



# 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, November 9, 2016

5:00 PM

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

---

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

**Present:** 10 - David Ahrens; Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

**Excused:** 1 - Wayne Bigelow

Please note: Kemble arrived at 5:01 PM at the start of Item E.1. Johnson arrived at 5:20 PM during Item E.2.

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Tolmie, to Approve the Minutes of the October 19, 2016 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None.

### D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

### E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

#### E.1. [45040](#)

Parking: November Activity Report, and September Revenue-Expense-Occupancy Reports - TPC 11.09.16

Asst. Parking Utility Manager highlighted items in the report (attached), and answered questions.

- YTD revenue was up \$1.1M or 10%, largely in Attended Facilities, up 17%; reflected transient non-permit parking in garages and Brayton. Some of the increase could be attributed to the June rate change.
- YTD revenue overall through May was up 6%, with Attended Facilities up 11% during that time due to increased off-peak occupancy, which had continued since the rate change.
- Though some occupancies had dropped slightly since the rate change, revenues were generally up.
- Meter revenue had remained flat. A software update was being installed,

and once the new rates were in place, some changes in on-street revenue were expected.

- Occupancies were shown on pages 6 and 7, in the left-hand columns.
- RP3 revenues were up 35%, due to the annual fee increase from \$21 to \$28 (replacement fee increased \$5 to \$7). For 2016-17 YTD, new permits = 4,820, replacements = 310 (vs. 2015-16, new permits = 4,865, replacements = 245).
- Monthly and Long-Term leases were lower due to intentional reductions, to provide greater availability.
- Expenses were coming in under budget. Some expenses were tracked by facility; but some general categories like "Administration" were attributed at year end; which made it hard to show net revenue on monthly basis. However, this could be provided as part of year-end reports. The pie charts on page 7 would be enlarged.
- Staff could look at the 3-hr meters along Monroe near the Stadium, to consider extending time limits and lowering rates on some of the meters (to possibly gain more parkers/revenue, and pull parkers out of the neighborhood).
- A predesign report for Judge Doyle would probably be available soon. Streit/Kovich made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [45041](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicator Reports, and Financial, Performance Measures and Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Reports - TPC 11.09.16

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted items in the report (attached), and answered questions.

- Fixed ridership was down 8%, driven by low gas prices. Paratransit ridership was up by 1.5%. Across the state, ridership was down 2-6%. Nationally, it was down 4.5%, due to gas prices. Ridership was up on routes with frequent service. Weekend routes with less frequent service were getting hit harder, due to gas prices (and notably, parking was up during off-peak).
  - Chargeable/preventable accidents were up @ 72. Insurance claims and reserves were at/below last year's level. Though minor, these were being monitored.
  - The ridership drop and corresponding revenue loss was offset in increases in advertising revenue and MA waiver revenues passed through by the County to Metro, making revenues better than budget; and expenses were underbudget driven by savings in personnel line items. At the end of September, budget was better than anticipated.
  - They had been planning to dip into contingency for delayed implementation of the fare increase, and for engineering/design work for Nakoosa Trail.
  - Security incidents were down on fixed routes, and up slightly on school dodger routes.
  - The 2017 budgets contained money for Nakoosa satellite bus garage and the first phase of BRT. It wasn't clear how the results of the election would affect the TIGER and Small Starts grants associated with these projects, but staff would provide updates as they knew more.
  - Repair/relining of diesel storage tanks had been completed, the first of many facility projects at Ingersoll.
  - Smart card features on the new fareboxes were being tested, and would continue to be tested over the next couple of years.
  - Upgrade of CAD/AVL real time vehicle location had been completed, providing more timely data.
- Kovich/Golden made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by

voice vote/other.

**F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

- F.1. [44545](#) Relating to Ceres Crossroad Services, LLC, Lunar Cycle Services, LLC, and Mercury Transport, LLC, applications for Pedal Cab operator licenses.

**A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Golden, to Re-refer to the December meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Kovich asked noted that among the attachments, the affidavits weren't signed, and wanted to check on this at the next meeting.**

- F.2. [40307](#) To include new street construction that recognizes the importance of street trees and tree canopy and delineating the terms for community involvement in decision-making in street reconstruction projects in the City's "Complete Streets" program as adopted by the Common Council on 12/15/09 (Resolution RES-09-00997, Legislative File No. 16250).

