



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

---

Thursday, November 6, 2008

5:00 PM

Room 260, Madison Municipal Building  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
(After 6 PM, use Doty St. entrance.)

---

PLEASE NOTE: Items are reported in Agenda order.

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 10 -

Margaret Bergamini; 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

Solomon arrived at 5:30 PM, and Sanborn arrived at 5:34 PM.

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Poulson, seconded by Webber, to Approve the Minutes of the October 2, 2008 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

### D. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

#### D.1. [12502](#)

Parking: September 2008 Revenue & October Activity Report - TPC 11.06.08

Knobeloch reviewed the Parking reports, highlighting the following items in the first three pages:

- Total YTD revenues were down \$105K (1.4%) from 2007, and \$180K (2.3%) lower than budget.
- On-street meter revenues (inc. from construction) were down \$75.5K (5.1%) from 2007, and \$103.9K lower than budget; about \$30K of this shortfall in YTD revenues due to four sets of snow emergencies in early 2008.
- The State Street Campus ramp experienced the largest decline in cashiered revenue – \$47.8K.
- The \$23.6K revenues in RP3 and Miscellaneous reflected money received from FEMA for extra costs related to snow removal on snow emergency days.
- Occupancies were down everywhere, most notably Cap Square North, Overture, and Buckeye, with the exception of Gov East, where they were up slightly.
- Enforcement stats dropped significantly from 23% to 15% between 2007 and 2008.

- Waiting list totals stayed level.

Knobeloch predicted a \$260K revenue shortfall by year-end.

Knobeloch then showed the group a sample pay-by-space stall marker with bike rack, made with galvanized steel so it wouldn't rust, which he said would cost about \$100/each, about half the cost of Milwaukee's. He talked about the budget amendment proposed by Alder Konkel, to take out the \$640K budgeted for multi-space in Parking's capital budget as well as additional multi-space money in the operating budget, because of some concern about lowering the cost of credit card fees. He said that Parking like other City agencies (Police and Metro) would be working with US Bank, which had the lowest rates available.

Webber mentioned that she had asked Konkel to put a hold on this amendment. In response to Webber, Knobeloch confirmed that the pay-by-space meters would more than make up any extra costs related to fees, through revenue enhancements offered by the meters: people usually add extra money to meters when they can use cards, parkers would not be able to piggy-back, enforcement and maintenance would be more efficient.

Knobeloch then noted that another amendment had been offered (by Konkel) to remove the money for planning an MMB ramp. Webber explained that the proposed ramp was tied to building a downtown hotel at MMB, and there was a study going on as whether another hotel was needed, and wondered why the City would pay for a ramp rather than the hotel industry. She said we should wait until the study was done, before deciding whether to build a new parking structure on a piece of land that may or may not be occupied by a new hotel. So it was a question of delaying until that part was clear.

Knobeloch went on to talk about the cost of maintaining the ramps – \$850K this year – for concrete remediation. Noting that Gov East was built in 1958, he said that if ramps were not maintained, they would have to be closed, which was why so much money was spent on maintenance.

Looking at Page A, Knobeloch pointed out that YTD revenues were \$180.4 lower than budget, noting revenue areas below budget at Evergreen (near Trader Joe's) and Wingra Lots, and the Campus (Langdon), E. Washington, Meriter, University Area, where meters had been removed at the request of the UW.

Knobeloch responded to questions. Based on info he heard at a conference, occupancies were down everywhere because of the economy and the price of gas, which he thought was changing behaviors.

Regarding multi-space meters:

- Rates (along with other info, inc. website info for Parking, Metro, Rideshare) could be shown on the LED screen on the machine, which could be programmed from a desktop; vs. the costly 3-month process of changing rates now.
- Prices could vary from space to space, and from area to area (setting differential pricing for special events and heavily-utilized spaces, etc.); and space-specific data would be readily available.

- When no parking/driving lanes were needed, the machines would stop collecting money.
- Collections would also be less costly because printouts would show what machines to do.
- 15 meters would be installed next year (two at Buckeye, replacing 54 meters there), during which time kinks could be worked out (such as solar panels powering the meters); with 70 meters in 2010, and 15 meters in 2011, totaling 100.

Knobeloch discussed the Identity Theft Prevention policy being developed by Parking: Parking would carry the cost of ensuring PCI compliance; staff had already stopped using driver's license info for RP 3, and no longer stored full credit card numbers for monthly parkers.

Knobeloch said that TE would pay for (at \$99/each) and Parking would install the bike racks on multi-space stall markers; and added that installing the racks on all (1,600) regular meters would present problems with painting and collection. Ad revenues were down because Adams had reduced space to the minimum amount of space required by contract. From now on, the revenues would probably stay the same. Adams was interested in continuing the contract. Looking at the three-month occupancy reports, on-street meters and ramps were showing a downward trend between 2007 and 2008. Knobeloch agreed to add a 3-month average to these occupancy reports.

White/Solomon moved to receive the report. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

D.2. [12503](#)

Metro YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 11.06.08

Kamp pointed out the following for the Performance Indicators YTD 2007 vs. 2008 (financial info through August, non-financial through September), noting that the Peer Comparisons in the report were based on 2004 data and providing newer 2006 data:

- Operating revenue/operating cost: 22.3% to 23.6%; compared to 2006 data: 22.5% Metro and 22.1% peers.
- Operating cost/revenue hour: \$97.36 to \$106.76; compared to 2006 data: \$96.14 Metro and \$94.30 peers.
- Operating cost/passenger trip: \$2.99 to \$3.11; compared to 2006 data: \$2.92 Metro and \$3.97 peers.
- Trips/revenue hour: 33.27 to 35.19 (higher than peers).
- Miles per road call: 5,899 to 5,083 (much higher than peers); though the number was dropping, staff would be comparing how Metro and its peers calculated this number.
- Customer complaints, compliments and suggestions had gone up in 2008.

