



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

Wednesday, April 11, 2012

5:00 PM

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

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM.

Present: 9 -

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

Absent: 1 -

Bridget R. Maniaci

Please note: There is one vacancy on the Commission in the position of Second Alternate. Also, Bergamini arrived at 5:07 PM, during Item E.1.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

After noting a typo on page 17, paragraph 2, where "trail" needed to be changed to "trial", a motion was made by Tolmie, seconded by Schmidt, to Approve the Minutes of the March 14, 2012 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

[Please note: This item followed Item F.4.] Registrant Jill Aruguete, a nurse practitioner at LaFollette High School on Pflaum Road, spoke before the group on behalf of the LaFollette High School (LHS) students who live in the Owl Creek/Liberty Place/Twin Oaks/Lost Creek area. These students had a service route to/from school, but didn't have access to regular service to/from their neighborhood. She had become involved as part of a grass roots effort. Public Health had been doing a community assessment of the area, and at a different event, had sensed the energy in the students living in the neighborhood. As a result, they had asked Aruguete to meet with the students to talk about their neighborhood, which she did starting last fall. The #1 issue for the students was transportation. Aruguete had continued to meet with a smaller workgroup, which was trying different things to get a bus route. A colleague, Bert Zipperer, had advised Aruguete to come to the Commission to talk about the issue. They were also circulating a petition and had 100 signatures so far, which they would continue working on. There was community support for this, even those who had cars, who said they would use a bus if they had access to one. Aruguete thought it was a nice green solution, that might also reduce police calls and other problems in the area.

Aruguete answered questions.

- The problem was lack of service to and from school outside of regular school hours, which had a major impact on academics. Students who missed the bus in the morning missed school that day, and students who needed extra help couldn't attend Homework Club after school, or attend summer school.
- Students also couldn't participate in other activities such as athletics, clubs, youth court, and night/weekend events.
- Parents of many of these students didn't have cars. Students living in the Section 8 housing were probably most affected.
- The neighborhood was very diverse. Liberty Place and Lost Creek were developments with single-family homes. Habitat for Humanity homes were located in the Twin Oaks area. Owl Creek was a loose grouping of duplexes and 4-plexes, with no neighborhood association. Most of the housing was relatively new.
- The area is large and spread out, built around a wetland area. Even if a kid wanted to catch a bus at Dutch Mill, the walk was more than a mile.
- For bikers, Marsh Road was the only path across the Beltline. Marsh Road narrowed down and got curvy towards Siggelkow Road. As an experienced biker, Aruguete didn't feel safe riding on Marsh Road; it wouldn't be safe at all if it were dark.
- She had written a letter outlining some of these issues.
- The students hoped to attend the next Commission meeting.
- They had met with Metro staff, who had estimated a cost of \$600K for "Cadillac" service: every half hour during busy times, every hour after 5-11 PM, and weekends. Students thought they could do with less than that, perhaps to start with just hourly service.

Members made the following comments and suggestions.

- Owl Creek and the Habitat homes formed a fairly low-income pocket in the area.
- It would be helpful for each student to identify exactly what bus service they wanted: when was service needed and where, what days, and why. It would help to determine what usage was anticipated, and whether there was a core constituency.
- As a caution, it hadn't been easy to get additional City service to LHS because of its location next to Monona, which was not part of the system and also because of general budget constraints.
- The neighborhood reflected classic urban sprawl; an isolated pocket located east of Hwy. 51 and south of the Beltline.
- This was a Planning issue as much as it was a Metro issue, which raised certain issues: How were these neighborhoods developing, what kind of size and density were needed to extend bus service there? The Planning Commission among others had approved the neighborhood plan for this area, in part because it would contain some of the most affordable housing in the city. Also, at the time there was talk of service to McFarland. Perhaps, McFarland and Planning should be contacted, to find out what stage of development would warrant service to the area at a low-enough cost to be sustainable. The students were welcome at the May meeting. But it might be at least the June meeting before Planning and Metro staff would be able to provide their info.
- A map of the area would be helpful.
- Info from the Public Health Nurse assessment of the neighborhood would be helpful. The demographics here were different from those of a neighborhood

like Grandview Commons.

Poulson said he would forward to members a copy of the letter Aruguete had sent him that day. He also suggested that she and the students come to the May meeting, perhaps to appear during the public segment of the meeting. And Metro could look again at what they might have. He and other members welcomed the students to attend, and invited Aruguete to forward any written materials to the Secretary ahead of the May meeting. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G.1., to continue discussion on that item.]

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

As mentioned at a previous meeting, Subeck disclosed that she rented monthly parking from the Parking Utility. But (per Michael May) this would not preclude her from participating (in items under G.).

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.1. [25853](#) Parking: March Activity, February Revenue/Expense and Occupancy Reports - TPC 04.11.12

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch introduced his successor, Tom Woznick, who had previous parking experience at the UW and as the Parking Manager at the Dane County Regional Airport, both large operations with budgets of \$17 million.

Knobloch then highlighted the following items:

- After starting out at \$28K/stall and steadily increasing, the cost per stall at Gov East was now estimated at \$41,618. At this level, Parking might have trouble doing Gov East, much less two more ramps.
- Per cash flow analysis, Parking's reserves would go negative in 2016.
- Plans for Gov East would have to be reconfigured. Current plans called for 1,300 and a massing on top. Parking couldn't even afford its own 600 stalls at this cost; but it was better to know this now than when ground was being broken. Certain items on Parking's wish list, like stall markers (with red/green lights) at an additional cost of \$500/stall, simply were not feasible.
- This new stall cost was a game-changer. Parking could not afford the \$131 million to replace three garages.
- Being reviewed and tweaked was a draft RFP to hire a consultant to look at Parking's financial sustainability, inc. finances and business models, ways to max revenues and minimize expenses.
- Like last year, Parking was again partnering with Art Fair on the Square, whereby artists could rent a space at Brayton for \$40 for the whole weekend (Fri. PM through Sunday).
- Parking had a new partner, a big valet service which would be serving a restaurant downtown.
- Twelve meters were being removed from the reserve area of the Brayton Lot, to make more spaces for permit parkers on the waiting list. The hourly section of the Lot would still have ample spaces.

