



# 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, June 13, 2012

5:00 PM

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

---

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 PM.

Poulson welcomed the Commission's new Second Alternate, Ann Kovich, and members and staff took turns introducing themselves.

Please note: Subeck arrived at 5:15 PM, and Maniaci arrived at 5:17 PM, during Agenda Item E.2.

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Tolmie, to Approve the Minutes of the May 9, 2012 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

### D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Bergamini recused herself from discussion and action on Agenda Item F.1. regarding changes to Campus routes, due to conflicts with her employment at the UW. She asked however that she be allowed to stay in the room to hear the discussion related to the item.

### E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.2. [26673](#) Parking: May 2012 Activity Report, April Revenue/Expense and Occupancy Reports, and Audited 2011 Year-End Revenue/Expense Report - TPC 06.13.12

**White/Bergamini made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

E.2. [26669](#) Metro: YTD Performance Indicator Reports (if available), Financial Report, and Rider-Revenue Comparison Report - TPC 06.13.12

**Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp and Metro Finance Manager highlighted items and answered questions about the Financial Report.**

• Metro was in good shape overall, generating an estimated \$118K in contingency. This was driven by revenues being overbudget (by \$108K) due to passenger revenues being up; because of a slight increase in ridership and

also because of some of the new contracts, where either the ridership was up or, in the case of the UW, a multi-year average kicked in.

- Results on the expense side were mixed, but also in pretty good shape.
- Looking at Salaries and OT, Metro had started the year with a record number of driver retirements/resignations/terminations. Reflecting trends across the state, 43 had left in the past 12 months, which was almost double the normal for Metro. As a result, salaries were underbudget and OT was overbudget. Of their 33 part-time positions, Metro expected to replace 30 over the first six months of 2012; reflecting a lot of turnover and keeping the training staff busy. Though struggling in the first half of the year, this could settle down in the 3rd and 4th quarters.
- Diesel fuel, oil and lubricants were slightly overbudget, a reminder that roughly 40% of Metro's diesel was on a fixed-price contract. With other departments, bids were opened to lock in the remaining 60% since the price/barrel had dropped nicely over the past couple months. An update would follow.
- Natural gas costs were also down, due to record lows.
- Among the drivers leaving, many had higher seniority. This could affect next year's budget as well.
- Owl Creek update: An internal service development committee (inc. Drew Beck) was working on a request from the Mayor to look at service expansions in 2013, should funds become available. Staff had been looking at several possibilities, using a 80/20 rule with a focus on overcrowding (based on data reflected on an updated "red dot" map that showed heaviest concentrations of ridership). Metro was looking at more frequent service on such routes at #2 and #4; and they were also looking at periphery service where there was a need, inc. such areas as Owl Creek.
- Staff was looking at alternatives and would be reporting back shortly about this and possible budget scenarios being discussed with the Mayor's Office.
- Needs analysis of Owl Creek included public transit options through Metro, and if there was a role for other services, working with other organizations to find alternatives. Staff was looking at alternative services related to peak vs. weekday vs. weekend periods, to see what was best served by what mode. Better pedestrian and bike access to the area was also being reviewed. Dane County's specialized transportation programs might be helpful.
- Metro would be reviewing proposals from the NRT's for service to other periphery neighborhoods also.

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

## F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [26670](#) Metro: Action on Changes to Campus Routes, and Routes 11 and 25 - TPC 06.13.12

Registrant Colin Bowden, 625 N. Frances, 53703, Vice-President of the State-Langdon Neighborhood Assn., spoke in opposition to reducing Route 81 service. Route 81 especially was very important to the neighborhood, during the summer as well as the rest of the year, when safety was an issue. People liked to party and drink, and reducing the SAFE Ride would leave a lot of people stranded. People in co-ops and frats would be concerned about cutting this. If there was a way to "compact" the Rts. 80/85 as proposed, or other ways to reduce other service/hours, he strongly urged that the Route 81 be left intact. Young people needed to stay safe.

Kamp and Metro Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck made the following comments.

- Beck and his staff had been working with UW staff. It wasn't easy when a partner asked for help from Metro to deal with a budget concern. UW had a budget shortfall amounting to roughly 3,200 service hours, which required a difficult but necessary look at all of the routes.
- On page 3 of the attachment (UW Routes Service Reduction Alternatives-May 17 2012 REVISION), Alt. D showed Revised Rts. 80/85, with a 7-bus rotation (vs. the current 8-bus rotation), which saved 1,639 hours.
- Then to get to the 3,200 hours, they had had to look at Rt. 81 and, similar to the late night Rt. 82, consider going to a 30-minute headway. Staff agreed this was an appropriate option to look at.
- While concern for safety at late night was certainly important, safety on the Rts. 80 and 85 was also important. As shown by Metro and UW data, they were two of the most (over)crowded routes in the system; so much so that signs on Campus reminded students and other riders to stand behind the line. This was difficult to enforce. They had had several serious close calls related to this.
- So the 80/85 had its own safety element that staff kept in mind when they decided that the 80/85 rotation was do-able; but reducing the 80/85 further was not part of their recommendation.
- In reviewing the recess version of revised Rts. 80/85 (Alt. F), staff realized the smaller geographics of this alternative saved 197 hours not reported earlier.

Metro recommended the adoption of the combination of Alt.'s A+D+F, for a total reduction of 3,596 hours. Subeck/Tolmie made a motion to approve staff recommendations for changes (on Campus).

Maniaci/Schmidt made a motion to adopt Maniaci's alternate proposal for service changes on Campus (attached). Maniaci summarized her proposal.

