



# 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](http://www.madisoncitychannel.com).**

---

Tuesday, February 8, 2011

5:00 PM

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

---

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

**Present:** 7 -

Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Gary L. Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Margaret Bergamini

**Absent:** 1 -

Jed Sanborn

**Excused:** 3 -

David E. Tolmie; Amanda F. White and Jay B. Ferm

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Hinz, to Approve the Minutes of the January 11, 2011 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Please note: Solomon arrived at 5:10 PM, during presentation of Item F.1.

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

### D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Items F.1. and F.2., before returning to Item E.1. and the remainder of the agenda items.

### E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

#### E.1. [21258](#)

Parking: January 2011 Activity Report, Revenue/Expense and Occupancy Reports for Oct-Nov-Dec 2010, and Parking Cashier MOU, Dec. 2010 - TPC 02.08.11

Please note: This item followed Agenda Items F.1. and F.2.

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch talked about the hand-out he distributed, concerning the age of City parking garages and the cost to replace them.

- The cost of building 1,435 stalls (@\$30K/each) at Gov East was \$43 million; Parking had enough in its cash flow (cash/reserves/borrowing capacity) for 600 stalls = \$18 million.

- The next oldest garage, Campus, would cost \$32 million to replace; and there, a new garage could not be built underground due to the water table. Parking hoped to partner with the UW on this, and could complete it in phases.
- When ramps stick around too long, like in Milwaukee, they have to be shut down due to maintenance issues. As reported earlier, the growing costs of repairs in 2010-11 at State St Cap were nearly \$600K.
- As Hinz remarked, plans for Block 88 and 105 should not hinder replacement of Gov East, which was becoming costlier to repair – \$70K this year alone.
- The cost to replace all the aging ramps (= 3,723 stalls) would be \$111.69 million, which had to be considered when doing planning for the next 20-30 years. How high would parking rates have to go to raise this money? They would have to be scary big
- . So, it was important to maintain structures, find partners whenever possible, not overbuild, and keep costs at \$30K/stall.

Schmitz asked if the TPC could have a discussion at some future meeting about the possibility of hiring a consultant to look at existing ramps, and create a long-term plan as to how to sustain them. She wondered, if the RTA passed, how people would get in/out of the central city, and how parking would be affected. Bergamini was glad to hear that Parking intended to have its own consultant to evaluate plans for Blocks 88 and 105. She thought these matters had to be considered from the point of view of maintaining the solvency of the Parking Utility.

Knobeloch then distributed photos of meters and parking facilities after the Feb. 2nd snow storm. The fine, powdery snow got inside the multi-space meters. The snow was removed by blowing it out with an air gun, and all the multi-space machines were up and running by the next day. Pay-on-foot machines at Brayton also worked fine. However, the POM meters didn't fare so well: the domes filled up with snow, which melted and got into the circuitry and created ice at the bottom so canisters couldn't be removed. All meters had some problems, but multi-space meters were easier to fix than POM's.

The total cost to clear the snow was \$60K. Some structures had 4-foot drifts inside of them. Following practices elsewhere, Parking had started barricading off the tops of the ramps during storms. Having not been compacted, the snow was easy to clear later on. Parking waited until third day to clear its roof-top areas (unless spaces were needed). Five Parking supervisors, one cashier and a few other Parking personnel reported to work on Feb. 2nd. All five ramps and Brayton worked with the gates down, which worked out okay.

When asked if the vendor had been contacted to see how the multi-space meters could be better protected, Knobeloch said the snow had entered through the narrow ticket receipt window; and Parking had contacted the vendor to see if the meters could be programmed to stop producing receipts (without shutting the entire machine down). If this was possible, then the receipt slots could be covered during a storm, with a message that said, "No receipt".

