



**City of Madison**  
**Meeting Minutes - Final**  
**TRANSIT AND PARKING**  
**COMMISSION**

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

---

Tuesday, February 8, 2005

5:00 PM

Rm. 260 MMB, 215 MLKJ Blvd.

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**Present:** Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Brenda K. Konkel, Ald. Robbie Webber, Carl D. Durocher, L. Jesse Kaysen, Chris R. Carlsen and Kevin L. Hoag

**Absent:** Tim Wong and Diane L. Paoni

**Excused:** Gary T. Dilweg and Kenneth M. Streit

Wong arrived 5:10 p.m., Paoni arrived 5:20 p.m., Streit arrived 5:55 p.m. (advance notice he would be late). Dilweg was absent (advance notification).

**Staff present:** Catherine Debo, Transit General Manager; Bill Kern, Parking Engineer 4; Julie Maryott-Walsh, Metro Marketing & Customer Services Manager

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 1/11/05**

A motion was made to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by acclamation.

**C. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No registrants.

**D. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

- D.1. [00266](#) Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County to provide \$19,280 in assistance to Madison Metro for transit information services, promotion efforts and operations for the calendar year 2005; and \$12,850 to the Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Planning Unit to support the 2005 County Specialized Transportation coordination activities for the calendar year 2005.

**Sponsors:** Brenda K. Konkel, Kenneth Golden and Robbie Webber

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

**Routine item, no discussion. The motion passed by acclamation.**

- D.2. [00218](#) Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an agreement between the City of Madison and HNTB Corporation for an Outer Loop Traffic Needs Study

**A motion was made by Kaysen, seconded by Ald. Webber, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** Golden, Webber, Kaysen, Carlsen and Hoag

**No:** Konkel and Wong

**Abstain:** Paoni

Bill Kern, Parking Engineer 4, was present on this item. Along with the resolution, members had been provided excerpts from the Outer Loop Traffic Needs Study bid document. Durocher noted that the document refers to the study being done in the fall of 2004, and he assumed this was a typographical error since the resolution itself indicates that the study will be done in 2005.

Webber referenced the Study Objectives section of the bid and asked whether the Synchro and SimTraffic simulations will include pedestrians. Kern advised that pedestrian volumes will be part of the study, although he did not know whether they would be done through these two specific software programs. Webber was aware that some traffic simulation programs only do motor vehicles and she wanted to make sure that other street users are included since they comprise a large volume of the Outer Loop traffic. Kern confirmed that the pedestrian side of it is an important part of the study.

Under Project Initiation, Webber wanted to know who was included in the "stakeholders." Kern did not have that information. The study will look at all movements of the Outer Loop circuit, including the impacts from the increased downtown residential development.

The last paragraph of the Analysis section mentions phasing, splits and offsets, and Webber asked for a definition of these terms. Kern indicated he would have to refer that question to Traffic Engineering staff.

Webber remarked that she didn't know what the study will entail and was hesitant to approve it. Debo mentioned that in the past Traffic Engineering has been good at including Metro as a "party of interest" in issues of this nature, and she wanted to "put in a plug" for Metro to be included although she assumed that would happen anyway. Kaysen wanted to make sure that the study collects data when buses are on the Outer Loop. The study should also look at whether there's an interaction between possible bus shelter placement and turning movements since there has been talk about possibly installing shelters on the Outer Loop. As far as the study details, she trusted that Webber will bring up the TPC's concerns when this item is before the PBMVC.

Golden commented that a number of years ago, the City spent a fair amount of money on the Wayfinding system. He felt that one of the few positive things to come out of that system was the decision to name the Outer Loop the Capitol Loop, and he thought that the term Capitol Loop should be used.

Konkel mentioned that she had requested referral to the TPC. She had a number of questions about the study, such as why the study is being done, who requested it, what's the perceived problem, and why is the City spending \$60,000 on it. Kern stated that he was not involved at the start of the process and did not know where it originated.

Wong expressed concern that the consultant selected for the study is the same firm that did the East Washington Avenue project. He felt the neighborhoods on either side of East Washington ended up fighting with the consultant because the consultant saw East Washington as a speedway to the suburbs. It is very difficult for residents in the neighborhoods on either side of East Washington to walk to the other side. Wong was concerned about awarding the Outer Loop study to a consultant like this, fearing there will be only lip service given to non-motor vehicle modes in the study and the whole objective will be to move cars faster .

Webber requested that staff draft a memo addressing these concerns before this item comes to the PBMVC. She did not want to approve a study when the TPC wasn't sure of the reason for the study, who will be involved (stakeholders), etc. She would like to see more information before moving ahead. Approval of the resolution does not appear to be time-sensitive since the study would not be done until the fall. These concerns need to be addressed, either at TPC or at the PBMVC.

Golden mentioned that he had been against referring this to the TPC in the first place. He was comfortable sending it to the PBMVC with the TPC's comments and questions. He also wanted to include the comment that the purpose of a WHEREAS clause in a resolution is to explain why the City is being asked to do something, and this resolution lacks such information, i.e., there's nothing indicating the purpose of the study.

Kaysen accepted a friendly amendment that the TPC comments and questions be sent to the PBMVC (via the draft minutes), including the suggestion to use the Capitol Loop reference.

D.3. [00335](#)

Conditionally accepting the Proposal from Statehouse West, LLC for a Mid-State Street Parking and Mixed-Use Facility, authorizing staff to negotiate the terms of the disposition of the Buckeye Lot, and for staff to submit to the Common Council the terms and conditions of any sale or redevelopment, and authorizing the Parking Utility to release a Request for Proposals for architectural and design services for an underground short-term parking facility to replace the existing Buckeye Lot.

**Sponsors:** Mayor Cieslewicz and Michael E. Verveer

**A motion was made by Hoag, seconded by Carlsen, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation to Approve as Substituted to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Absent:** Dilweg

**Aye:** Golden, Konkell, Webber, Kaysen, Carlsen, Hoag, Paoni and Streit

**No:** Wong

Durocher noted that TPC member Ken Streit was a member of the Mid-State Street Parking Facility Evaluation Team, and he suggested tabling this item until Streit arrived (estimated to be about 6:00 p.m.).

