Preliminary Engineering/NEPA Analysis
for the
Dane County/Greater Madison Metropolitan Area

For additional project information:www.transport2020.net

Minutes

TRANSPORT 2020
IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE (ITF) MEETING

Wednesday, April 25, 2007
5:00 p.m.
Madison Municipal Building, Room 300
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, WI

-- ROLL CALL

ITF Members Present:	Sandy Beaupre; Jim Berkenstadt; Michael Blaska; Sup. Chuck Erickson; Kristine Euclide; Ken Golden; Steve Hiniker; Lori Kay (*for LaMarr Billups*); Jesse Kaysen; Sup. Al Matano; Sup. Scott McDonell; Dick Wagner; LeAnna Wall (*for Joe Olson*).
ITF Members Absent:	John DeLamater (*notified*); Chris Klein.
TAC/Staff Present:	Bill Schaefer (Madison Area MPO); Tim Sobota (Madison Metro); David Trowbridge (Madison Planning and Development; *Transport 2020 Project Manager*).
Others Present:	Gari Berliot; Mike Cechvala (Madison Bus Advocates); Peter Cooper (Pan American Railway); Vikki Kratz (Isthmus); John Lackey (David Evans Associates); Ken Kinney (HNTB); Caron Kloser (HNTB); Bob Moore (HNTB); Kimon Proussaloglou (Cambridge Systematics); Bob Schaefer; Royce Williams (Pro-Rail); Bruce Wilson (Madison Bus Advocates).

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Sup. Scott McDonell welcomed Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force members to the meeting. Item 3 was heard at the end of the agenda.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 14, 2007 TASK FORCE MEETING

The Minutes for the 3-14-07 Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force meeting were unanimously approved, as submitted on a motion by Steve Hiniker/Jesse Kaysen.

3. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob McDonald noted that the MPO must approve the LPA and the time frame for doing that is tight with anticipated changes in the MPO.

Mike Cechvala spoke on behalf of bus advocates. He thanked the Transport 2020 team for allowing a table at next week's public meeting. He provided the group with a synopsis of proposed bus rapid transit on a regional level to complement the Transport 2020 rail investment.

Bob Schaefer commented that there may not be enough vehicles to accommodate peak travel demand. What is the top speed between stations? To make up for dwell times, the train cannot speed up too quickly or passengers will experience too much "jerking." The team should consider a grade separation at US 51. Finally, if rail transit becomes increasingly popular in the region, will communities be willing to give up rail corridors that are now bike trails?

Royce Williams noted that the city and county must be coordinated and supportive of each other for the New Starts application.

Peter Cooper, a representative of the Pan American Railway proposed that the ITF consider a public private partnership for a design-build project. His ridership and operations model would be competitive with the funding that the ITF would have to seek from federal and state resources.

4. REVIEW OF REVISED RIDERSHIP ESTIMATES FOR TRANSPORT 2020 BUILD ALTERNATIVES

Ken Kinney revisited the full transit vision from the earlier Transport 2020 study and future rail service to outlying communities in Dane County. He summarized the remaining alternatives (Alternatives 2a and 3) that will be subject to detailed ridership and cost analyses.

Kimon Proussaloglou reviewed the market area, noting both alternatives serve growing population and employment markets. The project team has completed the initial "sketch planning" ridership as required by FTA and has refined the ridership model to account for updated bus coding and transfer activity.

Kimon reviewed the characteristics of Alternative 2a, noting that daily forecast ridership is estimated at about 11,000 and 2.7 million annual riders. Additional ridership could also be realized from special event activities, ranging from 135,000 to 275,000 annual riders for events such as Badger football games and community events. This additional ridership assumed 5-10 percent of attendees would use transit.

Alternative 3 would have an estimated 8,400 daily ridership, or 2.1 million annual riders. In addition to special event ridership, this alternative could also attract 80,000 to 160,000 annual riders from travelers to and from the airport. This ridership is derived assuming a 5-10% share of all annual travelers using rail transit. Currently, the formal ridership estimates do not include potential ridership from special events or from airport users.

The project team would need to make the case with FTA to accept this additional component of potential ridership. Weekend trips are not included in the estimate either. Typically, regional models use a typical weekday snapshot of travel patterns and capture typical weekday transit ridership in a region. One point to help make the case would be to note the emphasis that event sponsors place on patrons using transit to avoid limited parking and traffic congestion on local streets.

When considering the 2030 scenarios for transit and highway times, rail transit travel times are competitive with auto and bus travel times. For example, travel speeds between the UW/VA Hospital and Monona Terrace are estimated by the 2030 model to be 20 mph, 14 mph and 12 mph for rail transit, auto and bus transit, respectively.

