



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

---

Tuesday, January 13, 2009

5:00 PM

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

---

### CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:06 PM.

**Present:** 9 -

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

**Excused:** 1 -

Sharon L. McCabe

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

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Poulson, to Approve the Minutes of the November 24, 2008 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Hinz, to Approve the Minutes of the December 9, 2008 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.**

### D. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

D.1. [13192](#) Parking: November 2008 Revenue and December Activity Reports - TPC 01.13.09

When asked, Knobeloch said that he would present a proposal for new parking rates at the February meeting, with a public hearing likely in March. The new rates would go into effect in June. He expected there to be a 20% in hourly rates, and 35-50% increases in monthly rates, with higher increases at the most popular facilities.

Hinz/Streit moved to receive the report. The motion carried unanimously.

D.2. [13189](#) Metro: YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 01.13.09

Responding to a question, Kamp said that growth in ridership in the last months of 2008 was consistent with the 6% growth during previous months.

Solomon/Webber moved to receive the report. The motion carried unanimously.

**E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

- E.1. [13186](#)** Parking: P-Plus TDM Review - Ward Paxton & Shelley Rufer - TPC 01.13.09

Shelley Rufer, from Physicians Plus, presented the “2008 Program Overview and Goals for 2009” report on the TDM program at their downtown location. [Please see the document attached to this item number.] She outlined efforts to improve employee participation in transportation alternatives, by promoting biking, walking, carpooling and busing, through cash incentives, promotional events, and bus passes. Comparing survey data from 2007 and 2008, there was some improvement in average vehicle occupancy. Rufer concluded by outlining the 2009 goals for their TDM program.

Rufer responded to questions. She said that the Parking Utility leased 60 spaces to Physicians Plus. The cash incentives given to employees for relinquishing their parking privileges (\$60/month) or for using a bus pass (and receiving an additional \$13) were taxed. People who used the parking spots or received free bus passes did not pay taxes on these benefits. Knobloch added that the lease was linked to changes in monthly parking rates. A member noted that at the previous Physicians Plus contract renewal, the Commission had asked that efforts be made to reduce the number of people who relied on cars and to reduce the number of parking spots that were needed; and remarked that the cash incentive provided to people who used the free bus pass was impressive.

Knobloch mentioned that Adams Advertising had just notified Parking that they would be either terminating or reducing their ad sales. The revenues from the ads, which funded the TDM program run through Paxton’s position at the MPO, would be reduced to \$12K by year-end. Webber hoped that along with promoting TDM among employers, some of the revenues were be used for Metro marketing; and further, that they were getting what they expected when the program was set up. She said she would like to see more extensive reports from Paxton in the future.

**Poulson/Streit moved to accept the report. The motion carried unanimously.**

- E.2. [12796](#)** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County to amend the 2008 contract for the purpose of providing the City with MA Waiver Community Integration Program (CIP), to offset approximately 60% of the cost of eligible paratransit trips provided by Metro Transit in calendar year 2008.

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

- E.3. [13050](#)** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County to provide \$19,300 in assistance to Metro Transit for transit information services, promotion efforts and operations for calendar year 2009, and \$12,900 to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (a Metropolitan Planning Organization) to support the County Specialized Transportation coordination activities for the calendar year 2009.

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

vote/other.

**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS**

**F.1. [13187](#)**

Metro: Discussion, and possible reconsideration of and action on Fares and 2009 Adopted Budget - TPC 01.13.09

Durocher recapped actions taken since last fall, including the hearing and actions taken by BOE, the Common Council and the Commission, regarding the 2009 Metro budget and fares.

Poulson/Hinz made a motion to reconsider the Commission's action at its December meeting, when it voted to retain the current Metro fare structure. During discussion, some members felt that a decision had been made, and that reconsideration was usually made when a different outcome might be expected. Other members felt that new information was now available that should be aired, that different (alternate) members were now eligible to vote, and the issue was of such importance, that it should be reconsidered. A vote was taken on the motion, which carried by a vote of six to two as follows:

**Ayes:** Sanborn, Solomon, Hinz, Poulson, White, Streit

**Noes:** Webber, Bergamini

**Non-voting:** Durocher

The Chair then called registrants to the table to speak, as follows:

Alder Julia Kerr, District 13, registered neither in support/opposition, and said that it was important to maintain service in her transit-dependent district; she had voted for the budget (to increase fares) because she didn't want Metro to be in a chronically under-funded situation; and she supported a reduced fare program.

