



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, February 8, 2012

5:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 7 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Kenneth Golden

Excused: 3 -

Chris Schmidt; Lisa Subeck and David E. Tolmie

Please note: The Commission has one vacancy in the position of Second Alternate. White arrived at 5:15 PM during Item E.1.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Schmitz, to Approve the Minutes of the January 11, 2012 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. [25272](#)

Parking: January 2012 Activity Report, Remediation Expenses, Garage Age, December 2011 Revenue/Expense/Occupancy, and 2012 Budget Documents - TPC 02.08.12

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch commented on the Quarterly Reports as follows.

- The closing date to fill his position was February 8th. Half of the applications submitted would be thrown out because they were incomplete. Interviews would be conducted with the others by early March.
- The report about the new MMB/GE garage would be ready the first week of March.
- Two reporters from the Cap Times and WSJ had contacted staff about the multi-space meters, to discuss the potential for pay-by-cell at State St Cap and "live" vacancy info now available online. [Please note: The article, "Madison to get pay-by-phone parking meters" appeared in the 02/13/12 Wisconsin State Journal.] Live vacancy info had gone world-wide at Parkopedia, which provided an app that picked up live vacancy info once every minute, and showed locations and cost of parking in Madison.

- Parking had \$2,766,000 capital expenses in 2011, which should be included when looking at the bottom line.
- The partnership with Shine had started and was working well.
- The trend reflected in "Remediation Expenses" was steep and scary. The \$1 million spent on repair patches, would last 2-5 years; and then the very same spots would need to be repaired again, because when patching, new concrete was poured on old concrete. They didn't bond like they would if the floor and the ceiling were being poured together. It was hard to stay ahead on this.
- Looking at the chart re: Garage Age, the average cost per stall had been updated to \$33K/each (which might be tweaked again by Kimley-Horn). Doing the stalls all the same way and using this average, the cost of replacing all the stalls in all the garages would be \$123 million.
- The cost for the first floor and a half underground was virtually the same as the cost for the first floor and a half above-ground, a lot less than for lower levels.
- Given the age and closeness in age of several of the garages (esp. Gov East, Lake St and State St Cap), a critical financial mass would soon be reached. None of the structures was going to fall down; money would be spent to keep them safe and serviceable.
- Bonds would be issued for 20 years, for each new structure. The problem was that customers wouldn't be willing to pay the high fees (\$5/hr) necessary to carry bonds to rebuild three structures all at once. Certainly, rates would have to be raised on a regular basis, and reconstruction of each structure would need to be staggered, unless a different financing model were used.
- TIF money for public parking (which would require a change in state law), public monies, tax subsidies, would be deal changers. The financial feasibility plan would provide a laundry list of ideas for financing.
- The older structures were built to last 50 years. Now with newer techniques and materials (like admixtures in concrete), structures were built to last 75 years. Adding new levels (with new technology) on top of old, like at State St Cap, was problematic, because the top levels were only as good as what was below.
- As to whether Parking was in a position to replace the ramps and should remain a responsibility of the City or whether financial responsibility for parking might be better served by private development, the feasibility plan would help people begin thinking long-term about issues like this.
- Short-term, the Utility had enough money in its reserves and could borrow enough to rebuild Gov East. But then, after using up all its proceeds, how would the Utility finance replacement of the next two garages? People needed to start thinking about the next 20 years.
- Though new planning and zoning requirements called for developments to provide more underground parking, the Utility's occupancy was probably affected more by people making different transportation choices.
- The UW's policy now was to maintain its current parking (at 13K) without adding any new. The Utility would be challenged to likewise simply maintain what it had.
- Through year-end, actual revenues were 104% of budget; estimates were close, just a little conservative.
- Re: revenues 2011 vs. 2010, total revenues were up \$100K, even though rates had not been increased during this period. The decrease from \$7.9 million to \$7.8 million at Attended Facilities was significant. But revenues increased at Metered Facilities (Buckeye and Brayton Lots) and Street Meters, due to multi-space meters, where parkers could use their credit cards. Monthly Parking had gone up.

- Re: revenues in specific areas, Cashiered Revenue at Cap Square North went up 9.88% (this year's "star", was sometimes full), Gov East went up 3.44%, Overture went up 7.03% (parkers were chasing the low fees there, at 70¢/hour).
- Revenues at Frances and Lake Street ramps had gone down some. People could exit from either side and data for them could probably be combined. However, Frances was newer and probably would be kept open when it came time to rebuild Lake Street, and it would be helpful to have separate figures then.
- Care was needed when comparing on-street meters for 2011 vs. 2010, because collection routes had changed with the installment of multi-space meters.

Knobeloch talked about the response to and impact of multi-space meters.

- 52% of the customers used credit cards, which indicated pent-up demand.
- Citations had gone down, which created a better parking experience.
- Parking revenues had gone up because parkers charged/paid more with credit cards.
- Parking enforcement was more efficient. PEO's using space-maintenance handhelds could check spaces for compliance without having to walk up to each vehicle, which should result in savings, once the system was built out.
- Data was collected for each stall, which could be analyzed for high or low usage. Rates could be adjusted in certain high-demand areas.
- The machines even notified staff when it was time to collect money or when the paper had run out.

Knobeloch highlighted average weekday occupancies in YTD Revenue/Statistics.

