



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes - Final
TRANSIT AND PARKING
COMMISSION

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

Tuesday, May 10, 2005

5:00 PM

215 MLKJ BLVD RM 260 (MMB)
(After 6 pm, use Doty St. entrance.)

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (notified absences: none)

Present: Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, L. Jesse Kaysen, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag, Diane L. Paoni and Kenneth M. Streit

Members introduced themselves to new members Sharon McCabe, Ald. Noel Radomski, and Ald. Jed Sanborn. Durocher advised that member Jesse Kaysen had submitted her resignation and this would be her last meeting. On behalf of the TPC, he thanked her for her work on the TPC.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 4/12/05

A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to Approve the Minutes A correction was noted on page 5, last paragraph, under item D.2. Transit Fare Structure: the reference should be to "Medicaid," not "Medicare."

Wong had a question about some of the statements made by staff in the fare structure discussion, but Durocher indicated this should be brought up under the discussion of this item on today's agenda. The motion passed by acclamation.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

Georgian Springen, 6211 Bridge Road, Monona, identified herself as a Metro bus driver and stated she serves on Metro's health and safety committee. She stated that bus drivers and passengers have encountered problems with bad behavior by some passengers, and she asked that the June agenda include the topic of security cameras on buses. The problems are occurring both on the buses and at the transfer points. Metro used to have cameras on the school routes, and drivers felt the cameras were effective in deterring bad behavior (fighting, swearing, property damage, etc.) and also were used by the school principals to identify the students. Ms. Springen remarked that in 2002, Metro had proposed to put cameras on mainline buses and at the transfer points, but the request was denied by the TPC and the Common Council. She advised that Beloit, Milwaukee, Wausau, Green Bay and Waukesha transit systems all use surveillance cameras. Cameras are also used in banks, convenience stores, at ATMs, etc. Metro drivers want a safe working environment and a pleasant experience for their passengers. Even though there may be some privacy concern about installing cameras, Metro drivers don't know of another way to protect themselves and passengers. Ms. Springen supported cameras for safety reasons.

Motion by Golden/Wong to allow the speaker an additional two minutes, carried unanimously.

Ms. Springen referenced recent news articles about behavior problems on buses and at the transfer points. She indicated that one driver did an informal survey of other drivers. Drivers are asking for help dealing with fighting, weapons, threats, swearing, drunks, assaults, etc. and to stop Metro being portrayed in a negative light.

Ms. Springer reiterated the request by drivers that the issue of purchase and installation of security cameras be placed on the next agenda.

Golden asked whether this has been discussed with the drivers' union, and Ms. Springen indicated that it will be an agenda topic at a meeting next week. Wong asked about the driver survey, and Ms. Springen advised that she could provide a copy of the survey. The driver received 31 responses, two from passengers and the rest from drivers.

Motion by Golden/Radomski to refer the issue to the Transit General Manager, the Teamsters Union, and Labor Relations since it appears to be a bargainable issue, and also refer it to the Madison Police Department. All referral parties should issue a report to the TPC on the nature and extent of the problem and a discussion of options, including but not limited to cameras, as soon as practicable.

Golden noted that generally union-related issues do not come to the TPC, and the TPC needs to be very respectful of that process and things that can be bargained.

Paoni asked about the possibility of a greater Police presence on buses during certain times. Ms. Springen noted that a lot of problems occur at the South Transfer Point, and there is additional Police and Metro supervisor attention there. She was not sure about officers riding the bus, although drivers would probably welcome that. Paoni asked if that is a bargainable issue. Ms. Springen advised that the union had offered to give MPD officers a free pass if they were on the bus since they would act as a deterrent to bad behavior, but they were told they could

not negotiate that. Debo commented that the City employees will soon have an unlimited ride pass program so all City employees, including police officers, will be able to ride for free. She anticipated the program starting in August.

Motion carried unanimously.

D. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- D.1. Communication dated April 4, 2005 from S. Thornton, 1104 Jenifer St., Madison re: Madison Metro external route annuciations.

A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Hoag, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER Members first heard from the registrant, Scott Thornton, 1104 Jenifer Street. Mr. Thornton stated that he started hearing the external announcements in March. He complained to the City, and the first response was that the announcements are required under the ADA. A subsequent response asked him to identify specific problems on a bus-by-bus basis. The external announcements were tested on three routes (1, 3, and 31) before being implemented system-wide. Mr. Thornton advised that Route 3 is one of three routes that stop in front of his house. He attended the ADATS meeting this past Thursday when this issue was discussed. Not using external announcements will not violate ADA, and he requested that the announcements in front of his house be stopped. It's already a problem with only Route 3 being announced. There was no advance notice that this was going to happen. Mr. Thornton asked that in the future when Metro is going to do something that affects property owners, that they be notified before it happens rather than reacting after it happens.

Mr. Thornton stated that the loudness of the announcement depends on how far the bus pulls up to the stop. At first, he could hear the announcements over his TV; now some of the announcements seem less audible.

Wong asked about the purpose of the announcement. Debo explained that there are both internal and external announcements. The external announcement is for those waiting to board a bus. Durocher said that Ann Gullickson, Transit Service Manager, was present to give a report on the automated stop announcements under agenda item D.2.

Golden wanted to know what happened at the ADATS meeting and whether this should be referred to them. Kaysen stated that ADATS members felt it was time for the issue to go to the TPC. Golden suggested that if the TPC comes up with a potential solution, it be run past the ADATS.

Paoni asked whether it was the case that some buses are too loud but not others. Mr. Thornton indicated that apparently some adjustments have been made, but the speakers are in different locations depending on the bus type. Again, the loudness also depends on where the bus stops. Mr. Thornton remarked that he hears a lot of noise from Metro buses, and this is just too much. Durocher asked whether the modifications have made a difference. Mr. Thornton couldn't say for sure since he's usually not home during the day.

Ald. Judy Olson, District 6, registered to speak. She was happy to hear that it appears there will be more discussion about this issue. She realized that Metro has other issues to address. Mr. Thornton is asking that the announcements in front of his house be terminated, and she encouraged the TPC to do so. Ald. Olson appreciated the hard work that goes into running the bus system, but you need to balance the impacts on adjoining neighbors. She hoped that there is some way to take into consideration Mr. Thornton's needs.

Paoni asked whether Ald. Olson had heard from any residents with disabilities who are thankful for the announcements, and Ald. Olson replied no. She recognized that Metro and the TPC need to balance the needs of people with disabilities. She recommended that the TPC and Metro try to address the needs of both users and residents. She noted that Mr. Thornton has three routes that stop in front of his house.

