



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

**PLEASE NOTE: This meeting can be viewed in a live webcast of Madison City Channel at
www.madisoncitychannel.com.**

Wednesday, December 14, 2011

5:00 PM

Room 201, City-County Building
City Council Chambers
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 PM.

Present: 9 -

Chris Schmidt; Ald. Lisa Subeck; David E. Tolmie; Amanda F. White;
Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M.
Streit and Kenneth Golden

Absent: 1 -

Ald. Bridget R. Maniaci

Please note: There is one vacancy on the Commission for Second Alternate.
White arrived at 5:06 PM, and Subeck arrived at 5:35 PM.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Schmidt, to Approve the Minutes
of the November 9, 2011 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.1. [24785](#)

Parking: November 2011 Activity Report, Remediation & Dis/Vet Parking charts, and
October Revenue/Expense & Occupancy Reports - TPC 12.14.11

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch talked about going online with
real-time counts of available parking at six Parking facilities.

- Parking had worked on this for seven years.
- The counts refreshed every minute.
- Parkers could access the info on their smartphones.
- Making it easier to find parking, the new application would help reduce traffic congestion and related pollution.
- Several thousand flyers with a scannable QR code were being printed and would be available for people to scan with their smartphones, which captured the URL address and connected parkers directly to the real-time data online.

Knobloch discussed the line chart of remediation costs from 2003 to 2011,
and projected through 2012, which clearly showed costs were increasing

sharply. But, he thought the chart actually understated the situation. Knobeloch had asked their consulting engineer to provide info about Gov East in the event that its replacement was delayed, to show which repairs were critical and would have to be done in the next few years. He predicted that with a delay at Gov East, the line would jump off the chart. The Utility's facilities were on average over 40 years old. A summary of the consultant's report would be forwarded to the Commission. Knobeloch also pointed out the bar graph related to the usage of metered spaces by people with disabilities, which averaged about 13-14% and had remained stable over the last few years. When asked about the many white lines on the floors in Gov East, Knobeloch said they identified spots where remediation was needed; and unfortunately, some of these had been repaired only two years ago.

Regarding Judge Doyle Square, Knobeloch thought Kimley-Horn had done a good job of using many different sources to get public input. They were still gathering information and hadn't come to any conclusions yet. Pretty soon they would have to set down a design; and there was lots of variability in what they could do. City staff and the three consultant groups -- ULI and Carl Walker, the Utility and Walker Parking, and Kimley-Horn, with Dave Trowbridge and George Austin among others -- met the previous day for their first session to discuss a joint design, putting the two blocks together.

Schmitz/Schmidt made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [24790](#)

Metro YTD Performance Indicators and Financial Report, and Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Reports - TPC 12.14.11

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted the following items:

- Ridership for October 2011 was up 14.6% over October 2010. This appeared to be the highest monthly ridership ever; and Metro appeared to be on track for a 40-year record.
- Financials: Metro was into their reserves by \$108,480. They had expected to be even more overbudget due to diesel costs. As seen in Expenses, "Fuel, Oil, Lubricants" were \$538,784 overbudget, driving the overrun. But with savings from lower parts and paratransit costs, and higher passenger revenues from ridership, the overrun had been kept to \$108K so far. BOE and the Comptroller had been informed of this year-end adjustment, due to diesel.

Streit/Tolmie made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [24468](#)

A Resolution Adopting the Downtown Plan as a Supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

Registrant Ledell Zellers, 510 N. Carroll, 53703, commented as follows.

- Both living and working downtown, she was very interested in what was in the Plan, which she thought generally a strong and good plan.
- Re: the study of Johnson & Gorham to consider converting it to a 2-way street, the study should go beyond Wisconsin Avenue to Broom and Bassett Streets also for study as 2-way streets, per the recommendation of the draft Mansion Hill Plan.
- A reference to car-sharing programs (like Community Car) should be

included. Such programs helped reduce cars of downtown residents; and offered an option to downtown employers, whose employees took transit to work and might need access to a car for appointments, etc.

- Page 85 talked about a Langdon mid-block pedestrian path/walkway, which was a great idea. But, the picture on the page showed a vehicle. It should be made clear this was a ped pathway.
- Language should be included to address the acute problem of mo-ped parking on front lawns and terraces downtown.
- A recommendation should be included to investigate increasing the cost of residential permits. Right now, annual permits were virtually free, and didn't really pay for the cost of cars to be able to park on-street. It could also encourage people to give up their cars.
- Zellers thanked City staff for doing an admirable job on the Plan.

