



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 8, 2017

5:00 PM

201 W. Mifflin Street
Madison Central Library, Room 302
Third Floor Conf. Room

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 9 - David Ahrens; Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 2 - David E. Tolmie and Wayne Bigelow

Please note: Kemble arrived at 5:02 PM, after action on the Minutes. Johnson arrived at 5:19 PM, during discussion of Item E.1.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Ahrens, to Approve the Minutes of the January 11, 2017 meeting. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 - David Ahrens; Ledell Zellers; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

Abstentions: 1 - Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 3 - Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie and Wayne Bigelow

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

E. TRANSIT QUARTERLY REPORTS

E.1. [46007](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Financial Performance and Measures, Ride-Revenue-Fare Type Reports, Hybrid Stats, Customer Feedback and Response Repts, NAR and Incident Repts, and Fleet Age Comparison - TPC 02.08.17

Poulson mentioned that due to long-standing software reporting issues, the

Parking Quarterly Reports were being deferred to March. Joined by Metro Transit Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck, Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp discussed the Quarterly/Year End Reports (attached), and answered questions.

- Ridership was down by 7.3% from 2015. Transit systems of similar size across the country had averaged a 5% drop. Low gas prices contributed to this.
- Where service was frequent or convenient, ridership was holding its own. Weekend ridership in December had dropped 15%, compared to 10-15% over the entire year. Bigger drops were seen on routes where service was spread out (Ex. with hourly headways).
- Without Route 80's, ridership was down 6.3%, likely due to more students living downtown. More automated passengers counters would soon be used instead of relying on driver counts.
- Road calls were down by 34%, since fuel tank had been relined. Inspections were on track.
- Paratransit ridership was up 1.9%. Where riders relied on their service, gas prices didn't affect ridership. Here too, road calls were down by 31.6%.
- Financials: Contingency reserves reflected the \$5M reduction/transfer last year, and costs to cover the delayed fare implementation. Even so, they were still expecting a YE balance of \$2.7M, above the level recommended in a 2008 Metro study. They tried to keep this higher to help with continuing maintenance of E. Washington facility.
- Ad revenues of \$594K were the highest ever, and met the goal of 1% of total revenue that was set for advertising in the 2008 Metro study.
- With MA ridership up, MA waiver revenues were over budget by \$385K.
- Ad and MA waiver revenues had helped counterbalance the drop in ridership.
- On the expense side, the calculation for salaries/wages had been reevaluated given the higher turnover in recent years, and 2016 was the last year using the old formula; thus the \$1.7M underbudget amount. OT costs were lower than 2015. Overall, operating expenses were underbudget by \$900K.
- Between revenue and expenses, they ended up in pretty good shape.
- Route productivity: Rt. 10, with high frequency to Campus and new health buildings, was up 3.8%. Rt. 75 with convenient service to Epic was up 10.9% despite being overcrowded. On new Rt. 31, where service had been expanded for equity reasons, ridership was climbing steadily.
- Average weekday ridership in December 2016 was up, at 44,871 (shown wrong on Productivity page, but shown correctly on Performance page). Average weekend ridership in December was down 15%, a fairly consistent trend throughout the year.
- Peer performance measures: Even compared to 2013 peer numbers, Metro ranked considerably better than peers in five of six categories.
- Revenue % and ride % changes: Even with the 7.4% ridership drop, fixed route passenger revenue had dropped by only 1.4%. And even though unlimited ride pass ridership was down, unlimited ride pass revenue was up 0.7%; driven by the two UW partners and the 4-year averaging of ridership that was done: i.e., when ridership rose rapidly, the UW was protected from steep increases and charges; and when ridership dropped, Metro was protected from steep drops in revenues.
- Paratransit performance indicators: Leave Attended trips = 80,887, out of 279,226 total paratransit trips. Metro Direct in-house service was providing 1 of every 5 paratransit rides. On-time performance %'s among providers continued to improve and were very good.

