



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, February 10, 2009

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 5:07 PM.

Present: 8 -

Margaret Bergamini; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. DuRocher; Amanda F. White;
Gary L. Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Sharon L. McCabe and Kenneth M.
Streit

Excused: 2 -

Brian L. Solomon and Robbie Webber

Please note: There is currently one vacancy on the Commission.

Solomon arrived at 5:21 PM, after the Minutes were approved. Webber arrived
at 6:14 PM, during staff presentation of Item E.3.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Poulson, to Approve the Minutes of
the January 13, 2009 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

Please note: A Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Solomon arrived during
staff presentation of Item D.1.

Present: 9 -

Margaret Bergamini; Brian L. Solomon; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. DuRocher;
Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Sharon L. McCabe
and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 1 -

Robbie Webber

D.1. [13538](#)

Parking: December 2008/4th Quarter Revenue Report, Key Statistics, and January
2009 Activity Report - TPC 02.10.09

Bill Knobloch (Parking Utility) noted that the 4th quarter/year end information
in the Reports was preliminary and unaudited; final numbers would become
available in April and presented at the May meeting. While reviewing the

Parking reports, Knobeloch made the following comments:

- Revenues (esp. in December) were significantly below budget and 2007 totals; this had happened only two or three times in the past 10 years; it would affect cash flow.
- Snow emergencies and the economic downturn (inc. construction-related revenues) contributed to this.
- While these developments took staff by surprise, reserves would probably not be affected.
- The new photo enforcement machines would help induce more people to buy RP 3 permits.
- Waiting times on waiting lists ranged from five months to 10 years, indicating rates may be too low.
- Parking was talking with a hotel developer, in hopes of partnering on a parking garage behind MMB.
- Looking at the continuing strength of Gov East, it would be a catastrophe for both the customers and the Utility to have to close it without proper replacement parking.
- Combined revenues at State Street Campus ramps were \$124K below last year's numbers.
- Average weekday occupancies were down in all locations except Gov East.
- Regarding the cashiered portion of ramps: 69% of all parkers stayed less than five hours – part-time parkers; long-term parkers were not all-day (9-hour) parkers; long-term parkers, comprising less than a third of all parkers, produced more than half of all revenues, and with shorter stays produced less revenue.
- Occupancies trended down between 2007 and 2008.

Responding to questions, Knobeloch said that the drop in revenues at the State Street Campus ramps was probably in part due to competition with the cheaper, UW all-day permits; and the unlimited ride pass programs at UW had been very successful, resulting in fewer parkers. The growth of high-density housing on/near Campus had reduced the need for cars and parking. Lighting was being improved there (in response to customer concerns about safety), and monthly permits could soon be offered at the Campus ramp, priced to compete with private parking nearby.

In terms of waiting times for monthly permits, Overture had the shortest (at 5-7 months), and Wilson and Blair had the longest (up to 10 years). Parking had to price monthly permits carefully, with current prices equivalent to roughly 15-17 days of parking, reflecting a small discount. Parking had received calls from interested parties inquiring about long-term leases for sizeable numbers of spaces, but when told about the requirement to create a TDM plan, most decided not to pursue a lease.

McCabe/Hinz moved to receive the Parking report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

D.2. [13564](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicator Reports and Other Quarterly Reports - TPC 02.10.09

In reviewing the Metro reports, Chuck Kamp made the following comments about Fixed Routes:

- YTD (year-end) 2008 service levels were very comparable to 2007.
- The 6% YTD increase in ridership was consistent with previous quarters.
- Though YTD vehicle accidents were up, included in this number were

“preventable” accidents, which had gone down from 125 to 104, and the remaining accidents were those where the drivers were not at fault (ex. hit by another vehicle); winter weather had been a contributing factor, overall.

- Record highs in ridership were hit in eleven of the twelve months in 2008; and ridership had not dropped when gas prices fell.
- The most productive routes were the UW routes; with Supplemental School Service providing 1 million rides (out of 13 million system-wide), significant in terms of the proposed changes to FTA school bus rules.
- The 2008 total of 13.4 million rides system-wide exceeded Metro’s benchmark of 12.9 million; and since 1970, this total was second only to the 1979 total of just under 14 million.

