



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

---

Tuesday, May 13, 2008

5:00 PM

Room GR-27, City-County Building  
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.

---

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:09 PM.

Present: 9 -

Brian L. Solomon; Robbie Webber; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. Durocher; Amanda F. White; Gary Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 1 -

Sharon L. McCabe

Hinz arrived at 5:13 PM.

Others present: Chuck Kamp, Sharon Persich, Tim Swobota, Ann Gullickson, Mick Rusch, Madison Metro Transit; Bill Knobloch, Parking Utility; Rebecca Cnare, Planning Department; Alan Fish and Rob Kennedy, UW-Madison; District 13 Alder Julia Kerr, and District 16 Alder Judy Compton.

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Webber, to Approve the Minutes of the 4/15/08 meeting. Sanborn requested that although Alder Konkell was shown as present in the body of the Minutes, that her name also be added to the line, "Others present" at the front of the Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

[PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Item E.1. at this point, and returned to the reports under D. following Item F.5.]

### D. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY/YTD REPORTS

#### D.1. [10369](#)

Parking: March 2008 Revenue and April Activity Report and 2007 Parking Revenue/Expense Overview - TPC 05.13.08

Knobloch highlighted items in the 2007 Parking Revenue/Expense Overview:

- The Utility would be putting \$1.9 million in reserves, due to more revenues and less expenses than anticipated.
- Revenues were \$10.5 million, thanks mainly to Gov East (but not to Overture, in spite of various efforts inc. the Ramp Shuttle).
- Advertising revenues came in slightly below budget; Adams Advertising went to minimum levels (per contract).
- Interest on investment was higher than expected; money set aside for

mid-State Street ramp was not withdrawn, and interest rates were higher in 2007.

- Salaries were 4.8% under budget, due to vacancies.
- While under budget for other purchased services, snow plowing was \$200K over.
- Payments to other city agencies were \$1+ million; included \$500K to Police Department for enforcement, and \$65K to Metro for Shuttle (budgeted for \$140K).
- Meter occupancy fees (rent paid to the City for metered parking spaces) was \$184K; \$23K paid to MPO for TDM services; \$1 million to PILOT, 4.1% below budget.
- State/county sales taxes were \$500K; 3.5% over budget due to higher than expected revenues.

Knobeloch then outlined the quarterly report (January through March):

- Total YTD revenue was 4.5% less than the same period for 2007: Snow days negatively affected ramps and on-street parking; spring break for UW and MATC fell in March this year (vs. April last year) affecting both State Street ramps; construction-related revenue was also down (fewer meters blocked due to construction), though meter hoods were up. RP 3 sold fewer permits – a continuing trend; fund is still staying whole though not paying expenses like it had.
- Occupancy changes in 1st Quarter (vs. 2007): Cap Square North went up, perhaps people were trying to find bargain; Gov East occupancy was still too high at 91% -- every day, people were finding it full at certain times of day, and length of stay was going down also; Buckeye Lot was down.
- Enforcement rate for on-street meters: 26% in 2007 vs. 14% in 2008; rate at UW was 90%.
- Monthly parking waiting lists were up; included people who were already monthly parkers.
- YTD revenues, actual vs. budget: Total revenues were under budget by 6%; Brayton Lot and Monroe Street area were over budget; University area was way off (\$20K less), due to spring break.
- YTD revenue, 2008 vs. 2007: Cap Square North was up, Frances and Lake ramps were down. At UW, it cost \$8 for a daily pass, while parking at our ramps was \$15/day – a decided rate disparity. Metered hoods were up 200%, but construction-related meter revenues were down 13%.
- Occupancy rates, 2008 vs. 2007: Though revenues were up at Brayton, occupancy at 91% was too high; likewise, Gov East was too high at 92%, up 2% from 2007; UW area went (drastically) down by 13%.
- Comparing occupancy rates, January-March, 2008 vs. 2007: Ramp occupancies were not too different (exc. possibly for March because of snow and spring break).

Webber/Hinz moved to receive the reports. The motion carried unanimously.

D.2. [10370](#)

Metro YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 05.13.08

Kamp pointed out the following items about Fixed Routes for the Quarter.

- Ridership, 2008 vs. 2007: March was down due to spring break, but January and February were up; with YTD ridership up nearly 1% overall.
- Vehicle accidents were up significantly due to weather; but passenger accidents were down.

- YTD, system-wide ridership was up .8%, and productivity was up 2.1%; without UW routes, ridership was up 5.6%, and productivity was up 5.7%.

Kamp then outlined Paratransit items for the Quarter.

- Total ridership went from 68K (2007 YTD) to 65K (2008 YTD), largely due to passenger issues with the weather; likewise, cancellation rate went up this year vs. last year.
- On-time performance was also affected by the weather, but that was expected to rebound.
- Paratransit ridership had bounced back in April, showing that 1st Quarter drop was related to the weather.
- YTD passenger accidents were down, but vehicle accidents were up.
- Looking at History, paratransit ridership in 1st Quarter was not as good as previous years due to weather, but this was expected to change as the year went on.

In reviewing the report about the new hybrid buses, Kamp noted that the miles per gallon on the six Gilligs was 4.21 mpg vs. 5.46 mpg on hybrids – a difference of 30%. Perhaps a more equitable way to show the difference in gas usage was to look at this percentage on Campus, where both Gilligs and hybrids carried larger loads, and the percentage was even higher (at 32.8%). Overall cost per mile for hybrids was lower, but that would become more meaningful as the buses got older and certain parts came off warranty. On a previous analysis of payback, diesel fuel was at \$2.50/gallon; but with fuel prices increasing, the payback was narrowing. Though not expecting to pay for the hybrids with fuel, this got closer with diesel prices approaching \$3.50-\$4.00/gallon.

Hoag/Solomon moved to receive the report. The motion carried unanimously.

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

## E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

[PLEASE NOTE: The items in Agenda Item E. followed Agenda Item C.]

### E.1. [10371](#)

Parking: Proposed Trial of Premium monthly pass -- Capital Square North - TPC  
05.13.08

Knobeloch reviewed some of the issues related to the proposed monthly premium passes. It was hoped that the passes would make better use of underutilized parking facilities, such as Cap Square North, and would provide 24/7 parking to potential customers, who either worked late or who lived downtown and needed overnight parking. Members had expressed concerns about the possibility of turning away special event parking patrons. Cap Sq North (CSN) rarely had "full" occupancy, usually for short periods during very large events like the Art Fair or Taste of Madison. The 50 spaces allotted to the premium passes at CSN represented 1% of the public parking downtown, and would have a very small impact on "full" hours, esp. at CSN. Passes would sell for \$145 for residents, and \$160 for non-residents. Staff recommended a one-year pilot program at CSN, after which staff would evaluate the results to determine whether or not to expand the program. Knobeloch said that the passes would first be offered to current monthly pass users, who may be

downtown or condo residents. Then, they would be marketed on the Parking website. Staff planned to make the pass look distinctive so that cashiers could spot the pass easily.