Motion by Golden/Webber to table this item until Streit arrived; carried with Wong voting no.

Motion by Kaysen/Webber to take item D.3. off the table (6:25 p.m.)

Kaysen asked why the project was being done the way it was, with the City selling the air rights and somebody else building in the air rights. Why not sell the whole thing and buy condominium parking? Hoag, who was a member of the Evaluation Team, thought the City might be breaking new ground in having privately held commercial development on top of the City-owned parking ramp. Kaysen asked if it's really necessary to have two different architects involved, and Hoag stated yes. Mark Olinger, Director of Planning and Development, indicated that the City cannot do "turn key" public works projects, i.e., have a developer build the ramp and sell it back to the City. Two architects are needed to protect the City's interests. The Capitol Centre Ramp was both a public works project and a private development project, but he acknowledged this type of project is not done very often.

Wong noted that the development proposal includes 50 condos with 63 underground parking stalls. This is a ratio of 1.3 stalls per unit, which he felt was excessive for a downtown residential building. One reason for living downtown presumably is to avoid commuting and owning a car. Given the cost of underground stalls, how will any of these condo units be affordable? He was concerned about displacing people who know how to live without cars with people who need 1.3 parking spots. Why is the City requiring so much parking in the downtown? The City needs to change its standards; they are obsolete and have negative consequences. The cost of these condos will reflect the underground parking, whether potential owners even own a car. Olinger advised that there is no requirement in the RFP for parking, nor is there a City parking requirement for downtown buildings. The recommendation for 63 spaces came from the developers, who believe they need this much parking to attract tenants. How it will be addressed vis-à-vis the inclusionary zoning units will need to be part of the negotiation process.

Wong asked if a survey has been done to gauge the short-term parking demand. The Parking Utility's occupancy data seems to show that parking is available during the day, when the short-term public parking would be needed. Is the public parking being built as a response to a real need, or in response to perception? He asked if there are any recent studies that demonstrate a demand for daytime parking in this area. Olinger noted that this had been discussed last July, including the history of past studies. The Common Council made a decision to release an RFP for a mid-State Street parking ramp. He was not aware of any further studies since the July decision. The identified need has been about 200 public stalls.

Webber requested clarification of the fiscal note. Olinger stated that the total estimated cost is \$11.1 million, of which \$6 million is available (\$3 million in bonding and \$3 million in PU cash) and the City needs to come up with another \$5 million, likely through the sale of the air rights or perhaps TIF or other financing.

The details need to be worked out as the proposal moves forward. The City does not have a design, so it doesn't have a firm cost yet. The resolution includes authorization to release an RFP for ramp design. Webber asked if the City and/or the Parking Utility are "on the hook" for the \$6 million, and Olinger indicated that there is budget authority for \$6 million, \$3 million in cash from the PU and \$3 million in bonding. The City needs to come up with an additional \$5 million, presumably from the sale of the air rights. Webber asked if these are taxable bonds. Olinger believed they will be non-taxable, although that decision has not been made yet. The public parking is to be short-term, so the bond restriction re: a 10% limit on long-term leased spaces is a moot point.

Webber directed attention to the fifth WHEREAS clause and the first BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED clauses on page 2, which imply that the City will need to do other things to make this a successful project, perhaps TIF funding or acquisition of properties. Olinger advised that the Community Development Authority would undertake the acquisition of any properties needed by the creation of the redevelopment district. The redevelopment district would include the Buckeye Lot, the three houses at 219, 221 and 223 West Gilman, the Pizzeria Uno building, Lisa Link Peace Park, and the property at 205 West Gilman (the joined houses). The developer's proposal suggested that the CDA buy the three houses, and acquisition of properties is included in the adopted \$11.1 budget. Webber asked if City funding assistance is needed beyond the fiscal note. Olinger replied that at this time, it would be fair to say that no other funding is necessary but that might change as we get further into the design process. However, he felt the project can be done for \$11.1 million at this time based on the calculations from other City agencies involved in the plans.

Konkel asked if the \$5 million for air rights is realistic. Olinger said they won't know until further into the design proposal. There are some per stall costs associated with that number, and the design of the ramp based on the proposal from Statehouse West is different than some of the other options. He did not know if there might be some efficiencies attached to the project versus what was suggested before. He did know that there is a shortfall between what is budgeted (\$6 million) and what is needed to build, but staff doesn't yet know the magnitude. For now, he believed the \$5 million shortfall is accurate but they need to get further along in the design development.

Konkel had concerns about the creation of a redevelopment district, the potential use of TIF funds, and the unknown shortfall, as well as the overall breadth of the resolution. She was not sure the City is ready to move ahead to a redevelopment district. Olinger pointed out that the City knows it needs to create the redevelopment district to acquire the three houses on West Gilman. Konkel asked if it's a given that they're being removed, because the second WHEREAS clause on the second page says that the plan "may" require acquisition. Olinger stated that the three houses will definitely be removed, reused or demolished. The house at 205 W. Gilman (2 joined houses) and Pizzeria Uno building are included in the redevelopment district because it appears from the preliminary drawings that the footings and other things come very close to those properties. The City wants to make sure that if issues arise over easements, air rights, etc. in order to construct the facility, that the City's interests are protected. If the City needs to deal with the owners of those two properties, it is in a position to do so. The City has no desire to acquire these two properties. If for some reason the property owners did not want to work with the City, the City needs the ability to

condemn easements or air rights to allow the project to happen (e.g., allow a construction crane in the air rights).

Referencing the need for parking, Hoag noted that much of the justification has been based on statistics showing 100% occupancy of the Buckeye Lot during daytime hours for the past several years. This is a very important part of the data. He pointed out that special event parking at the nearby ramps impacts the State Street business owners. Hoag said he will be adamant that the new ramp not be used for special event parking since it is being built to address a need for short-term parking.