- Occupancy at Lot 88 should be ignored; this was a popular spot for disabled parkers.
- Occupancy at Brayton Lot Paystation/Meters had dropped because of opening the Brayton permit lot next to them. But total revenue at all Brayton facilities had greatly improved. The permit lot was sold out. The Utility would get back all the money spent to buy the permit area.
- Wingra Lot had the lowest occupancy at 16%. The Utility hoped to interest developers in doing something there, along the lines of the two other developments on Monroe Street.
- The number of stalls in the three oldest ramps might currently be a little overcapacity for daily use. However, they would be rebuilt to last for 75 years, and who knew if this would be true in the future. In the case of Lake Street, the Utility wanted to partner with either the UW or a private developer; and the partners would need to have an open pocketbook.
- Re: Rev/Space/Day, any space not making \$3.00/space/day was not breaking even. Buckeye Lot made \$12.21/space/day. Shenk made \$1.01/space/day, 1/3 of breaking even.

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

E.2. [25274](#)

Metro: YTD Performance & Productivity, Ridership 1970-2011, Hybrid Stats, and Customer Feedback - TPC 02.08.12

Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted the following items in the reports.

- Fixed route ridership was up 1.3 million rides. Like Parking, sustainability was an issue for Metro: What model of operating and governance structure would best sustain that (level of ridership)? We might continue to look at an

RTA.

- This ridership growth was great news. However, with a bus garage built for 160 buses that currently housed 209 buses, and with interest in service changes being expressed (from Verona/Epic and others), Metro faced real constraints to have a sustainable growth pattern over the next couple of years.
- Chargeable accidents were up and non-chargeable accidents were down, with total accidents about even.
- Scheduled maintenance was on track.
- Ridership had increased 9.5% systemwide; 7.4% without UW routes, but still a sizeable amount.
- Despite overcrowding, Campus routes increased from 17% to 33%.
- Productivity had increased 8.8% systemwide.
- Verona/Epic service was up 20.7%.
- Of interest among routes at/below 60% of system average (shown with X's): Route 10 continued to float upwards (with a 30.6% rider increase). A year ago, Route 19 was not shown here; but despite a 4% increase in 2011, it was now listed here because its 4% increase didn't keep pace with the systemwide increase of 9.5%. Some leeway was needed to evaluate these routes.
- Route Performance: Though Middleton had some routes on the low end of productivity, all its routes combined showed an 8.8% increase in ridership. So while they might have routes with an "X", municipalities with lower ridership on certain routes still had healthy numbers.
- With no rate increase in either year, the 2010 and 2011 numbers reflected "apples to apples".

Kamp said he would bring year-end reports for the past 10 years, showing the productivity average (passengers/rev. hour) for the Campus and non-campus routes. If you added the Route 80's and the ridership taken by all the unlimited ride pass riders among UW student and staff, it comprised about 50% of the total ridership. Related to overcrowding on Route 80 buses, Metro had been having ongoing discussions with UW about service changes to accommodate ridership. Metro had also had two visits from manufacturers with articulated buses, which had successfully traveled over Observatory Hill. With wheels closer together in the front part of the bus, drivers reported that the articulated bus seemed to turn more easily than conventional 40-foot buses. Metro would continue trials of them. The Bus Size Study would also look at appropriately sized buses (both large and small).

When asked about the reasons for the large increase in ridership, Kamp said that across the U.S. over the past 15 years, transit ridership had grown 35%, outpacing VMT and population growth. Metro's ridership had grown 40-45% in this period. Factors at play nationally were environmental concerns, current economic stresses causing people to look for ways to save money. Metro ads cited savings of \$8-10K/year by eliminating one car, and compared the monthly cost of owning a car vs. buying a monthly pass. Analysts saw the change in transportations choices as becoming increasingly important. Metro's goal was not so much to replace the automobile but to be part of everyone's transportation options.

Also important was the culture in the ridership and the political support for transit in the community. After massive cuts in State funding, the City budget maintained Metro's services without increasing fares, which sent a message that our investment in transit was different than in other communities where services were cut back. Technology also played a positive role: Google Transit

and smart app's helped eliminate some of the uncertainty in taking the bus (i.e., Did I just miss my bus?) Metro was fortunate to have such advantages as automated vehicle location systems and political support.

Related to the large increase in ridership, members asked if Metro might be able to do some market research by surveying its ridership, to collect data about why people were riding; and if new, why they decided to start taking the bus.

When asked about what was happening with transportation funding at the federal level, Kamp said he wished it looked more encouraging than it did. It was important to have long-range funding documents in order to plan. In Metro's case, this would be the 6-year Reauthorization Bill, which was having multiple 3- and 6-month extensions, rather than Congress taking the leadership to look at what the transportation infrastructure needed (inc. road, bridges and public transit) and creating a long-term plan. Disappointingly, the House Ways and Means Committee had just passed a version of the Reauthorization Bill that would remove the mass transit account from the Transportation Trust Fund. After 30-40 years of the Fund providing 80% for roads/bridges and 20% for mass transit, the mass transit portion would instead come out of non-transportation funds. This was similar to what initially happened at the State level in the biennial budget. But, bi-partisan reaction to the State proposal determined that this was not a wise course of action if we were going to invest in our public transportation infrastructure.

