



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Master

File Number: 45285

File ID: 45285

File Type: Resolution

Status: Report of Officer

Version: 1

Reference:

Controlling Body: SUSTAINABLE
MADISON
TRANSPORTATION
MASTER PLAN
OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE
(Madison in Motion)

File Created Date : 11/29/2016

File Name: Adopting Madison in Motion

Final Action:

Title: Adopting Madison in Motion as the City of Madison's long-range transportation system plan, policy framework and resource for future transportation investments, as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

Notes:

Sponsors: Paul R. Soglin, Amanda Hall, Denise DeMarb, Tim Gruber, Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, Steve King, Matthew J. Phair, Maurice S. Cheeks, Ledell Zellers and Marsha A. Rummel

Effective Date:

Attachments: Draft MiM Recommendations Only (by Theme), Madison in Motion-draft priority recommendations-022317.pdf, MiM-Correction-Sheet-for-CC-022117.pdf, Draft MiM Background Document, Draft MiM Appendix, Draft MiM Executive Summary, MiM Council Briefing-120616 slides.pdf, Madison in Motion: Sept. 20, 2016 Open House Presentation, Madison in Motion: Briefing Book (Existing Conditions) – Sept 2014, Madison in Motion: Project Web Page, Street Cross Sections, MIM PPT Presentation to TPC 01.11.17.pdf, ITEM E.1. Registrants.pdf, Draft MiM Summary Document

Enactment Number:

Author: David Trowbridge, Principal Planner

Hearing Date:

Entered by: dtrowbridge@cityofmadison.com

Published Date:

Approval History

Version	Date	Approver	Action
1	11/29/2016	Benjamin John	Approve

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development	11/29/2016	Referred for Introduction				
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Referred for Introduction					
	Notes:	Sustainable Madison Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee; Pedestrian-Bicycle-Motor Vehicle Commission; Plan Commission, Long Range Transportation Planning Committee; Transit and Parking Commission; Board of Public Works; Economic Development Committee; Sustainable Madison Committee; Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO); Board of Estimates					
1	COMMON COUNCIL	12/06/2016	Referred	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATIO N MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)		02/16/2017	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Verveer, seconded by Rummel, to Referred to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion). The motion passed by voice vote/other.					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	12/06/2016	Referred	PEDESTRIAN/BIC YCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION		01/24/2017	
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Referred to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	12/06/2016	Referred	PLAN COMMISSION		02/06/2017	
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Referred to the PLAN COMMISSION					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	12/06/2016	Referred	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATIO N PLANNING COMMITTEE		01/26/2017	
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Referred to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	12/06/2016	Referred	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION		01/11/2017	

Action Text: This Resolution was Referred to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

Notes:

1 SUSTAINABLE MADISON 12/06/2016 Referred BOARD OF
TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC WORKS
MASTER PLAN
OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE (Madison in
Motion)

Action Text: This Resolution was Referred to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

Notes:

1 SUSTAINABLE MADISON 12/06/2016 Referred ECONOMIC 01/18/2017
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT
MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE
OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE (Madison in
Motion)

Action Text: This Resolution was Referred to the ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Notes:

1 SUSTAINABLE MADISON 12/06/2016 Referred SUSTAINABLE 01/23/2017
TRANSPORTATION MADISON
MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE
OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE (Madison in
Motion)

Action Text: This Resolution was Referred to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE

Notes:

1 SUSTAINABLE MADISON 12/06/2016 Referred MADISON AREA
TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATIO
MASTER PLAN N PLANNING
OVERSIGHT BOARD (MPO)
COMMITTEE (Madison in
Motion)

Action Text: This Resolution was Referred to the MADISON AREA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD (MPO)

Notes:

1 SUSTAINABLE MADISON 12/06/2016 Referred BOARD OF 02/13/2017
TRANSPORTATION ESTIMATES
MASTER PLAN
OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE (Madison in
Motion)

Action Text: This Resolution was Referred to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES

Notes:

1 BOARD OF PUBLIC 01/04/2017 Return to Lead with SUSTAINABLE 02/16/2017
WORKS the
Recommendation TRANSPORTATIO
for Approval N MASTER PLAN
OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE
(Madison in
Motion)

Action Text: David Trowbridge, Planning Unit, presented the Madison in Motion report. Motion made by Branson, second by Haack to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion). Motion passed by voice vote/other.

