



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, December 10, 2014

5:00 PM

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

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 9 - Lucas Dailey; Chris Schmidt; Anita Weier; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and Kate D. Lloyd

Excused: 1 - Wayne Bigelow

Please note: There is one vacancy on the Commission in the position of Second Alternate. Also, Lloyd arrived at 5:08 at the start of Item E.2., and Dailey arrived at 5:12 during Item F.1.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Weier, to Approve the Minutes of the November 5, 2014 meeting. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 - Chris Schmidt; Anita Weier; David E. Tolmie; Margaret Bergamini and Ann E. Kovich

Abstentions: 1 - Kenneth Golden

Excused: 3 - Lucas Dailey; Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Bergamini said she would recuse herself from Item G., the Public Hearing and any decision in connection to the proposed Unlimited Ride Pass increase.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

- E.1. [36473](#) Parking: November 2014 Activity Report, and October Revenue-Expense-Occupancy Reports - TPC 12.10.14

Parking Operations Manager Tom Woznick was not available due to illness. Interim Manager Bill Putnam filled in. Weier asked about the increase in wages for Oct. 2013 vs. Oct. 2014, though the YTD comparison was nearly the same. Putnam said he had the same question and would get more info to send in an email to members.

Golden asked for a discussion about the E. Washington parking ramp in the 2015 budget in relation to the Walker and the Staff Reports. Kovich asked for discussion of Judge Doyle Square (JDS) also; esp. now that it was back open, how this would affect timing. The Parking Utility should discuss strategic items.

Schmidt said the new RFP for JDS would probably specify something for Parking along the lines of what was in the Staff Report (i.e., the two large floor-plate model). But they might just tell the developer what we would do for parking; and to build above it (vs. the iterations they'd been doing for several years).

Schmidt added that the new ramp was put into the capital budget with the idea that suggestions and analysis would be done by the Ad Hoc Parking Committee and the TPC. With Woznick's departure, it wasn't clear how the Ad Hoc Committee would be staffed; and people were discussing if the work of the Ad Hoc Committee could be split between the Transport. Master Plan Committee and the TPC. Or, since these issues needed to be addressed, maybe the work would be done at the TPC if they couldn't get the Ad Hoc Committee going,

Poulson asked Putnam to convey to Woznick how much the Commission appreciated him. Coming from the outside, he brought a fresh perspective, and was always interested in what the customer would expect. He did a really good job, and he was sad Woznick was leaving. After some discussion, Poulson said he would prepare a thank you to Woznick, on behalf of the Commission.

Putnam relayed that Woznick wanted members to know he appreciated the support, assistance and leadership provided from them; he had enjoyed working with them and was thankful for all they contributed to the Parking Utility and the City. [Please note: Lloyd arrived at this point in the meeting.]

Kovich/Tolmie made a motion to receive the report. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

E.2. [36476](#)

Metro: YTD Paratransit Performance Indicators and Financial Report - TPC 12.10.14

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp noted that Fixed Route data was not available for the reports, because of an upgrade to the new fare boxes that set things back a bit. For this reason, Metro was holding payment to the fare box vendor, who was cooperating, though the process was going more slowly than expected. Data received that morning indicated a continuing trend of 3-4% increase in ridership. A full report should be available for the next meeting.

When asked about fuel contracts, Kamp said the cost was fixed at \$2.94/gal. for 2015, and ~\$2.70/gal. for 2016. Diesel prices on the street were much higher. Metro paid a bulk rate and didn't pay taxes on their fuel. Finance handled City

fuel purchases as a portfolio, with costs for Fleet on a floating basis. Metro needed to have fixed prices and certainty for the sake of partners and budgets. Metro estimated how much they were going to use for a given period, +/- a week for a year.

