



Minutes

**JOINT MEETING/WORKSHOP
OVERSIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (OAC) MEETING #24
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

Monday, April 29, 2002

5:15 pm

City/County Building, Room 201

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard

Madison, WI

-- ROLL CALL

OAC Members Present: David Cieslewicz; Ann Falconer; Ald. Ken Golden; Rob Kennedy; Ken Leonard; Supv. Scott McDonell; George Nelson; Ald. Warren Onken; Rose Phetteplace; Dick Wagner.

OAC Members Absent: LaMarr Billups (*notified*); Supv. Michael Blaska; Kristine Euclide; Patrick Goss (*notified*).

TAC/Staff Present: Jim Arts (Dane County Executive's Office); Catherine Debo (Madison Metro); David Dryer (Madison Traffic Engineering); Lori Kay (UW-Madison); Barbara Kipp (Wisconsin Department of Transportation - District 1 Planning); Linda Lovejoy (WisDOT, Urban Transit); Dan McCormick (Madison Traffic Engineering); Bob McDonald (Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization); Mari MacKenzie (Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Urban Planning); John Norwell (Dane County Highway and Transportation Department); Bill Schaefer (Madison Area MPO); David Trowbridge (Madison Planning and Development; *Project Administrator for Transport 2020*).

Others Present: Debby Aldrich; James Aldrich; Fred Bartol (Dane Alliance for Rail Transit); Hal Cohen (Urban Open Space Foundation); Stephanie Eiler (Parsons Brinckerhoff; *Project Manager for Transport 2020, conference call*); Kim Lobdell (KL Engineering); Al Matano; Kimon Proussaloglou (Cambridge Systematics, *conference call*); Bob Schaefer.

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Co-Chair Ken Golden welcomed Committee members to Meeting #24 of the Transport 2020 Oversight Advisory Committee/Technical Advisory Committee. There were no suggested modifications to the order of agenda items.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OAC/TAC MEETING #23 (APRIL 8, 2002)

The Minutes for Meeting #23 of the Oversight Advisory Committee/TAC were approved, as submitted on a motion by Rob Kennedy/Ann Falconer.

3. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The first registrant was Bob Schaefer. Mr. Schaefer said that he was disappointed with the Transport 2020 process, primarily because the traffic impact analysis information has not been considered in making decisions about the preferred transit alternative. He also expressed concern about the number of at-grade crossings that would need to be closed for trains, noting that 104,200 autos would be impacted every day by such closings. He said that this needs to be considered before decisions are made about the preferred alternative.

The next speaker was James Aldrich. Mr. Aldrich said that the commuter rail traffic, along with the high speed rail traffic would create numerous problems on street circulation and vehicular movement. He said that this needs to be considered when debating the issues.

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

Kimon Proussaloglou (Cambridge Systematics) presented some slides from the upcoming traffic impact analysis. He pointed out that, at this time, data regarding existing conditions (intersection level of service and delay) was available. He said that the future commuter rail and light rail analysis would be completed at the next OAC/TAC meeting and would be available in summary form for review.

Rob Kennedy said that it is important for the information to be clearly described in summary materials. Ald. Ken Golden asked about Farley/University Avenue intersection, and whether or not future plans for that intersection were considered in the analysis. Proussaloglou said that he would check with City Traffic Engineering to ensure that this is considered.

The Committee thanked Mr. Proussaloglou for his summary and looked forward to the revised information at the next meeting.

5. REVIEW OF REVISED BASELINE BUS, MINIMAL OPERABLE SEGMENT (MOS) & LOCALLY-PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA) MAPS FOR PUBLIC PRESENTATION

David Trowbridge showed the overheads for the revised maps of the MOS and LPA. He also showed the map of the revised Baseline Bus alternative. He noted that these had been modified by the Management Team and had been included in the recently-mailed announcement of the May 13th Public Information Meeting (PIM). Committee members felt that the maps were acceptable.

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

Stephanie Eiler provided an overview of a table summarizing the revised cost and ridership information for the MOS (and other alternatives, including the revised Baseline Bus alternative). She pointed out that the consultant team was disappointed to report that the “cost per new rider” figure for the MOS had not been reduced as much as had been hoped – from \$82.00 to \$61.60. Bob McDonald said that there needs to be a different point of comparison, such as the existing bus network. Rob Kennedy agreed, noting that the No-Build could be used for comparison. Dick Wagner also agreed with that approach.

