

**Meeting of the  
Greater Madison MPO Technical Coordinating Committee**

*April 24, 2024*

*[Virtual Meeting](#)*

*2:00 p.m.*

---

This meeting is being held virtually.

1. **Written Comments:** You can send comments on agenda items to [mpo@cityofmadison.com](mailto:mpo@cityofmadison.com).
2. **Register for Public Comment:**
  - Register to speak at the meeting.
  - Register to answer questions.
  - Register in support or opposition of an agenda item (without speaking)If you want to speak at this meeting, you must register. You can register at <https://www.cityofmadison.com/MeetingRegistration>. When you register, you will be sent an email with the information you will need to join the virtual meeting.
3. **Watch the Meeting:** If you would like to join the meeting as an observer, please visit <https://www.cityofmadison.com/clerk/meeting-schedule/watch-meetings-online>
4. **Listen to the Meeting by Phone:** You can call in to the meeting using the following number and meeting ID:  
(877) 853-5257 (toll free)  
Meeting ID: 893 0829 9825

**AGENDA**

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Meeting Minutes
3. Committee Member Reports
4. Presentation on Draft Regional Safety Action Plan and Recommendation to Release for Public Comment (20 min)
5. Review and Discussion of Draft MPO Comments on the I-39/90/94 Interstate Study (15 min)
6. Discussion on Upcoming MPO Projects: Active Transportation Plan (10 min)
7. Presentation on the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) & RoundTrip Platform (10 min)
8. Staff Reports
  - Local Program Update
  - Request for 2025-2029 project listings for TIP Update
  - Regional Travel Model Update Project
  - MPO Strategic Planning Update
  - UW TOPS Lab Upcoming Studies- Trail Count Modeling and Vulnerable Roadway Users Crash Reporting
  - Other
9. Next Scheduled Meeting Date
  - Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup> 2024
10. Adjournment

**Greater Madison MPO**  
**Technical Coordinating Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**

***February 28, 2024***

***Virtual Meeting via Zoom***

***2:00 p.m.***

---

**1. Roll Call**

***Members present:*** Brown, Holt, Husen, Koprowski, Kahler, Larson, Petykowski, Schmid, Stouder, Stauske, Tao, Violante

***Members absent:*** Bruun, Blau, Clark, Cruz, Dietz, Forlenza, Igl, Mountford, Semmann, Wheeler

***MPO Staff present:*** Andros, Hoesly, Kanning

***Other present in official capacity:*** Liz Callin (City of Madison)

**2. Approval of January 24, 2024, Meeting Minutes**

Tao moved, Stouder seconded, to approve the January 24, 2024, meeting minutes. Motion carried.

**3. Committee Member Reports**

- City of Middleton (Stauske): New zoning code has been adopted.
- WisDOT (Koprowski): Not a lot of construction going on in Dane County this year. We have one HSIP project at the intersection of Highway 14 and Deming Way. The project includes making turn lanes longer and protected. The let date is in mid-March. There is another resurfacing/pavement replacement project on Highway 113 north of Waunakee. That project extends 4 miles from Sunset Ln to CTH V and includes the bridge over Six Mile Creek. There will be detours for the entirety of that project.
- City of Madison (Petykowski): There are a couple of ongoing STBG projects: University Ave will resume on March 11, and we are hoping that will be completed in May, and we are still working on John Nolen Drive design, with PS&E and a let date later this year. The Autumn Ridge Path bridge over Highway 30 will begin later this fall. Otherwise it is mostly local projects we'll be working on. The City of Madison Transportation Commission will be reviewing the projects in the draft TIP at their meeting tonight.
- City of Sun Prairie (Brown): We are doing a pavement rehab project on O'Keefe Ave from Summerfield to Main Street. The project will include narrowing travel lanes to make space for on-street bike lanes. We are also reconstructing Vandenberg Rd this year, it will be Sun Prairie's first bike boulevard. We've also got a lot of design work for STB and TAP projects taking place in 2025, including the Bird Street path project. The City has hired Toole Design to help with Sun Prairie's Vision Zero action plan, we'll be working on that throughout the year. Sun Prairie also just applied for a USDOT RAISE grant to develop the Clarmar Drive corridor. Funding would go towards extending Clarmar Dr to Bailey Rd, to serve the future public works campus, and to built a new bike and pedestrian overpass over US 151.

