



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

5:00 PM

201 W. Mifflin Street
Madison Central Library, Room 302
Third Floor Conf. Room

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 9 - David Ahrens; Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 2 - Gary L. Poulson and Michael M. Johnson

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Streit, to Approve the Minutes of the February 8, 2017 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

E.1. [46402](#) Parking Year-End Report: March 2017 Activity Report, and December 2016 Revenue/Expense/Occupancy Reports - TPC 03.08.17

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

- Pages 3-8 of the reports now reflected revenues and expenses data as reported in MUNIS and the budget. Pages 10-13 reflected a compilation of transactional data drawn from multiple sources inc. meters, off-street facilities, bank deposits, cashiering and MUNIS.
- 2016 revenues at \$15.122M had gone up by 9% or \$1.274M compared to 2015. Lower monthly permit revenue (from cutting back on permits), was offset by hourly cashiered revenue.
- Shown at \$9.689M, expenses were not actually \$700K lower than 2015. The 2016 depreciation had not yet been posted in 2016 expenses. When it was, expenses for 2016 would end up being about \$80K lower than 2015.

- Before the rate change, some occupancies had been too high (over 80%), and now were in the range they needed to be. State Street Cap and Campus had increased in average occupancy.
 - About 3-4% of the increase in revenues could be attributed to the rate increase. The new rates were not programmed into the meters until November. Also, higher occupancies had occurred in the beginning of 2016 (up about 6% vs.2015), before the rate change.
 - The new \$8 Special Event rate had gone into effect on January 15, and so was not part of the 2016 revenue increase. Since then, occupancy for Special Events had actually increased. Other Campus parking facilities were charging \$15.
 - Even though weekday peak hour occupancy at Cap Square North had decreased slightly, revenues were up there due to evening and non-peak use.
 - Since the upgrade to new energy-efficient lighting at Cap Square North, electrical usage there had dropped 40% (down \$26K). This lighting upgrade was going out for bid for State Street Cap, where they expected to see similar savings.
- Kovich/Bigelow made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [46403](#) Metro YTD Fixed and Paratransit Performance Indicators - TPC 03.08.17

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp said that next month he would discuss the recent State Supreme Court ruling related to concealed carry on buses, and what they would be communicating to the public and to drivers. Golden/Kovich made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G.1.]

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [44003](#) Establishing the Task Force on Equity in Music and Entertainment.

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item G.1.] Bergamini wasn't certain what action was being required. Kovich made recommendations, as follows:

- References to the name of the Task Force should be consistent.
- The last Whereas on bottom of page 2 was confusing and run-on. It did call for a rep from the TPC, which was probably why it was referred to TPC, since transportation was important for music venues.
- It would be helpful to be clearer about the mission of the Task Force: Whether to study, review, explore best practices in other cities; and to make recommendations for short- and long-term strategies.

With no one present to speak about the resolution, members asked that either one of the sponsors or someone from the Mayor's Office be invited to the next meeting. A motion was made by Kemble, seconded by Kovich, to Refer to the April meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2a. [46249](#) SUBSTITUTE Recreating Section 3.14, creating Sections 33.55 and 33.56 of the Madison General Ordinances to update the Department of Transportation and create the Transportation Policy and Planning Board and the Transportation Commission.

Alders Kemble and Zellers answered questions about the proposal. Kemble said ACA John Strange's 2/28/17 memo (attached) laid out TORC's process well. Staff mentioned that a more recent "Expanded Drafter's Analysis" memo dated 3/3/17 (attached) had been emailed and provided to members, which contained additional info about the technical resolutions (Leg. File 46376 and 46377) connected to the proposed changes. Kemble noted that the Committee had wrapped up and adjourned sine die. Following that, ACA Strange circulated what had been decided at that meeting for editing comments by TORC members.

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Golden, to Refer the item to the April TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION meeting for further discussion, when ACA Strange would be available. They also requested that the proposal and ACA Strange's memo be sent to the TPC sub/committees to gather their comments (either through their meetings or through contact by email).

Re: other groups that had been contacted, Kamp noted that Strange had brought the proposal to CSOS. Zellers thought that Strange had also contacted ADATS; and both she and Kemble had provided monthly updates to the PBMVC and TPC.

