



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

Tuesday, August 10, 2010

5:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 8 -

Gary L. Poulson; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit; Margaret Bergamini; Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Jed Sanborn and Duane F. Hinz

Excused: 2 -

David E. Tolmie and Amanda F. White

Please note: Schmidt arrived at 5:10 PM, Solomon arrived at 5:15 PM, and Schmitz arrived at 5:30 PM, during presentation of Agenda Item D.1. Also, there is one vacancy on the Commission.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Poulson asked that the Minutes be amended to show that he turned the Chair over to White at the start of Deb Brennum's comments in Agenda Item G. (Public Hearing) and briefly left the meeting; and assumed the Chair again at the start of Julie Allen's statement.

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Hinz, to Approve the Minutes of the July 13, 2010 meeting as amended. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

D.1. [19461](#)

Parking: July 2010 Activity, June Revenue/Expenditure & Occupancy Reports - TPC 08.10.10

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch introduced Acting Parking Analyst Jim Koloen. While noting items in the Activity Report, Knobloch and Koloen added the following remarks:

- Boring rigs were taking samples in seven different spots where the new Gov East would be located; they went down 100 feet and took 22 samples, to check soil and water conditions; they would also check for petroleum under the current ramp, where a gas station sat years ago.
- The boring results would help with the design of the new garage footings (that will go down 70 feet), as well as the columns and how to space them; and

help provide a better idea of cost for these items.

- There had not yet been any discussion about who would be paying for any additional spaces at GE connected to the train station (as many as 400 spaces), or connected to other stakeholders such as a hotel, offices or a public market; cost distribution for all the stalls was not yet known.
- GE would probably have 1,500 stalls on five levels (300 stalls/level); estimated cost was \$36K/stall, with the total cost as high as \$50 million.
- Besides not knowing exactly how GE would be paid for, it wasn't clear where the money would come from, for the next ramp replacement at State Street Cap (only five years younger than GE, and constructed in ways not used anymore).
- Staff suggested eliminating the last three pages of the Parking Reports ("Central Area Parking Information" and "Revenues for the Month of"), which took a lot of staff time to compile and which contained info found elsewhere in the reports; later in the meeting, members agreed to this idea.
- The credit card problem with the multi-space meters had been fixed; the server was being tweaked, and the machines would be online soon.
- Conduit for cameras was being laid at Buckeye Lot, which would have cameras facing two ways to be able to see either end of the lot and the machines; good for customer safety and the police as well.
- Re: automation, the number one challenge of the Parking Utility was how to pay for the ramps that needed replacing; esp. under the current business model in which the parkers pay for everything, including the cost of replacement.
- Happily, monthly passes at GE was "overfull" right now, at the standard business rate of \$210.
- Parking had a ruling from the bond counsel and the City Attorney that monthly passes were not included in the 10% cap; monthly passes could be cut off or customers could leave with one month's notice; Parking had almost never kicked anyone out.
- Revenues through June gained 11% over last year due to the rate increases; however, this was expected to flatten over the next six months.
- Occupancies had increased slightly, but had not rebounded from when the rate increases began.
- Re: the electrical vehicle-charging stations, Parking would provide one stall but the cord could reach to any one of three stalls. Though the stall would not be reserved and anyone could park in it, with a sign to identify the station, it was unlikely many non-electrical parkers would. The charging station would need to be placed next to an accessible stall and be accessible. MG&E was providing the machine and the service gratis.
- Re: revenues for first half of the year, revenues were very close to budget at 49.3%.
- The 34.5% for expenditures actual to budget for the same period needed to be viewed with some skepticism, since these items were "year-end loaded", as for example, "payments to other depts." which would come due towards the end of the year.
- Payroll looked good at 41%, but even this was somewhat year-end loaded, with sick leave and comp time accruals in final pay periods.
- Actual 2010 expenditures vs. 2009 for payroll were down 3%; total expenditures were down \$719K or 17%, \$520K of which was debt service that had ceased.
- Revenues/expenditures for June now compared "apples to apples" since the rate increase of June, 2009 was no longer a factor.
- June 2010 revenues showed a slight decrease vs. 2009; attended facilities, street meters, residential parking went up, monthly parking went down;

interest on investment had bottomed out with only 1% interest on money in the bank.

