



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes - Final
TRANSIT AND PARKING
COMMISSION

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

Thursday, November 10, 2005

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 300 (Madison Municipal Building)
(After 6 pm, use Doty St. entrance.)

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Durocher called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Tim Wong arrived at 5:10 p.m. Kevin Hoag arrived at 5:15 p.m.

Present: Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Carl D. Durocher, Chris R. Carlsen, Sharon L. McCabe, Diane L. Paoni and Kenneth M. Streit

Absent: Tim Wong and Kevin L. Hoag

Excused: Ald. Jed Sanborn and Amanda F. White

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

D.1. [02344](#) Parking Sept 2005 Quarterly Report

Joanne Easland, Parking Analyst, was present. She stated the quarterly report look good. Carlsen asked whether persons on the monthly parking waiting list are referred to other persons on the waiting list as potential carpoolers. Easland was not sure but will check with the staff person who maintains the waiting list. Carlsen felt that facilitating carpooling is one way to move people off the waiting list and get additional revenues for the Parking Utility.

Carlsen referenced the October Activity Report statement indicating that the PU received its first payment of \$5,910 from Adams Outdoor Advertising and wanted to know what period of time this covered. Easland stated one month. The PU has a guaranteed rate of \$75,000 for the year.

Motion by McCabe/Radomski to accept the report, carried unanimously.

D.2. [02343](#) Metro YTD September 2005 Quarterly Report

As requested at the last TPC meeting, Debo provided a comparison of ridership and revenues. Debo commented that the new equipment provides wonderful statistics. The fare change was implemented August 9, and they took the statistics from September and compared them with last year's figures as well as Sharon Persich's revenue projections for the fare change. Some fares are close to projection while others are not. The biggest surprise was the popularity of the one-day pass. The data shows that not only did Metro not lose ridership, but ridership grew 8+% in September. When the TPC was considering the fare increase, staff presented information on the experience with past fare increases in Madison and advised that Metro had not sustained ridership losses. This data supports that experience, although Debo noted that high gas prices contributed to the increased ridership this year. There was a slight decline in the senior 10-ride fare, even though the senior fare remained the same from 2004. Miscellaneous revenue in 2005 is significantly lower than in 2004 because the new system is much more accurate in allocating revenues.

Golden was amazed at the one-day pass numbers and remarked that when he first read the report, he thought the one-day number was a typo. Debo advised that the one-day fare is \$3.40, which is more than double the cash fare. The average is three trips per one-day pass. It's apparent that riders have found it to be a very convenient type of fare. Golden requested that staff provide data re: which routes and times of day the pass is used. It might be wise to market the pass. Debo stated that Julie Maryott-Walsh has been doing some work on it because it's a new fare. Debo also found it interesting that the 2-4-6 fare has good usage, although they don't have data to compare it to the former 2-4-1 fare.

Wong wondered how typical this data is and preferred to see year-to-date numbers. Debo pointed out that the fare increase took effect August 9, so there is limited data at this time. She noted that these numbers bear out the 8.1% ridership increase in Sept. 2005 compared to Sept. 2004. Wong mentioned he had seen a formula related to gas prices and ridership, and if gas doubles in price then ridership should go up 14%. Debo noted that August ridership was 13.8% higher than in August 2004.

Wong asked if the spreadsheets could be provided in a format other than a .pdf file so he can perform his own calculations on the data. Debo will check with Sharon Persich.

In addition to the route/time of day information for the one-day pass requested by Golden, Streit requested that staff also provide information on the total number of trips taken with the pass. The number of rides shown in the comparison chart just shows how many passes were sold. Debo will check with Persich to see if this data is available.

Paoni directed attention to the ADA Certifications data on the Paratransit Indicators Report. The number of riders taking trips does not equal the number of clients. Debo explained that not all persons who are certified actually use the service.

Referencing item (c) on Debo's cover sheet, Paoni questioned why the budget isn't adjusted if Metro already knows that they will be \$183,000 over budget in 2006. Debo stated she has provided the Comptroller's office with budget adjustments for consideration. The Comptroller's office is concerned about the

fuel cost overrun and has requested Metro to provide its best guess estimate of how much money is needed to fully fund Metro for 2006. Some alders are supportive of adding money to the City budget for Metro. Debo advised that she gave a figure of \$796,000 to avoid service cuts and to take care of other issues, including the growth in paratransit. This figure takes into account that Metro is generating more revenues than anticipated due to higher ridership than anticipated. The Mayor's Executive Budget does not include the \$183,000 additional funding for paratransit, but the \$796,000 figure she provided to the Comptroller's office does.

