



City of Madison

Meeting Minutes - Final

TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

Tuesday, June 13, 2006

5:00 PM

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

PLEASE NOTE: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Durocher called the meeting to order at 5:05PM.

Present: Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Diane L. Paoni, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag, Kenneth M. Streit and Duane F. Hinz

The following members arrived shortly after both sets of minutes were approved: Wong arrived at 5:08PM, Hoag and Hinz arrived at 5:10PM, Alder Sanborn arrived at 5:13PM, and Alder Radomski arrived at 5:15PM.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Golden made a motion to approve both the minutes of the May 9, 2006 meeting and the May 22, 2006 public hearing. McCabe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

D.1 [03913](#) Parking: April 2006 Revenue and May Activity Report

Bill Knobloch highlighted items from the report. He said that revenues have been about what was expected. But notably, the Overture Center Ramp went up by \$8K in revenue, due to an average increase of people who parked there. Revenues from the Buckeye Lot went up significantly over last year (at the same time), with 21 people more parking there on average. Knobloch cautioned that these changes reflected numbers for only one month, and occurred before the new rate increases which started on June 1st (in the ramps). He said that the new meter plates would be arriving shortly, and that it would take six weeks to install all of them.

Golden wondered about the possible impact of tenants at 222 W. Washington on the Overture Ramp, and asked Knobloch to investigate if there are new tenants at the building, and to see how many tenants the building has altogether. [PLEASE NOTE: Since the meeting, Knobloch has reported that 45 of 60 possible spaces have been taken by "222".] Reflecting on utilization of the Buckeye Lot, Golden also questioned the efficacy of building a mid-State Street ramp if we can't fill the lot. Golden went on to remark that he and Knobloch had been working on an initiative to convert underutilized meters not next to businesses to

long-term meters, allowing people to park all day and hopefully utilize the meters more effectively. He said that the second part of the initiative involved expanding the number of streets where meters are located. He wanted to track the usage at these new meters, especially those with long-term parking (such as the 40 meters being installed on Monroe Street across from the Stadium), which will hopefully create a nice source of revenue, supporting the idea of converting more on-street meters to long-term parking and representing essentially a whole new parking program.

Knobeloch added that meters along Railroad Street with underutilized short-term parking have been converted to long-term (10-hour) parking at a cost of \$.50/hour, where people can park and walk to work at a relatively low cost (with ramps at \$1.10/hour now). In response to questions, Knobeloch noted that meters between Wisconsin Avenue and Henry Street on Langdon will be converted to long-term parking at \$.50/hour. Although this cost is comparatively low for some of these areas, Parking would like to maintain only two different meter rates throughout the City (\$1.25 and \$.50/hour), so customers don't get confused.

Members discussed other areas where long-term parking meters could possibly be located: West Washington Avenue, stadium side of Breese Terrace, zoo side of Drake Street, Vilas Park Drive off of Orchard and Mills near St. Mary's Hospital. Golden commented that one important criterion has been that no one should live on the streets where long-term parking meters are installed. In response to a question, Knobeloch said that traffic levels would be monitored for new locations (such as Monroe Street), to see what impact these new long-term meter zones will have. However, he didn't anticipate much change since long-term parkers tend to stay put.

Golden made a motion to accept the report. Sanborn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

D.2. [03920](#)

5.30.06 Parking Retreat Follow-up

Durocher invited Knobeloch to review the summary he prepared of the Parking Retreat. Knobeloch noted that nearly all Commission members attended the gathering. Five big issues were identified at the end of the meeting, which he placed inside a matrix/grid showing the different strategies members discussed to address them. Knobeloch said that he hoped the matrix would help members focus on key items for future discussion. He concluded by saying that it would now be up to the members to decide where they wanted to go with this.

Golden requested that another idea that came up at the end of the retreat be added to the summary. Instead of pursuing a strategy that encourages people to park near their destination, the members at the retreat talked about exploring a strategy where commuters could park in multi-use ramps on the periphery of the downtown, and use a circulator system to more quickly deliver them to their destinations within the downtown area. Knobeloch said he would add this idea to the list.

In response to a question from Debo about the ramps/circulator idea, Knobeloch said this had been discussed at the retreat, and that he had distributed Metro's information about costs for such a program; i.e., three buses with 10-minute headways at peak periods costing roughly \$132-138K (not including marketing costs). He noted however, that with State Street under construction, it wasn't

possible to run the program right now. He went on to say that in order to provide this service free to customers and still break even, new customer revenues would need to be generated at currently underutilized ramps (mainly, Capitol Square North and Overture). Knobloch said that strategies to generate these new revenues have been analyzed and it remains to be seen whether or not they would be successful, especially in view of the number of new customers needed. Debo remarked that it would be important for such a program to provide downtown circulation.

In response to a question about how the formula for state aid might apply to such a program, Debo and Knobloch agreed that there would likely be no benefit from parking customers who would ride free. But they felt that credits would probably be given for revenue from paying riders or riders with passes who wanted to use such a circulator bus (for example, students with UW passes).

Knobloch pointed out that the proposed program would operate between 10AM and 2PM -- the peak period when ramps are full and when customers might have to park in ramps other than those they would have wanted. This peak period corresponds nicely to Metro's ridership patterns, in that Metro has more buses available for service during the middle of the day. He concluded by saying that, while it might be good to have daylong circulator service, such a program would be a lot more costly.