- Expenses were up about \$37K, but much of this was payment to other City depts., which should be ignored since the timing for this was arbitrary.
- Re: specific areas of YTD revenues, cashiered revenue was up 11.78% or \$398.6K, due to rate effect from Jan.-May.
- Meters showed mixed revenue results; meters were phased in over month of June 2009.
- Revenues for construction-related meter removal had dropped from \$12K to zero, which said something about the economy.
- Monthly parking at GE went up 17%, which showed what an increase can do at a facility that was well-used.
- Actual YTD revenues were 1.82% above budget; had guessed a little conservatively, but was pretty close.
- Re: June budget vs. actual, RP3 permits were up; to cover expenses, at last rate change, permit fee was changed to stay at \$21 no matter when permit was issued; have had no complaints; in some other cities, the permit fee was \$500.
- Re: cashiered revenue budget vs. actual for June, had guessed a bit low; didn't realize how many folks would move to Cap Sq North, up 29% for June, showing the benefit of pricing facilities differently based on demand.
- Monthlies at GE were 25.5% over budget, thanks in part to the change in policy.
- Total revenue for June was 6.50% above budget, due to conservative guessing.
- Re: average weekday occupancies for June: Brayton meters went up slightly, and Buckeye went up from 53% to 63%; all cashiered facilities went up, with Cap Sq North up from 66% to 77%, and GE up from 75% to 82%.
- Wilson Lot was owned by Water Utility, and allowed Parking to rent from them. With 50 spaces total, the lot currently had seven vacancies, all reserved for business customers. At the same time, seven individuals were on waiting list. staff was looking at changing the ratio there, to open up more spaces for individuals rather than reserving them for businesses; and would be come back with a proposal to change the ratio at Wilson Lot.
- Wilson Lot was open to anyone for free after 6 PM and weekends.

Hinz/Solomon made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

D.2. [19462](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 08.10.10

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp pointed out the following items in the reports:

- Amount of service in first half of year was up 3.3% due to changes implemented last August.
- Overall ridership was nearly even; though down slightly by 4,458 YTD, it was up 13,349 in June; a small ridership increase was projected by year-end, as planned in 2010 budget.
- Though passenger accidents (falls) were up, vehicles accidents in all categories were down from 2009, esp. encouraging since 2009 statistics reflected a 5-year low and Metro had received a \$200K dividend from its insurance company for good safety performance.
- Road calls were down significantly, and inspections were up and on schedule.
- Route 80 continued to be the most productive route; showed 16% drop in