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

E.2. [25852](#) Metro: YTD Performance, Productivity and Financial Reports - TPC 04.11.12

With no questions or discussion, Tolmie/Schmidt made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [25574](#) SUBSTITUTE-Authorizing Metro Transit to transition from a contracted advertising vendor program for bus advertising to an in-house advertising program starting in 2013, using Metro Transit staff by amending the 2012 Metro Adopted Operating budget to create a new 1.0 FTE position tentatively titled "Transit Advertising Sales Representative," in compensation group and pay range of 44-xx, pending a classification determination by the Human Resources department.

Metro Transit General Director Kamp reiterated that the resolution would bring Metro's exterior advertising program in-house. In 2012, Metro would make the minimum contractual amount of \$450K with their current contractor. In a long-range plan passed in 2008, a goal was set for ad revenues to make 1% of Metro's budget, roughly \$530K. In order to do this, Metro proposed bringing the ad program in-house. Staff had researched this idea last year, and hoped to make 2012, the last year of the contract, its transition year by hiring a sales position a couple months early, to begin that process. Kamp noted that BOE recommended amending the resolution to separate the current ad content policy and wrap policy from the main purpose of the resolution, which was to act only on the creation of a new sales position at Metro. (See draft of the proposed changes attached.) Members were pleased to see an idea from Metro's long-range planning being implemented and commended staff for its courage, to put themselves in a position to rely on sales commissions to earn money, and to try to do better with the ad program than was currently being done – the opposite of initiatives to privatize.

A motion was made by Subeck, seconded by Bergamini, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER: Recommend to Adopt Substitute (Version 2), which incorporated the changes proposed by the Board of Estimates. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

[Please note: Without objection, at this point, the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G.1., to accommodate the schedule of a registrant.]

- F.2. [25824](#) Amending the 2012 Operating Budgets of Metro Transit and the Madison Police Department to fund a pilot program expanding the current Transfer Point Safety Initiative to focus more Madison Police Department coverage on the West Transfer Point and appropriating \$20,000 from the Contingent Reserve for this purpose.

[Please note: This item followed initial testimony on Item G.1.] Kamp said that Metro received \$100K in 2009 to begin to have some sort of security presence (whether Police or contract security) at the transfer points. They decided to develop a process with the Police Department. In their first year, Metro did not use that full amount. So in 2010, the amount was reduced to \$50K. Referring to the chart prepared by the Police Department (attached), Kamp said their work with the Police Dept. had been very satisfactory, in terms of beginning to reduce some of incidents at the South Transfer Point. However, there was an increasing number of incidents at the West Transfer Point; and they would use the \$20K to work with the Police on a proposal to beef up security there. They were requesting approval of a budget amendment to accomplish this.

Kamp answered questions.

- "Incidents" were those within Metro's area only: in the sidewalk area or the transfer point itself (not those at businesses nearby).
- Money was not being moved from other transfer points to do this.
- The \$20K was additive (to the \$50K). Considering that \$100K was budgeted initially, after looking at the data, it was possible that around \$70+K would be needed in 2013 budget.
- Regarding the time involved in reviewing videos to track incidents and cost-sharing arrangements with Police, the process was improving. Nearby police stations could download the video without Metro having to go through it, put it on a disk and transport the disk to the local station because Police computers were on the network. Metro's time involved finding the incident and putting it on the network, where the Police could pull it off and review it themselves in order to do the investigation. It was a shared effort, which had gotten more efficient from Metro's perspective.
- The \$20K would pay for more police presence at the WTP. Throughout the transit industry, police presence was shown to be more effective than paid contract security guards.
- As shown, Police presence had been having an impact at STP, and Metro wanted this for the other transfer points.
- There was a Metro budget item rather than a Police budget item because transit security issues at transfer points impacted customers. Some day, Metro might have its own transit security force, which would be a Transit expense. Though a good policy question, on a practical level, in order to have a truly effective transit security force (the Police) and to get the job done, Metro needed to have this in its budget for now.

A motion was made by Subeck, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT (15 VOTES REQUIRED) - REPORT OF OFFICER.

Members had the following discussion.

- Subeck thanked Metro for doing this. One of the biggest complaints from bus riders in her district was that they didn't feel safe at the WTP, which was also a reason why some people didn't take the bus. So transit safety and security were important. She still questioned whether this shouldn't be in the Police budget, but was glad that Metro was emphasizing this.
- Golden noted that if this money were in the Police budget, they would have the discretion to do whatever they wanted with it. With different priorities, it might not go towards the transfer point. So running the money through Metro was good because it made Metro the contractor and the Police the contractee. However, he was concerned about the extra cost to Transit. Kamp said the money paid for police presence. Last year, Metro had 1.3 million additional rides. They were doing a good job with safety and security. Like Subeck, feedback from Metro customers and drivers indicated that these efforts were having a positive impact on customers, employees and the community.
- Bergamini too appreciated the initiatives that Metro had taken on these issues at transfer points, including the actions of Metro drivers and other staff who acted with courage and ethics stepping into situations to reduce violence in the community. That said, she was concerned about the issue of interdepartmental costs; and though she too thought it was better to have this going through the Metro budget, she wanted to see more transparency in the process. Also, after a decade-long debate, the decision was made to place transfer points outside of residential neighborhoods and in isolated spots; to make them unfriendly to people by installing uncomfortable seats; and not to allow vendors. This was the result. When a system was built that assumed the

worst of passengers, that was what you got.

- White echoed Bergamini's comments about the location of the transfer points. The transfer points were in desolate areas, not near businesses and activity centers, which presented a whole slew of issues, first and foremost, safety. She hoped that sometime in the future, they would be in more central locations.
- Subeck wanted to start looking at design changes or other ways to enhance safety. Though the transfer points probably couldn't be moved anytime soon, perhaps more activity could be brought in to make them safer. Though an important piece now, she didn't think policing should be the long-term solution.
- Poulson recalled raising this issue at Long-Range Planning. The transfer points were 14 years old, the city had grown and we had a different sense of where riders were. It might be hard to move them, but if fire stations could be moved based on changes in demographics, perhaps it was time to do some long-range thinking about the location of transfer points.
- Tolmie wondered if policing in one area didn't sometimes displace the problem to another area. It was possible that more policing at the STP might simply have moved the problems to the WTP. And perhaps in another year, policing efforts would need to be reallocated again.

Kamp said that Metro and the TPC would be deeply involved in the development of the Transportation Master Plan, and this issue could be brought up in that process. A vote was taken, and the motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [25733](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County for the following purposes in the calendar year 2012: (1) providing the Transit Utility with MA Waiver Community Integration Program (CIP1) funding; (2) providing Dane County with State 85.20 funding by the Transit Utility for the County's provision of accessible transportation for persons unable to use the Transit Utility's paratransit services within its service area.

