



**City of Madison**  
**Meeting Minutes - Final**  
**TRANSIT AND PARKING**  
**COMMISSION**

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

---

Tuesday, July 12, 2005

5:00 PM

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

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER AMANDA WHITE**

Chair Durocher introduced new member Amanda White. White is the Executive Director of Community Car and described herself as a bicyclist and a Metro rider.

**Present:** Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Excused:** Diane L. Paoni

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 6/14/05**

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Ald. Sanborn, to Approve the Minutes . The motion passed by acclamation.

**C. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**D. OLD BUSINESS**

- D.1. [01191](#) Revising the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) to allow for the use of speed humps on local or collector streets with volumes of 5000 vpd or less

A motion was made by Ald. Sanborn, seconded by Wong, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION. Ann Gullickson, Transit Service Manager, appeared on behalf of Metro and registered in opposition to the proposed revision. If the revision is approved, she asked that Metro bus routes be excluded. Streets that could be impacted by the revision include Troy Drive, South Thompson, Pflaum Road, Vondron Road, Tokay Boulevard, Allen Street, and others. Metro is concerned about the potential for injury to passengers and drivers. Passengers who are not prepared when the bus goes over the speed hump might be bumped out of their seat or drop whatever it is they're holding; standing passengers may lose their balance. Gullickson noted that the policy revision provides that requests for speed humps on higher volume streets would come to Madison Metro for input, but she was concerned that the citizen input to the PBMVC will outweigh that of Metro. If speed humps are installed, some bus routes may be rerouted to other streets. Gullickson stated that Metro tries to locate bus routes on collector streets that fall within the revision rather than on small local streets, and she reiterated her concern about expanding the NTMP policy to include collector streets with volumes up to 5,000 vehicles per day (VPD). If the revision is approved, Gullickson again asked that bus routes be excluded from the policy.

Wong asked for clarification on how drivers or passengers would be hurt. Gullickson replied that Metro has tested driving buses over a speed hump at various speeds. Buses would have to slow down to 15 mph to avoid an impact on passengers. At 25 mph, there is quite a jolt, more so than in a car because of the length of the bus wheelbase. There is concern for passengers who may not be alert to the fact that a speed hump is coming up. Wong didn't have a problem with buses slowing down to 15 mph to go over a speed hump.

Ald. Robbie Webber, District 5, asked to speak on the issue. One of the streets that prompted the request for the policy revision is in her district. She asked whether Metro has considered reports from other cities where buses do go over speed humps, and Gullickson replied no. Webber remarked that while in Portland OR, she rode a bus that traveled over 5 or 6 speed humps on one street and she felt the driver was able to negotiate the humps without any negative impact on the bus or passengers. She wondered about research in other cities regarding use of humps on transit routes. Debo pointed out that the Traffic Engineering staff report to the PBMVC includes a table entitled "Speed Humps of Other Communities." This list shows that Portland does not use them on transit routes, although Webber responded that they do exist on transit routes in Portland. Debo felt that the TE staff report indicates that it's very unusual to have speed humps on transit routes or emergency routes.

Golden asked about the input from the Madison Fire Department re: emergency response routes. Arthur Ross, TE Pedestrian/Bicycle Coordinator, indicated that he has been working on this issue. The resolution has also been referred to the Public Safety Review Board, which has not yet acted on it. He reported that the MFD is not very keen on the policy revision. In response to a question from Golden, Ross indicated that the MPD is very hesitant to designate emergency response routes.

Durocher referenced Gullickson's earlier comment about testing various travel speeds over speed humps and asked whether there was a definite speed at which there is a danger to the bus. Gullickson replied it's unknown, although at 45 mph riders were thrown from their seats onto the floor. She acknowledged that

driving 45 mph over a speed hump would not be a typical situation. But at a speed of 30-35 mph, there is a liability concern about danger to the driver or passengers (if driver doesn't notice the hump).

Referencing the earlier comments about Portland, Webber noted that there are two types of speed humps used in Portland, one of which is used for transit routes. The table in TE's report also shows that a number of cities don't even mention transit routes in the "application conditions" and felt it speed humps don't appear to be a concern for many other cities.

Ross explained that the current policy allows speed humps on streets with a volume up to 3,000 VPD. TE has received requests from neighborhoods for speed humps on streets that exceed that volume. The streets in question are primarily residential in nature, and the residents prefer the speed hump as a technique that significantly impact traffic speeds. TE staff is trying to come up with a policy that encompasses streets up to 5,000 VPD, with a condition that requests for these higher volume streets would be run past Metro and the MFD. He confirmed that TE has received requests from residents to revise the NTMP policy.

Carlsen directed attention to the TE report, page 2, Speed Hump Selection Criteria, second bullet: the speed limit (posted) on the street is 25 mph or less. He felt that slowing down from 25 mph to 15 mph is not a big change and should not be traffic impediment. Ross stated that speed humps have been installed on bus routes like Fisher Street, where Metro retained the bus route, but on another street Metro rerouted the bus.

Susan DeVos, 626 Gately Terrace, registered in opposition. She is a member of the PBMVC but was representing herself. She urged the TPC to reject the policy revision. Metro has already rerouted buses because of traffic calming devices. TE needs to cooperate and consult with other City agencies when imposing traffic calming. Ms. DeVos noted that the resolution is sponsored by the PBMVC alders, but when the policy change was initially before the PBMVC, one alder voted for it, one voted against it, and one of the sponsoring alders was not on the PBMVC at that time. She asked that the TPC take this into consideration.

Traffic Engineering says that this measure is necessary, but that does not change the fact that that the MFD and Metro need to be consulted on any project. In fact, Ross testified to that effect. But if there is no change in the need to consult Metro, why is there a need to change the vehicle limit from 3,000 to 5,000? She believed the reason is that currently, if TE wants to put speed humps on a larger street, the onus is on them to prove that it won't interfere with MFD or Metro. But if the policy is revised, the onus will be on MFD and Metro. She recommended rejecting the change.