Michael Waidelich of the Planning Department made the following remarks about the Downtown Plan.

- Other downtown plans preceded this one: the Downtown 2000 Plan, prepared in 1989, and the Downtown Plan, prepared in 1970. Though this was the next comprehensive downtown plan, it did not start anew: To a large extent, it was based on recommendations that appeared first in the Comprehensive Plan, which itself was based on a study called "The Downtown Advisory Report" done two years earlier, with a lot of public input.
- It had been a long process putting the Plan together, which started in Spring 2008, and was delayed somewhat by other planning projects. In September 2010, a booklet of draft recommendations (without explanatory narrative and data) had been put out, which generated a lot of comment. Based on that, changes were made. One change in the organization of the Plan made it easier to follow, though it was still a fairly complicated document because all the sections of the Plan were inter-related and referred to one another.
- The Plan was organized around nine key ideas.
- "Celebrate the lakes": The #1 most popular idea, people recognized that the City needed to embrace its two lakefronts better than it had. Historically a lot of business activities were on the lakes that were no longer there, and we now had additional opportunities.
- "Strengthen the region's economic engine": Key to that was making the downtown an engaging place and creating the energy to attract the footloose, education-based worker and businesses that everyone wanted to grow locally. With a major university and medical center, the area had a lot going for it as an economic location. How might the downtown contribute to this by providing locations, infrastructure and amenities to make it more attractive?
- "Ensure a quality urban environment": The Plan contained recommendations for making the downtown even cooler.
- "Maintain strong neighborhoods and districts": The downtown was a quiltwork of different districts and neighborhoods with different characteristics. How might we enhance and strengthen them, even as they evolve, to maintain the sense that the downtown offered different places to go to with a little different feel?
- "Enhance liveability": Having had success over the past 10-15 years with new residents downtown and more housing development, how might we build on this?
- Other key ideas were: Increase transportation choices; build on historic resources (many of which were located in the downtown); expand recreational, cultural and entertainment offerings; and become a model of sustainability. Downtowns were inherently sustainable, being more compact with more transit

and more walkability/bikeability; but how might we go beyond that to become more sustainable?.

- Though focusing now on Key 6 (transportation choices), many transportation recommendations appeared in other parts of the Plan as well. Also, other plans dealt with large-scale transportation issues, such as the Comprehensive Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan and any number of more specific planning activities now. This Plan was not intended to preempt these other efforts, but to work with them and help create a vision for the downtown for the next 20 years.

Waidelich then discussed recommendations in Key 6, Increase Transportation Choices. The focus was to improve connections and transportation choices between downtown and near downtown activity centers (i.e., the Square, government, State Street, UW, Capital East district), and outlying communities; and to increase choices within the downtown itself to move around more easily.

To help do this, the Plan called for: high-quality ped, bike, streetscape amenities; compact, interconnected, intensively developed blocks; multimodal travel opportunities; efficient street networks; excellent access to high frequency mass transit; on-street structures and underground parking to meet the needs that become apparent, and eventual redevelopment of large surface parking lots (with redevelopment opportunities, came the need to address what to do with parking).

Recommendations for "Connections to Other Cities" included:

- Continue to plan for high-speed rail service to downtown. Though this had been deferred, it was still an important goal for the downtown. Intercity rail service should be important as the nation developed a more energy-efficient and engaging future in which people could travel to nearby metro areas by train as well as car or bus.
- Locate the train station in the vicinity of Monona Terrace. Though the station could end up somewhere else, it was important to keep it on the agenda.
- Provide intermodal facilities located near the rail station so people could connect to buses traveling to/from other cities and to Metro buses within the city.
- Provide universal transit shuttle service between downtown and Dane County Airport.

Recommendations for "Transit Service" included:

- Expand transit options within the downtown and to other parts of the city. The isthmus focused transit corridors, which gave the downtown good transit access.
- Continue to support the creation of an RTA.
- Consider a commuter rail system, and other forms of express transit. Studies had shown that to really expand employment downtown, high-capacity transit was needed, which could include commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and express bus service. But we shouldn't lose track of the fact that a rail ran along the edge of the downtown, close to major employment centers.
- Encourage transit-oriented development near transit stations.
- Improve Metro, with additional passenger amenities like shelters, signage, scheduling.
- Develop a downtown circulator system. Though previous attempts had not been really successful, maybe we hadn't yet found the right way to do it.

Beyond walking and cabs, we needed a way to move people among places downtown (for example, from a hotel to Overture and other places, and back).

