



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

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

---

Tuesday, January 11, 2005

5:00 PM, Room 260, Madison Municipal Building Use the Doty Street  
entrance after 6:00 p.m.

---

## A. CALL TO ORDER

**Present:** Alderperson Brenda K. Konkel, Alderperson Robbie Webber, Gary T. Dilweg,  
Carl D. Durocher, Kevin L. Hoag, L. Jesse Kaysen, Diane L. Paoni, Kenneth M.  
Streit and Tim Wong

**Absent:** Chris R. Carlsen

**Excused:** Alderperson Kenneth Golden

## B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 12/13/04

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Kaysen, to Approve the Minutes. The  
motion passed by acclamation.

## C. PUBLIC COMMENT

members of the public are allowed three minutes to make a presentation on an  
item which they would like the TPC to consider at a future meeting

Susan De Vos, 626 Gately Terrace, referenced the City's current snow removal policy and felt it shifts costs to Metro Transit because it forces disabled transit customers to use the more costly paratransit service rather than fixed route. The current policy puts snow removal of curb cuts and bus stops at a low priority, and this may make sense to Streets because the cost of the policy is borne by Metro. Ms. De Vos suggested that the TPC recommend changes to the City's snow removal policy. Clearing roads, including local streets, is given the highest priority, while clearing bus stops is given the lowest priority and clearing street crossings and islands is next to last priority. She recognized the need to clear arterials and collectors but felt that clearing certain bike paths, pedestrian paths and bus stops should have a higher priority than clearing most local streets. Ms. De Vos had brought her concerns to the PBMVC, of which she is a member, but the PBMVC supported the policy recommended by City Engineering and Streets. She stated that the issue will not go away. Metro has to absorb the cost for paratransit, and it makes disabled people the scapegoat for increased paratransit costs. Metro should insist that crosswalks on major arterials be accessible for wheelchair users by a certain time after a snowfall, and also identify major bus stops that should be cleared.

Konkel asked Ms. De Vos to clarify her concern. Ms. De Vos indicated that Streets policy is that crosswalks will be cleared within two weeks after a snowfall; this means that the disabled have to use paratransit, even though the snowfall happened a while ago. Konkel noted that in the last City budget, money was put back in for sidewalk snow removal but she was trying to get a sense of how big the problem is. Ms. De Vos suggested that Metro identify certain bus stops for priority clearing, including the crosswalks and ramps to those stops. She also suggested implementing a program where citizens could call in and request the clearing of a frequently-used stop. Webber asked whether it's the curb cuts and sidewalks leading up to the bus stops that are the problem. Ms. De Vos stated that in some instances, the sidewalk and curb cut is cleared but then Streets piles snow in front of the ramp, preventing access. Another problem is snow piled in the middle of the street, which prevents access across the street. She understood that there are a number of competing interests for snow removal but at least certain bus stops should be accessible. Webber noted that clearing the sidewalk and curb cut is the responsibility of the adjacent property owner. Ms. De Vos indicated that the windrows from snow plowing are the greatest problem.

Mike Neuman, no address given, brought up the issue of vehicle advertising, especially in the campus area. These trucks, with signs on them, idle while they are parked. The City should not allow movable ads and should preserve the climate. Konkel advised that Ald. Holtzman has drafted an ordinance that would address this. She will check to see which agencies are listed as referrals, although she did was not sure it was an appropriate issue for the TPC.

Eric Goodman, no address given, stated he lives in the Lake Point Dr./Bridge Road area on the southeast side. He asked that Metro study the options for service from that area to the East Transfer Point during peak hours. Debo stated that this is included in Metro's 2005 Strategic Plan for staff to look at.

## D. NEW BUSINESS

- D.1. Res. creating a Streetcar Study Committee to make recommendations to the Mayor & Common Council regarding the electric rail-running vehicle, the initial route & subsequent extensions, timing & phasing of construction, capital & fiscal plans, & management

Ald. Golden had submitted a written statement urging TPC support. Durocher advised that the BOE had recommended adoption at their meeting last night with a change in the committee appointment date to February 1, 2005.

Jeanne Hoffman, Mayor's office, stated that the Mayor is very excited to put together this committee. The City has received a \$300,000 Federal appropriation to conduct the study. She envisioned the committee make-up including downtown interests such as business, tourism, neighborhood associations, developers and alders. The committee would also link with the UW, which is interested in finding ways to bring employees to campus and get people around campus without using cars. The Study Committee will work with Metro. Ms. Hoffman emphasized that a streetcar will increase the transportation choices for people and noted that when a streetcar system was implemented in Portland, transit ridership went up across the board. A streetcar system allows the City to reach deeper into the driving market. As alternative transportation becomes more attractive, more people will shift their mode of travel.

Kaysen noted that the committee membership includes at least four members of Transport 2020 and asked if any members will come from the TPC. Ms. Hoffman stated that the other members will be named by the Mayor. She encouraged TPC members to contact the Mayor's office if they are interested in a possible appointment, but she emphasized the appointments are the purview of the Mayor (with confirmation by the Common Council).

Kaysen asked whether any of the money earmarked for the study was originally intended for Transport 2020. Ms. Hoffman replied no and indicated that Transport 2020 received \$500,000 to move ahead with their work.

Eric Goodman, no address given, identified himself as a UW student studying land use and transportation planning. He liked the idea of a streetcar system but wasn't sure that Madison is a big enough city to support it. He noted that Seattle and Vancouver use electric buses and felt the Study Committee should also look at this concept. It would cost less than streetcar system because it doesn't need rail. He urged that the Study Committee not limit its discussion to only streetcars. If the chosen route is considered good, why not just run a bus route down it and see what kind of ridership is generated. Wong asked what size population is necessary to support a streetcar system. Mr. Goodman did not have a minimum number but noted that Portland's population is 600,000. He felt that typically at least 500,000 is necessary for a rail system. Wong pointed out that Madison Metro's service level peer group in the WisDOT audit consists of cities larger than Madison, and he was not convinced that Madison is too small to support a streetcar system.