Kamp said this was a long-standing coordination arrangement between Metro and Dane County, which brought \$2+ million of MA waiver funding to the table to provide a higher level of service to customers. Metro recommended approval. A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Subeck, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.4. [25889](#)

Metro: Notice of Public Hearing to be held at the May 9, 2012 meeting of the Transit and Parking Commission, regarding Service Reductions to Campus Routes - TPC 04.11.12

Kamp said that Metro was working with UW staff, and had gotten indications of an estimated 10% reduction in Campus route hours. Metro was still working on scenarios with UW staff, and had no details yet. Marketing and CS Manager Mick Rusch said that UW Transportation Services would be holding a meeting on Campus on Thursday, May 3rd at 7 PM. Metro wanted to schedule a second hearing at the TPC's regular May meeting, to comply with federal guidelines and to provide two opportunities for public hearings to not only address student transportation but also to hear from anyone else using Campus routes. Because of good turnout at previous Campus hearings, Commissioners were encouraged to attend the May 3rd meeting. Subeck suggested issuing a notice of possible quorum for the Campus meeting.

Metro had gotten the message that the proposed reductions were for budget reasons. Bergamini said there were budget and cost-sharing concerns, and the Campus would also be doing its transportation planning process soon. She said a lot of hours were currently being run on Campus right now; and people wondered where they might be able to see some efficiencies. What she had seen from Metro staff so far looked good to her in terms of efficiencies, without the sort of impact one might expect when hearing 10%.

Golden/Streit made a motion to hold a hearing about service changes to Campus routes at the TPC's May meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: At this point in the meeting, members heard public comment from Jill Aruguete, as shown in Agenda Item C.]

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- G.1. [25857](#) TPC Discussion and Action on proposed 2012 parking rate modifications - TPC 04.11.12

[Please note: Registrant Carbine's comments followed Agenda Item F.1., out of agenda order.] Registrant Mary Carbine, representing Madison Central BID, 122 W. Washington #250, 53703, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Per the written comments from BID (attached), BID felt there were still unanswered questions and that the TPC should continue its good discussion about a more wholistic analysis of downtown parking. Concerns about Special Event fees were not just about maintaining the rate or about developing a system whereby non-event parkers could pay a lower rate. It was a bigger issue of communicating with customers about the availability of downtown parking, and directing those customers to the best parking options for them throughout the system. Carbine referred to a letter to the editor, which said the biggest complaint of Overture patrons was where to find a place to park. Carbine said she thought the problem wasn't so much the parking supply, but that people didn't know where to park. Once parkers got downtown, how did they flow among the different parking options? For example, signs in the area of the Overture ramp that directed people to public parking didn't link it to the Overture Center. This was a more wholistic issue. It might be more productive to look for ways to communicate better with customers to allow them to find the product (parking) more easily, and to raise revenue through other means than raising prices, which during a recession may not be the answer to getting more revenue and may result in something else. [Please note: The meeting took up Agenda Items F.2. through F.4. and heard comments under Agenda Item C., Public Appearances, before returning to this item.]

Registrant Jeanette Riechers, owner of Madison Sole, 414 State Street, 53703, spoke neither in support/opposition. Though a member of GSSBA and BID, Riechers said she was speaking as someone who paid rent and met payroll every two weeks. She had some concerns about the rate increase. She knew that Parking's mission was to provide parking that was safe, affordable and convenient, and it was a challenging to do that with the economic situation the Utility faced. As a retailer, she asked that everyone pull back, go slowly, and think about the big picture. The economic impact of parking was a daily reality for businesses in the downtown. She had been doing business downtown since 2002, and it was a challenging place to do business. People would be surprised at how fragile and tentative some businesses in the downtown were. Dense crowds didn't always produce customers. Parking was a huge part of

the situation, esp. event parking. Downtown businesses loved events, game days, Overture, etc., but people who came downtown for events didn't all shop. They were there for a different purpose. Different crowds had different purposes and behaviors. As part of the event parking, an accommodation was needed for folks who wanted to just have dinner and shop, not to attend a special event. Parking downtown could be perceived to be in short supply and expensive, esp. if people wanted to shop for just an hour. Consider how malls competed for shoppers. Riechers had a store at Hilldale, which provided free surface and ramp parking. People really needed to want to come downtown to deal with the parking. The situation with parking needed to facilitate and encourage traffic downtown, not to be a problem. It was important to persuade people that they could expect to find a place, know where to go and how much it would cost. Downtown needed to become part of their automatic set of choices, what they would opt for. It was just not that easy for visitors, esp. from small towns, to get around downtown and find a place to park. Riechers asked that members not jump to the conclusion that increasing rates or sending short-term parkers off to the alternate ramps was really the answer. She wanted everyone to think through the options, and to think long-term and big picture.

When asked, Riechers said that downtown businesses would miss the ramps if they had to be closed, but that they would deal with it. She suggested looking at different options: How might we increase business, and get more people to use more ramps; how do we communicate what's already there? She hoped the group would not make short-term decisions based on the fear of running out of reserves, which could cost customers for everyone, and everyone would lose. Regarding a flat point-of-entry fee during events, downtown was just one option among many. When there was an event downtown, people who might choose to come downtown needed to be able to rely on finding a place to park for just an hour or so (maybe by reserving part of a ramp/lot for short-term parkers) that was clearly identified and easily accessible, without a flat fee, which was considered inequitable. Regarding the multi-space meters, Riechers still observed some confusion for new people and visitors. However, fewer people were asking for change, and people seemed to be sorting things out. Overall, response to the meters was favorable, but she just wished they had been a little more intuitive.