Turning to the January Activity and other year-end reports, Knobeloch made the following comments:

- The Brayton Lot deal with the State turned out extremely well.
- An agreement about the 30 shared vans would soon be reached. Members would need to remember the 30 vans when considering all the surface lots in

- the future, since some may park at Wilson or Blair rather than Brayton.
- Since riders themselves split the cost, and while the resident/car pool rate at Brayton of \$121 was reasonable, it was higher than what they paid now, and some vans may go elsewhere.
  - Also pending was a review of the agreement by the Zoning Commission, which could have a changing use issue and require improvements at Brayton; but because Brayton was a “space holder”, Parking didn’t want to spend money for improvements there.
  - New multi-space meters would have a “maximum” button so parkers could immediately purchase the maximum time available at their space (2 or 3 hours) when using a credit card. Those already installed would be retrofitted with this feature.
  - Revenues had increased by 7.66% (\$842K). Even in those months unaffected by 2009 rate increases, revenues were up vs. 2009. This might mean the economy was coming back.
  - Though the report indicated that expenses had decreased dramatically, this should be viewed with caution since year-end expenses were not booked yet.
  - The expense for buying Brayton was an unbudgeted expense in 2011.
  - The MOU with Local 60 outlined the method to be used to fill vacant cashier positions, and was fairly straightforward; both parties were satisfied and glad to have it.
  - YTD Revenues 2010 vs. 2009 thru December, Cap Square North was up 21%, reflecting shift in demand from other lots, as hoped.
  - Buckeye Lot numbers, which reflected before/after multi-space, were up vs. 2009.
  - Cap Square meters were up 22.7%; Monroe and Schenks meters were up, but still didn’t break even; now being 3-hour meters, University Area meters were up 33.5%, but Campus Area closer in were down, prob. due to good bus service there.
  - Actual revenues were 4% higher than budgeted; pretty close, considering budgets were prepared 1½ years before Dec. 31st.
  - Average weekday occupancy 2009 vs. 2010 at Brayton went from 87% to 83%, because rates were raised there and parkers shifted to Cap Sq North, as planned; and Cap Sq North went from 63% to 76%, where many times even the top was nearly full.
  - Gov East went down from 81% to 74% due to higher increases; Overture went up 46% to 52%; with slightly higher rates, cost-conscious customers, and good bus service, State St Cap down from 55% to 51%; also, MATC downtown now had an enormously popular direct shuttle to/from Truax.
  - Though revenues had gone up for monthlies, monthly occupancies had gone down because waiting lists had gone down; it was taking longer to fill vacancies.

When Schmitz asked about plans for putting multi-space meters on the Square, Knobloch said it probably would be a low priority. Each block had four pole meters, and the cost of one multi-space machine at \$8,100 for each set of four would be very costly. And Parkers wouldn’t like to walk if just one multi-space (replacing all the pole meters) were placed on one side of the Square. He did acknowledge that these spaces were valuable; plus multi-space meters could be programmed to set a different cost for each individual space, depending on the demand for it. But he thought the rates for these spaces would have to be extremely high to pay for the cost of several multi-space meters (inc. ATT charges, etc.). He agreed to look at how the multi-space machines costed out over time, to see what the rate at the Square would need

to be. Schmitz thought the meters might be TIF-eligible.

Streit/Schmidt made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [21259](#)

Metro Performance Indicator Reports, Hybrid Stats and Commute Card Map - TPC 02.08.11

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted the following items in Metro's performance indicator reports through year-end.

- Fixed Route: Hours and miles were up compared to 2009, largely driven by the service changes in the last quarter of 2009; annualized, service was up 2% to 2.5%.
- Ridership in Dec. 2010 was up 99K over Dec. 2009; and was up 35K for the year over 2009 (+0.3%), ending at 13,623,461 – the second highest ridership in 40 years.
- Total accidents YTD were down; with chargeable/preventable accidents combined YTD up 2.
- Inspections were on schedule.
- Paratransit ridership YTD was up slightly by 2,110 in 2010 vs. 2009; total accidents were down one.
- Paratransit maintenance numbers were good.
- Paratransit performance indicators showed cancellation rate YTD 2010 vs. 2009 dropped from 17% to 15%; no-shows YTD dropped slightly from 2.2% to 1.9%.
- Abby Vans would be added to the list of providers in January.
- Customer complaints for all vendors and Metro combined were at 435 in 2010 vs. 565 in 2009 – reflecting a nice drop.
- Given early snows in December, on-time performance for was pretty good – above 90% level, which happily was in compliance with ADA; due to a software problem, the 85% shown for Metro Direct might be inaccurate.
- Fixed route productivity report likewise showed ridership up 0.3%; without Route 80's, it was up 4.3%.
- Route 80's had had some problems with counting early in the year, and extensive detours during construction season impacted ridership. Still, Route 80 had the highest productivity, at 92 rides/hour.
- Most routes were on the plus side: core and commuter routes, and routes on the periphery; up 1.5% without Route 80's.

