



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

Wednesday, August 10, 2016

5:00 PM

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

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Margaret Bergamini called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM.

Present: 8 - David Ahrens; Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 3 - Wayne Bigelow; Gary L. Poulson and Michael M. Johnson

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Tolmie, seconded by Kovich, to Approve the Minutes of the July 13, 2016 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

E.1. [43956](#)

Parking: August 2016 Activity Report and Updates, June Revenue/Expense/Occupancy Reports - TPC 08.10.16

Asst. Parking Utility Manager Sabrina Tolley discussed the August Activity Report (attached), and answered questions.

- Revenues by Category YTD: The numbers included one month since the 2016 rate change. Attended Facilities and Off-Street Meters continued to increase. On-Street Meters had remained pretty much the same; some meters had not yet been changed to reflect the rate increase; all would be changed by fall. Monthly & LT Agreements showed a decrease in revenues, because permits were being reduced in certain high-occupancy garages to provide greater availability to hourly/transient parkers (revenues from which offset the permit decrease).

- On page 2, questions about Judge Doyle (JD) garage were addressed: Use of TIF would not impact the way the garage was operated; it would be operated like all other facilities.

- Page 2 also contained answers to questions raised at the July meeting: The TPC was not required to authorize the use of funds from Utility reserves. The TPC was advisory; the Council ultimately decided how these funds were allocated. A 2015 memo from the City Attorney's Office was attached also, and

answered some of these questions regarding the TPC's role.

- As requested, the JD Development Agreement had been attached.
- Staff would keep the TPC informed about the JD development through the monthly reports. Potential action/decision items would be coming to TPC as well.

Golden requested that the City Attorney's Office address the question of whether Parking was a real public utility; and to identify who had standing to make an appeal on a rate set by the TPC. He also said they might want to change the ordinance to identify how the TPC could present to the Council its reasons for rate changes, since they were the body who decided this. Kovich/Zellers made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: Streit/Kovich made a motion to take up Item G.3., which with no objection, they did.]

E.2. [43957](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Financial and Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Reports, and Customer Feedback and Hybrid Stats - TPC 08.10. 13

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item G.3.] Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp, Planning/Scheduling Manager Drew Beck, and General Operations Supervisor Phil Gadke discussed different parts of the report.

- Page 8: Line 4, the numbers for passenger trips/revenue hour should not have \$ sign in front of them. Line 5, passenger trips/service area of population measured level of usage by a population in a transit service area. In the attached handout "Top 50 US Transit Systems" that showed passenger trips/capita in cities >200K, Madison compared favorably.
- Page 13: NAR meant the incident was investigated and the driver was "not assigned responsibility".
- Page 1: Chargeable accidents included buses that hit a fixed object (pole or shelter) = 28/51, or a collision (another vehicle) = 23/51.
- Uptick in passenger accidents involved "slip and falls": 29/88 occurred when vehicle was stopped; 15/88 occurred due to evasive maneuvers; 44/88 occurred when bus was moving, 25 when accelerating/decelerating, and 19 for no obvious reason. Increase was partly due to better reporting
- Rise in accidents due to loss of experienced drivers; Metro had 138 new drivers since 2011. Chargeable accidents involved drivers with less than five years experience. Drivers received targeted training as needed; as well as refresher training annually based on trends.
- Insurance pay-outs were \$6K less YTD. Many were rookie errors, not related to negligence .
- A suggestion was made to include top 20 pay-outs, and average/median pay-outs; to show the amount of damage. Info re: claims and reserves could be added to the Quarterly reports.
- Online, same-day reporting of accidents to Transit Mutual had just started in the fall of 2015. By next year, better YTD comparisons could be provided.
- The increase in chargeable accidents did reflect an uptick, related to new drivers and other things like mirrors being sheered off.
- Data was kept about chargeable accidents that resulted in personal injury (vs. not); and could be included in the reports.
- The terminology of "chargeable" (employee responsible), and "preventable" (other person responsible), reflected language used in the collective bargaining agreement.
- Page 3: The decrease in ridership (~5%) was comparable to the rest of the country in cities of similar size; largely due to drop in gas prices. In large

cities, ridership had increased slightly probably due to ongoing issues in large cities such as congestion, parking and toll costs.

