



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.*

Tuesday, April 12, 2011

5:00 PM

Room 260, Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
(After 6 PM, use Doty St. entrance.)

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM.

Present: 8 -

Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson;
Duane F. Hinz; Kenneth M. Streit; Jay B. Ferm and Margaret Bergamini

Absent: 1 -

Jed Sanborn

Excused: 2 -

David E. Tolmie and Susan M. Schmitz

Please note: Solomon arrived at 5:01, after the Minutes were approved.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Hinz, to Approve the Minutes of the March 8, 2011 meeting. The motion passed by the following vote:

Absent: 1 -

Sanborn

Excused: 3 -

Solomon; Tolmie and Schmitz

Ayes: 5 -

Schmidt; White; Hinz; Streit and Bergamini

Abstentions: 1 -

Ferm

Non Voting: 1 -

Poulson

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.1. [22004](#)

Parking: March 2011 Activity, February Revenue/Expense and Occupancy Reports - TPC 04.12.11

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch talked about the Informational Enclosure related to the MAX button on the new multi-space meters. The MAX button would allow anyone using a credit card to enter their space number and press the MAX button, and the maximum length of time the meter allowed would be given. Another new feature: the amount of "time bought" was now shown on the receipt. The machines didn't show how much time might be left for a space when the next parker purchased time for that space; so although the parker would get any leftover time, s/he wouldn't know it was there.

Solomon reported observing a multi-space customer who was frustrated by a machine because it didn't display the time limit for a space. Though the space marker showed this info, Solomon said the customer kept trying to increase the time on a 25-minute space, and became increasingly upset because the machine wouldn't accept any more money to let him buy more time. The customer had to run back to the marker to check the time limit. Solomon wondered if the machines could display this info. Knobloch said the machines wouldn't allow customers to overpay, but it would be nice if the machines also showed the time limit; he had seen the same customer response.

Streit/Solomon made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote/other.

E.2. [22005](#)

Metro YTD Performance Indicator (Fixed & Paratransit), Ride-Revenue by Fare Category, and Financial Reports - TPC 04.12.11

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted the following items on the YTD reports:

- With four school days in February when school dodgers did not operate, YTD school service ridership dropped 15% from 227K (in Feb. 2010) to 193K; and yet school dodgers still ranked third in productivity, with only a slight drop in productivity compared to 2010.
- Despite the loss of four days in school transportation, cash revenues went up in February and ridership remained about even, with a slight increase of 1,099, vs. Feb. 2010, due to riders going to the Square.
- YTD ridership was up 129K (+5%); perhaps an inkling of rising fuel costs.
- Fixed Route Rides % Change chart showed cash fares up 14.7% in January and up 20.2% in February vs. 2010, even though EZ Rider/Youth ridership was down 19.5% in February.
- In February, the growth in cash ridership countered the drop in student ridership.
- The cost of diesel fuel was \$60K under budget YTD because of a fixed price contract for a quantity of diesel (at \$1.98/gal) that ran into late Feb.
- However, with the fixed contract ending, Metro recently paid \$3.50/gal on a variable price contract. Given that Metro used 100K gallons of fuel/month and had budgeted for \$2.37/gal, the preliminary surplus was certain to change.
- While rising fuel prices were helping with ridership, they presented a challenge to the budget.
- The current variable price contract could be ended immediately if a better fixed price contract could be found.

Bergamini/Schmidt made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed

unanimously by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [21481](#) To approve the Madison Sustainability Plan.

Amanda White, Transportation Rep for the Sustainable City Ad Hoc Sub-Committee for the Public Sector, presented the Sustainability Plan to the TPC. She provided some background about the Plan and how it was developed.

- The new Sustainability Plan initiative began in October 2009 with the formation of the Sustainable Design & Energy Committee (SDEC); two subcommittees were created with 40 people representing many different areas of sustainability.
- Three public meetings were held initially (at the Goodman Center, Overture Center and the Sequoia Library) to get ideas and feedback on the Plan.
- “People, planet, and prosperity” was the theme for the Plan re-write, with the idea that these different areas affecting sustainability were all connected in one system; sustainability could not be fragmented, it was all part of a bigger system.
- The Plan Format included: Overview, Accountability, Background, and Categories for action and change.
- Within the three broad areas of the Plan, the following Categories for action and change were identified:
 1. ENVIRONMENT: Natural Systems; Carbon & Energy; Planning & Design; Transportation
 2. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY: Economic Development; Employment & Workforce Training
 3. SOCIAL, CAPITAL AND COMMUNITY HEALTH: Education; Affordable Housing; Health; Arts, Design & Culture
- Each Category had six components: Vision, Goals, Action, Timeframe, Funding, Lead Agencies & Partners.