Motion by Kaysen/Webber to recommend approval of the resolution.

Kaysen noted that there had been concern by some Transport 2020 members that this effort would detract from Transport 2020, but she was reassured that was not the case. The resolution makes it clear that the Study Committee's work will be coordinated with Transport 2020, and the study is not taking money from Transport 2020. She noted that a streetcar system is local while Transport 2020 is looking at a regional transportation system.

Hoag noted that the resolution specifically mentions a rail-running system, but he

wanted to make sure that all options are looked at, e.g., rubber-wheeled vehicles, and he wondered whether the language should be amended. Webber felt that one element of the study will be the different types of equipment that could be used, and she trusted that the study will compare streetcars to other vehicles.

It seemed to Wong that the resolution language rules out the study of dedicated bus lanes. He personally likes the idea of streetcars but some people have expressed concern that a streetcar system will conflict with Metro. Since the perception is out there, he suggested the resolution address the need to look at the interaction of streetcars and buses. Webber noted that this is already covered in the resolution.

Paoni mentioned that Transport 2020 identified three "prongs" to regional transit: commuter rail, local transportation like streetcars, and improving Metro bus service.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Present:** Alderperson Brenda K. Konkell, Alderperson Robbie Webber, Gary T. Dilweg, Carl D. Durocher, Kevin L. Hoag, L. Jesse Kaysen, Diane L. Paoni, Kenneth M. Streit and Tim Wong

**Absent:** Chris R. Carlsen

**Excused:** Alderperson Kenneth Golden

**D.2. ID 37424 Resolution authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an agreement with The American Center Owner's Association that would provide limited additional Metro Transit commuter service to The American Center**

**A motion was made by Wong, seconded by Ald. Webber. The motion passed by acclamation.**

**Present:** Alderperson Brenda K. Konkell, Alderperson Robbie Webber, Gary T. Dilweg, Carl D. Durocher, Kevin L. Hoag, L. Jesse Kaysen, Diane L. Paoni, Kenneth M. Streit and Tim Wong

**Absent:** Chris R. Carlsen

**Excused:** Alderperson Kenneth Golden

**00195**

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an agreement with The American Center Owner's Association that would provide limited additional Metro Transit commuter service to The American Center starting March 7, 2005 , with the American Center Owner's Association fully funding the cost of service between March 7, 2005 and March 6, 2006 , after which time service to the American Center would be maintained through calendar year 2006 at a minimum and may continue thereafter as Metro determines depending on route productivity, budget demands, and transit needs.

**A motion was made by Wong, seconded by Ald. Webber. The motion passed by acclamation.**

**Present:** Alderperson Brenda K. Konkell, Alderperson Robbie Webber, Alderperson Kenneth Golden, Chris R. Carlsen, Gary T. Dilweg, Carl D. Durocher, Kevin L. Hoag, L. Jesse Kaysen, Diane L. Paoni, Kenneth M. Streit and Tim Wong

calendar year 2006 at a minimum and may continue thereafter as Metro determines, depending on route productivity, budget demands and transit needs

**A motion was made by Wong, seconded by Ald. Webber. The motion passed by acclamation.**

- D.3. ID \_\_\_\_\_ Resolution approving the intent of the Parking Utility to sell the Evergreen Parking Lot located at 1802 Monroe Street to Monroe Neighbors, LLC (TPC lead)**

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Ald. Konkel, David Dryer, Interim Parking Manager, advised that there's a development proposal that encompasses this parking lot. The resolution declares the lot to be surplus but the sale terms have not been worked out. Durocher noted that the TPC is the lead referral but the Plan Commission and Board of Public Works have not yet taken action. Dryer stated he would like to keep the project moving along, and the TPC did not necessarily have to wait for the other recommendations. He did not know the timeline for the development proposal, although at last night's BOE meeting the project itself was referred.

Brad Murphy, Planning Unit Director, was present and reported that the developers are taking into consideration the comments from the BOE and are looking at changes to the project to address the BOE's concerns. But the desire is to move the project forward as quickly as possible. Webber asked if there's any reason that waiting for the other recommendations would significantly delay the project, given the BOE's action. Murphy wasn't sure if this would be a substantial delay and acknowledged that it's typical to receive the reports from the other referrals before the lead referral takes action.

Webber wanted to know if the actual sale of the property would come back to the TPC once the negotiation occurs, i.e., would the proposed sale price come back to the TPC for approval? Dryer was not sure how it would work. Webber then asked if the Evergreen Lot is breaking even. Dryer reported that the lot does not generate a significant amount of money and in fact typically loses money. Hoag pointed out that area businesses depend on the parking and referenced Ald. Golden's written comments on this item in which he stated that the development agreement will assure that the business district is provided necessary parking. However, the resolution does not contain language to that effect. Dryer stated the intention is that there will be some public parking for the business district, and the City will make sure that this parking is accommodated. Hoag asked if this needs to be included in the resolution, and Dryer indicated it could be made part of the deal.

Konkel preferred that the TPC not take action until it had the recommendations of the other referral agencies. She also wanted to make sure that the Parking Utility receives at least fair market value for the lot. The TPC doesn't have enough information at this time. Kaysen recalled that the TPC went through this with the sale of the Atwood Lot - the proposal was vague, and the developer was to maintain parking for the businesses. The actual negotiations did not come to the TPC. But she supported delaying action until the TPC hears back from the other referrals.

