



# 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](http://www.madisoncitychannel.com).**

---

Wednesday, March 14, 2012

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 PM.

Present: 7 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Chris Schmidt; Lisa Subeck; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Kenneth M. Streit and Kenneth Golden

Excused: 3 -

Amanda F. White; Margaret Bergamini and Susan M. Schmitz

Please note: The Second Alternate position on the Commission is vacant. Maniaci attended the meeting from 5:50 to 6:55 PM, during discussion of miscellaneous items (I.), the Public Hearing (G.1.), and the opening of the staff presentation about the rate modifications (G.2.).

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Golden, to Approve the Minutes of the February 8, 2012 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

### D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Related to Item G.2., Subeck disclosed that she rented monthly parking from the Parking Utility. Subeck had consulted City Attorney Michael May, who said that this shouldn't prevent Subeck from voting on items related to this because of a provision that deals with matters to the public; but that a disclosure would be appropriate.

### E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

#### E.1. [25587](#)

Parking: February 2012 Activity, and January Revenue/Expense/Occupancy Reports - TPC 03.14.12

With no discussion or questions, Subeck/Schmidt made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

#### E.2. [25588](#)

Metro: YTD Fixed Route Performance Indicator Reports, 2011 Year-End Ridership & Productivity by Route, Riders by Category & Route, Fixed Route Ride/Revenue/Change, Annual Ridership & Productivity 1997-2011, Unaudited Financial Performance Reports, and Paratransit Reports - TPC 03.14.12

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted items on the Metro reports (attached), as follows.

- Because the number of school days for UW and MMSD were fewer this January, ridership for January was down compared to last year. Quarterly Reports would be more meaningful.
- A new report called "Ridership & Productivity by Route" would now report by route, because of a new data system that sorted through the interlining (vs. routes like 5-18-13 previously being reported all together). Having collected this data for all of 2011, comparisons to 2012 could now be made route by route, rather than lumping routes together.
- In the news lately, transit ridership was up 2.3% nationally. While Metro's ridership was up 9.5% in 2011, APTA reported that bus ridership for comparable populations was up 4.8%.
- Re: Riders by Fare Category & Route for 2011, all UW ridership (students, employees and Route 80's) comprised 48.8% of Metro's total ridership, up from 48% in 2010.
- Re: Fixed Route Rides % Change for 2011 vs. 2010, the highest % change occurred in the Commuter ride cards at 265.7%, the second highest was Edgewood unlimited ride passes at 25.2%, the third highest was Senior/Disabled 31-day passes at 18% (= 500K rides), and the fourth highest was Adult cash fares at 13%. (With the opening of the VA Hospital parking ramp, Commute card numbers would come down.) Regarding the relationship between Senior/Disabled and paratransit ridership, paratransit was level for 2011. While there was a little overlap, paratransit was used mostly by people who couldn't take fixed route buses.
- Ridership in the second half of 2011 might have been a bit higher than the first half, possibly due to the long-term nature of the economy, as reflected in the rise in adult cash ridership, where Metro might be attracting some new riders before they figure out the 10-ride pass.
- Re: Annual Ridership & Productivity, 1997-2011 (with/out Campus), total ridership in 1997 was 1.2 million more with Campus than without; and this had grown steadily to 2011, when total ridership was 2.6 million more with Campus than without. Annual productivity in 1997 was 1 ride per hour higher with Campus; in 2011, this was 4 rides per hour higher with Campus. These numbers gave testimony to the importance of Campus ridership to overall ridership.

Kamp referred to the 2011 Unaudited Financial Performance Report, and said the small contribution to Reserves was largely the result of a \$400+K adjustment to Metro's budget from BOE in the 4th quarter. Metro Transit Finance Manager Wayne Block made the following comments and comparisons between 2010 and 2011.

- Unlimited ride pass revenue was up \$663K. While total revenue increased 15% due to the ridership, ridership increased 9.5%. Though prices for most of the unlimited ride pass programs remained the same in 2010 and 2011, the UW program had a price increase in August 2010, which was in effect for just four months in 2010, but all of 2011; thus the difference between revenue and ridership %'s.
- County revenue was down somewhat, primarily because there were fewer rides due to MA Waiver program, for which the County reimbursed Metro. County revenues came in \$85K underbudget, because certain programs with the County were discontinued because of the (State) broker program that took effect starting in the summer of 2011.
- Total revenues came in \$419K over budget due to the BOE adjustment made

in the 4th quarter mainly to cover the overage in diesel costs; contingency reserves wouldn't have covered all of it. Partners paid for their portion of the net deficit; but even with their input, Metro would still have been short \$400K.

- Among expenses, salaries/wages were \$382K under budget, with actuals a bit higher than 2010 (related to longevity raises).
- Overtime was almost exactly the same amount over budget, at \$387K. Metro had about twice the number of retirements in 2011 than they normally had, which impacted salaries and overtime. Up until August, OT had been tracking under budget; and in fact they had budgeted for it to decline over the year. Having hoped it would be much less, staffing problems in the last part of the year took OT overbudget. Still, compared to 2010, OT was flat.
- Having expected costs for natural gas to go up, this item was \$122K underbudget. Costs for natural gas were at historic lows.
- Building & Grounds supplies were high compared to 2010; but Rolling Stock/Support Equipment parts were significantly underbudget. These two items offset each other, and reflected how these expenses were being coded: in 2010, some rolling stock "parts" should have been coded to building/ground "supplies".
- Fuel/oils/lubricants costs were the biggest negative variance for the year, at \$647K; had earlier expected this to be more than \$1 million, but fuel prices had come down over the year.
- Costs for Paratransit Providers were underbudget due to fewer rides, and the contract Metro had gone out with was much more favorable.
- Bottom line: Variance between Revenues and Expenses was only a negative \$8,396 (as a result of the \$400K adjustment).

Staff was asked to provide info about the ride and reduction in Medicaid waiver. Golden/Tolmie made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

## F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

### F.1. [25589](#)

Metro: Update on Shelter Replacement Program, presented by Ann Gullickson, Transit Service Manager - TPC 03.14.12

Transit Service Manager Ann Gullickson discussed the memo about the replacement program for bus shelters (attached).

- Metro had received a federal grant to upgrade and replace its aging shelters (from later 70's- early 80's) with older designs and rust.
- Some newer shelter investments around the city showed Metro what they might do differently with its very visible image out in the community.
- Not an expansion program, Metro hoped to end up with about the same number of shelters.
- Metro would use this as an opportunity to evaluate shelter locations. No shelters jumped out to make staff think they were in the wrong place. But considering the changes in service and the service areas since the shelters were first put in, it was possible that a shelter might be removed and not returned to that particular bus stop.
- Staff was looking for input from the Commission and others, esp. regarding amenities they would like the shelters to have.

