



# Financial Analysis



# Financial Capacity Analysis

---

## **Introduction**

This section of the Regional Transportation Plan 2030 presents an assessment of the financial capacity of transportation providers in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area to implement the street, highway, transit, and other transportation improvements identified in the plan. The term “financial capacity” refers to the ability of each provider of transportation facilities and services to maintain and preserve the existing transportation system and to finance the planned improvements described earlier in the plan.

A financial capacity analysis is required by the recently enacted Safe, Accessible, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act – A legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) to demonstrate that metropolitan area transportation plans are fiscally constrained, which means the costs of the projects included in a plan and the maintenance and preservation of the existing transportation system can be covered using available and projected funding sources. When projected shortfalls exist, the regulations also require that new sources of revenue be identified. However, the plan may include, for illustrative purposes, additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if reasonable additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were available.

The financial capacity analysis considers the trends in sources and uses of funds, and estimates the ability of existing funding sources to meet the maintenance, preservation, and improvement needs of the transportation system, and is presented in the following sections.

## **Historical Funding Trends**

The Madison Metropolitan Area’s capacity to maintain, preserve, and improve its transportation system is largely defined by the conditions that exist today. The current institutional structures, trends in sources and use of funds, and trends in various tax bases can also affect future revenues. To know what resources can be expected to be made available to carry out the Regional Transportation Plan 2030, past funding efforts by local, state, and federal entities need to be determined.

### Municipal Streets and Roadways

Municipal streets are largely financed by local sources. The sources include special assessments, impact fees, and general revenues. The metropolitan area municipalities also use funds from the state’s General Transportation Aids program and the federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) to finance projects. A subcategory of the STP program is the STP-Urban program, which provides a designated funding amount to the Madison Urban Area since it is an area over 200,000 in population. The STP Urban funding allocation for the Madison Urban Area increased to \$5 million per year in 2002, \$5.3 million in 2004, and \$6.2 million in 2006. Funding levels for 2007-2010 are uncertain at this time but are expected to be in the \$5.3 to \$6.2 million range.

Table 26, Historical Local Street and Roadway Expenses, on the next page, shows the operating and maintenance costs, construction costs, and other associated costs for those units of government in the Madison Area MPO’s Planning Area from the year 2001 to 2004. The information was derived from the reports, *Revenues & Expenditures by Wisconsin Counties, Cities, Villages & Towns (2000-2004)*, published by the Wisconsin Department of Revenue. Operations and maintenance figures represent the combination of two reported categories, “Highway Maintenance and Administration” and “Road Related Facilities.” For those units of government that are partially within the MPO Planning area, the reported figures were adjusted based on the percent of their street system in the MPO Planning Area. Total annual costs from 2001-2004 range from \$64.2 million to \$84.2 million with an annual average of \$72.3 million.

### State Highway System

The state and federal highway funding sources that have typically been used for many years in the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area include:

- Interstate Maintenance (I/M)
- National Highway System (NHS)
- Surface Transportation Program (STP) State Flexible