Alder Satya Rhodes-Conway, District 12, registered neither in support/opposition, and urged members to make their decision solely on what they thought was best for the Metro system, adding that she thought that it was a false dichotomy to frame the issue as a choice between raising fares or cutting service. She felt there were ways to address the budget issue; while staff couldn't move money around in the budget (without Council approval), they could decide not to spend money on certain items.

Rosemary Lee, 111 W. Wilson, 53703, registered neither in support/opposition, and wondered why the Commission didn't consider a 25¢ fare increase; she was concerned about economically-challenged workers, who relied on 365-day service, if Sunday or Holiday service was cut; she supported low-income options.

Dave Carrig, 1645 Skyview Place, #10, 53713, registered in support, and talked about the current round of (bad) air advisories and the need to keep as many people as possible on the buses and out of cars.

Bryon Eagon, 614 Mendota Court, Apt. B, 53703, registered in opposition, and expressed concern that a fare increase would hurt low-income riders and students, who pay for passes through their segregated fees; he asked that any

subcommittee that might be formed include student representatives.

David Knuti, representing Madison Peak Oil Group, 222 S. Hamilton Street, 53703, registered in opposition to increased fares and reconsideration of the previous action taken, and presented a position paper from his organization. [An electronic or hard copy of Peak Oil's written statement can be obtained by contacting Anne Benishek-Clark, 267-8751.] For many reasons (inc. the environment and energy independence), Knuti said that bus fares were key factor in lowering individual car use; stronger incentives were needed to promote more bus use; local priorities needed to change and new funding sources were needed.

Alder Mark Clear, District 19, registered in support, and said that it was a misconception that a fare increase puts a burden on users; property tax support of Metro had doubled over the past ten years; other cities were raising fares. He felt it wasn't true that low fares would make the transit system stronger, but funding it well would. The budget passed by the Council reflected the will of the people, which should be respected; and given a choice, he would raise fares rather than face service cuts.

Alder Judy Compton, District 16, registered in support, and said she disagreed with the Commission's stance; if we wanted to get people out of their cars, we needed to provide adequate service, esp. to residents living on the periphery, who are paying for the system but have no service. If a fare increase was needed to provide this service, she favored it.

Durocher read the statement of Barbara Smith, 31 Sherman Terrace, Apt. 3, 53704, who had registered in opposition (to reconsideration and raising fares).

Al Matano, 3745 Ross Street, 53705, registered in opposition to reconsideration. [An electronic or hard copy of an email sent to the TPC from Matano is available by contacting Anne Benishek-Clark, 267-8751.] Matano made the following points: The Commission has the legal authority to make a decision without having to reconsider it; fare increases create a downward spiral (reduced ridership, reduced revenues, and service cuts); transit is a basic government service; poverty is an important social issue, but transit is not a charity; Metro should not have to pay for its own security force. He recommended that the Commission send its original decision back to the Common Council.

Michael Barrett, 2137 Sommers Avenue, 53704, registered in opposition (to reconsideration), and thanked the Commission for voting with courage and for being true guardians of a strong transit system.

Durocher read the statements of the following people:

- Catherine Hixon, 29 E. Wilson, 53703, registered in opposition, and wrote the following comments: Please do not destroy our mass transit system. Fare increases and cuts in service do this. Mass transit should not be a pay if you can or be charity. This is a basic service.
- Marina Drake, 46 Dixon Street, 53704, registered in opposition.
- Lorry Bond, 1902 Aberg Avenue, 53704, registered in opposition, and wrote the following comments: Bus fare is high enough! Get money from another

source. (Does the City really need a \$250K statue on State Street?)

Lisa Subeck, 818 S. Gammon Road, #4, 53719, registered neither in support or opposition, and said that while she would prefer no fare increase, she would rather see fare increases than service cuts, esp. with provisions for the neediest riders. Perhaps better service would attract new riders. Time would tell if a proposal for a \$27.50 monthly pass would be a reasonable amount to expect working families to pay. But certainly a cheaper unlimited bus pass would go way beyond getting people to/from work; it would make them much more mobile and provide access to more of the community (different stores, places to live, community programs and events).