Golden felt it should not be a case of "do it" versus "don't do it." He has talked to the MFD and is aware they don't have a designated fire response route nor do they appear to want one. Golden indicated that this issue originated with the Allen Street traffic calming project. The speeding data on different segments showed that there was not an overwhelming problem compared to some other traffic calming streets. Rather than simply say "let's go from 3,000 vpd to 5,000 vpd" he favored an approach that looked at the speeding problem (percentage of drivers going over the limit, and how much they exceeded the limit). Speed humps work very well in reducing speeds; islands are not as good. Golden noted

that the MFD concerns are important, and the hospitals are located in areas where nearby streets may have traffic calming.

Golden pointed out that the PBMVC is the lead referral. His preference was to advise the PBMVC to balance the need for traffic calming based on the severity and frequency of speeding versus the adverse impacts to ambulance patients and Metro passengers. He also cautioned that if the City goes too far with traffic calming, there will be a negative reaction and a momentum to roll it back. He did not support an absolute but suggested advising the PBMVC to be prudent and don't install speed humps on streets if the violation frequency and average speed is not that great.

Webber pointed out that TE and the PBMVC look at each individual traffic calming project and decide what's appropriate based on input from staff, citizens, and other City agencies such as Metro and MFD. Revising the policy would not mean that speed humps would automatically be installed. Two neighborhoods have specifically requested speed humps, and the policy revision would allow the consideration of speed humps. The revision does not make speed humps the default choice. Webber felt the emergency response issues should be dealt with by the Public Safety Review Board. The type of speed hump she recommended would be the type used in Portland. She urged the TPC to allow the option of using speed humps on higher volume streets, up to 5,000 VPD.

Sanborn noted that neighborhood residents vote on traffic calming projects, and they would be made aware that they might lose their transit route if speed humps are installed. Given the citizen input on traffic calming projects, he did not oppose the revision.

**Motion by Sanborn/Wong to approve the recommendation to revise the policy from 3,000 vpd to 5,000 vpd. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Excused:** Paoni

**Aye:** Golden, Sanborn, White, Carlsen, Wong and McCabe

**No:** Radomski and Hoag

**Non Voting:** Durocher and Streit

**Present:** 10 - Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Excused:** 1 - Diane L. Paoni

**D.2.** [01281](#)

Determining a Public Purpose and necessity and adopting a Relocation Order for the acquisition of Plat of land interests required for planned improvements of the Mid-State Street Parking Ramp in part of Block 58, Madison Original Plat, City of Madison, Dane County, Wisconsin and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to sign all necessary documents necessary to accomplish the acquisition of land interests. (4th AD)

A motion was made by Ald. Radomski, seconded by McCabe, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS Jeanne Hoffman, Mayoral Assistant, registered in support and was available to answer questions.

Larry Nelson, City Engineer, and Bill Knobloch, Parking Operations Manager, were present. The purpose of the order is to effect the acquisition of properties necessary to construct a mid-State Street Parking Ramp as provided in the adopted 2005 budget. Using a map, Nelson pointed out the area covered by the relocation order. The proposal is to acquire three Gilman Street properties that currently have existing residential units. To do the actual constructions, it's also necessary to acquire the land rights around the perimeter of the site to accommodate a crane, underpinnings, a soil retention system, etc. If the resolution is adopted by the Common Council, City Real Estate will get an appraisal and then make an offer to the property owners and tenants, following the strict requirements of the State statute on eminent domain.

Knobloch advised that a Request for Proposals for designing the structure resulted in three responses, and a design firm has been selected. The City is currently in the process of working on a project agreement.

Wong wanted to know the cost of the project. Knobloch stated that the average cost from the three design firms was \$12.5 million. The Parking Utility is committed to providing \$6 million, \$3 million from reserves and \$3 million in borrowing, leaving a \$6.5 million gap.

Sanborn inquired as to the status of condemning the properties. Nelson indicated there are some tax advantages to condemnation versus selling, and it's unknown at this time to what extent the owners will avail themselves of that. The resolution establishes a City procedure to move forward with acquiring the properties by eminent domain. Relocation assistance for the tenants is also provided. State statutes require the City to prepare a relocation plan.

McCabe asked if there is an easement that goes through the Buckeye Lot, and Knobloch replied yes. McCabe wondered how easements are dealt with, and Nelson indicated they are appraised as best as possible. The City will get appraisals and then negotiate with the property owners at the same time that the design process is proceeding, and the hope is to accommodate easements within the design itself. He estimated this parallel process will take about 8-10 months.

McCabe mentioned that the new parking ramp is an important project for the State Street merchants.

Motion by Radomski/McCabe to approve the resolution.

Sanborn found it a difficult decision whether to condemn property to build a parking ramp, especially a ramp with private businesses built on top of it. McCabe pointed out that the properties will not necessarily be condemned, and there is a tax advantage for the property owner with the condemnation process. Many people in the neighborhood want to see the project happen. It will be a benefit to the retailers and help in fixing up the area. She understood the concern about condemning private property. But it will be a public ramp that will benefit the surrounding property owners.

Streit mentioned it's still a possibility that the houses could be moved to another site.

Once the ramp is built, Wong wanted to know how much it will cost the taxpayers. Knobloch advised that the Parking Utility doesn't use tax dollars. The \$6 million from the Parking Utility is not from taxpayers. Knobloch stated that building a downtown underground ramp is expensive, about \$40,000 to \$50,000 per stall versus \$15,000 to \$20,000 per stall on the periphery. Revenue from the 263 spaces will not cover the expense. At this time, he did not know how the remaining \$6.5 million gap will be funded. If it comes from the Parking Utility, rates at all facilities would be increased. However, the City is still looking to sell the air rights to a developer. McCabe noted that one of the reasons for the ramp is to revitalize the area, which will result in an increase in State Street property assessments. You can't look at the ramp in isolation. Golden commented that the Parking Utility pays a Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) to the City based on an appraisal of its facilities, and this payment will likely be higher because of the new facility, thus adding more dollars to the General Fund.

Carlsen remarked that the project has been approved and is too far along to start talking again about whether it should be built. While he does not support condemning residences to build a parking ramp, the property owners have the option of a tax advantage.