Bergamini pointed out that directly-operated paratransit ridership was down 6,000. She wondered if this was deliberate, if Metro was trying to shift riders to contracted services. Kamp said this was likely due to long-term absences of paratransit drivers. Metro tried to keep balance between contracted and in-house service; Metro was filling some vacancies, so this number could bounce back in 2011. Bergamini then mentioned the insurance premium refund due to low accidents in 2009, and wondered if another would be forthcoming for 2010. Kamp thought that Metro would receive a dividend due to its good accident record; but probably not as large as 2009, due to situations with other members of the mutual insurance company.

Kamp then discussed the other reports.

- Customer Feedback report showed a total of 3,200 for all comments (complaints, compliments, and suggestions) in 2010 – lowest total in last three years; as an aside, Channel 3 had requested some info (under open records) for second half of year based on this report, and Metro would keep members

posted.

- Of the 3,200, paratransit had 478 total comments in 2010 vs. 625 in 2009; fixed route had 2,091 total inputs in 2010, which was the second lowest next to 2007 at 2,051 inputs, a year with a million less rides; it was notable that inputs had stayed relatively constant even though service and rides had increased so much.
- The new hybrids out-performed the most recently purchased 2009 non-hybrid buses, and out-performed the older hybrids, both in terms of fuel economy and in costs for maintenance.
- The Commute Card Participant map showed that most participants were concentrated in the core areas of Metro's service area, which corresponded to where most riders board/alight; participants accounted for 45K-50K rides in 2010.

Hinz/Schmidt made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F. 3. and the remainder of the agenda.

## F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

### F.1. [21105](#)

Authorizing a Joint Master Planning Process with the Marcus/ULI Block 88 Joint venture for a potential convention center hotel and other uses on Block 88, including possible use of the Madison Municipal Building; providing up to \$200,000 to assist in the preparation of the Block 88 Joint Master Plan; authorizing the release of a Request for Proposals for Master Planning for Block 105 (the Government East Parking Ramp site) and a 12-block area of downtown Madison, in conformance with the City's approved TIGER II grant from the U. S. Department of Transportation; and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to sign all documents necessary to start the planning processes.

**George Austin, Chair of the Public Market Square City Staff Team, discussed the resolution and staff team report (attached).**

- The resolution would initiate a coordinated planning process for development of Block 88 (MMB), Block 105 (Gov East), and a 12-block quadrant southeast of the Square, as identified in the approved TIGER II grant (for \$950K) to explore transit-oriented development options for the area.
- The 2011 capital budget included: funding for the larger planning area, with City funds to match TIGER II funding; and 2010 planning funds for planning and reconstruction of Gov East that incorporated concepts for a public market and bike station.
- Another piece of the planning/development in the area was the new Gov East parking garage underneath Block 88 and 105.
- The resolution established a 90-day joint planning effort between the City and Marcus/ULI: to look at how a hotel could be integrated into Block 88, to look at egress issues, connections to the below-grade ramp and pedestrian transit around the site, the potential use of the landmark Municipal Building as portion of a hotel, and the replacement of office space in MMB to other sites within the quadrant.
- The resolution also authorized an RFP to solicit a team, not only expert in parking but also in public market and bike-centered concepts, so all three pieces could be optimized in Block 105.
- This consulting team would use the data from the joint planning process for Block 88, to feed into its work on Block 105, which would start by mid-summer and finish by the end of the year with a Phase 1 report, related to how parking, public market and bike station could be coordinated.

