



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, May 11, 2016

5:00 PM

Monona Terrace
1 John Nolen Drive
(Wilson St. & MLK Blvd.)
Level 4, Rooms MNQR

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM. Poulson welcomed Alder Zellers.

Present: 9 - David Ahrens; Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; Wayne Bigelow; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and Kate D. Lloyd

Excused: 1 - David E. Tolmie

Please note: There is one vacancy on the Commission, in the position of Second Alternate. Please note also that Lloyd arrived at 5:02 PM and Kemble arrived at 5:04 PM, after the Minutes were approved.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Bigelow, to Approve the Minutes of the April 13, 2016 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Ayes: 7 - David Ahrens; Rebecca Kemble; Wayne Bigelow; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and Kate D. Lloyd

Abstentions: 1 - Ledell Zellers

Excused: 1 - David E. Tolmie

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Bergamini recused herself from Item H. related to the fare changes, due to an employment conflict of interest. The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G.1.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

- E.1. [42771](#) Parking: May 2016 Activity Report, March Revenue-Expense Reports - TPC
05.11.16

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item G.1.] Asst. Parking Utility Manager Sabrina Tolley mentioned that the Parking Analyst had retired. She would be preparing the regular reports for the interim, and invited members to make requests for info they might want. Golden asked for occupancy data for street meters and their general location; because underutilized meters could potentially become a Park and Walk lot with longer-term 10-hr meters. Tolley responded to questions.

- The 20 new multi-space meters would be the last to replace single-space coin meters. The remaining 550 single-space coin meters could possibly be replaced with single-space smart meters.
- Re: Judge Doyle Square, the negotiating team was working on terms of an agreement with Beitler. Updates on JDS would be included in the regular reports.
- The +/- shown for revenues on page 6 was meant to show the change 2016 vs. 2015.

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

E.2. [42827](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Financial Report, Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Comparisons, and Hybrid Stats - TPC 05.11.16

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted items in the Summary.

- YTD ridership: Through 1st Quarter, it was down 9.6% vs. 2015, probably due to gas prices, mild winter and overcrowding. Campus routes were down the most. With milder weather and higher density housing downtown/Campus, riders may have chosen to walk/bike. Also, Spring break fell in March this year. Ridership through February was down 6%, closer to the trend expected for the year.
- 1st Quarter Financials: Per approved Operating budget, the Contingency Fund would be reduced by ~\$1M for a number of items, inc. service increases and delay in the fare increase. Expenses/revenues remained pretty balanced.
- Key projects: Among these were a lease on Pennsylvania Avenue for the Buildings/Grounds unit, and the TIGER grant.
- An analysis of four underground diesel tanks had found some issues: No leaks were found, but corrosion at the top of the tanks required that their protective liners be replaced. The tanks were 30 years old, and no longer under warranty. The liners would extend their life 10-15 years.

Kovich/Zellers made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [42448](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into a contract on behalf of the City with JSD Professional Services, Inc. to provide consulting engineering services for maintenance of City of Madison Parking Utility structures and other facilities.

Tolley said the current contract with JSD would be ending, and the resolution would authorize a new 3-yr contract starting June 1st. JSD prepared annual condition reports of Parking structures, and oversaw public works construction and contracts. \$900K was in the 2016 budget to cover this. It was yet to be determined who would be overseeing the Judge Doyle Square project, which

was not included in this contract. A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Kovich, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2. [42687](#)

SUBSTITUTE Amending the 2016 adopted Parking Utility Capital budget and Aauthorizing a contract with Electronic Data Collection Corporation (EDC) for the purchase and maintenance of a Parking Enforcement Management System. ~~and amending the 2016 adopted Parking Utility-Capital budget and 2016 adopted Police Department Operating budget~~

Tolley said the MPD had gone back out for RFPs for enforcement system/equipment for onstreet meters, and found this vendor. The final cost was \$420,600. The \$300K in Parking's original 2012 budget had rolled over each year, and they now needed to amend their budget to cover the additional \$120,600. A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Bigelow, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [42336](#)

A resolution directing staff from Planning, Transit, Traffic Engineering and Engineering to study potential options for the future use and design of the 200 Block of Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd including possible closure of the street to motorized vehicles.

Kamp noted that bus routes traveled through this block. Staff would be involved in the study, esp. to review what alternatives Metro might have. The detour to Hamilton/Doty used during Farmers' Market was no ideal. They were looking at the possibility of continuing to allow buses on the block, as was done on State Street. Both Transit and Parking staff would be involved and would keep everyone apprised. A motion was made by Lloyd, seconded by Bergamini, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Item G.2.]

