Growth Priority Areas
(Item #7 and #32 on spreadsheet)
Update to page 15

The Growth Priority Areas Map on the following page shows Activity Centers and corridors planned prioritized for mixed-use infill development and redevelopment. It also, as well shows as prioritized peripheral growth areas and new Activity Centers that are planned to become the cores of new neighborhoods (see Strategy 5 in thethis Land Use and Transportation Element for a definition of "Activity Center").

Activity Centers
Activity Centers are broken down into Regional, Community, and Neighborhood Activity Centers, based on the centers' general size, position within the metro area, and current or prospective ability to draw from the surrounding area or region. Regional Activity Centers tend to be larger in size, along major streets and transit routes, and have the capacity to serve as a relatively intense mixed-use center for both the surrounding area and the city as a whole. Community Activity Centers still tend to have access to transit and major streets, but are expected to develop at a lower intensity than regional centers and serve a smaller area. Neighborhood centers tend to draw primarily from the surrounding neighborhoods, generally have less transit access, and are sometimes located along less busy streets or sections of streets.

Activity Centers are also broken into categories based on whether they are already established as a mixed-use center, have existing commercial or employment development that should transition to a mix of uses, or are currently undeveloped but planned for a future Activity Center. Established Activity Centers have tended to attract the majority of redevelopment since the last Comprehensive Plan in 2006, as they have the walkability, transit service, destinations, and other amenities already in place that residents demand. Established Activity Centers will continue to see redevelopment, but unlocking the potential of Activity Centers that are identified for a transition to mixed-use development will be a major key in addressing the strong preference for redevelopment expressed throughout the public interactions that took place as part of the Imagine Madison process (see Strategy 6 in the Land Use and Transportation Element for further discussion). A significant amount of public feedback expressed a desire to initiate or increase redevelopment in existing single-use commercial areas to convert them to more mixed-use areas. That feedback informed the high number of areas that have been identified as Transitioning Activity Centers on the Growth Priority Areas map.

The City should continue to encourage appropriate context-sensitive redevelopment within Activity Centers and mixed-use corridors through implementation of sStrategies and aActions within this Plan, but will also need to undertake detailed planning to set the stage for some identified current commercial and employment areas to transition to vibrant mixed-use Activity Centers. Such planning efforts should address the role of the City in facilitating transitions to mixed-use areas, especially with regard to parking.

Some Transitioning and Future Centers may take 20 or more years to become Established Centers. While creating more Established Activity Centers is a major focus of this Plan, there is no specific timetable for building out the various Transitioning and Future Activity Centers. Implementation of some Future Activity Centers will depend upon annexation of land into the city under existing boundary agreements.

Corridors
The Growth Priority Areas Map also shows corridors that have potential for a mix of uses along their length. These corridors are broken down into two categories. Community Corridors tend to be smaller arterial streets that serve the surrounding neighborhood and City. Regional Corridors are larger arterials that serve both the city and the region. The main considerations for designating a Community or Regional Corridor were generally:
- Good existing or planned transit service; and
- A mix of land uses along the length of the corridor, as shown in the Generalized Future Land Use Map.

Some major streets in the city, like Whitney Way and North Sherman Avenue, have planned BRT, but are primarily lined with Low Residential land uses, and are therefore not designated as corridors. Other major streets, such as John Nolen Drive and Packers Avenue, have some transit, but lack a diversity of existing or planned future land uses along the corridors. All corridors, with the exception of Williamson Street and portions of the Monroe/Regent

corridor, are (or will be) transitioning from their current auto-oriented development to more transit-, walk-, and bike-friendly styles of development.

Peripheral Growth Areas

New peripheral growth ~~will still be allowed, but~~ should occur within priority areas, as shown on the map on the following page. The City has an opportunity to capture the high regional demand for walkable living as part of newly developed Traditional Neighborhood Developments (TNDs) on the periphery. The smaller lots, gridded streets, and Activity Centers that are a part of TNDs not only aid in creating a strong sense of place, but also create high-value development and allow for more residents to be served with less infrastructure. When combined with continuing redevelopment, which tends to generate even more property value and occurs in areas where infrastructure and services are already present, the City's growth priorities will help contribute towards long-term financial stability.