- Various City bodies would then review the report and offer further direction, with Phase 1 parking ramp construction starting in 2012 or early 2013.
- Though parking for a high-speed rail no longer imposed a 2013 deadline, Gov East still urgently needed to be replaced, and the issues of Block 88 and Marcus development rights needed to be understood in relation to the new underground garage.
- Though the economy was not especially good, the time for planning was now, to be in a position to form public/private partnerships in 1-3 years to take advantage of any recovery.

Director of Planning and Community and Economic Development Mark Olinger joined Austin to answer member questions.

- The \$200K for joint planning would come from the Planning budget funds designated for public market planning.
- Marcus seemed committed to the process; having had preliminary discussions with the City in the fall to discuss their level of interest, and now having ULI as a partner to reinforce this interest.
- It was necessary to unlock an understanding of how Block 88 could be developed in order to see how the parking below grade in combination with Block 88-105 should proceed.
- The City would need to spend money independently to do this, if not for partnering to explore the public/private opportunity there.
- With various projects converging on these two blocks, financing would come from several sources: Parking was pursuing planning work for its underground garage; TIF incremental funds were committed to planning/development of these two blocks in the 2011 capital budget; the Block 88 joint planning effort would use a portion of these funds for joint direction of technical studies related to site engineering, parking design, schematic and conceptual development above-grade (inc. how to incorporate MMB into that).
- The City and Marcus have agreed to split these costs, with the City expending out-of-pocket costs today, and Marcus providing in-kind technical in-house staff toward the effort over the next 90 days.
- The \$950 TIGER II funds would not be part of the 90-day effort, but would be allocated for planning Block 105 and the 12-block area (per the RFP process).
- These were just the first steps to understand the related issues, to properly plan and put these projects together, to probably be developed in a 5-7 year period.
- The TIGER money was tied to master planning for Blocks 88-105 and the 12-block transit district (and was not specifically linked to the high-speed rail project).
- The City had a draft cooperation agreement with DOT, who fully expected the City to proceed with an intensive study of the 2 blocks and more conceptual analysis of the larger area.
- Along with the other ideas mentioned earlier (public market, bike station, etc.) was a strong thread in the planning, to look at whether an intermodal facility could work in the area; Parking and Metro staff were on the Staff Team to help give feedback as to whether Metro and/or other intercity buses had the desire or ability to land an intermodal facility within the area.
- Some consideration would also be given to the possibility of a train station at some point in the future.
- The garage could only be built once, and depending on what the mass would be above the parking garage, the 400 stalls originally designated for a rail station could be used by air rights development; so plans for the new MMB/Gov East garage still called for 1,435 stalls, and wasn't a use question so

much as a financing question.

- On a 90-day timeline, Austin would lead the Staff Team to Phase 1.
- The Staff Team included: Planning staff, Mark Olinger, Brad Murphy, Bill Fruehling, Michael Gay, Matt Mikolajewski and Don Marx; Parking's Bill Knobloch, Traffic Engineering's David Dryer and Dan McCormick, Metro's Tim Swoboda, Engineering's Jeanne Hoffmann, Rob Phillips and Chris Petykowski, Anne Zellhoefer from Attorney's, Mario Mendoza from Mayor's, Comptroller Dean Brasser, and EOC's Norman Davis.
- The first 90-day process (for Block 88) would be a City-Marcus-driven process to do the technical planning and produce a report by June.
- This report would then feed into the consulting planner's process (for Block 105), which would have a built-in public comment process throughout Phase 1, to include one public info meeting/month minimum for the public to check in with the consultant and interdisciplinary staff teams, with additional access through a website.

