



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

Wednesday, February 10, 2016

5:00 PM

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

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 PM.

Present: 6 - David Ahrens; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow; Gary L. Poulson and Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 3 - Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and Kate D. Lloyd

Please note: There are two vacancies on the Commission, one Alder member and one in the position of Second Alternate.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Ahrens, seconded by Bigelow, to Approve the Minutes of the January 13, 2016 meeting. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 - David Ahrens; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie and Wayne Bigelow

Abstentions: 1 - Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 3 - Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and Kate D. Lloyd

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

E.1. [41686](#)

Parking: February 2016 Activity Report, Revenue-Expense and Occupancy Reports - TPC 02.10.16

Asst. Parking Utility Manager Sabrina Tolley and Engineer Bill Putnam discussed the reports (attached), and answered questions.

- Though not final, revenue numbers were fairly accurate (inc. adjustments for sales tax).
- Exc. for State St Cap and Campus, average peak occupancies were high at ~80+%.
- %'s by revenue category: Attended facilities=60%, On-street meters=18%,

Monthly pkg and leases=14% (+6% over 2014).

- Based on actual usage, the average peak occupancies included monthly parkers who had swiped their card for the day.
- The rate change occurring a year later than normal, might account for the flat revenues and higher occupancies that rate changes usually balanced.
- The TPC Subcommittee would solicit comment from stakeholders/public on the rate change at their 2/22 meeting, and make recommendations.
- New sensor technology for smart single-space meters potentially could re-set the meter when spaces were vacated, work with multi-space meters, provide real-time data for mobile apps.
- Moving the 30-year old ATC line by Cap East would have allowed a more efficient design; but time and costs made it unfeasible.
- Year-end transactions had to be completed before determining net revenue for 2015. Beyond revenue, rate changes were key in adjusting occupancies.
- (Bergamini) Meters added to State St Cap in 2014 was perhaps contributing to the shift in meter space.

Bergamini/Bigelow made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [41687](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Financial, Performance Measures, Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Reports, Hybrid Stats and Customer Feedback - TPC 02.10.16

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp reviewed the Summary and reports (attached), and answered questions.

- The weighted average ridership calculation helped temper costs for the UW during ridership increases, and moderate revenues for Metro during ridership declines, as it was doing now.
- New Paratransit Program Manager Nancy Senn would be starting shortly. From WisDOT, Senn formerly served as Paratransit Manager in Milwaukee.
- Re: fuel prices and purchasing, over 10 years, Metro sometimes paid more/sometimes less vs. prevailing gas prices. Having transit partners, being able to predict fuel prices was an advantage. They were looking at locking in prices for 2018 at much lower levels than what they paid now. Prices were usually locked in a year in advance.
- Some of the favorable net surplus was committed to additional garage facility; and some would be used to replace contingency funds used to bridge the timing gap for the fare increase, taking the fund to ~\$6.3M.
- Staff would look into why the operating cost/revenue hour was up vs. 2014; and would bring 10-year summaries/graphs of ridership and financials (inc. Excel).

Bergamini expressed concern about the ridership drop (vs. 2014). Some of this was related to weather and detours (esp. on Route 80's). Ten routes showed increases; all the others were down. Past ridership didn't necessarily reflect gas prices. Kamp said the survey showed overcrowding as the #1 problem. When gas prices were low, riders may choose not to stand. Fixing overcrowding might improve ridership. Bergamini agreed, but that when riders were lost, it could be hard to get them back, making it important to think about this issue.

Tolmie/Bigelow made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- BF.1. [41688](#)** Parking: Request to hold public hearing at the March meeting to hear comment on proposed rate changes - TPC 02.10.16
- A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Ahrens, to Approve the request. Poulson said the TPC Subcommittee would be making a recommendation, by the time the TPC took action on the changes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**
- F.2. [41019](#)** Congratulating Ann Gullickson on her retirement and thanking her for almost 19 years of exemplary service to the City of Madison.
- A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**
- F.3. [41361](#)** Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter in to an agreement with Dane County to provide Group Access Service for the City of Madison for the calendar year 2016.
- Combining action on Items F.3. through F.6., a motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**
- F.4. [41362](#)** Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter in to an agreement with Dane County for the purpose of providing the Metro Transit Utility with State 85.21 funding given to Dane County for the provision of accessible transportation for eligible persons within Metro Transit's service area in the calendar year 2016.
- A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**
- F.5. [41363](#)** Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County to provide Volunteer Driver Escort Services for the City of Madison for the calendar year 2016.
- A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**
- F.6. [41367](#)** 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 2016, and \$5,000 to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (a Metropolitan Planning Organization) to support the County Specialized Transportation coordination activities for the calendar year 2016.
- A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Item G.3. at this point.]**

G. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

G.1. [41689](#) Parking: Discussion of Draft RFP for Capitol East Garage Design and Engineering Services - TPC 02.10.16

[Please note: This item followed Item G.3.] Parking staff and Economic Development Director Matt Mikolajewski discussed the documents related to the Draft RFP and conceptual drawings (attached).