Members made suggestions.

- Metro Marketing might work on branding Metro with some consistency.
- For energy efficiency, skylights might be a way to light shelters.

- Also, to save energy and still provide safety at night, perhaps lights with motion detectors could be used, which would activate when people entered the shelter.
- Lighting in some (additional) shelters could make the system be safer or (equally important) feel safer,
- Re: potential for advertising at shelters, perhaps shelters could be fitted with features making them amenable to ads in the future. (Ex. Portland shelters had ads that faced inward and other features that made them less offensive.)
- It would good if Metro could solicit input from neighborhoods regarding the (re)location of shelters, which some felt were in the wrong place. Based on issues like lighting and how the shelters got used, both positively and negatively, they might have different ideas for placement.

Staff answered questions.

- Metro would try to recycle parts from the shelters or sell them for recyclables. With the same standard spec's as newer shelters (at UW and State Street), possibly some glass panels could be saved and reused.
- Lighting was provided now in shelters in the downtown and commercial areas. Metro was looking at the cost of installing a back-lit panel as one of the walls in the shelters, to (at this point) post maps and schedules as well as to provide lighting. Then in the future, they would be ready to use for advertising.
- Alders were invited to give Metro any feedback from their neighborhoods about the location of shelters.

Poulson thanked Gullickson for the update.

F.2. [25590](#)

Metro: In-house advertising proposal, presented by Mick Rusch, Transit Marketing & Customer Service Manager - TPC 03.14.12

Neither supporting nor opposing the proposal, Registrant Jason Saari, Real Estate Manager for Adams Outdoor Advertising, spoke before the group. Saari's work at Adams included contract administration for assets and government affairs.

- Adams had become aware that Metro was considering converting its advertising program to an in-house program.
- Adams felt they had made great strides building up the advertising program over the past five years, taking it from \$8,000 in the first week to a projected \$800,000 in billing next year (the final year of the contract). One of the reasons for this success was the Adams support staff, 30 full-time employees, who contributed to the program in one way or another.
- Adams had maintained a solid working relationship with Metro's staff.
- Adams would be paying \$450K to Metro this year or 40% of their ad revenue, whichever was greater.
- For this, Metro contributed \$0 and had zero headaches. It was Adams' responsibility to promote the program and pay for that privilege.
- An in-house program would bring additional costs to Metro: graphic design, shipping and production, administrative costs, installation, sales commissions.

As the Commission considered the conversion to an in-house program, Saari asked that they look at the whole package and whether the end result would be \$450K per year in revenue, given all the costs associated with running the entire program. Poulson thanked Saari for sharing this information.

Kamp echoed Saari's comment about the good business relationship with

Adams. Mindful of the points made by Saari, Metro was looking at a long-term goal approved by the TPC and CC in 2008: that 1% of Metro's revenues – \$500 to \$550K – be made up of revenues from advertising. Mick Rusch, Jennifer Bacon and Peg Anthony of Metro's Marketing staff discussed the proposal (attached).

- Metro currently used a vendor for its ad program and shared revenues from it. Staff now proposed bringing the program in-house, as a means to increase revenues.
- Staff had explored other ways to do this, such as audio advertising (last year), but there hadn't been a lot of interest in that.
- Looking elsewhere, staff thought they might get the revenue otherwise gotten through audio advertising, by eliminating the revenue-sharing formula. They would get the biggest bang for their buck.
- Unlike audio ads, there would be no impact on customers if Metro took over the program.
- Metro would hire a sales person.
- Staff had been looking closely at this idea since it signed its last ad contract five years ago; esp. Jennifer Bacon, who had several years of media experience. Bacon had particularly focused on this project over the past two years, as part of a certified public manager program.
- Peg Anthony with the Commute Card program, also with several years in media sales, had developed an invoicing process to handle multiple vendors for the Commute Card program. So a piece of the plan was already in place. Over the past year, Anthony had also researched how other transit systems handled things.
- Since beginning with Metro, Mick Rusch had worked with Julie Maryott Walsh on the ad program, and had overseen the current contract with Adams over the past six years. Rusch was very familiar with how the program worked.
- Important to note was that the same vendor was not guaranteed. Each time a contract ended, Metro had to go out for bids. It took a full year to get a new vendor up to speed, training them in the garage, getting their paperwork to match what was needed. Also, with a ramp-up period, revenue was not as high initially.
- By bringing the program in-house, Metro would have a continuous program that built on itself. They would not have to go backwards and start over again.
- Metro had a six-year contract with Adams which ran through the end of this year.
- Over the past year, staff had contacted over a dozen transit agencies who already had or were building in-house departments, to see what worked and what was difficult for them and to get advice.
- Two key findings as to why to move forward: the potential for creating additional revenue and keeping a larger share of the revenue; and greater control over the process and streamlining everything within Metro, with greater control over advertising, the advertiser, and the fleet and how that was maneuvered.
- The most successful departments were those who hired a full time sales person, and built their programs that way; vs. taking on the task with the department they already had.
- An individual at Hampton Roads Transit was key in showing Metro how they built their program since last April.
- Agencies that hadn't been as successful as others were those who used staff they already had; by for example, asking a Marketing person without sales experience, to use any extra time to also sell. Successful programs were those with a full time person whose only responsibility was to sell, and who was

given a base salary and a commission structure as an incentive to sell and keep selling.

- As a contingency plan if the effort wasn't successful, Metro would have an RFP ready to go out and would contract with a vendor again.
- With all the research they had done, staff had a feel for how things should be structured. They would propose to hire an experienced sales rep from the community, using the model of another position in the City (at Monona Terrace) with a base salary and commission structure. This would be a revenue-generating position designed to pay for itself in the first year. Also, they had talked to various in-house support departments, such as Finance and Maintenance (for installation and production), who would help make the process seamless.

Staff answered questions.