Looking at Fixed Route operating statistics, hours and service between 2007 and 2008 were very close; and total ridership YTD through September had increased by 543,278 or 6% over 2007, following previous trends. Though the number of accidents early in the year was significant, the number of preventable and chargeable accidents had fallen. Ridership for eight of the nine months in 2008 was at all time highs (March being lower due to timing of spring break in 2008).

Regarding Route Productivity 2007 vs. 2008, trips/revenue hour went up 5.8%

(33.2 rides/hour to 35.2); and taking away Campus routes, ridership was up 8.7% and productivity was up 8%. Kamp reiterated that though Route 80 was the most productive route in the system, there had been a problem with drivers recording riders for a period of time in 2008, and therefore the % of change in ridership and productivity numbers appeared to be lagging because of this. Members later commented about how students on Route 80 will frequently enter through the rear door, making it difficult for drivers to track them. Kamp then pointed out the big increases in ridership and productivity in the Fitchburg and Verona routes and said that overall the commuter routes were up over the system average. In general, the numbers showed encouraging trends.

Turning to Paratransit Performance Indicators 2007 vs. 2008 YTD, Kamp highlighted the following:

- Operating revenue/operating cost dropped slightly: 46.8% to 45.7%.
- Operating cost/passenger trip went up slightly due to fuel: \$27.29 to \$28.61.
- Total trips went up 2% (196K to 199.9K), bouncing back after hard winter.
- Late service reports/1000 trips showed Metro Direct at 1.09 vs. 5.85 for system average.
- Total ADA-certified clients were 3,456; new certifications in September were 42 vs. 3 denials.

Looking at Paratransit Operating Statistics 2007 vs. 2008 YTD, the number of clients riding the system went down slightly from 1,668 to 1,641 (out of 3,456 eligible clients); though the total number of rides were up 2%. YTD, passenger accidents were down; and though vehicle accidents were up, most occurred earlier in the year during the winter. Regarding Monthly Ridership historically, three of the nine months in 2008 reflected all time highs; January through March were not, but April, July and September were, bouncing back after a rough winter and expecting that trend to continue.

Kamp responded to questions, as follows:

- Passenger revenue included unlimited ride passes, cash fares, and monthly tickets.
- With current fare structure (no changes), more revenue was coming from fares as ridership increased.
- When looking at 2006 numbers, there was only a \$2 difference between Metro and its peers re: operating cost/revenue hour.
- Reflecting on Bergamini's comments about the rise in popularity of transit in August and greater efficiencies in fuller loads, Kamp said that the fact that ridership was going up was helping to offset the overall increase in costs (for fuel), so that increased costs per trip was being controlled by that.
- Half of revenue was coming from unlimited ride passes and half was coming from cash fares, but wasn't sure which area contributed most to the 6% growth in ridership.
- Agreed that peer comparisons needed to compare Metro to peers with data from the same years.
- Extra buses used to carry overflow loads at peak times were typically buses that had been used to carry school kids in the area, and were not deadhead buses sent out just to carry overflow, which mitigated operating cost/revenue hour.

Kamp then reported on hybrids for the 3rd quarter:

- During the hot summer weather, hybrids showed 25% greater fuel

efficiency (vs. 33% during cooler periods) than the newest Gilligs: 4.14 mpg vs. 5.17 mpg.

- On Campus, hybrids obtained 4.78 mpg vs. Gilligs at 3.75 mpg; off Campus, hybrids obtained 5.38 vs. Gilligs at 4.14 – 30% difference.
- Cost per mile inc. fuel, parts + labor: \$0.87 for hybrids, which were newer, vs. \$1.18 for Gilligs.

Later, members asked that Metro try to present additional info that extrapolated costs and operating savings over the life of hybrids, which could then be compared to the difference in price for hybrids vs. diesels. Kamp said a couple of different fuel prices could be used in such a report to project out over the next few years as well. A request was also made for info re: savings in CO2 and particulate emissions, in order to see environmental savings. Ann Gullickson of Metro reported that warranties were generally 5-year on most components. Members realized that this could make it difficult to project out potential costs for parts and maintenance. Gullickson said that so far, the experience with hybrids was very similar to the other buses, with very little maintenance in the first year, even with new technology – very positive overall.

Regarding the Customer Feedback Report 2007 vs. 2008 September YTD, Kamp noted:

- Total input from customers went up from 2,311 in 2007 to 2,691 in 2008.
- In Planning, comments re: “Routes” totaled 47 in 2007 vs. 307 in 2008, due to recent route changes, which contributed to the difference in totals for the two years.
- Re: “Customer passed up”, which had increased from 155 in 2007 to 199 in 2008, Metro investigated each instance using GPS, but the report did not show which were valid or not.
- Compliments went up from 91 to 134 – nice to see esp. with challenging winter.
- Paratransit comments went down from 374 to 353, which were down significantly from 547 in 2005.