Motion by Webber/Konkel to refer until the TPC has the recommendations from the other referrals.

Webber felt the TPC needed more information. The project will be held up by other things, so delaying the sale of the lot will not be a major delay. She preferred to wait until the TPC has the recommendations of the other referrals.

Paoni asked about the process for a property to be declared surplus. Konkel advised that there is a committee process that it goes through, including recommendations from the committee on what they want to see on the site.

Paoni asked if the impact on PU revenues has been looked at, and Dryer replied

that the lot does not make money. Its role is to provide parking for the business district. The PU would get revenue from the sale of the lot. Konkel stressed the importance of being specific as to what the City wants on the site, and replacement public parking should be part of the resolution. She also mentioned that the price of the lot is an issue and the TPC should get something from Real Estate as to the sale price. Further, she would like the sale to come back to the TPC.

Motion to refer carried unanimously.

The motion passed by acclamation.

**Present:** Alderperson Brenda K. Konkel, Alderperson Robbie Webber, Gary T. Dilweg, Carl D. Durocher, Kevin L. Hoag, L. Jesse Kaysen, Diane L. Paoni, Kenneth M. Streit and Tim Wong

**Absent:** Chris R. Carlsen

**Excused:** Alderperson Kenneth Golden

**D.5. ID 37326 Resolution to adopt the Allied-Dunn's Marsh-Belmar Neighborhood's Physical Improvement Plan (Plan Commission lead)**

A motion was made by Kaysen, seconded by Ald. Webber, Motion by Kaysen/ Webber to refer to the next meeting so Ald. Golden (district alder) could be present, carried unanimously.

The motion passed by acclamation.

**E. OLD BUSINESS**

- E.1. [00284](#) Substitute Resolution directing Traffic Engineering, and Parking Utility and City Engineering staff to develop and implement a plan to return public parking to the Capitol Square

**Sponsors:** Mayor Cieslewicz, Michael E. Verveer and Kenneth Golden



A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Streit, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS recommended approval of option 6C with the following amendments: (1) maintain the bus stops at Pinckney-Mifflin, Carroll-Mifflin and Main-Pinckney; (2) use a mix of time limits ( from 15 minutes to 1 hour) that would be enforced until 6 p.m.; (3) plan for the management of tour buses and school buses; (4) add additional bike parking racks around the Square; (5) bag the meters on Farmers Market Saturdays from 6 a.m. until 2 p.m., late April to early November; (6) that the recommendation on bus shelters be studied by staff and brought back to the TPC; and (7) that the BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED clause be amended to read "... width be initiated, and that after the test, staff report back to the Board of Estimates, to a joint meeting of the Transit and Parking Commission and the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission, and to the Common Council. SEE THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION.

Members first heard from the registrants.

Jeanne Hoffman, Mayor's office:

- This issue is very important to the Mayor and he strongly supports providing short-term parking for the up-and-coming retail occurring on the Square.
- Adding parking would provide more of an urban, retail feel.
- The Square businesses have said that additional on-street parking would be helpful.
- City staff developed a number of options, which have been reviewed by the Downtown Coordinating Committee (DCC) and the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission (PBMVC).
- Acknowledged that not everyone is happy with the compromise but felt the compromise best addresses everyone's needs.
- The current situation on the Square is not good. There is a very wide bus/ bike/right turn only lane but the users don't seem to know where to position themselves.
- The recommended option provides separate travel lanes.
- The narrowing of the travel lane will have the beneficial impact of slowing down motor vehicle traffic.

The Mayor is working with staff to determine whether there is the budget authority to implement the option recommended by the PBMVC. There are a number of budget programs available, including some TIF districts, but there is a finite amount of money. The Mayor does not want to see the project so "loaded up" that it becomes financially unfeasible.

- Regarding the bus stops, Ms. Hoffman indicated it's possible to retain the bus stops even if the shelters are removed, especially for heavily-used stops.

In response to a question from Wong, Dryer stated that staff will work with the property owners to determine the time length on the parking meters. Wong asked how many times a meter can be plugged and was informed that re-plugging the meter is illegal, a parker can be ticketed for staying longer than the time limit on the meter.

Konkel referenced the DCC's recommendations and asked if there were any cost concerns. Dryer replied no, noting that staff likely will not change the sign wording from "loading" to "unloading." Designating cul-de-sacs as delivery zones might be a problem. It also gets into the problem with other earlier iterations of Square parking - increasing parking on the Square pushed other users to the side streets, which would necessitate some removal of parking there. Dryer noted that in this latest version, the Metro bus stops stay on the Square rather than move to the diagonal streets as earlier suggested. Relocating the bus

stops to the diagonal streets would have decreased the parking on those streets, thereby somewhat negating the parking spaces added to the Square. The issue of finding an off-site location for tour bus parking needs to be addressed. Ms. Hoffman noted that the State Capitol does not have a problem with a City policy that requires tour buses to park off-site, and the Capitol is willing to send information about tour bus parking to the schools.

Hoag felt that the past policy has been to discourage motor vehicle traffic on the Square and to encourage it one block off the Square. He expressed concern about motorists circling the Square looking for a parking spot, and he felt this plan puts a lot of cars on the Square. Traffic Engineering staff have estimated there would be an additional 550-700 vehicles per day, depending on the turn-over of the parking.

