

**Minutes of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Citizen Advisory Committee**

November 18, 2009

Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-110

5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: F. Bartol, T. Stoebig, J. Rider, R. Williams, E. Sundquist, C. Gjerde

Members Absent: R. Ferrell, D. Phillips, J. Guo, G. Hull, S. Hiniker

Staff Present: B. Schaefer

2. Approval of July 22, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Sundquist moved, Rider seconded, to approve the September 16 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority

Schaefer said that the county resolution creating the RTA was included in the packet. It was passed by the County Board at its last meeting. He said it would take some time for the appointments to the Board to be made and for the Board to organize, pass bylaws, etc. There was a meeting of the appointing authorities today to discuss tasks that needed to be done and a timeline. Schaefer said there are a number of legal issues that need to be resolved. One of them is whether the jurisdictional boundary of the RTA is just the MPO planning area or whether it includes all of the towns and City of Fitchburg that are only partially within the planning boundary. A somewhat separate issue is who gets to vote in the referendum. It might be impossible to limit voting on the referendum to only portions of the towns in the planning boundary. There is no funding for staff next year for the RTA.

Stoebig questioned the ability of the state to collect the sales tax for only properties within the MPO planning area. Williams suggested that WisDOT should play a role in overseeing the creation of the RTAs and perhaps provide some funding. Bartol questioned how much the state should be involved. Bartol also commented that the lack of staffing for the RTA was a problem given all the work that had to be done to get the RTA up and running and prepare for the referendum.

4. Review and Discussion of Draft Conceptual Transit Service Improvement Scenarios for the RTA

Schaefer reviewed the three conceptual scenarios. He said Scenario A includes a number of improvements in fixed-route bus service and additional demand responsive service. He outlined the different components of the bus service improvements. Scenario B includes the service improvements in Scenario A plus implementation of bus rapid transit (BRT) service in one or more corridors. Some changes would likely be needed in the bus service improvements. Scenario C includes the Scenario A bus improvements plus the starter rail service recommended in the Transport 2020 Study. As with Scenario B, some changes would be needed to the bus service improvements, probably even more so than in Scenario B.

Williams asked how the stops for the new express routes would be identified, and Schaefer said separate, very visible signs would be needed. Williams commented on the need for routes serving just the Isthmus area where the highest ridership is. He also mentioned the need for shuttle service between the airport and the downtown/UW campus area. Others agreed. Sundquist said the approach of first improving the bus system before adding BRT or rail service made sense. Bartol commented that a vision or strategic plan was needed for the transit system to provide a framework for making decisions on the specific transit improvements. He also said it was likely that intercity rail service would be implemented and that bus connections to the station needed to be planned. Lastly, he said that opportunities for public input on the transit service improvements needed to be provided. Stoebig said he was concerned about shifting of the cost of the current service to the RTA. Schaefer said that was

likely because the RTA didn't have the authority to levy a property tax, just the sales tax. Bartol said much of the funding for an intercity rail station would probably have to be local, possibly from the RTA. Gjerde asked about the cost of acquiring land for park-and-ride lots. Schaefer said that would be required in some cases. In other cases, land might be able to be leased (e.g., parking lot of a shopping center). Also, WisDOT is a source of funding for lots that would serve carpoolers and take traffic off state highways. For example, WisDOT is building a PNR lot off CTH N north of Cottage Grove as part of the Interstate 94 expansion project. Sundquist cautioned whether it was wise to assume everyone would receive some service, which could be costly in some cases for rural residents. Several persons commented on the need to re-think the bus transfer points. Moving some of them or adding new ones should be considered. Bartol suggested including bus stop and other amenities as part of the scenarios. Williams asked if Scenario C could include some BRT service and Schaefer said yes. Schaefer said more details about the scenarios would be presented at the next committee meeting.

5. Review and Discussion of Conceptual Regional Bus Service for Cities/Villages without Current Service and Verona

Schaefer said that Metro staff had developed conceptual routes for express bus service to the downtown/UW campus area. The primary purpose was to get an idea of the cost and bus needs for providing such service. The larger communities would have midday service, but that service would connect to a transfer point or other location rather than continue all the way to downtown. Schaefer said that while Metro staff did a good job in planning routes that served all of the higher density housing areas, he didn't think the communities could support such a high level of service. Also, he thought the peak period service should be designed with more emphasis on park-and-ride service and also be designed to serve peripheral Madison area neighborhoods (though with very limited stops) where possible. Metro staff indicated that was a possibility. More work will be done on the routes after getting information and feedback from the staff of these communities.

6. Committee Member Reports

Williams mentioned that the Madison Area Bus Advocates had been involved in trying to prevent the loss of the intercity bus terminal. The interim terminal for Greyhound Bus Co. off Stoughton Road was not in a good location due to the poor bus service to it. He said the issue of planning for a more permanent facility in a better location should be the responsibility of the RTA.

7. Staff Reports

Schaefer distributed copies of the final 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He said the MPO Policy Board approved the 2010 Work Program at its last meeting and that would be mailed to committee members when it is back from the printer. Some language was added to the work program regarding planning for an intercity terminal, but Schaefer noted that the MPO could not play a lead role in such an effort if it happened. Schaefer noted the future agenda items. He also noted that Bob McDonald is retiring next month and that committee members would be invited to a planned retirement party on Friday, December 11.

8. Next Meeting Dates

Wednesday, January 20, 2010 and Wednesday, March 17, 2010

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer