

City of Madison

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

	Tuesday, December 7, 2010	5:00 PM	Room 260, Madison Municipal Building 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. (After 6 PM, use Doty St. entrance.)
--	---------------------------	---------	---

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 PM.

Present: 8 -

Chris Schmidt; David E. Tolmie; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 3 -

Brian L. Solomon; Jed Sanborn and Jay B. Ferm

Please note: Streit arrived at 5:10 PM and Schmitz arrived at 5:30 PM, during Agenda Item F.2.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by White, seconded by Hinz, to Approve the Minutes of the October 14, 2010 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS Members of the body should make any required disclosures or recusals under the City's Ethics Code.

20526 Disclosures and Recusals - Transit and Parking Commission

No disclosures or recusals were made.

PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.2.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

E.1. 20402 Parking: October & November 2010 Activity, Rev/Exp and Occupancy Reports, and 2011 Operating Budget - TPC 12.07.10

PLEASE NOTE: This item followed Agenda Item F.2.

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobeloch discussed the November Activity

Report:

• MMB/GE: Work on the high-speed rail station parking had been put on hold. Plans for MMB/GE were continuing however; 1,435 stalls were planned; adding a sixth lower layer of stalls would cost \$11 million.

Multi-space meters: There had been 21K transactions at Buckeye Lot since they opened in September. Less costly than anticipated was the average credit card transaction fee at 15¢ vs. the anticipated 26¢. Higher than expected was the cost of the high-security wireless lines (at \$35 vs. anticipated \$17). Would have a better handle of costs within six months. More meters had been installed in other areas. Solar-powered meters worked just fine, even in 9° weather. A couple of meters had been vandalized, inc. some stall markers.
Vandalism: A total of 29 on-street meters (in Johnson, Langdon, Winnebago areas) had been vandalized in Oct-Nov by folks trying to steal the small amounts of money in them. The robbers were likely to continue until they were caught. Video surveillance cameras were being installed at Buckeye. Other vandalism included \$2,000 in damage to a Bobcat Toolcat at State St Cap, and glue was placed in cabinet locks of automated entry/exit stations there as well. Not sure why there had been so much vandalism. Cameras were being installed.

• Remediation contracts: This was still a work in progress; just found a rusty I-beam at Overture that would need to be replaced.

 \cdot Revenues and occupancies at all facilities were up, Oct. 2010 vs. 2009; expenses were down.

 \cdot Outer Loop improvements in the quadrant between E. Washington to State Street would cost the Utility \$75K, which was unbudgeted. Based on linear frontage feet, Parking would be the largest single payer of assessments for this project.

Three references were made in the budget about not furthering automation.
Things were looking good for 2010 and would end up okay.

PLEASE NOTE: Being 6:00 PM at this point, the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G, the public hearing on Route 38. Once the hearing and action were completed, this report continued as follows.

Knobeloch responded to member questions.

 \cdot Vandalism: Occurred late at night. Though meters contained small amounts of money, it could cost \$500 to repair them. It was esp. costly to fix those in the Atwood area where revenues were so low. Because the multi-space meters were more secure, the effects of vandalism were minimal.

Multi-space meters: Had received some good feedback, but mostly no feedback (which was good feedback). Parking was working to refine certain features on them. The graphics had been redone 3X; and various coin and button options were being tried out, so that when the remaining meters were ordered, they would be set up to suit the customers. For example, identifying one of the buttons as a "maximum" button seemed like a good idea.
Despite low revenues and costly repairs, it was unlikely the single-pole meters at Shenk's Corners would be removed because the businesses there prefer that they stay.

Looking at 2010 revenue charts and occupancy statistics for the third quarter, Knobeloch pointed out the following items:

 \cdot Total revenues YTD through September were 3.78% over budget; Cap Sq North was operating in the high 70%'s, while %'s for Gov East were down slightly, indicating a shift.