**TABLE 26  
HISTORICAL LOCAL STREET AND ROADWAY EXPENSES (000's)**

County/ Municipality	2001				2002				2003				2004			
	O & M	Const.	Other	Total	O & M	Const.	Other	Total	O & M	Const.	Other	Total	O & M	Const.	Other	Total
Dane County	7,000.3	2,323.9	0.0	9,324.2	7,275.5	2,028.3	17.0	9,320.8	8,058.4	2,147.5	0.0	10,205.9	7,422.6	2,476.7	22.0	9,921.3
C. Fitchburg <sup>2</sup>	1,548.4	371.1	205.7	2,125.2	1,649.7	947.6	203.5	2,800.9	1,144.3	774.8	171.8	2,091.0	1,160.9	1,151.1	173.6	2,485.5
C. Madison	14,031.6	12,117.1	4,445.9	30,594.6	11,063.4	12,348.1	2,577.5	25,989.0	11,186.2	13,694.7	3,126.9	28,009.8	13,840.7	18,540.3	775.0	33,156.0
C. Middleton	1,534.8	1,545.2	472.0	3,552.0	1,533.1	5,173.6	824.1	7,530.8	7,898.8	11,388.5	1,819.1	21,106.4	1,970.0	428.4	423.6	2,822.0
C. Monona	591.1	474.4	0.0	1,065.5	765.4	398.9	0.0	1,164.3	702.3	352.6	0.0	1,054.9	904.2	449.4	0.0	1,353.6
C. Stoughton	2,057.2	368.8	145.3	2,571.3	2,411.3	1,248.4	163.4	3,823.1	1,598.5	616.6	171.9	2,387.0	1,466.9	393.0	159.4	2,019.3
C. Sun Prairie	2,567.2	2,778.8	231.3	5,577.3	2,227.5	1,780.0	257.8	4,265.3	2,735.3	1,763.6	269.8	4,768.7	3,907.7	1,605.8	485.4	5,998.9
C. Verona	1,823.3	1,617.4	0.0	3,440.7	935.8	949.7	0.0	1,885.5	2,918.4	858.5	0.0	3,776.9	4,699.6	298.0	0.0	4,997.6
V. Cottage Grove	415.1	329.5	0.0	744.6	299.3	10.3	0.0	309.6	1,033.2	2,005.5	0.0	3,038.7	628.4	67.0	0.0	695.4
V. Maple Bluff	137.0	0.0	0.0	137.0	101.7	0.0	0.0	101.7	108.7	0.0	0.0	108.7	168.3	58.0	0.0	226.3
V. McFarland	717.9	44.7	0.0	762.6	733.9	80.2	0.0	814.1	954.6	118.2	0.0	1,072.8	885.0	215.4	0.0	1,100.4
V. Shorewood Hills	781.5	880.7	1.6	1,663.8	228.8	222.5	3.2	454.5	309.3	335.5	2.2	647.0	298.0	48.7	2.1	348.8
V. Waunakee	1,664.3	1,109.2	114.7	2,888.2	1,435.0	616.4	155.6	2,207.0	1,213.0	682.3	5.9	1,881.2	983.5	1,745.3	21.7	2,750.5
T. Blooming Grove	74.5	82.9	0.0	157.4	110.4	241.7	0.0	352.1	105.7	2.5	0.0	108.2	120.2	90.2	0.0	210.4
T. Bristol <sup>3</sup>	54.8	0.0	0.0	54.8	86.3	0.0	0.0	86.3	91.3	0.0	0.0	91.3	63.9	0.0	0.0	63.9
T. Burke	196.2	119.3	0.0	315.5	137.1	54.2	0.0	191.3	225.1	310.8	0.0	535.9	304.3	186.8	0.0	491.1
T. Cottage Grove <sup>4</sup>	147.6	55.0	0.0	202.6	132.0	46.3	0.0	178.3	108.4	64.0	0.0	172.4	167.4	50.7	0.0	218.1
T. Dunkirk <sup>5</sup>	52.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	34.0	22.5	0.0	56.5	53.8	0.0	0.0	53.8	50.3	0.0	0.0	50.3
T. Dunn <sup>6</sup>	452.4	78.6	0.0	531.0	285.1	110.6	0.0	395.7	265.1	131.0	0.0	396.1	246.9	122.2	0.0	369.0
T. Madison	329.3	0.0	75.0	404.3	262.9	182.9	81.3	527.1	392.2	447.4	83.7	923.3	363.1	1,136.9	84.0	1,584.0
T. Middleton	230.5	155.4	0.0	385.9	235.1	148.4	0.0	383.5	206.6	315.6	0.0	522.2	393.3	366.4	0.0	759.7
T. Pleasant Springs <sup>7</sup>	94.9	0.0	0.0	94.9	84.7	0.0	0.0	84.7	74.5	0.0	0.0	74.5	70.2	0.0	0.0	70.2
T. Rutland <sup>8</sup>	18.6	15.0	0.0	33.7	18.1	36.4	0.0	54.5	37.5	8.9	0.0	46.4	19.7	27.4	0.0	47.1
T. Springfield <sup>9</sup>	111.6	66.0	0.0	177.5	81.1	53.8	0.0	134.9	56.3	71.5	0.0	127.9	115.0	5.0	0.0	120.1
T. Sun Prairie <sup>10</sup>	88.0	51.5	0.0	139.5	92.4	30.4	0.0	122.8	140.4	64.9	0.0	205.3	131.1	5.1	0.0	136.2
T. Verona <sup>11</sup>	365.4	0.0	0.0	365.4	515.1	0.0	0.0	515.1	325.5	0.0	1.7	327.2	461.9	0.0	2.2	464.1
T. Westport <sup>12</sup>	299.2	118.6	0.0	417.8	268.2	131.0	0.0	399.2	153.9	263.8	0.0	417.7	156.4	286.4	0.0	442.8
T. Windsor <sup>13</sup>	41.9	2.0	0.0	43.9	35.0	3.3	0.0	38.3	31.9	36.2	0.0	68.0	30.4	24.1	0.0	54.5
<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>37,426.6</b>	<b>24,705.1</b>	<b>5,691.5</b>	<b>67,823.2</b>	<b>33,037.8</b>	<b>26,865.5</b>	<b>4,283.4</b>	<b>64,186.7</b>	<b>42,131.3</b>	<b>36,434.9</b>	<b>5,653.0</b>	<b>84,219.3</b>	<b>41,029.9</b>	<b>29,778.2</b>	<b>2,149.0</b>	<b>72,957.1</b>