Because a broad spectrum of topics was discussed at the retreat, Durocher asked members if they wanted to put specific topics on upcoming agendas for discussion each month, to generate ideas and strategies for ongoing operations. Or if members chose, they could simply carry the ideas from the retreat forward with them as they conduct their regular business.

After some discussion about the need to continue exploring specific topics raised at the retreat, especially since some items involved strategic planning and policy shifts, Golden proposed that the ideas from the retreat be formalized and outlined in a short, tight strategic plan with key parking initiatives. He recalled that the old Transportation Commission had the ability to create transit and parking subcommittees, and wondered if a smaller group might be a better format for developing a strategic plan. He suggested that perhaps the Commission could "constitute" a Parking Subcommittee, where perhaps external stakeholders could participate, and which would be charged with developing a strategic plan (similar in scope to Metro's). Paoni expressed concern that such a subcommittee not be broadened to include too many people outside of the Commission; but added that she wouldn't object to seeking input from community members with a stake in the issues, as long as the Commission keeps ownership of the process.

Knobloch interjected that he hoped the group would look at and prioritize the big-ticket items on the list of proposed projects created at the retreat. Citing the additional proposals for changes behind the Municipal Building, Knobloch said the list represents way too many dollars for what monies are available through parking revenues. He said that since the entire list of projects could not be completed without more money, either another funding source would need to be found, or the proposed projects would have to be prioritized. He felt that if the group didn't make a point of setting priorities, priorities would be set for them because certain things are happening whether they want them to or not. He added that everyone needed to think about what's important for the community

and what's not.

Wong mentioned that a corollary to this is the need to be more explicit about how much things cost. He said that people complain when prices go up, without knowing what's driving the costs. He saw a need for Parking to provide more information about the costs associated with such big projects as Government East, where the costs of fixing or replacing it remain unclear.

Knobeloch responded by saying that he had just met with consulting engineers about Government East, and they had told him the cost of replacing the ramp right now would be \$18 million. He added that this figure would need to be hugely adjusted for inflation if looking at costs in 2015, when the ramp would have to be demolished because upkeep would become too expensive. He noted that \$232K was spent in restoration last year alone.

Considering the issue of funding for projects, Golden raised the question of whether or not certain properties (such as Government East and Buckeye) would be better off sold for private development because of their valuable locations. Revenues from such sales could be used to develop other efforts such as a peripheral circulator system. The City could sell some of these assets to create "funding" for other projects.

Durocher commented that discussions about strategic planning for Parking keep swirling around Government East (concerning whether or not to replace it, and the impact of this on availability of money for other things). He felt that the Commission needed more information from Parking about projected costs and the assumptions being made related to various approaches to maintaining or replacing the ramp at some point. He said it might make sense to put the question of Government East on the next agenda, so that staff would get a better idea of what direction the Commission wants to go with it.

Members went on to discuss the idea of creating a Parking subcommittee to review different alternatives for future plans and projects, from which the Commission could set priorities. It was agreed that the Parking staff could draft a basic resolution to be discussed and more fully developed at the next meeting.

Golden made a motion that staff should draft a resolution for discussion at the next Commission meeting, which would create a Parking Subcommittee with the charge of developing a strategic plan with alternatives and impacts, to which the Commission and various segments of the community could respond. This subcommittee would also help develop priority ranking for large expenditures, such as ramp construction and demolition. Wong seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

At Durocher's suggestion, the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item E.1. before returning to Agenda Item D.3.

D.3. [03915](#)

Metro YTD Performance Indicator Reports - 6.13.06 TPC Meeting

Debo highlighted key items. She noted that ridership is up 6.2% over last year, and the number of complaints is at its lowest since Metro began keeping track of them in 2001: .10 per 1000. She added that Paratransit ridership is down about 1% from last year. In response to a question, Debo said that the growth trend in ridership appears to be slowing. In response to other requests, she said that

Metro would provide information at the July meeting comparing ad revenues between Madison and other transit systems, as well as to provide information about the general areas of complaints.

Golden made a motion to accept the report. Wong seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item E.2.

E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

E.1. [03912](#) Report: Shelters and Shelter Sites on Capitol Square

Durocher called registrants to the table.

A statement from Susan DeVos was read by Laurie Wermter, in which DeVos expressed her support for maintaining seven bus shelters on the Capitol Square. On behalf of Madison Area Bus Advocates, she stated that the City Engineer's report should only be accepted provided that there continue to be seven bus shelters on the Square -- even if this would mean keeping the three old ones not slated for replacement -- to show the City's commitment to mass transit downtown. Noting that people need protection from the elements, she said that the three old shelters should not be torn down until sincere efforts were made to procure funding to replace them with possibly less fancy and smaller shelters (rather than simply providing exposed benches at these stops). Referring to the budget hearings last fall, she said that many speakers who supported replacing the shelters didn't realize that some shelters were not included in the plans. She went on to state that TIF funds are not the only source for funding shelters on the Square; and suggested that civic organizations or corporations might wish to underwrite a reasonable cost of a shelter if they given acknowledgement as the donor (through dedication plaques on the shelter, for example). Citing efforts to change state law currently interpreted to prohibit such plaques, she expressed the hope that the old shelters remain up until this legal question is resolved and ideas for other funding sources could be explored. Until then, she asked, why make riders suffer without the shelters?