Wong asked about the number of transfers. Debo stated that the number of transfers is higher than in 2004, largely due to the fact that the recording of transfers is now more accurate. The number reflects the number of transfers put into the system, not the number of transfers handed out (some people take a transfer but don't use it). The transfer is only counted as a ride if it's used. She advised that Federal regulations define what is counted as a ride.

Golden was unclear as to the funding level for paratransit contained in the Mayor's budget versus what's needed. Without shifting any money from Metro's contingency reserve, does Metro have enough to fund paratransit? Debo replied it has to fund paratransit because it's a federal mandate under the ADA. Golden asked whether Debo has applied extra money to paratransit. Debo responded that once Metro knew what the Mayor's budget would be, changes were made to fit that budget. The cost of service is for both fixed route and paratransit. The need to cut \$557,000 worth of service is both fixed route and paratransit. Golden recognized that paratransit service is a federal mandate and that Metro has a certain amount of revenue. To obey the ADA, does Metro first apply its funding to paratransit? Debo replied no, since the ADA service is complementary to the fixed route service. If fixed route service is cut, there's an impact on paratransit. Golden asked whether paratransit is over budget this year. Debo stated that in 2006, they anticipate that paratransit costs will be over budget by \$183,000 as a result of the big increase in ridership. But paratransit service is only one item in the budget, and the fixed route and paratransit budgets are an allocation not a line item. Golden was still trying to clarify the paratransit budget. If you use the example that paratransit received \$2.5 million in the 2005 budget, is it correct to say that 2005 expenses are \$2.5 million plus \$183,000? Are paratransit costs higher in 2005 than anticipated? Debo replied that Metro does not get separate funding for paratransit, it receives "all modes" funding. She expected that Metro will use most of its contingency reserve to cover all overruns in 2005. A 9.3% increase in paratransit ridership YTD, at an average cost of \$26 per ride, is significant. She confirmed Golden's estimate that there will probably be 20,000-30,000 more paratransit rides than budgeted for. Golden asked if this will be the same for 2006. Debo replied a number of things are going on. The approach by staff is to control the number of paratransit trips. One way is to work with the County to have MA (not MA "waiver") trips, which are funded at 100%, be provided by a common carrier. Golden questioned whether it's reasonable to expect a reduction of 30,000 trips by doing this, and Debo replied yes.

Motion by McCabe/Streit to accept the report, carried unanimously.

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

Excused: Ald. Jed Sanborn and Amanda F. White

E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- E.1. [02345](#) Monroe Commons (Evergreen Lot) public parking

David Keller, 448 W. Washington Avenue, identified himself as the developer of this project and registered in support. He requested that the stalls in the replacement parking for the Evergreen Lot have one-hour meters. He advised that the number of on-street stalls has been increased by 7 or 8, thereby increasing the amount of two-hour parking. Mr. Keller stated he has been in contact with the Monroe Street merchants. He indicated the business community is not concerned with having one-hour meters. The grocery store has indicated a need for 24 one-hour stalls.

Bill Putnam, Parking Utility engineer, advised that staff preferred two-hour meters. There is a concern that the one-hour meters will pose a problem for Monroe Street shoppers.

Golden explained that the former grocery store and its parking lot, as well as the Evergreen Lot, have been converted into a larger grocery store and two parking facilities. One will serve the condos above the grocery store and will be private parking. A portion of the stalls will be designated as free parking for the grocery store. A covered parking lot will replace the parking in the former Evergreen Lot. On-street parking has also been increased. Golden did not necessarily agree with the staff report. He felt most parkers will first try for the free parking, although there will be some overflow grocery parking. Golden noted that this will be a public lot and it's within the TPC's purview to set the time limits. The grocery store is requesting one-hour meters. With the additional on-street metered spaces, the possibility of converting the Wingra Lot 10-hour meters to two hour, and because the grocery store lessee is new to Madison, Golden preferred to allow the one-hour meters and see how it goes for a year or two. Many of the Monroe Street merchants view the grocery store as being a business generator and they want to make sure the store operates as best it can. The purpose of the parking lot is to support the Monroe Street business district, and Golden believed the lot will serve the other businesses more than it will the grocery store, except for peak grocery shopping times. There seems to be neighborhood consensus to allow the one-hour meters, so he was comfortable with it.