- Page 6 of the 2/5/16 hand-out requested info about nine items, inc. their qualifications/experience and approach to items in Attachment 1; i.e., requirements of City public works contracts and project specifics.
- The purpose of the RFP was to select a qualified design firm. Staff expected to receive some conceptual designs.
- The draft had not yet been released, and staff welcomed member input.
- The City would own the commercial/retail space, and could be the landlord. Or it could create a master lease agreement, possibly with Gebhardt, to manage the property and handle the leases.
- The number of stalls had been reduced to 450, with the potential to build up if demand increased in the future. Initial capital costs would be lower, more within what they might be able to do with TIF or what they might finance.
- Staff was still working out the terms of the lease agreement with Gebhardt. Estimates of their daytime usage had led to the reduction in spaces.
- The Utility would operate the garage. Gebhardt/daytime parkers would use a prox card that could be swiped, similar to monthly parkers.
- The City was talking to MG&E about a ground lease or sale of the land.
- During the day, the 450 spaces would be designated for Gebhardt's 800 South-Cosmos development: a 100K-sf building constructed by American Family Insurance, with half the space for Starting Block and the other half for AFI offices or leased out.
- An additional 50K-sf would be constructed by Gebhardt: 13K for retail and 35K entertainment venue, whose patrons would use the garage in the PM, paying an hourly rate.
- The conceptual drawings reflected height options for the retail fronting Main Street, 1A being a single level, and 2A being a full height and full potential build-out.
- Commerical space on the first floor would have some retail to animate the street. If buiilt, floors abovewould have small office and light production space.
- MG&E could potentially place solar installations on the roof.
- Bike parking = 600 sf faced Main Street.
- The monthly and hourly rates would be lower than downtown rates.
- No reserve funds would be used to build the garage; only TIF. The Utility would be responsible for all capital and operating expenses after it was built.
- Staff hoped to come back to the Council, BOE and TPC in March with the financial structure for the facility, by the time the TPC received the contract.
- They had been meeting with Finance and the City Attorney's Office to talk through the PILOT issue, and were looking at a couple of options.

Bergamini was uncomfortable with the idea of a land lease with MG&E. Also, the development planned to serve a mix of businesses, some with people who wouldn't work strictly 9 to 5. Thought should be given to conflicting uses inc. residential development, and how it would spill into the neighborhood and impact street parking. Kemble said one formula proposed for PILOT would be based on revenue produced by the facility vs. property value.

G.2. [41690](#)

Metro: Fare Change Discussion - TPC 02.10.16

Finance Manager Wayne Block and Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch joined Kamp to discuss the fare change.

- Staff had sorted through federal guidelines and local policies related to equity in fares.
- The approved budget had Metro dipping into its contingency fund in 2016, by \$500K, because the full impact of the fare increase wouldn't be felt until 2017.
- Metro didn't want a fare change to be borne disproportionately by low income riders or people of color.
- The policy (pg. 12 of the fare equity analysis attached), helped staff determine which fares were used by these groups. The equity policy of 5% variance was submitted to the feds, who hadn't indicated any problem.
- Five fare categories were identified, which were used to develop the spreadsheet example (attached).
- Budget impacts were shown on the spreadsheet, in the right three columns at the bottom: \$1,278,312 = the first full year of fare changes in 2019 (after UW passes went from \$1.15 to \$1.35); \$155, 272 in 2016, with fare changes eff. 9/1/16; \$483,232 in 2017, roughly = to the \$500K from contingency.
- It was difficult to gauge the impact of a fare increase on ridership. The spread used the same methodology used for the 2009 fare increase, developed by Metro staff based on studies an experience. The % change in rides flowed from that model.
- In 2009, the methodology predicted 0.50% increase in ridership; the results came within 0.10%-0.20% of that. At the time, some thought ridership would go down so much that Metro would lose revenue; but ridership did go up slightly.
- The methodology was also used in the targeted fare increases in 2012, with results that were fairly close.
- Other transit systems used other models. The standard was the Simpson Index, which said that for every 10% of increase, ridership would go down 3%. But research showed that each fare category had to be examined.
- The spread showed a 0.17% drop in ridership. Though numbers might change, the %'s would probably remain much the same.
- Using the % increase column in the spread: Of the fares being increased, the lowest increase was 12% (for Youth 10-ride and Commute Card). The policy stated that any equity-sensitive fare could not increase higher than 5% over 12%; i.e., anything over 17% would violate the policy. The 31-day passes were equity-sensitive fares, but the % increase for them was 16.4%, below 17%, less than a 5% variance.
- Equity-sensitive fares were identified in graphs on pgs. 14-15 of the packet.