Kovich wondered what in the current ordinances wasn't included in the proposed ordinances; and if something was left out, why it was left out.

Bigelow was shocked that TORC had not talked to the sub/committees that would be disbanded by ordinance changes; esp. since at some point, the City had seen fit to create them to represent certain constituencies and deal with their special issues. Even if some of these groups had been contacted/involved during the process, he still thought that they should be presented with the final result. Kemble said that this was where they were in the process now.

Noting that the effective date was 1/1/18, Golden thought they had enough time to respond to Bigelow's concern. If CCOC was the Lead, they should be prepared to gather comment on the proposal. He himself had comments (emailed to members) that he wanted to discuss at the next meeting.

Bigelow wondered if TPC could take the lead to gather input from TPC sub/committees and other transportation-related committees, to submit to CCOC. Zellers felt that the issues were very important, and that they could do this as well as other things to address member concerns.

Re: CCOC and new committee appointments, Kemble noted that TORC was started a year ago by Alder DeMarb, then President of the Council. Kemble said that she and Zellers were members of the current CCOC, and TORC members appointed to the new CCOC would provide continuity. Also, the Mayor had assured them that he would make appointments to the current committees in April, and would ask appointees of their interest in any new committees.

Kovich had other questions/comments that she would put in writing for the next meeting, and suggested that other members do likewise.

After further discussion, the proposal was referred directly to the two TPC

Subcommittees, CSOS and ADATS. PBMVC and LRTPC could be invited to send their comments to TPC if they chose. As far as a timeline, these groups could submit their comments until the end of April (after the next ADATS meeting). The TPC could then package all the comments at the May meeting to send to CCOC. A vote was taken, and the motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2b. [46376](#) Repealing Sections 3.14(1) through (3) and 3.14(4)(k) through 3.14(11) of the Madison General Ordinances to update the Department of Transportation Department ordinance.

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Golden, to Refer to the April TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2c. [46377](#) CHARTER ORDINANCE - Repealing Section 3.14(4)(a) through (j) of the Madison General Ordinances to restructure the Department of Transportation .

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Golden, to Refer to the April TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [46371](#) Amending the Parking Utility 2017 Adopted Capital Budget to increase budget authority by \$80,000 for the Overture Center Garage Elevator modernization project.

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Tolmie, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. Tolley noted that a Substitute might be needed at BOE to increase the \$80K shown in the resolution. The lowest bidder had not met Affirmative Action requirements, and unless they filed an appeal by the end of the day, the bid would go the next lowest bid of \$115K. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.4. [45821](#) Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County to provide \$19,300 in assistance to Metro Transit for transit information services, promotion efforts and operations for calendar year 2017, and \$5,000 to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (a Metropolitan Planning Organization) to support the County Specialized Transportation coordination activities for the calendar year 2017.

Kamp said this was part of a long-standing, coordination agreement between Dane County, Metro Transit and the MPO, and was the same as last year's agreement. A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Bigelow, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.5. [45922](#) SUBSTITUTE-Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into a sole source agreement with the National Transit Institute to provide Transit Leadership Training in Madison for Wisconsin transit systems; and amending the adopted 2017 Metro Transit operating budget to accept the revenue for the estimated cost of this training of \$50,000. The 80% federal share of the cost will be reimbursed by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and the 20% local share will be reimbursed by Transit Mutual Insurance company. The cost of this training will be covered by funding from Transit Mutual Insurance Company and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

Kamp had been working with his predecessor Paul Larrousse, Director of the National Transit Institute, and with transit management consultant Barbara

Gannon to arrange this. He had attended a national transit management seminar 30 years ago, with which Gannon had been involved. A number of people in the transit industry were retiring. Training resources had been more scarce for younger individuals in the industry.

About 20-25 Metro employees would be attending two 3-day sessions in June and August here in Madison, using some space at the UW. The training would deal with leadership aspects, to look at how to maintain a resilient organization and recover from difficult situations; and how to manage good CEO/board/mayoral relationships. Chair Poulson would participate. Going beyond covering labor contracts and the standard training offered by the City, the training would look at the future of transit and leadership. Twenty transit systems were interested in sending attendees, for the same reasons.