- UW Route 80 ridership comprised 260K of the 650K drop (40%); and yet was #1 in productivity at 78.8 rides/hours. The drop could in part be due to increased apartments downtown.
- Metro was at a point where they couldn't grow their system. They were at peak-hour ridership capacity.
- Route 10 had increased 7.5%. It provided high-quality, frequent service, similar to big-city services. Likewise, Route 75 was express-like service to Epic. It wasn't hurt by overcrowding, and could grow with articulated buses. If Metro could grow like that, it would be even with big cities.
- With frequencies on weekends at once/hour on E. Washington, it was no surprise that weekend ridership overall was down 20%. If 15-minute service could be provided, that wouldn't be the case.
- Page 7: Metro was doing well financially. The drop in the contingency reserves was planned.
- Metro did not get the TIGER grant, so plans for Nakoosa Trail were on hold. Staff was looking at other grant opportunities. If money were available for buses, they would still need a place to put them first.
- 2017 Revenue projections had been adjusted based on ridership, lower gas prices, and timing of pass agreements (when their fares would change).

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

F. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

- F.1. [43968](#) Metro: Summary of 2015 Metro Transit System Audit, presented by Jodi Dobson of Baker Tilly - TPC 08.10.16

Baker Tilly Auditor Jodi Dobson reviewed the Metro Transit 2015 Audit Presentation distributed to members (attached). The audit went well, even with a new accounting system.

- Page 1: The unmodified or clean opinion was what people looked for. The physical inventory not done by YE 2015 was now completed.
- Page 2: The 2015 ridership drop was not unique to Madison.
- Page 3: Lower ridership had had a minor impact on revenues; in fact, revenues had increased slightly. Revenues exceeded expenses by \$2M.
- Page 4: The top three sources of revenue - State operating aids (30%), passenger fares (23%) and the local aid from the City (21%), hadn't changed much, which was good for budgeting purposes.
- Page 5: Expenses had increased very slightly; purchased services had decreased. With the new payroll system, what used to be invoiced thru inter-agency billings was now tracked and charged as direct labor, and fell into a wage category.
- Page 6: The % break-out of expenses by type had remained almost the same from year to year. Exception was "Miscellaneous": Inter-agency billings went down by 1% and compensation/benefits went up 1%, for the reasons just stated.
- Page 7: "Recommendations" were suggestions to enhance operations or improve efficiencies.
- The issue of journal entry review had been addressed. Timely invoice preparation and the YE documentation process, had been impacted by the switch to MUNIS and a lengthy staffing issue (which had been resolved).
- Page 8: GASB No. 68 changed the focus on reporting, to show net liability

and net asset for pensions. Estimates indicated a net pension asset of \$4.6M, which was positive.

Members thanked Dobson for her presentation and commended Metro for their work on the audit as well.

F.2. [43969](#)

Metro: Update on Williamson Street detour study and pilot - TPC 08.10.16

Kamp and Beck referred to the preliminary documents (attached), which showed what sort of data they would be collecting and where they were headed with the study. Staff discussed the information.