1 Operations and Maintenance Costs  
 2 Estimated at 97.25%  
 3 Estimated at 28.21%  
 4 Estimated at 36.21%  
 5 Estimated at 23.50%  
 6 Estimated at 78.12%  
 7 Estimated at 27.56%  
 8 Estimated at 15.77%  
 9 Estimated at 37.92%  
 10 Estimated at 47.23%  
 11 Estimated at 65.16%  
 12 Estimated at 94.59%  
 13 Estimated at 8.00%

- STP Safety
- STP Rural (STP-R)
- Bridge Replacement & Rehabilitation (BR)

Table 27 illustrates federal and state funding of roadway projects programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area from 2002 to 2006. Total annual spending costs from 2002-2006 range from a low of \$22.8 million to a high of \$64.1 million. Total federal and state funding of transportation projects (non-transit) for the same time period ranges from \$29.9 million to \$76.7 million with an annual average of 40.6 million.

These costs are further summarized in Table 28, on the next page, in which annual averages were generated for estimates of potential future revenues.

In the past, it was typically assumed that federal and state highway revenues would equal the amount of money needed to maintain and add to the highway system. However, the motor fuel taxes, registration fees, and other state and federal revenue sources that have traditionally funded these projects have not been able to keep up with the rapidly rising costs of maintaining and adding to the state's highway system. It is anticipated that the state's new transportation plan called Connections 2030 will address this issue.

### Transit

The major transit operator in the Madison Metropolitan Area is Metro Transit, which is owned by the City of Madison and operates within the oversight of the Mayor, Common Council, and the City's Transit & Parking Commission. Metro contracts with other communities and public institutions (including UW-Madison and the Madison Metropolitan School District) to provide service. Most transit service is provided by Metro on regular fixed-routes using large buses. Other transit services include Metro paratransit service, other demand-responsive services, special event shuttles, state vanpools, and ridesharing services.

Funding has been a major challenge for the transit system in the past and will continue to be in the future due to the lack of a dedicated local funding source for transit and very tight budget situations at the state and local levels. Table 29, on page 167, shows the transit system's operating expenses and revenues from 2002-2006, which ranges from a low of \$44.4 million to a high of \$51.7 million with an annual average of \$48.9 million.