Kaysen remarked that everyone agrees there's a perception problem about downtown parking. However, parking is available on the Capitol side of the Square. She expressed concern about using concrete to fix a perception problem and suggested better marketing. Ms. Hoffman advised that the parking on the inside of the Square is controlled by the Capitol, and State DOA has made it clear that they do not plan to make this parking available to the City. Ms. Hoffman recognized that marketing is part of the focus that the City needs to undertake. But the issue is more complex than that. There are all sorts of trips that people make, and a quick stop at the bank is a different trip than shopping. Having parking available at the front door is the best advertising. Ms. Hoffman noted that an advertising program is an ongoing expense. The recommended option is a capital expense that would be done once. The Parking Utility will get revenue from the meters that could be used for additional marketing.

Wong agreed with Kaysen that the perception is more of a problem than an actual lack of parking. The proposal calls for adding only 27 parking stalls, and he felt the perception will still be there and in fact might be worse if cars are circling the Square, looking for a parking space. Will the City then want to add more parking stalls? Ms. Hoffman replied that 27 stalls are all that can be added. The Mayor does not want to move Metro off the Square, and this proposal balances transit with some additional parking. There is no support from the Mayor's office for more parking than these 27 spaces. Ms. Hoffman recognized that some of the ramps may have available parking, but the Capitol Square North Ramp, for example, is not conducive for a quick stop at a Square store. Parking on the Square would be more helpful to the retail businesses. Wong mentioned that others may not understand that 27 stalls are all that will be added, and he wondered if this is opening a Pandora's box. Ms. Hoffman replied no and reiterated that the Mayor does not support additional parking above this proposal.

Paoni wondered about congestion levels on the Square and whether the turning movements and slower moving traffic would be a barrier for people parking on the Square. Dryer commented that the estimated 550-700 additional vehicles per day is not a lot. Ms. Hoffman noted that the retail businesses want slower-moving traffic going past their front door. She did not see the additional vehicles making the Square so congested that there would be gridlock.

Webber asked if funding is available for the option that cuts into the terrace. Ms. Hoffman stated that the 2005 capital budget includes an ongoing pavement maintenance account in City Engineering. The City Engineer plans to use \$200,

000 from this account to replace the pavement joints in the proposed bike lane. It would also be necessary to remark the Square, and Ms. Hoffman noted that the 2005 capital budget also includes a couple TIF districts that have approved funding for items such as streetscape work, and the City would use that funding for marking the Square. She pointed out that the plans and specifications for the actual construction work will come to the Common Council. Ms. Hoffman indicated that there's no funding available to widen the pavement. Cutting into the terrace probably doubles the cost of the project and is not fiscally feasible.

Dilweg asked whether any of the 27 parking stalls will be for handicapped parkers. Dryer said that staff have discussed it. If a meter is longer than one-half hour, a handicapped parker can park there all day without paying. Staff will try reasonable time limits and see how the meters are used.

Mark Shahan, 607 Piper Drive, representing himself and the PBMVC:

- He commented that the trip data compiled by Traffic Engineering provides a good snapshot of what's happening on the Square. There are more ped, bike and bus trips than auto trips.
- Given the volume of alternative traffic modes, he urged the TPC to be careful when making changes to the operation of the Square.
- Shahan agreed that the current bus/bike/right turn only lane is ill-defined and that there needs to be a separate bike lane.
- The PBMVC focused on three options, 4A Modified, 4B (cut into the curb) and 6C (retain existing roadway width and use colored concrete for the bike lane). The problem with 4A Modified is that it didn't have a separate bike lane.
- He used the University Avenue bike lane as the starting point for coming up with an option that accommodates all roadway users while providing the additional parking that the Mayor wants. This led him to option 4B, which provides what he considered to be the minimal clearance for bikers (if the vehicle is traveling in the middle of its lane, there's 3 feet of clearance between the vehicle and a bicyclist in the bike lane. However, funding for this option is a big issue.
- Option 6C puts in a bike lane by narrowing the other traffic lanes. There would only be about two feet between a bus and a bicyclist, and about 2½ feet between the bicyclist and the car lane.
- He disagreed that the narrower lanes would slow traffic. The signals are already timed to 17-20 miles per hour.
- His preference is for option 4B since it best meets the multi-modal needs.
- If 6C is approved, Shahan requested that the pavement joints be moved such that if the City wants to implement 4B in the future, the pavement won't have to be redone.

Paoni asked whether the PBMVC typically recommends a 5-foot bike lane. Shahan indicated normally the lane would be at least six feet, but there are circumstances where it might be five feet. Dryer indicated there are concerns about the narrow lanes and that they may be separate in name only and traffic may encroach into the adjoining lane. In response to a question, Tim Sobota of Metro staff advised that a bus is 8'6" wide but including the mirrors on both sides equals 11 feet.

Paul Haskew, 453 Togstad Glen:

- He is a member of the DCC and BID.
- The DCC became convinced that the additional parking would create a better sense of place and would be helpful to the businesses.

- Currently, four buses idle in the bus/bike/RTO lane and the fumes create problems for the nearby businesses. The options under consideration would relocate four buses off the Square.
- He liked option 4B and felt it would be an attractive improvement to the Square and make it seem more like a downtown retail area.
- The meters will generate revenues for the Parking Utility.

Susan Schmitz, 210 Marinette Trail, representing Downtown Madison, Inc.:

- This is an economic development issue as well as a transit and parking issue. Local businesses need the opportunity for customers to park close by.
- DMI is very supportive of this effort and has waited 30 years for parking to be restored on the Square.
- Some congestion is part of a healthy and lively downtown.
- Traffic should move slowly past businesses and DMI supports a narrow vehicle lane.
- It sent a good message to the local businesses when the PBMVC passed their recommendation.