		 Meters in the University Area were up significantly (likely due to new 3-hour meters), those in the Campus area (around State St.) were down. 2010 YTD revenues through Sept. were up 8.86% vs. 2009; rate hike occurred half way through 2009. Cashiered revenues YTD through Sept. were up 10.74% over 2009; even more for Oct. at 10.78%. Off-street meters YTD were up 4.80% vs. 2009; slightly less in Oct. at 3.58%. On-street meters YTD were up 9.30% vs. 2009; in Oct., at 7.70%. A reflection of the poor economy, construction hoods were down 21%; and for the first time ever, there had been no revenues at all in 2010 for "Construction Meter Removal". Monthlies were up 2%, and up more in October. Looking at occupancies, the MMB Lot 88 showed increased average weekday occupancy Sept. '09 vs. Sept. '10; however, when looking at revenues and rev/space/day, they were down. Many of these spaces were used by disabled parkers, who parked there at no charge. While Gov East occupancy went from 84% to 75%, the rev/space/day went up, from \$9.24 to \$9.83 – the highest in the system.
E.2.	<u>20403</u>	Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Rider-Revenue, Hybrid, Financial, C/S Reports, 2011 Operating Budget and OT Reports, and WisDOT Transit Efficiency Report - TPC 12.07.10
		 Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp reviewed the reports for the third quarter: Through September, total ridership YTD for fixed routes was up 22K over last year, though Sept. was 44.8K below Sept. 2009. Numbers for the month of October were also below Oct. 2009, and numbers through October 2010 YTD were down slightly from 2009; not sure why, but possibly due to state furloughs and a drop in Campus ridership. Per the American Public Transit Assn., nationwide, transit systems that were Metro's size based on service level were down 2.7%; APTA cited the economy as the reason for this. All accidents YTD were down slightly from 2009 ('09 had reflected a 5-yr low and had garnered a \$200K insurance reimbursement); and inspections were on track. Total fixed route ridership YTD through Sept. was up just 0.2%; without UW routes, it was up 4.2%; Campus routes were being monitored closely, and the numbers shown were considered accurate. Productivity YTD through Sept. was -2.24%; but without UW routes, it was up 1.27%. Paratransit ridership YTD was very even compared to 2009; vehicle accidents were down slightly; and inspections were on track. Operating cost/passenger trip were down both for fixed and for paratransit, driven by fuel savings. On-time performance percentages for all service providers were very good; Cap. Express and Badger Cab would soon stop providing paratransit, and Abby Vans would begin providing service. Cash ridership (through Sept.) was down significantly compared to 2009 and 2008, along with adult and 10-ride tickets, though less so; 31-day pass ridership and unlimited ride pass ridership had both increased, compared to

the past two years, showing a shift to passes.

 \cdot Hybrid buses continued to get 20+% improved fuel economy; soon the report would include the 14 new hybrid buses.

 \cdot Total customer feedback comments YTD were 2,298 vs. 2,528 in '09 and 2,691 in '08; lots of Planning comments in '09 related to route changes, and the number of Fixed Route comments (the bulk of all comments) was roughly the same.

 \cdot With the help of cameras, future reports would differentiate complaints for which the driver was not assigned responsibility.

• Re: Financial Report, total revenues were below budget \$256K, which included \$320K in passenger revenues; however compared to 2009, passenger revenues were up \$488.8K.

• Though short on overall revenues, due to lower expenditures, Metro was just about even on budget through the first three quarters, with a slight contribution to reserves projected.

 \cdot Madison's share of local subsidies was down \$2 million from 2009; this was driven by stimulus funding (with 2010 stimulus funding being applied for), and because of being locked in at \$1.98/gal for fuel.

Metro's contract for diesel was locked in at \$1.98/gal based on quantity/usage; based on projected usage, it looked like Metro would continue to be locked in at \$1.98/gal through mid-late February, which would help the budget next year even if Metro were not able to get such a good price/gallon.
Overtime comparisons showed a drop of 34% in driver overtime for the first three quarters vs. 2009; though other employee categories were higher, total overtime was (still) lower than 2009.

• Contributing to this, Metro had received approval to add drivers, which was helping because they could fill vacancies immediately; plus, they had made some adjustments as to how they worked the extra board, which also helped; projections showed this drop in driver OT likely to continue.

 \cdot Looking at Metro's top 20 highest paid employees, there had been significant drops in OT/total YTD pay among the highest paid drivers in 2009 .