Paoni asked if the on-street stalls are always available, and Putnam advised that there's a no parking restriction during the afternoon peak hour. In response to Carlsen's question, Mr. Keller stated that there will be 38 free parking stalls for the grocery, and there are two handicapped stalls next to the elevator. There are about 7 or 8 on-street stalls that would not be available during rush hour or on football Saturdays. Mr. Keller pointed out that on Harrison Street, the number of on-street stalls went from four to ten.

Wong wanted to know how non-grocery store patrons would be prevented from parking in the free stalls. Golden replied that it's a private facility and not the City's problem.

Durocher noted that the grocery store has very convenient bus service.

Mr. Keller mentioned that the grocery store will have an internal loading dock.

Motion by Streit/Golden to recommend one-hour meters and that the parking be reviewed in two years to see if changes need to be made.

Hoag was surprised the Monroe Street merchants are supporting the request.

Golden remarked that the Monroe Street businesses are a pretty tight group and if there was a concern the TPC would have heard about it. He emphasized that this is not the only parking facility in the area, and there is also on-street parking. Everyone did a balancing act, and the grocery store is a very important business and needs to be successful. He assumed the grocery store operators will be flexible if the parking is not working for the area.

Paoni commented that when she has traveled with friends to the Monroe Street area, two-hour parking has often been difficult to find. She suggested the stalls be two-hour meters and patrons can plug the meter for only one hour if they don't plan to stay long.

Motion carried, with Hoag and Paoni voting no and Wong abstaining.

E.2. [02341](#)

Parking ramp agreements with Madison Symphony, Madison Opera, and Bethel Lutheran Church

Golden recalled the agreement with Bethel Lutheran Church but was less familiar with the ones for the Madison Symphony Orchestra and the Madison Opera. While the agreements make a lot of sense, he wondered whether the Parking Utility is cutting sweetheart deals for Madison's elite. Would the same deal for reserved spaces be offered to some other group? It hasn't been publicized that others could have this deal. Madison is a very policy-driven City, yet the TPC does not have a policy regarding agreements like this.

Carlsen remarked that the agreement with Bethel has been in place for a while and it appears that what's before the TPC is a renewal for 2005.

Paoni asked about the difference in pricing for the agreements, but Putnam did not have that information available. However, he noted that the MSO and MO agreements appear to be tied to the special event fee.

Golden suggested separating out the Bethel agreement since it is quite different from the other two. He recalled that when former Parking Manager Hinz determined that it made financial sense to have a cashier on duty at the State Street Capitol Ramp on Sundays, Bethel asked whether it was possible to have the church pay for the parking rather than the individual church patrons paying for it. Putnam noted that Bethel actually pays for all ramp parkers, not just Bethel members, who enter at 7:00 a.m. or after and exit by 12:45 p.m.

Golden reiterated that he didn't have any history on the MSO and MO agreements, but they appear to be requests for reserved parking in a prime spot for VIPs. The organizations pay only \$3.00 per stall, which is the regular special event fee. Neither organization is being charged extra to have the spaces reserved. Paoni was surprised the MSO wants reserved spaces at the State Street Capitol Ramp instead of the Overture Ramp. Putnam noted that with the Overture construction there is no back entrance, and the front door is actually closer to the SSCO ramp. Paoni noted that the occupancy data shows that the Overture Ramp has less demand than the SSCO, so perhaps the reserved spaces should be at Overture.

Debo mentioned that it seemed strange there was no resolution authorizing the agreements.

Motion by Streit/Golden to refer to the next meeting, with a friendly amendment by Carlsen to separate out the Bethel agreement.

Amendments by Golden regarding the referral of the MSO and MO agreements: (1) provide information on how the reserved stalls are assigned to MSO and MO patrons; (2) staff should include a policy or have a discussion on whether a policy is needed to insure that access to this kind of benefit is given to anyone who requests it; (3) are there any PU costs associated with "roping off" the reserved spaces; this extra service is now being provided for free but should be compensated; and (4) this is a premium service - should the TPC consider having a premium rate for a guaranteed first floor stall.

