



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

Wednesday, January 11, 2012

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 PM.

Present: 9 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Chris Schmidt; Lisa Subeck; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Kenneth Golden

Excused: 1 -

David E. Tolmie

Please note: There is one vacancy on the Commission, in the position of Second Alternate. Also, Schmitz arrived at 5:08 PM, Maniaci arrived at 5:10 PM, and Subeck arrived at 5:16 PM, during the Parking Report.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Streit, to Approve the Minutes of the December 14, 2011 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.1. [24993](#)

Parking: December 2011 Activity Report, Gov East Remediation Cost Estimate & Plans, November Revenue/Expense & Occupancy Reports - TPC 01.11.12

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch discussed the Gov East condition report, which was prepared by Jeff Edge, of JSD Professional Services, consulting engineers on a 3-year retainer with the Utility.

- Areas needing repairs were identified by dragging a chain to locate hollow places or de-laminated concrete. A ball-peen hammer was used on the ceiling and the columns.
- All of the red shown in the diagrams were areas that were identified on the top surface. What wasn't known was how deep the areas went.
- A corner of each area was squared off to help estimate the square footage of concrete to be removed; and then a factor of 1.1 or 1.2 was applied to this number to come to the totals shown in "Probable Costs" (reflected as square feet, or linear feet for expansion joints, or pounds of steel for rebar).
- Unit costs for concrete removal ranged from \$28 to \$70/sq ft, based on depth

of removal. Full depth removal of 6-8 inches cost \$70, while 2-4 inches of removal on the overlay cost \$28.

- The remediation effort to bring Gov East up to the standards of other facilities would be \$1.8 million, which didn't include the electrical and storm sewer. The electrical vault located under the sidewalk on Doty was sort of scary; with leakage over the past 54 years, the conduit was rusty. Adding costs for repairs of these additional items would bring the total to \$2 million.
- When asked if there were any safety concerns for customers or employees that required urgent repairs, JSD said no.
- When asked what would have to be done if demolition of Gov East were delayed (now not likely to happen until at least 2014), JSD said only repairs necessary to keep things going could be done. [Please note: Schmitz arrived at this point in the meeting.]
- By 2013, such needed repairs would probably cost \$200K. If demolition were delayed as long as 10 years, more repairs could be done each year.
- With demolition pending however, certain items would not be repaired/replaced; such as the \$250K membrane, which was too expensive to install, only to be torn down the next year.
- More important than what the report said was what it didn't say; i.e., it didn't say that we needed to do something with Gov East right now. It was more important to do the Blocks 88-105 project right, and to line partners up. [Please note: Maniaci arrived at this point in the meeting.]
- Re: closing one or two of the worst bays in order to delay repairs if needed: The level in most need of repair was Floor 1 at (Doty) street level, which would be hard to close because of its entrance and drive aisle. It was unlikely that a consultant would recommend closing the stalls alone, since certain condition issues on Floor 1 related to the 20-foot rods of steel rebar underneath the concrete, affecting the entire floor span.
- Highest on the list of costs was Item #4 (Topside Slab Repair Below 2-Layers of Reinforcing) at \$703K, for repairs on all four floors.
- To do these repairs, the concrete would be sawcut to square the corners, and then would be jackhammered as far down as the de-laminated concrete went down (some of which was 2-inch concrete overlay).
- The depths for removal were never less than estimated, since estimates were done months ahead of repairs, and deterioration continued after the estimates were done. As a result, actual costs would probably be a little higher than estimated. Plus some column work was needed, which was also expensive. [Please note: Subeck arrived at this point in the meeting.]
- Having used factors of 1.1 or 1.2 on the estimates, 10-20% had already been added to the estimated costs. So actual costs at Gov East would be pretty close to estimated costs.
- The consultant wasn't at all concerned about the safety or security of the structure.

Knobeloch answered questions.