[The following discussion/action took place as part of agenda item D.2.]

It was noted that item D.1., Mr. Thornton's communication, needed an action to be reported back to the Common Council.

Motion by Golden/Hoag to report to the Common Council that the TPC requested staff to prepare a comprehensive report on the operating policy for announcements and bring it to the TPC for approval in a timely way; said report to address all users of Metro and affected residents near bus stops; carried unanimously. The motion passed by acclamation.

D.2. ITS Update

Ann Gullickson, Transit Service Manager, briefly reviewed the memo that had been provided in the agenda packet. Internal announcements began last November. The internal announcements, which are an ADA requirement, let riders know the upcoming stop. Metro worked with the TPC in defining the stops to be announced. In the "inner zone," which has a heavy volume of boardings and alightings, every bus stop is announced. The inner zone is defined as the area bounded by the Yahara River, Wingra Creek, and Midvale Boulevard. Once outside this area, Metro follows the ADA guidelines for stops that must be announced: published timepoints, major intersections, major destinations, and at periodic intervals to assist in passenger orientation. Citizen calls to Metro's Customer Service Representatives were used to identify the "major destinations" requested by passengers. The outer zone stops are adjusted and modified as Metro receives feedback from customers. Internal announcements were implemented on pilot routes last fall, and announcements on all routes were implemented in February.

Gullickson reported that about six weeks ago, Metro implemented external announcements on four routes. The announcements are for people waiting at bus stops that serve multiple routes. Staff had assumed that the radius around the bus stop would trigger when the announcement is made. But it's been a bit of problem to determine when the announcement is made. It needs to be made soon enough to allow passengers time to get ready to disembark. But there are other triggers within the system as to when the announcement is made. In fact, the bus stop radius is the third (not first) most important trigger. Metro is continuing to work with the vendor to get more control and uniformity as to when the announcement is made; sometimes it is made too close to the stop or even after the stop and serves more as an orientation announcement.

For external announcements, the issue is the decibel level. Metro used a decibel meter and in two occasions adjusted the volume down. The level varies from bus to bus; the speakers are placed in different locations depending on the manufacturer, and the speakers have different covers. The sound level also depends on weather conditions, wind, etc. Gullickson stated that Metro has done its best to bring the volume down as low as possible but still be audible to people waiting at the stop. The announcements also need to be loud enough to be heard at the transfer points above the other noise, including idling buses. The sound is now at a level where Metro may not be able to keep it that low; it depends on customer feedback as to whether it's too low for people who rely on it.

Kaysen asked if there are qualitative measures as to practical decibel levels for braking buses, idling buses, announcements, etc. Gullickson indicated that Metro did receive a three-page list of decibel levels of various sounds. She stated that Metro is trying to bring the decibel level down to 70 decibels. The loudest announcement measured close to 80.

Carlsen asked whether the speakers are flush mounted or whether they can be tipped. Gullickson stated that on some buses, the speaker cover is louvered down toward passengers. On other buses, the speaker is mounted flush in the bus, at about knee height. Carlsen wondered whether Metro is in non-compliance with Madison's sound ordinance. Right now, the external announcements are being tested on only three routes, and he anticipated there will be more complaints when the announcements are implemented systemwide and he felt the problem needs to be addressed. Gullickson remarked that Mr.

Thornton's feedback has been very valuable and has given Metro a chance to test the levels and find a more appropriate volume. Metro also received interesting feedback from ADATS, including some members who suggested that Metro should perhaps step back and see how valuable and necessary a tool this is. It's something for Metro to think about during the pilot program, as well as actively solicit participation by the visually impaired to ride the pilot routes and let Metro know whether the announcements are useful. Gullickson pointed out that Metro has to comply with the ADA, and if external announcements are not used it is the responsibility of the driver to make the announcements.

Streit asked whether there is a specific timeline for the phase-in of all routes, i.e., is there a deadline for ADA compliance? Kaysen interjected that it was due in 1992. Streit asked whether Metro has contacted the manufacturers, but Gullickson advised that the adjustments can be made in-house. As far as the external announcement, Golden asked if the only choices are on or off. Is the external announcement activated whenever the bus stops, or only when someone boards? Gullickson stated it's activated when the doors open. Golden asked whether it's possible to change it to only when someone's boarding, since someone getting off doesn't need it. These kinds of variables need to be considered. Is it possible to choose the stops for external announcements? He asked that staff provide a report on the technical capabilities available. Hoag asked whether a noise expert has looked at controlling the volume by installing covers over the speakers, etc. There are other measures besides decibels to consider. Gullickson replied that may be something they could pursue.

In response to Wong's question, Gullickson stated that the announcement is activated when the doors are opened. She reiterated that the external announcements are made only at stops serving more than one route. Wong stated he has not heard the external announcements himself, and he felt they probably are less noisy than gas-powered lawn mowers.

Debo mentioned that the internal announcements are geocoded, while the external announcements are triggered by the door opening.

Paoni stated that she relies on the stop announcements and help from the bus drivers. She noted that the TPC has talked about this issue several times, and the final implementation date for announcements keeps being changed. Metro gave a date of July 1, and Paoni wanted to hear a commitment to resolve any problems by then. Implementation of stop announcements is already 13 years late. Paoni noted that Gullickson's staff memo refers to only three customer complaints on the pilot internal announcements, yet she herself has made more than that. Gullickson stated the information came from the Customer Service Representatives, and she will check on it. Paoni advised that the internal announcements are not very useful until the sequencing problems can be addressed. Other transit systems have probably used this equipment, and perhaps Metro could check with them.

Paoni asked whether detours and the Farmers' Market route will be announced. Gullickson stated the drivers will be doing the announcements for the Farmers' Market. Detours that change by the day or the time of day (like the Farmers' Market) will not have automatic announcements. Longstanding detours during major construction projects will have the detour stops automatically announced. Paoni commented that when Metro and the TPC talked about installing this

automated system, one of the reasons was because of the spotty record of driver announcements. She wondered if this is a training issue. She was concerned that the driver problem will continue with detours and requested that there be additional driver training. Gullickson advised that Metro has been instructing drivers as to their responsibilities, and automated announcements do not relieve them of their duties. It will be a long-term training issue and for some drivers it might even involve discipline. It will take a variety of tools to make it happen: notice postings, training sessions, newsletter, etc. Paoni advised that she has encountered consistent non-compliance and wondered what the solution is-what is the plan to address it? Gullickson stated that if Metro receives consistent feedback that a driver is not announcing stops, there is a process. But Paoni felt that if it's a problem with a number of drivers, that would seem to signal that it's a systemic problem, and Gullickson agreed.

