



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, November 7, 2012

5:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 201, City-County Bldg.
City Council Chambers

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM.

Present: 7 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Chris Schmidt; Lisa Subeck; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini and Kenneth Golden

Excused: 4 -

David E. Tolmie; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Ann E. Kovich

Please note: Maniaci arrived at 5:08 PM.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by White, seconded by Golden, to Approve the Minutes of the October 10, 2012 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

E.1. [28190](#)

Parking: September 2012 Activity Report, September Revenue, Expense & Occupancy Reports - TPC 11.07.12

Parking Operations Manager Tom Woznick highlighted the following items in the reports (attached).

- YTD Revenues and Occupancy through September: Monthly parking increased \$95K (15.7%), street meters increased by \$147K (10.5%). Peak occupancies were between 41-76% for all garages.
- Staff worked with two sets of occupancy data, one for monthly parkers and permits, and another for cashiered occupancy. Soon one more comprehensive occupancy number would be provided that combined both.
- Operating expenses had decreased by \$8K YTD, with an increase in operating income of \$1K vs. 2011.
- Garage remediation and contract work had been completed. A full report would be provided shortly.
- For 2013 WIAA Boys basketball and wrestling, the City had committed to \$4

event parking at State St Campus, Overture and State St Cap. This rate would continue at State St Campus for the duration of the 8-year agreement. Commitments for the other two garages would be made once the sustainability study was completed. Typically, staff would come to the Commission with information of this kind (ahead of time), but negotiations were between the Mayor and the WIAA. Still members were welcome to relay any concerns. Keeping these WIAA tournaments in Madison was a good thing for the city, and Parking was happy to help by offering a rate that would accommodate that.

- Electric charging stations: Now had two in Overture, and one each in Cap Square North and State Street-Lake. They were starting to see some demand for this.
- The draft of the Financial Sustainability RFP was being finalized by various departments, and would likely be out in a couple of weeks.
- Parking had entered into a contract with Tom's Bobcat & Concrete Removal for snow removal, effective immediately. Tom's Bobcat had subcontracted with CZ Trucking, a previous contractor with Parking who had been happy about their interactions with Tom's.

Woznick asked commissioners for their input on a request that had come up. Parking currently had one rate for motorcycles, \$225/year, for parking from 4 AM to 10 PM, Monday through Friday. Someone had asked about a rate for parking 24/7. Staff was considering a rate of \$50/month, or an annual rate of \$300/year for 24/7 parking. And along with this, a rate of \$40/month for 4 AM-10 PM could be offered.

Subeck wondered if this might not end up as motorcycle storage, esp. in the winter; and might there be any harm in that? Woznick said the intent of the requestor was to obtain storage for a few months; and until Parking started offering such an arrangement, they wouldn't know if there was any danger in doing so. The Parking garages offered a secure, covered structure. It was space the Utility would not be using, and would be a good use of the space. They would want to keep an eye on implications. [Please note: Maniaci arrived at this point in the meeting.]

Subeck then asked whether 24/7 automobile parkers were required to move their vehicles every couple of days. Woznick said 24/7 parkers did not have to move their vehicles because they were outside of the restrictions, unlike all other parkers, who were required to move their vehicles every 48 hours. When asked, Woznick said that no regular vehicle parking would be impacted. Bergamini thought consideration should be given to unintended consequences such as how snow removal might be affected by these additional 24/7 parkers; and if advertised, how demand might skyrocket due to mopeds. White advised Woznick to look at the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Moped Parking, since there was a similarity between mopeds and motorcycles.

Golden noted a problem he had figuring out the reason for fluctuations in the average weekday occupancy %'s for cashiered facilities. Then he realized that they had fluctuated because of maintenance on the spaces, which caused the number of spaces to go down and the % to increase. Though mathematically correct, it was useless policy-wise. Perhaps when there was a substantial change in spaces from month to month, staff could give a raw number, which would show that even though the % went up, we had fewer parkers. He asked if

staff could also add some sort of total occupancy % for all cashiered facilities (and possibly on-street), which might be useful as an indicator number for the health both of the Parking Utility and the downtown.