- City of Madison (Tao): The City will be releasing its first Vision Zero progress report, which will summarize the City's work from 2020 to 2022. The City has made some really good progress in building new bike and pedestrian infrastructure, lowering speed limits, engaging communities, and other areas. Thanks to a collaboration with UW-Madison and WisDOT, we just submitted a grant for the ATTAIN (Advanced Transportation Technology and Innovation) program. The grant is for a \$6.5 million project to build a Vision Zero technology and innovation corridor along the length of USH 151 in Madison (from the Beltline to the Interstate).
- City of Verona (Holt): City of Verona was awarded a bronze Bike Friendly Communities award. We had previously had a bronze award from BFC but the application this time was more involved, so we're happy we maintained our rating. We are getting close to hiring a new public works director, which will let the acting public works director return to their regular job as parks director.

#### 4. Update on the Development of the Regional Safety Action Plan

Hoesly and the SRF consultant team (Nicole Bitzan, and Priyam Saxena) provided an update on the Regional Safety Action Plan. Bitzan first explained the methodology used to prioritize locations for improvements and the countermeasures toolkit that helps users identify appropriate countermeasures for different types of crash profiles.

Saxena then described the 2024 Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) notice of funding opportunity (NOFO) and how it differs from the 2023 SS4A NOFO. Bitzan then ran through a potential timeline that would allow the MPO to submit a SS4A Planning and Demonstration grant for the August submission deadline.

Hoesly noted that during the presentation to the MPO Board on the Regional Safety Action Plan a couple of months ago, before submission deadlines were finalized, it was agreed that it would be best to wait until the 4<sup>th</sup> round of funding to apply. But now that we have that August 29<sup>th</sup> deadline as an option, we believe that we would have enough time between the time that the Regional Safety Action Plan is adopted and when the submittals are due in August to prepare an application. If we are going to apply, we'd like to have two, or ideally three, communities participating who would identify projects that they would like to include in the application, and then the MPO would also include two or three projects in the application as well. The TOPS Lab at UW-Madison has proposed a couple of projects to the MPO, including additional vulnerable road user analyses. The MPO is also looking into whether funding for the MPO's StreetLight Data subscription might be eligible for funding through the SS4A program. Hoesly suggested communities look into the different types of projects that could be funded with under the SS4A program: bike and pedestrian plans, corridor studies, access management plans, active transportation plans, safe routes to school activities, etc. She noted that decisions on funding applications submitted this year would be made next year and that recipients of funding would have five years to complete their projects. Hoesly said that the MPO wants to gauge communities' interest in moving forward on an SS4A application before the next TCC meeting, and that she would be reaching out to MPO communities to discuss.

Stauske said he liked the prioritization methodology used by the SRF team and that he thought it was a helpful way to assess priorities. He said that it would be helpful to have a memo on this that he could share with the City of Middleton's Pedestrian, Bicycle, & Transit Committee.

Kahler said that Fitchburg staff is interested in using SS4A funding for a Vision Zero plan and possibly also a bike and pedestrian plan, and that it would be easy to get a resolution of support for these projects if funding is secured.

Tao said Madison would also be on board with submitting a regional SS4A application this year and could put together a resolution of support. Madison has received both a planning and an implementation grant from SS4A, and another individual grant application by the City is unlikely to be successful. He said the City of Madison could partner in a regional grant application in August of 2024 as well as February of 2025.

Hoesly asked the committee members if they could identify committees in their communities where a memo or a presentation about the SS4A grant application process could be helpful.