- She supported a more wholistic, balanced approach to the cuts, rather than simply cutting the late night service in half, cutting to half-hour headways instead of the existing 15-minute service.
- Her proposal was basically Alt. D+E, and looking at the Rt. 81 starting later in a couple of different ways. Along with the Alt. D, revised 80/85's 7-bus rotation, she would adopt Alt. E, a 3-bus rotation with 17-minute service over the summer months.
- Thirdly, she proposed a slightly reduced Rt. 81 schedule in two ways.
- Per page 2, Rts. 81 and 82-Late Night Service Calendar, there would be 220 days of service in 2012-13. Considering that other good transportation options were available thru existing service around 6:30 to 7:30 that covered much of the same area that the Rt. 81 covered, she recommended that instead of starting the Rt. 81 at 6:36, it should start at 8:06 PM (as shown on page 3, Rt. 81 service schedule). This would save 1.5 hours across 220 service days or nearly 330 hours of cuts.
- With a small gap in hours to reach 3,200, she noticed that service was being provided four days in August prior to classes starting on Sept. 4, 2012. Perhaps some minor cuts to service over these four days was possible, and starting the service closer to when classes started.
- These were manageable, pragmatic cut proposals that would ensure that this neighborhood had this late night bus service when there weren't other transportation options available at the times and places that Rt. 81 served.
- Summary data prepared for the May 9th TPC showed the frequency of who was riding the bus esp. during the recess period.

- Portions of the 2005 Long Range Transportation Plan and TDM Plan for UW-Madison (attached) showed the history of SAFERide and how the bus program was the backbone of this program.
- The UW had been putting its focus on bus service while at the same time de-emphasizing the other programs (esp. cab service).

Maniaci was concerned that if Rt. 81 was cut to half this year, UW Transportation Services would come back next year and propose that the entire route be cut because ridership would be down because people had stopped using it so much because service was so infrequent. There were strategic reasons why the route was drawn the way it was: It ended at Paterson by Norris Court, an area heavily populated by grad students who needed late night options. There really was no "kum ba ya" way to make cuts. Metro argued that they would rather have the full summer service on the 80 route over the summer months; and she would argue that there was a greater utility and greater public good in having the 15-minute late night service during the nine months of the school year, on the SAFERide Program. She had heard quite a lot from the Mansion Hill Assn. and they had just heard from the Langdon-State Street Assn. Being summer, unfortunately, many of the neighborhood stakeholders were not now available when the decision was being made. The current Route 81 service was incredibly valuable utility for the population that was served by it. Her neighborhood was in transition with the predominance of undergraduate housing going up into the towers, and a lot of the neighborhood was being filled in by grad students and young professionals. She was concerned that these grad students might choose to live in neighborhoods with more amenities.

Members asked questions. Maniaci said the trade-off was between reducing summer service on Rt. 80/85, from a 12-minute to 17-minute service; or reducing Rt. 81 service from 15-minute service to 30-minute service during the school year. Beck said the Rt. 80/85 was very productive over the summer. Though the number of riders dropped off, so did the number of buses, so productivity remained high (80+ passengers/bus hour). The Rt. 81 didn't run during the summer. Maniaci was sensitive to the fact that cuts to the Rt. 81 bumped up the number of hours being cut to 3,596, which was 300+ hours over the target number of 3,200 hours

Metro staff responded to Maniaci's proposal.

- Because Rt. 80/85 had strong productivity in the summer months, they were concerned about safety and overcrowding in a 3-bus rotation. They already went from an 8-bus to a 4-bus rotation right now (in recess). They were thinning the route out, going to a Rt. 80/85 combination. They felt comfortable going to a 7-bus rotation on that (during the standard schedule), but to go to a 3-bus (during recess), overcrowding would be problematic.
- From a scheduling standpoint, to efficiently start drivers, it would be difficult to start drivers at 8 in the evening.
- Metro had reviewed Maniaci's proposal and costed out Alt. E. and discussed it; and felt that safety was a key issue in a 3-bus rotation.
- In balancing the safety issues (between overcrowding and providing late night service), and considering that these routes were the most productive in the entire system, Metro wished they didn't have to have this discussion.
- But they had the reality of dealing with a partner with a budget concern, similar to Fitchburg and Middleton coming to them. Staff looked at ridership productivity and overcrowding as trumping the safety issue at night, given that

the Rt. 82 at night was already on a 30-minute headway, not an easy headway, through which they had managed safety reasonably well. They felt they could do likewise with the Rt. 81.

Staff answered questions.

- Given that Rt. 81 operated every 15 minutes and did four loops that took one hour for one bus to do, in an hour, it carried 30 people on average. The Rt. 82 operated every 30 minutes, did two loops in an hour, and carried roughly 80 riders an hour.
- The Rt. 81 and 82 overlapped only at their boarding point at Memorial Union; otherwise they ran in different loops in different areas of Campus.
- If the Rt. 80/85 were reduced to a 3-bus rotation, there would be a higher probability that riders would be turned away, since they were now occasionally turned away, even during the summer months. They were currently doing 80-100 rides an hour, compared to the system-wide average of 38; over twice the number of rides on regular routes, inc. the Rts. 2 and 4. Tolmie: As a regular rider of the Rt. 80, which was packed with a 4-bus rotation, he couldn't imagine it being cut to 3 buses. He thought it likely that people would be turned away, which with a 17-minute frequency, would create some real problems for people trying to get somewhere by a certain time.
- Re: moving more quickly towards bigger buses to better handle capacity, the Council had just introduced a resolution to issue an RFP for a bus size study. Larger, articulated buses could be part of the longer-term solution on Campus.
- One reason for not moving forward immediately to acquire larger buses was the bus garage, which now held 209 buses in a 160-bus facility. Metro was looking at building a satellite facility over the next 5-8 years, which could be designed not only to address the bus size issue but also to deal with alternate fuel vehicles like compressed natural gas that would require infrastructure improvements.
- Following the bus study and during the next 5-year procurement, the option to buy 60-foot buses could be added.
- Re: un/loading times, the longer buses could have three doors that all could have fare-box capabilities, to help deal with the boarding/alighting in an efficient way.