- Metro was working with Traffic Engineering, to collect parking, intersection and ped data.
- Run Time Analysis: For each route, two weeks of data were collected on trip-by-trip basis, using May data for Jenifer (before construction) and mid-June data for Williamson. Sample sizes were the same. AM peak period, mid-day, and PM peak period were included in the data set.
- Longer travel times on Jenifer Street were likely the result of a combination of factors: Fewer trips on Willy Street, stops located only at signalized intersections, and fewer turning movements compared to Jenifer.
- The survey did not offer the option of returning buses to Jenifer with stops every other block, because such a proposal had been brought to the TPC a couple years ago, when there was strong sentiment and the TPC voted to keep stops every block.
- Metro took that as their direction, and didn't want to complicate the current discussion with that option. However, if the TPC wanted, it could be added.
- Re: frequent back-ups on Williamson, TE was closely monitoring traffic. So far, staff hadn't received much feedback. They probably wouldn't see the full effect of the detour until fall when school started. Some traffic would be diverted to E. Washington as well.
- Metro and Alder Rummel were assembling focus groups to look at life on Willy Street and on Jenifer Street. Metro was surveying the drivers to compare Williamson and Jenifer also. With staff help, Alder Rummel would also look into the impact on businesses.
- The study would try to answer the question: What is the life of the community and how can it best be served by transit?
- Construction on Jenifer was on track for completion in November. TE would be asked to refresh their counts.
- Though characterized as a Metro study, data was being collected from all arenas and this wasn't just about Metro.

Members commented as follows.

- Data about population trends would be helpful; for example, how many people had moved to the north side of Williamson in recent years.
- In Question 2 of the survey, it would be good to ask people why they chose option #1 or #2.
- Part of the controversy centered on residents who objected to bus stops in front of their homes. Perhaps the option of stops every other block on Jenifer would cut that in half, and speed up the travel times. Members agreed that this option should be added.
- For a more wholistic approach, perhaps Planning staff could be asked to help look at the issues of life of the street and issues of the community; who would benefit and who would be adversely affected.

Registrants were invited to speak.

1) Tara Camfield, 1112 Jenifer Street, 53703, spoke for herself and Richard Schick, at the same address: Having lived on Jenifer for eight years, she supported the study. Much had changed over the years: In 1997, Metro had 23 fixed routes; by 2013, this was 67. More buses traveled down Jenifer than ever before. The population north of Williamson was bigger than ever before. To get more complete info, the study should extend through the winter after Jenifer reopened and parking would again be available there, which could take some of the pressure off of Williamson.

2) Brooke Seeliger, 1 Langdon Street, 53703: A long-time Willy St. customer, she was now an employee of a business on Willy Street for a year, earning a sustainable, living wage because of that business. The neighborhood alone could not support the businesses there; they relied on other parts of the city. People passing through the neighborhood would not park on Jenifer to shop on Willy Street. The quality of life in the area had been enriched by these businesses. For the sake of local jobs and the local economy, parking was needed on Willy Street.

3) Tammy Schreiter, 1402 Rutledge Street, 53703, owner of Hatch Art House and Hazel General Store on Williamson: If parking weren't restored, businesses would fail, and the neighborhood would lose the special character that drew people to it. The temporary bus stop was 10 feet from her door. Over 20 spaces had been removed; shoppers could no longer easily park. Income for her business had plummeted; her salary was gone. People had bought their homes on Jenifer, knowing buses ran on it. Jenifer was built for transit. Their stretch of Williamson (1200 block) was not, which now with buses, was especially congested. In its recent re-do of Willy Street, sidewalks were widened and the street was narrowed to make it more walkable. The street had flourished; but now it could be torn apart. The alder had not talked to people on Williamson; though Kamp had contacted her. Having this happen without everyone being informed wasn't fair.

4) Eileen Doyle, 605 S. Few Street, 53703: A 30-year resident of the neighborhood, former Willy St. business owner, bus user, walker, driver and bike rider, she was thrilled by the way Willy Street had evolved and become more user-friendly. She could walk from her house and find anything she needed on Willy Street. In the '80's, when buses were on Willy, drivers avoided the street and sped down residential streets to get through the neighborhood, creating very dangerous situations. The remodeling of Willy St. made it more inviting. It had no bus lane. With buses now added to traffic there, she was trying to figure out how to cross Willy Street at 5 PM. She felt the proposal was not well-thought out, or it would have happened years ago. People needed to be uniformly informed about meetings. She wondered why discussion about the study didn't start before construction.

