



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE

Monday, December 15, 2014

4:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 300 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The Meeting was called to order at 4:34 PM with verification from the Secretary that the Meeting was properly noticed and a quorum was present.

Also in attendance was J Hoffman, K van Lith, D Trowbridge, K Wolf and M Chechvala.

Present: 12 - David Ahrens; Hans J. Hinke; Rajan V. Shukla; John M. Robinson; Lance E. Green; Sam J. Breidenbach; Richard J. Pearson; Jesse J. Shields; David P. Rhode; Chelsea Chandler; Michael J. Vickerman and Sophia S. Rogers

Absent: 1 - Zachary T. Schuster

Excused: 5 - John M. Conowall; Anya M. Firszt; Jeannette E. LeZaks; Richard A. Heinemann and Bradley Campbell

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Ahrens, seconded by Rhode, to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one from the Public registered to speak.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals.

NEW BUSINESS

Motion to take #4 from the agenda out of order was made by Jesse Shields, Seconded by David Ahrens. Approved Unanimously.

1. [35566](#)

Accepting the Madison Transit Corridor (BRT) Study Report, endorsing the recommendations contained in the Report as a conceptual component of the City's strategy for addressing future transportation system planning and development, and to authorize moving forward to the next phase of project development, environmental evaluation and project implementation.

Attachments: [MPO Handout to EDC Oct 15 2014.pdf](#)
[Madison Transit Corridor Study](#)
[Final Corridor Alignment Maps](#)
[Bus Rapid Transit \(BRT\) 2-pager](#)
[Susan DeVos comments-103014.pdf](#)
[LRTPC Recommendation for Title of Leg File 35566.pdf](#)
[TPC Item F.1. - Leg. File 35566, excerpted from the 11.5.14 Draft Minutes.p](#)
[Two Page Report](#)
[Full Report](#)
[Corridor/Alignment Maps](#)
[LRTPC recommened changes to resolution-121914.pdf](#)

Trowbridge stated that he was at the November SMC meeting also talking about transportation, specifically the city's transportation study. Now he is here to talk about the BRT study and he also brought Mike Cechvala from the MPO to answer questions.

Trowbridge stated that he felt good about the study and that the only area that will be difficult will be the downtown and where the BRT goes – State Street? The Square?

Green asked what are the next steps for the project development and funding.

Cechvala indicated that it will take 3-4 years to put everything together. There are politics and funding that need to be worked out.

An RTA needs to be created. The system will need a garage which is large funding levels and that perhaps both the BRT and the bus garage could both get funding. BRT runs about \$2-4 million per mile and a garage will be between \$30-50 million.

Trowbridge indicated that the financing is key as the FTA would like help to fund the project but only at about 50%. How Metro Transit is run right now does not work in the long-term.

Green asked if we need an RTA?

Trowbridge indicated that we need to fund 50% of the project. He also indicated that the Chamber of Commerce and other businesses need to get behind this and the project needs to look at economic development more seriously.

Rogers asked about private funding.

Cechvala indicated that this was very rare and the only time he can think of is the streetcar project in Portland – that Microsoft paid for a short segment to their offices.

Chandler asked why BRT?

Cechvala indicated that there are studies going back to 1991 – looking at all different types of modes but that for cities our size we don't have the ridership to look at anything else but BRT. Transport 2020 was one of those studies and it is not cost effective at \$16-18 million per mile.

Vickerman asked about the fare structure.

Trowbridge indicated that this has not been set yet, that no system pays for itself and this will be part of the community discussion in the future.

Rogers asked if this is the right direction to go in?

Breidenbach indicated that the UW and large businesses will need to help push for this. The economic impact will help businesses.

Trowbridge indicated they are starting to do that and they are looking at developing TMA's or Transportation Management Associations – which group businesses together and then they work on transportation issues as a whole.

Hoffman asked about connection to the airport.

Cechvala indicated that the exact location of the route to the airport has yet to be determined.

Hoffman also indicated that the routes need to then look at development opportunities along the route to increase the property tax base.

