



**Preliminary Engineering/NEPA Analysis
for the
Dane County/Greater Madison Metropolitan Area**

For additional project information: www.transport2020.net

Minutes

TRANSPORT 2020 IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE (ITF) MEETING

Thursday, May 10, 2007

5:00 p.m.

**Madison Municipal Building, Room 300
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, WI**

-- **ROLL CALL**

ITF Members Present: Sandy Beaupre; Michael Blaska; Sup. Chuck Erickson; Kristine Euclide; Steve Hiniker; Lori Kay (*for LaMarr Billups*); Jesse Kaysen; Sup. Scott McDonell; Dick Wagner.

ITF Members Absent: Jim Berkenstadt (*notified*); John DeLamater (*notified*); Ken Golden (*notified*); Chris Klein; Sup. Al Matano (*notified*); LeAnna Wall (*for Joe Olson; notified*).

TAC/Staff Present: Rod Clark (Wisconsin Department of Transportation); Bob McDonald (Madison Area MPO); Sharon Persich (Madison Metro); Bob Pike (Madison Area MPO); David Trowbridge (Madison Planning and Development; *Transport 2020 Project Manager*).

Others Present: Fred Bartol (Dane Alliance for Rail Transit); Margaret Bergamini (Associated Students of Madison); Rebecca Cnare (Madison Mayor's Office); Matthew DeFour (Wisconsin State Journal); Ken Kinney (HNTB); Ken Lucht (Wisconsin and Southern Railroad); Patrick McDonnell (441 North Paterson Street); Gregg Petersen (Dane County Highway and Transportation Department); Keith Plasterer (6813 Winston Drive); Bob Schaefer; Julia Suprock (HNTB); Royce Williams (Pro-Rail); Bruce Wilson (Madison Bus Advocates).

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Sup. Scott McDonell welcomed Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force members to the meeting. There were no suggested changes to the agenda.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 25, 2007 TASK FORCE MEETING

The Minutes for the 4-25-07 Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force meeting were unanimously approved, as submitted on a motion by Michael Blaska/Jesse Kaysen.

3. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Patrick McDonnell began by thanking Ken Kinney for presenting the rail build alternatives at the PIM on May 3rd; he believes that both are good options. His preference is for Alternative 3 because he believes that it is more urban and regional than Alternative 2a, which he considers to be the more suburban option. Mr. McDonnell prefers Alternative 3 because he believes it would provide more multi-modal connections, better serve the business, convention, and tourist industries, provide an opportunity for a Park and Ride lot at the airport terminus, and provide better opportunities to diversify demand and increase mobility. Mr. McDonnell finds Alternative 2a to be less versatile and focused on suburban growth.

Fred Bartol also testified at the May 3rd meeting. Mr. Bartol believes that Alternative 3 is preferable because any potential engineering issues which may arise from track sharing with the proposed high speed rail would be more easily resolved in Alternative 3's proposed corridor than Alternative 2a's proposed corridor.

Bob Schaefer brought written comments to the meeting, which were distributed. Mr. Schaefer is not in favor of either alternative and believes that the proposed corridors for both alternatives were only chosen because of existing track. He believes that an expanded bus system is a more regional option.

4. REVIEW OF PUBLIC INPUT RECEIVED AT MAY 3RD TRANSPORT 2020 PIM (Ken Kinney)

Ken Kinney presented a summary of the May 3rd public information meeting. Included in this summary was a review of the alternatives evaluation criteria and how the criteria was used to reduce the 6 initial alternatives to Alternative 2a and 3. Kinney also presented a comparison of headway times, capital costs and ridership for each alternative. Finally, Kinney presented a comparison of the two remaining build alternatives based on the initial evaluation criteria. He emphasized that the differences between the two alternatives can be found in the categories of ridership, economic development, and regional land use.

5. OVERVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE PROCESS TO SELECT TRANSPORT 2020 LOCALLY-PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA); POSSIBLE TASK FORCE ACTION ON LPA (Ken Kinney)

ITF members asked how ridership numbers compare to other systems. Kinney noted that Transport 2020 compares well against other transit systems around the country. Kinney also commented he is just beginning to look at ridership numbers in relation to user benefits.

ITF members remarked that there were a number of comments at the May 3rd meeting in support of extending Alternative 2a to downtown Sun Prairie. ITF members asked what effect this expansion would have on costs and cost effectiveness. Kinney responded that he and Kimon Proussaloglou (Cambridge Systematics) are currently working on developing numbers and will have them completed before a scheduled May 24th meeting with the mayor of Sun Prairie.

ITF members asked if Kinney could forecast how a potential high speed rail service would affect ridership on Alternatives 2a and 3. Kinney responded that he would review forecasted ridership numbers for the high speed rail and estimate how that share would impact ridership on Alternatives 2a and 3. Kinney commented that he would expect the share to be small because the backbone of either alternative is workday commuters, but that he would report back in two weeks. Dave Trowbridge commented that the ITF needs to be cautious in making projections for ridership on Alternatives 2a or 3

based on projections related to a proposed high speed rail.

ITF members asked whether special events and airport ridership numbers had been included in the ridership forecasts. Kinney responded that they had been, and that he projects a low number of air travelers would use the proposed rail to access the airport.

ITF members asked if either Alternative 2a or 3 could be changed in the future, based on the potential implementation of the high speed rail project. Specifically, ITF members wondered whether the eastern branches of both Alternative 2a and Alternative 3 could be constructed in order to complement the proposed high speed rail line. Kinney responded that either alternative could be made compatible with a proposed high speed rail.

ITF members commented that they were struck by the number of comments at the May 3rd meeting in support of inter-modal connections. The members continue to assume that this is part of a regional transit system and should continue to highlight the point that either alternative will complement the existing bus system. The members also commented that the county has provided good service through this planning process.

ITF members commented that they were impressed at the last hearing by the positive momentum of Transport 2020 and the diverse group of citizens who have provided oral and written comments. Specifically, residents from neighboring communities have provided positive feedback on the alternatives, which highlights regional enthusiasm for the project moving forward.

ITF members suggested that interested persons should read the transit-supportive land use report in order to better understand the amount of qualitative and quantitative work that has been completed to guide the decision-making process. Members also commented that it would be helpful to have completed reports easily accessible for the public to review.

ITF members requested that Kinney prepare a written response to Mayor Cieslwich's memo regarding regional transit issues. Kinney confirmed that he will draft a response for circulation.

ITF members requested that answers to outstanding questions be resolved in advance of the next ITF meeting.

6. UPDATE: TRANSPORT 2020 PROJECT TIMELINE/NEXT STEPS

Ken Kinney noted that the following Transport 2020 meetings are currently scheduled:

Implementation Task Force

- Thursday, May 24, 4:30 p.m., Room 300 MMB

FTA Headquarters Briefing

- Thursday, May 31, 9:00 a.m. (EST), FTA, Washington, D.C.

ITF members asked what will happen at the FTA meeting. David Trowbridge responded that it is a meeting with FTA planning staff to review documents completed to date and get feedback on project progress. This is not a submittal of any documentation, and Transport 2020 cannot move into Preliminary Engineering without FTA approval.

7. INFORMATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS BY TASK FORCE MEMBERS

There were no announcements or information provided by Task Force members.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

These minutes represent the writer's interpretation of discussion and resolution of key points. Please contact Julia Suprock of HNTB (312/798-0276) to discuss questions, modifications or corrections.