



CHAPTER 5 BICYCLE CENTER











Acknowledgments

To best serve the City of Madison, Kimley-Horn assembled a master planning consulting team that is committed to delivering exceptional service and innovative solutions for the Judge Doyle Square project. Kimley-Horn greatly appreciates the collaborative effort of the entire team in the preparation of this document. Team partners and their areas of master planning responsibility are as follows:

- Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. Lead master planning consultant, project management, public involvement, TIA, environmental scoping, parking consulting, structural engineering
- Potter Lawson, Inc. Project architecture, land use master planning, City office space study, project management team
- Urban Assets Lead public involvement, master planning, project management team
- Mobis Transportation Alternatives / Bikestation Bicycle center consultant
- Ken Saiki Design, Inc. Public improvements and streetscape, landscape architecture
- KJWW Engineering Consultants Mechanical, electrical, HVAC engineering consultant
- PSJ Engineering, Inc. Fire protection consultant
- Mortenson Construction Construction cost estimating, construction feasibility consultant
- Charles Quagliana, Architect Historic preservation consultant

Kimley-Horn also appreciates the contributions and partnership of the many City of Madison staff members who contributed to the content and quality of this document. The City of Madison established a Project Team that included key City staff, representing the following agencies and divisions:

- Planning and Community and Economic Development
- Traffic Engineering
- Parking Utility
- (Division of City Engineering) • Metro Transit

- Facility Management

- City Attorney's Office
- Office of the Mayor
- City Engineering
- Monona Terrace Community
 and Convention Center



Contents

This document—**Chapter 5: Bicycle Center**—is a part of the final report summarizing the Judge Doyle Square Master Plan completed in April 2012. The structure and presentation of the final report has been developed to specifically address the many aspects of the master planning process in a manner that can be easily read as a whole or in parts based on the interest and needs of the reader. The final report is separated into an introduction and eight chapters:



Each chapter has been bound separately and includes applicable images, tables, and drawings to provide additional information and documentation. Each chapter can stand alone as a summary document for a particular aspect of the project. When combined, the document provides a comprehensive summary of the significant areas of information gathering, study, planning, and management for the Judge Doyle Square master planning effort.









Chapter 5: Bicycle Center

Introduction

The City of Madison has a long history of sustainability and community involvement, as evidenced by the nationally recognized Dane County Farmers' Market, numerous co-operative organizations, and yearly celebrations such as the "Rhythm and Booms" 4th of July event. As of 2010, the City of Madison's population was estimated to be 233,209.

In 2006, the League of American Bicyclists recognized Madison as a Gold Level Bicycle Friendly Community. Madison has a well-established street grid system with an everexpanding number of dedicated shared-use lanes along with an integrated network of both existing and planned recreational trails as well as strong education, outreach, and advocacy efforts and organizations.

The Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin is very active in Madison as a strong bicycling advocacy group and facilitator of services such as valet bicycle parking during both City and University of Wisconsin-sponsored events. Additionally, the first annual Bike Madison Spring Fair was held in May 2011 and featured bike education classes and an introduction to the Metro Madison Rack-N-Roll program.



Bicycle Commuters Photo courtesy of the Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin.

The two largest employers in the City are the State Government and the University of Wisconsin. According to interviews with University officials, of approximately 56,000 students, faculty, and staff, 15,000 use bicycles on a daily basis. During multiple site visits within the vicinity of Judge Doyle Square by the consultant team, it was noted that at the State Government buildings at South Webster

and King Streets, more than 100 bicycles appeared to be parked during weekday work periods in the open plaza area between the State Government General Executive Facility (GEF) Buildings 2 and 3.









Overall, the City has a high mode share of bicycling, constituting about 4% of commuting trips citywide and approximately 10% of all Downtown trips during favorable weather.

Purpose of Work

The City of Madison has engaged Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to develop a conceptual master plan for the redevelopment of Block 105, also known as Judge Doyle Square. As part of Phase 1 of this project, Kimley-Horn consultant team member and bicycle center specialist Mobis Transportation Alternatives / Bikestation was retained to investigate, on a conceptual level, the feasibility of including a bicycle center within Judge Doyle Square. The conceptual plan will define the need for secure indoor bicycle parking and other cyclist amenities to most effectively serve the bicycling community, as well as potential cyclists, in Madison. It will also explore, at a high level, possible operational scenarios.

There are currently more than 20 bicycle centers existing and dozens more planned in the United States. A bicycle center can be defined as a facility providing services such as:

- Secure bicycle parking (valet and 24/7 access)
- Transit/bike route information and classes
- Changing rooms/restrooms/showers
- Bicycle and personal lockers
- Bicycle/transit services (bikes on bus, bike lost and found)
- Seminars and community space
- Bike tours/ecotourism

- Bicycle repairs
- Bicycle retail
- Bicycle rental/bike sharing
- Hybrid/electric vehicle sharing (car, NEVs, scooter, bicycle)
- Café
- Internet kiosk
- Bicycle wash station



Growth of this public transportation amenity has grown quickly in the past few years due to recognition that bicycle centers:

- Increase and encourage bicycling as a form of transportation: 90% of facility users are cycling more often
- Are effective at reducing automobile trips and congestion: 50% of facility users previously drove for those trips
- Are an excellent way to connect multi-modal trips, particularly leveraging transit and increasing transit ridership: 62% of users connect to transit due to the provision of services such as secure indoor bicycle parking, since the lack of these amenities is consistently listed in the top three reasons why people don't use a bicycle

The work performed in Phase 1 of this project is solely conceptual or preliminary in nature, and should not be considered as a set of final recommendations. The concepts identified and evaluated from a preliminary standpoint in Phase 1 will be further refined and finalized in subsequent phases (including Schematic Design) of this project.

Phase 1 Scope of Work

Public Involvement

Mobis, as part of the Kimley-Horn team, collaborated to provide multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement, including an online survey, interviews with various stakeholder groups, and public input meetings related to the proposed bicycle center. These opportunities for public involvement ensured that all stakeholders had a role in the planning and design of the bicycle center within Block 105.

Market Study/Best Practices Report: Abbreviated

The Kimley-Horn team prepared a market analysis of existing bicycle-related facilities on a local, regional, and national scale. The type of information gathered included size, usage rates, user fees and fee structures, and programming for similar facilities/ cities. The market analysis included research of existing data sources for the City of Madison, the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission, other bicycle centers nationally, local bicycle-related retail operators, and other sources of information.

Needs Assessment: Phase I

The Kimley-Horn team used our proven methods of evaluation to determine both current and latent demand for secure bicycle parking and other program components of the bicycle center. The selection and manner of incorporation of the final program







components is paramount to the long-term sustainability of the bicycle center. In Phase I, this work will be conceptual. This task evaluated:

- What alternative transportation modes, services, and facilities are needed or desired at the bicycle center
- The extent of each identified need
- Relative priority, if any, of each need
- The best way to integrate many types of commutes with Madison Metro Transit services, the proposed development within Judge Doyle Square, and commercial destinations such as the City Convention Center and surrounding employment centers

Conceptual Bicycle Center Location/Size

Kimley-Horn and Potter Lawson developed a conceptual bicycle center design whose location and size effectively incorporates the program components, enhances the financial and environmental sustainability of the facility, is a visible signal of the City's commitment to bicycling, and maintains safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian circulation patterns. This task broke down into the following subtasks:

- 1) **SERVICE PLAN** Recommended strategies, services, and facilities to serve the needs identified.
- 2) **SPACE PLAN** Identified the amount of space (indoor and outdoor) needed to implement the service plan. The floor plan should be maximized for service to users and financial sustainability.
- 3) **SITE ANALYSIS** Recommended location(s) where the plan should be implemented in relation to the rest of the activities within Block 105. Some considerations included in the site analysis are:
 - a) What facilities are available to meet the identified needs?
 - b) What facilities need to be constructed?
 - c) Where should the facilities be positioned within Block 105?

Preliminary Business/Operations Plan and Cost Estimates

The Kimley-Horn team prepared a Preliminary Business/Operations Plan that includes conceptual capital and operating pro formas, with assumptions regarding staffing requirements, viable operating scenarios, and some interaction with potential operators to determine feasibility. Regarding cost estimates, a capital pro forma is provided that identifies costs to install/construct the final program components. The operating pro forma incorporates multiple data inputs for revenues and expenditures into three 5-year operating scenarios.





Overall Project Deliverables

 Bicycle Center Summary Report (as part of this Master Planning Project Summary Report)

Public Awareness and Input

Mobis, as part of the Kimley-Horn team,

participated in a significant public outreach effort that included meetings with stakeholders, bicycle advocacy groups, media, and the general public. Some meetings were specific to the bicycle center, and some reviewed the progress of the complete project, including the bicycle center. Key meetings the team facilitated are listed below:

- On September 14, 2011, the bicycle center focus group meeting was held to gather input directly from individuals, companies, and other constituencies involved in bicycling within the City.
- On November 8, 2011, team members met with the Downtown Madison, Inc. (DMI) Bike Subcommittee to discuss the results of the final online public needs assessment survey and abbreviated market study.









- Mobis participated in two of the public advisory meetings, which encouraged a variety of stakeholders to provide input on the project. Specific feedback on the bicycle center was sought and obtained at each of these meetings.
- A total of three public meetings were held on September 14, 2011, November 8, 2011, and December 14, 2011 to present the team's conceptual master plan, including the bicycle center, and provide opportunity for public input. With regard to the bicycle center, the goal for these meetings was to procure comments from the general public and possible users of the bicycle center while also creating an opportunity to facilitate informal discussions with potential operators of the



facility. Multiple presentation boards were available for review that provided information regarding conceptual floor plans, programming, and potential service/operational plans available for this facility.

A complete list of the public involvement events is included in Chapter 1: Public Involvement. A summary of the comments provided to the team by the public is provided in Appendix 1-A of that chapter.

Survey Conclusions



 Approximately 52% of survey respondents stated that their primary destination when traveling to/from Downtown Madison by bicycle is their place of employment. Approximately 59% of the survey respondents indicated that their place of employment is 7 blocks or more from Judge Doyle Square/Block 105, yet 82% said that they might or would definitely use the facility.

It can be inferred from this data that while a bicycle center in Block 105/ Judge Doyle Square will clearly be useful for a great number of Downtown bicycle commuters, satellite bicycle parking locations in other areas of





Downtown would also meet with positive response. It also indicates that many survey respondents would find the facility useful during the workday for parking even if it's not their primary parking for their office.