1	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	01/11/2017	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATIO N MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	02/16/2017	Pass
---	-----------------------------------	------------	--	--	------------	------

- Action Text:** [Please note: This item followed Agenda Item F.4.] Chief Transportation Planner and MIM Project Manager David Trowbridge reviewed the major transportation elements in the MIM long-range transportation plan (MIM PowerPoint attached), and answered questions.
- (Page 1) The Isthmus Freeway Plan from 1955 reflected the direction many cities took to serve their central districts. We now realized how this would have destroyed neighborhoods, State Street/the Square, and the entire character of the Isthmus.
 - (Page 2) The resolution and plan recognized that we now must rely on other modes of transportation to provide mobility in the central city that included public transit, living close to destinations, bicycle transportation, and walking – important principles for MIM. Along with integrating MIM into the various neighborhood and City plans, the resolution called for MIM to provide realistic mode choices other than driving if possible.
 - Draft Recommendations included: Policy statements, maps/routes that laid out networks for our transit and bike system in the long term; best practices for designing infrastructure and delivering transportation services, esp. in light of evolving technology.
 - MIM was not a program of individual projects; those decisions were made as part of the capital budget process. Instead, MIM was meant to be a resource for the development of projects; and deferring to other more detailed plans, called for follow-up in connection to such plans as TDP and BRT.
 - (Page 3) Outreach was made to a wide variety of stakeholders with varying needs, inc. senior and low-income groups, millennials, and others, collecting feedback throughout the process.
 - (Page 4) Land use: As the city grew over the coming decades, we needed to be mindful of how and where we developed. The map showed areas where development were expected to occur, which needed to be part of neighborhood planning and link into the transportation system also. Large parts of the city and periphery were off-limits to development, such as single family neighborhoods that were stable, and large areas of farmland and environmental resources.
 - (Page 4-5) MIM talked about Activity Center Planning, another name for what Planning had been doing for years: TOD, mixed land uses, good transit services to that, strong ped environment, and community services nearby. Hilldale and the East Rail Corridors were examples of larger-scale, higher-density Activity Centers with a mix of income groups and housing, retail, and employment. Smaller-scale nodes abutting neighborhoods were possibilities for Activity Center planning also.
 - (Page 6) The map showed areas in the city where such Centers with a more urban form could occur, to consider transportation linkages when planning. The graph showed that 7/10 trips to work were made by automobile, whether alone or car-pooling. The City hoped to improve the numbers for other modes.
 - (Page 7) The blue Transit map showed that in some areas of the city, as many as 30% were using transit due to relatively short travel times, the cost and lack of parking, and high levels of transit service. They were hoping that if these conditions could be replicated in other areas of the city, more people would make these choices.
 - (Page 8) Public Transit recommendations included BRT and local bus coordination; and the roles played by Park & Ride, First Mile/Last Mile, as well as more robust and sustainable regional financing to allow for growth and keep up with inflation.
 - BRT would include articulated buses, nice stations/amenities, and new technology.
 - (Page 9) The map showed areas of low-income housing in the city circled in red. People who were dependent on low-income housing were becoming more and more dispersed, further away from core transit areas and from jobs within 30 minutes of where they lived. Low-income and people of color had to transfer 1-2x to get to work.
 - To gather information, staff talked to people at Transfer Points and heard unbelievable stories: One-way trips of 90 minutes; jobs that started so early that Metro couldn't serve these riders, who had to take cabs instead. These people were trying to get to jobs and turn their lives around, and the transportation system and location of housing didn't work for them. The City wanted to rectify that moving forward.
 - Benefits of BRT included faster, more frequent service, and off-board fare payment, which would save a lot of time.
 - (Pages 10) Maps included potential BRT routes in every direction, connecting to partnering communities to help create a regional system, and connecting to many areas with job density.
 - (Page 11) However, BRT did not address housing location for people who needed to access jobs, as shown by the First Mile/Last Mile map. If people didn't live right on the corridor, then they had to travel a mile to get to a corridor. It was costly to run a fixed route bus to circulate through these areas,

not to mention having to go through a Transfer Point. People might go out of their way to use BRT, but First Mile/Last Mile planning needed to be refined.