5) Michael Gustavson, 1402 Rutledge, 53703: Opposed to relocating the bus routes to Williamson on a permanent basis, he felt the study had been initiated because of a few people on Jenifer Street, who were more organized because of the construction and had raised questions. People on Williamson had not been consulted, which is why the situation felt one-sided. He asked people to imagine the lively environment created by sidewalk cafes, and the effect of loud and smelly buses racing by. Contrast this with the effect of a row of parked cars, which narrowed traffic to one lane, and created a buffer for businesses and safety for pedestrians. He wondered who would make up the focus groups; and how decisions would be made. At previous meetings, the Alder said she would check with people on Willy St. about how they felt about bus stops in front of their businesses; but she hadn't. Now a study was being

done to look at making the temporary stops permanent.

Commissioners and staff commented as follows.

- Though some speakers seemed to think this was a done deal, the study were very much in the preliminary stages. At least two neighborhood meetings would be held, in addition to continuing discussion and opportunities for input at the TPC. Commissioners would be waiting for and listening to the results of the study. Some of these objections were premature.
- The study wasn't ordered by a few people on Jenifer. Discussion about the bus detour started in early 2016 because of Jenifer reconstruction. Staff originally proposed putting the detour on E. Washington. This was opposed by neighbors who thought it too far to walk and unsafe at night.
- Buses were instead routed down Willy Street. And they had started looking at on-time issues and equity. The current study had its roots back then.
- On-time performance impacted riders who lived on the outskirts and needed to make transfers, and those who didn't own cars and were transit-dependent. The study would look at multiple issues.
- After some experience with the detour, Alder Rummel had come to ask the TPC to review some of the issues involved. At the July meeting, it became clear that the original timeframe was too short, and data should be gathered during some fall and early winter months.
- With the help of several agencies, staff would bring sample data back, to make sure everyone saw it and could provide input regarding other data that might be needed. Data about the financial impact on businesses on Williamson would be included.
- Any general notifications related to this issue and any communications of the various kinds of meetings that had been held and would be held, would be listed in the report.
- As for whether the TPC was the best equipped to study economic impact, Metro staff could tap into other City staff, inc. Economic Development. Along with input from residents, it was hoped that businesses would share information about financial impacts on them. This wasn't just a Metro study, it involved other inputs too.

Golden disclosed that the mother and sister of his son-in-law operated a business in the affected area of Williamson Street.

Please note: Attendance is shown here to reflect that Ahrens left at this point in the meeting, at 7:05 PM.

Present: 7 - Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 4 - David Ahrens; Wayne Bigelow; Gary L. Poulson and Michael M. Johnson

F.3. Metro: Family Care Committee Process Update

Kamp said that the previous week the Common Council had approved the Committee, which would include several TPC members. Transit Service Manager Crystal Martin added that an initial meeting was being scheduled, to choose a chair/vice-chair and set up meeting dates.

F.4. Transportation Ordinance Review Committee Update

Alder Zellers reported that TORC was going well. Presentations had been

informative about how transit and city committees interact to accomplish what they do. The group was starting to look at draft language.

From a staff perspective, Kamp found it helpful to have TE, Engineering, and Transportation Planning together to discuss how they interacted now, and to look at examples of projects where a different set-up might work better. A project like an inter-city bus depot might benefit from a different structure. Yet, some felt things worked just fine now. Another question was whether the City needed a Transportation Department or a Transportation Commission. It wasn't clear where that discussion would go.

G. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- G.1. [43962](#) Metro: Paratransit Leave Attended Services Policy - Review and approval of a draft policy to address service suspensions related to violations of established operational parameters for Leave Attended trips - TPC 08.10.16

Kamp said he didn't expect a decision now, but wanted to inform members of some of the issues involved before bringing it back to them. Paratransit Program Manager Nancy Senn described the Leave Attended service provided by Metro.