Durocher asked if Metro has received feedback from riders other than TPC members, and Gullickson said they had one comment from someone asking why the external announcements were not on all the buses.

Durocher suggested that the TPC receive periodic updates.

Kaysen remarked that if she had to rely on stop announcements, she would not be able to use the system. She has seen visually impaired customers receive terrible customer service on the bus. The ADA requirements should be a floor, not a ceiling. The stops in the periphery are far apart and all of them should be announced, and she suggested the TPC consider this as a policy. She has worked on this issue for the past 20 years. Stop announcements make a difference not only to visually impaired riders but also for riders who are learning to read English, visitors, and people trying to figure out how to use the system. She was very frustrated that the technology is so challenging to use. Kaysen was aware of other transit systems that have used announcements for the past 10 years. She hoped that Metro could find another transit system with the same Siemens equipment and see how they solved their problems. Perhaps Metro has not invested the energy that other systems around the country have done. Getting drivers to announce stops is a challenge but doable. APTA can provide training for Metro. Kaysen strongly urged Metro to take proactive steps to make announcements a reality before the issue ends up in court. She commented that over a month's time, she heard only two bus drivers announce stops-this is a systemwide problem. Metro needs to come up with a system that has a strong training program as well as the equipment. Kaysen again requested that internal announcements be used for all stops.

Golden noted that he had referred Mr. Thornton's communication to the TPC. Metro and the TPC need to address the users of Metro as well as affected residents. He suggested that staff develop a comprehensive policy on the use of announcements, including enumeration of technical issues, whether individualization is possible, and cost impacts.

It was noted that item D.1., Mr. Thornton's communication, needed an action to be reported back to the Common Council.

Motion by Golden/Hoag to report to the Common Council that the TPC requested staff to prepare a comprehensive report on the operating policy for announcements and bring it to the TPC for approval in a timely way; said report

**to address all users of Metro and affected residents near bus stops; carried
unanimously.**

D.3. Annual review of Physicians Plus Insurance Corp. TDM Plan

Members were provided a memo from Mayor Cieslewicz in which he asked the TPC to approve a continued relationship with the employers and developer. He noted that funds generated from the parking ramp advertising program will be used to hire a TDM coordinator for the City.

David Dryer noted that Shelly Rufer, PPIC Human Resources Director, was unable to attend the meeting due to medical reasons.

Ald. Robbie Webber, former TPC member, was present for the discussion. She noted that last year, the TPC emphasized that they wanted to see progress in reducing single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips. While there appears to have been some variation from year to year, the question is whether the TPC finds the mode split to be adequate and whether PPIC has done enough as far as incentives for non-SOV modes and disincentives for SOV use.

Wong felt that PPIC is not making significant progress and in fact is not even trying because they don't need to. He was very insulted by the results and felt that PPIC is thumbing its nose at the City. PPIC employees have free parking so there's no reason for them not to drive. He liked the idea of upping the amount that employees have to pay for parking but didn't see PPIC making any serious effort in this regard. He contrasted the PPIC plan with the Network222 plan, which he felt is doing a better job.

Golden agreed that there has not been much progress in reducing SOV trips. He recalled that when the TPC first came up with the idea of leveraging parking spaces for a TDM Plan, it had never been done before in Madison. The intent was to use Parking Utility facilities to induce employers to encourage TDM, reduce the SOV trips, and increase the number of people per vehicle brought to the downtown. He did not agree with Wong that PPIC was thumbing its nose at the TPC. Golden commented that he will be very curious to see how many City employees take advantage of the free bus pass when it is offered this summer. He believed that the average mode split for downtown is more favorable than PPIC's results. He recalled that when the long-term lease program was initiated, it was agreed that the employer could do whatever it wanted for TDM efforts but there must be results. Golden felt that PPIC has not achieved the desired results, and he would not support renewing the lease. He was ready to put the parking spaces back into the mix. Golden felt the TPC should look at terminating the agreement, perhaps giving PPIC a "short" chance to get better results or else lose the spaces.

Paoni asked Dryer if he had any information as to why PPIC was not getting more employees to use alternate modes, but Dryer indicated he couldn't answer that. He did not know what the employee type is and whether it lends itself to transit or other modes.

Kaysen agreed with Golden's suggestion for a short chance to improve results. She noted that it's currently an easy time of year to get people to use alternate modes, and she felt that a six month period might be better than three months in order to get a more true result; she felt that three months of summer weather might result in an alternate mode "spike" that would not carry through year-round

Motion by Kaysen/Carlsen to require a 10% reduction in SOV trips within the next

six months (by November 2005) or the lease won't be renewed.

Given a possible six-month timeframe, Golden asked about the optimal time for changing the status of the parking spaces. Also, should the spaces go back to daily spaces or should the Parking Utility approach other employers about using the spaces? Dryer was not sure what he would do. He emphasized that the first step would be to check with the City Attorney's office about terminating the lease. The terms for terminating the lease are somewhat vague. Dryer expressed concern that the TPC's proposed requirement for a 10% reduction in SOV trips was pulled out of the air and might not withstand scrutiny as a reasonable requirement. He enumerated the conditions for a 60-day termination of the lease by the City: (1) the lessee fails to make the rental payment when due; (2) the lease would render the interest on the City's parking revenue bonds no longer tax exempt; or (3) the lessee defaults under any other substantial term or condition of the lease. He was not sure that PPIC would be found in default. Golden agreed that the idea of terminating the lease needs to be run by the City Attorney, and something that might be used to support the TPC's position is a comparison of PPIC's percentage of SOV trips (86%) with the year 2000 data from the MPO showing the average Central Business District SOV use to be 58%. Dryer remarked that the Federal EPA guidelines shoot for 86%.

Golden asked that staff and the City Attorney bring back a recommendation on the basis of what's been discussed tonight, but what's loud and clear is that if it's okayed by the City Attorney, the lease would be terminated.

Hoag was uncomfortable with the discussion. While he would like to convince commuters not to drive downtown, he recognized that the City has a concern about keeping employers in the downtown and he was not sure the TPC's proposed action would go over well. He was a little concerned that if the TPC is serious about this, the City needs to take a more active approach in the TDM efforts rather than putting the burden on the employer. Wong understood Hoag's concern and agreed that the City could be doing more to encourage non-SOV commuting. But the TPC has statistics that show in general how people get downtown, and those numbers show that only 58% use SOV. PPIC is supposed to be working on meeting this target, but they appear to be going backwards. Wong didn't think it was unreasonable to say to PPIC that they are not making progress because they are not charging for parking. If employees had to pay the full parking price, they might change their mode of travel.