The motion passed by the following vote:

**Excused:** Paoni

**Aye:** Golden, Radomski, Sanborn, White, Carlsen, McCabe and Hoag

**No:** Wong

**Non Voting:** Durocher and Streit

**Enactment No:** RES-05-00612

D.3. Transit fare proposal(s) and scheduling of public hearing

Members first heard from the registrants.

Michael Barrett, 2137 Sommers Avenue:

- Provided a handout re: his research showing that a fare increase leads to a ridership decrease.
- Recognized the importance of transit, including the environmental and social justice perspectives.
- Also recognized the perspective of the taxpayer.
- Has looked at the economics of fare rates and the impact on revenues and found that increasing fares actually decreases revenues. This has been proven across the country.
- The predictions based on the models cited in his handout have come true.
- With Metro's last fare increase, it was promised that there would be no service cuts, but cuts did happen and the budgetary problem has gotten worse.
- The APTA formula (handout) has been proven: if rates are raised 10%, there's a 4% loss in ridership; 20% increase leads to 8% loss, etc.
- It doesn't make sense for Madison to seek to reduce ridership.
- Would like to see revenues increased and less fixation on fares.

Lisa Subeck, 818 S. Gammon Road #4:

- Opposed a fare increase.
- From a social justice standpoint, an increase can be devastating for the poorest members of the community.
- When some of her clients are trying to budget, coming up with money for transportation to/from work is very difficult.
- Understood that some increase may have to occur but asked that other options be considered first.
- Put a priority on keeping fares as low as possible for the transit-dependent as well as choice riders.
- Keep transit affordable.
- Didn't think a multi-year increase was responsible since there's no idea where costs will go in future years; need to look at the budget each year.
- Fare increases hurt the most transit-dependent population and she would rather see the revenue come from the taxpayers.

Golden noted that the Mayor has given the TPC a charge to come up with \$500,000 so the TPC has to deal with raising revenues or cutting service. Would Ms. Subeck support cuts in service to meet that target? Ms. Subeck stated she couldn't answer without knowing what would be cut, maybe there are logical cuts. She mentioned that there are under-served areas of the city, and putting inclusionary zoning in these neighborhoods doesn't help if there's no transit service. She suggested looking at advertising revenues to reduce the amount needed from a fare increase. She would also support more money coming from the City's General Fund.

Golden noted that in order for the City to maintain all existing services in 2006, it would mean an 8% increase in the tax levy. He asked Ms. Subeck if she would support a property tax increase like that in order to keep Metro rates the same. Ms. Subeck stated she would support having the \$500,000 come from property taxes.

Sharon Williams, 327 E. Bluff

- Identified herself as a Metro bus driver.

- Supported a fare increase.
- Diesel fuel costs have gone up.
- Metro charges less than other transit systems.
- Supported the idea of wrapped buses to increase advertising revenues.
- Ad space inside the buses is under-utilized and Metro Marketing needs to be more involved in seeking ads.
- Once cameras are installed at the transfer points, she would support ads there as well.
- Noted that ads at transfer points and perhaps bus shelters will increase maintenance costs so need to keep that in mind.
- Clean Air Action Days free fares only affect cash and ticket holders.
- The 2-4-1 discount fare is widely abused.
- Felt that Metro gives fares away.
- More ads and a gradual fare increase would help Metro.

Michael Jacob, 410 Russell Street, representing Progressive Dane

- Opposed a fare increase.
- If you look at the fare options and how they are laid out, the TPC has been hampered in creating the best mix for Madison and riders.
- Need to look at what kind of bang we get for our buck.
- Nowhere can he find information as to which fare increase results in what kind of revenue and what kind of loss.
- The Unlimited Ride Pass deals are extraordinary, and Drafts 9 and 10 should have a larger increase for the URP rate.
- What if there's another option out there that hasn't been presented? In Draft 9, what if the 2006 URP rate was increased to 90¢ or 95¢ instead of 88¢? It would still be a good deal for the URP contractors, and perhaps it would allow the other rate increases to be smaller.
- He hoped these kind of questions are answered before the TPC goes to a public hearing.
- He was shocked by the language in the Mayor's memo to the TPC.
- Urged the TPC to get the information at their disposal and to not be bullied into a corner.

Motion by Wong/Hoag to allow the speaker another minute, carried unanimously.

- Suggested that the TPC get better information and create an option 11, one that meets the concerns of the TPC and the community and is not limited to what's been sold so far.
- Don't be held hostage by doomsday predictions.
- Consider the \$500,000 target in context with the rest of the City budget.
- Do not have a multi-year fare increase.
- Get Metro out of nay saying other revenue options.
- Felt a better proposal could be put together.

Referencing Mr. Jacob's comment about "bang for the buck," Sanborn noted that each option estimates the revenue increase and the ridership loss, is that not enough? Mr. Jacobs replied no, he could not tell what another option would generate. He wants to see an option that shows how much revenue would be generated if the URP rate is increased to 90¢ in 2006. Or what happens if you freeze the adult cash fare? Sanborn noted there are 17 different fares and it would be necessary to plug in hundreds of options to find out what would happen. The TPC needs to come up with some broad principles, analyze the



options, and make a decision on a proposal to bring forward to public hearing. Mr. Jacob supported the principles of protecting low income riders and choice riders, and he felt that the options presented fail to do that. Maybe staff should put together a spreadsheet and take a hard look at the URP rate in order to lessen the increase on other fare types.

Referencing the Mayor's memo to the TPC, Golden indicated that whether you like what the Mayor said or not, if the Mayor keeps his promise and in October there's \$500,000 missing from Metro's budget, the actual shortfall could be as much as \$ 700,000 when you include the lack of a fare increase in the later part of 2005. Metro and the TPC could do something early in 2006 to meet the budget, but the severity would be much greater. Golden asked Mr. Jacob if he supported service cuts. Mr. Jacob indicated that cuts should be part of the mix. But the TPC needs to look at other revenue options as well. Golden asked Mr. Jacob whether he supported a property tax increase, and Mr. Jacob replied that we are not faced with that decision. Golden noted that if they increased other revenues and cut service but still had a budget gap, should a fare increase be part of the mix? Mr. Jacob replied an increase should be part of the mix since you need to deal with the reality of increased costs.