- 2) Approximately 29% of survey respondents stated that they ride a bicycle every day and that it is their primary mode of transportation to work, while another 13% indicated that they ride a bicycle 3 to 4 times per week and also use it as their primary mode of transportation to work. This indicates that a majority of Madison survey respondents are avid cyclists and are also highly multi-modal, switching between car and bike or bike and transit.
- 3) Survey respondents who indicated that their primary destination for traveling Downtown on a bicycle is their place of employment also revealed that their commute to work was a) 0 to 3 miles (28%), b) 3 to 5 miles (36%), and c) 5 miles or more (23%), closely mirroring the results for all Madison bicycle trips.
- 4) Of the respondents who indicated that their primary mode of transportation for errands/social activities is a bicycle, approximately 46% traveled a distance of 0 to 3 miles, 51% traveled a distance of 3 to 5 miles, and 17% traveled a distance of 5 miles or more. This indicates that errands and social activities generate shorter trips than commutes overall.
- 5) Among male survey respondents, approximately 23% indicated their annual income to be between \$50k and \$75k per year, while 25% of female survey respondents indicated the same income category. Additionally, 18% of male survey respondents indicated their annual income to be between \$25k and \$49k, while 30% of female survey respondents indicated the same information. Mirroring nationwide surveys, this information shows a broad economic demographic of bicycling in Madison.
- 6) Of the approximately 87% of survey respondents who indicated that secure indoor bicycle parking was their highest desired amenity within the bicycle center, 28% also indicated that their place of employment would be their primary Downtown destination when using the Judge Doyle Square bicycle center. Interestingly, approximately 45% of the same survey respondents who chose secure indoor bicycle parking as their highest desired amenity indicated that their primary Downtown destination(s) while using the bicycle center would be social activities.
- 7) The survey respondents represented a wide geographic and demographic distribution.







Additional Survey Data



Note: City of Madison respondents indicated a high willingness to pay for bicycle center services.







City Department/Agency Meetings

Mobis participated in multiple meetings with the City Project Management Team (PMT).

Other Stakeholder Input

The project team received input and responded to individuals and organizations via telephone and email throughout Phase I of the project. Both the Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin and the Downtown Madison, Inc. Bike Subcommittee provided vision documents for the bicycle center (included in Appendix 5-A). All comments and documents have been considered and incorporated into the findings of this report, consistent with other public input.

Local, Regional, and National Perspective

As part of the scope of services for the Judge Doyle Square project, Mobis, as part of the Kimley-Horn team, performed research on select public bike locker programs and public secure indoor bicycle parking facilities in the following categories:

- Greater Madison area
- State of Wisconsin
- North America

Our market study research consisted of phone interviews with the on-site operators and managing agencies of various facilities and programs, Internet research, and review of current data from seven facilities under Bikestation[®] management. A total of two public bicycle locker operators were identified within the Greater Madison area. Currently, there are no public secure indoor bicycle parking facilities in the Greater Madison area. Within the State of Wisconsin, we interviewed numerous officials with the Cities of Milwaukee, Eau Claire, and Oshkosh in addition to the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh campus. There are no public secure indoor bicycle parking facilities in these areas. The City of Milwaukee does have a public bicycle locker program.

From a national perspective, there are numerous public bicycle parking locker programs. We selected seven locations with climates or market size similar to Madison for our research and comparison. We identified a total of 21 secure indoor bicycle parking facilities for the purposes of this report (not all show similar characteristics to Madison).

The data spreadsheet that provides all of the information acquired by the team on both public bike locker systems and secure indoor bicycle parking facilities is included in this report in Appendix 5-B.







The two data tables below provide specific information, including the average number of bike parking spaces available within the highlighted group of facilities and the user fees associated with them. Additionally, our research revealed that the average age of public secure indoor bicycle parking facilities is approximately four years, with an average daily capacity of approximately 45%.

Table 1 provides a summary of the average number of bicycle parking spaces for both public locker systems and secure indoor bicycle parking facilities for all of the facilities researched. The table also includes average fees charged to users: administrative fees (if any) and per hour, daily, monthly, and yearly subscriber fees for use of the facility.

Table 2 focuses on seven of the 21 identified public secure indoor bicycle parking facilities that are similar in climate or market size to Madison. The information highlighted below includes the average number of secure indoor bicycle parking spaces per facility and the average fees charged to users: periodic administrative fees (if any) and per hour, daily, monthly, and yearly subscriber fees for use of the facility.

Table	1:	Bicycle	Locker	Systems	Summary
-------	----	---------	--------	---------	---------

Overall Totals	Greater Madison Area	State of Wisconsin	North America
Average Number of Bike Locker Spaces per System	43	24	591
Average Number of Indoor Secure Bike Spaces per Facility	0	0	136
Average Yearly Administration/ Deposit Fee (all facilities)	\$18	\$0	\$18
Average Hourly Usage Fee for Bike Lockers	NA	NA	NA
Average Hourly Usage Fee for Secure Indoor Bike Parking	NA	NA	\$0.02
Average Daily Usage Fee for Bike Lockers	NA	\$0	NA
Average Daily Usage Fee for Secure Indoor Bike Parking	NA	NA	\$2.85
Average Monthly Usage Fee for Bike Lockers	NA	\$0	\$10.50
Average Monthly Usage Fee for Secure Indoor Bike Parking	NA	NA	\$17.62
Average Yearly Usage Fee for Bike Lockers	\$68	\$0	\$116.25
Average Yearly Usage Fee for Secure Indoor Bike Parking	NA	NA	\$101.33



Table 2: Public Secure Indoor Bicycle Parking Facilities Summary

Totals for National Facilities with Seasonal Climates Similar to Wisconsin											
Facilities include: Chicago, IL; Portland, OR; Washington Cleveland, OH; Seattle, WA; St. Louis, MO; and Toronto	n, DC; , Canada										
Average # of Indoor Secure Bike Spaces per Facility	120										
Average Yearly Administration/Deposit Fee	\$15.63										
Average Hourly Usage Fee	\$0.02										
Average Daily Usage Fee	\$3.17										
Average Monthly Usage Fee	\$19.00										
Average Yearly Usage Fee	\$103.71										
Average 2010 Median Household Income for the 7 Locations	\$49,927										
2010 Median Household Income for the City of Madison, Wisconsin	\$51,288										

In closing, the results of this abbreviated market study should be used as a guide for determining the appropriate fees to charge users of the Judge Doyle Square bicycle center. It is anticipated that evaluation of business/operations plans of other centers will be completed in later phases of this project, to provide a higher level of study and comparison.

Brief Case Studies

As part of our scope of services for the Judge Doyle Square project, Mobis, as part of the Kimley-Horn team, performed research and prepared brief case studies on select public secure indoor bicycle parking facilities in the following cities:

- Washington, DC
- Seattle, WA
- Santa Barbara, CA

Bikestation Washington D.C.

- Opened October 2009
- 1,700 square feet; 124 bike spaces
- Retail, repair, bike rental, changing room, lockers









- Usage rates: 80-95%, seasonal
- Staffing: Staffed 66 hours/week by Bike n Roll Washington DC (bicycle rental/tour operator); 24/7 access via Bikestation membership/technology
- Land: Union Station Redevelopment Corp (USRC)
- Capital expenditures: \$3 million, FHWA and Washington DC Department of Transportation (DDOT)
- Operational expenditures: \$215,000 annually, covered by retail operations, user fees, with DDOT and USRC support in the amount of \$25,000-\$30,000 per year

Seattle Bike Port

- Opened May 2003, closed December 2011*
- 2,100 square feet; 72 bike spaces
- Limited retail, repair, bike rental, changing room, lockers, bicycle advocacy offices
- Usage rate: varied from a high of 80% to a low of 20%
- Staffing: Staffed unknown hours/week by Bicycle Alliance of Washington and JRA (bicycle retailer); 24/7 access via Bicycle Alliance membership



Photo courtesy of Bicycle Alliance of Washington website

- Land: Private
- Capital expenditures: \$750,000, FHWA, FTA
- Operational expenditures: approximately \$175,000 annually, covered by retail lease with support from JRA Bicycles, Bicycle Alliance of Washington, King County Metro, City of Seattle, and Sound Transit. Agency support amounted to approximately \$65,000-\$85,000 per year.

*Closed due to issues with non-profit bicycle advocacy group operation and ongoing agency support.





Bikestation Santa Barbara

- Date opened: May 2007
- 1,360 square feet; 78 bike spaces
- Restrooms, shower, lockers, self-service vending and repair, info center
- Usage rates: 65%-90%, seasonal
- Staffing: unstaffed; 24/7 access via Bikestation membership/technology
- Land: Public; bicycle center space developed as part of new Granada Garage and City offices
- Capital expenditures: \$125,000 (excluding costs of building structure); bond proceeds from garage project
- Operational expenditures: \$35,000 annually, covered by user fees with support from the City of Santa Barbara Parking Department in the amount of \$25,000 per year







Needs Assessment

The objective of this task was to identify and define the variety of needs for the bicycle center in Judge Doyle Square. This is a fundamental element of the study, and subsequent tasks relied upon completion of this assessment.

In addition to securing valuable information through multiple public involvement activities, the team also researched and analyzed multiple documents to prepare this report, including the following:

- Demographic and modes of transportation data in both the 2010 U.S. Census and the American Community Survey
- Maps/reports from multiple sources related to both existing and future bike circulation/parking accommodations in Madison
- 2011 map prepared by the City of Madison Traffic Engineering Division identifying the locations of existing exterior bicycle parking racks Downtown
- Downtown Madison, Inc. survey performed in 2011 that provided data on bicycle ridership and infrastructure in the central business district/Downtown area
- A 2009 phone survey, facilitated by the City of Madison Traffic Engineering Division and an outside company, which provided data on current bicycle ridership and desired infrastructure
- 2011 bicycle counts as captured by the team at multiple intersections in proximity to Judge Doyle Square
- Metro Transit bus station maps and service schedules

The public involvement process offered an opportunity for stakeholders to provide the team with detailed knowledge of the needs, opportunities, and challenges that the bicycle center could encounter. This information was useful for formulating preliminary operating recommendations. Interviews with stakeholders also garnered further understanding of the project's strengths and liabilities and assisted in identifying potential mutually beneficial partnerships.

Assumptions

Though amenities vary widely depending on available space, resources, and programming demand, typical bicycle centers in the United States may include some or all of the following common services in addition to the core service of secure



bicycle parking, whether that be valet (full service by staff) or electronic (self-service, membership-based access):

- Changing rooms
- Showers
- Restrooms
- Lockers
- Bicycling classes and information
- Bicycle retail

- Repair services
- Bicycle rental
- Bicycle sharing
- Vending
- Bicycle advocacy/community space
- Repair stands and tools

The amenities requested by the community of Madison did not vary greatly from the most common, with the exception of a bicycle wash station, which ranked high due to the specific weather and seasonality of the Madison area. Other less common programs/amenities that eventually could be considered as a part of the programming

or in the space, as appropriate, are:

- Valet teams for event parking
- Lost and found bicycle programs
- Employer bicycle fleet maintenance programs
- Car sharing and bike sharing
- O&M agreements

Mobis evaluated existing demand as well as potential for growth based on travel patterns from similar facilities (bike-transit and multi-modal centers). This method was contextualized by analyzing data specific to the City of

Madison via surveys and any available transportation-related documentation, taking into account specific weather and seasonal patterns.

A frequently used method for predicting demand for a use such as the bicycle center is examining existing facilities that share similar community and transit characteristics. These types of facilities have a very high incidence of latent demand ("build it and they will come"). In surveys, more than 50% of Bikestation users were previously









driving automobiles and would still be doing so if not for the available amenities and services. Over 90% of Bikestation users bicycle more often. Furthermore, about 65% of the facility users incorporate public transit as a component of their daily commute.