Poulson/Solomon moved to approve the recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

E.2. [10372](#)

Final Action on Madison Metro's proposed route changes to be implemented in August, 2008 - TPC 05.13.08

Durocher remarked on the vibrant, passionate appearances at the public hearing in April. Staff was now presenting new recommendations based on hearing input. He noted the letter sent to the TPC by the Northside Planning Council, which thanked Metro for their response to neighborhood concerns about preserving Routes #17 and #22 and expressed support for Metro's revised proposal. He also cited a letter sent to the TPC from Alder Lauren Cnare of District 3, which expressed regret that the extension of Route 14 into Sprecher East and McClellan Park Neighborhoods would be delayed until 2009. She urged that a Park n' Ride be established at the East Transfer Point in the interim. A third letter from the Mayor supported the use of \$53K from Metro's contingency funds to implement the final round of the proposed service changes, and discussed changes to Routes 6, 17 and 22. The letter also discussed the lack of funding for the Town of Madison portion of Route 13. [Electronic or hard copies of these letters are available by contacting TPC Recording Secretary, Anne Benishek-Clark at 267-8751.]

Registrants were then invited to appear before the Commission. District 13 Alder Julia Kerr said that her district was very much in the crosshairs of changes to Route 13. She did not support any cuts to Route 13, but was happy that Metro had come back with other options than those presented in April, which would have "commuterized" the Route and would have left the Goodman Pool and Romnes Apartments without service, both of which are heavily transit-dependent entities. Kerr supported the Short-Turn Campus option, which preserved the Ardmore Loop as well as service along Olin Avenue to the Pool and Romnes Apartments, whose residents relied heavily on buses and for whom buses were not a lifestyle choice. Durocher noted that Route 13 was the focus of a high level of concern, as communicated to the Commission through customer feedback to Metro, email, phone calls, letters and hearing testimony. He said that with so much of Route 13 falling outside of the City, everyone was struggling with the equity issue of Madisonians paying for service in extraterritorial jurisdictions. In response, Kerr thought the majority of the Short-Turn Campus option was located inside the City of Madison. Durocher said that members and staff were very interested in seeking a good solution to the issues surrounding Route 13.

Thomas Mertz, 1210 Gilson Street, 53715: Agreed with Adler Kerr and preferred the Short-Turn Campus option for Route 13, which preserved the most service and provided more and faster service to/from Campus. The West Washington option would be his second choice, but the other options were unacceptable. While the initial proposals were well publicized and the hearing well attended, he felt that these revised proposals were not well publicized. Though unsure if it was logistically possible, Mertz urged the TPC to delay its action on the proposals in order to better publicize the new proposals and get more public input. To propose cuts to a major route (Route

13) in a heavily transit-dependent, central city neighborhood that had previously seen cuts (to Routes 27 and 47), just wasn't right. Mertz also mentioned that Route 13 now served many middle schoolers in the trailer park, and the financially strapped School District would be forced to bus these children if service was discontinued there.

Michael Barrett, 2137 Sommers Avenue, 53704: Strongly supported bus service along Williamson Street-Atwood Avenue and reinstating Route 10, which would bring bus service to where bus riders are. Routes 10 and 11 had been cut even though Route 10 had been the fourth most productive route and Route 11 the second most productive route in the City. Route 4 had been cut in half, and Route 3 had been cut on weekends. Instead of zero-sum thinking and pitting one neighborhood against another, people should focus efforts on building Metro. Barrett encouraged alders to begin building the City according to transit-oriented standards rather than the current highway sprawl standards. The car-oriented design was undermining the long-term health of the City. He thought the Comprehensive Plan was being ignored.

Margaret Bergamini, 454 N. Few Street, 53703: Speaking as a private citizen, she had no comments on specific routes, but instead requested that the proposals be tabled in order to provide more time for the public to review the recent revisions to original proposals. The hearing had provided lots of insight. The public needed more time to look at the new descriptions and understand them. While she empathized with staff and its implementation timeline, she favored tabling the new proposals to give the public a chance to provide the input that Metro and the City wanted.

Cynthia Travis, 3150 St. Paul Avenue, 53714: Speaking on behalf of her family and other families like hers, she asked the TPC to table the route changes for a little while, so people could wrap their minds around the new proposals. She had looked at new changes two or three times, and still wasn't sure what she was looking at. Rather than cutting service, she suggested increasing fares to make the system work. She worked third shift, and asked that the group think about people who didn't have cars and totally relied on buses to get to/from work and to/from daycare. Her family used Routes 22, 21, and Route 13, which her kids rode to Goodman Pool, where they could spend the day and she would know they were safe.

Responding to a member question related to concerns of the visually impaired (raised at the public hearing) about the relocation of the bus stop at East Towne, Metro staff said that they were having discussions with the Mall about this. Staff had taken a walking tour with the blind, both at West Towne and East Towne Malls. People were more comfortable now than before about the change, but wanted traffic control in the main aisle of the drive in front of the mall. Staff planned to approach East Towne Mall about providing this. Metro's relocation plan met ADA requirements, it would be up the Mall to provide the additional traffic control requested. Metro couldn't dictate to the Mall.

Kamp went on to say that with the lead time needed for implementation, Metro was hoping to finalize decisions about the route changes by the end of May. Any decision about Route 13 could include a contingency indicating that if funding were identified, which alternative would be selected.

In response to a question, Kamp said the Town of Madison shortfall became apparent in late 2007 – early 2008, when Metro submitted proposals to its partners, including a \$111K service proposal to the Town of Madison. When the Town informed Metro that it only had budgeted \$85K for its service, Metro began working with the Town to try to find ways to fit service levels inside the Town’s budget. Billing was based on mileage, and whether a bus stops or not and where, vis à vis municipal boundaries; when a stop was shared, the cost was split. Metro tried very hard to charge each municipality in an equitable way. The boundaries between the City and Town of Madison were very complicated, and Metro had reviewed everything with the Town to try to find a solution.

Kamp said that in general, rather than proposing to expand right now, Metro was focusing on core, existing services because there was less money available than hoped and the contingency reserve would need to be used for diesel fuel.

Tim Swobota of Metro summarized changes that were made to the original proposals based on input from the hearing, as “bolded” in the written document entitled, “Recommended August Service Changes.” [Electronic or hard copies of this document are available by contacting TPC Recording Secretary, Anne Benishek-Clark at 267-8751.]