**Poulson invited registrants to speak.**

**1) Linda Ranieri, Lance Lane, 53716, also representing Suzanne Harp, and member of the Lake Edge Neighborhood Assn., spoke in support of the proposal.**

**\* Recognizing the need for road improvements and mobility assistance and access, they were also concerned about the removal of old growth trees to accomodate sidewalks and curbs.**

**\* Each neighborhood needed to have a voice in the road/sidewalk construction process.**

**\* Also needed was an environmental study on loss of trees, runoff to lakes, and the impact of concrete on the environment. This had not been done since implementation of the 2009 Complete Streets (CS) resolution (Leg File 16250).**

**\* The area of Dean and Allis now being reviewed was not a bus route, was not walking distance to a library or grocery store, which were qualifiers under CS guidelines.**

**\* 90% of Turner area residents, inc. many with mobility concerns, did not want sidewalks. Likewise, 80% of Dean/Allis area residents, also inc. many elderly residents with mobility concerns, did not want sidewalks.**

**\* Each neighborhood should be allowed to meet, discuss and decide what was necessary with regard to environment, mobility/access, and financial burdens related to road construction.**

**\* This should not be a government mandate. Madison residents should be looking at the future, and the impact of 200 miles of concrete on the city.**

**2) Kathleen Drew, Monona Drive, 53716, spoke in opposition to the proposal.**

**\* While recognizing that losing trees can have a significant impact on the appearance of a street, for the Dean/Allis project, it was unclear what trees would be lost for necessary sewer work, or which would be saved if any, by eliminating the idea of sidewalks.**

**\* When a road project was slated, neighbors certainly should work with the City to minimize negative impacts, for which a process was already in place.**

**\* However, this proposal went well beyond any one project, and would create a significant hurdle for all future road projects.**

**\* Complete Streets meant pedestrians and bicycles were considered when a road was to be constructed; which resulted in better design, minimized**

disruption, and saved money when it was done all at once.

\* Giving neighborhoods, streets, or single blocks veto power over an overall transportation plan that improved walkability and bike accessibility, would basically scuttle the CS concept.

\* When neighbors opposed a change, they would find a reason for not doing it (i.e., on quiet streets, bike lanes weren't needed; on busy streets, bikers wouldn't use them anyway).

\* Pockets of vetos resulted in sidewalks that didn't connect to anything. Why have mass transit, if people couldn't get safely to the bus stops? Why have a bike lane that disappeared and then reappeared a mile down the street?

\* Upside of sidewalks: When sidewalks were added, more people walked and improved their health. Bike lanes offered a good alternative for short commutes. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Assn.

recommended streets with sidewalks/bike lanes because more eyes on the street, prevented crime. Property values rose fastest in ped-friendly areas.

\* CS was adopted not just to benefit the immediate neighborhood, but to serve the greater good. Walking and biking benefited everyone by relieving traffic and parking congestion, and more.

\* She had worked with the City on Monona Drive, and it had been very successful. Neighbors were involved in decisions about width of sidewalks and the selection of new trees. The City had a process for community input that worked. She urged that Complete Streets not be spoiled.

3) Pamela DeVore, East Dean Avenue, 53716, member of Lake Edge Neighborhood Assn. spoke in support of the proposal.

\* Beyond just being heard, residents wanted to reach consensus between the City's goals and their need for safe, accessible, and yet tree-lined, water-controlled streets with a rural feeling.

\* A process was needed that included neighborhood feedback and research by the City to align its plans with the neighborhood's goals, which may include: Maintaining old-growth and urban forests; run-off catchments to retain water in local soil rather filling the lakes with phosphorus; marked bike/walk lanes instead of sidewalks in areas of little ped traffic.

\* Lake Edge valued its huge, old growth trees, providing access to wild life and deep shade; while at the same, understanding that people needed to travel safely by any means, inc. bikers, strollers, runners, walkers.