With the real possibility that the Transportation Trust Fund would go bankrupt, the House was not being forward-looking. Kamp was not optimistic in the short-term, but thought people would come around to their senses in the long-run. When the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee looked at this issue, they would likely have a different view. White mentioned that this was an attack on all transportation choices; almost all funds were eliminated for biking and walking as well.

Kamp continued with the Transit reports.

- Paratransit ridership was down slightly, 0.90%.
- Abby Vans provided 18% of all paratransit service, a very good first year for a new provider. Typical of new providers, their # of complaints was a little high, but this could be expected to fall into line with the others.
- Percentages for on-time performance were good for all providers.
- Hybrid buses continued to get better fuel economy than diesel buses. Older hybrids had a slightly higher cost per mile, but lessons were learned in that first order, and the newer 2010 hybrids were getting a nice savings per mile (even) compared to 2009 Gilligs.
- Campus buses utilized different configurations with more standing room, which increased capacity. And some had larger rear doors. Two of the older hybrids were dedicated to Campus routes.
- Re: customer feedback, from 2010 to 2011, the number of comments had risen from 3,200 to 3,445; but the number of comments per million passengers had dropped from 235 to 231. Fixed route and paratransit were the two largest categories.

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

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [25113](#) Informational Presentation on the Transportation Master Plan Draft Scope of Work

Registrant Gary Peterson, 1210 Marinette Trail, 53705, spoke in support of the item, and made the following suggestions (regarding Leg. File 25113 attachment, "Transportation Master Plan-Draft Scope 1-17-12").

- Page 4: Add a focus group of downtown organizations (inc. DMI). They had people involved in various aspects of transportation, and because the Plan would look at increasing the density of the downtown.
- Page 8: The performance measures shown were good. But given the 35-year plan horizon, the RPF should ask the consultants to explain the standards they would use (such as average delay at intersections). With the changes likely to occur in transportation over the next 35 years, we should see the criteria they would use to evaluate.

Planning Division Project Manager David Trowbridge made a PowerPoint presentation, outlining the Draft Scope of Work. Trowbridge prefaced his remarks by saying that this was a major effort for the City, and that many of the Commissioners were involved in transportation at different levels besides the TPC. The City had developed many modal plans over the past decades. Some were produced by the City staff and some by their regional partners, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO), which did regional planning for all modes of transportation that affected the city in a profound way. An intent of this project was to bring all of these plans together into one coherent document, with an eye towards mode connectivity.

Please see the PowerPoint attached to Leg. File 25113, identified as "TMP Scope Briefing 02.06.12". The following reflects additional comments Trowbridge made.

"Overview/Purpose"

- Among its goals would be to ensure that transportation and land use visions worked together.
- The implementation plan that identified specific priorities/costs could be used by decision-makers in setting investment priorities.
- Work would start mid-summer. Though the budget seemed like a lot, care was needed, esp. with what people wanted the Plan to do. We would build on what we had; we couldn't afford to start over with every form of transportation in every corner of the city.
- An ad hoc task force would guide the consultant team.
- Existing plans that focused on transportation and density would be used, esp. the Comprehensive Plan, which resulted from a lot of research and consensus-building; its Transportation Objectives and Policies chapter should form the basis of everything we did moving forward.
- Other transportation system plans would also be examined. The MPO's Transportation Plan 2035 had recommendations for all modes; its maps of major highways and city streets/arterials, regional bicycle facilities, and regional transit corridors, which would be reviewed for consistency with City goals, policies and efforts.
- Traffic Engineering and Engineering did a lot of work on bicycle planning for on- and off-street bike routes, a fine system to build upon.
- An important new effort would be the regional transit corridor analysis related to high-capacity public transit. Relying on this analysis and working with Metro, the Plan would look at bus rapid transit/express buses, and

changes they might require of Metro; how to work with the Transfer Points; how to build upon Metro's success and the growing demand for transit.

"Draft Scope of Work"

- The Work Tasks were what staff thought the consultants should produce. Bidders could also offer ideas, based on their experience in transportation planning. The final list of work tasks might look a little different.
- Task 1 called for timelines and specific deliverables.
- Task 2 called for a specific plan for public outreach, inc. stakeholders with a unique interest in transportation and land use. Other ideas for outreach and focus groups could be added.
- Task 3 called for review of land use plans and policies (inc. Comprehensive, Downtown Plans). Every neighborhood plan would not be re-opened, given the work to develop recommendations supported by the neighbors that made sense and provided liveable density. But they would be studied for ways to improve them.
- Two land use scenarios were called for: one implementing current plans; and one involving more compact growth. The latter had to be carefully defined.
- The Comprehensive Plan identified areas throughout the city for infill development. However, what might be done in the East Rail Corridor would be different than what might be done in the Near North Side in terms of density, scale and mix of uses.
- The planning horizon was 2035, to sync up with the regional planning of the TPB. Population/housing/employment would be updated to help develop travel demand forecasts. Every single traffic analysis zone would not be re-tooled (too expensive), but it would show magnitude and order of effort to reflect the compact growth in the models, to see how transportation demand would differ under different land use scenarios.
- Task 4 called for review of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Task 5 called for review of existing and ongoing transportation system plans and recommendations. Perhaps not all as relevant now as they had been, they were worth review. (Would a downtown circulator be useful to boost redevelopment and meet some needs in the downtown?)
- Task 6 called for (no more than) five multi-modal system alternatives; the task force could determine if less were needed. These would show different levels of investment in different modes, and use performance-based measures and standards, as a basis for decision-making.
- Measures were useful in talking about the quality of transportation; such as travel time, which for transit included walking and waiting time, and impacted decisions whether/not to use another mode. Travel time analysis of cars/bikes was also useful.
- Certain geographic areas of the city, such as the central part, would require more focus. There was lots of talk about circulation and the one-way street system. Were two-way streets better? The effect of these questions on the system as a whole would need to be considered. Given the specifics of such issues, care with the budget was needed.
- Emphasis would be placed on interconnectivity: How did transit work with bikes, were there opportunities for Park and Rides? Were there innovative ways to look at technologies to help the transferring of people, using different modes and making it more convenient?
- Related to plans for the five modes, the consultant would prepare recommendations for arterials and collector streets, pedestrian facilities, bike facilities, public transit and public parking facilities (as described).
- To help all modes work together better and offer incentives to users, the consultant would develop a prototype TDM program for employers; and a