- The Park and Ride map showed untapped potential for transit use. BRT will be fast, but how would people get to it? One way would be drive. People were now parking in neighborhoods to the chagrin of some residents. But perhaps Park and Ride could be formalized to identify areas with free parking, to encourage more transit use. A follow-up Park and Ride study was being recommended.
- Regarding reconstituting Transport 2020 into a new committee to begin planning for BRT, it was possible the City could move forward on its own without the County and WisDOT, who could assign some remaining funds to the City.
- (Page 12) While ridership was growing, level of service was not, because we couldn't afford to add service to meet the demand. Non-local shares of funding were flat/shrinking, and the local share (property tax) was picking up the slack just to cover inflationary growth, not to mention growth of service to peripheral areas. Metro had a funding crisis, and a stable regional source of funding was needed to allow the City to grow with its partners.
- (Page 13-15) MIM recommended a process be started to look at some sort of regional entity to pay for and govern Metro; and look at possible other funding sources (user/developer/infrastructure fees, bonding, public/private partnerships, etc.) MIM also recommended TDM's and TMA's be pursued.
- (Page 16-17) Opportunities for express bus service existed, esp. through a regional transit entity. Locations for an intercity bus terminal (at Beford and now at Lake) had been discussed. Like the terminal at LaCrosse, it would be desirable to have some other land use above ground. In the heart of the Campus, the Lake Street location showed some promise, esp. if the City could partner with the UW, and if the bus companies would use it.
- (Page 18-19) Next steps would be to measure how we were doing over time. This year, a national household survey would be conducted to see how people were making decisions about trips for work, shopping and recreation. This would be tracked over time.
- Previously, a goal had been 20% bicycling citywide by 2020. But now they would drill down further, by creating zones throughout the city and applying different numeric goals based on conditions there. If they felt there was more opportunity to get a higher mode split in some zones due to service there, this should be reflected in performance monitoring.
- Technological changes: These should adapt to the urban environment we would like to create. People wanted to walk and bike, and have a liveable environment. For example, we didn't yet know how/when the technology of driverless cars would advance, but weren't designing our city around them. The City would monitor changes (payment cards and electric bikes), and consider pilot projects for them.

Members asked questions and made recommendations:

- (Zellers) Page 11, Action Items: The timeframe for the update/implementation of the Comprehensive Plan should be 1-5 years.
- (Zellers) Page 13: Car-sharing could go a long way in reducing individual cars in denser areas, but it had not been happening. How might they get this off the ground? Companies like Cars-2-Go hadn't shown any interest since the issue with State regulatory hurdle had been resolved. Developers could help by providing both a spot and a car for car-sharing.
- (Trowbridge) The City would need to start working with these companies again; perhaps to find spots for them in private developments, or to figure out the parking issue.
- (Zellers/Trowbridge) Page 14, Action Items: Along with targeting larger employers to use transit passes, smaller employers/groups could conglomerate through TMA's to do this (as the plan recommended).
- (Zellers/Trowbridge) The plan did not discuss minimizing one-way streets, which had pros/cons; and their applicability in certain geographic and urban contexts varied. To look at specific changes or improvements like that, a corridor plan with surveys and modeling and a high level of detail was needed, and that was called out in the plan.
- (Kemble) Paratransit and land use were connected, and funding was shifting. This was something we should explicitly and specifically plan for.
- (Trowbridge) Page 14 talked about improving access to affordable housing and employment, which was a place where the plan could say transit-dependent and paratransit-dependent persons should be integrated into housing strongly served by transit. This was not purposely omitted, but it could be called out more.
- (Golden) The plan should make some mention about maintaining paratransit services above the

minimum. Some reference should be made to the Bus Study and the recommendation to use articulated and small buses. If the planning horizon was 30-40 years, perhaps the plan should mention that.

