



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

For additional project information: [www.transport2020.net](http://www.transport2020.net)

## Minutes

### TRANSPORT 2020: IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE (ITF) TRANSIT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

**Wednesday, March 15, 2006**

**4:45 pm**

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

#### -- ROLL CALL

Subcommittee Present: John DeLamater; Kristine Euclide; Ald. Ken Golden (*alternate*); Jesse Kaysen; Supv. Scott McDonell (*alternate*); John Vesperman (*for Rose Phetteplace*).

Subcommittee Absent: Jim Berkenstadt (*notified*); Supv. Chuck Erickson (*notified*).

TAC/Staff Present: Rod Clark (WisDOT-Bureau of Transit and Local Roads); Ann Gullickson (Madison Metro); Rob Kennedy (UW-Madison); Bob McDonald (Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization); David Trowbridge (Madison Planning and Development; *Transport 2020 Project Manager*); Michael Waidelich (Madison Planning and Development).

Others Present: Fred Bartol (Dane Alliance for Rail Transit); Sandy Beaupre (ITF Member); Ken Kinney (*HNTB Project Manager*); Caron Kloser (HNTB); Bob Schaefer; Dick Wagner (ITF Member).

#### 1. INTRODUCTIONS

Transit Operations Subcommittee Co-Chair Jesse Kaysen welcomed Subcommittee members to the meeting. Subcommittee members introduced each other to members of the consultant team.

#### 2. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

Ken Kinney opened the meeting reviewing the study schedule, noting that the purpose of the meeting was to present initial preliminary alternatives for the subcommittee's review, comment and initial acceptance. The anticipated alternatives will include a No-Build, a Baseline Alternative that includes upgrades to the existing bus transit system, and three build alternatives (which would include the

minimum operating segment from the preferred alternative in the previous Transport 2020 Alternatives Analysis).

The definition of the preliminary alternatives will include routes, operations and technology options. Evaluation criteria will include:

- Capital costs
- O and M costs
- Social, economic, environmental impacts
- Transit integration potential (with Metro and potential streetcar)
- Financial feasibility
- Ridership
- Economic development impact
- New Starts
- Regional land use impact

The evaluation criteria at this level of analysis will be very broad. Detailed evaluation would be done on Detailed Alternatives in the summer 2006. Ken noted some strategic guidelines to consider facilitating the review of Preliminary Alternatives; that is, to make sure the Baseline is the simplest possible solution, and the build alternatives range from minimal bus system redesign to building on the Metro Plan, to building on the LPA from the previous study.

The subcommittee and ITF must remain focused on maintaining the schedule of screening the Preliminary Alternatives by April 5 and formalizing the selection of Detailed Alternatives after the April 26 Scoping Meeting. The selection of Detailed Alternatives is scheduled at a May 11 ITF meeting. The Subcommittee agreed to regroup after the Scoping Meeting on April 27, noon, to review outcome of the meeting and make initial recommendations on Detailed Alternatives.

Ken reviewed technology options and reminded the group to focus on what equipment does in terms of service and not be concerned with what technology is called. There are technologies that can run on either existing rail corridors or in the street. While it will be important to define differences in technology, it is important to note that some of the same equipment can run in different corridors.

Some subcommittee members requested that a spreadsheet be prepared to compare the various technologies. The project team has initiated a comparison between technologies, and a spreadsheet will be distributed during the week of March 27.

Ken reviewed routes on maps presented to the group. Many noted if future development wouldn't be appropriate to note on the maps, which now show current employment centers. Others noted that employment density and how close employment is within a 1/2-mile radius of the route would show better accessibility to markets along the alternative routes. The consultant team will prepare such an exhibit.

Many alternative routes were discussed by the group, but all agreed to remain focused on study corridor in this phase as a first step in implementing a broader transit system. The committee agreed to move forward with further developing the Preliminary Alternatives presented, but look at possibly extending route further east to a logical park-and-ride location between East Towne and Sun Prairie. Since the adopted LPA will be carried forward as one of the final detailed alternatives, optional terminal locations will be evaluated in Task 6.

Other comments made at the meeting inquired how the Streetcar study will fit in with the Preliminary Alternatives. The analysis will need to take that into consideration. Another attendee noted that buses reach more people and provide more flexibility.

### 3. ADJOURNMENT

The Transit Operations Subcommittee adjourned its meeting at 6:00 p.m. The next Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for April 27, 2006 at 12:00.

***These minutes represent the writer's interpretation of discussion and resolution of key points. Please contact Caron Kloser of HNTB (414/359-2300) to discuss questions, modifications or corrections.***