Each facility has, on average, between 45 and 90 bike parking users each weekday. Like other public services and retail development, bicycle center use takes time to achieve maturity, particularly because it is a new concept. It typically takes up to two years of facility operations to achieve maturity, but that time frame can be significantly accelerated with 1) significant, compelling, and consistent marketing and outreach programs; 2) appropriate location, visibility, and services offered at the facility; and 3) an ideal operating scenario with strong public support and an operator who is focused, professional, and enthusiastic.



As years go by, it is important that marketing and incentive campaigns are continually updated and implemented in order to capture new users and alter transportation habits. It is also important to note that usage growth varies dependent on location and that overall, as alternative transportation modes are gaining in popularity and recognition of these types of centers grow, the adoption curve at new facilities with good location characteristics is shortening.

> Another trend observed by Mobis is that bicycling as a transportation mode tends to be highly seasonal, with usage rising in the spring and summer and dropping during the fall and winter. This can be attributed to weather and daylight during commute periods. When clocks are set forward an hour for daylight savings time in March, ridership to these types of facilities

begins to increase; conversely, when clocks are set back in November, ridership drops off.

Analysis

During site visits between September and November 2011, the project team observed that during conventional weekday work hours, the State Government Buildings located at Doty Street and King Street experience overcrowding and capacity issues

Figure 4-9: 2021 Build PM Peak Hour Turning Movement Volumes



with employee bike parking. There are obviously not enough parking spaces available. There are likely other overcrowding situations related to bicycle parking elsewhere in the Downtown. While this observation indicates an inadequate bicycle parking supply at this location, it can be viewed as a positive indicator of demand for a bicycle center in Judge Doyle Square—many employees and visitors choose to utilize bicycles for transportation purposes.

Through research performed as part of the bicycle center market study, the team confirmed that there are no public secure 24/7 bicycle parking facilities within either the Greater Madison area or the State of Wisconsin. Several key responses in the Bicycle Survey prepared by the team should be noted here. First, the number one requested facility program component was secure indoor 24/7 accessible bicycle parking; restrooms and self-service repair were the second and third most desired amenities, respectively. Second, approximately 52% of survey respondents stated that their primary destination when traveling to/from Downtown Madison by bicycle is their place of employment. Third, approximately 36% of survey respondents indicated that the length of their daily commute by bicycle is between 3 and 5 miles.

During the public involvement process for this project, the team was provided with a vision statement for the bicycle center by both the Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin (BFW) and Downtown Madison, Inc. (DMI). The team appreciates the efforts of BFW and DMI in preparing the vision statements and has included them in this report in Appendix 5-A.

Three key goals for creating the bicycle center are:

- 1. Servicing the needs of the current bicycling community
- 2. Educating and engaging new bicyclists
- 3. Facilitating a strong connection between Madison's Metro Transit system and bicycles as a primary source of transportation

Today, each Metro Transit has a bike rack that can carry a maximum of two bicycles. For those who don't need a bicycle at both ends of their trip, a bicycle center can be a way for transit customers to avoid the full rack problem and the associated wait for the next bus, by leaving their bicycle at the bicycle center. This facility would also leverage and complement the B-cycle bike sharing system that exists in Madison. In most bicycle sharing programs throughout the United States, there is significant overlap between those who own a bicycle and those who use a public bike sharing system.

Traffic counts during weekday p.m. peak hour trips for all modes of transportation, including bicycles, were performed by Kimley-Horn in the vicinity of Judge Doyle Square. This information is provided in Chapter 4: Traffic Impact Analysis. The bicycle count data were incorporated into the bicycle center planning process.





The public involvement process and existing City records and correspondence identified several barriers to bicycling in the Judge Doyle Square area, particularly on Wilson and Doty Streets. It is important to the viability and vibrancy of the bicycle center that barriers to bicycling in the area be addressed successfully. As part of the concept for Judge Doyle Square, multiple streetscape improvements are proposed with an emphasis on creating a "sense of place" as well as more effectively accommodating bicycles and automobiles on South Pinckney Street—this street is envisioned to serve as a key bike connection between the Capitol Square and Monona Terrace. Specifics of the streetscape improvements are included in Chapter 2: Master Planning.

Conclusions

Based upon outreach for this study and the above-mentioned statistics on bike parking availability and usage, Mobis recommends that a total of 150 secure bike parking spaces be allocated within the bicycle center. Approximately 60 of the secure bicycle parking spaces would be constructed in the initial phase. As success dictates, the additional 90 bicycle parking spaces would be constructed in a second/expansion phase. At maturity, this bike center would be in the top three highest capacity bicycle centers in the U.S.

Bike parking facilities are shared-use, meaning that a facility with a capacity of 100 to 150 bicycles could serve between 225 and 300 or more patrons based upon the fact that not every patron rides their bicycle every day. Moreover, the capacity of the conceptual floor plan greatly exceeds even that number, and depending on the eventual operating scenario and actual demand for bike parking versus other services and amenities, bicycle parking could expand significantly further (up to 150 more spaces).

The team has noted that Downtown Madison has an exceptionally high bicycling rate and that the City and the community interest and advocacy groups have highly effective channels for disseminating information. These facts have been incorporated into the overall demand analysis, and these characteristics of Madison undoubtedly will facilitate growing usage of the bike center more rapidly than average.

Demand for the services at the proposed bicycle center can certainly be increased if the facility is effectively marketed to potential users whose needs are not currently served, such as the 70% of survey respondents who indicated that if convenient bicycle services were made available, they would potentially utilize bicycles and/or public transit as primary mode(s) of transportation for their daily work commute. There also appears to be significant demand from individuals who are running errands or going to social activities. In addition, other segments of the population would benefit, such





as recreational bike riders who use the Capital City Trail and those who would not risk parking their bikes using on-street bike racks.

Marketing to larger employers such as the County and State Government offices would be effective to encourage their employees to use the bicycle center, as well as perhaps add an employee benefit akin to the benefits already received for highquality automobile parking. To enhance demand, the project's partners should focus on effective marketing through all available channels. The operating scenarios outline programs and other value-added services to encourage and enable greater use of the bicycle center. Future partnerships with community/advocacy groups such as the Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin could also increase demand for the alternative transportation services offered by the bicycle center.

Finally, when high-speed rail does come to Madison, the bicycle facility will undoubtedly be exceptionally popular to use in conjunction with the nearest rail station, which is envisioned to be located within one block of the bicycle center.



Potter Lawson Success by Design





Concept Plan Development

The objective of this task was to develop a plan for the bicycle center. This task can be divided into the following subtasks:

- a) **SERVICE PLAN** Recommend strategies, services, and facilities to serve the needs identified in the public involvement and needs assessment tasks.
- b) **SPACE PLAN** Identify the amount of space (indoor and outdoor) needed to implement the service plan. The floor plan should be maximized for service to users and financial sustainability.
- c) **CONTEXT WITHIN JUDGE DOYLE SQUARE** Analyze potential positions within Judge Doyle Square to locate the bicycle center, using the following assumptions:
 - i) What existing facilities are available within the City to meet the identified needs?
 - ii) What facilities need to be constructed?
 - iii) Where is the optimum location for the bicycle center in Judge Doyle Square?
- d) CONCEPTUAL FLOOR PLAN Develop illustrations of the site, buildings, and facilities included in the recommended service lan. The recommended facility should elevate the status of alternative transportation and instill pride in the City of Madison. The design should use architecture as part of its street level elevation that serves to effectively promote the bicycle center, is sensitive to the environment, and complements the surrounding land uses.

Conceptual Service Plan

The vision for the bicycle center is one that begins with a sound and flexible service plan that will create a sustainable venture and provide for additional services as needed and warranted. The service plan, i.e., the services offered, plays into the design elements as well. The following conceptual scenarios have been crafted in response to Mobis's analysis and stakeholder feedback:



Table 3: Facility Type: Street-Level Retail Space

Facility Type: Street-Level Retail Space										
Description	An interactive, staffed, or unstaffed secure bicycle parking facility that provides opportunities to engage both current and new bicyclists, including facility user-related retail and repair services. The structure itself will be part of a larger block-sized mixed-use redevelopment.									
Operating Structure	Three operating structures are possible: Public, Private, or Public/Private partnership. Potential operators will be interviewed and evaluated in later phases of this project.									
Long-Term Potential	Central location to integrate bicycles with the Madison METRO public transit system while providing valuable amenities to facility users.									
Operating Hours	Three staff operating scenarios are possible: Unstaffed, limited, or full-time.									
	1) A full-time staff scenario with the following business hours of operation has been analyzed in Task 6:									
	- Summer hours (Apr 1 to Oct 28): Monday thru Friday, 7 a.m7 p.m., and Saturday/Sunday 10 a.m6 p.m.									
	- Winter hours (Oct 29 to Mar 31): Monday thru Friday, 7 a.m6 p.m. and Saturday/Sunday closed									
	2) A limited staff scenario with the following business hours of operation has been analyzed: 7 a.m9 a.m. and 3 p.m7 p.m. weekdays									
	3) Unstaffed with automated subscriber access only									







 Table 4: Program Components: Public Accessible and Access-Controlled

Program Components: Public	Accessible and Access-Controlled
24/7 Secure Bicycle Parking with Access Control System	The option could be available for both staffed valet parking during business hours and after-hours or membership secure access parking. Access control systems create a more flexible and sustainable operating scenario, provide additional service to users, and generate reports to show utilization and other data.
Restrooms and Changing Rooms	Two restrooms will be provided with adjacent changing areas, including lockers.
Self-Service Repair Area	The self-service repair area will consist of a repair stand, a tool box, air pump, and work bench. Air for tires should be provided in both the secure access membership area and near the front door of the retail area—perhaps outside the front door.
Bicycle Wash Station	A bicycle wash station should be positioned in a location that will allow efficient removal of road salt, dust, and other debris prior to entering the secure bicycle parking area.
Lockers	Lockers for personal belongings will be available as part of the changing room area. The recommended size of lockers is 18" x 18" x 18" or 18" x 18" x 24".
Bike-Related Retail or Bike Shop Area Bike Sharing	Two possible scenarios: 1) A limited bike-related retail area that primarily sells components such as bicycle seats, inner tubes, and tires; or 2) A full- service bicycle shop that offers a range of services, from bicycle sales to parts to repair services. A dedicated exterior area for daytime display and operations is necessary. Bike rental and sharing operations/storage could be facilitated in the retail and secure access areas of the bicycle center.
Food Service and Vending	Pre-packaged food and beverage could be integrated into the operations. Vending machine(s) for parts, toiletries, and snacks could be provided within the interior of the facility at a to-be-determined location. Food service can be provided by the adjacent commercial/retail uses developed in Judge Doyle Square.
Transit and Bicycling Information	Metro Transit, the City, and BFW, among others, could have services and materials available to facility users in the form of either an automated kiosk or material display stand. Bicycle maps, safety, City tourism related to the Monona Terrace Convention Center, and other information will be available from an information rack and/or operator staff.