- Regarding peripheral expert functions: Staff had identified areas where they might need outside help. Metro had a talented in-house graphic designer, who was willing to assist. As stated in the proposal, they would issue an RFP for a graphic design company, to have on reserve and be available to Metro. Though they hadn't done so, staff was willing to explore other City agencies and opportunities to collaborate.
- Staff would put together a budget detailing costs for specific activities.
- Once approved through the proper channels, the program could possibly even be expanded to advertising in shelters.
- Metro had discussed the possibility of having the sales person serve other City agencies.
- In order to fill the buses and benefit other agencies, Metro could offer discounts to other City agencies (Parks, Monona Terrace, etc.) for ads inside of buses that would promote our own City services.
- With the current arrangement with Adams, the wraps and inside/outside of bus advertising were not sold to capacity. The 20-wrap max had been reached at times, but not over the past year. Partial wraps, smaller ads and other products seemed to be more popular right now, possibly because they were more affordable.
- Besides this idea and audio advertising, staff had talked about shelter advertising. But this would require switching out shelters to make them backlit, and would be more to give new shelters to the community than to generate revenues.
- Metro would not have its own print shop (to make the ads), and would rely on a contractor for that.
- Staff had explored the idea of using the website as a platform for ads, but APM's currently prohibited this.

Golden talked about a mayoral initiative years ago to identify all the City agencies that did public information and advertising to see if some synergy could be created. But there was too much organizational resistance for the agencies to get together; everybody wanted to protect their own turf. Perhaps, rather than coming from the mayor, such an initiative would be easier to pull off if it came laterally from peers. He felt there might be opportunities for this if the expertise (shared between agencies) was applicable.

Subeck said there was a lot to like about the idea of going in-house, but there clearly was risk as well. She wondered if Metro had other options to reach the ad revenue goal. Rusch said that apart from ideas mentioned earlier, this proposal was the one staff felt would give the biggest bang for the buck. As for

projected revenues, they hoped to do what they were doing now in the first year, and to reach the 1% goal in the second year. Bacon said the reason for going in-house was not because sales were poor; there was a lot of advertising out there. There was just room for more. Rusch said staff would not be asking for more than 20 full wraps. They planned to keep everything the same, except for who would be selling the ads. Initially, Metro would hire a full-time sales person. Perhaps down the road, they would add a full- or part-time sales support person, and possibly some maintenance (for installation and production). [Please note: Maniaci arrived at this point in the meeting, at 5:50 PM.]

Kamp said the next step would be to draft a resolution for introduction at the Council, with referrals to BOE, Personnel Board, and TPC. Poulson thanked staff for the information, and noted that no action was needed on the item.

**G. 6:00 PM -- PUBLIC HEARING: To hear public comment on proposed 2012 parking rate modifications**

**G.1. [25591](#)** Public Hearing on proposed 2012 parking rate modifications - TPC 03.14.12

Sue Ellingson, Alder for the 13th District, made the following comments, expressing partial opposition to the proposed rate changes for parking meters on Monroe Street.

- She had discussed the proposal with Bill Knobloch, and had received responses to a survey from 20 Monroe Street merchants.
- The proposal called for raising on-street meters on Monroe Street from \$1.00 to \$1.50/hour, and Evergreen Lot (at Trader Joe's) from \$1.00 to \$1.25/hour.
- The merchants liked the meters and thought them important to their businesses, but preferred them to be lower than \$1.50/hour; some said \$1.00 and some said \$1.25.
- In her view, the purpose of parking meters was to make sure limited parking space was used efficiently.
- The meters that should have the highest prices were those used all the time, where we wanted turnover: i.e., meters in the 1800 block (Harrison Street around the corner from Trader Joe's) and the Evergreen Lot should be \$1.50/hour.
- However, those in the 1700 and 1900 blocks were not as busy and should be \$1.25/hour. Since parkers didn't use the meters in the 1600 block, leave them at \$1.00/hour, to encourage people to park a block or two away from the shops in the 1800 block and walk to them.
- Since the Wingra Lot loses \$60-70K/year, it would be okay to sell the Wingra Lot to a developer and to incorporate public parking. It didn't make sense for the City to lose this much money; and no one parked there, with free parking on the street right next to it.
- She disagreed with the idea that revenue from Monroe Street meters should help pay for parking ramps downtown. Monroe Street was a marginal area, which should pay for itself.

As to whether Monroe Street meters should pay for parking downtown, Subeck noted that the same argument might be made for Monroe Street paying for anything downtown when we thought about city tax dollars and how they were divided up. How would we figure out what meters paid for what area: they all went into the same Parking Utility, just as property taxes went into the same pot to pay for things all over the city? How was the Parking Utility different,

and why should it be treated differently than for any other service the City pays for? Ellingson said that revenue and expense per space could be broken out for parking. And for example, if it cost more for trash pick-up at an office building than a home, maybe the building should pay more. Subeck said she struggled with approaches that tried to break things out by area, given that everything else ran across (areas). Ellingson said Monroe Street was a marginal area, where free parking was available nearby, unlike downtown where cheap parking was hard to find. As far as removing meters in the 1600 block, merchants (along with Parking) would probably want meters to remain there to encourage turnover. As to whether Monroe Street merchants would consider covering the deficit themselves, Ellingson said she hadn't asked. It was hard to get a fix on what the deficit might be. Apart from the 1600 block, meters in the area were close to breaking even. As far as placing meters on Regent Street, merchants there hadn't asked for them.

Registrant Mary Carbine, representing Madison Central BID, opposed the proposal. (See attached a March 7, 2012 memo submitted by BID.)

- BID asked that the process be slowed down, that no decision be made immediately, and that another month be allowed for analysis, info and input.
- BID understood Parking's needed for adequate revenues to fund its operation, but the economic impact of parking on the downtown had to be considered, for merchants, restaurants, and major employers.
- With the recession continuing, gas prices and Metro ridership going up, some ramps were not seeing the same daily use levels; which raised the question: Would increasing the price of your product increase your revenues? Were there other ways to bring in revenues by improving the product, access to the product, and making other modifications, that did not involve raising the price of the product? (Options were shown in the memo.) After several successive 3-year price increases and the price-sensitivity of customers, Parking might be at point where it might lose customers instead of raising revenues. More analysis was needed.
- BID's biggest concern was special event parking. BID understood the reason behind it, and didn't think \$5 was too much. The problem was the non-event parkers, and lack of options and communication to them about where they could go if they were not coming for an event, creating a negative experience. BID had the same concerns as in 2009; and no substantial progress had been made. Though real-time info was available, it didn't say if special event parking was in effect at a ramp or where else they might go.
- Improvements were needed: For example, perhaps a floor could be reserved the ramp for short-term (2-hr) parkers; and/or information could be posted to divert non-event parkers to other ramps.
- BID also had some concern about raising rate for all on-street meters, including pole meters that didn't offer any more features, but required carrying so many quarters to use them.
- Re: increased hours of enforcement at certain meters: Where would these be? More analysis and discussion was needed.
- BID also suggested that there be tiered rates for meter hoods (resident/non-resident?), to keep them reasonable for essential purposes, but to discourage them for non-essential uses (semi's parked for days in front of storefronts).

Carbine answered questions.