Webber pointed out that delivery vehicles won't be able to pull up in front of businesses any more and wondered if this will be a problem. Ms. Schmitz felt it's similar to the issue of eliminating deliveries on State Street during certain hours because of the outdoor cafes. DMI met with the major delivery companies and they were very accommodating. Webber noted that deliveries are an issue for businesses, and she didn't want the City to solve one problem but create another one. Ms. Schmitz indicated that the delivery trucks may have to go around the corner.

Wong referenced Ms. Schmitz's comment about removal of parking on the Square 30 years ago and commented that most of the downtown businesses had already left by then. Ms. Schmitz indicated her information came from businesses that have been downtown for 30 years or more.

Referencing the perception issue, Kaysen asked whether the coupon parking program had helped to encourage people to shop downtown. Ms. Schmitz indicated that perception and marketing are important issues that need to be addressed, but they are separate from this. There does need to be some public education about where to park, and she has discussed this with Dryer and the possibility of BID working on it.

Kaysen pointed out that there were three traffic fatalities in the downtown in 2003, and she wondered if traffic safety had an impact on business and customers' decision to come downtown. Ms. Schmitz did not think so and has not heard that from businesses.

Paoni wanted to know what transit does for these businesses. Ms. Schmitz stated transit plays a huge role and is part of an active downtown, making it easy for people to get to the center city.

Ald. Mike Verveer, District 4:

- Strongly supported the resolution and felt it was a long time in coming.
- He recognized that bike advocates have some concerns about the recommended option but it's imperative that the City add as many parking stalls as possible. He felt it will increase the vibrancy of the Square and improve the

diversity of businesses, including the Outer Ring, by changing the perception that there's no place to park.

- He appreciated that the Mayor has made it a priority and he noted that the BOE unanimously recommended adoption at last night's meeting.

Ledell Zellers, no address given, representing the DCC:

- She lives downtown and is familiar with the ped issues on the Square.
- The DCC supports parking on the Square. The DCC has members who walk and bike, and they support the compromise that has a separate bike lane.

Bryant Walker Smith, no address given, representing the DCC:

- He bikes and likes the current wide shared bike lane.
- There seems to be a perception that there's no reason to come to the Square. When he talked with business owners, it became clear that they need parking.
- The DCC supports an active downtown that accommodates short-term parking.

David Bogen, 109 S. Segoe Road:

- Opposed the plan.
- Proponents think that the parking will revitalize the Square, but instead of talking about which option to implement, people should be talking about whether this should be done at all.
- The lack of "vibrancy" on the Square is due to the make-up of the businesses on the Square, and adding more parking stalls will not solve the problem. Most of the existing stores close at 5 p.m.
- The Farmers' Market brings the most vibrancy to the Square, yet there's no parking on the Square during the Markets. The most vibrant street is State Street, which doesn't have parking. There's no link between vitality and parking.
- Everyone agrees that there's a perception that there's no parking, and the City should be looking at the root cause of the problem. One reason that people have a difficult time finding a place to park is that there's very little promotion, for example, the signs directing people to the parking ramps are very small. It would be easier and cheaper to first try better signing for the existing parking.
- Of the 27 new stalls, one-third will be in front of banks or chain stores like Starbucks, so he failed to see how this would support local businesses.
- As far as slowing traffic, the signals are already timed for 17-20 miles per hour and making it even slower does not make sense.
- This proposal is a solution looking for a problem.

Larry Johnson, P. O. Box 1485, Madison, representing the Dane County Farmers' Market:

- His preference is that there be no parking on the Square on Saturdays during the Farmers' Market season.
- Distributed a copy of a 2003 survey of Farmers' Market customers. During the 2003 season, almost 500,000 people attended, and the majority of these people also spent money in the downtown area. The estimated economic impact was almost \$6 million.
- Mr. Johnson noted that the Farmers' Market needs on-street space for vendor parking and customer pick-up.
- He reiterated his preference for maintaining the current policy of no parking and no buses on the Square on Farmers' Market Saturdays from 6am-2 pm, late April to early November. He was very encouraged that this was a recommendation of the PBMVC.

**William Patterson, 1014 Williamson Street #2:**

- Supported parking on the Square but had some concerns. Bicyclists need a safe way to traverse the Square.
- He uses the bus and urged that the bus stop in front of Walgreens be retained.
- He expressed concern that the shelter will be taken away. Moving the bus stops off the Square, without a shelter, is not a solution. He personally preferred to wait on the Square than on the side street.
- If you really want to help the downtown, you need to make it more friendly for those who live and work downtown to move around. Mid-day bus schedules are not good. It's time for the City and Metro to get more creative about the new downtown residents, perhaps consider a circulator at night. He thought this would make more of a difference for the businesses than adding 27 stalls.

**Sonya Newenhouse, 1425 Rutledge St.:**

- She is a member of the DCC and owns property on the Square.
- The size of the lanes in the recommended option could change in the future if necessary.
- She noted the need for more bike racks on the Square.
- She suggested that benches be put in at the bus stops where the shelters are removed.
- The current shared bike lane is ill-defined, and she supported a separate bike lane. She asked that the pavement be redone so that the joints are not in the middle of the bike lane.
- She referenced the potential economic impact to the downtown if each user of the additional stalls spent \$10.
- She supported the additional parking as a way to retain local businesses.

**Susan De Vos, 626 Gately Terrace:**

- She is a member of the PBMVC but was testifying as a private citizen.
- Opposed the plan.
- The Square is a major transfer point for transit users, and the removal of bus shelters concerned her. When bus riders were surveyed a while ago, they strongly supported staying on the Square rather than moving to the Outer Ring. She uses two of the three stops that would be moved.
- The Square retail cannot compete with the malls. It should try to be more like State Street and improve accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians (more bike parking, more benches, etc.).