Dryer pointed out that PPIC did increase the parking cash-out to \$60. Parking Utility staff recommended that PPIC charge for parking, but he did not know PPIC's response.

McCabe wondered about PPIC's expectations and preferred to bring them into the discussion since the TPC is talking about taking fairly drastic action.

Kaysen withdrew her motion.

Webber mentioned that the TPC had talked with PPIC representatives last year. At that time, the TPC was not pleased with PPIC's progress. The TPC made some suggestions and stated that if they didn't see progress, they would not renew the lease. Webber acknowledged that PPIC did increase the parking cash-out in 2004 but that's the only new thing that has been done. They did not increase

what they charge for parking. She was pleased to see that PPIC did a new survey of employees. In response to the question asking employees to rank incentives for using alternate modes, the highest ranked was "flexible work schedule," which PPIC indicates it uses somewhat. However, the second highest was "guaranteed ride home in an emergency" yet PPIC still does not have a formal ride home program. This appears to be extremely important to employees. Considering how high it ranked, it seemed to Webber that PPIC would do something to establish a formal ride home program. Webber commented that PPIC had a year to work on the TPC's comments from last year's review.

[Ed. note: The following excerpt is taken from the minutes of the TPC's 5/11/04 meeting:

Motion by Kaysen/Webber to accept the staff report and recommendations and further that PPIC conduct an employee survey (reusing the HNTB survey if possible) and use the survey as an opportunity to advertise the incentives for alternative modes.

Friendly amendment by Paoni that PPIC be encouraged to integrate the results of the survey in their TDM plan.

Friendly amendment by Webber to rephrase the motion to say that the TPC requests that PPIC do a new survey of employees and comment on the results vis-à-vis the implications for their TDM program, said comments to be included in the next annual review.

Wong recognized that the TPC can't make it a condition of the lease, but he asked if the TPC can suggest that PPIC charge for parking. He would like to see better numbers. Wong was frustrated that the TPC doesn't have much leverage because it's a 10-year lease for the stalls and PPIC is not violating it in any way. Carlsen remarked that over the years, PPIC has tried to make improvements in the program based on suggestions from the TPC and from within the company. He did not believe that the TPC should take a threatening stance toward PPIC. Wong agreed but pointed out that PPIC's numbers are going the wrong way. Webber did not feel that the TPC needed to do anything at this point. She believed that Ms. Rufer and Mr. Preizler will take the suggestions from the TPC seriously even if they are not a requirement and will consider that the City and its citizens are very serious about cutting down on SOV trips, especially in the downtown. Further, at some point the lease could be renegotiated or terminated, and PPIC is aware that there is some expectation that progress will be made in reducing the number of SOV trips and the number of parking stalls required. She did not believe that the TPC has to try and make this a requirement. She felt that PPIC is listening to the TPC comments.

Motion carried unanimously. END OF 2004 EXCERPT]

Paoni remarked that during the discussion last year, PPIC was put on notice to make some changes. However, no representatives were present tonight to discuss whether they feel they had made such changes. She agreed that the TPC needs legal clarification as to the conditions of the lease and whether not meeting the TPC's requests is sufficient to terminate the lease. The TPC can't have a greater expectation of PPIC than what is called for in the lease.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to (1) refer the matter to the City Attorney for the

purpose of reviewing the merits of any argument for lease termination, and that the TPC discuss the item in closed session if necessary; (2) that David Dryer and Ward Paxton review the current TDM Plan and offer recommendations to enhance or improve performance; (3) that PPIC be asked to attend the June TPC meeting to discuss what they can do to improve their performance; and (4) that the TPC report to PPIC its concern about the results of their TDM efforts and the need to significantly decrease SOV trips, and inform PPIC that the TPC is discussing lease termination but has not made any decisions; motion carried unanimously.

D.4. Network222 (West Washington Associates) TDM Plan

Members were provided a memo from Mayor Cieslewicz in which he asked the TPC to approve a continued relationship with the employers and developer. He noted that funds generated from the parking ramp advertising program will be used to hire a TDM coordinator for the City.

Stacy Nemeth, The Fiore Companies, 150 East Gilman St. and Bill Kunkler, West Washington Associates/Fiore Companies, registered in support of the plan and were available to answer questions.

Rebecca Grossberg, Madison Environmental Group, 25 N. Pinckney Street, commented that Fiore is very committed to the TDM Plan. She reminded the TPC that they had seen the preliminary TDM Plan last December. Subsequent to that, MEG did a market research survey of current Network 222 employees. This provided baseline data as to commuter mode. The baseline data shows that use of alternate commute modes (non-SOV) is already quite high, which shows that Network222 is already doing something right. Fifty-nine percent (59%) answered "yes" or "maybe" when asked if they would consider increasing their use of alternative transportation. Ms. Grossberg noted that Network222 is not completely full yet and the mix of employers will likely change, but the TDM goal is to reduce the SOV rate from 75% to 69%. This number refers to the percent of employees using SOV at least once per week during warm months of the year.

Motion by Golden/Kaysen to allow the speaker an additional two minutes, carried unanimously.

To meet the goal for all modes, MEG will provide a package of TDM programs as outlined in the Plan. The programs will be marketed through a brochure and an interactive website. MEG will be involved with the TDM Plan on an ongoing basis and will meet with the individual tenants. Kaysen asked whether Fiore will be underwriting the activities on an ongoing basis. Ms. Nemeth stated yes, there will be an ongoing expense built into the operating budget for the building to have a consultant for the management and operation of the TDM Plan.

Golden noted that the Plan does not mention a Transportation Management Association, and he asked whether a TMA was considered. Ms. Grossberg indicated she was not versed in the TMA structure.

Kaysen referenced the staff report and conditions and requested that Network222 come back in a year with long-term goals.