Wayne Block of Metro discussed the Financial Performance Report, 2007 vs. 2008 YTD:

- The deficit had decreased by \$200K since August.
- Contributing to this decrease in the deficit: fare revenue had improved compared to budget by \$40K in September alone, and total revenue had improved by \$60K.
- Also significant in contributing to this were fixed asset expenses of \$150K budgeted for September, which didn’t go through, but which would add to deficit when it did.
- Projections through the end of the year indicated a \$526K total deficit in 2008.
- Rising fuel costs over budget during the year were mirrored in the deficit; but it was promising that though fuel costs were currently \$886K over budget, this was not entirely reflected in the smaller amount of deficit.
- Fuel costs were not as much of a factor as they had been earlier in the year and were coming down, as passenger revenue continued to increase over budget.

Poulson/Webber moved to receive the report. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

**E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS**

**E.1. [12125](#)**

Parking: Draft Resolution No. TPC-36 (revised), regarding removal of five or more on-street meters due to projects - referred to TPC 11.06.08

Knobeloch updated members on developments related to the agreement between the Parking Utility and the UW and the removal of meters on Campus. With a \$1 million price tag for 33 meters over the life of the meters, the agreement was intended to identify ways to compensate Parking for the loss of the meters without money exchanging hands.

At the request of the UW, in mid-July, Parking removed meters on Murray Street, losing the attendant hood money (from the contractor). Three weeks later, the fence still hadn't gone up. Lesson learned: Don't remove meters until the fence goes up. In late August, Parking had changed meters on 1400 block of Monroe Street, from 2 to 3-hour. UW changed their meter rates to \$1.25 to match Parking's rates.

Parking had identified ten locations for new meters and thought there might be room for some additional meters. Staff found a few more on Mills Street, where construction is now occurring, and on Langdon Street, in front of the Memorial Union. But the UW argued that these new spaces were not in line with its Master Plan, which depended on permits and off-street ramps. However, on-street meters worked best for Parking and its customers. Though not in line with the UW Plan, the City and its customers relied on on-street meters; as for example, near to the State Historical Society on Langdon. Knobeloch hoped that the TPC would agree with Parking about installing some meters in the new locations identified, to make up some of the lost revenues and to give people some extra parking.

In late September, Knobeloch had met with Bill Mann at the UWEX Pyle Center, who needed 60 parking spaces on a regular basis, which could be accommodated at the Lake Street ramp and would help replace lost revenue from removed meters (though it wouldn't replace the convenience of meters for customers). Knobeloch hadn't heard anything further about this since, but Gordon Graham would be following up with Mann.

Revenue was down \$44K in the University Area, where meters had been removed (on Orchard and Murray Streets); and revenue in the Campus Area was down \$24K. Knobeloch said that he mentioned all of this to point out that when an agreement was made with a developer, it was critical to track how it actually worked out. Did it replace the parking, did it replace the revenue, did it give people convenient places to park, did it give people with disabilities their stalls, were there loading zones and taxi loading zones? This was what was important, not what was said on paper. Once spaces were removed, they were gone; we could never go backwards. The City needed to have agreements that worked.

Turning to the proposed TPC resolution (TPC-36), Knobeloch said he worked with Hinz to revise the original draft. While working on the resolution, he was sensitive to the fact that meters were Parking assets, which had to be compensated at fair market value, as required by the bond covenants to protect the bond holders. This was why he was so concerned about what was

promised in agreements, because once this line was crossed, we would not be able to go back and get the meters back.

Hoag said he liked the wording in the new draft, and talked about the efforts of the UW to reduce vehicle traffic around certain areas like the Memorial Union, which were heavily used by pedestrians. In terms of having meters on Langdon, he thought the nearby Lake Street ramp was very convenient alternative. Philosophically, he didn't see this so much as a revenue loss, as a step in the right direction to take meters out of the area. He felt that Langdon was not served well by cruising traffic looking for parking.

Knobeloch said that Traffic Engineering had been involved in reviewing the possible locations for new meters on Langdon and Mills, and did not consider them a hazard to pedestrians or bikes. He said that using Hoag's argument re: Lake Street ramp, maybe people would wonder about removing the other 30-50 meters along Langdon. But would parking at Lake Street really be considered a good alternative and as convenient by parkers (esp. quick-trip parkers)? He didn't think so. And whether that revenue would go to the City at Lake Street ramp or to the University at Helen C. White, or to a nearby private ramp, was another question. There was no guarantee that the lost revenue would come back to the City.

Hoag said that he preferred to review each situation on a case-by-case basis, and the new language in the draft with the minimum of 5 or more meters would probably address his concerns about always having to replace fewer than five.

In response to members, Knobeloch then clarified that, per the proposal, requests to remove 5 or more meters would need to come before the TPC, for them to weigh in. However, the final review and decision would probably lie with Planning and Development and the Council. He also said that the revenue stream associated with a particular parking space was considered an "asset" according to bond covenants. He talked about developers who were required to present TDM plans; through which they were held accountable. He thought it important to have this sort of leverage built into any agreement, including the UW's.

A motion was made by Hoag, seconded by Hinz, to Approve Resolution No. TPC-36 as presented. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [11560](#)

Creating and implementing a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation and parking design for central Madison.

Webber updated members about the status of this proposal. LRTPC had a long discussion about it at its last meeting, esp. as regards DCC being the Lead on the resolution. It seemed that all parties (sponsors, LRTPC and staff) involved felt that it would be more logical for LRTPC to be the Lead. So Planning staff was re-drafting a new resolution, which would have to go back to Council to change the Lead to LRTPC. A clearer version of the resolution was currently being re-drafted, at which point it would return to Council where LRTPC would likely be named Lead.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Sanborn, to Refer the item to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION, until the proposal was re-drafted

and sent back to the Common Council for re-referral. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.3. [12127](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to amend the contract with Gillig Corporation for the manufacture and delivery of up to seventy-five (75) coaches and spare parts, and amending the 2008 Metro Transit Capital budget to transfer \$119,000 from the Swiss Colony Park and Ride to support the purchase of the transit coaches. The cost of the first order of buses is not to exceed \$7,040,000.