Table 5: Conceptual Space Plan (approximately 3,000 gsf)

Service	Space Required (square feet)
INTERIOR – Secure 24/7 Bicycle Parking	600-1,000
INTERIOR – Future Bicycle Parking Expansion Area	900-1,200
INTERIOR – Facility User-Related Retail	300-1,800
INTERIOR – Two Restrooms, Personal Storage Lockers, and Changing Area	400
INTERIOR – Self-Service Repair and Bike Wash Station	100-200
INTERIOR – Administrative Operations, Mechanicals, and Storage	300-400
INTERIOR – Informational/Educational Meeting Space	200
INTERIOR – Potential Bike Mechanic Area	300
INTERIOR – Bicycling Information Kiosk	10
INTERIOR – Vending Machine Area	50
INTERIOR – Future Expansion/Storage Space	500
EXTERIOR – Short-Term Bike Parking Racks	60
EXTERIOR – Space for Daytime Operations Display	50

Site Analysis

This analysis is based on a single location for the bicycle center on Block 105, as part of the Judge Doyle Square redevelopment. The bicycle center will be positioned at street level with direct frontage on and access to Pinckney Street through a designated curb cut. Pinckney Street is a north-south arterial that connects bicyclists from the Lake Monona Bicycle Trail via Monona Terrace (by means of the Monona Terrace Bicycle Elevator) to Capitol Square. Doty Street, which abuts the northern edge of Block 105, is part of the "Outer Loop" road system that surrounds the Capitol Square. Both Pinckney Street (two-way) and Wilson Street (one-way westbound) offer current and future opportunities to facilitate safe and efficient bicycle circulation. This area currently is a major corridor for bicyclists.

The proximity of significant employers—such as State and County Government offices as well as numerous private sector employers—and bus routes provides a large base of potential users for the bicycle center.



Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.





Conceptual Site Plan





Exterior Lighting

Lighting in public environments contributes to increased personal and property safety as well as a greater aesthetic appeal. Visibility of the facility both day and night will generate interest and use. The sidewalk areas along Pinckney Street, Wilson Street, and Doty Street should have lighting fixtures that provide sufficient illumination to ensure safe and efficient bicycle circulation, especially in the areas adjacent to the parking garage entry/exits. Adequate lighting will provide users with a safe, comfortable environment. Adequate exterior lighting will also deter criminal activity and help identify any problems via review of security cameras.

Exterior Security

Good visibility along Doty and Wilson Streets at the parking garage entrances should be established. Additionally, the exterior and immediate surrounding areas of the bicycle center should have good lines of sight. This will increase the security of the area. Blind spots within or around the bicycle center need to be minimized as much as possible to reduce the potential for conflicting movements between pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles on the surrounding streets.

Interior Lighting

Like exterior lighting, interior lighting is an important component of the bicycle center, both as a retail concept as well as a security feature for clear sight lines, adequately lit security review, and comfort of the user or customer. The lighting inside the bicycle center needs to be bright to ensure a safe, comfortable environment for patrons, while also maintaining a visual presence from Pinckney Street during off-peak hours.

It should be noted that future development phases of this project will further refine the conceptual floor plan. These refinements may include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Facility layout for proper weather-proofing and economy
- Potential retail space fit out with full improvements, dedicated retail entrance, and HVAC
- Dedicated corridor entrance with floor drains directly from exterior to secure access bicycle parking area rather than through retail area to accommodate safe tracking and clean-up of mud, snow, and debris and to minimize wear and tear on other areas of the facility
- Secure access bicycle parking area that would consist of concrete floors and limited climate control







Conceptual Business/Operations Plan and Cost Estimates

The objective of this task was to estimate the cost of implementing the bicycle center concept plan. As part of this task, Mobis prepared conceptual operating scenarios and five-year pro forma budgets for the recommended preliminary service plan. These scenarios and budgets were developed based upon the actual experience and costs of bicycle centers in the United States and contextualized based upon the Madison market and the public outreach and needs assessment tasks of this project. Consideration was given to what level of public investment could potentially be necessary for the operation of the bicycle center. Elements of the cost estimates cover:

- Estimated potential capital and other start-up costs
- Potential operations and maintenance expenses
- Income potential

Capital Costs

Estimated Capital Expenses Budget

The estimated capital expenses include the cost of construction of the facility, as well as those costs associated with operations and programming that will remain in place in the building, no matter what the operational scenario. Some of the specialized components of the bicycle center are discussed below, and access control and security systems are discussed in the Bicycle Center Operations Definitions section of this report.

This capital expenses budget is based upon a fully staffed plus retail opportunity; if an unstaffed scenario is chosen, costs may be reduced by 10-15%. The amount of savings in capital costs is limited because the vast majority of necessary equipment and improvements are required in any scenario. A retailer would supply their own proprietary and/or expendable furniture, fixtures, and equipment.

The estimated total capital and start-up expenses are \$899,163. This includes \$396,750 allocated to this square footage for construction of the building (3,450 square feet at \$115/sq. ft.) and \$120,750 for the cost of building the "white box" or retail sleeve (3,450 square feet at \$35/sq. ft.). The space is usually provided by the developer in a semi-finished condition. It is not typical for these costs to be the responsibility of the sponsor or tenant, but we have included them here for reference of total costs. Bicycle center capital expenses typically are covered by federal, state, regional, and local grants.



Capital Expe	enses (Based	on Floor Pla	n Option No.	2 w/ 1,800 bike-ret	ail-				
operator are	a)					Spor	nsor Estimate	Op	erator Est.
1	Two Tior Dioy	ala raaka				¢	92 500 00	¢	
1	Two-Tiel Bicy	cie lacks	Diaplay			ф Ф	02,500.00	ф Ф	-
2	Exterior Bike		Display)			¢ \$	1,000.00	¢	-
3	Retractible ga	ite between re	pair and memi	ber areas		¢ \$	9,000.00	¢	-
4	Construction	or Retail Sleev	е			¢ \$	517,500.00	ф	-
5	Architecture/	i Station Traincoring (D	ormitting by S	ita Davalanar)		ф Ф	9,000.00	¢	
0	Architecture/	Engineening (P		ite Developer)		ф Ф	9,000.00	¢	-
1	Building Peril		sks and inspec	clions (Cost Paid by	Developel)	ф Ф	3,000.00	φ	-
0	Restrooms (2) hih haan namu	a a tar			ф Ф	10,000.00	φ	-
9	Nop sink and	bib nose con	lector			\$	1,000.00	þ	-
10	Plumbing					\$	4,700.00	\$	-
11	Electrical					\$	15,000.00	\$	-
12	Lighting					\$	5,000.00	\$	-
13	Painting					\$	2,500.00	\$	-
14	Lockers	(2)				\$	2,320.00	\$	-
15	Locker Bench	ies (2)				\$	300.00	\$	-
16	Changing Roo	om Benches (3	3)			\$	450.00	\$	-
17	Janitorial Loci	ker				\$	150.00	\$	-
18	Information De	esk				\$	400.00	\$	-
19	Information He	older				\$	300.00	\$	-
20	FF & E					\$	17,250.00	\$	-
21	Retail Display	Walls and Ha	ardware (Slat v	vall)		\$	1,200.00	\$	-
22	Other retail di	splay fixtures				\$	1,500.00	\$	-
23	Cash Counter	•				\$	4,000.00	\$	-
24	Air Compress	or and Access	sories			\$	600.00	\$	-
25	Work Bench	and Tool Ches	t			\$	3,500.00	\$	-
26	Tools, Repair	Stand & Air P	umps			\$	1,500.00	\$	-
27	Vending Macl	nine (member	area)			\$	3,200.00	\$	-
28	Security Acce	ess System (N	lember Entry	Door)		\$	24,000.00	\$	-
29	Security Card	s (180)				\$	1,080.00	\$	-
30	Internal Video	Security Sys	tem (6 camera	is)		\$	10,000.00	\$	-
31	Internal Secu	rity System for	Entryways,	Windows & Theft		\$	5,800.00	\$	-
32	Telephone Lin	ies				\$	150.00	\$	-
33	DSL Lines					\$	450.00	\$	-
34	Facility Signa	ge				\$	10,000.00	\$	-
35	Wayfinding S	ignage				\$	5,000.00	\$	-
36	Signage Perm	nits				\$	900.00	\$	-
37	Storage Roon	n- Storage Uni	ts			\$	2,000.00	\$	-
38	Office Furnitu	re				\$	-	\$	1,000.00
39	Computer sys	stem				\$	-	\$	5,000.00
40	Marketing					\$	15,000.00	\$	5,000.00
41	Website (mer	nbership and i	nformation)			\$	-	\$	8,000.00
42	Project Mana	gement, incl. o	overhead and a	administration		\$	58,000.00	\$	-
43	Subtotal					\$	838,250.00	\$	19,000.00
44	Contingency	@	5%			\$	41,912.50	\$	-
45				Totals		\$	880,162.50	\$	19,000.00

Estimated total capital and start-up expenses: \$899,163



27



Bicycle Center Operations Definitions

Unstaffed versus Staffed Facility

Three staffing scenarios are currently under consideration for the bicycle center:

1. Unstaffed Facility

- All building program components would be access-controlled on a 24/7 basis

2. Limited Staffed Facility

• Limited staffing responsibilities for the operator, such as a bicycle shop and/or volunteer/non-profit organization

3. Full-Time Staffed Facility with Significant Retail/Repair Component

• Staffing services supplied primarily by a private operator, with oversight management or contractual requirements by an outside public entity such as the City

Staffing would allow for more customer interaction and security, as well as the potential for carrying out an array of public service and/or business activities, such as bicycling information and classes, bicycle retail, repairs, selling transit passes, etc. However, human resource costs are the major cost consideration. Through a controlled access and membership management system, a facility may be unstaffed or can make certain areas accessible 24/7 and still provide high levels of service and security for users for a fraction of the costs of staffing a facility (though options for generating revenue are reduced in parallel).

The controlled access and membership system includes three parts: the physical equipment required for entrance to the facility, the security elements, and the back-office administration of memberships. People who want to become a member would go through a sign-up process (typically online) and receive an access device, such as a proximity card or key-fob, which would allow entrance to the secured bike parking area. The member would then swipe his/her access device to enter the facility and proceed to a rack to park and secure their bike. Security cameras and other security elements would be in place to record this process and discourage misuse of the facility.

In an initially conservative or low-resource scenario, by planning for future needs and growth, the facility can be easily converted from unattended operations to a staffed scenario when, and if, usage and funding warrants the expansion.



Staffed Facility: Limited-Time versus Full-Time

Access in a limited-time staffing scenario can be carried out in several ways. The facility can be staffed and accessible only during certain hours of the day, such as morning and evening heavy commute hours. Or it can be accessed by members 24 hours per day with the assistance of security technology, while maintaining a part-time attendant to service the needs of all non-member users.

Phasing

A hybrid scenario to consider is a phased approach to the bicycle center. For instance, the facility could start out as a self-serve, subscriber-only facility and move to a staffed facility at some point in its life cycle, whether that be two years, five years, or 10 years in the future. This scenario is generally used when there is low or uncertain demand for staffed services at the facility and/or a lack of resources to immediately embrace a fully staffed scenario. It allows for lower risk upfront and for growing the market organically.

Administration and Management

The positions of the technology administrator and the day-to-day operator are vital to the success of the bicycle center. The request for proposal (RFP) must list specific criteria that stress the relevant experience, reliability, and professionalism of the vendors to ensure new visitors and users experience an environment that is consistent, friendly, and clean. There are endless scenarios when both parties will have to coordinate on issues that may arise. Therefore, it is important that the RFP lay out the hierarchical structure so that both parties can clearly communicate and understand the teamwork involved in running a successful bicycle center. Because of the high profile nature of this facility, it is also critical that the administrator/operator recognize the importance of the facility.