\* There were creative ways to solve these issues without putting anyone out. It took open, transparent conversations with the people who were paying for the reconstruction. When committees and politicians formed policy without first having these conversations and making a commitment to neighborhood goals, they were not respecting the citizens they were charged to represent.

City Engineer Rob Phillips, Principal Engineer Christy Bachmann and Metro's Kamp answered questions.

- Re: the City's goal of having sidewalks for all residents, the resolution would require an affirmative vote by residents on residential, local streets, where streets were being reconstructed.

- Most residents in areas with sidewalks said they liked them.

- In staff's experience, in areas without sidewalks, less than 50% supported installing them. As a result, it was not likely sidewalks would be retrofitted on local, residential streets if the resolution passed.

- Whether safety was a consideration, sidewalks were installed to connect destinations (to get people to parks, schools, shopping districts, or bus routes).

For priority routes for sidewalks where sidewalk didn't exist, this was typically the case. This could occur on any class of street, inc. local, residential streets, and could be a priority.

- The proposal didn't apply to repairing sidewalks.
- Veto power probably couldn't be used for portions of a project, but would apply to the entire project.
- The City had no policy about it, but customarily sidewalks were not installed if it would cause excessive tree loss. Value judgements came into play based on various criteria; ultimately the BPW and the Council made the decision.
- Relative to accessibility to buses (Ex. sidewalks/pads for wheelchairs), Metro had no metric on how many bus routes were on streets with no sidewalks. They had received customer feedback about it. Not/having sidewalks was an especially big issue in winter.

Ahrens/Golden made a motion to recommend adoption. Sponsor Alder Ahrens discussed the proposal.

- Regarding the issue of safety, and the notion that being on a sidewalk is safer than being on the perimeter of un-sidewalk streets: In reviewing Pedestrian crash data for the previous 10 years at the time Turner Avenue was being considered, he had found no ped incidents in un-sidewalked areas. Most accidents had occurred at intersections where peds crossed major roadways (arterial streets).
- For the most part, un-sidewalked areas had very low car traffic, lack of aggressiveness, and a lot of give and take between cars and peds. Where he lived now, he saw many peds, dogs and bikes.
- The resolution would not apply to roads like Seminole Highway. It excluded collector streets and arterials.
- The neighborhoods most subjected to this were the least wealthy areas. The Turner corridor was one of the poorest areas, and after two years, the level of anger, sadness, resentment was palpable. The area was starkly different: They had had a fully mature tree canopy, where now none existed; it was an environmental and landscape catastrophe for the people who lived there. The issues of tree canopy and of sidewalks needed to be balanced.
- At the time CS was passed in 2009, the resolution didn't mention environmental impacts, and instead touted the wonders of bike lanes and sidewalks.
- What they had seen though were some big environmental impacts. Using data from two MIM reports, in 2014, 36% of city streets had no sidewalks, now it was 25%. Other data said 492 then, vs. 209 miles now, of streets with no sidewalks. For sidewalks on one side of street, 147 miles then, vs. 93 miles now. How much were we paving, how many trees were we cutting down? No one knew.
- As for terraced trees, pre-ash bore, Forestry reported that the City had 90K street trees: 25% were ash, and of those, 40% would be removed, and 12K would remain; leaving 82K trees.
- Under current policy, unless a sidewalk was diverted, a terraced tree within 8 feet of a sidewalk, would be gone. On Turner and Camden, those trees were gone. Using the numbers for the change in # of miles of streets with no sidewalk (2014 and now), we would lose 25-32K of trees.
- It was unlikely the City would engage in massive building program of hundreds of miles. However, there was complete blindness when CS was passed. Did anyone ask about the trees and loss of them? MIM didn't mention trees either. The natural environment barely came up as an issue.

- With this proposal, alders would hear that tree canopy was a big issue for many people. At a meeting in his district, 75 people talked about tree canopy, not sidewalks. Trees provided shade for peds and for homes. When Turner Avenue came to the Council very late at night, the neighbors who spoke were the elderly, inc. a couple with walkers, who said they had no problem walking on the street. People found the streets to be as or more safe in winter than sidewalks that weren't cleared properly.
- It was possible that intermittent sidewalks could result. Larger projects were typically 6-8 blocks long. In his district, some blocks had sidewalk and some didn't. He didn't get the sense that homes with sidewalks were more valuable.
- Neighbors felt that tree canopy was very important to their quality of life; and had more ped output. Having no sidewalk was of much less concern.
- Many times these areas were in older sections of town, and the streets didn't lead anyway. The amount of traffic was limited. The only reason to drive there was if you lived there. These were truly residential areas. Also, the City didn't reconstruct these streets, and they weren't in good condition, so cars were slower for that reason also.
- Recognizing that the Council didn't favor small, segmented decision-making, the reason for offering choice here was because old growth trees was a big issue.