**Darin Burleigh, 5018 Tomahawk Trail:**

- Opposed the plan because it's trying to address a perceived problem, not a real problem.
- The real problem is that people don't know that parking is available. Adding more parking to the existing supply won't solve the problem.
- If the goal is to increase shopping, you need more additional shoppers than could be accommodated with 27 stalls.
- More emphasis should be placed on transit to get thousands of people downtown.
- All the parking options are compromises and diminish transit and bike accommodations. The proposal has both financial costs and costs in terms of people's ability to use bikes and transit.
- The center of the city should be more bike friendly. Bike facilities around the city are expanding but not in the central city.
- When considering the options, the fundamental question should be whether there is a problem.

- He urged the TPC to maintain the bus and bike accommodations.

Kaysen asked Burleigh his opinion regarding a 5-foot bike lane. He thought it was okay but was not sure the other vehicles would stay within their narrow lane width.

Jeff Schimpff, 2721 Kendall Avenue, provided a written statement:

- He is a bicycle commuter. The top priority for decision-makers should be the safety of bicyclists, with the next concern being to ensure there's no negative impact on bus service.
- Diagonal parking is unsafe for bicyclists since many motorists do not take appropriate precautions when backing out.
- He supported converting all existing Square parking to open public parking.
- Retail on the Square was not killed by a lack of parking, and he failed to see any convincing information that putting additional parking on the Square will provide a significant boost to retail businesses. There is existing available parking in the ramps. Shoppers would not be guaranteed a parking spot in front of the store they wish to patronize and may need to walk some distance, minimizing any perceived convenience.
- The expansion of downtown residential units and office development should bring in new customers to support downtown businesses.
- If the City decides to put in parking, he preferred an option that would cut into the curb to provide a parking lane, 10-foot traffic lane, 7-foot bike lane, 12-foot bus lane, and a parking lane on the Capitol side. This would be safest for bicyclists.

Michael Barrett, 2137 Sommers Ave.:

- He usually doesn't support the expansion of parking but this situation is different: small number of new stalls, it doesn't increase the amount of existing pavement, it could calm traffic, could make life easier for bicyclists, and could create a buffer zone between peds and moving traffic. But the plan must be done right.
- Option 4B is the ideal option but he understood the budgetary issues associated with cutting into the curb. He could live with option 6C but it squeezes bicyclists between two streams of traffic.

Kaysen asked how he viewed the University Avenue bike lane. Mr. Barrett stated that as a bicyclist, he feels squeezed in the 8-foot wide lane. However, traffic on the Square will be traveling slower than on University Avenue. The 5-foot lane on the Square will be uncomfortable, but the current shared lane is not working and is a mess.

Peg Scholtes, 115 S. Franklin Street:

- She owns the Capitol Kids store on the Square.
- She was impressed by the willingness of people to negotiate and come up with something that works for everyone.
- So far in the discussion, parents of young children have been underrepresented. It's difficult to bike or walk with children in the winter.
- Some of the previous speakers underestimated the value of one or two additional customers a day for a small business.
- Most of the phone calls she receives from potential customers are about parking. Kaysen asked Scholtes what she tells people when they call and ask about parking. Ms. Scholtes indicated she directs them side streets such as W. Washington (now that it's open again after construction) or Main Street, and she

also asks them to think about how far they would walk in a mall.

- If a customer purchases a large item, there's no legal place for them to park in front of the store. The lack of parking also makes it difficult for people with mobility problems.
- The lack of parking is not just a perception but a reality for her and her customers. There are more obstacles to a downtown business than she anticipated.
- There isn't a close parking ramp for the Carroll Street side of the Square. The Dane County Ramp is basically reserved. Paoni asked about parking at Monona Terrace, which Scholtes indicated would be about 4 blocks from her store. She felt the general public doesn't view the Monona Terrace Ramp as an option for public parking.

In response to Wong's question, Ms. Scholtes stated she favored a mix of time limits for the meters, with a one-hour maximum. Webber asked if the parking spaces would be a problem for delivery trucks. Ms. Scholtes did not think so, noting that the UPS driver currently comes through the alley and many delivery trucks use the multiple driveways at the Inn on the Park.

There being no further registrants, the item was opened up for TPC discussion. Kaysen expressed concern about an 11-foot bus lane when the bus (with mirrors) is that wide and the fact bicyclists would be next to the bus lane. Debo indicated that the height of the bus mirrors could be a problem for bicyclists although it was hard to say at this time. She assumed that the buses will be moving very slow. She thought a 16-foot shared lane might be better. Dryer acknowledged that the lane widths are tight, but it's one-way traffic, low speed, and low volume. Kaysen reiterated her safety concern about the buses staying in their lane, especially in bad weather. She did not want to design a system that produces conflicts. The 9-foot travel lane is also narrow. She thought it might be useful to have signs about who yields, etc., but Dryer pointed out that no amount of signing will keep vehicles in their lane.

Wong was concerned about losing three bus stops, especially the one in front of Walgreens which he described as a key stop. The memo from Metro indicates that the stop, without a shelter, would be moved to King Street. He felt bus accommodations should trump the parking. Debo stated that staff has talked about retaining the three stops on the Square, although the shelters would be removed. The three stops are ones at which very few routes stop. The stops would be the "stop and go" type. The shelters will remain at the other four stops on the Square where the buses queue. Wong noted that the shelter removal is still a problem, especially for riders waiting in bad weather. Could the shelters be moved closer to the corner? Debo was not sure. Dryer indicated he did not have a problem with a shelter closer to the corner but he didn't want the bus blocking the intersection while it waited. Debo confirmed that the bus stops will be maintained on the Square; the only question at this time is whether the shelters can be retained. Mayoral Assistant Hoffman agreed that the three bus stops will remain on the Square. She noted that since only a few bus routes use these stops, perhaps a smaller shelter could be put in closer to the corner.