Tao said that such a presentation would probably be helpful for Madison's Transportation Commission.

## **5. Presentation on the Madison Passenger Rail Station Study**

Callin provided an overview of City of Madison's Passenger Rail Station Study including the project schedule and service development update, potential station sites and preliminary evaluations, and public involvement and next steps. The City's station study is part of a larger statewide planning effort that is evaluating several potential new and expanded passenger rail services in the state. The City wants to have a station identified so that the state can have that information as it works to plan the route for the new rail service.

She identified eight potential sites along existing rail lines in Madison, ranging from Monona Terrace, downtown, to the former Oscar Meyer site, on the City's north side, and described how they compare to one another on a variety of different measures, including accessibility, proximity to tourist destinations and hotels, and land use. She said that the city has been holding public meeting and gathering public feedback, and will be sharing draft recommendations and site plans with the public in the spring or summer of this year.

Stauske asked if the City will be prioritizing potential sites. Callin replied that the plan is to identify one site as the top priority but to also identify "plan B" and "plan C" sites as well. Each of these sites will have more detailed cost information, a site plan, and a high-level implementation plan.

## **6. Discussion on Transitioning to an "e-TIP" Electronic Transportation Improvement Program**

Kanning reviewed the MPO's process for developing the transportation improvement program (TIP) for the Greater Madison Area, including the TIP schedule and the software used. He highlighted how inefficient and time consuming the process is for staff and the potential for errors.

He then provided an overview of the e-TIP, a web-based platform from EcoInteractive that would allow project sponsors to enter information about their projects directly—type, description, schedule, costs, funding sources, and location. STBG and TAP applications would also be submitted using the e-TIP website. Because the e-TIP platform integrates the work currently done across multiple software platforms (ArcGIS, Excel, Word) and allows project sponsors to enter their information directly, it would be expected to significantly reduce MPO staff time needed to put together the TIP and reduce the potential for errors.

Kanning then showed an example of the e-TIP used by CMAP, the MPO for the Chicago area.

He said the MPO had spoken to EcoInteractive about using their software and met with WisDOT and FHWA staff to discuss the possibility of starting an e-TIP pilot project. He explained that SEWRPC is

working with EcoInteractive to build an e-TIP for their agency and that other MPOs in the state have also expressed interest in converting to an e-TIP. He asked the TCC for their input and noted that the Policy Board was supportive of the idea when it was presented at their last meeting. He said that if communities were hesitant to enter all of their project information directly into the web-based platform, EcoInteractive has said that they could produce an Excel template alternative that communities could use instead, and which would allow project information to be easily uploaded to the e-TIP.

Stauske asked whether the MPO had been able to test the software beyond viewing the trial. Kanning said that the MPO has not been able to try the software but that he had spoken with other MPOs who have had a positive experience with it, and that EcoInteractive would design the e-TIP to the specifications of the MPO. Hoesly said that SEWRPC had been initially planning to hire a consultant to build a non-web-based e-TIP software platform for them but after speaking with EcoInteractive and testing some of the functionality by loading some of their TIP information into the software they decided that the EcoInteractive e-TIP platform was the best option.

Stauske said it sounds like the e-TIP would make things easier and more efficient. He asked if there was an “idiot’s guide” to using the e-TIP platform. Hoesly said that CMAP’s e-TIP website has a resource page with a series of short videos explaining how to input data, retrieve information, and accomplish other tasks.

Koprowski also said he thought the e-TIP sounds good. He asked MPO staff if they had heard anything about what WisDOT’s SE Region thought about SEWRPC’s transition to the e-TIP. Andros said that she had spoken to SEWRPC MPO Director, Chris Hiebert, about it and they were very impressed by the demo and discussion with EcoInteractive. She also noted that, in response to Stauske’s question, the MPO would be holding training sessions and would be working with communities to ensure a smooth transition to the e-TIP.