Golden/Weier made a motion to receive the report. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [35852](#) Accepting the South Capitol Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) District Planning Study Final Report, Executive Summary (Report of the South Capitol District Planning Committee) and the recommendations contained within.
- Planning Project Manager David Trowbridge made a Power Point presentation. (See attached "SCTOD Summary Presentation Nov-Dec 2014".)
- Funded by a federal TIGER grant, this project had three phases: one was a conceptual plan for the 2-block Judge Doyle Square; another was to look at a broader 15-block district related to transportation, connectivity, public transit and parking.
 - Five general areas of analysis were covered: an intermodal terminal, the lakeshore path, a bridge over John Nolen Drive with connectivity to Wilson, intersections along John Nolen (at North Shore, Broom, Williamson/Blair), and Wilson Street (between Hamilton and King).
 - Intermodal terminal: They focused on locations close to Campus, and thought they might do something with a parcel owned by the Boldt company; and worked on a plan to incorporate a bus terminal on the first floor with apartments and office above. But they couldn't come to any agreement about how to fund the intercity bus terminal piece. Boldt was interested in other aspects of the land use project and not being in the bus business. This idea was not moving forward, but was still in the Report as a desirable location, along with building designs that had been developed (page 7 of attached PowerPoint).
 - With Badger Bus terminal gone for five years, the UW Memorial Union, though not a public building, had been functioning as a de facto bus terminal for the Campus. Now the Chazen was serving as such, and was creating challenges for local transit and bike movements through the area. The Committee was eager to find a location for the terminal, with the current idea being to evaluate the Lake Street Parking garage as a very good location for that type of facility, as part of garage reconstruction.
 - Lake Monona Path: Had lots of trees but was too narrow for all the use it got, inc. fast/slow bikes, dog walkers, joggers, pedestrians. The Committee recommended to try to separate the uses as best they could, with pedestrians on lake side. This concept was workable in some locations, but Law Park was not very wide, and a key consideration was to stay within the current lake edge and not fill in the lake. That limited their options.
 - Bridges: The idea was we needed better connectivity for Law Park from Wilson Street for pedestrians and bikers. Other than the bike elevator, there were very few access points to Wilson from Monona Terrace. They looked at Narrow Bridges and Wide Plaza Bridges, taking into account the amount of space they would take, and the aesthetic impact on the shoreline and skyline. A plaza bridge could serve as a park amenity.
 - Bridge locations (page 20): South of Monona Terrace (MT) was more

problematic, due to impact on the skyline approaching the downtown on John Nolen. Those north of the Terrace were more favorable for engineering purposes. Bridges would have to clear the railroad tracks by 25 feet, which posed challenges.

- (Pages 21-25) One concept had the path sweeping out into the lake, but the Committee did not favor that because it would have required pilings into the lake and triggered a challenging permitting process. They looked at the idea of narrow bridges on each side of MT just for peds and bikes. But the visual impacts on MT were strong, and the MT Board was not in favor of this, given the architectural integrity of the building. Also, by following ADA standards for (spiraling) grades on the bridges, a lot of green space would be gobbled up. However, some concepts integrated with redevelopment offered nice park amenities (pages 27-30).

- East Gateway Concepts and associated intersections, which had an impact on transit service through the area (pages 32-37):

- A tunnel for John Nolen to go underneath with Williamson going over the top of a bridge, which was rejected due to the potential cost, though the community might come around and support the idea of grade-separating for the sake of bike and ped movement;

- A Hovenring at Wilson/Blair, rejected due the span of the bridge, which would have a huge visual and structural impact;

- A round-about at the same location, which would have to be huge to accommodate all the traffic and would be challenging with the railroad there;

- Hancock intersection alternative, which would create a new signalized intersection at Hancock, with Wilson being the cul de sac. While it offered some benefits for bikes and peds and traffic flow, it would really disrupt transit service (Routes 3, 4, 38). Also Engineering had some issues with the grades in the Hancock extension to John Nolen, with the slope down to the railroad tracks.

- The Committee was firm that it wanted only low-cost alternatives examined as part of the study. They took a look at the two driveways along Machinery Row, which caused problems for bikes and motorists, with visibility a challenge. This might be something that could be done fairly soon. Blair was not slated for reconstruction, a state highway for at least a few years; and to give access to businesses there, another intersection would have to be created. They had very little area to work with, and this would require a closer look by Engineering.

