



# 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, 2016

5:00 PM

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

---

### JOINT MEETING WITH LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR AGENDA ITEMS A.THROUGH D.

#### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL OF THE JOINT MEETING

Poulson called the Joint Meeting of the TPC and LRTPC to order at 5:00 PM.

**Present:** 10 - David Ahrens; Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

**Excused:** 1 - Wayne Bigelow

Please note: Bergamini and Kemble arrived at 5:02 PM. Johnson arrived at 5:09 PM. Golden arrived at 5:10 PM. LRTPC members in attendance: Al Matano present at 5:00 PM; Mark Shahan, Grant Foster, and Alder Tim Gruber arrived by 5:15 PM. TPC members Bergamini and Golden are also members of LRTPC. LRTPC member Alder Paul Skidmore attended briefly from 7:07 to 7:10 PM.

#### B. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

#### C. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS

##### C.1. [45381](#) REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT UW CAMPUS MASTER PLAN (TRANSPORTATION ELEMENTS)

Gary Brown and Aaron Williams of UW-Madison Campus Planning and Landscape Architecture, Patrick Kass of UW-Madison Transportation Services, and Brian Smalkoski of Kimley-Horn were in attendance to provide the update and answer questions about the Long Range Transportation portion of the Master Plan. Brown presented the PowerPoint attached, which outlined the Plan's Schedule, Process and Engagement, Transportation Context and Transportation Recommendations for the Long Range Transportation Plan.

- **Schedule/Overview:** The planning process began in January 2015, and would be brought to the City for approval in January-February 2017. A campus plan was done every 10 years. Besides looking at building capacity, this Plan looked at landscaping, utility, stormwater and a long range transportation.
- **Engagement/Outreach:** Staff from City Planning, TE, Engineering, Metro

Transit and the Mayor's Office, as well as Shorewood Hills had been involved. 250 meetings had been held on/off campus, with committees, orgs and neighbors.

- Context: Since 2005, many bicycle, pedestrian, roadway and parking improvements had been made (such as Campus Drive bike path, East Campus Mall ped path). Data had been gathered to show motor vehicle traffic and congestion, average daily bus boardings, and parking occupancies at various locations (as shown in maps and graphs).
- Among peer universities, UW was second to the bottom for parking spaces per person. UW did not have lots of available open land for parking. But UW did a good job of moving people around, using alternative transportation modes. Parking for students was not allowed on Campus. With 40+K students, the UW didn't have the capacity.
- However, parking for visitors was needed. Often visitors used City garages or parked in neighborhoods.
- Major Recommendations: Better connect bike paths (Ex. Campus Drive Path to Babcock and Chamberlain Ave. Bridge); new pedestrian connections (Ex. raised walkway at N. Charter-Linden); key intersection improvements (Ex. Univ. Ave. and Henry Mall); convert surface parking into consolidated structures; over 20-40 years, create 2,000+ new visitor spaces. (See attached PPT for specific proposals for transit operations, roadways, walking, biking, and parking.)

Poulson noted that quorum for LRTPC had been achieved. Brown and members discussed the Plan.

- (Golden) The UW would be interested partnering with the City in a redevelopment of the Lake Street garage, possibly a parking facility for the Campus and/or an intercity bus station.
- The idea from 2005 of one-way pairs on Charter-Mills had been abandoned; among other things, Mills had bus routes both ways. Now, they were thinking of changing the two blocks of one-way traffic on Charter back to two-way all the way to Regent, and possibly remove street parking on one side; which could relieve pressure on Johnson and Dayton; and make things less confusing (the bike lane now moved in the opposite direction of traffic).
- With no quadrangles or green spaces, the area south of University didn't have the feel of a campus. Studies showed students did better when they looked out on green spaces, so it might make sense to vacate the two blocks of Brooks Street (between Johnson and Dayton), to create a ped mall and green space. The UW had been buying property (residences) there. [Please note: Golden excused himself to attend another meeting, at 5:30 PM, returning at 6:11 PM.]
- (Gruber) Concerned about the losing the connectivity of removing Brooks Street from grid, Gruber liked the idea of converting Charter to two-way, good for cars and bikes, and wondered if Orchard could also be made two-way. Brown said the City could look at that, but (mostly residential) Orchard seemed to be functioning okay as a one-way. A ped mall on Brooks was a very long-range idea; the area now included private properties.
- (Gruber) Re: how Campus Drive separates the Campus from neighborhoods south of there, the Plan recommended a second ped bridge over the Drive, which City TE supported also. This depended on obtaining right-of-way on the south side to create a place for the bridge to land; another joint development opportunity. The bridge could possibly connect over Paunack Place, south of the growing Vet School.