Satya Rhodes-Conway, 1918 E. Main Street #1

- Opposed a multi-year increase.
- Urged consideration of the impact of an increase on the transit-dependent population.
- This discussion is happening in isolation when it should not be. Consider a fare increase in the context of the entire City budget.
- Multi-year increase cuts the public out of the process. Also doesn't allow for change or innovative ideas to deal with the revenue situation. Should be a year-by-year discussion.
- If you have to raise fares, raise it for those who can afford it. Reconsider the contracts with the UW and others for URP agreements, get a better deal for Metro. If reconsider the URP agreements, could avoid a rate increase for the transit-dependent.
- Need to set priorities for the City, and have this discussion at budget time.
- Would like to see Madison support the transit system and she would support a larger portion of Metro's budget coming from the City.

Ald. Brenda Konkel, 511 E. Mifflin Street, representing the 2nd District:

- Opposed a fare increase.
- Had a hard time understanding some of the numbers on the fare options and found some interesting things when did her own spreadsheets.
- Adult farebox, tickets and passes (excluding unlimited ride passes) make up about 9% of Metro's revenue. Mayor is asking that \$500,000 come from a source that is only 9% of revenues. URP agreements account for 16% of revenues (2004 figures).
- She would like to stick to some kind of ratio for the fare increases that mimics what Metro is already doing rather than having the bulk of the shortfall made up by those outside the URP agreements.
- If look at revenues that are not URP agreements, the farebox is 28% of that revenue.
- Given the social justice issues and impacts on those serving the low income population, concerned that this 28% is a fairly high number and would bear a large part of the burden of a fare increase.

- If have \$3.6 million in revenues and 28% of that comes from cash fares, it does have a large impact on the low income populations. (Adult tickets are 22% and monthly passes are 19%.)
- Information provided is good but hard time figuring out what the numbers mean, the increases are all over the board, very difficult to see where the increases are.
- Preferred a one-year increase and see what happens and what other things can be done. A four-year increase takes away the public input.
- An every-other year increase (as suggested in memo from Ald. Golden) is an okay option.
- Make the TPC agenda material available to the public on-line.
- Why bring only one option to go to public hearing? Give the public more choices to react to.
- On a short timeline, seems a disservice to the public.
- Echoed the social justice issues raised by other speakers.
- Past service efficiencies had a dramatic impact on riders. Now talking about a fare increase for riders whose trip time increased.
- She looked at the transit budget, some items are considerably over budget while others are under budget.
- Look at whether there's a way to use Parking Utility revenues to help Metro
- Which URP agreements are coming due such that the rate could be changed?

Carlsen wondered whether a property tax increase to cover a larger City subsidy would affect the same people the speakers are concerned about - the low income, the elderly, etc. Won't landlords raise rents to cover the increased property taxes? Konkel felt that for the vast majority of the transit-dependent population, their rent is determined more by the market and vacancies than by property taxes. Funding an additional \$500,000 for Metro would result in a .4% difference in the tax levy.

Wong asked for clarification of Konkel's earlier comment about 9%. She replied that Metro's 2004 total \$3.6 million from the farebox (tickets, passes and cash but not URP) represented 9.2% of expenditures or 9.39% of revenues (of \$41 million budget). Cash fares are less than 10% of the entire budget. URP agreements are 16-18%.

Sanborn questioned whether the transit-dependent are really using the cash fare to the extent indicated by some of the speakers. Konkel replied that most cannot come up with enough money at one time to buy a monthly pass or even a book of tickets. Ms. Subeck commented that the fare increase probably impacts the working poor the most since they use the bus frequently but most often pay the cash fare. Sanborn was skeptical since the cash fare costs so much more than the monthly pass for regular users. Konkel agreed but reiterated that many of the transit-dependent don't have enough cash at one time to do what makes economic sense. Sanborn suggested that the TPC try to come up with a way to address this issue, rather than making the low income transit-dependent population the determining factor for the whole fare proposal. [Golden asked that his memo be provided to all TPC members.] Golden noted that he had met with representatives of the homeless consortium. Assuming that the City can afford and allocate funds for some kind of RFP program, he would like to see a program that continues the current ticket distribution and covers the increased cost. In addition, the program would pay for the first monthly pass, thereby allowing the rider to save their cash fare and accumulate enough to buy the next monthly pass

. He wanted to pursue this in order to negate the impact of a fare increase on the low income transit-dependent population. The program would be handled through the Office of Community Services. Assuming such a program is a companion part to this proposal, would that provide leeway in raising fares? Konkel stated she was not sure. The demand is so high for transportation, and probably only certain people would qualify for the pass program. People who need the bus to search for housing, jobs, etc. probably would still be paying the cash fare. Golden agreed and noted that the intent is not to meet the transportation needs of the entire low income population, but the program would mitigate the impact of the fare increase for some. Konkel indicated it depends on who would be served: there are limited dollars, and you can serve more people but less for each person, or serve fewer people but give them a higher benefit.

Sanborn asked which would impact the low income population the most, raising the cash fare or raising the monthly pass, and Konkel replied the cash fare.

Jeanne Hoffman, Mayoral Assistant:

- Supported a fare increase.
- Reminded the TPC and the audience that the Mayor is transit-friendly and very supportive of transit.
- In the City's 2005 operating budget, the Mayor provided more funding for Metro than management requested.
- Even though the 2005 budget contained an increase in the fuel budget over 2004, there is an overrun in 2005.
- In August, City of Madison employees will participate in an unlimited ride pass agreement.
- In 2005, the Mayor moved the funding of the Rhythm & Booms shuttle to the room tax rather than having Metro cover it.
- There was a substantial increase in Metro's 2005 budget.
- In 2006, the Mayor will consider an additional City subsidy for Metro, but it is a partnership between the TPC and the Mayor and the shortfall needs to be covered by means other than just the tax levy.
- The Mayor's memo to the TPC talks about a host of different options.
- The charge for the TPC is to responsibly budget for all items. The key is to be responsible and realistic with revenue projections and recognize that a fare increase will need to be part of the mix.
- Emphasized that farebox increases affect Metro's other partners; those entities share in the farebox revenues and it affects how much those communities have to pay.
- The Mayor is supportive of transit and will put more in the levy, but she could not speak for Metro's partner communities. Putting this burden on the other governmental bodies may cause problems with the City's service, i.e., other communities may choose to cut service, which would have a domino effect for many residents, especially the transit-dependent population.
- The Mayor's memo indicates that he would be willing to consider a program to help low income transit riders with a pass program; the door is open for the alders and service providers to come up with a solution to meet those needs.
- A multi-year increase is a difficult decision but when you look into the future, there's no increase in State aid, fuel prices will not go down, and costs will not go down.
- A multi-year increase will help build the transit system. The Mayor wants to get more people on transit, possibility of adding Verona and Sun Prairie as partners.