Streit indicated that at the most recent meeting of the Evaluation Team, they agreed that the best time to undertake construction is during the same timeframe as the reconstruction of this segment of State Street. Also, the Team expressed some interest in having the architect for the parking ramp explore putting parking under Lisa Link Peace Park and the impact on design, cost and revenues. Olinger stated that it would result in 72 more spaces (24 per level), and it's one of the things to explore in the next design stage.

Webber was resigned to the fact that a parking ramp will be built in this area even though she wasn't convinced of the need for this many spaces in this location. She was concerned about the cost of the public parking - about \$27,000 per stall, which does not include interest on the bonds. There is quite a bit of existing parking in the area. She was concerned that if the City approves this, the City will end up on the hook for more costs in the future, i.e., something will happen and the rationale will be "well, we approved it and it's too late to turn back." With each step forward in this project, it's more difficult to go back and make a change. There are still many questions, including the financing. With this much money on the line for parking stalls, she did not feel it was soup yet.

Wong asked if Parking staff had done any long-range projections regarding the impact on parking demand if gas goes up to \$5.00 a gallon in two years. Kern replied that additional parking in the mid-State Street area has been studied for many years and there has been a lot of discussion. The decision has been made that additional public parking is needed. The Parking Utility has not done any studies on the impacts of \$5.00/gallon gasoline. Wong felt that if gas prices double, some people will stop driving and this needs to be taken into consideration when talking about parking demand. Shouldn't the Parking Utility undertake this type of long-term planning? Durocher interjected that TPC members could not expect staff to answer broad questions about the direction of the economy.

Konkel stated she would not vote for the resolution. She was surprised that no one from the neighborhood was present at the TPC meeting, remarking that if the neighborhood knew that three houses will be removed, they would have something to say about it. This resolution is making a big jump by creating a redevelopment district, and she was not comfortable with that. She felt the resolution approves more than what the TPC realizes, e.g., the phrase "public financial participation" sounds like TIF to her. There has not been enough discussion about the redevelopment district. Konkel also expressed concern that the City can't rely on receiving \$5 million for the air rights. If the resolution is approved and the project moves forward but the City doesn't get the \$5 million, then what.

Olinger clarified that the City will be selling the air rights to the Buckeye Lot; the lot itself will become part of the underground ramp, which will remain in the title of the Parking Utility. He agreed that there needs to be a lot more discussion. This resolution basically says that the City released an RFP, they received a proposal, and the Evaluation Team (including two members from Capitol Neighborhoods), reviewed the proposal and found it to be responsive to the RFP. The Evaluation Team is aware that three houses are slated for relocation, recycling or demolition. One of the neighborhood representatives is not happy about it, but the potential need to do this was included in the RFP. Olinger acknowledged that a lot of work needs to occur between this stage and the financing plan, including closing the \$5 million gap. If that gap can't be closed, City staff will be back saying that we don't have a deal. But in order to identify the gap amount, staff needs a preliminary layout of the parking ramp design. This resolution authorizes going to the next level to see if there's a project. Approval of the resolution basically authorizes staff to continue discussions with the developer and see if we have a viable project. Approval of the resolution does not say that we have a project.

Motion by Hoag/Carlsen to approve the resolution.

Hoag accepted a friendly amendment by Paoni to change "may" to "will" in the second WHEREAS clause on page 2 (eighth WHEREAS clause overall).

Motion by Konkell/Kaysen to amend the resolution by striking the first BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED clause regarding creation of a redevelopment district.

Konkel reiterated her concern about moving forward so quickly to create a redevelopment district. Golden wondered what this amendment would do to the timetable, schedule, and costs for both the City and the developer. Olinger advised that Statehouse West's proposal asked the City to acquire the three properties, and the City's adopted budget provides for the CDA to make the acquisition. The acquisition may be friendly, or it may require eminent domain. The amendment would slow down the process if the developer is unable to acquire the properties, because the parking ramp can't move forward. Golden noted that the BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED clause does not mention specific properties but instead refers to "any properties." It's been known since the beginning that the three houses on West Gilman are part of the project, but what's new is the potential need to use the air rights of other properties for staging construction equipment, etc. He asked Konkell to clarify her concern. Konkell had two main concerns: (1) the TPC's motion amends the resolution to state that implementation of the plan will (rather than may) require the acquisition and removal of the three Gilman Street properties, and (2) the creation of a redevelopment district, which is news to her. Hoag wanted to confirm that striking the language would not slow down the project as long as the property owners are willing to sell to the developer, and Olinger stated that is correct. However, if the owners won't sell to the developer, the City won't be able to use eminent domain to acquire the properties. Hoag indicated that acquiring homes for the purpose of additional parking did not rise the level of triggering eminent domain. Webber agreed and wanted to know why the City would be acquiring the properties if the development is going to be for private interests. If the argument is that the three houses are needed for a City parking ramp, she could not support that and she would not approve acquiring houses to build a downtown

ramp. If the developer wants to acquire the properties to build condos, that's fine; but she did not want the City doing it.

Motion to amend the resolution by deleting the first BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED clause carried, with Golden and Carlsen voting no.

Konkel felt that deleting this paragraph brings the resolution closer to reflecting what Olinger has been saying about the purpose of the resolution. She asked for clarification of the BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED clause, does it just direct staff to work with the developer on the listed items to see whether there's a deal and then come back to the TPC? Olinger said yes.

Paoni asked whether the TPC needed to revise the fiscal note since it references the redevelopment district. Golden noted that the fiscal note is based on the underlying resolution language; if the BOE approves the TPC's changes, the fiscal note will be revised to reflect the revised text. Olinger noted that at some point the City will need to create a redevelopment district because the 2005 adopted budget authorizes funding to acquire the three houses. If the three houses cannot be purchased, it will be necessary to create a redevelopment district. Konkel pointed out that just because something is authorized in the budget, it doesn't mean it has to happen.

Motion to approve the resolution as amended (changing may to will and deleting the BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED clause) carried, with Wong voting no.