 \cdot Re: WisDOT's annual Cost-Efficiency Report comparing systems around the state based on six criteria, Metro continued to be in compliance; this was important because non-compliance (with three of the six criteria) had the potential to impact state funding.

 \cdot Metro was slightly outside the standard deviation on expense/revenue hour, but in many other areas, Metro was significantly better than its peers, esp. for ridership/hour and passengers/capita: Metro had 51.83 passengers/capita vs. the Mean of 20.85 and vs. Lansing (also a State capital) at 35.61.

• The Teamsters contract had been settled; there would be a 3% increase effective the last pay period of 2011, and a 2% increase the last pay period of 2012; it also included some language to modify suspensions and unexcused absences; and some language to equalize and reduce OT hours.

Kamp and Finance Manager Wayne Block addressed questions about the drop in cash fares and 10-ride passes:

· Total revenues for 2010 would be very close to budget.

 \cdot More data was available from the first part of 2010 to help prepare the 2011 budget, which took into account trends in these two areas.

 \cdot Though a 1.5-2% increase in ridership was projected for 2010, it was likely to only break even; the economy and fare increase were factors in this.

 \cdot The 2010 budget was prepared right after the fare increase; staff had to take a shot in the dark as to what would occur; plus, they had just started to see the impact of a changing economy.

 \cdot With a slight increase in ridership at the start of 2010, projections were based on the premise that this would continue; but it didn't, and ridership started to taper off in those categories.

 \cdot Though budgeted too high in those two fare categories, unlimited ride passes came to the rescue.

• Revenues had increased significantly since the fare increase, but the ridership decrease diminished what was anticipated.

 \cdot Between 2009-2010, these fare categories were staying flat, with fluctuations from month to month; it was hard to discern the meaning behind this trend.

While happy about the increase in unlimited ride passes, White hoped that riders without the option of an unlimited ride pass were not being lost, along with others in the community who were paying at the higher rate. She wondered about the impact of the fare increase on them. Kamp thought this a good question. Partially addressing this was the YTD total of 125.9K rides taken through the low-income pass program. White was happy about that, but wondered about other groups of riders outside of low-income.

Scheduling Manager Drew Beck said the counts on the Route 80's relied entirely on the drivers, who punched a key on the fare box to keep a tally. Counts could vary depending on how crowded a bus was. When 30 riders boarded all at once, it was difficult to key the count. Conditions and individual ability also created variability. Staff had started carefully examining data from the eleven Route 80 buses, watching for sharp fluctuations in counts from day to day, and talking to the driver or looking at play-backs, etc. to see what might have happened. Staff was going into much greater detail to monitor this. Kamp added that extensive detours had had a big impact this year. Bergamini agreed the condition of the routes (esp. for 81's and 82's) was certainly a factor, even going into the fall. She mentioned the continuing debate about whether swiping would be better than punching in capturing accurate counts.

Kamp discussed the Teamsters agreement, which had been ratified by the members and approved by BOE. Some provisions included disciplinary measures such as "working suspensions", additional extra board language to manage the distribution of OT, and additional flexibility to use part-timers for school dodgers. Taken collectively, these items will help to manage costs and keep OT in balance. Noting that the agreement had gone to mediation (not arbitration), a couple of the differences between Metro and the Union related to starting the 2% increase at the beginning of 2012 rather than the end; and a provision, which was dropped, that would have put a limit on the amount of OT/week, but the other rules in #10 helped to achieve that goal. The modified package was approved by members, 200+ to 50.

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

PLEASE NOTE: White left the meeting at 6:40 PM during Agenda Item E.2., and was not present for the vote on Item F.1.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. 20290 Amending Sec. 23.05(1), Sec. 23.05(3)(a) and creating Sec. 23.05(4)(e) of the Madison General Ordinances to include vehicular entrances to City parking ramps and prohibiting smoking in all stairwells of City parking ramps and within 10 feet of

the entrance to a City parking ramp.

