



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, July 11, 2012

5:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room GR-22 (City-County Building)

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order 5:00 PM.

Present: 11 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Chris Schmidt; Lisa Subeck; David E. Tolmie;
Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Susan M.
Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit; Kenneth Golden and Ann E. Kovich

Please note: Schmidt and Tolmie arrived at 5:02 PM, after the Minutes were approved and the Chair was elected. Schmitz and White arrived at 5:04 PM, after the Minutes were approved and the Chair and Vice-Chair were elected.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Subeck, seconded by Golden, to Approve the Minutes of the June 13, 2012 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

E.1. [26973](#) Election of Chair & Vice-Chair - TPC 07.11.12

Bergamini/Maniaci nominated Poulson for Chair. Poulson asked three times for other nominations. Bergamini/Maniaci made a motion to close nominations and take a vote. Poulson was elected Chair by voice vote/other.

[Please note: Schmidt and Tolmie arrived at this point in the meeting.]

Bergamini/Tolmie nominated White for Vice-Chair. Poulson asked three times for other nominations. Golden/Subeck made a motion to close nominations and take a vote. White was elected Vice-Chair by voice vote/other.

E.2. [26974](#) Proposed additions to the Rules and Procedures - TPC 07.11.12

[Please note: Schmitz and White arrived at this point in the meeting.] Noting that nine regular members were now present, Poulson asked Alternates not to vote. Maniaci/Subeck made a motion to adopt the two proposed changes to the

Rules and Procedures.

Poulson talked about his reason for proposing the new language in Section II-Meetings, C(2). Next month, it was possible that both the Chair and Vice-Chair would not be available to preside over the meeting. Robert's Rules did provide that members could select someone to preside over the meeting. But because this could take a few minutes, his addition to the Rules would create certainty about which member would preside over a meeting in the absence of both the Chair and Vice-Chair. Members discussed whether "longest time on the Commission" was total time or consecutive time, and whether Alternates or Alders could ever serve as presider. Poulson said that he specifically chose the word "preside" rather than "chair" in his proposal (to avoid potential conflicts with other parts of the Rules or ordinances governing who could be Chair). Subeck noted that it was unlikely an Alternate would ever preside because Alternates were rarely the longest-serving members.

Without objection, Bergamini made a friendly amendment to the motion to add the word "consecutive" to the proposed rule, as follows: "...the citizen member present with the longest consecutive time on the Commission...." Poulson clarified that "consecutive" meant continuous time on the Commission, without a break.

Subeck discussed her reason for proposing the new language in Section IV-Public Hearings, B(6). Regarding a suggestion by Golden to change the word "will" to "shall" or "may", Subeck said she would agree to "shall", but not to "may". She went on to say that on issues related to bus route, schedules, fares and fee changes, the Commission had consistently received feedback from the public and members about the difficulty of holding a hearing and making an informed decision on the same night. Generally, members needed staff to go back and gather more info about different options. This change would make the process fairer for the public, would make things more organized, and would ensure that items got to the Commission with enough time in place. Members had frequently heard staff say that a decision had to be made quickly, in order to have enough time to implement the changes (print booklets, etc.) Members on the other hand, had wanted to refer action on the item. With this change, everyone would know ahead of time that decisions on such items would be referred to the following meeting, and everyone could plan accordingly. Subeck felt this would create better public process, and respond to what they had heard both from members and the public.

Poulson said that without objection, the verb in the sentence could be changed from "will" to "shall". Poulson said that his initial reaction was not to support such a change, because of two situations: Where there was a solid reason to move the item forward faster; or the opposite, where the item was such a small matter that it could be adopted without delay (Ex. recent changes to Routes 11 and 25). However, his objection was tempered by the fact that the rule could be overturned by two-thirds of the body. Though he wouldn't mind leaving this issue up to the discretion of the Chair, he understood where Subeck was coming from. If staff felt there was some real urgency about a matter, they would have to convince six members of the need to act immediately.

Poulson pointed out the TPC rule regarding suspension of rules in Section V-Miscellaneous. Golden wondered if legal notice of suspension of rules would need to be given on the meeting agenda (as was done on Council agendas).