- The reasons for the drop in certain occupancy rates could be attributed to economy. Plus, rates were raised at certain ramps to redistribute parking demand. But even at Gov East, occupancy was not bad at 77% YTD; vs. Cap Square North being a little high at 84% YTD.
- Re: low occupancy at E. Washington meters and the feasibility of installing long-term, 10-hour meters at a discount for Park & Walk, Parking had successfully tried this idea at the end of Langdon Street. Students loved them, and they still provided turnover. Where this hadn't worked was Railroad Street and Wingra Lot, because the demand wasn't there like it was on Langdon.

Right now, meters by the GEF building were popular and no change was needed there. But there might be potential for 10-hour meters further out on E. Washington.

- In terms of how price has affected occupancy rates, people were thinking more about alternative transportation modes (like busing, biking and walking) because of higher parking rates; as evidenced by the rise in bus ridership and the drop in certain parking occupancies, such as State St Cap and State St Campus. These two facilities which depended heavily on students and staff had lost the most business.

White/Golden made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [24994](#)

Metro: YTD Productivity & Performance, Financial, and Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Reports - TPC 01.11.12

Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted a few items in the reports.

- Metro ridership at 13.649 million YTD through November was as much ridership as for all of 2010.
- As of 12/7/11, ridership crossed the 14 million mark, the first time in over 40 years.
- Metro had gone to BOE with a \$400K adjustment to its budget. Metro was dipping into reserves, due to extra fuel costs, which were \$624 overbudget. This was being offset by the ridership increase and passenger revenues of \$220K, and savings in parts and paratransit.

Golden/Schmitz made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. **NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

F.1. [24646](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County to provide \$19,300 in assistance to Metro Transit for transit information services, promotion efforts, and operations for calendar year 2012, and \$5,000 to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (a Metropolitan Planning Organization) to support the County Specialized Transportation coordination activities for the calendar year 2012.

Kamp said the resolution represented a long-standing coordination agreement that helped Metro, and provided services to the County. He recommended approval.

A motion was made by Ald. Maniaci, seconded by Schmidt, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS**

G.1. [24468](#)

A Resolution Adopting the Downtown Plan as a Supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

Golden made a suggestion regarding process to help expedite Commission review of the Plan, bearing in mind that the Plan was subject to adoption of the Plan Commission, not the TPC. Two options were available: The group could all agree on what was sent back to the Lead. Or the group could let the Plan

Commission sift and winnow through the comments made by TPC members, with their transportation experience and perspective, recognizing the possibility of staff comments being made on such things as financial feasibility, etc. Apart from removing something completely objectionable, Golden didn't think much would be gained by debating the merit of each comment. In reading over the comments, he found them interesting; and though he didn't agree with all of them, he didn't disagree with any one of them strongly enough to bring it up. He recommended that after a constructive discussion, the TPC make a recommendation to accept the resolution and to send all the comments to the Plan Commission with the idea that they and Planning staff would go through them and do the right thing by them.

Maniaci disagreed with this suggestion; though the easy thing to do, it was a cop out. The TPC was the transportation committee, and she didn't think the Plan Commission would nuance through a list of comments sent by the TPC. She thought this was the time and place and the body to have the debate about the transportation portion of the Plan. She proposed listing the comments on a white board, looking at where ideas agreed, and sending the Plan Commission what the TPC as a body agreed to, and what the TPC as a whole didn't agree to. Items that everyone uniformly agreed should be added in, and could be taken up; other items could be put on the record noting that consensus wasn't reached on them.

Schmitz discussed a motion at the December meeting that recommended making comments now, as well as revisiting the Downtown Plan after the Transportation Plan was completed. She thought that this earlier motion put things in context. Recording Secretary Anne Benishek-Clark read portions of the December meeting minutes to refresh everyone's memories about the previous discussion and sequence of motions, which led up to the final (substitute) motion: To wait until the January meeting to take action on the Plan and make recommendations, after members had time to review all the comments inc. those made at the December meeting as well as any additional comments members wished to submit by December 21st.