prototype operational structure for TMA's, to provide a way for them to be administered at a small level (ex. an office park) or at a larger level (ex. the whole downtown or the Campus, which already operated like a TMA in many ways).

- Along with developing/prioritizing implementation recommendations and estimating costs, the Plan would identify potential funding sources (esp. local and regional sources, like an RTA).
- Task 7 called for compiling the analyses and documenting the recommendations, inc. benefits/impacts of the various options. Were some more beneficial than others in terms of economics, environment, mobility?

Trowbridge noted the timeline for committee review and procurement, with work beginning in July, and answered questions and responded to comments.

- Staff was recommending that the UW be on the task force, to tap into its experience as a successful TMA with a rich array of TDM options, excellent transit service, a good pedestrian environment, and high-cost or non-existent parking. It could be a focus group as well.
- Completing the Plan in 18 months was a concern; but the work would build on existing plans and fill in holes.
- To avoid re-opening old issues and to make sure the input process stayed focused, land use visions (for neighborhoods) and goals/objectives for transportation would be used as the starting point. From these would flow the options where these came together.
- One work task was to set goals/objectives based on existing plans; one of which might be (from the transit corridor study) to provide a high-quality airport shuttle to/from various points of the downtown.
- The Plan would set targets for performance measures and standards (VMT, a given % of households needed to be within a certain distance of a bus route, etc.) People could offer other ideas for measures.

Members offered their comments.

Maniaci: While hers and other downtown neighborhoods would heavily rely on it, she didn't want this city-wide plan to be high-jacked by Isthmus-specific interests; balance was needed. The Parking portion should be expanded to look at on-street parking, which dictated transportation choices. Without this, the Plan would miss a key to downtown demand and traffic patterns. Perhaps tangible goals would better define the parameters of the Plan; i.e., increased bus routes or bus frequency, a direct airport-downtown route, higher efficiency on-street parking. The Plan seemed overly long and yet not specific enough, but maybe the consultants would do this. Rather than a dartboard of ideas, the Plan would identify marching orders, and the consultants would have to balance the many sometimes competing interests, with winners and losers in that decision-making process. It was important to know how the consultants would take all the info and balance all the choices (with 90 neighborhood associations, many neighborhood and City plans). This would be key to the effectiveness of the Plan. It would also be valuable to evaluate data and public opinion about how Metro's transit hubs were working. With talk of redevelopment of the site at South Park and how the sites were layed out, with goals for timelines to get across town and issues of customer usability of public transportation, it would be useful to look at how these functioned. Do we want to continue them or do we want to go more towards defacto hubs (like East Towne); had there been changes in how we wanted to see transportation used?

Golden: He complimented Trowbridge on the Draft Scope; and appreciated that there might not be enough money to do everything he would propose. Like Maniaci, he didn't think Parking was adequately discussed in the draft. It might be helpful to get info currently available from Parking about its facilities (age/condition/replacement), as well as the results of the upcoming feasibility study. Facility and timing issues, and the role of private and public parking might be reviewed (inc. info about parking policy from a 1985 report). He was concerned about how the central area was defined to the west: why not extend it to Farley which stopped at the Hospital; or perhaps go even further west to the Hilldale-Segoe area, considering density and infill and what was happening there? The City had very little say in the RTA. In the bullet points on pgs 1-2, add that the Plan anticipates metropolitan-regional approaches to governance and funding, where the City should be adequately represented. Add to the focus groups: Human service professionals (ex. Transit for Jobs, other providers), and a variety of public and private employers (inc. City and County).

Bergamini: She thanked the Planning staff for making the draft scope available in the time requested. The UW was going out to bid on a study about some Campus transit issues; with a similar timeline, there might be opportunities for cooperation. Mopeds and moped parking should be added. Students should be included among the focus groups, perhaps in a couple different groupings: a UW Hospital/Med-Nursing School group had different sets of interests/needs than those of a Park Street/Bascom group. The western end of Campus was really expanding, and like Golden, she felt the western edge of the central area should go to Univ. Bay Drive/Farley, where more student and researcher housing was located. Besides the downtown, other centers of employment and business activity should be (over)sampled when doing focus groups: Mineral Point and Epic corridors, the East Towne area (ripe for redevelopment), and Allied and Dunns Marsh areas where major development of the corridor would impact the neighborhoods. Transportation and economic development studies had been done for such efforts as Transport 2020, which looked at when various parts of the city would build out, and included forecasts for employment and activity centers. Reviewing this previous work would be helpful.