D.4. [00430](#)

Authorizing the Transit General Manager to prepare and file an application for a Reverse Commute grant with Wisconsin Department of Transportation in connection with proposed commuter service to the City of Verona, and authorizing the Mayor to sign the application.

**Sponsors:** Brenda K. Konkel

*Due to timing constraints, TPC (lead) took this up before it went to BOE. BOE recommended approval on 2/14/05.*

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

.



Kaysen asked whether the grant is "gravy." Debo replied that in discussions with Verona and Epic, Epic intimated that it would cover full funding of this service if the grant fell through. But the grant has already been pre-approved so she did not anticipate any problems.

Golden wanted to commend Verona Mayor Volker for honoring a two-year old commitment he made to Ald. Golden, as a member of the Regional Plan Commission, to pursue transit service given the opportunity offered by Epic. He indicated that this is the best example of cooperation with a nearby community that he's seen since he's been on the Common Council. He felt that Mayor Volker deserves the TPC's praise.

Webber noted that the fiscal note indicates that there would be no net cost impact to Metro or the City of Madison. But what happens at the end of the two-year grant? Debo reported that she met with Verona and State DOT. The plan is that the State will provide direct funding assistance to Verona to help fund the service (50/50 split), beginning in July 2007. Basically, the grant takes the place of the State funding for the first two years to address a timing "void" since the State DOT needs to approve a project two years in advance before providing direct funding.

Paoni wanted to know when the Verona service will start, and Debo responded the first day that Epic moves in, probably in August. Paoni asked how long it will take for Verona to receive the grant money, and Debo stated that the objective is to have it in place when the service begins.

In response to Carlsen's question, Debo advised that the Verona service is a commuter service and does not include paratransit. She emphasized it will be accessible fixed route service.

Debo noted that in order to get the resolution approved as quickly as possible, she was asking the TPC (lead) to take action prior to receiving the recommendation of the BOE, which will be taking it up on February 14. Golden pointed out that there is ample precedent for having the lead agency act before the other referrals, and he did not see this as a problem.

## E. OLD BUSINESS

- E.1. [00244](#) Approving the intent of the Parking Utility to sell the Evergreen Parking Lot located at 1802 Monroe Street to Monroe Neighbors, LLC

**Sponsors:** Kenneth Golden

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

**Absent:** Dilweg and Streit

**Aye:** Golden, Webber, Durocher, Kaysen and Paoni

**Abstain:** Konkel, Carlsen, Wong and Hoag

David Keller, 448 W. Washington Avenue, appeared in support and was available to answer questions.

Motion by Golden/Kaysen to approve.

Referencing the 1/11/05 memo from Craig Hungerford of Monroe Neighbors, LLC, Konkel asked for details of the statement that "a replacement parking scenario acceptable to all parties has been established." Don Marx, City Real Estate, advised that this is no longer a true statement and the parties are continuing negotiations.

Konkel indicated she was contemplating a motion to revise the last BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED paragraph to add "The terms and conditions shall minimally include one to one replacement of the current public parking, with clearly visible signage directing the public to the replacement parking." Marx noted that this is pretty specific and preferred that the language not be added and that staff be allowed to negotiate the best deal for the City. Golden remarked that while Konkel's proposed language is equivocal since it sets a minimum, he was concerned that the minimum would become the negotiating position. He hoped that the ultimate deal will provide for more public parking, and he recognized that signage will be part of that. He did not want to have negotiations lock in one to one replacement (24 spaces). He has had discussions with the developer, and he felt that they were on the same page that any parking not associated with the condo portion of the project would be open to the public, including the grocery store operators. This would mean the potential of 24 stalls plus an additional 39 spaces available to the public. He did not want to put a number in the resolution and preferred to let staff negotiate to the City's best advantage. Konkel asked how much parking is needed for a grocery store, and Golden replied 36 stalls (based on a 12,000 square foot store).

Marx advised that staff's recommendation is to adopt the resolution, which only approves the intent to sell the property to the abutting property owner. The terms and conditions will come back to the Common Council for approval. Paoni asked whether the replacement parking needs to be in place to do this, and Marx replied no. It is very clear to staff what the TPC wants and what the neighborhood businesses and residents want. Paoni asked whether the specifics would come back to the TPC and Marx said yes.

In response to Carlsen's question, Marx advised that no other City departments expressed interest in the surplus property.

Konkel remarked that people going to the grocery store will likely know there is public parking, but how will other people know that public parking is available. Marx replied that signage is on the table. It needs to be readily recognizable as public parking, i.e., the standard logo with a green P inside a circle. He indicated that Traffic Engineering staff have insisted that there will be adequate signage or the deal with not proceed. Kern confirmed that there have been discussions about using the standard City parking logo to make it clear to the public that parking is available.

E.2. [00337](#)

Adopting the Allied-Dunn's Marsh-Belmar Neighborhood's Physical Improvement Plan. 10th Ald. Dist.

Sponsors: Mayor Cieslewicz and Kenneth Golden

A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Absent:** Dilweg and Streit

**Aye:** Golden, Webber, Kaysen, Carlsen, Wong, Hoag and Paoni

**Abstain:** Konkel

Brad Murphy, City Planning Unit Director, and Tim Sobota, Metro staff, were present. Murphy displayed the principal plan map. He advised that the project originated in response to WisDOT's Verona Road-West Beltline Highway Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). WisDOT, City of Madison and City of Fitchburg joined together to fund the Physical Improvement Plan. Many of the recommendations in the Plan are focused on the DEIS and the Verona Road project. The resolution commenting on the DEIS went to a number of City commissions, including the TPC. The resolution was approved by the Common Council last September and is part of the Plan, as are City staff comments on the DEIS.