Next, Laurie Wermter addressed the Commission. She said that she does not own a car, and she walks and buses everyday as her sole means of transportation. She expressed concern for "orphaned" bus stops, where shelters are slated for removal and not replaced. She acknowledged that these stops probably wouldn't need such large shelters as those planned for the major bus stops. She mentioned the riders who may very much need shelter from the weather and may not be able to easily move to another stop, such as people who are not young, strong adults, or people traveling with children, or people who carrying things and have no car. She said that users at the Square needed protection from the elements just as much as those as the Transfer Points, and asked the Commission not to leave these riders in a lurch. She went on to point out the particular importance of the stop at Walgreen's, for people picking up medicine; the stop at the Historical Society, serving thousands of riders annually; and the often windy stop near the YWCA, serving homeless mothers and children.

Durocher read comments from Bob Paolino. Paolino contended that although usage statistics showed three stops were used less, this could easily be explained by the fact that these locations have fewer routes assigned to them and therefore have lower aggregate numbers. Also, he felt that any passenger on any

route should be able to board or get off at any stop a bus passes; no bus route should deliberately pass a stop that might be beneficial to a passenger. Referring to the argument that more parking is needed on the Square near businesses located there (possibly at the expense of preserving bus stops), Paolino wondered why it was okay for bus riders to walk 2-3 blocks to reach a bus stop while drivers had to park steps away from their destination. Paolino concluded by stating that a functional shelter is better than no shelter at all. He wondered why riders on certain routes should have shelters while others don't, and urged that the old shelters be kept until they could be replaced.

Durocher then moved on to discussion with staff. In response to a question, Debo said that Metro applies existing usage standards to determine if a bus stop qualifies for a shelter, and said that the three stops in question on the Square would not necessarily meet these standards. However, she added that sometimes shelters are located where usage is low.

Durocher invited City Engineer Larry Nelson to come to the table, to summarize his report and answer questions. Nelson said that the Council made money available to replace the monumental shelters now on the Square with new, monumental shelters. He said that the new shelters would be similar in design to the new shelters on State Street, though they are larger as befits the higher volume of bus traffic on Square. Nelson noted that originally, the plan was to replace four shelters, but then the Mayor instructed that five shelters be replaced (as shown on the sketch provided to members). He said that a resolution was needed with the scope of the design, and that the working drawings needed to be finalized. He pointed out that the budget for each shelter was \$70K, not including the pavement beneath which will be changed to conform to the surfaces now seen on State Street and being installed on the Square when sidewalk needs to be replaced. He added that some utilities would need to be relocated, and that existing shelters would need to be demolished. Referring to the timeline for the project, he said that Engineering needed to get some direction from the Commission and the Board of Public Works to finalize plans and specifications to get them out for bid. In order to avoid the risk of demolishing shelters and not having new ones ready to put up, he felt the entire process needed to be completed by next spring. He noted that this represented quite a long lead-time, and concluded by saying that the present plan was based on funding available today.

When asked why some of the shelters were being replaced if money was not available to replace all of them, Nelson said that the shelters were 25 years old, unattractive, and in disrepair, with bricks falling out of them. In response to a different question, he said that one of the criteria for replacing certain shelters (and not others) was based on their location in TIF districts. Rebecca Cnare from the City Planning Department added that the three bus stops not getting new shelters (at Walgreen's, N. Pinckney and N. Carroll) were not located in TIF districts. Nicolette later noted that of the five new shelters, only one shelter located in front of U.S. Bank - the Glass Bank - was not inside a TIF district. Nelson confirmed that the budget now includes money for five shelters (rather than four as originally budgeted).

In response to a question, Archie Nicolette of the City Planning Department said that two spots inside the shelters had been designated for wheelchairs, and the 3-foot overhangs on the ends of the shelters could also be used for this purpose.

He added that the overall was created to provide as much flexible space as possible to protect people from wind and rain. During further discussion, Debo confirmed that the new shelter design meets ADA requirements, including those for the turning radius of wheelchairs. (PLEASE NOTE: Debo later consulted Paul Aulik to verify that the design plans for the shelters were ADA-compliant relative to entrances and turning radii. Aulik confirmed that they were compliant. In addition, Debo asked City Engineering to check back with Metro when plans were developed for the siting of the shelters to ensure that entrances and exits, and pathways to/from them, will be ADA-compliant.) With regard to accommodating wheelchairs, Nicolette said that the new shelters on State Street are smaller/narrower than those proposed for the Square, because the available space on State Street is much narrower between sidewalk and curb.

Members then went on to discuss how the TIF districts affected which bus stops would have the new shelters. Nicolette said that the TIF districts on the Square were established years ago based on many different criteria, and were set up parcel by parcel. As a result, TIF may or may not apply to parcels right next to each other. Nelson noted that these previously-established TIF districts determined which shelters would be replaced.