Kamp asked that the resolution be amended to remove references to the % split because the exact % was yet to be determined; and to re-write those sections (as shown in Version 2). The estimated cost would remain \$50K. A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER-To Adopt the Substitute (Version 2). The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.6. [46404](#)

Metro: Request for public hearing regarding targeted service changes, effective August 2017 - TPC 03.08.17

Transit Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck and Transit Planner Tim Sobota reviewed the proposed service changes (attached).

- Routes 2 & 28: Buses would go to the stop nearest the Job Center first before going to the North TP.
- Route 11: The current stops on Nob Hill backed up to the fence along the Beltline creating a safety issue. Stops would be shifted to Badger Lane, allowing for sidewalks and boarding pads.
- Route 14: The route would be simplified; but depended on whether a signal was installed at Colony and Gammon. Per TE staff, the signal could be installed as early as this year. If that didn't happen, current routing would continue. Farmington-Westfield had 1-2 riders/day; the reason for going there now was to avoid making a left turn across Gammon. Randolph further west had lots of density and development.
- Route 33: The change would straighten out the route, skirt the neighborhood, and provide service further north. Staff didn't expect much opposition to this.
- Route 35: A business in the Atlas Avenue area had 55 people interested in service at peak AM/PM times. Using a reverse commute, in the AM, the route would serve the industrial park first, and then cover Route 35 ending up at the ETP. In the PM, the route would do the opposite, first covering the Route 35 loop, then serving the industrial park, and returning to the ETP. Staff thought the new route rather complicated, and wasn't quite ready to recommend it; but wanted to see what feedback they got, esp. in light of the request for service. Staff could look at whether the frontage road east of Stoughton Road would be faster than Hwy. 51 in the AM. In the PM, with no signal, the left turn from the frontage road onto Milwaukee Street, would be problematic.
- Route 55: The current route wasn't reaching the WTP in time for many Epic employees to make transfers in the afternoon, inc. those transferring to the Route 73 (to Watts Road-High Point area). The proposed route would travel through areas where many employees lived. It had received favorable reviews

from Epic staff. Providing quick, direct rides, the new route could shore up rider numbers. It would interline at Epic with Route 75, going from WTP into Verona as a Route 55, and returning to the WTP as a Route 75.

- Route 56: With McKee Road reconstruction, buses wouldn't be able to safely make the left turn at Stonecreek onto McKee. So the route would be moved from Stonecreek to Maple Grove, where a signal was located. On the north end of route, service would be moved from Stratford to Carnwood, and use the same stops as Route 51, making things less confusing.
- Route 57: Like Route 56, this would move service from Stonecreek to Maple Grove to take advantage of signal. With McKee reconstruction, folks in East Pass-Stonecreek area, who didn't want to walk to Maple Grove, would have a better ped crossing at McKee to get to stops on the other side. Moving from Piping Rock to Hammersley would make it consistent with off-peak and evening service, and be less confusing. Distance between Stonecreek and Maple Grove was less than a 1/4-mile.
- Route 59: A weekend route paid for by Fitchburg, the current route connected Dunns Marsh to Fitchrona Road/Target and Hyvee. Ridership hadn't panned out there. The schedule would be shifted by a half-hour, so it didn't follow Routes 50/51. Fitchburg had been wanting a cross-Fitchburg route that went west-east, and to the Fitchburg Library. Dunn Marsh folks could still take Route 18 to WTP and then Route 59 to get to Fitchrona area. It would add 15 minutes to the trip. Fitchburg's Transportation and Transit Committee had approved this as an item for their own public hearing (the day after ours); after which they would vote on it. Fitchburg wanted this and Metro had worked with them on it. Two-thirds of Dunn's Marsh was located in Fitchburg.
- Route 72 and 73: The changes would standardize where Route 72 and 73 started and ended, and wouldn't reduce service and only involved changing bus stop signs and the destination sign on the bus.
- Additional changes: Stops would be added to a few routes to provide more locations to transfer to other routes. Other changes would enhance service.