Hinz urged leaders of the process to take care that the resulting plan would facilitate and not constrain Parking from moving ahead with construction of Gov East, without having to wait for an actual development to occur above-ground. Every year, Parking was incurring additional costs for repairs to the ramp. Austin said the Team understood this and the need to quickly provide some info to Parking about potential uses in Block 88 particularly, so construction could begin there first to make sure some parking was available for businesses before Gov East was demolished. Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch later confirmed that 1,435 stalls would be built on five levels underground, and that Parking knew once these were built, the garage could go no deeper. The bottom slab was two feet above the water table (of Lake Monona). He also remarked that Parking would be hiring its own consultants to review the results of the 90-day process.

District 6 Alder Marsha Rummel spoke in support of the resolution. With the area having many unknowns and lots of moving parts, this would be a good for the conversation that had started years earlier, when improvements to MMB had been on hold. She herself was committed to involving the public and to keeping this an open process. In earlier discussions with Marcus, they had felt the market was dead. She took it as a good sign that they were now partnering with ULI, and was glad to participate and see where things led.

Registered in support of the resolution, Chris Schramm of Urban Land Interests (ULI), 10 E. Doty, 53703, was available for questions, but did not speak.

David Knuti, 615 W. Main, 53703, spoke in support of the resolution, and discussed the intercity bus situation. Madison Peak Oil and Madison Bus Advocates had opposed the closure of the Badger Bus terminal, which had left a hole in the facilities in the city and created a negative trend among intercity buses. As warned, the loss created a pile-up on Langdon, and a dispersal of bus service away from its main market. Greyhound had ended up relocating to many places on the periphery before ending up on Langdon, with no ticketing or passenger service facility. To the extent that the plan would contain any multi-modal planning at all, he hoped the planning area could be expanded into the Campus area, to extend down to the old train station (W. Wash. and Bedford) and neighboring areas. He also requested that the City appoint an Inter-city Bus Planner to bring ideas to the table for optimum bus service to the

city. As planning funds become available, this person could advocate for what was needed for inter-city buses.

After a motion by Schmitz/Solomon (below) to recommend adoption of the resolution, members had the following discussion:

- Bergamini expressed concerns. Locating a train and bus station downtown was driven by the high-speed rail funding. At the time, she hadn't thought downtown was ideal for either a train or bus station. She was disappointed that the resolution defined such a limited area, since now, with the loss of the rail, she thought any further planning should include looking at the Yahara Station for an intermodal bus station, esp. with questions about fitting such a station in a space downtown. She was also concerned that the resolution talked about intermodal transit links, but said nothing explicitly about intercity buses.
- Schmidt thought an intermodal center downtown (or close to) was still a good plan, to bring residents and visitors to the downtown would benefit everyone. He hoped the high-speed rail option would come back someday. Nothing had changed regarding the viability of having intermodal options downtown. The boundaries for the 12-block area were tied to the TIGER grant.

A motion was made by Schmitz, seconded by Solomon, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Absent:** 1 -  
Sanborn

**Excused:** 3 -  
Tolmie; White and Ferm

**Ayes:** 5 -  
Solomon; Schmidt; Hinz; Schmitz and Streit

**Abstentions:** 1 -  
Bergamini

**Non Voting:** 1 -  
Poulson

**F.2. [21250](#)**

Update on TDP/RTA and potential transit service expansion in/outside of Madison - presented by Steve Hiniker, RTA Board, and Bill Schaefer, MPO - TPC 02.08.11

**Bill Schaefer from the Madison Area Planning Organization talked about how the Transit Development Plan (TDP) related to the RTA plan.**

- The TDP was a strategic plan intended to be used as a planning and budget guide that the MPO prepared in cooperation with Metro staff about every five years.
- Committee work on the TDP over the past couple of years had produced updated, expanded design guidelines and performance standards for the transit system.
- Then, with the creation of the RTA, the Board shifted its efforts towards developing service scenarios for consideration by the RTA, which became the basis for Draft Phase 1 Plan for Transit (attached).
- With the possibility of an earlier date for the RTA referendum, the focus had shifted again to supporting the effort to develop a conceptual transit plan – the Draft Plan, when it was clear that there wouldn't be time to develop a more detailed plan if there were an earlier date for a referendum.
- Hopefully work would get back to the TDP, the immediate focus of which



would depend on the RTA plan and the referendum. The TDP would address issues beyond the initial service plan for the RTA, but would coordinate with it, to make it as beneficial as possible.