Bergamini said that the group had had a very comprehensive discussion about this, and when she looked at the additional comments that were submitted after the December meeting (including those from Golden, Schmitz, UDC, other committees and the public), there seemed to be a broad consensus that transportation was missing and should be added into the Plan in greater detail. Where there seemed to be a lack of consensus (mostly in other committees) was the level of detail that a Plan like this should go into. Some committees talked about lane width and height of railings, while others talked about the broad vision; and Bergamini wasn't sure where to draw that line. She thought the TPC could go back to a motion to submit its comments, and also appreciate the work of the other committees which noted that details of transportation planning were lacking and needed to be revisited, which was properly the scope of the transportation study (plan); and that the Downtown Plan as a whole should be looked at and potentially revised with the benefit of that transportation study having been done.

White agreed with Bergamini, and thought the group had had a great discussion at the last meeting, with a lot of comments made and further comments submitted. She wasn't sure what further discussion would do to help, when really what they needed was the transportation plan. She thought it

premature to approve this chapter, because it was like putting the cart before the horse without the overall transportation plan. At the same time, she supported a motion to amend and revisit the chapter after the transportation plan was finished, as Bergamini had proposed. Bergamini added that individuals (representing themselves) could also contact Planning to explain their comments, if they wished.

Subeck agreed with Bergamini and White, saying that she didn't think it would be helpful to rehash all the comments without having the Transportation Plan first. She preferred forwarding the comments along, with a motion to recommend that the chapter be revisited as was suggested at the December meeting. Golden talked about reviewing the many different member and staff comments, inc. those that seemed at variance with each other, and found that he didn't really disagree with any of them. Assuming that members had read the December minutes and pertinent parts of the Downtown Plan, he suggested that for the sake of time members could bring up issues that were not done to their liking, issues with which they disagreed, and issues that were missing (vs. discussing things with which they all agreed).

Benishek-Clark clarified with members which portions of the December minutes that they wished forwarded to the Plan Commission: Bulleted comments made by members, starting at the bottom of Page 6 and running to mid-page on Page 9, and by Parking staff, at the bottom of Page 9 and the top of Page 10.

Golden discussed the recommendation he submitted on December 21st in advance of the January meeting (attached). He wanted the City to have a longer-term vision without being specific, and look to a time when (probably for environmental reasons more than oil issues) the city will need to be nimble enough to convert to a very different way of getting around. For example, certain streets in Madison could very easily be adapted to a European style of moving around. Certain other streets might have to be completely re-done. As streets and systems were being (re) designed, they should be done in a way that anticipated that kind of conversion. In addition to the physical things, public education was needed to promote transit, to call people out for how inconsistent their behavior was with their values, and to educate them to the probability that at some point there would be a conversion and we should be prepared for it. Such things as housing policies, commercial policies, food distribution would be need to be restructured when that time came. His statement was an attempt to say this from a transportation perspective.

Subeck felt that along with environmental costs, there were financial and social justice costs to relying on automobiles: roads were costlier than transit; and the more reliant we were on cars, the less accessible transportation was for those with less. She suggested adding two words to the first sentence in Golden's statement to read: "The city should recognize the environmental, economic and social costs of continuing to rely on automobiles long term...."

Maniaci added the following to member comments and recommendations for the Plan.

- A direct bus between the airport and Downtown was needed.
- Since the city was on an isthmus, we should begin discussion about lobbying for congestion pricing ability.
- Her neighborhood had long discussed a Park & Ride at First Street.

Transportation issues weren't confined to the boundaries of the Downtown Plan.