Registrant Susan Springman, representing the Mullins Group, 401 N. Carroll, 53703 spoke. Though registered in opposition, she knew something had to be done. She had worked in the downtown for 25 years, renting/building office space and talking to office users all the time. She sympathized with Parking's dilemma; and after this, she hoped that everyone could sit down and talk about the future. She couldn't imagine what the future would be if all these ramps had to be replaced, though the downtown had to have parking. The office market was fragile. The first state agency (DFI) was being lost to the suburbs, which she believed had to do with the cost of parking. Things were different today, with the economic times; public employees had taken a big hit to their paycheck. Parking was a hit to their paycheck. Elected officials thought moving to the suburbs was like giving employees a \$3,000 "increase" to their paycheck, because they wouldn't have to pay for parking downtown anymore. This was happening in the private sector also. Her group had a half empty office building at 22 E. Mifflin, which they'd never had before. Thirty on the Square would be empty soon. Organizations were concerned about their overhead costs, inc. parking. Her group had to subsidize their tenants in their

own ramps, or they had to reduce rent to make up for that cost. It was about a \$350/sq ft cost on a lease rate. Concerned about overhead and wanting to give their employees a "raise", businesses were beginning to think about moving somewhere else. Springman understood that the Utility had fiduciary responsibilities, but wondered how the Parking Utility would be able to provide parking in the future. Perhaps a much different discussion was needed. She wasn't sure if all the ramps had to be replaced. Privates had their own ramps and put a lot of money into them. Or she wondered how quickly the ramps needed to be replaced. People needed to dig into this. Re: Judge Doyle Square, Springman thought it laudable to put parking below grade in order to develop the space above; but she didn't think it could be done, given the cost. Having built University Square, she knew the cost factor for underground parking was double. And this cost couldn't be paid out of the pocket book of the parker; it had to be go into the development above. She didn't have a solution, but thought people would have to really dig into this, and that the private sector could be a party to those discussions, to brainstorm and try to come with some innovative ideas.

Poulson invited Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobeloch to the table, and appreciated the work he put into his responses to the questions raised by members. Knobeloch noted that he agreed with much of what the speakers said, and went on to highlight some items in his memo to the Commission (attached).

- The price of the new ramp was now \$25 million for 600 stalls (vs. \$21 million).
- During the month delay, Parking reviewed everything and changed some things based on testimony from the previous meeting.
- Monroe Street: Total demand there was nearly identical to anywhere else in the city, inc. downtown.
- Without street meter revenue, Parking couldn't maintain or rebuild its structures. Debt service from a multi-million bond issue could not be put on the backs of parkers, because parkers in Madison wouldn't pay the high rates required. Chicago could charge \$5/hour to help build its structures, but Madison parkers wouldn't pay this. Instead, the Utility used street meter revenue to do this. Some meters more than paid for themselves (like the \$11/space/day at Buckeye Lot). So when people said they didn't want their meters to support the structures, there really wasn't any other way to do it, apart from locking the doors. Bond underwriters would require system-wide revenue, as they always had.
- Parking proposed a compromise for Monroe Street. Rather than trying to apply different rates to different blocks, a lower, single rate of \$1.40/hour was now proposed for all on-street meters, and Evergreen and Wingra Lots.
- Wingra Lot: Staff had spoken to the Library Interim Director and Board Chair, real estate staff and the alder, who all agreed the Lot could be sold to a developer that would be acceptable to the neighborhood. But this would take a while. In the meantime, Parking was losing money there. Even renting out spaces during the day at \$100/month for ten spaces = \$1,000/month or \$10K/year didn't come close to making up Wingra's deficit of \$70K/year. The rest of the system subsidized the Lot. If the Lot were sold and if a viable activity got going there, it would likely improve revenues at nearby meters. When asked, the Monroe St. Business Association said they were not in a position to buy, subsidize or maintain the Lot.
- Pay-on-entry fee: Staff didn't disagree with anything they heard about this. To event-goers already spending quite a bit on an event, the extra \$1 would mean very little. But Parking did need to do a better job at selling their other

properties, and when they filled up, to tell and show parkers where to go. Signs could show addresses of other ramps, and could be placed along a route (like "Burma Shave" signs) to lead people to the next nearest ramp with available parking. One advantage Parking already had was the new real-time technology that told people where to find structures with vacant spaces. This technology could also be used with the pay-by-space meters eventually.

- Pole meter fee: Revenues from this increase (from \$1.50 to \$1.75/hr) combined with the \$1 increase for POE, amounted to half the value of the entire increase. Without these, the increase would amount to very little.
- Staff supported expanding the trial to the areas off State Street (by book store, for example). Police was on board to enforce the extra hour for free to 7 PM, for meters by the Union, and other spots as determined by staff and the Commission. Staff would monitor the turn-over during the trial.
- Meter hoods: Everyone could agree that ads on a semi was not an "essential" use of hoods; and staff would work with the Attorney's Office on this. There were only 4-5 appropriate reasons for using hoods.
- Lost ticket fee: Staff felt linking this to the highest-priced facility, at \$36/day, was too high.
- Increasing night fee from \$5 to \$7 rather than increasing some hourly rates: Parking had tried this in 2009, when the PM fee was raised from \$3 to \$5, and had lost its shirts on that. Competitors had excess parking at night, because during the day their spaces were used by tenants. They charged \$3 at night. Staff felt the PM fee should remain at \$5.
- Use of citation revenue: Asst. City Atty. Ann Zellhoefer reported that the Council could use citation money for anything they wanted. So, yes, the Council could choose to use the citation money now going into the General Fund to offset the \$500K that was paid to the Police to enforce meters.
- Monthly parking increases at certain locations: People who were now paying \$1.10/hr (\$116/monthly) at CSN, could move to Overture and park at its new rate of 75¢/hr (\$110/monthly), and actually save money. So by moving, people could lower their rates and keep them there for three years. Rates were driven by parking availability, which was why rate increases were not spread evenly across all the ramps. For example, Lake Street lost a lot of parkers to buses over the past few years, and it wouldn't be wise to raise rates there.
- Volume discounts: Parking could offer these, though it was unclear what they would be. Parking already did this for leases. It had recently signed a lease with a company leasing at Overture, whose discount was to pay the resident rate (\$103/mo) vs. the non-resident rate (\$124/mo). Regarding monthlies, he would recommend uncapping them at every facility until they hit 80%; then cap them back up. Let that go for a year or two, and report back on how this worked at each location.
- Can Parking personnel be given authority to enforce on the streets? Staff hadn't yet gotten an answer back from the Attorney's Office.
- Summary of changes from the original proposal (as reflected in the new rate chart prepared for the 04.11.12 meeting): Add some extra streets downtown to conduct the trial of later enforcement times; make the rate for all of Monroe Street \$1.40/hr (inc. lots); sell the Wingra Lot; and forbid the use of meter hoods for advertising purposes.

Knobeloch responded to questions from members.