Bigelow/Tolmie made a motion to approve the request for public hearing at the April TPC. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.7. [46425](#)

Amending the 2017 Capital Budget to Increase by \$6 million the Funding & Authorization for the Judge Doyle Public Parking Garage Project on Block 88.

Planning-Community-Economic Development Director Natalie Erdman and Finance Director Dave Schmiedeke discussed the proposed amendment.

- In 2016, the Council made the decision to put parking underground on Block 88, and LVDA was hired to design the public portion of the project inc. replacement of Gov East on Block 88 with a minimum of 560 and a target of 600 spaces; a bike center; reconstruction of Pinckney Street right-of-way; and demolition of Gov East once the new garage was built.
- The contract called for LVDA to provide a cost estimate at the end of the schematic design phase, and did not allow them to go on to design development until Project Manager George Austin and Parking Manager David Dryer authorized them to proceed.
- In January, LVDA delivered schematic drawings for an approx. 600-car garage, and other public pieces. The cost estimate came in about \$10M higher than anticipated. Staff got a second opinion from a national construction company, which came in with about the same number, and which gave them a good check on the numbers in the market place.

- Staff spent time with LVDA establishing the level at which they would be going into ground water, since what was adding significant expense was the work of retaining the adjacent site/soil pinning, pumping mechanisms and waterproofing on lower levels.
- Through that process, they determined the lowest level they could go without having to do that water work. They also looked at redesigning the garage with a different structural system, with a shorter span system, to stay out of the water and manage the concrete. This resulted in fewer parking spaces, 560 (vs. 600): 40 for Fleet and the minimum 520 to replace Gov East.
- Doing this, they were able to take \$4M off the price, but still left a \$6M gap.
- The Staff Team decided to move forward with policy makers that any further reduction in the cost would either take them down to a structure smaller than what was targeted for replacement of Gov East, or would put them in a position of designing something that would not be a long-term, high quality structure that the City should expect.
- Staff then started looking at ways they could potentially fund the \$6M of additional cost. The resolution proposed using Parking reserves, and then using land-lease payments from the developer for Blocks 88 and 105, totaling about \$750K/year, to re-pay reserves the \$6M + interest (at City's investment rate).
- They were moving with some haste, because one of the sources to pay for the garage included \$24M in TID 25, which would need to be committed by mid-September, or they would lose the ability to use the money. For bids to be back by then, the design team needed to move forward with design development drawings by the end of March. So they hoped to return the resolution to the Council by March 21.

Staff and members discussed the proposal further.

- (Erdman) The garage would go four floors underground, and out under Pinckney. They had looked at the costs of bringing the entire garage above-ground, but it would take too long to redesign that; they would lose the \$24M. Also, the cost would be more than the \$13M originally programmed for an above-ground garage. The cost pressures were the tight markets in construction right now, for big concrete structures. Contractors could pick and choose; and concrete costs and mark-ups were high.
- (Erdman and Schmiedeke) The lease payments would otherwise have gone into the General Fund, but hadn't been assigned to any particular use. The lease was a 98-year land-lease. It would take 12 years to re-pay the Parking reserves.
- Re: reducing the number of spaces, the floor for the number was 520 to replace Gov East + 40 for Fleet. Parking was sort of hoping for more. They would be losing some spaces onsite and on Pinckney/Wilson/Doty.
- (Tolley) The Utility would see a net loss of parking in the area, as many as 40 spaces. Along with spaces at Lot 88, some Doty spaces would be lost to driveways, and some Pinckney spaces would be lost in the new streetscape design (bike lanes, ped enhancements and a fountain). The cost to go deeper underground to replace the lost spaces by increasing spaces in the garage, would be prohibitive.
- (Erdman) The bike center had been reduced from 5,000 to 2,500 sq. ft and moved to the Doty side of the block. If an operator couldn't be found, they could reconfigure and reduce the scope of the center.
- (Tolley) The use of \$6M from reserves would not immediately hamper other Utility projects. They would need to look at future projects and timing for Lake

Street. With the 2018 rate change, reserves generated would be ~\$6M from 2018 and out.