- West Gateway Concepts - Broom Street (pages 39-40): Offered some bike and ped improvements that stayed at grade level (no bridge) so as not to disrupt the City's skyline.

- Wilson Street - One-way segment from King to Hamilton (pages 42-46): Had lots of ped traffic, with bikes that went the wrong way on the sidewalk. Bike facilities in both directions were desired. On-street parking was needed for deliveries to businesses and for transit. They looked at a couple options for one-way and two-way traffic. Within the City's right-of-way, they didn't have much space to work with, and there were trade-offs.

- They looked at one-way concepts with a bike lane going in the opposite direction and a barrier; but on-street parking would be lost, which was problematic and was resisted by stakeholders.

- They looked at two-way concepts with bike movement in both directions, but again they would either lose parking on one side or they would lose the terrace and the green space.

- Even though the Committee wanted to lower cost and lower lake-impact alternatives, some members of the community suggested they needed to think

big, if they really wanted to transform the area and fix the problems (pages 48-51):

-- Downtown Design Professionals floated an idea to create a tunnel to bury the traffic and reclaim some of the area as park; could cost \$100+ million and would be very challenging from engineering perspective.

-- Kenton Peters wouldn't create a tunnel but would cover much of John Nolen Drive and create park-like terrace; wouldn't change intersection (for peds and bikes); but much less expensive, and would meet the need of improving the park space without encroaching on lake.

-- Ken Saiki would add park space and bike amenities; but would require lake fill, which would not be easy to do esp. with DNR against filling the lake.

-- Ron Shutvet would create an underpass for boats and bicycles at Broom and Northshore; but would require raising John Nolen Drive 6-7 feet, no small undertaking; but visionary and provides an interesting amenity.

- The Committee asked that these images be included in the Report as informational, for people to consider possibly for more detailed analysis.

- The resolution didn't endorse the findings, but asked that the Report be accepted, and presented options for more detailed design moving forward.

Kovich said this was an unusual summary report in that it didn't make a lot of recommendations. Having chaired some of the meetings, she observed vibrant discussions, and community involvement. She was proud of the result, because it was a balanced portrayal of what everybody thought should be brought forward to the community; to remind people that there was not an easy answer to any of these issues, and that a lot more study and work would be needed. She gave kudos to Trowbridge, because he had to take all of the ideas and put them into an Executive Summary.

Trowbridge replied that even though they hadn't come up with a firm, unanimous consensus on recommendations on what to move forward, at least they were armed with the many trade-offs that existed that would have to be dealt with at some point. He felt they had done a good job involving the neighborhoods and businesses in the area.

Bergamini echoed kudos to Trowbridge for shepherding this process; and appreciated that the options were all laid out, which had required much effort. The area was not an easy space, and she was glad that the Report didn't preclude anything but laid out the challenges. She asked about the E. Wilson cul-de-sac concept, and whether they had considered placing a bus lane there. Trowbridge said they had looked at an inbound bus lane; but besides the engineering challenges for all the other traffic, this would have taken away the benefits of the cul-de-sac for pedestrians and bikes.

Dailey also thought it a very good report. He had been part of the Design Professional Work Group for a few years, and worked on some of these sorts of plans. He liked how much community work had been included, and how the report included all the different options and the depth of the work.

Golden had a couple of questions, and in the interest of honesty, said he was not as impressed as others were. Recognizing that Lake Street was a preferred location for the bus terminal, he wondered why the MMSD parking lot was not considered for an intercity terminal. It had the space for a facility that could include parking and other uses on top. Trowbridge said the UW opposed this because they had plans for the area, and was eyeing it for a shared parking

arrangement. They owned half of the lot, and MMSD owned the other half. Golden thought we should talk to them too.

Golden liked the idea of separating peds and bikes along Law Park, and wondered if there was any way to take some lane width from John Nolen Drive, recapture some green space, and allocate it to ped and bike use. Trowbridge said they could petition the Federal Highway Administration to narrow the lanes, like they had for E. Washington. Golden said it was something to consider.