Ald. Ken Golden asked Catherine Debo if existing information on Madison Metro could be developed. Debo said that this could be provided. Golden also pointed out that all of the columns need not be presented at the PIM and that, in many instances, the federal information requirements mean very little locally. George Nelson asked how “cost per new rider” is calculated. Eiler said that she could not answer that, but would check into it. Nelson said that it is important to point out that this figure is meaningful only in that it ensures compliance with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations. Golden agreed and said that information about costs, etc. should be portrayed in an “annualized” manner – in order to reduce “sticker shock”.

Dick Wagner said that ridership for special events should be factored into the information presented at the PIM. Eiler said that she would check with Cambridge Systematics to get that information. Rob Kennedy said that the “rail attractiveness factor”, although not allowed by FTA, would still be helpful in local evaluation of the issue. Eiler said that she could make some statements to that effect. George Nelson agreed that this factor is important, noting that the ridership model numbers alone do not justify a rail investment.

Ken Golden also stressed the importance of presenting the land use evaluation findings at the PIM. Stephanie Eiler cautioned linking the land use information to the cost information, as it may unnecessarily spark a debate of “who benefits and who pays”.

Rob Kennedy asked if the cost savings from more economical station platforms were included in the revised cost estimates. Eiler said that they were and that a “minimal” approach for amenities with the system was assumed. She said that, overall, the costs of the stations went down. Eiler also said that the consultant team is concerned that the costs are minimums and that there needs to be an understanding of that. Golden wanted the cost estimates to be credible, and Eiler ensured him that they were.

Ken Leonard suggested that the streetcar costs be left on the table, due to the fact that this alternative has been discussed in the media. Golden suggested that the timing of a streetcar implementation be made clear in a footnote. David Cieslewicz suggested removing the costs, particularly because he feels the streetcar costs are wrong and ridership estimates do not exist. Kennedy agreed with removing it.

Ann Falconer said that the streetcar should be included in the PIM presentation, at some level. Golden agreed and said that the table is separate from the entire PIM presentation – separating the full LPA vision and MOS. Dick Wagner felt that the streetcar should be left off the table, but included the data in the PIM presentation. Wagner also objected to calling the table an “evaluation matrix”, noting that the table leaves out many of the important criteria – such as land use, etc. The Committee agreed to present the LPA and MOS separately at the PIM and label the table “cost/ridership comparison”.

Eiler confirmed that the table column headings would include current Madison Metro, 2020 No-Build Bus, Baseline Bus and MOS – removing the Expanded Regional Bus and MOS + Streetcar. In addition, she confirmed that a annualized ridership will be added as a line item and the cost per new rider line deleted. The Committee agreed to those changes.

David Cieslewicz asked about presenting land use and air quality issues at the PIM. Eiler replied that land use information would be presented on boards at the PIM (i.e., employment and property value changes). She said that air quality issues would be presented as part of the overall evaluation matrices. Dick Wagner suggested updating the evaluation matrix to include the MOS, in addition to the other Phase 2 alternatives. Eiler agreed to update the evaluation matrices. Wagner said that this would be acceptable.

Lori Kay asked if there was backup data for total capital costs, such as line item costs. Eiler said that she would email this to Dave Trowbridge and he could forward that to interested Committee members.

Catherine Debo referred to total annualized costs and asked if Metro’s costs were included. Eiler confirmed that they were, assuming 2020 costs. Debo suggested adding a footnote to the table to ensure that everyone understands this.

Rob Kennedy suggested scheduling a Management Team meeting to review the PIM materials, before they are finalized. Golden said that the Committee could schedule this at the end of the meeting.

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

Ald. Ken Golden reminded Committee members that the Finance and Governance 1-pagers had been slightly revised to reflect recent comments made by the OAC/TAC and Management Team. He asked for further comments and concerns.

Ken Leonard suggested some changes to the Finance 1-pager, basically making it clear that there would need to be changes in state legislation for some of the state funding options shown – both capital and operating.