- (Trowbridge) The plan referred to "6-10 years and beyond".
- (Golden) It would probably be a good idea for the different recommendations in this plan be conveyed to the MPO so that they could be reflected in the MPO's plan (i.e. the next TDP). It also wasn't clear as to how this plan would fold into the Comprehensive Plan.
- (Trowbridge) The resolution said MIM would be a supplement to the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- (Golden/Trowbridge) Re: how MIM would be worked into the TDP (in order to pursue alternative funding beyond property tax), MIM needed to keep a delicate balance, so as not to supersede the TDP. MIM didn't talk about roadway capacity planning, because the MPO maintained the regional model. But MIM did talk about looking at innovative ways to provide First Mile/Last Mile, and maybe that could be emphasized in the TDP.
- (Golden) Governance (esp. intergovernmental) wasn't really discussed in the plan. Though an RTA was not an option, it was possible under the Statutes to make inter-governmental agreements if it involved the County, to create something that quacked a bit like an RTA. Given the current and likely future shape of the Legislature, the plan should explore governance (whether through the MPO or a different body) of how transit collaboration should be handled.
- (Golden) A County committee that he chaired had come up with \$1.5M of capital funding. But the County Attorney said the County couldn't fund transit, which wasn't really the case, esp. in light of how the County already funded a lot of transit.
- (Golden) Regardless, the County role in partnering and mainline funding should be pursued, given the property tax base they had compared to us. The historic role of counties was to connect communities. Some placeholder language should be added to MIM to address governance and intergovernmental cooperation.
- (Trowbridge/Golden) The bottom of Page 2 (Action Items) contained some language related to regional transportation and transit governance in the Madison metro area and Dane County. This could be expanded.
- (Trowbridge) A resolution had just been introduced related to regional transit, which was referred to the TPC.

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Golden, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion); and to document Commission comments on the MIM Correction Sheet. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.5.]

Notes: The motion included a request that Commission comments be documented on the Correction Sheet.

1	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	01/18/2017	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	02/16/2017	Pass
---	--------------------------------	------------	---	--	------------	------

Action Text: Dave Trowbridge presents the Madison in Motion Plan. Committee discussed various aspects of the plan with Mr. Trowbridge. A motion was made by King, seconded by Kemble, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion). The motion passed by voice vote.

1	SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE	01/23/2017	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	02/16/2017	
---	-------------------------------	------------	---	--	------------	--

Action Text: David Trowbridge presented recommendations from the MIM plan and draft summary documents. MIM is not a list of projects, but a plan to enhance various transportation modes and to develop transit oriented development patterns. Committee asked various questions like if, MIM include policies the impacted driver behaviors (No) and some around rail issues. (Controlled by DOT and State of Wisconsin.) Committee agreed that MIM draft materials were good and comprehensive and offered some suggestions with regard to complete streets planning processes including urban forestry issues earlier in the process, varying street sizes and testing of Bus Rapid Transit options as soon as possible. Motion made by Campbell, second by Vickerman to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion). Motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

1	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/ MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	01/24/2017	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATIO N MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	01/24/2017	02/16/2017	Pass
---	--	------------	--	--	------------	------------	------

Action Text: The following registrants spoke in support of Madison in Motion. Susan Schmitz 210 Marinette Trail; Gary Peterson 210 Marinette Trail.

This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion) due back on 1/24/2017 by the following votes:

Ayes: 7 Ledell Zellers; Paul E. Skidmore; Rebecca Kemble; Eric C. Lewandowski; Mark D. Bennett; Susan M. De Vos and Scott A. Kolar

Noes: 1 Grant A. Foster

Excused: 2 Sarah (Sally) A. Lehner and Aaron S. P. Crandall

Non Voting: 1 Michael W. Rewey

1	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE	01/26/2017	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATIO N MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	02/16/2017		
---	--	------------	---	--	------------	--	--

Action Text: Ken Johnson/Grant Foster submitted a motion to recommend adding an addendum to the Madison in Motion plan, identifying the City department that will lead the implementation of the Action Items (as well as the supporting/participating departments). That motion passed unanimously.