- Hybrid stats: Fuel economy was better on the hybrids. The 2007 hybrids, which were reaching the end of their life, showed a slightly higher cost per mile than the older Gilligs. Notably, over nearly 10 years, no full battery packs had been ever been replaced. The newer Gilligs were costing more per mile due to fuel filters and more precise EPA standards; and because of the fuel problems mentioned earlier and having to replace fuel injectors.
- Customer feedback: Input totals for 2016 were slightly up from 2015, but down from 2013 and 2014. Prompt response to feedback (within 10 days) continued to be very good at 96.83%.
- NAR (Not Assigned Responsibility) Counts: GPS and cameras helped to determine when something was driver's responsibility or not, in such categories as Bus Early or Driver Rude. Re: Stroller Policy, staff had been able to manage this issue through more relaxed enforcement, in recognition that Metro had a social service element as well as on-time performance element.
- The age of buses steadily averaged 7.50 to 8 years because buses were always being replaced.
- The drops in ridership for MATC and Edgewood might be related to the MATC shuttle and Uber, but this would be hard to measure. Metro had been asked if they could operate the shuttle service when it started. But because buses were needed at peak periods, Metro struggled to meet their requirements, so MATC had gone to Lamers.

Members commented as follows.

- Golden noted the small productivity drop on Rt. 19 indicating that transit-dependent people were still using transit. He suggested that with the focus on equity, increases/decreases on routes through low-income areas might be highlighted. Looking at drops on Rts. 50 and 22, Bergamini wasn't sure the idea of a connection between income distribution in an area that a route covered and ridership patterns, would hold.
- Bergamini noted that MATC had experimented over the past 10 years (Ex. van shuttles between their locations). To really understand the situation, they would need to talk the person who advises their pass program. Their shuttle schedule and service seemed to be on-again/off-again; and we didn't always know.
- Re: Assembly Rep. Scott Allen's proposal to require that 25% of operating costs of transit systems come from fare boxes, Governmental Relations Officer Nick Zavos said that there didn't seem to be a groundswell of support for this, and that Allen seemed to be acting on his own. Smaller systems would be hurt most. Only Madison and Milwaukee would even have a hope of meeting such a requirement. Municipalities in his own district were planning to discuss this with him.

Turning to the accident data, Kamp reminded members that chargeable accidents were those where driver was primarily responsible, and preventable were those where other person was ticketed but steps might have been taken by the driver to prevent the accident. Claims over the year had been in line with previous years, staying at a lower level and not reflecting the increase shown. The accidents had been minor in nature. They had had a lot of turnover in drivers.

General Operations Supervisor for Safety and Security Phil Gadke reviewed Highlights of the Metro Accident Summary and the 2003-216 Annual Chargeable and Preventable Accidents (attached), and responded to questions.

- The increase of preventable accidents in the first half of the year seemed to have been an anomaly.
- No major chargeable accidents had occurred; and they had had no significant damage claims (either to their vehicles or to others).
- Paratransit performance had been excellent. (Only one chargeable accident had occurred: A vehicle backed into a satellite dish in a parking lot in the dark.)
- At Main and Carroll with the temporary sidewalk curb-side, 10 mirrors had been torn off (10 of the 88); not surprising, given the intense activity there.
- Training was being planned to help drivers relieve some of the stress of the job.
- The Union contract defined "major" accident as an accident that was Metro's responsibility and involved a pedestrian or bicyclist; everything else was defined as "minor" regardless of damage amount.
- Efforts had been made to build relationships and trust between supervisors and drivers, so that drivers felt comfortable to come in and talk about close calls.
- When accidents were identified as chargeable, drivers were asked to show how they might not be. This had sometimes resulted in chargeable accidents being reduced to preventable.
- With many new drivers, lots of simple mistakes were due to inexperience.

Kamp noted that certain service changes were requested for safety reasons, in response to major accidents, even if they may negatively impact service for some customers. He also noted that the #1 feedback items in refresher training in 2015 was the issue of close calls with intercity buses on University Avenue. University and Park was the location with the highest number of close calls, and was high on their agenda, to work with TE and others, inc. drivers, to look at how they could improve the situation.

With additional concerns raised by Zellers, Kamp said staff had determined that their next project would be to tackle the issue of delivery trucks on University Avenue. Bergamini had heard about similar problems for bikers in the contraflow lane on University, east of Frances Street. Because Parking Enforcement was supposed to be watching blocks in this area, they might be helpful with the bus lanes as well. Gadke said that when PE was asked about the problem, they were told that the vehicles were "standing" not "parking".

Kamp said they would be looking into these definitions in the Uniform Vehicle code, as well as using their videos to review the situation. Poulson thanked Gadke for his good report and work. Kovich/Zellers made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [43726](#) Establishing Goals for Regional Transit Authority Legislation.