Hoag raised questions about the high cost of each shelter (\$70K). Nicolette said that the shelters went out for competitive bidding. After visiting other communities to see what they have and how much their shelters cost, he thought the cost was fairly reasonable for a custom design and the small number of shelters needed. Nelson went on to say that the shelters are monumental shelters which were specially designed to be functional, ornamental and in keeping with the Capitol Park. He added that if smaller, boxed lots were purchased in larger volumes (like those along E. Washington), then the cost of each shelter would be much lower. However, the interest and direction for these shelters had been to create something ornamental for the Square. Nicolette noted that these shelters will be the largest items in the public right-of-way around the Square, and will have the most impact visually and aesthetically in terms of the character and personality of the area. He emphasized that it was important to spend time to get the shelters right, because they will be around for a long time, many people will use them and they are key to creating the overall feel that people want. He thought the shelters were a good investment.

Hoag then pointed out that public speakers had all said they wanted to keep existing shelters until they could be replaced, to serve the people who need them. He stated that this is a democracy and the Commission needs to take very seriously statements from the public; and without exception, members of the public have said that don't want to tear any of the old shelters down before others are put up. He wondered if the cost of maintaining the shelters for a while might be lower than the cost of tearing them down. He observed that people would be getting cold and wet in the interest of creating a certain ambience. He asked staff to provide information about the cost of repairing shelters compared to the cost of tearing them down. He said that he suspected it would be cheaper to maintain them for a while, and that he strongly recommended keeping shelters up and maintained until we could afford to replace them.

Nicolette responded that Planning had taken its direction from Metro, who had to decide what level shelter to put at particular stops, based on usage. One goal has been to eventually remove all the bricks on Square, and if some of the old

shelters are kept, the City might have an incrementally refurbished Square. Hoag responded that such a situation could create a bigger incentive for finding the funds needed to replace all the shelters.

In response to a question about the expense of tuck-pointing failing masonry, Nelson said that tuck-pointing the bricks is very expensive, and that demolition is probably the least expensive component of these projects. While such repairs could be costed out, Nelson said that the larger question remains as to who will pay for this, how would these repairs be financed. Another member asked about the other costs related to replacing the shelters, such as demolition, relocation of utilities, foundation base, restoring the sidewalk. Nelson said that these costs (which will include removing the brick bases) will vary somewhat for each shelter, and that consultants are currently costing out these items for presentation at the next Board of Public Works meeting. However, he was particularly interested in hearing what the group thought about the concept of the shelter.

In response to further questioning about the cost of the new custom shelters (versus the much lower cost of prefabricated shelters), Nicolette said that the size of the new shelters plays a large part in the cost. The size of a custom shelter is approximately the size of two or three pre-fabricated shelters, and some of the materials for the custom shelters will be more durable and will keep maintenance costs down. He felt that the estimated cost of the custom-designed shelters is reasonable compared to those he'd seen in other cities.

Nelson responded to a question about the cost of demolition compared to maintaining a shelter. He said that he didn't have such estimates but guessed it could cost about \$25K to tuck-point and paint an old shelter, and that demolition could cost between \$5-10K, depending on how far below the foundation they'd have to go.

Members began asking questions about the design and layout of the shelters. Nicolette said that there would be one eight-foot curved bench on the outside of the shelter, and one 12-foot bench inside facing the bus. There were no other benches in front of the shelter, in order to maximize space for wheelchairs loading and unloading from buses. Nicolette added however that old benches would be kept until such time as they could be replaced.

Nicolette went on to discuss the open style of the shelters. He said that the design was intended to balance many different qualities. They wanted to match the design of shelters on State Street, which is open and airy. They also wanted to provide a lot of different surfaces, so that when the wind was blowing from different directions, people could find a place to stand. He said they might find this outside the shelter under one of the overhangs, which extend out three feet on both ends and 16-17 inches along the sides. Hopefully, all of these features will allow people to move around and find the level of protection and comfort they want. Nicolette added that the design moves away from the closed style of the old shelters, because they have found people don't like to stand or sit in them because they feel trapped.

White commented that perhaps the design was a little too open in terms of protecting people from rain for example. While she agreed that the old shelters felt too dark and constricting (due to the height of the brick), she felt that the glass in the new shelters, by contrast, creates a much more open feeling and

wondered if perhaps the new shelters couldn't be closed off a bit more to provide more protection to accommodate for intense weather. Nicolette said that the design for the new shelters is flexible; and because of its modular design, it would be possible to add/subtract panels to the openings at some time in the future, once we see how the current design works.

Durocher observed that the side panels on the new shelters don't go close to grade level, which means that when temperatures fall around zero and the wind is blowing, there will be a wind chill around a person's feet. He wondered if the modular design would allow the walls to be lowered, if needed. Nicolette said the shelters could be modified somewhat. He went on to say that designers had received input from mall crews, who said that they preferred openings at the bottoms of the panels for easier cleaning and maintenance. He noted that although the walls could be lowered, if they were not completely closed off, there would probably still be some problem with wind chill. After some discussion about openings on various old shelter types, Nicolette said that the designers had tried to incorporate ideas and input from many different groups of people (Parks, Engineering, Metro) as they drafted this final design. He said he welcomed good ideas, but noted that a lot of thought and work had been put into the design up to this point. He wondered how much more time people wanted to invest in getting the shelters built.

In response to a question, Durocher said that this was a report; so while the Commission did not have to take an action, the Commission could move to make recommendations. Such action would be advisory to City Engineering.

Wong requested that the Commission be provided with cost estimates for maintaining the two or three old shelters for a couple of years until money could be found to replace them, in order to compare this against the costs of demolishing them. He said that he agreed with Hoag's earlier remarks that the Commission should listen to riders and keep old shelters up until they could be replaced.