The potential roles of the administrator, operator, and City of Madison will be further examined in subsequent phases of this project.

Access Control and Visitor Management and Reporting System

One of the most challenging aspects of launching and operating the bicycle center will be selecting and operating an access control and visitor management and reporting system. Access control is any mechanism by which a system grants or revokes the right to access data or perform some action. In the case of the bicycle center at Judge Doyle Square, access control refers to users' ability to access the secure bicycle parking area. There is a wide spectrum of access control mechanisms that can accomplish this, from something as simple as a user's own padlock to a more complicated computer network system with a universal fare card or oversight by a company specialized in bicycle center user management and operations.



29



Access control systems, visitor management/reporting systems, data transmission, power, reliability, capital cost, and security access-vendor control will be evaluated in depth as part of later project design phases.

Conceptual Operational Scenarios

Scenario A – Private Operator

In private operation, the private sector takes on all the responsibility of operating and managing the bicycle center. This could be either a for-profit enterprise, such as a bicycle retailer, or a non-profit organization such as an advocacy organization. However, as evidenced by the lack of privately funded operations in the United States, private operation is highly unlikely, and usually an unsustainable venture.

There are three main reasons that these facilities tend not to be privately operated land costs, connection to public transit, and lack of a profitable business model. For these facilities to be successful, they need to be located in urban environments close to transit and/or major employment or business destinations. The land in these areas

> tends to be scarce and thus extremely expensive. Whether a private operator purchases or leases land, the costs tend to be prohibitive. Furthermore, secure bicycle parking and other public services do not generate a substantial revenue stream that would encourage the private sector to enter the marketplace. There is, however, a hybrid of this scenario that may be possible for the Madison market, which could entail a private/private partnership between the developer of Block 105 and a retailer. This scenario should be explored.

Advantages of Private Operation

One of the greatest advantages of private operation is that all of the underlying responsibilities and costs associated with provision of the bicycle center would be transferred to the private sector. If a financially sustainable market were to exist for a bicycle center, competition among various operators would also foster increased customer service and options.

Disadvantages of Private Operation



Private operators would provide services at the strongest market locations from a revenue perspective, and implement pricing structures that might not necessarily coincide with the goals and objectives of the overall transportation system. Additionally, removing





the responsibility of providing these services from the public sector may further marginalize alternative transportation.

Implementation of Private Operations

Since implementation of private operations is an organic process that requires the development of a profitable market for the bicycle center, the public sector's role in implementation is through the encouragement of alternative transportation, thereby increasing the size of the market and number of potential users. This can be used in conjunction with incentivizing developers to create high-quality space for these services.

Scenario B – Public Operator

Similar to public parking, mass transit, and other public services, the bicycle center can be integrated into the operations of an existing public agency, such as the parking utility. Considering the public-benefit nature of these facilities, providing and operating bicycle centers would fit within the public sector's mission.

Advantages of Public Operation

One of the most important advantages of public operation is the acknowledgment that bicycles are part of the transportation system and a service to transit customers, and therefore need to be supported by the public sector. Additionally, the planning required to make public transportation work seamlessly across numerous districts, cities, and counties requires cooperation among various different public agencies. The public sector is accustomed to parking operations, which is the utility to which bicycle facilities are most likely to belong.

Disadvantages of Public Operation

Operation of a bicycle center by a public agency would require multi-departmental cooperation, the institutionalization of program management, and the coordination of maintenance and procurement. With a large public organization that provides hundreds of different services, operating a bicycle center can become a complex and expensive human resources web, so scale of operations is important in a public sector operations scenario. Retail operations would be limited or infeasible in a pure public sector scenario.

Implementation of Public Operations

To implement a public bicycle center, a public agency must first conduct a needs assessment analysis, secure funding, and operate the facility upon opening.

Scenario C – Public/Private Partnership

A public/private partnership is a strategic and mutually beneficial relationship between a public agency and a private enterprise to accomplish a specific objective—in this case, operating a bicycle center.



Potter Lawson





Advantages of Public/Private Partnership

The most significant advantages of a public/private partnership are cost, risk sharing, and project synergy. By partnering with a private organization, the public agency can take advantage of reducing its time commitment and operational oversight on the project while benefiting from the private sector's specialty and business skills. Additionally, if a financial incentive is built into the relationship, the private operator may be more inclined to fulfill the mission of the project (generating increased alternative transportation trips) while also generating increased revenue.

The synergy that can exist between a public and private venture will be strongest when each partner is responsible for areas of the project in which they are most competent. For example, public agencies have experience administering complex funding agreements and grants, which are required for these types of projects, whereas private businesses tend not to have this experience. The private sector usually has the skills necessary to manage hourly wage employees, track inventory, and interact with customers on a regular basis. Working with a private entity that can focus on providing essential services as one of four or five major objectives might increase customer service, help streamline the process, and potentially reduce operating costs.

Furthermore, public agencies can tap into their existing regional marketing and outreach programs, and the private sector can implement grassroots campaigns. Clearly delineating the tasks for which each party is responsible will increase the likelihood of the project's success. Partnering with a private entity to provide for the operations of a bicycle center can also increase the quality of service that the facility provides because of prioritization and streamlining.

Disadvantages of Public/Private Partnership

Some major challenges of a public/private partnership are control, expectations, and performance. Like any project, it is extremely important that all parties understand their role, as well as the goals and objectives for the project. It is important that clear goals and objectives are drafted with a corresponding outline of the incentives, positive and negative, to encourage meeting established benchmarks.

Implementation of Public/Private Operations

The implementation of a public/private bicycle center can take two different approaches. First, the public agency can develop the project and then put the operations of the facility out to public bid through an RFP to secure an operator. Or the public agency can first secure an operator and then develop the project in partnership with the operator. Depending upon the situation, either technique can be effective.

At such a time as potential operators are identified through an RFQ/RFP process, a careful analysis of the potential operator's business plan, financial capabilities, professionalism, and operational strategy for the bicycle center should be performed.



Operating Budget/Pro Formas: Three Staffing Scenarios

SCENARIO 1 – Unstaffed Facility

·																
BUDGET	SUMMAR	Y PROJE	CTIONS - I	MEDIAN C	AS	E STUD	Y SCENARIO									
														Sce	enario:	
Size of Fa	cility	(sqft)	3450		Ma	nager Hour	ly wage @		(hr)		\$16.00			Rer	nt	best
Rent	1	(\$/sqft/Yr)	\$0.00		Sta	ff Hourly w	age @		(hr)	\$11.00				Me	mbership	median
		(\$/sqft/Mo)	\$0.00		Bike Parking Spaces						60			Re	tail	worst
					Dai	ly Member	ship Charge		(use)		\$2.00					
					Mo	nthly Memb	pership Charge		(Mo)	\$	15.00					
					Anr	nual Memb	ership Charge		(Yr)	\$	150.00					
Number of	membership	os paid per n	nonth							_						_
Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun		Jul	Au	g	Sep)	Oc	t	No	/	Dec
39	39	51	57	57	1	54	54	1	54	1	51	1	48	1	39	39
									(T	~			(F		(F '	
					Ŷ	ear One			rear Iwo	Ŷ	ear Inree	1	rear Four	Ŷ	rear Five	
INCOME	Total Mamb	arahin Davar			¢	10 000		¢	20 765	¢	22 024	¢	DE 114	¢	27 625	
	Detail Dent				¢	10,009		¢	20,755	¢	22,031	¢	23,114	¢	27,025	
	Relail, Relia	al, and Repa	Revenue		¢	-		¢	-	¢	-	ф Ф	-	ф Ф	-	
	Deverage ar				¢	-		φ	-	¢	-	φ	-	φ	-	
-					¢	18 860		¢	20 755	¢	22 831	¢	25 114	¢	27 625	
-	TOTAL INC				φ	10,009		φ	20,755	φ	22,031	φ	25,114	φ	27,025	
-			20		¢	(125)		¢	(131)	¢	(138)	¢	(145)	¢	(152)	
	TOTAL COS				φ	(125)		φ	(131)	φ	(136)	φ	(145)	φ	(152)	
GROSS P	ROFIT				\$	18 744		\$	20 624	\$	22 693	\$	24 969	\$	27 473	
					Ψ	10,111		Ŷ	20,021	Ψ	22,000	Ψ	21,000	Ψ	21,110	
EXPENSES	2															
	,															
-	Annual One	rating Costs*			\$	(32 740)	68.06%	\$	(32 029)	s	(33 150)	\$	(34,310)	\$	(35 511)	
	, annuar oper				Ŷ	(02,110)	00.0070	Ŷ	(02,020)	Ŷ	(00,100)	Ŷ	(01,010)	Ψ	(00,011)	
	Total Marke	tina			\$	(7.900)	16.42%	\$	(8,177)	\$	(8.463)	\$	(8,759)	\$	(9.065)	
						(.,)		-	(0,)		(0,000)	-	(-,)	•	(-,)	
	Total Gross	Staffing			\$	(360)	0.75%	\$	(373)	\$	(386)	\$	(399)	\$	(413)	
		January			-	()		-	()		(000)	Ŧ	(000)	-	()	
	Total Profes	sional Fees			\$	-	0.00%	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
	Rent				\$	(12)	0.02%	\$	(12)	\$	(13)	\$	(13)	\$	(14)	
	Total Utilities	S			\$	(4,800)	9.98%	\$	(4,968)	\$	(5,142)	\$	(5,322)	\$	(5,508)	
	Contingency	/**			\$	(2,291)	4.76%	\$	(2,371)	\$	(2,454)	\$	(2,540)	\$	(2,629)	
TOTAL EX	PENSES				\$	(48,103)		\$	(47,929)	\$	(49,606)	\$	(51,342)	\$	(53,139)	
Operator F	Profit Margin	(12%)			\$	(5,772)		\$	(5,751)	\$	(5,953)	\$	(6,161)	\$	(6,377)	
						,					,		,		,	
	Net Operati	ing Income			\$	(35,131)		\$	(33,056)	\$	(32,866)	\$	(32,534)	\$	(32,043)	
* Annual Ope	rating Costs ma	inly include ma	nagement fees	of the access co	ontrol	and security	systems by an outsid	de co	ntractor, and	are ty	pical of facili	ties r	nationwide.			
** Contingence	y includes costs	for Computer u	updates, Dues,	Education. Taxe	s, Tro	avel, Website	Expenses and Extra	neous	Wages.							