Whether or not there was a way to address all the safety issues, Maniaci said she was concerned that once Rt. 81 service was cut, they would never get it back. She would argue in favor of trying the 3-bus rotation (on Rt. 80/85) to see if it would work, and to keep the late night service. She would rather have crowded riders on the bus than to have unsafe situations, police calls and rapes on Langdon Street; esp. since it sounded like things were moving towards articulated buses. And crowded buses on Campus would provide even more impetus to get larger buses sooner rather than later. As the alder for the Rt. 81 neighborhood and looking at the situation strategically, in the short term, she would rather maintain the SAFERide bus service, esp. considering the cuts to the other pieces of the SAFERide Program on Campus, knowing that we were moving towards more comprehensive crowd management on the buses. Plus, activity on Campus was less over the summer. She didn't really see a compromise that would address the different safety issues.

When asked about any increase in rapes and crime on the west side of Campus (along Rt. 82) with 30-minute service, Kamp said from Metro's perspective, safety had been managed effectively there. But Metro had no info about specific incidents; perhaps Campus staff had. The Rt. 81 had always

provided 15-minute service, so there was no way to know what if any increase there would be in incidents of crime, if it were reduced to 30-minute service.

Subeck said she appreciated what Maniaci was trying to do. Both Maniaci and Metro were trying to make the best out of a bad situation. The reality was that the UW had limited funding available for this, which put the Commission between a rock and a hard place because it would have to decide exactly how to cut service (the decision had been made elsewhere that service was to be cut). Looking at the ridership, with 30 passengers/revenue hour on the Rt. 81, Subeck couldn't justify cutting other service in lieu of reducing the frequency of Rt. 81 service. Given the number of regular buses that travelled in the Rt. 81 area in the early evening, she was interested in the idea of starting the Rt. 81 service later in order to keep the service more frequent. She wondered if starting the Rt. 81 later, say around 10 PM when drivers might be ending other routes, if something like a 20-minute frequency would be feasible. But she was not comfortable with reducing Rts. 80/85 to a 3-bus rotation to do that. Service already dropped over the summer. Having heard from Eagle Heights residents, who were year-round riders, it would be a hardship for them, esp. those with children, to be turned away and forced to wait. Added to this were the safety concerns due to overcrowding.

Schmidt supported Maniaci's proposal. He too was concerned about the precedent being set. Without getting into the business of a partner (UW), there were reasons why they were making these cuts that had nothing to do with the buses. He was concerned that the Commission would be having this discussion again next year and perhaps deciding they needed to go to three buses next year. If there was a way for this body to send a message to the UW administration (not Transportation Services) that they needed to pay attention to this and not put the burden on other bodies to make the hard choices, that would be good.

Tolmie said it was a really difficult decision either way, a lose-lose situation. But looking at the ridership numbers, if the new proposal were adopted, they would be almost be putting at risk more of the riders than if they adopted Metro's proposal. It would almost be punishing those who rode the bus most frequently, the majority of riders vs. many fewer. Nonetheless, he applauded and thanked Maniaci for her effort.

A vote was taken on the Maniaci motion: Ayes: Maniaci, Schmidt, Schmitz; Noes: Subeck, Tolmie, White, Kovich; with the Chair non-voting and Bergamini recused. The motion failed 4 to 3, with 2 not voting.

Discussion on the original motion followed. Maniaci thought Subeck brought up a good point. Maniaci herself had been trying to offer a compromise option. She wanted to discuss the value of having 15-minute service. She had proposed one way, and Subeck had thought productively about doing it another. Her proposal had Rt. 81 service starting after 8 PM; while Subeck had it starting it after 10 PM. Both ways maintained 15-minute service. Maniaci said she understood the issue of different ridership levels. But for the purpose the Rt. 81 was supposed to be functioning, as the late night service for SAFE transportation options, it was not acceptable that, at 1 AM, someone would have to wait a half hour on the curb for the bus (while who knew who was walking by). As they had heard at the hearing, the value of the 15-minute service late at night was to get off the street, to move quickly and not to be

standing in one place stationary waiting. Maniaci wanted to take the time to figure this out; she felt it was too important to just coast through. She asked staff to look at the numbers again, and consider how the cuts could be made and still meet everyone needs.

Staff responded to questions.

- Re: timing and deadlines, Kamp said the changes would go into effect on the last Sunday in August. Delaying a decision until the July meeting wouldn't allow enough time to implement the changes (print new schedules, other internal work) by the end of August. If the TPC didn't approve the current proposal, Metro was in a very challenging situation in their partnership with UW and how they would meet their budgetary goal.
- Re: amending the motion to ask Metro to investigate the possibility of providing 15- or 20-minute service later at night, Kamp said both Metro and UW staff had costed this out right after the Campus hearing. The staffs jointly decided this was not a recommendation they should bring to the table. If Metro were directed to do that, staff would work with the UW to see how they might do it. But if asked to see what they could do, both staffs had already done that. Considering the times the Rt. 81 operated currently, providing 30-minute service (like the Rt. 82) seemed a reasonable proposal to put forward. Also, in terms of reliability, it would be problematic to require drivers to report late at night (at 10:30 PM).

Gordon Graham, Asst. Director, UW Transportation Services, commented.