After identifying key revisions to the original proposals for each route, Swobota talked about the four maps attached to the document, which showed possible options for Route 13. The first map showed options presented at the April hearing, which assumed funding for service south of Olin Avenue, and which had been designed to stay on a 60-minute schedule and make connections at the STP, by reversing the Park and Olin portions of the route in the AM and PM. The second map (Olin Avenue Loop) assumed no funding for service south of Olin; reduced the need for two buses/two drivers (during peak hours) to one bus/one driver yet provided half-hour service seven days a week to the Pool, Romnes Apartments and the Square; eliminated connection to South Transfer Point.

The third map (W. Washington Avenue) was another way to connect the South Transfer Point to the Square, doing it in less than 60 minutes, by cutting service on Park Street northbound, cutting service out of Town of Madison trailer park in the Capitol Heights neighborhood. The fourth map (Short-Turn Campus) provided service from the South Transfer Point to Campus within 60 minutes, maintained trips in both directions on Olin Avenue and in the Ardmere Loop, but cut service to State Street and the Square (which would now require transfers on Johnson or University). The W. Washington and Short-Turn Campus options were based on finding funding for the \$26K needed for the Town of Madison.

Staff described the complexity of determining jurisdictions and costs (to Town vs. City of Madison) for each of the Route 13 options. For example, while Koster and Ardmere were in the City of Madison, Capitol View Terrace which extended east of N. Rusk was in the Town of Madison; the west side of N. Rusk was in the City but the east side of N. Rusk (on the Alliant side) was in the Town of Madison. Looking closely at certain boundaries as shown on the MPO’s map, Metro found that costs might actually be added to the Town rather

than reduced.

Staff responded to questions from members. The Short-Turn Campus option would maintain current levels of service and frequency to the Interfaith Hospitality Network, located on the north side of Olin just west of the Coliseum Bar. Data from Tuesday, October 16, 2007, showed the following boardings at bus stops along (current) Route 13:

- At Rimrock/J. Nolen bus stop, there were 5 boardings, with 4 inbound and 1 towards STP.
- At Rimrock/Rusk bus stop, there were 33 boardings, with 27 inbound and 6 towards STP.
- For the bus stop in the section of N. Rusk located in the Town of Madison, there 48 boardings, with 19 inbound and 29 towards STP.
- At Ardmore/Koster Loop bus stop, there were 25 boardings, with 11 inbound and 14 towards STP.
- For two other bus stops on Badger Road between Park and Rusk, there were 11 boardings, 7 inbound and 4 towards STP.

Durocher read the statement of registrant Ted Voth, 1146 Williamson Street, #3, 53703, who in general was opposed to service changes, saying that the people worst hurt by service cuts are those who need Metro the most; wondered why Metro couldn't be funded adequately.

Streit/Sanborn moved to approve the current recommendations of staff, which included the revisions made since the last round of proposals were presented at the public hearing in April; but separating out Route 13 for further discussion and separate action, in order to move forward on everything but that.

Various members expressed concern about some of the changes in the first round of proposals presented in April that made cuts to certain routes (Routes 3, 17, 20, 21, 22, 38), and wondered how the new proposals addressed these and other concerns about tight schedules and driver stress. After staff more thoroughly explained how the current set of recommendations revised several of the April proposals, members felt that many concerns had been addressed. However, members thought that the new recommendations had been presented in a confusing way in the documents – hard for them and for the public to understand. In further discussion, members wondered if action on the proposals could be delayed to provide time to prepare the recommendations differently to show final proposals (compared to existing service, without reference to any previous proposals that were now passé), so that members would know exactly what they were voting on. It was felt that perhaps the delay would also provide time to find funding for Route 13.

With the route changes planned for implementation at the start of the next school year, staff expressed deep concerns about delaying action more than a couple of weeks, because of the time involved in updating the automation on buses, scheduling driver bids, printing new schedules, updating the website (including the Trip Planner), and changing signage.

Hoag and White felt that the Commission had an obligation to the public to make sure that everyone understood what was really being proposed, without any lingering confusion, and to receive public input on this basis. Solomon felt

that trying to hold a hearing (in April) and make a decision (in May) within two meetings was too fast. While he understood the time crunch Metro was under, he had heard from many constituents, who were having a hard time understanding the proposals, both between what they were seeing and what they were hearing. Solomon still had questions about the proposals, and said he would have a hard time voting immediately on the proposals. He was concerned about delaying a month, but was also concerned about holding a special meeting in two weeks. People had packed the room at the April hearing, who said they absolutely depended on Metro. If a meeting were held in two weeks, would the public have enough time to read and respond to the proposals by then? Solomon felt that a delay was necessary but wanted to balance this against staff needs.

Poulson/Webber moved to suspend the motion on the table, in order to take up F.3. out of order.

[PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.3. at this point. Following Agenda Item F.1., the meeting returned to this item and continued discussion about the proposed route changes.]

Poulson/Hoag moved to take this agenda item off table to continue discussion. The motion passed.

Kamp said it was important to implement the changes at the start of the next school year because people made transportation plans for children. He said that he would prefer to hold a special meeting in two weeks on Tuesday, May 27th, and that staff could make available a new, simpler set of recommendations by the Tuesday, May 20th.

Streit/Hoag made a substitute motion, calling for a special meeting to be held on Tuesday, May 27th, just to discuss this single item; and requesting that staff prepare a new statement of their recommendations for August implementation, which would be ready for the public and made available on buses and the website one week in advance of the meeting. Members felt that staff had been responsive to comments, and didn't anticipate as large a turnout as at the hearing.

Sanborn wondered if perhaps there was a group of changes, which staff could start preparing for implementation. Swobota said that there probably were. Solomon suggested that by identifying the routes about which members still had questions, perhaps staff would know better how to proceed. Various members identified the following routes: Routes 3, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 38 and 39.

Durocher remarked that the Commission wanted staff to present what the proposals actually would be, and not to reiterate previous proposals. He said members could phone staff with any questions about a particular route. Webber and White said they would not be able to attend the May 27th meeting.

The motion carried unanimously.

[PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.5. at this point.]

Solomon later expressed concern about the action taken on Item E.2., and wondered what would happen if members were not happy with the proposals at that time, esp. Route 13. After further discussion about this and importance of receiving public input on the new proposals, Durocher thought that members would have more clarity in two weeks, and that maybe the funding issues for Route 13 would be more resolved by then. While the meeting would not be a hearing per se, there were people present, who could get the word out, and it also looked like there would be quorum.