Golden commented that there was a fundamental difference between the Network 222 and PPIC TDM Plans. PPIC came in with the Mayor at their side in an effort to retain PPIC as a downtown employer. The issue for the TPC was "why PPIC and not someone else?" The TPC authorized staff to put out a request for downtown employers interested in participating in a TDM Plan in order to rent City stalls on a long-term basis, and only PPIC responded. The intent of the program was to see significant improvement (decrease) in SOV use. The idea of keeping an employer downtown was a major factor. Network222 has taken a different course. When Alliant moved from the downtown a few years ago, it opened up a lot of parking as well as vacant space in Fiore's building. Fiore needed long-term parking to market its building and was willing to consider whatever program the City came up with to revitalize the West Washington corridor. The City considered a number of parking options, such as space at Metropolitan Place and

even building a new structure. But there was always the idea in the background that the City would arrange to offer parking space to Network222 in exchange for a TDM Plan. Because the building involves multiple small tenants, it offers the opportunity of creating a TMA, which Golden described as an association of multiple employers who participate in a single TDM program. It opens up more opportunities for carpooling, etc. He hoped that Network222 offered the opportunity to create the city's first TMA, an idea whose time has come.

Golden remarked that while he has not been very satisfied with PPIC's results, it's better than an employer building a parking ramp. The TPC needs to judge whether Network222's Plan is a good proposal and to decide the larger issue of whether the TPC wants to continue down the road of using Parking Utility facilities to leverage TDM Plans.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to approve the Network222 plan subject to the negotiated addition of Transportation Management Association language as agreeable to Network222 and City staff.

Friendly amendment by Paoni that the City Attorney be requested to draft model TDM contract language for future agreements; motion as amended carried unanimously.

D.5.

Amending portions of Section 11.06 to modify fees and procedures for licensing of public passenger services, to provide an exception to the 24 hour service requirement in the event of certain unsafe weather conditions, to permit a premium fare for large parties, and to allow a passenger to be charged a "no-load" fee as well as a fee for soiling or damaging a vehicle.

A motion was made by Ald. Golden to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER Bill Knobloch of the Transportation Dept. was present as staff on this item. Tom Royston, 5238 Esker Drive, Madison, representing Badger Cab Co., and Karl Schulte, 2458 Pennsylvania Avenue, Madison, representing Union Cab, registered in support and were present to answer questions.**

Motion by Golden/Kaysen to approve the ordinance.

Durocher noted for the benefit of the new members that the changes had been discussed at a previous TPC meeting. Kaysen recalled the previous concern that someone requesting an accessible cab could be charged extra if the only vehicle available was a large one. Has this been addressed? Knobloch said yes, it was addressed by language stating that the extra fee could be charged only if the customer requested a vehicle that could accommodate six or more passengers.

Sanborn wanted to confirm that the ordinance changes allow, rather than mandate, that the cab companies do these things. Knobloch responded yes, the ordinance changes give the carriers greater flexibility. The changes also provide greater flexibility for customers, who will be able to order a single large vehicle rather than two separate vehicles to transport a group of people.

Motion carried unanimously. The motion passed by acclamation.

D.6. Dis/Vet parking spaces on the Square (request from Parking Council for People With Disabilities)

Members were provided a memo from Mayor Cieslewicz in which he asked that the TPC not designate any of the new Square parking stalls specifically for disabled parking.

Bill Knobloch provided a brief overview of how this item came to be on the TPC agenda. Yesterday, the City implemented 27 new metered parking stalls on the outside of the Capitol Square. The meters are either 25 minutes or 2 hours. None of the stalls were designated for disabled parking. People with a disabled hangtag or license plate can park at any of the meters. At the 25 minute-meters, they need to plug the meter and abide by the time limit. At the 2-hour meters, they don't need to pay and can park there all day if they desire. Knobloch stated he did a visual survey today of the parking stalls at 10 a.m., noon, 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. and saw only one vehicle with a dis/vet tag. Carlsen indicated that was his vehicle.

Knobloch stated that the parking meters and associated traffic lane configuration changes are being done on a trial basis. At the end of the trial, staff will decide what kind of parking needs to be established for dis/vet parkers. The Parking Council for People With Disabilities passed a motion asking that evaluation of the trial be referred to the Parking Council for their comments and recommendations before the TPC makes a recommendation.

Carlsen advised that he serves as Chair of the Parking Council and remarked that he was chastised by people in the disabled community for not having dis/vet stalls included in the trial. He recognized that he had "missed the boat" for not referring this to the Parking Council when the pilot was brought up earlier at the TPC. Carlsen stated he had sent a letter to both Knobloch and the Mayor, relaying the Parking Council's view that it was inappropriate to implement any kind of trial without at least two dis/vet spaces. The parking ignores the needs of the disabled community, and he felt the lack of designated dis/vet spaces is a gross oversight. He remarked that when he drove around the Square about 4 p.m. today, he saw a number of conflicts between vehicles, buses and delivery trucks, as well as tour buses parked in front of metered spaces but no enforcement. He talked to a shop owner who also indicated a problem with tour buses parked on the Square in front of meters. Carlsen mentioned that he had not yet had a response from the Mayor or Knobloch in response to the letter he had sent them.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to refer the trial evaluation to the Parking Council as requested by the Parking Council, and to refer the question of whether the new metered stalls are on the Parking Enforcement Officer routes for enforcement.

Carlsen mentioned that he also saw vehicles parked at stalls with expired meters. Knobloch stated that the metered spaces are on the enforcement routes but there is a grace period. Knobloch indicated that when he did his noon survey, he saw 13 vehicles in non-metered spaces and a few vehicles in metered stalls. A number of school/tour buses, attended by the drivers, were in No Parking zones. He did not see any school buses parked in metered stalls. Knobloch said he will send a letter to all bus companies encouraging them to use loading zones to drop off/pick up their passengers but to wait at Olin Park.

Friendly amendment by Kaysen, accepted by Golden/Carlsen, that two dis/vet spaces be added for the remainder of the trial period, the locations to be

determined by staff.

Golden remarked that the real victory for the disabled community will be when their needs are included right from the beginning. In a comment to Knobloch, Golden suggested that there be no grace period for parking violations. Golden also expressed concern about the problem with delivery trucks destroying the curbs and causing problems for Metro buses dropping off passengers.

Debo noted that the conflicts with tour/school buses need to be addressed. This issue was part and parcel of the discussions with staff and the Common Council and it has to be dealt with as promised. There are hundreds of school buses that use the Square. Metro buses will not be able to access their designated spots. Knobloch indicated the letter will be sent to bus companies, sponsors (e.g., museums), and the Capitol. He pointed out that enforcement has not started yet. He agreed that the message needs to get out to the bus companies. Debo appreciated that efforts are being undertaken. Knobloch remarked that for the long term, delivery trucks are the real problem.

Carlsen mentioned that as far as dis/vet parking, staff need to consider that the ADA is considering a requirement for one dis/vet space on each block face that has metered parking. The Parking Council is only asking for two spaces during the test on four block faces.

