



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes - Final
TRANSIT AND PARKING
COMMISSION

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

Tuesday, August 8, 2006

5:00 PM

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

PLEASE NOTE: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Durocher called the meeting to order at 5:07PM.

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

Excused: Jed Sanborn and Kevin L. Hoag

Wong and Hinz arrived at 5:12PM.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 7/25/06 (if available)

The 7/25/06 meeting minutes will be approved at the September 14, 2006 meeting.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

At this point, Golden made a motion to proceed ahead to Agenda Item G.1. as the first order of business. Radomski seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

D.1. [04290](#)

Parking: June 2006 Revenue, Key Statistics and July 2006 Activity Report

Bill Knobloch of Parking began by saying that the June report was a significant because rates changed at the ramps and for long-term leases in June. He noted that rates hadn't change on the streets on June 1st because decals were not yet available for the meters at that time. But with the installation of the new decals completed, the impact of meter rate changes would start showing up in the July report. He said that all the new construction-related rates (i.e., hooding rates) started on July 1st.

Knobloch pointed out that revenue at cashiered parking locations went up by 18 %, while demand went down a little bit, as expected when rates are raised. He noted that the revenue on monthly rentals and long-term leases went up, because when rates go up, monthly rentals and long-term leases go up.

He then referred to occupancy rates for 2005 to 2006. Remarking that all ramps except Overture received some sort of rate increase, he said that Capitol Square North ramp occupancy went down from 69% to 57%; Overture went up, from 40% to 45%; Government East, State Street/Campus, State Street/Capitol went down a bit in demand. However, even with a pretty hefty increase, Brayton Lot stayed

about the same. Buckeye Lot stayed about the same at 78% occupancy. With no rate changes and expectations for no significant changes in occupancy, meter occupancy performed as expected: meters on the street stayed about the same, while off-street meters went down a little bit.

Knobeloch responded to a question that occupancy rates are determined by PARCS equipment, which takes a reading every half hour at the ramps.

Looking at waiting lists, Knobeloch noted that Government East waiting list went from 143 in April, to 71 in June - a drop of almost half.

Golden moved to accept report. McCabe seconded the motion.

In response to a question, Knobeloch explained that revenues shown on page one of the report compared June 2006 to June 2005; with 2006 revenue from ramps up by 18% and 2006 revenue from monthly leases up by 9.3%, compared to June 2005. He said that Parking's occupancy counts shown on page C2 of the report don't always correspond to PARCS' occupancy figures shown on page 2 of the report. He noted that Parking does its own "spot surveys" to prepare numbers on page C2. For these spot surveys, on a given day, someone does an actual spot count. On the other hand, PARCS numbers are averages, based on the readings done every half hour. Knobeloch said the readings are probably more accurate than Parking's spot counts (which represent one moment in time), but Parking has to do spot counts at locations like the Buckeye Lot because PARCS equipment is not installed there.

The motion passed unanimously.

At 5:33 PM, Durocher announced that the meeting had reached the time, which had been posted for the public hearing regarding a proposed Special Event Fare Increase -- Agenda Item E. The meeting proceeded to that item.

D.2. [04291](#)

Metro YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 8.8.06

Debo began discussion with a look at the June 2006 Financial Report, and noted that like last year at this time, Metro is running a deficit related to fuel - primarily diesel fuel, but also natural gas and electricity. She said that if the trend continues, Metro could have a \$772K+ deficit. She added however, other revenue sources will mitigate the situation; such as the completion of the billings for the unlimited ride pass contracts, which should generate August through December revenues of \$289K+, and increased ridership, which should produce additional revenues of \$44K. She went on to say that Metro should also see a \$45K+ savings on the purchase of paratransit vehicles, and added that Metro also has a small contingent reserve of \$269,400, which altogether would leave a potential deficit of \$125K.

She said that even though this potential deficit represents a fraction of a percent of the entire budget, it was not something she wanted to see. She said that over the past few years, she has seen Metro's contingent reserves dwindle due to rising fuel costs. She noted that last year, a number of departments had to request a transfer from the City Contingent Reserve for fuel overages, and said that Metro may have to do this as well, in October or November. She pointed out that during the budget process last year, Metro had predicted a potential deficit of \$300K due to rising fuel costs, but expressed hope that perhaps the worst had

passed. She concluded by saying that this June Financial Report would be used in crafting the 2007 budget. Turning to June Performance Indicator Reports, Debo noted that general ridership was 6.9% greater than last year; and that paratransit ridership had fallen about 1.4% from last year.