- The \$21 residential permit fee was left at \$21 because, by ordinance, Parking could only charge as much as it needed to cover costs. But the ordinance could be changed. The rate had been tweaked a few years ago, because the fee wasn't keeping up with the cost. One of the biggest costs was the signs, which

cost about \$200 each when they were initially installed and which had to be replaced about every 7 years. This cost was again impacting Parking in a big way. Some cities charged hundreds of dollars for the same permit.

- Q: What about the idea that instead of enforcing and charging for later enforcement times on street meters in event areas, two-hour parking (at no charge) would be posted and enforced after 6 PM? Knobloch said enforcement would be the key. Parking had no issue with the idea, but Enforcement would have to buy into it.

- Q: What if the Commission decided that the Utility couldn't afford to pay for the parking monitors? Could the Commission sponsor a budget amendment to do this (subject to CC and BOE)? If yes, what would be the consequences? Knobloch said that the monitors wouldn't enforce the meters, and Parking would be on its own. One thing for sure: If meters weren't enforced, people wouldn't pay. Besides the five monitors that enforced the meters, the other 30+ monitors enforced alternate-side parking, two-hour, out-of-space parking, etc. (where no money was involved). Knobloch didn't remember a time when the Police Dept. wasn't paid to enforce meters. An alternative might be to give Parking personnel the authority to enforce meters themselves (meters only; not all the other types of parking rules).

- Q: If all the parking citation money went into the General Fund, perhaps the cost of enforcing meters should also come out of the General Fund, esp. if enforcement of all the other parking rules was paid out of the General Fund? Esp. since the Utility could no longer afford to pay for meter enforcement. Though the idea might not fly, perhaps it was worth raising the question? Knobloch noted that parking meters generated \$5+ million/year in citations, all of which went into the General Fund. And he confirmed that the cost of meter enforcement did not come out of the General Fund; instead the Utility paid \$500K/year directly to the Police Dept. for this (through an inter-agency payment).

Golden said he wanted to get rid of Wingra Lot, and proposed that a resolution be introduced to immediately begin the property disposition process for Wingra Lot. Schmidt suggested that perhaps the alder for the district (Ellingson) could be involved in this. Knobloch said Parking did not need to declare the Lot as "surplus" (as most other agencies did), because the Parking Utility was exempt from that clause. Golden/Subeck made a motion to seek aldermanic sponsorship for a resolution to dispose of the Wingra Lot. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Given the motion that was passed, Golden asked that any discussion of Monroe Street area now exclude Wingra Lot (revenue and costs), and that only the street meters and Evergreen Lot be considered. He talked about how meters got into business districts outside of the downtown; how typically, owners started out by requesting two-hour parking, then one-hour parking. And then finding that this wasn't creating enough turnover, they requested meters. Way back, when the meters were put in at Atwood and Monroe, this was the City's way of promoting the business districts. Even though the meters didn't make money for the Utility, at the time, that wasn't a concern like it was now. Regent Street had no meters because business owners there were very opposed to them. On one hand, he understood that the Utility couldn't afford to subsidize the periphery meters anymore and they had to pay their own way. On the other hand, should the businesses be bullied into a rate they didn't want? What if the businesses said they didn't want meters anymore, and wanted one-hour parking instead?

Golden/Streit made a motion to approve the parking rate proposal package as presented (which he confirmed with Knobloch would include a trial of later enforcement time to 7 PM for certain street meters on Langdon and near Overture). Poulson said that the group could now discuss the proposal and entertain any amendments.

Schmidt said that he had talked to Alder Verveer, who wasn't fond of the idea of different enforcement times and who might change this at BOE. Schmidt had also talked to the Mayor about some of the long-term issues for the Utility, which were already on the Mayor's radar as far as options. So he felt there was some momentum to get some long-term planning done, which would include the sustainability of the Utility. Even if the current proposal were approved, the Utility would still be behind, even without the costs for Gov East. Knobloch mentioned Parking's proposal to hire a consultant to look at the issue of Utility's financial sustainability. Schmidt added that this might include related items like talking to state agencies about their leasing needs, and maybe juggling those numbers around. Schmitz said she understood the financials but there was also the economic reality that people had talked about. Schmidt said there was only so much that could be done; and even the current proposal might not make it all the way through the Council. The deficit would still exist.

White asked Knobloch about the signage issue which had been discussed repeatedly over the past few years, and the fact that people couldn't find the ramps, which could be affecting the some of the financial stability of certain ramps, like Overture. Knobloch said the Parking had done some things to impact that.

- Many parking websites had linked to Parking's website and they had also linked to the Google finder, which were ways to do it. Also, it wouldn't be long before vacant spaces among the multi-space meters would be on the web too. Once people knew vacancies were on a certain street, they could use technology to get there.
- He felt signage esp. during a special event was a critical need; how to find a ramp that was not having one.
- For years, information like this had been communicated to cashiers, who could share it with customers. But the problem with that was the customer had to get up to the window. Cashiers would sometimes walk out into the street to tell people in line, where they could find a nearby ramp with vacancies. He was sure there were better ways to do this, and thought the new Parking Manager would have some ideas about this.

White said she didn't feel signage would solve all the financial problems, but this was an important part of the wholistic equation as mentioned by Carbine. Knobloch talked about how the Utility had sold 8,800 POE's on the three days of the WIAA tournament. The UW sold about 3,500. The Chamber of Commerce and other cities had helped Parking get the word out. All this worked; two ramps had been filled and attendees were happy. Signs were out, to direct people to State Street Cap which had extra hourly spaces and had never filled up.

Subeck thought the technology was great, but she wouldn't know where to find it. And if she were driving downtown and hadn't planned ahead, she wouldn't be checking her phone and risk getting a ticket. She knew few people who

went to Overture who were aware of or used the Overture ramp; typically they went straight to State St Cap. She wondered about placing old-school signs on the Capitol Loop that physically pointed people to "Overture Center Parking" or State St Cap. White added that info about event parking at the Overture ramp could be placed in Overture programs and inserted with tickets. Knobeloch agreed and thought these were good ideas.

Subeck said she was struggling with the rate proposal; the increases felt arbitrary.