Schmidt said he was uncomfortable with the concept that the TPC "shall" refer an item, because it would tie the Commission's hands too much.

Without objection, Poulson said the votes on each of the two proposed rule changes could be done separately. On the motion to adopt the proposed change in Section II, C(2), as amended, the motion passed unanimously by voice vote/other. On the motion to adopt the proposed change in Section IV, B(6), as amended, a roll call vote was taken resulting in a tie vote as follows: Ayes: White, Bergamini, Subeck, Schmitz; Noes: Schmidt, Tolmie, Streit, Maniaci. Chair Poulson broke the tie by voting aye. The motion passed 5-4. [Please note: Subeck left at this point in the meeting, at 5:18 PM.]

E.3. [26975](#) Appointments to other committees, if any - TPC 07.11.12

Poulson said that there really weren't any vacancies at this time, but invited new member, Ann Kovich, to look at the sub/committees to see if any of them interested her, in the event that other members might want to change their assignments.

F. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

F.1. [26976](#) Parking: June 2012 Activity Report, and May Revenue/Expense and Occupancy Reports - TPC 07.11.12

Parking Operations Manager Tom Woznick talked about the the new Pay by Cell pilot that had been soft-released on July 3rd and was working well. A letter explaining how this program worked and how customers could use it, was sent to Mary Carbine and BID to distribute to local businesses. Customers could pay for their parking by cell via an app for smartphones or android devices. Customers could also call a number and do an IVR regular session, indicating the desired number of minutes, on a regular cellphone. Staff was planning to issue a press release on Monday, July 16th, and a press conference at Buckeye Lot on Tuesday, July 17th at 1 PM, to roll out the program officially. The vendor, ParkNOW, would be onsite at Peace Park and Buckeye Lot the following weekend, during Maxwell Street Days, to promote the service and provide promotional vouchers for parking, paid for by ParkNOW. The program would increase flexibility and convenience for customers to pay for parking.

Woznick clarified that the MPD would be replacing all of the equipment used in its enforcement system. They now used two pieces of equipment for parking enforcement: one to check spaces and another to write tickets. These two units would be replaced by one handheld component. The Utility would be paying the costs of this replacement.

White/Schmitz made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2. [26977](#) Metro: YTD Monthly Reports - TPC 07.11.12

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp noted that ridership and performance reports were not available this month because Metro's server unexpectedly needed an upgrade. Also, the data recorder portion of the fare box system was down for a couple of days, and an estimation process was

being used for the data that was lost. The info would be recovered and a full report would be available at the August meeting. Concerning the financial report (attached), Kamp said that through the efforts of Finance Manager Wayne Block and Finance Dept. Director David Schmiedicke, 60% of their diesel budget not already at a fixed price was awarded at \$2.69/gal (vs. the \$3.08/gal budgeted), for the rest of this year and all of 2013.

Kamp answered questions.

- Re: the 5% target given to City's agencies for cuts in their operating budgets, everything was on the table, from the revenue side, to the expense side, to the advertising side. It was likely that the savings in diesel costs would be counted.
- The 5% cuts would have to be balanced carefully against what would be needed to address continuing increases in ridership.
- Ridership was up nationwide. Young Americans were using transit in greater numbers. And the economy was causing everyone to look at how we invest in transit infrastructure in our communities.
- Added to this was the Mayor's request to look at areas where an expansion of service should be considered. At the same time, all public services were facing unprecedented challenges in resources.
- Metro would participate in the 5% reduction exercise, just as it would look at areas to expand service. Both efforts would be on parallel tracks, for the policy-makers to make their decisions.
- Re: big cuts to walking and biking in the federal reauthorization bill and its impact on transit, the good news was that instead of going 3-months at a time with extensions, now they had a couple of years with the authorization providing guidelines for planning purposes, which was helpful.
- Working with the City's contact person in DC, Len Simon, and WURTA , Metro was still sorting through the bill to understand it more fully. Staff would have more info in months to come.
- There were substantive changes.