Kamp made the following observations about Paratransit services:

- Total trips were up 2% from 2007, reflecting a more controlled ridership than Fixed; with every trip a cost, this level of growth was manageable and helped with budget.
- DDS subscription trips were up 6%.
- The total of No shows/Rides provided remained at 2.2%.
- Maintenance inspections had stayed close to schedule.
- Of total trips provided, two-thirds of riders were ambulatory; one-third were non-ambulatory.
- On-time performance was down a little, due to winter weather in December.
- About half of eligible ADA-certified riders actually rode Paratransit.
- Passenger accidents were down, while vehicle accidents were up due to weather.
- Four of 12 months were record months for Paratransit.

Customer feedback had increased by 500 comments over 2007, in large part due to public hearings/meetings related to service changes; people more readily used email and cell phones to offer their feedback. Of the 150 more comments in 2008 about Fixed Routes, 50 were compliments. Metro was increasingly using cameras to investigate complaints and concerns, and by the end of next year, all buses would have cameras.

The hybrids showed 28% better MPG than the newest Gilligs, with 36% better MPG on Campus routes. Metro would be looking for additional federal money in the stimulus package to help with additional hybrid purchases among the 42 buses remaining in the balance of its current 5-year procurement. In the future, Metro would report comparisons of emissions (CO2 and particulate matter) between conventional and hybrid buses, which would be helpful for funding purposes; and would also show how fuel economy and related costs translated over the 12-year life cycle of a bus.

Per member requests, Metro would provide a breakdown of ridership by fare categories as well as the number of preventable accidents in future reports. Metro was also looking at new codes to show when Metro was or was not responsible for situations reported in feedback.

Streit/Poulson moved to receive the Metro report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- E.1. [13488](#) Authorizing the conversion of the current CTR revenue equipment software (PARCS)

to ZEAG (ZMS) software and associated hardware changes. This would also authorize a sole source purchase from ZEAG (USA), Inc. to make these changes. ZEAG will also maintain the software/hardware through assuming the CTR maintenance contract, which is currently \$52,452 per year.

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

Bergamini/Solomon made a motion to table Agenda Item E.2., until the arrival of Webber, who sponsored the resolution, Leg. File #13113.

The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item E.3.

A Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Webber arrived at 6:14 PM, during staff presentation of Agenda Item E.3.

Present: 10 -

Margaret Bergamini; Brian L. Solomon; Robbie Webber; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. DuRocher; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Sharon L. McCabe and Kenneth M. Streit

Following the arrival of Webber and completion of Item E.3., Poulson/Hinz moved to take Item E.2. off the table, and the meeting proceeded to Item E.2.

E.2. [13113](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Creating Section 12.127 of the Madison General Ordinances to create 20 minute parking zones from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on any day except Sundays and holidays; amending Sec. 12.141 to include Sec. 12.127 in the penalty section and amending Sec. 1.08(3)(a) to create a bail deposit for violations of 20 minute parking restrictions.

Webber explained that the space being proposed for 20-minute parking was located by a coffee shop. The space was unmetered and situated in a residential neighborhood with 2-hour parking. Having completed a 6-month trial, the resolution now would permanently designate 20-minute parking for the space, which would encourage turnover and help customers wanting to quickly run in/out of the coffee shop. Per the recommendation of PBMVC, Webber recommended that the word "south" be added to the verbiage in the resolution in order to better describe the space, which represented one portion of one block.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Bergamini, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER: Recommend to Adopt Substitute (Version 2), which adds the word "south" to provide directional language, as follows: "...a point 85 feet south from Chadbourne Avenue to a point 160 feet south from Chadbourne Avenue." The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.3. [13557](#)

Parking: Staff Proposal for 2009 Parking Rates - TPC 02.10.09

Please note: This item followed Agenda Item E.1.

Knobeloch made the following comments about the process and principles used to develop the proposed rate modifications. (Please see the table prepared by staff entitled "Rate Increase Proposal for 2009," attached.)

Process:

- Staff presents recommendations to TPC on 2/10/09.

- TPC makes recommendations and staff returns on 3/10/09 with public hearing and final recommendations.
- TPC takes action on 3/10/09 so that PU has time to start implementation by 6/1/9. Every month delay costs the PU over \$100 K in revenue.
- Process (not event) takes 3 months, to order decals, write software changes, and change signs etc.; a final decision was needed by March.

Purpose of any rate modification:

- To generate sufficient revenue to cover future costs plus a cushion for hard times.
- Besides ongoing operational expenses (salaries, benefits, purchased services, supplies, capital assets), it must cover expected capital expenses.
- The current cash flow including all of the operational/capital expenses calls for rate modifications every 3 years. The last increase was in June 2006; the next one is planned for June 2012.