Trowbridge mentioned that the developers along East Washington Ave are asking for it.

A motion was made by Green, seconded by Rogers, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion). The motion passed by voice vote/other.

2. [36159](#)

La Follette Capstone - opportunity to inform Working Groups

Attachments: [Sustainable Madison Capstone Project 12.8.2014.docx](#)
[LaGro_CRSC Best Practices_final.pdf](#)

Hoffman gave a quick update – that the proposal was sent in and we are waiting to hear.

3. [36552](#)

Energy and carbon follow up --commission a study of alternatives that can drive emissions reductions

Attachments: [2010-05-06-LGO-1.1.pdf](#)
[2012 LGOP REPORT_Final.pdf](#)
[City Of Madison Local Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis8-3'](#)
[City of Madison Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory.docx](#)
[ghg-inventory-full.pdf](#)
[ICLEI U.S. Community Protocol - July2013-Version1.1.pdf](#)
[Madison Community Carbon Inventory May 2014.pdf](#)
[Madison GHG Report Final Draft.pdf](#)

Shukla indicated that the rate case with MGE was approved.

Chandler sent around a report on King County and highlighted section 4.

Green indicated that it seemed like a big effort.

Chandler indicated that the consultants worked on it for one year and then handed it off to the city.

Shukla mentioned that Richard Heinemann is not here but that he is looking into the MOU between the City of Minneapolis and Excel Energy.

Hoffman explained the difference between the MOU and the King County Study.

Ahrens asked what will the study do?

Hoffman indicated the differences between a pollution inventory and the MOU.

Shukla wondered if there is a difference.

Shields indicated that the committee needs to decide what it wants.

Vickerman indicated that in the past We Energy asked for a higher RES than the law – through a settlement – and the utility showed leadership – but that the utility needed support from the community. If MGE did something similar they would need support from the community.

Shukla indicated that we need to look at the legal issues regarding franchising – which in MN are term limited but in WI are unlimited. Richard Heinemann will be looking into this more.

4. [36553](#) Spotlight: Sustainability and the Arts

Karin Wolf talked about Central Part art and storm water working together. She is looking to pass a percentage for art ordinance.

Wolf also talked about the BLINK program, which provides small amounts of funding for art that can have a civic element, such as Wingra – recording interviews or the rain catchment that looks like water lilies.

Wolf talked about a project along the Yahara where 7-10 artists did installations along the river. One installation was red tears in the trees – it was very visual statement.

Wolf also spoke about an installation going in at Meadowridge Library – the artist is an environmental artist using materials that would usually get land filled.

The Library got a grant for Central through the NEA.

The City has tried to get a grant through the UW – so far not successful.

The theme is to educate through art. So a crazy idea would be to have an artist work for Streets – and help educate people about recycling through art.

Wolf also mentioned that they are developing standards for the BLINK program and trying to get more funding for the arts. Ideally the city would have an art education program in all neighborhoods. Wolf indicated that she is working with the schools on this.

Wolf also talked about the east side art installation of the tree – made from “junk”.

Wolf stated that they will also have a database of all the BLINK projects on the city’s web site soon.

Wolf mentioned the pod that was installed as a part of a conference at Monona Terrace – which got a lot of attention. Monona Terrace has now hired David Wells to do more installations this next summer, such as art on the river from Dubuque, IA. Art will be going on the roof and walk way.

Pearson asked about Seattle

Wolf stated that Seattle is the place that we can learn from. She mentioned that a water treatment facility used art in the building of one of their treatment facilities and now people get married there!

Green suggested that the City needs to get this art information on the City’s web site.

Robertson asked what can SMC do to help about the percentage for art?

Wolf also talked about Central Library and how art was incorporated into the design of the building. There was little money for art but art was incorporated

into the building. The foundation did purchase some art that you also see in the building.

Green asked if we can use our sustainable funding for this?

Wolf suggested an artist in resident program for the recycling department.

Shukla indicated that the committee would need to decide about the funding.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Vickerman talked about the RENEW Conference.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Ahrens, seconded by Robinson, to Adjourn at 6:00 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.