Koprowski said that WisDOT is also currently looking at ways to automate the TIP process statewide.

Hoesly said that MPO staff have had regular discussions with WisDOT’s Central Office as well as with FHWA and if the MPO pursues an e-TIP, we will continue working with WisDOT and FHWA to ensure that the platform will meet everyone’s needs. She also noted that local communities in the MPO area may be able to potentially partner with the MPO to put their local CIP on the MPO’s e-TIP platform, which may be a way to gain additional cost savings.

## 7. Staff Report

- Update on urban and planning area boundaries.
  - The Policy Board approved the draft urban boundary that the TCC recommended. That will still need to go through the state and federal process to be officially adopted.
  - The next step is to start working on the planning area boundary. The Policy Board is interested in having MPO staff reach out to Mt Horeb to gauge their interest in being included in the planning area. Staff will be meeting with Mt Horeb in the next week or two. Mt Horeb staff seems interested in learning more about what their inclusion in the planning area would entail.

- Once the planning area boundary has been finalized, the MPO will have an opportunity to revisit our operating rules and procedures. As far as the TCC goes, this may include adding a representative from Mt Horeb. We could also explore adding other members representing other stakeholders, such as regional economic development groups.
- Local program update (STBG-U, TAP, and Carbon Reduction Program)
  - STBG-U funding: we are still working on project scheduling. The biggest hang up is the John Nolen Drive Phase 1 project, which was initially scheduled for 2027. However, the project received federal BIP funding that needs to be spent by 2025, so we need to look at how we can move our STBG-U funding around to meet that accelerated schedule.
- Other
  - We are working on an amendment to our Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). At the end of last year, we found out that we had about \$130,000 more carryover funding than we had expected due to staff changes. That additional funding will provide more cushion for our 2024 planning activities. We will provide an update on that at an upcoming meeting.
  - We have a new marketing and outreach specialist at the MPO. She has helped us put together an annual report, which we will be sending out in the next week or two and will also have available digitally.

## **8. Next Scheduled Meeting Date**

- Wednesday, March 27<sup>th</sup>

## **9. Adjournment**

Stauske adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.





GREATER MADISON  
**mpo**

# Regional Safety Action Plan DRAFT



## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	x-2
Letter from MPO .....	x-3
Acronyms and Abbreviations .....	x-5
Chapter 1 Why a Safety Action Plan? .....	1-1
National Context .....	1-1
The Approach to Traffic Safety.....	1-1
Vulnerable Road Users .....	1-3
Chapter 2 Roadway Safety in the Greater Madison MPO .....	2-1
About the Greater Madison MPO .....	2-1
Why the MPO Needs a Regional Safety Action Plan .....	2-2
Vision and Goals .....	2-3
Chapter 3 State of Practice.....	3-1
Chapter 4 Engaging the MPO’s Communities .....	4-1
What was heard?.....	4-7
Chapter 5 Data Evaluation.....	5-1
Crash Summary and Crash Profiles .....	5-1
Developing a High Injury Network.....	5-6
Equity Analysis .....	5-8
Chapter 6 Taking Action – Toolkit.....	6-1
Engineering Countermeasures.....	6-2
Non-Engineering Countermeasures .....	6-3
Chapter 7 Road to Zero .....	7-1
Growing Safety Culture within the Greater Madison MPO.....	7-1
Prioritization - How to use the data evaluation.....	7-2
Systemic Implementation .....	7-9
Measuring and Reporting Progress.....	7-12

Download the Draft Report and Appendices at:  
<https://sftp.cityofmadison.com:443/ui/#/syncplify/share?N=YMc4ywWDGCwzeCyZUtXBL7>





**Date:** 4/18/2024

**To:** MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

**Re:** DRAFT MPO Comments on I-39/90/94 EIS Concurrence Point 2 (Preferred Alternative)

**Background:**

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are conducting the I-39/90/94 Corridor Study between US 12/18 in Madison and US 12/STH 16 in Wisconsin Dells. The study corridor is about 67 miles long and travels through Dane, Columbia, Sauk and Juneau counties. The purpose of the I-39/90/94 Corridor Study is to address existing and future traffic demands, safety issues, and aging and outdated infrastructure. WisDOT has identified project needs and developed a range of alternatives, including two new interchanges in the Madison Area, to be included in the environmental impact statement (EIS).