Task Force members questioned how much of the ridership comes from existing bus service. The project team has not yet determined that in detail, but they will be doing so in the coming weeks. Kimon

noted that ridership is sensitive to increased drive access trips (that is, available park and ride lots allow for increased riders).

The increase in ridership, compared to previous phases of the Transport 2020 project, is due to increased frequency of rail service, reconfiguring of bus routes to integrate with the rail service, improving the model coding, and factoring in transfers better than previous versions of the model.

Task force members questioned if the different operating plans for Alternative 2a and 3 will make it difficult to compare the alternatives. Ken Kinney and Bob Moore noted that the intent of the different plans was to optimize operations to attract the greatest number of riders. The frequency of service and drive access is very important to attracting more riders. For example, on the west end Alternative 3 attracts more riders due to higher service frequency. However, the park and ride lot at the east end of Alternative 2a attracts more riders, compared to Alternative 3, even with lower frequency. Alternative 2a performs better than Alternative 3 on the east end because it serves more TOD-supportive land use.

The next step in ridership forecasting will be to develop ridership for the Baseline alternative and complete the user benefits analysis.

5. REVIEW OF REVISED CAPITAL COSTS OF TRANSPORT 2020 BUILD ALTERNATIVES

Bob Moore reviewed key capital cost components that will can significantly affect capital costs, including single vs. double track, station platform types, vehicle types and providing grade crossing warning devices that allow Quiet Zones throughout the corridor.

Moore noted that a lot of progress had been made since the last meeting in coordinating the infrastructure requirements with the operating plan.

Costs for Alternative 2a range from $233 to $285 million, and Alternative 3 ranges from $196 to $237 million. Alternative 5 ranges from $365 to $486 million. Electrification costs account for a significant amount of Alternative 5 costs. Costs are typically reported as cost per route-mile. Alternative 2A is designed as a principally two track system in the core with single track on the ends. Alternative 3 is a single track system with short passing tracks at stations where opposite direction trains meet. Calculations to reflect costs and benefits are developed for the New Starts application.

The ITF members asked if single track is more vulnerable to snow. Moore responded that single track is vulnerable to any kind of delay, as opposite direction traffic must meet at a station passing siding. A delay suffered by one train will cascade through the system as the opposite direction train cannot advance until the delayed train arrives at the passing siding. The capital costs assume four spare vehicles, which is common at this early planning phase of the study. ITF members requested if there were statistics available on the vehicle downtimes from other transit systems. Moore will inquire about this.

Passenger vehicle seats will vary, but usually around 130 seats, with room for 50-60 standing passengers. It is assumed that vehicles will be bike friendly.

Updated operating costs were presented; Alternative 2a at $10.4 million, Alternative 3 at $7.8 million and Alternative 5 at $10.8 million. ITF members noted that Transport 2020 O&M costs reflect total cost to operate the transit system and assumes no offsetting costs from other funding sources; current Metro Transit O&M costs are reported only as local share of those costs and do not include offsetting costs such as state funds and fare box recovery.

ITF members asked if the project cost assumes the cost of DMU vehicles that can also be street running vehicles. Moore responded there is not much data available on hybrid vehicles; the contingency is meant to cover some of that uncertainty. The project team assumed vehicles would be run as two-car pairs at this time.

The ITF members noted that while signal upgrades are a large part of the capital costs, this will benefit rail operations in the corridor as well. The community will benefit from improved safety at grade

crossings and quieter freight rail operations due to the use of continuous welded rail and grade crossing systems that meet whistle ban requirements.

Ken Kinney wrapped up the presentation with a recap of comparing the transit capital costs with costs of other highway and parking infrastructure capital costs in the region. He also revisited the estimated impact of transit on local development, noting that the market analysis conducted for the study showed the most dramatic increase in jobs around the transit corridors. Of important note is that the market analysis does not indicate new jobs, but rather a reallocation of jobs to the transit corridor.

Kinney noted that Transport 2020 compares well against other transit systems around the country. Its ridership is comparable with similarly sized cities. Furthermore, the ITF is progressing well with finance and governance elements and there is a strong TOD element.

6. UPDATE: TRANSPORT 2020 PROJECT TIMELINE/NEXT STEPS

Ken Kinney noted that the following Transport 2020 meetings are currently scheduled:

Implementation Task Force
- Thursday, May 10, 5:00 p.m., Room 300 MMB

Transport 2020 Public Informational Meeting
- Thursday, May 3, 5:00-8:00 p.m., Monona Terrace

7. INFORMATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS BY TASK FORCE MEMBERS

There were no announcements or information provided by Task Force members.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

These minutes represent the writer's interpretation of discussion and resolution of key points. Please contact Caron Kloser of HNTB (414/359-2300) to discuss questions, modifications or corrections.