

Transportation Alternatives Analysis for the Dane County / Greater Madison Metropolitan Area

Minutes

JOINT MEETING/WORKSHOP OVERSIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (OAC) MEETING #19 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Wednesday, January 30, 2002 5:15 pm Madison Municipal Building, Room 260 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard Madison, WI

-- ROLL CALL

OAC Members Present: LaMarr Billups; Supv. Michael Blaska; David Cieslewicz; Kristine Euclide

(5:40); Ann Falconer; Ald. Ken Golden; Patrick Goss; Rob Kennedy; Douglas Dalton (for Ken Leonard); George Nelson; Ald. Warren Onken; Rose

Phetteplace; Dick Wagner.

OAC Members Absent: Supv. Scott McDonell (notified).

TAC/Staff Present: Jim Arts (Dane County Executive's Office); Catherine Debo (Madison Metro);

Lori Kay (UW-Madison); Barbara Kipp (WisDOT District 1, Planning); Bob McDonald (Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization); Mari McKenzie (WisDOT, Bureau of Planning); Larry Nelson (City of Madison, Engineering); John Norwell (Dane County Highway and Transportation Department); Judy P. Olson (City of Madison, Mayor's Office); Bill Schaefer (Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization); David Trowbridge (Madison Planning and Development; *Project Administrator for Transport*

2020); Todd Violante (Dane County Planning and Development).

Others Present: Debby Lynn Aldrich; James R. Aldrich; Fred Bartol (Dane Alliance for Rail

Transit); John DeLamater; Jesse Kaysen; Al Matano (Sierra Club); Kelly C.

McKay; Royce Williams.

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Project Administrator David Trowbridge welcomed Committee members to Meeting #19 of the Transport 2020 Oversight Advisory Committee/Technical Advisory Committee. Trowbridge provided a brief overview of the meeting materials (sent in the packet) and also handed out a few additional items to help with the discussion of Phase 2 alternatives.

He said that the intent of tonight's meeting is to discuss the information now before the Committees, although some additional traffic impact and environmental screening information would still be forthcoming (from the consultants) at a future meeting. He said that the agenda lists several issue areas that could be discussed (i.e., costs, ridership, governance, etc.) but that the Committees need not go through each of the areas – it only serves as a general guide to the information at hand.

Co-Chair Ken Golden welcomed and introduced new OAC member Patrick Goss. Golden noted that Mr. Goss was replacing Bob Cook as the Governor's appointee to the OAC. Goss said that he is the Deputy Secretary for the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and that he is looking forward to serving on the Committee.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OAC/TAC MEETING #18 (DECEMBER 19, 2001)

The Minutes for Meeting #18 of the Oversight Advisory Committee/TAC were approved, as submitted on a motion by Dick Wagner/Ann Falconer.

3. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The only speaker for this agenda item was Royce Williams. Williams said that he is active in a group that supports intercity passenger rail service, but is also interested in other transit modes. He said that he is pleased to hear that a streetcar system is being given further consideration in Transport 2020. He also stressed the importance of the linkage to local bus service. Williams pointed out the need to serve the airport better than is currently being done. Finally, he asked that a regional form of government be considered for operating the preferred transit alternative. Williams said that he supports regional governance for many urban services, particularly transportation.

4. OAC/TAC DISCUSSION: INITIAL PHASE 2 EVALUATION INFORMATION

Rob Kennedy distributed a 1-page summary of key issues and steps he felt were important to move toward a Locally-Preferred Alternative (LPA). Ald. Ken Golden said that he didn't think the LPA would be an either/or of the alternatives looked at in Phase 2 – he felt the LPA could be a combination of modes and technologies. He said that the LPA should serve all travel markets in the region and added that phasing should be an important component of the LPA. Golden also said that the ultimate regional system should be thought of beyond the 20-year planning horizon.

Rob Kennedy agreed and said that the LPA needed to include components that worked together as a complete system, and that each piece builds upon others. He said that the typical light rail transit (LRT) system, at \$30 million per mile, is off the table. However, he felt that a less-expensive street-running option could still be important. He said that integration with the local bus system will be very important. Kennedy also added that the regional bus component of the Phase 2 alternatives could be scaled back considerably (i.e., focused on peak service only).

George Nelson said that the previous comments were right on track with his thinking. He said that it is important that the Committee simplify the system, even if it is a combination system, into something that is easily understood. He agreed that the bus system's role is important and supports moving the process forward.

David Cieslewicz said that Rob Kennedy's 1-pager helped to frame this issue. He said that a hybrid transit system serves the regional and City of Madison transit markets the best. He also said that there are affordable options to accomplish this and he supports this approach.

Dick Wagner said that the ultimate transit system is good for visioning purposes, but that the LPA needs to be a start toward that vision. He said that the real alternative to the LPA is doing nothing – and this is an unacceptable alternative, in his view. He said that the LPA, even a starter-type system, needs to be good enough to be worth the initial investment. Wagner said that the ridership numbers could be

positively affected by other variables, such as fares and parking costs, and that the Committee should think about this. He said that it is important to keep the ultimate vision in mind as the various transit technologies are being refined.

Ald. Ken Golden said that commuting to the central part of the City is increasing and will continue to do so. He said that traffic congestion will increase and a single-spined transit system may not be the best way to deal with this. He said that several transportation corridors could be served and in different ways. He gave the example of Park Street, which he thought could be served very well with street-running system. He also said that the bus transitway was intriguing as an opportunity to provide improved express bus service on certain routes. He added that the LPA could include a combination of many transit modes and technologies.