Governmental Relations Officer Nick Zavos from the Mayor's Office discussed the resolution, and answered questions.

- The goal of the resolution was to start talking about specifics of what RTA legislation would look like, to go on record with some parameters, to start talking to other communities, and to start the conversation internally.
- The Mayor had brought up this issue at a recent meeting of Dane County

Cities and Villages Assn. Once the resolution was adopted, the City could start to go to other communities to show them what we put together as a beginning point, and discuss it with them and get more details worked out.

- The res would be sent to such communities as Verona, Fitchburg, Middleton, to invite their engagement and input.
- As far as taking the issue to the State Legislature, the Mayor had started conversations with the Speaker. This would give him something to discuss. Transportation and transit funding would be a big issue in the State budget.
- It wasn't likely anything would be enacted anytime soon at the State level. But over the next couple years, it would be good to have some of the details worked out before it became a possibility.
- As for how Transit assets would be integrated into a multi-jurisdictional RTA, it was probably premature to start that discussion. But a couple possibilities might be that the RTA could contract with the existing system, or that the existing system could be subsumed into it.

Golden remarked that the biggest defect in the first RTA was that among the resources being committed, the City's portion was 80% and the local shares were 20%; but RTA membership was almost reversed, with Madison at <30%. After talking to former RTA members, he thought the inclusion of the word "representative" would be critical to protect Madison from that kind of mistake. At the time, some felt it was more important to get the RTA than to get it right. Not interested in arguing that point, he thought it was something the City should consider since this was a City res.

Zavos said that the issue of representation was raised at the LRTPC, which recommended that the fourth bullet point be changed to read, "The governing board would be comprised of elected officials representative of participating communities within the RTA area." He further noted that CCOC had also recommended a similar change to the fourth bullet, as well as to add the word "representative" in the first bullet point, to say "A representative RTA could be formed by two or more municipal governing bodies." CCOC also changed the word "beginning" in the last BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED clause, to say that the city is committed to "continuing" discussions (with community leaders and others shown there).

Golden/Kovich made a motion to recommend adoption of the resolution as amended by LRTPC and CCOC. Members then discussed the resolution.

- (Golden) The last Whereas clause should be deleted; we knew the situation was challenging; we didn't need to say it. Due to the taxing authority, the majority of the RTA members should be elected officials. But some sort of citizen participation should be included, perhaps in the form of an advisory committee. Also, the RTA structure (an operating entity) should be defined esp. in relation to the MPO (a planning entity) so that the decision-making could be easily understood.
- (Kemble) The CCOC amended the fourth bullet be changed to add the words "and representatives" after "elected officials". This was an opening statement, a starting point for discussions with the state and local communities.
- (Bergamini) She was concerned about the res, based on earlier attempts with Transport 2020 and an RTA, where an error was made: a lack of true consultation, compromise and communication among the communities involved. To have this come out as a City res and to have it come as a surprise to CSOS, comprised of partner communities was disappointing. These

communities had committed time and money and worked cooperatively with Metro Transit. To not include them in the shaping of this res, which said some very specific things, was disturbing.

- (Bergamini) While concerned about Madison's assets, an RTA couldn't be built without acting like a region (vs. taking what was passed by one jurisdiction to others and saying this is what we want to do, what do you think?) Language in the proposal was very specific. The funding mechanism suggested was a sales tax, but that was not the only way to fund an RTA (vs. a wheel tax, or something else). This was fine as a draft, but the partners should be at the table with us while this was being shaped.

[Please note: Ahrens left at this point in the meeting, at 6:04 PM.]

- (Bergamini) The legal definition of "municipal governing bodies" wouldn't include the County. While this might be what we want, is that what was intended here?

- (Bergamini) It was good that the Mayor and staff were trying to get the process moving again, but we needed to do it in a collaborative fashion, and to make sure such people as the Mayor of Fitchburg knew it was coming.