- ADA service was meant for those with disabilities who couldn't use fixed route service. Paratransit was a shared-ride service with eligibility requirements and certain service criteria. It was meant to provide a service that was complementary to fixed route service.
- ADA requirements called for curb-to-curb service. Metro exceeded this, with not only door-to-door, but also leave attended service, where drivers escorted a rider to the door and made sure someone was there to receive the rider.
- Metro screened riders for what level of service they needed, and made sure everyone (inc. agencies, families) understood that someone must be at their destination to receive them.
- If no one was there to receive them, the rider was brought back on board, which was when problems began.
- As they became aware of an issue, Dane County had been very helpful to reach out to agencies and individuals involved.
- To address persistent issues, the Policy was brought to ADA Transit Subcommittee (ADATS). The "red line" version (attached) incorporated ADATS comments into the draft Policy.
- The 8/10/15 memo from Crystal Martin (attached) described how other cities handled this issue.
- ADATS hadn't made further progress, and it was now being brought to the TPC.

Golden asked the following questions.

- Was there a difference in how this was handled by Metro+ and by contractors?
- What happened when a rider was brought back on board?
- What were the (hourly) costs involved with delays?
- What was the impact on service to other riders? Was another vehicle called out; did delays result in not meeting ADA standards?

Senn said there was a big impact when no one was there to receive the individual. Drivers were instructed to wait five minutes, and contact the dispatcher, who began making calls to care-givers. If no one answered, the

driver had to go back on their route with the rider on board, and return later. It definitely disrupted service and impacted other riders. Staff could get data and anecdotes. Kovich noted that returning to try another drop-off, at a minimum equaled the cost of whole (extra) trip. Along with safety, understanding this cost would be important in developing options.

Division Administrator of Dane County Adult Community Services presented his memo to the Commission (attached), and said that he greatly appreciated Metro staff and Metro's service, and was pleased to work with the City address the issue. The numbers weren't always big, but each issue was a problem. A couple hundred riders with intellectual and developmental disabilities relied on Leave Attended Service for their employment, and wouldn't have their jobs if it weren't for the service. If information in their reports to the State was different than info in Metro's incident reports, it would be provided.

Golden made a motion to refer the item to ADATS; and if ADATS failed to get quorum, the item could be brought back to the TPC directly at the discretion of the Transit Manager. Kovich seconded the motion. Bergamini felt this sort of issue was what a specialized committee like ADATS should review (vs. TPC); they needed to get ADATS going again. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

G.2. [43787](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into a contract without a competitive selection process for architectural and engineering design services for the public development portion of the Judge Doyle Square (JDS) project with _____, the same firm(s) to be used by Beitler Real Estate Services LLC.

Tolley outlined the new information provided in the Substitute (attached), which identified the design team and the cost of the services, \$2,846,820 (which included \$330K that may/may not be spent on consultant fees or extensions on construction time). The resolution would allow the City to enter into a contract without a competitive bidding process in order to use the same design team for the public portion of the Judge Doyle project as would be used for the private portion, because of the complexity of the project and timing, and to make sure the design for the underground garage was compatible with the above-ground structure.

Project Manager George Austin discussed the proposal and project.

- In a competitive process requesting proposals to develop Judge Doyle Square, which included replacing Gov East, the City received four proposals in May 2015. The first iteration didn't go through, and the proposals were updated in January.
- The Common Council selected Beitler Real Estates Services of Chicago in April.
- The public component of the proposal included the 600-space garage and a bicycle center. The private component included apartments over the garage on Block 88, and construction of apartments and a hotel on Block 105, following removal of the old ramp and completion of the new ramp on Block 88.
- For this joint public-private venture, they brought forward a team of professionals to design an integrated project.
- In July, the Council authorized the development agreement between the City and Beitler. So while they didn't competitively request proposals

architectural/engineering services, this was part of a competitive solicitation.