**Ann Gullickson, Metro's Transit Service Manager, explained that when they awarded a contract for buses, got a price in and put the resolution through, they usually left themselves a little wiggle room as to what the maximum price might be, placing it above the bid. So then at pre-production meetings with the manufacturer, they could analyze what equipment was available and what changes they might want to make, having some room to go ahead and make those changes.**

**This time, enough wiggle room was not factored in, to allow for delivery costs and specific equipment modifications that were being requested. As a result, Metro wanted to add a little more money into the budget by transferring the money earmarked for the ETP Park and Ride to enhance this purchase instead. For example, the money would be used for a new type of exterior mirror, an improved securement system (for wheelchair tie-downs), and for interior LED lighting (rather than the current fluorescents).**

**In response to questions, Gullickson said the resolution modified a current contract with Gillig, to allow for the add-ons described earlier and for delivery costs, over and above the costs shown in the initial contract. The initial 5-year contract allowed for the option to buy hybrids in years 3, 4 and 5, so that if funding for hybrids became available, Metro could quickly go out and get hybrids without having to go out to bid. The engines and transmissions for any new hybrids would be the same (Cummins-Voith) as for the current hybrids. The first 22 buses would arrive in 2009.**

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

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [12169](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Amending various portions of Sections 12.1375 and 12.138 of the Madison General Ordinances to increase permit fees, to update language pertaining to the Director of Transportation, and update language pertaining to residential parking permits.

**Knobeloch said that the resolution added 1-hour parking zones to RP3 districts (along with the current 2-hour parking zones); and increased the cost of duplicate permits from \$1 to \$5, and the cost of 1-day contractor permits from \$2 to \$5; effective September 1, 2009. Contractors (rather than homeowners) were generally aware of the need for permits.**

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

F.2. [12413](#)

SUBSTITUTE Amending Section 12.1335 of the Madison General Ordinances to strike alternate side parking regulations from November 15 through March 15 and subsection (2) "snow emergency zone"; amending Sec. 12.1335(4) of the Madison General Ordinances to create alternate side parking regulations during a declared snow emergency; repealing Secs. 12.1335(4)(c) and 12.1335(6) of the Madison General Ordinances and amending Sec. 1.08(3)(a) of the Madison General Ordinances to eliminate the bail deposit for Alternate Side Parking from November 15-March 15.

**Michael Reichert, 6701 Fairhaven Road, 53719, appeared before the group, opposing the proposed resolution. As a retired taxi driver, who drove 7,000 miles each winter, he found the old system of no alternate side parking to be a disaster. He felt there had to be a system for people to get the word; without alternate side parking, there would be confusion because people wouldn't hear about a snow emergency. When plows had to go around cars, large portions of a street were lost; and then when the unplowed snow froze, these lanes were still impassable 2-1/2 months later. He was also concerned about keeping streets open for fire trucks. When asked, he wasn't sure if the new \$60 fine would be enough incentive for people to get their cars off the street in a snow emergency.**

**Al Schumacher, Streets Superintendent, appeared before the Commission to speak against the proposed ordinance change, because of the negative fiscal and safety impacts. Prior to the current system of alternate-side parking and snow emergency zones, there was a citywide alternate-side parking ordinance. But at that time, there were no Parking Enforcement Officers (PEOs), just beat police officers, for whom the issue was of low priority. As a result, when a snow emergency was declared, people were not accustomed to moving and streets everywhere got very narrow. Then the City established the system of a snow emergency zone downtown, with \$10 fines in alternate-side parking areas and \$20 fines in the snow emergency zones. Seven years ago, the fines went to \$20 and \$30 respectively, and hourly PEO's were hired to ticket in the alternate-side parking areas during non-snow emergencies to condition parkers in those areas, and to converge on the downtown area during snow emergencies. The conditioned response in the outside areas worked very well – people moved their cars. But even with a \$30 ticket, parkers in the snow emergency zone didn't respond well. There were more than 800 tickets issued in two nights of one snow emergency last winter, during which eight snow emergencies were declared, and Streets plowed 14 times. Streets continued to have problems, and even though they had posted and towed, they had to bring extra towing vehicles and PEO's on overtime in to help.**

**To be efficient at plowing, Schumacher said that Streets needed to have cars off the streets. It was so much cheaper to go down a street with no cars on it and plow it back once, which cost less than \$20 per face block. When tow trucks and PEO's were needed to remove cars, then the cost went to \$200 per face block. When they didn't have compliance and had to post for 48 hours, then bring in PEO's and tow trucks, and remove snow that had become concrete, the cost went up to \$2,000 per face block.**

**Schumacher went on to talk about the extra cost and time it could take if people in alternate-side areas weren't conditioned to comply when snow emergencies occurred. With delays in clearing cars off these streets, it could**

become necessary to hire extra contractors and/or call in extra city crews in order to clear the entire city in a timely way – both of which would cost the City much more money. Otherwise, with existing personnel and equipment, it could take three nights to clear the city, which residents would find unacceptable. Added nights of plowing would delay the clearing of pedestrian areas – bus stops, crosswalks, and vision hazards. It would also be difficult to maintain appropriate PEO staffing levels: Who would want to work for just 4-5 snow emergencies?