Woznick reported on parking at the garages during the President's visit. Overture and State St Cap filled up to nearly 100%. The campaign asked that all the stalls at Gov East and Brayton be designated exclusively for Dis/Vet parkers, and would be paying for all the stalls at both. Cap Sq North filled to about 80%; and because the campaign reserved stalls there, it will pay for the rest. State St Campus reached about 75% peak occupancy. Overall, the event resulted in good utilization everywhere. Poulson thanked Parking staff for making their services available and doing what they did that morning.

Golden/Maniaci made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [28191](#)

Metro YTD Performance Indicators, Financial, Ridership/Revenue Comparison by Fare Type, Performance Measures, & Hybrid Statistics Reports - TPC 11.07.12

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp and Metro staff noted key items and answered questions about the reports (attached).

- Fixed Route: Ridership was down 174,674 in September and 62,475 YTD (all due to September). This was driven by two things: 1) September was the first month of cuts to Campus routes; and 2) Last September had 8 weekend days, this September had 10 weekend days. This would switch in October and would balance out.
- Accidents: Passenger accidents were up 14 YTD. Vehicle accidents were down by 34 YTD, with drops in all types.
- Inspections were on schedule.
- Route Productivity: Due to Campus changes, system total ridership was down 0.6% YTD; but without Campus routes, ridership was up 2.3% YTD. Productivity system-wide was down 1.8%; but without Campus, was up 0.8%. Drops were shown in individual Route 80's.
- Paratransit stats: Ridership was down slightly from 201,679 to 196,853 YTD. Some of this was due to rides being shifted to Logisticare. Another part of that was due to the more economical distribution of rides resulting from the new Agency Fare, where agencies were diligent about allocating their agency fares.
- Accidents: Passenger accidents were up slightly, by 3; but total vehicle accidents were down significantly, by 9.
- Inspections were on schedule.
- Paratransit "no shows" were down by almost half YTD, from 4,474 to 2,497 (2.2% to 1.3%), which was good.
- On-time Performance was at or above 90%, an encouraging trend.

Finance Manager Wayne Block discussed the Financial Perf. Report.

- Bottom Line: At this point, they were estimating that \$154K would be added to Reserves, based on obtaining an additional appropriation from the City at the end of the year of \$175K. This was the result of some issues with the way the budget was finished up in 2011: In the transition from Exec. budget to adopted budget, revenue from the partners was overstated. The City had told them that if they were to end up underbudget, it would do an additional appropriation rather than to eat further into the Reserve.
- Labor continued to look positive. Currently, this was overbudget by \$133K, but had been improving dramatically over the past few months. Overtime had been running very high in the first part of the year, but this had been resolved,

primarily by hiring a lot of drivers (filling vacancies from many retirements and other types of terminations over the past year). Straight salaries were far underbudget, but that imbalance also continued to improve.

- Natural gas was way underbudget, because they had anticipated it would go up when preparing the budget a year and half ago; but natural gas had instead remained remarkably low (as had electricity).

- Fuel and oil: This was going further and further underbudget due to the favorable contract that took effect July 1st, in which 40% of their diesel fuel was being purchased at \$2.69/gal. (vs. \$3+/gal. on the market), and fuel had been budgeted at \$3.05/gal. This would continue to get more and more underbudget. The contract would extend through all of 2013, and would cover all of their fuel purchases at this low price. Unless something unusual happened, this would continue to be much better than what they could have purchased on the open market.

- Fixed assets: Metro had a number of fixed assets that they purchased with operating funds because their useful lives would not reach ten years, which was what was required to obtain general obligation debt to purchase assets. Right now, they were a \$1 million underbudget, but this would change in December, when they would take receipt of eight paratransit vehicles. They had budgeted to receive those earlier in the year, but would be arriving at the end of the year.

Kamp and Planning & Scheduling Manager Drew Beck answered questions.

- Campus routes: Noting that the month of data they had for September included the effect of having more weekend service and less weekday service, ridership on Route 80 in September went from 256K to 170K (related to both to the additional weekend and to cuts in service). Productivity was still very high, and crowding (esp. at class change) was comparable to what it was before the changes. When they had October data, they would have a better picture.

- Loading was roughly the same. They had one less bus in circulation throughout the day. Buses were similarly packed. One improvement had been on-time performance: They were not having the severe schedule issues they were having back with the old 80 route. Drivers reported that it was a less stressful situation for them despite the continued busy-ness of the route. Customer complaints had been surprisingly low.

