



## Minutes

**JOINT MEETING/WORKSHOP  
OVERSIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (OAC) MEETING #27  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

**Wednesday, August 7, 2002  
5:30 pm  
City/County Building, Courtroom 2G  
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Madison, WI**

-- **ROLL CALL**

OAC Members Present: Lori Kay (*for LaMarr Billups*); Supv. Michael Blaska; David Cieslewicz; Kristine Euclide; Ann Falconer; Ald. Ken Golden; Mari MacKenzie (*for Patrick Goss*); Doug Dalton (*for Ken Leonard*); Supv. Scott McDonell; George Nelson; Ald. Warren Onken; Adam Clayton (*for Rose Phetteplace*).

OAC Members Absent: Dick Wagner (*notified*).

TAC/Staff Present: Catherine Debo (Madison Metro); Michael Gay (City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development); Linda Lovejoy (Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transit); Bob McDonald (Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization); John Norwell (Dane County Highway and Transportation Department); Mark Opitz (City of Middleton, Planning); Bill Schaefer (Madison Area MPO); Tim Sobota (Madison Metro).

Others Present: Fred Bartol (Dane Alliance for Rail Transit); Jerry Bridgman; Tom Fleming (DART); Matt Hintze (HNTB); Al Matano (Sierra Club and Dane County Board Supervisor District 11); Bob Schaefer.

**1. REVIEW OF AGENDA**

Co-Chair Scott McDonell welcomed Committee members to Meeting #27 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 #26 (JUNE 24, 2002)**

The Minutes for Meeting #26 of the Oversight Advisory Committee/TAC were approved, as submitted

on a motion by Ald. Warren Onken/George Nelson.

### 3. **OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

The first registrant was Bob Schaefer. Mr. Schaefer said that the draft final report does not adequately address transportation problems. He felt that land use issues had been given more consideration than transportation issues. He said that transit boardings and the farebox recovery for the recommended transit alternative are poor and that there are several more cost effective options that should be pursued, such as a bus option. He also felt that auto travel would be negatively affected by the rail option, noting that many roadway crossings would be affected.

Jerry Bridgman spoke next. He said that he has been disappointed with the OAC's activities and the Final Report. He said that the preferred alternative increases congestion and that this does not improve the quality of life for City residents. He said that mobility is decreased with the alternative selected and that there are better ways to spend approximately \$250 million. He said that this amount of funds could buy a much better bus fleet and could also purchase affordable housing for City residents.

### 4. **REVIEW/DISCUSSION OF REVISED *DRAFT* TRANSPORT 2020 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

David Trowbridge said that Stephanie Eiler has revised the 200-page Final Report and also provided a revised 15-page Executive Summary for OAC/TAC review. He said that the OAC/TAC members should take a copy of the 200-page report, if they wish, and provide any final comments by August 16<sup>th</sup>. The executive summary, Trowbridge said, could be further modified if the OAC or Management Team wishes. He said that committee members have provided some comments on the revised executive summary and he asked for more this evening.

Doug Dalton said that there are some references to highway costs and the language implies that this was an "alternative" considered in the context of the Transport 2020 transit alternatives. He asked that this language be modified to indicate that these highway costs are simply examples. He said that this should be changed in the full report and the executive summary.

Kristine Euclide said that the executive summary is an improvement but still needs work. She said that pictures and graphics would be very helpful and also suggested a shorter version. She said that the next step in the Transport 2020 process will be to obtain local support and that a brief summary document will be helpful in that pursuit. Ald. Ken Golden said that the Dane County Regional Planning Commission produces a large Regional Trends report and also a 4-page summary – and suggested that this approach could be used for the Transport 2020 summary document.

George Nelson felt that it may be premature to start soliciting input and support from local units of government in Dane County until we have a better assurance that federal funds can be obtained. Ken Golden said that we need to show local support before the federal officials provide funds.

Ald. Warren Onken felt that the next step in Transport 2020 should be the creation of an entity to oversee the next steps in the process. He felt that the OAC should recommend that this committee be formed. He said that the report provides a foundation from which to move forward but that the ultimate governing authority needs to be considered. Onken also felt that the report used the term "Madison" too much. George Nelson agreed that the governing authority should be created and that this process should begin as soon as possible.

Dave Cieslewicz said that resolutions will likely be debated at the Madison Common Council and Dane County Board and that there are numerous unanswered questions. He also agreed that a shorter, snappier summary document is needed. Doug Dalton agreed with that as well. Supv. Scott McDonnell felt that a 3-4 page summary document would be appropriate.

Ald. Ken Golden also felt that the executive summary was too heavy on process and that the ultimate transit vision needed to be accentuated. He said that the document should be exciting and be capable of generating interest from the general public. Ann Falconer agreed that local support is critical and that a

shorter document would be helpful. Lori Kay also felt that a shorter version of the executive summary should be developed, but that the process for the project should be referred to.