Ahrens hoped members would endorse his proposal because it was in keeping with what we wanted from people, to be engaged in government. Also, it addressed the lack of understanding when the 2009 CS resolution was passed and the lack of info about the environmental and social costs if the process were to continue as it was.

Members discussed the proposal further.

Tolmie: As a user of a service animal, he and his dog were two people wide when they walked. On streets which didn't have sidewalks, when snow was plowed up, he stuck way out into the street. The dog was trained to stay between him and the edge of road, to keep him away from any obstacles on that side, putting him out in the street. It was a risk, for him or any blind person, when they had no sidewalk.

- Contrary to what had been said, a sidewalk was important, even if it wasn't always cleared well. Without one, he was sprayed by cars passing by; or ran the possibility of being hit by a car on a patch of ice. Not having a sidewalk was a risk to the disabled.
- Madison Ordinances said sidewalks had to be two people wide, which was good for him and his dog. In Middleton, they weren't that wide, and it was difficult to get around. A reason why data showed no accidents on streets with no sidewalks, could be that people didn't walk on them because they were dangerous.
- If he needed to get somewhere, he would have to consider taking a ride or find a another route to get around those areas. Members needed to consider the disabled, and impacts on where they were going and how they would get there, esp. regarding their safety.

Zellers: She appreciated Tolmie's well-stated comments, which reflected some of her thoughts and concerns as well. She also had a big concern about losing trees in the city, but the resolution didn't focus on this, and left it wide open for any reason or no reason to reject sidewalks. If loss of trees was a major issue, it should be better addressed in the resolution. As it stood, she couldn't

support the proposal.

Kovich: Losing trees was a concern of hers as well, but she wanted to better understand the impact of sidewalks on buses and the safety issues of the disabled. The proposal would need address both these areas before she would support it.

Bergamini: She was conflicted about the resolution. In many circumstances, it was safer and easier to provide mass transit and paratransit if sidewalks, aprons and pads. She also knew that many streets in older neighborhoods were short, with light traffic; and though they might have paratransit on them, would likely not have a bus route on them. The proposal excluded arterials and collectors, and no plebiscite would be held for those. Still, she was concerned about the hodge-podge this opened them up to.

Ahrens: Regarding Tolmie's comments, which were serious, well-meant and based on his and others' experience, as an observer in his district, which had a preponderance of these streets, he hadn't heard complaints about cars being threatening, vs. the way people talked about other areas, even those with sidewalks. This was an issue but the overwhelming balance of it in terms of the level of danger, data showed that these streets did not pose such a danger.

- A street in his district was a bus route, a route to school, had curves making it hard for cars and peds to see each other; but it had no sidewalks. He wondered why this wasn't under consideration for sidewalks as opposed to others.
- Bus routes could be included as an exception in the resolution; but his caution on that was Turner Avenue. Though a bus route, it had low bus usage, and it was changed for small number of bus riders without regard for the people who lived there. On the other hand, bus pads could be placed in areas where no sidewalks existed, and he had requested some. Accommodations could be made in that regard.

Kemble: Echoing Zellers' remarks, whether inside the resolution or apart from it, the issue of tree canopy needed to be formally addressed esp. in the terraces, that it be heavily weighted when sidewalk decisions were being made.

- However, having a plebiscite block by block was a bad process for large City infrastructure projects. Residents should have input, esp. at very earliest point, but having votes on sidewalks was not good.
- The process for determining how and where to put sidewalks needed to be better refined, to include the value of our tree canopy and to provide multiple avenues for neighbor involvement in the decision-making process.
- Along with the safety issue was an equity issue, involving generational equity. On smaller streets with no sidewalks in her district, residents were divided about whether they wanted them, with some wanting them as a space for their kids to play, while others opposed them and felt they had survived without them. This was about future residents, and how this could deny access to them if we didn't have the Complete Streets infrastructure that they might need.
- She would not be voting for the resolution, but would support it, if the tree issue were addressed.