Maniaci remarked that the young people she talked to wouldn't necessarily make a point to call and complain. But they might give feedback if sought out, perhaps through a "Q" code (with a Survey Monkey), which would be a nice way to engage the demographic of riders who take that route, to get a sense of how it was working, what they were seeing, and what they would like to see changed. This might provide some good information re: the route changes.

Other cities had been successful in surveying riders with Q codes while sitting on high-user routes, to engage them on system performance. Having been in NYC recently, Maniaci also observed some self-promotion on the subways in ads that talked about what had been done to improve service, which might be another way to engage riders on these routes, through marketing. Info from these routes could be useful to grow the system, since many of riders used other routes as well.

Beck noted that an open house was scheduled for the following week, in which the preliminary results of the UW Campus Transportation study would be given; at which they might hear some things about how the changes were

going.

Bergamini asked for info about the changes had been made to the detour on the Route 80, in response to customer feedback. Beck said that at the beginning of the semester, they had been having real problems with the construction zone at the end of Langdon/Park near the Memorial Union. Clusters of buses would be caught in the area. And then when they finally travelled south down Park Street, they would be hung up again waiting for pedestrians when trying to make a right turn west onto University Avenue. They were having problems with buses getting bunched up on the east side of Campus, and not getting through to the rest of the Campus. As a result, they got off of Langdon. Now buses were coming northbound on Park Street from University and going up the hill, which was being really well-received.

Bergamini said she had heard part of the consumer response to the construction detour was that Bascom Hill had become quite inaccessible, esp. to people who had trouble getting up the hill. The change to the detour was to get away from the Langdon side of the Union as much as possible. Beck said the change had occurred about a month earlier; and a lot of passengers and drivers were happy about it.

Bergamini noted that the UW had commissioned a consultant to do an analysis of the Campus transportation system and accessible transportation on Campus. Events were planned for the following Tues. and Wed., during which the consultants, Nelson-Nygaard, would present the preliminary results of extensive survey work they had done with staff, students and focus groups, esp. with people with disabilities. They would also be presenting some ideas for revamping Campus routes. The details would be made available on Metro's website.

Kamp continued his review of the Ride/Revenue comparison and the remaining items.

- Fixed route passenger revenue was up. (Total passengers revenues were down because as noted earlier, Paratransit passenger revenues were down, related to agency fares. A lot of fares were purchased before the agency fare went into effect. This would level off over time.)
- Ridership was up among cash and ticket sales, from 3.881 to 3.943 million. Unlimited pass ridership was also up, from 4.118 to 4.223 million. Most ridership categories continued to show increases.
- Ridership was down 0.6% but passenger revenues were up 0.6%.
- Performance measures reflected operating ratios that were reported to the State and used across the transit industry. Operating cost/passenger trip continued to drop incrementally, from \$2.98 to \$2.90/trip, with corresponding drops in operating cost/platform hours and other categories. Paratransit was up a little bit, for some of the reasons mentioned earlier, but still in good shape overall.
- Hybrid statistics: The increase in miles/gallon for the older hybrids reflected less of an increase, because 2 of the 5 older buses were on Campus, which was harder on them. Looking at 2009 and 2010 stats, the hybrids did about 22% better for fuel economy, and better for CPM. They continued to get positive feedback on the hybrids. There was an amendment in the budget to buy four additional hybrids, which would go to the Council the following week.

Schmidt/Bergamini made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed

by voice vote/other.

For various reasons inc. better handicapped accessibility, Maniaci and other members said they liked meeting in Room 201 CCB, and asked staff to investigate if the Commission could meet there instead of Room 260 MMB.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [28095](#) Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a long-term use agreement with Hovde Building Co., LLC, for 40-90 parking stalls at Overture Center parking garage.

Woznick said that staff recommended approval of the resolution. He referred members to the attachment, which showed different categories for occupancy at the Overture garage between Sept. 2011 through August 2012.

1st graph: showed "cashiered occupied" only.

2nd graph: showed "cashiered" + monthly/LT leases (inc. Fiore and Shine).

3rd graph: showed "cashiered" + monthly/LT leases + MFD, at 24 stalls, effective Dec. 1st or Jan. 1st, with 24/7 parking for 10 months.