UrbanFootprint Appendix
(Item #57 on spreadsheet)
Update to page 161

Public Input Results – Website

UrbanFootprint analysis was used as part of an Imagine Madison website module where visitors had an opportunity to explore outcomes and view maps based on the three citywide scenarios summarized above. Website visitors could explore the anticipated land consumption, household water use, household vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and time spent walking associated with each scenario, alongside maps that depicted geographic variations in these metrics. It is important to note that in an effort to keep participation accessible and concise, dozens of other possible UrbanFootprint metrics were not presented. Further, other potential considerations that could factor in to a discussion of where to accommodate growth such as impacts on parking, transit ridership, property values, and rental rates were not covered. Upon reviewing the information that was available, participants could then choose the scenario that most closely matched their vision for the future of the city.

See the maps on the following pages for a comparison of where development of new dwelling units was generally shown for each scenario (green represents edge development and pink represents redevelopment; the darker the color, the more intense the development). Two-thirds of respondents ~~chose~~ selected ~~the~~ Scenario #3 (which showed ~~scenario with~~ the most infill and redevelopment), as the generally preferred path for future development in the city. 20% chose ~~the scenario with an even mix of edge development and redevelopment, and 13% chose the scenario with the most edge development~~Scenario #2, and 13% felt Scenario #1 was most appropriate for accommodating future growth.

In addition to reviewing and selecting their preferred UrbanFootprint growth scenario, respondents could also answer three multiple choice questions covering what type of neighborhood housing they preferred, how important they felt it was to have neighborhoods close to destinations such as schools and shops, and how important they felt it was to have neighborhoods with access to public transit. Additionally, participants were asked open-ended questions about good locations for lower cost housing, what area/neighborhood should be prioritized for development and why, and for examples of valued development (i.e., favorite neighborhoods or projects that could be considered a good example for future development).

Public Input Results – Community Meetings and Resident Panels

Imagine Madison community ~~public~~ meetings used UrbanFootprint in a different manner. Background information was provided to ~~community meeting attendees~~ participants in an introductory presentation and via a series of displays that showed existing conditions for the percent of trips taken by non-car modes of transportation, walking minutes per day for adults, and miles driven per household per year (~~also known as "vehicle miles traveled," or~~ VMT). These maps conveyed the geographic differences between how people ~~households~~ travel based on ~~where they live~~location.

Community meeting participants could explore select information from the same three scenarios that were provided on the Imagine Madison website. They were then asked to place dots on a map of the city and surrounding area to show where they thought~~felt~~ the city should accommodate the ~~estimated~~ 40,000 housing units ~~that are~~ anticipated in the next twenty years. As with the website, this was not a statistically valid survey, but of those electing to participate during community meetings, ~~N~~ninety-one percent of dots were placed in infill and redevelopment areas. A similar growth prioritization exercise was provided to Resident Panels, though none of the UrbanFootprint background information was included. ~~and~~ 81% of resident panel ~~responses prioritized~~dots were placed ~~growth~~ in infill and redevelopment areas. The multiple choice and open-ended questions that were on the website were also provided to community meeting and Resident Panel attendees.

Green and Resilient Strategy 3

(Item #79 and #80 in spreadsheet)
page 90

Strategy 3

Increase the use and accessibility of energy efficiency upgrades and renewable energy.

Actions:

a. Implement the Energy Plan to reach the goal of 100% renewable and zero-net carbon emissions.

a.b.   Promote various financing tools to fund energy efficiency upgrades and renewable energy.

b. Partner with electrical utilities to provide education aboutincrease renewable energy and provide education on theassociated cost savings.

c.

d. Identify locations for solar installations and other renewable energy sources, including City facilities.

e.d.   Support infrastructure to expand the use of electric vehicles, and other eco-friendly fuel sources. including the City's fleet.

The City recently adopted a community wide goal to transition to 100% renewable energy and net-zero carbon emissions. There has been a lot of change and technological advancement in the area of renewable energy in recent years. Solar and wind energy is competing with non-renewable sources such as coal and natural gas. We must continue to evaluate and address climate change impacts by reducing greenhouse gas emissions through the expanded use of renewable energy and promotion of energy efficiency measures.