White turned to the Transportation section of the Plan on page 20, and reviewed the six goals and related action items for Transportation. She invited members to comment on them and the overall Plan. Having developed much of this part, White felt that one of the biggest goals and the basis for the Transportation section was the first goal: to implement the many existing city, county and regional alternative transportation plans, rather than ‘reinventing the wheel’. Other goals were:

- expand alternatives to driving in more neighborhoods;
- increase sustainable transportation funding and incentive programs, currently lacking but needed to implement the plans;
- establish uniform, consistent evaluation methods understanding sustainable transportation usage (in such areas as busing, ride-share, biking), and using the info to set realistic goals;
- maximize the use of alternative transportation infrastructure through marketing; and
- improve communication among City departments in order to implement ideas faster.

White and members commented on the Plan, as follows:

- Counting evaluation across different transportation modes currently included Metro counts and the Bike Counts program.

- However, there were no uniform methods for counting in all the different modes of sustainable transportation, communicating the info to the community, and using the methods to establish concrete goals on what to be working towards for reducing car miles, etc.
- For example, the City had improved the Bike Counts program by increasing the counts and establishing more uniform ways to do the counts from year to year, which provided more consistent data for comparing years.
- But more work could be done to create more uniformity and consistency, for bikes and other transportation modes as well.
- The Plan called for measuring VMT (vehicle miles traveled) and other important transportation data, but it didn't get real specific about exactly what to measure; rather, it proposed that staff develop an evaluation plan (to establish methodology and standards) for the community to review, which could include measuring carbon footprint, gas and oil consumption.
- The Natural Step framework was discussed and incorporated into the planning process; and since the City had adopted it and used it in its sustainability process, it was likely to be in the forefront of Plan efforts and public discussion.

Kamp offered suggestions for changes/additions to the Plan:

- Under Transportation Goal 1, to include the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee plan among the plans cited; and in conjunction with that, to add Metro to the list of Lead Agencies.
- Also, to add the Regional Transit Authority's plan to those being listed.

White mentioned other plans that might have been included here, and felt that to be consistent, perhaps all the different plans should be listed or none should be listed.

In view of Madison Central BID's concerns about requiring groups to create TDM plans and after learning that the City did not have one, Poulson thought that before imposing this requirement on such groups as non-profits or those holding sporadic events, the City ought to have its own.

When asked, White said that rather than taking action to amend the Plan, recommendations for changes should be directed to Jeanne Hoffmann, who staffed the Sustainability Committee SDEC.

Solomon recommended that instead of asking groups to independently develop a TDM plan, a template or menu of TDM options should be made available to provide guidance. While supporting the requirement for event holders to provide TDM plans, it shouldn't create a negative burden and discourage groups from holding events, or taking their events elsewhere. He recommended that the City offer a menu tree to draw from. White cited an Action item for a Marketing person for Transportation and Sustainability, whose role might include the function of promoting alternative transportation and TDMs.

Since plans were usually used as guides rather than action plans, Hinz thought that "Actions" should be defined better at the beginning of the Plan. For example, one fairly strong Action called for free parking in the ramps for car-sharing programs. If the TPC were to approve the Plan (in general), it could later be interpreted that the Commission approved of this and other individual Actions in the Plan. Therefore, it might be better to define "Action" as

“suggested action”, which would need further action by the appropriate body.

White said what while the Plan was meant to have strong legs, the intent was for staff to take the “Actions” and turn them into formal action items with more substance and specificity.

Bergamini mentioned that the LRTPC had spent quite a bit of time over the past year looking at ways to evaluate and determine what makes an adequate TDM program, in part within the context of the Zoning rewrite and how it would fit. A question arose as to who review such TDM plans, TPC or LRTPC. Most at LRTPC felt that it would be appropriate for the LRTPC to do so. She suggested that people might review the LRTPC minutes related to this.

Regarding the proposed Marketing position, Bergamini pointed out that the position of TDM Director (working out of the MPO and coordinating the Ride-Share program) already existed.