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

G.1. [41691](#)

Metro: Jenifer Street Construction Plans and related Bus Stop and Detour Information - TPC 02.10.16 & 03.09.16

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp referred to the nearside diagram that had been sent (attached), shown with the other improvements on Jenifer Street, which included a bulb at the corner that moved the stop back a number of feet. The bulb would improve the line of sight for pedestrians and bicyclists, who were trying to enter the intersection. Currently, the curb for the bus stop ran in a straight line to the corner.

Poulson called registrants forward.

1) John Olson, 1600 Calico Ct., Sun Prairie, 53590, co-owner of the church property (Capital City Sanctuary) at Jenifer and Ingersoll, spoke in favor of keeping the stops as they were: As a driving instructor and having been born/raised on Jenifer, the main goal was safety. In his experience, vehicles needed to make a secondary stop because speed on Jenifer was an issue. Moving the buses back would improve the line of sight. Also, by keeping the stops as they were, other problems wouldn't be increased, for residents and for senior/disabled church-goers, who needed the parking for easier access.

2) Gayle Gold, 1044 Jenifer Street, 53703, spoke in opposition to the relocation of the bus stops: Referring to her diagram (attached), the current westbound nearside stop impacted one driveway. A farside stop would impact dense housing/vehicles and multiple driveways. Jenifer was a main commuter bike route. Residents would have a harder time seeing them around the buses. Plus, the road would be two feet narrower. The concerns expressed by Scott Thornton in his letter (attached), would be multiplied by 15 (residents affected by a farside stop). She would need help backing out of her driveway.

3) Jeff Waldman, 1050 Jenifer Street, 53703, spoke in opposition to the relocation of the bus stops: A farside stops would be dangerous. It was hard to see around cars now, much less to see around buses which were taller. Jenifer would be narrower. He hoped the detour would show that Willy Street was where the buses belonged, on a commercial street; rather than to disturb the peace and quiet of those living on Jenifer Street, a residential street. He hoped the TPC would vote in support of him and his neighbors.

4) Joyce Cullen, 1054 Jenifer Street, 53703, spoke in favor of keeping the stops as they were: Having a farside stop in front of her house would decrease its value. She had bought her house a year ago with the understanding that a bus stop would not be in front of it. A bus stopped two feet from their front door would interfere with their environment. She and her husband had moved here because they thought it could be their home. They wanted to raise a family, and for safety concerns, she didn't want children around a bus stop. It was a terrible idea to stop buses in front of multiple driveways. She was concerned about safety, but why fix a problem that didn't exist in this spot?

5) Donna Davis, member representing Capital City Sanctuary, 1103 Jenifer Street, 53703, spoke in opposition to the relocation of the bus stops: She wanted to retain the parking spaces needed by senior/elderly church-goers and young families. They had concerns about health issues as well.

6) Scott Thornton, 1104 Jenifer Street, 53703, spoke in opposition to the new nearside design for the stop in front of his house, which would push the buses back, so they would sit across his driveway. While he felt a bus stop was an asset to the neighborhood, this stop was not just a bus stop: It was a transfer point for shift changes and relief buses. With the bump-out, buses would not be able to pull up, eliminating access to his property as required by municipal code. Also, as a safety issue, when he couldn't get into his driveway, he held up traffic in both directions. Right now, when buses pulled up, he had room to get in/out of his driveway; and the bus did not block the crosswalk. With the bump out, there would not be room.

District 6 Alder Marsha Rummel joined the table: The bulb-outs along the street were a way to narrow the street and provide more pedestrian safety. Perhaps they could put the bulb-out in front of the church instead, to address Thornton's concerns. She was rooting for Williamson to be become the permanent route.

Joined by Metro Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck, staff and members talked about the new nearside configuration.

- The bulb-out was placed at the bus stop to provide a better line of sight for pedestrians crossing from the north side to the south side of Jenifer.

- It helped to address some of staff's safety concerns.
- Moving it across the street wouldn't address the pedestrian issue.
- The bulb-out at Ingersoll was smaller/shorter than others on Jenifer.
- It was staff's understanding that with the bulb-out, buses would block Thornton's driveway.
- A signal, ped light or stop sign would have to satisfy warrants (traffic/ped volumes) for installation. Criteria hadn't been met so far. The Alder could ask for a new review to see.