## F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

### F.1. [09550](#)

AMENDED SUBSTITUTE - Adopting the Stoughton Road Revitalization Project Plan and the goals, recommendations, and implementation steps contained therein as a supplement to the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Rebecca Cnare of the Planning Department gave some background to the Stoughton Road Revitalization Project (SRRP) Plan. The process began in 2005, when a group of eight different neighborhood association representatives and residents, three alders and two county supervisors got together outside of the City process to create a neighborhood plan with a vision for this corridor. An 8-page summary of the Revitalization Project was distributed. [Electronic or hard copies of this summary are available by contacting the Planning & Development Department at 266-4635.] The Wis DOT had begun working on a construction plan for the corridor, which provided an opportunity for the group to get input from people via focus groups and public meetings, knowing that DOT was working on their separate plan. Cnare said the SRRP Plan was a neighborhood land-use and urban design plan. Because the transportation effect of the DOT plan was significant and had to be taken into account, the SRRP talked about the group's findings and what they wanted DOT to look at and consider. As a result, the SRRP was careful not to say absolutely one thing or another about the WisDOT plan.

Cnare, the three alders and the Stoughton Road Steering Committee were working on preparing an amendment to the SRRP, to make sure that language be included that:

- Supports the expansion of the Park 'n Ride lot on Broadway – either a simple expansion or as part of a development (probably what everyone would prefer).
- Looks at bicycle route connections and transit connections (“community connections” displayed in language and maps) that could happen along the corridor.

Cnare responded to questions. By approving the SRRP, the TPC would be recommending that the plan be included in the Comprehensive Plan, rather than approving specifics in the SRRP, such as reconfigurations of intersections. Alder Lauren Cnare would be introducing some amendments at the Plan Committee meeting the following Monday. Also, many comments/opinions about the WisDOT plan and the planning process had been collected, which the group hoped would be included and considered when the City provided comment on the draft EIS. The City would be encouraging WisDOT to take a look at the SRRP to see how it might influence their three Alternatives. Madison Metro was involved; staff attended meetings. Though the group didn't want the Plan to get too specific, it realized that if the desired kind of

development happened here, it would become important to study what needs Metro would have.

Registrant Fred Arnold, Chair of the Stoughton Road Revitalization Project, spoke before the group. He said that a few years ago, in 2005, there was no Stoughton Road Project, no core group, and no thought about where to go with the project. A few people were invited to attend a meeting at Pinney Branch Library in June 2005 to talk about Stoughton Road, where they listed the attributes of the 4-mile corridor between Highway 30 and the Beltline. These attributes were discussed in terms of their relevance to the community, their attractiveness and the kinds of contributions they made to the community. People did not care much for what they saw, and felt that they could do better. The core group of the Stoughton Road Revitalization Project was formed and he was named Chair. First, they created a vision statement focusing on aesthetics, creating a welcoming approach to the City, safety, public art, sustainable practices, and more, related to things that help define the City.

Arnold went on to say that the process was a ground-up, collaborative, and inclusive. Their group was able to generate revenue sources (from state, county, city and private sectors) to finance the work of their consultant; and held four large public meetings, many focus group and neighborhood meetings, talks with Senator, Assembly members, County Exec, Mayor and others. The SRRP was the result of a planning process, with the intent that once approved, the Plan would take off and result in a 10- to 30-year project that would transform the Stoughton Road corridor into a place to be proud of and where people would be happy to call home. Regarding the issue of transit-oriented development in the Plan, Cnare said the SRRP took its cue from the Comprehensive Plan and its concern with the intersections of Highway 51 at Buckeye and Pflaum. The SRRP talked about the need for taller buildings (higher density), mixed-use development, and employment as factors in transit-oriented development in these areas.

District 16 Alder Judy Compton then appeared before the group. She said that the Project had been one of the most admirable things she had experienced as an alder. It was 100% grass roots effort, where eight neighborhoods thought that their "front door" had been neglected too long, that the entry into their neighborhoods was extremely negative, that maybe the reason they weren't getting services that other neighborhoods were getting was that they didn't have an identity. The Stoughton Road corridor was where people came into the city, which contained the State Capitol, the county seat and the City of Madison itself. One of three "front doors" to the City, Highway 51 stretched from Louisiana to Hurley. The project group found themselves among many communities all along the Highway who were working to revitalize it.

The eight neighborhoods representing 25,000 city residents determined they were going to do this with/without support of the city, county or state because it needed to be done. So they went about trying to raise funds to create the plan, and did a good job of it. Eventually, they received support from the City, County, and State. Compton sought TPC approval and wanted to make the Commission aware of the need to better integrate Metro into the 16th, 15th and 3rd districts, because the southeast quadrant of the city was one of major sites in the city with underutilized land ripe for economic development. The area had increased its number of bike paths/lanes, and now needed better bus

service to the area; so, for example, people in the 16th district didn't feel they had to hop in their car to drive downtown to get a bus. She hoped that once the need for buses was there, enough service would be provided (as opposed to cutting service on such Routes as 17 and 38). Compton talked about possible plans for the Park 'n Ride, which could include multi-level parking with a coffee shop on site. Currently, the lot was being used by people taking the bus to Chicago; and by people who parked there and then rode their bikes to the Ag building.

Compton said that she and others would be coming to the TPC as different parts of the Plan were developed. She believed it could be implemented in five years. She felt that the area was obviously a sensible place for smaller shops and integrated neighborhood businesses, much needed for economic development, so people have a place to go for lunch and to do errands. Rather than being threatened by the possibility of undesirable elements coming into the area, residents of the three districts wanted to take control. Compton felt it was necessary to move quickly, because they were about 20 years behind, and businesses were leaving the corridor because they feared the DOT Plan and being forgotten. The Plan lets these businesses know that people wanted them to stay, and wanted integrated neighborhood use. The Plan aimed to make this area an major asset. Compton concluded by saying that the neighborhood group was one of five in the U.S. in a position to receive an award as "Neighborhood USA". Poulson thanked Compton for her presentation, and said he was happy to hear that she would be a strong supporter of Metro for future service improvements.

Solomon/Poulson moved to recommend approval of the Plan. During discussion, Webber noted that the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Committee had discussed the appropriateness of having a bus route that ran from the Park 'n Ride lot straight up Stoughton Road to the East Transfer Point. It might take a lot of people coming in from out of town off of Stoughton Road, and get them to the ETP, where they could get to pretty much anywhere in the city. Webber offered a friendly amendment to the motion, to encourage the Parking and Transit Utilities to work together to accomplish this at some point in the future.

The motion passed by voice vote/other to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION: The Commission recommended approval of the Plan with the recommendation (put forward by Webber) that the Parking and Transit Utilities be encouraged to work together to create a bus route that would run from the E. Broadway Park and Ride directly to Metro's East Transfer Point, straight up Stoughton Road.