In January 2023, the MPO accepted an invitation from WisDOT to become a “participating agency” for the I-39/90/94 Interstate Study. Such agencies participate in coordination meetings and have added opportunities for comment on the project purpose and need, alternatives to be considered, and impacts.

Concurrence is a written determination by a participating agency that the information provided to-date is adequate to agree that the study can be advanced to the next stage of study development.

Concurrence by an agency at a concurrence point does not imply that the study has been approved by that agency, nor that it has released its obligation to determine whether the fully developed study meets statutory review criteria. The formal concurrence points occur at the following junctures:

- Concurrence Point #1: Purpose and Need statement for the study and alternatives to be carried forward for detailed study
  - The MPO did not provide comment on the study’s purpose and need.
- Concurrence Point #2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative for addressing study purpose and need
  - The MPO is encouraged to submit comments on the preferred alternative and conceptual mitigation under this concurrence point. Comments on this concurrence point are due by May 1<sup>st</sup>. MPO staff are compiling comments for review and recommendation by the MPO Technical Coordinating Committee and MPO Policy Board.

A series of Public Involvement Meetings (PIM) were held January 30<sup>th</sup>-Feb 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024, detailing alternatives screening and identifying alternatives recommended for further study in the EIS. A recording of the presentation and meeting exhibits can be found at

<https://wisconsin.dot.gov/Pages/projects/by-region/sw/399094/public.aspx>.

## Consistency with MPO Plans:

*Connect Greater Madison 2050* is the MPO's most recently adopted regional transportation plan (RTP), which identifies how the region intends to invest in the transportation system to accommodate current travel demands and future growth, while setting investment priorities balancing limited funds. Surface transportation improvements receiving federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Authority (FTA) must be consistent with the MPO's RTP, and included in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Page 4-16 of the RTP states: "major state highway projects potentially involving capacity expansion are expected to come out of the current major corridor studies of the Beltline, Stoughton Road/USH 51, and the Interstate (39/90/94) (Beltline to Portage [now Wisconsin Dells])... The Interstate study is looking at long-term needs in that corridor, which revolve around its heavy freight use and summer tourist traffic peaks. As part of this study, potential new interchanges at Hoepker Road and I-90/94 and Milwaukee Street extension and I-94 will be studied for their impact on operations, including other interchanges."

Figure 4-d, Roadway Recommendations and Supporting Actions, includes the following recommendation and supporting action:

- "Expand regional roadway system capacity to address critical bottlenecks and accommodate future planned growth consistent with RTP goals" (4-d 3)
  - "Complete major corridor studies of the Beltline, Stoughton Road/USH 51, and Interstate 39/90/94. Upon completion of accepted environmental documentation, seek enumeration as Majors projects and advance recommended alternatives. Continue to implement short-term TSM, safety, and multi-modal improvements in the corridors in the interim until Majors program funding is secured." (4-d 3A)

The MPO is also required to develop and maintain a Congestion Management Process (CMP), which was most recently updated in 2022 as part of the RTP update. Federal regulations require that "the transportation planning process in a TMA shall address congestion management through a process that provides for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system, based on a cooperatively developed and implemented metropolitan-wide strategy, or new and existing transportation facilities... through the use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies."

The CMP contains the following objectives:

- Increase system reliability for all modes to provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods on the region's arterial roadway network, reducing excessive delays where possible, prioritizing operational improvements of existing infrastructure and existing bottlenecks over new roadway capacity expansion.
- Prioritize alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel to reduce roadway demand, increase equity, and minimize environmental impacts including greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change.