- A multi-year increase has the advantage of giving Madison and other partners a budget in advance; this is important and should be considered.
- There is momentum with transit-implementing new farebox technology that will help with URP agreements, new GIS technology that makes it easier to use transit, etc.
- Optimistic that system will continue to improve, but this could be hindered by the inaction of the TPC to look responsibly at the 2006 budget and beyond.
- Asking the TPC to schedule a public hearing and noted the importance of moving forward.
- Asked the members to consider the Mayor's memo carefully and not to set it aside.

Hoag noted that a number of registrants opposed a multi-year increase but yet the Mayor supports it. He felt going with a multi-year increase is a challenge to the democratic process and the opportunity for public input. He wondered whether the Mayor would back off from that aspect of the proposal. Hoffman indicated that the Mayor would like the TPC to consider a multi-year increase and if there's no need to increase the fares each year, then the increase would not be implemented. There could be a process tied to the multi-year increase, but he would like to have the TPC on record as meeting the revenue targets to maintain and perhaps expand service.

Hoag expressed concern as to where Metro falls in the mix of the City budget. Transit-dependent riders who pay cash represent the lowest income population of the city. The proposed increases are way above inflation. Hoag believed that fuel prices will increase even higher in the next few years, meaning more people will need transit. While he's hearing that the Mayor is transit friendly, it's still the status quo and he felt more could be done. In the next few years, mass transit will be even more important, and what can be done to change the City's priorities and improve transportation?

Hoffman recognized that usually low income people are more transit dependent, but choice riders are of all economic levels. The Mayor's memo speaks to a partnership with the TPC. He is willing to add dollars to the levy to help Metro, but he is also asking for a fare increase. He provided a revenue target but it's up to the TPC to work with staff and come up with the best option to meet that target. She pointed out to simply continue existing City services will cost an additional \$10 million, which is about an 8% tax levy. There will be some tough decisions made in many agencies, not just Metro. She heard from the speakers today that everything has to be considered. The next step for the TPC is to schedule a public hearing. Metro received a 2% increase in State aids, but this comes after four years of flat aids and ever-increasing fuel costs.

Debo referred to page 4 of the financial audit provided in the agenda packet (item E.9) and the chart tracking Metro's historical ridership. It shows that ridership has grown after every fare increase. Metro had a fare increase in January 2004 and saw both increased revenues and increased ridership. She emphasized that Metro staff has been very judicious in the type of fare increases it has proposed. They try to mitigate ridership loss and have been successful in that regard.

In response to a question, Debo stated that the City of Madison pays 18¢ for every \$1.00 of Metro's costs. She reminded members of the revenue & expense chart that they have been provided over the past five months and they know what the

trend is and the fact that every year the gap gets worse. A four-year fare structure would be better for Metro and would allow staff to focus on improving services rather than focusing on stopgap measures to cover the revenue shortfall each year. Staff have been successful in improving service but can't continue to do without stability and funding. Fare revenues are a very important funding source.

Debo emphasized that the TPC needs to adopt an option to bring to public hearing. From a legal perspective, the public needs to know the maximum fare so they can respond and give input. She asked whether members wanted to take a straw poll on the 12 options presented. Debo reiterated that Metro needs to generate a certain level of revenue, and the options presented by staff are the ones that will generate the needed revenue with the least amount of ridership loss. Options 6 and 8 have been vetted the most. Debo stated she took Option 6 to the Madison Metropolitan School District and they accepted the fact that youth fares would go up. In some options, the youth fares go up even more than Option 6. The MMSD is a very important partner with Metro in meeting the transportation needs of school children.

Golden wanted to know why the youth cash fare in Option 6 is kept low, noting it doesn't seem to follow Oram. Debo advised that staff checked with peer systems and by and large, they did not provide a discount for youth; however, they didn't carry almost all the middle school and high school students as Metro does through contract arrangements with the School District. For youth fares, Metro is trying to get away from the discount on a discount on a discount. The proposal is to have a youth cash fare that is 50% of the adult cash fare while tickets and passes would have no further discounts similar to the current convenience fares for seniors and disabled people using fixed route buses.

Golden inquired as to the options for the Unlimited Ride Pass rates, given the contracts. Debo noted the 2005 rate is 82.5¢. Most of the contracts are annual and come due in August. So in August 2006, the rate could be subject to renegotiation with the exception of the UW students, who have a three-year contract. Golden clarified that if the option for public hearing includes an URP rate increase, for 2006 the new rate would only be in effect from August through December for most of the contracts. Debo said that is generally true. She advised that under the previous UW student agreement, the average fare had been 55¢. Under this contract it started in year one at 78¢, will become 80¢ this August, and will become 82.5¢ next August (2006).

In response to Wong's question, Debo clarified that the line "Total Revenues" refers to new (additional) revenues. The amounts are cumulative. Wong asked why the 2009 column is blank in all options yet it shows an increase in Total Revenues. Sharon Persich of Metro explained that the revenues reflect the additional revenues received from a fare increase in August 2008.

Wong noted that the ridership loss figures are all over the map. Persich advised that the general formula is a .3% loss for every 1% increase in fares. In Option 6, all fares increase by 3%. In the other options, different fares have a different percentage increase. Debo stated it also relates to riders shifting to other modes based on the fare. Wong asked for ridership loss figures for each fare type, but Debo indicated this would be reams of paper.