F.2. [10009](#)

Amending Section 12.1335(4)(c) of the Madison General Ordinances to modify the dates when the City can declare a snow emergency.

[PLEASE NOTE: This item followed Agenda Item D.2.]

A motion was made by Hinz, seconded by Webber, 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.4. at this point.]

F.3. [10373](#)

Parking: Removal of public on-street metered parking due to UW projects - TPC  
05.13.08

Registrant Alan Fish, Associate Vice Chancellor, UW Facilities Planning and Management, appeared before the Commission to talk about visitor parking issues that the UW and the City jointly have between them. He displayed a map showing an inventory of visitor parking on Campus on city streets with about 150 City meters, many around Union and Langdon, in the central Campus, on Brooks, Mills, Orchard and Monroe. The UW was in the same visitor parking business as the City, which he felt needed to be run as a partnership. He identified three projects in the next three years, which would be in the same right-of-ways as the City meters: Institute of Discovery, Union South, and East Campus Mall. The question was how to handle the service and revenue issues. Like the City Parking Utility, the UW didn't get any tax money, but ran by the revenues generated from parking, citations and permits.

In the spirit of the City staff report, to work together as partners, the UW proposed that City and UW staff sit down together and find other locations in the Campus area for the 30 meters that would be displaced. UW staff had already identified some possible locations, which currently had 2-hour parking. Rather than paying \$1.2 million for the displaced meters, Fish thought that the City and UW could identify places to relocate the meters so that the effect on the City Parking Utility would be financially neutral.

Fish passed out a summary of current and planned parking and transportation projects on Campus and their related costs, to show how deeply involved in the UW was involved in these areas. [Electronic or hard copies of this document are available by contacting TPC Recording Secretary, Anne Benishek-Clark at 267-8751.] Fish described three pending underground parking projects at University Square, Gordon Commons and Union South that would incorporate a bike station and a commuter rail station. He said that when the City and the UW looked at how they redeveloped land, they didn't want to get into position of cannibalizing each other's revenues, because each were in the same business. He concluded by urging the TPC would pass a resolution to allow the two groups to work together to develop a proposal to relocate the City meters within the Campus boundary, rather than to charge the UW \$1.2 million – which could be used to build 600 new visitor parking spaces to help handle UW and City issues. Both shared space, and they needed to share solutions.

Responding to questions, Fish said that the new parking spaces would not be shared with the City per se, but they would be shared with the public. Along with UW permit parking, each new site would provide visitor parking, with Gordon Commons being 100% visitor parking. Webber noted the importance of short-term onstreet parking, which gave people an opportunity to do quick errands or drop-offs in commercial and office areas. Because the placement of this type of parking was critical, she was concerned that some of these spaces would be lost. She was particularly concerned about the Orchard and Johnson Street areas near the new Institute of Discovery and Union South. Fish described a Drop-Off site being planned for the Institute of Discovery on Orchard Street. Webber thought there was still a need for places where people could leave their car for 20 minutes.

When asked about Fish's proposal to work together, Knobloch said that this

was the first approach listed in his staff report. The two groups had done this very thing at the other end of Murray Street, where the UW wanted to eliminate all the metered parking, but in the end, four stalls were kept – a nice compromise, where each got some of what they wanted. Knobloch said that he had a responsibility to TPC to report when valuable assets like onstreet parking meters – which provided service and revenues – were being displaced, not just at the UW but elsewhere as well. Equal to 2% of the City's total onstreet parking, the loss of 32 meters would be noticeable. While needing to ensure that the value of each meter is preserved (in terms of its new location), Knobloch thought the two groups could work together to find compromises. Hinz said he had heard Fish say that any proposal would have to recognize both the loss of stalls that need to be replaced and the financial losses/benefits to the City's Parking Utility. He thought that whatever plan was developed could serve as a model for working out similar situations with other groups, and felt working out a mutually agreeable plan would be a good way to proceed. He asked that the onstreet rental money paid by the Utility to the City not be overlooked in the process. Knobloch agreed, and noted that the onstreet rental charged by the City was 10% of gross revenue (in this case, \$1 million of gross revenue), which would come out of the City's pocket, not the Parking Utility's.

Hinz/Solomon moved that UW and the Parking Utility work together to develop a plan which would recognize both the loss of parking stalls that need to be replaced and the financial effect on the Parking Utility; and that this action in no way committed the TPC to approving said plan (and final approval would lie with the Parking Utility and the Council). The motion carried unanimously.

[PLEASE NOTE: Upon the motion of Hoag/Solomon, the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.1. at this point.]

F.4. [10044](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Amending the Parking Utility's 2008 Adopted Capital and Operating Budgets in order to convert the current CTR revenue equipment software (PARCS) to Zeag (ZMS) software and make the associated hardware changes. This would also approve a sole source purchase from ZEAG (USA) Inc. to make these changes. Zeag will also maintain the software/hardware through assuming the CTR maintenance contract which is currently \$51,804/year.

[PLEASE NOTE: This agenda item followed Item F.2.]

Knobloch thanked the TPC alders for sponsoring this item. Parking had ZEAG revenue equipment in all the garages and Brayton Lot, which with a cost of over \$3 million was a very large investment. The equipment was all connected by fiber optics and was a complex system, with 63 peripherals in booths and entry/exit stations. The distributor for ZEAG, CTR Systems, had helped with installation and ongoing support. CTR was based mainly on the east coast and used a computer system called PARCS, which was the computer system – the brains – that currently ran the ZEAG equipment.

ZEAG had their own software system called ZMS, developed to use with their equipment. CTR and ZEAG have a good relationship, but unfortunately CTR can't provide the onsite support (sometimes) needed to accomplish relative simple things, such as getting parking occupancies on the Web so that people could figure out where to park before they got downtown. With a customer base in the midwest, ZEAG had already been available three times in the past

six months to look the system over and to detail what was needed to convert to ZMS, which was how the \$155K was determined. This amount would be taken from Parking's sign capital asset program, so it would be revenue and cost neutral to the Parking Utility to do this conversion.

After the switch to ZEAG/ZMS, Parking could move forward on some of their projects, like cashier lists and signage, etc. The conversion called for a \$155K change to Parking's budget. The resolution would allow Parking to change its operating and capital budget to reflect the new expense of \$155K, not approved in the original budget. Knobeloch said that Parking was asking approval of the substitute, which reflected some "housekeeping" changes suggested by the City Attorney's Office. Knobeloch concluded by saying that the departure from CTR was amicable, and that monthly maintenance costs would remain the same.

A motion was made by Poulson, seconded by Hinz, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT (15 VOTES REQUIRED) - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

[PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.6. at this point.]