There are some transit impacts related to the Verona Road project that were commented on and are in the Plan. Some of the primary recommendations concerned the crossing of Verona Road with Raymond Road, the placement of noise barriers on the frontage road along Britta Parkway, creating entrances into the neighborhood at Raymond Road and Summit, and redevelopment of the Super Saver site including an extension of Summit to Red Arrow Trail. There are other recommendations not related to the DEIS, some of which have already been implemented such as traffic calming along Allied Drive, development of the Boys and Girls Club neighborhood center, development of the vacant property south of Belmar Park for owner-occupied housing, and additional sidewalks in areas that don't have sidewalk connections (many are in the City of Fitchburg). There are some proposed ped connections between sections of the neighborhoods, and a connection between Allied Drive and the Southwest Bike Path is being worked on.

Paoni asked whether overall transit opportunities are improved or lessened. Murphy indicated that the Plan is generally neutral as far as near-term recommendations with the exception of the extension of Summit Road into the neighborhood, which may provide better transit circulation within the neighborhood. The hope is that the Summit extension will improve access. This is probably the only near-term recommendation that will directly affect transit. As far as long term, the benefits of the Raymond crossing will be somewhat offset by some of the negative impacts of the Verona-West Beltline project.

Sobota mentioned that the traffic calming devices slow down buses as well as other motor vehicles. He also noted that the Summit extension would provide a different way to get buses into the neighborhood without needing to go into Fitchburg. Debo commented that ped enhancements are helpful to transit.

Paoni asked about re-routing buses during the Verona Road construction project. Sobota indicated it depends on the amount of infrastructure that the State project includes as far as eliminating local ramps and access. Sobota noted that the comments by various City staff regarding the DEIS and potential infrastructure changes (closure of Seminole ramps, closure of Chalet Gardens access, etc.) are contained at the back of the Plan. Murphy advised that these comments were provided to WisDOT as part of the City's response to the DEIS, and WisDOT will need to respond to each of them before issuing the final EIS. The City looks forward to WisDOT's response to the City's concerns and their ideas for mitigating the identified negative impacts.

Paoni asked if there is any concern about acting on this Plan before the Verona-West Beltline project is finalized. Murphy stated that having the adopted Plan in place as a policy document would help to strengthen the City's position as far as the final EIS.

Wong recalled reading a comment in the Plan that cited the Southwest Bike Path as a barrier to neighborhood movement. He did not like the concept of a bike path being seen as a barrier to neighborhood mobility. Murphy did not recall that comment but indicated it could be reworded if it's stated as Wong recalled; Wong stated he will try to find it and forward it to Murphy. Kaysen recalled the comment as well and thought it related to the fact that the path is in a rail line and there is a rather steep berm on one side. Murphy stated that the barrier comment makes sense if it refers to the rail line corridor, which is difficult to cross. He will try to find the section in question and revise the language. Webber also recollected that it referred to the rail line, and it is very difficult to get to the bike path from Allied Drive. The City has mentioned that it would like to make more connections but it's private property. Murphy stated that the City is pursuing one connection in the Plan; there may be other opportunities but nothing has been specifically identified.

Konkel remarked that some of the things in the Plan are contrary to other things the City has recently done. She wondered whether any of the physical improvements regarding roadways are already out of date. Murphy replied that the exact location of the Summit Road extension to Red Arrow has yet to be determined and there are several alternatives in the Plan. They will be fine-tuned as the City continues to work with the developer of the Super Saver site. The exact alignment for the road was identified as a concept in the Plan and still needs to be engineered. But this type of work is typically done after the concept plan is adopted. One of the situations with this Plan is that some of the implementation activities are already underway, such as redevelopment of the Super Saver property.

### E.3. Transit Plans for FY05

Debo handed out revised versions of both the Strategic Annual Plan and the Marketing Plan that reflect comments from the ADAPPOS and the Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee. The Plans were on the TPC agenda for further input and/or adoption.

#### E.3.a. Strategic Annual Plan

Goal 1.E., Development of park and ride lots: Wong had read an article which indicated that park and ride lots are at best neutral and perhaps even negative in terms of overall transit ridership. Since they also increase the amount of impervious surface, he questioned the strategy of park and ride lots and felt they subsidize commuting and living in the suburbs. He was somewhat concerned about thinking of them as unquestioned good things.

Goal 3.C., Develop updated fare structure to generate more revenue: Wong felt the ridership trend seems to show that the fare increase last January may have had more of a negative impact than initially assumed and he didn't want to raise fares by another 10-20%.

Goal 1.C.(8), Improved passenger amenities: Golden referenced the clearing of snow from bus stops and how that impacts getting on/off the bus. Many times the back door of the bus is functionally useless because riders can't get out due to snow piles. Also, bus drivers should be mindful to stop at the concrete pads. Sometimes drivers stop at the muddy terrace, and then should be sensitized to that. Metro should also explore the opportunity offered by sidewalk programs to extend the area used by bus passengers for getting on/off.

Goal 2.B.(2), Encourage migration from paratransit to transit services through training programs: Golden noted that 58% of funding for the training program can come from Medicaid.

Motion by Konkell/Carlsen to approve the 2005 Strategic Annual Plan.

Goal 3.J., Increase revenues/sources: Konkell suggested removing the reference to CDBG grants as a funding source since the Federal program is slated to be cut. Debo preferred to leave it in for now in case the program is not cut.

Goal 1, Increase Ridership: Webber noted the language states that the "measure of goal" is a comparison of trips, and she asked whether this would be accomplished through a survey. How will Metro know whether ridership growth is due to new riders versus current riders using the system more often? Debo indicated the intent is to have a general measure of the number of trips, it would not be broken down between new and current riders.

Goal 1.B., Ride pass and other ridership incentives: Webber asked whether Metro will have some data on the success of the St. Marys ride pass program, and Debo stated yes.

Goal 1.C.(8)(f), Improved passenger amenities: Webber was pleased to see that Metro is considering commercial kiosks at the transfer points. This is an opportunity to generate additional revenues and provide a passenger amenity. Having a kiosk that sold magazines, newspapers or something like granola bars would be a huge improvement.