Method:

- The table shows over 50 variables that could be adjusted in any direction; many different tradeoffs could have been made.
- For instance, rather than increasing the on-street meters by 25¢/hour, enforcement times could have been increased to 10 PM and/or include Sunday enforcement (as Chicago is doing). In the past, businesses preferred raising rates to extending enforcement times.
- Rather than increasing Monroe/Schenk meters by 50¢/hour, all of the other street meters could have been increased by a larger amount.
- Instead of increasing the special event fee by \$1.00, fees for daily parkers could have been increased by a larger amount.

Principles that Parking tries to adhere to:

- Rates need to have staying power – to last for 3 years. Rate changes are costly to make.
- The street meters should be the most expensive parking to create turnover; longer-term parkers should be in the structures that may not be as convenient to their destination. It costs the PU about \$2.35/meter/day to have street meters; all meter groupings should cover their costs.
- Lots and structures (less convenient) should be less expensive than on-street parking.
- Hourly cashiered rates are market-driven and monthly rates should represent at least 15-17 days of hourly parking.
- Parking at popular facilities especially those that fill up should be more expensive than less popular structures that have excess capacity – help eliminate “FULL” signs. (Gov East and Brayton Lot).
- Monthly parkers at popular facilities should get a larger increase.
- Customers should be able to buy monthly permits with limited delay (6 months).
- Longer-term (10-hour) meters on the periphery should be less expensive than short-term meters downtown to encourage Park & Walk. (Railroad Street and Langdon Street by Wisconsin Avenue).
- Leased stalls sell for the resident monthly price + 10% administrative fee.
- 24/7 permits cost at least the non-resident fee + 10% administrative fee.
- Special event fees are market-driven and create over \$725K in revenues; allow patrons to exit the facility quickly after an event and encourages others to park elsewhere; pollution and the exit wait would be excessive without the special event fee.

- Grace periods must provide ample time to use the POF machine, get back to their car and exit. It's especially difficult for seniors that must climb stairs. Other parkers like students at MATC can complete an errand within the 20-minute time period.
- Lost ticket fee must reduce the likelihood of customers "losing" their ticket vs. paying a higher daily fee. (Hyatt charges \$200 for lost tickets). In December 2008, Parking had 465 lost tickets, 163 alone at Gov East. We are being gamed by patrons owing us more than the \$10 lost ticket fee.
- RP3 fees must cover the cost of providing the service but we can ride reserves in this area.
- Advertising revenue funds our TDM efforts; 2009 revenues overstated by \$33K.
- Meter hoods, construction hang tags must discourage sponsors from reserving stalls longer than necessary and replace lost potential funding.
- Every entity must pay the same fee for meter hoods and hang tags (inc. UW, Kohl Center, Overture etc.)
- Multi-space machines have a higher cost and a higher fee (20¢/hour more).

Knobeloch noted the following corrections/additions to the 2009 Rate Proposal table:

- CSN monthly should be \$125, not \$121/month for residents.
- CSN monthly should be \$150, not \$145/month for non-residents.
- Charge for covering DIS/VET signs for special events should be \$50 flat fee, to cover costs of TE covering/uncovering DIS/VET signs.

Members had the following comments and questions:

- McCabe spoke about the enforcement times/rates at the UW and the need to share information; and wondered about the impact of higher rates on the appeal of downtown.
- Webber asked about reducing the Special Event fee from the current \$4 to \$3, instead of raising it to \$5. Hinz asked for info about Special Event fees at UW and Alliant Center at the next meeting. Sanborn asked if the Special Event attendance declined after the increase from \$3 to \$4 in 2006. Staff would check.
- Durocher wondered about the impact of eliminating pro-ration of \$21/year RP3 fee; would fewer be sold after mid-season?
- White discussed the potential to raise the evening/weekend maximum in ramps to \$5 rather than \$4 (to encourage bus use); Poulson wondered about shortening the "overnight" period.
- Hinz observed that the overnight maximum was designed to encourage parkers to use ramps to help clear the streets for street cleaning and snow removal; rates needed to balance this goal against incentives to use buses.