Tolmie: As it stood, he would not support the resolution.

- He highly favored saving every tree they could. But installing a bus pad with no sidewalks to get to that pad was still a safety issue.
- Not having anything for disabled and elderly, esp. in the winter, was in his experience exceedingly dangerous (not to mention unpleasant when covered head to toe by slush).
- In looking to move to a nice neighborhood, these areas would be off limits to people like him who couldn't safely negotiate the streets. What if a current resident became disabled, would they have to move away from a place they loved, for safety reasons?
- Sidewalks were an issue esp. to get to bus routes, to make sure everyone had a way to get to the bus pads.

Kovich: It seemed that if Ahrens would make some changes to address some of the concerns expressed by members, they might consider supporting the proposal.

Having heard this, Ahrens made a substitute motion, seconded by Golden, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation to Place on File without Prejudice. Ahrens said he wanted to have the opportunity to further discuss the resolution with Commissioners, Engineering and other interested parties. Poulson clarified that in the absence of Bigelow, First Alternate Johnson would be able to vote, but Second Alternate Streit could not.

Golden felt a better way of addressing this would be to work with Engineering staff to memorialize what was being done in practice; and to give the discretion to BPW to determine whether sidewalk was appropriate, and allow them to consider the maturity and placement of the tree canopy. A lot of subjective judgement was involved. As was mentioned, generally people who didn't have sidewalks, didn't want them and that would happen. He felt that BPW would exercise their judgement prudently. We would have sidewalks where they should be, and where they would be jury-rigged, we wouldn't have them.

Zellers recommended that Ahrens look more broadly than just BPW. The Committee on the Environment or the Sustainability Committee might have a different perspective than BPW.

Ahrens mentioned equity and how this was applied. Camden Road and Turner Avenue were among the poorest areas in the city, and had had sidewalks put in. During discussions about annexation of the Town of Madison, the Mayor assured the people who lived in the Arboretum that they would not get sidewalks there and all their trees would be kept in place. Apparently, sidewalks were good for some (inc. peds/bikes), but not for others. Unless they had something pretty strong and boilerplate, they would have inequitable results esp. related to class.

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

[Please note: Ahrens and Johnson left the meeting at this point, at 6:25 PM.]

## G. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

- G.1. [45042](#) Update on Leg. File 44813, RFP to solicit an operator for Bicycle Center on



Block 88, presented by Transportation Planner David Trowbridge - TPC  
11.09.16

Judge Doyle Square (JDS) Project Director George Austin presented information about the Bicycle Center planned for Block 88, and the status of the RFP (attached).

- In 2009-2010, as part of efforts to increase the bike transportation mode in the city, the idea of a center was discussed, where bikes could be stored and be available to commuters in the business district, along with certain amenities.
- In 2010, the former Mayor proposed including a Bicycle Center as part of 2-block project called Public Market Square, that would also include parking for the a train station, reconstruction of Gov East, the public market, a hotel and other commercial/retail spaces.
- In 2011, planning for this was launched. The City had received money through a TIGER grant for multi-modal planning on the southeast side of the Square.
- In the first phase, Kimley-Horn was hired to perform a study, looking at Block 105 and inclusion of a bike center: They surveyed other bicycle centers across the country (where/how they worked and key components); and they did a market study, with 1,500+ respondents.
- The 2012 capital budget for TE included \$1M for a bike center as a component of the Public Market Square. This had been reauthorized every year since then.
- In the summer of 2012, a staff team report on all the concepts for Blocks 88 and 105, made a recommendation that the City provide only front-end capital costs for the bike center, and that an operating model be selected which did not require ongoing City financial assistance. The Council adopted this language, as part of a resolution to create an RFQ/RFP for now renamed Judge Doyle Square.
- Staff was now engaged in a pre-design study for a parking ramp. The City would own the garage on Block 88 and the Bicycle Center within it.
- In the preliminary planning, 5,000 sq. feet had been reserved for the Center, which would be at mid-block on S. Pinckney at grade level, a prominent retail presence on the street.
- They hoped to bring on an operator to run the Bicycle Center by February 2017, when design development process would begin. Responses to the RFP were due in December. Though not a major piece of JDS, the Bicycle Center had always been a consistent component.