White: She thanked the Planning Department and the Mayor's Office, and was excited about the Plan. She felt the downtown-airport bus connection was important enough that it should be called out in the work study; it was a huge missed opportunity for the city. Also, with the rising importance of technology in the ridership growth, technology should be a key focus of the Plan. It was good to see that the Plan would identify a hierarchy of bike routes. But it should also emphasize separated bicycle facilities, both on-street and off-street, whether a buffered bike lane or a path, if we wanted more moms/kids and seniors to bike. The Plan should evaluate where in the city all these types of facilities could go. The discussion of TDM programs should include large city events, like Concerts on the Square and Taste of Madison, because of the major traffic and parking issues associated with them. Under pedestrian facilities on page 9, one of the biggest barriers to ped mobility was enforcement of yields at crosswalks, more a policy issue than an infrastructure issue.

Schmitz: She thought the draft was great, and made the following suggestions. On page 1, paragraph 2, add the word "legitimate" to say the Plan would

integrate "all legitimate modes," because in certain groups, bicycling was still not considered a legitimate mode of transportation. Under Scope of Work on page 3, paragraph 4, where it said the consultant would coordinate with other planning entities in the region, add the cities in the MPO that have up-to-date transportation plans; some communities had done some good work to connect to Madison already. Similarly, under Public Participation, on page 4, paragraph 2, add the area communities in the MPO. Also, add that Plan recommendations should line it up with the City's Sustainability Plan.

Director of the Planning & Community & Economic Development, Steven Cover, spoke to the group and answered questions.

- The consultant would need to be able to manage a very complex project, and be innovative and progressive. Consultants from the city and from all over the country would be interested, so it was likely someone good would be chosen.
- An internal City design team would be set up within Planning, which would look at things city-wide, esp. the outer reaches of the city, where communities had housing but no place to go, no place to walk to, no neighborhood center. The Team would identify where to potentially locate activity hubs to enhance the quality of life for these communities, and hopefully would work with the consultant to plug their recommendations into the Plan.
- Key to the Plan was a realistic, well-thought-out implementation plan: what needs to be done in what order over a 20-25 year period, and how this would be funded. With state and federal sources ever diminishing, part of the effort would be to identify new creative ways to fund these improvements at a local level, which might carry the majority of the cost.
- Transportation was critical in economic development, and input from business community and employers would be sought. In terms of the ways the Plan might seek and assist in economic development, the Plan would identify growth businesses and areas for potential business development (such as Epic, Research Park).

F.2. [25273](#)

Madison B-cycle 2011 Overview, presented by Brian Conger, B-cycle City Manager - TPC 02.08.12

Brian Conger, B-cycle Field Operations Director, and the new B-cycle City Manager, Claire Hurley, appeared before the group. Conger was excited about the Transportation Plan, and the complementary role that B-Cycle could play in intermodal connections and improving mobility downtown. Conger described the B-cycle program as follows. (His PowerPoint is viewable at Channel 12 TPC meeting archives.)

- B-cycle was in a 5-year partnership with City to provide bike-sharing, which allowed stations in right-of-ways and parks, and expedited the permit process; with the help and input of City team headed by Parks' Kevin Briski.
- Operated by Trek as for-profit business, Trek was providing \$1.4 million to expand program from 27 to 35 stations and 350 bikes. Operating costs were covered by member revenues, sponsorship and advertising, with any operation deficit underwritten by Trek. Sponsors included: Trek, Humana, Crispin-Porter-Bogusky (of Colorado).
- An automated bike rental system aimed at making it easy for people to get around by bike, B-cycle came together four years ago, with goals to improve liveability of downtowns and to get people moving on bikes. It now operated in 12 cities around U.S. in a mix of not-for-profit and private operations.
- The four pillars of the program were the bike, the station, the software and the operations. A smartphone app allowed users to access the system at any time to see what bikes were available at a station.

- Users could either walk up to a station or purchase membership online; then choose a bike, ride it, and park it at the closest station.
- Two types of membership could be purchased: an annual membership/access fee (\$65/45 student), or a walk-up membership/access fee (\$10/24 hours). Once the access fee was paid, the first 30 minutes/trip were included. To encourage turnover, a usage fee of \$2 was charged after 30 minutes, for up to an hour; after which \$5 more was charged for an additional 30 minutes (a total of \$7 for 1-1/2 hours).
- Its vision: to make Madison a vibrant place to live, work and play, and make it easy for people to get around by bike.
- Metrics from 2011: 18,500 trips in 200 days (really not fully operational until July); 6,437 users; 472 annual members; 4.3 million calories burned; 103,188 lbs. of carbon offset.
- Concentrated mainly in downtown/Capitol area, stations were located as far east as Olbrich Gardens and as far west as UW Hospital; 4 stations were sponsored by partner UW.
- A heat map (from UW Urban Planning) showed trip patterns; the stations with the most round trips were Law Park, W. Main/Hamilton, Wisconsin/E. Mifflin, Memorial Union, and State Street.
- The map showed very little cross-neighborhood connectivity north/south of E. Washington (in Maniaci's district); but some stations in these areas were not installed until late in the season. Better info re: long-term trends would be available after the next (full) season. Also, GPS would be installed on more bikes to gather better data.
- Among top- and low-performing stations: Annual members (mostly condo residents and park & riders) used top-performing Law Park. By contrast, the station by Cap Square North was low-performing. Success seemed to be a matter of a few blocks and different levels of foot traffic. Before giving up certain lower-usage stations, opportunities to target potential users would be explored (Ex. employees at UW Hospital).
- Other statistics: 90% of customers were casual users (walk-ups that purchased short-term memberships); 7% were annual members. Weekly users were rare, usually the result of trial promotions. Annual users made 41% of all trips, with 20.4 average trips/user, who traveled shorter distances, vs. 1.7 average trips by casual users, who used the bikes for longer periods of time.
- Using mailing addresses, a map showed geographic distribution of annual members was concentrated on the Isthmus. Using phone area codes for walk-ups, 43% casual users listed Wisconsin area codes, and 57% listed out-of-state codes (could indicate students or new residents who hadn't switch cell phone numbers).
- Goals for 2012: Start season either March 15 or April 1; expand to 30+ stations and 300+ bikes; promote B-cycle in the work place, esp. to approach downtown employers and UW, to provide membership for employees; do educational outreach to visitors and residents, to show people how to use the system (for getting around, park and ride, etc.), a key to creating new users; build on partnership with UW, with student and faculty outreach.
- The student market hadn't really been scratched. If it suddenly increased, B-cycle would welcome the challenge and add more stations if sponsors (like the UW) came in to help.