Debo referenced Wong's earlier comments about park and ride lots. She advised that the North Transfer Point park and ride is packed on weekdays. The lot provides an opportunity for more people to use transit. Park and ride lots at transfer points are targeted at a specific market, and it is one of the goals of the transit system to do that. A park and ride lot for the East Transfer Point is in

Metro's capital plan. There's another park and ride lot at the Sherman Plaza Shopping Center. Metro would like to do something at the West Transfer Point as well and has had discussions with the UW in this regard. Debo was aware of the article referenced by Wong but she did not draw the same conclusion from it. It has been a long sought goal of the transit system to increase ridership, and a park and ride lot offers another opportunity for people to use transit. Wong asked if there are statistics on the percentage of park and ride lot parkers who actually take the bus. Debo replied that at Sherman Plaza and the North Transfer Point, it's 100% based on observations. Wong commented that from the limited sense of just Metro, park and ride lots might be attractive. But on the other hand, providing free parking might encourage exurban sprawl by providing free parking. He could see some benefit to park and ride lots but they were not completely good. Webber understood Wong's concern and also questioned paving more surface. Building a park and ride basically provides a parking lot, and she strongly encouraged the development of mixed use around the lot. She was aware that there are informal park and ride lots around the city. For instance, commuters park for free on the neighborhood streets near the West Transfer Point. Neighborhood residents then get upset about non-residents parking on the streets, which she did not understand since these are public streets. Before increasing the amount of paved surface by building a park and ride lot, Metro should assess whether there's sufficient on-street parking available within two to three blocks.

Debo also wished to respond to Wong's earlier comment about a fare increase. She reminded the TPC that as part of the 2005 budget process, the Mayor specifically asked the TPC to look at increasing revenues, including a fare increase. There is already a projected \$1.2 million budget deficit for 2006 and Metro needs to look at filling the hole. Debo will be bringing a proposal to the TPC soon.

Referencing the West Transfer Point and the informal park and ride, Carlsen noted that the shopping center has posted signs that motorists cannot park there to only use the bus. The West Transfer Point is a perfect example of a mixed use location (grocery store, Walgreens) for a park and ride lot mentioned earlier by Webber. If there were a formal park and ride lot, transit users would not be parking in the neighborhoods. Carlsen felt that park and ride lots increase transit use and decrease congestion on downtown streets. Debo indicated that Metro would be interested in a commercial mixed use location for a park and ride lot where possible.

Goal 1.C.(8)(b): Paoni was pleased to see the additional language re: an aggressive implementation schedule for ITS elements, including stop announcement. Debo advised that staff is working as fast as possible to get this done and the stop announcements are about to go into effect.

Motion carried.

E.3.b. Related Marketing Plan

Julie Maryott-Walsh, Customer Service and Marketing Manager, was present. Maryott-Walsh pointed out that the transit system map and other Metro print materials use the term "Capitol Loop."

Maryott-Walsh advised that the Marketing Plan is based on the Strategic Plan. Webber asked whether it's been advertised that the Internet trip planner can now be done in real time. Maryott-Walsh stated that it was advertised on the back of buses and on the back of the Ride Guide. However, it is still being worked on and improved so there has not been a lot of advertising. Also, Metro has limited marketing funds. Webber encouraged Metro to think about a news release to try and get some newspaper coverage. When steps are taken to make it easier to use Metro, it should be publicized. Debo stated that Metro has been holding off until all AVL features are up and running (and the quirks have been worked out) before doing a big release. Maryott-Walsh emphasized that Metro is not quite where it wants to be with the real time planning so they don't want to spend money promoting it yet. But people are using it and Metro has been able to cut back on the printing of the Ride Guide. Webber asked if the trip planner could be modified that so a rider doesn't have to put in the exact location; Maryott-Walsh stated she would bring it to staff. She will also check on an address entry problem relayed by Wong.

Motion by Wong/Kaysen to approve, carried unanimously.

E.4 Discussion re: advertising in printed media and in bus shelters and at Transfer Points

Debo advised that Metro plans to introduce its new fare collection equipment, including the new transfers, on or about July 1. Metro is suggesting to include advertising on the transfers/daily passes, the back page of the Ride Guide and on the face of the system map in order to increase revenues. Debo mentioned that when Metro went out to bid for its current bus ads, they requested that the vendors suggest other options for ad revenues, and these were some of the suggestions. Metro would not need to go out for bid for the print media ads, and Debo was requesting permission from the TPC to proceed.

Debo stated that Metro would also like to develop an RFP for ads in the shelters and at transfer points; the RFP would come back to the TPC for approval. If the TPC approves, she would like to invite some potential vendors to talk about the type of RFP. Again, the primary objective is to increase revenues. It might be possible to obtain additional shelters by having advertising sponsors.

In response to a question, Debo indicated staff would like the print ads to start this summer.

Maryott-Walsh showed a demo transfer with advertising. Ads would be used for transfers and daily passes, both of which are issued by the farebox. Daily VisiTour passes will also be available for sale on the buses with the new farebox equipment.

In response to a question from Webber, Maryott-Walsh stated the ad would be on the front of the transfer/daily pass stock, with the "valid for" information on the back. In response to Kaysen's question, Maryott-Walsh indicated that the ads would be pre-printed on the transfers (along with the Metro logo) and thus would not slow down the process for issuing transfers.

Konkel asked if staff had an estimate of the revenue that would be generated. Maryott-Walsh noted that Meara Media proposed this as part of their bid for the bus ads, and Metro will talk to them. Konkel asked if print ads are widely used in the transit industry, and Maryott-Walsh replied yes. Konkel then asked if the same advertising restrictions for bus ads would apply to print media, and Maryott-Walsh stated yes. She indicated that the proposal is to print a year's worth of transfers, or about 1,000,000. The Ride Guide advertising could be for a full page, half page, etc. Konkel commented that she didn't want the ads to be so expensive that they would be limited to big companies, so she supported selling small space ads on the back of the Ride Guide. Maryott-Walsh indicated that the proposal is not fully developed and she could mention this to Meara Media. Webber confirmed that Metro is talking about transfers and daily passes, not monthly passes. Debo mentioned that the ads would be on both the transfers and daily passes since they are printed on the same card stock.

