



Minutes

**JOINT MEETING/WORKSHOP
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
OVERSIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (OAC) MTG #20 (*quorum present*)**

Wednesday, February 13, 2002

5:15 pm

**Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-110
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, WI**

-- ROLL CALL

OAC Members Present: Supv. Michael Blaska; David Cieslewicz; Kristine Euclide; Ann Falconer; Rob Kennedy; Ken Leonard; Supv. Scott McDonell; Dick Wagner.

OAC Members Absent: LaMarr Billups (*notified*); Ald. Ken Golden (*notified*); Patrick Goss (*notified*); George Nelson (*notified*); Ald. Warren Onken (*notified*); Rose Phetteplace (*notified*).

TAC/Staff Present: Douglas Dalton (WisDOT, Bureau of Planning); Catherine Debo (Madison Metro); Michael Friedlander (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Ozone and SIP Development Section); 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); Sharon Persich (Madison Metro); Bill Schaefer (Madison Area MPO); Tim Sobota (Madison Metro); David Trowbridge (City of Madison, Planning and Development; *Project Administrator for Transport 2020*); Michael Waidelich (City of Madison, Planning and Development).

Others Present: Fred Bartol (Dane Alliance for Rail Transit); John DeLamater; Stephanie Eiler (Parsons Brinckerhoff; *Project Manager for Transport 2020, conference call*); Don Emerson (Parsons Brinckerhoff, *conference call*); Rich Kedzior (UW-Madison, Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning); Al Matano (Sierra Club); Kimon Proussaloglou (Cambridge Systematics, *conference call*); Bob Schaefer (Ridgewood Neighborhood Association); Kate Strom (UW-Madison, Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning).

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Project Administrator David Trowbridge welcomed members of the Technical Advisory Committee (and also OAC members) to the meeting. He said that the TAC would be meeting this evening. However, he also said that in the event that a quorum of the OAC is present, the meeting has been noticed as such. Trowbridge then 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.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OAC/TAC MEETING #19 (JANUARY 30, 2002)

The approval of the Minutes for Meeting #19 of the Oversight Advisory Committee/TAC was referred to the February 27th OAC/TAC meeting, as a quorum of the OAC was not present at the time of this agenda item.

3. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public wishing to speak.

4. TAC (POSSIBLE OAC, IF QUORUM) DISCUSSION OF PHASE 2 EVALUATION INFORMATION – LEADING TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DRAFT LOCALLY-PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA)

David Trowbridge provided a brief overview of staff work activities since the January 30th OAC/TAC meeting. He said that staff had begun to work on details of a Draft LPA, particularly changes in some core rail network, express bus service and local bus service. He distributed a 1-page summary of a Phase 1 core system, which also included descriptions of possible future phases.

Trowbridge also pointed out that the PB Team had developed a few additional pieces of information since the January 30th meeting. Those items included in the packet included environmental screening maps and matrices, a memo re: the land use comparison to No-Build alternative and a memo outlining some streetcar cost estimates. The latter two items, he said, were prepared in response to OAC members' requests.

Trowbridge then handed two additional pieces of information - a blank "evaluation matrix" (that will be filled in later and used to review and evaluate the five Phase 2 alternatives) and a memo (with tables) from Kimon Proussaloglou regarding the Phase 2 sensitivity model runs and detailed segment/station ridership information for the Commuter Rail Core System.

Trowbridge said that the evaluation matrix would be used to review and evaluate the five Phase 2 alternatives. He reminded the committee members of the five alternatives and some of their cost information:

Alt. 1: Expanded Regional Bus

- (Formerly TSM/Enhanced Bus); includes express bus routes and park and ride lots, overlaid on local bus system

Capital Cost: \$56.3 million

Operating and Maintenance Cost: \$51.1 million/year

Alt. 2: Commuter Rail Core System

- Greenway Center to East Towne

Capital Cost: \$165.3 million

Operating and Maintenance Cost: \$51.1 million/year

Alt. 3: Commuter Rail 4-Line System

- Greenway Center to Sun Prairie

- Dane County Regional Airport to McFarland

Capital Cost: \$284.6 - 311.5 million

Operating and Maintenance Cost: \$60.2 million/year

Alt. 4: Street-Running Rail

- Prairie Towne Center to East Towne

Capital Cost: \$539 million

Operating and Maintenance Cost: \$52.8 million/year

Alt. 5: Bus Transitway

- Busway and Diamond Lanes

Capital Cost: \$27.9 million

Operating and Maintenance Cost: \$51.2 million/year

Finally, Trowbridge said that Don Emerson (PB Team, Herndon, VA office) was plugged into the conference call to answer questions about the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts process. In particular, Mr. Emerson would be discussing what information needed to be provided to FTA (re: the LPA) at the end of the Transport 2020 process. Trowbridge said that it will be helpful to have OAC members in attendance this evening to hear Mr. Emerson's thoughts on that subject.