- Utilize new transportation technology (using computers for traffic flow, real time signage for parking and buses).

Recommendations for "Complete Streets" included:

- Provide streets that accommodate vehicles, bikes, pedestrians, and transit vehicles (on transit routes).
- Consider converting some one-way streets to two-way. Visitors often commented how difficult it was to get around because of the one-way streets. Some things were facilitated by one-way streets as well. But the issue should be at least be reviewed, as would now occur as part of the Comprehensive Transportation Study.
- Improve safety and aesthetics at key intersections, esp. those that were gateways to the downtown and were not easy to use for bikes, peds, or vehicles (like Blair-Williamson-John Nolen).
- Restripe W. Washington to have bike lanes and one lane of traffic each way. Right now, it wasn't clear where the lanes were and where bikes were supposed to be.

Recommendations for "Parking" included:

- Provide a balanced approach to parking. Parking was a controversial issue, and parking studies often ended up with inconclusive results. Though a challenge, we should work to balance the need to find a place to park downtown, with the understandable desire that not everybody can drive downtown, and promote other modes--bus, bike, walking.
- Continue to evaluate the need for on-site parking on a project-by-project basis. Some additions to parking capacity have occurred as part of private projects. Continue to look at this as an opportunity to provide the parking the development needed, with a little extra to help others out, when appropriate.
- Address backyard parking. People were still parking illegally in backyards. This should be considered as redevelopment occurred, when this parking might be accommodated within the development.
- Study the City's role in providing parking in future. Over the years, there had been discussion about public vs. private, constraints on the Utility, what kind of parking, how their bonds were structured, etc. Public parking was an important part of the mix, but not the only thing that could be done.
- Try to encourage parking underground, eliminate surface lots, and align parking with something else, putting parking in the interior and storefronts on the sidewalk.

Recommendations for "Bicycle Facilities" included:

- Improve and expand bicycle facilities.
- Consider contraflow lanes on some one-way streets. Though this was not always a good idea, it should be considered in certain situations. Bikers sometimes went a long way out of their way to get where they were going.
- Add bike lanes to East and West Washington, Broom and Bassett.
- Provide ample parking, convenient to where bikers are going.
- Continue to build and enhance bicycle infrastructure generally.
- Expand opportunities for visitor and intermittent use of bicycles, to be able to use a bike and leave it somewhere else (vs. returning it to where it was rented).

Recommendations for "Pedestrian Connections" included:

- Improve connections by creating and improving sidewalks and multi-use paths where we can.
- Enhance streetscapes, esp. on certain streets and ped routes, inc. those from certain parking ramps to popular destinations.
- Among other ped improvements, complete a path between James Madison Park and the Memorial Union, create the Langdon Mid-Block Path, and extend the East Campus Mall to Brittingham Park.

Recommendations for "Wayfinding" included:

- Improve signage to help pedestrians get around downtown, and to designate historic districts.
- Look at signage for bikeways and major ped routes.

Recommendations for "TDM Plans" included:

- Encourage preparation of TDM plans by major downtown employers to manage how employees get to/from their business that deemphasize single-occupancy automobiles and promote alternatives, like transit, bicycling, car-pooling and walking.
- Require TDM plans for major developments as part of their approval process.
- Consider forming a Transportation Management Associations (TMA), for several enterprises or for businesses in a certain area to do a joint transportation plan which might offer opportunities that weren't available in a single entity.

With regard to the "Comprehensive Transportation Study":

- The Study would be city-wide and cover areas way beyond those covered by the Downtown Plan. The Downtown Plan didn't include some recommendations that it might have because their impact would have gone beyond the downtown area.
- The Study would be an opportunity to tie transportation modes together on a city-wide basis. How will the transit system, the street system, the location of parking ramps, all work together?

Waidelich said staff hoped the Commission would take some action, and pass the Plan along with comments and recommendations. Fourteen groups would be reviewing the Plan, and if there were referrals, the process would take a very long time.

Members appreciated the three years of hard work put into the Plan by staff and committee members, and thought it a good plan generally. However, members felt the Plan focused too much on the short term and lacked a long-term vision (how we wanted the Downtown to look in 40-50 years). Along with written comments submitted by members (attached), Commissioners raised questions and made comments and suggestions, as follows.

- Incorporate TMA's into the zoning code, to the extent it can be mandated to either property owners or larger business and office concerns. Leaving it as an option would not be workable.
- Related to the discussion of shuttles and visitors, emphasize downtown linkage to/from the Alliant Center more.
- Add a bus-time map if feasible, along with a drive-time map.
- Distinguish between regular visitors/commuters from neighboring communities, and infrequent visitors from further away. Their knowledge of the city was different, and Plan recommendations for such things as parking and way-finding should be sensitive to that.