In response to a question about paratransit figures, Debo said that it was possible to see some savings in this area. Debo noted that Metro had seen an increase in DDS clients with the possibility for more revenue from MA waiver money. Golden observed that there are some projections indicating over 2,000 disabled people may be moving to the Dane County area in the next 5 years - a trend that would also affect this revenue. Responding to another question, Debo said that the additional \$289K anticipated from final billings for unlimited pass agreements is predicated upon trends in YTD ridership among these groups. Debo then clarified a question related to interpreting the various reports as they pertained to revenues, and said that the June Financial Report shows total Passenger Revenues for 2006 at \$3.890 million compared to \$3.707 million in 2005.

Wong asked if anything "jumped out" at Debo about the reports, especially the Route Productivity report. Debo said that after developing and working with the reports for five years, average "trips" is so much higher than it had been before, and 60% of that average is almost twice what it was five years ago; i.e., 60% of the system average five years ago was 10, and now it's 20. Considering this, she noted that even the lowest performers showed fairly good numbers, and commented on how various factors affect averages for particular routes -- how some routes are merely extensions of other larger routes, how route changes can change averages, etc.

Wong asked about current efforts by WURTA to generate additional state funding for rising fuel costs, and Debo responded that this would be a good question to raise when discussing the 2007 budget and fares. In response to a question about combined data for Routes 14 and 15, Debo said that these routes are interlined. Drivers sometimes forget to key in the new route number, such that ridership data for the routes is combined. Shortly, staff will have another element of the ITS system going into effect which would help to segregate the data so that it can be reported separately.

Golden moved to accept the reports, and McCabe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Having already considered Agenda Item E., the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.1. at this point.

E. PUBLIC HEARING

04292

Public Hearing starting at 5:30PM: To gather customer feedback on a Special Event Fare Increase Proposal

Durocher declared the hearing open. No registrants appeared for the public hearing, so Durocher declared the public hearing closed.

Golden then moved to adopt a \$1 increase for special event fares, from \$3 to \$4. Wong seconded the motion. Golden requested that football shuttle usage be tracked following the increase to see what impact it will have.

Responding to a question about the Revenue Projections info, Debo said that it is pretty hard to predict how the increase will affect shuttle usage. In the past, the increase from \$2 to \$3 didn't show an appreciable impact. She added that other factors play into the situation, such as the kind of season the team has and the number of home games.

While observing that members support the increase, Durocher said he had some reluctance to see it happen; especially in the spirit of the non-binding declaration by the Council to move towards such revenue sources as advertising, hoping that the Commission would then hold the line on fare increases. Also, with the elasticity of the projections about reduced ridership, he was reluctant to do anything that might reduce ridership.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting then proceeded back to Agenda Item D.2.

F. OLD BUSINESS

F.1. [04132](#)

Draft resolution to create an ad hoc subcommittee on Parking strategic planning - TPC 8.8.06

Golden proposed some additions/changes to the basic language contained in the draft resolution (distributed to the Commission before the meeting), which he stated would primarily affect the composition of the new subcommittee to be more reflective of the broader community. Golden proposed the following additions/changes: The TPC request that "the Mayor and Common Council create an ad hoc committee consisting of not less than three TPC members, and representatives from the following stakeholder groups: downtown business representatives (3), including the downtown Business Improvement District; UW appointee (1); State DOA appointee (1); downtown office owners and developers (3)." Later in the meeting, other members and staff suggested that two more representatives be added to the committee: a parking customer (a regular parker in the downtown public parking facilities), and a member of the Ped/Bike/Motor Vehicle Commission. Golden went on to propose that the committee "develop a short- and long-term strategic plan and report its recommendations to the TPC by March 2007," which would give the committee more than six months to develop a plan.

[Please note: Golden read his proposed changes verbatim to the Commission, and later submitted his changes in writing to the Commission Secretary for further drafting as recommended by the Commission.]

Golden moved to adopt the new language for the proposed resolution. McCabe seconded the motion. McCabe commented that she thought it was very important to have these particular stakeholders included on the committee, because they are the people directly affected by what the Commission does to parking ramps. Hinz suggested adding language about who would staff the committee.