Bergamini remarked that Madison often proved the exception when it came to ridership. A complicating factor was the expansion of unlimited ride passes, which made it difficult to immediately assess the financial impact.

Rusch said they would be requesting a public hearing for May, to go into effect by September. The chart would be provided as an info item on the next agenda. Staff would clarify survey %'s for unlimited ride passes related to college and K-12 students.

G.3. [41691](#)

Metro: Jenifer Street Construction Plans and related Bus Stop and Detour Information - TPC 02.10.16

[Please note: This item followed Item F.6.] Kamp said the Jenifer Street

construction project had produced feedback about bus stop placement at Ingersoll, and the E. Washington Avenue detour. District 6 Alder Marsha Rummel had asked that the discussion be brought to the TPC. Transit Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck, Operations Supervisor Phil Gadke, and Transit Planner Tim Sobota joined Kamp to talk about the plans.

- The TPC had previously recommended keeping stops on every block of Jenifer; and had given Metro discretion regarding nearside vs. farside stop placement.
- Nearside bus stops: They presented safety issues for people and traffic trying to cross in front of the bus, esp. at Ingersoll, where buses parked for 2-3 minutes for driver exchanges and time points. Traffic and parking rules were involved. The 2013 TDP recommended farside stops wherever practical, because they were safer and easier operationally.
- Important factors in planning the detour: Maintaining on-time performance for Routes 3, 4 and 7, so that riders made their connections at transfer points, an issue with equity implications; the availability of ADA boarding pads; avoiding traffic jams.
- Reconstruction would run from May to October, and extend from Baldwin to Livingston.

Written and verbal statements from registrants followed. [Please see attached Registration slips, as well as written comments submitted to the Commission outside of the meeting.]

- 1) Julie Spears, 307 S. Few Street wrote in opposition to detour: Preferred Willy St. to the long walk on dark streets from E. Wash.
- 2) Jeff Waldman, 1050 Jenifer Street, opposed bus stop relocation: Concerned about traffic and idling in front of his house, safety of those going in/out of 3-4 driveways affected, tree removal, home values and parking availability.
- 3) Jeff Wright, 1037 Williamson Street, spoke for Dennis Chandler/Ms. Gold, owners of 1044 Jenifer Street, who opposed bus stop relocation: Residents invested in homes based on the current stop locations. The stops presented no safety issue; no pedestrians had ever been injured. A map (attached) showed the safety problems created by moving the stops between driveways serving multi-unit dwellings.
- 4) Peter Wolff, 945 Jenifer Street, supported/opposed various items: Opposed moving the stops; had never seen any ped/vehicle problems because of right turns at Ingersoll. Backing stops off of intersections might be good. Neighbors were discussing placing stop signs on Jenifer and Ingersoll, to slow non-resident traffic. If so, it would work better for buses if stops stayed where they were.
- 5) Larry Jensen, 1618 Jenifer Street, wrote in opposition to detour: Preferred Spaight St. to E. Wash., which would be inconvenient and potentially dangerous for riders.
- 6) Mike O'Brien, owner of 3-unit building at 1046 Jenifer Street, opposed bus stop relocation: With 7 adults in his unit, all with cars, the stop would create parking problems; 100 buses stopping within 15 feet of front door and loitering riders would create pollution, noise, safety problems; property values and rentals would fall.
- 7) Joyce Liao, 1054 Jenifer Street, opposed bus stop relocation: A stop in front of their house would affect its resale value; the cost of installing a fence would be a hardship. Had bought the house with the idea of starting a family there; a bus stop would disrupt their environment. Re: safety, people didn't cross in the front of the bus now.

- 8) Gary Tipler, Chair, Marquette Neighborhood Assn. Traffic Committee, opposed the detour and asked for further review of the bus stop relocation: A detour on E. Wash. would be a huge inconvenience; created many concerns for women walking a 1/2-mile from E. Wash. to the neighborhood, through an industrial part of town where two attacks had occurred. Instead, two alternatives could be considered: a) a shuttle running between E. Wash. and the neighborhood, that would serve the Square; or b) using Willy St. for at least one of the routes. Four owners on Willy had said they wouldn't mind having a stop in front of their building (vs. customers coming/going from E. Wash). Using Spaight was a possibility, but its width might create problems.
- 9) Donna Davis, read a statement (attached) from John Olson, owner of historical landmark, Capital City Sanctuary Church, 1103 Jenifer Street, who opposed bus stop relocation: Felt that speed control with stop signs on Jenifer would improve safety more; on-street parking spots would be preserved (esp. for elderly/disabled); and homes with driveways and the church would not be disturbed, by noise/loitering. Wondered if Landmarks Commission had been consulted.
- 10) Karolyn Beebe, 220 Merry Street, wrote in opposition to detour: Being short-term, preferred Willy St. instead.
- 11) Gregg Sanford, owner and resident of 1050 Jenifer, wrote in opposition to bus stop relocation: Arguments for relocating the stops were weak; relocation would impact safety on busy driveways; property values would be negatively affected.