Referring to BID’s comments about researching the impact of toll zones (the 8th Carbon & Energy Action item on page 28), Solomon recommended that the words “downtown” and “central” be removed from the verbiage. Though he supported the idea, he felt the focus shouldn’t just be solely on the downtown. The issue needed to be approached in a holistic way; there was far more congestion on the Beltline on the far east and west sides (like Verona Road) than downtown. Focusing just on the downtown would create more sprawl.

When asked about whether the Plan established a TDM program within the City, White said it required new developments, events and businesses to have TDM plans (under Transportation Goal 2 Actions, page 22). But it didn’t go into any detail about how the plans should be generated or implemented. The SDEC felt that this was more a staff level project.

Ferm recommended that an Action item be added to say that the City should take the lead to establish a TDM plan and create a format for other to follow; some pieces in the creation of such a plan could even be outsourced. Many things in the planning process would work much better if there were a formal TDM process; if the City could say “follow this”. Because this currently wasn’t defined, when the issue came up to developers, they would say there was no process or way to evaluate it. Major developments had been repeatedly coming in with no TDM; no one had told staff to do it. Ferm encouraged the SDEC to look at making this language as strong as possible.

In terms of VMT’s and reducing Carbon Footprints, Poulson thought the SDEC might revisit the issue of residency requirements for City employees (which had been gained through contracts and “me too” clauses). He would be interested to know how many City employees lived outside of Madison or outside of Dane County (or even outside of the state). With cars being the main mode of travel and until the RTA gets up and running, the SDEC might consider investigating this issue and adding Action language about it, if it thought it within the scope of the Plan. Solomon thought this comment could be put in the “Employment and Workforce” section.

Solomon remarked that no one wanted to see the Plan sit on the shelf, but with staff so busy it was likely that many Goals would not be reached before the Plan had to be redone. He wondered whether the Goals and Actions had been

prioritized. White said that a loose Timeline had been developed, and the SDEC had discussed at length how to prioritize goals and make the action items “actionable”. Because of the scope of sustainability, this was challenging. But White agreed that prioritizing and having a stronger timeline would be helpful. If there were a way to do this before moving the Plan forward, with lots of intersections among Goals and Actions, Solomon thought it would be worthwhile to identify common themes repeated over multiple Goals. These inter-related, high-level areas might be the hardest places to work, but they would offer more bang for the buck and have the biggest impact.

Knobeloch made the following recommendations for additions/deletions in the Plan.

- On page 23, under Transportation Goal 3, to increase sustainable transportation funding and incentive programs, add: Promote a Smart Park policy, whereby drivers know where to find available parking, and aren’t encouraged to drive unnecessary miles (some estimate as much as 20% of downtown mileage), which cause congestion and pollution while looking for a parking place. Milwaukee had received a grant for \$2.1 million for such a program, and though expensive, we could work towards this.
- On page 33, under Carbon & Energy Goal 5, to obtain 25% electricity, heating and transportation energy from clean energy sources by 2025, add:
 1. Promote solar-powered city infrastructure for such things as signs (school and crosswalk flashers) and parking meters.
 2. Encourage public and private parking facilities of over 500 (or diff #) stalls to install charging stations for electric vehicles.
 3. Encourage new above-grade parking facilities to have solar canopies and/or green areas on the top level.
 4. Curtail or eliminate free parking for people with disabilities at meters, which encourages them to drive single-occupant vehicles rather than take public transportation.
- On page 22, under Transportation Goal 2, to provide a reasonable number of free parking spaces to car-sharing programs vehicles in parking ramps, delete “free parking”. Per City Asst. Attorney Anne Zellhoefer:

“The provision does not designate what entity is to provide a “reasonable number” of free parking spaces in a ramp for car-sharing program vehicles. If the goal is meant for ramps operated by the City’s Parking Utility, it is unlikely the goal can be met.

Currently, there is no outstanding debt encumbering the City’s parking ramps. If the city is to borrow for a new ramp, and if the revenue bonds are tax-exempt, then it will not be allowable for the Utility to offer free parking spaces to car-sharing programs. The revenue bond covenants will prohibit such a use.”