Mark Shahan/Brad Cantrell submitted a motion to modify the language in the new recommendation below, pertaining to the use and refinement of transportation system performance measures over time. That motion passed unanimously.

New Theme – “Measuring and Monitoring Transportation System Performance”

Action Items (next 1-5 years)

- o The City of Madison should work with local and regional partners (including the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, Wisconsin Department of Transportation and other area jurisdictions) to develop and maintain a transportation system performance measurement and monitoring program, to monitor transportation mode share changes over time. The performance measurement program should establish a base year 2016 dataset, utilizing the National Household Transportation Survey (NHTS) and providing necessary resources to increase the sample size (to ensure statistical validity) and to also allow for geographic targeting of data collection within certain locations of the City (to ensure that economically disadvantaged or other potentially underserved populations are reached). The City should also enhance its current data collection program to collect transportation system user volumes at specific locations throughout the City, including motor vehicle counts, transit user counts, as well as bicycle and pedestrian counts, and monitor changes over time. In addition, the City should continue to develop and refine new performance measures over time (as well as consider evolving measures), as new data sources and data collection techniques become available and reliable. Special emphasis should be given to performance measures that are specifically tailored to individual transportation modes, demographic groups and geographic locations in the City.

Brad Cantrell/Jim Polewski submitted a motion to recommend adoption of Resolution ID 45285 (as amended). That motion passed unanimously.

Notes:

1	PLAN COMMISSION	02/06/2017	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)	02/16/2017	Pass
---	-----------------	------------	---	--	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Zellers, seconded by King, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion). The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes: On a motion by Ald. Zellers, seconded by Ald. King, the Plan Commission recommended approval of the Madison in Motion plan to the Sustainable Madison Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee with the following addition to the adopting resolution:

- Be it further resolved that staff will identify 5 priority action items from among the 1-5 year action items within each of the thematic goals and for each of those identified action items will define who, when and what will be done to accomplish the selected priority action items with accompanying measures of success.

The motion to recommend approval passed by voice vote/ other.

1	BOARD OF ESTIMATES	02/13/2017	RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER			Pass
---	--------------------	------------	---	--	--	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Eskrich, seconded by Wood, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

1 SUSTAINABLE MADISON 02/16/2017 RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER Pass
TRANSPORTATION
MASTER PLAN
OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)

Action Text: A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Gruber, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER.

Lynn Hobbie/Ken Golden submitted a motion to recommend making changes to various Madison in Motion documents, as indicated in the Correction Sheet (dated 2-7-17). Chair Gary Poulson asked if there were additional modifications to be suggested by the Oversight Committee

Ken Golden/Rob Kennedy submitted a motion to add a new recommendation under the Theme "Improving the Public Transit System on Madison and throughout the Region".

Policy and Best Practice Recommendations

- o Metro Transit should continue to seek to maintain the provision of ADA paratransit service above the current ADA minimum standards, which will help to adequately meet the needs of its customers (contingent upon continued robust regional funding).

That motion passed unanimously.

Ken Golden/Rob Kennedy submitted a motion to modify an existing recommendation under the Theme "Building and Maintaining Streets and Roadways for All Users".

Policy and Best Practice Recommendations

- o As opportunities for reconstruction of existing streets arise, identify existing roadways with excess capacity (i.e., those with unutilized on-street parking lanes). To the extent possible, for construction of new streets and reconstruction of existing streets, narrow the street and reallocate space to more productive uses than under-utilized asphalt, such as widening the terrace, installing or expanding boulevards, or expanding bike or pedestrian facilities.

Ald. David Ahrens offered a comment. He asked that, in the draft Priorities Addendum, more specific timeframes for recommended actions be identified (such as 1-2 years, and 3-5 years).

