



Minutes

**JOINT MEETING/WORKSHOP
OVERSIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (OAC) MEETING #23
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

Monday, April 8, 2002

5:15 pm

City/County Building, Room 201

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard

Madison, WI

-- ROLL CALL

OAC Members Present: David Cieslewicz; Kristine Euclide (5:30); Ann Falconer; Ald. Ken Golden; Patrick Goss; Rob Kennedy; Ken Leonard; Supv. Scott McDonell; Ald. Warren Onken; Dick Wagner.

OAC Members Absent: LaMarr Billups (*notified*); Supv. Michael Blaska; George Nelson (*notified*); Rose Phetteplace (*notified*).

TAC/Staff Present: Jim Arts (Dane County Executive's Office); Renee Callaway (UW-Madison); Doug Dalton (Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Urban Planning); Catherine Debo (Madison Metro); Lori Kay (UW-Madison); Linda Lovejoy (WisDOT, Urban Transit); Bob McDonald (Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization); John Norwell (Dane County Highway and Transportation Department); Bill Schaefer (Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization); David Trowbridge (Madison Planning and Development; *Project Administrator for Transport 2020*); Michael Waidelich (Madison Planning and Development).

Others Present: Debby Aldrich; James Aldrich; Fred Bartol (Dane Alliance for Rail Transit); John DeLamater; Stephanie Eiler (Parsons Brinckerhoff; *Project Manager for Transport 2020*); Don Emerson (Parsons Brinckerhoff, *conference call*); Tom Fleming; Kim Lobdell (KL Engineering); Al Matano; Bob Schaefer; Prof. Brian Stone (UW-Madison, Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning); David Warner (Parsons Brinckerhoff).

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Co-Chairs Scott McDonell and Ken Golden welcomed Committee members to Meeting #23 of the Transport 2020 Oversight Advisory Committee/Technical Advisory Committee. Agenda item 8,

regarding traffic impact analyses, was moved to the end of the agenda. There were no other modifications to the order of agenda items.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OAC/TAC MEETING #22 (MARCH 11, 2002)

The Minutes for Meeting #22 of the Oversight Advisory Committee/TAC were approved, as submitted on a motion by Rob Kennedy/Ald. Warren Onken.

3. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The only registrant was Bob Schaefer. Mr. Schaefer said that the light rail system being discussed might be powered with overhead electric wires, and that these could cause a hazard for fire fighters. He said that this should be considered by the Committee as they make their decisions on what alternatives move forward. He also stressed the importance of reviewing the traffic impacts that would be caused by the closures of at-grade street crossings, particularly for the commuter rail alternative. He said that the costs of such delays caused by commuter rail should be factored into the evaluation.

4. OVERVIEW OF UW-MADISON DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING (URPL) WORKSHOP

Professor Brian Stone provided the Committee members an overview of work being conducted by graduate students in this Spring's URPL workshop. He noted that students would be conducting planning and analysis for four commuter rail station area sites – including the Greenway Center area, the Medical Center area, the East Rail Corridor and downtown Sun Prairie.

Professor Stone distributed a 1-page summary of the project and pointed out that the students would be conducting visual image surveys and also reviewing in-fill development potential in these station areas. He said that land use incentives would also be evaluated for these areas. Stone concluded by noting that the workshop findings and final report would be presented at a public forum in the near future.

Committee members thanked Professor Stone for his overview.

5. DRAFT CITY OF MADISON RESOLUTION: REVIEW/APPROVAL OF TRANSPORT 2020 CONTRACT AMENDMENT

The Committee recommended that the Madison Common Council adopt the resolution (to extend the Transport 2020 consultant contract deadline to June 30, 2002), as submitted on a motion by Rob Kennedy/Ald. Warren Onken. Ald. Ken Golden said that this resolution could be dealt with on the floor (at the April 9th Common Council meeting), since the OAC is the only referral. He said that he or Ald. Onken would take care of that.

6. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF LOCALLY-PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA) & MINIMAL OPERABLE SEGMENT (MOS) DESCRIPTIONS, INCLUDING MAPS FOR PUBLIC PRESENTATION

Stephanie Eiler distributed a memorandum to Committee members and said that the Draft LPA and MOS had been tentatively approved by the OAC at its March 11 meeting. She said that the 3-page description had been developed to refine the general LPA concept. She also distributed 3 new color maps, showing various versions of the LPA. Eiler said that the maps and LPA description needed to be finalized before the next Public Information Meeting (May 13th).