Streit remarked that another benefit of the reserved parking is the quick exit at the end of the show.

Motion to refer the MSO and MO agreements carried unanimously.

Members asked whether they should take up the Bethel agreement now. Debo reiterated her belief that it needed a resolution, even if it's a renewal. Carlsen noted the term of the agreement is for calendar year 2005.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to refer the Bethel agreement to the next meeting and that it be dealt with separately from the MSO and MO agreements, carried unanimously.

- E.3. [02303](#) Accepting sponsorship of Miller Brewing Company for the provision of free expanded transit service on New Year's Eve, and authorizing the Mayor and Clerk to sign an agreement with Miller Brewing Company, which may contain an indemnification clause.

A motion was made by Carlsen, seconded by Hoag, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER Wong asked if the \$10,000 provided by Miller Brewing covers the entire cost. Debo replied no, although it originally did. In 2004, Metro covered about \$5,000 of the cost. Miller's contribution of \$10,000 has remained at the same level for a long time. Wong expressed concern about the cost to Metro and wondered whether Metro should solicit donations from other brewing companies. Miller is getting credit for sponsoring the free rides even though Miller doesn't cover the entire cost. Debo commented that Miller's contribution is similar to a grant.

Golden felt the fiscal note should include information that the service is not free and that there is a cost to Metro. Paoni noted that Metro would save \$5,000 if service on New Year's Eve was provided at the normal level. Golden asked whether Miller is paying for the extension of service, and Debo replied yes. Golden thought the resolution should reflect that the City is paying for the free rides and that Miller is paying for the ability to extend service past the time it would normally stop running. Wong asked for a breakdown of what it costs to provide the service beyond the normal time. Debo indicated it depends on the day of the week. Wong inquired whether Miller's \$10,000 donation covers more than extending service past 11 p.m. Debo explained that if Miller did not pay for extending the service, New Year's Eve would be treated as a reduced service day since it's the day before a holiday. Paoni noted that later on the agenda is an item related to eliminating holiday service. Would eliminating holiday service also eliminate New Year's Eve service? Debo replied no. Metro's "day" starts at 4:00 a.m., so the holiday starts at 4:00 a.m. on January 1. She reiterated that New Year's Eve is a reduced service day, not a holiday.

Durocher interjected that the TPC was making this way more complex than it needed to be. The City has accepted the grant in the past. Metro's costs are going up so the grant no longer fully funds the service, but the donation is still free money. He wanted to continue promoting the free rides on New Year's Eve. If the TPC wants the \$10,000 to cover more of the service, perhaps the free rides could start later in the evening. However, he cautioned against starting the rides too late because people want to use the service to get to parties, etc. and if the service is not available when they want to go out, they will drive instead. Carlsen also expressed concern about starting the service too late since families use it to attend New Year's Eve activities on the Square.

Wong was curious as to how Miller's contribution occurs each year. Debo stated that each year, Julie Maryott-Walsh, Metro's Marketing Manager, contacts Miller to see if they want to continue. Wong asked if the issue of an inflation increase comes up. Debo replied yes, but Miller determines what it wants to give.

Wong asked if there's a way to estimate what the service really costs. Debo responded that for next year, Metro can provide a better idea of what it costs Metro, ridership data, and the impact of starting the rides later.

Durocher advised that prior to Miller providing the grant, Metro staff had to solicit donations from various entities each year. But it's difficult to solicit small gifts from a number of organizations. Then Miller came forward and said they would do the whole thing. He reminded members that this is a grant and Metro doesn't have a lot of negotiating power. Paoni suggested Metro ask for a \$5,000 budget amendment to make the service completely free. Debo replied that it's not worth pursuing a budget amendment for such a small amount. She felt it's probably

better dealt with next year with a full report on the experience, ridership, costs, etc. Paoni was concerned about Metro trying to come up with \$5,000 when it's facing service cuts.

Streit suggested that Metro express thanks to Miller for the \$10,000 grant. The positive image of transit service is probably worth the \$5,000 that Metro has to kick in. There is a clear message that is sent out and it reflects well on the transit system.

The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: Sanborn and White
Aye: Golden, Radomski, Carlsen, Wong, McCabe, Hoag and Streit
No: Paoni
Non Voting: Durocher

Enactment No: RES-05-00960

- E.4. [02308](#) Authorizing a budget amendment appropriating \$12,800 from the City General Fund Contingent Reserve to the Transit Utility for the provision of four "fare-free" Clean Air Action Days as requested by the City during 2005.