**TABLE 27  
FEDERAL AND STATE SPENDING COSTS BY FUNDING SOURCE  
NON-TRANSIT PROJECTS 2002-2006**

	Funds Programmed (\$000)					5yr Total	Average/yr
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006		
<b>A. ROADWAY FUNDS</b>							
<b>Federal</b>							
Interstate Maintenance (I/M)	9,582	492	4,602	713	425	15,814	3,163
National Highway System (NHS)	3,409	2,118	22,468	19,696	14,309	62,000	12,400
Surface Transportation Program (STP) State Flexible	1,861	3,148	8,198	1,639	1,234	16,080	3,216
STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)	4,990	4,990	5,320	5,320	6,227	26,847	5,369
STP Safety	1,290	584	973	1,492	1,125	5,464	1,093
STP Rural			1,200	600	2,720	4,520	904
Bridge Replacement & Rehabilitation	118	492	827	81	1,558	3,076	615
Federal Earmark	n/a	n/a	2,528	960	2,500	5,988	1,198
<b>Subtotal Federal</b>	<b>21,250</b>	<b>11,824</b>	<b>46,116</b>	<b>30,501</b>	<b>30,098</b>	<b>139,789</b>	<b>27,958</b>
<b>State</b>	<b>6,272</b>	<b>11,032</b>	<b>18,016</b>	<b>13,766</b>	<b>14,172</b>	<b>63,258</b>	<b>12,652</b>
<b>Subtotal Federal &amp; State Roadway</b>	<b>27,522</b>	<b>22,856</b>	<b>64,132</b>	<b>44,267</b>	<b>44,270</b>	<b>203,047</b>	<b>40,609</b>
<b>B. Federal &amp; State Transportation (non-roadway &amp; non-transit)</b>							
Transp. & Community & System Pres. Pilot Prgm. (TCSP)	n/a	550	n/a	n/a	n/a	550	110
STP Transportation Enhancements	1,127	2,077	1,595	4,432	3,319	12,550	2,510
Other State (WisDOA, WisDNR, UW, Ped/Bike, Rail)	1,273	1,397	2,803	28,057	10,613	44,143	8,829
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2,400</b>	<b>4,024</b>	<b>4,398</b>	<b>32,489</b>	<b>13,932</b>	<b>57,243</b>	<b>11,449</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>29,922</b>	<b>26,880</b>	<b>68,530</b>	<b>76,756</b>	<b>58,202</b>	<b>260,290</b>	<b>52,058</b>

Source: Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Area (2002-2006)

**TABLE 28  
SUMMARY OF FEDERAL AND STATE SPENDING COSTS BY FUNDING SOURCE  
NON-TRANSIT PROJECTS 2002-2006**

	Funds Programmed (\$000)					5yr Total	Average/yr
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006		
<b>State and Federal</b>							
Highway Const., Maint., etc	22,532	17,866	58,812	38,947	38,043	176,200	35,240
STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)	4,990	4,990	5,320	5,320	6,227	26,847	5,369
Transp. & Community & System Pres. Pilot Prgm. (TCSP)	n/a	550	n/a	n/a	n/a	550	110
STP Transportation Enhancements	1,127	2,077	1,595	4,432	3,319	12,550	2,510
Other State	1,273	1,397	2,803	28,057	10,613	44,143	8,829
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>29,922</b>	<b>26,880</b>	<b>68,530</b>	<b>76,756</b>	<b>58,202</b>	<b>260,290</b>	<b>52,058</b>

Source: Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Area (2002-2006)

Major Metropolitan Area Projects

These projects are typically funded with federal STP-Urban funds and/or local funds. The STP-Urban funds have been identified above. Some major projects have also been totally done with local funds. An example of the combination of STP-Urban funds and local funds on major projects, as well as the level of funding, can be found in Table 24, on page 135, in the street and roadway recommendations section of the plan. The projects shown in the 2007-2010 column of Table 24 are projects already programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the region.