- UW staff had worked with Metro a lot in recent months to come up with the best options, and had held several forums and stakeholder meetings on Campus. Most recently, they had met with Eagle Heights residents, and asked for a show of hands re: their preferred options.
- UW staff had a good sense of Campus preference, which was to cut the Rt. 81 service and preserve as much of the Rts. 80/85 service as possible.
- The Rts. 80/85 buses were completely packed, which meant there was no room for people in wheelchairs to try get on; even for people who were able, but needed some assistance, it was very difficult.
- He was not in favor of reducing Rts. 80/85 any more than was absolutely necessary, because it was the most "in demand" service in the city of Madison. It seemed unreasonable to make it more inconvenient for 1.2 million riders so that a few thousand could have service late at night.
- Even during recess, the combined Rts. 80/85 would be the most heavily used service in the city.
- When asked about increasing UW Police presence to improve safety along the Rt. 81 route, Graham said that safety was an ongoing discussion on Campus. They tried not to get wrapped up in crises as they came along, but rather tried to plan for the long term, with stable, predictable kinds of programs on Campus. This allowed incoming Freshmen to know what their options were, and plan accordingly, and allowed people who had been on Campus for some time, to adjust their plans around the things that were available. Stability around programs was hugely important.
- He had just talked to UW PD Capt. Solie about SAFERide (taxi and bus), and the WALK program. Some of these programs had remained unchanged for years. The Rt. 81 had provided 15-minute service since its inception. However, many things had changed: where people lived and how they got around on Campus, the patterns and routes they took.
- It was time to again look at transportation options on Campus, and the UW had hired a consultant (at a cost of \$110K) to review bus systems on Campus

and make recommendations (to be completed after Jan. 1).

- They were trying to take a comprehensive approach as well as trying to respond to the immediate need of the budgetary issue.
- It was regrettable to have to be talking about making cuts to some of the most important transit options in the city. But this was the reality.

Maniaci noted that the UW was spending \$100K to study buses on Campus. Metro had all that info and data through their systems. Graham said the consultants were using a lot of Metro data, but they had also conducted several onboard (origin/destination) surveys, to look at how to optimize the service, so that along with making cuts, they might become more efficient about how they operated the system. Maniaci noted the hypocrisy of the UW using available resources to spend \$100K to study Metro bus routes, while at the same time asking for cuts to service (because they didn't have enough money). While she understood the UW's need to plan for their long term, she hoped they would respect the fact that the Commission (serving the city) also had to look at long-term options as well. While the discussion had revolved around the needs of the Campus, the routes in question also served the downtown, which was the city. The University was part of the city. In looking at the four areas served by Rt. 81 and 82, only one of them directly served on Campus; the others directly served the neighborhoods.

Maniaci asked Kamp what the City would have to do to pick up the slack, if the University was shifting its position and saying this was no longer a priority for them for late-night service, and pulling its resources from long-standing programs and stable service routes that stretched back twenty years. She wondered what the City's future response would be related to late-night service to these communities and neighborhoods. Kamp wondered how different things might be if a RTA existed, whereby the City would have a source in addition to the UW, to help provide the flexibility and funding to address issues like this. He was optimistic about the possibility for an RTA; but agreed this wouldn't help with the reality of the situation right now.

A vote was taken on the original (Subeck/Tolmie) motion: Ayes: Schmidt, Subeck, Schmitz, Tolmie, White, Kovich; Noes: Maniaci; with the Chair non-voting and Bergamini recused. The motion passed 6 to 1, with 2 not voting.

Schmidt/Subeck made a motion to approve staff recommendations for changes to Routes 11 and 25 (attached). The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G.6.]

## NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

G.1. [26351](#)

SUBSTITUTE Amending various portions of Section 11.06 of the Madison General Ordinances to make pedal-cab licensing more affordable for licensees and to streamline the licensing process.

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item G.6.] Traffic Engineering Transportation Operations Analyst Keith Pollock talked about how the resolution developed out of discussions and shared concerns among Dist. 4 Alder Mike Verveer, Police Capt. Carl Gloede, Asst. City Attorney Adriana Peguero and himself.

- Unlicensed pedal cab operators, who cruised mainly at night on State Street,



didn't have insurance in case of an accident, and might have a criminal background, since no one knew who they were.

- The police had no leverage to stop the drivers if they were operating dangerously or had a bad track record.
- The ordinances had a big loophole that said if a pedal-cab operator was working strictly for donations, they didn't have to be licensed.
- Along with closing the loophole, the proposal would reduce the cost of entrance for legal pedal-cabs.
- Several people had expressed interest in starting a pedal-cab operation, but were discouraged when they found out how much it cost. The only licensed operator now was the large 12-person pedal-cab (Capitol Pedaler) that the Commission had approved for licensing in 2011.
- The proposal would reduce the cost of licensing from \$1,200 to \$125 for an initial 1-year license, and from \$1,800 to \$200 for an initial 2-year license; plus the vehicle sticker would be reduced from \$60 to \$35.
- Operators would be required to have valid insurance, and a valid permit that would entail a background check.
- Also, when Capitol Pedaler was licensed, the process took several months by the time the license approval went through the Council and Commission.
- The proposal would give Traffic Engineering the ability to give a provisional permit to operators as long as they had valid insurance and a permit, and passed a vehicle inspection (with Ped/Bike staff) to help ensure safety. Meanwhile, the application for a license would go through the formal approval process, and once approved, a final permit would be issued.
- The proposal would bring insurance requirements up to accepted standards (both for pedal-cabs and taxis, though all the taxis had insurance well above the required amount).
- Re: PBMVC's recommendation to amend the proposal to lift the restriction on hours of operation for pedal-cabs with one or two passengers: Both Metro and TE were opposed to pedal-cabs operating during the day for safety reasons.

Dist. 4 Alder Mike Verveer spoke in support of the resolution.