- Linkage between Monona Terrace and the rest of the commercial/retail downtown was incomplete, and perhaps Pinckney Street should be added to the list of streets for enhanced pedestrian facilities/amenities.
- Be bold about de-emphasizing vehicular use downtown, esp. in light of limited right-of-way and discussions about street direction and bike facilities. For example, Strassbourg removed lanes from streets, built high-capacity light rail service, and placed parking facilities outside of the city-center. To go so far as to try to improve the environment for pedestrians and bikes and to have a shuttle, the Plan could be more visionary and could expressly state the goal of limiting vehicular use long-term, even if this is a few generations away. At the same time, access to any point in the downtown by means of high-capacity transit, shuttle service, biking facilities, etc. should be guaranteed.
- While the Plan contained many good recommendations, it lacked an overall vision or goal: In the end, what would transportation in and to/from downtown look like? The Plan needed an over-arching vision of where we eventually want to get to. To what end were the individual recommendations made?
- The Plan didn't address commuting issues. Suggestions contained in the Plan (such as adding bus/bike amenities) were good, and were likely offered by people who already used buses and bikes. But how do we get (new) people on the bus? Parts of the community didn't use the bus because they felt it wasn't an efficient ride for them (it took too long, the stop was too far from their house, etc.) Even with a Comprehensive Transportation study in the long-term, before the Downtown Plan was finalized, it should address the question: How do we help people better commute downtown, to add to a vibrant and thriving downtown?
- The Plan lacked a vision of how younger generations would use transportation: What would their needs be in the next 10 or 20 years? The Plan was a wish-list for the short-term, but didn't look at the long-term re: how people would move in out of the downtown conveniently.
- The Plan lacked a list of future legitimate modes of transportation, like bicycles. Bicycles seemed to just be thrown in here and there in the Plan; but it needed to be legitimized as a serious mode of transportation. The list should include bicycles, along with buses, automobiles, car-sharing, commuter cars, and B-Cycle.
- On page 76, remove the statement that the RTA recommended commuter rail: The RTA plan for transit did not recommend commuter passenger rail. While commuter rail could be discussed in this Plan, it was not part of an RTA recommendation.
- Alarming, 2000 census data showed that, even in dense, transit-friendly neighborhoods, the number of cars/household had gone up (to 1.7 cars/household), with only 2-3 persons in an average downtown household. With the trend was going the wrong way then, it would be good to know what 2010 data showed now. Word-of-mouth was that more and more students were bringing cars to campus, despite what had been done with transportation (inc. TDM, bikes and mopeds, etc.). Apparently, it was still hard to get around on Campus.
- The Plan needed to focus more on Intelligent Transportation Systems specifically for mass transit, and include such things as traffic signal prioritization.
- The Plan should include efficiencies for bus and pedestrians (i.e., narrowing streets), not only those for cars.
- The Plan needed to get realistic about where to put a train and intercity buses, etc. Cramming all this at/around Gov East would not work: Too many tear-downs would have to occur, and too many diesel fumes would fill an area

intended to be comfortable for people, esp. visitors.