Durocher read the statements of the following people:

- Alder Marsha Rummel, District 6, registered in opposition, and wrote the following comments: The 6th District supports and uses Metro. Both choice and low-income riders in the district have contacted me in opposition to raising cash fares for those who can least afford it. The gap is such a small part of Metro's total budget and I hope you can find creative solutions. Use the contingency fund to offset the gap and keep cash fares as low as possible.
- Ted Voth, 1335 Williamson Street, #3, 53703, registered in opposition to a fare increase.

Melanie Foxcroft, 5710 Hammersley Road, 53711, registered in opposition to a fare increase, and said: Metro's budget should not be separated from the rest of the City budget; transit is a public service. She questioned why a marketing position or a private security force at transfer points was needed; why unlimited ride pass holders (like City employees) couldn't pay more; why more was needed in the contingency fund; and felt that development on the peripheries was costly for the City.

Laurie Wermter, 847 Williamson Street, #9, 53703, registered in opposition to reconsideration, and said: She opposed a fare increase for environmental and economic reasons; thought the Mayor and Common Council could develop better solutions for the budget gap (than service cuts); low-income fare proposals needed to address the needs of all the 55K people at/below poverty level; and hoped the Commission would stick to its (previous) decision.

Tim Wong, 161 Jackson Street, 53704, registered in opposition to reconsideration and to all bus fare increases at this time, and said: Conditions had changed since past fare increases with regard to elasticity; in the past, more people were getting into unlimited ride pass programs (to offset the effect of lost ridership/revenues); plus gas prices were low now. He felt that the City could come up with money to address the budget gap; and recommended that a vote be postponed to see what federal and state money would become available. He expressed concern about creating a two-tiered fare system for regular and low-income riders; thought the City might be violating State law with regard to TPC authority; suggested looking at service cuts to the periphery (with higher costs/rider); and worried about a downward spiral.

Jacque Pokorney, a Chair of Progressive Dane, registered in opposition (to reconsideration and a fare increase), and said: Progressive Dane supported

the TPC, and asked the Mayor and Common Council to stand for democracy and to respect the Commission's forward thinking in its previous decision to retain current fares. To minimize the impact of any bus fare increase, an increase to parking rates should be considered as well. Contrary to how the discussion had been framed, there were other options to the budget shortfall besides raising fares, reducing service, or cutting employees. Alternative funding sources could be sought to make the transit system more sustainable and equitable. In continuing discussions to find compromises, consideration should be given to low-income proposals, marketing, and the long-term health of Metro ridership, as well as maintenance of Transit for Jobs. The TPC was empowered to make decisions about fares and schedules, and for the sake of democracy, community involvement and our form of local government, the Commission should be allowed to hold an open and honest debate without fear of consequence.

Steven Schooler, representing Porchlight, Inc., registered neither in support or opposition, and said: Porchlight administered the Transit for Jobs Program. Schooler talked about how the program arose, adding that it was never intended to be a revolving loan fund. He supported the low-income proposal; and though it wouldn't meet the demand, it was a start. Perhaps the subcommittee could address how to make a low-income fare sustainable. He thought a \$23.50 to \$30.00 monthly rate would be affordable for working people. Schooler thought it a delicate balance between how to increase fares and then subsidize low-income riders. To raise fares in some ways amounted to one set of low-income persons subsidizing another set of lower-income persons. He could not purport to tell the Commission what to consider, but felt it was a necessity to have some sort of Transit for Jobs program and some sort of low-income fare. It was feasible to raise fares in order to support these, but this would require great care with regard to the issue of one group of low-income riders subsidizing another.

Cathy Casper, 2114 Red Arrow Trail, 53711, registered in opposition, and said: While she could understand raising revenue, she could also see the impact on people. Her elderly neighbors couldn't afford a \$27.50 pass, and many of them didn't apply for food stamps even though they would qualify; they would end up subsidizing others. Every time fares had been increased, bus service had been lost. She preferred one low fare for everyone to encourage ridership; many families found it cheaper and more convenient to own a car than to ride the bus. The Police should provide security. Transit should be considered a basic service.

Durocher read the statement of Alder Paul Skidmore, District 9, who registered in support of reconsideration and increasing bus fares.