Stephanie Eiler asked that Don Emerson be given the opportunity to say a few words first, as he needs to leave by 6:00 p.m. Emerson pointed out that FTA will expect certain information before allowing a project to move into the Preliminary Engineering (PE)/NEPA process. He said that it is important to lock down funding commitment as best you can, as a community. He said that a game plan to obtain funding can also be an important piece, if funding isn't completely committed. Emerson also said that the project needs to be defined reasonably well - in terms of geographic limits and general transit technology. He also said that the exact transit technology (electric, DMU, etc.) could be fuzzy at the end of the alternatives analysis. Calling it a "rail" is good enough, in some respects (although costs - which change based on which technology is chosen - need to be fairly clear). Finally, Emerson said that the MPO long-range land use and transportation plan should include the project.

Rob Kennedy asked Emerson to look over the 1-page summary of LPA issues and provide his feedback, particularly from an FTA perspective. David Cieslewicz asked about the PE process and whether or not NEPA was a part of it. Emerson said that the two processes could move forward simultaneously. Ken Leonard asked how detailed the financial plan needed to be. Emerson said that the project should be part of the financially-constrained MPO plan and indicate a plan to obtaining funding (i.e., include language such as "the project intends to go after _____ funding sources").

Bob McDonald expressed concern about the need to include the project in the MPO plan, as only the Transport 2020 study is in the plan at this time. Doug Dalton said that he would work with FHWA to address the situation. Dalton said that the rules may be changing on some of these issues.

The OAC/TAC thanked Emerson for his insights and looked forward to working more with him as the LPA and financial planning becomes more refined.

Kimon Proussaloglou then described some of the modeling information in his memo and summary tables (i.e., sensitivity runs and station ridership information). Lori Kay said that the UW stations are still shown incorrectly. Proussaloglou said that he would correct these.

Michael Friedlander asked about the model output – particularly system-wide vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and average speed per link - for the five Phase 2 alternatives. He asked if Proussaloglou could provide that information to him. Friedlander said that this information can be used by WisDNR to provide some detailed air quality information for review. Proussaloglou said that he would provide this to Friedlander.

Rob Kennedy asked about Table 3 and why the boardings at Monona Terrace station were so low. Proussaloglou and Bob McDonald agreed that it was because of the way the zones were drawn and the way the walk links were coded. They agreed that the general area ridership was still correct and that this is a minor problem that can be corrected in future modeling.

Kimon Proussaloglou then summarized Table 4, which provides detailed ridership information for the park-and-ride locations. Proussaloglou noted that the bus transfer points (particularly the west and south) showed strong ridership results.

Doug Dalton asked if there were any “breaking points” for the extent of the rail system – i.e., where the costs go up or down significantly at geographic points on the system. Stephanie Eiler said that this could be looked into, but noted that operating and capital costs need to be examined differently when trying to “optimize” the system’s structure. Dave Cieslewicz asked if cost per rider was still being used for analysis. Eiler said that it was not required but would be developed for the five alternatives.

Kristine Euclide asked if there were some rules of thumb for additional costs of improving service headways – for example, to 20 minutes, 10 minutes, etc. Eiler said that the capital cost increases for improving headways is basically for additional vehicles. She said that operating cost increases are harder to determine, but that they could be extrapolated.

Scott McDonnell asked about the streetcar cost memo, and how much variability there could be in the cost estimates. Eiler said that the memo explains that there is some variability, but that the cost estimates are fairly well documented. Dave Cieslewicz said that he would review and provide comments on the memo and cost estimates.

Before ending the consultant conference call, Eiler stressed the importance of the upcoming finance and governance discussions. She urged the committees to begin thinking about these issues.

- - end conference call

Scott McDonnell said that, in crafting the Draft Locally-Preferred Alternative, the committees should think about reducing the amount of competition that is taking place among the various transit modes. He said that it may be useful to revisit the location of the bus transfer points as well. Catherine Debo said that it may be possible to consider a large multi-modal transfer point somewhere near the UW campus. Sharon Persich pointed out that the existing bus transfer points are situated to provide an important function for local transit service, but may not be situated as well for regional service.

Dick Wagner suggested that the express bus service might be truncated and allowed to feed the rail line. Tim Sobota pointed out that this would force a transfer and would reduce express bus service to the central part of the City of Madison.

Dave Cieslewicz said that, even if there are transfers, it is important to provide a frequent rail service with numerous stops. He said that it is important to experience what type of transit service could be provided with a street-running system. Tim Sobota said that some of these link details could be modified in the forecasting model.

Bob McDonald pointed out that it may not be very helpful to tweak individual aspects of the model’s underlying structure, at least not at this stage of the analysis. John Norwell agreed and noted that the

ridership numbers had been based on fairly conservative assumptions regarding land use, service frequency, parking costs, and fares. David Trowbridge agreed with Norwell and McDonald, noting that adjusting these factors will have a much greater impact on ridership than tweaking the stations and transit vehicle speeds. Trowbridge admitted that improving service frequencies would also likely add costs, which needs to be kept in mind.

Kristine Euclide commented that the draft evaluation matrix should include a column for the Locally-Preferred Alternative as well, in order to show how well that system would compare with the other five alternatives. Trowbridge said that this could be done. He also said that the next meeting of the OAC/TAC, February 27th would include a discussion of items to review as part of the overall alternative evaluation matrix.

5. TRANSPORT 2020 PROJECT SCHEDULE/NEXT STEPS

Committee members then scheduled/confirmed the following Transport 2020 OAC/TAC meetings (*please note the varying meeting times and alternating meeting locations*):

- 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 8th, 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 7:00 p.m.