Referencing the financial audit chart, White asked if there's any data as to what

type of ridership increased, i.e., was it due to Unlimited Ride Pass agreements, the cash fare, etc. Debo stated that Metro doesn't have good data in that regard but does have data from 2004 as far as the breakdown in ridership by fare type. URP agreements have become more significant over the years, and Metro can track ridership by the contract. Ridership by UW employees has grown dramatically. Metro staff try to take into account the shift from other fare types when an URP agreement goes into effect. Persich advised that Metro's old farebox equipment did not have enough keys to track all fares, and multiple fares were assigned to one key. To try and go back and recreate the ridership by fare data would be an enormous amount of work.

Debo mentioned that in 1991 and 1996, Metro increased the cash fare but not tickets and passes and lost revenue in cash fares because of the huge shift to the discounted fares. Staff look at all impacts of a fare charge and are very meticulous in thoroughly vetting each option using Simpson-Curtin elasticity measures and Oram discount relationships.

White asked about Metro's marketing goals. Debo stated there is a TPC-adopted Marketing Plan that is based on the Strategic Plan. White commented that she rides Routes 3 and 4 and was surprised that there few interior ads. Debo advised that Metro has a contract with an agency to sell ads. Compared with peer transit systems, Metro does fairly well in overall ad revenues. The ad contract guarantees Metro a minimum amount, and Metro also receives a percentage of sales above that. Most advertising revenue is made on the exterior of buses; revenue generated by interior ads is very slight so much of the advertising effort by advertising contractors goes to exterior ads. White mentioned that she has seen more interior ads in buses in other cities. Debo reiterated that it's the responsibility of the contracted ad agency to sell the ad space.

Durocher emphasized that the TPC needed to come to a resolution on scheduling a public hearing. Golden remarked that the TPC did not need to debate tonight about a specific proposal since the purpose of the public hearing is to get input. Given the revenue picture, the TPC needs to talk about a fare increase and then talk about other ways to raise additional revenues or find service efficiencies. Golden suggested that the option put out for public hearing be the maximum fare increase. The TPC can always adopt something less than that.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to hold a public hearing on a fare increase that would be effective 8/7/05:

1. Use the Option 6 2006 numbers with these changes: adult cash fare of \$1.75, youth cash fare of \$1.00, and an URP rate of 87.5¢ for agreements that are renegotiated in 2006. This proposal would be the maximum. [The new rates would be for the remainder of 2005 and all of 2006.]
2. In the public hearing announcement, indicate that the TPC is also seeking comment on a low income transit assistance program to be offered by the City ( not by Metro)
3. Propose that the TPC is going to have a fare plan for multi years that may include raising any fare by 6-10%, with the specific distribution to be determined later
4. Metro is considering minimal service cuts for efficiencies
5. Metro will consider strategies to increase advertising revenue by placing ads at the transfer points and fully wrapping buses.

Golden requested that the hearing notice ask for public input on all five issues.

Golden noted that the process is somewhat unusual this year in that the TPC is dealing with this before the budget has been announced or acted on. He plans to draft a resolution asking the Council to indicate whether they agree with the Mayor's directive to the TPC to raise \$500,000 in additional revenues, or whether they support getting the money from the tax levy. This is an issue the Council should take on and debate.

Streit asked whether the public hearing proposal could include a 20¢ co-pay per trip for URP riders. Debo stated no, since some of the agreements are covered by labor contracts. Golden thought the co-pay is a good idea to bring up when the various URP agreements are being renegotiated. Streit clarified that he was not talking about changing the URP rate itself. Golden felt the co-pay issue was premature at this time. The URP agreement has been thought out in a certain way, and this takes it in a very different direction. He wanted time to contemplate the impacts. Streit felt the co-pay would be consistent with the 10-15¢ increases in other rates. Durocher stated that while he was supportive of the "tip jar" volunteer concept, he was hesitant to include a mandatory co-pay as part of the public hearing proposal. The idea has merit during the time when the URP agreements are being renegotiated. Streit mentioned that including it in the public hearing proposal would put out a "map" as to what the TPC would be looking at for future contracts. He wanted to get it out there as a fare increase. Golden stated it would blindside the URP partners without giving them advance notice or providing them a chance for input. It would also result in different programs for UW employees versus UW students. The issue should be an internal discussion at the UW level. He was open to the possibility of having different policies, but you need to give a heads up to the people who contract with Metro, and do it in a logical way. Debo emphasized that the URP agreements are voluntary on the part of the institutions, who do it as an incentive to use transit, to address limited parking, and to improve their TDM programs. Metro benefits from the agreements with stable revenue and she would like to negotiate additional agreements with other employers.

Ald. Konkel supported putting out Golden's suggestion for a public hearing. She noted that she had done some calculations and found that less than 10% of Metro's revenues come from ads. Looking to ads to fill the budget gap is a false choice since they won't generate much money. Streit's proposal for a co-pay would have a bigger gain in revenues than ads.

Sanborn supported the motion, although he noted that Option 8 had lower ridership loss estimates. Persich noted that the ridership loss estimates for Option 6 would be different since the TPC has changed some of the fares. Sanborn wondered if it would be better to go with a two-step increase, one in 2005 and one in 2006. He suggested going with Option 9, except keep the cash fare at \$1.50 in 2006. Golden accepted this as friendly, including an URP rate of 88¢ in 2006. He reiterated that the proposal put out to public hearing is the maximum. Sanborn liked Option 9 because it generated a lot of revenue but had the smallest increase in the cash fare. Persich stated that the downside of Option 9 is that the youth and student fare increases are really large. Sanborn remarked that the current youth discount is out of whack. Also, the youth and student rates remain the same from 2006 to 2007 whereas other fares increase in 2007. He

emphasized that he was trying to address those who would be hit hardest by a fare increase.

Golden interjected that this is the debate the TPC should be having after the public hearing. For tonight, the TPC needs to select the maximum fare increase to put out for public hearing. While the Mayor supports an annual fare increase, his own preference with raising fares is to "get it done" and not do it every year.

Amended motion by Hoag/Wong to support Golden's motion except strike item 3 re: multi year increases.