- Beautifying the area was difficult, esp. with the railroad right-of-way along the Drive. They might be able to do something to treat their edge visually, as they worked on the bike path. They didn't have a whole lot of space there; but if/when Campus Drive was rebuilt, there might be something they could do.
- (Zellers) If they were to do all the parking development (for visitors) as shown, the total net increase over the next 20-40 years would be 2,165. The question was whether over time, they would need to. Also, their parking numbers fluctuated as buildings were torn down/added, so there might be some faculty/staff replacement parking involved in this number; but the majority would be visitor parking.
- (Shahan) Re: vacating Walnut Street and other street removals, ped and bicycle access would be maintained. Re: using Urban Footprint on Campus Drive in the future, the railroad could be difficult to work with at times; esp. when asking for new at-grade crossings. Some tracks were used for storing vehicles on a spur and moving cars on a siding there.
- In terms of a second bridge, there had been some discussion about placing one further west possibly at Univ. Bay Drive; Shorewood Hills had talked about one that might run east-west, but not sure if this was feasible. The area had lots of options for ped bridges, but it was a question of what land they would need and could be obtained on the south side for a landing.
- They had looked at bike lanes on Johnson Street. But a proposed dual lane on University and one now on Dayton, would seem serve people pretty well. A bike lane on Johnson would mean a loss of a travel lane there. If TE thought it feasible, it was a City right-of-way, and a City responsibility to look at that. Johnson Street's cross-section was narrower than University's. Also, Johnson had little room in the right-of-way out past the drive lanes.
- Shahan: Expressed concern about how the number of lanes changed on Johnson. It would be better if the lane configuration was more consistent.
- They were still studying how dual bike lane on University would work at intersections and bikes being on the wrong side of the street for one direction. Each intersection had its own characteristics; they would need to take a hard look at signalization just for bikes, going right or left, room for stacking space, left-turning vehicles going southbound, etc.
- As for protected bike lanes on either side of University, the question was how the lane on the north side would work with the bus lane: Would it be a protected zone between the bus and cars? They didn't seem to have enough space. If it were located on the inside of the bus lane, then there would be issues with bus riders passing through the bike zone. They were nowhere near implementation, and would look at all the details around these issues over the next 10-20 years.
- (Foster) Re: how technology informed the need for more parking, Kimley-Horn modeled the entire Campus with Park+. Ideally, occupancy should be no more than 85% full, to avoid traffic problems and people circulating around, looking for available parking. The south end of Campus had a shortfall now, which then propagated/rippled throughout the Campus; which was why the proposal called for more parking on south Campus. [Please note: Ahrens left the meeting at this point, at 5:58 PM.]
- The UW planned to maintain the line on the current ratio for faculty/staff parking of 0.34 spaces/employee. Parking for visitors was different in that visitors weren't familiar with the Campus, or the bus, ped and bike systems. Because visitors usually didn't know where they were going and how to get there, they were treated differently. By contrast, students and staff dealt with the lack of parking every day.