Golden was also surprised there weren't staff reports (from Engineering and Traffic Engineering) associated with the report. Though it made it a bit harder to read, he appreciated that all the rejected parts were in the report; but expected to see what staff preferences were in an attached report. Trowbridge said that rather than a separate report, TE's positions on things were integrated into the report and added context to the Committee's feelings and recommendations.

Golden said the report didn't provide clear direction on some things. He knew that accepting the report was like saying let's move on. But he felt that the people inheriting the report would have to re-live all the issues. It contained a lot about what not to do, but there wasn't a whole lot of guidance about what should be done. With the Williamson/John Nolen intersection, he got a sense of all the difficulties various plans would create, but got no sense of what we should do there. He also didn't understand the report discussing a bus depot, while we were actively pursuing a different one.

Trowbridge said the bus depot deal fell apart late in the game. And if there were low-hanging fruit to resolve issues at Williamson/John Nolen, they would have been plucked long ago. However, the report recommendation re: the driveways at Machinery Row was significant and would have a positive impact on safety.

Re: the transit center, Kovich pointed out that the Committee's charge was to study sites within SCTOD area, and the site being discussed now was not in that area. Trowbridge added that when they received the grant, the inter-modal terminal was going to be at the high-speed rail terminal. Kovich said they did the best they could with what they had. Poulson thought they had done a very good job.

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Dailey, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION. [Please note: Golden asked that his vote be reported as "Present", but because Legistar software doesn't offer that option, his vote has been recorded as "Non-voting".] The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Chris Schmidt; Anita Weier; David E. Tolmie; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Lucas Dailey and Kate D. Lloyd

Excused: 1 - Wayne Bigelow

Non Voting: 2 - Gary L. Poulson and Kenneth Golden

F.2. [36477](#)

Receipt of the Final Report of the TPC Subcommittee to Review Taxi Regulations & Shared-Ride Services - TPC 12.10.14

Registrant Adam Chern, Madison 53704, spoke in opposition to the illegal taxi operations of TNC's because they posed a threat to safety, living-wage jobs, equity and access, and rule of law. (Please see Chern's complete statement attached.)

After talking to Subcommittee Chair Bigelow, Poulson thought the TPC might want to wait until the other committees weighed in on the two versions of the legislation from Alder Resnick and Mayor Soglin, as well as having the benefit of the info from the Subcommittee. It was his intent was refer it to a future meeting, perhaps January. Keith Pollock from TE had talked to staff for the two committees. The EOC would consider the item on Jan. 8th, and the PSRC on Jan. 13th. TPC would meet on Jan. 14th. Given the tight turn-around time, Bergamini said she would prefer to schedule the item for the February TPC. Poulson said he would take that into consideration when he helped set the January agenda.

Kovich said the Subcommittee looked at major issues, and didn't endorse one proposal over the other. Instead they focused on what they thought made sense, and hoped to see something come back that incorporated all the recommendations into one proposal.

Members discussed what motion to make, and what action the Commission might take on the proposals and Subcommittee recommendations. Schmidt felt that the TPC could receive the Report, which would be attached to the resolution for the Secondaries to review along with the proposals. After the Secondaries took action and made their recommendations, the TPC would then review everything and decide what to do. If the TPC chose to take action, they could pick what they wanted and ask for something to be drafted.

A motion was made by Kovich/Weier to receive the Report. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Poulson said they would revisit the item either in January or February for final action.

F.3. [36080](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with SSM Health Care of Wisconsin, Inc., owning and operating St. Mary's Hospital Medical Center, for the provision of employee/volunteer passes for Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement to the transit utility of \$1.15 per fixed route trip and the applicable paratransit price in the fare tariff at the time the ride is taken during the first year of the agreement (January 1, 2015 - December 31, 2015) and the applicable per ride price in the then current fare tariff at the time the ride is taken for all rides during the second year of the agreement (January 1, 2016 - December 31, 2016) if the option for the second year is exercised.