- A 24-hour bus system should be considered. Students would continue to bring cars to Campus until transit provided a way to get home safely from the library at 4-6 AM.
- In preparing the Plan, staff and committee members were asked to put the cart before the horse: Without a robust Transportation Plan that addressed a lot of issues that had been raised and that set specific goals, priorities and a vision, it would be hard to develop that piece within the Downtown Plan. Without this, (naturally) the recommendations in the Plan seemed rather piecemeal. For example, what were our goals for reducing vehicle miles traveled?
- The Plan should discuss marketing. The "Smart Trips" program (started in Portland) marketed existing transportation choices to neighborhoods, and saw a reduction in car trips of 9% per neighborhood, without adding any new infrastructure. Madison seemed to invest in infrastructure (for bikes and transit) without investing in marketing these assets.
- The Plan should emphasize the use of technology to better promote bike, transit and parking systems.
- The Plan should include a goal that 20% of trips in Madison be made by bike by 2020.
- Though supportive of Plan recommendations for W. Washington (striping, buffered bike lanes, etc.), staff should check with Traffic Engineering about this since TE had previously indicated such changes were not feasible, due to space and parking issues.
- The bicycle component of the Plan was lacking. European cities had 40-50% trips made by bike, by creating separate bicycling facilities. Buffered bike lanes between cars and bikes helped moms, kids, seniors feel more comfortable biking.
- The Plan suggested amenities and improvements to the downtown to make it more liveable and attractive for residents, workers, and visitors. Did it discuss delivery vehicles (suppliers) and their impact?
- The number cited for bus trips around the Outer Loop seemed low, and should be re-checked.
- Because of our unusual street grid, It would be difficult for people to navigate the downtown whether streets were one-way or two-way. People would still get lost. At least, lack of familiarity made drivers slow down.
- Re: the Outer Loop and other downtown streets: Narrow the streets, take a lane, make pedestrian rights-of-way broader, install street-side amenities, have dedicated bus lanes, install bus shelters; and deal with the key issue of delivery traffic, look at rail corridors (for freight), and how to work with this commercial network to make small storefront businesses viable, which was central to the Plan.
- Instead of focusing only on efficiency for cars, consider the look and feel of the whole area for people in all modes.
- While all good, these suggestions, in isolation, would be hard to implement without an overall vision. Was the city really ready to adopt a strategy like Strassbourg, which abandoned automobiles in its central commercial district, in order to implement these?
- While worth aspiring to, some of these ideas would be hard to achieve. For example, 24-hour transit service was not financially sustainable; and removing parking and installing bike facilities had not historically been popular among businesses.
- In making a series of incremental changes like these, care was needed not to thoughtlessly support pro-transit and anti-parking measures that would strike

fear into the business community. While some of this could be accomplished, a shared vision with the business community and more marketing and discussion with other segments was needed before going this route. It wouldn't be good for Madison to lose its competitive edge because businesses viewed some other community as friendlier to vehicles and more sustainable for them.

- Perhaps, identifying these changes as a vision for 2050 would allow the community to prepare.
- Though a Transportation Plan was needed, the Downtown Plan was not intended to be that. The Downtown Plan contained a lot of different pieces taken from a lot of different places, which was fine, because the place for transportation innovation was not in a Downtown Plan. That belonged in a different plan developed by other agencies and committees (MPO, TPC, etc.).
- Attitudes towards transportation and alternate modes had changed in the past 20 years, from simply thinking that more parking was needed to enlightened business owners who were providing commute cards and bike amenities, and promoting car- and ride-sharing.
- If attitudes could change like this so quickly over the past 15-20 years, what would they be 20 years from now?
- We were talking about something big when we talked about a Transportation Plan. And when we talked about transportation just within the downtown, it was different, calling for a little of this and that.

Planning staff responded as follows to questions/comments.

- The statistic that 3% of trips were made by bikes was based on 2000 census data, and specifically related to trips to work (located) downtown.
- Certain other info (such as average # of cars/household) from the 2010 census was not yet available.
- Recommendation #122 on page 74, generally stated: Utilize intelligent system technology (i.e., traveler info), and other wayfinding improvements. However, other specific intelligent transportation system enhancements should be added.
- The topic of how to bring things in/out of the downtown was discussed at a project level and in the zoning code. The issue was challenging because the downtown lacked alleys and suppliers now used big trucks. Though the issue was probably more site-specific than the Plan tended to address, it could be added to the Plan, esp. since the topic came up frequently on a practical level.
- The Plan contained many recommendations about the Outer Loop, mostly with regard to its relative unattractiveness compared to the Square (partly because it was used to divert transit and vehicular traffic from the Square), and its lack of amenities. The issue of improving the Outer Loop was challenged by the number of lanes there; and no one was saying that a lane should taken/used to create a wider terrace and bike path.
- The topic of changing the direction of the flow on the Outer Loop was not discussed. That was part of the bigger issue of reviewing the whole system of (one-way) streets and traffic flow. Visitors and bikes had a hard time getting around downtown, with its many one-way streets.

Referring to pages 80-81, Parking's Knobloch made the following remarks.

- He was happy to see the comment about TIF for public parking, because when TIF was provided only to the private sector, the Utility could not readily compete.
- The Plan said nothing about the Utility maintaining its current inventory of parking. If big money was not put into the current aging parking stock over the

next 20 years, the Utility would eventually have to lock its doors. A keystone to the UW's transportation plan was to maintain its current inventory of 13,000 stalls, while having all the growth in other modes -- similar to what the City was trying to do.

- Some on-street parking was being lost for various reasons; but certain businesses around town (on Regent and Williamson) could benefit from better turnover on their streets with either 2-hour parking or more meters.