Debo clarified that route design determines where some bus stops are located, as for example the stop in front of Walgreen's, which is the last stop for buses before turning down King Street; or the stop in front of L'Etoile, which is the last stop before buses turn down Hamilton. Route structure rather than the number of riders, determines how many buses stop at these points. She added that it would up to the Commission to decide whether to keep the old shelters up until they could be replaced.

Golden made a motion to accept the report as it stands (while acknowledging that members would be free to amend the motion). Sanborn seconded the motion.

Golden commented that the design and construction of new shelters on the Square represents the very end of a very mature process involving the entire redesign of State Street and the Square. He said that certain items were passed and approved, and now we are implementing them (as we see with the current State Street reconstruction). He marked that it would be problematic if the Commission goes off in an entirely different direction. He added that this doesn't mean the Commission has to approve everything before them, but he urged members to make recommendations with the understanding that this is a process with some maturity.

Golden went on to say that the design of the new shelters has been a lightning rod throughout the process, and any problems with this, probably should have been addressed better, earlier. At this point, however, he preferred to see the shelters replicate themes of the other shelters along State Street, rather than having some of the older bunker types along side of the new shelters. He said he continued to be interested in finding out if smaller versions of the new shelters could be purchased for a much lower price. He reflected on how shelters are located, based on certain standards, in order to avoid situations where people start questioning why they don't have a shelter at their particular stop. He felt that placing shelters in certain locations needed to be driven by policy not politics. He cautioned members that the proposal as it is, would face tough sledding when it gets to the Council because of the cost. He worried about adding the cost of two more shelters to the package, especially if they were added at locations that might not meet certain standards. He preferred to keep costs down.

Paoni said that she would like to change the motion, to give staff a chance to provide additional information about other options that might be available under existing funding to build shelters on all seven stops.

At Durocher's suggestion, Paoni made a substitute motion to refer the agenda item to the Commission's next meeting, in order to get further information from staff before acting on the report. No one seconded the motion, and the motion died.

Paoni noted that by accepting the report, the Commission would be approving construction of at least four shelters at the cost of \$280 (not including the cost of demolition and sub-surfacing), which would allow people to get wet and cold, would repeat some of the problems of the State Street shelters, and would provide less seating than the current shelters. As a bus rider, she preferred to have a shelter that not only looks pretty, but which also would be more functional, especially for the amount of money being spent. She felt that if money was found to add a fifth shelter, the Commission should stop and try to see if there might be money for the last two shelters. She concluded by saying that the process was not dead, and the Commission should more carefully review the design to try to achieve something practical as well as pretty.

Hoag made a motion to amend the original motion, stating that he hoped it would be considered a friendly amendment, to recommend that the two existing shelters (not currently slated for replacement) be maintained instead of merely providing benches at these locations, until such time as additional funding could be found to replace these existing shelters with new shelters. Wong seconded the motion to amend.

Hoag spoke to his motion saying that he thought there is a difference between taking away shelters where they already exist (which rightly creates a lightning rod for discussion), and the process of placing shelters in new locations. Responding to Golden's concerns, Hoag said that most people regard shelter removal as a "take-away," and standards for locating new shelters aren't necessarily applicable to removals. However, he did agree with the need to have a common style, and would like to see the Commission drive the process to get all new shelters. Overall, he preferred to leave a couple of old shelters up as "

place marks” for a little while, in order to show the intention of replacing them when the City could afford to do so.

In support of Hoag's motion, Wong and Paoni offered language to amend the report to say “five of the” seven shelters shall be removed; and to say the remaining two shelters “shall be maintained until they can be replaced with another shelter.”

Golden remarked that he didn't consider this Hoag's amendment friendly to his original motion, mainly because he felt that “the bus had already left the stop” (the process was too far along to make these sort of changes). He found it ironic that he found himself defending something he didn't support in the first place. He said that if the policy about siting shelters supported keeping the two shelters, he would support the amendment. He reiterated his concern that, by maintaining shelters in certain locations where usage standards were not met, the debate would be re-opened about building shelters that are not warranted in locations all over the city.

White stated that she wanted to add another amendment to Hoag's motion to amend, in which the design would be changed to add a panel inside one of the openings on the front and one panel inside one of the openings on the back of each shelter, in order to provide real shelter. Durocher said that White could offer her amendment after a vote had been taken on Hoag's motion to amend.

In response to Wong's request for more cost information about temporarily maintaining the shelters, Durocher pointed out that Paoni's previous motion to defer the item in order obtain this very info, had not been successful.

Durocher added these comments regarding Hoag's motion to amend. He felt that the bus stop by the YWCA is one of the coldest spots on the Square especially when the wind blows out of the north over the lake, a fact that could add further justification for maintaining a shelter there. He found it ironic to be arguing with a table of engineers about putting more weight on utilitarian interests than on aesthetics. He said that people driving around the Square are very concerned with how things look around the Square, while bus riders are more concerned with utilitarian considerations. He urged members to weigh each of these perspectives. He added that if Hoag's amendment fails, members could propose a compromise amendment to retain the shelter by the N. Pinckney and Hamilton (by the YWCA), and let go of the battle about the shelter on N. Carroll and State Street.