4th graph: showed all of the above + Hovde at 40 stalls, the initial amount of parking effective Jan.1st.

5th graph: showed all of the above, but with Hovde at 90 stalls. Noting that Hovde would have to give 30-days notice for any # above 40 stalls, this graph reflected the maximum of occupancy. Staff was comfortable with this though it was unlikely this maximum would ever be reached, when both MFD and Hovde would occupy 24 + 90 stalls at any given time, to potentially produce 91% occupancy during WIAA.

Poulson appreciated having the graphic. Golden wondered what would happen if the Utility went into debt, which would put limitations on leased parking.

Woznick said he had discussed this at length with Anne Zellhoefer in the City Attorney's Office. They anticipated revenue bonds would be needed as part of the Judge Doyle Square project, and they would want to ensure that they did not come close to the maximum allowed for leased parking, in order to get the best rates for the bonds. The current (45 Fiore + 35 Shine) and the potential (90 Hovde) leased stalls at Overture would total 170 stalls. This was well below the system standard of 10% of all garage availability. With 3,500 stalls system-wide, this would allow up to 350 stalls with lease agreements.

When asked, Woznick said that language in the resolution encouraged Hovde to develop an internal TDM plan; but it didn't require that one be submitted, since Overture had such low occupancy and leasing the stalls would benefit the Utility. Golden noted that when parking was more scarce, they had more clout about this. He suggested that, in addition to TDM verbiage, language be added to lease agreements that lessees might become members of a transportation management associations. Some lessees were too small to do ride-sharing by themselves; but members of an association in a geographic area could do more. Trip reduction should continue to be a goal. He recommended that some permissive language be drafted, to serve as an educational tool and perhaps as an incentive to lease fewer spaces for the same number of people. Contact info for the ride-share coordinator could also be shown in the agreements, sort of like advertising in the contract. Poulson agreed that info like this could be provided for lessees to consider, esp. as occupancy approached the 90% level.

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Schmidt, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Please note: Janine Punzel of Hovde Properties registered in support of the resolution, and was available for questions, if needed.

[Please note: Since it was not yet 6 PM, Poulson proceeded to to Items H. and I.]

G. 6:00 PM -- PUBLIC HEARING: To hear public comment on proposed Metro fare increases, effective January 1, 2013.

G.1. [28189](#) Metro: Public Hearing on proposed Metro fare increases, to go into effect January 1, 2013.

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item I.] Poulson reconvened the meeting at 6 PM and noted quorum was present. He said that the Commission would first hear public comment about the bus fare increase proposal, after which members could ask questions of registrants and of Metro staff. He reminded everyone that it was the Common Council who approved the budget, though the Commission would have to respond to it, in some fashion. A potential fare increase was on the table, but if there were other suggestions that did not include that, people were welcome to state them, for the Commission to consider. If Metro didn't get the needed revenue, some service component would need to be cut, and members would appreciate hearing any ideas about this as well.

The following registrants appeared before the Commission, unless otherwise noted.

Rosemary Lee, 111 W. Wilson St. #108, 53703, a Metro-dependent rider, supported the rate increase: Metro costs kept escalating; Metro provided good service at reasonable rates; with the senior fare, transfer program was a good deal; smaller periodic increases were preferable to larger ones every 5-6 years; an increase would help ensure Metro's stability in difficult economic times; reductions at non-peak times might be an option; summer youth pass was too low, and could be \$50-\$75.

Susan DeVos, 610 N. Midvale Blvd., 53705, speaking as a member of ADATS, said that ADATS supported keeping the 31-day Senior/Disabled Pass on par with the Low Income Pass without referring to a specific dollar figure, which could stay at \$27.50; ADATS did not endorse a hike to \$32 (as portrayed by the memo sent to the TPC); the Sr/Dis Pass should remain affordable to people on fixed incomes; the Low Income Pass was set up to be a half-price pass like the Sr/Dis Pass, so it would be ironic for the Low Income Pass to remain at half-price while the Sr/Dis did not; Metro seemed ambivalent about Sr/Dis rates; perhaps the Sr/Dis Pass could be limited to off-peak hours, and those who could afford it, could migrate to a regular pass or pay an extra cash fare. [Please see DeVos' written statement attached.]