33



SCENARIO 2 – Limited Staffed Facility

BUDGE	T SUMMAR	RY PROJE	CTIONS -	MEDIAN C	ASE	STU	OY SCENARIO									
														Sc	enario:	
Size of F	acility	(sqft)	3450		Mana	ager Ho	urly wage @		(hr)		\$16.00			Re	ent	best
Rent		(\$/sqft/Yr)	\$0.00		Staff	Hourly	wage @		(hr)		\$11.00			Me	embership	median
		(\$/sqft/Mo)	\$0.00		Bike	Parkin	g Spaces				60			Re	etail	median
					Daily	Membe	ership Charge		(use)		\$2.00					
					Mon	thly Men	nbership Charge		(Mo)	\$	15.00					
					Annu	ual Mem	bership Charge		(Yr)	\$	150.00					
Number o	of membershi	ps paid per	month													
Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun		Jul	Au	g	Se	c	Oc	:t	No	V	Dec
3	39 39	51	57	57		54	54	ļ	54		51		48		39	39
					Ye	ar One)	Year Two	Y	ear Three	`	Year Four	`	Year Five	
INCOME																
	Total Memb	ership Reve	nue		\$	18,869		\$	20,755	\$	22,831	\$	25,114	\$	27,625	
	Retail, Rent	tal, and Repa	ir Revenue		\$	12,300		\$	13,530	\$	14,883	\$	16,371	\$	18,008	
	Beverage a	nd Nutrition			\$	-		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
	TOTAL INC	OME SUBTO	JIAL		\$	31,169		\$	34,285	\$	37,714	\$	41,485	\$	45,634	
					¢	(405)		6	(424)		(420)	¢	(445)	¢	(450)	
	TUTAL CO	ST OF GOU	05		Э	(125)		¢	(131)	1 2	(138)	¢	(145)	¢	(152)	
CPOSS					¢ ź	31 044		¢	34 154	¢	37 576	¢	11 3/1	¢	15 182	
0110000					ψ、	51,077		Ψ	54,154	Ψ	57,570	Ψ	-1,0-1	Ψ	40,402	
EXDENSE	=9															
	Annual Ope	erating Costs	*		\$	(35 870)	36.65%	s	(35 205)	s	(36 437)	\$	(37 713)	\$	(39 033)	
	/ annual ope				Ψ.	(00,010)	00.0070	V	(00,200)	V	(00,107)	Ψ	(07,110)	Ψ	(00,000)	
	Total Marke	etina			\$	(7.900)	8.07%	\$	(8,177)	\$	(8.463)	\$	(8,759)	\$	(9.065)	
					Ŧ	(.,)			(0,)	-	(0, 000)	-	(-,)	-	(-,)	
	Total Gross	Staffing			\$	(39,441)	40.29%	\$	(40,821)	\$	(42,250)	\$	(43,728)	\$	(45,259)	
						,							,		,	
	Total Profes	ssional Fees			\$	(2,200)	2.25%	\$	(2,277)	\$	(2,357)	\$	(2,439)	\$	(2,525)	
	Rent				\$	(12)	0.01%	\$	(12)	\$	(13)	\$	(13)	\$	(14)	
	Total Utilitie	s			\$	(7,800)	7.97%	\$	(8,073)	\$	(8,356)	\$	(8,648)	\$	(8,951)	
	Contingenc	y**			\$	(4,661)	4.76%	\$	(4,824)	\$	(4,993)	\$	(5,168)	\$	(5,349)	
TOTAL E	EXPENSES				\$ (9	97,884)		\$	(99,389)	\$	(102,868)	\$	(106,468)	\$	(110,194)	
Operator	Profit Margir	า (12%)			\$ (11,746)		\$	(11,927)	\$	(12,344)	\$	(12,776)	\$	(13,223)	
	Net Operat	ting Income			\$ (78,586)	1	\$	(77,162)	\$	(77,636)	\$	(77,904)	\$	(77,936)	
* Annual Op	perating Costs ma	ainly include mo	anagement fees	of the access c	ontrol	and secur	ity systems by an outsi	de co	ontractor, and	are	typical of faci	lities	nationwide.			
** Continge	ncy includes costs	s for Computer	updates, Dues,	Education. Tax	es, Tra	vel, Webs	ite Expenses and Extra	neou	us Wages.							<u> </u>



SCENARIO 3: Full-Time Staffed with Significant Retail/Repair Component

BUDGFT			CTIONS -		ASE STUD	Y SCENARIO			1		1				
202021													Sc	enario [.]	
Size of Fa	cility	(saft)	3450		Manager Hou	Irly wage @		(hr)		\$16.00			Re	ont	hest
Dize of 1 a	lonity	(Sqit)	00 + 00 00 02		Stoff Hourly y			(III) (br)		¢10.00			M	amborshin	bost
Rent		(\$/sqft/Mo)	\$0.00 \$0.00		Biko Darking			(111)		φ11.00 60				stail	modian
		(\$/\$417100)	φ0.00		DIKE FAIKII	Jopaces				00			I NO	tali	meulan
					D 11 M 1			()		<u> </u>					
					Daily Membe	rship Charge		(use)	•	\$2.00					
					Monthly Mem	bership Charge		(Mo)	\$	15.00					
					Annual Memb	bership Charge		(Yr)	\$	150.00					
Number of	fmembershi	os paid per i	month												
Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Au	g	Se	р	Oc	t	No	V	Dec
59	9 59	77	86	86	81	81		81	1	77	-	72		59	59
					Year One		`	Year Two	Y	ear Three	١	ear Four	`	Year Five	
INCOME															
	Total Memb	ership Rever	nue		\$ 28,303		\$	31,133	\$	34,246	\$	37,671	\$	41,438	
	Retail, Rent	al, and Repa	ir Revenue		\$ 208,200		\$	229,020	\$	251,922	\$	277,114	\$	304,826	
	Beverage a	nd Nutrition			\$-		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
	TOTAL INC	OME SUBTO	DTAL		\$ 236,503		\$	260,153	\$	286,168	\$	314,785	\$	346,264	
	TOTAL COS	ST OF GOO	DS		\$ (66,725)		\$	(69,062)	\$	(71,481)	\$	(73,985)	\$	(76,577)	
GROSS F	PROFIT				\$ 169,778		\$	191,091	\$	214,687	\$	240,800	\$	269,687	
EXPENSE	S														
	Annual Ope	rating Costs	e		\$ (46,710)	26.52%	\$	(46,372)	\$	(47,995)	\$	(49,675)	\$	(51,414)	
										,		,			
	Total Marke	ting			\$ (7,900)	4.49%	\$	(8,177)	\$	(8,463)	\$	(8,759)	\$	(9,065)	
-					,			(, ,		(, ,		(, ,		(, ,	
	Total Gross	Staffing			\$ (100.098)	56.84%	\$	(103.601)	\$	(107.227)	\$	(110.980)	\$	(114.865)	
-		J			, (, , , , , , , ,			(, ,		(- , , ,		(-,,		(,,	
	Total Profes	sional Fees			\$ (5.200)	2.95%	\$	(5.382)	\$	(5.570)	\$	(5.765)	\$	(5.967)	
-					(-,,			(-,,		(-,,		(-,,		(-,,	
	Rent				\$ (12)	0.01%	\$	(12)	\$	(13)	\$	(13)	\$	(14)	
					,			()		(-)		(-)		()	
	Total Utilitie	s			\$ (7.800)	4.43%	\$	(8.073)	\$	(8.356)	\$	(8.648)	\$	(8.951)	
					(, ,			(-,,		(-,,		(-,,		(-,,	
	Contingency	/**			\$ (8.386)	4.76%	\$	(8.680)	\$	(8,983)	\$	(9,298)	\$	(9.623)	
		,			+ (-,)		-	(-,)	-	(-,)		(=,===)	-	(*,*=*)	
TOTAL EX	XPENSES				\$ (176 106)		\$	(180 297)	\$	(186 607)	\$	(193 138)	\$	(199 898)	
					φ(110,100)		Ψ	(100,201)	Ψ	(100,001)	Ψ	(100,100)	Ŷ	(100,000)	
Operator	Profit Margin	(12%)			¢ (21 122)		¢	(21.636)	¢	(22 303)	¢	(23 177)	¢	(23.088)	
	i ioni iviai yli	1 (12/0)			ψ (21,100)		φ	(21,000)	ψ	(22,000)	ψ	(20,177)	φ	(20,500)	
	Not Operat	ing Income			\$ (27 464)	1	¢	(10 0 4 2)	¢	5 6 0 7	¢	21 10F	¢	15 004	
	iver Operat				φ (∠1, 401)		φ	(10,042)	Ψ	5,007	φ	24,403	φ	40,001	
* Appurel O	proting Ct-	indu indude :	unggome-t f-	of the groot	patrol and "	L	ida :	optract	 a==	tunical -ff.	1	ontion	-		
** Contingen	erunny Costs ma	for Computer	undatas Du	Education		to Exponence and Exten		uniraciór, and	i ure	турісат от тасі	niiles	nalionwide.	-		
Coningen	cy includes costs	nor Computer	opaales, Dues,	Laucunon, Taxe	sa, muvel, vveDSI	ie Expenses and Extra	meor	us muges.	1		1		1		









Operational Budgeting Assumptions

The operations budget within the pro formas identified above take into consideration the three respective staffing scenarios. The following are assumptions made in each of the budget scenarios:

- Increases in income were represented by a 10% annual adjustment.
- Expense increases were based on the annual inflation rate of 3.5%.
- The membership program included in the income subtotal is for use of secure bike parking at the following possible rates: \$150/yr, \$15/mo, or \$2/day. Locker and changing room access can be an additional cost, but it is currently included in the base membership rates.
- The assumed administrative costs consider an existing intermodal center access control and security systems vendor.
- This scenario assumes no rent to the operator. There are no bicycle parking facilities in the U.S. that charge rent to the operator. It is more typical to address this through a profit-sharing waterfall, if applicable and appropriate.
- Opportunity costs and other costs associated with build-out and rental of the space: Typical triple-net (NNN or lease/rent) for this space would be in the range of \$19-\$23 per square foot. At 3,450 gsf, that equates to \$6,037.50 per month or \$72,450 per year. The space is assumed to be delivered to this tenant in a white box or semifinished state, ready for the build-out listed in the capital expenses section of this document.

Conclusions: Operating/Administrative Scenarios

The net of the operating budgets above is a series of trade-offs—an unstaffed scenario requires lower start-up costs and lower cost in initial years, but revenue potential is lower and ongoing investment by the project sponsor likely will be needed. In the fully staffed scenario, start-up costs are higher, but the possibility exists for a self-sustaining facility in the future.

In subsequent phases of this project, a formal operating scenario will be refined and will take into consideration potential partners, resources, and needs. During subsequent phases, the following will be explored (through interviews):

- 1) Potential operators in the community who could provide ancillary services for the center, such as bicycle advocacy-related programming, bicycle retail or repair, bicycle sharing/rentals, car sharing, snacks, etc.
- 2) Metro Transit and other tourism information
- 3) Corporate or development support/sponsorship
- 4) Government/agency support

It will also lay out potential revenue or profit-sharing models for the City to consider, if applicable.



BICYCLE CENTER APPENDIX 5-A



Vision Statement

Judge Doyle Square Bicycle Station Downtown Madison, Inc. Bicycle Sub-Committee December 2, 2011

Bicycling will play an integral role in the overall place-making vision of the entire Judge Doyle Square project, both on its own and as an anchor for the entertainment district in the immediately surrounding area. Bicycles and bicycling will enhance the project's distinctive Madison personality, aesthetic appeal, sustainability and economic vitality. It will acknowledge bicycling as a legitimate mode of transportation; it will promote/showcase the growing local bike industry; and it will be a model for additional bicycle facilities throughout the greater area.