Bergamini/Bigelow made a motion that the TPC recommend to Metro and City Engineering that the bus stops on Jenifer Street be retained on the nearside of the intersections at Ingersoll. Bergamini didn't want to micro-manage and wanted to leave it to Traffic Engineering and Metro to figure out the safest way to fit two buses and make it as safe as possible for pedestrians; and staff should determine the size of the bump-out. The debate had centered on whether stops should nearside or farside. Metro probably still preferred farside, and she respectfully disagreed in this particular instance at this set of stops.

Golden asked whether staff or the Commission had the authority to make a decision. Kamp said that staff usually decided where to locate bus stops. But occasionally, the reality was that staff review didn't agree with issues that were raised. A year ago, the TPC had voted to keep the stops on every block, but to have staff decide on near or farside. Now with this intersection, staff was hearing otherwise. All the other stops were being moved to farside. Kamp couldn't provide a legal answer, but the pragmatic one was that if the Commission told staff that they wanted to make a decision on their bus stops, staff would bring it to them for action.

A vote was taken and the motion passed, as follows: 7 Ayes-Bergamini, Golden, Zellers, Kemble, Ahrens, Bigelow, and Kovich. 1 No: Lloyd. Non-voting: Poulson. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item E.1.]

- G.2. [42828](#) Resolution No. TPC 16-11, memorializing adoption of the Parking Rate Schedule effective 06.01.16 - TPC 05.11.16

[Please note: This item followed Item F.3.] Kovich/Golden made a motion to approve the TPC resolution. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

- G.3. **Metro: Action on proposed services changes effective August 2016.**

Kamp said that staff continued to recommend the service changes brought before the Commission in April. They had received a handful of comments regarding the (combination) Route 5/13. Beck joined Kamp to answer questions. The Fitchburg Transportation and Transit Commission had agreed with the changes affecting their routes. Regarding Routes 18/19 and walking distances at Allied Drive, things would be improved. Bergamini/Golden made a motion to approve the route changes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

- [42425](#) Metro: Public Hearing and subsequent documents regarding proposed Metro service changes, effective in August, 2016 - TPC 04.13.16 & 05.11.16

H. 6:00 PM - PUBLIC HEARING: To hear public comment on certain proposed fare changes to go into effect in Fall 2016.

[42829](#)

Metro: Public hearing on proposed targeted fare changes - TPC 05.11.16

Poulson called the hearing to order at 6:00 PM. Metro's Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch and Finance Manager Wayne Block joined Kamp to discuss the proposed fare changes.

- Survey data was used to comply with local and federal requirements on equity considerations.
- The fare proposal was reviewed according to the recently implemented Fare Equity Policy. (Please see the PowerPoint attached to Leg. File 42829.) The wording of the Policy was taken from other transit agencies.
- The lowest % increase among non-equity fares was for the Youth 10-Ride card = 12%. Therefore, equity sensitive fares could not increase by more than 17% (+5%). The highest increase among equity sensitive fares was 16.4%, within these parameters.
- The adopted Operating budget required Metro to utilize ~\$1M in its Contingency Fund to balance its budget in 2016. In order not to continue this practice, and to offset \$500K of \$1M, Metro proposed the fare increase.
- The fare increase would help pay for some of the supplemental requests included in the Operating budget: the route changes, two additional bus cleaners, the lease for the Middleton bus garage, and a change in insurance coverage that raised the cost substantially.
- With a fare increase taking effect in Fall, these costs impacted the 2016 budget by \$500K. In 2017, these costs would be covered by the fare increase.

Members and staff discussed the proposal and related issues.

- (Kamp) Re: Family Care changes in Dane County: Following a presentation by Dane County staff, a staff study group was formed. The \$3.8M/yr in federal Medicaid Waiver funding that the County passed through to Metro may be diverted to other causes by 2017-18. Staff would develop recommendations to bring to the TPC.
- (Golden) The pass-through \$ paid for 58% of paratransit trips and the City paid for 42%. The City was currently paying the State share of the Medicaid costs. While the anticipated changes would be a hit, the City would be paying for less service, which could result in a windfall of \$3M for Metro. He wondered why then a \$500K/yr fare increase was needed at this point.
- (Kamp) It was too soon to tell if this would be the outcome. There were counties where the paratransit trips did not follow the money, and the transit systems were required to provide those services to individuals eligible for paratransit service. It could turn out that those trips wouldn't be diverted to other providers, and the funding wouldn't come to Metro, which would result in just the opposite, where Metro was hit with a multi-million dollar extra expense. It wasn't clear yet, which was why staff was studying the situation.
- (Golden) Crystal Martin was involved in placing a provision in regulations that would insulate paratransit systems statewide from any kind of service agency diversion, to use Metro to provide the services they were providing. They didn't have enough info now, and he was not trying to make decisions/recommendations. But he wanted it on the record that there was as much chance of a windfall as there was of an additional expense. He hoped the staff report would be timely enough to be part of their decision-making.
- (Golden) The methodology didn't seem fair if it didn't take into account the number of years between fare increases. (Ex: Youth 10-Ride at 12% was last

increased in 2009. 12% divided by 7 years = 1.7%.)