Dennis Andino, 245 S. Park, 53715, opposed changing the Senior/Disabled Pass to \$40 and the Low Income Pass to \$32; what was the difference? they should be the same amount; with breathing problems himself, he wondered why drivers couldn't stop where disabled people needed to; Paratransit fare should be \$4.00 round-trip, not \$4.00 one-way.

Russell Novkov, 4817 Sheboygan Ave. #508, 53705, not wishing to speak, registered in opposition to raising the Senior/Disabled Pass by \$12.50.

On behalf of Novkov and herself, Amy Starobin, 837 N. Gammon Rd. #D , 53717, spoke in opposition: Took Paratransit and used Senior/Disabled Pass; Sr/Dis Pass would be increased by \$12.50, and Low Income by \$4.50; disabled people she knew got food stamps and medicaid; should they now apply for Low Income passes, and would more of these be available; \$4.50 increase was reasonable, \$12.50 was not; an unintended result would probably be more disabled people using Low Income passes. Re: Paratransit, understood the need to increase to \$4 during peak times; but wanted \$3 fares for weekends.

Gary Muskat, 6911 Franklin Ave., Middleton, 53562, not wishing to speak, registered in opposition.

Michael Czechanski, 2010 E. Main St., 53704, not wishing to speak, registered in opposition.

Ron Schutz, 133 Division, 53704, spoke in opposition: The proposed Senior/Disabled Pass would increase over 30%, while all other increases were around 10%; objected to this unfair skew that put him in position of funding other increases; the bus was his only way to get to work, and this put stress on his ability to go to work.

Rebecca Wahl, 755 Braxton #4201, 53715, questioned the cost of the 10-ride Senior/Dis card and the discrepancy with the cost of 10 rides at Senior Cash fare (= 25¢ diff), which should be equal, to promote people to ride bus more; liked 10-ride card, which allowed riders to use only what they needed; unreasonable to charge more for 10-ride card than for the fare. Also, perhaps people could present their "Forward" food stamp or "Forward" card to show they were disabled to get Low Income Pass, to resolve the issue with seniors who could afford the increase vs. people with disabilities who could not.

Norm Littlejohn, 1230 Williamson #2, 53703, not wishing to speak, registered in opposition: Many low-income people had little choice but to take the bus; the recession was not over and the fare increases would be a heavy burden on low-income riders.

David Frazer, 5809 Raymond Rd #2, 53711, representing Riders in Disagreement with Excessive Rates (R.I.D.E.R.) spoke in opposition: He was shocked by having to pay more for so little; for a transit system which had such reduced service on weekends; with shelters at 10% of the stops, and riders often stranded at transfer points in the winter when buses missed connections. He objected to disproportionately raising Senior/Disabled rates by 45% (vs. 13% for others); the new rates were excessive compared to other cities of a similar size and among APTA Award winners; increases were unfair esp. when students would pay \$55/semester while Seniors would pay \$40/month; reflected political specter that thought of those who relied on public services as "parasites"; it was an attack on people who relied on the system. Other options had not been considered except to raise rates or slash routes; he had three ideas for everyone to consider [shown in the entire RIDER statement attached]. Rates were just raised three years ago; it was easy for the Council to raise fares because they didn't rely on public transportation; regular

increases were likely to continue unless people put up a fight.

[Please note: Maniaci left at this point in the meeting, at 6:25 PM.]

Harry Richardson, 18 Sherman Terrace #4, 53704, not wishing to speak, registered in opposition: Asked that bus fares not be increased in difficult economic times; find the money perhaps from giving less to Overture, or from banks "rewarded" for borrowing from them.

D'Shanna Hargrove, 132 E. Wilson #313, 53703, spoke in opposition: The question was what was equitable, the right thing to do; since it looked like colleges and hospitals comprised large groups of Metro riders, perhaps more money could be collected from them; as an Edgewood student, she could afford to pay a little bit more.

Linda Ketcham, 813 Flora Lane, 53714, representing Madison Area Urban Ministry, spoke in opposition: As an interfaith social justice organization, MUM's mission statement was to "stand with the poor and hurting in Dane County." They were very concerned about the impact of the proposed fares on seniors and people with disabilities, and people living at or below the poverty level; as well as the impact on the hundreds of non-profits in the county that provided bus tickets. These non-profits got no discounts, so every fare increase reduced the number of tickets they could provide to people in need. With increased numbers of people using food pantries and becoming homeless, the time was not right for the fare increases. MUM asked that the proposals be reconsidered.