- He had approached Pollock and the City Attorney's Office with his concern that over many years, there had been a proliferation of pedal-cabs operating in the core downtown area.
- Overall, this was a wonderful thing; they contributed to the eclectic, funky nature of State Street/downtown, and were an asset. But they weren't licensed, and no one knew who the operators were.
- For their part, operators found Chapter 11 of the Ordinances way too cumbersome and overwhelming, esp. the financial hardship. Some operators were on fixed incomes, some were students, and some were seasonals.
- The purpose of the legislation was to encourage operators (in a nice way) to be licensed, and thus to be insured and to meet various requirements/regulations, inc. equipment inspections and background checks.
- Current ordinances had a loophole, whereby people could operate freely (without licenses) if they said they weren't charging a specific fare, but were working only for a gratuity/tip.
- PBMVC had a good discussion about lifting the time of day restriction. Metro and TE could explain their opposition to this. Notably however, the restriction applied only to weekdays, not weekends.
- Hopefully, action on the resolution would be completed by the end of June, since the new licensing year would begin on July 1.

Verveer, Pollock and Kamp answered questions.

- On page 6, Paragraph 3 of subdivision (j), related to prohibited hours of operation: The new language, "unless approved by the City Traffic Engineer", would give TE the flexibility to either allow operation during the week (perhaps on holidays or during restricted hours, as requested on a case-by-case basis); or to prohibit operation for safety reasons on a particular weekend day (due to a special event).
- Capitol Pedaler had asked about the possibility of operating before 6 PM on a couple of occasions. The new language gave TE some flexibility to address this. An operator like Capitol Pedaler could notify TE staff in advance of when they wanted to operate during restricted hours; then TE could notify staff at Metro so they could alert drivers to expect pedal-cabs in the vicinity. TE and Metro had agreed to do this on a trial basis.
- The change to the start time of prohibited hours from 2:00 AM to 6:00 AM, recognized that pedal-cabs were prolific at bar time when buses were more scarce.
- Re: Metro's position: Metro had an internal team that reviewed schedules and safety issues. Staff from this team felt that, in view of the number of things that were happening on the core streets and the many obstacles there, the presence of pedal-cabs added an extra level of safety concerns. Metro ran fewer buses on weekends, so the situation was more manageable then. But weekdays were not manageable.

A motion was made by Subeck, seconded by Bergamini, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. As a member of PBMVC and for due diligence, Maniaci discussed PBMVC's recommendation to change the proposal, which dealt with hours of operation for pedal-cabs that carried one or two passengers. The bike reps on PBMVC felt that these 1- or 2-passenger cabs traveled at the same speed in the same places as other bikes currently on the roads, and they didn't share the concerns about safety and see the need to limit their hours of operation. They agreed about restricting hours of operations for large pedal-cabs. Bergamini didn't support this recommendation, and said she would defer to the safety experts on this. Also, these were cabs, so they stopped/started and their movements were less predictable than other bicyclists. She felt that TE would be flexible enough to work with the situation as it developed, and if at some point TE felt that hours of operation could be expanded for these operators, that would be fine. The vote was taken and the motion passed by voice vote/other.

G.2. [26671](#)

Metro: Bus Lines (Poetry Contest) Agreement - TPC 06.13.12

Metro Marketing and Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch discussed the 2012-13 "Bus Lines" program and agreement with Madison Arts Commission (MAC), and answered questions.

- The \$3,000 from MAC would be used for printing, and to publish the poems of the eight winners on the buses, in the Ride Guide and on-line.
- Bus flyers announcing the contest had just gone out on the buses, and information was being put out on Metro's website and in text messages.
- The contest would be completed by Sept. 30th; at which time, Metro Marketing staff and MAC staff would judge the entries.
- Metro would then publicize and recognize the winners.
- This was the fourth year of the program.
- Staff would discuss with MAC staff the issues related to expanding the program beyond "Madison high school students".

Being an informational item, no action was needed.

G.3. [26672](#)

Parking: Resolution No. TPC 16-10, memorializing 2012 Parking rate modifications - TPC 06.13.12

**A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Subeck, to Approve Resolution No. TPC 16-10, memorializing the 2012 Parking Utility rate modifications. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

G.4. [26299](#)

Amending Section 1.08(3) of the Madison General Ordinances to reduce the bail deposit for expired meter violations.

**Because no one was present to discuss the resolution, a motion was made by Subeck, seconded by Schmitz, to Refer to the July meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

G.5. [26300](#)

Creating Section 23.561 of the Madison General Ordinances to prohibit towing a vehicle from private property without owner consent, a repossession judgment, or a citation issued to the vehicle for illegal parking.

**Dist. 4 Alder Mike Verveer discussed his reasons for sponsoring the ordinance.**

- **A constituent had contacted him, claiming that he was mistakenly towed from a private parking lot. His was not an isolated incident.**
- **In talking to MPD Parking Enforcement, he learned that private towing companies and their clients (landlords, property owners) had stopped calling Parking Enforcement to cite a vehicle before it was towed. This practice violated Sec. 349.13(3m) of the Wisconsin Statutes, which required that a municipal authority cite a vehicle before it could be towed from private property.**
- **The statute was largely being ignored; and MPD had unwittingly contributed to this, because they weren't aware of the statute and hadn't made policymakers or the City Attorney aware of the noticeable decrease in "parking privates" over the past few years.**
- **The fiscal note said that the City was losing \$60K-\$100K per year in parking fine revenue, because property owners no longer had the MPD involved in private parking violations.**
- **This wasn't his motivation for the ordinance; it was the lack of accountability and consumer protection for people parking illegally on private property and the resulting actions, whether by mistake or not.**
- **In the case of his constituent, the constituent felt he had had permission to park in the lot; but then was towed by Schmidt's (who happened to be the City's official towing contractor) to Schmidt's lot on the south side, was charged an exorbitant towing fee of over \$100, and was told he had to pay a daily storage fee.**
- **He had learned that most major Madison property companies had contracts with towing companies and were making money off of this, which was really disturbing.**
- **MPD talked to Schmidt's, their towing contractor, who had since stopped towing vehicles on private lots without a City citation.**
- **Coincidentally, Capt. Vic Wahl of the West Police District had also contacted the City Attorney's Office about small-time towing companies that had contracts with landlords, who were constantly towing vehicles in the Allied neighborhood at will. This led to disputes between the vehicles owners and the wrecker operators, and patrol officers were being called to deal with these disputes. Capt. Wahl couldn't believe that it was lawful that all these cars were being towed without a citation.**

- The legislation would not only codify the state statute in City general ordinances, it would also provide a penalty for towing done in violation of that state statute. With the new ordinance, MPD could cite tow truck operators, landlords or their agents who engaged in this prohibited practice.