In response to a question, Golden said the committee would develop a strategic plan, which could include short-term plans to address the immediate capital

“crunch” (with mid-State Street and Government East); and which could include long-term plans to reflect some of the discussions at the Retreat (i.e., ideas about locating facilities near where people want to go or further out where commuters can park, and taking into consideration a street car system). He went on to outline how the process might work: When the plan/report was done, the committee would develop a resolution to “cover” the report, which would list the committee’s recommendations in detail for the Mayor and Council to consider for adoption. The report itself would be attached to the resolution and wouldn’t be subject to change, but the covering resolution could be amended. Golden said that the report could be referred to the TPC as lead referral, and to other commissions such as Long-Range Transit Planning, BOE, and Planning.

Responding to Paoni, Golden explained why he felt that the proposed committee had to be separate from TPC. TPC oversees two different utilities and it would be difficult to accomplish this effort in one Tuesday a month. He felt that creating a strategic plan should be a separate project in which stakeholders are involved (so a plan isn’t created that they might hate.) Paoni recalled the Parking Retreat, where members didn’t want to see planning taken away from the Commission, and where members had compromised by agreeing to work at a certain number of meetings on planning. She felt that the proposal put everything back to where they started. Golden replied that the group could opt to keep the planning work exclusively within the Commission, but that members would probably have to bank two extra meetings a month over the next six months, and he wondered if everyone could sustain that level of effort.

Several questions about level of TPC involvement and representatives on the committee were raised and discussed. Wong wondered if the committee should include parkers. Golden wasn’t sure how to identify a “representative” parker. White wondered about having a downtown resident participate on the committee, but Golden said this would only be needed if the plan were going to be a siting study. White said to alleviate the concern that TPC is not deeply involved, maybe the committee could provide quarterly reports to the Commission. Golden said maybe the number of TPC members on the committee should be increased to “not less than five.”

[Please note: Paoni left the meeting at this point in the meeting, at 6:15PM.]

Knobloch talked about Wong’s idea to include parkers, and suggested that a representative could easily be identified among monthly parkers, a segment of parkers which comprises 60% of Parking’s revenue. He felt it was important to have at least one representative from the group who will “pick up the tab.” Durocher asked if members wanted to include a parker in place of one of the representatives already mentioned, or whether a parker should simply be added to the composition of the committee.

Hinz suggested that when the report and resolution pass through the TPC, there be some thought given as to how the TPC could formally adopt the report as part of its long-range plan for the Parking Utility. Golden observed that members seemed to be expressing ambivalence about letting this planning get away from the Commission, and added that there would be nothing to stop the Commission from keeping this committee as an advisory group to the Commission with the Commission alone adopting a final plan. The only problem he saw with this approach would be that the Council would eventually need to approve any

proposals growing out of a plan, which might be weakened by not having the Council more involved from the beginning. Hinz agreed with Golden about the importance of Council endorsement of the plan, and said that his was a different concern: He wished that the Commission would have a way to adopt the plan as its strategic long-range plan, upon which to base its future decisions. He wondered if language in the resolution might be able to address this.

Referring back to the composition of the committee, White thought it would be strategic to have someone who represents the biking, walking, and busing community. White offered a friendly amendment that the committee be composed of 13 members by adding one representative from the Ped/Bike/Motor Vehicle Commission and one parker to the committee. The motion to adopt Golden's version of the draft resolution (to create an ad hoc committee on Parking strategic planning), as amended by White, passed unanimously.

F.2. [04293](#)

2007 Metro Operating and Capital Budgets

A. Debo discussed the Operating Budget and how Metro was looking at how they might draw down more federal dollars. She noted that there was no federal operating assistance per se, but there are federal reimbursements for costs primarily associated with preventative maintenance and Metro hoped to maximize those. She said that it looked like the budget would be short \$200K or so, and as a result, Metro would make mention in its budget that it anticipated a reduction of service which could become effective in February 2007. Debo said that Metro had identified a few ideas for service reduction with reduced impact that could be considered: 1) summer reduction in service on certain routes (such as Route #9 - heavily used by UW students during the school year, but for which service could be eliminated during the summer); or 2) a slight reduction in evening service on Sundays; and 3) if necessary, reduction in some holiday service. She noted that the first two ideas would be the most likely to happen, in the event Metro couldn't squeeze anymore out of its budget than it already had. Debo said she had talked to Mayor about this and told him it was likely that Metro would "call out" potential reduction of service in order to balance its budget.