Knobeloch said any bond underwriter would want it written into the covenant that free parking is not provided, without any exceptions. Over the years, he had received hundreds of requests for free parking from well-meaning entities and groups, but he had had to say no. For example, the 29 State share-ride vans at Brayton Lot received the “resident” (reduced) rate of \$121/month, amounting to \$42K/year, \$850K in 20 years. After paying \$1.4 million for the State’s portion of Brayton, Knobeloch wondered if the City would want to give parking away to these vans, as suggested by this provision in the Plan. That

was not to say that grants couldn't subsidize parking for car-sharing vehicles.

Kamp added the following recommendations:

- The Long-Range Metro Ad Hoc Committee had identified funding from a Regional Transit Authority as one of its top priorities (for funding, regional, and governance reasons). If the Sustainability Committee were to prioritize Goals, it might like to consider doing likewise.
- In view of some efforts in the Legislature to disband and recreate RTA's, perhaps the Committee would like to look at some of the issues related to whether the "T" in RTA should be "Transportation" or "Transit".

In discussing what motion to make, White and others didn't think that a vote specifically to approve the Plan was needed at this point, but that the Commission could simply return their recommendations regarding the Plan to the Lead. A motion was made by Solomon, seconded by Bergamini, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other. (See TPC Notes in Leg. File 21481, for a bulleted summary of the preceding recommendations and comments.)

F.2. [22018](#)

Parking: Proposal for creating Premium (24/7 monthly) Permit rates at all structures and Brayton Lot - TPC 04.12.11

Knobeloch presented his recommendations (attached) for monthly, 24/7 Premium parking permit rates at all of the Parking structures and Brayton Lot.

- Surface lots normally were not ideal for offering premium permits, because of issues related to snow removal and overnight parking. But someone from the State already parked 24/7 at Brayton, and would probably want this to continue. It was possible that a few other Premium permits might be sold there, but Parking wasn't interested in selling too many here.
- The permit would attract apartment and condo dwellers, who were tired of dealing with the street scene and trying to find parking in high-demand parking areas.
- Meant to be a discount, the Premium rates were all cheaper than 24/7 hourly rates would be at these facilities. Besides the fact that nights were a time of very low occupancy, these permits would bring in extra revenue, provide a service and attract a new parking niche, which private facilities were already soliciting.
- It wasn't expected that too many Premium permits would be sold at these rates, but Parking would come back in a year and report how successful they had been at marketing these.
- For the time being, the total number of monthly permits (Standard and Premium combined) would not change; and if Parking wanted to change the caps, staff would discuss it with the TPC.
- The Premium permits would be offered to current monthly parkers first, who might prefer to pay a little more to have 24/7 parking; then it would be marketed to others.
- Compared to privates, the rates might be a little high; but besides night parking, customers wouldn't be paying more for special events or weekends (which was not offered with the Standard monthly pass). Parking would start with these rates, review how many permits were being sold and adjust the rates if needed.
- Brayton's monthly rate was lower percentage-wise compared to its full hourly rate than other facilities, because it was a surface lot (parkers had to scrape windows, etc.). If the newly opened (State) spaces were filled up

quickly with more monthly parkers, Parking would review the rates here to see if they were too low.

- All rates would be reviewed in June 2012, and could be adjusted then if needed.

A motion was made by White, seconded by Hinz, to Approve the proposed Premium Pass and rates at all Parking structures and Brayton Lot. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Please note: Being 6:00 PM, the meeting proceeded to Item G., the public hearing.

Please note: Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Streit excused himself from the meeting at 6:15 PM, after the vote was taken on Item G.1., but before action was taken on Items F.4. through F.9.

Present: 7 -

Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Jay B. Ferm and Margaret Bergamini

Absent: 1 -

Jed Sanborn

Excused: 3 -

David E. Tolmie; Susan M. Schmitz and Kenneth M. Streit

F.3. [22006](#)

Metro: Update on State Budget's impact on Metro

Please note: This item followed Agenda Item G.1. From this point on, the meeting proceeded in the order the items are shown on the Agenda.

Referring to WURTA document (attached), Kamp commented that they were finding many questions and even confusion at the legislative level about how serious the employee protection issue was. He further remarked:

- The report was prepared to improve awareness of what the federal Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964 required as far as employee protections.
- WURTA was working with the FTA to clarify the FTA's position on this issue. In a phone conference that week, the FTA had been very vague, given that the budget repair bill was in the courts.
- The Association and other individuals were considering a formal request by the Wisconsin congressional delegation to the FTA and Department of Labor, to identify the issues that will arise with this law and 13(c) agreements when the collective bargaining agreements of various Wisconsin transit systems expire.
- The situation affected federal funding to Metro, currently at \$7.6 million annually (previously, as high as \$10.5 million); which represented about 12% of Metro's operating budget and all of the 80% share of Metro's federal budget.