- (Kamp) The Policy addressed the % in the year the fare increase was made. Changes to this might be brought back in the future.
- (Kovich) The lowest % increase of a non-equity sensitive fare would seem to be zero. If we were choosing to not increase certain fares, then that was a comparative point.
- (Kamp) To cover the \$9M costs for Paratransit, some funding came from MA Waiver and some came from the City. Potentially a regulation could be used to avoid having the costs of those trips shifted to Metro, the Agency Fare. Metro had found it challenging to enforce agencies to use an Agency Fare, if individuals came in one at a time, or if they came in in groups to avoid the agency fare. It would be hard to guarantee that Metro wouldn't incur that cost.
- (Kamp) Re: Metro's obligation to provide Paratransit: Under ADA, a certification process assessed an individual's ability to ride the bus for some or all of their trips. If the person qualified for Paratransit for some or all of their trips, whether MA Waiver eligible or not, they were eligible to use the community's ADA Paratransit services. Their preliminary conclusion was that there would be individuals still riding even though they had at one time been MA Waiver-eligible clients.

Poulson called registrants to the table.

1) Robert Lewin, W. Washington Avenue, 53703, spoke in opposition to the fare increases: A downtown resident with many routes at his disposal, he owned a car but used a 10-Ride pass to ride the bus a lot. He hoped the Commission would find ways not to increase rates. Ridership was vital to the city, and any time the price went up, it impacted the ability of somebody to ride the bus. Increases made bus use less attractive.

2) Melanie Foxcroft, Lakeland Avenue, 53704, spoke in opposition to the fare increases: Between the last fare increase in 2009 and now, inflation had risen 11%. The cumulative rate of increase for many of the fare categories far exceeded that. The cumulative rates of increases made between 03.01.09 and the proposed increase on 09.01.16 ranged from 16.7% to 33.3% to 45.8%. (See % Increase chart prepared by Yvonne Schwinge, attached.) Meanwhile private developers were receiving millions in public money for parking, which undermined the demand for more non-auto infrastructure. Perhaps developers should pay development fees for locating downtown; and parkers should pay for themselves. Transportation equity was important, since many people rode the bus. Was it more equitable to raise bus fares or to charge parkers the market rate downtown? Perhaps Metro could tap into its large Contingency Fund. Or the benefit of low fuel costs could be passed on to consumers. Regarding equity, how many in Owl Creek would be able to afford to ride the bus if their fares were increased?

3) Yvonne Schwinge, S. Franklin Street, 53703, spoke in opposition to the fare increases, esp. to the 31-day pass: Past fare increases should be considered when deciding the %, not just the current fare. Using data received from Metro, she developed a chart showing the cumulative rates of increases from rates in effect on 03.01.09 forward. (See her complete statement and % Increase chart attached.) The increase to the equity sensitive 31-day pass was not in line with the other fare types. Data gathered from the on-board survey did not include weekend ridership, but it was being used to inform decisions about passes used on weekends. If an increase were made to the 31-day pass, additional

weekend service should be added.

4) Nancy (no last name/address) wrote comments in opposition to the fare increases, read by Poulson: How did you figure the raises? The 31-day \$9 not fair. I want to know complete rationale.

5) Thea Bach, Danbury Street, 53711, member of Dunn's Marsh Neighborhood Council, spoke in opposition to the fare increases, esp. to the 31-day pass: The Dunn's Marsh-Allied Drive neighborhood had nothing they could get to on foot: No doctor/dentist, dry cleaner, grocery store. A transit-dependent rider with a modest income, she had to take the bus to go everywhere, and planned her life around the Route 18. She took three buses to get to Central Colony where she worked. She left at Noon, and got home at 11 PM. With no side vision, she planned her life around Metro. The current \$58 for the pass was already a burden for her. The rate increase would be taking grocery money from one of her neighbors. For the poor and disabled people in her neighborhood, the bus was everybody's car. She asked that the 31-day pass not be increased. It would hurt her.