The MPO has adopted the following hierarchy of congestion management priorities as part of the CMP:

1. Strategies that eliminate vehicle trips through land use changes or other actions that reduce peak-period vehicle trips like flexible work hours or telecommuting.
2. Strategies that eliminate peak period vehicle trips by causing a mode change from auto to transit, cycle, or pedestrian mode.

3. Strategies that improve the operation of the existing roadway system, making it more efficient and safe for all users.
4. Strategies that add roadway capacity, primarily at bottlenecks or other strategic locations. Considered only when strategies outlined in priorities 1-3 above are not adequate to meet roadway needs and consistent with RTP recommendations.

Congestion-related performance measures and targets were also developed for the CMP. The CMP establishes a level of service (LOS) D for roadways functionally classified as “Freeway-Interstate.” A more detailed analysis of the Interstate corridor study’s traffic analysis, including LOS, is included in the following section.

**Traffic Analysis:** The I-39/90/94 Corridor Study “Design Considerations and Representative Day Methodology” document dated August 8, 2022, hereinafter referred to as the traffic operations analysis, uses a goal of LOS D for the 100<sup>th</sup> highest hour (K100) for the section of the Interstate from USH 12/18 to USH 151, a goal of LOS D for the 30<sup>th</sup> highest hour (K30) for the section of the Interstate from USH 151 to CTH I (i.e., the north boundary of the MPO planning area), and a goal of LOS C for the 30<sup>th</sup> highest hour for the section of the Interstate north of CTH I.

- WisDOT FDM 11-5-3.2.1 defines the desirable LOS thresholds as the desirable degree of design year congestion. The desirable LOS is determined by the type of roadway facility and whether the roadway is in an urban or rural area.

The LOS thresholds for the Interstate used in the traffic operations analysis -- “C” for the rural areas and “D” for the MPO planning area -- are consistent with the LOS threshold recommendations set forth in the FDM. The LOS threshold of “D” for the Interstate that is used for the planning area in the traffic operations analysis is consistent with the Interstate LOS target set forth in the MPO’s CMP.

The CMP describes LOS as a standard performance measure that compares actual or forecasted traffic volume on a roadway to its capacity and assigns the roadway an associated level of service (LOS) based on an A-F scale. For the CMP, the MPO utilized planning level daily traffic volume capacities developed by WisDOT using the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Map F-b from the CMP indicates that in 2019, there was moderate (LOS D) roadway congestion between the Beltline Interchange and Badger Interchange. Map F-f from the CMP indicates that in 2050, there will be severe to extreme (LOS E, F) congestion just north of the Beltline Interchange, moderate (LOS D) congestion north of that to the Badger Interchange, and moderate (LOS D) congestion just north of the Badger interchange for 2050 (no-build Interstate scenario). The Dane County travel demand model was used for this planning-level LOS analysis, which is based on daily volumes rather than specific peak hour volumes.

- WisDOT FDM 11-5-3.5.1 defines the determination of design hour volumes (DHV) for the LOS analysis. The general guidance in the FDM is to use the 30th highest hourly volume as the DHV, but there are exceptions for higher design hours.

For the Interstate Corridor Study, the 100<sup>th</sup> highest hour (K100) was used for the segment from the Beltline to USH 151. The 30<sup>th</sup> highest hour (K30) was used everywhere else. It is an improvement for K100 to be used for at least some of the Interstate (i.e., Beltline to USH 151), with a goal of LOS D. It is also an improvement for the goal to be LOS D for the segment from USH 151 to CTH I, even though the design hour is K30. Our understanding is that the previous Interstate study (Madison to Portage) used K30 with a goal of LOS C for the entire corridor from the Beltline to Portage.