Staff made the following remarks:

- Short-term parking rates had the lowest elasticity, while long-term parking rates had the highest.
- Behaviors had not changed when Special Event fee was increased from \$3 to \$4.
- Overnight maximums at ramps gave parkers a break, so they didn't have to run out and get more money in the AM's.
- It was not cost-effective to end "overnight" hours earlier (at 7 AM); demand was low then and enforcement costs would mitigate any gain.
- New photo enforcement equipment would encourage more parkers in RP3 to purchase permits, and create more needed turnover among those with permits.

Members requested that their suggestions – to increase evening/weekend maximum to \$5 and to keep Special Event fees at \$4 – be incorporated into an alternative package for consideration at the March meeting along with the staff rate proposal.

Hinz/Streit made a motion to hold a public hearing on proposed parking rate increases at the March meeting. The motion passes by voice vote/other.

E.4. [13540](#)

Metro: Proposed Bus Pilot Project to Reduce Bus Stops and Improve Service - TPC 02.10.09

Durocher invited registrants to the table to speak, or read their written statements, as follows.

- Ted Voth, 1335 Williamson, #2, 53703, registered in opposition to removal of bus stops and wrote: I am opposed to closing bus stops on the Isthmus, punishing your most faithful riders. Once you shut them down for the trial, they're gone. The public did not receive timely notice of the proposal.
- Todd Jensen, Board Member of Wil-Mar Neighborhood Center, spoke in opposition to closing of the bus stop(s) at Jenifer and Brearly Streets. He said that the stop(s) provided great access to participants in the Center's senior lunch program, food pantry and Saturday meal programs, all of which served hundreds of people and provided thousands of meals per month. Many of these people used the bus to get to the Wil-Mar; and the Center served as a bus shelter during inclement weather. The next bus stop was a block away, but will all the seniors using the Center, it was important for the bus stop(s) to be close by.
- Barbara Smith, 31 Sherman Terrace, # 3, 53704, registered in opposition to the pilot project to reduce bus stops.
- Tim Wong, 161 Jackson Street, 53704, registered in opposition to the pilot project to reduce bus stops.
- District 2 Alder Brenda Konkel appeared to speak in opposition to the pilot project. She understood why Metro was looking at efficiencies; but for seniors, disabled people and families, taking away bus stops wasn't worth the efficiencies. A block was a long way for seniors, and many sidewalks on the isthmus didn't get cleared well over winter. Along with hearing concerns about eliminating stops at Yahara House and Wil-Mar and encountering general disheartenment about the proposal, Konkel had concerns about the timing of the pilot, during a period of turnover on the isthmus and at a time when fares were likely to be raised. She had questions about the process with regard to the length of the pilot and whether a hearing would be held at the end of it. She wondered if other options couldn't be considered, such as running express buses on some of the proposed pilot routes or between transfer points.

Tim Sobota, Metro Transit Planner, joined Kamp at the table to answer questions. Kamp discussed the proposal (see 2/3/09 Metro Memo attached), as follows:

- Metro wanted to talk to bus advocates and alders to discuss the timing and length of the trial, but hoped to run the pilot during the spring, when loads were higher than over the summer.
- The Commission would be reviewing the updated 2009 Transit Development Plan later in the year, and results from the trial could be useful when looking at standards for bus stop spacing.
- Along with considering comments at the Commission, Metro would measure feedback through their usual customer service channels and through a rider

survey.

- If the pilot didn't work, Metro was committed to returning to the current arrangements.
- The proposal being presented was a first draft, and Metro would try to address questions and concerns, and make some revisions for consideration at the April meeting.

Members made the following comments:

- They had heard public comment on both sides of the issue: Those who wanted to keep bus stops intact (esp. theirs), and those who wanted buses to move faster and questioned the need for stops on every block.
- In Portland, buses hopscotched each other along corridors where multiple bus lines traveled; if street widths allowed, this might be an option to prevent buses from flocking and backing up at a single stop.
- It was a good idea to wait another month to gather more feedback, because the proposal had come up rather quickly without a lot of notice.
- The effort to save costs and possibly avoid raising fares was appreciated; however the timing of the proposal/trial was problematic, coming at a time when fares were likely to go up.
- Perhaps a discussion and decision about the proposal could be tied to a hearing related to whatever service expansion might come out of the Council decision about a fare increase, which would make it seem less negative.
- We do need to look at ways to speed up delivery times esp. for riders making transfers, perhaps by looking at delays at transfer points.
- We might even study eliminating the transfer points or creating some hybrid of them.
- Some possible efficiencies (as alternatives to eliminating bus stops) could be: express routes, leapfrogging (as previously mentioned); or locating bus stops away from the bottom/midway of hills, where a lot of gas is used to stop/start.
- Perhaps packaging the proposal with other ideas and options would show that we were keeping an eye on ways to be more efficient without trying to make things harder for a particular group of riders.
- A request was made to collect data about gas savings during such a trial.
- It was important to develop a communication plan for the trial: beforehand, to make the public aware of why the stops were closed and why the trial was happening; and later, to collect feedback.
- Caution was needed when making changes to core routes used by the majority of core riders.
- A question was raised as to how much time would be needed to provide proper notice to the public before the trial began, and to produce solid and sufficient data under typical peak conditions (probably in spring).
- Finding ways to save time was a safety issue, in terms of the way drivers were often forced to make up time in order to make connections at transfer points.
- Feedback from drivers on the proposal would be useful.
- Perhaps Wil-Mar and Yahara House stops could be kept (instead of other stops near them).
- Peak times of the year were more desirable to gather useful data from a trial of this kind (this spring, or during winter weather).

Staff offered the following information:

- Staff had not looked at counts at these stops; however, E. Washington was used as a model for the proposal on the Jenifer and E. Johnson/Gorham

- corridors – because of the location of bus stops and signals/controlled intersections on cross streets.
- Success would be measured by looking at GPS data and running times from the trial, and comparing it to current and recent data (with similar ridership levels) to see if it was saving travel time.
 - This efficiency would not any difference in the budget shortfall; it was intended to respond to customer requests to provide better service on certain routes (ex. Routes 3 and 7) for making timely transfers.
 - The proposal was not meant to save costs; it was meant to be save travel time for customers, not only to secure transfers but also to reduce the time it took to stop every 1/8th of a mile for single boardings/alightings and then safely merge back into traffic.
 - The “skip/stop” approach would create issues along corridors on the isthmus (like Gorham) where frequencies were built on routes with disparate transfer points and destinations (unlike other cities where buses traveled to the same destinations).
 - Because of timing of signals, skipping stops on State Street wouldn’t save much time.
 - Because express service would cost millions, the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Report had recommended only offering this type of service on top of existing service so as not to cut service or limit other service expansion opportunities; however, this might be feasible with a stable local funding source such as that provided through an RTA (perhaps in couple years).
 - The LRMTTP Report also identified the transfer points as a need, but with an eye to locating them better and improving associated Park & Rides in the long term (2013 or beyond).
 - The proposal was preliminary; Metro would return in a month to provide new information incorporating the feedback and ideas just shared as well as info re: communication plan, length of pilot, etc.
 - Metro hoped to have the trial done before the end of the school year.

Solomon/White moved to refer the proposal to the March meeting to allow staff to gather more feedback and information, and to make changes to the proposal in response to some of the ideas and suggestions discussed. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [13188](#) Discussion regarding formation of a subcommittee to look at creating a fare/discounted tickets/passes for low-income individuals or non-profit organizations - referred from TPC 01.13.09 to TPC 02.10.09

Solomon/Poulson moved to re-refer this item to the next meeting, until after the Common Council made their decision regarding fares and the budget on February 24th. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

- F.2. [13565](#) Letter to the FTA regarding proposed rules for school bus operations - TPC 02.10.09

Kamp highlighted key points in the draft letter from the Mayor to the DOT, expressing opposition to the proposed FTA rules regarding School Bus Operations, which would eliminate the highly cooperative and cost-effective arrangement between Metro and the Schools in providing good public transportation service to the community. (Please see the attached document.)

Solomon/White made a motion to endorse the letter, and to request that an additional paragraph be added to the letter citing the Commission's endorsement. The motion carried 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

Webber recommended that members take a look at Item 4 – Leg. File 12771 in the 1/15/09 LRTPC Minutes, related to the plan for the Northeast Neighborhoods and TDM and transportation goals. Otherwise, no action was needed on these items.

H. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

H.1. General announcements by Chair

Durocher noted that a member was needed to fill a vacancy on the Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee, and asked anyone who was interested to let him know.

H.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Members suggested that the Commission might like to invite someone from Transport 2020 to provide an update on their efforts; and expressed interest in hearing from the Parking Strategic Plan Committee.

With the public hearing and some key proposals being taken up at the March meeting, members hoped that staff could streamline the March agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Solomon, to Adjourn at 8:29 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.