RTA Board Member Steve Hiniker discussed the Draft Phase 1 Plan for Transit prepared by the RTA Board:

- The document was based on a lot of public input, and was still a work in progress.
- It was not a detailed plan (such as the MPO would prepare), but instead reflected a vision of where the RTA would go if a ¼-cent increase in sales tax were approved.
- It also wasn't a budget document, but instead outlined estimated costs and a range of cost based on estimated revenues through a referendum.
- The plan for transit was divided into four parts: Need, Scope, Economic Analysis, and Process.
- Need was demonstrated by regional growth and certain traffic "pinch points" in/around Madison, causing loss of economic activity due to congestion; changes in the need for transit, with a younger population living in the urban center(s) and an aging population.
- Our good bus system could be made better with more resources.
- If Madison and Dane County was going to prosper and compete, it needed more resources for area transit, esp. in the face of looming state funding cuts.

The near-term Scope of the plan over next 3-4 years (Phase 1) sought to integrate and improve existing systems and to expand transit on a regional basis. Improvements and estimated annual costs would include the following:

- 1) Regional Express Bus service to seven neighboring communities and the airport (\$2.5-3.0 million).
- 2) Expanded service to neighboring communities (\$1.5-2.0 million).
- 3) Improvements to service within current Metro service territory, to address pent-up demand and some short-comings; to restore some basic service (previously reduced due to lack of money), to increase frequency of service and better coordinate transfers (\$2.5-3.0 million).
- 4) Additional Park and Rides with features that provide a more seamless connection for people coming into Madison, and facilitate transfers from one mode of transport to another (\$750K-1M).
- 5) Expanded Paratransit Service to parallel expansion of fixed routes (\$500-750K); and improved Specialized Transportation Services for elderly/disabled (\$500K), to address pent-up demand there.
- 6) Modernizing the transit system to be more user and environmentally friendly, with such things as WiFi and "wave" cards, and more hybrids (\$1-2 M).
- 7) RTA participation in studies with the City of Madison to find the best location for an Intermodal Transit Center for intercity and local buses, taxis, bikes (to be built in Phase 2). Ideally, such a facility would be along a fixed route, centrally located.
- 8) Bus stops would be improved to provide more customer amenities, inc. pads, schedule info, bike lockers (\$200-300K).
- 9) Shared Ride Taxi Service would be expanded to 3-4 more communities.
- 10) Planning and administrative services would be set up the RTA (\$250-450K).
- 11) The RTA would participate in studies that might lead to commuter rail and bus rapid transit at a later time; and if advisable, would come back with a referendum for the additional ¼-cent sales tax to fund these items.

Hiniker went on to talk about the Economic Analysis and Benefits.

- The RTA was planning to propose a ¼-cent sales tax which would generate an estimated \$15-\$17 million/year in revenues (based on the % of economic activity within the MPO boundaries).
- Estimated costs for the scope of expanded services would range from \$10.2 million to \$13.5 million.
- The RTA could potentially provide offsets to localities now supporting transit services through property tax/local contribution.
- Measurements and performance standards would be used to evaluate services.

Hiniker outlined the Process used for public input, including community meetings and meetings with local representatives and service providers, as well as email and phone calls. A survey had been conducted in a couple communities. An RTA web site and an Advisory Committee had been set up, and ongoing efforts would be made to keep the general public informed.

Hiniker and Kamp answered member questions:

- The cost estimates included capital costs for improving the Metro fleet, as well as operating costs going forward.
- Costs shown for regional express bus service, whether provided by Metro or contracted out, tried to reflect total costs.
- Costs for improvements to certain existing routes were based on costs used in Metro's budgeting process.
- Though not a budget document or a detailed plan, efforts were made to provide best estimates. For example, different communities might/might not be eligible for various types of special transportation funding, and this was considered along with what would be needed from the RTA to achieve certain elements of the Plan.