F.5. [09966](#)

Metro: Discuss proposed Monthly Free Fare Day (deferred from previous meetings), to include review of recommendations from Draft Final Report of the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee and staff report on fiscal implications -- TPC 05.13.08

[PLEASE NOTE: This agenda item followed the conclusion of Item E.2.]

Registrant Susan DeVos, 626 Gately Terrace, 53711 appeared to speak. She was speaking for herself rather than as member of MABA, which hadn't discussed this issue. DeVos said she had resigned from the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Committee because of items like this, and thought it reasonable to say a few words. The bottom line was two-fold: First, Metro could not afford this. Second, no one was going to find the absence of a \$1.50 fare an incentive to make a 1- to 1½ -hour bus trip rather than taking a 10-minute car trip, even if the person was earning minimum wage. Time was too valuable. At this time, Metro would be better off using its money to provide better service than to waste it by making fares free for people who would most likely ride the bus anyway. Rather than talking at length about her well-known opposition to making bus wraps permanent (in Agenda Item F.6.), DeVos felt that revenue of any kind was better spent on improving present service than on underwriting monthly free fare days. While she thought that there were better ways to bring in revenue and the bus wrap experiment should die, if it were kept alive, (she wanted Metro to) prioritize best the revenue that it brought in.

Durocher then read the statement of registrant Barbara Smith, 31 Sherman Terrace, Apt. 3, 53704: I proposed a free fare day on a regular basis, as a potential way to increase ridership. However, I hope the TPC will consider this proposal in context, not in isolation. It may be an idea that could be tried in the future after Metro implements higher-priority changes and particularly improves service and service times. It's important that service improvements be put in place before large marketing initiatives like this.

A member of the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Committee Ad Hoc

Committee, White provided some background to the proposed free fare day. She said the idea came out of the Marketing Subcommittee of LRMTTP, of which she was Chair. It had been identified as a mid-term recommendation in the Committee's draft Final Report, which means it would be a few years before it would be implemented. She said this recommendation along with all the others contained in the Report needed to be reviewed in terms of cost and the best time to implement them. There were many items in the Report that were more expensive (i.e., new technology), but they reflected a number of ideas that Metro could consider and potentially implement, which would increase the financial stability of Metro. The Report was not suggesting that all the proposals had to be implemented within three years.

White said that this particular idea grew out of the response to Clean Air Action Days, which were reactive. People felt that this would be a more proactive approach to doing a promotion to get more visibility and more people to consider Metro, and there were a number of different ways to do this. The Committee was presenting this to Metro as a potential idea that could make a lot of marketing sense; but Metro would need to do a cost analysis to see if it was feasible. Kamp noted that, as a mid-term recommendation, this would not be implemented in 2008 or 2009.

Durocher said that this was something the TPC could decide on as an alternative to achieve the same ridership goals intended by Clean Air Action Days, and arguments could be made that this approach would be more effective. White added that she agreed with DeVos that there might be items (like technology) that should have higher priority, but this was just one of many items in the Report. Durocher concluded by saying that this had been an informational discussion (only).

[PLEASE NOTE: The meeting went back to Agenda Item D.1. at this point.]

A Roll Call is reported here to reflect that Streit left the meeting during discussion of Item F.6., before the vote on the item was taken.

**Present:** 8 -

Brian L. Solomon; Robbie Webber; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. Durocher; Amanda F. White; Gary Poulson; Duane F. Hinz and Kevin L. Hoag

**Excused:** 2 -

Sharon L. McCabe and Kenneth M. Streit

**F.6.**     [10204](#)

SECOND SUBSTITUTE - Authorizing an amendment to the Metro Transit Advertising and Leased Space Policy and to the Contract with Adams Outdoor Advertising, Ltd. Partnership to allow fully illustrated transit advertisements on Metro Coaches, not to exceed ten 20 full wraps per year.

[PLEASE NOTE: This agenda item followed Item F.4.]

Durocher read the statements of the following registrants:

·     Barbara Smith, 31 Sherman Terrace, Apt. 3, 53704: I do not like the bus wraps. Content of the ads are a concern to me. Currently the beer wraps undermine city and county efforts to limit alcohol abuse. I am particularly concerned that there could be a bus wrap to promote military service. Bus wraps limit visibility for bus riders and degrade the riding experience. It adds too much aggressive commercialism to the life of the bus rider, without

enough in return to the city. Please end the full bus wraps.

· David Waugh, 1213 E. Mifflin, 53703: Please remove all wraps. A significant percentage of ridership opposes them.

Durocher commented that a document of online survey results containing public feedback had been made available to members as well.

Mick Rusch of Metro, and Michelle Reddington of Adams Advertising were invited to come to the table. Kamp provided some background. The current contract with Adams ran from January 2007 to December 2009. Rather than taking action ahead of TPC, BOE had referred the resolution to their next meeting. Full wraps had been a high visibility topic. Metro was looking for a balanced approach, to recognize the way these ad revenues helped Metro with its budgetary issues, but also to recognize people's concerns about full bus wraps.

Metro was bringing this before the TPC now because the bus wrap pilot began in March 2007; and being May 2008, there were clients interested in one-year contracts, which wouldn't fall within the time of the two-year pilot. Metro wanted clarification for this, to guide Adams over the balance of their 3-year contract, and to provide stability on this issue. The resolution proposed ten full bus wraps, with clarification to allow partial wraps to cover some windows, in order to keep Metro in a positive, increasing revenue stream.

Kamp said Metro had partial wraps from one or two vendors that didn't cover any of the windows. Given the controversy over covering windows and given the potential revenue that could be generated, Metro wanted to make it clear that if the number of full wraps were reduced to ten, Adams would be given the flexibility to cover some of the windows. Pointing to sample photos, Kamp said half wraps would allow light in on one side and better visibility. "King Kongs" went from the bottom to top of the bus but a front and back window left uncovered. Metro was looking at that kind of adjustment to the policy for the balance of the contract with Adams, to maintain its revenue stream for balance of the three years; with the possibility of looking at an extension to the contract later on. Metro wanted to know what the ad wrap policy should be, for the remainder of the first three years of their contract with Adams.

Referring to a question raised at BOE, Sanborn wondered if it were feasible to make contracts for less than a year, and whether this would harm Adams' ability to sell ads. Reddington said the issue for most clients re: signing up for a year was the substantial production cost of \$6,500 paid by them. With space costs about \$3,200/month, most advertisers wanted to invest long-term, to spread out the production cost over the length of the contract. To, for example, run an ad two months wouldn't work for most advertisers. Reddington said shorter-term contracts would definitely diminish their ability to find advertisers.