6) Tim Wong, Jackson Street, 53704, former TPC member, spoke in opposition to the fare increases: Interestingly, he was removed from the TPC by a previous mayor, after he opposed the last increase. Fare increases were always a bad idea. Studies showed they led to lower ridership. Along with "captive" riders, Madison had many "choice" riders, who be lost if fares were raised. Why an increase when ridership was up, gas prices were low, and more people were driving? The City subsidized motor vehicles/driving, and needed to support transit, to create some balance. Run buses later at night. With 11% inflation since 2009, the proposed fares would be above inflation.

7) Lori Hobbs, Union Street, 53704, spoke in opposition to the increases, esp. to the 31-day Senior/Disabled pass: A long-time rider, she felt that some seniors and disabled couldn't afford the pass. If increases were made, service should run on weekends and later into the night; riders couldn't get to their destinations when buses quit early. She objected to violations of the stroller policy; often seniors/disabled like herself were forced to stand. She also objected to smoking/drinking at bus stops.

8) An unidentified person wrote comments in opposition to the fare increases, read by Poulson: Fare increase of almost \$10 for Adult 31-day pass was excessive. Clean buses were important but a \$5 increase would be adequate.

9) David Hobbs, Union Street, 53704, spoke in opposition to the increase to the 31-day Senior/Disabled pass: He used the pass to go everywhere. More night and weekend service was needed, along with service to such places as the Plaza movie theater and the Humane Society.

10) John Newman, Algoma Street, 53704, spoke in opposition to the increase to the 31-day pass: He wondered why the non-equity fares were increased by 12%, but the equity sensitive fares were increased by 16%. It would seem that equity sensitive fares should be increased at a lower rate, because people depended on them. After his car broke down, he began to ride the bus everyday to work. Even with his car being fixed, he would be interested in continuing to ride the bus, but with the ~\$10 increase to his pass, he probably

wouldn't. Weekend service wasn't getting more convenient with the increase.

11) Michael Goodman, Maple Wood Lane, 53704, spoke in opposition to the fare increases, esp. to the 31-day Senior/Disabled pass: Why were passes being increased, and not the Cash fares? He didn't get a pension, and as a Senior, any increase would be significant financially. Also, these increases came against a backdrop of declining quality of service, such as drivers taking the wrong route, missed stops, bus design (space dedicated to wheelchairs, limited bus straps).

Poulson closed the public hearing and noted that the TPC would probably take action on the fares at its June 8th meeting.

- Related to Schwinge's chart, members asked staff for fare increase data since 2000, with annualized %'s, to see how fast/slow fares had changed.
- Golden asked for the following info related to MA Waiver trips: 1) % of all Paratransit rides that were Waiver rides; 2) the raw number of Waiver rides/year; 3) the average cost being used for a Waiver ride (the actual cost being billed); 4) the amount of federal dollars being reimbursed per ride and for the Waiver total; and 5) Madison's share per Waiver ride and Waiver total for just the Waiver rides.
- Kovich reiterated: When looking at equity sensitive fares and thinking about the lowest % of increase, they needed to consider that fares with no increase were the lowest.

Kamp invited members to send (Wayne Block or Anne Benishek-Clark) any scenarios they might have, to look at their impact on revenues.

I. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

- I.1. [42846](#) Metro: Update about lease at 2422 Pennsylvania Avenue - TPC 05.11.16

Kamp noted that Metro was housing 200 buses at a facility designed for 160. The Long-Range Facilities Committee had identified the Pennsylvania site for the Building and Grounds unit, which would move in 1-2 months, freeing up some space at the existing Ingersoll garage.

- I.2. Metro: Update on TIGER grant application - TPC 05.11.16

Kamp submitted their second effort to secure a TIGER grant that was due 4/29.

- They were continuing to look at the Nakoosa site for a satellite bus garage for 50-70 buses, depending on the number of 40-ft. or 60-ft. articulated buses.
- Staff had worked with Vandewalle to make their points more effectively on some of the equity and economic development limitations they had because they couldn't expand during peak hours.
- They were requesting \$17.5M in federal funding, and hoped to hear by Fall.
- A link of the whole report was sent out, and members were encouraged to call if they had questions.

J. 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)
TPC Subcommittee (to review issues outlined in Leg. File 37359)
Ad Hoc Transportation Ordinance Review Committee

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Poulson noted that the annual organizational meeting (inc. elections and review of Rules and Procedures) would be held in July.

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Golden noted that TPC members populated other committees advisory to TPC, and it would be valuable to periodically hear from members what these committees were doing. Benishek-Clark suggested that Reports of Other Committees would be an appropriate place for short verbal summaries to occur.

Golden also asked for a review of the Fare Equity Policy, and how the percentages were being implemented.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Zellers, seconded by Kovich, to Adjourn at 7:05 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.