- (Erdman) The new Anchor Bank garage would have ~200 spaces, many of which were committed to the offices and apartments there. How much would be public parking wasn't known.
- (Kemble) Acknowledging a loss of spaces/revenue to the Utility, the general downtown scene for parking would be changing with the addition of that.
- (Kovich) It would be helpful to get firmer numbers of net impact on parking availability downtown when that became known, esp. if parking were going to be lost.
- (Erdman and Zellers) Of the \$1M for the bike center, \$300K was federal money originally designated for an intermodal transportation facility, of which the bike center was the last vestige. The City was at risk of losing several million dollars if it didn't include an intermodal component. The new structure would provide improved bike parking for the public, along with a bike center in some form.
- (Golden and Erdman) Perhaps some of the Fleet parking could be moved to Brayton Lot, depending on the demand for public parking at the new garage.

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Golden, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [The meeting proceeded to Item G.2.]

G. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

- G.1. [46405](#) Metro: FTA FY 2016 Triennial Review, August 12, 2016 - TPC 03.08.17

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item E.2.] Metro Finance Manager Wayne Block talked about the Triennial Review process and results (attached).

- Metro received \$10M/year in federal funding. The FTA conducted the Review to check on Metro's compliance with federal requirements related to this funding.
- The Review was a two-step process: First, Metro responded to a lengthy questionnaire (192 pages long) and submitted lots of documents. Second, an FTA rep spent two days in Madison to follow up.
- The Review focused on 17 areas, with the majority of their time spent on financial management and capacity, technical capacity, ADA, procurement, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, and maintenance. All of these areas had to be properly documented. For example, they spent time at the Shop reviewing records for preventative maintenance and road calls, to make sure Metro was taking care of their stuff.
- If something was found to be in some way deficient, they would issue a finding.
- In 2013, the FTA issued three findings (re: plans for subrecipients, independent cost estimates, and DBE), which were relatively minor. In one case, Metro simply hadn't provided certain reports.
- This year, two relatively minor findings were issued related to Legal and Charter Bus. For Legal, the feds wanted to know what their lobbyist was up to; staff had not prepared the correct report for that. Similarly, for the Charter Bus, Metro hadn't prepared reports in a certain, specific way.
- Of the 596 reviews done nationwide, Metro was among the 24% with two or less findings. The average number of findings was eight; 67% of all the reviews had a procurement finding.

Kamp said that the two findings were the result of reporting methods: There was a specific way to submit this info on the FTA website. Metro had responded to the findings and remedied them in a timely way; and received close-out letters from the FTA in December. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.1. and the remainder of the agenda.]

G.2. [46406](#)

Metro: Proposed Monroe Street bus stops after 2018 reconstruction - TPC 03.08.17

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item F.7.] Kamp said staff had been looking at this in anticipation of Monroe Street reconstruction in 2018. It was a corridor that was not aligned with the TDP bus stop spacing. Metro staff Drew Beck and Tim Sobota provided an overview of the plan (attached).

- The stops would be spread a bit more to improve on-time performance and schedule reliability at transfer points.
- Stops would be located far-side/after intersections, providing peds with a better sightline.
- The average distance between stops would be ~2.5 blocks or 1,000 feet (per TDP).

Staff answered questions and members commented.

- (Beck) There would be six fewer stops overall for both West and East Monroe.
- (Golden) It might be helpful to include boardings info from the "bubble" map for these stops; and maybe before/after info.
- (Golden) With TOD development in the area esp. on Knickerbocker, it looked like a stop was being moved away. It might be good to show TOD.
- (Golden) As far as engaging/notifying neighbors, the majority of riders came from the apartments along Monroe, where they could target mailings. Info could also be put on neighborhood website.
- (Beck) Flyers would be placed on the buses. Public workshops were planned on April 27 for the East segment, and on May 24 for the West segment. Findings would be reported to TPC in June.
- (Sobota) Re: the triangle at Regent/Breese/Monroe, a Route 3 and 58 bus stop would be located on east side of Breese heading north. The Crazylegs diagonal might be closed.
- (Zellers) In reducing bus stops, communication was key. It would be good to post the info on bus stop poles, where riders waited, inc. visitors/non-residents.
- (Sobota) Re: bus stop reductions, the TDP called for detailed bus stop analysis, and engaging the public, staff and policymakers, to minimize impacts to transit users esp. those with limited mobility; thus, the engagement timeline outlined by Beck. Also in keeping with the TDP, bus stop spacing was being reviewed on this corridor as it was being reconstructed.
- Besides relocating to far-side stops, they also looked at where traffic signals were located, and tried to orient out from signalized ped crossings at these intersections, spacing stops equal distances on either side of those. Taking all these elements into consideration made for some quirky situations.