- Her remarks were endorsed by the 18-person BID Board, which included a cross-section of large and small merchants and property owners throughout



the district. Feedback was similar to what was provided three years ago. The Greater State Street Business Assn. had reviewed the comments, and they had also been sent out to DMI membership. They had received no disagreement.

- It might be helpful to explore the idea of increasing on-street meter hours in order to increase revenue and create turnover (esp. utilizing the technology of the new meters), but more specific info was needed (about which meters and what hours) before commenting on this.
- Re: essential vs. non-essential use of meter hoods: Contractual obligations for un/loading was an essential use (ex. Overture), while trucks parked for days on end for events or protests were non-essential. Perhaps a higher rate for non-essential users would be a disincentive.

Registrant June Goglio, 944 E. Dayton, 53703, a Parking Cashier for the Utility, spoke neither in support nor opposition to the proposal. She had handed out hundreds of flyers about the hearing and was surprised more people hadn't turned out.

- Her main concern was the rate increase from \$20 to \$30 for the lost ticket fee, which was raised from \$10 to \$20, three years ago. As a 16-year employee of Parking, she was led to believe that the lost ticket fee should reflect what a charge for a 24-hour period would be. The lost ticket fee was charged by the day, based on when the parker came into the facility. If the rate increase was approved, Gov East would be the most expensive ramp (with a daytime rate of \$1.50/hour), which with a 24-hour time period fee, would cost \$24.50. A \$30 fee seemed excessive. Perhaps the fee could be set at \$25; because at Overture, the 24-hour time period fee would be \$14.75 (\$30=2-day fee); and it wouldn't be feasible to have different lost ticket fees for different ramps.
- The ticket itself says "to take the ticket with you", which increased the incidence of people losing their ticket (esp. walking to/from appointments, when the ticket could be lost almost anywhere.) People sometimes lost tickets inside their cars, down their dashes, consoles, etc.
- \$30 seemed like a lot. The fee shouldn't be punitive, and should be more in line with an all day fee. It seemed especially unfair to regular, daily parkers, who paid \$12.60/day, and now would have to pay an additional \$30 for a lost ticket. She hoped members would reconsider this.
- Another concern was the ever-increasing hourly rates for daily parkers. Many of these parkers were public employees, who had salary cuts this past year.
- Parking did need revenue to replace ramps. But rather than charging daily parkers with higher hourly rates, the night and weekend rate could be raised from \$5 to \$7. This increase wasn't likely to deter people from coming downtown at night.
- A question re: Failure to Pay notices that turned into tickets: If the parker didn't pay their parking fee after 10 days, a ticket was issued and sent to the Police Department. Was the parking fee portion of the ticket every returned to Parking? If it wasn't, it should be.

Registrant Lester Pines, representing Cullen, Weston, Pines and Bach LLC, 122 W. Washington, 53703, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

- Everyone at the firm loved Madison; and any problems that Madison (and Parking) had, the firm laid at the feet of Gov. Walker.
- The firm had always been located downtown, and had been a very good customer of the Utility for decades.
- Though speaking in opposition to increase, he recognized that the increase was not particularly significant. His concern was more of a policy issue.
- As shown by the number of vacancies, monthly parking was not being

heavily utilized. And he understood that the City's goal was to reduce the number of cars that came downtown.

- If Parking wanted to raise revenues, it would make sense to incentivize customers to use monthly parking if it was available. Raising the rates wouldn't incentivize people. If Parking wanted to raise more revenue, reducing the cost would be the best business plan.
- The firm wouldn't leave the downtown because of this. But trying to raise revenue from your best customers was not the best plan. There were businesses who would move to the periphery rather than pay more for parking.
- The firm parked at both State St Cap and Overture, and would pay \$1,700 more per year (7%), if the rates were approved. While the individual increases weren't huge, the firm rented a lot of spaces for their employees, many of whom commuted from outside the city. They currently paid about \$25,000/year.
- With a surfeit of monthly parking available, Parking should try to fill these spaces, which would raise a lot more money than would be raised by getting extra money out of long-term customers.

Registrant Janell Knutson, 126 Pine View Drive, 53704, a monthly parker at Cap Sq North, spoke in opposition to the proposed 12% increase at Cap Sq North (far greater than 7%).

- Many monthly parkers were government workers, who worked at the GEF buildings. Wages and take-home pay for state and public workers had decreased in recent years, inc. frozen wages, unpaid furloughs, and increases in fringe benefit contributions.
- The proposed increase was far greater than rate of inflation for the past three years.
- Significant increases in the monthly parking cost would likely result in a decrease in monthly parking demand in that area.
- It cost more for monthly parking in Madison than in Milwaukee, which said something negative about Madison.
- The proposal included a premium increase for the popular ramps. Most of the weekday parkers were employees who worked downtown.
- Rarely was Cap Sq North full (exc. during special events or protests).
- She questioned the logic of trying to get monthly renters to move to a ramp six blocks away from work.
- Wouldn't businesses prefer to have visitors (that shop/dine) parking near State Street rather than public workers?
- Once the additional money was collected to rebuild/repair the ramps, she thought it unlikely that costs would go down.

Registrant Sandra Torkildson, representing the Greater State St. Business Association, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

- GSSBA's membership composed mostly of small retailers, restaurants and bars on State Street, supported BID's recommendations, esp. its position on event parking.
- One of the busiest times for downtown businesses was the evening. In an economy where both people worked, a lot of shopping was done after 5 PM. Event parking usually started around 4-4:30 PM.
- One complaint she heard from customers and other businesses was event parking. People coming downtown to pick up a book on hold, were disappointed to have to pay an extra \$4, and \$5 would really be a problem.
- It would be good to slow down, to look at options like extended hours for meters, which would not be available for event people because of the short length.

- Nighttime hours became even more important for downtown businesses when the weather got nice. Business was often better between 5-8 PM than during the rest of the day.
- This was an issue that should be addressed: to explore ways to make parking more available to non-event parkers, to make it more convenient for them..
- She didn't have info to show how the last parking increase impacted revenues, but she (and possibly other merchants) could try to track that following this change.
- Short-term parkers were those who needed anywhere from a half hour to two hours, enough time to shop or eat.

Registrant Alexis Turner, 3553 Richie Road, 53593, a Parking Cashier for the Utility since 1993, spoke neither for nor against the proposal.