Hoag asked if all one million transfers would have the same ad, and Maryott-Walsh replied yes since that's the most cost-effective way to do it. Hoag mentioned that as printing technology advances, it might be possible to have individual businesses buy ads for specific routes. Debo pointed out that each print layout costs money, but Hoag noted that technology is changing very quickly and this might be something to consider in the future.

Wong asked for a ballpark figure of the ad revenue, but Maryott-Walsh indicated she was unable to give one at this time. Debo stated that staff will try to get as much as possible. If staff finds that it's not worth it, they won't do it again. But she would like TPC approval to move forward and try it. Maryott-Walsh advised that it takes 60-90 days for printing, and they would like to have a June 1 printing deadline to make sure that everything is ready to go by July 1. The transfers/daily pass would be the first ad sale, and then they would sell space on the Ride Guide and map.

Golden confirmed that the TPC action would basically be approving a one-year trial. Konkel asked what the guaranteed revenue would be, and Debo explained that this is separate from the bus ad contract and the revenue split is negotiable. If Metro is not satisfied with Meara's proposal, Metro could go through someone else. Debo emphasized that what she was seeking at this time is permission from the TPC to put ads on transfers/daily passes, the Ride Guide and the map to raise additional revenues. She confirmed that it would be a pilot project.

Paoni asked whether the Ride Guide ad would be for a year and Maryott-Walsh indicated that it would likely be a six-month ad.

Golden was willing to try it for a year but had one concern. If the ads produce "x" amount of revenue, that amount will be built into the 2006 budget and then if Metro backs off from the ads, that amount will need to be covered with other revenues. He would like to somehow have these ad revenues outside the budget. Once something is built into the budget, it's hard to back out later because the



money is difficult to replace. Golden was looking for a way to put the additional ad revenues in a "lock box" for now. Debo stated that the revenues must be treated as income in the year the ads generate the revenue. We can forego including any additional revenue for advertising beyond the one year period for this print media in the 2006 budget. Debo stated she will be coming to the TPC in August with the proposed 2006 budget, and the TPC can discuss it further at that time. But she noted that the additional ad revenues are needed to address the 2005 budget deficit. When she brings the 2006 budget to the TPC in August, Metro will have a good idea of the revenue that will be generated.

Carlsen had concerns about ads at the shelters and transfer points and felt this should be separated out from the discussion.

Konkel was comfortable with ads on the back of the Ride Guide and the map because they would be for six months. But she had concerns about one advertiser for one year's worth of transfers and felt it was a huge commitment to make. She preferred to see more turn-over, like with the Ride Guide and map. Having it for a shorter period of time would seem more like a pilot. Streit suggested that staff check the revenue/cost difference between one ad for one million transfers versus two separate ads, each for 500,000 transfers. The revenue that could be generated from two advertisers might offset the higher printing costs. Carlsen agreed that one year/one million seems like a lot, but it costs more to print a smaller volume. He felt it might be better to try and sell to one advertiser since they would get better coverage with one million transfers, and the printing cost would be lower.

Debo felt the TPC was getting into minutiae. Staff will work out the best deal for the transfers, and getting the highest revenues is in Metro's interest. She again asked for the TPC's permission to move ahead on the concept. Hoag felt the heart of the TPC's concern is locking into one advertiser for one year, and he asked staff to check on what it would cost to do two 500,000 printings versus one printing of 1,000,000. Konkel stated she could support the concept if staff came back with details on the transfers to address the concerns that have been expressed. The proposal may not generate enough revenue, Metro may not get a high enough guarantee, etc. She was concerned about locking in with one advertiser for one year; Metro might be criticized if they chose a bad advertiser. Webber reminded members that the transfers have a "shelf life" of two hours, the worse that could happen is that the business advertised could go out of business. She was fine with a one-year period. However, she was distressed to learn that Metro needs this additional revenue for the 2005 budget. Not many people will see the ads on transfers, so she was not sure how much ad revenue Metro will be able to get but trusted that staff will get as much as they can.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to approve the staff request to seek and obtain advertising for transfers/daily passes, the Ride Guide and the system map and that staff be instructed to explore the issue of a smaller printing volume, with increased revenues offsetting the increased printing costs. Staff should do whatever brings in the most revenue for Metro. The ads should be done as one-year pilot for all three media type, and the TPC makes no recommendation as to advertising in shelters and transfer points at this time. The issue will come back to the TPC at the end of the one-year pilot. Motion carried, with Konkel voting no.

Regarding ads in the shelters and transfer points, Debo stated she was seeking

permission to talk with potential vendors about what to put in an RFP. Golden had some concerns about shelter and transfer point ads. These would be different than ads on buses in that the ads would be visible 24 hours a day to nearby residents. Metro needs to be cautious about placement of the ads and he suggested working with City Planning staff. He was not sure that this concept was far enough along for a RFP. Carlsen also expressed concern that Metro might be violating City ordinances, but Debo stated it has been looked at. Kaysen supported getting an idea of the income that might be generated and the ordinances that need to be considered. She liked the idea of Capitol Loop shelters and could support ads on urban shelters like that. She suggested that Metro check with Planning, the Urban Design Commission, and the City Attorney's office before putting together an RFP. Debo asked if she had the TPC's permission to meet with folks to get more information and then bring it back to the TPC, and members did not have an objection.

E.5. [00185](#)

Amending Section 3.51(4)(k)1. of the Madison General Ordinances to modify the composition and terms, clarify the duties, and change the title of the ADA Transit Subcommittee to the Transit and Parking Commission.

**Sponsors:** Jean M. MacCubbin, Brenda K. Konkell and Kenneth Golden  
*Substitute ordinance requested*

**Refer For Attorney Review to the Attorney's Office/Approval Group**

[00185](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Amending Section 3.51(4)(k)1. of the Madison General Ordinances to modify the composition and terms, clarify the duties, and change the title of the ADA Transit Subcommittee to the Transit and Parking Commission.

**Sponsors:** Jean M. MacCubbin, Brenda K. Konkell and Kenneth Golden

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

.