G.3. [46429](#)

Closure of Bus Stop on Gorham Street at Bassett Street - TPC 03.08.17

Asst. City Traffic Engineer Yang Tao joined Beck and Sobota to discuss the Gorham-Bassett Street bus stop. (See documents attached.)

- (Beck) Some elements of the Gorham-Bassett intersection included: The new

building to the northwest; the current bus stop nearby on Gorham; two new bike lanes on each side of Bassett going in opposite directions with bikes crossing at the intersection; and now a new traffic signal. Having a bus stop among all this presented issues.

- (Tao) Reasons for installing a signal at this intersection:

- * It was a heavily used ped crossing. They had received many complaints about this, inc. from transit customers who crossed to the bus stop.
- * With further development in the area, the situation was likely to get worse. The James would house a 1,000 people, creating more demand to cross the street.

- * Another project south on Bassett planned for this summer would add protected bike lanes on each side of the street. With these new bike lanes and with Bassett-Gorham being a major collector point for bikes traveling between Campus and John Nolen, bikes crossing here was likely to increase, making things more complicated, and creating the need for signalization here.

- (Tao) Signalization would improve ped safety, but there would be some unintended consequences as well. With no signal now and buses stopped at the current location blocking the view, peds were not able to see oncoming traffic and traffic was not able to see them. Peds were on their own and had to be very cautious. On the other hand, a signal could give them a false sense of security. When they saw a walk light, they might just go without checking.

- (Tao) Along with blocked sightlines, there was a free-flow, left-turn lane coming off of Broom, where traffic often tried to change lanes. Because of the curve there, if peds weren't careful and vehicles weren't watching for a red light, it could be very bad.

- (Tao) Another reason for moving the stop: The James would have a major driveway very close to the intersection, in the area of the bus stop. Lots of cars, mopeds and bikes would be coming out of that driveway.

- (Tao) A third reason: TE had been trying to address the bike and bus conflicts on this block. The block between Broom and Bassett was mostly a parking lane with a narrow area for bikes. When a bus un/loaded riders, the bikes had to go around them by edging into the traffic lane. Bikers had complained that this was quite dangerous. Also, when the bus came to stop, it had to cross bikes; and when it got back into traffic, it had to cross bikes again.

- (Tao) TE thought it would be safer to move the bus stop from the near side of the intersection to the farside of it.

Beck said that keeping in mind that distances between stops not be too far, Metro had come up with two possibilities for relocating the stop:

- 1) They could place the stop further east on Gorham in front of Riley's and Brickhouse BBQ. Some metered parking would need to be taken, and it wouldn't address the issue of bikes coming up behind the bus.

- 2) Per TE's idea, they could stretch around the curve and place the stop closer to Gilman, which would increase the distance from the previous stop on State Street, to almost a quarter mile; and would increase the walking distance for residents in the Broom-Bassett neighborhood. This became a bigger issue on weekends, when only an hourly Route 5 ran on W. Washington Avenue. The proposed Gilman stop was just 40 feet away from the current stop on University beyond Frances, and they could possibly combine the two stops.

Tao noted that both options involved lots of considerations, inc. the distance between stops. From a traffic operations and safety point of view, the stop on University near Gilman would be better because of the dedicated bus and bike

lane there, which would reduce bus-bike conflicts. From a Parking point of view, since the parking spaces near Broom were heavily used, it would be good to keep them.

Members and staff discussed the options further.