Kamp said Metro would continue to provide periodic updates on what they were doing and learning about the situation. Poulson was impressed with the document and how clearly it laid everything out. No action was needed on the update.

F.4. [21537](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Edgewood College for the provision of access by Edgewood students and employees to Metro Transit for fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement per trip for the contract period.

A motion was made by Hinz, seconded by Schmidt, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:

- Absent:** 1 -
Sanborn
- Excused:** 3 -
Tolmie; Schmitz and Streit
- Ayes:** 5 -
Schmidt; White; Hinz; Ferm and Solomon
- Abstentions:** 1 -
Bergamini
- Non Voting:** 1 -
Poulson

F.5. [21739](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County for provision of access by employees to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement by Dane County to the transit utility for rides taken by Dane County employees for the term April 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012 with one automatic renewal for an additional year (April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013).

Kamp said the agreement focused on one department at Dane County that currently purchased 31-day passes for employees. They were looking at the unlimited ride format with an eye to expanding the program as funding became available in other departments. In a way it was new for Dane County; and in a way, it was starting as a substitute for the 31-day pass. This was an unlimited ride pass agreement, separate from the Commuter Pass program.

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Solomon, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:

- Absent:** 1 -
Sanborn
- Excused:** 3 -
Tolmie; Schmitz and Streit
- Ayes:** 5 -
White; Hinz; Ferm; Solomon and Schmidt
- Abstentions:** 1 -
Bergamini
- Non Voting:** 1 -
Poulson

F.6. [21668](#)

Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a Section 5307, public transit capital, capital maintenance, and capital planning grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

Poulson suggested that action be taken on the four remaining Agenda items, F.6. through F.9., resolutions related to USDOT applications for federal

funding. Kamp noted that normally Metro would wait for the 2011 federal budget to be done before filing these applications. But Metro had picked up signals that the FTA was encouraging people to begin the grant process now, a side benefit being to get clarification from the Department of Labor if there were any issues with employee protections. So far, they had gotten a signal from DOL that they would not have an issue because Metro had collective bargaining agreements through March 2014. Metro had not heard of any problems with moving forward with these grants.

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

- F.7. [21669](#) Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a Section 5309 formula public transit capital grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

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

- F.8. [21670](#) Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a public transit capital grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

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

- F.9. [21671](#) Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a public transit capital grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

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

G. 6:00 PM – PUBLIC HEARING

- G.1. PUBLIC HEARING ON LEGISLATIVE FILE 21751: To hear comments on the Capitol Pedicycle application for an operator's license.

Following completion of Agenda Item F.2., the public hearing was called to order at 6:00 PM.

Traffic Engineering's Transportation Operations Analyst Keith Pollock presented TE's report and recommendation regarding the application of Capitol Pedicycle dba Capitol Pedaler, for a pedal-cab service operator license.

- Capitol Pedaler was the first pedal-cab to apply for a pedal-cab license.
- The application had been thoroughly reviewed by the Mayor's Office, the Fire Department, Metro, and the Risk Manager.
- The vehicle itself was unique: It carried up to 15 passengers, was

pedal-powered, and measured 17.5 feet long, 5 feet wide, and 9.5 feet high.

- No alcohol would be allowed.
- Its insurance indemnified the City, and Risk Manager Eric Veum had okayed the application.
- Though the pedal-cab might present a minor obstacle for buses on State Street, Metro thought the buses would be able to get around it as they do other objects.
- Once the issue of alcohol was removed, WisDOT said the pedal-cab was basically a large, slow-moving bicycle and would need to follow the rules of the road for bikes, but it was perfectly legal to drive on public roads.
- TE had reviewed the routes and was satisfied with their safety as currently presented; one route originally proposed for John Nolen Drive had been removed at TE's request. As the business got going and demands for different routes developed, the routes might evolve and TE would continue to work with the Pedaler on this.
- Though DOT characterized the vehicle as a "bicycle", TE was not likely to allow routes on bicycle paths, because the pedal-cab was too wide.