***Projected Transportation Expenses and Revenues***

Assuming that the historical funding levels shown in Tables 26 through Table 29 will remain relatively constant over the next 24-year period to the year 2030, it is estimated that approximately \$4,573,850,000 could potentially be available to finance projects. These projections are summarized in the bottom half of Table 30, on page 168. To estimate projected expenses over this period of time, levels of funding are based on the average annual amount of funding programmed in the MPO 2006-2010 TIP for each funding source. These projections are shown in the top half of Table 30. A constant dollar analysis was used.

Expenses Notes

- The state and federal highway cost estimates are based on the average annual amount of state and federal funding programmed for 2007-2010 in the 2006-2010 TIP multiplied by the number of years for each project period.
- TCSP funding has been relatively small in the Madison Metropolitan Area and future expenses are not expected.
- The Dane County & Communities expenses are based on the annual average expenditure trends from 2001-2004 in Table 26.
- Metro Transit capital costs are based on the average annual costs shown in Table 29 and multiplied by the number of years for each project period.
- Metro Transit operating expenses were increased 3% per year based on the average increases in the past 5 years.
- Metro Transit capital and operating costs do not include costs associated with a fixed guide way system and other associated bus service improvements being studied by Transport 2020. A new funding source and governance structure are being studied as part of that project.

Revenues Notes

- The state and federal highway revenue estimates are based upon spending levels from 2002 to 2006. Annual averages were estimated and then projected for each funding source for each future project period.
- TCSP funding has been relatively small in the Madison Metropolitan Area and future revenues are not expected.
- The Dane County & Communities revenues were assumed to continue into the future at the annual averages that were expended in the past. It is assumed that communities would adjust spending levels based on budget limits.
- Metro Transit revenues assume that state and federal governments will continue to fund Metro at current funding ratios and percentages. It is assumed that local funding levels will remain the same or increase over the planning period.



**TABLE 29  
METRO TRANSIT OPERATING REVENUES AND EXPENSES (2002-2006)**

	Funds Programmed (\$000)					5yr Total	Average/yr
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006		
<b>Expenditures</b>							
Capital Costs	11,682	18,886	15,285	14,105	13,273	73,232	14,646
Operating Costs	32,697	32,804	34,278	35,272	36,038	171,090	34,218
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>44,380</b>	<b>51,691</b>	<b>49,563</b>	<b>49,377</b>	<b>49,311</b>	<b>244,322</b>	<b>48,864</b>
<b>Revenues</b>							
FTA Section 5307 & 5309 Capital	9,346	15,109	12,228	11,284	10,755	58,721	11,744
State 85.20 Operating & JARC	14,867	15,167	15,726	15,167	15,525	76,452	15,290
Farebox & Other Revenue	8,737	8,912	9,716	10,511	10,848	48,724	9,745
Local Funds – Madison	9,200	10,219	9,498	10,058	9,792	48,766	9,753
Other local funds	2,231	2,284	2,394	2,357	2,392	11,658	2,332
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>44,380</b>	<b>51,691</b>	<b>49,563</b>	<b>49,377</b>	<b>49,311</b>	<b>244,322</b>	<b>48,864</b>

Source: Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Area (2002-2006)

The results of the expense and revenue projection analysis suggest that potential revenues will slightly exceed expenses during the 24-year period, but these projections could be affected by many factors.

### ***Recommended Plan Projects***

Table 24, on page 135, identifies the list of potential arterial street and roadway improvements from 2007-2030 recommended in the plan. It includes capacity improvement projects and system preservation projects. Section 1 and Section 3 of the table identifies the potential capacity improvements and system preservation projects that are already programmed in the adopted 2006-2010 TIP for the region. Sources of funding and funding levels are also identified.

It is assumed that the annual average level of funding from each funding source in the 2007-2010 time period will continue over the planning horizon to be applied against projects identified in the 2011-2020 and 2021-2030 time periods shown in Sections 2 and 4 of Table 24.