- A vibrant downtown strengthened the city.
- We didn't want to outprice ourselves out of the market of having parkers.
- We needed to maintain the integrity of the structures. We didn't what what happened in Milwaukee to happen here. Gov East was 50 years old and the concrete was deteriorating.
- Everyone (merchants, students, employees) in the downtown contributed to the success of the downtown, esp. those who had an investment, businesses and organizations. Their success was our success.
- If we're overpriced, we will drive away people who would normally come down.
- Though initially concerned about the loss of revenue, the 20-minute grace period turned out to be a good thing. It changed people's perspective who wondered whether parking was available downtown. Perhaps because of 2008, now there seemed to be too much parking available downtown.
- People often said our rates were so much cheaper than Chicago's. She assumed they were referring to ramps. According to her research, meter rates in 2011-2012 in Chicago ranged as follows: 82% of their metered parking went from \$1.50 in 2011 to \$1.75/hour in 2012. In the central business district outside the Loop with 16% of the metered parking, rates went from \$3.00 to \$3.50. For high demand parking from 8 (AM) to 9PM, rates went from \$5.00 to \$5.75; and remained the same for the other hours, at \$2.50.
- Some parking in Chicago cost \$20 for 20 minutes, which she had no interest in paying.
- For Madison, a balance was needed between charging reasonable rates and maintaining the structures.
- Referring to Goglio's comments, Failure to Pay fines could sometimes reach \$500. This and the \$30 lost ticket fee were concerns. Parkers who abused the system (through lost tickets) should be dealt with separately. Along with creating long lines at the exit while parkers searched for tickets, telling people the lost ticket fee was \$20 already was difficult, esp. when they learned they could not leave to look and come back. A 30-cent per hour increase was too much.

With no other registrants, the public hearing was closed.

Please note: Written comments about the proposed parking rate modifications were submitted by Susan Springman, Realtor and Secretary of Downtown Madison, Inc. Springman's statement is attached.

03.14.12

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch presented information about the rate modification proposal and answered questions.

- There was no deadline for implementing rate changes. He had established a 3-year timeline for reviewing and updating rates. Prior to his tenure, this was done more frequently.
- The current rate modification package would generate \$600K/year, so every month of delay would result in \$50K of lost revenue.
- He hoped that a decision could be made quickly, in order to begin implementation, which was a process, not an event. It took 6-8 weeks to change out the pole meters. Under the proposal, the rates would go into effect June 1st, the date of his retirement. If a decision was not made soon, his successor would be leading the discussion.

Because she had to leave, Maniaci asked that after Commissioners had a thorough discussion, they might consider delaying a decision on the proposal. After hearing public comment, she wanted to explore and work on some items in the proposal, and thought others probably did as well. Poulson checked to see if Maniaci could attend a meeting on March 29th, should the Commission opt to meet sooner than April. Maniaci said she could. [Please note: Maniaci then left the meeting, at 6:55 PM.]

Knobloch thanked the speakers for their thoughtful comments, and continued with his presentation.

- He had received 15 emails and a few voicemails.
- In terms of disseminating info about the proposal and the hearing, Parking had advertised it vigorously. BID and DMI got it early. A press release had been sent to 16 local media outlets, and it was put on the City and Parking websites. A legal notice was published in the WSJ. Four thousand flyers were distributed by hand at exit stations in Parking facilities, and placed at pay-on-foot stations and on cars at all the Lots. A notice was mailed to all the monthly parkers. The flyers were available also at Parking's front desk and lobby kiosk. Three WIBA Radio sister stations played a half-hour interview with Knobloch. He was also interviewed by Channel 3, and all the local newspapers inc. the campus papers picked up on it. And finally, information about the proposal and the hearing was published as part of the Commission's agenda and meeting notices.
- With 10,000 customers a day, it was disappointing that more people did not show up or submit comments. More input would be good.
- An editorial in the Wis. State Journal suggested that the Utility might not need to raise rates if all the parkers with disabilities paid for their parking. This represented 14% of the Utility's revenues. However, this alone probably wouldn't do it.
- The reasons for the rate modifications: If the Utility wasn't able to make ends meet with its current business model, it would have to close its doors eventually. The Utility itself was its only source of revenue. Would the City back-stop the Utility if it had bonds outstanding? It wasn't clear.
- When the rebuilding of Gov East was first discussed, the cost per stall was \$25K; now, per the consultants, the fully loaded cost per stall was \$41K (which included plans, specs, testings).
- Three years ago, Parking redistributed demand from highly utilized Gov East and Brayton by significantly raising rates there. But rates at Cap Sq North were kept the same, and as hoped, a flood of people moved there. Cap Sq North now was the busiest ramp; and it filled up, which wasn't desirable.

- The purpose of rate modifications was to redistribute demand and promote parking availability, probably the #1 purpose of parking; because people expected to find parking, whether 8 AM, Noon or 7 PM. People often complained about not finding parking around the Memorial Union. If a facility was full, something was wrong.
- Longer-term parking was promoted when availability was high; for example, the 10-hour meters at the end of Langdon near Wisconsin Avenue.
- Turn-over was also promoted to help ensure availability. Parking had 5,500 spaces in its system, with 10,000 customers per day, which on average represented one turnover per day. Of course, some spaces turned over as many as five times per day.
- Parkers were encouraged not to lose their tickets. At Chicago's Hyatt, parking was \$26/day, and their lost ticket fee was \$300. Parking's most expensive facility was Brayton Lot (with no nighttime fee) at \$36/day. People did sometimes stay there longer than a day, and then lost their tickets. After the last rate increase when lost ticket fees went from \$10 to \$20/day, the number of lost tickets dropped by half in three months. Evidently, some lost tickets were not lost. Also, for people who honestly lost their tickets, but later found them, they could send their found tickets to Parking, and be charged only for the time they parked.
- Re: the increase of the special event fee to \$5: The UW charged \$15 for its event parking, and the rate went up to \$20-\$25 closer to the Kohl Center. The standard rate at the Alliant Center was \$6. By comparison, \$5 was reasonable. Also a \$5 bill was easier to handle and make change with.
- Re: varying meter rates by meter type: Staff thought all the meter rates should be the same; it shouldn't matter what type of meter was involved, kiosk or pole.
- Re: varying the rates between street meters, lots and garages: Garages were the least convenient (off the beaten path), so should have the lowest rates. Lots were the next least convenient, so should have the next lowest rates. On-street meters were the most convenient, so should have the highest rates. Parking professionals almost all said that the least convenient should be the cheapest.
- Re: the Monroe and Atwood meters: Most business people wanted the meters. It was a given that nobody wanted to pay for parking and nobody wanted to pay more for parking. But there was cost to parking; there was no "free parking". Even at the mall, there was a fee for parking, though it was hidden. If the those who received the benefit of the parking were to pay – the employers, the merchants, that would be fine; but it was more likely that parkers would continue to pay.
- Parking experts would say to put in longer-term meters where parking was available (like 10-hour meters on Langdon and Railroad Streets); i.e., take time limits off where there was parking availability.
- In structures, the best parking availability for generating revenue was around 80%. If it got to 90%, the structure would too often be full. Monthly parking was opened up at Overture four years ago, with 50 passes. Instead of gaining revenues there, revenues dropped because parkers who were paying hourly rates there shifted to monthly parking. The Utility "stole" customers from itself.
- The Utility has a policy for people on waiting lists for monthly parking, of never having to wait longer than six months. Some structures, like Gov East and State St Cap, had immediate openings. It would be ideal if there was no waiting lists anywhere.
- The Utility wanted the lots to break even. MMB was bad, and Wingra was worse. Knobeloch appreciated Alder Ellingson's support for selling Wingra. He