Bergamini pointed out that also under the Building Code, vehicles were prohibited from sitting unmoved for too long; and Building Inspectors could be called to ticket tenants or landlords to have abandoned vehicles moved out. Madison's definition of an "abandoned vehicle" was strict, at least on the street: After three days, a vehicle was considered abandoned. She thought there was also a limit under the Building Code, after which someone could be told to get a car out or make it operable, or it would be towed and fined; and wondered how the new ordinance would mesh with this. Verveer said he would look into it, but his understanding was that under the new minimum housing code, a vehicle simply had to be operable, and there wasn't a time limit; though there was a 48-hour limit for street "storage", he wasn't aware of a time limit on private property.

Having seen the negative direction that towing on private lots had taken in other cities like Chicago, Maniaci supported the new ordinance. She wondered what recourse a person would have, who was illegally towed and charged for impound fees, etc. Verveer said this would be considered a civil matter that would be handled in Small Claims Court. [Please note: Schmitz left at this point in the meeting, at 7:45 PM.] Regarding the language of the ordinance and who would be fined, Verveer said the language was almost verbatim from the state statutes, and in consulting with the Attorney's Office and Police had determined that they had some flexibility: Either the property owners or their agents or the towing operators or their agents could be cited.

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Kovich, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item H.]

G.6. [26332](#)

A SUBSTITUTE accepting the Report of the Judge Doyle Square Staff Team dated March 20, 2012 and Directing Further Follow-up Actions.

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item F.1.] Project Director George Austin and Project Manager David Trowbridge presented information related to the completion of Phase 1 of planning for Judge Doyle Square (JDS), the Report of the Staff Team (attached), and the proposal to start Phase 2 of the project. Austin outlined the history of the project.

- The current resolution (Leg. File 26332) would set in motion a number of work tasks and items to move forward on the next phase of planning. After review by several committees, the resolution was scheduled to return to the Council on July 17th.
- When originally announced in Sept. 2010, the project was called the "Public Market Square" project. The City Staff Team was formed (inc. Traffic Engineering, Parking, Transit, among others), and Austin was hired under contract with the City to lead the Team during the early planning stages.
- At the time, High Speed Rail funds fueled the energy and timing related to getting the station underway at Monona Terrace and the need to add 400 stalls of parking to support that train station.
- Things changed in Nov. 2010, and the High Speed Rail funds were sent back to the federal government in Dec. 2010.
- The Staff Team regrouped and concluded that remaining elements of the

project provided compelling reasons to try to move forward:

-- The City had received TIGER II funds to study intermodal transit connections in this quadrant of the downtown;

-- The site was identified as a high priority site for the potential placement of a public market;

-- Monona Terrace (reinforced by the Convention Bureau) had identified the need to study whether we could add hotel rooms to support the Monona Terrace operations to respond to increased competition of other venues in the region;

-- The need to continue to repair or replace Gov East, an important parking facility in the downtown and a critical issue;

-- The opportunity to include a bicycle center in this quadrant of the city, to focus on bicycle-related movements from the bike path into the central business district, which came out of a special team that had visited Europe to study bicycle operations there.

- These elements formed the nucleus of the project.
- The Council authorized two items in Feb. 2011 to move things forward: to engage the Marcus Hotels & Resorts (MHR), which holds a development right, to study how additional hotel rooms might be added to Block 88; and to seek a planning team to assist the City in thinking through how Block 105 (Gov East) could be developed in the future.
- With the April 2011 election and a review of the project by the new administration, the Council, for various reasons, removed the public market from the project in June. The project was to continue but was renamed "Judge Doyle Square", stemming from the fact that former Judge Doyle's courtroom had been located in Room 260 MMB, and was a rich part of Madison's history.
- In July 2011, the Council authorized Kimley-Horn (consultants) to proceed with a very robust public involvement plan. In fact, an Advisory Group that included TPC Chair Poulson, Alder Schmidt and Members Schmitz and White, helped think through the process that brought forward the recommendations now being presented.

Austin went on to discuss the Staff Report. For details of his presentation, please see the attached document entitled, "JDS Committee Presentation".

Following are additional comments made by Austin.

#### CHAPTER 1:

- Chapter 1 dealt with Gov East and the need to either replace it in the near future or significantly repair it, since it was a 54-year old ramp. The idea for the new structure was to capture at-grade use and place the new parking underground, to create an additional tax base, perhaps additional apartments, to unlock the potential of Blocks 88 and 105 so economic development could occur in the heart of downtown Madison.
- Underground parking would be more expensive and challenging, but it provided the opportunity to bring economic vitality to both blocks.
- The intent of the resolution was to allow the project to enter its next phase, in order to sort through what the costs and trade-offs were, and whether in fact they could put together a development.
- The planning number was to create a 1,300-car ramp underground, with 600 stalls to replace the Utility's parking, with 100 stalls for City operations, with 200 stalls for the hotel, and 400 stalls potentially for other above-grade commercial uses. The allocation of the 600 stalls for private sector above-grade uses were estimates, since it wasn't yet clear what the land uses might be. For example, of the 600 stalls, a boutique hotel might need 300 stalls, which would leave 300 for other businesses. Planning took into account that a

downtown hotel required less parking (than suburban hotels) because guests more often used different types of transportation to arrive there.