7. OVERVIEW OF REFINED COST AND RIDERSHIP INFORMATION (FOR MINIMAL OPERABLE SEGMENT)

Stephanie Eiler distributed a summary table showing the refined cost and ridership information for the Minimal Operable Segment (MOS). She noted that the “cost per new rider” for the MOS, as compared to the baseline bus (Expanded Regional Bus) was very high (about \$82) and would need to be discussed. Don Emerson (PB Team, via conference call) said that it was possible to rethink the baseline bus alternative used in the calculation, since it is important to the evaluation that will be conducted by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Rob Kennedy said that the baseline bus (or “TSM”, as it has been referred) should be a base for comparison but should be a system that could be implemented with the current revenue base. He said that the Expanded Regional Bus alternative could not be implemented with current revenue arrangements. Kennedy suggested using a new baseline bus. Bob McDonald noted that the ridership for the Expanded Regional Bus alternative was very high, and perhaps should be looked at.

Dick Wagner said that the No-Build alternative should be compared with other choices. Don Emerson noted that the No-Build alternative should be used only in those communities where there has already been a thorough expansion of bus services, beyond the basic bus system. Kennedy reiterated that the baseline bus should be revisited, using a system that could easily be implemented at this time, adding that this type of system would be better for comparison purposes. Wagner agreed that if the choice is the Expanded Regional Bus vs. Commuter Rail, nothing will move forward. Ald. Ken Golden said that the No-Build or something similar should be used for comparison as the baseline bus. Ald. Golden also said that, in thinking about the downtown connector ridership in the LPA description, the former “downtown get around” bus route could be explored for coming up with an estimate for ridership (on that downtown connector system).

Rob Kennedy asked the PB Team if a more moderate baseline bus alternative could be developed, for comparison to the MOS. Don Emerson replied that the new baseline bus should be somewhere in between the Expanded Regional Bus and the No-Build. Emerson also pointed out that the baseline bus and the MOS need to have a similar service area. He also said that the underlying input assumptions, such as land use, need to be similar – although FTA acknowledges that a rail alternative could have different land use. Emerson also noted that the baseline bus and the MOS’s supporting bus need to be similar.

Kennedy suggested that the new baseline bus could be closer to the No-Build since Madison Metro already has a very high level of service (per capita), even compared to cities many times the size of Madison. Catherine Debo agreed that a new baseline could be used, noting that some outer-ring communities are requesting commuter service from Metro.

Ald. Warren Onken said that the park-and-ride component had not been fleshed out enough and that a new baseline bus could include some of those components (under the current funding sources). Stephanie Eiler said that the WisDOT Park-and-Ride study could be reviewed for approaches to incorporate. Ken Leonard expressed concerns about the land use assumptions used in the modeling, and said that this needs to be documented. He also said that the Expanded Regional Bus alternative was competitive and should continue to be considered. Ald. Golden said that the Expanded Regional Bus would continue as an alternative, but likely not be the background for the MOS.

Rob Kennedy/Scott McDonell submitted a motion“to support the LPA/MOS description and maps (for further public review and subsequent adjustments) and to ask the Management Team to revise the baseline bus alternative (for a more fair cost effectiveness comparison to the MOS)”.

Kristine Euclide said that she supports the motion, noting that there needs to be a better baseline bus alternative for comparison. She also stressed the importance of land use in the evaluation, and hoped that it would remain at the forefront of the upcoming public discussions.

Stephanie Eiler said that she would talk to Cambridge and try to come up with a way to conduct another

model run (or two) but cautioned the Committee that the contract will be ending soon. She stressed the importance of coming to some decisions by April 30th, in order to allow the deliverables to be completed by June 30th.

The Kennedy/McDonell motion carried unanimously.

8. **OAC/TAC DISCUSSION OF FINANCE/GOVERNANCE ISSUES & CRITICAL DECISION ITEMS**

Stephanie Eiler referred OAC/TAC members to the Finance and Governance 1-pagers from the packet. She summarized the 1-pagers and asked for any comments or concerns at this time.

Rob Kennedy said that the cost share estimates in the Finance 1-pager at this time are reasonable, at least for initial discussion purposes. In terms of the ½ cent sales tax referenced in the Finance 1-pager, Don Emerson said that this would likely fully fund the local share of the MOS system being discussed at this time. Ald. Ken Golden expressed concern about approving this concept with some members not present. Eiler said that this is a draft and the OAC only needs to be comfortable enough with it for further public review.

Kristine Euclide expressed concern about showing the ½ cent county-wide sales tax as the only local revenue source shown on the 1-pager. She suggested listing that as an example of a local revenue source, but said that there are other options that haven't been fully explored yet. Catherine Debo suggested that existing transit service could also be covered by the local sales tax. Don Emerson pointed out that a ¼ cent county wide sales tax would generate \$15 million annually, plenty for the local share of the MOS.

Supv. Scott McDonell said that the sales tax would be paid for by many in the county who do not directly receive the service being funded, and that this sentiment exists and needs to be considered. He also said that sales tax is not entirely consistent, and that it fluctuates from year to year. He also said that sales taxes are desirable, in part because they aren't tapped as much as other revenue sources at this time. McDonell said that burdens should also be considered.