On behalf of Traffic Engineering, Pollock recommended that the application be approved.

Two of Capitol Pedaler's business partners, Linda Besser and Lou Fernandez, appeared before the group to discuss the application and answer questions.

- Their intent was to provide a group-friendly type of entertainment for two hours, for groups of 10-15 people.
- A big team-building exercise, in Europe the bikes were often equipped with a spigot for beer tappers; but serving alcohol wasn't their interest or emphasis.
- They wanted 18- to 70-year olds, and groups and businesses who might want to promote team-building, all to participate.
- Having been City and State cops, they wanted the experience to be eco-friendly and fun, without all the boisterous, drunken behavior sometimes found on State Street.
- They had asked the (Dutch) manufacturer to equip the bike with four hydraulic brakes because Madison was hillier than Amsterdam; and the back was handicapped accessible – with a place for a wheelchair to be bolted down.
- The vehicle weighed 2,000 pounds.
- Some coffee shops were interested in supplying sandwiches and drinks; and they were working on the Zoo and some alternative suburban areas, where restaurants, bars, shops were located, to explore and develop other areas.
- It was possible the business would evolve into more than one bike, and they would have employees.
- They discovered the bike at an event in Milwaukee and fell in love with it, and having two owners from Holland, the idea of the business hit a chord; they might even like to manufacture their own bike at some point.
- Per their insurance policy, passengers needed to sign both a liability waiver and a "code of conduct" form; also, helmets were available for safety.
- The vehicle had no motor; only a taxi permit was needed.
- The vehicle had two headlights in the front that worked off a battery, and a reflector on the back.

Ferm was concerned about how the vehicle would work in dense, downtown traffic esp. during events, since it was less maneuverable than a bike, operated like a slow-moving car and took up a full lane. Besser reported on a dry-run the previous Saturday between 10 AM and 3 PM, on Capitol/State Route. Because

the incline up Carroll on the Square presented some difficulty, they might have to change the route a bit. Otherwise, they signaled and pulled over when they needed to, to let other vehicles by. It was a light traffic day. Fernandez said though the bike traveled 5 mph, buses seemed to accommodate it and just went around it; it didn't seem to impede traffic enough to slow it down or stop it.

In terms of public response, people were very curious and had given a lot of "thumbs up". They were cheered during the St. Pat's parade, and had received lots of inquiries about when it would be available. They had already donated rides to raffles and fundraisers; someone had paid full price for it at a silent auction. People seemed eager for this to come to Madison.

When asked, Pollock said that although a taxi license would be issued for the operation, the rules for regular taxicabs would not apply. He also mentioned that Alder Verveer and he had recently talked about reviewing the pedal-cab license process. There were other pedal-cabs already operating out on the streets, which weren't currently licensed by the City because of a loophole whereby they worked for "tips" only, placing them outside of the City's jurisdiction. Pollock, Verveer and the Police were planning to meet soon to discuss the possibility of changing the ordinance related to how these types of vehicles worked. Regular taxi rules were also not being applied to a horse-drawn carriage that had been licensed.

Seeing no additional speakers/registrants, Poulson closed the hearing at 6:15 PM.

G.2. [21751](#)

Relating to Capitol Pedicycle d/b/a Capitol Pedaler Cab Application (CP) for a pedal-cab service operator license.

PLEASE NOTE: Because Item G.1. was taken out of Agenda order (between Item F.2. and F.3.), Streit was present when the vote was taken on this resolution.

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

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

[07828](#)

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

No action was needed on these items.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

I.1. General announcements by Chair (Verbal announcements, for information only)

Poulson said that at the May meeting, the future financial sustainability of the Parking Utility would be discussed. The Commission might even consider hiring a parking consultant to study the issue.

The City Attorney was working on a resolution related to providing bus service for state legislators.

With committee appointments coming up, Poulson thanked the Alders who had served on the Commission and hoped they would be able to continue to work with the group.

Related to the sustainability of the Parking Utility, Ferm had heard that the Utility didn't charge market rates because of its bond structure, which required that the Utility not be a profit center. Now that there was no debt, perhaps this question could be explored more. Poulson said the window of opportunity was rapidly closing, but thought this was a good point that could be part of the sustainability discussion.

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

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by White, to Adjourn at 6:25 PM.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.