The City of Madison is already advancing renewable energy through partnerships with our electrical utilities, installing solar energy systems on city buildings through the Green Madison program, and encouraging businesses and residents to install solar through MadiSUN. Regarding energy efficiency, all new City buildings are LEED certified and the City provides funding to the private sector to add insulation, upgrade lighting and HVAC systems, and trains building management staff on strategies to reduce energy use.

a. Implement the Energy Plan
A key part of moving toward cleaner energy will be identifying projects in public and private buildings to reduce fossil-fuel based energy consumption and expand use of renewable energy sources. The City should prioritize installation of renewable energy systems, such as solar, wind, and geothermal, on City facilities. In addition, the City's detailed sub-area plans should identify opportunities for shared solar installations.

ab. Financing Tools
The City should promote programs that finance the cost of energy efficiency upgrades and renewables. Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing, sourced through and open lending market, can cover the full cost of energy efficiency upgrades and renewables over a long repayment period. Energy savings can offset the repayment cost. Like property taxes, PACE financing may be transferred to the next property owner if the property is sold. Examples of energy efficiency upgrades that can be financed through PACE include lighting, heating and cooling, insulation, and solar panels. Shared Savings through Madison Gas and Electric and Focus on Energy are other programs which help residents and businesses reduce energy usage. waste.

bc. Education

Another method for increasing the use and accessibility of sustainable energy practices is through awareness. The City should partner with electrical utilities and nonprofits to create an education program about the benefits of and cost savings associated with renewable energy and energy efficiency. energy cost parity, which occurs when the cost of renewable energy becomes equal to or less than electricity from conventional energy forms like fossil fuels. This program should provide materials in several languages and be promoted to community based organizations that directly work with underrepresented groups.

c. Identify Locations
The City recently adopted a community wide goal to transition to 100% renewable energy and net zero carbon emissions. To implement this goal, the community must identify projects in public and private buildings to reduce our fossil-fuel based energy consumption and expand use of renewable energy sources. The City should prioritize installation of renewable energy systems, such as solar, wind, and geothermal, on City facilities. In addition, the City's detailed land use plans should identify opportunities for shared solar installations.

d. Eco-Friendly Vehicle Infrastructure
Transportation is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. In addition to providing alternative forms of transportation for the public, the City should plan for and support infrastructure to expand the use of electric vehicles and other eco-friendly fuel sources including biogas, natural gas, and plug-in hybrids. This vital infrastructure will support not only privately owned vehicles, but also the transition of the City's fleet to electric vehicles and biogas. Madison is in the implementation stage of converting the City's fleet to cleaner energy sources, by bringing electric cars and buses into the fleet.This vital infrastructure will support not only privately owned vehicles, but also the transition of the City's fleet to electric vehicles.

Commented [KLL1]: Add definitions to the glossary:
MadiSUN
LEED
Biogas

Land Use and Transportation Supplement
(Item #120 on spreadsheet)
(Change "Land Use Supplement" to "Land Use and Transportation Supplement" and add a new subsection to page 127; July 30, 2018 meeting – Metro-recommended redlines in red)

Transportation

Transportation Systems for Persons with Disabilities
All of the City's Metro buses are equipped with accessibility features, including bus stop annunciators, wheelchair securement locations, ADA-accessible ramps, and a kneeling feature, enabling all individuals, with operator assistance, to board, ride, and disembark from all standard Metro buses. The City will continue to purchase such buses, including for any future implementation of bus rapid transit (BRT). Improvement of transit service through implementation of BRT (see LU&T Strategy 1) will benefit persons with disabilities, as will extension of standard Metro service (see LU&T Strategy 2).

Changes to state law have resulted in mandatory City participation inImplementation of the State of Wisconsin's Family Care program in Dane County in 2018 may result in the shifting of an estimated , which shifted $3.9 million of funding away from Metro's paratransit program to contractors. The anticipated loss of funding will result in changes to Metro's paratransit service. The detailed work of determining the precise magnitude of the changes, when they will be implemented, and how they will be implemented will be undertaken by the City's Transportation Policy and Planning Board and Transportation Commission.

Air Transportation
The region's major air transportation facility is Dane County Regional Airport, which is administered by the County. The City will continue to work with Dane County to maintain and improve air passenger services and air freight services to attract, maintain, and enhance business development in the City.

Trucking
The City will continue to provide truck routes for the safe and efficient movement of truck traffic within the city to provide access to and serve the needs of city residents and businesses. The negative impact of trucks on existing and future residential neighborhoods should be minimized.

Water Transportation
City, resident, and business use of the area's lakes and rivers is generally limited to recreational purposes. The City has no plans to pursue water transportation.