- The garage would have 600 spaces underground, covering 200K sq. ft., creating a platform for 144 apartments and 33.4K sq. ft. of retail space and ancillary parking above. What was being built below had to support what was being built above, making it critical to have coordination, continuity and efficiency.
- The fee was ~8+% of the \$30.4M facility, not a cheap fee compared to Cap East, which would be an above-ground, single-purpose facility. The cost of the garage was based on its being underground and supporting the large project above, from which the City would collect rent for 98 years and derive a tax base.
- Members of the City staff team felt this was a fair contract with a very talented design team: LVDA, the lead architect (with expertise in large, complex commercial buildings, inc. parking ramps) would be partnering with InSite, a local firm and consultant for the MMB re-do. Among the other firms would be Walker Parking Design Consultants, to help with the operational program requirements developed by the Utility, and ensure the ramp met City design guidelines.
- Reflecting an 18-month schedule, the contract contained a contingency reimbursable. If some funds weren't needed, they wouldn't be spent. The contract provided triggers at certain points of the process that would require Parking Manager approval to proceed.
- The timeline: nine months for design (to June 2017); and four months for bidding (to October 2017). Using the full 18 months, the ramp would be completed in March 2019. The development agreement had a target date for completion of November 2018. The question was how to shrink the process and yet maintain high quality.
- The entire City Coordination Team met with Beitler, and included: Director of Planning & Community and Economic Development, Finance Director, City Engineering, Traffic Engineer, the Asst. Parking Utility Manager, and Austin. A larger City staff team assisted as well.

Staff answered questions.

- The development agreement said the City would do construction administration (CA) for the parking garage. Construction administration was also included in the Sub. That was because CA came from all sides of the project: from the builder, who oversaw construction; and from the architect, who stayed involved during the construction phase, doing inspections and reviewing change orders and lien waivers. This CA language was standard in every architectural contract for a building of this nature, and did not duplicate work of the builder or the owner. The City would also provide CA services through City Engineering, as any owner would do. This was simply due diligence.
- Re: the difference in cost in the first version of the resolution vs. the Sub, a number probably shouldn't have been included, but it likely represented the architectural component of the overall fee. The \$2.8M now included an engineering component, with consultants for various aspects of the engineering, for security, for elevator. Some of this may not be spent. They negotiated an efficient contract that allowed for six months more of construction administration and other responsibilities, but added little more cost than originally projected.
- This would affect the overall cost of the ramp: Parking Utility reserves would provide and be capped at \$13M, and with an additional amount of \$24M in TIF

for the Parking Utility's component of the ramp, totalling \$37M. Additionally, replacement parking for Fleet vehicles = \$1M, and the bike center = \$1M, for a total of \$39M for public construction. [\$39 comprised of \$30.4M for ramp and bike center + \$2.8M for A&E services + furniture/fixtures/equipment to operate ramp + ~10% for construction contingency]

- They had originally hoped for a cost of \$40K/stall (Anchor's cost was higher). The cost/stall was now estimated at \$49K, to account for inflation. This was a conservative estimate and it could end up being less.

Expressing dissatisfaction with a study they had done a couple years ago, Golden asked why Walker Parking was involved. Austin said that TE & PKG staff wanted a parking consultant on the team: To work with staff during the pre-design phase to identify operating program requirements (best practices for sustainability, transportation, customers, safety); to do cost/benefit analyses of them; to provide comfort to the owner that someone was on the team who knew parking facilities. Golden felt this was not a strong part of the proposal.

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s): Recommend adoption of Substitute (Version 2), attached. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Item G.4.]

G.3. [42270](#)

2nd SUBSTITUTE - Resolution to execute a contract with Graef-USA Inc. for \$610,000 to complete architecture/engineering for a Capitol East District Parking Structure; ~~and to accept the Capitol East District Parking Structure Staff Report.~~

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item E.1.] Economic Development Director Matthew Mikolajewski outlined the agreement with Graef-USA, Inc. (attached).