Although the MPO’s comments are focused on the study’s potential impacts within the MPO’s planning area, we do question the need to add a general-purpose lane north of Madison. Even when using the 30<sup>th</sup> highest hour volume (K30), the I-39/90/94 Corridor Study peak-hour operations maps indicate that the current LOS between CTH I and Portage is mostly “D” (with one “C” segment), and that the future LOS is “D” (no-build Interstate scenario).

**Proposed MPO Comments:**

The table below includes WisDOT’s recommended preferred alternative for the I-39/90/94 mainline and each of the existing and proposed new interchanges within the MPO’s planning area. MPO staff reviewed comments submitted on the study by local agencies within the planning area and included them below. The MPO recommendation is based upon consistency with MPO adopted plans, review of local agency comments, and staff review.

WisDOT Recommended Preferred Alternative	Compiled Local Agency Comments	MPO Recommendation
<b>I-39/90/94 Freeway (Mainline)</b>		
<p>Modernization Plus Added General-Purpose Lane</p>	<p><b>Madison:</b> Does not concur with the recommendation for the I-39/90/94 freeway of the modernization plus added general-purpose lane. The City continues to have concerns regarding induced travel demand brought on by capacity expansion and believes the Modernization Hybrid (managed lane) Alternative would have less overall travel demand impact.</p> <p>Discourages the addition of Collector Distributor roads along the mainline. The addition of these roads effectively takes a 6- to 8-lane section of Freeway and converts it into a 12-lane section of freeway.</p> <p><b>DeForest:</b> Supports the expanded travel lane over a flex lane for the interstate. This will provide a safe and efficient corridor as well as cost less over time than a flex lane.</p> <p><b>Dane Co. Highway Dept:</b> Concerned with maintenance budget impacts if managed lane would be recommended.</p>	<p>Staff recommends a neutral position on added general-purpose lane. Looking at the differences between a managed lane (like the Beltline flex lane) and a general purpose lane, MPO staff agrees that a general purpose lane offers a better safety and operations benefits over a managed lane in this corridor; however, during the previous Interstate EIS study, the MPO Policy Board was opposed to capacity expansion, primarily focusing comments on the traffic operations analysis. After reviewing the traffic operations analysis for this study, staff feels that the Interstate study team has better addressed MPO concerns with the analysis this time around using LOS D as the desired threshold in the Madison planning area, which is consistent with the LOS target for interstates established in the MPO’s adopted congestion management process. However, concerns remain around the impacts of induced traffic and community impacts.</p>

<b>I-94/WIS 30 Interchange</b>		
Full Modernization Alternative #2	<b>Madison:</b> Concur; with an emphasis on the importance of providing full pedestrian and bicycle accommodations with the reconstruction of the Milwaukee Street bridge over the interstate.	Concur.
<b>Milwaukee Street Interchange (Proposed new)</b>		
Partial Cloverleaf	<b>Madison:</b> Concur.	Concur. This interchange is identified in the Connect Greater Madison 2050 RTP.
<b>US 151/High Crossing Boulevard Interchange</b>		
Directional	<p><b>Madison:</b> Concur with the recommendation at the US 151/High Crossing Blvd Interchange of the Directional Alternative, with an understanding of the installation of signals at the service interchange ramp terminals and the construction of a shared-use path through the interchange to American Parkway/Nelson Rd.</p> <p><b>Sun Prairie:</b> Concur. The City is especially thankful to see WisDOT's planned extension of the Side Path along USH-151 that currently terminates at Nelson Road be extended west to the East Washington Avenue Frontage Road. A safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian connection between Madison and Sun Prairie has long been a high Active Transportation Priority for Sun Prairie, and the completion of this Side Path into the City of Madison is a massive step toward creating an active transportation connection between the two communities. The City Council feels that the alternative appropriate supports vehicular travel between Madison and Sun Prairie.</p>	Concur. Encourage shared-use path and signalization of ramp terminals.
<b>Hoepker Road Interchange (Proposed new)</b>		
Shifted Diamond	<b>Madison:</b> Concur	Concur. This interchange is identified in the Connect Greater Madison 2050 RTP.