Schumacher said there would be additional public education costs. Streets currently leafleted and conducted an info campaign in the existing snow emergency zone. Under the proposal, they would now have to notify the entire city – 140,000 households – at a cost of \$27K/year. Also, current listserv technology was not quite ready to handle massive e-mailings in a timely way. Schumacher also cited the loss of \$400-500K revenue to the City, from the 20-25,000 citations issued every year in the alternate-side parking areas. In tough budget times, could we afford to lose this revenue? Also, Parking could stand to lose revenue from its ramps, when snow emergencies went into a third night.

City Engineer Larry Nelson also expressed concerns about the proposal, especially having just come off of a record-breaking winter that pushed resources to the limit. The current system recognized that there was insufficient off-street parking for people downtown, which was why alternate-side parking was not required there. As a result, plows had to go back to these streets multiple times to get them completely cleared. This was accomplished in a fairly timely way because plows didn't have to revisit the outer areas with alternate-side parking. Nelson said the City didn't have enough resources to do multiple plowings throughout the city, if the entire city were to be identified as a snow emergency zone.

Much of current resources were allocated to clear bike lanes (using smaller vehicles), which might need to be pulled off to do streets. There was increasing demand to clear sidewalks on city parcels, as well as to maintain accessibility for people with disabilities. These areas were done after streets were plowed, and this process would be delayed. Last winter, Engineering was involved in clearing bus stops, working overtime for weeks, in between clearing streets. Nelson felt that should the proposal be adopted, City resources would be diluted, seriously impacting the public even in winters less severe than last. Later, Nelson said that he was not confident that Streets/Engineering could provide snow/ice services to the city under the proposed regulations. He felt that it would be very hard to educate citizens and achieve enough compliance to be able to do their job in a timely way throughout the winter.

Fire Chief Debra Amesqua addressed the proposal from a public safety perspective, noting that the space needed for emergency services was 20 useable feet, in order to be able to work in mitigated situations. This was assuming that Fire could get to the call. With record amounts of snow over the past few years and with more predicted, Fire had been working on winter contingency plans with Streets. In fact, there had been emergency calls when Fire had asked Streets to escort them to a call because Fire could not get to the call; which pulled resources away from the Streets' regular operations.

Amesqua said the proposal wouldn't change the situation in the inner city, which was not working. On the other hand, the situation in the outlying areas of the city was working quite well, and to make changes there seemed counterproductive. Amesqua felt that people should talk to the department heads about what they were struggling with, to try to find ways to meet everyone's needs. From a safety perspective, she felt the proposed changes were going in the wrong direction. Amesqua felt that any efforts to change the ordinances should focus on the inner city where there wasn't enough space for the cars that demanded parking on the streets.

Ray Harmon, from the Mayor's Office addressed the Commission. Noting the good information from the City managers regarding the ways the proposal could negatively impact each of their departments, he asked members to consider how the changes would impact City operations and the City budget in a tough budget season. The proposal would cause City costs to increase and City revenue to decrease, a bad combination. With that in mind, he urged members not to approve the proposal.

During subsequent discussion, Commission members pointed out the following:

- Under the proposal, cars would still be required to park on alternate sides when Streets needed to plow, as they do now; and because this remained the same, it was hard to see why new costs or problems would result, as staff argued.
- The connection made between lack of compliance in the downtown snow emergency zone and greater levels of compliance in the alternate-side areas was faulty, since a big factor affecting compliance in either area was having a parking space to move to.
- People responded poorly to the argument that there would be lost revenue from fewer fines; we shouldn't be implying that we are going to have rules that don't make sense in order to collect fines from the public.
- There was an inconsistency in arguing that alternate-side parking was working so well now, while at the same time arguing that so much revenue would be lost from alternate-side fines if the rules were to be changed.
- Perhaps two different periods/levels of response could be created: snow emergency and alternate-side parking effect, whereby outlying areas might have to park on alternate sides for a longer period of time in order to provide enough time to get snow cleared.
- While the strategy to condition parkers was understandable, there must some middle ground that could be found, to stop requiring parkers move their cars, esp. when there was little or no snow on the ground.
- Perhaps the higher fines for snow emergencies will generate better compliance; and will help gauge what would happen if the city were to move away from alternate-side parking.
- If fines were high enough, people would learn fast.
- The goal of the increased fines was not to generate more revenue, but rather to increase conditioned response (vs. using alternate-side parking all winter long to accomplish this).
- Considering the statistics from last winter (6,400 cars cited in the snow emergency zone, very few cited in alternate-side areas during snow emergencies, 20,000-25,000 cars cited for alternate-side parking violations throughout the winter outside of snow emergencies), virtually all of the alternate-side tickets have nothing to do with the goal of the ordinance except

to create a conditioned response.

- With higher fines and better communication systems, there would be an opportunity to learn a lot this coming winter.
- It was possible that higher compliance levels in outlying areas vs. those in the central city had to do with different behaviors and options: downtown residents drive less frequently and have fewer choices for parking their cars off-street.
- Perhaps alternate-side parking could be required from the first time snow fell in the street until the time it stopped.