- Re: alternatives, such as taxis and shuttles, and other opportunities for visitors, to keep the number down, the UW often suggested other options besides single-occupancy vehicles for getting on Campus. They encouraged groups to use hotel shuttles, for example. But they had 4.6 million visitors/year on Campus, who couldn't all be served like staff/students by alternative transportation. They were trying to manage it, but there was still an unmet need.
- This was a Plan, which could change over time as new situations developed (such as commuter rail). If they found they didn't need the parking, they wouldn't build it; but this was the Plan based on what they saw now.
- Foster: Like Shahan, hoped more could be done with Johnson related to bike access, perhaps shifting some of the use in the right-of-way. He thought a protected bike lane on University was a step in the right direction, and suggested a focus on two areas: Connections at both ends, incoming traffic from Gorham and outgoing traffic on west end; and at the intersections, to provide protected intersections. Studies showed it was more dangerous to have protected lanes without protected intersections than it was to have unprotected lanes. Protected intersections provided a turning pocket beneficial for peds. A new motor vehicle lane at the intersection at Park wouldn't be possible with a protected intersection.
- The UW planned to examine each intersection much more closely before they implementing a protected bike lane. They had already flagged the bike path from University to Old University, as something that needed more work.
- (Matano) Re: lack of signage on the bike path during construction around Camp Randall: It was a mapped bike route, and there should have been signage and detours for bikers. Hopefully, construction was done in that area; and gates should be open there.
- Bergamini: Related to bike lanes on University and the coming of bus rapid transit, switching a bike and/or bus lane might work well, if (as in Seattle) parking (vs. a traditional barrier) was used as the protective barrier for the bike lane.
- (Bergamini) The 2005 Plan identified three potential locations for rail service (along the rail corridor that ran through Campus), at Kohl Center/Frances/East Campus Mall, Union South (where some building had been done), and at west end of Campus by UWH at Highland or Univ. Bay Drive. The west end would be more challenging since it was federal property (VA Hospital), but do-able. They were carrying this idea through into the new Plan.
- Bergamini: For transportation and time management purposes, perhaps more time could be added to 15-minute class change time, to allow students to get from one end of the Campus to the other, esp. the undergrads attending pre-professional classes on the west end. The Route 80 couldn't make it in 15 minutes; and proliferation of mo-peds wasn't desirable.
- It would be tough changing the class schedule; it went back to utilization numbers.
- (Bergamini) A potential parking ramp at Monroe and Randall anticipated new growth and facilities at Engineering. But this would be 20-30 years out. In the meantime, the UW could start purchasing property in that block. Bergamini noted that the housing in this block was relatively inexpensive housing, which was an issue for the city.
- Although the UW prepared a Master Plan every 10 years, the Plans were not 10-year plans, but were ultimate build-out capacity plans.

Poulson thanked UW staff for their thorough presentation.

C.2. [44190](#)

Planning Division staff update on Comprehensive Plan - Imagine Madison

Planning Division staff, Brian Grady, Kirstie Laatsch and Colin Punt, presented a PowerPoint and discussed the Imagine Madison Comprehensive Plan (CP) Draft Goals and the City Snapshot (attached).

- The City was about to update its CP, which was done every 10 years, and was long-range looking decades out. With Planning Commission as the Lead, staff would be visiting about 10 boards/commissions in each of the four phases of the project.
- The City Snapshot was a summary of current data, to show where the City was today, to spark some ideas of items to address in the Plan.
- The last plan was done in 2006, in response to a state law passed in late 1990's, which required cities that do land-use regulation to have a CP to show where the city would be growing and provide some predictability.
- Containing the nine elements required by law (housing, transportation, and more), the CP guided decision-making and investment, and overarched other City plans.
- A map (Slide 5) showed areas annexed by the City over decades since 1850. In the past 20 years, the City had grown "out" less and grown "up" more; vs. the 1950's-60's, when City almost doubled in size. As shown by the map, things changed quite a bit in 10 years.
- A second map (Slide 6), the Generalized Future Land Use Plan taken from the current 2006 CP, showed recommended land uses for areas in the City today, and in future City growth areas. This map was used to review development proposals and was cited on a daily basis in Planning. It was used for standards review of certain projects and for their own planning purposes; to suggest where roads should be and how big, where to locate a new fire station, library, etc.; and generally to see where city growing and how to most efficiently provide services.
- Four guiding lenses for the project were: Equity, Sustainability, Health and Adaptability.
- Why the CP was important: 70,000 new residents were expected in Madison by 2040, and we needed to consider where they would live, work, how they would get around, and what services they would need.
- Madison was becoming more diverse, with more younger people between 20-34, but also more older adults as well since 2000. Between 2006-2014, the city had become more racially diverse: In 2014, among those under 18, 56% were white. In 10-20 years, current elementary school students will be the next leaders in Madison, and we were planning for that progression.
- Public engagement techniques included: Imagine Madison.com website (with surveys and info); social media (Facebook and Twitter); videos (promotional, and interviews with residents to gain their perspectives on what they see for Madison's future); resident panels to better engage with underrepresented groups in Madison.
- Two kick-off meetings occurred the week before, attended by 165 total, using response clickers to get live results on survey questions.
- Timeline: Now in Phase 1, to identify Issues/Goals; next phase, identify Strategies; next fall, Prioritize actions; Spring 2018, Draft Plan.
- Issues and Draft Goals (attached): In this first phase, staff looked at 30 different City plans and their goals, and synthesized them into hierarchically high-level goals; wanted to use a lot of the good that other parts of City have done.
- The current CP had 33 goals, very detailed. They wanted to rein in the length of the new plan, and developed 13 goals with 10 topic areas.