A motion was made by Carlsen, seconded by Hoag, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER Debo briefly explained that the resolution authorizes Metro to be reimbursed for the cost of providing four "fare free" Clean Air Action Days as requested by the City in 2005.

Wong wanted to know if Metro is sure that \$12,800 will cover the actual cost. Debo stated that the estimated cost for 2005 is \$3,200 for each day and in 2006 the estimated cost is \$3,800. Wong asked if ridership on Clean Air Action Days will be tracked to see whether the free fares actually result in increased ridership. Debo indicated that Metro can look at ridership for the few weeks surrounding the Clean Air Action Day and look at the ridership on a normal day to calculate the value of the free rides. The free fares days affect riders who use cash or 10-ride cards. Wong felt Metro should know how many people are taking advantage of the free fare and make sure they are getting the full reimbursement.

The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: Sanborn and White
Aye: Golden, Radomski, Carlsen, McCabe, Hoag, Paoni and Streit
Abstain: Wong
Non Voting: Durocher

Enactment No: RES-05-00961

F. OLD BUSINESS

- F.1. [02342](#) Metro service change proposals

There were a number of citizens in attendance for this item, and Durocher clarified that this was not a public hearing (as had been erroneously reported by the Wisconsin State Journal). However, scheduling a public hearing might be discussed at tonight's meeting.

Members then heard from the registrants.

Amy Starobin, 837 N. Gammon Road #3, asked the TPC alders to support the budget amendment for Metro to avoid service cuts. She uses Routes 8 and 15, and these routes seem to be the first ones cut.

Russell Novkov, 4817 Sheboygan Avenue #8, registered in opposition to service cuts (did not wish to speak).

Michael Barrett, 2137 Sommers Avenue, opposed service cuts. He spoke at the Common Council in support of fully funding Metro so that cuts are not necessary. It was his understanding that Ald. Golden and other alders have sponsored an amendment to keep Metro whole, and he thanked Ald. Golden for his leadership in putting that forward. However, he was afraid that effort will not be enough and he asked the TPC members for their help. He encouraged members to talk with their neighbors and neighborhood associations to contact their alders about supporting the budget amendment to avoid service cuts. Now is the time to exercise leadership as a TPC member. Mr. Barrett also expressed displeasure about the lack of transparency in the ridership and financial numbers. Durocher asked which numbers he was concerned about. Mr. Barrett replied that citizens were told that with the fare increase, there would be no cuts in service. That was in the context of a 4% drop in ridership as a result of the fare increase. But then, even though Metro has had an increase in ridership and revenues, it is still short of funds. First Metro said it needed \$500,000 to cover the shortfall, and now that number has grown to \$796,000. Barrett realized that fuel prices are fluctuating, but they have now gone down. Debo interjected that diesel fuel prices have not gone down. Barrett emphasized that people who are advocating for transit funding are having problems doing so when the numbers keep changing.

[Paoni left the meeting at 6:50 p.m.]

Bert Zipperer, 1337 Jenifer Street, supported more buses. He distributed a document providing an overview of bus service for LaFollette High School students who live on the south side. He emphasized that the lack of bus service affects more than LHS but he was speaking from the LHS aspect. The lack of service disproportionately affects students of color and/or low income families. Zipperer displayed a map of the LHS attendance area and existing Metro routes. Debo noted that there is supplemental school service, but Zipperer pointed out that the supplemental service does not help students in the middle of the day, nor is it available for parents to use to attend school functions at night. He also noted that the supplemental service is paid for by the School District. Zipperer estimated that about 20% of LHS students (300-350 students) live on the south side, and this represents about 50% of the Asian American students, about 50% of the Latino American students, and about 40% of the African American students. The supplemental bus leaves LHS about 10 minutes after school ends. If southside students want to attend an activity after school, they can't do it. The Madison School Community Recreation will fund a bus that leaves at 5:30 p.m., but that is the only time and it only covers one direction to the south side. The

MSCR provided an after-school bus in January 2005, but it was not heavily used because students had to register for the after-school activities earlier in the school year.

Zipperer emphasized that the lack of service affects other schools in the area as well, for example Allis Elementary, Nuestro Mundo Elementary, Glendale Elementary and Sennett Middle School all lack a bus connection to the schools for families living on the south side.