Durocher noted that before the TPC was the ordinance as originally drafted as well as changes recommended by the ADAPPOS. The subcommittee was established to set up a plan for conforming Madison's transit system to the ADA and to submit progress and compliance updates. This was accomplished a long time ago, and the subcommittee's role has changed and evolved. The ADAPPOS has spent considerable time on recommendations for new ordinance language to reflect these changes.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to approve the ordinance.

Referencing item 1.b. Revised Composition, Golden recommended that the term "people with cognitive disabilities" be changed to "people with developmental disabilities" to make it more clear.

Golden clarified his motion as approving the ordinance as recommended by the subcommittee, but separating out the "maximizing transportation options" language for discussion and making a further amendment to change "cognitive" to "developmental."

He asked for clarification of the language dispute between ADAPPOS and Debo about the phrase "maximizing transportation options for everyone." Both sides seem to feel very strongly about it, but the language didn't seem significant to him. Kaysen first addressed the reason for using the word "cognitive." She indicated that ADAPPOS wanted to include persons with brain injuries who are not necessarily developmentally disabled. Golden advised that the State definition of developmental disabilities includes brain injuries (although the Federal definition does not).

Kaysen advised that ADAPPOS felt the "maximizing transportation" language is important to make sure that there is some language to address the historical commitment Metro has had to provide paratransit and accessible fixed route, regardless of the ADA mandate. The specific ADA mandate for the ADAPPOS has expired, and the ADA itself may expire. Golden asked if this was related to individualized rides for paratransit, and Kaysen replied no. Debo stated she recently met with ADAPPOS to talk about this. She did not think the wording was particularly apt in that it implies that there might be a plethora of options available to people. During her meeting with ADAPPOS, members clarified that the language was more to the point of enhancing or improving transportation services by whatever means. Debo suggested alternate language of ". . . with a view towards enhancing or improving transportation services where feasible." It seems to get at the desire for excellence in terms of delivery of services that she sensed was the intent of ADAPPOS. Golden felt both points of view were valid but didn't see the ADAPPOS language as a "free pass." It simply says that the committee can look at things, including things that may not be in the ADA mandate but are still related to providing transportation services to disabled people. For example, ADAPPOS could have recommended that staff ask Verona to provide paratransit service even though it's outside the ADA mandate. It's something that could have been budget neutral for Metro because Verona would pay for the service. He saw the addition of this language as an attempt to maximize community participation by people with disabilities through the provision of transit services, to the extent the budget allows.

Paoni referenced item 1.f., Eligibility Hearing Panel, and asked what other steps

occur before the final step. Kaysen indicated that the first step is to talk it over with transit staff.

Motion to approve adding the language "maximizing transportation options for everyone" carried unanimously.

Motion to approve the ordinance as amended (changing "cognitive" to "developmental" and adding the phrase "maximizing transportation options for everyone").

Durocher left at 8:10 p.m. and Vice-Chair Kaysen assumed the Chair duties.

## F. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

### F.1. Parking Quarterly Report - December 2004

Motion by Golden/Wong to approve the reports, with items F.2. and F.3. separated out. Motion to approve the parking revenue report carried unanimously.

### F.2. Special Event Parking Information - Calendar of 2005 Events

Webber pointed out that according to the calendar of special events provided in the agenda packet, January had 27 days of special event parking. The Parking Utility, Downtown Madison, Inc., Convention and Visitors Bureau, Chamber of Commerce and others advertise a \$1.00/\$2.00 maximum fee for nights and weekends, but perhaps they should re-think this wording. Also, maybe staff should come back with something that addresses the fact that it's not really "special" if it happens all the time. Webber asked whether the calendar had been printed from the Parking Utility's web page, and Kern replied yes. He also noted that the Parking Utility's web site is in the process of being redone. In response to Paoni's question, Kern stated that organizations that advertise the evening/ weekend maximum rate have been contacted, although he could not be sure that every agency has been reached. Golden agreed that it seemed like false advertising if every month has 27 days of special event parking. He wondered, however, if that is typical or whether January was a one-time thing. He suggested that staff look at the numbers and see whether the rates are being presented in a fair and reasonable way to the public.

Webber noted that some special events are not added to the calendar until three days in advance, and February already has 15 days of special event parking. She wanted to have it noted for the record that there is false advertising regarding the parking rates for nights and weekends, and this information is on various web sites, including the City's. She wanted the relevant parties to be made aware of this, and she asked that this issue be put on a future TPC agenda to decide what the City's portion of correcting this problem should be.

### F.3. Metro Quarterly Report - December 2004

Wong referenced the second bulleted item re: unlimited ride pass agreements and asked why the summer ridership was not anticipated. Debo replied that it's history and the problem has been corrected for 2005.

Wong referenced the fact that revenues are 8% less than budgeted and felt this emphasizes the point that ridership goes down when fares go up. It appears that Metro did not project this accurately. Debo clarified that ridership has gone up. Revenues are less than projected, largely due to the fact that when staff projected the impact of the fare changes, they underestimated the number of riders who would shift from tickets to passes. The template for future revenue projections will be changed to reflect this preference for passes over tickets. The experience showed that the importance of convenience of a pass to the consumer is greater than anticipated.

Kaysen asked whether Metro could consider a pass for less than 30 days, for example a 2-week pass, which might be more attractive to low income riders. Debo stated they will look at it.

Motion by Webber/Carlsen to accept the report carried unanimously.

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

- G.1. ADA Paratransit Plan Oversight Subcommittee - 1/6/05
- G.2. Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee - 1/27/05
- G.3. Parking Council for People With Disabilities - 1/18/05
- G.4. Long Range Transportation Planning Commission - 1/20/05
- G.5. State Street Design Project Oversight Subcommittee
- G.6. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

## **H. GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- H.1. General Announcements by Chair  
*None*
- H.2. Commission Member Items for Future Agenda  
*None*

## **I. ADJOURNMENT**

*Upon a motion by Wong/Konkel, the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.*

**Submitted by Gail Phillips, Recording Secretary**