- Already, responses from public meetings and surveys emphasized provision of affordable housing, concern about environmental and sustainability issues, public safety, and equity (with equity and sustainability also among the four lenses mentioned earlier).
- Along with visiting board/committees/commissions to get feedback, they were doing online engagement, and had just launched a new survey. The boards/committees/commissions would be very involved in Phases 2 and 3, to identify policies and action items.

Members commented, and staff responded to questions about the Draft Goals.

- (Foster) Re: Goal 2, and what was meant by "safe and efficient transportation system": Efficient meant timely; for example, bus riders could move through the city quickly, making that mode attractive. Staff wanted to touch on how the city connected to other communities, both in terms of efficiency of movement, but also in terms of integration of the communities and the various transportation modes.
- Foster: The word "efficiency" didn't resonate with him here; and the idea of being well-connected seemed different than efficient. Also, "choices" was word used in other plans, referring to multi-modality. But what we hadn't talked about as a city for a while was sustainability (one of the lenses) and impact on health. Equity was addressed in Goal 3, "access for all". But with the focus on efficiency and choices, he wasn't quite seeing where they were headed. It didn't describe where we were trying to go with transportation, which he hoped would be to decrease reliance on single-occupancy motor vehicle use.
- Foster: Though it was among lenses, he was looking for health in the goal list, since it was a critical component of city services and quality of life. Maybe they should review the lenses and look again at (apply them to) the goals. He also felt some of the goals, such as transportation, could be more specific (in terms of eventually measuring them), like the Land Use goals were. Along with calling out equity in Transportation with the words, "access for all", perhaps health and sustainability should be applied as well. Maybe in terms of environment and health, sustainability would be a better word than efficiency.
- Staff thought each of the lenses could apply to all the goals; for example, all four lenses could apply to transportation. The headings for the Goals were early categorizations, which could be chapters in the Plan, within which the lenses would be infused and discussed. They tried to wordsmith concise goals, rather than for example adding "to provide choices for all" to address equity in every goal. Re: measurements, that would be part of the next phase, to develop strategies that were measurable, with targets for certain years.
- Golden: Mentioning other transportation plans (MIM, MPO plan, CARPC GMV, BRT study), he wondered what the relationship of those plans was to this. Though also done by Planning, MIM was richer; and he had expected overlap. While appreciating the Snapshot, the BRT study had identified four corridors, in addition to a central corridor. The pink mapping on page 8 of the Snapshot ignored those corridors (Sherman Avenue, Park Street, Mineral Point Road). MIM had two scenarios, one towards infill, the other towards expanding the edge. The report chose infill. What he had seen so far, didn't seem to relate to these.
- Staff said they were familiar with the other plans and the scenarios in MIM, but that the map on page 8 really looked back 10 years, and wasn't looking forward. Many of the timeframes in the booklet were from 2005-2015, to show what had happened over the past 10 years; in this map, recent development in

high frequency transit areas. BRT maps were not included, but they would be going forward.

- Regarding MIM, they were at the tail end of the MIM and it contained many more detailed recommendations, which the CP would also provide. Staff saw MIM fitting right into and occupying the transportation portion of the CP, where key elements of MIM would be elevated. MIM and CP were paired at the hip.
- As far as CARPC's GMV values work, staff had borrowed their methodology for their polling, which would be used in different phases. As far as two missing grocery stores mentioned by Golden, staff had noticed some errors since publication and would be updating the booklet on their webpage.
- (Gruber) Regarding old neighborhood plans and how they might fit in, staff hadn't yet settled that. NYC Parks Commissioner Silver who recently visited Madison, said that cities really needed to have one plan so everyone knew where to go, with neighborhood plans stuffed into it. Throughout this process, staff would further figure out that relationship; how to integrate a plan that looked decades ahead with plans that were detailed, on a block-to-block level.
- Gruber: Regarding Land Use Goal 6 and creating a sense of place, auto-oriented areas (like highways) had the worst sense of place. There were no easy answers when it came to creating a sense of place, but it was something to think about. Admittedly, the CP was in its early stages and the goals were formulative.
- For this effort, staff would look at neighborhoods that developed quickly in 1970's-90's when auto was more ubiquitous; and consider how to bring in mixed-use nodes/centers, so people could walk/bike to these amenities.
- (Gruber) Re: how growth of 70K would work with roads that were already at capacity, staff thought technology would help. Also many new residents were riding Metro. Seattle had recently decided not build any new roads or parking lots; with the idea that people would alter their mode choices and lifestyles. Land use choices to limit number of destinations and distances to them, and keeping things more compact and mixed, would affect level of traffic. [Please note: Golden left the meeting at this point, at 6:55 PM.]
- Page 10 of the Snapshot showed Beltline and Isthmus traffic going back 10 years, with Isthmus traffic increasing some and Beltline traffic flattening/decreasing even as we added population. Automobile traffic hadn't really increased that much, and hopefully that trend would continue.
- Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp: Metro was beyond capacity; and BRT was a way to add capacity and improve travel times. With our geography and more compact development, transit ridership would increase, and they would need to keep up with transit capacity so it wouldn't result in the transportation conflicts being suggested.
- (Gruber) Re: potential conflicts between plans for compact, mixed-use infill, and the sometimes negative response of residents to big developments in their neighborhoods, staff hoped to be transparent about where infill development could be. They would provide more detail about these areas. They would also try to show how infill was more efficient for the city and how it supported their goals and lenses. They wanted to involve more people in the process, and try to reach a more diverse audience; and would try to get more buy-in for the City's vision, to create more context.
- Kovich: With regard to the Guiding Lenses and looking at the Goals, transportation had to be affordable, economic growth had to be at a sustainable pace. Perhaps the Lenses or a statement about them could be placed at the top of the Goals, so people knew we were thinking about these in relation to all the goals.