Alder Rummel spoke in opposition to the farside bus stops and the detour.

- Some residents on the westbound side of Ingersoll backed out of their driveway into the intersection. The safety risk with this was more serious than right turns in front of buses. The current stop westbound was in front of one house recessed from the street, with a driveway quite a distance from the corner. The impact here wasn't the same as the impact on the three lots with shared driveways. The blinking lights of parked buses usually helped show the intentions of the driver. The cost/benefit of a farside stop didn't justify it.
- Jenifer was wide and flat, had no stops signs from Baldwin to the cul-de-sac, making it easy for everyone to speed on it, inc. buses. Neighbors had asked about traffic calming, inc. speed humps. Metro opposed this, so instead the plan called for bulb-outs. To some degree, Metro was determining future safety on this street. Because neighbors were willing to share the street with Metro, they would not have certain traffic calming measures.
- The detour raised safety concerns about traveling through the rail corridor, esp. at night. Also, because the distance was a half-mile, people might stop using the bus. Since the detour was temporary, could Willy Street be considered instead, perhaps using 3-4 stops near willing business owners?
- Re: temporarily removing parking on Willy St. from Baldwin to Livingston to accommodate buses, this had been done during construction. If some businesses were willing, it should be considered.
- The project had been delayed one year. Engineering felt some urgency, to replace 100-year old sanitary sewers.
- Re: Spaight Street for the detour, the turn at the west end was tight; plus it had speed humps.

Members discussed the issues.

- No hard evidence had been provided as to the advantage of farside over nearside stops. Having cars back out onto Jenifer St. completely blind to

- oncoming traffic, was a more tangible risk than having pedestrians peek around a bus at a nearside stop, for which no injuries had been reported.
- The E. Wash. detour raised real concerns about the safety of walking through the rail corridor. Fear about this placed a tremendous burden on people, and they might just stop taking the bus.
 - Using Willy St. might create traffic issues, but it may be better, esp. if parking were removed. If the project was on the fast track, it would be up to the Alder to talk to the Willy St. businesses. Spaight too might work, and would keep the detour in the neighborhood.
 - Because of certain advantages in the surroundings, perhaps Brearly could be used for the driver exchange/time point.

Poulson reminded members that they had given Metro the discretion to move stops from nearside to farside; the TPC typically did not decide matters like detours and stop locations. He hoped the body would not get involved in a stop-by-stop analysis, and would leave it up to staff.

Bergamini agreed that they shouldn't micro-manage. But Metro had the most intimate knowledge of the project, and it was appropriate for them to discuss important corridors like this. Though historically staff made these decisions, Rummel felt the TPC could still advise staff.

Kamp and Metro staff commented as follows.

- Re: safety of nearside/farside stops, video cameras showed many close calls with pedestrians walking in front of buses. A student got hit on Monroe Street. The farside stop standard had legitimate safety issues.
- The nearside, west-bound stop placed buses less than 15 feet from the crosswalk, which violated ordinances and blocked visibility. Given the volume of cars on Ingersoll (1,750/day) and Jenifer (2,200/day), these parked buses (100/day) had a significant effect.
- Staff had not yet completed the City's equity process related to alternative detours, taking into account passengers who didn't live in the district who needed to make transfers on time.
- With a Willy St. detour, they would be looking at restricting parking, having stops every other block to make up some time, and identifying accessible stops.
- Re: the Ingersoll stop (vs. Brearly) for driver relief: Ingersoll was written into the contract because drivers were paid for travel time. Adding five minutes of travel time would add ~1,500 more hours/year. Also, all routes through the isthmus used Ingersoll for their time point; riders had come to expect buses to wait there.

Kamp said staff would complete the equity process on detour alternatives, consider the comments and suggestions made at the meeting, and update the TPC in March.

**H. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only; no action required.
(Most recent meeting minutes electronically attached, if available)**

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission

Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
TPC Subcommittee (to review issues outlined in Leg. File 37359)

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

**I.1. General announcements by Chair (Verbal announcements, for information only) -
None.**

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Related to fares, Kemble mentioned a situation with MMSD-funded bus passes, where because of a tenth of a mile difference, half the students living at Vera Court and Kennedy Heights got passes, and half didn't. It was a hot issue, and TPC would be hearing more about. Although MMSD said they would give passes to all the students this year, they weren't prepared to do so again; and they suggested that Metro needed to lower their fares for them.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Tolmie, to Adjourn at 8:03 PM.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.