Zipperer went over the transit timing issues involved for a student who left LaFollette at 5:45 p.m. It would take over two hours for the student to reach their south side home. He briefly described the south side neighborhoods in the LaFollette attendance area and pointed them out on a map. Zipperer felt the lack of service seems to be an anomaly in the City's transit service rather than a school issue. It's also an issue of social justice.

Golden wondered whether the TPC should hold a meeting at LHS and have this as a special item of business. Zipperer advised that the EOC has set up a subcommittee to plan and hold public hearings, one at the school and one in the neighborhood. Golden asked whether Zipperer anticipated a good turn-out at the hearings. Zipperer indicated that the EOC subcommittee is considering a 4:00 p. m. hearing at the school and another one at the community center the following night which would allow the families to attend. The TPC will be invited since it's important for the TPC to hear directly from the potential customers. Zipperer felt conducting the hearing in partnership would be a good idea.

Referencing Barrett's concern about the amended amount of funding necessary for Metro, Debo stated she had been asked by the Comptroller's office to look at what would be needed for 2006 based on new information at this time. She met with Metro's financial staff and worked on new estimates, although the cost for fuel in 2006 is a big unknown. The new estimate is \$796,000 to fully fund Metro in 2006. Right now, diesel fuel is \$2.36/gallon and the new estimate is based on the premise of an average cost of \$2.00/gallon in 2006. When Metro submitted its budget in August, the estimated average fuel cost was \$1.78/gallon. Debo felt the premise of an average cost of \$2.00/gallon is reasonable; she did not want to over-estimate. The \$796,000 figure would cover the \$586,000 in service cuts. Debo applauded the efforts of Barrett and other transit advocates to get full funding for Metro.

Carlsen asked for confirmation that if the budget amendment goes through, then service cuts are not needed, and Debo replied that is correct.

Motion by Carlsen/Wong to refer this issue to the next TPC meeting after the Common Council has adopted the budget, rather than spending a lot of time tonight on something that may not happen.

In response to Wong's question, Debo indicated that \$2.00/gallon is staff's "best guess" for the average cost of ultra low sulfur fuel in 2006. The money from MG&E for using ultra low sulfur is built into the budget.

Referencing the proposed timeline, Golden asked whether it's necessary to select a public hearing date tonight so that the TPC can act on the service changes at its regular meeting on Dec. 8. Debo noted that Metro needs to advertise the public

hearing, hold the hearing, and perhaps hold a special TPC meeting after the hearing to adopt the cuts. All savings related to the proposed cuts are based on a March implementation date, and the changes must be adopted in December to make the March implementation date. Also, having a meeting later in December may pose problems because of the holidays. She urged the TPC to set a public hearing date tonight and then see what happens with the budget. If the TPC does not want to act tonight, perhaps the TPC could set a date to meet after the Council meeting to discuss what happened at the Council meeting and to set a public hearing if necessary. Streit suggested meeting on the fifth Tuesday, November 29. Debo noted the Council is meeting that night, but perhaps the TPC could meet before the Council meeting. It would be a one-item agenda.

Golden advised that the Council has set aside three nights for the budget. Tuesday, Nov. 15 will be a public hearing on the amendments. The funding for Metro depends on how the amendment is handled, and he preferred to separate out paratransit and fixed route. Paratransit service is a federal mandate under the ADA and if funding for that is a separate amendment, he believed it would pass without debate. McCabe wondered if it would be helpful for the Council to have information on the cuts being considered to meet the budget shortfall, and Golden presumed that Debo will provide that information to the alders.

Amended motion by Carlsen/Wong to refer to a special TPC meeting on Nov. 29, with said meeting to be canceled if the Council fully funds Metro; carried unanimously.

If the TPC needs to meet on November 29, Streit requested that Metro provide information on the total number of riders for each cut, the cost per trip, etc. Debo noted a correction to Attachment C provided in the agenda packet, item 4 re: elimination of holiday service would affect 581 paratransit trips not 62, and in scenario #2 elimination of holiday service would affect 483 trips not 48. Golden asked that a corrected copy of this document be provided for the November 29 meeting.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to suspend the rules to take up item F.3. out of order, carried unanimously.

F.2. [02080](#) Report re: Parking on the Capitol Square.