- productivity vs. 2009, but this was partly due to driver error in counting, which was corrected and should taper off over the coming months.
- Overall ridership was down 0.1%, but without Route 80's, ridership was up 3.8%.
 - Productivity was down slightly by 3% as expected with addition of new routes; without Route 80's, productivity was up 0.15%.
 - Per recent news article, early 2010 ridership for other systems across the country of similar size and population was down 1%; and for other systems with a similar level of service, ridership was down 3%. While wanting Metro ridership to be up, clearly the economy was impacting ridership everywhere.
 - Re: Ridership & Revenue Comparisons, fixed route passenger revenue increased from \$4.986 million to \$5.313 million YTD.
 - In cash and ticket category, revenues were up \$60K, with cash fares down and 31-day passes up; in all all unlimited ride pass categories, revenues were up for a total of \$270K; so the revenue increase was being driven by unlimited ride pass revenue increases.
 - Though overall ridership was down by 4,000 rides, clearly ridership in the Route 80's was the driving factor, which was down from 1.370 to 1.152 million; vs. cash and ticket ridership, which was up from 2.675 to 2.717 million, and unlimited ridership, which was up from 2.421 to 2.635 million.
 - Also, the number of transfers was down 50K; and if these were even with last year, ridership would actually be up.
 - Re: % changes, revenues were up 6.6%, and ridership was down 0.1%; even as some cash categories dropped, other categories increased significantly, i.e., unlimited passes for MATC.
 - In first half of 2010, paratransit ridership and total accidents were about even with 2009.
 - Indicators showed a modest increase of 2% in operating cost/paratransit trip; and a drop from \$2.97 to \$2.93/trip in operating cost for fixed routes, due mainly to a drop in fuel costs in a fixed price contract.
 - No shows were down from 2.2 to 1.8%, providing a smoother operation.
 - Looking at number of clients served (@ 1,590 YTD) vs. total number eligible (@ 3,977), less than half of eligible users were actually using service in 6-month period; this was consistent with other transit systems, where people seemed to sign up for service as an "insurance policy".
 - On-time performances for all providers at 90%+ were good.
 - Metro worked with Fleet Service, Comptroller and Mayor to figure out when to go out for bid on fixed price fuel contracts, which would probably look at the market again in a couple of months.
 - Financials for the first half of the year were in good shape: while passenger revenues were down by \$203.6K from budget, they were above last year by \$351.5 YTD.
 - The City of Madison subsidy was down \$1.457 million from last year, along with subsidies from other funding partners, due to the drop in fuel costs and one-time stimulus funding of \$950K; which all partners were enjoying.
 - Though total revenues were slightly lower than budgeted, so were expenditures under budget by \$241.6K, which offset the revenue shortfall to create a projected contribution of \$53,542 to the contingency reserve.
 - As was normally true with the number of vacancies, salaries and benefits YTD were under budget; more notably was the fact that overtime was under budget as well; both items contributed most to total expenses being under budget.
 - The cost of fuel, oils & lubricants was below last year by \$705.7K; this area was over budget YTD by \$109K because January's fuel was at the previously high fixed price of \$3.00/gallon; with a much lower cost of \$1.98/gallon since

then, the \$109K would slowly decrease.

· For 2nd quarter, campus hybrids were getting 32% better miles/gal. and non-Campus hybrids were getting 20-25% better miles/gal. than non-hybrids; five new hybrids were just put into service, and the remaining would be shortly, which would be used on core routes where they got the best bang for the buck.

· Total Customer Feedback items (inc. complaints/compliments/suggestions sent via email/phone) were down YTD from 1,707 in 2009, to 1,445 in 2010, which was lower than previous years; fixed route inputs had dropped from 983 to 945, and paratransit inputs had dropped from 373 to 260 (with largest drop in "late" complaints and related issues due to transition to new service provider in early 2009).

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

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- E.1. [19463](#) Parking: Proposed Resolution No. TPC-38 regarding Parking Utility Revenue Bond Redemption - TPC 08.10.10

Knobeloch said that the proposed TPC resolution came about because of a concern that the Commission was not involved in any formal process related to Parking bond redemption last December. Since bond redemption was as important as bond issuance, the resolution stated that when parking bonds were issued or redeemed, the Parking Manager would come to the Commission for its recommendation, which would be passed on to the Common Council before the Council made its final decision. A motion was made by Hinz, seconded by Schmitz, to Approve Resolution No. TPC-38. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [19464](#) Federal and state regulations regarding the City's ability to regulate inter-city commercial buses - Carolyn Hogg, City Attorney's Office

In response to Leg. File 13805, requesting that the TPC research the issue of the City's ability to regulate intercity commercial buses and report back its findings to the Common Council, the Commission invited Carolyn Hogg of the City Attorney's Office to appear before them to answer several key questions. Hogg made a presentation to the Commission about the following items:

- Background and History of Federal and State Law related to Regulation of Common Carriers
- Questions related to Municipal Regulation

For more detailed information about Hogg's presentation and responses to member questions, please see attached: "Report and Findings of the Transit and Parking Commission"; and an outline entitled "Local/State/Federal Regulatory Framework – Common Carrier of Passengers" distributed by Hogg.