too thought the Utility should sell it. If the merchants wanted to buy it and run it, that would be great. Whatever development occurred there would probably add vibrancy to the neighborhood, and might help make the meters in the area pay for themselves. He would recommend listing this as surplus, and getting rid of it.

- The hottest pass was the Utility's newest pass, the Premium 24/7 pass, which was also the most expensive pass. Why would someone pay this much? Because they were tired of the hassle of parking on the street and getting ticketed. By the time they paid their tickets, it cost less to buy a Premium pass. Some of these customers were condo owners who needed a second space, who otherwise might pay for \$30K/year for a parking space in their building, and thought the pass a good deal by comparison. The success of the Premium pass was a really good development.

- In terms of costs, 43% of the Utility's operating costs were for its employees. Parking was a people-based agency, with 76 employees; adding hourly and seasonal, made this 100; who received regular step and longevity increases. Purchased services went up every year. One example of this was the cost of credit card transactions. About half of the Utility's revenue was generated on credit cards. Credit card companies had started targeting fees for small transactions. Just that day, the credit card company informed the Utility that it was increasing each transaction by 10 cents, which would cost the Utility an additional \$149K in fees (out of the \$600K the Utility hoped to gain by the rate changes).

- The debt service was zero now. Many utilities had debt service as their #1 expense item. With underground \$41K stalls, the Utility could easily get that big. But the Utility never wanted to get so big that this would be true. When bond underwriters looked at a utility's business, they looked at system revenue. No underwriter would likely underwrite a parking utility based on the revenue from one public ramp. You could not make ends meet on a new public ramp when paying debt service on it. This had never happened with the City of Madison. With the modest rates Madison had, revenue was needed from all facilities, esp. meters, to make it work.

- Underwriters had to use system revenue, or the rates would have to be excessively high. For example, in Chicago, the Hyatt could charge \$26/day with a \$300 lost ticket fee because it had a captive audience, a "monopoly". At Millennium Park downtown, two hours of parking on a Sunday cost \$20. Chicago colleagues had reported that they needed \$26/day/stall, but aimed for \$52/day/stall. When getting \$52/day/stall, you could actually build extra parking and still pay for it. By contrast, Madison's rates were in the area of \$5/stall.

- Parking construction costs in Chicago and Madison were about the same; though land costs were higher in Chicago. But with rates of \$52/day, people in Chicago were trying to build extra parking because they could afford it..

- If the Utility didn't have to pay PILOT and the occupancy fees, it wouldn't need the rate increases.

- If the Utility got its citation revenue, it wouldn't need the increases either. The UW was able to do a lot of good things because their revenue included citation revenue. The Utility is allowed to keep Failure to Pay fees, before it became a ticket. But once it went to ticket, the Utility got nothing, not even its original parking fees. The Utility didn't receive any citation money, even from the tickets the Utility itself issued. And even if the ticket went to court and Parking staff used their time to testify in court, the Utility received no money.

- Most other parking utilities got the ticket revenue. With it, it was possible to do great things.

- But what you take out of someone else's pocket, leaves them short. If the

Police Dept. didn't received \$500K for writing tickets, it would leave a hole in its budget. It was important to look at the bigger picture. Still people should know that this was not the business model used by most other parking utilities.

- Re: chart for Monroe/Atwood Streets Collection Route Comparison (attached), 2011 data was not yet included; in particular, the big cost of multi-space meters was missing from the systemwide expenses. With this, the chart would show Monroe area revenues even further away from meeting average expense/space, even with the revenues from the meters in the 1400 block along the Stadium and Stadium Bar, which were already at \$1.50/hour. If these parkers chose, they could just cross the street and park for \$1.00/hour. A rate increase might make it possible to place multi-space machines on the busiest blocks of Monroe Street.
- Whether looking at the rate changes by dollar amount or percentage of change, the number should be divided by three, since it had been three years since the last rate change.
- Some rates weren't raised at all, such as State St Campus (the largest ramp), because UW students and staff have started taking the bus. With development near Overture, the rate went up 5 cents/hour. If people wanted half-price parking from Gov East, they could go to Overture, which was about a six-minute walk away from GE.
- Cap Square North had the biggest increase of 30 cents/hour. The average stay at CSN was 3-4 hours; so these parkers would pay between 90 cents and \$1.20 more.
- While this might seem like a lot to people on a tight budget, it took a lot of money to maintain these ramps. The Utility did not want to close its doors. It needed to maintain its financial sustainability. To keep paying its bills, the Utility needed to charge its customers.
- Parking Analyst Jim Koloen talked about the effect of the 2009 increases: Before the last rate change in 2008, Gov East was at 91% occupancy. GE received the highest increase in 2009, after which its occupancy decreased to 79%, but its revenue increased. In 2010, occupancy went to 74%, and revenue increased. In 2011, occupancy went back up to 76%, and revenue increased.
- With very low occupancy and the cheapest rates, Overture's rates remained the same over these years. It had 46% occupancy in 2008 and 56% occupancy now.
- Cap Sq North also had low occupancy in 2008, at 53%. Because GE had such a high occupancy rate, Parking wanted to move some of those parkers to a different ramp. This effort succeeded wildly. In 2009, CSN occupancy went up by 10% to 63%; in 2010 it was 76%; and in 2011, it was 83%. Now more crowded, Parking wanted to shift some of the CSN parkers to Overture, where rates and occupancy were much lower.
- Knobloch continued. One mistake made three years ago was to raise the all-night rate from \$3 to \$5 (vs. raising the POE fee from \$4 to \$5). Competition around the Square kept their rates at \$3, and the Utility's night business went down. The point was that staff could do their best to predict what would happen with the different rate changes, but with so many variables, it wasn't certain.
- With the current proposal, staff hoped to raise \$600K/year, which was half of what was needed to rebuild three more ramps. It would take \$1.2 million more revenues per year to make the Utility's cash flow work.