Hoag's motion to maintain the two shelters (not slated for replacement) passed, with the vote as follows:

Ayes: Sanborn, White, Paoni, Wong and Hoag
Noes: Golden, Radomski and McCabe
Non-voting members: Durocher, Streit and Hinz

White offered an amendment to recommend that the design of the new shelters be changed somewhat. She recommended the following: Add a clear window-like panel to one of the three open panels in the front of the shelter, and add another clear window-like panel to one of the open panels in the back of the shelter, using the same clear materials as those used in the rest of the structure. She felt these

modifications would make the structure more of an actual shelter, and would make it aesthetically pleasing as well. She felt that if the City was going to spend this amount of money, the shelters should protect people better. Paoni seconded the motion. The motion passed, with the vote as follows:

Ayes: Golden, Sanborn, White, Paoni, McCabe, Wong and Hoag

Noes: Radomski

Non-voting members: Durocher, Streit and Hinz

Durocher called the vote for the main motion to accept the report with the two amendments.

Ayes: Sanborn, White, Paoni, Wong and Hoag

Noes: Golden, Radomski and McCabe

Non-voting members: Durocher, Streit and Hinz

Durocher noted that the motion carried with two recommendations to City Engineering.

The meeting returned to Agenda Item D.3., Metro YTD Reports.

E.2. [03634](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with the University of Wisconsin - Madison for the continuation of provision of UW-paid access by its employees to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement to the transit utility for UW and UW Hospital employee trips for the period September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007.

A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Wong, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER

Debo noted that this was the third in a series of contracts renewed this spring, and the fifth and final of the existing unlimited ride pass agreements with the new rate. Per discussions with the City Attorney's Office, Durocher clarified that Hoag would be allowed to vote, since merely being a UW employee who uses the unlimited ride pass would not disqualify him from voting. However, he added that Radomski is part of the administrative unit at the UW that negotiates the pass agreement, and therefore he should abstain from voting. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: Golden, Sanborn, White, Paoni, Wong, McCabe and Hoag

Abstain: Radomski

Non Voting: Durocher, Streit and Hinz

Debo briefly noted that Items E.3. through E.5. are all resolutions related to formula grants with specific amounts that are obtained every year.

Golden moved to adopt the resolutions in Items E.3 through E.5. Wong seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

E.3. [03651](#)

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 Ald. Golden, seconded by Wong, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by acclamation

.

- E.4. [03652](#) 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.

A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Wong, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by acclamation

.

- E.5. [03677](#) Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a public transit capital grant with Wisconsin Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with WISDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Wong, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by acclamation

.

- E.6. [03678](#) Authorizing the Metro Transit General Manger to execute consignment agreements with various retail, employer and other establishments that wish to become official Metro Sales or Commuter Choice Outlets and maintain on-site inventories of Metro fare media for the purpose of sale to the public/employees or providing to employees as a work benefit.

A motion was made by Ald. Sanborn, seconded by McCabe, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER

Debo remarked that this was a "housekeeping" item. She explained that, for 35 years, Metro has had the General Manager sign off on the consignment agreements (of small dollar value) with 60+ outlets in the area that carry Metro passes. At the advice of the City Attorney, the resolution codifies this process. The motion passed by acclamation.

- E.7. [03747](#) SECOND SUBSTITUTE - Authorizing additional amendments to the Metro Transit Advertising and Leased Space Policy to allow fully illustrated transit advertisements on Metro coaches.

A motion was made by Wong, seconded by Hoag, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER Recommend to Adopt Second Substitute. Amendments were made to add language to define length of trial period based on when an ad contract begins, and allows these contracts to sunset within two years after program starts; and to add language to affirm that advertising wraps will not interfere with customers ability to see out bus windows.

At the beginning of discussion about this agenda item, Julie Maryott-Walsh of Metro displayed a sample of a window, in which the bottom half was covered with the vinyl material that would be used to create bus wraps, and the top half was left clear -- in order to show the difference between the two. She remarked that the ad design on the outside of a window couldn't be seen from inside the window.

A motion was made by Wong to recommend the resolution for adoption. Hoag seconded the motion.

Radomski offered a friendly amendment developed with Metro staff, to add the following language to the last bulleted item under "NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED" on page 3: "Wraps shall not significantly interfere with passengers ability to see out windows."

Golden remarked that adding this language wasn't to suggest that the present design does interfere with the ability to see out the windows. Rather, he thought that the new language would merely reinforces the fact that the vinyl covering doesn't significantly impair the view, which might help allay the concerns of some people about that.

Radomski spoke in support of the resolution as amended, by saying that the ad revenue generated by the full wrap program would hopefully reduce the need for service cuts. He said that the Council is constantly balancing concerns about going too far with full wrap ads and the need to find new revenue sources.

Debo acknowledged Radomski and other sponsors for their hard work on the resolution, and said that she wanted to discuss impact of the language that had been added by the Board of Estimates the night before. She explained how things would work if the BOE substitute were adopted. Metro would go out to bid for a contractor, who would then seek out advertising during the course of their term. This contractor would not be able to find advertisers on the first day of the program, but would probably engage advertisers to purchase wraps over the course of the first year. She wondered if the resolution could be clarified so that contracts entered into during the one-year trial would be honored for the terms of the agreement that would be worked out. She said, for example, if a contract were entered into during the first month for a year's period of time, the contract would lap one month over the one-year trial period; and if a contract were signed in the seventh month, that contract would lap five months beyond the one-year trial period. She said that should the resolution pass, it would create an opportunity to amount a fair amount of ad revenue. She added that realistically, advertisers would not participate in the trial program if Metro couldn't honor the agreements that advertisers seek. She said that she wanted to modify the BOE substitute to make this clearer.