Bergamini said she had heard bus advocates were as unhappy with the reauthorization bill as the ped/bike folks. But because it contained changes specific to each state and size of the system, she wasn't sure what impact the bill would have on Metro particularly. The upside was that the TIGER grant program would continue. Kamp added that the State of Good Repair would continue also. But there were some changes with negative impacts as well.

Schmitz/Streit made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- G.1. [26299](#) Amending Section 1.08(3) of the Madison General Ordinances to reduce the bail deposit for expired meter violations.
- Woznick said that he had talked to Maureen O'Brien in the City Attorney's office, and learned the reason for the change and that it would codify current practice. In February 2010, an ordinance increased bail deposit amounts by \$5, for 70+ different citation codes. When that was done, Sec. 12.145(1)(a) was specifically excluded from that group, because it resulted in customer complaints that identified it as one of the most contentious citations. At the same time, the bail deposit in Sec. 12.145(1)(e) for expired multi-space meters

was increased with the rest. Because multi-space was just being piloted at the time and there were few citations, it was overlooked.

As a result, the ordinances contained two different citation amounts for on-street meters: one for single-space meters (at \$20) and another for multi-space meters (at \$25). When PEO's were faced with this dilemma, they decided to issue citations of \$20 for multi-space meters, like they would for single-space meters, citing the 12.145(1)(a) code rather than the 12.145(1)(e) code.

This ordinance change would codify existing practice, and resolve the problem of having two different citation amounts for on-street meters. A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Streit, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

H. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

H.1. [26883](#) Feasibility of using In-House Resources for the Provision of Parking Utility Security Services.

AFSCME Local 60 Vice-President, Timothy Birkley, 4314 Hegg Avenue, 53716, thanked Finance Parking staff for their work on the Report (attached), and made the following remarks.

- The Report was an apples-to-apples report; and he had originally suggested an analysis based on a reduction in hours of service.
- The motive behind this was to remove the profit model from providing public safety to City employees and the public, who utilized their services.
- The Report showed that it would cost about 30% more than JBM services cost, with the same amount of hours offered now; with a wage and benefit increase for the employees who provide the services at well over 100%.
- This demonstrated that the profit motive in providing public safety was prevalent in the services offered by JBM.
- Re: officer duties in the Report, Local 60 did have issues in the field that some of the officers were doing bargaining unit work, such as answering the Help Line, directing traffic, and other issues. Officers could be doing much more if they were in-sourced.
- Re: the cost section of the Report, his suggestion was to reduce hours between 400-800 hours/year out the current 8,736 hours, which would reduce the cost by \$20-40K overall.
- Re: ongoing cost related to the Command Center and other issues in the Report, \$12-13K could be knocked off the continuing cost. There was space inside current facilities to put a desk and computer to look at monitors; we didn't have to pay \$6,000/year in rent for this.
- Training and certifications for the people providing the services were all done in-house by the owner of JBM; which would work well for the people in the field who would be trained in security and protection.
- Labor hadn't been included at all in the discussion of this. No one in the field ever sat down and discussed these matters over the time the Report was being prepared.
- Labor would like to continue the discussion, to look at the structure of providing services within the model shown and how they could do it at a comparable cost, without someone getting rich off of Parking employees and the public.
- Members were urged to look at the ordinances, esp. in the area of parking

citations. If Parking was going to be treated like a private entity and expected to generate its own revenue to continue operations, then the Utility was being put at a disadvantage, not on the same level playing field as private industry. For example, the FTP tickets issued by Parking Cashiers were turned over to the MPD, and once collected, were put in the General Fund. Parking never recouped this money owed to the Utility.

- These ordinances needed to be changed for Parking to at least be able to recoup costs in its facilities.

Birkley answered questions.