- This resolution initiated the design work for Cap East, which would be done in three segments: schematic design (~\$133K), design development (~\$141K), and preparation of construction documents (~\$335K). The separate development agreement with Gebhardt, American Family and MG&E would be introduced in a different resolution probably in September.
- At each step, CTE and Parking Manager David Dryer would have the ability to authorize the consultant to continue. This allowed them to begin the work. But if for some reason, the project didn't move forward, the City was not committed to the full \$610K. could stop this process with no jeopardy.
- The garage would have 450 stalls, estimated at \$13M: During the daytime, half would be used by American Family-Spark (inc. Starting Block-Madison), and half would be used by Gebhardt-Cosmos (inc. offices and an entertainment venue). At night, the stalls would be available to the public.
- The Utility was interested in finding out what it would cost to build additional stalls upfront (beyond 450), for hourly parkers. Work with Graef would help determine the cost/benefit of doing this.

Mikolajewski answered questions.

- The land would be purchased from MG&E and owned by the City. Except for determining environmental due diligence, that part of the agreement was settled.
- Details about how the Utility would be compensated and the operational relationship would be outlined in the lease as part of the exhibits for the larger agreement with the private parties, now being negotiated. If the TPC wanted

to give advice on the proposed lease, it could.

- The City would own the garage.

Registrant Andrew Gussert, Riverview Drive, Waunakee, spoke in opposition: A former lobbyist for the Orpheum Group and a regular concert-goer, he spoke for himself. He had heard from people who were against the garage for environmental reasons, and felt that the \$9M in TIF could better go to other projects, inc. ped, bike and mass transit (vs. encouraging more vehicles). Along with some others, he felt the real story here wasn't being told. TIF was helping to fund the garage for use by concert-goers of Cosmos, a music venue. This would impact other downtown venues (Barrymore, Majestic, Overture, Monona Terrace, etc.). He wondered if the proposed concert venue held up to TIF requirements. When he attended concerts, he had no problems parking.

Ahrens responded: They were putting 5% down on the project, which was not a lump sum, but would be used incrementally. If the numbers didn't look promising, they wouldn't spend all of it. They hoped the garage would be revenue positive (to help with building other garages); and in fact, a troubling aspect about this, was the garage wouldn't be paying PILOT. A really viable project would have expanding revenues which at some point would be at 100% PILOT.

A motion was made by Ahrens, seconded by Kovich, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. Members commented.

- (Kovich) They needed to take this step to get to the next step.
- (Golden) They were moving ahead on a parking ramp, with no guarantees about who would be in it. Not for/against at this point, he would have liked more info in the whereas statements, to provide better context. They were floating in the ether.

A vote was taken. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting returned to Agenda Item E.2., and proceeded through the remainder of the Agenda.]

G.4. [43955](#)

Staff presentation and request to hold a public hearing at the regular September meeting, to hear public comment on proposed special event rate changes and creation of a short-term parking rate in the lower level of the State Street Capitol Garage.

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item G.2.] Tolley discussed her memo (attached), related to proposed rate changes to Special Event POE fees, and to the Lower Level of State Street Cap.

- Special Event rates would be divided into three tiers based on number of attendees, with parking rates in Tiers II and III for larger events and consistent with UW parking rates.
- Rates for State Street Cap-Lower Level were intended to provide more turnover and availability for short-term parkers, and to dis-incentivize special event and longer-term parkers.
- Tier II and III rates would be implemented at State Street Campus garage effective November 1, 2016.
- The memo provided details regarding the specific rates, and implementation dates for the other rate changes (i.e., Special Event changes would depend on the timing of Council action on extended hours of on-street enforcement, likely next spring; and State Street Cap changes would depend on installation of

equipment.)

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Kovich, to Approve the staff request to hold a public hearing at the regular September meeting, to hear comment on the proposed rate changes. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Zellers commended Kovich and Tolley for their work on the TPC Subcommittee.

G.5. [43676](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with MillerCoors, LLC to accept a financial donation of \$15,000 to help cover the costs of free ride events on UW Homecoming, Saturday, November 12, 2016 and New Year's Eve, December 31, 2016. This agreement includes an indemnification clause.

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

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

[07828](#)

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

I. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

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