On behalf of and at the request of Ahrens, Golden presented Ahrens' amendment to the third bullet point, to strike the words "amount" and "would need to", to instead say the "level" of the sales tax "should" be authorized in the referendum. Golden/Zellers made a motion to adopt this amendment. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

When asked about conversations with other communities, Zavos said that along with mentioning the resolution to the members of the Cities and Villages Assn., he had chatted personally with Mayor Arnold. However, the idea was more the opposite; that to have such conversations, the City needed to have a place to start, a formal document to say where it wanted to begin. Kamp noted that due to scheduling they had been unable to bring the resolution to CSOS earlier, but that it would be on an upcoming agenda. Any informal discussions he had had, were clouded by the many discussions over the years with all their partners, which they would continue, esp. at CSOS.

Re: the political climate and whether certain provisions of the res might be feasible under the current administration, Zavos said that in part they were a recognition of that. For example, by calling for exclusively elected officials, a level of citizen expertise was cut out. But for State Rep. Vos, this was a very important premise, that if public money was being spent, it should be elected officials making those decisions. This was the first time the issue of sales tax vs. other types of taxes had come up; so he couldn't speak to that.

Golden/Bergamini made a motion to delete the last Whereas, related to RTA legislation being politically challenging. Besides the reasons he previously stated, based on Bergamini's comments about other communities and the language about the city (alone) pushing forward, Golden felt the clause wasn't necessary and didn't belong in the res. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Poulson called for a vote on the main motion, as amended by LRTPC, CCOC and TPC. Recalling historical discussions about funding mechanisms for an RTA, Bergamini said there were complications with collecting a sales tax, which was currently done through counties. At that time, the question arose how this would work if the boundaries of an RTA weren't coterminous with the

County. She wasn't sure a sales tax was a position that the City should commit itself to. Kovich said the City needed this to move RTA discussion forward; it was a starting point, not the final product.

The main motion made by Golden, seconded by Kovich, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the COMMON COUNCIL ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITTEE included: Recommend approval of the resolution as previously amended by LRTPC and CCOC; and as further amended by the TPC to 1) delete the final Whereas clause related to the RTA legislation being politically challenging, and (2) change the third bullet point to say, "The 'level' of the sales tax 'should' be authorized in the referendum, but could not exceed 0.5%." The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 - Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

Noes: 1 - Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 3 - David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow and David Ahrens

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

F.2. [45618](#)

Metro: Proposed Leave Attended Policy - TPC 02.08.17

Registrants Jennifer Hardesty and Jamie Mortenson of Transit Solutions spoke in favor of the proposed policy, because it would be in the best interest of everyone using the Paratransit program.

- Incidents involving staff being unavailable to receive passengers had been an ongoing issue, despite efforts of a number of parties. Such incidents caused delays for other passengers, distress for everyone on the bus, and disrupted upcoming rides on the driver's schedule.
- In the first five weeks of 2017, they had reported ten leave attended incidents, six of which involved the same two clients. In addition to the ten passengers whose staff was not available, eleven other passengers were affected.
- When able to contact staff during the incidents, drivers were able to determine when it would be safe to attempt a second drop-off. When unable to reach staff or family, the passenger had to be kept on board.
- In January, they had had a passenger with only one working contact number, for which they did not receive an answer or return call. They tried dropping off the passenger three times, before they found someone at home. The passenger was on board for almost 2.5 hours.
- Drivers knew the passengers were not necessarily to blame, and would never support a policy that did not have everyone's best interest in mind. But such incidents as the one just described needed to be prevented. They felt this policy would protect passengers from these unfortunate incidents and unnecessary distress caused by them.

Paratransit Program Manager Nancy Senn noted that the contents of the policy and the accompanying TPC resolution being presented to members was pretty much as it had been before. (Please see proposed policy, TPC res, and summary attached.)

- Since the last meeting, staff attempted to convene meetings with ADATS members, which they were unable to do in the short turnaround time. As a result, Senn contacted members individually, and in the course of that, a

consensus seemed to form about what they thought would be acceptable.

- In these and previous discussions, members were uncomfortable with the impact of a suspension falling on the customer who may not be control of the situation. Senn shared with them she couldn't really come to a method of meting out a consequence to the party responsible for being present for the customer.
- She walked ADATS members through what might work in the policy proposed by staff. From that, she found members were most concerned about there being a finite period of suspension, and about having a shorter period of suspension. The differences between staff proposal and ADATS member preferences were shown in the Follow up summary. Other items in the proposal were not adjusted.
- A suspension would only go into effect in a 2nd or 3rd occurrence: Members wanted a 30-day suspension, and a 60-day suspension, respectively; and felt a 6-month suspension was much too long.
- Senn pointed out the opportunities to appeal; and that a reinstatement could occur during a suspension that would require a customer travel with an attendant. In talking to Dane County, they were comfortable with that being their role, to work with service providers to ensure they were held responsible for providing some replacement service during the period of the suspension. This would place the burden on a more appropriate party than the customer (with whom Metro had contact).