Debo then went on to outline two supplemental budget items that had survived discussion:

1) A \$10K request for security-related funding, potentially for use of uniformed police officers to ride along on an as-needed basis as security issues may warrant. While representing a small amount of money when considering time and half for police, this would be one part of the arsenal of tools found in Metro's security plan, which could be used during the course of the year, as necessary.

2) Expansion of commuter service to the High Point-Raymond area (based on the positive response from surveys there), by extending Route #58 and through some modifications to other routes such as #56 and #57, with a net cost of \$97K.

Debo remarked that a previous idea to request money for an extra staff person had been dropped, because of how tight the budget was.

Golden made a suggestion. He noted that when the budget comes out, if Metro details the things that could be cut, the TPC usually ends up having to cut those things. With the Commission in charge of route schedules and with this being the Mayor's budget, Golden proposed that the Mayor state an amount and add: "

with a \$200K cut, to be determined by the TPC.” Golden said he would prefer not to telescope specific items for cuts, which certain other people would immediately assume would happen. With the budget providing a target amount, Golden wanted the actual cuts to be left up to TPC discretion “after the fact rather than before the fact.” Debo agreed that this idea had merit.

In response to a question about numbers relative to summer vs. non-summer ridership on Route #9, Debo said the route had been a handy route and has had high ridership but pointed out that it might be advisable (per Golden’s suggestion) not to talk about specific numbers on specific routes at this time. At such time as this would be discussed, this information would be made available.

B. Debo then discussed the Capital Budget which had recently gone over to the Capital Investment Review Committee (CIRC), and incorporated the following: the five hybrid buses; transit system upgrades identified in a list of technical projects, including one to obtain 10 more cameras on buses; building/remodel/ expansion projects with the current focus on small projects around the facility.

Golden wondered about obtaining Homeland Security money to purchase cameras. Debo said staff had been monitoring this issue, but added that the State allocates these monies, and Milwaukee is getting the money presently because it’s considered a high-risk area (as opposed to Madison).

This report was informational only, and the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

F.3. [04296](#)

Rate and Fare Discussion-continued TPC 8.8.06

Debo referred to the updated chart showing Revenue and Expense Projections through 2009, providing a general idea of what will happen after 2007, especially with regard to costs. She urged members to keep an eye on these numbers periodically. She noted that the chart indicated slowing costs in 2008 and 2009 (after a couple of years of sharp increases due to rising fuel costs); but said that this may be wishful thinking, because it reflected normal growth rates of 3%. Even so, this growth rate would take costs \$1.4 million higher in 2008 and the same amount higher again in 2009; and that number will grow over time as the cost of living index increases.

Responding to a question, Debo said that health insurance costs were expected to increase by 9% in 2007, with combined wages and benefits comprising 75% of the budget. Debo said that Metro had negotiated some good agreements in the past, and contracts have been negotiated through 2007. She noted that Metro has had to obtain reasonable agreements that are not greater than the cost of living. Since employees enjoy a generous longevity benefit, average increases were typically more than the cost of living; and these assumptions had been built into the budget.

Debo went on to discuss what happened at the previous Commission meeting, and said that it was her understanding that the TPC would not make fare-related changes in 2007, in view of the Council’s desire (when approving full bus wraps) not to see this, and in view of the shortage of time to affect changes by January when the first unlimited ride pass agreement would come up.

However, she had understood that members were interested in looking at a rate

that would be a guide in discussions about unlimited ride passes. She recalled that Margaret Bergamini of the UW, had mentioned that average adult fares had been a basis of discussion in past negotiations for unlimited ride pass agreements. As a result, Metro staff had meticulously calculated an "average adult fare" (representative of what had been happening from January through June), which (aside from the unlimited ride pass agreements) had come out to 89.8 cents.

Wong wondered what the methodology had been in developing this number, because he thought it didn't seem correct intuitively (based on number of transfers vs. total rides). Debo replied that the basis for this number was found in the Comparison of Ridership and Revenues report (now based on fiscal years). She added that the number of transfers shown there only apply to cash and 10-ride tickets, and do not apply to 31-day passes and unlimited ride passes.