- Gov East could not be removed without having replacement parking available. This fundamental element required that this part of the project be staged in a way to make that happen.
- It was important to avoid being speculative: Whatever happened here would cost a lot of money, in terms of equity and debt, both for private development and the City.
- Spec's for parking would proceed after above-grade uses were known: They would seek proposals and find out who the partners would be; when commitments were secured, then they would be in position to spend money to design a ramp.
- Staff agreed that the conceptual design was something that needed to make sense, in terms of entrances/exits, traffic engineering issues, and the need to maintain cash booths and automated operations in much the same balance as they were now.
- The design would need refinement. It must be emphasized that the expense of this ramp at \$40+K/stall was significantly more than the Utility would need to spend if it were to just tear down and rebuild the ramp above-ground at a cost of \$25K/stall. This was a big gap, which the Staff Team recognized would be challenging. They would need to proceed to the next level to understand how to build the most efficient ramp with the right number of stalls, not to overbuild or underbuild.
- Being early in the process and using conceptual drawings, conservative numbers were being used. The City's consultant suggested that this would be a good planning number for total development cost. Though more standard above-ground parking might cost \$15K/stall, the \$20-25K/stall that was cited in the Report as the base cost for above-ground replacement of Gov East represented a range; actual costs could be more/less.
- Clearly, going underground would be more expensive, creating both challenges and opportunities, and was among the things that would need to be sorted through in the next phase.

#### CHAPTER 2:

- In 2011, Monona Terrace (MT) lost \$420K in future business and about \$3.5 million in economic impact, because of the room block issue. Competition in other markets (Milwaukee, Omaha, Columbus) were investing to make themselves more attractive destinations, through an aggressive addition of hotel rooms.
- The 2008 City commission report by the Hunden Group (attached) suggested that MT needed an additional 250 room block to grow its business. Currently, there were 150 rooms that were locked in with the MT Hilton. Adding 250 to that would create about a 400 room block, which consultants have suggested was needed to more effectively draw the larger conventions (with 1000+ attendees) and produced the spin-off benefit in terms of other spending in the community.
- The Marcus (MHR) development right on Block 88 was reduced beginning this year, which gave the City more flexibility. Previously, over the first decade of the bonds, the City could not have gone forward with an RFP. Now the City could go out with an RFP, with Marcus holding the right to manage the hotel that would be built: Marcus would have a window to negotiate the management agreement with whomever the City selected to operate the hotel. If the hotelier did not select Marcus to run the hotel, then they could pick anyone else, but could not offer better terms than were offered to MHR. This could affect timing.

- Based on the suggestion that the new hotel rooms be within 1,200 feet of MT, Block 88/105 were primary locations.
- MHR had developed two options for Block 88: 1) To utilize the Municipal Building (MMB), listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and utilize the City's office space; or 2) To leave MMB in place for municipal use, and build a hotel in the vacant half of Block 88 fronting on Pinckney Street.
- Marcus would build a slightly smaller hotel and provide a smaller room block, something that would be sorted through in the coming round. Based on the cost of developing these projects, it was important to test the market. For example, a 278-room hotel including the MMB was estimated to cost \$77 million, or \$277K/room; without MMB, the number of rooms would increase to 292, and the cost/room would be cut by \$42K/room, a significant reduction.
- A "room block" was the number of rooms that the convention center controlled for a certain period of time, usually a year or two in advance of an event. As the date of the event drew closer, generally these rooms were released so the hotelier could use them for other commercial/leisure business.
- The MT Hilton's had 234 rooms, and the room block there was 150. With a 292-room hotel, it would be unlikely to have 250 of them blocked out in a hotel that size. Though a higher % could be negotiated, it was unlikely they could get to the 250 number suggested by the Hunden Group. On one hand, Marcus didn't think a 400-room hotel was marketable; and on the other hand, conventional wisdom was that a 400-room hotel was needed to reach the 250 room block.
- These were the issues that needed to be sorted out, by testing the market in order to know more. The RFP would help them understand these relationships better.
- We needed to make sure we had people competing in the private sector to develop these rooms and understand what this meant to the City. So the Staff Team was recommending that the City initiate a RFQ/RFP for development teams, as a next step.

[Please note: White left the meeting at this point in the meeting, at 6:40 PM.]

#### CHAPTER 3:

- Future use of MMB was an element in the City's larger, space needs planning program. It was important to begin to thoroughly understand the development options in Blocks 88/105, inc. the re-use of MMB for non-City offices.
- What generated the Substitute resolution was the fact that the Mayor's Public Works Improvement Staff Team had recommended that MMB continue to be used for city offices. If this was what the City truly desired, it was important to decide this upfront, rather than bringing people on, spending money and then learning we didn't really want to use MMB for alternative use.
- The Substitute included the bias that the City preferred to use MMB for City offices, but wouldn't preclude alternative proposals, in which case however, City offices would have to be relocated within Blocks 88/105 or an equivalent distance, in order to keep the relationship of the core of municipal operations the same.
- The resolution called for proposals to develop schematic designs and cost estimates to renovate MMB. Because MMB was on the National Register, the extent of what would be done would be limited. It was an 86,000 sq.ft. office building. Based on a space needs study done as part of the Block 105 planning, the Space Program would be about 90,000 sq. ft. looking out 10-15 years. That would be further tested in the next phase. But it gave the City data to negotiate with private entities to know what the City's interests were.
- Re: the loss of 6,000 sq. ft. of meeting rooms on the lower level of MMB, perhaps three stories could be filled in the "U" of MMB which could provide

20-30,000 sq.ft. (Less likely would be adding space to the top of MMB, due to its historic nature.)

