

**Item F.1. – Leg. File 35566, excerpted from the 11/5/14 Draft Minutes of the Transit and Parking Commission:**

David Trowbridge from the Planning Department, and Bill Schaefer and Mike Cechvala from the MPO, summarized the resolution and answered questions.

- The resolution would accept the Madison Transit Corridor Study prepared by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board and completed last year; and called for taking the next steps to start working with regional partners and convening a Bus Rapid Transit Intergovernmental Oversight Committee.
- The Committee would be charged with getting involved with BRT project development, conducting an environmental evaluation (NEPA) and an economic impact study, and revisiting routes and operating plans, giving finer detail to the work started by the MPO.
- This process would probably take about 18 months, inc. a few months for the Committee to be constituted.
- Staff felt that it was important for the City to make a statement at this time, because it was going through a Transportation Master Plan process, charged with looking at all transportation modes; and BRT was a system option that offered a desirable high-capacity transit alternative that they wanted to explore further.

Members and staff commented about the resolution and the BRT study as follows.

- Kovich wondered how Paratransit would fit into BRT and how it would be impacted. In talking to Kamp, it sounded like Paratransit might be enhanced, if they Fixed Route service/service area were increased. It would be good to consider this from a planning standpoint and from a stakeholder standpoint, as they looked at impact and how to implement. It seemed that Paratransit was tied in, and that there were some potential benefits they should be thinking about. The vehicles that provided the service might be used by riders who would otherwise use Paratransit. This could be a positive for stakeholder groups; perhaps small, but important.
- Kamp said a question came up through the study as to whether they would realign any of their existing bus routes. The answer was that very likely they would look at changing some routes to feeder service into the stations. And if these reached out more out into the periphery, there was the potential for the ADA Paratransit service area to expand. While ADA Paratransit wasn't a focal point, the service area could possibly be enhanced. [Please note: Schmidt arrived at this point in the meeting.]
- Weier pointed out that the change to the title of the resolution proposed by LRTPC (attached) to take out "recommendations contained in the Report".
- Trowbridge said this was suggested because the Report did not have a recommendations section, which had caused some confusion.
- Also, it was felt that because the next Committee would be revisiting the recommendations in the Study and would be reevaluating so much of it, that if the Council went on record to endorse the recommendations contained in the Report, that would be misleading as far as the next Committee's charge.
- Weier didn't quite agree with the Report's analysis of the North Side; and also didn't think it was looked at in light of equity. Though equity was briefly mentioned, it didn't seem to recognize the problems; even though it could save a lot of important time on the North Side. The Report didn't seem to favor the North Side, and asked if this observation was accurate.
- Schaefer said that though the estimating process for ridership was not as involved as they'd go through in the next phase of the study, based on ridership and based on the redevelopment potential, the North Side was viewed as the weakest among the four different corridors.
- Weier felt that this would depend on how it was laid out, and viewed from an equity perspective, on what needed the most redevelopment. The time savings there were the highest at 42% (compared to much lower rates in other areas), which meant that a lot of people suffered with very long trips currently.

- Trowbridge said this was why they didn't want to say something so strongly, such as a recommendation for a phasing, because the criteria used by the next Committee might place a higher importance on equity or connectivity of people to jobs. This was something they were digging into in the Master Plan: i.e., how to provide access from low-income areas to the BRT service, which didn't go through every low-income area; they were very dispersed, as were the job opportunities for them. This was primarily the reason for pulling back on that.
- Weier was glad to hear this. The City was placing a big emphasis on equity now, and she wanted that to be considered.
- Bergamini asked if a Title VI review would be done as part of the NEPA. Trowbridge said that an onboard survey revision would be done in part to meet the requirements of Title VI. Schaefer said some sort of broader environmental justice analysis would need to be done as part of the next process. Bergamini thought this would be another way to address these many issues of equity.

Poulson thought the process would be for the Oversight Committee to review the Corridor Study and to come up with some recommendations, which would then go through the normal process to develop proposals that would come back through the committee system and ultimately the Council could weigh in. Trowbridge said the Oversight Committee would look at this report and the work of Madison in Motion, as well as the transit feeders and demand-response and other ideas, to directly link these neighborhoods with the service.

Kovich asked how her comments and Weier's comments would be documented. Trowbridge said their comments could be excerpted from the Minutes and passed along to the Lead committee, Madison in Motion, which could then add special consideration of these items, as was done with a recommendation from the Economic Development Committee. The TPC could submit a motion to that effect.

In response to further questions, Poulson said that along with a recommendation to accept the report, the TPC could express its support for the title change proposed by LRTPC, and provide copies of the Minutes of its discussion. The TPC was the last Secondary referral to consider the resolution before it was returned to the Lead, Madison in Motion Committee. Bergamini made a motion, seconded by Kovich, to adopt the revised title from the LRTPC, and to request that the Minutes from this discussion be forwarded to Madison in Motion, to reflect the Commission's concerns about the future direction of this phase of the study. The motion passed by voice vote/other.