Schmitz said the purpose of the draft plan was to show people what they would get (estimated) for ¼-cent tax, and to make it clear that commuter rail (which would require a ½-cent tax) was not part of the plan. Poulson suggested the Plan mention that regional express service opened the possibility for a variety of sizes for buses appropriate to deliver the service (i.e., vans could be used for few riders). He also said that once a referendum passed, the RTA would need to hold discussions with the various transit commissions concerning overlapping jurisdiction and authority. For example, Metro would be a provider and not owned by the RTA. Perhaps an MOU or changes to commission charters would be appropriate. Hiniker pointed out that at least at the outset, the RTA would not be an owner/operator; instead it would contract with existing/new operators. Whether the RTA would eventually become the owner/operator remained to be seen.

Being an informational presentation, no action was needed on the item. Please note: The meeting returned to Agenda Item E.1.

**F.3.**     [21097](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County for the following purposes in the calendar year 2011: (1) providing the Transit Utility with MA Waiver Community Integration Program (CIP) funding; (2) providing Dane County with State 85.20 funding by the Transit Utility for the County's provision of accessible transportation for persons unable to use the Transit Utility's paratransit services within its service area.

**Please note: This item followed Agenda Item E.2.**

Being standard annual contracts, no comments were made on Leg. Files 21097 and 21187.

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

F.4. [21187](#)

SUBSTITUTE: Authorizing the Mayor and 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 2011, and \$12,900 \$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 2011.

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

F.5. [21260](#)

Buses on Langdon Street/Removal of meters - presented by Keith Pollock, Traffic Engineering - TPC 02.08.11

Traffic Engineering (TE) Transportation Operations Analyst Keith Pollock provided background information regarding the decision to remove parking meters from Langdon Street to make room for Greyhound to stop in front of the Memorial Union.

- UW Transportation Services had contacted Pollock in early January to express concerns that Greyhound had started service on Langdon Street on January 7th, adding ten buses on a daily basis.
- They were already concerned about buses double-parked, parked too close to the crosswalk and the general gridlock on Langdon during peak periods.
- Echoing these concerns were Memorial Union staff and two competitors, Van Galder and Badger Bus, who were quite irate that Greyhound would be allowed to stop there.
- In looking for solutions, TE met with Carolyn Hogg at City Attorney's Office, who had submitted a legal finding (to the TPC last year) that TE had some authority in dealing with intercity buses in terms of traffic safety and changing signs.
- But prohibiting a particular intercity bus from serving a particular area or other restrictions would be very problematic legally.
- City Traffic Engineer David Dryer felt this was causing a very serious public safety issue; he worried that for example, a student wearing an iPod could walk out from behind a double-parked bus or a bus parked too close to crosswalk, and be hurt by a vehicle that didn't see the pedestrian coming.
- He felt that something urgently needed to be done; and on January 18th, the new signage and four parking spaces were implemented, to make the most efficient use of the curb space with the stops clearly demarcated to show exactly where the buses were to park.
- Along with a rep from Greyhound, Pollock monitored the new set-up over the following week, which seemed to work out fairly well.
- On Friday afternoon when a lot of students traveled to Milwaukee, Badger Bus had 3-4 buses stacked there at a given time (and spotted one bus that parked in front of a meter and didn't pay).
- Greyhound didn't seem to load a lot of people at the Union so far; Van Galder and Badger Bus still had the lion's share of passengers.
- TE was concerned that Parking would lose a significant amount of revenue

with the removal of the meters (five motorcycle and two vehicle), but felt the safety issue had to be addressed;

- TE was still looking at whether this was a good long-term solution, and was looking for other potential locations for buses to stage; and would welcome any ideas that the Commission had.

Pollock and Knobeloch answered member questions.

- Re: asking buses to pay for the parking spaces, Hogg had said this would be legally problematic; other cities (like New York City) had studied the matter and found that state law (inc. Wisconsin's) would have to be changed.