- Why have Recommendation #137 to add bike lanes on E. Washington from Blair to Pinckney, which would mirror the Bike Boulevard on Mifflin Street?
- The Residential Parking Permit program should be overhauled. The current program incentivized people to bring their cars downtown, and create the expectation that people could pay \$22/year to park in front of their residences.
- Recommendation #129 re: aesthetics and backyard parking could be left out. A committee had gone through all the issues about backyard parking. A good look was needed at how the discussion had evolved in terms of the Zoning Code rewrite and usable open space requirements. Since it was really a zoning issue, perhaps a clarification was needed. The reality was that we can't get rid of backyard parking and push everyone out on the street, esp. with too many people trying to park on the street already. The broad-brush approach to this issue was not satisfactory.
- A small business parking permit program should be considered, in terms of economic development and land use conflicts downtown and based on comments from small retail business owners. An update of the 1978 Transportation Plan was needed.
- Re: expanding parking ramp capacity where able and the recommendations on page 81 for more underground parking: Her neighborhood had discussed Cap Sq North, in which they preferred having the ramp built out to create higher capacity (vs. residential parking there), which would provide better use for the neighborhood, for winter snow parking, etc. In general, no mention was made in the Plan of spending money to increase available ramp parking.
- More bike parking was needed (beyond commercial areas) in residential areas downtown, where people were tripping over bikes and bikes were being chained to trees and poles.

Golden appreciated Maniaci's comments about backyard parking and the residential permit program. He had worked on the backyard parking committee, which basically concluded that the problem would eventually be resolved because backyard parking would be eliminated if the downtown residences and redevelopments occurred as they should. As for the permit program, it was originally designed for University Heights, and it made no sense anywhere else it was being used. He felt it was up to the downtown alders to take the issue on, where there were 300 spaces and 700 parkers. The permit was supposed to be cost-based. Maniaci noted that the current permit fee paid for processing the permits, but did not include the costs of street-sweeping, ticket enforcement, and other costs that were not being captured in the permit program. She understood the political ramifications. Downtown constituents wouldn't like paying more for a permit and making it harder to get one. It was interesting asking people what they would do. Golden talked about the issue of parking in neighborhoods around West High, which was resolved by opening up parking along Speedway. Maniaci reiterated her recommendation (above) that the permit program needed to be evaluated and updated.

Schmitz strongly endorsed Golden's vision statement (of 12/21st). She said the Downtown Plan was a plan, not an implementation document; and Golden's statement set the stage for the plan. It also helped inform Key 2 which identified the downtown as the region's economic engine. As an economic engine, the downtown needed a critical mass of people and increased housing options, and it needed to be more condensed, a place where people could live, work, shop and play. Transportation worked directly into this. She felt we

needed to start thinking differently. The community had high sustainability values and downtowns were inherently more sustainable if they were built that way. She said she would be glad if Golden's statement came from the group. Golden said the statement was taken from the city of Strasbourg, which had similarities to Madison (an island rather than an isthmus). Schmitz said this was what Portland and Amsterdam did, to look long-term. Golden mentioned how Strasbourg priced parking out of downtown, improved light rail, and moved parking to the periphery of the downtown. Schmitz added her support to the Golden's earlier comment re: Page 74, about creating a representative RTA.

Members wondered how their comments should be sent back to the Lead. During discussion, staff suggested extracting the bulleted comments of members and staff from both meetings and adding any comments submitted by members in writing, and inserting them into the motion.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Maniaci, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s). The Transit and Parking Commission recommends that the resolution be approved with the recommendation that the following statement and subsequent (bulleted) comments be incorporated into the Downtown Plan, recognizing that the Downtown Plan will not be complete until it includes a complete Transportation Plan that speaks specifically to the long-term environmental, economic and social costs mentioned in the vision statement. The Commission appreciates the comments of other committees and commissions, which have also raised concerns about the lack of vital transportation planning in this document, and further suggests that its lists of comments and questions be used to help frame both the Transportation Plan and the Zoning Code Rewrite. While the Commission didn't have perfect consensus along all these points, everyone agreed that all these points should be considered. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Under Key 6 on page 71, at the beginning of the Transportation section, insert the statement: The city should recognize the environmental, economic and social costs of continuing to rely on automobiles long term and seek the in cooperation and support of our County, State and Federal partners for a long range strategy that envisions a downtown Madison where motorized vehicles are significantly deemphasized as the primary means of getting to and circulating around the downtown. This vision must include multi-year efforts to educate the public and policy makers about the types of infrastructural changes needed to make this vision possible. While the Transit and Parking Commission recognizes the current and likely continuing role of individually owned motor vehicles for use in reaching and circulating between downtown destinations for years to come, this recommendation is intended to begin a strategy that, at minimum, moves motor vehicles to the edge of the downtown or even the edge of the city to remote parking facilities. This must be coupled with the creation of high(er) frequency, high capacity transit service options for movement of people to and around the downtown.