### **Capacity Improvements**

Local funds programmed for roadway capacity improvements in the 2007-2010 time period are just under \$30 million or just under \$7.5 million per year. This level of funding from local sources, if continued, is more than sufficient for projects identified in the 2011-2020 time period at \$5.9 million per year or approximately \$59 million over that decade. Similarly, it is also sufficient to cover projects identified in the 2021-2030 time period at \$4.2 million per year or approximately \$42.5 million over that decade.

STP Urban funds for capacity improvements are currently programmed in the 2007-2010 time period at just under \$1.7 million or just under \$0.5 million per year. The use of STP Urban funding for capacity improvements in the next two decades have not been specifically identified, but are typically used with local funds in the paragraph above which appear sufficient to cover the projects identified in the recommended plan.

Federal and State funds for capacity improvements are currently programmed in the 2007-2010 time period at \$25 million or just under \$6.3 million per year. No capacity improvements have been identified over the next two time periods due to several studies that are underway. Recommended improvements and sources of funding are unknown at this time. The recommended plan calls for the completion of studies of the Beltline and Beltline interchanges (Mineral Point Road, Verona Road, Fish Hatchery Road, Park Street/USH 14, and Stoughton Road), Interstate 39/90 and its interchanges at STH 19 and USH 12/18. It also recommends the completion of EISs for USH 51 (Interstate I39/90 to Terminal Drive), USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton), and the Verona Road/West Beltline Corridor. The types of improvements, timing of improvements, and sources of funding are dependent on the outcomes of these studies. New studies are programmed at \$10.3 million.

**TABLE 30  
PROJECTED EXPENSES AND REVENUES OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS  
MADISON METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA (2007-2030)**

<b>Projected Expenses (\$000s)</b>	<b>2007-2010</b>	<b>2011-2020</b>	<b>2021-2030</b>	<b>Planning Period Total</b>
<b>State and Federal</b>				
Highway Const., Maint., etc.	99,220	248,050	248,050	595,320
STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)	23,332	58,330	58,330	139,992
Transp. & Community & System Pres. Pilot Prgm. (TCSP)	-	-	-	-
STP Transportation Enhancements	3,456	8,640	8,640	20,736
Other State	28,724	71,810	71,810	172,344
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>154,732</b>	<b>386,830</b>	<b>386,830</b>	<b>928,392</b>
<b>Dane County &amp; Communities</b>				
Street Operations and Maintenance	153,626	384,064	384,064	921,754
Street Construction	117,784	294,459	294,459	706,702
Street-Related Facilities	17,777	44,442	44,442	106,662
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>289,186</b>	<b>722,966</b>	<b>722,966</b>	<b>1,735,118</b>
<b>Metro Transit</b>				
Capital Expenses	58,584	146,460	146,460	351,504
Operating Expenses	150,764	464,930	624,782	1,240,476
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>209,348</b>	<b>611,390</b>	<b>771,242</b>	<b>1,591,980</b>
<b>Total Projected Expenses</b>	<b>653,266</b>	<b>1,721,186</b>	<b>1,881,038</b>	<b>4,255,490</b>
<b>Projected Revenues (\$000s)</b>				
<b>State and Federal</b>				
Highway Const., Maint., etc.	140,960	352,400	352,400	845,760
STP Urban (Madison Urban Area)	21,478	53,694	53,694	128,866
Transp. & Community & System Pres. Pilot Prgm. (TCSP)	-	-	-	-
STP Transportation Enhancements	10,040	25,100	25,100	60,240
Other State	35,314	88,286	88,286	211,886
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>207,792</b>	<b>519,480</b>	<b>519,480</b>	<b>1,246,752</b>
<b>Dane County &amp; Communities</b>				
Street Operations and Maintenance	153,626	384,064	384,064	921,754
Street Construction	117,784	294,459	294,459	706,702
Street-Related Facilities	17,777	44,442	44,442	106,662
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>289,186</b>	<b>722,966</b>	<b>722,966</b>	<b>1,735,118</b>
<b>Metro Transit</b>				
Capital Expenses	58,584	146,460	146,460	351,504
Operating Expenses	150,764	464,930	624,782	1,240,476
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>209,348</b>	<b>611,390</b>	<b>771,242</b>	<b>1,591,980</b>
<b>Total Projected Revenues</b>	<b>706,326</b>	<b>1,853,836</b>	<b>2,013,688</b>	<b>4,573,850</b>