Knobeloch talked about the impetus behind the resolution, sponsored by Alders Schmidt and Solomon. The grounds around MATC-Downtown had become a tobacco-free zone, and MATC students were now crossing Carroll street to the State St Cap garage to stand and smoke at the vehicle entrances and inside the stairwells. Cigarette butts were being tossed around these areas and stuffed into grates, which were difficult to clean up. MATC administration was willing to talk to the students, but with a revolving student population, they needed help. The resolution would amend the ordinances to add areas within 10 feet of vehicular entrances (most of the frontage of parking garages) to the places in/around garages where smoking was prohibited.

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

PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.3.

F.2. <u>20053</u> Information and Discussion on the Draft Recommendations for the Downtown Plan.

Michael Waidelich, Principal Planner, Planning Division, prefaced the presentation by talking about the five large public meetings starting in Spring 2008 that led to the development of the Draft Recommendations for the Downtown Plan in Fall 2010. Planning had also held dozens of meetings with neighborhood and business associations, community groups and commissions, through which ideas were gathered. Not the Final Plan, the Draft Recommendations contained objectives and goals that would be fleshed in the draft Final Plan, and that were being used in the current review process to solicit comments/suggestions from several plan-oriented commissions, which could be incorporated into the Plan.

Bill Fruhling, Principal Planner, Planning Division, displayed several maps to show the areas covered by the Plan, which focused on the area between Park and Blair Streets between the lakes, but which also took into account adjacent areas (ie., the University, hospitals, east rail corridor and Capitol Gateway) that transportation decisions tried to tie in and make more integral. The Plan had a 25-year planning horizon. With a focus on transportation, Fruhling referred to the "Connections & Linkages" map (on pg. 9), the "Moving Around" section, Objective 2 (on pg. 24), "Objective 6" (on pg. 28) related to parking, and "Objective 9" (on pg 30) related to a comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan.

Many transportation ideas revolved around future passenger rail and land use recommendations, and a proposed Circulator which would cover the east rail corridor and tie adjacent activity and employment areas to Downtown.
 Included were recommendations to improve the Outer Loop, to make it more friendly to pedestrians and bus passengers, with landscaping, lighting, and bump-outs. One portion of the Outer Loop between E. Washington and W. Washington was scheduled for improvements next year, which would include a couple of new bus shelters.

· Ideas included reconstructing parking facilities underground where possible, with mixed uses above; various vacant and surface parking areas were identified as underutilized sites, where development could occur along with parking.

· Certain ideas would be investigated as part of a comprehensive multi-modal

transportation/parking study and plan: for example, the effects of converting some one-way streets back to two-way streets would be studied. The Plan would provide a specific framework for the study.

Fruhling responded to questions from Commission members.

• "Grand corridor concept": E. & W. Washington, MLK Blvd. and Wisconsin Ave. leading up to the Capitol all have extra large right-of-ways (132' vs. 66'). With MLK and E. Wash. done, discussion focused on W. Wash. and Wisconsin Ave. One idea floated for Wisconsin Ave. involved putting a median in the middle of the the street and narrowing the terraces. The recommendation now called for no median, and retaining the wide tree-lined terraces and deep set-backs.

Redevelopment in the W. Washington and W. Mifflin area: Current ideas for this area were the most unsettled, whether to retain the wide terraces, deep set-backs, save most of the houses, and incorporate higher density development in the middle of the blocks and peripheral streets; or whether it should be looked at as part of larger scale redevelopment opportunity.
Comprehensive downtown transportation plan: Studies and the Plan needed to include more metrics/measures (inc. consistent bike and bus counts).
Signage and way-finding: Though Planning had not heard many requests specifically from bicyclists, they had had many requests in general, esp. to help visitors whether traveling on foot, bike or by car.

• Parking recommendations: They did not include a mid-State Street ramp or additional parking on W. Washington. Nothing new was suggested for backyard parking, though it was addressed somewhat within ideas for new development, esp. in the Mifflin area. Where empty spaces in the middle of the blocks were now being used by commuter parking, in the future, they would be designated for residents on a parcel-by-parcel basis.

• Setting priorities and timelines: Planning wanted to keep the Draft short and simple while gathering feedback; afterwards ideas would be fleshed out and priorities/timelines would be set, with a focus on implementation in the Final Plan.

 \cdot Zoning, Parking & Obj. 9 (Transportation Plan): Some Planning staff members were involved in both the zoning rewrite and the Downtown plan. With regard to parking and zoning, the Draft recommended that parking be considered on a case-by-case basis because this seemed to work well now.