City of Fitchburg District 4 Alder Steve Arnold, representing himself and his constituents, spoke in opposition: His neighborhood was served by Routes 44 and 48, and his Capitol area workplace was served by many Metro routes. He served on Fitchburg's Transportation & Transit Commission, Common Council, CSOS, UW Faculty Senate's Campus Transportation Committee; and was a member of the Assn. of Pedestrian & Bicycle Professionals, Congress of the New Urbanism, and Madison Area Bus Advocates. As someone with a serious interest in public transportation, he opposed the fare increase on two grounds: 1) The process by which the increase was proposed and could be approved did not respect the significant interest of Metro's contracted services partners; 2) Increasing Metro fares was in response to an across-the-board 5% cut applied equally to every City of Madison department. How to invest public money for various uses in City government should be a policy choice for the Common Council, not a simplistic, numerical goal. Metro deserved more public support, not less. Arnold went on to discuss the two issues, governance and investment policy: the need for collaboration with partners and the difficulties partners face in timing their budgets to respond to fare increases; and the need to invest in public transit as a policy matter rather than a budget matter, because it benefits went beyond those who used it. [Please see Arnold's complete statement attached.]

Susan Wahl, 1902 Londonderry Drive, 53704, spoke in opposition: Used to take Paratransit for \$6-8, but found it a lot cheaper to pay \$1 to ride on fixed route buses; before people "robbed Peter to pay Paul", they should make sure Peter had money in his pocket. She would have to drastically reduce her ridership; an increase would put it out of her reach. As a disabled veteran on VA pension and Social Security, it was a stretch for her to buy a bus pass after all her bills

were paid. She urged members to think about people like her.

Damon Terrell, 630 W. Olin Ave., 53715, spoke in opposition: Having ridden buses all his life, it was part of his culture and felt empowered by his bus system. One of the best things about being a college student was getting a bus pass every semester; having access to good transit was one of the reasons he wanted to stay in Madison and raise a family here. Madison was resilient because it rejected austerity in times of economic turmoil, and instead funded people and improved their lives; it prioritized public transportation. If fares were reduced, people's lives would be improved. Madison had the resources to be creative and figure this out. Though he hadn't added to the debt, he was continually paying more for things and his belt got tighter. He believed people could make the right decision.

Peter Wolff, 945 Jenifer St., 53703, spoke in opposition to the price of the Senior/Disabled Pass: Seniors who used this were likely to be low-income; the new rate was out of line with past formulas for senior fares, which for diff fare categories was usually half the adult rate; the increase of 45% was over 3 times the average rate of the increases for other fares, which was way out. As a regular rider, he was amazed at how ridership had grown; with productivity going up, why weren't fares going down? Obviously, something was wrong with the system.

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Ave., 53711, spoke in opposition: A senior who rode the bus, he was disturbed about increasing the base fare (NYC and Chicago charged \$2.25, and they were a lot bigger systems), and about how this was done. Last year, the Mayor was good to transit and protected it from the ravages of the Walker administration, but this year, no one knew about the increase until October, making it hard to look at other options; if presented earlier in the budget cycle, a wheel tax could have been considered; it was really discouraging, doing this outside the normal budget cycle.

Sue Pastor, 2502 Green Ridge Dr., 53704, spoke in opposition: Impressed by the collective wisdom of the speakers, she hoped that policy-making could one day start by gathering info from the people affected; public transportation was for the public good (like libraries), and benefitted everyone (not only riders) by reducing congestion; it wasn't fair to pass costs on to users, many among the most economically vulnerable; in times of austerity, public transportation was a safety net; a good thing that reflected the values of our community. A 5% cut across-the-board was not smart policy, and was not based on an economic analysis of the incomes of riders, to show how paying 50¢ more per day impacted them. This was not the time to increase the burden individually on people. She guessed that the City had lots of hidden expenses for time spent on development projects and wondered what their per capita cost/benefit was; how about charging a premium to the people who profited from development? She urged the Commission to tell the Council "no" on the rate increase.