Kamp said this was a two-year agreement. The first year would be at the current fare tariff rate of \$1.15, and the second year would be at whatever the approved tariff would be in the second year. This had been a good partnership for both entities, and Metro recommended approval. A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Golden, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Anita Weier; David E. Tolmie; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Kate D. Lloyd; Lucas Dailey and Chris Schmidt

Abstentions: 1 - Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 1 - Wayne Bigelow

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

F.4. [36294](#) Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County to provide \$19,300 in assistance to Metro Transit for transit information services, promotion efforts and operations for calendar year 2015, and \$5,000 to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (a Metropolitan Planning Organization) to support the County Specialized Transportation coordination activities for the calendar year 2015.

Kamp said this was a long-standing coordination agreement to help with public information, which had gone through the MPO as well. Metro recommended approval. A motion was made by Lloyd, seconded by Weier, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Item H.1. at this point in the meeting.]

G. **6:00 PM - PUBLIC HEARING: To hear public comment on proposed increase to Unlimited Ride Pass rate.**

G.1. [36493](#) Metro: Public Hearing on proposed increase to Unlimited Ride Pass Rate from \$1.15 to \$1.20 per ride - TPC 12.10.14

[Please note: This item followed Item H.1. Also, please note that Weier left the meeting at 6 PM, at this point; and Bergamini recused herself during this item.]

Poulson explained that staff would present information about the proposal, after which members could ask clarifying questions. Then, members of the public registered to speak would be invited to do so. After further clarifying questions, the public hearing would be closed. The proposal would put on the January agenda for possible action.

Kamp noted that Metro's 2015 approved budget contained \$96,300 to provide WI-FI services on Metro buses, contingent on TPC approval of a 5¢ fare increase to be applied only to rides of Unlimited Ride pass holders. The hearing notice indicated the potential to look at all fares. Feedback had been collected through Metro's website and info on the buses.

Kamp and Metro Marketing & Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch responded to member questions.

- Staff had not discussed offering an Unlimited Ride pass program to Epic since Epic was one of their biggest Commute Card clients. The Commute Card rate was set at \$1.25/ride.
- The need for WI-FI was based on a number of things: Metro had heard from customers anecdotally about the need, meetings at Epic where they heard of the need, and alders who wanted this to be explored. Also the 2008 Long-Range Plan said Metro should strive to provide additional amenities, and this fit in that broad category. The Mayor had also asked for this to be included in Metro's budget for 2015.
- Re: operational or other benefits of WI-FI, it would potentially allow Metro to increase the polling on bus apps for the purposes of providing more accurate

real-time info. Right now, polling occurred about once/minute; with WI-FI this could increase to 3-5 times/minute.

- The updated Feedback document that was handed out contained three more responses than the document sent out in the mailing. These were received after staff sent out a text message with a link to the Feedback form.

Registrants were invited to speak. (Please see the attached registration slips and comments.)

- Richard Hare, Gammon Road, 53717, commented that people already had Smart Phones and didn't really need WI-FI. He didn't see many riders with laptops. Increasing fares to make certain tech improvements like this wouldn't help him, because he couldn't afford the gadgets associated with them.

- Amanda Love, Spaight Street, 53704, a member of the Madison College Student Senate, opposed the rate increase. MC would be paying the cost of the increase. Because this increase was solely for WI-FI and not other operational needs, she was concerned they would see another cost increase in a year or two. While they could handle this increase to \$1.20, if it were to go up to \$1.30 or \$1.35 in the near future, that could be a lot more difficult for them to take on. She didn't see WI-FI as a particularly burning demand. Along with other students who took the bus, she experienced standing room only most of the time, which made it hard to use laptops.

- Margaret Wolfe, Madison, a former Madison College student, opposed the rate increase. She objected to the fact that if a pass holder transferred, the school was charged twice, while a regular rider got a transfer. Also, when fares were raised, ridership decreased. She worked downtown, and estimated that 80% of her co-workers drove because they didn't see the bus fare as affordable for them. These drivers clogged up streets downtown, which made it harder for businesses to do business. If instead the fare was lowered, more people would be encouraged to use buses, producing stronger ridership and less traffic downtown. She also hoped that the State could be persuaded to offer a reduced bus pass as an employee benefit.

When asked what was on Metro's supplemental budget list that wasn't funded, Kamp mentioned two items: leasing garage space out by MATC (per space shortages), and additional evening and Saturday service on Routes 2 and 7 (per TDP). The cost of the additional service would be \$175K for 2015, or \$500K annualized.