Hoag noted that a multi-year increase is a big jump from precedence. It does not provide enough protection for the democratic process and public input. It also sends the message that Metro is failing. Golden didn't like the idea of a multi-year fare increase but felt it should be part of the public hearing; he felt it will become a "lurking" issue if they don't hear loud and clear from the public on it.

Amended motion failed to carry (two ayes).

Wong felt the ridership chart in the financial audit is distorted. In the past when fares were raised every year, ridership went down and ridership has never recovered to where it was.

Wong expressed concern that the fare proposal has a 44% increase in the cost of tickets. Durocher interjected that the issue for the TPC is to decide on which option to bring to the public hearing, not a final decision on fares. Sanborn pointed out that if you look at the cost of tickets over a longer period of time, their increase is in line with other fares. Sometimes tickets only went up 5¢ when other fares went up much more. Members need to keep that in mind.

Motion as stated by Golden/Carlsen carried, with Sanborn voting no.

Motion by Carlsen/Radomski to schedule the public hearing on Tuesday, July 26, with a follow-up meeting on August 3 if a decision is not made on 7/26.

Golden strongly urged that the TPC not take action on 7/26. Taking action on the same night as the public hearing gives the appearance of a done deal. The TPC needs time to filter the input from the public hearing, as well as enough time to genuinely debate the fare proposal. It will be a difficult issue.

Motion carried unanimously, with members agreeing to meet at 5:00 p.m. on 7/26 to conduct regular business and hold the public hearing at 5:30 p.m.

[Wong left at 8:15 p.m.]

**Present:** Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Absent:** Tim Wong

**Excused:** Diane L. Paoni

- D.4. Draft Metro policy document: misbehavior on buses, at Transfer Points, etc. (referred from June meeting)



Sharon Williams, 327 E. Bluff, registered in support.

- Identified herself as Metro bus driver and was representing other bus drivers.
- Thanked the TPC for their support in investigating the use of surveillance cameras.
- Common Council voted to approve consideration of surveillance cameras.
- Supported Ann Gullickson's cover memo, including the use of cameras.
- Drivers suggested change to section VII.B. (page 4): have the appeals board consist of 1 alder, 1 MPD rep, and 1 passenger. The officer would be valuable in explaining the seriousness of the offense. Also suggested that the offender not be allowed on the driver's bus until it's been deemed safe for the driver. The appeal needs to be prompt for all concerned.
- Metro managements needs to make sure that supervisors follow the procedure or it means nothing.
- Security cameras are doable at a reasonable cost.
- Thanked the TPC for recognizing the safety problems on buses and at transfer points and for helping to find a solution to the problem. Especially thanked Ann Gullickson for her work on the procedure.

Debo noted that the policy has been worked on for over six months, and all staff gave substantial input. The policy is based on the Library's procedure, and staff also looked at policies in other transit systems. The policy has been reviewed by the City Attorney's office. Debo would like to implement a policy in the near future.

Motion by Sanborn/Hoag to approve, carried unanimously.

D.5. Discussion: camera surveillance (referred from June meeting)

Sanborn noted that this is an issue that will need extensive discussion. Golden noted that the Common Council accepted the TPC's motion from 6/14/05 except they added a condition that the security plan needs to be sent to the Council for adoption.

Motion by Sanborn/Radomski to refer, carried unanimously.

D.6. Metro Annual Report (referred from June meeting)

Debo remarked that Metro sets a very demanding Strategic Plan for itself, and the Annual Report highlights the goals that have been accomplished. She urged members to read it and take note of all that Metro has accomplished in the past year.

D.7. Facilities Needs Analysis/Master Plan (referred from June meeting)

Debo noted that the Capital Budget (agenda item E.7.) describes what Metro wants to do with its facilities. For the past several years, the WisDOT audit has found that Metro's facilities are inadequate. The objective is to meet the recommendations of the audit. Through RNL Design, Metro has developed a plan . The whole project will take 2½ years to build and Metro still needs to get the funding in line, much of which will be through federal grants. She then reviewed some of the details:

- Part of the facility on the East Washington-Ingersoll corner will be torn down and reconstructed to make it more productive.
- Building behind the main facility will house maintenance functions as well as provide 1½ levels of parking.
- The parking would be used by Metro employees and also by other employers in the vicinity (who would pay for the parking).
- Per Federal requirements, all facilities, including the parking ramp over the maintenance facility, will be very security conscious.
- It may be possible to make parking for a fee available on weekends for people going to the park.
- Building will have an attractive façade along East Washington, Ingersoll and Railroad Street.
- Plan before the TPC is the massing design and the next step is the schematic design.
- Will be a "green built" building.
- Includes two rows of trees on East Washington and upgraded landscaping.
- Will accommodate Metro's needs for 20 years, including expansion of service.
- Staff in the leased facility will move into the new building.
- Will have room for staff amenities such as a lunchroom.
- Will improve staff morale to have a facility that is adequate for their needs.

Debo felt the consultant did a fantastic job. The next phase will bring more details, including costs. The project could be as much as \$58 million, but it will be phased in. This cost includes leasing some space while the work is being done, engineering costs, etc.

Carlsen suggested a tour of the existing facilities to give members a better idea of what needs to be done. Debo stated she has a tour scheduled on July 28 as part of the Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee meeting, and she invited TPC members to attend.

McCabe referenced the future development in this area and asked about the possibility of shared parking. Debo indicated that Metro is open to the idea of providing employee parking for nearby businesses but there are security measures that need to be addressed. On weekends, some parking may be available for park users on a fee basis.

In response to Durocher's question, Debo indicated that the new facility will be located on Metro's existing 10.4 acres (many transit systems Metro's size are 18 acres or so).

## E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to adopt items E.1. through E.6. Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit recused themselves from voting on item E.1. because they are employed by the UW. Since item E.1. was not separated out from the motion, the four members were also recused from voting on items E.2 through E.6.

E.1. [01493](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an agreement with the University of Wisconsin-Madison for the provision of free access by UW-Madison and UW Hospital employees to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement to the transit utility for estimated employee trips for the period September 1, 2005 through August 31, 2006.