- Shahan: The word "efficient" was troublesome because it could be applied to many things ( such monetary or natural resources). He preferred the word "sustainable". It was important to make clear what was meant by that. To conserve natural resources and be sustainable, the use of motor vehicles needed to be brought up. If we were to increase density in our urban core, we couldn't do it with motor vehicles. We needed to be very upfront about that. Also, he didn't see the word "infill" used in the Land Use goals. Related to Land Use, a couple different issues to address were: Growth on the periphery, and how to retrofit older parts of the city to make them more compact and livable, use less resources, so we didn't have to grow out on the periphery. The goals could be more specific about this, and generally. They didn't really grab him.

- Based on feedback, staff would add/revise the Goals, to be the foundation for moving forward with strategies. They might recategorize them, see if there were themes. In sorting all the ideas to create buckets of goals, they were pushed up into a very general level. More details would be provided as they moved forward. [Please note: Skidmore arrived at this point in the meeting, at 7:07; and departed when the Joint Meeting adjourned.]

- Bergamini: The booklet was nicely done; and clearly couldn't contain every data point generated in the last 20 years. However, related to Metro Transit routes and peak hour frequency shown on page 10 and transportation planning, Metro staff generated a map that showed what % of households were within a certain distance of transit routes. That proportion had gone down in past 15-20 years, mostly due to growth on the periphery, which could not be served well. This map was somewhat deceptive in that E. Washington and S. Park corridors didn't have frequent all-day service. For example, S. Park went to hourly at ~6 PM; and on weekends, E. Washington was served once an hour with Route 6. This wasn't equitable. On transit maps, it was important to differentiate between peak and off-peak, weekend and holiday service, esp. as it impacted employment and equity. A Metro survey showed a higher number of transfers made by low-income people and people of color. This map masked that problem. Service levels would also affect the level of density in these corridors, which could not be accommodated by automobiles.

Poulson thanked Planning staff, and asked for a motion to adjourn the Joint Meeting.

#### D. ADJOURNMENT OF JOINT MEETING OF TPC AND LRTPC

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Tolmie, to Adjourn the Joint Meeting at 7:10 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

#### E. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL OF TPC

Poulson called the meeting of the TPC to order at 7:10, immediately following adjournment of the Joint Meeting.

**Present:** 8 - Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

**Excused:** 3 - David Ahrens; Wayne Bigelow and Kenneth Golden

#### F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES



A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Streit, to Approve the Minutes of the November 9, 2016 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

## G. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

[45539](#)

Joe Mannchen Registration Slip and Statement requesting that Bus Stop #8235 near Journey Mental Health Center be relocated - TPC 12.14.16

Joe Mannchen, Outpatient Specialist at Journey Mental Health Services (JMHC), 49 Kessel Court, spoke before the group. (See full statement attached.)