Planning Department Planner Dan McAuliffe discussed provisions in the RFP. Because the Center would not open for two years, the RFP had been drafted to allow some flexibility for vendors.

- Based on the survey info, the draft included some minimum baseline requirements and some optional elements.
- Required components were: Secure, indoor bike parking (24/7 for bike members); changing areas and lockers; limited bike supplies for purchase (tubes, basic tools, etc.); self-service bike maintenance station, restrooms; and the operator would maintain the facility.
- Desirable/optional features were: Staffed presence, showers, staffed service center (tune-ups), enhanced bike retail, bike wash station, bike rental/share.
- Beyond that, bike vendors could provide other elements that were part of their business model. Also, the RFP asked the operator and how they would approach racial equity and social justice issues; and how they would showcase Madison's bike economy.

- Interviews would be done in the first week of January, with Council approval hopefully on Jan. 17th.

Austin and McAuliffe answered questions.

- The City would provide space at below-market rent. But they didn't know how much operators could afford. The City's hands wouldn't be tied if it chose not to charge rent. Even with no rent payment, there would be a lease structure.
- The \$1M allocation would not likely be used up entirely by construction, so some funds could be available for furniture, fixtures and equipment. But no dollar amount was yet determined. The City would retain ownership of those items.
- The RFP required the operator to maintain cleanliness and security (through key fob access for after-hour use).
- The operator would be a (non-profit or for-profit) private entity operating in a public facility. Office of Real Estate Services would be the owner/lessor/administrator of the space. The asset would be owned by the City of Madison, not the Parking Utility, which would also not be paying for it or responsible for it.
- They didn't know if the operation would produce any income. Kimley-Horn study said it would be a tough push. They had written the RFP to encourage vendors to think it through and offer the best deal they could.

Noting that the RFP resolution had come before PBMCV the previous month, Kemble had requested that staff bring the update to the TPC. She asked Austin to clarify ownership and lines of responsibility. He said the City would own the entire structure, and the Parking Utility would administer the parking facility; the vendor would administer the leased space of the Bike Center. The Utility would have financial responsibility for maintenance/repairs for its own portion of the building only.

Kemble said that PBMCV had had concerns about the financial viability of this model, and about the need for public subsidies. She was glad to hear of interest from potential operators. Historically, these centers only thrived because of heavy subsidies, not just on the capital side, but on the operating side as well. Given that this was bike parking structure inside a larger Utility structure (but not the responsibility of the Utility), she wondered in the future, if some financial issues would arise, if Parking would be asked to bring it under their wing. This was why she wanted TPC to have information about it from the beginning.

Kovich shared similar concerns about public subsidy. But it seemed that in the current format, no operating expenses would be paid by the City. The RFP would determine whether that was feasible or not; and the City would have an opportunity to review this issue again when this came back.

In response to Kovich staff presence listed under optional, McAuliffe said staff presence was strongly recommended, but that the number of hours would vary depending on days/times and retail hours, etc. They would expect some baseline staff presence, to be able to sell memberships, and respond to daily users of the facility. Though not shown in the baseline requirements, this would be something staff would look at and weigh, asking respondents how much staff time they would provide weekly. As much as possible was

desirable, but they didn't know how much vendors could manage.

McAuliffe said the proposed term of the lease was five years, to provide some stability for the City. Staff had heard clearly everyone's desire for ongoing City oversight of the operation and its viability. It was tough to tell what the future would bring, but the City would have the power to monitor changes beyond the baseline proposal. Through the RFP process a vendor would be selected, with whom the City would negotiate. That would be the start of a discussion through which the various elements would be ironed out.

[Please note: Kemble left at this point in the meeting, at 7:00 PM.]