Sanborn asked if the locations for the dis/vet spaces have been determined, to which Knobloch replied no. Golden reminded staff that the grade cannot exceed 8%, which will eliminate some locations.

Motion as amended carried unanimously.

D.7.

Authorizing the Parking Utility to sign an agreement with Adams Outdoor Advertising Limited Partnership to sell and manage advertising services for the City's Parking Utility.

A motion was made by Ald. Golden to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER Members were provided a memo from Mayor Cieslewicz in which he asked the TPC to approve the resolution. He noted that funds generated from the parking ramp advertising program will be used to hire a TDM coordinator for the City. Further, he believed that parking ramp ads are a good way to create a better environment in a dark and not very appealing area and can give local businesses an additional way to advertise.

Pat Frawley and Chris Eisenberger, Adams Outdoor Advertising, 102 E. Badger Road, were present to answer questions.

Knobeloch advised that Adams Outdoor Advertising was the only bidder in response to the Parking Utility's Request for Proposals. The agreement guarantees the Utility a minimum amount of revenues. The ads will be lighted signs, and he directed members to the Agreement and the Policy on Leased Advertising Space (included in the agenda packet) for the restrictions on the ads. He felt the ads will enhance the ramps.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to approve the resolution.

Kaysen directed attention to the "Maintenance and Repair" section and asked whether the reference to twenty-four hours meant "business" hours. Knobeloch indicated it was not defined. Mr. Eisenberger pointed out that it will be in Adams' best interests to get the work done as soon as possible. In response to Wong's question, Knobeloch advised that Adams will pay all electrical costs associated with the lighting via a separate meter.

Motion carried unanimously. The motion passed by acclamation.

D.8 Transit discussion: Cost Allocation methodology

Debo directed attention to the "Public Subsidy Computations" chart provided with the agenda. Staff spent some time on the calculations, which estimate what would happen in 2006 both with and without application of the proposed fare increase. The Revenue and Expense Projection chart depicts the next four years and shows that the fare proposal revenues would take the system about halfway to where it needs to be in meeting the budget gap in each of those four years.

Debo mentioned that the City of Madison has not been subject to the allocation formula applied to everyone else and has fallen behind. She indicated that Metro's costs are estimated to increase by 4% (rather than 3%) in 2006 due to fuel costs, and the chart shows the big impact on Metro's partners even after the application of County MA waiver funding and advertising revenues.

Debo then brought up an idea she had mentioned at last month's meeting, i.e., that since paratransit service is billed on the basis of hours of fixed route service, the paratransit funding should also be applied that way. She recalled Golden suggesting at the last meeting that paratransit revenues be applied based on the number of customers and their municipality of residence. Debo had responded at that time that if paratransit were billed that way, it would be an appropriate way to allocate revenues. She advised that 2004 paratransit data for Madison showed that 91% of trips were by Madison residents. If trips were billed based on customer residence, and revenues were applied that way, Madison would end up paying significantly more because the per trip cost (approx. \$27) is so much greater than the revenue that comes in. Billing on that basis is not something she would recommend. It would change the contractual agreements with Metro's partners, and it would vary substantially from year to year and there would be no consistency in the billing. The current paratransit billing works very well and is fair. Revenue should be applied in the same way, and that is what she's advocating in the allocation concept for the two types of County revenues.

Debo offered two concepts for allocating the advertising revenue: (1) on the same basis as the operating assistance revenue for the buses, which comes to Metro as the urbanized area, not the City per se; or (2) apply it to the contingent reserve.

Golden noted that the chart shows the Madison Metropolitan School District as one of Metro's partners. He wondered whether an untapped source of revenue might be the MMSD students in the MA waiver program. Debo noted that the School District itself provides free semester passes for children below a certain income level. Golden indicated that he was referring to the potential for overlapping eligibility. Oftentimes, when a child is eligible for services through the school district but the County doesn't provide the service, and the County covers the service, then it wouldn't be coming through the County but through the School District and they would probably be paying Metro for any paratransit trips they were buying. Debo felt the School District may be eligible for the funds. Golden thought it was worth checking out for potential revenues. Durocher noted that the School District contracts separately with paratransit providers for children outside of Madison. Golden remarked that might be a good decision except for children who are Medicaid eligible.

Debo remarked that the cost allocation concept is an opportunity to come to a policy decision. In each budget cycle, Metro tells the City what it needs to pay to maintain the level of service. This cost allocation method would provide an

upfront cost before the budget cycle starts. This is the amount that would maintain the existing service level and the City would know that its share will increase each year as costs increase. If the increase is not built into Metro's budget, the obvious assumption is that Metro should reduce service. Since 1999, service has been reduced in Madison as measured by revenue hours. Madison would know upfront what it needs to contribute to continue the level of service. The cost allocation could be adopted as a policy proposal for billing to all communities, including Madison. There would be consistency across the board, which is a stronger approach than currently. Golden asked how revenue from the UW, Edgewood and MATC is allocated. Debo stated the passenger revenue is allocated route by route. If two communities share a route, such as Route 60 shared by Madison and Middleton, the revenue is allocated proportionately. This is reflected in the operating revenue column on the chart.

Kaysen noted that the chart shows that Madison would need to pay an additional \$911,900 (on top of its current subsidy) if there is no fare increase. She remarked that the TPC alders will have to decide how to "sell" a \$911,000 increase to the rest of the Council. In the past, the Madison increase request was vague but now it can be tied to hours of service. But she wondered how you measure the value of "being Madison" - people want to come here, it's a destination. Is it right to bill everyone the same way? Consideration should also be given to question whether the TPC is acting as an advisory board for Madison, or for Metro as the urbanized area? As the board for Metro, it makes sense to go to the new approach. But if the TPC is the transit board for Madison, there might be some inertia to implement this change.

Paoni wondered how this fits in with Transport 2020 and a regional approach to transit. Golden remarked that a regional approach to governance is moving slow, and some major entities would have to pay a lot more money. A major issue is how to create a regional transit board where all entities feel they are being satisfactorily represented.

Debo indicated that under Metro's partner contracts, Metro is required to share State and Federal funding but what has not been addressed is County funding. Metro has been using a cost allocation formula for all entities except the City of Madison. It's a very fair system based on the hours of service. It's a mechanism for a metropolitan transit system. However, since it hasn't been applied to Madison, the level of route service in Madison has kept going down. Allocating the costs based on service puts it up front and says "this is what it costs." The Common Council may say the City can't afford it and there are other priorities, but then it would be understood upfront that there would be reductions in Madison's service. Paoni noted that Metro's deficit is growing and if the cost allocation concept is implemented, Metro still needs a lot more money from the City, even with the proposed fare structure. Could that all happen in time to balance things out? Debo stated that she needs to determine what will happen. She would like approval from the TPC by June or July as to the approach since Metro needs to put together their budget and let their partners know what their costs will be. The fare is another issue-but the allocation method could be voted on as a policy.