Knobeloch answered questions.

- Timeframe for special event parking: Starts 2 hours and 15 minutes before

the event, and stops 15 minutes after it starts. Otherwise, regular ticket prices applied. The difference between paying special event parking fees and regular fees could be very little, depending on how long people parked. The only purpose of the fee was to empty the ramps quickly at the end of an event.

- The one exception to this timeframe was the WIAA tournaments because officials had asked that the parking be all day (vs. standard 2+ hours). The event fee was used only at Overture and State St Campus, nearest to the Kohl Center, on Thursday, Friday and Saturday. A sign was placed out front to direct hourly parkers to State St Cap. Parking lost money at these ramps on these days, because all of the commuters who normally paid \$9-10/day, paid only \$4. However, WIAA brought a lot of business to State Street businesses and the City. Parking hoped the tournament would stay and contract with Madison.
- Parking had explored possible solutions for hourly parkers who might want to park at the ramp for a short time and not pay the event fee. They had started out by simply asking parkers if they were attending the event or not. Not surprisingly, most everyone would say "no" (even if everyone in the car was wearing sports apparel). Other garages around Campus simply charged what they were going to charge, without asking questions.
- It would help to better identify garages that weren't on special event parking. But really, 2+ hours wasn't a very long period out of 24 hours. Also businesses could absorb some of the cost by using the coupon system that was available, by offering a \$1-off or \$2-off coupon to customers. Businesses paid only when the coupons were used. Parking had over 200 merchants and vendors using coupons now.
- With most garages, it wasn't possible to nest different spaces inside the gates because the queue was outside the gates.
- One exception was State St Cap, which had meters outside the gate along the side. At the bottom of this ramp were 116 reserved spaces. Perhaps these reserved parkers could be moved upstairs; and this area could be opened up to multispace parkers. The problem with that was that occasionally this space was rented out; as for example, to Overture for its Crescendo Club who attended Symphony and Opera performances. These people had paid a premium for their season tickets, which was bundled with their parking. If it weren't for arrangements with renters, the Utility would certainly open up this area to hourly parking. It would be complicated to reserve spaces upstairs, but it was possible; esp. since the number of times renters used the area were few. Renters would have to be notified if a change like this were to occur. State St Cap was the only ramp that had segregated parking with separate entrances where something like this would work; plus it was close to State Street.
- Adjusting rates to shift parkers from higher occupancy to lower occupancy ramps worked most effectively with price-sensitive customers. Gov East was so successful because occupancy had been reduced enough to ensure that parking was always available there. And now hopefully people would move from Cap Sq North to Overture, which would help free up parking at CSN and improve occupancy at Overture. It was hard to say how things would go at Overture, with the new Library and other developments near there. But it was unlikely to fill up in the next three years.
- Ultimately, the Utility hoped to balance out demand among its five structures. It would be good if every ramp operated like Gov East does now.
- Private lots didn't want the hourly business; it was too hard to handle and too expensive. The Utility could not compete with a TIF-supported lot, because it couldn't get its price down to where theirs was. Their monthly prices were lower. Their hourly parking was very limited, with rates at \$3/hour. Some of the privates used an AVI system, which scanned the chips on the parkers



windshield, so people didn't even have to stop at the gate when they were leaving.

- It was possible to remove the message telling parkers to take their ticket with them; and to show the lost ticket fee instead.
- It wasn't possible to increase the cost of parking fees to cover the increased cost of small credit card transactions because the credit card companies wouldn't allow it. Per the rules of credit card companies, price differentials couldn't be charged for this. The penalty was not to be allowed to use credit cards at all.

Streit said he was prepared to vote on the rate proposal. Though difficult, TPC members had a responsibility to vote on rates for the buses and for parking. Apart from the rates changes every three years, over the other 35 months, the group heard about how much it cost to repair things. The situation was "pay me now or pay me later". Money would have to set aside at increasing rates either to keep making repairs on the ramps or to pay for rebuilding them.

Streit had one question: Why not charge until 8 PM on street meters, to encourage turnover and keep parking available for short-term parkers, rather than working around event fees in the ramps? Knobloch said he was planning to conduct a trial on Langdon Street in the two blocks between the Union and the Library, where multi-space meters had been installed. The multi-space meters could be changed to show the extended enforcement hours, simply by reprogramming their displays. As far as including more meters just off of State Street in the trial, Knobloch would want to study which ones had availability and which didn't. Another reason he was starting the trial on just the two blocks on Langdon was because the Police said they wouldn't charge Parking any more to enforce them. If the whole system were to be enforced to 7 PM (as recommended three years ago) or to 8 PM, the Police would probably charge more. He wished he could use Parking people to enforce the meters, but that was against City ordinance, which would have to be changed to allow this. Knobloch said he wanted to conduct the trial first, and then look at other areas where this might be tried.

Since ramp replacement would be driving costs going forward, Schmidt was interested in hearing more about the cost creep at Gov East. Knobloch said two things happened. As the biggest underground facility in the city, GE was originally envisioned as a huge platform where 330 stalls per floor could be built (more than 1,500 stalls). But even after careful planning, the reality was that only 1,300 stalls would fit. Knobloch predicted that this number would go below 1,300 and possibly significantly below. As the number of stalls shrank, the cost per stall went up. Consultants often wanted to project minimal costs for doing things under ideal conditions, but this didn't work; probable cost was needed. We didn't want to find out at the end that costs far exceeded original estimates (like in Ann Arbor). At least, Madison already knew.

For example, when the cost was estimated at \$35K/stall, Parking mentioned that the walls needed to be painted white and extra lighting was needed, because it wasn't good for the garage to look and feel like cave. People were afraid of underground facilities, and didn't want to go in them. Parkers had to be encouraged to go into them; and what was more, to go back into them a second time. When Knobloch saw the Planning and Engineering consultant's estimates, he noticed the cost for A&E was missing. When asked, they said this would cost an additional \$2.7 million; which was certainly part of the cost

and should have been included in the per stall estimates. Originally, Parking had received a low-ball estimate on revenue equipment. But they realized they would have to have equipment in all four corners of the ramp, not in just one quadrant. Six different groups couldn't be doing revenue collection; the most logical would be for Parking to do this. And with so many partners, it was complicated. Per Walker Parking Consultants, the cost to do this would be \$840K (vs. \$200-400K).