G.2. [45044](#)

Update on Greater Madison Vision, presented by CARPC Deputy Director Steve Steinhoff and Alder Larry Palm - TPC 11.09.16

CARPC Deputy Director Steve Steinhoff and CARPC Chair, Alder Larry Palm, discussed the work of the Greater Madison Vision Initiative. (See PowerPoint attached.)

- The Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (RPC) was established in 2007 by Executive Order of Gov. Jim Doyle, in response to a request of local governments representing 87% of the County population: To transcend municipal boundaries to protect natural resources, and promote economic growth and sound land development practices.
- As an RPC, the body had the legal authority over intergovernmental agreements and WI water quality planning administrative code; and could define the Master Plan for the physical development of the region, and develop areawide water quality management plans.
- There was no single master plan for the region. CARPC had responsibility for regional planning related to land use and water quality management. Other entities created plans that were regional in nature, as well.
- CARPC was shifting its focus from being an urban service area (approval) agency, to focus on the broader mandate of regional planning. In 2016, CARPC members and staff had started the groundwork for a strategic planning process, starting with a broad general discussion about the values and visions of the community, which would later be sorted into categories.
- Greater Madison Vision (GMV) was an effort to create a community-led coalition of individuals and community members, businesses and orgs, to develop a common community vision that was so inspiring that everyone would readily adopt it.
- CARPC would continue to do land use and water quality aspects of regional planning, but GMV would lead the visioning and engagement process.
- To do this effectively, GMV looked at successful planning processes in other parts of the country, such as "Envision Utah". There they had brought together various people/groups to create vision and plan, resulting in lower costs for communities, BRT and infrastructure improvements. They were so successful that the scope of their effort had gone from Salt Lake City to encompass all of Utah, and had created a much more unified and powerful process going forward.
- GMV goal: To bring people together to create a long-term vision and strategy that would guide decisions about future growth of the region, and improve the quality of life, economic opportunity and natural environment for all.
- GMV had a 35-member steering committee composed of reps from non-profits (22%), education (8%), labor (3%), government (32%) and business (35%), which met quarterly. They were all behind the effort, and had realized

that to move forward as a community, they needed to actively plan together.

- Informational materials had been prepared by staff re: good planning was, scenarios they would use, and public engagement.
- A first project was a value study to determine regional priorities, in which many members of the community participated and identified regional challenges and regional equities. (See Slide 24, Public Values and Priorities.) Responses seemed to very much align with priorities and issues nationally.
- The next step was to connect land use and growth choices to regional priorities: Connecting such things as density, land use, street connectivity, access/location to good jobs, more affordable housing, etc.
- CARPC was working with the City and the Transportation Planning Board. City Planning had used CARPC's value study in some of their promotional materials to help them inform their engagement.
- They had worked with the UW to develop a simplified version of Urban Footprint, where people could make various choices about land use and see the trade-offs of these choices.
- The simulation would be applied to a map of Dane County and used in public engagement to create alternate scenarios. Using this input, four alternate development scenarios for the region would be designed.
- Urban Footprint would analyze the different scenarios with a range of metrics, in such categories as Public Health, Transportation, Energy and Water Use, etc. These would be all be combined into a preferred scenario, which would be measured up with the different metrics analyzed. The next step would be to implement the vision and strategy both locally and regionally.
- Progress would then be tracked through indicators over a period of years, making adjustments along the way. CARPC would serve as a resource, making the Urban Footprint tool available to local governments as they updated their comprehensive plans to better implement regional and local goals.
- Having laid the groundwork, next year, GMV would be focusing on the engagement phase, followed by planning, creating a vision/strategy, and implementation. Hopefully, this would be an ongoing process, where plans and priorities would be updated going into the future.

A member of CARPC, Golden remarked that it was composed of reps of various units of government, inc. cities, towns, villages, making CARPC one of the only places with such a mix of perspectives. Historically some of these communities acted with a sense of independence rather than a sense of region. The GMV would replace the old plan "Vision 2020", which was obsolete. Given the success this model had had in Utah, this process held promise to pull in a broader community, inc. the development community as they developed areas of Dane County.

G.3. [45043](#)

Metro: Update on Intercity bus location - TPC 11.09.16

Kamp referred members to the safety assessment (University Avenue project report attached), jointly authored by Metro and TE. He also pointed to the handout from Metro Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck, regarding relocating a Metro bus stop on N. Lake Street (attached).