The group voted to take a short recess at 7:33 PM, and reconvened at 7:45 PM.

Carolyn Hogg, Asst. City Attorney, spoke to the group about procedural and substantive issues. Procedurally, because the group voted to reconsider, Solomon's original motion from the December meeting was again before them (as it was before a vote was taken), which made it possible to propose substitutes, etc. The issue of the budget and a TPC motion to set a different fare level would be subject to appeal at the Common Council. The TPC could only consider fares; service cuts could not be addressed without a hearing.

Substantively, the TPC had the authority to set fares and levels of service; the Common Council had the authority to set the budget; and the Transit Manager had to authority to propose the Transit budget and to execute it.

Hogg went on to answer questions. Despite criticism that the TPC had been irresponsible in not addressing the budget as part of its previous fare decision, it really couldn't have done so, since the budget was the purview of the Common Council; though the TPC could make recommendations. She didn't know if there was a requirement that an agency had to have a balanced budget at the beginning of its budget year. Budgets were predictive, and if an agency went over budget (Ex. Streets and Police), they went to the Council to amend their budgets. Managers could not transfer money from one major (budget) object to another without a budget amendment, but had some flexibility within certain limits (Ex. to use money from a contingency fund to cover unexpected fuel costs).

Alder Brenda Konkel, former member of BOE, said that in the past, departments did what they needed/wanted to, and then came back to the BOE at the end of the year to ask for money to cover any overages. Hogg said the difference was whether an agency built a deficit into their budget from the start vs. having unanticipated overages over the course of the budget year. In further discussion between members and staff, it was stated that a manager had some discretion regarding whether or not to spend money that had been budgeted (Ex. could fill a position or not), within certain limits (Ex. could not cut a big bus route in half).

Sanborn/Hinz made a substitute motion to adopt the set of fares shown (in Metro's Table) as the "2009 Adopted Budget", which had been approved by the Common Council and which would raise cash fares to \$2.00.

Hinz/Webber made a motion to amend the substitute motion, to recommend adoption contingent on including the "Mayor's Low-Income Pass Initiative". Bergamini and Sanborn objected to the amendment. Sanborn said that though he was favor of the spirit of the amendment, it got very complicated when a body passed a motion contingent on something else. He wondered what would happen to the original motion if the "Initiative" didn't pass. He was also concerned that Hinz's amendment might in effect approve the low-income program before they had even discussed it.

Solomon noted that Metro's "2009 Adopted Budget" passed by the Common Council stated that Metro "should develop a series of recommendations to provide fare relief to low-income riders in order to prepare future fare increase recommendations." He wondered if the next item on the Agenda (F.2.) regarding discussion of a subcommittee was not already incorporated into Sanborn's substitute. In light of this new information, Hinz offered to withdraw his amendment. But because the amendment was already on the table, it was the property of the body and a vote needed to be taken on it.

Kamp then pointed out that on Metro's Table prepared for the meeting, entitled "Fare Increase and Revenue Options (For 1/13/2009 TPC meeting)", saying that Sanborn's substitute was reflected in the column identified as "2009 adopted budget." Hinz's amendment was reflected in the column identified as "4/1/09

fare increase with low-income pass” that showed a 31-day low-income pass for \$27.50 and that allowed for the purchase of 3,600 passes/month, as suggested in the first phase of the Mayor’s Initiative for 2009. Kamp also pointed out that the “Revised Revenue” line in the “4/1/09” column showed \$640,826 in revenues vs. the \$762,934 revenues in the 2009 Adopted Budget. The \$122K difference between the two options anticipated the cost of the first phase of the Mayor’s Initiative, for which \$100K of Metro’s contingency fund would be used.

A vote was taken on Hinz’s amendment (to Sanborn’s substitute motion), which failed unanimously by voice vote/other.

Streit/Hinz moved to amend Sanborn’s substitute motion to instead adopt the fare structure identified (in Metro’s Table) as “4/1/09 fare increase with low-income pass”.

After some discussion as to whether this was proper procedurally, the Commission decided to first take a vote on Sanborn’s substitute motion, which recommended adoption of the fare structure identified as “2009 adopted budget” (as passed by the Common Council). A vote was taken on Sanborn’s substitute motion, which failed unanimously by voice vote/other.