Based on federal and state law, Hogg's assessed the City's authority in this area, as follows:

- As a matter of federal law, the City needs to be concerned about preemption in the area of economic regulations; its strongest ability to regulate is in the area of safety.
- Looking at state law, the State largely retains control in the area of common carriers, and does not delegate much authority to municipalities.
- The City's strongest area of authority lies in traffic safety and convenience in relation to streets, roads and routes in the municipality.
- Within the parameters of traffic safety, the City can determine where to locate bus stops for intercity buses, with the focus being on public safety (vs. economics), esp. as it relates to traffic safety, availability of parking for passengers, and traffic congestion issues.

[Please note: Sanborn left at this point in the meeting, at 6:15 PM.]

Hogg addressed several key questions, as follows:

Question 1: If a bus company loses its facility, can the City allocate a street lane as an on-street "mini" facility and issue a permit to use the street for staging buses (vs. simply loading/unloading), which basically creates an on-street terminal? No; streets are open to the public for travel available equally, and cannot be used for a private purpose.

Question 2: Can the City require interstate carriers of passengers to have off-street facilities; to buy, rent, or build, and require a terminal no matter what their business model is? Very likely, no.

Question 3: Can the City require carriers to provide bus shelters for passengers to wait or cement pads for easier access? It depends on whether this is viewed as an economic regulation vs. a safety regulation: if economic, no; if safety, possibly.

Question 4: Can the City require intercity bus stops to be in certain locations? Without more details, it is hard to say.

Question 5: Can intercity bus companies be required to pay for damage and can they be required to be licensed by the City and pay a fee? No.

Question 6: Can the City restrict a bus stop to use by one company (at a time) if additional bus stop usage could cause a dangerous situation? Yes.

Summary: The City's focus needs to be on its ability to reasonably regulate the traffic issues related to bus stops, and avoid moving into areas that implicate the business or economic regulation of the industry.

Hogg responded to member questions related to the following:

- The City could reasonably differentiate between Metro and intercity buses, when considering criteria related to bus stops.
- In talking about Milwaukee's multi-modal station and a question related to Madison's transfer points, she wasn't sure if the City could require carriers to stop at a transfer point; perhaps so, if it was thought to be the only appropriate spot for traffic and parking reasons, although it might require a change in state law to do so. Like us, Milwaukee regulates bus stops and even has a Bus Stop Committee.

- It was appropriate to raise an issue with buses if they were stopping in an area that wasn't safe, was outside a designated bus stop, or had no available parking.
- The City could ban parking on Langdon Street in front of the Union (or put in parking meters there) if it chose to do so, based on whether these actions served the public interest. The City regulated in a balance with considerations for public interest.
- In talking about whether the City could consider personal safety (vs. traffic safety), more specific info would be needed. It would probably be helpful to establish a set of criteria as to where a bus stop should be. A concern would be that this might get into the economic realm.
- While the City could restrict the number of buses at a bus stop, it couldn't dedicate a certain spot to a single bus company. The City could say that buses cannot go beyond the space provided for a stop, and the companies might voluntarily route themselves elsewhere.
- The City cannot regulate how often bus companies shift their stops. [PLEASE NOTE: After reviewing this statement, Hogg corrected the information, as follows: Federal law, 49 USC § 14501, allows states and municipalities to require notice, not in excess of 30 days, of changes in schedules. It is unclear whether the federal statutory term "schedules" refers to a transportation schedule or a "schedule of rates." This language could arguably provide support for notice regarding changes in stop location (schedule). In addition it should be noted that the federal regulations contain obligations on this issue as follows: 49 CFR Sec. 374.311(b) Continuity of service. No carrier shall change an existing regular-route schedule without first displaying conspicuously a notice in each facility and on each bus affected. Such notice shall be displayed for a reasonable time before it becomes effective and shall contain the carrier's name, a description of the proposed schedule change, the effective date thereof, the reasons for the change, the availability of alternate service, and the name and address of the carrier representative passengers may contact.] However, it served carrier's own interests to be in a predictable, stable location.
- Implicit in the free use of streets and the right to travel was the right to temporarily load and unload (as long as parking was not prohibited). Like other vehicles, buses were allowed to do this. The question would be whether this remains true if parked over a longer period of time.