Conger answered questions.

- If a station was full when a user tried to return a bike, s/he could use the kiosk screen to find the closest station with open docks, and would receive a 15-minute credit to get there. The smartphone app could also help with this,

esp. for large groups of users. Also, a team of mechanics went throughout the system twice a day, to "rebalance" the number of bikes. A 1.5 ratio of docks to bikes was used (9 docks to 6 bikes). Each bike got a maintenance check every two weeks, and stations were rebalanced then as well.

- Conger didn't have financial results to report. But even with the time squeeze and costs related to quickly get up and running, generally speaking, results were as expected for the first year, esp. since the system wasn't fully installed until July. They didn't make money, but they hadn't expected to. Most programs like this began with an educational period; and the second and third years would be more revealing. Users and sales spiked in August, which hopefully would happen in May/June this coming year. Annual members continued to take trips into December, while walk-up business fell off with the cold snap in late October.
- Rather than making adjustments by removing stations, the first focus would be to install more stations. It would be costly to remove concrete pads, and bring the space back to its original condition. Also, the investment had already been made, and the locations were chosen for a reason. It would be preferable to give certain stations another shot to become economically viable, perhaps with some additional marketing and partnering. They would continue to stay in touch with the City through the permitting process, and would include alders when new stations were installed in their district.
- Regarding the way Boston's program notified users about going offline over winter, and considering that 97% of all users were walk-ups, B-cycle planned to redesign the station kiosks to better communicate with users, about re-opening in the spring as well as how the system worked. While they were able to email annual members about the system closing, they could have done a better job of using the stations to announce this to walk-ups.

Members talked about their experience with the system. Maniaci said that station locations were key. Also, special events (like Crazy Legs or Taste of Madison) offered an opportunity to expand usage, when people wanted to get somewhere on a moment's notice. She had used a bike to attend a Badger game and was pleased about how quickly she could cut through traffic. She asked about price points. Conger said they were still reviewing whether the walk-up user fee should be \$10 (or less), and there could be some changes. Maniaci also talked about being an annual user and running into some difficulty using the kiosk the first time; she suggested they might look at ways to improve the experience of first users. She found the bikes to be in good condition, except that the seats sometimes twisted. Regarding feedback she had heard, Schmitz said B-cycle provided one more option for people to get around downtown. Moreover, B-cycle was defining how people were getting around downtown; since there weren't any specific routes, users were defining them. She predicted amazing usage in 2012 because people would be more familiar with the system.

Poulson thanked Conger and Hurley for coming. [PLEASE NOTE: Schmitz left at this point in the meeting, at 7:35 PM.]

F.3. [25312](#)

Presentation on Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update, by Bill Schaefer, MPO - TPC 02.08.12

MPO Transportation Planning Manager Bill Schaefer discussed the recent update to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). [The Summary of the 2035 RTP Update is attached.]

- The RTP was an overall framework plan, that identified projects, strategies

and actions; which was further refined through corridor and area studies, and mode-specific plans (like the TDP) – more of a beginning than end point.

