryover funds, in a given year, the lower ranked projects are typically moved to future years for ranking with all other projects in a given year.

The Madison Area MPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) reviews the MPO staff’s preliminary listing of priority STP-Urban projects by year and makes an initial recommendation on the project listings to the MPO Policy Board. The MPO Policy Board reviews and approves the preliminary project listings, with any changes, for inclusion in the total draft TIP distributed for public review and comment. Following the public review process, the TCC makes a final recommendation on the STP-Urban priority project listings and the total TIP to the MPO Policy Board. The MPO Policy Board reviews and approves the total TIP, including the STP-Urban priority project listings, for submittal to WisDOT for approval and inclusion in the Statewide TIP.

1.5 Criteria

The following two overall types of criteria are used by the Madison Area MPO to develop the list of priority projects for STP-Urban funding:

a) Screening criteria for candidate projects. The first step in the priority setting process is to ensure that the proposed projects will meet TEA-21 requirements, are consistent with the adopted Vision 2020 Dane County Land Use & Transportation Plan, are consistent with the goals and objectives in Section 1.3, and have a reasonable expectation of being funded.

b) Scoring criteria to evaluate projects based on relative merit. The mandates and goals and objectives of TEA-21 and the Vision 2020 Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan have been incorporated into a set of factors to which points have been assigned to score candidate STP-Urban projects. Performance-based standards are used, where feasible.
1.51 Screening Criteria

Candidate STP-Urban projects are required to be in conformance with the following threshold requirements before they are scored and ranked for funding. The screening criteria fall into three basic groups:

a) **Consistency requirements.** Projects are required to be:

   1) Included in or consistent with the adopted Vision 2020 *Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan*, including the Congestion Management System incorporated into the plan, and separate mode-specific elements of the plan, such as the five-year Transit Development Program and the Bicycle Transportation Plan, and more specific local land use plans; and

   2) Consistent with the general goals and objectives of TEA-21. Public participation in the development of a listing of candidate STP-Urban projects is also strongly encouraged. (See Attachment A-2 for guidelines on public participation.)

b) **Financial requirements.** The programming of STP-Urban funds is constrained by anticipated available STP-Urban funding each year. Therefore, projects are required to have reasonable cost estimates and be supported by adequate financial plans. Adequate financial plans include the identification of all sources of funding to build the project and reasonable project phasing. All local contributions to a project must have the backing of a policy board with the authority to commit funds.

c) **Project-specific requirements.** All projects are required to be well defined and detailed enough so they can be taken directly to an “A-95” type review. In addition, the *multi-modal* aspects of all projects should be stressed, where applicable, and cost estimates by mode should be broken out in further detail, where feasible, in order to better assess the score a project receives from the scoring criteria listed below. In general, the following information is needed:

**Roadway Projects**

1. Engineering
2. Right-of-way
3. Construction/Reconstruction (indicate all that apply)
   a. Resurface
   b. Reconstruction (grade, base, surface)
   c. Widen (number of lanes)
   d. New location
   e. Changes in structure such as:
      - Bridge reconstruction
      - Bridge in new location
      - Interchange
4. Specify minor projects, such as:
   a. Signs
   b. Lighting
   c. Intersection improvement
   d. Safety project
   e. Left-turn bay
Non-roadway Projects. While these projects cannot be categorized as well as roadway projects, descriptions should be as clear and detailed as possible.

Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP) Projects. Special discretionary funding is available on a statewide basis for the following types of projects:

- Provision of facilities for pedestrians and/or bicyclists
- Provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion and use thereof for pedestrian/bicycle trails)
- Historic preservation
- Rehabilitation/operation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities (including historic railroad facilities and canals)
- Establishment of transportation museums
- Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites
- Scenic or historic highway programs (including the provision of tourist and welcome center facilities)
- Landscaping and other scenic beautification
- Control and removal of outdoor advertising
- Environmental mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff or reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity
- Archaeological planning and research

Separate Cost Estimates for Engineering, Right-of-way, and Construction by Mode. In addition to information on multi-modal use (traffic volumes, number of bicyclists, number of transit riders, etc.), improvement costs by mode and by year, where feasible (such as cost for bike lanes, traffic lanes, pedestrian facilities, etc.) are also sought.

Specify the Special Federal Fund Type Expected to be Used. See Page 13 of the TIP for a listing of federal-aid transportation sources of funds.