Following are member comments from the Commission's December and January meetings as well as those submitted by members in writing, for Plan Commission consideration:

- Incorporate TMA's into the zoning code, to the extent it can be mandated to either property owners or larger business and office concerns. Leaving it as an option would not be workable.

- Related to the discussion of shuttles and visitors, emphasize downtown linkage to/from the Alliant Center more.
- Add a bus-time map if feasible, along with a drive-time map.
- Distinguish between regular visitors/commuters from neighboring communities, and infrequent visitors from further away. Their knowledge of the city was different, and Plan recommendations for such things as parking and way-finding should be sensitive to that.
- Linkage between Monona Terrace and the rest of the commercial/retail downtown was incomplete, and perhaps Pinckney Street should be added to the list of streets for enhanced pedestrian facilities/amenities.
- Be bold about de-emphasizing vehicular use downtown, esp. in light of limited right-of-way and discussions about street direction and bike facilities. For example, Strassbourg removed lanes from streets, built high-capacity light rail service, and placed parking facilities outside of the city-center. To go so far as to try to improve the environment for pedestrians and bikes and to have a shuttle, the Plan could be more visionary and could expressly state the goal of limiting vehicular use long-term, even if this is a few generations away. At the same time, access to any point in the downtown by means of high-capacity transit, shuttle service, biking facilities, etc. should be guaranteed.
- While the Plan contained many good recommendations, it lacked an overall vision or goal: In the end, what would transportation in and to/from downtown look like? The Plan needed an over-arching vision of where we eventually want to get to. To what end were the individual recommendations made?
- The Plan didn't address commuting issues. Suggestions contained in the Plan (such as adding bus/bike amenities) were good, and were likely offered by people who already used buses and bikes. But how do we get (new) people on the bus? Parts of the community didn't use the bus because they felt it wasn't an efficient ride for them (it took too long, the stop was too far from their house, etc.) Even with a Comprehensive Transportation study in the long-term, before the Downtown Plan was finalized, it should address the question: How do we help people better commute downtown, to add to a vibrant and thriving downtown?
- The Plan lacked a vision of how younger generations would use transportation: What would their needs be in the next 10 or 20 years? The Plan was a wish-list for the short-term, but didn't look at the long-term re: how people would move in out of the downtown conveniently.
- The Plan lacked a list of future legitimate modes of transportation, like bicycles. Bicycles seemed to just be thrown in here and there in the Plan; but it needed to be legitimized as a serious mode of transportation. The list should include bicycles, along with buses, automobiles, car-sharing, commuter cars, and B-Cycle.
- On page 76, remove the statement that the RTA recommended commuter rail: The RTA plan for transit did not recommend commuter passenger rail. While commuter rail could be discussed in the Plan, it was not part of an RTA recommendation.
- Alarmingly, 2000 census data showed that, even in dense, transit-friendly neighborhoods, the number of cars/household had gone up (to 1.7 cars/household), with only 2-3 persons in an average downtown household. With the trend was going the wrong way then, it would be good to know what 2010 data showed now. Word-of-mouth was that more and more students were bringing a car to campus, despite what had been done with transportation (inc. TDM, bikes and mopeds, etc.). Apparently, it was still hard to get around on Campus.
- The Plan needed to focus more on Intelligent Transportation Systems

specifically for mass transit, and include such things as traffic signal prioritization.