- In terms of transit, a lot of the issues raised in the Plan would be further fleshed out as part of the BRT study and the TDP, now that the MPO was once again fully staffed. (Schaefer introduced new Transportation Planner Mike Cechvala.)
- Major updates were done every 10 years; this was a minor update.
- Forecasts for population, employment, households, and traffic had been redone, which had been a big part of the effort and would be used as the foundation for the City Transportation Plan (City Plan).
- Due to a federally-imposed deadline and having been short-staffed for two years, the timeline for review had become very compressed, with a public hearing in late February and MPO Board action in early March.
- This was only a prelude to other efforts inc. the City Plan. The next RTP update would be starting at the end of 2013, about the time the City Plan would be completed. The MPO Plan was the official plan for federal/state funding purposes, making MPO involvement in the City Plan important.
- Hopefully what came out of the City Plan with its extensive public participation process (to vet some of these issues), would make the MPO's job easier at the time of the next major update.
- Representing a small modification to the RTP, the first Transit recommendation was to continue to plan and implement high-capacity transit service and evaluate appropriate technology and routing for it. [See pg 2 of the Summary for Public Transit recommendations.]
- Particularly good info would come from the BRT study re: potential routing feasibility of BRT and how this might impact Metro service, and how the two could be integrated; some of which would be part of their work on the TDP.
- The Corridor map [pg 4 of Summary] formed the initial framework for developing a long-range transit plan. In the past, the main focus had previously been on the east-west corridor, but there needed to be a more comprehensive plan that identified all important transit corridors, both on-street and potential rail corridors. The map showed a sort of hierarchy of rapid transit corridors: rail (Transport 2020), bus rapid transit (potential route options, for review as part of BRT study), existing/potential local bus corridors (like Johnson/Gorham, high ridership but not rapid transit), and express bus.
- Overlaid on these were potential redevelopment (TOD) areas that had been identified in local plans. An important purpose of these plans was to determine where high levels of transit were anticipated, in order to know where to invest in facilities or fixed guideways, and to help facilitate transit-supported development in these corridors. (Besides the BRT study through the Sustainability Communities grant, was a TOD market study that would focus on these BRT corridors, and an Infill Redevelopment site inventory, all of which would feed into the BRT study.)
- This first Transit recommendation reflected a slight change from previous versions of the RTP; i.e., retaining the basic concept of high-capacity rapid transit service but reevaluating Transport 2020.
- The second Transit recommendation expressed continued MPO support for a representative RTA.
- The other recommendations touched on some of the issues that the MPO and Metro would try to address in the TDP, such as bus overcrowding, and efficiencies like a bus consolidation program.

Schaefer concluded by saying that overall the Update was a prelude of more to come. He invited members to submit individual comments by February 29th, to

allow time for staff review and response before presenting final recommendations to the Board.

Like Schaefer, Golden viewed this as a compliance plan at this point; members should not view this as their last chance to comment on something of magnitude. With ongoing studies and the MPO's plan to do a major update in late 2013, that would be the time to receive significant comment. Based on the positive reaction of the Commission to his statement that was added to the Downtown Plan, Golden asked for the Commission's endorsement of a modified version of the statement to be inserted in the RTP Update in the Overall Goal and Policy Objectives on page 1, in column 2, before the bulleted list of key policy objectives. [See the modified version of Golden's statement attached.] He said the edited statement essentially conveyed the same message, and would provide some consistency across the plans.

Without proper notice on the agenda, Poulson wasn't certain if the Commission could consider a revision to Schaefer's presentation. Based on law (and not custom) and whether agenda items were shown as action and nonaction items, Golden thought the Commission could take action, if all the members liked it. Since he was on the MPO's Transportation Planning Board, he could make the proposal there as well, but was hoping for TPC support. Bergamini said that with the statement's position in the report and its emphasis on peripheral Park and Rides, she wasn't comfortable with Golden's proposal. It represented a major policy statement. Also, the outside boundaries for the Downtown Plan were different than those for the Regional Plan. Members had no further comments. Golden appreciated that this might not be an action item, and did not pursue it.

F.4. [25275](#)

Metro: Potential Service Updates to Verona - TPC 02.08.12

Kamp said that Metro Planning staff had been meeting with the City of Verona and Epic over the past months. The info materials (attached) contained cost estimates, maps and schedules for potential service expansions, with an interest expressed to begin service as early as March. Though not a formal request from the City of Verona, Metro wanted the Commission to see the proposal.

Metro's Planning & Scheduling Manager Drew Beck discussed the potential changes to Verona service.

- Referring to the Route 55 map, existing service was shown in red, and expanded service was shown in green.
- The proposed changes would fill in gaps in the Route 55 schedule. Route 55 had limited stops, between Verona, Epic and the West Transfer Point.
- With overcrowding on existing trips, Epic asked if Metro could add trips in between the hourly trips, going out there every half hour in the morning and afternoon (as shown in the Route 55 rectangle on the left).
- In designing the service, Metro tried to squeeze as much service as they could out of two buses, swapping buses between expanded Route 55 and the new Route 75. Route 75 would operate between the Capitol Square and Verona/Epic, providing a more direct shot out to the Epic campus for Epic employees who live in the downtown area.
- Route 75 would travel around the Square out W. Washington, with stops along W. Washington, stopping at Regent Street and at Erin and Park Streets; traveling out Fish Hatchery, with an additional stop at Badger Road, to interact

with buses out of South Transfer Point, and at Caddis Bnd (with a concentration of Epic folks); from where it would zip out to Verona/Epic; essentially, providing 2-1/2 trips in the morning and 2-1/2 trips in the afternoon.

- Fitchburg identified the Caddis Bnd stop as a confluence of their routes.
- With limited stops, it probably took 40 minutes to travel from the Square to Epic.
- It was possible that the number of stops on W. Washington would change.
- The City of Fitchburg was involved in the discussions.

Kamp said a skeptic from the City of Verona asked if people were really using the bus. Metro was able to show them videos of orderly lines of 30-40 Epic folks boarding the bus, and packed buses of people standing and sitting very quietly working on their computers – a productive 40 minutes rather than a wasted 25.