After staff and member comments concluded, Schmitz proposed that maybe the Transportation section of the Downtown Plan be set aside until the Comprehensive Transportation Plan was prepared, at which point a Transportation section for the Downtown Plan could be done, which fit into that.

Schmitz cited the RTA plan for transit, as an example of a bigger, more visionary statement: Create a transit system that allows autos, buses, bikes, trains, airport passengers, and pedestrians to function compatibly, within a coordinated, modernized system. (And from this would eventually come specific items like better bus shelters.) This was what people should be looking at right now, and should be the mission of the City's Transportation Plan. Then, the Downtown Transportation section would slide into that.

Schmitz/Subeck made a motion to recommend that the Transportation section of the Downtown Plan be set aside until completion of the City's Transportation Plan. Bergamini offered a friendly amendment to the motion to say that the Transportation section of the Downtown Plan be "set aside and rewritten after the completion" of the City's Transportation Plan.

Poulson asked if the Commission had a recommendation for the overall Plan, apart from its recommendation for the Transportation section.

While in sympathy with the sentiment, Golden felt the Plan had to move on and that the Commission couldn't just redact the transportation elements of it and have it be a meaningful plan. Though an opinion not shared by everyone, Golden felt the authors of the Plan had done a good job of finding all the debris of transportation scattered among many different plans from the past 40 years and putting it into the Plan. What they didn't do was prepare the Transportation Plan (work, which should be done by the TPC and others).

Golden offered an alternate approach that the Commission approve the Plan subject to the comments made at the meeting, to be presented to Plan Commission for their consideration; and ask that the Plan be amended to specifically reference the future Transportation Plan, which recommendations when adopted, would be incorporated into the Downtown Plan by amendment. With this approach, if the completed Transportation Plan were substantially different from or went beyond what was now in the Downtown Plan, it would at that time become the way we would do transportation in the downtown. Perhaps this would get the Commission where it wanted to go, without redacting what had been done.

Schmidt agreed with Golden. On a practical level, this was an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and would have a role in the Plan Commission deliberations; if the Transportation section were taken out of the Plan, there would be a time when those recommendations wouldn't have any force at all.

Schmidt thought it safer to work on what was there, and use the language suggested by Golden. Either way, we would have to do an amendment to the Downtown Plan; procedurally later on, it would amount to the same thing. But in the interim (perhaps a couple years), if redacted, we would lack the benefit of some of the recommendations which would probably have a substantial impact on PUD's that would come along downtown.

Schmidt/Golden made an alternate motion that the Transportation section be retained, that the Commission's comments be forwarded to the bodies, and recommend that a statement be included to say the Plan should be amended upon completion of the city-wide Transportation Plan.

White noted that Golden's verbiage talked about amending the Plan to include a reference to the City Transportation Plan. She said the Downtown Plan already included a statement that it "would support the vision and goals" of such a city-wide Transportation Plan. Also, she felt it strange to support something that might well be null and void after the Transportation Plan was created; it was an odd timing situation.

Schmitz said she had numerous recommendations/comments on the Transportation section, and wondered what would happen to those. She said that if she agreed to the alternate motion, she wanted to see some changes in the Transportation section. Golden offered an amendment to Schmidt's alternate motion, that would add some of his original language, to approve the Plan "subject to the comments made at this meeting" and submitted at this meeting (having heard no disagreement about the comments that had been made). As to comments that had not yet been made, he had submitted written comments prior to the meeting, in order to avoid verbalizing all of them at the meeting. He suggested that Schmitz either make her comments now or submit them directly to the Plan Commission.

Schmidt restated his alternate motion (to the original motion), that the Commission recommend approval of the Downtown Plan, subject to the comments contained in the Minutes and additional materials provided by Commission members; and that the Transportation section should be revised and go through the amendment process once the city-wide Transportation Plan was completed. Without objection from the body, Schmitz withdrew her original motion.

Bergamini said that a number of points had been discussed, and there seemed to be pretty good consensus about a lot of things. But she had no idea what Schmitz had in her comments not yet presented. She wondered if the Commission would consider those comments a sense of the whole group, as endorsed by the whole group or not. She wanted to hear the group speak as a Commission, to put everything together and be visionary.

Schmidt said that when resolutions were forwarded with comments, it was generally understood that individual comments were from the individual. However, the Commission could take the opportunity to continue talking, discuss individual comments, and highlight them in some fashion.