- The Plan should include efficiencies for bus and pedestrians (i.e., narrowing streets), not only for cars.
- The Plan needed to get realistic about where to put a train and intercity buses, etc. Cramming all this at/around Gov East would not work: Too many tear-downs would have to occur, and too many diesel fumes would fill an area intended to be comfortable for people, esp. visitors.
- A 24-hour bus system should be considered. Students would continue to bring cars to Campus until transit provided a way to get home safely from the library at 4-6 AM.
- In preparing the Plan, staff and committee members were asked to put the cart before the horse: Without a robust Transportation Plan that addressed a lot of issues that had been raised and that set specific goals, priorities and a vision, it would be hard to develop that piece within the Downtown Plan. Without this, (naturally) the recommendations in the Plan seemed rather piecemeal. For example, what were our goals for reducing vehicle miles traveled?
- The Plan should discuss marketing. The "Smart Trips" program (started in Portland) marketed existing transportation choices to neighborhoods, and saw a reduction in car trips of 9% per neighborhood, without adding any new infrastructure. Madison seemed to invest in infrastructure (for bikes and transit) without investing in marketing these assets.
- The Plan should emphasize the use of technology to better promote bike, transit and parking systems.
- The Plan should include a goal that 20% of trips in Madison be made by bike by 2020.
- Though supportive of Plan recommendations for W. Washington (striping, buffered bike lanes, etc.), staff should check with Traffic Engineering about this since TE had previously indicated such changes were not feasible, due to space and parking issues.
- The bicycle component of the Plan was lacking. European cities had 40-50% trips made by bike, by creating separate bicycling facilities. Buffered bike lanes between cars and bikes helped moms, kids, seniors feel more comfortable biking.
- The Plan suggested amenities and improvements to the downtown to make it more liveable and attractive for residents, workers, and visitors. Did it discuss delivery vehicles (suppliers) and their impact?
- The number cited for bus trips around the Outer Loop seemed low, and should be re-checked.
- Because of our unusual street grid, It would be difficult for people to navigate the downtown whether streets were one-way or two-way. People would still get lost. At least, lack of familiarity made drivers slow down.
- Re: the Outer Loop and other downtown streets: Narrow the streets, take a lane, make pedestrian rights-of-way broader, install street-side amenities, have dedicated bus lanes, install bus shelters; and deal with the key issue of delivery traffic, look at rail corridors (for freight), and how to work with this commercial network to make small storefront businesses viable, which was central to the Plan.
- Instead of focusing only on efficiency for cars, consider the look and feel of the whole area for people in all modes.
- While all good, these suggestions, in isolation, would be hard to implement without an overall vision. Was the city really ready to adopt a strategy like Strassbourg, which abandoned automobiles in its central commercial district,

in order to implement these?