Tim Wong, 161 Jackson St., Madison, 53704, spoke in opposition: A former Commissioner, he was not reappointed in part because of opposing fare increases. MABA and he had talked to the Mayor last year and urged him not to raise fares; the Mayor showed an understanding of transit and why we wouldn't want to raise fares. The bus system was a service much like police and fire, and should be rolled into the City service system. APTA studies showed that a 10% rate increase could result in a 3% decrease in ridership.

Three suggestions to help increase revenues: Charge a fee to motorists entering the central city (like London); the County should contribute to the system, thru a wheel tax dedicated to Metro; Owl Creek was built in the middle of nowhere, and either we should admit our mistake and abandon it, or Owl Creek should be annexed by McFarland, which should join the bus system.

Melanie Foxcroft, 2138 Lakelawn Ave., 53704, not wishing to speak, registered in opposition: Asked that fares not be increased again, except for large employer/institution group rates, in order to generate the necessary funds.

Christian R. Hansen, 636 Langdon St., 53703, not wishing to speak, registered in opposition.

Julie Spears, 307 S. Few St., 53703, not wishing to speak, registered in opposition.

C.J. Terrell, 1225 Jenifer St., 53703, spoke in opposition: Rode the Madison buses all his life (over 20 years); had seen rates go up, increases in the number of transfers and length of time needed to cross the city, service extended to other communities before it was provided to city neighborhoods desperate for it. In view of the many cities of comparable size with lower fares, \$2.00 was already high for a city of our (population and geographic) size. Previous increases to Metro fares hadn't resulted in better service. We lived in an economic climate that discriminated against users of public transit; on job interviews, riding the bus was not considered reliable transportation. If Metro was not considered reliable, why did it deserve a fare increase? To buck the trends towards poverty, joblessness, homelessness, crime and illiteracy, the City must fund the appropriate programs. He hoped Madison would be a bubble of sanity and solve the Metro budget without a detrimental fare increase. The folks attending the hearing were not representative of Metro ridership, who would be most hurt by the increases, who were already oppressed to the point that they didn't show up to meetings like this. Governmental bodies were systematically attacking the people who needed government services the most.

Having heard from all registrants, staff answered questions from members.

- The 25¢ discrepancy between the 10-ticket Senior/Disabled fare and the cash fare was a mistake in the numbers.
- The current Low Income Pass program provided 300 passes/month, 3,600 passes/year; sold at Metro, Dane Co. Job Center and the City Treasurer, they were sold out early in the month. The number of passes would remain the same.
- Re: the logic behind the increase for the 31-day Senior/Disabled pass: (As shown in the chart "Historical fixed route ridership by fare category" attached), the Sr/Dis pass began as a pilot in 2007. At that time, the Adult 31-day Pass had ridership of 1.1 to 1.25 million; that number had dropped to 913-950K in 2012, a decrease of 200-300K. This was a much larger drop than anticipated. In putting together the proposals, they looked at still providing a \$22 discount for Sr/Dis, but to try to get back some of the revenue resulting from the large shift from the Adult 31-Day Pass to the Sr/Dis 31-Day Pass (now at 539K rides from 49K the first year). It was an attempt to balance revenues given that shift.
- Re: data showing the % of senior/disabled riders who were also low-income: A survey done for Transport 2020 contained configurations by age and other categories, which might have relevant data. Staff would check.

- Many of the peer systems that were mentioned in fare comparisons, were regional transit authorities with dedicated funding that did not compete with other city services.
- Staff would have comparisons with peer systems at its next meeting.
- Re: the timing of the budget and its impact on partners: The same process was followed four years ago when fare increases were also proposed, which were announced in October during the budget process rather than the summer. Even though CSOS was an excellent way to work towards regional cooperation, one of the problems with the current process was putting together a budget that wasn't released to the public until early October. Kamp was looking at this. In a recent meeting, the Mayor spoke about ways of communicating earlier.
- It was tricky, having had a CSOS meeting just before the budget was released and sharing with its partners what their local shares were with the fare increase, because they had to get out budget estimates, and yet not talking openly that those estimates included a fare increase. This was certainly a limitation of the current system, but this was what they had to work with.
- A regional transit authority would allow everyone to look at things regionally and to focus on transit and the issues that had been mentioned earlier. It would be wonderful to be able to think in that forum. Without this however, they were dealing the best they could with the situation. They tried to inform partners as soon as was practically possible.
- Re: the Low-Income Pass: They went on sale on the 1st of each month, and ran 31 days from the first day they were activated (say the 3rd). The passes sold out in three days. Metro had made sure to make them look like other 31-day passes, and drivers had no reason to ask for ID. With the Sr/Dis Pass, if a rider didn't look like they qualified, drivers could ask for ID. Based on the guidance policy-makers had given them, Metro saw these as two different passes.