After Hogg concluded her presentation and responded to member questions, members began discussing different ways the Commission might proceed.

Poulson suggested that perhaps the Common Council could create a special committee to look at establishing dedicated areas for intercity bus stops, working with the various bus companies to know which locations worked best with their routes. Though the buses wouldn't have to use all the areas, at least specific areas would be designated where passenger safety issues were covered. The committee could develop standards and criteria for establishing bus stops.

Solomon liked Poulson's idea, but wondered if perhaps bus companies could apply (to the City) for a specific stop, which could then be evaluated for safety issues (vs. designating where stops could be). Poulson thought bus company participation was important, but felt concerns about safety were paramount. Schmidt said that initially he thought companies should apply, but then thought this got too close to regulation.

Hogg said that she wasn't sure the key issue was the legal parameters in which the City can regulate, as much as it was the policy around the issue; outlining the legal authority wouldn't necessarily get the TPC or the Council where they wanted to go.

Schmidt and Poulson talked about the Council resolution (Leg. File 13805), which requested a report from the TPC by September 7th. After some discussion, Schmidt suggested that the minutes be sent to the Council, along a summary statement.

[As Schmidt began to formulate a statement, additional questions arose, which are shown in the attached Report.]

Solomon asked if the goal of the resolution was for the TPC to give some guidance to the Council, perhaps to make some sort of recommendation; or if it was to report what they had heard and leave it up to the Council to decide what to do next. As one of the sponsors, Schmidt thought that a recommendation would be good, but that providing an informational report would also be helpful, since it wasn't previously clear what powers if any the City had.

Poulson said that the Commission needed to report something back to the Council, which may lead to other actions by the Council. Solomon discussed the options: 1) (least desirable was) to try to put together a recommendation at this meeting; 2) to report back to the Council with a finding that the City was very limited in its ability to regulate but some possibilities existed with regard to the safety angle, and let the Council decide what to do next; 3) or to ask the Council for more time to come up with recommendations (such as a suggestion that TPC form a small subcommittee to do the work vs. the Council). He preferred the middle option to simply bring a report back to the Council as Schmidt suggested. If the Council didn't take action at some point, the TPC could always take this up again and move forward with it.

Schmidt/Solomon moved that the Commission return to the Council a report based the Recording Secretary's minutes of this portion of the meeting (Agenda Item F.1.), along with text summarizing the Commission's findings, as follows:

- 1) The City of Madison has no ability to dictate that intercity buses use a multi-modal station.
- 2) The City can designate loading and unloading locations based on traffic safety concerns.
- 3) The City cannot specify that only one (named) bus company can use an on-street site.

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

[PLEASE NOTE: After receiving additional information, Schmidt asked that his statement of Finding #1 be corrected, to say: "The City cannot require that intercity buses provide off-street facilities. However, the City might have the ability to require intercity buses to use a multi-modal station." As a result of these changes, the Commission placed on its 09/02/10 Agenda a review of the Report and summary of Findings.]

F.2. [19465](#)

Metro: Annual Paratransit Program Progress Report - Crystal Martin, Metro Paratransit Program Manager

Metro Paratransit Program Manager Crystal Martin made the following remarks about the Annual Progress Report:

- The Report provided good info about basic ADA requirements, and how Metro implemented them and measured performance.
- Ways to show that the program was not limited by capacity constraints (for ADA accessibility) was to complete applications within 21 days, and to provide service on time: Applications were completed within 21 days, and average on-time performance was 94%. Though the on-time average for Metro Direct was 88%, upon further investigation, it was determined that data was not being accurately reported, and improvement would likely be shown in 2010.
- Another way to measure capacity constraints was the ability to take requests for service, which was measured by hold time when customers called in. The chart on page 2 showed that hold time had decreased by about half in 2008 and 2009 from previous years. Metro's Customer Service Center had been improved, and now had a CS Supervisor; Metro had received positive customer feedback about these changes.
- Ridership was very stable, up 1% in 2009 (and 2.3% in 2008); very easy and predictable increases. By contrast, dramatic increases of 12-15% among other systems around the state in recent years made it difficult to plan service.
- With the fare increase last April, ridership was being watched closely in 2010: So far, cash ridership seemed to be down, while rides on funded pass programs were up; it seemed people were being more discretionary in their trip-taking.
- Paratransit program costs for the last four years had remained stable; and happily, average cost per paratransit trip had been dropping down.
- The no-show rate of 2.2% in 2009 remained stable.
- The cancellation rate of 17% was relatively high; 10% of these cancellations came in on the day of service, after schedules had been assigned to drivers, which was costly and unproductive.
- Complaints were level, except for a spike last year during a transition to a new service provider; compliments were also received, with the chart showing a spike in August.
- Productivity, which was the average trips completed per service hour, showed improvement in 2008 and 2009, up to the 2009 daily average of 2.0 rides/hour, with credit going to dispatchers and drivers for managing their schedules; this also helped control costs.
- Metro had expanded coordination with human service programs, inc. Care Wisconsin and Medicaid Common Carrier, a great service for people (esp. on fixed incomes) who haven't had access to specialized medical vehicles and who can now get a referral from the County for fare assistance, through which Metro was reimbursed, was providing more service to more people without increasing Metro's costs.
- Also, Metro's coordination with the County was a national model; Metro was fortunate to have positive relationships there.
- The biggest accomplishment of ADATS (and approved by TPC) was the creation of an agency fare; this resolution had circulated to systems around the state, to serve as a model for coordination with human service agencies, to help resolve some difficult discussions for systems having fewer resources than we did.
- Very good progress was made in the area of scheduling standing ride requests using Trapeze software; by June 2010, 93% of all standing wheelchair

rides and 62% of all ambulatory rides were templated/assigned to routes; this provided more consistency and stable schedules for customers, who had expressed their appreciation.

- Metro would be upgrading to a newer version of Trapeze shortly.

Martin discussed the WisDOT Audit recommendation to track paratransit customer complaints. Metro did work through the issues with customers, but they didn't assess validity to each complaint (like they did for fixed routes). With other more pressing matters, this hadn't been the biggest priority, but staff would look at this before the next audit.

Bergamini complimented Martin and the Paratransit Unit on what they had been able to do over the years. Before ADA went into effect, people were concerned about how costs would be controlled, and what would happen with a growing population of people needing the service and how levels of customer service would be affected. Metro's Paratransit Program had made significant progress in on-time performance, in the way phone systems were operating, in controlling costs, and in coordinating funding. On behalf of the Commission, Bergamini thanked Martin and her staff for doing such a phenomenal job; and for the leadership provided by Martin and Mick Rusch, Customer Service and Marketing Manager.

Streit/Solomon made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [19466](#)

Metro: Update on 2009 Management Performance Audit (by Gannett-Fleming) - TPC 08.10.10

Kamp highlighted a few key issues raised by the audit 1½ years ago:

- Overall governance: An RTA had been formed, and Metro was working on this on a regular basis.
- Absence without pay and family medical leave: Metro was addressing this, as reflected in overtime reports and updates on labor contracts.
- IT staffing study to look at needs for information by Metro and its customers: A budget item for this was requested/rejected, but would probably happen as the RTA progressed; staff had also looked at ways to reorganize to provide more IT support.