Sanborn noted that the potential difference to Metro between 20 full wraps vs. 10 would be \$153,600, which would be above/beyond the guarantee. Kamp said that the effort to clarify the definition of partial wraps was an attempt to recover some of the \$153,600, in order to stay as close to the revenue stream as was originally projected. Reddington said that partial wraps sold for about half the price of a full wrap. Kamp said that the resolution would allow for an

unlimited number of partials, as was the case now; and it clarified that King Kongs were included in the definition of partial wraps. Referring to another question at BOE, Kamp said that 57% of the bus stops had "enunciation" (announcing the stop). [PLEASE NOTE: Streit left the meeting at 8:50 PM, at this point in the meeting.]

Based on ad revenues for Years 2 and 3, members observed that there would be a loss of approximately \$125K/year if there were no full wraps; which, when divided by 15 buses, amounted to between \$8K and 10K per bus. Rusch said that Year 1 was the start-up year for full wraps, so it would not be a representative year. Kamp said that the projection for Year 3 of \$225K, which assumed no wrapped buses, could be as much as \$300K with 10 full wraps and the partial wraps as newly defined by the resolution.

With huge concern about windows and acknowledging that the half wraps and King Kongs were a little better, Solomon wondered if there were any options that would keep the windows clearer. He liked the "Find a Gem" example better than the "Kansas State Fair." Reddington clarified that the King Kong would have advertising on one side of bus (on the driver side), while the other side (door side) would be kept clear; which meant only four windows would be covered. Adams had tried to come up with some creative alternatives to full wraps, and still generate the revenue needed.

Durocher noted that having the passenger side clear would help address passenger complaints about the difficulty of seeing out of screened windows, esp. towards out the side of the bus facing their destination. Comparing revenues of King Kong/partial wraps to full wraps. Reddington said that partial wraps would bring in about \$1,000/month vs. \$3,200/month for full wraps. Adams would offer many different types/sizes of partial wraps at different monetary levels; for example, a half wrap (also on the driver's side of the bus only) could bring in \$1,500 to \$1,600/month.

Durocher clarified with Kamp what members would be acting on: whether to keep the pilot a truly two-year pilot; or to create a policy to cover the remainder of the 3-year contract with Adams, which would be used if the contract were extended. Webber added that the question was also about having 10 full wrap buses.

A motion was made by Poulson, seconded by Sanborn, to recommend adoption of the resolution.

While wanting Metro to have the financing it needed, Webber said she was offended by the fact that buses were the only things being considered for advertising. The idea that we were offending people's sensibilities while at same time making it hard for them to see out of the buses, (and while at the same time in a different committee trying to reduce the number of billboards in the city), was difficult for her to swallow. It was very hard for her to vote every time this issue came up. She and many other people didn't like the bus wraps, due to visibility, safety and other issues. Some had problems with the types of ads, and some thought them visual pollution. By contrast, we didn't put ads on fire trucks or city plows; why did Metro have to go begging for money, while these other city services didn't?

Durocher asked for a 5-minute recess in order to make a phone call. Webber/Solomon moved to recess. Later, Durocher called to meeting back to order.

Hoag was strongly in support of wrapping buses for several reasons.

- For lack of \$26K from the Town of Madison, we are talking about stopping the Route 13, which could include important stops along the route within Madison. This was a good indication that they needed to look at and pursue all financial options.
- He understood sentiments in statements about local, state and national preferences for transportation, which put us in the position of having to go out and look for advertising money to finance our public transit systems. But buses were big flat surfaces amenable to advertising, while fire trucks/snow plows were not; plus buses were on the road every day.
- In Europe, where buses receive much greater support and there were fantastic transit systems, even the most progressive and beautiful cities had wrapped buses and streetcars. Why was Madison different?
- Though he might be in the minority, he thought the ads made the buses look better. He also liked reading on the bus, and on sunny days, preferred wrapped buses. There were some visibility issues though that should be weighed. However, on any given issue, those opposed always spoke out, and we didn't often hear from those who supported. In talking to his neighbors, some didn't like the darkness of the wraps while others didn't mind at all.

Hoag concluded by saying that we should continue to work to change national policy, but in the mean time, we needed to keep our routes, esp. those like Route 13.

Solomon said that he previously co-sponsored the legislation to increase the number of wrapped buses from 15 to 20, because, while he didn't like bus wraps, he didn't like service cuts more. He wondered what would happen to flexibility and revenue, if Adams sold more ads with the less intrusive wraps. Reddington said there wouldn't be as much revenue because there would be less flexibility with the message: the more room for the message, which lent itself to more creativity, the more excited clients got about the impact their advertising would make. In an example comparing the East Towne half wrap to the DeJope full wrap, Rusch remarked on the greater impact made by full wraps, which generated much more attention.

Understanding that the resolution would decrease the number of full wraps from 20 to 10 and it would increase the flexibility around partial wraps, Solomon wondered how the resolution changed things from a pilot to a policy. Kamp said that when the Assistant City Attorney read the proposal, she said the wording would be better if it referred to Metro's "Advertising and Leased Space Policy" and the contract with Adams, so that it would be very clear that this would be the policy used for the balance of the contract with Adams. Kamp said that when Metro came back at the end of the three years, he hoped that the Commission would be deciding on a contract and not rehashing the issues about the policy.

Kamp clarified that the unlimited partial wraps would include half wraps and King Kongs. Durocher observed that because we hadn't yet used King Kong or half wraps and had no data on them, there was a potential for substantial

revenue there. White said that she had been a vocal supporter for full wraps and wrapped advertising on LRMT. While she didn't like wraps either, she hated cutting service more. In asking people what they thought, she was surprised that several said they felt motion sickness on the bus. She felt that when the issue became a quality of experience, then that was a big deal. She was really conflicted, and wondered what would happen to revenue if full wraps left two windows open. Reddington said that one window was already left open, behind the front passenger door. Kamp said one of the values of pilot had been exploring the issue of leaving this window open. They found that drivers relied on this window for their observation. As a result, Metro had asked Adams to be flexible about this for future wraps. Typically when the safety issue was explained, most advertisers understood. While happy to hear this, White wondered if one additional window could be left unwrapped without losing too much revenue. Kamp said that staff would rather not over control Adams in this regard.

Sanborn/Poulson moved to amend the resolution to change the words "not to exceed 10 full wraps" in the Title to say "20" (consistent with the current number approved by the Council), which would require eliminating the first sentence in the third paragraph and changing the number to 20 in the first sentence of the final paragraph.