Bill Schaefer suggested changing the title and cost estimates in the 1-pager and referring to the actual MOS costs. The Committee agreed to that. Eiler asked that the MOS be re-named to a “start-up” system or something similar. The Committee agreed.

Ald. Golden asked for any suggested changes to the Governance 1-pager. George Nelson said that the 1-pager should make clear that, while we are in the process of applying for federal transit dollars, the community should still go ahead and form a joint regional transit authority at this time. He said that it is important to try to get Madison Metro governed on a regional basis immediately, independent of the timing of the federal applications, etc.

Ken Leonard suggested that reference to the Secretary of WisDOT, under “membership”, be deleted. He wasn’t sure if the Department had the authority to be on such a board.

Stephanie Eiler wanted to make sure that the Committee understands the fact that there is more work to be done, beyond that shown on the 1-pagers, in regard to finance and governance (in order to show FTA that there is sufficient commitment to finance and operate the system).

8. REVIEW/DISCUSSION OF INFORMATION TO BE PRESENTED AT MAY 13TH PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

Kim Lobdell handed out the May 13th PIM announcement (sent to approximately 900 recipients) and asked for additional comments on materials to be presented at the PIM, in addition to the many suggestions already provided this evening.

Lobdell also recommended providing materials that describe how the Committee has moved from the Phase 2 alternatives to the *Draft* MOS and LPA. Lobdell felt that the evaluation matrices can be used for public presentation. George Nelson hoped that the materials would not be complicated. He noted that the meeting announcement was very simple and well done.

Dick Wagner suggested being careful not to get bogged down in the evaluation and focus on the recommendation at hand. Wagner agreed, though, that there needs to be a link shown between the Phase 2 evaluation to the LPA and MOS. Golden concurred with Wagner and said that he wished to see less about the process and focus on the reasons for the recommendation. Rob Kennedy suggested having one display board showing the Phase 2 alternatives. Lobdell said that she would do that.

Kim Lobdell also said that examples of the various rail technologies would be shown, in addition to the background Goals and Objectives, Problem Statement, etc. She also asked for comments on the maps that would be shown. The Committee agreed to show the Baseline Bus, Draft MOS and Full LPA. Ann Falconer suggested adding the existing Madison Metro system. The Committee agreed. Lobdell said that 2 sets of maps would be used at the PIM, to spread out the crowds. Lobdell said that the revised cost/ridership table would be included on a large board.

In terms of handouts, Lobdell suggested having traffic impact materials ready. The Committee felt that this information would not be ready by that time. Lobdell asked about the Finance and Governance 1-

papers, and whether or not they could be provided as handouts. The Committee agreed that this could be done. In addition, the Committee suggested referring to the LPA as the "Full System Vision". Lobdell asked about a land use handout. Wagner agreed that this needs to be done, but was unsure of what to hand out. Golden suggested that bullet points could be provided in handouts.

In terms of the formal presentation, Lobdell suggested that the Management Team review materials to be included in that presentation. Lobdell noted that the written comment sheets, etc. would also be available for the general public, as have been in the past.

9. TRANSPORT 2020 PROJECT SCHEDULE/NEXT STEPS

Ald. Golden said that there are two major functions left for the OAC before the end of the project: (1) incorporate public comments, and (2) endorse/adopt the final Transport 2020 report/deliverables to forward on to our sponsoring agencies. Stephanie Eiler said that draft deliverables could be provided in early June. Golden said that Management Teams could be utilized in June and that the May 22nd date should be planned as an OAC meeting - for providing final advice to the consultant team, based on comments received at the PIM.

Rob Kennedy agreed and said that the Management Team should be used for initial reviews of the materials. Golden said that, after the May 13th PIM, the Management Team should meet in early June and the OAC later in June.

The Committee members then confirmed the next Transport 2020 meetings:

- Management Team: Wednesday, May 8th, 12:00 noon, Room LL-110 Madison Municipal Building;
- 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; and,
- OAC Meeting #25/TAC: Wednesday, May 22nd, 5:15 p.m., Room 260 Madison Municipal Building.

10. ITEMS BY OAC CO-CHAIRS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

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

11. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 7:40 p.m.