Golden understood that crowded buses could make use of laptops difficult, and wondered if many of those who would potentially benefit from WI-FI, would be excluded from using it because many of them were on the overcrowded buses. He asked if there were a way to answer that in a substantive way. Kamp said this was a point well taken; but that if they had WI-FI, there were many times when people would use it. He saw standing riders using their smartphones, and thought there would be general applicability for individuals.

Golden asked if Metro had received a lot of requests from "below" (from riders). Kamp said that looking across the transportation industry, WI-FI was a growing amenity; popular on intercity buses, long-haul trains, but also on city buses where people sometimes rode for half hour or 45 minutes. At one of the Transportation Master Plan meetings, one young person was asked about Millennials using transit. His answer was, "I view transit as the 25th hour of my day, with a half hour in the AM and a half hour in the PM when I'm not driving,

and can do emailing and banking. I'm able to do things."

Kamp added that one of the key aspects of 2008 was that Metro needed to focus on amenities more. They now had lights and schedules in their shelters, and this fits with that effort to offer more amenities. Kovich reiterated the earlier comment that WI-FI would provide more accurate real-time info for riders who used the bus app, another application for adding WI-FI.

Kamp said they would bring any further customer feedback to the January meeting. Poulson closed the hearing at 6:20 PM.

H. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

H.1. [35994](#)

Metro: Annual Paratransit Progress Report, presented by Paratransit Program Manager Crystal Martin - TPC 11.05.14

[Please note: This item was taken up ahead of Item G., before the scheduled start time of 6 PM for the public hearing.] Paratransit Program Manager Crystal Martin highlighted items in the Report.

- In 2013, the program provided 270K one-way trips for people with disabilities in the Metro service area.
- On-time performance for Metro's direct service and three contracted fleets ran at 94%.
- A one-way trip cost \$3.25, for the paratransit rider and one person to accompany them at no additional charge. The actual cost of the ride was \$34.75.
- There were a couple of big changes in the last two years.
- They no longer had the long-term assignment program. This had been a set-aside program for high-volume users, who usually took ~40 trips/month; commuters going back and forth to work, who usually had standing rides that came and went at the same time of day.
- The program ran for eight years and provided very good service, because it was so consistent. Riders were able to call contractors directly to set up rides, with standing schedules and standing drivers. Initially the benefits were not just the consistent service, but they also got more competitive pricing because of the stability of the service.
- Eventually the margin disappeared, and a ride cost whatever it cost, even when efficiencies were built into the service. Eventually other benefits faded away also.
- Now that they could get real-time data, they decided to bring those rides back into being directly handled by Metro, because they wouldn't be able to import the data otherwise. With some other technical issues, they had let that contract expire and did not go out to bid again for it.
- Another change was that ADATS had done away with the Paratransit peak fares, which were created to encourage ridership in off-peak. But with so many pass programs and coordinated services, the fare wasn't very effective; it didn't motivate riders.
- Also, a pilot program had been conducted to do in-person assessments. Traditionally, when people applied for the Paratransit service, they filled out a paper application, which was reviewed by staff to determine whether the person was able to use Fixed services or qualified for Paratransit. The national trend and training was to interview applicants in person, and conduct physical and cognitive testing. Then staff reviewed the person's transportation needs with them.

- Metro's pilot had gone very well. And going into 2014, they had applied for 53.10 federal funding administered through the MPO, and hired a staff person to conduct in-person assessments starting in June. So far, so good. In a few months, they would be able to report trends with that.

Martin answered questions.