Debo directed members' attention to the beneficial impact of the fare increase on the 2006 cost allocation. She hoped to see other revenue sources that would mitigate the cost to the partners. There is the possibility that State aid will be increased. Miscellaneous revenue sources, like vending at the transfer points,

will not generate a lot of money; advertising at bus shelters would likely not generate substantial revenues the first few years due to the need to provide electricity, etc. Debo pointed out that even if Metro gets a 2% increase in State aid, it would be shared with the other partners; it would not be a lot for Madison but it would help mitigate the impact of changing the cost allocation. In response to Paoni's question, Debo stated that the cost allocation chart provides a preliminary idea of what Madison would need to pay above its current subsidy, although the numbers may change somewhat as Metro works on putting together its budget in the next couple of months.

Wong asked whether approving the cost allocation concept also approves a fare increase. Debo replied no. The change in the cost allocation is that Madison would have the same formula applied as Metro's other partners.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to accept the report; carried with Wong abstaining.

E. OLD BUSINESS ITEMS

- E.1. Transit fare structure discussion

Debo noted that Metro and the TPC have been talking about changing the fare structure, as requested in the Mayor's 2005 Executive Budget. Fares were last raised in January 2004. To address past budget shortfalls resulting from increased costs, Metro has either cut service or raised fares. Over the years, Metro's passengers have said they prefer fare increases to service cuts. The process suggested by Debo is to implement a fare change this summer, see what happens with City and State funding, and then see what would be necessary as far as service reductions. The Draft 6 fare proposal includes the additional information requested by the TPC at their last meeting.

Wong had been absent from the April TPC meeting and mentioned that there were statements in the April minutes that he didn't think were accurate. There's a high percentage of riders who get a free bus pass and thus are not affected by a fare increase the same way as those who pay. He was not sure the overall ridership change referenced by staff takes into account those riders on a "fixed" program. Wong felt that when you talk about a fare increase, you're really talking about what happens to choice riders versus captive riders. He believed that choice riders use tickets most often. The Draft 6 fare proposal does not show the pre-January 2004 fares; if it did, it would show that ticket prices increased 22% with the Jan. fare increase. If tickets are used by choice riders, and you want to keep these riders in the system, then why is the ticket price increasing 70% by August 2008? In the same time period, the unlimited ride pass rate only goes up 8.5%. To increase the "choice" fare by 70% seems like a recipe for disaster. Wong felt it was an untrue statement in the April minutes that Metro has not lost ridership due to fare increases; he recalled that fare increases almost killed Metro in the late 1970s to mid 1980s when ridership decreased dramatically. If the ticket fare increases 70% over four years, the system will lose riders they might have gained from high gas prices.

Debo asked what the alternative is-service cuts or worse. Wong replied that the alternative is to come up with a better fare structure. Debo pointed out that an adult Quik Tik ticket goes up 10¢ per ride each year, although Wong interjected that it had also gone up 20¢ in 2004. Debo stated that Metro did not see a ridership loss from the 2004 increase nor from past fare increases. She noted that the fare proposal is set up so that all fare media take a hit, with the largest hit on youth. Metro did a survey of other transit systems comparable to Madison's size, and most do not provide a break for youth. And if they did offer a youth discount, they did not offer a discount on a discount on a discount (as Metro currently does). Youth already have a reduced fare, and the proposal is to phase it in to a convenience fare over three years. Debo directed attention to the ridership loss chart prepared by Sharon Persich, which projects losses if the Simpson-Curtin formula holds true for Madison. Wong wanted to know why the increase "hits" are so disproportionate-tickets increase from 90¢ at the end of 2003 to \$1.53 by August 2008 while unlimited ride passes would only go up from 82.5¢ in 2005 to 90¢ by August 2008.

Golden noted that at the April meeting, the TPC had indicated that they needed to get an answer from the Mayor as to what he plans to do with transit. The TPC does not want to go through a public hearing on fare increases if it's not necessary. Fare increases and service cuts are not the only choices. Golden pointed out that the Mayor had provided a memo addressing a number of items on tonight's agenda but did not comment on this item. He strongly felt that the TPC needs a revenue target from the Mayor, and he did not want to move forward

until the Mayor makes a statement.

Rather than having the TPC focus on things they didn't like in the fare proposal and then having Debo defend why staff made that recommendation, Golden thought it may be more productive for the TPC to say "if a fare increase is necessary, these are some of the considerations we would like to see." For example, the unlimited ride pass fare is derivative of the average cost per ride. He wanted to have the TPC discuss the convenience fare for youth. The peak hour increase for paratransit is lower than the off-peak increase and the TPC may want to adjust that. He also wanted to recognize the fact that the adult tickets had a big increase in 2004. Golden was concerned about 8% and 9% increases for tickets given inflation and stagnant salaries.

Golden indicated that before the TPC goes to public hearing, he wanted to (1) hear from the Mayor; (2) before getting into minutiae, the TPC needs to step back and look at what we're trying to do with the fare package, what are we trying to accomplish, and (3) the 2-4-1 fare needs to be addressed.

Durocher left at 8:20 p.m., and Kaysen assumed the Chair duties.

Debo indicated that she had spoken with Mayoral Assistant Jeanne Hoffman, who indicated that the Mayor supported going forward with a public hearing to get input. A hearing would allow Metro to present the problem re: major increase in costs, lay out the proposal to raise fares rather than cut service, and then get public input. The secondary purpose of the hearing is that the legislature is currently deliberating the State budget and the public discussion would drive home Metro's point about the impact of increased costs. The Mayor's office is not planning to take a stance but rather to observe the type of commentary received from the public.

Hoag was surprised to see a four-year fare structure. Fuel prices are very unpredictable, and the fare increases may not be enough in upcoming years. Debo acknowledged that there is a downside in that regard re: adopting a four-year plan. But staff felt the proposal is about what the system could tolerate without hurting the ridership. If fuel costs continue to go up, the fare increase proposal may only cover 40-45% rather than 50% of the shortfall as projected. Debo also pointed out that if the four-year plan is adopted and Metro's "ship comes in" in a year or two, the next scheduled fare increase could be deferred. But she felt that going into crisis mode every year was hurting the system.