Tolmie wondered about gathering all the comments together and put them before the Commission, so they could defer the decision about the motion or the approval until the next meeting. That way, they could get all the comments

together and speak as a Commission, vs. having random comments emailed in. White added that, along those lines, perhaps if the comments were given to the committee managing the Plan, then a new draft of the Transportation section could come back the TPC, based on those comments. The TPC would then have something to base their discussion around. Though it would draw out the 3-year process further, White was uncomfortable enough with the Transportation chapter, that spending more time on it was warranted.

A substitute motion was made by Golden, seconded by Schmitz, to Re-refer the resolution to the January meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION to allow staff to prepare the Minutes with staff and member comment, and to allow members to submit additional written comments to staff by December 21, 2011, so that the entire package could be presented to the Commission for review. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2. [24719](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a long-term parking lease with Shine Advertising Co., LLC, for 35-50 parking stalls at Overture Center parking garage.

Parking's Knobeloch provided some background re: the lease with Shine Advertising. He introduced Angie Radecke, Comptroller at Shine Advertising, who was available for questions. Knobeloch said that Shine had recently purchased and was renovating the White Horse Inn. Across the street stood the Overture parking garage, with low occupancy. A long-term lease at State Street Cap had just been terminated. Shine wanted 35-50 stalls at Overture. These were not reserved stalls. Shine parkers would get a "prox card" like other renters there. This would be a 5-year lease, with a 5-year renewal at the rate then current.

White recused herself because the Bike Federation received pro bono work from Shine. A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Ald. Subeck, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:

- Absent:** 1 -
Ald. Maniaci
- Recused:** 1 -
White
- Ayes:** 7 -
Schmidt; Ald. Subeck; Tolmie; Bergamini; Schmitz; Streit and Golden
- Non Voting:** 1 -
Poulson

F.3. [24786](#)

Metro: Request to hold hearing on Fitchburg service changes - TPC 12.14.11

Between the two scenarios presented (attached), Kamp said that the Fitchburg Transit Commission had chosen May 27th scenario. Kamp requested permission to hold a hearing regarding the service changes, though it wasn't certain whether this would be in February, March or April. Metro would provide monthly updates about this. Stemming from Fitchburg's budget decision to cut \$12,000, the list of potential service cuts was shown on the agenda attachment. Kamp said it wasn't necessary to go over the details, since Fitchburg was still sorting this out. If the Commission was comfortable doing so, Kamp asked for permission to hold a hearing, with an update to follow in January or February.

Subeck/Tolmie made a motion to give Metro permission to hold such a hearing. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.4. [24788](#)

Metro: Update on Metro's bus fleet - Jeff Butler, Metro Maintenance Manager, and Ann Gullickson, Metro Transit Service Manager - TPC 12.14.11

Kamp said this presentation related to some items that had recently been brought before the Commission: Metro had expanded its fleet given a recent bus purchase, a new bus procurement was coming up, and Metro had a new bus Maintenance Manager, Jeff Butler. Metro Transit Services Manager, Ann Gullickson, introduced Butler, who was promoted six months ago, replacing Jim Dregson who retired after 30 years.

Referring to the chart (attached), Gullickson and Butler shared the following history and information about the fleet and maintenance unit.

- When planning for the route restructure back in 1997, Metro purchased 35 buses and grew their fleet from 163 to 198 buses, and remained at that number for a decade.
- Ridership increases in the past couple years had allowed Metro to creep that number up. Instead of retiring several old buses when new ones were added, they had kept one or two. After the recent purchase, they had decided to keep five, because of increased demand for service in Verona, 14% growth in the current service area, and overcrowding in commuter hours.
- Metro now had 209 buses, and would be adding 14 more next summer.
- They would keep evaluating the dynamic between expanded service and decisions to incrementally add buses, which pushed against the reality of an overcrowded facility, including the gymnastics of Butler's crew every night to get these buses cleaned, ready and parked in a way to get out for service in the morning.
- Metro would continue look at both short- and long-term ways to deal with the fleet size, such as leasing another facility or a satellite facility.
- The new buses arriving next summer would be the last of the current 75-bus, 5-year purchase. Metro was just starting a new RPF to go out to bid on buses to be added over the next five years, in order to be able to award a contract in time to have buses delivered in 2013.
- The fleet mix now was all standard 40-foot buses. The bus size study would be looking at whether there should be a different mix: Should there be smaller buses, articulated buses, or should we continue with 40-foot buses?
- Eight years, Metro came to the TPC with the idea of hybrid buses, to look at what could be done to have Green Energy in the fleet. It was time to look at this again, to see what sort of opportunities were abroad: Did hybrid buses continue to be the best Green alternative in the long run? The \$200K price differential for hybrids had not come down (likely because other communities like Madison were willing to pay the difference). Metro would come back in a year or two with what they found, which might be that hybrids remained the best alternative.