Transit Service Manager Ann Gullickson said Metro was working to develop standard operating procedures (SOP) both for operations and for maintenance:

- Along with dealing with routes and schedules, drivers were faced with having to make quick decisions that involved customer service issues.
- SOP would help provide guidelines for handling these situations, so that customers could experience consistent, reasonable application of the rules.
- The rules were not entirely black and white; customer service involved nuance. Drivers were empowered to be out front, and SOP would help them.
- Staff was looking at a manual for drivers used by the Twin Cities.
- On the Shop side, Metro was updating its 20-year old Safety Manual, looking at ways to avoid accidents/injuries inside a crowded facility, where tire work, welding, painting were done, and where forklifts, vehicles and people all moved around.
- Facility security had become more important since 2001, and would be a new piece of the updated manual.

Transit Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck talked about the first

audit recommendation to increase staffing for data gathering and analysis:

- This was really a high priority that depended on the budget and the eventual staffing study.
- A half-time IT person would be going full time, which would help greatly in the process of merging AVL and ridership data that came out of the fare boxes, to more accurately determine where rides were taking place.
- Though currently working hard on schedule adjustments for fall and RTA routing concepts and just keeping their heads above water, in time staff hoped to get to more of these items.

Transit Marketing and Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch discussed customer service improvements that included:

- A new phone call recording system, to help ensure paratransit rides were booked correctly and info given to customers was accurate;
- New IP phones, which electronically added capacity to the phone system so customers could get through to operators;
- A new specialized CS supervisor who treated the operation like a Call Center, receiving as many as a 1,000 calls/day;
- Re: an audit recommendation to calculate average length of calls by call type (fixed route vs. paratransit), purchase of an IVR system was in the 2011 budget; this data could also guide decisions about staffing.

Transit Finance Manager Wayne Block discussed the audit recommendation related to review of the cash-handling process. In the past, the focus on controls for cash-handling was on the cash room where all cash fares from buses were handled. Though current controls there were pretty good, given how much money was involved, staff felt it could be scrutinized more. Recently, the CS supervisor had discovered a couple of discrepancies in cash-handling at the front window where bus tickets/passes were sold at Metro. Spearheaded by Rusch and CS staff, better controls had been implemented in the front office. As a result of this experience, staff realized they needed to tighten up the entire operation, and the issue of cash-handling had become a high priority.

Being an update, no action was needed on this item.

F.4. [19317](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into contracts with Trapeze Software Group, Inc. for the purchase, customization & implementation of the Transit Workforce Scheduling Software project and for related services.

Kamp said the current system was in need of an update. Though the City was implementing the new ERP system, everyone agreed that Metro was unique in its needs for transit scheduling and labor requirements, and should go out separately to bid on a transit-specific system. Trapeze Software, with which Metro had a lot of experience, came in with the lowest bid (of four). Metro's IS Manager Dave Eveland, Wayne Block and Ann Gullickson were involved in the selection process. The new software would provide better controls and reporting of payroll and work scheduling data, the sorts of things that would help control OT and guarantee time better, and more effectively monitor absences and vacancy rates. Staff recommended approval.

A motion was made by Solomon, seconded by Hinz, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. 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
Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Parking Strategic Plan
Low Income Bus Pass Program Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

No action was needed on these items.

H. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Poulson updated members on future agenda items:

- 1) The stroller policy was still under review, and would require a couple more months before coming back to the TPC.
- 2) Commission Rules and Procedures would be reaffirmed in an upcoming meeting. Poulson had originally planned to propose a rule change to allow alternates to vote on Chair and Vice-Chair, and on the rules under which they too had to operate. But he had determined that this would likely require an ordinance change, not a TPC rule change; and would be talking to TPC alders about sponsoring such a change.
- 3) An update on low-income bus passes would be planned for a meeting closer to budget discussions, when this would have more import.
- 4) A presentation by Knobloch about automated payment systems and that situation would also be scheduled closer to budget time.

Poulson said he had recently been busy visiting Metro. He was involved in roll-out of the new hybrid buses and had joined the press conference with Tammy Baldwin on July 9th. He had also attended a special event that was receiving some national attention, in which Metro honored employees by adding the names of the employees' children, grandchildren, and other special children in their lives to 20 fixed-route buses.

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

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Schmitz, to Adjourn at 7:45 PM.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.