- He requested that Bus Stop #8235 (eastbound) be moved one block west to intersection of Kessel Court and Schroeder Road; and requested a crosswalk across Schroeder Road at Kessel Court.
- JMHC consumers esp. those with mobility problems needed to have the shortest route possible; and reducing the distance they would have to travel by one block particularly in inclement weather, would have positive impact on consumers.
- Supporting data was shown on page 1 of the statement. JMHC served 12,000 consumer/year, 290 people/day, 27% of whom were using mass transit to get to the facility.
- Part of his duties at JMHC was to minimize or eliminate barriers for consumers may have getting to their appointments. Anytime a consumer couldn't get to an appointment, it could negatively impact their mental health and recovery process.
- Moving this bus stop would encourage those receiving services at JMHC to continue to do so in the best way possible.

Poulson thanked Mannchen and noted that this item was not on the agenda for action. But should it be on a future agenda, Mannchen would be so informed.

## H. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

H.1. [45413](#)

Parking: December 2016 Activity Report, October Revenue-Expense-Occupancy Reports - TPC 12.14.16

[Please see Parking reports attached.] Zellers/Kovich made motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

H.2. [45407](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Financial & Performance Measures, and Ride-Revenue-Fare Type Reports - TPC 12.14.16

Kamp noted that as of October, Metro's contingency reserve fund was shown with a balance of \$7.5 million (in Metro's Financial report attached). By action of the City Council, \$5 million of that had been moved to Fleet Services' reserve fund. Future reports would show this down by that amount. Fleet Services would replace fire trucks, snow plows, etc. Their reserves had been depleted.

Kamp clarified that the money that was moved didn't have anything to do with the garage project. Also, the reserves were not any of the other municipality reserves, it was strictly the City of Madison's portion of Metro's reserves. The 2008 Long Range Metro Transit Plan recommended at that time, that the City's goals for reserves be \$2.5 million. Regarding how this would affect Metro's

ability to pursue the Nakoosa bus facility, BRT and expansion of standard service, the City's 5-year CIP listed Nakoosa and BRT; commitments to the first phase of BRT and to build at Nakoosa.

Metro had hoped to use some of contingency for improvements at the E. Washington facility, now listed in the CIP as using 80% federal and 20% local ,which would be a challenge, just as it getting federal funding for Nakoosa and BRT would be a challenge. Regarding not having the cash in hand and Metro's ability to compete effectively for federal funds, Kamp was concerned about that. But with tension between funding needs throughout the City, Metro was part of the City. They had had an appropriately intense discussion with Finance Department about this recommendation, and now would move forward to deal with the request to the feds as best they could. The recommendation had been on the Council's consent agenda, approval of which amounted to a unanimous vote.

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

## I. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- I.1. [44545](#) Relating to Ceres Crossroad Services, LLC, Lunar Cycle Services, LLC, and Mercury Transport, LLC, applications for Pedal Cab operator licenses.

In response to a question raised at an earlier meeting, TE Transportation Analyst Keith Pollock said all the permits had been signed and notarized at the Clerk's Office. A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

- I.2. [45409](#) Parking: Resolution No. TPC 16-13, regarding proposed Parking Utility Special Event Rate, effective January 15, 2017 - TPC 12.14.16

Poulson noted that Registrant Sandra Torkildson, TPC Subcommittee Member, has distributed a letter signed by several State Street area business owners (attached).

Registrant Torkildson, Elizabeth Street, 53703, spoke before the group.

- Not opposed to raising the special event rate per se, she opposed raising the rate without thinking about short-term parking alternatives.
- She urged that meter enforcement times be extended on Monday through Saturday to 10 PM, and on Sunday, from Noon to 5 PM; only within a two-block radius of State Street. With not much retail there, businesses on the other side of the Square didn't want it.
- Customers of her store would not pay \$8 to pick up a book.
- In 2015, there were 157 days of event parking. Most of those events were on Fridays and Saturdays, which for downtown retailers were their busiest days. (Restaurants weren't as concerned, because they had really good business on event days and weren't affected by the event rate.)
- Realizing enforcement times couldn't be changed as quickly as changing rates, she hoped it would be in place by the Fall when most events started happening. Retail business was heaviest between September and January. The City had just spent \$50K on a plan to revitalize businesses downtown, and that would be worthless if this change wasn't made.

- She urged that the group put a "caveat" on the TPC resolution, to say they would work toward this change.
- The downtown was becoming more competitive, and many people didn't understand that free parking often meant no parking. In a demand situation, turnover was needed.
- She realized this would be a trade-off; that on non-event days, people would be paying for parking. Also, this would require additional enforcement, esp. on days of events. Hopefully, increased revenue would help with this.