Knobeloch said the end result was that costs went up on certain essential items, while the number of stalls went down. He saw this cost creep continuing some; but at \$41K, they were a lot closer to reality. Rather than finding additional costs, he expected the stall number to decrease. Other things had to be considered besides how many stalls to build, such as where the ramps came down, and where to place security offices and cashier booths; which all factored into how many stalls would fit into a structure. Valet parking for the hotel would take up a lot of space. So, the original estimate of \$28K/stall was way too low.

Schmidt wondered if the demands of potential partners, which were driving some of the design decisions, had been reasonable. Knobeloch said that some of their requests had to be turned down; for example, a separate valet entrance on Pinckney Street. People had a very different vision for Pinckney: a ped and bike way, with some isolated parking for retail shops. The hotel already almost had a private exit, on Wilson Street. For the most part, as far as the design was concerned, the partners had been reasonable; some of what the consultants had thought was critical was found not to be so critical. When it looked like the number of stalls might fall below 1,300 due to some of the design requests, staff said this simply couldn't happen.

Staff emphasized to everyone that the most important thing for the underground structure was the parking experience. Everything else was secondary. Originally, the planning team had said the most important goal of the underground structure was to maximize the above-ground uses. Knobeloch told the team that they would end up with an underground structure that no one would park in, and asked the planning team to re-write this goal. In fact, one of the first versions of the plan called for 8'2" stalls (to maximize above-ground features). Knobeloch told the team that people could not park in stalls this narrow; parkers wouldn't be able to open their doors.

Schmidt asked if there had been any discussion about what we might try to do at Lake Street (the next structure scheduled for replacement after Gov East). Knobeloch said he had talked to the UW re: the possibility of partnering; though interested initially, they seemed less so now. He had also talked to one developer who wanted to build apartments above the garage, but he came to the table with a small purse. This structure would be the easiest to replace, esp. if not going below grade too much. Because of a 12-foot water table there, the new structure would have to be mostly above-ground. Since Frances Street was newer and was only connected by bridges, it could be run as a separate entity. So we could do what we wanted with Lake Street, including mixed use. But Parking needed to find a partner with their own money to invest, who would not depend on Parking to pay for their parking. Knobeloch thought this possible.

Schmidt also asked if wrapper buildings might be considered for new

structures (like Lake Street). We might need to build higher, but we'd get mixed use and wouldn't be putting parking decks right out on the street; an idea we might pursue for future lot redevelopments. Knobloch said the only structure with this potential was Campus, because of its size. The footprints for the other structures were too small (inc. State St Cap). Designers certainly were doing things (like wrap-arounds) to make ramps look better. Knobloch thought this would be easier and cheaper (going above ground) at Lake Street than at GE & State St Cap; esp. having a partner with money. But he was worried about State St Cap, where \$300K was spent in 2011.

Even with a revenue loss, Golden said he assumed the proposal would be referred, because of a strong request to do so. He asked for more information from Parking, related to the following items.

- An idea was considered in 1990, to increase the rate for the first hour at the ramps. Perhaps some numbers could be run to see what this would look like, inc. revenue implications.
- Wingra Lot: Consult the Library about implications for the Library if the lot were removed completely as a public parking facility. Also, as a possible CDA issue, he wasn't sure if selling the lot to the private sector would be the best. Having some control, there could be some development in at least four or five of the lots.
- Consult Orange Schroeder, head of the Monroe Street business association; to see, (minus Wingra Lot, which would reduce the deficit substantially), whether the Monroe Street business district might be willing to cover the deficit, out of revenues they might collect either informally, formally, or by creating a BID. This was perhaps a more ambitious approach than a rate increase; but worth asking the question.
- Lester Pines comments and concerns about employer retention: Could different rates be offered depending on the number of spaces a party rented (volume discounts), given low utilization at certain ramps (i.e., Overture)? Filling some spaces rather than having them empty, would generate more revenue. Perhaps we could offer volume discounts in increments of 10? He asked that Parking provide data about the number of monthly parkers and vacancy rate at each facility, along with rate information.
- Though separate from the current discussion of rate changes, the idea of building mixed-use facilities and leasing the property in order to generate revenues, should be explored in the future.
- Meter revenue past 6 PM: Parking's trial should go beyond meters in the Langdon area, to include areas those near Overture, given the high-end parkers who came there and didn't use the facilities and given that event parking around the Overture was intense. Data from this expanded trial area would be very useful. Also, target times for the underlying activity creating the need for parking: 7 and 8 PM for merchants, and 9 and 10 PM for Overture.
- Enforcement revenues/costs: Since Parking rents the streets, what about changing the ordinances to allow Failure to Pay tickets to be put on the streets that Parking rents? It would affect City revenues; but (it might work) if it was done as part of a broader parking fine review, and it was tagged to something to make it neutral. Since Parking rented the street, it would be logical to do this and give Parking staff enforcement authority for just this narrow band of activity (not other law enforcement activity like alternate side parking, or permit parking).

Streit/Golden moved to refer action on the Parking proposal to a future meeting, on a date to be determined by the Chair. Schmidt felt the Commission

needed to look more closely at some of the issues raised by Knobeloch. Also, in terms of policy-making, he wondered if some goals and parameters should be set for future rebuilds in view of the debt load the Utility would have from Gov East, which would drive what they had to do going forward. Even at a cost of \$50K, they might do better to take another month. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote/other.

**H. 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.**

**I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**I.1. General announcements by Chair - None.**

**I.2. Commission member items for future agendas**

Maniaci suggested that members might like to check out the minutes from the Plan Commission's March meeting, to see whether the TPC's transportation recommendations were added to the Downtown Plan. She also mentioned that she had asked Metro to explore how music on buses might impact rider behavior. For example, would playing classical music on certain routes change behavior? Kamp said Metro had on their list for review.

Poulson reported on the inquiry to the City Attorney about holding a Commission meeting outside of the City. Basically it wasn't encouraged, but it wasn't prevented. During discussion, members agreed that though the idea had merit, it may not be appropriate or politic, because of limited or no transit accessibility to meetings outside of the city esp. in the evening. It was suggested that perhaps a Metro bus could be provided to transport people. With regard to federal guidelines, Kamp remarked that for a couple RTA public hearings held outside of Metro's service area, a Metro bus was deemed appropriate governmental use for a non-charter-like special event. They had run into no issues; so this was a possibility for visits to areas without service.

Golden suggested that maybe the CSOS could hold meetings in the communities of transit partners, esp. if held towards the end of the day and if announced and advertised. Golden reported how successful some Regional Planning Commission meetings had been, where small communities came to talk with pride about their development plans. The fact that the RPC traveled to these communities showed respect and treated them with importance; which is what Golden wanted to replicate for transit in the communities with which we contract.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made to Adjourn at 8:15 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.