**CHAPTER 4:**

- Underground parking (below Blocks 88, 105 and Pinckney Street) would be connected to above-grade uses.
- The idea was to create a very pedestrian-friendly space at street level in the two blocks, with the potential for a bike center at grade.
- Recommended land uses: residential, with about 115 apartments; commercial, with the potential for a boutique hotel having about 150 rooms (which added to 250 rooms on Block 88, would total 400 rooms), or for office space, depending on the market.
- Block 105 Massing Model: Yellow on right = apartment tower, red/green on the bottom = retail/restaurant and bike center, blue = office space, and yellow on left = additional offices or boutique hotel.
- Block 105 Conceptual Floor Plan: Four ramp entrances = two on Doty and two on Wilson. Unique loading area = trucks would move thru the site adjacent to the property line, would unload inside the building and exit onto Wilson (thru a separate exit), thus reducing stacking on the street and their visibility. Retail opportunities in red = located on the corners to increase the pedestrian connection and flow in the central business district. Across Pinckney, non-MMB section on Block 88 = restaurants, hotel lobby and support space, with joint loading off Doty for hotel and MMB at that location. A great deal of planning was yet to come, but this provided the basic approach to above-grade uses in the two blocks.
- Block 105 Streetscape & Public Improvements:
  - Access and two-way circulation on Pinckney would be maintained (per input from TE, Pkg and Transit), because MLK Blvd. was closed so often. This would provide important traffic flow; buses could use it (having looked at turning radiuses); travel lanes would be shared with bikes and motorized traffic. Low volumes on Pinckney for vehicles would support this shared use. The ramp entrance on Pinckney would be eliminated, which really congested that short street.
  - The template from the Outer Ring from the north side of the Square would be used, with bulbing out at the corners to improve pedestrian circulation.
  - Significant bike enhancements would improve connectivity between MT and the Square on the Pinckney bike path.
  - Sidewalk enhancements to engage public spaces included a proposal that the street level set-back from the property line on Pinckney be an additional five feet. On Wilson and Doty, there would be a 15-foot sidewalk, providing a robust pedestrian experience. This would also provide 19 feet of sidewalk on Pinckney.
  - The planners also suggested study of a counter-flow bike lane on Wilson because of the issue of bike traffic traveling west to east and using the sidewalk, raising safety issues.
  - Tradeoff: The 38 parking stalls along the south side of the street. This would need to be studied further; the Transportation Plan and the 2nd phase of the multi-modal study would take this into consideration.
- Reasons for eliminating the ramp entrance/exit on Pinckney: The ramp would be larger, and would require additional capacity for exiting the ramp. With two exits on Doty and two on Wilson, we would have twice the number we had now. Also, to create a good pedestrian experience, the turning movements had to be removed. Though it also made for a much better bike boulevard, the idea was mainly driven by the additional ramp capacity and enhanced streetscapes.



**CHAPTER 5:**

- With lots of moving parts, this could be one of the more complex projects the City will have undertaken. It also represented significant economic value: Potentially, \$75 million in increased property values that could generate an additional \$660K in property tax revenues, and an additional \$600K-\$1 million in room taxes. It would increase Monona Terrace revenue (not yet quantified), and sales taxes from residents and visitors.
- It would be a positive catalyst for development by increasing density, raising demand, and encouraging higher and better uses of underutilized property (i.e., eleven parcels in the adjoining 12-block area, inc. five on E. Wilson). The second phase of the project would help identify the economic potential for the entire area and how the different pieces might fit together, and the public support needed.

**CHAPTER 6:**

- Initiating an RFQ/RFP was the next critical step, to see if the project had the "legs" to become an important addition to our city.
- The next phase should take about nine months, beginning in the Fall 2012.
- The resolution did not commit the City to any specific development activity.
- Because of its outdated systems, more info about MMB renovation was needed regardless.

Austin and Trowbridge answered questions.

- The timeline was not overly optimistic. It could not sustain a lot of delays.
- Replacement parking in Block 88 needed to occur first. Parking staff had made it clear that they needed to move forward as quickly as possible on this.
- As for the TIF deadline (of 2017) and the speed at which the process could move, if by 2013 we were in position to have teams and proposals that could be vetted and fully understood in order to negotiate relationships, it was conceivable that in 2014, the first phase of parking could begin. With the first phase of underground parking and a structural slab (upon which a hotel could build) by 2015, work on Block 105 could begin.
- Regarding how Marcus and the RFP process might affect the timeline, the City's terms provided a 120-day window.
- Re: the estimated cost/stall rising from \$25K to \$41K: The parking designers (Kimley-Horn) found that to incorporate urban amenities and retail on the ground floor in Block 105, the steep slope from Doty to Wilson presented challenges; creating ground-level retail space interfered with parking circulation on the floor plates below. They also found they would hit the water table sooner than originally thought (at Level 4-5). When Marcus and ULI first looked at Block 105, they weren't so focused on creating an urban vision. Early cost estimates reflected construction costs rather than the (full) development cost, which included not only parking construction costs, but also architectural requirements (for above-ground uses), equipment to operate the ramp, etc.

A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Schmitz, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to the Agenda Item G.1. and the remainder of the New Business Items.]

**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 (Verbal announcements, for information only)**

Poulson reminded everyone that the annual organizational meeting would be held at the July meeting, with the election of officers. The Commission's Rules and Procedures would also be considered, if anyone had any changes to propose.

Poulson mentioned some other items that had previously been suggested for future meetings: the update on Long Range Plan would be in July/August; being a bigger item than originally imagined, the update on Owl Creek would be sometime in the future; and since an RFP was about to be issued to hire a consultant to study Parking Utility's sustainability, this would be scheduled when the consultant's report was completed.

**I.2. Commission member items for future agendas - None.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Maniaci, to Adjourn at 7:52 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**