Rob Kennedy/Jay Ferm submitted a motion to create a process to evaluate progress, and identify which boards or commissions would be responsible for tracking implementation progress for each action item. That motion passed unanimously.

Ald. Maurice Cheeks/Mike Rewey submitted a motion to add a new recommendation under the Theme "Improving the Public Transit System on Madison and throughout the Region".

Action Items (next 1-5 years)

- o Require, as appropriate, that a variety of Bus Rapid Transit infrastructure or other system accommodations be dedicated by developments located along designated BRT corridors or adjacent to BRT station areas, in conjunction with applicable regulations and/or zoning required for development approval.

On the main motion by Ken Golden/Ald. Tim Gruber to recommend adoption of Resolution ID 45285, as including amendments in the Correction Sheet and by Oversight Committee members, the MiM Oversight Committee voted unanimously in favor.

1 COMMON COUNCIL 02/28/2017

Text of Legislative File 45285

Fiscal Note

There is no fiscal impact associated with the adoption of the Plan. Implementing specific

recommendations within the Plan will require the inclusion of expenditures in future capital and operating budgets, subject to Common Council approval at that time.

Title

Adopting Madison in Motion as the City of Madison's long-range transportation system plan, policy framework and resource for future transportation investments, as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

Body

WHEREAS the City of Madison's population and economy is growing, and in order to continue to facilitate this growth and ensure a high quality of life, the City has identified a need for a comprehensive transportation plan that integrates all modes of passenger and freight transportation (i.e., auto, bicycle, public transportation, pedestrian, high-capacity transit, air, etc.), identifies how those modes interconnect and work together, and identifies how the City's numerous plans and policies are enhanced and supported by it; and

WHEREAS two thirds of jobs in Madison are held by non-residents, Madison's transportation system must support local and regional needs; and

WHEREAS the unique geography of Madison concentrates vehicular traffic onto a limited number of corridors, which have very limited opportunity for adding capacity; and

WHEREAS neighborhoods with many low-income residents and persons of color often are in areas that are difficult to serve with traditional transit services, resulting in longer travel times for those who often have no other choice; and

WHEREAS the City of Madison supports goals to use land use objectives and policies that improve the residential quality of life for urban neighborhoods and improve mobility/access options for all Madison area residents and visitors to the City, and the coordination and integration of Madison's transportation and land use plans, policies and practices will help keep Madison vibrant and attractive to businesses, visitors and residents; and

WHEREAS the purpose of Madison in Motion is to guide transportation decisions in the City of Madison (and coordinate the City's decisions with those of the greater larger metropolitan area), in order to help make Madison a more walkable, bikeable and livable city; and

WHEREAS Madison's public streets are places that must work for all people, including those on foot, on bicycles, using transit, in automobiles, those with disabilities, residents and businesses; and

WHEREAS Madison in Motion helps to create and strengthen livable neighborhoods, will place an emphasis on creating transportation choices (especially bicycling, walking and public transportation), and will help make the City more accessible and attractive to employers, visitors and residents; and

WHEREAS as we grow, the transportation system must provide mobility options for more residents, employees and visitors, but must do so in a way that supports our vision for Madison: a thriving downtown, vibrant main streets and strong neighborhoods, supported by a robust economy providing opportunities for all residents; and

WHEREAS Madison in Motion included an extensive public and stakeholder input program throughout the course of the project, which generated highly valuable insight into the specific transportation needs of our citizens, businesses and visitors; and

WHEREAS Madison in Motion identifies the transportation policies and best practices, strategies and implementation recommendations necessary to connect all elements of the City's transportation system (providing clear connections to the regional transportation system), and includes a transportation system vision for the City to strive toward over the next 25 years, and beyond.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Common Council hereby adopts Madison in Motion as the City of Madison's long-range transportation system plan, policy framework and guide for future transportation investments, as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Common Council directs staff of various transportation implementation agencies including, but not limited, to City Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Planning and Metro Transit to work together to ensure that the recommended policies, concepts and best practices contained in Madison in Motion are integrated to the extent possible into future transportation projects.