Torkildson responded to questions.

- Alder Verveer said he would support the two-block enforcement area, but hadn't yet decided about the times.
- In consideration of the proposal to raise rates for basketball, if enforcement were to happen by Fall, she would be satisfied, even if the \$8 rate were to start in January.
- From Thanksgiving to Christmas in 2015, there had been special event parking every Friday, Saturday and Sunday (and some Thursdays). These were the three most important days to retailers. She made double in those three days than what she made during the rest of the week.

Asst. Parking Utility Manager Sabrina Tolley discussed the proposed resolution.

- The tiered rate proposal had been brought to the TPC in August, which due to public comment, was referred back to the TPC Subcommittee.
- Staff was asked to bring forward to the Subcommittee an updated version based on what they had heard.
- The new version called for \$10/\$15 at State Street Campus, eliminating POE for football games due to timing issues raised; maintaining a consistent practice with what they did now, but just changing the rate there. It also called for \$8 POE at all other facilities.
- The Subcommittee looked at a tiered structure for SS Campus, but tying it to extended enforcement hours. So the tiered idea was not eliminated, but was tabled for the time being. For now, they recommended an \$8 rate at all facilities effective January 15, 2017, as presented in the TPC resolution.

Poulson mentioned that all the TPC Subcommittee members except Torkildson voted for the current proposal. Kovich clarified that rather than moving ahead to the tiered structure right away, they wanted the additional revenue by moving from \$5 to \$8 now; but also they wanted to work hard with the downtown alders to move forward on expanded enforcement times, so they could move to tiered pricing (of \$12) at SS Campus and Overture for large events at Kohl Center. That was always the Subcommittee's intent, but it was just a matter of timing.

Zellers said it was critical to get on top of this, to address it for the good of the State Street retailers. She was uncomfortable going forward with this without having this better in hand. She wondered how quickly they could move forward on extended meter times. Tolley said it would depend on the boundaries. A two-block radius would not likely require hiring a new Parking Enforcement Officer, which would reduce the time otherwise needed for posting/hiring. The ordinance change would be the typical 3-4 month process to move through the Council and referrals, plus 3 months to do programming. Zellers observed that this was a tight schedule, if they wanted it in place by August or September.

Bergamini also had concerns about the timeline and the change of enforcement times. She understood the need to be competitive with other vendors, and wondered how critical it would be to revenues to do the rate change now vs. in August. Tolley said staff estimated it would amount to \$120K. Event parking had been at \$5 since 2012, and revenues had been flat. It was something they needed to take action on. But it wouldn't be dire if they didn't have the new rate in place until August.

In response to Streit, Tolley guessed the number of spaces in a two-block radius would be a couple hundred. In response to Kovich, Tolley said most event parking ranged from \$10 to \$15 and \$25, depending on the type of event. Kovich noted that they were significantly under the market, and the proposal before them was under the market.

Zellers proposed amending the resolution, to add the following Whereas and Resolved clauses:

**WHEREAS**, a change in the special event parking fee will impact availability of on-street parking supporting State Street retailers.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Transit and Parking Commission will bring forward a proposal for increased hours of enforcement for on-street parking within two blocks of State Street, with an intent to have such change in place by September 2017.

Zellers/Streit made a motion to approve the additional language. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Kovich/Johnson made a motion to approve the TPC resolution as amended by the additional language. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

## J. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- J.1. [45410](#) Metro: Examine the feasibility increasing the number of full wrap ads on buses - TPC 12.14.16

Referring to the documents attached, Kamp said staff was seeking direction about how to proceed. The Operating Budget directed them to look into this, and explore additional revenues from full wrap ads; but it had no dollar amount associated with it.

Customer Service and Marketing staff Mick Rusch and Jessy Stammer joined Kamp to answer questions.

- As to what was meant by 20 full wraps/year, staff had been defining that as 20 annual contracts. This year, they had begun looking at the number of wraps they averaged per month. It wasn't really clear.
- This year, they averaged 9 wraps/month, with some months as few as 2. In September and October, they had a lot of interest in full wraps, and ran 27 in a two-week period.
- The language was written when Adams was doing the ads, and they only sold annual full wrap contracts. When they took it in-house, they didn't have that limit of the annual. Metro gave them whatever period clients wanted, with an average of five months.
- Because the rule wasn't very clear, Kamp was comfortable temporarily going over 20, given the average of less than 10/month.