1.52 Scoring Criteria

The scoring criteria provided in the following chart and described below were formulated with the following objectives in mind:

- **Reward** projects that meet the objectives of TEA-21 and the Vision 2020 *Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan*, address a documented need, or solve an identified problem. Specifically, projects that are the outcome of the Congestion Management System mandated by TEA-21 and regional and local transportation/land use planning processes, and projects that meet the greatest need or solve the larger problems are rewarded through the point system.

- **Promote** cost effective projects, particularly those that fit optimal replacement cycles or demonstrably improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the metropolitan transportation system.

- **Encourage** projects that accommodate multiple transportation modes and foster inter-jurisdictional cooperation through the point system.

---

1 The Statewide Multi-Modal Improvement Program (SMIP) incorporates funding from the Transportation Enhancement Program and a portion of the funds from the STP-Discretionary or Flexible Program. A single form is used to solicit applications for funding under both programs.
• **Base** the criteria on the most recently adopted plans and programs.

• **Consider** within the scoring and programming scheme the eight areas established by TEA-21 (see Attachment A-3), particularly in the consideration of the external impacts and multi-modal aspects of transportation projects.

**It is important to stress that the criteria provided below is not static and is expected to change over time as experience is gained through each iteration of the process. Further, emphasis areas stressed by the federal government or special preferences by local units of government will also change and inevitably lead to the addition of new factors and the discarding of others.**

I. **Consistency**

A. **Must be Based on the Vision 2020 Dane County Land Use & Transportation Plan, Including Mode-Specific Elements of the Plan, and Local Plans.** This factor is a check-off category to ensure that projects being evaluated have passed the preliminary screening criteria. No score is applied.

B. **Prevents System Breakdown or is a Key System Element.** If the project is consistent, this factor gives some weight to a project according to its overall relationship with the rest of the system, whether it is on the roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian system. (High importance = 6, medium importance = 4, low importance = 2)

II. **Improve Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Safety of the Regional Transportation System**

A. **Safety and Security.** Based on an assessment of existing safety and security problems and the extent to which the proposed project will reduce such problems on the regional transportation system. Crash statistics and standards will be utilized in consideration of roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian projects, while safety and security of passengers and employees will be considered for transit projects. It is recognized that parts of a roadway project could also improve the safety of the transit, bicycle, and/or pedestrian systems. (High reduction in accidents or high increase in safety = 6, medium reduction = 4, low reduction = 2)

B. **Congestion Relief.** Based on an assessment of existing congestion problems and the impact of the proposed project in reducing such problems. Existing congestion is evaluated across all modes by looking at the volume of traffic and the number of people affected by the congestion. For example, volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) is one possible measure for roadways, while bus crowding (i.e., load factor), passengers per revenue vehicle hour or mile by route, level of service (bus trips per day), and service reliability can be used for transit projects. Bicycle counts on existing paths and origin/destination studies or surveys are also useful in estimating usage or the number of potential people affected by bicycle projects. (High impact = 6, medium impact = 4, low impact = 2)

C. **Congestion Prevention.** Reflects the extent to which a project contributes to preventing long-term congestion by maximizing/optimizing the existing capacity of the transportation system. Rewards projects that maximize the efficiency of the transportation system through transportation demand management (TDM) (e.g., encouraging shift to higher capacity mode or shift in trip time), or transportation system management (TSM) (e.g., improving traffic flow). TDM strategies include rideshare programs, parking management, financial incentives, pricing, employer commute option programs, transit/bicycle/pedestrian improvements, and
park-and-ride lots. TSM strategies include general traffic engineering, traffic signal timing, ramp metering, and bus/bike lanes. (High contribution = 6, medium contribution = 4, low contribution = 2)

D. **Cost Effectiveness.** Takes into account the overall benefits of the project based on the other criteria compared to the cost of the project.

E. **Multi-modal.** Recognizes and rewards projects which include accommodations for more than one mode of travel. (More than two modes = 6, two modes = 4, one mode = 2)

F. **Degree of Multi-Modal Use.** Reflects the degree of use of “alternative” transportation modes, e.g., number of bus trips/day, number of bicyclists/day, etc. (High degree = 6, medium degree = 4, low degree = 2.)