Durocher highlighted the statement in the memo from City Traffic Engineer Dryer that no specific action was required by the TPC. The report will be forwarded to the Common Council for their consideration. The TPC's comments, if any, will be forwarded as well but it's up to the Council whether to make the pilot permanent.

Wong objected to the elimination of three bus shelters on the Square but Debo clarified that this issue is not related to parking on the Square.

Motion by Carlsen/Streit to accept the report. Friendly amendment by Durocher that, based on the testimony at the joint meeting on 9/28/05, the meters remain in effect during the Saturday Farmers' Markets (don't bag the meters). Motion carried with Wong voting no.

F.3. [02207](#) Adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

A motion was made by McCabe, seconded by Hoag, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION Dave Trowbridge and Linda Horvath of City Planning were present. The public hearing draft was released on October 28, and that was the document the TPC had in their packets. Planning staff were looking for TPC approval of the ordinance to adopt the Plan. The Common Council will take it up on December 13.

Trowbridge remarked that the PBMVC and TPC provided good comments at their joint meeting on October 25. The recommended changes from the meeting have not been incorporated in the Plan but will be transmitted to the Plan Commission as suggested changes. Durocher wanted to know the difference between the draft Plan provided in May versus the one provided in October. Trowbridge stated the transportation changes were highlighted at the October joint meeting.

Golden inquired as to the reason for the push to get this adopted, is there a statutory deadline? Trowbridge replied that there's a deadline with the State grant. Golden noted that the Plan is going before a number of committees/commissions, and he felt some will need a "push" to act now. Trowbridge stated there's a push within Planning to get this done.

Michael Barrett, 2137 Sommers Avenue, registered in opposition and provided a written comment: "My biggest complaint is that the plan features no discussion and no policy proposals increasing frequency of service. Spatial coverage is much less important than frequency, especially if the city follows through with the rest of the plan which calls for dense, mixed use TODs."

Debo recalled that an earlier version of the Plan included a statement that the City would fund transit service in such a way that they could maintain and expand service, and she wondered what happened to that. Golden remarked that the Plan talks about expansion of service into newly developed areas but Barrett's comment is correct, they never discuss frequency issues. He would like to see something about 30-minute service. Debo pointed out that the TPC reviews the Transit Development Program developed by the MPO, and that document addresses more specific issues like levels of service. Trowbridge indicated that something about frequency of service could be put in the Plan, although Debo emphasized that frequency relates to funding. Wong commented that as urban sprawl expands, the City needs to plan for transit service and he didn't want to see service to new areas occur at the expense of existing service. At some point does the City draw a line and say that we cannot provide service to new areas because we want to provide better service in existing areas. Consideration should be given to where to increase service in order to maximize ridership. Trowbridge felt the first objective gets into that but the Transit Development Program could flesh it out.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to add a statement that the City aspires to increase transit service so that travel time is no greater than 30 minutes from boarding to destination, with the intent that this should be a service standard.

Debo felt this is a good idea but it would require express buses. Golden just wanted to put it out there, and he emphasized that he used the word "aspire." Debo remarked that the intent is great but where is the funding? Trowbridge suggested that "if determined to be cost effective" could be added as a qualifier, but Golden did not think it was necessary at this point. Durocher noted that the motion is to be the consensus of the TPC. It would add language to the Plan that

says the City puts a high priority on effective public transportation. The chance of achieving it is a separate issue.

Motion carried unanimously.

Trowbridge asked if this comment carries a higher significance than the other comments from the 10/25 joint meeting that were not made in the form of a motion, and Golden replied no.

Wong felt there are contradictions in the Plan, such as talking about improving air quality but then making it easy to drive to the suburbs.

Durocher relayed the feedback from the ADA Transit Subcommittee, specifically two comments by member Susan DeVos. Her references to page, policy and objective numbering did not correspond with the most recent draft, but it appears they correspond to the following numbering:

1. Page 3-13: It is nice that under Policy 10 pedestrian issues such as snow removal are addressed, but there is no mention of curb cuts. In planning documents, it is very important to be aware of the issue of curb cuts and that we need construction of more curb cuts. There needs to be recognition in planning that wheelchair users use sidewalks too. It could be addressed in a separate policy or be included in an existing policy.
2. The plan talks about paratransit services as what is being done to meet ADA standards, but there is no mention that mainline buses have equipment for disabled people as well. Language about that could be included in Objective 9 on page 3-13. The word "accessible" could be inserted so that it would read "Implement a variety of accessible public transit services throughout the City of Madison.. Implement accessible transit services in a manner.."