Zellers said she was not a fan of bus wraps; they did not add to the ambience or attractiveness of the city. She didn't object to their accounting, but she was not in favor of adding more. At Council, she voted for the whole budget package, but everyone was clear she did not support it.

Kovich wondered how the language could best be modified; what would be helpful to staff, what they could live within; what would make it easier to monitor the limits and recognize them. With 4th quarter being their busiest period in the past two years, Rusch said staff would like to be able to sell as many wraps as the group would let them in 4th quarter. Being lighter in the beginning of the year, they would rather not turn that kind of money away (from HMO's primarily) in the 4th quarter. So leeway in the 4th quarter would be helpful.

Kamp said that if members were comfortable with the flexibility of averaging 20 wraps or less, they would provide info about what that revenue would look like. Streit noted that 20 "annual" contracts equaled 240 months of contracts, which would be fair considering that was what the initial policy called for, but in the form of annual contracts. Rather than making a decision immediately, Kamp said the advantage of coming back would be that they could bring revenue estimates.

Kamp said this was the first year the question had come up. While also not a fan of rolling billboards, Bergamini complimented staff on their excellent job in selling and vetting these ads. They had done so much better than the private contractor, which showed up in the design and experience of riding on the buses. She thanked staff. Kamp said the staff's coordination among different staffs was excellent as well.

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to Defer the item to the next meeting, and asked that staff bring revenue projections back. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

- J.2. [45119](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County to provide Volunteer Driver Escort Services for the City of Madison for the calendar year 2017.

Poulson suggested that Items J.2. through J.4. be combined, and asked for a motion on them. A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

- J.3. [45120](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter in to an agreement with Dane County for the purpose of providing the Metro Transit Utility with State 85.21 funding given to Dane County for the provision of accessible transportation for eligible persons within Metro Transit's service area in the calendar year 2017.

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

- J.4. [45121](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter in to an agreement with Dane County to provide Group Access Service for the City of Madison for the

calendar year 2017.

**A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**J.5. [45122](#)**

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County for the following purposes in the calendar year 2017: (1) providing the Transit Utility with MA Waiver Community Integration Program (CIP) funding; (2) providing Dane County with State 85.20 funding by the Transit Utility for the County's provision of accessible transportation for persons unable to use the Transit Utility's paratransit services with its service area.

**A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**K. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

**K.1. [45411](#)**

Update on Transportation Ordinance Review Ad Hoc Committee - TPC 12.14.16

Kemble said TORC hoped to be done with its work by March at the latest. Every function of each agency had been sifted and winnowed.

- The new structure would include a new Transportation Policy and Planning Board, composed mostly of alders. It wasn't yet clear whether there would be one or two commissions below that, which would deal with oversight of operational aspects.
- They had discussed needing more robust transportation planning in the City, but did not yet know where that would sit.
- The ACA would be bringing back a more refined list of functions and who did what.
- The composition of the commissions was not yet determined. The initial proposal didn't identify specific stakeholders on the commissions, but there had been push back on that.

Kemble invited TPC member to attend as TORC nailed down the details. Bergamini commented that if the various functions were redistributed and we ended up with an alder-heavy Board, heavy on policy issues, she was concerned that they would be excluding the voices of specific constituencies in the policy-making function, which was where they needed to be heard.

Kemble said that the final proposal would be referred to the various committees/commissions, but if members wanted to provide input, they should come to the meetings.

**K.2. [45412](#)**

Annual Statement of Interests Form: Please complete and submit to the City Clerk's Office by Tuesday, January 3, 2017.

Kovich said to watch for the "green check" to confirm the form had been submitted.

**L. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only; no action required.  
(Most recent meeting minutes electronically attached, if available)**

07828

ADA Transit Subcommittee  
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee  
Parking Council for People with Disabilities  
Long Range Transportation Planning Committee  
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee  
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)  
TPC Subcommittee (to review issues outlined in Leg. File 37359)  
Ad Hoc Transportation Ordinance Review Committee  
Ad Hoc Metro Paratransit Medicaid Waiver Funding & Policy Review  
Committee

**M. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**  
(For information only; not for discussion)

**M.1. General announcements by Chair**

Poulson wished everyone Happy Holidays.

**M.2. Commission member suggestions for items on future agendas**

Kovich asked for monthly updates on Judge Doyle Square.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Tolmie, seconded by Johnson, to Adjourn at 8:06 PM.  
The motion passed by voice vote/other.