Sanborn agreed with Debo's suggestion to clarify the resolution, and said he had also wondered what would happen with contracts that would extend beyond the one-year trial period. Maryott-Walsh noted that the cost to advertisers of installing a wrap is substantial, and said that most buyers would like one (or even two-year) contracts. She felt that Metro would have to provide at least a one-year minimum. Sanborn offered a friendly amendment to insert in the first bullet point: "...on the date of each wrap contract issuance...." He went on to ask Metro to report back to the Commission if they find that the one-year term of each contract was inhibiting potential ad sales because maybe he and others could go back to the Council to change this time limit.

Golden suggested adding a sunset date to extend two years out, to add to Sanborn's language, "with a sunset date two years after program formally starts." Debo and members continued to discuss various ways to express this intent in the resolution language, and agreed that they were formulating a second substitute to allow contracts to go beyond the one year after the program starts, but all contracts would sunset no later than two years after the program starts.

Hoag said that the new hybrid buses should not be included in this full wrap program. He predicted that because hybrids will probably generate attention, advertisers might request them for their advertising. Hoag preferred to create the maximum ability to market the hybrids without ads on them. Debo responded that in previous Commission meetings, members had suggested that perhaps some partial wraps on hybrids could be good, especially if the ads were bought by "sponsors" and were complementary to the theme of hybrids. Hoag agreed with this idea, as long as the ads were appropriate to hybrids and Metro approved them. Debo concluded by saying that, like Hoag, she believed a distinction should be made between ads on standard buses and ads on hybrids.

Paoni wondered how the tinting and vinyl ad materials proposed for Metro's buses compared to those adopted by Milwaukee County a couple years ago, and asked if there were any other transit systems in state using similar materials. Maryott-Walsh said she couldn't be certain, but that the sample wrap materials could be what Milwaukee is using, because they are what are currently on the market.

Paoni expressed concerns about riders' ability to see out of the windows, particularly on detour routes where the automatic announcements are not working right now. Referring to the wrap material used in Milwaukee, Paoni said that riders had not been able to see out of "wrapped" windows, especially in the winter. She added that riders had hated the wraps and pulled them off. She said that the experience had been like sitting in a cave. Since this was a big concern to Paoni, she said that she wanted some reports from other bus systems that had used the materials, to prove to her that they did not have the same problems as Milwaukee did. Maryott-Walsh said that she would speak to Milwaukee about these experiences, but noted that Milwaukee is still wrapping buses; they haven't stopped this practice.

Radomski said that he had met with Carolyn Hall to discuss wraps and ADA issues, as well as related literature, case law, and experiences in other municipalities. They had discussed the question of interior lighting, and whether visually impaired people would have enough light to be able to move around freely inside and exit the bus. Radomski said that there had been no complaints, case law or rulings found to suggest problems with this.

Paoni responded by saying that her ADA concern had to do with her ability to see out the windows, especially with the lack of conformity in some stop announcements. After Durocher reviewed some meeting procedures, Paoni clarified the ADA issue that continued to concern her. She said that she objected to the resolution because she cannot see out wrapped windows, not because she objected to advertising on buses.

Sanborn responded to Paoni's comments by saying that he understood her concerns, but hoped that she could support the resolution because it provides that wraps will be placed on only 15 (out of 200+) buses, calls for a rider survey and includes a sunset provision. He said that Metro would have the ability to correct any problems. Given potential revenues and Metro's current financial condition, the desire to expand service while not raising fares, he hoped members would be willing to give wrapping a try.

Laurie Wermter, a member of the public, returned to the table to speak to the Commission about this agenda item. She said she was delighted to see this item on the agenda, because of her concern about Metro's Advertising and Leased Space Policy in general, in which (she noted) all free speech rights of riders are taken away. She had previously asked the Commission to revise the policy because it bans bus riders from handing out any written materials while on the bus. This issue came up before when she wanted to save the #10 and #11 buses from being cancelled. She's concerned that this ban is buried in the policy, and she thinks that the Commission should look into creating a "Bus Riders Bill of Rights," which could address the ban.

With regard to the proposed fully wrapped buses, Wermter asked the Commission please allow bus riders to have their dignity while riding. She said that riders ride buses for different reasons: some because they can't afford other transportation and some because they wish to protect the environment - but they all deserved their dignity. While not objecting to covering the rest of the bus, she asked that, at a minimum, the windows not be covered. She would not call a two-year period a "trial" because that would be a long time to ride buses like this, and added that the wraps would probably be put on the most popular buses thus impacting a lot of people. She also asked that the resolution be referred to ADA Transit Subcommittee, since she had heard that they had not had a chance to review this proposal. She wondered how much it would cost to clean off the wraps, if advertisers don't want to renew an ad. Debo clarified that the party providing the ad, would be required to take it off and restore the bus to its previous condition; there would be no cost to Metro.