LaMarr Billups said that his experience is in large urban areas, where there are several transit mode options for travelers. He agreed that a multi-modal system would be the best way to serve all transit markets. He also stressed the importance of the Park Street corridor, particularly in serving markets on the south and southeast sides of the City of Madison.

Kristine Euclide said that a review of the initial goals and objectives will be helpful in discussing which modes and technologies are best. She said that the original goals, which were included in the packet, could be augmented as well.

Rob Kennedy said that there seems to be a clear need for a regional transit system, such as commuter rail, but also for a connector system – providing primarily localized transit service. He said that a streetcar system could provide this very well. Kennedy said that developing an ultimate vision of how all of these modes work together will be helpful.

George Nelson agreed that a rail system that utilizes the existing railroad rights-of-way will be important. He also said that a central city connector piece makes sense. He said that a full package needs to be put together (which could include fare policies, parking policies and land use). David Cieslewicz agreed and said that the sensitivity runs show that some of the variables help ridership and need to be part of a comprehensive transportation investment package.

Ald. Warren Onken said that it is important to think about how this community can capture its available assets, such as the bus system and some of the railroad corridors. He said that the trolley system could evolve, but that we should build upon what we've already invested in. He agreed that the regional system would be subsidized in the interim years, but that it would still be important to establish (for long-term goals).

Rose Phetteplace said that it is important that we come together on an ultimate vision and determine what can be done in 10 years, 20 years, 30 years, etc. She agreed that phasing should be an important component of the LPA.

Ald. Ken Golden said that the park-and-ride component needs particular attention, as do the land use impacts. He said that the enhanced property values need to be considered as the costs of the transportation alternatives are being discussed. Kristine Euclide agreed and noted that other communities are taking creative financial approaches with land use, redevelopment and transportation implementation.

LaMarr Billups asked what the outer-ring communities, like Sun Prairie, are thinking about this process. Supv. Michael Blaska said that there is interest in the systems we are talking about and a general recognition that transportation problems are regional in nature. However, it is difficult to gauge interest without a clear proposal and financial package. Dick Wagner agreed that most Dane County communities are interested. he also said that the development of these communities, their land use pattern, and their orientation to Madison is an asset that is not often recognized.

Ken Golden said that it will be important to generate interest among these communities and hoped that the Committee and its members could think of ways to do this. George Nelson said that the geography of the urban area presents an opportunity from which to build upon. Dick Wagner agreed, noting that much of the ridership increase being modeled is from the park-and-ride areas – essentially a new market. He said

that interest exists in these communities.

Ann Falconer said that, although new markets are important, it is critically important to ensure that the existing transit users are considered. She said that this market is an asset that should also be built upon. She said that amenities are important to the transit user and that much can be done to enhance the public transit experience. She noted that congestion in this area is not so bad that the existence of a new transit system (by itself) will cause massive changes in travel habits.

Ken Golden said that he would like to instruct the consultant team to begin fleshing out a new transit system concept that meets all of the transit market needs and includes some version of a street-running trolley system. He said that this should be the beginning of a draft LPA.

Bob McDonald pointed out that the consultant's work plan includes the potential to mix and match various modes in developing the LPA. John Norwell agreed that this is part of the consultant work plan and should be pursued.

Ken Golden also pointed out that the relationship of the various modes to the existing Madison Metro bus transfer centers needs to be clarified. He said that this should be an important component of the LPA and the mix of modes included in it.

George Nelson suggested that Rob Kennedy's 1-pager be put into a memorandum and forwarded to the consultant team. Doug Dalton suggested that the fine details of the draft LPA could be put together by the Technical Advisory Committee, with participation by interested members of the OAC. Ken Golden suggested that the consultant team help put the LPA together and ensure that this is part of the Final Report development. He also agreed that the TAC could lead the next meeting - discussing the details of the draft LPA. He said that the OAC could review and refine it at a later meeting.

Lori Kay stressed the importance of making the LPA as understandable as possible. She said that one community (Columbus, OH) had developed an interesting way to utilize park-and-ride facilities with a transit system. Kay said that this Committee should take a look at this and consider other interesting approaches. She said that there are numerous examples to review and that the TAC can be very helpful in determining what might make sense in this community.

Catherine Debo said that this is not the end of the analysis. She said that Metro staff have been asked to review the information we have at this time and help to refine a draft LPA. She agreed that a multi-modal approach is worthwhile and that the local bus system's role in that would be very important.

Dick Wagner said that the original goals and objectives should be reviewed as we develop a draft LPA. Kristine Euclide agreed and said that she hoped the consultant would provide a good presentation of information to help lead us toward the draft LPA. The Oversight Advisory Committee then asked staff and the TAC to begin thinking about concepts for a draft LPA, and how the various modal components (and other variables) might fit together.

5. TRANSPORT 2020 PROJECT SCHEDULE/NEXT STEPS

The Committee members then scheduled/confirmed the following Transport 2020 OAC/TAC meetings, noting that the TAC would take the lead at the February 13th meeting (*please note the varying meeting times and alternating meeting locations*):

- OAC Meeting #20/TAC: Wednesday, February 13th, 5:15 p.m., Room LL-110 Madison Municipal Building;
- OAC Meeting #21/TAC: Wednesday, February 27th, 7:00 p.m., Room 201 City/County Building;
- OAC Meeting #22/TAC: Monday, March 11th, 6:15 p.m., Room 201 City/County Building;

and,

- OAC Meeting #23/TAC: Monday, April 8^{th} , 6:15 p.m., Room 260 Madison Municipal Building.

David Trowbridge pointed out that there may not be a need to meet on each of these dates and that he would notify all OAC/TAC members in the event of a cancellation.

6. ITEMS BY OAC CO-CHAIRS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

There were no items by the Co-Chair or Committee members.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 6:50 p.m.