G. **Preserves Existing System.** Seeks to reward projects that preserve the existing transportation infrastructure, which is a primary objective of TEA-21. (6 points, if applicable)

### III. System Expansion

A. **Demand.** This factor goes beyond existing congestion problems and scores projects, which address future and/or latent demand for all modes in a significant way. Examples of future demand can be expressed in terms of level of service (LOS), traffic volume, existing and forecast transit ridership, forecast travel demand within a corridor, etc. (Projects offering future relief in high-growth corridors = 6, medium amounts of future relief = 4, low amounts of future relief = 2)

B. **Transportation Corridor Preservation.** Seeks to recognize preservation of future transportation corridors regardless of mode. Projects which seek to preserve an endangered transportation corridor = 6, major corridor = 4, minor corridor = 2)

### IV. External Impacts

A. **Transportation Control Measure (TCM) Effectiveness.** TCM measures include such things as employer-based transportation management, parking management programs, transit improvement, park & ride lots, work schedule changes, financial incentives, education and encouragement programs, traffic flow improvements, and area-wide ride share programs. (High = 6, medium = 4, low = 2)

B. **Supports Compact Land Use.** Seeks to reward projects that promote an increase in density, more efficient land use, and reduced auto dependence. (If the project meets all three of these criteria, it receives a score of 6, two of the criteria = 4, one of the criteria = 2)

C. **Energy Conservation.** Seeks to provide credit for projects, which promote a shift from the single-occupant vehicle (SOV) to other modes such as transit, carpooling, bicycling, or walking in order to conserve energy and resources. (A project which does this directly will receive a score of 6; those projects which do this indirectly = 4, low impact projects = 2. Scale of energy savings needs to be recognized.)

D. **Air Pollution Reduction.** Addresses the air impacts of a project. Some projects are designed to improve long-term air quality by reducing and/or shortening motor vehicle trips, while
others may provide short-term and/or localized benefits by improving motor vehicle traffic flow. It is recognized that the potential for traffic diversion and/or induced travel may offset, at least to some extent, the short-term benefits of traffic flow improvements. (High, long-term level of air pollution reduction = 6, medium reduction = 4, low reduction = 2.)

E. Noise Reduction. As in the case of air pollution reduction, this factor also seeks to reward projects that reduce noise levels. (High-level reduction = 6, medium-level reduction = 4, low reduction = 2)

V. Complexity of Project Preparation
Some projects of merit may have been on the waiting list for several years due to their complexity (e.g., involves multiple jurisdictions or difficult engineering or planning issues). Some consideration is provided by this factor in terms of equity. (Complex project having been in development for over five years = 6, 2 to 5 years = 4, 0 to 2 years = 2)

VI. Land Use and Transportation System Change Interrelationship
Indicates how well the project timing can be programmed in close relationship to land use changes and other transportation system changes, as well as having the approval of the local policy body. (High interrelationship = 6, medium interrelationship = 4, low interrelationship = 2)

VII. Intermodal Connectivity/Linkages to Other Transportation Systems
Seeks to provide credit to projects that make an interconnection with other modes (transfer points) or provide linkages with other transportation systems, e.g., link transit and specialized transportation systems. (Three or more mode transfer points/linkages = 6, two-mode transfer point = 4, one-mode transfer point = 2)
### 2008-2012 TIP/STP-URBAN PROJECTS SCORING

**Nov-07**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Ped/Bike</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Ped/Bike</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Ped/Bike</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Ped/Bike</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTH N (CTH BB to Rail Line)</td>
<td>Madison Ped/Bike Safety</td>
<td>Ride sharing 2008</td>
<td>Planning 2008</td>
<td>CTH D/Fish Hatchery Rd. (Lacy Rd. to Irish Ln.)</td>
<td>CTH M (Valley View/Pleasant View Extension Intersection)</td>
<td>Monona Dr. Segment 1 (Broadway to Pflaum)</td>
<td>CTH M (Broadway to Phaum)</td>
<td>East Washington Ave. Segment 4 (Margaret to Madison C.)</td>
<td>Madison Ped/Bike Safety</td>
<td>Ride sharing 2009</td>
<td>Planning 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH N (CTH BB to Rail Line)</td>
<td>Madison Ped/Bike Safety</td>
<td>Ride sharing 2008</td>
<td>Planning 2008</td>
<td>CTH D/Fish Hatchery Rd. (Lacy Rd. to Irish Ln.)</td>
<td>CTH M (Valley View/Pleasant View Extension Intersection)</td>
<td>Monona Dr. Segment 1 (Broadway to Pflaum)</td>
<td>CTH M (Broadway to Phaum)</td>
<td>East Washington Ave. Segment 4 (Margaret to Madison C.)</td>
<td>Madison Ped/Bike Safety</td>
<td>Ride sharing 2009</td>
<td>Planning 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Consistency