City staff made the following comments:

- Requiring alternate-side parking throughout the winter produced a conditioned response in people.
- If people were not conditioned and then missed a snow emergency declaration, they wouldn't know to move their cars.
- Even with 13 inches of snow in one day last winter, 800 cars in the central city did not move.
- Those cars in the near east and near west side neighborhoods without good off-street options were more problematic than those in outlying areas.
- It wasn't yet certain how increased fines would motivate people to move their cars during snow emergencies.
- Perhaps a good compromise would be to have lower fines in outlying alternate-side parking areas during non-snow emergencies.
- Perhaps people in outlying areas could be conditioned to know that alternate side parking was required when there was snow on the ground (rather than during a declared snow emergency); then these areas would be cleared enough to get through, so that when a snow emergency occurred, equipment/resources could be used to clear the central city.
- Currently, hourly PEO's were used to enforce alternate-side parking; it wasn't clear from the fiscal note whether there would be PEO's available for enforcement even during a snow emergency.
- With 58 salt/sand operations last winter, it wasn't strictly snow removal that necessitated alternate-side parking, esp. on 26-foot wide streets.
- Higher fines may or may not work, esp. in the central city; on heavy snow days this past winter, it wouldn't have mattered how much the fines were, because folks couldn't move their cars. Maybe the best way to get compliance would be to pick up the car and move it.
- It would be helpful to see how the higher fines worked out this coming winter, but it might take 2-3 years to see what impact the fines have.
- Fines didn't allow (directly help) the agencies to take care of the streets.
- With a narrow window, there wasn't enough time to plow; the public wouldn't stand for a 3-day response in clearing the streets.
- During non-snow emergencies, PEO's worked in alternate-side parking areas; during snow emergencies, PEO's worked entirely in the snow emergency zone, which was why there were few citations issued in alternate-side areas during the snow emergencies.
- Realizing there were fewer off-street options for downtown residents, it was hoped that longer hours for free parking in ramps and opening up Parks parking lots would help with compliance.
- There might be compromises that could be discussed.

Schumacher responded to member questions about the new communication systems:

- There was a new “winter” portal set up on the City website.
- On this site, people could sign up for automatic text messaging and listserv (email), and see official communications re: weather forecasts and goals.
- In the corner of every city web page, there would have a flashing message the status of snow emergencies.
- Media outlets would be notified of any snow emergency prior to 9 PM on the night a snow emergency was declared.

In response to other questions, Schumacher said that a snow emergency declaration was in effect for 48 hours, but the Street Superintendent had the authority to extend that to additional nights if necessary. He said that using the criteria of snow on the street, as the basis for triggering alternate-side parking, would present a problem for Parking Enforcement: When do they call in their PEO's? Also, snow didn't always fall across the entire city all at once; sometimes, lots of snow fell in some areas of the city while there was no snow in other areas.

Webber talked about her reasons for proposing the new snow emergency rules. Her constituents frequently asked her why they were required to move their cars every night between November and March or get a ticket, even when there was no snow on the ground, often for weeks at a time. She saw no reason for them to move their cars when there was no snow on the ground, and no plows or salt trucks were out. In her neighborhood, an older part of the city, there were a limited number of parking spots, and people had trouble finding parking spaces. Taking away 50% of the parking spots every night put a burden on the neighborhood. Also, many residents there didn't use their cars every day, and often, walked, bused or biked. She thought it incredibly wasteful, in terms of gas, pollution and time, for them to have to start their cars and drive around the block every night, looking for a different spot to park. She felt that the City should require people to move their cars when it needed them to do so; but, it shouldn't make them move their cars when it wasn't needed.

Webber said she was willing to extend the snow emergency time to all day if necessary; to tow the cars; to establish snow emergency routes, where people couldn't park at all during a snow emergency, so that those streets could get plowed first; to raise the fines as high as necessary. But she didn't want to make people move their cars when there was no reason. She noted that people in alternate-side parking areas were not getting ticketed during snow emergencies: The City was ticketing people when they didn't need to move their cars, but not ticketing them when they did need to move their cars. Plus, four of the last five winters were mild.

Webber also stated that she was philosophically opposed to ticketing people just because the City needed the money. On the other hand, she had supported budgeting money for an auto-chalking system, because her neighborhood had a 2-hour parking restriction for people who didn't have a residential parking permit, which wasn't getting enforced. She put in a budget amendment in order to get better enforcement of that regulation, which people actually wanted enforced to free up parking spots, and which would also improve revenue.

Webber explained that she made the effective date June 1, 2009, so there

would be lots of time to prepare and discuss the idea. She agreed to the higher fines during snow emergencies because she knew she would be introducing this proposal. She felt it was a trade-off: Sock folks when it did snow and they needed to move their cars; and give them a break when there was no good reason for them to move their cars every night. She was willing to introduce any kind of ordinance to provide more incentive for people to move their cars. She felt that \$60 was a pretty good incentive, but realized that some people wouldn't move their cars no matter what. She described a situation in her block, where a car was parked in a spot for two solid weeks and was never ticketed. She finally called and had the car towed because there was no enforcement in her neighborhood when it did snow. She concluded by saying that current rules did not seem to be working from the citizens' point of view.

Webber moved to refer the item, so that staff could work on it some more and because other committees would be working on it as well. Hinz seconded the motion. Webber moved to suspend the rules to allow Hoag to speak about the proposal.

Hoag said he was very supportive when he heard discussion about the proposal. As Associate Director of the Engine Research Center at the UW, his field of expertise was emission control. For all automobiles with a catalyst in the exhaust (i.e., virtually all cars made since the 1970's), the majority of emissions occurred only on warm-up, when a car is started. This was much more the case with newer cars. Toyota did a study recently on the street of Tokyo that demonstrated that once a car was fully warmed up, the stuff coming out of the exhaust was cleaner than the background air. New cars were very clean once the catalyst was warmed up, and (tellingly) automakers were focusing on rapid warm-up to help meet emission standards.