- While worth aspiring to, some of these ideas would be hard to achieve. For example, 24-hour transit service was not financially sustainable; and removing parking and installing bike facilities had not historically been popular among businesses.
- In making a series of incremental changes like these, care was needed not to thoughtlessly support pro-transit and anti-parking measures that would strike fear into the business community. While some of this could be accomplished, a shared vision with the business community and more marketing and discussion with other segments was needed before going this route. It wouldn't be good for Madison to lose its competitive edge because businesses viewed some other community as friendlier to vehicles and more sustainable for them.
- Perhaps, identifying these changes as a vision for 2050 would allow the community to prepare.
- Though a Transportation Plan was needed, the Downtown Plan was not intended to be that. The Downtown Plan contained a lot of different pieces taken from a lot of different places, which was fine, because the place for transportation innovation was not in a Downtown Plan. That belonged in a different plan developed by other agencies and committees (MPO, TPC, etc.).
- Attitudes towards transportation and alternate modes had changed in the past 20 years, from simply thinking that more parking was needed to enlightened business owners who were providing commute cards and bike amenities, and promoting car- and ride-sharing.
- If attitudes could change like this so quickly over the past 15-20 years, what would they be 20 years from now?
- We were talking about something big when we talked about a Transportation Plan. And when we talked about transportation just within the downtown, it was different, calling for a little of this and that.
- A direct bus between the airport and Downtown was needed.
- Since the city was on an isthmus, we should begin discussion about lobbying for congestion pricing ability.
- Her neighborhood had long discussed a Park & Ride at First Street. Transportation issues weren't confined to the boundaries of the Downtown Plan.
- Why have Recommendation #137 to add bike lanes on E. Washington from Blair to Pinckney, which would mirror the Bike Boulevard on Mifflin Street?
- The Residential Parking Permit program should be overhauled. The current program incentivized people to bring their cars downtown, and create the expectation that people could pay \$22/year to park in front of their residences.
- Recommendation #129 re: aesthetics and backyard parking could be left out. A committee had gone through all the issues about backyard parking. A good look was needed at how the discussion had evolved in terms of the Zoning Code rewrite and usable open space requirements. Since it was really a zoning issue, perhaps a clarification was needed. The reality was that we can't get rid of backyard parking and push everyone out on the street, esp. with too many people trying to park on the street already. The broad-brush approach to this issue was not satisfactory.
- A small business parking permit program should be considered, in terms of economic development and land use conflicts downtown and based on comments from small retail business owners. An update of the 1978 Transportation Plan was needed.
- Re: expanding parking ramp capacity where able and the recommendations on page 81 for more underground parking: Her neighborhood had discussed

Cap Sq North, in which they preferred having the ramp built out to create higher capacity (vs. residential parking there), which would provide better use for the neighborhood, for winter snow parking, etc. In general, no mention was made of spending money to increase available ramp parking.

- More bike parking was needed (beyond commercial areas) in residential areas downtown, where people were tripping over bikes and bikes were being chained to trees and poles.
 - Page 5 - In addition to attracting and retaining businesses, we should do the same for all levels of government. The IRS, some state agencies and now even the CARPC are considering moving from the downtown or have done so.
 - Page 5 - Use of the term Commercial does not distinguish between office and retail uses. These generate different kinds of parking demands so should be discussed and planned for separately.
 - Key # 6 needs to separately discuss visitors from the city or county from visitors from outside the region. Their needs are very different.
 - Page 21 - Government employment is no longer stable for reasons that should be obvious -- work at home and contracting, not to mention deficit reduction need to be mentioned.
 - Page 27 - Consider varying heights on individual blocks to avoid the walled in look.
 - Page 31 - Consider filling in retail gaps like first block of Pinckney ST from Monona Terrace.
 - Page 32 - Drive time map is OK- Add a bike time map too, and even a ped time map.
 - New idea: Mention the need for connection the Alliant center, a major activity center near the downtown that could help retail and reduce parking demand by providing a transit link.
 - Page 73 - Create and airport shuttle in collaboration with the county.
 - Page 73 - Add recommendation to study adding dedicated bus lanes on downtown streets and on key connecting routes to speed up bus service.
 - Page 74 on RTA: Create a representative RTA that grows out of the TPSC and Metro so existing expertise can be tapped. CSOC was intended as a seed for a future RTA getting other communities experience in transit governance.
 - Somewhere in the P. 70s: Add a recommendation to study creating a circulator for all large Kohl center events so that buses can get people to city and UW parking ramps. Tie in with season ticket holder mailings.
 - Pages 77-80 - Consider reducing the downtown as a destination for cars by building all new ramps on the edge of the downtown and adding high frequency circulators to the mix. Create multimodal transportation hubs. See Strasbourg France's model.
 - Madison lacks real time information on where parking is available when people encounter full ramps. Some sort of signage and way finding should be considered.
 - Parking recommendation: Area parking need studies like the one done 10 years ago on west Wash corridor (Bauman administration) should be done when shortages (or surpluses) are observed in the utilities facilities.
 - Mandate TMAs to the extent possible in the zoning code.
- Under Key 6:
- Create a Vision for what a true Multi-Modal system would look like and how it would function in a seamless manner.
 - Not clear what the adopted "Regional Transportation Plan" is referring to. Is this the RTA Plan for Transit?
 - A statement needs to be made in this section that recognizes bicycle commuting as a legitimate mode of transportation.