- Re: other City agencies that purchased comparable private security services, CDA used JBM. Monona Terrace had Command Center operators, who secured the building and the grounds at night. Park Rangers had some similar duties. He had wanted the position to be analyzed as though it were a Command Center position.
- The liability issues were speculative, when talking about employees getting injured on the job. He had seen one incident in four years, where a security person was injured; and there were almost as many incidents of Parking Cashiers being assaulted as JBM personnel, i.e. once in the last four years.
- Another issue was the living wage standard that was given to contractors. He was concerned that the current contractor was not meeting the standard. In 2012, the living wage was supposed to be increased from \$11.66 to \$11.82/hour; and he had reason to believe that JBM had not done this since the beginning of 2012.
- In terms of an ideal process for including labor to review, re-do or expand the Report and the time involved, it might take a few months for Birkley, the Parking union steward and other Parking managers and employees to sit down with Finance and Labor Relations, and have a basic discussion. But it would have to be on the premise that they would not be reducing the cost to the point where it would be less than JBM; it would be comparable costs. The idea would be to remove the profit model out of the security services and public safety within the City of Madison. We could do that and still provide safety.
- Labor just needed to be able to sit at the table, and offer some ideas; they might be rejected, but it would be nice to have a voice and a discussion.

Parking Operations Manager Tom Woznick, Finance Director David Schmiedicke, and Budget Analyst Dan Bohrod talked about the Report.

- (Woznick) Staff recommended that the Report be accepted. He read the last paragraph of the Report, as follows: "On balance, therefore, while it is good to continue to explore the manner, costs and alternatives of City services, it appears that, at this time, the provision of security services by employees is more costly and relatively inefficient as compared with the provision of such services by a private firm."
- (Woznick) In the previous paragraph, the Report stated: "Perhaps most important, the City's potential exposure to large Workers Compensation or liability claims is significantly increased if employees undertake security-related services. With the exception of the Madison Police Department, the City does not employ security personnel, not the least reason of which is potential costs due to injuries and other liabilities."
- (Schmiedicke) By having security services provided through a private contractor (since 1990), workers comp was part of the overall contract cost, and didn't have to be managed by the City. Though hard to quantify, this was a risk issue of some concern. The Report was aimed at what the Parking Utility thought was needed to manage an in-house security service from a staffing

perspective.

- (Bohrod) City Risk Manager Eric Veum was better equipped to discuss the risk issues, and would be available at BOE to discuss that element. Finance attempted to cost what they could; and referenced the other issues like liability, which was "the elephant in the room": It had huge potential, but they couldn't assign any cost to it. They didn't know JBM's experience with this issue. The CDA, which also used JBM, had an incident for which (fortunately) JBM bore the cost. Many thousands of dollars could be involved. But the City didn't have to deal with that because it was under the contractor's purview.

Parking and Finance staff, including Parking Operations Supervisor David Wills, responded to questions.

- (Bergamini/Bohrod) Parking's contract with JBM ended at the end of 2014; but no one knew when CDA's contract with JBM ended. Only Parking and CDA contracted for private security services of this type; possibly Monona Terrace. The Park Ranger program was in-house.
- (Maniaci/Bohrod) Contractors were required to stipulate that they would meet provisions of the living wage requirement. But the City did not actively monitor this; the City had a complaint-driver process. If the City didn't receive a complaint, they assumed that the contractor was doing what they had agreed to do.
- (Golden/Bohrod) The City had a formal intake process for complaints, through the Affirmative Action department; they would need to hear from an employee who had been directly violated.
- (Golden/Bohrod) Some years ago, the Fire Department and Local 311 had set up a model to jointly study certain issues, which had been well accepted by labor and management. Finance wasn't involved in this past collaborative experience, and this hadn't been given this charge in preparing the current Report. They had tried to lay the groundwork for policymakers to make judgements. Also, this might be a matter of negotiation potentially, and not something Finance wanted to wade into without additional direction from the Council.
- (Wills) When Parking was first approached with this idea, he felt he had worked with Birkley, providing information so that Birkley could come up with his initial model. There had been an attempt to work cooperatively with Local 60, at least initially, if not during the later stages of the Report.
- (Golden/Wills) Re: how the job classification and rate of pay was handled in the Report, a position description was developed, and then evaluated by Mike Lipski in HR, who determined where pay would fall comparatively.
- (White/Bohrod) The Report was due on June 30th, so that presumably if anything were to come of the Report, it could be included in a subsequent budget. Other than that, it had no time sensitivities.

