

Statements to be Entered into Meeting Record  
Long Range Transportation Planning Committee  
Thursday, October 30, 2014  
Susan De Vos

**Item 6.** While I favor the further development of Bus Rapid Transit in the Madison Area (region), there are at least two issues with the current plan that need to accompany any “endorsement” from me:

1. There be no elimination of local service. Rather, only additions be entertained. What is being recommended is **not** only additions. On page 27 of the report, it is stated:

*Modifications made to the local bus service within each corridor are presented in the corridor analysis later in this report and are detailed in Appendix I. A list of affected routes by corridor is shown in Table 4. Significant changes assumed include the deletion of Route 5 south of the Capitol Square, Route 6 east of the Capitol Square, and Route 67; and the rerouting of Route 70 from the Capitol Square to the West Transfer Point. Route 5 along Park Street is almost entirely duplicative of the south BRT corridor with the exception of the deviation along Fisher Street. This deviation serves an important neighborhood center; however, two BRT stations would be located two blocks to the west on Park Street. Route 6 along East Washington Avenue would be replaced with a low-frequency route serving local stops west of about Milwaukee Street. East of Milwaukee Street, some service coverage would be provided by Routes 4, 34, and 20. Route 20 would be rerouted to provide service coverage on Portage Road and Hayes Road. Route 67 primarily serves trips from the West Transfer Point to West Towne, which would be served by the east-west BRT line. Local coverage along Mineral Point Road would be provided by Route 14 and potentially a lower frequency peripheral route.*

Furthermore, BRT stations would be spaced at least 3/4 miles apart whereas local transit is planned to stop much more frequently.

Can one honestly think that a bus advocate would endorse cannibalizing one system to enable another?

2. “Next steps” involve regional planning, engineering design, and funding. Madison holds half the urban population of Dane County and many people who work in Madison come in from the other half. It thus makes most sense for the County to shoulder the fiscal burden of further development of a plan that had been started with the fiscal assistance of a regional body as well. The City of Madison should not shoulder that burden. The County’s current funding of transportation projects is limited to roads and bridges. That funding should be expanded to consideration of transit.

Additionally, a federal New Starts grant would only cover 50% of the capital costs for such a scheme and nothing for operational costs. As residents of Madison pay county taxes along with other county residents, the County should be expected to pay the other 50% of the capital costs

and to oversee all the capital costs. If the county wants to sub-contract with Metro, fine, but that is another issue.