- The bus companies had purchased bags to cover meters to reserve spaces temporarily last summer during construction on Langdon; but Hogg would have to discuss the legalities of requiring this on an ongoing basis.

- Parking was projected to lose \$67K from these lost meters over 20 years (\$3,350/yr).

Bergamini said she thought buses were obligated to pay for meter spaces; however she recognized the laws were complicated. Being someone who worked at the Union, she thought the current solution would be very temporary, with construction starting on the Union parking lot and the theater wing of the Union. In talking to UW Transportation Services and the Memorial Union, it wasn't yet clear how these projects would be staged/phased.

Lot #1 next to the Union always had issues: It contained loading docks for the Union and the access point for the loading docks for the Pyle Center and Red Gym; 350-400 trucks came through there weekly, some of which frequently had to stack in the parking lot aisles because there were no open parking spots. As a result, Bergamini felt great urgency about finding a location for an intercity site because demand would only increase. Over spring break, charter buses carrying students to other parts of the country would add to the problem. With so many pedestrians, mo-peds, increased Metro service, and traffic conflicts in general, it was important to address the safety issue first beyond the rights of these bus companies to use these facilities.

Pollock noted that the Union had already alerted charter bus companies that they should not park at the Union, but acknowledged that some would probably still do so. Bergamini had seen some charters using 15-minute parking spots to load student for more than two hours. She also observed that paratransit buses used the space in front of the crosswalk, to access nearby ramps to the Union. Poulson added that when Lot #1 became off-limits, parents dropping off students would double-park in the area as well, creating a nightmare. Pollock mentioned how taxis frequently used Lot #1 also.

Knowing what lay ahead, Poulson felt that a more permanent solution was urgently needed. Streit wondered if, in the short term, more parking enforcement in the area could alleviate the problem with double-parking. With the Langdon location so obviously inadequate and the lack of self-monitoring, he wondered if the City was looking at relocating these bus services elsewhere.

Pollock said that unless a bus depot was built and bus companies were required to go there, this was a complicated issue. The bus companies would prefer to stay at the Union unless another location could be found close to the Campus. Streit remarked that Greyhound alone wasn't the problem; all the

companies had changed their business model and now used free street parking. He felt a different location needed to be found, without the volume of pedestrian traffic at the Union. He felt this was the City's responsibility, that eventually there should be no loading on Langdon.

Pollock agreed, and said there was nothing stopping the City from putting meters all the way down Langdon and prohibiting buses from stopping there. Finding another location was the issue. Hinz also agreed, and said that parking should extend all the way down the front of the Union, and that double-parking should really be enforced on the street; which would force the buses to find a different solution themselves instead of creating a problem for the City. Bergamini said that cost of police enforcement was high, but suggested that ticketing could be done by video, by expanding the Police webcam system out from State Street. She was torn about this, because there was a reason people went to the Union to get the buses: It was good customer service for students/staff, centrally located and there was some parking. She reiterated her concern about planning for Block 88/105 because it didn't talk about locating buses there, which was a more urgent matter. Because this was an informational item, no action was needed.

F.6. [21281](#)

Metro: North Transfer Point Roof Panel Issue - TPC 02.08.11

Kamp updated members on Metro's decision to close the passenger area at the North Transfer Point, and two other transfer points with the same roof design. The roof panels at NTP, which weighed several hundred pounds, had become unhinged and were hanging down. (See the attached photos.) Metro had asked City Engineering to inspect the roofs, esp. the fasteners. Trucks had been illegally turning around at the North Transfer Point, and had repeatedly knocked the panels and loosened them. Metro had closed the NTP passenger area for safety reasons. Engineering and the repair company would be inspecting the East and West Transfer Points as well, and a proposal to temporarily close and repair the transfer points was coming before BPW. He wanted the Commission to know what was happening.

G. **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  
Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Parking Strategic Plan  
Low Income Bus Pass Program Committee  
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

No action was needed on these items.

H. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

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

**Poulson had no announcements; and noted the Informational Enclosures.**

**H.2. Commission member items for future agendas - None.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Hinz, to Adjourn at 7:25 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**