Golden noted that since the Council and appropriated the money, anything the Commission did would have to be budget neutral. Based on testimony and strong sentiment for reducing the Sr/Dis Pass and Low Income passes, he offered the idea of increasing the 10-ride ticket by 50¢ and possibly raising the 31-day pass to \$65 (vs. \$62) to compensate for reduced revenue from the Sr/Dis and Low Income passes; and asked Metro to look at how this might work. He also asked Metro to model revenues, if the Sr/Dis Pass went to \$35 (vs. \$40), and the Low Income Pass went to \$30 (vs. \$32), so members would have some info at its next meeting to see the impact of such changes. Metro would also be welcome to give their take on his proposals. His suggestions were based on the idea that the 10-ride and 31-day adult pass were not low-income specific, like the other two passes. The original reason for keeping youth passes low-cost was to encourage them to use the system to take advantage of the resources in the community and not be stuck in their neighborhoods. He was using the same logic now for keeping senior fares lower. Metro could make adjustments to the model to try to remain revenue neutral.

White wondered if it made sense to separate the Senior/Disabled pass into two passes since many disabled had income issues. White also remarked that the Commission was in charge of making the final decision regarding the fare increase. In years past, the TPC had been able to provide its input before the Council made its decision about the operating budget. She was therefore disappointed that the TPC was not taking action at this meeting and would not

be able to provide its recommendations about the fare increase to the Council before it voted on the budget.

Bergamini noted that apart from the issue of rationing, since the Low Income passes became available just on the 1st and sold out quickly, seniors and disabled switching to the Low Income pass may not fit their budgeting. It was not an "apples to apples" comparison.

Golden wondered if there might be a way to resolve the problem of having a limited number of Low Income Passes, and the severe increase to the Sr/Dis pass due to the loss of revenue from the big shift from regular 31-day to Sr/Dis passes. He thought they might assume that there were two income cohorts in the Sr/Dis Pass: one group who were low-income and unable to get one of the 300 Low Income passes; and another who were in a higher income group. Would it be possible to give the same exact pass to both groups, but charge the \$40 rate to those who afford it, and charge a second rate to those who had proof they were low-income; rather than doing what he previously proposed, which was to lower the rate for both? Or would this be hard to administer and create too many details in the fare tariff?

Kamp said the current system to qualify for Low Income Passes was self-certification: People signed a form that indicated they were eligible for the criteria listed on the form. That was all they had to do. As for Senior/Disabled Passes, anyone could purchase those: Someone could come in and say they were purchasing the pass for a relative, for example. So Golden's idea would be hard to do administratively; though Kamp said he would check to see if he might be missing something. Golden said he understood the problem; and felt his suggestion could just be kept for future reference.

With reference to White's comments and the Commission's process rules, Poulson said the Commission would be taking action in some fashion at its December 12th meeting. Schmidt said the budget would be taken up at the Council the following Tuesday (Nov. 13th at 5:30 PM), and would be taking public testimony before beginning deliberations. Also, Council amendments to the budget would be coming out the next day that would likely heavily influence the tone, tenor and content of the discussion on bus fares. Poulson declared the public hearing closed.

H. 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
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
Judge Doyle Square Committee

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item F.1.] Poulson pointed out the newly included, informative minutes for the Judge Doyle Square Committee; and suggested that as the Parking Utility Commission, they might want to keep on top of developments there and ask for presentations. No action was needed on Item H.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

I.1. General announcements by Chair (Verbal announcements, for information only)

Poulson mentioned that the Update on the Final Report of the Long-Range Transit Planning Committee would be presented at the December meeting.

Golden invited members to the annual conference of Capital Area Regional Planning Commission on Nov. 14th at Monona Terrace, with workshops on public health, climate adaptation, air and water quality, social equity, transportation, housing.

Subeck/Golden made a motion to recess for eight minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: Following recess, the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G.]

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas - None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by White, to Adjourn at 7:35 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.