- Usually WisDOT did Management Audit every 5 years. The last one was done in 2009. Though we might expect one in 2014, DOT had just implemented a new grant management program, which was a huge undertaking and they had put a lot of resources into making that happen.
- Keeping up with on-street supervision was always a challenge. Metro was so lean, it was hard to get the regular observations made. Though ridership had grown, staff hadn't grown; even with more trips, they had the same number of staff to observe trips.
- With changes to MAP-21, the New Freedom Grant program had been rolled into the 53.10 program. Parts of the state had carried over their funds. The two programs were almost exactly the same; but there were some differences. For example, Union Cab had been eligible to purchase paratransit vehicles under New Freedom, but that was not the case under 53.10. Metro was funded under 53.10.
- Regarding trends in cost per trip for 2014, they used audit info from 2013, and allowing for increases in wages, fuel, etc., they estimated increased costs for 2014. They had to come in under what the actual costs might be, because they were prohibited from making a profit. They typically came in several dollars under.
- Martin added that they would be going out for bids for new contractors in 2015.

Kamp remarked that coordination of the Paratransit program was very complex, with ADA requirements, working with the County, several agencies and private companies, as well as the new in-person assessment program. On top of managing all this, Martin was the Chair of the WURTA, helping with info sharing and legislative initiatives throughout the state. He wanted to express his appreciation of her efforts. Members thanked Martin as well. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Item G., the Public Hearing.]

H.2. [36481](#)

Metro: WisDOT Transit System Cost-Efficiency Comparison 2007-2013 - TPC 12.10.14

[Please note: This item followed Item G.1., the public hearing. Bergamini rejoined the group at this point.] Kamp talked about the 2013 Performance Standards (attached). This was one page out of the 40-page WisDOT report, the first in several years. It would be reviewed in more detail in the Quarterly Reports.

- The info represented a combined measure of Fixed and Paratransit. For example, it was harder to separate out "cost/ride" when one was in the \$30 range and the other was in the \$3 range.
- The colored cells indicate those transit systems, which didn't fall in the parameters set by the +/- one standard deviation of the group mean.
- Madison Metro had no colored cells for the six measures that ranging from cost/ride, revenue/expense (fare box recovery) ratio, etc. In five of the six areas, Metro was doing better than the mean. In expense/hour, they were higher. They would have more info about this in the Quarterly Report.

Golden asked if the method for calculating/accruing the cost was consistent

throughout all the transit systems. Metro has a history of paying a lot of interagency charges (since the days the State paid a % of our budget rather than a fixed amount.) In Iowa, perhaps they didn't pay their Personnel department and their costs would be lower; but then we were compared to them and found to be more expensive.

Metro Finance Manager said that National Transit Database was used, and there could be differences in the way that different transit systems entered info into the NTD. However, Metro did not show interagency charges as part of operating expenses. Though interagency charges were part of their budget submission to the City, they were not part of this. Out of Metro's \$57 million budget, interagency charges comprised \$600-700K. Kamp added that when performance reviews were done throughout the county, the NTD data was the source of data, recognizing that no sets of data (state by state, transit system by transit system) were perfectly comparable.

Bergamini said that she and her students had seen this report earlier, and had some questions about it, which they directed to WisDOT. They were most interested in expense/revenue hour over time. As a result, substantial changes were made to our numbers, and to Milwaukee's as well. She wondered why this particular group of systems was used: There had been a tradition of using two different groups of comparable systems, because we provided so much more service for our population area than most.

Kamp said staff had talked to DOT and found that the numbers in years prior to 2011-12 did not include all costs, but 2012-13 did include those costs. These numbers had been corrected now, following calls from Bergamini and Metro. Metro had also asked how the peer cities were selected. Though the current list of peers was very different from the list used in the past, they said their general assessment was based on service area, population, and similar characteristics. For example, Champaign-Urbana hadn't been in their peer group previously because their population was ~100+K, while ours was ~350-400K. But some other systems on the current list were larger and hadn't previously been in the peer group either.

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

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

J.

[36486](#)

Annual Statement of Interests, due January 6, 2015 [Per MGO Sec. 3.35(9)(b)]

Poulson reminded members to fill out their SOL's.

K. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Poulson mentioned that he, Kamp and others had traveled to Minneapolis; and at a future meeting he'd like to talk about how they had figured out a regional sense of planning, moved projects through a system of public involvement, and got things done.

K.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Kovich reiterated her request to (when appropriate) have an update on Judge Doyle Square esp. as it related to parking.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Kovich, to Adjourn at 6:30 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.