Wong referenced Golden's earlier comment that the unlimited ride pass rate is derivative of other fares and costs, and wanted to know why the unlimited ride rate increase is much less than the other fares. Debo stated that the unlimited ride pass agreements negotiated in the past round contained a substantially greater rate per trip than they had in the past, e.g., the UW student rate went from 55¢ to 82.5¢. Staff looked at the issue of fairness re: the number of trips delivered by the pass agreements and the discount to the monthly pass holder. The type of discount for the unlimited ride pass is the same discount as offered to youth and elderly/disabled. There is a parity. Starting in 2006, the unlimited ride pass rate is 50% of the base adult fare.

Carlsen remarked that when the TPC was going through this same thing last year, the TPC held a special meeting with the Mayor because of the anxiety in the

community when fare increases are proposed. The TPC relayed to the Mayor that a public hearing is very trying for both TPC members and the public. The Mayor increased the City support and a public hearing was not necessary. Carlsen commented that the TPC has had to make very tough decisions, and he agreed with Golden that the TPC needs more input from the Mayor before going out to the community. Carlsen wanted to have specific information from the Mayor as to what he will propose in his budget. He felt the TPC should be routinely receiving this information from the Mayor each year so that the TPC doesn't need to have this same discussion about going to public hearing without having all the facts.

Sanborn remarked that even if the Mayor comes up with money this year, that may not solve the problem to the extent that fare increases can be avoided. He wanted to know how past increases have affected each fare type. Has a study been done looking at which fare structure would maximize revenues? For instance, if a private business offers a discount for volume, it's because it maximizes revenues. Perhaps the TPC needs to determine what fare structure makes the most sense economically and start moving in that direction over time. Paoni noted that Metro wants the TPC to go forward with a public hearing on the proposed fare change, and it sounds like the Mayor wants the TPC to go forward with a "strategic planning" meeting to get public input on how to solve the budget problem. These sound very different, with different expectations. If it hasn't even been determined that a fare increase and service cuts are the only options available, it's misleading to go to public hearing at this time.

Responding to Sanborn's comment, Debo advised that the proposed fare structure has been vetted for maximizing revenue and minimizing potential ridership loss. Metro has a deep discount that got lost over time, and Metro is now trying to move back to an Oram fare structure where there's a reasonable deep discount that makes sense from both a revenue and a ridership standpoint. She reiterated that the fare structure has been vetted from the perspective referenced by Sanborn. But Sanborn asked whether that vetting process started from the status quo, rather than starting from scratch i.e., if you were building a new bus system, what fare structure would be used. He realized this isn't something that Metro could do in one year, but perhaps it could start in that direction. Debo remarked that Metro does not have a blank slate to start from. Some fare structures are required by Federal law, e.g., the elderly/handicapped fare cannot be higher than half of the base cash fare, and paratransit cannot be more than double the base cash fare. The proposed fare structure for paratransit that retains the \$1.00 difference between the peak and off-peak fare was approved by ADATS. Debo explained that many of the fares are related to the cash fare, and Metro's structure is not dissimilar to other transit systems' fare structures.

Wong asked whether the unlimited ride pass rate is coupled to the overall cost. He didn't think that anything should be coupled with the cash fare since it represents such a small percentage of ridership. Also, Debo had mentioned that the unlimited ride pass rate is half of the adult cash fare, but the unlimited ride pass rate doesn't increase at all in 2006 while the cash fare goes up 10%. Wong also questioned the inequity between the unlimited ride pass rate and tickets. He reiterated his belief that the most likely fare medium used by choice riders is the 10-trip ticket. Debo advised that choice riders use all types of fares and it often depends on whether their employer offers a monthly pass or they're covered by an unlimited ride pass agreement. Wong stated that these are not choice riders,

although Debo disagreed and said a lot of those people use transit by choice.

Golden requested the following: (1) the new TPC members be provided with literature on the deep discount fare structure. The basic premise is that having a deep discount maximizes revenues and increases ridership; (2) in terms of Sanborn's comments and approaching Metro as a business, the transit system is part of a multi-modal transportation system and there are other considerations besides business, e.g., environmental considerations, congestion and travel time, and the social dimensions such as transit-dependent populations; (3) Paoni's comment about a strategic planning hearing versus a public hearing was interesting, although he wasn't sure that was the message from the Mayor. Public hearings produce angst, and he didn't want to schedule one unnecessarily; (4) if it is decided to hold a public hearing, he was not comfortable with the current proposal-he did not want to adopt a four-year plan, although he thought it was good for staff to think about four-year increments, and there are various things in the fare structure that he would like to tinker with. Debo stated staff could re-look at the structure. Sanborn suggested that staff establish a fare "cap" and then look at the relationship between the different fares from a business standpoint. Debo stated staff already does this.

In response to Wong's question, Sharon Persich of Metro staff stated that most choice riders use the monthly pass or tickets. Kaysen noted that Wong and staff were likely defining "choice rider" in different terms. Wong stated he was talking about someone who only rides the bus about four times a month. He strongly felt that this type of rider uses tickets, and if their fare gets jacked up so much higher than any other rider, they'll stop using the bus. Hoag felt that infrequent riders are just one subset of choice riders. [At the 6/14/05 TPC meeting, Wong clarified that he meant to describe a choice rider as someone who rides no more than four times a week to and from, for a total of eight trips per week, where buying a monthly pass would not be an economically good choice.]

Motion by Paoni/Wong to refer to the June TPC meeting for discussion; carried unanimously.

E.2. Transit status updates

F. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

F.1. Parking Quarterly Report - March

F.2. Parking ramp operations survey during special events

F.3. Metro YTD March Financial and Monthly Performance Indicator Reports

G. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES/COMMISSIONS/AD HOC GROUPS (presented for information only)

G.1. ADA Transit Subcommittee (4/7/05 minutes and cover memo from ADATS Chair Jesse Kaysen)

G.2. Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee (4/28/05 minutes)

- G.3. Parking Council for People With Disabilities (see agenda item D.6.)
- G.4. Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission (4/21/05 minutes)
- G.5. Mid-State Street Parking & Mixed Use Facility Evaluation Team (3/28/05 minutes)
- G.6. State Street Design Project Oversight Subcommittee
- G.7. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

H. GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS

- H.1. General announcements by Chair
- H.2. Commission member items for future agenda

ADJOURNMENT

Informational enclosures:

4/29/05 memo from Sharon Persich re: Allied Drive service

Park & Read (April 2005)