Bergamini/Golden made a motion to receive the Report, and to return it to the Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES: That additional study be done in cooperation with Local 60. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

H.2. [26978](#)

Metro: 2011 Financial Audit Report, presented by Jodi Dobson, Baker-Tilly - TPC 07.11.12

Senior Manager of the 2011 Metro Audit, Jodi Dobson, added the following comments to those shown in the 2011 Audit Presentation document attached. Metro Finance Manager Wayne Block and Kamp also answered questions.

- The annual Transit audit was completed for three reasons: as part of the

wider City audit; to test for compliance with federal and state grant funding agreements; and because of bond requirements.

- The Financial Statements were prepared by management and were the responsibility of management and the governing body (TPC). It was the auditors responsibility to give their opinion as to whether those statements were a materially correct presentation of the financial position and operations of Metro. On pages 1-2, the auditors had issued an unqualified, or a clean opinion -- the highest level of assurance the auditors could give on the Financial Statements.
- For outside readers, the Financial Statements gave a good picture of what was going on.
- Pages 3-14 of the Financial Statements, Management's Discussion and Analysis, was a great overview of what happened over the year, in plain English.
- Page 1 (2011 Audit Presentation): There were fourteen areas related to federal funding that had to be examined for compliance purposes, which was not included in Metro's bound report, but was included in the City-wide single audit report. There were no findings for Metro related to federal funding.
- Page 2: Metro had a notably large 9.5% increase in ridership, which demonstrated that Metro was a vital resource to the community.
- Page 3: Between 2010 and 2011, fare revenue and other local subsidies went up fairly consistently with the change in ridership; the State subsidies went up 3%; and federal subsidies (driven by maintenance projects) went down a little, and as a result, the City's portion went up a little more.
- State subsidies for transit operating assistance came only from the State (through Sec. 85.20 of the Statutes) for operations only. Federal funding could be used for both capital and operating purposes.
- Page 4: Revenues from the State at 35% and the fed's at 12% had remained consistent over five years. However, passenger fares and other operating revenues (ad sales and other miscellaneous revenues) had increased over the five years, resulting in a decrease in costs picked up by other local government, from 32 to 28%. So some of the things that management had been able to do had helped defer a little bit on local governments.
- Page 5: While ridership had gone up by 9.5%, expenses had gone up by less than 3%. Management was to be commended for controlling this so well. Not surprisingly the biggest expense was for fuel.
- Page 6: The largest proportion of costs was for employees (who provided the service), fuel and tires, and purchased transportation. These numbers had been consistent over a 5-year period, with few fluctuations, which reflected a stable operation.
- (Block) Interest expenses reduced over the five years due to refinancing some high interest bonds for much lower interest bonds.
- Page 7: Though no errors had been found in the Local Subsidy Calculation, because of the level of detail involved in the amounts of different input and information, the auditors made the recommendation that one person gather the info and complete the calculation, while another person reviewed everything, before this got into the numbers at year end. This was an area inherently risky to have errors in it.
- (Kamp) Block had correctly done the subsidy calculation using the old methodology. He would now be making some changes (based on the new formula for subsidy computations), and would continue to be the primary person to balance everything for all the municipalities. But now, he would have a second set of eyes to double-check.
- (Block) Metro currently had a second professional accountant that would

soon be freed up to help Block with this.

- Re: best accounting practices, it was acceptable to use a second person within the same department who was adequately trained to double-check items like this. In smaller organizations, where a second trained person might not be available, it was fine to use someone from outside the department with accounting expertise.
- (Bergamini) It would probably be good to make sure that there was always two accountants in a department, as back-up for one another and to ensure smooth succession when needed. (Dobson) This was also true for journal entry review, which Metro was intending to implement in 2012.
- Page 8: Per American Institute of Certified Accountants standards, required communications between management and the auditors went very smoothly; 2011 was a very consistent year, which was good. Management did a really good job preparing for and working with the auditors.
- Page 1 of Auditor's 6/14/12 letter re: five months of outstanding bills for shared services: Now, with full staffing, there would be new expectations for timely billings to help with cash flows.