Regional and State Transportation Plans
Some transportation-related planning and project development that affect the city are managed by other local, regional, or state agencies or entities. The City has an excellent relationship with the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MATPB), which is the federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison urban area. The MATPB is the policy body responsible for cooperative, comprehensive regional transportation planning and decision making. The City has worked closely with the MATPB to ensure that regional plans integrate the City's transportation interests and concerns. The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan goals, objectives, and policies line up well with the transportation-related Strategies and Actions of this Plan. Similarly, the MATPB's 2015 Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County continues the City's and region's strong commitment to bicycling for transportation and recreation, ensuring that City efforts to improve the bicycle system are well-integrated with adjoining municipalities. Finally, the MATPB's 2013 Bus Rapid Transit Study set the stage for the system included in this Plan. The City anticipates working closely with the Board to implement BRT, per the previously undertaken planning efforts.

While the State of Wisconsin maintains a statewide plan for transportation (Connections 2030), with statewide plans for specific detailed topics like bicycling, pedestrians, freight, and rail, the plans that tend to be most applicable to the city are for specific highways and corridors. However, with recent state transportation funding challenges, many studies and planned projects, such as the Beltline and Stoughton Road/US Highway 51, have been delayed, and it is uncertain when the projects will be restarted, making it difficult to integrate such projects and plans within this Plan. The City shares some common goals with the State, such as improving connectivity across existing limited-access highways like the Beltline. At other times, goals can be at odds, but the City will look to continue engaging with the State to ensure that local and regional interests are well-represented in State projects that impact Madison. Madison in Motion, the city's Transportation Master Plan, contains more information on how the City can connect with regional planning efforts and work with WisDOT to improve connectivity and transportation in the Madison region.

Strategy 6
Facilitate compact growth to reduce the development of farmland.

Dane County contains some of Wisconsin's most productive farmland. Feedback through the Imagine Madison process highlighted the importance of infill/redevelopment and compact edge growth to reduce the loss of farmland. The City of Madison strives to accommodate a large share of Dane County's growth within a small geographic area. For example, about 50% of the new housing units constructed in Madison over the last decade were infill/redevelopment projects, primarily multifamily residential projects. This compact growth pattern reduces the demand for development of farmland within the county. Even City of Madison edge development that converts farmland to housing and employment uses is an improvement over spreading the same amount of housing and employment development over a much larger rural area. The impacts of low density rural development are particularly acute when they are located in isolated areas and interrupt ~~larger~~ tracts of farmland and efficient farming operations.

~~Input on growth prioritization from Imagine Madison public feedback indicated a strong preference for infill (building on undeveloped land that is surrounded by other development) and redevelopment (building on previously developed land) over edge development (building on farmland) to satisfy continuing demand for more housing.~~

~~About 50% of the new housing units constructed in the City of Madison since 2006 have been in redevelopment projects, primarily as multifamily residential. When asked which areas of the city are most appropriate to accommodate future growth, 81% of Resident Panel survey respondents and 91% of community meeting respondents preferred land in already-developed areas. Similarly, about two-thirds of website survey respondents advocated for an even higher amount of infill and redevelopment than the city has seen since adoption of the city's last Comprehensive Plan in 2006. 20% of website survey respondents felt that aiming for a 50/50 mix was appropriate.~~

The ~~strong~~ community preference for infill and redevelopment should not be taken as a demand for ~~totally~~ eliminating edge growth. Recognizing the importance of creating well-designed and complete neighborhoods, regardless of where they are located, the City should continue to reexamine peripheral neighborhood development plans and update them, seeking opportunities to allow for more efficient land use and to reduce the rate at which farmland is developed. Such changes should be accompanied by increased street, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity to shorten trips, facilitate future transit service, and encourage more healthy transportation options such as walking and biking to nearby jobs and mixed-use activity centers. The C~~c~~ity should continue to preserve options for urban growth by exercising its extraterritorial ~~zoning powers~~jurisdiction and by working with nearby communities on intergovernmental agreements that ~~prohibit~~ limit low density, low-value, high (municipal service) cost development in potential future city expansion areas.