Hoag went on to say that during the first few minutes of operation was when we got almost all of the carbon monoxide, unburned hydrocarbons, and oxides of nitrogen. He had heard from the EPA and others that Madison was very close to being a non-attainment zone from an air quality standpoint. As soon as a city was designated a non-attainment zone, the fiscal impacts on everybody were really high, because of emissions testing that would have to be done on every car every year, because there would have to be re-formulated gasoline in every pump, and other ramifications. The biggest reason for finding an alternative to alternate-side parking was that every day we were forcing thousands of cars to start up for the sole purpose of moving them to the other side of the street. The negative consequences of the pollution put into the air and the possibility of becoming a non-attainment zone were a big part of rationale behind the proposal.

Hoag said that when weighing these consequences against the need to condition people, he would prefer to use high fines and other strategies to help condition people, rather than requiring alternate-side parking on a daily basis. As a progressive city concerned about air quality, this was a huge issue. Harmon thanked Hoag and said that City staff was sensitive to the information provided; and said that he would like more information and to work with Webber to figure out a compromise.

While in support of the proposal, White wondered if rather than having a strict

November 15th start date for alternate-side parking, there could be an announcement of a start date when it was actually needed.

Sanborn acknowledged staff's real concerns about losing the effect of conditioning resulting in more cars on both sides of the street when snow emergencies occurred, under the new rules. However, he wondered how much higher fines would offset this. At lower fine levels, some people preferred to pay the fine rather than try to find a spot to move their cars. But he expected that there would be a tipping point, at which people would rather move their cars than pay a (higher) fine. Sanborn was inclined to support the proposal, but would consider referring it beyond the winter, in order to see how the increased fines affect the snow emergency zone. If we were to see a considerable increase in compliance, that would bode well for what would happen if this change were implemented for the following winter. Webber had no problem with this.

Streit said he heard that for City staff, there was a workforce issue involved here. During snow emergencies, a certain number of people normally working on alternate-side parking had to be immediately deployable to the central city. In order to make things really work in the central city during snow emergency, perhaps we needed to think about how to create an effective workforce for those occasions (like that used for games at Camp Randall); vs. keeping a workforce busy over 4 months of the year in order to have them readily available in the emergencies. He wanted this issue – a critical part of staff concerns – to be studied.

The question was called, and the motion to refer passed by voice vote/other.

At the point, the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item H.1., so that Durocher could make an announcement before he excused himself from the meeting.

**PLEASE NOTE: A Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Durocher turned the Chair over to Vice-Chair Amanda White and left the meeting.**

**Present:** 9 -

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

**Excused:** 2 -

Carl D. Durocher and Sharon L. McCabe

**A motion was made by Sanborn, seconded by Solomon, to Take A five-minute Recess. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**F.3.**     [12385](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Care Wisconsin First, Inc. for the purpose of providing reimbursement to Metro Transit from funding for Medicaid Partnership services for Metro Transit's provision of accessible transportation within its service area to persons eligible for funding under the Care Wisconsin Program, for an initial one-year contract period during the calendar year 2009 with automatic renewal for additional one-year periods in 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.

**The meeting reconvened.**

**Crystal Martin, Metro's Paratransit Program Manager, and Rex Owens,**

Transportation Services Manager for Care Wisconsin First Inc., appeared before the Commission. Martin said that the resolution authorized a funding agreement for accessible services with Madison Metro from Care Wisconsin, which served people with disabilities through a state program for Medicaid partnership. Some people in their client base were eligible for Metro paratransit services through its application process, and also made use of Metro's fixed route buses and their accessibility features. This agreement would allow for those trips served by Metro to be funded through their program.

In addition, their program was part of the State's Human Services transportation, and federal and state governments were currently encouraging coordination of public transportation with Human Services, and slowly the funding processes were requiring coordination. This agreement represented a cooperative effort between Metro and Care Wisconsin to coordinate services.

In terms working towards the future, there were changes being made in the way the State intended to deliver Medicaid services to eligible Wisconsin residents, and this helped Metro build relationships with new entities providing these new services for the State in their new model, and this would hopefully allow a transition for Metro as this happens.

Responding to a question, Martin said that the "100% of per trip costs" referred to in the last paragraph, meant that Metro would be reimbursed for the public price of the fare media used for fixed route services, and for 100% of the cost of service provided by paratransit services (not fares). Bergamini moved to recommend adoption of the resolution. Martin added that she and Owens had been keeping ADATS well informed.

Based on advice from the City Attorney's Office, Martin asked that some new language in the final paragraph be added after "authorized riders eligible for Medicaid transportation funding", as follows: "or any other funding sources, state or federal". Webber offered a friendly amendment to add this language and create a substitute, which members endorsed.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Hoag, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER,** to adopt the Substitute (Version 2), which enlarged the scope of possible funding sources for Care Wisconsin First, Inc. authorized riders. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.4. [12126](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County for the following purposes in the calendar year 2009: (1) providing the Transit Utility with MA Waiver Community Integration Program (CIP) funding; (2) providing Dane County with State 85.20 funding by the Transit Utility for the County's provision of accessible transportation for persons unable to use the Transit Utility's paratransit services within its service area.

Martin said that the resolution reflected an annual agreement between Metro and Dane County Human Services, which funded 155,000 paratransit rides per year, out of Metro's 260,000 total (55%) – a significant source of revenue for Metro. Serving people with developmental disabilities in the State's MA waiver program, this was the starting point for coordinated human services transportation with the County, and as Metro moved forward in developing

relationships with other entities, this was the basis that helped them move forward. Poulson asked that references in the resolution to the State's Department of Health and Services (DHSS) be edited to say Department of Health Services (DHS).