- She understood that increases had to be done and they were planned out for a reason. But she felt the big picture overview was missing, which was not just about sustainability. It was about what we were doing with our parking downtown.
- Though we needed to replace three ramps, the issue was not just about replacement. It was about what we would replace them with and how we would replace them.
- She understood that revenue was needed right now, but was uncomfortable about raising rates without a long-term plan that addressed questions like: What were our needs; what was the period of time over which we would need it; how could we start a planned system of rate increases that people were prepared for, made sense and were done in an orderly fashion; and what other revenue sources were there (could we increase stalls in certain places, or cut costs where we didn't need stalls)?
- She felt a consultant should come in and do a review of that and develop a master strategic plan.
- As a parker looking at the situation from the outside, she saw rates being increased every three years. She felt that parkers should know well in advance, and that there should be some sort of system for distributing the increases; perhaps by increasing a little less at a time, instead of going up 20¢/hr all at once, increasing 10¢/hr over a period of 2-3 years. She thought there were a lot of options.
- She knew the situation was hard, esp. at a turning point where a comprehensive review was needed, while at the same time, revenue was needed.
- She felt maybe it was time to say "no". Until they had a comprehensive picture, she was uncomfortable approving a rate increase.
- She preferred moving forward with a resolution to hire a consultant for a true master plan of that focuses on parking, not just the sustainability of the Utility, but that also focuses on the vitality and economic development and needs of downtown Madison.

While he understood Subeck's position, Poulson said that the processes Subeck described would take extraordinary amounts of time.

- Also, a Comprehensive Transportation Plan was being developed, for which they had suggested Parking be part of the transportation mix (though how extensive that review would be, was unknown).
- But they were facing a significant situation with the Parking Utility, and though he didn't get a vote, Poulson said he personally would support the proposal. He thought they had to move forward.
- Other ideas mentioned by Subeck could be pursued also, whether as a subgroup of the TPC, or whether through a paid consultant, or whether through another attempt to do a long-range plan again (which hadn't worked out).
- The Commission was on the dime now, to move forward or not. The

consequence of not doing anything would be \$50K in lost revenue per month.

- Unfortunately, there weren't a lot of revenue streams for the Utility, but there were a lot of expenses, which maybe shouldn't be theirs, but still were theirs for now, at least until folks on the Council might change them. He thought it could turn into a real mud fight if they went down that road. Though he would applaud the effort, it wouldn't be fun.

Schmitz said she agreed entirely with Subeck.

- She wasn't comfortable with taking a vote on the proposal at this time. There hadn't been enough thought put into this, or enough information gathered.
- She asked people to consider the information from the few folks who had spoken about the customers. What effect would this have on the customers? What economic effect would this have on businesses?
- She didn't think it was so much about increases (to do them or not); it was how they would do it. This was complicated. They now had multi-space meters, which provided more flexibility. What would be the real impact on people coming downtown? They had different uses by the same people, with different expectations. There were commuter parkers during the day with certain expectations; and there were parkers who came to shop or dine at night with different expectations.
- This was complex, and she wasn't convinced that they had to move that fast. She didn't think it would take that long, esp. if they brought the community to the table, like the folks who spoke earlier that night, who could share their thoughts with the group and how this was really working. It didn't make sense to move forward.

Golden said he had an amendment to make, which he hoped to explain.

- He applauded Knobloch, who was strongly motivated to try to maximize revenues in order to build what we needed, knowing we couldn't build at all. And let's face it, we couldn't build at all. So why pretend we could?
- Also, for years the group had talked about being market sensitive, and the market was weak right now. Government employees had taken hits on salaries and some compassion could be shown for the people who parked at some of the facilities. Having listened to people at the public hearing, some of the changes he wanted to make came from what he heard.
- What had come out of member comments was similar to what he was thinking. Maybe they needed a consultant and maybe they didn't. Golden said he certainly thought that given the fact that what they were basically saying here was, hey, government couldn't afford to do this anymore at the level it was doing it; so maybe it was time to have a task force with the private sector, with people like Springman, who provided parking for their buildings in the private market.
- He just visited Cleveland, and there was no parking utility at all; it was all private entities, and their rates were lower than Madison's; right in the heart of the downtown with gigantic surface lots.
- At another time, they would need to have another discussion about the right way to deal with that. Land use people would need to be part of the discussion, because right now, the City had no parking requirements in the downtown and hadn't had any for 40 years. That might be something they should revisit.

Golden mentioned two ideas he wasn't proposing, but was intrigued with.

- Maybe the pilot study was needed, but maybe the Utility should just go ahead and charge until 9 PM in areas where people were using the meters. It was time to get real. When he went to Overture, and when he occasionally tried to park

on the street, it was full. If these street meters went for another three hours, there would be supplemental revenues; and with the multi-space meters, they could provide a kinder and gentler rate for evening if they wanted.

- The second idea he wasn't going to propose at this time, was to reduce the number of monitors as way to reduce costs. If the Utility wasn't getting any of the money, why bother? Maybe there was a tipping level, if there were some enforcement, but it was something to look at.

Golden then outlined his amendments, and why he proposed them. Members were welcome to separate and vote individual items down, but he wanted to respond to people who had come to the hearing, and at least have a discussion about what they had asked the Commission to do.

- Cap Sq North: Reduce the proposed \$1.10 to \$1.00, based on what the hearing speakers had said about the size of the increase.
- State St Cap: Keep at \$1.00, because the ramp predominantly served the State Street business community. It was less a commuter ramp.
- Failure to pay fee: \$25, because he had heard that people hated \$30, and \$36 would be silly.
- Lost Ticket fee: \$25, again, just to be a little kinder and not do a 50% increase.
- Lost Ticket fee for Brayton Lot: \$25, same as the other Lost Ticket fee.
- Street meters in the Periphery Areas: Reduce the proposed \$1.40 to \$1.20.
- Evergreen Lot: Likewise, \$1.20, because the people who asked for the meters were saying it was too much. It wouldn't be much of a revenue hit; it would go half way.
- Wingra Lot: In addition to selling the Lot, why not make it monthly? Pull all except for maybe two of the meters, to take some cost out of the equation. They shouldn't sustain the Lot while waiting for the property disposition process to go on.

Golden added this comment, which was not part of the amendments.

- 10-hour meters: There were some places where they might be able to get more revenue, like near the Field House, where if the hours were increased, people could park there all day. If people weren't parking there at all now, maybe if they could park there all day at a lower rate, it might be good.

Poulson clarified that this was an amendment that the group would vote on separately. If it were to pass, it would become part of the main motion.