- (Streit) From a driver's perspective, he would prefer not to have to drive around buses pulling in/out at Riley's. The lanes there were narrow, and drivers were already anxious as they approached the curve. It was an issue of safety for bicyclists more than the convenience of the bus stop.
- (Kemble) A stop at Riley's was too close to Broom, for the safety of motorists and everyone. With incoming traffic from Broom Street, there was already a lot of confusion; adding a bus there would make it more so. It would be chaotic for peds, bikes and other drivers. Placing the stop beyond the new signal made sense; people would hopefully be calm, looking around, and aware that transitions were happening.
- (Bergamini) The stop just west of Henry on Gorham seemed to be underutilized, esp. by comparison to the number of people coming off of Broom-Bassett. Maybe the stop could be moved to the other side of State Street, putting it closer to Broom Street residents.
- (Beck) When State was closed off for events, the Henry stop was heavily used. Also, buses now stopped on State just before turning onto Gorham. A stop around the corner would be too close; though the two stops could possibly be combined.
- (Bergamini) For safety's sake, the Gilman option was the better one, but Beck was right about the rider-shed from Broom and Bassett. In surveys, neighbors in the area complained about distance to bus stops. Still it was a confusing area, and it was good that staff was working on it.
- (Tao) One traffic signal would be on the right side of Gorham going west, just before the (barred) ped crosswalk. A second overhead signal with an arm would be placed on the middle island on Bassett where it intersected Gorham.
- (Golden) The lanes coming down the hill from Broom onto Gorham had solid lines, making it esp. hard for people in the free-left lane to get across University to turn right on Frances. Maybe the solid lines should be eliminated, because people crossed them anyway. Also, the free-left, slip lane should be eliminated. It created fear. With a traffic signal there, it would be better to have all the cars turning with the light, and even create two left-turn lanes there if needed. Otherwise, the placement of the new signals at Gorham-Bassett were perfect.
- (Tao) The slip lane relieved congestion on Broom (which could back up as far as Mifflin). But TE could look at this for the future.
- (Sobota) The issue of a false sense of security with walk lights would hold true at the Gilman location as well, where a signal was located also. Maybe the stop at Frances beyond the signal should remain, rather than having a bus traffic zone blocking the sightlines for peds and for vehicles at Frances/Gilman. [Please note: Ahrens left the meeting at this point, at 7:45 PM.]
- (Beck) The bus stop zone would pretty much run from just past the curve up to Gilman. It had to be fairly long to give drivers the room they needed to slide in, while at the same time watching for bikes on their right. Also, more than one bus might be trying to stop there at one time.
- (Sobota) An operational concern of supervisors was having both bikes and buses stopped on red as the new traffic light: When the light changed, they would all be coming around the curve with bikes in the blind spot of the bus. If the stop were right past the corner, the bus would be in a race with the bikes

to get ahead of them. Or it would have to hang back in the traffic lane, waiting for the bikes to pass.

- (Streit) Such races probably wouldn't be very frequent because bikes would likely not stop at the signal on red, but would probably slip on through (creating some risk for peds who might not be watching for them as they crossed on a walk light). A different issue was the double-parking on University just west of Frances, where bus drivers were forced to pull a hard left to get around the delivery trucks. Placing the stop east of Gilman would give them more room to get around the trucks.

- (Beck) Metro was working with TE on signage for the area, so that double-parking rules could be enforced, which would help.

- (Tao) Right now, the signage said "No parking at any time". Actively un/loading was not considered a parking activity, and so, was allowed. If the signs were changed to say "No Stopping, Standing, or Parking," the Police would have more power to enforce. But for years, businesses in the area complained that they didn't have any place for deliveries to un/load, creating a long-standing debate. The "No Parking" rules only applied to the lanes along the curb, usually a parking lane; in this case, the bus and bike lane.

Beck concluded by saying that Metro had been having good conversations with Engineering and Traffic Engineering about the stop.

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

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long Range Transportation Planning Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
Ad Hoc Metro Paratransit Medicaid Waiver Funding & Policy Review
Committee

**I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
(For information only; not for discussion)**

I.1. General announcements by Chair

None.

I.2. Commission member suggestions for items on future agendas

None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Golden, to Adjourn at 7:54 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.