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

F.5. [12494](#)

Metro: Informational update about fares and elasticity - TPC 11.06.08

Kamp said that Abrams-Cherwony was reviewing this and he would have information available for the December meeting, when the decision about fares would be made. A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Solomon, to Rerefer the item to the December meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.6. [11986](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to accept sponsorship by MillerCoors, LLC in the amount of \$10,000 to help offset the cost of providing free expanded transit service on New Year's Eve. The agreement includes an indemnification clause.

Mick Rusch, Metro's Marketing Manager said that Miller's (non-negotiable) contribution of \$10K did not cover all the costs. Kamp added that the money represented about half of the total costs, and felt this was an important service Metro provided to the community. Miller's contribution was a valuable offset to a service that got about 1,000 cars off the road that night. Because this was a good public relations opportunity, Hoag wondered if others might be interested in sponsoring the service as well. Rusch said this was something Metro could look into.

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

F.7. [12383](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to amend their current agreement with St. Mary's Hospital Medical Center to continue the provision of fare free access by St. Mary's employees and volunteers to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement to the Transit Utility for trips taken for the period of January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009.

Kamp said the resolution was a proposed extension of the unlimited ride pass agreement with St. Mary's. Recognizing that Metro was looking at fare changes, Kamp said there was delay in completing the agreement as St. Mary's modified their 2008 contract to include volunteers. Through that process, things were delayed getting to this point. Kamp asked that the resolution be approved, since St. Mary's was ready to move forward and had bargained in good faith.

Poulson/Sanborn moved to recommend adoption.

Webber said she was torn. At a time when fare increases were being considered, some people felt that the multi-year unlimited ride pass programs were not paying as much because they had already signed a contract. She was ambivalent about the resolution; and as she had told Kamp, one of the things about delays in signing a contract, was that some things might change

in the terms of the contract. She was hesitant to sign a contract at the lower rate, when debating a 33% increase in cash fares because of the City budget. Metro might be passing up a lot of money, if fares were to be increased, and the agreement was completed at a lower rate.

Solomon had the same concern, and asked Kamp if there was any way to address this issue, perhaps by arranging some sort of 6-month deal (though one year was not that long), or by including a 6-month contingency clause. Kamp had told contacts at St. Mary's that the current proposal might not go through and that they might have to revisit the agreement. The folks at St. Mary's understood that. Metro told St. Mary's that they estimated that the adult fare could be \$1.05 (vs. \$0.95.2), if a fare increase went through. Kamp discussed with St. Mary's what might happen at the Council or at the TPC, and what options might be available.

Webber/Poulson made a substitute motion, to move approval with the provision that when the TPC made its decision regarding fares, that the per ride amount might need to change.

Members discussed various options for drafting a substitute. Poulson said that maybe an alternative might be to offer two more rates, depending on a 25-cent or a 50-cent increase. Solomon said the intent of his previous proposal was to do one contract, wherein the first six months would be at \$0.95.2, but that the second six months would be contingent on what TPC decided. This would give St. Mary's six months to prepare for any change. Kamp agreed that the new language could suggest that the rate for the second six months of the contract would be at the rate approved and contained in the new fare tariff.

When asked, Kamp said that most of the other unlimited ride contracts had already been signed and approved through 2009 (except that MATC would be negotiating in the spring in for academic year 2009-2010), with one-year extension options. White hoped that the Metro and the Commission were being consistent and fair with all the pass partners, noting that Meriter had just signed their contract. Webber said that there would always be inconsistencies depending on when a contract was signed; there were risks to not signing a contract when you had a contract in front of you.

Webber suggested adding a final paragraph to create a substitute resolution, as follows: BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the per ride reimbursement amount after the first six months will be based on the unlimited pass fare rate decided by the TPC.

PLEASE NOTE: Bergamini was excused from the meeting when the vote was taken on this item.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Poulson, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER: Recommend to adopt Substitute (Version 2), which provides for the contingency that if the TPC changes its fare schedule, the rates for the second six months of the contract would change as well. The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: 3 -

Margaret Bergamini; Sharon L. McCabe and Carl D. Durocher

**Ayes:** 7 -

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

**Non Voting:** 1 -

Amanda F. White

**F.8.**     [12492](#)             Proposed TPC Meeting Schedule for 2009 - TPC 11.06.08

**A motion was made by Hinz, seconded by Solomon, to Approve the 2009 meeting schedule as presented thus far. November's meeting date was yet to be determined, because certain Council budget dates had not yet been set. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**F.9.**     [12493](#)             Metro: Review of bus shelter standards (Page 5 of 2004-2008 Transit Development Program - Service Goals and Standards) - TPC 12.09.08

**Kamp asked to defer the item, but noted that Metro had begun working with the MPO to revise the standards, which would be brought back to the TPC for approval. Kamp would provide an update in December as to how Metro used the standards, and how Metro was dealing with the older shelters available as a result of the newer UW shelters. Kamp said the standards did affect where shelters were located.**

**A motion was made by Poulson, seconded by Bergamini, to Rerefer the item to the December meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

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

[07828](#)             ADA Transit Subcommittee  
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee  
Parking Council for People with Disabilities  
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission  
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee  
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee  
Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee  
Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Parking Strategic Plan

**No action was needed on these items.**

**H.       ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

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

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

**Bearing in mind the Town of Madison's budget shortfall for funding Route 13 in 2008, Durocher noted that the Town of Madison would be holding its 2009 budget hearing on November 18, 2008, at 6:00 PM.**

**[PLEASE NOTE: Following Durocher's announcement and a short recess, the**

meeting returned to Agenda Item F.3.]

H.2. Commission member items for future agendas - None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Hinz, to Adjourn at 9:10 PM.  
The motion passed by voice vote/other.