Poulson thought there must other (Green) technologies/improvements that should be considered. Bergamini said that though there were other technologies, she wouldn't expect price differentials to change very soon, because the number of buses produced was so small that there was little economy of scale. She wondered if this was true. Gullickson said that Metro's research was just beginning, but she was aware that for example, the price differential between a standard diesel bus and a CNG (compressed natural gas)

bus was about \$40-50K (vs. \$200K+ for hybrids). One consideration in leasing or building another facility vs. remodeling its current facility, would be the capacity and cost to provide monitoring and safety equipment for CNG buses possibly.

Issues and questions were raised by members, which staff answered as follows.

- Metro did still have the five historic buses (listed at the top of the chart) available for viewing; but might be in the market for a buyer (ex. a museum) of these buses to help free up space.
- Re: the expected life span of hybrids vs. diesels, hybrids had outperformed the diesels. They cost a little more to maintain, but required less maintenance than diesels. In looking at the cost of hybrids vs. diesels, Metro looked at whether they could recoup the difference in cost from both gas and maintenance costs.
- Two wheelchair spaces were the number spec'd/needed for regular buses (vs. four for paratransit).
- Was there any data to show adding certain extras/amenities (like real-time bus info) were cost-effective in terms of bringing additional riders to transit?
- Issues like the ever-expanding fleet and the value of the property where the current facility stood were all part of Metro's (strategic) long-range facility planning process. The bus size study would help with this by looking at such questions as: what was the future for fuel, what about the service lane and bus-washing activities, etc.?
- Occasionally, a bicyclist was turned away because a bus didn't have enough bike racks. Some buses already had three-slot racks, but there were problems with DMV's in some states re: lighting and illumination standards. For that reason, the newest buses came with two-slot racks. Though Metro preferred the 3-slot racks, they were waiting for the lighting issues (in these other states) to be resolved rather than facing the possibility of having to remove 3-slot racks from all their buses.

Poulson thanked Gullickson and Butler for their presentation.

F.5. [24787](#)

Metro: Update on Transit Mutual Insurance Rating Program - Ann Gullickson, Metro Transit Service Manager - TPC 12.14.11

Gullickson referred to the attachment, which showed the Schedule Rating Plan review of Transit Mutual Insurance Corp. of Wisconsin (TMI).

- TMI had a program to encourage transit systems that got insurance from them to undertake safety programs that they thought would mitigate their losses.
- Each year TMI evaluated some of the efforts made by each transit system. In 2011, Metro received the highest rating possible in each area identified by TMI and would receive a reduction in their premium for each item, resulting in roughly \$28K in savings to Metro.
- Among the five items listed, most interesting was Item 2 re: Implementation of a written Mobility Device and Stroller, Cart, etc. Securement Policy.
- After much discussion at the TPC, a policy decision was made not to support such strong enforcement as was proposed by staff because of the message staff was getting from the insurance company to do so. And yet, Metro got the highest rating for this item.
- When asked, TMI said the highest rating was given because of the amount of education Metro did in the community and with parents re: the safety issue of children in strollers, through public discussion and information posted on its

website, as well as through its stroller give-aways and feedback on them.

- So, even though the decision was not made to strictly enforce the stroller policy, Metro got credit for the efforts it made to educate everyone.
- Metro got loss runs every month, which was used in a rolling 5-year period. If a system had a significantly bad history, it would take five years to get away from it.

Members applauded the report. Kamp explained that TMI was unique in focusing on transit operations. In addition to doing the audit, they rode on buses and came to the facility, and pointed out things to work on. TMI's board was made up of risk managers and transit service managers, inc. Gullickson, who had just been reappointed by the Mayor to serve another term. [Please note: Subeck left at this point in the meeting, at 7:10 PM.]

**G. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only
(Most recent meeting minutes attached, if available)**

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

No action was needed on these items.

H. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

H.1. General announcements by Chair - None.

H.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Schmitz asked that Brian Conger from B-Cycle be invited to the January meeting, to report on their findings and data about who was using their service since B-Cycle opened on June 1st, which was very revealing about how people were moving around downtown.

Based on discussion at previous meetings, Bergamini asked that the RFP for the Transportation Plan be brought by Planning to either the January or February meeting, when the draft was ready.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Tolmie, to Adjourn at 7:14 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.