Durocher commented that this is not the first time the issue of full ad wrapping has come up. Though he sensed a shift in attitude towards the idea at this time, he noted that it had not been approved in the past. Though a non-voting member, he explained why he had been and continued to be against ad wraps. He said that he opposed commercial exploitation of public property, and he opposed ads for aesthetic reasons as well. He felt that the ads contributed to the visual pollution downtown and everyone needed respite from being perpetually bombarded by advertising. With regard to the economic impact on Metro, he said that the projected revenues might be optimistic; Metro hadn't always been able to sell all its available space and projections for ad revenue had fallen short in the past. With Metro's operating budget at \$40 million now, he predicted that even if revenue projections were met, ads would not be the panacea to bail Metro out. Though apparently in the minority on the issue, he felt that he needed to share

these thoughts.

White added that while she didn't like the idea of fully advertised buses for aesthetic reasons, she thought it would be worse to see riders pleading with the Commission not to raise fares. She wanted to do everything possible to avoid that situation; and hoped members would be willing to give the idea a try to see what revenue opportunities might exist. In response to a question, Debo clarified that the route numbers on the side and back of buses would not be covered up.

A final vote was taken on the motion to recommend the Second Substitute resolution, containing the three language changes previously identified. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: Radomski, Sanborn, White, Wong, McCabe and Hoag

No: Golden and Paoni

Non Voting: Durocher, Streit and Hinz

Golden and Radomski left the meeting at 8:05PM.

E.8. [03917](#)

"Benchmarks" for Transit

Commenting that this item was an information piece, Debo highlighted Metro's two benchmarks, which had been developed in response to a request from the Mayor's office to all city departments/divisions to help track their progress during the year and to help in the budget process. Metro looked at two key indicators used throughout the industry to track its transit service: to increase ridership and to improve ridership per revenue hour (the number of trips or passengers per hour). Noting that the projected numbers were understated rather than overstated, Debo asked members how they felt about the indicators in general.

Paoni moved to accept the report, and McCabe seconded the motion. In the discussion that followed, Paoni said that the benchmarks missed issues related to the important goal of serving the transit dependent. She noted that during previous Commission discussions, a tension had been identified between serving commuters during the rush hours rather than serving all riders during off-peak times. She noted that the easiest and fastest way to meet the objectives of these indicators would be to move to a commuter system (most volume in shortest amount of time). She felt that it would be good to counterbalance this push with some other indicators that would measure service to the transit dependent in order to provide more equity.

Debo noted the difference between these benchmarks and Metro's strategic plan, which (for example) identified the need to provide more service in core areas. She said that the department had been specifically asked to provide only two indicators as a means of telling the transit story, which these two classic indicators would do. She added that it would be hard to measure and collect data for an indicator such as that proposed by Paoni; but noted that per civil rights requirements, Metro does identify route service to low income areas, which has been found to reflect favorably. Paoni reiterated her concern that a measure be included beyond those that are reflective of commuter activity.

After further discussion about deferring the item to the next meeting, Durocher pointed out that members needed to vote on the original motion before a new

motion could be offered to defer.

A vote was taken on the motion to accept the report, as follows:

AYES: Sanborn, White, Hoag, McCabe, Streit and Hinz

NOES: Paoni and Wong

Non-voting: Durocher

The motion passed.

E.9. Discussion: Fare Tariff for 2007

Debo noted that the current round of contracts for unlimited ride pass agreements had just been completed. She wanted to know if the Commission wanted to begin discussion on modifying the fare structure which would reflect potentially the fare tariffs for future pass agreements, special event fares, etc. She said that in order to complete the current budget process, Metro would need to provide the City with a figure for its unlimited ride pass agreement that will go into effect in January. She was hoping to get Commission input about a possible rate change, so she could build this info into the estimate she would give to the City. Members agreed that they would be interested in looking at and discussing ideas about fare changes at a future meeting.

Wong left the meeting at 8:12PM.

F. OLD BUSINESS

- F.1. [03918](#) Metro Transit Updates: Annual Reports; Service Change update; Update on surveys conducted in Madison neighborhoods, Cross Plains, Oregon/Stoughton; ETP Park & Ride

As members looked at the item, Durocher commented that the Annual Report looked good and concise. Debo then went on to summarize the remaining items. She had just attended a public hearing at Fitchburg, where she heard only positive comments about the proposed route change to extend bus service to Lacy Road and the Community Center. She added that Metro had been going to the other communities with proposals based on survey feedback. She concluded by saying that the ETP Park and Ride resolution would be ready for consideration at the next meeting.

Streit moved to accept all other the remaining reports. McCabe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

G. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES/COMMISSIONS/AD HOC GROUPS (for information only)

- G.1. ADA Transit Subcommittee (April meeting minutes attached)
- G.2. Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee (No meeting in May)
- G.3. Parking Council for People with Disabilities (April meeting minutes attached)
- G.4. Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission (May meeting minutes attached)

G.5. State Street Design Project Oversight Committee

G.6. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

H. GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS

H.1. General announcements by Chair

Durocher pointed out the informational flyer announcing the Streetcar Forum, and the updated Commission roster and rules. Debo noted the newspaper article about the budget challenges of the Milwaukee Transit system, and an interesting proposal to create a sales tax at the county level to help the transit system as well as other public agencies.

H.2. Commission member items for future agendas

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:19PM.