Bridges are currently programmed with Federal and State funds at just over \$5 million or just under \$1.3 million per year in the 2007-2010 time period. As in the case above, capacity improvements for bridges in the next two time periods are unknown at this time.

New interchanges that are not part of the studies identified above are currently programmed with local funds at \$6.0 million in the 2007-2010 time period. One interchange at \$16.0 million is programmed in the 2011-2020 time period with local funds and two interchanges totaling \$12.0 million are planned in the 2021-2030 time period with local funds.



### System Preservation

Local funds programmed for roadway preservation improvements in the 2007-2010 time period are \$20.0 million or approximately \$5.0 million per year. This level of funding from local sources, if continued, is more than sufficient for known projects identified in the 2011-2020 time period at approximately \$2.1 million per year or approximately \$20.7 million over that decade. System preservation projects have not been identified in the 2021-2030 time period.

STP Urban funds for roadway preservation improvements are currently programmed in the 2007-2010 time period at \$23.2 million or \$5.8 million per year. This level of funding, if continued, is more than sufficient for projects identified in the 2011-2020 time period at \$0.6 million per year or approximately \$6.1 million over that decade. The use of STP Urban funding for preservation improvements in the last time period is unknown at this time.

Federal and State funds for roadway preservation improvements are currently programmed in the 2007-2010 time period at \$21.6 million or just over \$5.4 million per year. This level of funding, if continued, is more than sufficient for known projects identified in the 2011-2020 time period at \$1.2 million per year or approximately \$12.0 million over that decade. The use of federal and state funding for preservation improvements in the last time period is unknown at this time. While Federal Earmarks have been identified in the 2007-2010 time period, earmarks in the next two time periods are unknown. Bridges are currently programmed with Federal and State funds at just over \$4.2 million or just over \$1.0 million per year in the 2007-2010 time period. System preservation improvements for bridges in the next two time periods are unknown at this time.

### ***System Preservation Beyond the Recommended Plan***

An emphasis area of SAFETEA-LU is for transportation plans to try to identify the costs of the projects for maintenance and preservation of the existing transportation system. This is a new area for the Madison Area MPO and significant efforts have been put forth to get the necessary data to do the analysis with limited success.

For the first time, MPO staff was able to create a map (Figure 17 on page 47) showing the pavement condition of the local and state arterial and collector roadways for the year 2005. The difficulty in producing this map is that the state and local units of government use different pavement evaluation systems (see Roadway Pavement and Bridge Conditions section of the plan). In addition, gaps exist in data provided by local governments to the Wisconsin Information System for Local Roads (WISLR). However, MPO staff interpolated the data to the extent possible to produce Figure 17. From this map, it was determined that the overall pavement condition of state roadways is better than that of county and local arterial/collector roadways. Around 75% of state roadways are in the best pavement condition category compared to 36% of county and 44% of municipal arterial/collector roadways.

To do a system preservation analysis of the roadways in the three pavement condition categories shown in Figure 17 on roadways other than the state highway system requires tying this information to the Local Street and Roadway Expenses (Operations and Maintenance and Construction) shown in Table 26. It is unknown, except for the City of Madison, the percent of these funds that are being spent on local roads versus collectors or arterials. Given this difficulty, the MPO will continue to work with WisDOT, FHWA, and local units of government to see if this gap can be bridged.

