

**Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes**

City-County Building, 210 MLK Jr. Blvd.

November 15, 2017

Room 103A

5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: R. Clark, M. Jones, C. Lawler, J. Rider, T. Stoebig, E. Sullivan, R. Williams, T. Wilson, D. Wood

Members Absent: K. Canto, J. Richard

Staff Present: W. Schaefer, W. Holloway

2. Approval of July 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Wood, seconded by Sullivan, to approve the July 19, 2017 meeting minutes.

3. Review of September 20, 2017 Meeting Notes

The September 20, 2017 meeting notes did not need to be approved because the meeting was held with no quorum. There were no comments on the notes.

4. Staff Reports

Schaefer provided an overview of the 2018 work program. He explained the MPO's decision to support the state safety performance measure targets rather than adopt its own targets. He provided some background information on the MPO's work on Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress Analysis, and also on the MPO-CARPC workgroup that was created to identify ways to better integrate the two agencies' planning efforts in the short and long-term.

During discussion of the work program, Clark inquired about reasons for the declining transit ridership and the data that might be used to help answer that question. Schaefer responded that declining transit ridership was a nationwide trend and was likely due in part by low gas prices, the improving economy, students moving close to campus, and other factors. He agreed it would be difficult to obtain the information needed to answer the question, but thought a non-rider survey would be beneficial as well as further analysis of the routes, times, etc. where ridership was declining.

Regarding the MPO-CARPC workgroup, Stoebig asked about the hurdles to the MPO merging back with CARPC and the reasons for the split. Schaefer provided some background on the split and some of the obstacles to merger. He said a merger would likely take several years or more to implement if it were done so the initial focus was on short-term actions such as co-location of staff.

5. Presentation on Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Corridor Feasibility Analysis and Phase 1 Project Corridor Identification

Schaefer explained that a 2013 BRT feasibility study identified a system vision. The next step is to identify an initial project from the vision to implement first. He said an interagency staff group undertook a BRT corridor feasibility analysis. Schaefer provided a presentation on the findings of that analysis and the criteria used to identify the recommended east-west corridor for the Phase 1 project. He said a city of Madison resolution to recommend moving forward to develop a project in that corridor was going through city transportation committees now.

Clark commented that he was unclear on the process required for securing federal funding for the BRT project, and asked whether an alternatives process had been undertaken. Schaefer responded that, because this will be a Small Starts project, FTA does not require a formal alternatives analysis that is required for larger rail transit projects. The BRT study, along with the earlier studies, were sufficient. He explained that the next study would flesh out a project for which FTA approval would be sought to enter the federal process starting with project development.

Stoebig asked about the potential for BRT to spur development in the same way that rail transit has been shown to increase development. Schaefer responded that the evidence indicates BRT, especially higher end BRT, may spur redevelopment to some degree, but not as much as with rail transit. Rather than using BRT to spur development in the Madison area, the goal with BRT is to serve areas expected to redevelop and that will be major destinations in the coming years.

Wood inquired about the extent to which the BRT system is expected to utilize dedicated lanes. Schaefer explained that the system would likely utilize existing curbside bus lanes (e.g., on Mineral Point Road and University Avenue near campus) with bus lanes added on East Washington Avenue between downtown and USH 30 in place of parking. S. Park Street was the one corridor where median running bus lanes could potentially be added.

Sullivan stated that she remains concerned with equity issues and asked if existing routes were evaluated to determine how well they are serving environmental justice (EJ) communities. She said that, in particular she is concerned about residents being able to reach full-size grocery stores where they can access healthy food beyond what is available at convenience stores. Stoebig said that he was also interested in whether bus routes will be restructured after BRT goes in. Schaefer responded that modification of existing bus routes to complement BRT service would be needed and was important. Some initial concepts have been developed, but more detailed planning was necessary. Improvements could also be made to routes serving EJ areas independent of the BRT service.

Williams asked why people assume that the federal government will provide funding for BRT in the absence of an RTA. Schaefer noted that the initial project will be located entirely in the city of Madison. The city has budgeted the funding to cover the local share cost of the project and will need to demonstrate the ability to cover the additional operating costs. Schaefer said a Madison project would compete well for funding against other BRT projects. Williams also asked how the projected population and employment growth on the Isthmus would be accommodated. Schaefer responded that the BRT system is a first step in providing high quality transit for the growing population in the central Madison area.

Williams noted that he expects a major conflict to arise over the planned elimination of street parking on East Washington Avenue to create dedicated lanes for BRT. Schaefer said that, while there will be pushback, staff has observed that many of the people parking along East Washington Avenue are doing so to access the bus. These people may welcome the improved transit service despite the inconvenience of losing some currently available street parking.

6. Presentation on Study of Dane County Crashes Involving Bicyclists and Pedestrians

Holloway presented on the Dane County Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Study currently being completed by the MPO, detailing the study's purpose, methodology, and initial findings. He said staff was drafting a study report that would have additional information and some general recommendations. Schaefer said staff would also be working to get the study findings publicized so that local law enforcement, safety education, and public works staff and groups can use the information for their work.

Rider suggested breaking out overtaking crashes by time of day, saying that these types of crashes seem to be more common at night. Schaefer suggested that overtaking crashes and other crash types could be mapped to aid in understanding where they are occurring.

7. Committee Member Reports

None

8. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 17, 2018 at the same location.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Notes were recorded by W. Schaefer and W. Holloway.