Registrant Alan Fugate, representing Van Galder Bus Company, spoke before the group. They hoped to work with the City to find a safe and suitable location for inter-city bus service. Though no location would be perfect, they hoped to avoid shifting risk from one location to another. Fugate listed some unresolved issues on Langdon, and made some suggestions for alternate location. (See

details in the statement attached.)

Zellers asked how long on average did buses stopped for loading/unloading. Fugate said unloading and reloading typically took about 15-20 minutes; plus sometimes "dwell time" in between to clean out bus and give drivers a break. He thought a separate lay-up area or staging area would be helpful for this. Zellers noted that parking was at a huge premium in this area, with oversold street parking spots. So a staging area would be a big issue too.

Zellers then asked whether buses were turned off. Fugate said an idling ordinance governed some of this; but in general, they told their bus drivers to shut their buses down and not idle. But if they didn't have a spot for buses to go, they would circle around until their time.

Streit asked how the Red Gym location had worked during construction. Fugate said it was fine. He added that sometimes they used Dayton in front of the Kohl Center for a staging area so as not to tie up the main real estate. Streit thought the bus stop in front of Lake Street ramp might also work for this. Golden wondered how close and what size staging area was needed. Fugate said room enough for two buses. Golden suggested talking to the UW about the side street next to the Kohl Center.

Kovich asked about actually having an intercity bus center. Fugate said the industry was moving away from brick/mortar. They preferred to use park/ride lots; and to have the flexibility to pick up/drop off. With the advent of technology, did people really want to sit in a facility?

Bergamini noted that the trend away from brick and mortar presented some safety issues for the public; such as waiting with no shelter during tornado warnings, an actual situation that happened last summer; not to mention the traffic and environmental hazards. Familiar with the idling ordinance, she worked across the street from where they now loaded/unloaded. Often there were more than two buses there, esp. during busy times of the year. Diesel fumes were an issue esp. when they needed to have their air conditioning running (when it was hot and humid). She wondered if the City built a bus station, would they use it and pay fees for that?

Fugate said they now had an incentive for drivers not to idle. Along with the issue of fumes, the company didn't want buses idling for cost reasons and because it caused problems with the particulate filters. The expectation was that buses would be warm in the winter and cool in the summer, but they couldn't always maintain that. They knew they couldn't dwell, and the industry was self-adjusting. As far as a bus terminal, it would depend on the location and how convenient it would be for riders. Likewise, it would depend on what the fees would be (since they were moving away from that model). When asked about "starters", this was something only VanGalder and Badger Bus were doing, to help get riders and buses in/out faster.

Beck described the proposed change to the bus stop (per email and map attached).

- The existing stop in front of Pyle Center would be eliminated which would free up parking (westbound) on Langdon, across from where the intercity buses would be.

- The stop on Lake Street by the ramp would be eliminated (where only Route 80 stopped); and would be moved north of State Street on Lake Street.
- This would hopefully ease congestion on Langdon.

Metro Safety Supervisor Phil Gadke said this had been a long process. He had gathered lots of input from drivers, and this was a redundant issue for them. Based on the analysis, they hoped to mitigate hazards for bicyclists and increased risk of accidents. Streit said the TPC supported moving the intercity bus location; it only had lingering concerns about double-parked cars on Langdon. Kamp said the issue of waiting cars had been taken to TE. They didn't yet have a perfect solution.

- G.4. [44790](#) Update on Ad Hoc Transportation Ordinance Review Committee, presented by Alders Kemble and Zellers - TPC 11.09.16

Zellers said the Committee was looking at an adjustment to the number of committees; creating two bodies, a Transportation Board and a Transportation Commission. The group would be evaluating whether the work of the commission would be too much for one body. This would be mirrored in the staffing structure, which would be pretty much the way it now was. And the option of hiring a Director of Transportation would be retained. The next meeting would be on November 30th.

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

[07828](#)

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

Poulson said that the December meeting would likely be a joint meeting with LRTPC, to hear a presentation by the UW on their Master Plan.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to Adjourn at 7:46 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.