Paoni advised that the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission has worked on defining travel lanes and street widths, and she wondered how an 11-foot bus lane fits in. Dryer stated that the 9-foot travel lane is the bare minimum but has been used before. Given the traffic conditions on the Square - one-way, low speed, and low volume - he felt it is an option. He would prefer to widen the



roadway by cutting into the terrace, but it is too costly. Paoni asked about the anticipated travel speed in the 11-foot bus lane, and Dryer noted that the signals are timed to 17-20 miles per hour. He did not anticipate significant travel speed changes. Paoni asked if the 8-foot parking lane is a minimum, and Dryer replied yes, as is the 5-foot bike lane.

Durocher reminded members that the PBMVC had recommended option 6C as its first choice. The substitute resolution that was handed out at the meeting identifies this as the preferred option.

Debo commented that currently buses and bicyclists share a wide lane, and it seems to have worked well. She has received no complaints about a shared bus/bike lane on the Square over the years. Webber commented that oftentimes when she is bicycling on the Square, the shared lane is partially blocked by a delivery truck, tour bus, etc., and she and the bus driver have to share about 10 feet of the lane, and they manage. Hoffman pointed out that portions of the Square will not have parking, and in those locations the buses can use this additional space.

Referencing the funding sources, Kaysen asked if the \$200,000 for the joint replacement is coming from the same pot of money used to improve areas that don't have sidewalks and get bus pads. Hoffman replied no. City Engineering has a pavement maintenance budget, and City Engineer Nelson has agreed to use \$200,000 for replacing the joint line around the Square.

Konkel felt the substitute resolution does not address a lot of the elements discussed by the various commissions, for instance, it says nothing about colored concrete for the bike lane and the fiscal note indicates only \$19,500. Dryer stated that City Engineering has estimated \$400,000-\$700,000 to cut out the joint line and replace the concrete, with the higher estimate being for colored concrete in the bike lane. That number still needs to be firmed up. The fiscal note does not include redoing the concrete. Wong asked how much it would cost to expand the roadway, and Dryer indicated the initial estimate was at least \$500,000 but it would probably be much higher due to the utilities underneath the sidewalk. Hoffman agreed that the cost would likely exceed \$500,000.

Konkel wanted to confirm that the substitute resolution captures the PBMVC's recommendation. Hoffman replied yes. Paoni noted that the substitute mentions a test and asked how this would work. Dryer replied that staff wants to make sure the lane configuration will work before cutting out the joint and making other physical changes. It will probably be evident fairly quickly if the lanes don't work. The test would be implemented this spring.

Konkel asked if the fiscal note of \$19,500 refers to the test. Hoffman replied that there isn't a fiscal note for the test, it will likely be done with available staff and available funds. To fix the joint line in option 6C, the City Engineer has estimated \$400,000 and \$700,000 if use colored concrete. In response to Kaysen's question, Hoffman advised that the \$200,000 for joint replacement is part of the \$400,000-\$700,000 cost. Wong questioned having a bike lane with a joint line in the middle during the test. Dryer acknowledged that it could be a "wheel grabber" and staff will try to address this, perhaps with a cold patch. Dryer emphasized that City staff will do whatever it takes to make the joint line safe for bicyclists.

Wong asked if it's possible to have a third option, one that's wider than the existing 41-foot cross section but not as wide as 4B so you could avoid the

utilities. Both Dryer and Hoffman indicated that if the City is going to go to the trouble and expense of widening the roadway, it wants to "do it right" and make the lanes wide enough.

Kaysen wanted to know how long the test will last. Dryer did not anticipate it lasting long, probably 90 days or less. Hoffman indicated that the intent is to get a feel of how the lanes operate and the spatial relationship. Konkel suggested that the amount of time for the test be left up to staff in case they need to end it quickly because of safety problems.

Kaysen referenced the action taken by the TPC a while ago to approve the purchase of new shelters for the Square. Debo indicated this is on the back burner for now. It was Hoffman's understanding that the money for the new Square shelters was taken out of the 2005 capital budget.

Motion by Webber/Streit to approve the substitute resolution with option 6C as recommended by the PBMVC.

Webber indicated her support for additional parking was based on the fact it will not increase the amount of existing pavement and it will address the problem with the current shared bike/bus lane. Option 6C will at least improve the situation. She realized that the lanes are very tight and all users will think they are squeezed, but everyone gets their own lane. Also, the City may be willing to reconsider cutting into the curb at some future date if these lane widths don't work. The proposal also makes the business owners happy.

Hoag strongly opposed the motion. (1) The short trips being talked about cause the worse emission problems. Anything that encourages short trips and start/stop driving is not good for the environment. (2) He was uncomfortable with any action that encourages individual cars, especially for short trips. This policy is going in the wrong direction. Vibrancy comes from foot traffic, having hundreds of people walking about. The case made by the business people for more parking seems to be anecdotal; no surveys have been done. Providing parking directly in front of the store discourages browsing and additional shopping. Hoag strongly urged the TPC to re-think a proposal that encourages start/stop vehicle trips. He is a biker and does not have a problem with the shared bike lane on the Square, it seems safe to him. The proposed 5-foot bike lane does not allow space for passing another bicyclist without encroaching into either the travel lane or the bus lane.