The OAC members provided more written comments to Dave Trowbridge and asked him to integrate them into the various reports. The OAC also agreed that a shorter version of the executive summary needed to be produced.

## **5. REVIEW/DISCUSSION OF *DRAFT* TRANSPORT 2020 FINAL REPORT TRANSMITTAL LETTER**

David Trowbridge referred committee members to the draft letter in the packet. He said that this letter was intended to accompany the Transport 2020 reports and would come from the OAC. He said that this would be sent to all units of government in Dane County, in addition to the Madison Area MPO, the University of Wisconsin and any other interested entities.

Supv. Michael Blaska wondered why the letter would be sent to all units of government. He suggested that, instead, it be sent back to the sponsoring bodies of Transport 2020 – the City of Madison, Dane County and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. He said that the letter could recommend creating the authority, etc. but that the sponsoring agencies should take it from there. He added that units of government can then pass various resolutions on Transport 2020 as they feel appropriate.

Dave Cieslewicz agreed that the letter should go back to the sponsoring agencies, but also hoped that the process would not lose momentum. He said that this issue needed more debate in the public. Scott McDonnell said that it is Dane County's responsibility to reach out to units of government. He added that the Common Council and County Board should pass resolutions agreeing on the next steps in the process.

Michael Blaska suggested that the City of Madison and Dane County should create the follow-up governing authority or a special committee to carry on the Transport 2020 process. Kristine Euclide said that the OAC should make recommendations back to the sponsoring agencies, but that the report and executive summary documents need to be better communicators. She said that the technical information is sufficient but that the presentation quality is lacking.

Mari MacKenzie said that WisDOT needs to have a locally-preferred alternative (LPA) that has local consensus, and that this needs to be communicated. She also suggested adding a federal process flow chart to the summary document. Dave Cieslewicz said that there is consensus among OAC members on the LPA and the Minimal Operable Segment (MOS) and that this can be communicated in the letter.

The OAC agreed to send the transmittal letter back to all funding and sponsoring agencies as a cover to the Transport 2020 final report and executive summary documents.

## **6. DISCUSSION OF OAC FINAL RECOMMENDATION RE: *DRAFT* TRANSPORT 2020 FINAL REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The OAC asked that the Transport 2020 executive summary be revised and that a shorter version also be prepared. The committee also agreed that the Management Team could take the lead in those revisions, and that revised versions could be provided to all OAC/TAC by email.

David Trowbridge was asked to refine the executive summary and to develop a shorter, perhaps 4-page version of the executive summary. Trowbridge said that he would do this and said that much of the shorter version could be used in the final newsletter. Ald. Ken Golden said that this revision, to be coordinated by the Management Team, should be completed in September. Committee members agreed that this was a good approach.

Dave Cieslewicz/George Nelson then submitted the following motion:

The Transport 2020 Oversight Advisory Committee (OAC) accepts the Transport 2020 Final Report and its findings/recommendations and recommends that the start-up system, the Minimal Operable Segment (MOS), proceed to the next step in the development/implementation of that system – the Preliminary Engineering (PE) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental documentation as an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement. Furthermore, the OAC recommends that the full system vision (locally-preferred alternative concept) be further considered and refined as part of future planning and engineering phases.

The motion carried unanimously, 12-0.

## 7. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS IN TRANSPORT 2020 PROJECT

Ald. Warren Onken said that it is very important that the governance issue be figured out soon. He said that there needs to be regional agreement to move forward as a partnership. George Nelson agreed and noted that the report and its findings needs to be sent back to the sponsoring agencies with a recommendation to move forward.

Ald. Ken Golden/George Nelson then submitted the following motion:

The Transport 2020 Oversight Advisory Committee (OAC) recommends that the sponsoring agencies of Transport 2020 jointly create a committee, to include representatives of the sponsoring bodies (and any other interested entities), for the purposes of monitoring efforts to obtain federal funding, overseeing the next step in the development/implementation of the Minimal Operable Segment – the Preliminary Engineering (PE) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental documentation as an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement, and ensuring the implementation of the full Transport 2020 system vision.

The motion carried unanimously, 10-0.

## 8. TRANSPORT 2020 PROJECT SCHEDULE/NEXT STEPS

The Committee members were then reminded of the remaining activities pertaining to Transport 2020:

- Additional Management Team Meeting to Finalize Executive Summary (*to be scheduled*)
- Final Newsletter (*to be mailed out – early Fall 2002*)

## 9. ITEMS BY OAC CO-CHAIRS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

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

## 10. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 7:05 p.m.