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Tolmie, to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Commissioners applauded Metro staff and Dobson for their work on the audit.

H.3. [26979](#)

Metro: Update on Ad Wrap Policy, presented by Mick Rusch, Metro Marketing & Customer Service Manager - TPC 07.11.12

[Please note: Schmitz left at this point in the meeting, at 6:17 PM.] Kamp noted that the proposal to bring the exterior advertising program in-house had been approved by BOE, and that staff had worked with HR on the classification process for the new sales position and hiring would occur. In response to questions, the ad content and wrap policy would not be changing.

Metro Transit Marketing and Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch said the current policy allowed for up to 20 full wraps during the course of the year and an unlimited number of partial wraps. This would remain the same for the next two years, during the in-house ad pilot program; after which, they would look at revenues, give a report and make their recommendations for the wrap program. Over the past couple of years (with Adams), only 4-6 full wraps had been sold during the course of each year. During one 2-month period, one advertiser had bought 10 full wraps. They had not approached the maximum of 20; the full wraps had not been popular. Kamp noted that "full wrap" meant that both sides and the back of the bus were wrapped. And though many buses appeared to be fully wrapped, they weren't.

Rusch said that the new sales position would be commissioned. Also, when Metro did an RFP for the materials and to contract for wrap installation, staff would look very closely at the different wrap materials (which would almost as important as the price), to find the best possible product for passengers to be able to see through the windows.

H.4. [26935](#)

Metro: Paratransit Progress Report 2012, presented by Crystal Martin, Paratransit Program Manager - TPC 07.11.12

Paratransit Program Manager Crystal Martin discussed the annual Paratransit Program Progress Report and the Fact Sheet that summarized the Report (attached).

- The full Report contained all the details about Paratransit's operations,

regulatory requirements, its work with contractors and the ADA Transit Subcommittee, and its follow-up on recommendations made in the 5-year WiDOT Management Performance Audit and FTA Triennial Review.

- Unlike previous trends where ridership had steadily increased a little bit, Paratransit ridership was down slightly in 2011 vs. 2010; likely due to the changes in the State Medicaid Transportation program and the statewide Medicaid brokerage that started last July.
- Metro had previously coordinated some trips for the State Medicaid program through Metro Paratransit and through the County program (and their administration of that). This ceased when the brokerage started, and those riders went with the statewide broker to provide those trips. This might explain the spike in complaints in July. What happened in 2011 represented a significant change in the transportation structure across the state for all providers. Former Metro riders now with a different service came to Metro to get answers to their questions, even though Metro couldn't really provide info to them. (Maniaci) By September, Metro was pretty much back to business as usual.
- The new State brokerage hired private firms to initiate the service, including one contractor that had previously worked with Metro. Transition on that scale is daunting, and it showed all the way around.
- The decrease was not caused by paratransit riders going mainline. Lift usage data tracked wheelchair riders on mainline routes.
- Eligibility determinations and recertifications were done in-house. Metro automatically recertified paratransit customers every three years; a letter was sent asking for updated contact/address info. This was based on the presumption that customers were permanently disabled. Temporary eligibility was given to those who indicated on their application that their disability might be temporary; and staff followed up with these people at an appropriate ending date.
- Productivity for 2011 was at 2.17 rides/hour, an improvement over prior years at 1.8-1.9. Metro tracked productivity through its directly-operated service and one contractor paid by the hour. Staff had been able to negotiate with passengers about grouping trips to some common destinations (dialysis clinics, City-County Building, supported work/employment locations), which helped greatly with productivity and freeing up resources to provide more trips in a timely way.
- On-time performance was recorded on mobile data terminals and GPS verified for Metro's directly-operated service. Contractors self-reported this data directly into Metro's database; one contractor had GPS verification. Staff was looking at ways to improve this data collection, but were fairly satisfied with what they had. They also followed up with direct observation by road supervisors during the course of the day.
- The Program's no-show policy had been updated. Penalties had been reduced and notification to customers was timelier. Rather than a carbon copy form with a return envelope, notification was done by postcard generated from their database the very next day. So far, no shows had decreased by 50%. Another change to the policy included tracking late cancellations, for people giving less than one-hour's notice, and counting them as no-shows. Since this change had been implemented last November, these were down 50-52%.
- These policy changes had helped productivity; the schedules weren't falling apart during the day. With fewer adjustments, the schedules ran more smoothly. Customers should be thanked for this, since they were able to modify their behavior to achieve this after they began being notified more frequently and in a more timely way.