• Sustainability: Because this goal cut across all the recommendations, asterisks were placed next to items that related directly to making the Downtown more sustainable.

Members made the following remarks.

 \cdot Hinz felt that the study suggested in Obj. 9 should be identified as a high priority, to be completed before major changes were made in transportation elements.

• Bergamini wanted to get away from the "ad hoc" approach to parking and zoning because she didn't think it worked well. While providing more mass transit infrastructure to the University, it wasn't growing quickly enough to accommodate need; more students were bringing cars onto Campus because they couldn't to get to all the different places they needed to go. It was critical to look at all the studies together in order develop a transit plan where all the pieces were linked; for example, allowing two cars/unit was not enough impetus to improve the bus system.

• Poulson was pleased with the emphasis on improving amenities on the Outer Loop, and wondered how the budget was apportioned to address this. With

seven bus stops and buses being re-routed to the Outer Loop more than 100 times/year, Poulson thought improvements to the Outer Loop should be a priority. Fruhling noted that some work on Outer Loop was beginning next year.

• Poulson thought that verbiage be added to Recommendation 2.2 under "Moving Around" to say, "providing service to the Downtown."

With the many parcels of private property between the Memorial Union and James Madison Park, Bergamini didn't think a lakeside path between Picnic Point and James Madison would become a reality any time soon. Fruhling said that most of the path was already in place already, because easements had been acquired over time. He agreed that because of fewer easements between Lake Street and Wisconsin Avenue, completing this section of the path wouldn't be easy; it would be both politically challenging and expensive. But because access to the lakes was the #1 comment they heard, they wanted to look seriously at the feasibility of this. Noting that the Plan went 25 years out, Schmitz felt that a big idea (like the path) was needed to make it happen. White agreed and said the path was important from a bicycling perspective.

Poulson asked Metro Transit and Parking staff for their comments. Referring to Obj. 6 on pg. 28, Knobeloch said all the items would have some repurcussions for Parking.

 \cdot Re: Item 6.1 calling for no specific parking requirements in the Zoning Ordinance (as is now the case), Parking currently issued RP3 permits. If you had none, folks would still bring their cars. This year, in some areas, four permits were issued for every one space available, which devalued the permits for some people.

· Re: backyard parking, nobody knew how to stop that.

 \cdot Re: Item 6.3, parking wasn't free; there was cost to cleaning up the salt and dirt brought into the ramps, which deteriorated them.

• People also needed to think about the rate restructures, and how low that could remain and still pay for the facilities. Parking had to look at a different financial structure for facilities, because the cost of replacing them had skyrocketed. To go underground at Lake Street would likely cost as much as \$50-60K/stall due to water tables; Parking would need to charge Chicago rates unless it eventually established a new financial structure to support those costs.

 \cdot Parking was already working on some of the other items, such as electric charging stations.

• The draft recommendations for Parking were pretty good overall.

Kamp talked about recommendations under Obj. 9.1 on pg. 30. • Item 6, converting some one-way streets back to two-way: a robust discussion needed to continue, esp. about Wilson Street; not to eliminate anything until options could be fully explored.

• Item 7, Downtown circulator: Having just experimented with this idea with "Route 89", a new circulator would need to be marketed as a different kind of thing, and approached cautiously.

• In general, many of the draft recommendations related to Transit were consistent with items in the Long-Range Transit Plan and discussions at the RTA (such as BRT); the draft captured some of the important key concepts.

Fruhling said that the first full plan would be introduced in the first quarter of 2011, and would again be referred to the Commission and others for review

and feedback.

PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item E.1. at this point.

F.3. 20239 Substitute Resolution: Providing the Wisconsin Department of Transportation with the City of Madison's comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Verona Road/USH 18/151 Project.

PLEASE NOTE: This item followed Agenda Item F.1. Please note also that although the title shown here for Leg. File 20239 indicates Substitute Version 2 (created after this meeting), the Commission considered and made recommendations on the original Version 1 (attached to Leg. File 20239).