Kovich noted that the appeal process had to be very specific, to be understood by everyone clearly. She wondered who the notices went to, and in requiring a written appeal within 10 days, ten days from when? Also, who would be in a position to help the person appeal? She was concerned about the possibility of a year being the period of suspension and thought the period might be shortened up (to create a maximum of 180 days). She thought that reviewing the timeframe for suspensions would be good; and felt that asking the customer to reapply at the end of a suspension added a layer of difficulty.

Deputy Transit General Manager and former Paratransit Program Manager Crystal Martin commented.

- Immediate notification: When for example, a passenger became disruptive, their service was suspended immediately after they were dropped off. Staff then tried to sort out what happened, and whether an intervention was needed before the person could use the service again. Dane County was helpful with this, and would help get the message through to the agencies so they knew what to expect the next day.
- Calls and emails were used. They had a good communications circle, so if Metro couldn't make notification directly, it was done through Dane County. After sending immediate notification, staff followed up with written documentation.
- Appeals: They were very lenient, esp. in terms of response times for appeals. The appeals needed to be done in writing, but could be kept simple and submitted online. If an appeal arrived outside of the 10-day federal guideline, and it had merit and deserved to be heard, staff brought the appeal forward. They weren't interested in kicking people off the service. They implemented policy in a compassionate way.
- They talked to people beforehand, and warned them that the letter they would receive would sound harsh. But that was because it needed to be very specific and not to leave any question in the end (esp. in the event of an FTA

complaint).

- Re-applying after a suspension period: The proposal was similar to what was done for someone who had temporary eligibility (such as someone needing paratransit for a short time), where an end date was assigned to their eligibility. Staff didn't call them to ask if they needed more time; it was up to them to notify Metro. Likewise, riders who suspended their service to go on vacation were asked to call when they had a definite date to restart their service. That way if something happened to delay their restart, the riders wouldn't accumulate no-shows.
- Also, given very limited staff, this method relieved the administrative challenge of tracking these dates, esp. with 80,000 Leave Attended Rides per year. The customer needed to take the responsibility to notify Metro that their suspension was over, and to show they had made arrangements and had an action plan. This helped staff know that they were ready to go, and wouldn't end up right back in a suspension period.
- All the customer needed to do was get in touch with staff, by sending something in writing (inc. online) to say their suspension was over and ask what to do. Then staff could go over what was needed going forward, almost like a counseling session. This kept everyone on the same page.
- Re: the 30-60 day spread (minimum), this gave staff a way manage their workflow. It would be very difficult to track suspensions that started on various dates of one month and ended exactly 30 days later on all those different dates the following month. By ending suspensions at the end of the following month regardless of which date the suspension started in the previous, staff could identify who had been suspended in the midst of the previous month, see who had sent in appeals, and work with them all at once as a group, which helped them manage staff time and work flow.

Poulson mentioned that this had been a long-standing issue, and hoped they could come to some specific direction for staff on this policy at this meeting. They had received ideas and thoughts from staff and from ADATS members. Members discussed having a shorter length of suspension for a third violation. When asked, staff said the problem occurred both in family living situations and at group homes. It was usually a case manager/broker who coordinated appeals/responses with Metro; Dane County carefully tracked when people could resume service and were sure to follow up on deadlines.

Streit/Kovich made a motion to approve Resolution No. TPC-46 with an amendment to say that the minimum service suspension for a third violation would be 90 days, rather than 180 days. Members and the Chair thanked staff for all their hard work, compassion and patience. Martin thanked Transit Solutions and other contractors for being dutiful throughout the long process at ADATS and TPC, noting that some contractors got paid by the ride not by the hour, and this had had a big impact on them and their ability to deliver services.

The motion passed 6 to 1, as follows: Ayes - Streit, Kovich, Johnson, Kemble, Zellers, Bergamini. Noes - Golden. Non-voting - Poulson. Excused - Ahrens, Bigelow and Tolmie.