- (Developed in 2011 in preparation for the state-wide Medicaid brokerage) standardized agency agreements had been finalized with five agencies; another was in discussion. These agreements had helped human service agencies review tickets they had purchased in the past, which they had perhaps been over-purchasing. They discovered customers who had been socking away paratransit tickets and those were valuable pieces of transportation.
- An ADA regulatory update removed the term "common wheelchair" from regulations, which indicated the minimum size of a mobility device that would be transported. This raised questions about how this impacted the implementation of the size of the mobility device that needed to be transported. The FTA was currently developing guidelines to be issued later this year. In the meantime, the Acting Director of FTA Dept. of Civil Rights was contacted, who said that the way Metro had implemented its oversized mobility device policy was true to the intent of the changes; and as long as Metro followed the spirit, it would continue to be in compliance with the changes. Once the guidelines were completed, Metro would look at making some wording changes in its policies.
- Despite significant staff turnover in Paratransit, transitions went smoothly without service disruptions. The Program was now fully staffed.
- Metro had been in touch with the state Medicaid broker, which was not yet in a position to coordinate with ADA Complementary Paratransit. But Metro had made itself available, when that became an option.
- The MA Waiver program that generated almost \$3 million/year, for persons going to supported employment, had been steady in 2011 and was growing a little in 2012. This currently made up 62% of their daily trips. Metro continued to work well with the County to keep this program running smoothly.
- The audit had identified some additional allowable costs that could be attributed to paratransit cost. Though this made it look like costs had gone up, Metro was spending the same amount of money. With this, they were able to attribute more costs to the program, which helped with their agency fares, which in turn offered an opportunity to increase revenue.
- Though Metro didn't have any, various types of hybrid buses were available for paratransit.

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Tolmie, to receive the Report. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: Golden left at this point in the meeting, at 6:35 PM.]

H.5. [26626](#)

Authorizing Metro Transit to participate in a bid process to hire a consultant/consulting firm to conduct a Bus Size Study.

Kamp noted that the Long Range Metro (Ad Hoc) Committee Plan had recommended looking into the issue of bus size, both small and large; and that this should be done as part of the Transit Development Plan, with the MPO as the lead. Metro was glad for that, because to be candid, Metro had a bias towards larger buses; they were trying to manage overcrowding on a daily basis. Having the MPO take the lead on the technical side would be helpful. Metro was eager for the study to get under way.

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

H.6. [26302](#)

Authorizing the Mayor to appoint the following members to a Steering Committee for

the Bus Size Study:

Ken Golden, Transit and Parking Commission Member
Alder Chris Schmidt, Transit and Parking Commission Member and City of Madison
Common Council
Alder Jill Johnson, City of Madison Common Council
Tod Sloan, Epic Systems, Administration
Joe Kapper, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Transit Program Manager
Susan De Vos, Madison Area Bus Advocates, President
Darwin Ward, University of Wisconsin - Madison, Commuter Solutions Manager

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

**I. 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)

No action was needed on these items.

J. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Poulson said that the update on the Ad Hoc Long Range Metro Transit Report recommendations would likely be scheduled for the September meeting.

Streit thought that Metro should be applauded for receiving the APTA award. Kamp talked about the invitation to the August 15th presentation related to this, and said the award also reflected the good support of the community, Metro riders and the Commission.

Bergamini mentioned that APTA would be holding its annual conference in October in Seattle, and hoped that staff could attend because it would offer an opportunity to look over and freely investigate new equipment.

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

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Maniaci, to Adjourn at 6:40 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.