Commentary notes:

The Judge Doyle Square project is a unique and significant opportunity to better integrate bicycling into the fabric of downtown Madison. Although we are pleased that there will be a bike center, we note that this is an opportunity to think beyond the brick and mortar of the bike center itself.

The bicycle center will help the City of Madison achieve its goal of Platinum Status from the League of American Bicyclists.

We want to challenge Madison's city planners and the project consultants to create a Judge Doyle Square where bicycling is integrated into the broader place-making vision of the entire project.

We do not see a bicycle center as merely a space people park their bikes and then go on to other destinations in the downtown area (although the bicycle center certainly should serve that purpose, in part). What we aspire to is a place-making vision of Judge Doyle Square that can make it (along with the restaurants, clubs, and other destinations in the area immediately surrounding Judge Doyle Square) a cycling destination in its own right. We envision the bicycle center as an integral part of a hub that will attract people of all ages and means to Judge Doyle Square, the adjacent entertainment district, and the downtown area for special events, such as the Farmers' Market, Concerts on the Square, and the Art Fairs On (and Off) The Square.

Madison's cycling population is growing, health conscious and influential. Madison is developing a positive national brand for its bicycling facilities and culture. Bicycle-friendliness helps our city attract and retain its creative class, its young professionals, its families with children, visitors to the area and also makes Madison a more livable city for our older residents who have sold homes and relocated downtown. This is an opportunity for Judge Doyle Square to become Madison's downtown cycling community hub and a multi-modal facility.

When Judge Doyle Square becomes a bike-friendly destination, it will not only support the vitality of the whole project and the entertainment district in the area immediately surrounding the project, but it will also legitimize bicycling as a mode of transportation. People will not only cycle to Judge Doyle Square; they will also spend time and money there. The facility will achieve something that is distinctly Madison.



MEMO

- TO: Karl Sutter, Kimley-Horn; Melissa Huggins, Urban Assets; Andrea White-Kjoss, Mobis; Andrew Wright, Mobis; Ken Saiki, Ken Saiki Design; George Austin, City of Madison; Steve Cover, City of Madison; David Trowbridge, City of Madison; David Dryer, City of Madison; Anne Monks, City of Madison; Rob Phillips, City of Madison
- **FROM:** Amanda White, Associate Director, Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin Members of the Greater Madison Bicycling Advisory Council
- **DATE:** 12/6/2011
- **RE:** Vision for Judge Doyle Square
- **CC:** Tony Fernandez, Arthur Ross, Alder Mike Verveer, Alder Marsha Rummel, Bicycle Pedestrian Motor Vehicle Committee Chair Robbie Webber

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin's (Bike Fed) vision for bicycling improvements in the Judge Doyle Square redevelopment. I have appreciated and enjoyed the opportunity to serve on the project Advisory Committee and to participate in the bicycle focus group.

On behalf of the Bike Fed's 1,500 Madison-area members, I thank the Project Team and the City of Madison for considering bicycling a priority during the project planning process. The project team leaders, especially Melissa Huggins of Urban Assets and Andrew Wright of Mobis, have been professional and responsive in addressing the needs and concerns of the bicycling community. We would, however, urge more detailed surveying and market research be conducted in phase two in order to have the greatest sense of usage patterns and viable price points for a bike center in our local market.

Judge Doyle Square Vision

Judge Doyle Square is located in an area that poses significant dangers and obstacles for bicyclists. Through the Judge Doyle Square redevelopment process the City has an opportunity to rethink not just the building structure but to also plan for safer, more convenient mobility for bicyclists and all street users traveling to and around Judge Doyle Square.

Our vision for Judge Doyle Square is that it will be one of the most bicycle-friendly destinations in the city and it will serve as a hub for bicycling activity and support. By increasing the bikeability and bike amenities of this downtown block, bicycling will significantly contribute to the neighborhood vitality, economic prosperity, and environmental sustainability of this district.

Initial Recommendations

Bicycle infrastructure and connection improvements

Currently, the Judge Doyle Square location is not very bicycle-friendly. There are no bike lanes or bicycle facilities on East Wilson Street, South Pinckney Street and East Doty Street. One-way traffic on East Wilson and East Doty Streets is fast and creates conditions that are not appealing for anyone except the most experienced and confident bicyclists. Because of this, bicyclists often choose to bike on the sidewalk, especially on East Wilson Street. The majority of these sidewalk bicyclists appear to be commuters who are trying to get to the Capital City Trail by Machinery Row. Bicycling on the sidewalk causes safety issues for both bicyclists and pedestrians and we do not support this behavior; however, this is the type of activity that results given the lack of safe bicycle infrastructure options. Therefore, our number one priority for making this area more bicycle-friendly is to add a buffered contraflow bicycle

lane on East Wilson Street that continues on to West Wilson Street and creates a seamless connection for those heading eastbound to the bike path near Machinery Row. This improvement should largely eliminate bicycling on the sidewalk and will encourage more people to go by bike.

Attention should also be focused on improving the convenience for bicyclists moving through the King Street/East Wilson intersection. Because of the downgrade and the signal timing, bicyclists often ride through red lights heading eastbound on King. Better accommodations for bicyclists need to be made in order to discourage this unsafe behavior.

Although bike parking is being provided in the bike center, it is highly important to provide ample parking around the outside of the building too. Outdoor parking meets short-term bike parking need and caters to a different bicycle audience than the bike station will.

We are supportive of the initial design concepts for South Pinckney Street that designate this street as a bike boulevard, improve the visibility of the connection from South Pinckney Street to the bike elevator, and create a contraflow lane on the 100 block of South Pinckney Street.

Bicycle Center

We applaud the City and the Project Team for continuing to plan for a bicycle center in the Judge Doyle Square project. A robust bicycle center is an essential part of transforming Madison into a city that supports 20% of trips made by bike by2020. We already face a significant bike parking deficit downtown. As we move closer to our 20% goal, we must invest in projects like the bike center to meet growing demand.

We envision the bicycle center as a one-stop bicycle support center for a variety of bicyclists. Whether you need a secure place to park, a quick tune-up or information about how to bike in Madison, the bike center should be a place that Madison residents and visitors alike can find a variety of bicycle support. Bike parking should be secure, available 24/7 and include long-term, short-term and event parking options.

The Bike Fed has supported and contributed to Downtown Madison Inc.'s work on providing a vision for the bicycle center. In an effort to reduce redundancy, I refer to the list of amenities provided by DMI.

Visibility of the bicycle center from street level will be essential to the bicycle center's success. Whether there is a bicycle retail center on the main level or the bicycle center is completely underground, there needs to be clear, visible and inviting signage from all directions of the project leading bicyclists to the center.

Given that Madison is in the unique and fortunate position to have a variety of local bike industry and retail businesses, I strongly urge the city to work with these local businesses to supply many of the amenities and parking solutions.

Finally, many successful bike centers across the country and around the world link the bike center to other transportation modes. Many people choose to take transit or drive to the bike center, pick up their bike and ride across town to their destination. This holistic transportation tie should be considered when planning for the center. Those who park their car in the garage should have easy access to the bike center and bus stops should be located as near to the bike center as possible.

Once again, thank you for making bicycling one of the priorities of this project. Please let us know if there is any way we can further assist the great work of the Project Team and the City of Madison.



BICYCLE CENTER APPENDIX 5-B



Public Bicycle Parking Facility Market Study (Abbreviated): Local, Regional & North America Perspective																	
				# Secure Bike		Membership	Yearly	Hourly		Monthly	Yearly						
Facility Name & Address	Data Surveyed	Onanadi	Tupos of Sorvices Offered:	Parking	Utilization/	Required for	Administration	Bicycle Barking Fao:	Daily Bicycle	Bicycle Barking East	Bicycle Barking Foo	Operator Name:	Initial Capital	Sponsor	Operating Subsidu:	Staffad/UpStaffad	Woh site Links
GREATER MADISON-AREA	Date Surveyed.	Opened.	Types of Services Offered.	spaces.	Capacity.	Useage.	ree/Deposit	Tarking Pee.	Tarking Pee.	Tarking Fee.	Tarking Fee	. Operator Name.	Cost.	Name.	Subsidy.	Starred/Unstarred	Web site Link.
PERSPECTIVE																	
Public Bike Locker Programs																	
University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus	Sept. 2011	NA	Enclosed bike lockers (2 bikes each); Waiting list.	130	100%	No	\$10	NA	NA	NA	\$85.00	University	\$45,500	NA	NA	NA	http://transportation .wisc.edu/transportat ion/bike_paidparking aspx
University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus	Sept. 2011	NA	Two (2) bike cages that contain 16 and 11 secure bike parking spaces respectively; Key entry.	27	50%	Yes	\$10	NA	NA	NA	\$65.00	University	unknown	NA	NA	Unstaffed	http://transportation .wisc.edu/transportat ion/bike_paidparking .aspx
West Main Street & South Fairchild Street Location, Madison, WI	Sept. 2011	NA	Bike lockers (1 bike per locker) available to public for rent within public parking garage; Waiting list.	8	100%	No	\$25	NA	NA	NA	\$60.00	Dane County Parking Ramp	unknown	NA	NA	NA	http://www.countyof dane.com/pwht/adm in/parking_ramp.asp x
City/County Office Building on South Carroll Street, Madison, WI	Sept. 2011	NA	Bike lockers (1 bike per locker) available to public for rent; Located at the rear of the building;waiting list.	8	100%	No	\$25	NA	NA	NA	\$60.00	Dane County Parking Ramp	unknown	NA	NA	NA	http://www.countyof dane.com/pwht/adm in/parking_ramp.asp x
Public Secure/Indoor Bike Parking Facilities																	
STATE-WIDE PERSPECTIVE																	
Public Bike Locker Programs																	
City of Milwaukee	Sept. 2011	NA	2 Locations: Bike lockers (1 bike per locker) available for public rent	24	Unknown	Yes	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	City of Milwaukee	unknown	NA	NA	NA	
Public Secure/Indoor Bike Parking Facilities																	
NONE																	
NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE																	
Public Bike Locker Programs																	
City of Minneapolis, MN	Sept. 2011	NA	A total of 29 locations for the bike lockers; Showers are also available with the rental of a bicycle locker at two locations.	249	Unknown	No	\$10	NA	NA	NA	\$75.00	City of Minneapolis	Unknown			NA	http://www.ci.minne apolis.mn.us/bicycles /bikeparking- lockers.asp
Downtown Portland, OR	Sept. 2011	NA	Multiple locations throughout the downtown area.	133	75%	No	\$95	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16.00	\$190.00	Portland Bureau of Transportation	Unknown			NA	http://www.portland online.com/transport ation/index.cfm?&a= 58383&c=34813#Do
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)	Sept. 2011	NA	Lockers available at multiple METRO stops on all light rail lines.	1,272	40%	No	\$10	NA	NA	NA	\$200.00	WMATA	Unknown			NA	http://www.wmata.c om/getting_around/ bike_ride/parking_cf
RTD, Denver, Colorado	Sept. 2011	NA	Available at Park-n-Ride, transit stops and light rail stations.	710	Unknown	No	\$30	NA	NA	\$5.00	\$0.00	RTD	Unknown			NA	http://www.rtd- denver.com/Bike_n_
Public Secure Indoor Bike Parking Facilities																	nucisiti
"Bikestation Long Beach", 1st Street Transit Mall at Promenade Park, 223 East 1st Street, Long Beach, CA	Sept. 2011	1996	24-hour indoor bicycle parking (free during regular business hours), shower/changing rooms, personal lockers, bike rentals, professional repair services, a retail bike shop, self-service bike repair station, free air supply, transit and biycling information and classes	100	50%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$1.00	\$12.00	\$96.00	Bikestation	\$1,500,000	City of Lon Beach, Lon Beach Redevelopr ent Agency	g g \$48,000/y n v	Staffed	http://home.bikestatio n.com/longbeach
"Bikestation Palo Alto", 95 University Avenue, Palo Alto, CA	Sept. 2011	1998	24-hour indoor bicycle parking, bicycle repairs and retail available with operating partner 1 block away and free air supply.	96	75%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$1.00	\$12.00	\$96.00	Palo Alto Bicycles	\$100,000	None	None	Unstaffed	http://home.bikestatio n.com/paloalto