Members discussed the amendment. Schmidt liked it; it took smaller steps. When asked about what dollar difference the changes would make, Knobloch said that all their numbers were really projections. He added that he didn't disagree with the idea of taking smaller steps all the time and coming out with the same figure. He had received an inquiry that asked why this hadn't been started 40 years ago, with little increases every year. But it cost something to do all those changes, esp. changing the pole meters, which was labor-intensive. Nonetheless, Knobloch thought that maybe the 3-year pattern was archaic.

White respected what BID and the business owners had to say, and she didn't want to do any harm to the economics of the downtown or the business community. It was a wonderful place to be, and they needed to support those businesses. But, it was hard for her to feel that an increase from \$1.00 to \$1.10, at State St Cap for example, was such a burden. Though not a business owner,

when she came downtown for dinner with friends for two hours, that amounted to \$2.00 for parking. She fully agreed that they needed a long-term sustainability plan or something for parking, and she basically agreed with everything that had been said. But when she looked at the numbers, it was hard for her to feel that the increases were huge increases. She had recently heard a great speaker at the National Bike Summit, an expert in "Generation Y", who talked about what Generation Y wanted, They wanted to live and work downtown. White predicted they would see some major changes in the downtown and the demand for downtown, which were things to think about long-term. But from her perspective, \$1.00/hr going to \$1.10, to park and enjoy State Street seemed small.

Tolmie responded that with the economy the way it was, with the hit state employees had taken, and with the price of gas going through the roof, all these things had a cumulative effect. In the current economy, every dollar was precious. When this was multiplied for people who commuted every day (vs. one visit), an extra \$2-3 per day added up pretty quickly. He felt bad for the commuters; this was a really hard thing to swallow, esp. for state employees who really had no choice but to park downtown or find alternative transportation. Raising the rates would probably be a good thing for Metro; they would get more service, as parking got more expensive and gas went up. He was having hard time supporting this when everyone was taking hits somewhere else.

White asked Knobloch about how many many commuters were paying hourly rates. Knobloch said that most commuters were monthly parkers. And though there were waiting lists at some ramps, anyone could get into Overture today.

Subeck talked about working downtown and being an hourly parker because there wasn't an opening for monthly parking. So though not every commuter was hourly, some were paying hourly rates. And while 10¢ didn't sound like much, it was a 10% increase. If all of a person's expenses increased 10%, that would be a major hit to the pocket book. Though a dime/hour didn't sound like a lot, when this was put in the context of paying 10% more than you previously paid, and a 10% reduction in pay (which many government workers recently took), this did have some significance. Also, there were many in-between people who didn't work a consistent schedule, so it wasn't worth it to them to rent monthly. But because they were paying the top end at the hourly rate, they were paying nearly the monthly rate. For example, MATC students might spend 20 hours downtown and be in that position. Over the course of the year, 10¢/hour added up.

Streit said he preferred not holding the proposal hostage, in order to develop a long-term plan. Along with Schmitz and Hinz, he had been on the Parking Strategic Plan Committee, which had met for eight months and gone nowhere. The idea that a committee could come up with a great idea, and at the end of the time, come up with a schedule of rates for the next year, was not going to happen; it was not going to happen that quickly. A lot of questions had been raised. For example, if student demand had changed, did we really need the Lake and Frances ramps? A lot of issues would be brought up, and maybe the longer-term planning was going to take time, and maybe five plans would have to be done, because maybe there were five different zones or neighborhoods to be considered. He cautioned against thinking that they could come up with that kind of plan in a relatively short period of time.

Golden made a couple of points. The amendment was an amendment. If they didn't like the whole thing, did they like the amended thing more or less than the original proposal? If members voted no on both, they might end up with the original, which was worse than what they wanted. Members could vote yes on the amendment, and still vote no on the whole proposal, even as amended. The intent of his amendment was partly symbolic. He was troubled when a public hearing was held, and the group did nothing that they were asked to do (and appeared to act like they knew better). Regarding commuters, there seemed to be more monthly parkers now than when he realized. When he worked downtown, there were many occasions when he had to leave downtown for a few hours. So he bused three days a week, and drove the other two and paid the full fee. When he had kids, it was the reverse; he drove more than he bused. People with kids would likely park more, and take the bus when they could; so they might need to park 2-3 days a week and wouldn't do monthly parking. These were younger people, who probably were making less, which compounded the issue.

Golden said this had been a fascinating discussion about what they were going to do long-term. But maybe the City needed to step back (and not to worry, we're not going to get rid of you), and decide what role it should have in parking. We had proceeded over the past 50 years with the same set of assumptions. They weren't wrong, and Madison had been a pretty successful city. They had done a decent job with what they had done. But they had kind of a big bill in front of them, and the City wasn't going to charge \$40/day for parking. In addition to what a high-paid consultant could offer, we needed to bring the private sector into the discussion. And maybe we wanted to be Cleveland, and have people go out and open their own parking lots. We could sell them some parking lots cheap ("fixer-uppers"). He remembered transit studies that came up with \$200 million dollar bills, and everybody went crazy. But he hadn't seen any media go crazy over the amount of Parking's bill. Hey, State Journal, should we spend government money on parking? At any rate, he felt the City needed to review what it was doing.

Schmitz liked Golden's amendments. But listening to the discussion, she noted how members had been talking about different types of customers: regular commuters, part-time commuters, shoppers, entertainment people. Then there was the parking "triangle": did we want low-cost parking, quantity or convenience? We couldn't always have all three. And we had different customers with different expectations. People coming downtown for entertainment didn't care about paying a little more. But this brought them back to the point that they needed to keep talking about this, because it was complex. They were talking about customers, and lots of money. We couldn't use yesterday's logic for the future. Things were different. Technology was different, customers were different, and expectations were different. People were living their lives differently. Even if the amendment passed, they couldn't go home and think they were done. They had to keep the conversation going; and they had to bring in the private sector like the Mullins Group and ULI, who knew a lot about this stuff, and worked with it every day.

Schmidt said what they had before them represented the high-end, worst-case estimate; and a couple of the ramps couldn't be done underground at all. The number was big and scary, but it just highlighted the fact that they needed to do some long-range planning. They needed to figure out how this would fold into the Transportation Plan; and whether they would need to look beyond the

downtown, to consider the whole Park and Ride equation and transit, esp. when they talked about commuters. Many commuters were doing Park and Ride, which would drive down demand for the expensive ramps downtown. All this made a great argument for long-range planning, but Schmidt felt they shouldn't get too hung up on that at this point. He thought they should come up with a rate structure that got them closer to what they wanted, and should keep that moving forward. He liked Golden's amendment.