Konkel offered the following amendments: (1) maintain the bus stops at King-Main and Mifflin-Pinckney; (2) use a mix of time limited meters (from 15 minutes to 1 hour) that would be enforced until 6 p.m.; (3) plan for the management of tour buses and school buses; (4) install additional bike parking racks around the Square; (5) bag the meters on Farmers' Market Saturdays from 6 a.m. until 2 p.m., late April to early November; (6) that a recommendation on Square bus shelters be studied by staff and brought back to the TPC; and (7) that the BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED clause be further amended to read "... width be initiated, and that after the test, staff report back to the Board of Estimates, the TPC and the Common Council prior to full implementation." Webber accepted these as friendly.

Konkel stated that when this item was before the BOE last night, they did not see the Substitute Resolution, nor did they talk about the costs mentioned tonight. She felt some of the BOE alders would be very surprised about information

brought out at the TPC meeting, and she expressed concern that the BOE didn't realize the full implications of the resolution. Hoffman indicated the substitute could be referred back to the BOE, and Konkel felt that would be a good idea.

Konkel accepted a friendly amendment by Kaysen to have the test results reported back to a joint meeting of the TPC and PBMVC, the BOE, and the Common Council.

Hoffman asked for clarification as to the intent of the joint meeting. Dryer emphasized that staff will not have objective data, and there will be no before/after studies or things like that. Webber referenced Hoffman's earlier comment that the test is to get an idea of how the lanes feel to the users, and information lie that is important to the TPC and the PBMVC. Konkel also wanted to know who will determine whether the lanes "work" or "don't work."

[Durocher left at 8:30 p.m. and Vice-Chair Kaysen took over as Chair.]

Paoni asked whether the joint meeting would be after the test of option 6C, and Konkel indicated that was her intent. She also indicated the Substitute did not need to go back to the BOE at this time but could wait until after the test. Paoni supported the test but did not want to have any bus shelters removed. Dryer wanted clarification on the "results" expected to be presented to the joint meeting. Members indicated they wanted to have staff's observations as to how the lanes operated and any public input received by staff, and they were not asking staff to collect any specific data.

Konkel revised item (1) of her amendments to include retaining the third bus stop on the Square at Carroll-State.

Motion as amended carried on a 5-2 vote (yes: Dilweg, Konkel, Streit, Webber and Paoni; no: Wong and Hoag).

The motion passed by the following vote:

**Aye:** Dilweg, Konkel, Webber, Kaysen, Paoni and Streit

**No:** Hoag and Wong

## **E.2. Transit Plans for FY05**

### **E.2.a. Strategic Annual Plan**

**ACTION:** Referred to next meeting. (Discussion follows) Debo referenced the revised Draft Strategic Annual Plan and noted that the bold print reflects the suggestions made at last month's TPC meeting. Tonight was an opportunity for members to give further input and then to address the Marketing Plan, which is based on the Strategic Plan.

Kaysen wanted staff to address finding a way to make the "via" alternate routes easier to understand. She has looked at how other cities do things, and she felt there are opportunities to simplify how Metro presents the alternate routes. Debo directed attention to Goal 1.C.(5). Kaysen indicated she was looking for something more specific, with a goal of synchronizing the information in the bus "head" sign with the signing, publications, schedules and web site to reduce the amount of decoding skill needed by riders, especially new or less frequent riders. Debo suggested encapsulating this in a modification to the Marketing Plan, which addresses how Metro communicates information about schedules. She could add something about marketing the alternate routes in such a way that it's easier to understand by the public. It would tie back to Strategic Plan Goal 1.C.(5). Kaysen emphasized that an important element for her is coordinating the signs, maps and guides. She also suggested that each route "branch" have its own map in the Ride Guide. For example, a rider could look at "6A" and easily see which streets the route goes on. Debo stated she will draft some wording to capture the concept.

Konkel asked if Goal 1.C.(2) includes bus service from Allied Drive to the Job Center on Aberg Avenue, and Debo replied no. She noted that Allied Drive currently has far more service than anywhere else except the Isthmus. With the current budget, there is no way to add this direct service. However, there are routes from the West Transfer Point and the South Transfer Point that go directly to the North Transfer Point. Debo also noted that when Metro staff surveyed the Allied Drive area as to transit needs, service to the Job Center was not requested. In fact, very little input was received. Konkel indicated the survey probably didn't get to the people who need transit service to the Job Center, especially if the survey was in English; a survey in Hmong and Spanish might have been more effective. Debo commented that Metro is always in the process of discussing service improvements, but the Allied area is already served well. Konkel pointed out that the City is focusing a lot of time and effort on the Allied Drive area, and perhaps there needs to be another method to find out what the area needs in term of transit service.

Motion by Webber/Konkel to refer item E.2.a. and E.2.b. to the next meeting due to the lateness of the hour, carried unanimously.

**E.2.b. Related Marketing Plan**

**ACTION:** Referred to next meeting

**E.3. TPC Resolution #34, policy re: Segways on Madison Metro transit vehicles**

**ACTION:** Approved.

**E.4. Ordinance amending sec. 3.51(4)(k)1. of the MGO to modify the composition and terms, clarify the duties, and change the title of the ADA Transit Subcommittee to the Transit and Parking Commission**

**ACTION: Referred**

**F. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS**

Parking Revenue Report - November revenue

Moved by consent

**F.2. YTD November Transit Performance Indicators**

Moved by consent

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

All reports were moved by consent.

**G.1. ADA Paratransit Plan Oversight Subcommittee - 12/2/04 minutes encl**

**G.2. Parking Council for People With Disabilities - 12/14/04**

**G.3. Long Range Transportation Planning Commission - 12/16/04 minutes encl**

**G.4. State Street Design Project Oversight Committee**

**G.5. 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

If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats or other accommodations, please contact the Office of the Common Council at 266-4071, TTY 267-8670. Please do so 48 hours prior to the meeting so that proper arrangements can be made.