Rob Kennedy/Kristine Euclide submitted a motion to endorse the Finance concept, with a suggested change to the recommendation's 4th bullet – to read: “For example, a new county-wide ¼ to ½ cent sales tax (which would require state enabling legislation and local referendum) could be pursued; as a component of that, local communities would develop ways to provide fair property tax relief to those communities contributing to the system in other ways.”

Ken Leonard pointed out that recommendations on funding were not made by the Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force. He clarified that a state share of funding capital costs for local systems was an option listed in the Final Report. He said that other options were also considered. Leonard said that, in terms of operating costs, the size of the fund is fixed and that other systems might suffer if a commuter rail system were paid for out of that fund.

Ald. Golden hoped to think about beneficiaries in allocating funding responsibilities, perhaps looking at level of service provided. He said that the 2nd bullet (under recommendations) is not a good method, as it uses “existing tax commitment”. Golden suggested new language for the 2nd bullet, to read “Local unit contribution should be derived from a fair assessment of the benefits of the system to that local community”. Kennedy said that this is friendly to the original motion, as long as it allows the PB Team to develop the LPA's financial plans. Don Emerson said that this is acceptable, as long as PB was not being asked to develop the methodology for benefit allocation. Emerson noted that he provided some example indicators of what other communities have done in this area – such as route miles of service, passenger miles, number of boardings within the jurisdiction, number of stations, etc.

Lori Kay stressed the importance of listing the sales tax as one example and tying it to a methodology to allocate based on benefits. She said that the looser it is left, the more criticism it will encounter. She said that as many examples as possible should be listed in the 1-pager. Catherine Debo said that revenue hours of service is currently used by Metro as an indicator.

David Cieslewicz also suggested adding parking revenues as a potential source. Also, increases in property values around rail stations could be tapped, in a manner similar to that used in TIF districts. Golden said that the bonding for the Parking Utility may preclude that being used. Kristine Euclide said that this could be noted in the example. She also agreed that a special assessment could be listed as an example. Scott McDonell suggested that these examples be added contingent on Management Team review.

The motion to revise the Finance 1-pager passed unanimously.

In terms of the Governance 1-pager, Stephanie Eiler provided Committee members a brief overview and asked for any comments or concerns at this time. She reiterated that this is a draft and the OAC only needs to be comfortable enough with it as a concept for further public review.

Ald. Golden suggested that the 2nd bullet in the “Membership” area could list communities with “regional bus service”. He also said that the membership seems reasonable.

David Cieslewicz asked what is happening to Madison Metro under this option. Ald. Golden assumed that this authority would include Metro and would govern a single transit system as a free-standing oversight authority.

Ald. Ken Golden/Rob Kennedy submitted a motion to suggest modifying the 2nd bullet under the “Potential Decision Areas/Authorities” area to read: “Coordinate service with agencies and local communities (i.e., City of Madison, other transit, City Traffic Engineering, other municipalities, local planning commissions)”. Kristine Euclide said that the language could be a lightning rod for expanding transit service to new areas. She also said that the membership on the governing board needs to also reflect community benefits and cost allocation. She said that the membership and cost allocation needs to be linked in some way.

Ald. Ken Golden suggested adding a note before the membership is listed, to read: “The relative composition of future membership would be subject to an assessment of the relative financial contribution of the various appointing entities”. Euclide said that this would be helpful. Catherine Debo suggested stating an 11-member authority, with specific membership allocation based on financial contribution.

The motion to revise the Governance 1-pager passed unanimously.

9. TRANSPORT 2020 PROJECT SCHEDULE/NEXT STEPS

The Committee members then confirmed the next Transport 2020 meetings:

- Management Team: Friday, April 12th, 12:00 noon, Room LL-110 Madison Municipal Building;
- OAC Meeting #24/TAC: Monday, April 29th, 5:15 p.m., Room 201 City/County Building; and,
- Final Public Informational Meeting (PIM): Monday, May 13th, 5:00-8:00 p.m. (*w/brief presentation at 6:00 p.m.*), at Alliant Energy Center.

Rob Kennedy suggested that the outer-ring communities be contacted individually, rather than a large Focus Group. The OAC agreed to that.

Kim Lobdell also noted that the Business Community Focus Group would be held after the Public Information Meeting.

10. UPDATE: PHASE 2 TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (FOR SELECTED PHASE 2 TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES)

Stephanie Eiler pointed out that the analysis has been completed and that City Traffic Engineering staff are reviewing the information. This will be presented to the OAC/TAC at the April 29th meeting. Ald. Golden said that this should be presented at the May 13th Public Information Meeting as well, since there is a great deal of interest in this issue.

11. ITEMS BY OAC CO-CHAIRS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

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

12. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 7:45 p.m.