This strategy and the accompanying actions are closely related to Strategy 5 on the preceding pages.

b. Priority Growth Areas
Peripheral growth should first occur in areas already served by utilities, followed by other areas already within the Central Urban Service Area (CUSA). Leapfrog development should be minimized, though it is sometimes unavoidable if certain landowners do not choose to develop their properties. Growth should be guided through careful planning of utility extensions and phasing plans included within updated ~~NDPs~~Neighborhood Development Plans. There is currently a significant amount of undeveloped land in the CUSA~~, right now. any~~ A~~a~~mendments to add land to the CUSA should be ~~carefully considered and be~~ consistent with adopted City plans and should include consideration of variables including ~~consider~~ the amount of farmland that would be lost and the amount of development that would be accommodated. See the Growth Priority Areas Map in the Growth Framework Element for priority peripheral growth areas and priority infill-/redevelopment areas.

Land Use Trends and Land Demand Analysis

(Item #121 on spreadsheet)

Update to page 126

Wisconsin's Comprehensive Planning Legislation requires municipalities to provide 20-year projections for land uses in five-year increments. The required projections, shown in Table 1, are based on a variety of spatial assumptions. The projections shown here are general estimates. Changes in demand, financial changes, and other factors may considerably alter these projections. Additionally, land uses such as agriculture do not make up a significant percentage of City land and, in an urban setting, are often accessory to other land uses and are thus not included. Nevertheless, despite the shortcomings of the assumptions and difficulty in making projections in general, the land demand analysis provides a framework for estimating the amount of land the City will need to accommodate growth through 2040.

[insert existing Table 1 from page 126]

Trends in the price of land and the amount, intensity, and density of existing land uses are some of the attributes that dictate how land is used in Madison. The following tables and discussions provide an explanation of land price, development, intensity, and density trends. Table 2 shows that between 2000 and 2016, the city of Madison has annexed approximately 13 square miles. During the same time, the city's population increase by nearly 50,000 residents, resulting in an increase in residential density within city limits from 3,106 to 3,156 persons per square mile. During the same time, equalized land value within the city has increased from $67,350 to $117,485 per acre, a rate of increase nearly double the inflation rate over the same period. Table 3 shows the change in the acres of land dedicated to current land uses. Despite an increase of over 2,400 acres between 2005 and 2017, the number of acres used for agriculture or sitting vacant has declined by nearly 1,700 acres, meaning a large amount of land already within Madison city limits is being converted to other uses, primarily residential, commercial, and parks and open space. In 2017, non-vacant commercially-, industrially-, and employment-zoned parcels had an average floor area ratio of 0.25, which represent significant intensity increases over the 0.15 FAR projection for commercial uses and 0.20 FAR projection for industrial uses in the 2006 Comprehensive Plan. Table 4 shows parcel creation in Madison via plats and certified survey maps. While parcel creation fluctuates from year to year, recent totals are higher than the years of 2007-2009, when fewer than 200 new parcels were created each year. Parcel creation is still below the decade of 1997-2006, when 900 parcels were created annually on average.

Table 2: City Area, Valuation, and Density

Year	Land Area (sq. mi.)	Equalized Value (Land only)	Value/Acre	Population	Population Density (per sq. mi.)
2016	80.0	$6,017,511,950	$117,485	252,557	3,156
2014	78.5	$5,699,050,800	$113,504	245,674	3,131
2012	75.2	$5,544,386,800	$115,271	240,315	3,198
2010	75.0	$4,978,806,200	$103,779	233,777	3,119
2008	74.7	$5,410,955,000	$113,160	226,650	3,034
2006	74.2	$5,179,451,200	$109,116	223,280	3,010
2004	72.4	$4,478,252,400	$ 96,642	217,935	3,010
2002	71.6	$3,635,501,300	$ 79,325	213,679	2,984
2000	67.0	$2,887,522,900	$ 67,350	208,054	3,106

Source: Land Value: DOR Statement of Changes in Equalized Value; Area: Planning Division; Population: US Census Bureau, Wisconsin Dept. of Administration

Table 3: Existing Land Use (acres)

Land Use	2005	2017	Increase
Residential	13,140	15,008	14%
Commercial	4,133	4,942	20%
Industrial	4,079	4,161	2%
Institutional	2,334	2,282	-2%
Parks & Open Space	8,719	9,645	11%
Agriculture & Vacant	7,568	5,887	-22%

Source: Planning Division

Table 4: Parcel Creation

Year	Parcels Created
2013	184
2014	958
2015	316
2016	468
2017	649

Source: CARPC Regional Trends, Planning Division

[land demand analysis continues with existing paragraph 2 and table 2, now re-labeled table 5 – all other tables must be re-labeled]