Golden asked whether the intent of these comments is to provide paratransit service above the requirements of the ADA. Durocher clarified that the intent is to remember to describe the service as accessible.

Golden noted that there are ADA requirements for housing but because of the speed of development, transit service is not yet provided because the density is not high enough. If the City truly wants to make the housing accessible, then accessible transportation should be provided.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to add a policy stating that the City should aspire to provide paratransit to new residential developments above the ADA minimums so that accessible housing can be served by accessible transit as early as is feasible

Debo pointed out that the ADATS deals with the issue of accessibility, and that committee has supported a policy that Metro provide the level of ADA service that is complementary to fixed route transit service. This would be an unfunded mandate and she cautioned against shifting substantial dollars from fixed route to paratransit, which would completely change the orientation of service. The ADA contains conditions of time and space that make paratransit service complementary to fixed route service. Debo strongly felt the motion sets forth a policy decision that should be discussed at ADATS and then adopted by the TPC, but the Comprehensive Plan is not the place for it. The intent of the ADATS was to insert "accessible" where it would carry across the meaning of accessible fixed route service complemented by paratransit service under the requirements

of the ADA. Golden pointed out that the ADATS advises the TPC and the TPC chooses what it wants to do with that advice. He stated that he was heavily involved in writing the City's first ADA Plan and creating the ADA subcommittee. The City provides way above the minimum, although Debo stated not in time and place. Golden felt that wasn't true, noting that for years the City provided services to Town of Middleton residents who were beyond ¾ mile from the mainline route in Middleton. The former Transportation Commission adopted a policy that Metro would serve this area in spite of the fact that it fell outside the ADA requirements. However, when budget stresses hit paratransit, the policy had to be rescinded. Golden commented that the motion states that the City will "aspire" to provide this service, and if the City policy makers want to make this a policy, that's their decision. The Plan document has a list of policies in it, and he felt the motion is appropriate. The motion gives the City the authority to provide the service, but it does not commit any funding. When the City approves a development like the Habitat for Humanity development on Marsh Road, the City may choose to provide paratransit service there prior to when it's required under the ADA. If they want to do this, they can; but the Plan does not commit the City to making this decision. Golden stated there was nothing inconsistent with the adoption of a policy like this. He realized it's fiscally challenging but it would only be done under circumstances where the need is great and the money is available. Including this in the Plan provides a statement of the City's values.

Durocher clarified that the policy would be to aspire to provide a level of paratransit service above the minimum requirements of the ADA. On the other hand, the ADATS has had requests to extend the service area beyond the ¾ mile policy and the ADATS has consistently decided that having a policy and adhering to it is more important than granting a lot of exceptions. He wanted to provide that context. He added that the motion does not add a mandate to the Plan, rather it's similar to a vision statement.

Debo clarified that Golden was talking about paratransit service, not ADA paratransit.

Motion carried unanimously.

In response to Wong's question, Horvath stated the comment period on the Plan is still open.

Motion by McCabe/Hoag to approve the Plan as recommended for amendment carried unanimously.

[Golden left at 7:55 p.m.]
The motion passed by acclamation.

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

Motion by Carlsen/McCabe to accept reports G.1. through G.7., carried unanimously.

G.1. ADA Transit Subcommittee - 10/6/05 minutes

G.2. Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee - No meeting in October

- G.3. Parking Council for People With Disabilities
- G.4. Long Range Transportation Planning Commission - 10/20/05 minutes
- G.5. Mid-State Street Parking & Mixed Use Facility Evaluation Team
- G.6. State Street Design Project Oversight Subcommittee
- G.7. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

H. GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS

- H.1. General announcements by Chair

Durocher stated there is an opening on the LRTPC for a TPC rep. Carlsen advised that the Parking Council on People With Disabilities would like to change its composition to include an alder member. The alder does not need to be a member of the TPC. Radomski stated he will discuss this with Golden. Durocher noted that the TPC's other standing subcommittee, the ADATS, has an alder member.

- H.2. Commission member items for future agenda

None

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Wong/Carlsen, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Informational enclosures