	<b>Sun Prairie:</b> Concur. Supports the proposed interchange of I-39/90 with Hoepker Road and feels this is appropriate given the growth and development patterns on the west side of the City.	
<b>US 51 Interchange</b>		
Partial Cloverleaf	<b>DeForest:</b> Preferred Alt 2, but supports the partial cloverleaf. Requests that the intersection at E. Metro Dr. and Williamsburg Way be improved with signalization. Requests that WisDOT include bike or pedestrian trail along the eastern side of USH 51. <b>Madison:</b> Concur	Concur. Encourage bike/ped connections and support request for signalization.
<b>WIS 19 Interchange</b>		
U-Ramp	<b>DeForest:</b> Concur- least costly, shortest construction impact, least impact to local businesses. Requests multi-use trail along northside of STH 19 to provide for bike/ped connection for both sides of Interstate.	Concur. Encourage bike/ped connections
<b>County V Interchange</b>		
No-Build (Diverging Diamond being built by Buccee’s development)	-	-

**Additional Comments:**

In addition to the proposed MPO comments on WisDOT’s preferred alternative, staff recommend including the following comments:

- Support Madison’s identified priority bike/ped connections.
- Recommend all bridge crossings over the Interstate have bike/ped accommodations.
- Strongly encourage noise mitigation.
- Strongly encourage TDM/TSMO strategies such as park and rides, including TDM strategies during construction.



## Preparing for the MPO's Active Transportation Plan

The MPO's [Bike Plan](#) was completed nearly 10 years ago and is due for an update. MPO staff feel that folding the Bike Plan update into a broader Active Transportation Plan that includes walking, non-motorized transportation modes, and micromobility devices is most appropriate, since these modes all rely on much of the same infrastructure and benefit from many of the same types of supportive policies.

Recent and developing local and statewide active transportation planning efforts make it an ideal time to develop a plan for the Greater Madison area. The City of Sun Prairie completed its [Active Transportation Plan](#) in 2023, WisDOT is currently working on the statewide [Active Transportation Plan](#), and the City of Madison is preparing to issue an RFP for a consultant to assist the City in developing an active transportation plan of its own. The MPO's Active Transportation Plan will help to link these plans as part of our regional network and will provide a roadmap for other communities that lack active transportation plans of their own.

### ***Stakeholders***

City of Madison (Traffic Engineering, ADA Transition Plan Team, Disability Rights Commission, DOT, Metro), Dane County Aging and Disability Resource Center, City/County Public Health, WisDOT, WisDNR, UW Health Healthy Kids Collaborative/Healthy Kids Dane, UW Transportation Services, Madison Bikes, Sun Prairie Moves, Bike Fitchburg, Bike Fed/SRTS, Madison is for People, Downtown Madison Inc. (DMI), Destination Madison, B-Cycle, Madison College, Bombay Bicycle Club (?), local chambers of commerce, local governments, Madison Region Economic Partnership (MadREP).

### ***Goals and Objectives***

- Identify gaps and barriers in the bicycle and pedestrian networks and prioritize locations for improvement and potential policy changes.
- Assess transportation system performance for people with disabilities and identify high-priority infrastructure and policy improvements.
- Assess the impact of the active transportation system and proposed improvements on job-access, quality of life, and the economy.
- Provide implementation-focused guidance to communities to help them select appropriate policy and infrastructure solutions to safety and connectivity issues.
- Provide information on current best practices in the areas of bicycle and pedestrian planning.
- Revise the MPO's current STBG scoring criteria.

### ***Questions for Discussion by the TCC***

As members of our Technical Committee and representatives of your communities, we would appreciate your input on the following questions at the next TCC meeting:

1. Are we missing any stakeholders? Who?
2. Are there other goals and objectives you would like to see for the Plan?
3. What are the top issues/concerns related to active transportation in your community?
4. What would make this plan most useful for your agency?