**A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit recused themselves from voting on item E.1. since they are employed by the UW. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** Golden, Sanborn, Durocher, White and Carlsen

**Abstain:** Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit

**Present:** 9 - Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Absent:** 1 - Tim Wong

**Excused:** 1 - Diane L. Paoni

**Enactment No:** RES-05-00638

E.2. [01473](#)

Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a Section 5307, public transit capital, capital maintenance, and capital planning grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

**A motion was made, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER There was a motion by Golden/Carlsen to adopt items E.1. through E.6. Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit recused themselves from voting on item E.1. because they are employed by the UW. Since item E.1. was not separated out from the motion, the four members were also recused from voting on items E.2 through E.6.**

**The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** Golden, Sanborn, Durocher, White and Carlsen

**Abstain:** Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit

**Present:** 9 - Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Absent:** 1 - Tim Wong

**Excused:** 1 - Diane L. Paoni

**Enactment No:** RES-05-00635

E.3. [01474](#)

Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a Section 5309 formula public transit capital grant with U.S. Department of Transportation

and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

**A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER** There was a motion by Golden/ Carlsen to adopt items E.1. through E.6. Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit recused themselves from voting on item E.1. because they are employed by the UW. Since item E.1. was not separated out from the motion, the four members were also recused from voting on items E.2 through E.6.

The motion passed by the following vote:

**Aye:** Golden, Sanborn, Durocher, White and Carlsen

**Abstain:** Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit

**Present:** 9 - Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Absent:** 1 - Tim Wong

**Excused:** 1 - Diane L. Paoni

**Enactment No:** RES-05-00636

**E.4. [01475](#)**

Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a public transit capital grant with Wisconsin Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with WISDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

**A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER** There was a motion by Golden/ Carlsen to adopt items E.1. through E.6. Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit recused themselves from voting on item E.1. because they are employed by the UW. Since item E.1. was not separated out from the motion, the four members were also recused from voting on items E.2 through E.6. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Aye:** Golden, Sanborn, Durocher, White and Carlsen

**Abstain:** Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit

**Present:** 9 - Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Absent:** 1 - Tim Wong

**Excused:** 1 - Diane L. Paoni

**Enactment No:** RES-05-00637

**E.5. [01534](#)**

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a service agreement with the City of Verona for the provision of commuter bus service between West Transfer Point in Madison and bus stops in Verona, including the new Epic

Systems campus, starting in September, 2005 for a period of two years, with option for renewal thereafter.

**A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER** There was a motion by Golden/ Carlsen to adopt items E.1. through E.6. Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit recused themselves from voting on item E.1. because they are employed by the UW. Since item E.1. was not separated out from the motion, the four members were also recused from voting on items E.2 through E.6. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Aye:** Golden, Sanborn, Durocher, White and Carlsen

**Abstain:** Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit

**Present:** 9 - Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Absent:** 1 - Tim Wong

**Excused:** 1 - Diane L. Paoni

**Enactment No:** RES-05-00639

**E.6. [01541](#)**

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to sign and execute an agreement between the City of Madison and WP Beverages, LLC for the provision of vending machine services for cold beverages at Metro Transit's North, South, East, and West Transfer Points for an initial period of one year, with an option to extend the agreement for two (2) periods of one (1) year each by mutual agreement of the parties.

**A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER** There was a motion by Golden/ Carlsen to adopt items E.1. through E.6. Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit recused themselves from voting on item E.1. because they are employed by the UW. Since item E.1. was not separated out from the motion, the four members were also recused from voting on items E.2 through E.6. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Aye:** Golden, Sanborn, Durocher, White and Carlsen

**Abstain:** Radomski, McCabe, Hoag and Streit

**Present:** 9 - Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Amanda F. White, Chris R. Carlsen, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

**Absent:** 1 - Tim Wong

**Excused:** 1 - Diane L. Paoni

**Enactment No:** RES-05-00640

**E.7. Review and approval of Metro Capital Budget**

Debo directed attention to the cover memo outlining the plans for Metro's new facility.

She remarked that one problem with the capital budget is that the pie is only so big and will not accommodate all of Metro's needs. Metro wants to get the facility built, so it will take a higher priority than new buses. Purchase of new coaches will be delayed for two years to get sufficient funding for the new building. The fleet is 7-8 years old on average and is very well-maintained. There are a few other minor things in the capital budget. ITS has diminished as part of the capital plan because Metro now has the equipment it wished to acquire.

Golden noted that Metro has been on a 12-year replacement schedule for coaches and wondered what this means for the fleet, will it show up as an increased maintenance budget item? Debo emphasized that the priority is getting the facility work done, that Maintenance is on-board with the approach and stands to gain a great deal in the construction of a new maintenance facility.

Hoag remarked that there's no mention of hybrid buses. Debo stated that Metro brought the issue to the attention of the City but the City indicated they have other priorities and many other capital items on the City's plate. Hybrids are not a priority now but might be in two years when Metro gets back to replacing its fleet. Testing of hybrids in other parts of the country has gone well, and as time goes on the cost will go down (hybrids now cost twice as much). Metro is very interested in pursuing this and may be able to make some inroads in a couple years.

- E.8. Metro Operating Budget discussion re: supplemental requests concerning staffing and service
- E.9. FY2004 Transit financial audit

## **F. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS**

**Motion by Golden/Sanborn to accept all reports on the agenda, without separation; carried unanimously.**

- F.1. Parking May 2005 Revenue Report
- F.2. Transit YTD May Performance Indicators

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

- G.1. ADA Transit Subcommittee - 6/2/05 minutes
- G.2. Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee - 6/23/05 minutes
- G.3. Parking Council For People With Disabilities - 6/21/05 minutes
- G.4. Long Range Transportation Planning Commission - 6/16/05 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 reported that he recommended to the Mayor's office that Wong be appointed as the TPC rep to the LRTPC.**

H.2. Rescheduling of Dec. 13, 2005 TPC meeting due to conflict with Common Council meeting (referred from June meeting)

**Motion by Golden/Carlsen to reschedule the meeting for Thursday, Dec. 8, carried unanimously.**

H.3. Commission member items for future agenda

**None**

## ADJOURNMENT

**Upon a motion by Golden/Carlsen, the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.**

Informational enclosures: updated TPC roster & adopted TPC Rules & Procedures