"Bikestation Santa Barbara", 1219 Anacapa Street, Santa Barbara, CA	Sept. 2011	2007	24-hour indoor secure bicycle parking, shower, unisex bathroom, personal storage lockers, self- service bike repair station, free air supply, transit and biycling information and classes and a vending machine with bicycle accessories for purchase.	78	50%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$1.00	\$12.00	\$96.00	NA	\$125,000	City of Santa Barbara	\$25,000/y r	Unstaffed	<u>http://home.bikestatio</u> n.com/santabarbara
"Bikestation Washington DC", 50 Massachusetts Avenue NE, Washington DC	Sept. 2011	2009	24-hour indoor secure bike parking, private changing room, personal storage lockers, daily bike rentals, tours, bike repairs and bike-retail sales.	140	80%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$1.00	\$12.00	\$96.00	Bike and Roll DC	\$3,000,000	District Department of Transportati on	\$25,000/y r	Staffed	http://home.bikestatio n.com/washingtondc
"Bikestation Claremont", 200 West 1st St. Claremont, CA	Sept. 2011	2010	24-hour indoor secure bicycle parking, restroom, changing room, self-service bicycle repair stand and tools, and retail accessory sales. Valet repair service and bike rentals through adjacent bicycle shop.	38	10%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$1.00	\$12.00	\$96.00	NA	\$250,000	City of Claremont	\$24.000/y r	Unstaffed	<u>http://home.bikestatio</u> n.com/claremont
"Bikestation Hillsboro", 265 SE 8th Avenue, Hillsboro, OR	Sept. 2011	2010	24-hour indoor secure indoor bicycle parking, showers, restrooms, personal storage lockers, a bicycle self-repair stand with tools, and public transit information.	42	10%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$1.00	\$12.00	\$96.00	City of Hillsboro	\$400,000	City of Hillsboro	\$10,000/y r	Unstaffed	<u>http://home.bikestatio</u> n.com/hillsboro- oregon-bikestation
"Bikestation Covina", 600 N Citrus Ave, Covina, CA	Sept. 2011	2010	24-hour secure indoor parking	36	10%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$1.00	\$12.00	\$96.00	NA	\$120,000	City of Covina	None	Unstaffed	http://home.bikestatio n.com/covina
"McDonald's Cycle Center", 239 East Randolph Street, Chicago IL	Sept. 2011	2004	24-hour indoor secure bike parking, lockers, showers, changing room, bike repairs, tours, and rentals.	250	50%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$5.00	\$30.00	\$169.00	Bike-N-Roll	\$2,000,000	McDonald's Corporation	Unknown	Staffed	http://www.chicagobik estation.com/
"The Bike Rack", 2148 East 4th Street, Cleveland, Ohio	Sept. 2011	2011	24-hour secure indoor bicycle parking, shower, changing room, personal storage lockers(38), bike rentals and a full service bicycle repair shop.	50	10%	Yes(No- Daily walk- up service is permitted)	\$20	NA	\$5.00	\$25.00	NA	Downtown Cleveland Alliance	\$600,000	Cleveland Clinic	No	Staffed	http://www.clevelandb ikerack.com/
"Seattle Bike Port", 311 3rd Avenue South Seattle, WA	Sept. 2011	2003	24-hour secure indoor bicycle parking, shower, personal storage lockers and a full service bicycle repair shop w/ 24-hour self-service bike stand & tools and a vending machine.	67	20%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$2.00	\$15.00	\$120.00	King County Metro	\$750,000	No	\$15,000	Staffed by Bicycle Alliance of Washington	<u>http://www.bicyclealli ance.org/aboutbaw/bi keport.html</u>
"Downtown Bicycle Station", 1011 Locust Street, St. Louis, MO	Sept. 2011	2011	Indoor secure 20-hour access bike parking, showers and locker rooms. Bike repair and bike-related repair offered by adjacent bicycle sales shop.	120	50%	Yes	\$20	NA	\$5.00	\$20.00	\$150.00	Partnership for Downtown St. Louis	unknown	Multiple:	Unknown	Staffed via adjacent bike shop personnel	http://trailnet.org/dow ntown-bicycle-station
Smart Commute Facilities(3 locations), Hamilton, Ontario, CA	Sept. 2011	2010	Sheltered and secure vertical bike parking racks surrounded by fence attached to steel posts in 3 total locations(59 spaces in all).	60	75%	Yes	\$0	NA	NA	NA	\$50.00	Hamilton Municipal Parking System	unknown	No	No	Unstaffed	http://www.smartcom mutehamilton.ca/en/bi ke/secureparking
2208 Shattuck Avenue, Berkeley, CA	Sept. 2011	1998	24-hour indoor secure bike parking, free valet parking(120 spaces), repairs & sales, rentals	268	50%	Yes	\$20	\$0.03	NA	NA	NA	Alameda Bicycle(Private Operator)	unknown	BART	Yes	Staffed	http://bartbikestation. com/getstarted.php
298 Market Street, Embarcadero, CA	Sept. 2011	2004	Indoor secure bike parking during BART operating hours only, free valet parking, repairs & sales, rentals.	130	50%	Yes	\$20	\$0.02	NA	NA	NA	Alameda Bicycle(Private Operator)	unknown	BART	Yes	Staffed	http://bartbikestation. com/getstarted.php
3301 East 12th Street, Fruitvale, CA	Sept. 2011	2004	Indoor secure valet bike parking, bike repairs, bike-related sales and rentals	200	75%	No	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	Alameda Bicycle(Private Operator)	unknown	BART	Unknown	Staffed	http://bartbikestation. com/getstarted.php
The San Francisco Bike Parking Facility, San Francisco, CA	Sept. 2011	2006	Indoor secure bike parking	180	90%	No	\$0	\$0.00	NA	NA	NA	Warm Planet Bikes	\$700,000	Caltrain	Yes	Staffed	http://www.caltrain.co m/riderinfo/Bicycles/Bi cycle_Parking.html

Tri-Met/Bikelink "Bike & Ride" (Beaverton, Gresham Central and Sunset Transit Locations), Portland, Oregon	Sept. 2011	2011	24-hour indoor secure bike parking	178	10%	Yes	\$5	\$0.02	NA	NA	NA	Trimet/Bikelink	\$1,125,000	None	No	Unstaffed	http://www.trimet.org /howtoride/bikes/bike andride.htm_
Portland State University (PSU)- 4 On-Campus Locations	Sept. 2011	2010	24/7 Secure, ID-card access control bike parking, self-service repair stand with tools and free air supply.	228	40%	Yes	\$5	NA	NA	NA	\$45.00	PSU Transportation & Parking Services Dept.	\$375,000	None	No	Unstaffed	http://www.pdx.edu/tr ansportation/bicycles
"The Bike Cellar", 200 East 5th St, Tempe, AZ	Sept. 2011	2009	20/7 Indoor secure bike parking (4am to midnight), showers, bike mechanic on-site daily, personal lockers and towels available for rent @ additional charge(<i>must be a</i> <i>member</i>).	112	50%	Yes	\$0	NA	\$10.00	\$30.00	\$144.00	City of Tempe	\$500,000	No	No	Staffed	http://www.thebicycle cellar.com/_
"RTC/Bonneville Bike Center", 101 E. Bonneville Way, Las Vegas, NV	Sept. 2011	2010	Indoor secure bike parking (5am- 9pm/7 days per wk), bike-related retail, personal lockers, showers, restrooms, bike rentals and bike safety clinics	86	50	Yes	\$20	NA	NA	NA	\$20.00	Las Vegas Cyclery	unknown	No	No	Staffed	http://www.rtcbikecen ter.com/
"Santa Monica Bicycle Center" (2nd & Colorado/4th & Broadway), Santa Monica, CA	Sept. 2011	2011	Secure, access-controlled indoor bicycle parking, Showers, bathrooms, personal lockers, Bicycle repairs/accessory sales/rentals, Bike/Segway sharing program, Cycling education/safety classes/programs and free valet bike parking.	400	NA	Yes	Unknown	NA	\$3.00	\$25.00	\$150.00	City of Santa Monica/Bike & Park, LLC	\$2 million	City of Santa Monica	Yes	Staffed	http://www.bikeandpa rk.com/city/santa- monica/become-a- member_
OVERALL TOTALS:	Facilities in Greater Madison Area	Facilities in Wisconsin	Facilities in North America														
Average # of Bike Locker Spaces per SYSTEM:	43	24	591														
Average # of Indoor Secure Bike Spaces per Facility:	0	0	136														
Average Yearly Administration/Deposit Fee(ALL FACILITIES):	\$18	\$0	\$18														
Average Hourly Usage Fee for Bike Lockers	NA	NA	NA														
Average Hourly Usage Fee for Secure Indoo Bike Parking:	I NA	NA	\$0.02														
Average Daily Usage Fee for Bike Lockers:	NA	\$0	NA														
Average Daily Usage Fee for Secure Indoor Bike Parking:	NA	NA	\$2.85														
Average Monthly Usage Fee for Bike Lockers:	NA	\$0	\$10.50														
Average Monthly Usage Fee for Secure Indoor Bike Parking:	NA	NA	\$17.62														
Average Yearly Usage Fee for Bike Lockers	\$68	\$0	\$116.25														
Average Yearly Usage Fee for Secure Indoor Bike Parking:	NA	NA	\$101.33														
TOTALS FOR NATIONAL FACILITIES WITH SEASONAL CLIMATES SIMILAR TO WISCONSIN:	Facilities include: Chicago IL, Portland Oregon, Washington DC, Cleveland OH, Seattle WA, St Louis MO and Ontario Canada (7 total)																
FACILITY:	120																
Average Yearly Administration/Deposit Fee:		\$15.63															
Average Houriy Usage Fee: Average Daily Usage Fee:	\$3.17																
Average Monthly Usage Fee:	\$19.00																
Average Yearly Usage Fee:	\$103.71																
for the 7 Locations:			\$49,927														
2010 Median Household Income for the City of Madison, Wisconsin	\$51,288																

Median Household Income per 2010 Census
\$46,781
\$58,906
\$74,660
\$48,325
\$58,990
\$27,761
<u>\$34,065</u>
\$49,927