Knobeloch said he hadn't talked about the expense side of the situation. In analyzing the past twenty years, staff had found that, just like clockwork, expenses had gone up 3% every year, and revenues had gone up 3% every year. So, which came first? If they didn't do that, they would lose ground every year. Parking had been on this treadmill of increasing revenues 3% because their expenses had gone up 3% every year. This may not sound like a lot, and in the private sector maybe it wasn't. But this was what was happening; and the current proposal probably didn't even do it. He agreed that Parking probably needed a different structure, but allowing the Utility to just fall a little behind every year with expenses still going up, wouldn't do it either.

Poulson called for a vote on the amendment. Members voted six in favor (Schmidt, Subeck, Tolmie, Streit, Schmitz, Golden) and two against (Bergamini, White), with Poulson not voting. Poulson said the amendment now was part of the main motion.

Subeck didn't think it needed to be part of the proposal, but she suggested that Parking take a closer look at special event parking, and possibilities for reserving certain parts of ramps with separate entry for non-event parking during events (i.e. State St ramp). She also thought the special event rates were the one spot where they were grossly low, relative even to other special event parking. If we had accommodations for non-event parkers, and since UW was charging triple our rates for a space that might not even be close to the Kohl Center, we might want to do something with this rate without out-costing ourselves. We could potentially raise that rate, if we had alternatives for people who weren't attending the event.

Subeck also thought a market study should be part of any long-term planning effort. Referring to elasticity models for transit, she also wondered if parking had anything like this; for example, based on increases, how much was demand likely to drop? Knobeloch said they had lots of books on the subject, which they used to determine what rates were likely to generate. Every rate increase he had seen since being with the City, he had observed a little downward trend in demand initially. But every time, it came back up, so he would guarantee that this would happen now. Already, parkers were moving from CSN to Overture, and the rates hadn't even changed yet.

Poulson turned to the main motion.

Bergamini noted that there were externalities at play that everyone on the Commission wasn't aware of, in part because some of them hadn't been finalized: the construction schedule on the Memorial Union; what might happen with WIAA; what would be the residential trends, would we end up approving the large-scale apartment building on Mills and Brooks? She had heard calls for market studies since 1984, when she moved here. They had heard a lot of anecdotal evidence. Parkers at the UW and everybody had

anecdotes about how hard or easy it was to find parking. She herself had no problem finding parking ever, probably due to good parking karma. People at the UW were regularly thrown out of parking spots they paid for, because of special events. They got no discount, they got nothing for this. And when they had a football day falling on the first day of classes and the opening of Union South, they were asked to consider not coming to work (with no pay). Bergamini felt that Knobloch had done a fine job of managing the finances of the Utility. She trusted his judgement on what was needed to keep things afloat. They could always do more long-range planning, and the bottom line was that parking wasn't free, and it wasn't an inalienable right. As a result, she was going to vote in favor of the increase.

Poulson put the motion to a vote, and members voted 5 in favor and 3 against (Subeck, Schmitz and Tolmie), with Poulson not voting. White asked for clarification about the motion. Poulson said the amendments had been adopted 6 to 2, and were now part of the main motion. The main motion was now to vote on the Parking Utility's proposal with the amendments incorporated into it.

Because of the confusion, Poulson took a re-vote to adopt the Utility's proposal as amended by Golden. The motion passed 5 to 3, with Poulson not voting. Those voting in favor were: Schmidt, Bergamini, Streit, Tolmie, and Golden. Those voting against were: Subeck, Schmitz and White.

The meeting then proceeded to Item G.2., which changed ordinances affected by these rate modifications.

G.2. [25912](#)

SUBSTITUTE Amending Sec. 12.142(1), Sec. 12.142(3), creating Sec. 12.142(7), renumbering and amending current Sec. 12.142(7) to (8) and amending Sec. 12.12.1425(3)(b)1. and Sec. 12.145(3) of the Madison General Ordinances to increase the rates for metered parking and allow for contractor hang tag permits to be used for metered parking in a manner similar to meter hooding.

Knobloch explained that the ordinance introduced at Council and presented to members in the Agenda materials reflected the \$1.40 rate in the Periphery Areas that staff had proposed after the last meeting. Now that the Commission had just changed this rate to \$1.20 in their action on the amended rate schedule, this new rate of \$1.20 would need to be changed in the the ordinance proposal, which would thereby make it a substitute. As a result, the Commission would be voting on adoption of the substitute.

Schmidt said that since this still needed to go to BOE (out of referral sequence), if BOE changed it again there and returned the item to Council with a second recommendation, the Council could re-refer the item back to TPC. When asked why the TPC needed to act on the substitute immediately, Poulson said the intention was for the rates to go into effect on June 1st. Because of the month delay already, it was going to be more difficult for the Utility to make the change-over by June 1st. Knobloch said if the item weren't passed now and was returned to the Commission later, the rates would go into effect July 1st instead, which would result in about \$40K in lost revenues. Schmidt recommended that the TPC make its recommendation now, then BOE could make their recommendation, after which the alders could re-refer the item back, if they needed to.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Schmidt, to RECOMMEND TO

COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER: Recommend adoption of a Substitute which changed Version 1 (amending ordinances to reflect 2012 parking rate modifications), in the following way: Parking staff originally proposed a rate of \$1.40/hour for on-street meters in the Periphery Areas of Schenk-Atwood and Monroe Street. The TPC instead recommended a rate of \$1.20/hour for on-street meters in these areas. The motion passed by the following vote:

Absent: 1 -

Bridget R. Maniaci

Ayes: 7 -

Chris Schmidt; David E. Tolmie; Amanda F. White; Margaret Bergamini; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Kenneth Golden

Noes: 1 -

Lisa Subeck

Non Voting: 1 -

Gary L. Poulson

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

[07828](#)

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

Poulson pointed out the CSOS Minutes, which he thought members might like to review. They covered a couple of important issues that would be coming before the Commission shortly: MA Waiver and the 5th quarter contingency.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Poulson said he would forward the letter he had received from LaFollette High School, and that they would pursue the issue as recommended.

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Schmitz wondered how the Commission would proceed, given their discussion. Poulson said that perhaps a commissioner would like to come forward with a proposal for some sort of group. He himself would not. Golden suggested that maybe the Mayor's Office could be engaged in that discussion, perhaps by Alder Schmidt.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Tolmie, to Adjourn at 7:35 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.