Golden wondered what might have happened to commuter pass riders when the commuter pass was eliminated. Debo pointed out monthly passes, and could see shifts in 2004 and 2005 to different kinds of fares: Cash trips went up, one-day pass trips went way up, 10-ride tickets went up, and 31-day passes went slightly down. But to track the commuter pass riders, they would need to look further back than this. Debo said it was especially hard to track these shifts because of fare changes and the growth of unlimited ride passes in the midst of this.

Responding to a question from Wong, Debo noted that the numbers on the Comparison of Ridership and Revenue report and the Fixed Route YTD financial report don't match because of the way they are calculated. The financial report is based on sales of passes and tickets and quarterly pass billings, the other report shows all the unlimited ride pass trips whether or not they have been billed. Debo indicated that Sharon does some interpellation in the fares report. The financial report is accurate for what it depicts.

Debo said the reason for this discussion was that Metro would be starting negotiations with the UW Student Association (ASM) this fall, and the student association has traditionally preferred a 3-year agreement. And as a result, rates for outlying years need to be included in the fare tariff. Debo said that if the TPC agreed that the average adult fare - 89.8 cents would be an appropriate starting point, it suggests some possibilities: Metro could use expected percentage increases in costs to determine what rates and other fares should be over time.

Golden recalled the issues that drove original discussions about pass agreements. With Edgewood, their interest in creating pass agreements was driven by land-use concerns. In our discussion with the UW and later MATC, we talked about wanting to increase ridership. Additionally, the UW had a progressive approach which aimed to take cars off the streets and parkers out of the system. He observed that recent discussions were driven by the rising fuel costs, and even bus riders had to face this issue. Golden said he was, more than ever, receptive to the idea of fare increases because of the way fuel costs drive everything now. Based on recent conversations with the State, both Debo and Golden were excited by the prospect of developing an Unlimited Ride Pass Agreement for State employees.

Golden proposed that rates proposed for unlimited ride pass negotiations navigate between three markers: Not to adversely ridership in any significant

way; to reflect cost increases in the rates we charge the institutions; and to compare these fares to those of self-paying customers. Debo said that this is what Metro is showing them, with the "average" adult rate, and applying it to expected cost increases.

McCabe liked that the base rate is similar to the other (unlimited pass) rate, but seriously wondered if 3% increases in fares would keep up with fuel increases (without creating deficits). She thought perhaps ridership would rise with rising fuel costs but wasn't sure if this would compensate for rising fuel costs. Debo said Metro couldn't predict the rate of fuel increases, but suggested that maybe a fuel accelerator could be put into agreements to account for any huge increases in fuel costs. Radomski liked Debo's idea and hoped it would be applied to all the agreements and fares in general.

Golden summarized by saying that members appeared to think that Metro was going in the right direction with its average fare and its proposal to base fares on costs, adding that Debo's idea about an accelerator was very good. Debo wondered if members wanted to put these ideas into a fare tariff, and if so, if they wanted to hold a public hearing. In response to Debo's concern about formalizing fares based on a fuel accelerator, Golden said that this could be handled inside the contracts, to be triggered when fuel cost increases actually occur.

Debo asked if members wished to use the information contained in her August 3rd memo as a basis for a public hearing. In response, Golden made a motion to schedule such a public hearing as part of the next TPC meeting. McCabe seconded the motion. In response to Wong, Debo said that it was urgent to hold this hearing now, in order to have established rates for 2008 through 2010 when starting UW negotiations. With regard to Wong's question about efforts at WURTA, Debo said that there has got to be a major increase in state funding to help municipalities keep up with rising fuel costs, but she doubted if Metro could count on all of the monies coming from the State Legislature. She thought that taking this step to hold a public hearing was a prudent thing to do.

McCabe wondered if there really had to be a formal public hearing, because unlimited ride pass contracts are made with employers (not with the public). Durocher remarked that any unlimited ride pass rates passed after a public hearing, would be no more than advisory because they are still subject to agreement by each employer. Debo indicated that when the rate is formally established by TPC in the Fare Tariff, it becomes non-negotiable. This is specifically what the TPC had set out to do two years ago. In response to a further question from Golden, Debo said that while the rate for unlimited ride pass agreements does not have to be published in the fare tariff, it is the mechanism specifically chosen by TPC to fix the rate. However, the TPC doesn't have to hold a public hearing to set the rates in the Fare Tariff; TPC can just set the rates. Golden then suggested that rather than holding a public hearing, the TPC should invite interested parties (Unlimited Ride Pass Agreement partners) to attend a discussion and make comments about these proposed rates. Debo suggested that this alternative could be an agenda action item at the next meeting.