Kamp had asked the City Attorney's Office to look at Metro's agreement with Verona. Because of the timing and pilot nature of the proposal, and if they truly wanted to move quickly, Metro would have to help Verona modify their application to WisDOT, Kamp asked if the Commission would have any objection to Metro taking care of the changes administratively, to streamline the process to get everything done in March. Metro would bring the TPC updates every month. Epic would pay the local share. Cost estimates showed state aid at 53%; Verona could apply for state funds independently and get more money than Metro would. Since the changes reflected a service addition and not a cut, a hearing was not required. Poulson noted that though different from custom, urgency was needed. Bergamini pointed out that this had been in discussion for months, intended to serve mainly Epic employees with Epic helping to finance it, based on employee surveys. So it was not an unknown quantity to the public it was intended to serve. Maniaci hoped the stops around the Square would be staggered to connect with buses from the eastside, where a lot of Epic employees lived.

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- G.1. [25276](#) Metro: Update on Disabled Vets & Free Pass Request - TPC 02.08.12

Jennifer Bacon of Metro's Marketing Department provided the following information.

- Metro asked the Dane County Veterans Services Office to distribute a survey for them, to see how many people might use the pass.
- The survey was distributed in late January. With just two responses to the survey, both indicating they would use the pass, Metro didn't really have info to move forward.
- Metro received requests from various organizations for free passes on a weekly basis; historically, Metro has said no.
- Based on research of other Wisconsin transit systems, most were not able to provide free passes for veterans. A few do offer free or discounted programs.

Bacon and Kamp answered questions.

- From what they understood, the request was for all vets, not just disabled vets.
- Dane County Vets Services had been asked for info re: how many disabled vets were eligible for paratransit service; but Metro hadn't yet received this info.

- Vets Services said they would email and use regular mail to distribute the survey. They had a List-Serv for email, so it would have received wide distribution.
- This was the second completely new attempt to distribute the survey, which would be given to the end of February; after which Metro would come back with their recommendation.

Maniaci suggested that it might be more fruitful to send a postcard, with a link to Survey Monkey; and asked Metro to guide Vets Services in the survey process, and follow up to see if they did what they said they would. She would be interested in such a program, if its parameters were simply getting vets with services to those services (rather than every vet in the city receiving a free pass). Or a discounted pass might be considered. She asked Metro to check with the reps from the VA to see what they had in mind, if the idea was to provide free fares to vets needing services vs. all former active duty military.

Golden said that he would want to determine eligibility on a person's income. In fact, he didn't like it that all seniors could receive a discounted fare regardless of their income. He would want such a program to be targeted. He also suggested that Medicaid be used as a guide. Medicaid paid 58% of paratransit rides. He was concerned about doing this without participation from veterans groups; particularly since those who might be willing to subsidize veterans weren't necessarily those who would subsidize transit (esp. looking at the composition of the State Legislature right now). He didn't think the City should put up money for people who could afford the bus ride; nor should the City be the sole payer or perhaps a payer at all, for this kind of benefit. He might support the City paying a share, but not the entire share, esp. when we see programs like Medicaid paying a majority of cost.

White was amenable to looking into the idea, since a request had been made. But like Golden, she had concerns. She thought some major financial decisions and hardships were coming up, when people might have to reevaluate the discounts already being given. It would take a lot to persuade her to take on any new discounts right now.

Bergamini pointed out that some vets involved in more recent conflicts might be covered by other programs because, for example, they were faculty or students at UW and MATC, or had access to Medicaid and paratransit. She echoed concern about any sort of request of this nature, which honors people for serving the country in a particular way; since there were a lot of other people who served the country in a particular way, like Peace Corps veterans. Metro was a transit agency not a social service agency. This was a Medicaid or Vets Administration issue.

Referring to the info materials (attached) that mirrored member comments, Kamp talked about the examples of state programs where state VA funding was used for transit (ex. Minnesota). Part of Metro's efforts would be to work with the group and suggest they focus there as well. Also, U.S. Transportation Secretary LaHood had just announced a new federal VA transportation program for transit. It seemed member comments and Metro's direction to them were in line.

Maniaci noted that besides the Dane County Vets Services, there were a lot of younger active vet organizations that could be contacted. These groups

needed to be advocating for this idea; and she wanted to see if there was real support for it. To get more survey results, this might be next logical place, to send the survey out to those direct veterans groups outside of the formal bureaucracy. At that point, those vets would need to come to table to answer questions about their needs, against which the balance of resources would be weighed. She felt other outlets should be used, to get the info out.

Poulson thanked Bacon, and said further updates about the issue would soon follow.

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

07828

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

No action was needed on these items.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

I.1. General announcements by Chair - None.

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Maniaci said that results from the Johnson-Gorham study would soon be available, and wondered if the group would be interested. Poulson said he didn't think a presentation was necessary, but if people were interested in the report, it could be distributed. Benishek-Clark suggested that it be distributed as an Informational Enclosure with some future agenda.

Golden observed that Metro contracted with a number of other communities, and noted that the MPO had just met in Fitchburg and was given a wonderful presentation by Fitchburg about their land use and transportation plans. He also pointed out that 20% of the local funding for transit now came from these other municipalities and the UW. Golden wondered if the Commission might want to take a field trip once a year, to different communities who could make whatever sort of presentation it wanted about their future plans for transit; with the idea that by going there, they would be moved to think a lot about transit as well. Maniaci wondered if the Commission could hold a meeting outside of the city. Benishek-Clark said she would contact the City Attorney about the question.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by White, seconded by Maniaci, to Adjourn at 8:20 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.