Referring to the 8-page compilation of City agency comments, Poulson asked Kamp if the three phases of the WisDOT Verona Plan would help/hinder transit. Kamp said that the Plan was very close to neutral from a time standpoint because travel speed improvements would counter the longer distances that routes would need to go. Metro was comfortable with Stage 1 of the Plan and could support it, esp. if pedestrian access comments would be taken into account.

Bergamini remarked that she had heard a great deal of concern about comments made about Phases 1, 2 and 3 of this project. When asked about having dedicated bus rapid transit lanes, WisDOT responded that it wasn't worth it because there would never be the sort of increase during Phase 1 to justify that. But with the growth in Verona routes and the introduction of the RTA, LRTPC members were disappointed in this response and felt that WisDOT analysis had not delved deeply enough into mass transit possibilities; and a number of the comments about pedestrian facilities seemed to be so basic. People expressed concern that WisDOT was too focused on the movement of cars rather than on the movement of people (whether on bikes, on foot, on buses or in cars). Neighbors were concerned about the impact of the Plan on living conditions, air quality and access to transit. Bergamini was not especially pleased with the Plan.

During further discussion, Poulson thought the Commission comments could express concern that the Plan not preclude the possibility of bus rapid transit, relative to growth in the area and RTA planning. In response to a question, Bergamini said that beyond adding a lane for BRT, the Plan needed to consider the kind of facilities BRT's required, such as shared lanes, pull-outs, bus stops and intersections with ways to get to/from them. Providing dedicated lanes was one issue, but providing adequate bus stops were another. The design didn't provide places where it would be easy to add bus passes with landing pads; and it didn't provide adequate sidewalks. People were expected to go 3/4's of the way around an intersection to get to one point. Markers of BRT's included attractive bus stops that could be used by a lot of people. The area affected by the Plan had many pedestrians (some hidden), including elderly and people with strollers. Facilities needed to be up to snuff.

In summary, TPC members endorsed Metro Transit's portion of City agency comments, and expressed the following recommendations/concerns: • The Plan should not preclude the possibility of bus rapid transit in this corridor, due to increased development between Madison and Verona, and to avoid hindering the RTA planning and decision-making process. • The Plan had no room for the kind of facilities that BRT's require: shared lanes, pull-outs, bus passes with landing pads, easy sidewalk access.

PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item H. and the remainder of the agenda.

G. 6:00 PM - PUBLIC HEARING: To hear comments on proposed change to Route 38 at Groveland Terrace-Pflaum Road

G.1. 20300 Public Hearing on proposed change to Route 38 at Groveland-Pflaum - TPC 12.07.10

PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to this item at 6:00 PM, during presentation of Agenda Item E.1.

Poulson called the hearing to order. Kamp said Metro had revised its proposal. Rather than traveling on Kvamme to avoid the difficult turn at Groveland, as a temporary detour, buses now traveled on Monona Drive. Metro had started the detour in anticipation of winter. (See the attached map for the new alternative.) The Alder for the neighborhood was pleased with the alternative. Metro Scheduling Manager Drew Beck, who rode the #38, said most riders saw the difficulty with the Groveland turn and accepted the change. Asking three times and seeing no registrants, Poulson closed the hearing.

G.2. 20301 TPC Discussion and Action on proposed change to Route 38 at Groveland-Pflaum -12.07.10

A motion was made by White, seconded by Tolmie, to Approve the alternative route change to Route 38, which shifted service on Groveland between Pflaum and Tompkins, to Monona Drive between these two streets. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PLEASE NOTE: At this point, the meeting returned to Agenda Item E.1. to continue Parking's Quarterly Report.

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

07828ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Parking Strategic Plan
Low Income Bus Pass Program Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

No action was needed on these items.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Poulson said that Bill Schaefer would be presenting an update on the TDP and potential routes at one of the upcoming meetings. He also asked Schmitz if she could bring minutes or a report on RTA activities, and maybe figure out a way to get that info to the Commission on a regular basis.

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Schmitz asked to members keep in mind the issue of sustaining City parking ramps long-term; with them falling down, to look at something more wholistic. The future seemed kind of murky; and the issue was connected to RTA work as well.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Schmitz, seconded by Schmidt, to Adjourn at 7:03 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.