F.3. [45479](#)

Authorizing the Mayor to renew the bus pass agreement originally authorized by RES-15-00030 for one additional year with SSM Health St. Mary's Hospital - Madison for reimbursement of rides taken by St. Mary's employees and volunteers

This Resolution was RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER

G. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

G.1. [46008](#) Parking: Request for monthly permits at Wingra Lot - TPC 02.08.17

Registrant Greg Shimanski, who was doing a development in the 1600 block of Monroe Street, spoke in support of having monthly permits at Wingra Lot. As part of the development, they had been asked by Engineering to close 250 feet in the alley between Oakland and Grant. This would block parking and driveways for two of the residences (3-5 cars) along the southside of the alley. He hoped he could work with City staff to rent temporary parking for them for a year starting in April at the rate of \$70/month/car.

Asst. Parking Utility Manager Sabrina Tolley discussed her memo (attached). The Utility had previously provided a small number of temporary monthly permits at Wingra by administratively establishing guidelines and rates to do so. Based on the recent rate change, a rate of \$70/permit/month would be consistent with rates charged at the Lot previously. The annual revenue here in 2016 had been \$400-500 per space (with 19 revenue-generating spaces). At \$70/space/month, the annual revenue of \$840 for each of these spaces would be substantially more. The Lot had low daily occupancy, with a good portion of occupancy during the non-paid evening hours.

Tolley supported issuing the permits, but wanted to provide some info and background, and give the TPC an opportunity to weigh in. Poulson had recalled that similar requests had previously been handled administratively, but wanted the TPC to hear this particular proposal, and be given the chance to weigh in officially.

Golden mentioned that the Lot had been surplused some years ago, and was supposed to go to a neighborhood committee to explore if they could try to sell it and encourage some sort of development on it (because of its low occupancy). When he had asked City Traffic Engineer David Dryer about this, he said that with Monroe Street reconstruction, staff wanted to have some place to deal with whatever arose from that.

As a result, Golden thought that this should be the last time the TPC ever saw/heard anything about operating the Lot, and that Tolley should be given complete authority. He hoped after construction, the City might be able to sell the property and get some tax revenue from it. When asked, Tolley explained the July 2015 guidelines were framed in response to the requests made at that time. With no further discussion, Poulson thanked Tolley for the update.

G.2. [46009](#) Metro: Update on Paratransit MA Waiver Funding & Policy Review Committee, Transit Services Manager Crystal Martin - TPC 02.08.17

Martin and Senn discussed the work of the Committee.

- Members were Alder Kemble, Carl Durocher, Jim Cobb, Ken Golden, Jesse Kaysen, Tim Gruber, Margaret Bergamini, Mary Jacobs; co-chairs were Golden and Kaysen. Five meetings had been held, with seven to go.
- They had spent some time examining the problem coming up, and had

developed questions for the State Dept. of Health Services, to which they promptly and thoroughly responded.

- They had discussed different approaches: To have direct discussions with the State, which was outside of their current model for implementing Family Care in expansion counties; or to wait to have direct negotiations with the MCO's once they were determined, later this summer, which didn't give them a lot of time to develop plans; or to go through some scenarios and develop a tool box for how to respond to each scenario, which was what they were now doing.
- At their last meeting, they had looked at three likely scenarios: 1) the MCO's might want to maintain the status quo; 2) the MCO's might want to do what they thought the plan was, and pay \$3.25, which was the public fare for each ride; or 3) the MCO's might want a tiered agency fare arrangement, depending on the level of service beyond ADA, adjusting the level of agency fare payment they'd be interested in.
- Staff would bring their predictions to the next meeting and info as to how these would impact funding, ridership, service criteria, and how they might mitigate the impact on funding. From this, the group would shape policy for each scenario and develop them as tools for their toolbox, and pull them out depending on how situation unfolds as they approach January 1, 2018, and to be better able to negotiate from a position of strength.
- The Committee would then draft recommendations about how to proceed implementing a toolbox approach.
- The meetings were on a two-week cycle, and staff was trying to stay a couple steps ahead of the Committee.

Kemble thanked staff for all their work. This was an incredibly detailed and confusing issue, because of lack of information and process.

G.3. [46010](#)

Update on Transportation Ordinance Review Ad Hoc Committee, Alders Kemble and Zellers - TPC 02.08.17

Kemble and Zellers gave an update on TORC.