Golden then offered a substitute motion to invite parties to past agreements to the next meeting to comment on the agenda action item. McCabe seconded the motion. The motion passed, as follows:

Ayes: Golden, Radomski, McCabe, Streit, White and Hinz.

Noes: Wong

Excused: Sanborn, Hoag, Paoni

Non-voting: Durocher

G. NEW BUSINESS

- G.1. [03712](#) Adopting the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Plan and recommendations contained therein as a supplement to the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan. 19th Ald. Dist.

A motion was made by Radomski, seconded by Golden, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION

Archie Nicolette of City Planning introduced the presentation by saying that he had served as the liaison for the Neighborhood Association, the consultants and the City staff, to help coordinate the different elements of the Plan. He said that the Planning Department has a neighborhood planning grant program, through which the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association was awarded a grant to develop a neighborhood plan. The Association hired Schreiber & Anderson Associates to help them design their plan. Nicolette said this was one of the first plans to be developed after the Comprehensive Plan was passed, so the Spring Harbor Plan is organized the same way as the Comprehensive Plan. As a result, the elements of the Neighborhood Plan flow to the Comprehensive Plan. Nicolette noted that the boundaries of the Plan are Lake Mendota, Marshall Park, the rail line that runs along Old Middleton Road, and the Golf Course in Shorewood, with University Avenue running down the middle of the area. Nicolette then turned over the presentation of the Plan to the two Co-Chairs of the Spring Harbor Plan Steering Committee, Celest Regenberg and Bob Steffen.

Regenberg gave a brief history of the process involved in developing the Neighborhood Plan. She said that after the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association Board of Directors selected Schreiber and Anderson Associates to help develop a plan, a Steering Committee was named, composed of five residents, five business people, the Association President and the two Co-Chairs (both long-time residents of the neighborhood). Regenberg said that there had been broad public input to the Plan. Much input came from neighborhood forums and focus groups that identified concerns for various segments of the area: property owners, tenants, businesses, rental property owners, and people with transportation issues. Schreiber and Anderson also conducted individual interviews with the three large stakeholders - primarily owners at the more business-oriented eastern end of the area. Oversight meetings were held with City and County staff, as well. After all these meetings, the Plan was condensed and eight top priorities were identified for recommended solutions and suggestions for implementation. Regenberg highlighted some of the top concerns addressed in the Plan:

- University Avenue - the condition of its surface, its design to accommodate heavy use, with safety being the #1 priority of concern.
- Additional modes of transportation to move people - by means of Madison Metro, bike path extensions, and rail options (with possibly two stops in the neighborhood)

She concluded by reiterating that the Plan was designed to fit into the Comprehensive Plan. In response to a question, Regenberg said there would have to be a lot more discussion before a decision could be made regarding what type of rail unit (light rail vs. commuter rail) would ultimately be used on the existing Wisconsin Southern rail lines.

At this point, Bob Steffen addressed the group. He said that developing the Plan had been a learning process, starting officially in April 2005. He said that the Plan was a 3-5 year plan, and that they were nearing the end of this phase of the process. He added that everyone was anxious to see the Plan adopted so that the Neighborhood could begin maintenance on it. A question arose in the neighborhood recently about the fact that certain bus issues raised in the Plan

had already been resolved by the upcoming Metro route changes, as outlined in a neighborhood meeting with Metro. In response to this question, the Steering Committee felt that it was fine if certain issues had already been resolved, and that the adoption process didn't need to be stopped in order to revise the Plan to reflect these recent developments. Steffens concluded his statements by asking if members had any questions related to parking, transit, Park and Rides, or the traffic coming in from the new Highway 12.

Golden noted that Transport 2020 committee had tentatively focused on the area just east of Whitney Way and just north of Old Middleton Road, as a location for a rail station. He said that this idea had land use implications as well as transportation implications, because such a siting decision could involve a parking structure and more intensive land use than is currently there. He wondered if the Plan alluded to this possibility and if there would be any objections to such an idea. Steffens replied that there has been a lot of discussion among residents and businesses about redevelopment in this particular area (referred to as "the Triangle" - i.e., University Place Associates), in terms of the grading there and how it might accommodate underground parking to go along with a possible transit site. He had heard no objections to this idea. Nicolette pointed to the map contained in the full Plan report, which sited a light rail station at this location. While suggesting that the label probably should be changed to say "commuter rail" or "intra-city rail," he emphasized that the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association had always been very supportive of locating a rail station there.