Streit/Hinz then made a substitute motion to adopt the set of fares identified as “4/1/09 fare increase with low-income pass”.

Members who supported the “4/1/09” option made the following comments:

- People now knew the potential consequences of not raising fares would be service cuts.
- Much of the testimony at the public hearing related to complaints about service.
- Increases made in 2009 would be in place over future years to help relieve financial pressure and improve service and the system. And if fares should need to be raised in 2010, people would still be opposed to it.
- A new professional analysis validated the accuracy of Metro’s elasticity model (and rebutted the APTA elasticity model cited at the December meeting).
- Though below the cost of running the system and the taxpayer contribution to Metro, the increase was in line with inflation.
- Though viewing transit as a basic service was a legitimate position, opponents of the fare increase needed to be more upfront about trying to phase fares down to zero by not raising fares over time.
- Metro’s elasticity model had much credence because it was based on local experience with previous fare increases, and drew upon nation-wide analyses as well.
- Parking rates would be going up very shortly.
- Until the whole community chose to increase the subsidy to Metro (even to the point of a zero fare), fares had to continue to increase to keep up with costs.
- Staff had concerns about the sole elasticity number used in the APTA model, because it didn’t take into account fare structures with deep discounts and with different elasticities for different fares. Madison’s situation was unique; and considering various indices, Metro’s model provided a better predictive tool.
- Between 2004 and 2006, with a fare increase in August 2005, revenues from



cash, tickets and monthly/semester passes exceeded Metro's estimates at the time (not including contract and non-revenue rides.)

- The low-income proposal was a good start in addressing concerns about low-income riders.
- Considering the many deeply discounted fares available, perhaps only 25% of all riders would be affected by the full \$2.00 fare.

Members who opposed the "4/1/09" option made the following comments:

- Though a low-income pass was included in this proposal, the same reasons expressed previously (for opposing a fare increase) still remained. This new proposal did not address all of the issues and concerns raised at the December meeting, inc. those related to the impact on working families, choice riders, vehicle use, the economy, the environment.
- Though laudable, the low-income proposal did not affect enough people to eliminate continuing concerns about the impact of a \$2.00 fare on low-income riders.
- It did not address the issue of the \$2.00 price point, which would drive many choice riders back into their cars.
- Contrary to how its validity had been questioned, the (APTA) elasticity model presented in December was based on solid research. Key transit systems and current transit research supported and used this model (inc. the FTA, Chatham, GA, Charlotte, NC, and the TRB, among others), esp. as it related to smaller cities.
- Because elasticity models reflect best estimates, there are many possibilities for how things could turn out; which could include such a big drop in ridership that revenues from a \$2.00 fare increase might never materialize.
- Everyone would like to see a continuation of the momentum in ridership growth and system expansion; and steep increases (inc. those for S/D and Paratransit) could start to erode this.
- The current economic situation must be considered (high rates of lay-offs, and low gas prices that create disincentive for choice riders.)
- The need for low-income fares would be mitigated by not raising fares in the first place.
- There were a limitless number of fare proposals that could be considered besides this one.
- Surveys of Metro riders reported high percentages of riders "who did not have a vehicle available for that trip"; indicating that a lot of riders were already struggling financially, and with the economy, many more would be.
- A new federal transportation budget, a new state legislature, a new federal administration, and a new stimulus package could soon change the current transportation funding and infrastructure; inc. financial assistance to transit systems to help with increased fuel costs and service expansion and to prevent fare increases.
- The 6% growth in ridership in 2008 was probably driven by higher gas prices, but now much lower gas prices could make it harder for Metro to compete, and choice riders may be lost.
- Ridership increases had not kept pace with the increase in vehicle trips; and we needed to improve service and hold the line on fares to encourage the use of transit, because it was the most economically efficient thing to do as a community.
- With the recession and serious environmental problems, now was not the right time to raise fares.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt the set of fares identified as “4/1/09 fare increase with low-income pass”, as follows:

Ayes: Sanborn, Hinz, Poulson, Streit  
Noes: Solomon, Webber, White, Bergamini

Because the vote resulted in a tie, Chair Durocher broke the tie by casting a “No” vote. The motion failed.