- TORC was also moving at a rapid pace, and had recently experienced a little whiplash going in one direction and then another.
- At the 2/14 meeting, they hoped to put the draft proposal together, to be able to send it to referrals (inc. TPC, PBMVC, CCOC), and back to the Council while the current Council still existed.
- The work was ambitious and complicated. The Committee had confidence in staff's ability to work together, and didn't want to diminish that. At the same time, they were looking at how they might enhance that in terms of more policy support and more broad-based communication and connection on transportation, without adding extra layers that were unneeded.
- They were looking at the current Sec. 3.14 and the Dept. of Transportation, esp. the functions of a Director of Transportation and putting that into a new job at the same level as David Dryer and Chuck Kamp, to create a ruling troika, which would include a new Transportation Policy and Planning Manger, TE/PKG, and Transit.
- This new manager could be help answer the question from people in the community of who does transportation and who communicates with the public. This person would have some planning and administrative staff, and would hold the bigger vision of all the various plans, inc. the environmental plan, the Comprehensive Plan, MIM.
- This manager would coordinate projects as they came up, to make sure that they were in line with these plans; as well as to uplift the visibility and

importance of Metro in overall transportation planning and road construction planning, to support Kamp and balance decisions about right of way and road use -- a co-advocate for transit and ped/bike, a professional, and a resource wrangler to support comprehensive transportation planning and policy.

- The Committee still needed to determine whether to have one or two bodies/Commissions under the Board, which would affect TPC and its role.

Golden wondered where/how certain entities fit in: Engineering, since they were the ones who built the roads, and collaborated already; transportation folks in Planning (such as David Trowbridge); and where and how this would relate to the MPO, its staff and budget. Also, it sounded like there would be a main committee, a controlling body, that did the visioning but not the details, and there would be a body under that was the operations committee. He wasn't sure how well such a hierarchy would work.

Kemble said that TORC had done quite a bit of thinking about the second issue re: the relationship of the two bodies. As far as the first question, they were proposing one new position, and perhaps moving resources over from Planning to DOT. That person would work closely with the MPO and Engineering, which was really the point of doing this, the problem they were trying to solve. A critical part of the Board/Commission structure was to have a regional member sit on the body that made policy for Metro. They still needed to figure out how this regional person would function with regard to non-transit decisions if they sat on the overall policy board; and whether a Transit-only policy body was needed.

Based on what people were expecting, Bergamini thought the job description for the new position would have to call for civil engineer with a degree in planning and several years in transit. Where would a person with this skill set combination be found? Kemble said they weren't looking to duplicate any part of Dryer's and Kamp's job. They were trying to fill the role of what other cities called a Director, without creating another level of hierarchy; and skewing towards the planning/visioning side, not the engineering side. Zellers said this would need to work this out, once they got there.

Bergamini raised other questions.

- She wondered how the proposal related to the RTA resolution just approved.
- Also, having sat on CSOS, she wasn't sure the different communities could select a single person to represent the various needs of local partners, which varied dramatically in size and type.
- Lastly, she wondered how many members on the bodies would be elected or community folks; and whether and which of the seats would be designated for particular constituencies. Her own bias would be towards people with disabilities, esp. those who used fixed route service or Paratransit. This had been really critical for the education of other members of current committees, and for writing better policy and creating a better system.

Kemble said several members shared Bergamini's opinion about including people with disabilities. Re: the RTA, the Committee had asked the ACA to shape the language in the proposal to be able to build towards an RTA. Kemble added that they had also discussed reducing the number of electeds on the bodies.

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 Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
Transportation Ordinance Review Ad Hoc Committee
Ad Hoc Metro Paratransit Medicaid Waiver Funding & Policy Review
Committee

I. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
(For information only; not for discussion)

I.1. General announcements by Chair

None.

I.2. Commission member suggestions for items on future agendas

In response to an inquiry by Poulson, Transit Scheduling Manager Drew Beck updated members on the disposition of a request made in a Public Appearance at the December meeting, related to moving a bus stop near Journey Mental Health Center. Beck said the stop would not be moved because the proposed location was next to a home, would require a new crosswalk and island, and was not considered as safe as the current location of the stop, which had a shelter and was located next to a park. The representative from Journey and the alder for the area had been informed.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Bergamini, to Adjourn at 7:19 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.