As the Alder for this district (Ald. District 19), Radomski commented that the development of the Plan had been a fabulous process, thanks to Regenbergs and Steffens. He added that a fortunate outgrowth of the planning process was the way the business community had participated, including the holding company that owns the land in the Triangle, as well as the land where the PSC and its parking structure are located. He said that discussion was continuing with City staff and the Neighborhood Association about future land use at this location, with the possibility of rail stations, higher density, mixed-use, transit-oriented development. He noted that guidelines hadn't as yet been designed, and there had been a conscious decision not to do so during the planning process. However, he said that luckily, key groups were already involved in the process -- the holding company, other area businesses (including University Place Associates), and the neighborhood association - and recognized fully that major development was imminent in this area.

Golden felt it was important for everyone to be clear about this, because consultants working with Transport 2020 were very interested in this site because of its potential for transit-oriented development. Radomski went on to say that Alder Gruber and other alders in multiple neighborhoods, as well as county supervisors have been involved in ongoing discussions to get everyone on the same page about redevelopment in the adjoining areas of Hilldale, DOT and Spring Harbor. Later, he noted that DOT had hired consultants to draw up plans for development of their property, and remarked that developments within each of these areas will certainly impact development in the other areas. Steffens also observed the intergovernmental process in developing certain aspects of the Spring Harbor Plan.

Radomski moved to recommend adoption of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Plan as contained in its report, with the friendly recommendation that language in

the report referring to "light rail" be changed to say "rail."

[Please note: Paoni was present when this vote was taken.]

The motion passed by acclamation.

After completing Agenda Item G.1., the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item D.1.

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

After Agenda Item F.3. was completed, the meeting considered the following items.

Wong moved that reports for Agenda Items H.1. through H.6. be accepted. Golden seconded the motion.

Durocher asked to separate out the minutes of the Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission, in order to note that in its action at its last meeting, the LRTPC had extended a special invitation to Commission members to attend a hearing regarding North Stoughton Road. Durocher observed that if enough TPC members attended this hearing (five), Wong could act as TPC Chair and hold a joint meeting with the LRTPC.

Members then went on to pass the motion unanimously.

- H.1. ADA Transit Subcommittee (May meeting minutes attached)
- H.2. Contracted Services Oversight Subcommittee (no July meeting)
- H.3. Parking Council for People with Disabilities
- H.4. Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission (July meeting minutes attached)
- H.5. State Street Design Project Oversight Committee
- H.6. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

I. GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS

- I.1. General announcements by Chair

Durocher commented that the TPC had had the City Engineer at its June meeting to discuss plans for bus shelters on the Capitol Square. At that meeting, the TPC had approved the Engineer's plan with two modifications: To recommend no demolition of old bus shelters until money was available to replace them; and to modify the design to add more panels to the shelters as windbreaks. At the subsequent Council meeting to consider the plans, no mention was made of the TPC recommendations, and some people were offended that the Council might be either negligently or deliberately slighting the TPC, especially after all the discussion and time it had taken to consider the plans. After the meeting, Alder

Robbie Webber and Durocher looked more closely at the Council agenda and discovered the fact that the plans were tracked by two different Legistar numbers, and there had been no conspiracy to exclude TPC input. The council had acted on the Legistar item pertaining to the contract and since it had been referred to the Mayor's office, there would be no action taken until it came back to the Council. In addition, there were no plans to begin the shelters until next spring. Durocher concluded by saying that there had been no conspiracy to eliminate TPC from the process.

Debo said that she was very proud to hear Durocher open his remarks to the Council by saying, "Metro has no peers." She was so pleased to hear him say this because she is the one usually promoting this idea. Durocher said he received messages the following day from other Metro fans and supporters, who also felt that way.

Durocher asked which members would like to be put on a list to give to the Mayor, to be considered for appointment to the new ad hoc Parking committee. McCabe, Streit, Hinz and Golden expressed interest in this.

Golden then proposed that, in order to save a month, the Parking resolution could be referred to no one but the Common Council "at the request of the TPC" (to show that it had been vetted by the TPC and to explain why there were no referrals). He said that he would make sure that the Council named the TPC as lead referral. No action was taken on this proposal, before the meeting adjourned.

- I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:25PM.