- Commuting and visitors need to be mentioned in this section—possibly a “Park Once” concept.
- When talking about parking, bicycle parking needs to be mentioned.
- Bicycles and bicycle routes need to be mentioned under “Connections to other Cities”.
- Remember to include Taxi/Cab service when talking about modes/connections.

Transit Service and Recommendations:

- “Connecting the bicycle network” needs to be added along with the goal of separated bicycle lanes.
- Our bus service is not “excellent” at this time because of a lack of appropriate funding. Metro is not able to connect to the outlying areas of the city.

**Changes at the State level (to provide for RTA legislation) need to be a goal
Commuter Rail/Bus Rapid Transit Service:**

- The RTA “Plan for Transit” did not recommend commuter rail—remove that language (they referenced it for the future).
- Accommodations for bicycles need to be added

Circulator Transit Service:

- This needs a different approach because it has not worked in the past. Take a look at B-Cycle to get our hands around how people get around in the DT because on B-Cycle, they can define their own route. B-Cycle needs to be part of this conversation.
- Accommodate bicycles on one-way streets.

Bicycle Facilities:

- Recommendation # 137 should be for ALL STREETS including segregated lanes on busier streets.
- Reference 20 by 2020 as a goal for bicycle commuting
- Separate bicycle lights.
- Talk about visitors, B-Cycle and bike rentals
- Reference partnerships with the Cycling companies that are located in the area and how they can help us build a multi-modal system—Trek, Saris, Pacific Cycle, B-Cycle, Planet Bike.

Wayfinding:

- The use of technology is key to the future of wayfinding

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plans:

- There is too much passive language in this section. Is this part of the vision or not?
- Recommendation #158 is good: Add “Use data gathered from B-Cycle for the DT Circulator discussion along with data from our other partners”.

Following are the comments from Parking staff.

- The Plan recommendation about TIF for public parking was good, because when TIF was provided only to the private sector, the Utility could not readily compete.
- The Plan said nothing about the Utility maintaining its current inventory of parking. If big money was not put into the current aging parking stock over the next 20 years, the Utility would eventually have to lock its doors. A keystone to the UW's transportation plan was to maintain its current inventory of 13,000 stalls, while having all the growth in other modes -- similar to what the City was trying to do.
- Some on-street parking was being lost for various reasons; but certain businesses around town (on Regent and Williamson) could benefit from better turnover on their streets with either 2-hour parking or more meters.

Golden asked that when the motion were drafted, it be sent out to members for review. If needed, they could send any concerns to Poulson who could mediate. Maniaci asked Michael Waidlich of Planning how Planning staff would handle these comments/suggestions. He said that they would probably go through the comments from all the committees, inc. the TPC, and prepare a document that somehow factored the comments for the Plan Commission.

**H. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only
(Most recent meeting minutes attached, if available)**

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

No action was needed on these items.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

I.1. General announcements by Chair (Verbal announcements, for information only)

Poulson mentioned two presentations planned for the February meeting, from B-Cycle and from David Trowbridge about the RFP for the Transportation Plan.

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Subeck asked if there would be a follow-up on the presentation about disabled vets and free fares. Kamp said Metro had met with the key players, who agreed that some data should be collected. So a survey was developed and being circulated among the VA group, which Metro would review; after which they would come back to the group with a recommendation.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Ald. Subeck, to Adjourn at 6:17 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.