Solomon/Poulson made a substitute motion to adopt the set of fares identified as “Option 1” on the Metro Table entitled “Fare and Revenue Options (For 12/9/2008 TPC meeting)” – also labeled “Version 2 – Expanded Table of Options, TPC 01.13.09 Item F.1.” – combined with the elimination of the \$150 K proposed service expansion (as contained in Metro’s 2009 budget).

Members who supported the substitute motion made the following comments:

- Option 1, which called for a cash fare of \$1.75, maintained the deep discounts (unlike Option 1A).
- The choice had not been simply between fare increases or route cuts, but had involved other budget possibilities as well.
- Some of the current budget situation could have been mitigated if the Common Council had made different decisions about Metro’s budget.
- This compromise would help address some of the concerns about a fare increase because it decreased the impact on riders (in all fare categories), and it would also help address some of Metro’s revenue issues.
- It would buy some time in order to see what changes in federal funding might occur, which would help transit.
- The decision regarding the fare structure and the elimination of the service expansion were within the TPC’s authority to decide.
- Option 1 would raise \$400K without the low-income proposal, or \$300K with the low-income proposal; with a shortfall of \$130K or \$230 K respectively.
- The TPC could recommend ways to cover the shortfall (with some possibilities shown in the hand-out distributed by Solomon entitled “TPC Fare/Budget Proposal”, which can be made available upon request.) However, Metro staff would be in the best position to decide how to cover the shortfall.
- This compromise reflected a responsible attempt to address Metro’s budget situation and to respect the various positions held by people about a fare increase.
- The previous TPC decision for no fare increase would very likely be appealed to the Council and the result could be a 50¢ increase. This compromise could possibly avoid such an appeal and could help meet some revenue objectives.
- While not perfect, the compromise responded to requests from the public not to raise fares to \$2.00, and it also increased revenue to help address the budget hole.
- The Commission needed to take steps to increase fares somewhat; ideally fares should be raised in small increments, rather than waiting years and then making large increases.

Staff pointed out that the estimated shortfalls should be based on a system-wide amount of \$760K vs. the \$680K cited. As a result, the Option 1 compromise without a low-income proposal would result in a \$210K shortfall not a \$130K shortfall. The amount each system partner would be asked to pay for their portion of service would depend on how much the cash fare would be;

if the cash fare were lower, the partners would have to contribute more. Some members had thought the cash fare was over and above what was charged to partners (i.e., that partner contributions were not contingent on the amount of cash fare.) Also, since partners had just started contributing to the contingency fund, an inconsistency would be created if the City did not also contribute to the fund.

Members who opposed the substitute motion made the following comments:

- The compromise was worse than other options, because it created higher fares without fixing the budget problem.
- Because it didn't address the budget problem for the long term, fares would likely have to be raised again in a year or two.
- (Among recommendations for covering the shortfall), additional security and marketing were critical for increasing ridership; the contingency fund desperately needed to be rebuilt; and where would additional marketing revenue come from?
- With the current economy and the environmental problems we face, any fare increase would be wrong, and Madison should be a leader in not raising fares.
- There were other choices (besides a fare increase or service cuts); and fare increases should not be the way to pay for investment spending that we cannot afford at this time.
- The service expansion was not part of Metro's original budget, but was added to it as part of the \$2.00 fare proposal; the "expansion" really reflected restoration of service that had been cut over the years.
- The system had been in a death spiral (of rate increases and service cuts) for ten years, and a fare increase did not guarantee that there would be no further service cuts.
- Ridership was increasing but was not keeping pace (and a fare increase would not help).

A roll call was taken on the substitute motion to adopt Option 1 fare structure [as shown on the Table prepared by Metro entitled, "Fare Increase and Revenue Options (For 12/9/08 TPC meeting)"], combined with the elimination of the proposed \$150K service expansion (contained in Metro's 2009 budget), as follows:

Ayes: Poulson, Solomon, Streit, Hinz

Noes: White, Webber, Sanborn, Bergamini

Because the vote resulted in a tie, Chair Durocher broke the tie by casting a "Yes" vote. The motion carried.

**F.2.**     [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

A motion was made by Solomon, seconded by Sanborn, to Rerefer the item to the February meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION, and that the Mayor's proposal for a low-income pass initiative also be considered along with this. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

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

07828

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

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

**H. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**H.1. General announcements by Chair - None.**

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Solomon, to Adjourn at 9:46 PM.  
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**