- **A. Must Be Based On Management Systems, Plans, TDP, RTP, Etc.**
- **B. Prevents System Breakdown or Key System Element (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **C. Congestion Prevention (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **D. Cost Effective/Life Cycle Cost: Cost/# of people affected daily, then normalize (0-6)**
- **E. Multi-modal (>two modes=6, two modes=4, one mode=2)**
- **F. Degree of Multi-modal Use (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **G. Preserves Existing System (6 points if applicable)**

### II. Improve Efficiency and Effectiveness of Reg. Transp. Sys.

- **A. Safety and Security (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **B. Congestion Relief (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **C. Congestion Prevention (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **D. Cost Effective/Life Cycle Cost: Cost/# of people affected daily, then normalize (0-6)**
- **E. Multi-modal (>two modes=6, two modes=4, one mode=2)**
- **F. Degree of Multi-modal Use (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **G. Preserves Existing System (6 points if applicable)**

### III. System Expansion

- **A. Demand: examples include volumes, load factors, etc. (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **B. Transp. Corridor Preservation ROW (endangered=6, major=4, minor=2)**

### IV. External Impacts

- **A. Federal and State TCM Effectiveness (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **B. Supports Land Use: 1. Promotes increased density around transit stations; 2. Promotes more efficient land use; 3. Reduces auto dependence (all three=6, two=4, one=2)**
- **C. Energy Conservation/Modal Shift: Directly promotes shift from SOV (rail, bus, HOV, or ped/bike)=6; indirect shift (park&ride lots, signal intercon., etc.)=4; low impact=2**
- **D. Air pollution reduction (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**
- **E. Noise Reduction. (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)**

### V. Complexity of Project Preparation

- **High=6, Medium=4, Low=2**

### VI. Land Use and Transportation System Change Interrelationship

- **High=6, Medium=4, Low=2**

### VII. Intermodal Connectivity

- > 3 modes=6, 3 modes=4, 2 modes=2

**Total Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Shaded columns are projects seeking STP-Urban supplemental funding, NHS-Local Funding, or additional funding under these programs should it become available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Ped/Bike</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTH N (Clark St. Intersection)</td>
<td>CTH S (Mineral Point Rd. (CTH M/Junction Intersection) Phase 1)</td>
<td>E. Johnson St. (N. Butler to First St.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Main St. (USH 151 to O'Keeffe Ave.)</td>
<td>Old Middleton Rd. (Capital Ave. to Countryside Ln.)</td>
<td>Madison Ped/Bike Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Ave./CTH MS (Allen Blvd. to Sego Rd.)</td>
<td>Madison Ped/Bike Safety</td>
<td>Ridesharing 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Consistency
A. Must Be Based On Management Systems, Plans, TDP, RTP, Etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Improve Efficiency and Effectiveness of Reg. Transp. Sys.
A. Safety and Security (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Congestion Relief (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Congestion Prevention (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Cost Effective/Life Cycle Cost: Cost/# of people affected daily, then normalize (0-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Multi-modal (>two modes=6, two modes=4, one mode=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Degree of Multi-modal Use (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Preserves Existing System (6 points if applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. System Expansion
A. Demand: examples include volumes, load factors, etc. (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Transp. Corridor Preservation ROW (endangered=6, major=4, minor=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. External Impacts
A. Federal and State TCM Effectiveness (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Supports Land Use: 1. Promotes increased density around transit stations; 2. Promotes more efficient land use; 3. Reduces auto dependence (all three=6, two=4, one=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Energy Conservation/Modal Shift: Directly promotes shift from SOV (rail, bus, HOV, or ped/bike)=6; indirect shift (park&ride lots, signal intercon., etc.)=4; low impact=2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Air pollution reduction (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Noise Reduction (High=6, Med=4, Low=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. Complexity of Project Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. Land Use and Transportation System Change Interrelationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VII. Intermodal Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shaded columns are projects seeking STP-Urban supplemental funding, NHS-Local Funding, or additional funding under these programs should it become available.