Sanborn also didn't want to cut any services, and felt the difference between 10 and 20 full wraps was significant, esp. in view of tweaks to routes and what that meant. He had ridden on wrapped buses, and didn't think they impaired visibility a lot. Though they might present a problem for some visually impaired, buses had the voice system; and if that wasn't enough, he thought something else could be worked out for them, rather than reducing this program. If it were up to him, he would sell as many as full wraps as possible, and found the ads attractive. He felt there were good reasons why we didn't advertise on other types of city vehicles.

Solomon said he wanted to offer a friendly addition to Sanborn's amendment, to amend the final paragraph to make it clearer that all partial wrap ads would leave some passengers windows uncovered. Sanborn agreed to this.

When asked, Kamp said that the reduction from 20 full wraps to 10 was an effort to address community concerns; Metro knew this was an emotional subject and felt it had an obligation to show they were listening. Durocher stated that if the TPC recommended a reduction from 20 full wraps to 10, he thought a lot of people would be satisfied. He said he did not offer this comment as an argument in the debate, but merely as an observation.

A vote was taken on the Sanborn/Poulson motion to amend the maximum number of fully wrapped buses from 10 to 20, which carried as follows:

Ayes: Hinz, Hoag, Poulson, Sanborn and Solomon

Noes: Webber and White

Excused: McCabe and Streit

Non-voting: Durocher

Webber said she agreed with Solomon that she didn't want to see service cuts. Personally, she was not offended as many others by the wraps, but felt she must listen to the feedback they'd gotten. She was also swayed in part by the fact that other City vehicles and buildings were not used for ads; why not try to get revenue from them? She said she would still vote against this because she had heard from people that the wraps presented a physical problem for them on the bus. She felt that bus service was a basic City service and Metro shouldn't need to go scraping for the money. She would rather cut a road project and all the interest payments on that project, than ask for further degradation of our Metro service. She would vote against this, and if people wanted to know how she would get the money, she said she had lots of places she could find it.

Sanborn felt the need to lay out what he felt was being discussed. They were talking about significant amounts of money that would have an impact on routes and service. On the other hand, 10 to 20 buses would be fully wrapped, not the whole fleet; and they would be continuing the practice of partial wraps and placard advertising as before. He said that while we had cultural norms about placing ads just anywhere, we were accustomed to seeing ads on buses. This was not an "all or nothing" situation, but rather a proposal to keep 20 fully wrapped buses in place.

Durocher made the following comments, which he said came out of his tenure on the LRMTTP Committee, which had been working on ideas to improve service, increase ridership, and upgrade the image of riding a bus, to see it as a choice over a car and not just a necessary service for people who are transit-dependent. His comments also came from personal feedback and from the tabulated feedback indicating that more people were negative about fully wrapped buses than positive. This era of high fuel prices and other concerns made it more important to improve the appeal of mass transit, and to take into account how the ridership viewed it. He would have had easier time making the decision to reduce the number to 10 as an indefinite policy; and now that it was back to 20, he had more difficulty.

Durocher said that the continual struggle with revenue was agonizing, but what was new to him was that Adams had capability to sell King Kongs and half wraps with unknown and untapped revenue potential, which gave an advertiser the option to buy ads that were more noticeable than placards. He had an intuition that these would sell well, and the resolution didn't restrict how many of these could be sold. He would be happy if we sold a 100, because they didn't cover all the windows, and provided seating for people who wanted to avoid motion sickness and who wanted to see the stops. He had a problem with full wraps and branding public vehicles, which then didn't look like a bus. The King Kongs and the half wraps allowed buses to continue to look like buses, gave us as yet unknown revenue potential and accommodated people who objected strongly to riding a bus with wrapped windows. Durocher concluded by saying he did not support the motion to continue full wraps as an ongoing policy, and definitely not with 20 buses.

Solomon said he was torn on this. The reason he voted for 20 was that it didn't change that much. The TPC had already voted for 20 and so had the Council. Twenty had already been budgeted, and he didn't have a problem with it. The

resolution just affected the current contract period, and once the contract expired, there would be an opportunity to vote on this again. He concluded by saying that considering what they faced last month and again tonight, he would continue to support this.

Solomon offered some revised language for the last paragraph of the resolution, to say that Metro's ad and leased space policy in the contract with Adams would be amended to continue the practice of 20 fully wrapped ads on coaches per year, as well as to continue the practice of allowing unlimited partial wrap ads, all of which would leave at least some passenger windows unwrapped.

As a friendly amendment to the original motion, Solomon/Poulson moved to amend the language in the final paragraph of the resolution as proposed by Solomon. (See Substitute Leg. File 10204.) The motion passed unanimously by voice vote/other.

Hoag cautioned against getting too excited about the King Kong and partial wraps because he had heard a pretty clear indication that those didn't market as well, and that the revenue-generating possibilities weren't so great. He was also concerned about the idea that fully wrapped buses conflicted with good marketing strategies. Many major systems in cities around the world proved this idea wrong.

Kamp clarified that the main motion as amended by the two amendments would give Adams the ability to sell up to 20 full wraps per year during the remainder of contract through 2009, along with partial wraps; there would no longer be a two-year pilot; and, before entering another agreement with Adams, the TPC would have another opportunity to revisit the policy.

A vote was taken on the main motion to recommended adoption of the resolution as amended (in the form of a substitute), to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Excused:** 2 -

Sharon L. McCabe and Kenneth M. Streit

**Ayes:** 6 -

Brian L. Solomon; Jed Sanborn; Amanda F. White; Gary Poulson; Duane F. Hinz and Kevin L. Hoag

**Noes:** 1 -

Robbie Webber

**Non Voting:** 1 -

Carl D. Durocher

**F.7. [10374](#)**

Metro: Proposal to increase the Special Event round trip fee (now defined as charter service by the Federal Transit Administration) from \$4 to \$5 - TPC 05.13.08

**Kamp pointed out the chart, which showed that Metro was not able to cover costs for the special event buses over past years with a \$4 round trip fee. Metro was requesting an increase to \$5 for the fare, to help cover costs and allow some flexibility in covering fuel costs, in case Metro would get any special event services for what was now considered "charter service." He**

added that it was easier to handle \$5 as well.

A motion was made by White, seconded by Sanborn, to Approve the Special Event fare increase from \$4 to \$5, effective June 15, 2008. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**G. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEE - 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  
Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee  
Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Parking Strategic Plan

**No action was needed on these reports listed under Agenda Item G.**

**H. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**H.1. General announcements by Chair**

**H.2. Commission member suggestions for future agenda items**

Durocher asked that there be a discussion about the process for public input to Commission members, looking at various protocols about this, just for discussion purposes.

Solomon asked that timing of the public hearing and Metro route changes be reviewed to see if they could be given more time in the future.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Sanborn/White made a motion to adjourn at 9:44 PM.