



# 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](http://www.madisoncitychannel.com).**

---

Wednesday, December 12, 2012

5:00 PM

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

---

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 PM.

Present: 9 -

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

Excused: 2 -

Bridget R. Maniaci and David E. Tolmie

Please note: Kovich arrived at 5:05 PM during Agenda Item C. Subeck arrived  
at 5:10 PM, after completion of Agenda Item D.

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Schmidt, to Approve the Minutes  
of the November 7, 2012 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Allen Barkoff, 2930 Barlow Street, 53705, spoke of the need for a liberal free  
bus pass allocation policy for the homeless in Madison. He became aware of  
the need during his association with "Occupy Madison". He also volunteered  
with the Bubbles Laundry program, whereby homeless could wash their  
clothes for free. He had gotten to know a lot of homeless people and the  
barriers they faced that prevented them from helping themselves and lift  
themselves out of being homeless. A couple examples: One man needed a  
photo ID for a job, but didn't have a way to get to the DMV. Barkoff gave him a  
ride to get an ID, and now the man was on his way to helping himself. People  
living at Token Creek were given a ride into town to the warming center in the  
morning and a ride back out to Token Creek in the evening. While at the  
warming center, whatever folks needed to do – to go to the Job Center, buy  
food, do laundry, take a shower, they needed a bus pass to do. People at  
agencies that provide free passes said some days they had passes, and other  
days they didn't, at which point, the homeless people were just out of luck. The  
need was there. Other cities had liberal programs to provide bus passes for  
homeless. The buses ran regardless, so it wasn't an economic issue; it was  
political. Barkoff hoped the issue would be considered at the TPC, and that  
more free bus passes could be given to homeless people.

Dave Peters, Madison, said he thought Madison had a pretty good bus system

(esp. compared to Wausau, where he was from). In order for homeless people to become formerly homeless, they needed a job; they needed a way to get to a job. The City could pay one way or another, either by supporting people without jobs, by paying for their rent and medical services; or by doing something that led to something constructive, by paying for bus service so people can at least get to a job. Peters volunteered at the warming center. He knew the people staying at Token Creek, which was (insanely) way off the bus lines. With bus passes, people could take advantage of such services as free showers. He felt it wasn't really a matter of money; it was a matter of will. Did the City want to provide something that could eventually help its treasury, or did it just want to keep flushing money away?

Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp said the issue was really more a political than practical matter. Chair Poulson said the group would explore this further.

**D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.**

**E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS**

- E.1. [28572](#) Parking: November 2012 Activity Report, and October Revenue/Expenses/Occupancy Reports - TPC 12.12.12

**Members had no questions about the report. Subeck/Schmidt made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

- E.2. [28573](#) Metro YTD Performance Indicators, and Financial, Rider/Revenue by Fare Type, Performance Measures, and Annual Accident Totals Reports - TPC 12.12.12

**Metro staff and members discussed the reports.**

- **(Block) Re: the Financials, the reason the WI Retirement item was \$1 million less than 2011 was due to employees now paying half of the contribution, previously paid by the City. Metro knew which groups of employees would be contributing and when; which was why this item varied only \$30K from budget (under budget, like salaries in general).**
- **(Kamp) Re: drop in ridership/productivity of Route 80's, Route 85 no longer existed and was combined with other routes (due to UW's request to cut 10% service). The variance between % change in ridership and productivity could be due to some drivers not counting riders. However, the drops were within expectations, given the cuts in Campus service. Without Campus routes, ridership was up 3.2%, and productivity was up 1%.**
- **(Bergamini) The %'s for Routes 81-82 (Late Night Circulators) also dropped considerably. This was possibly the first time these were not in top five for productivity, in part due to detours whereby the Route 81 has been severely truncated. Also the UW had fewer work/school days in September.**

**Schmidt/Kovich made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

- F.1. [28375](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the Clerk to execute a long-term parking lease with Hammes Company for at least 32 stalls at State Street Capitol parking garage.

Parking Operations Manager Tom Woznick talked about the long-term parking lease with Hammes Company at State Street Cap.

- A month earlier, Hammes approached Parking about lease agreement in the reserved section off of street level.
- With the reconstruction of the Edgewater, 32 parkers from National Guardian would be displaced. Hammes agreed to provide parking for them as part of the closing of the negotiations.
- Parking had sufficient space at State St Cap to do so.
- The agreement would be between a year and 1-1/2 yr. depending on how long the reconstruction would take. Hammes would give Parking 30-day notice once they were ready to park in their facility again.
- This was good for the Utility, and he hoped the group would approve the resolution.

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

F.2. [28576](#)

Metro: Presentation of Community Partnership Awards to App Developers - TPC 12.12.12

Metro's Marketing & Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch and Information Services Manager Dave Eveland joined Kamp to make presentations of Community Partnership Awards to app developers, who helped develop apps to provide schedule and real-time info to customers (which had been among the customer service recommendations in the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Report, to be discussed later in the meeting).

Greg Tracy took Metro's data and converted it to make it available for remote computer terminals, so customers could access real-time info at such locations as Mother Fool's.

Aleksander Dobkin, a UW student now at Google, developed an android-compatible app to show real-time locations of buses (because he "wanted to know where his bus was").

With Metro having limited resources and needing help from the community, Brad Leege, Bryan Shelton and Nick Weaver from the UW IT stepped up to develop and now maintain a bus app that was one of the most popular apps on UW Mobile. As a result, fewer Ride Guides were being used.

Metro was presenting the first (hopefully of many) Community Partnership Awards to these recipients for helping make Metro information available through technology that was easily accessible and less frightening to people.

Leege said that their bus app was far and away their most popular feature on UW Mobile, used by students, staff and Campus visitors from all over the state and the world. Tracy said that there were between 130K-140K requests per week on the app he helped develop. With regard to info on signage at bus stops, Rusch had just spoken to SOS at the Wis. State Journal about how phone apps and the 4-digit bus stop numbers could be used in conjunction items on Metro's website to get a lot of different kinds of info. Even with ridership growing by over a million riders in 2011, Metro had ordered 5,000 fewer Ride Guides, which saved on printing costs.

Subeck joked that Kamp, being so good at it, could do some advertising for the phone apps. Kamp said there was nothing so satisfying as asking riders who were having trouble with their phones if they needed help.

F.3. [28574](#)

Update on 2013-2017 Transit Development Plan - Mike Cechvala, Madison Area Planning Organization

Mike Cechvala of the MPO said the TDP was a short- to medium-term update of transit planning activities in the Madison area. The last TDP was issued for 2004-2008, so it was past time for an update. The Draft TDP would be available for comment shortly, after which it would be sent to the Council and the Madison Area Planning Board for adoption. Among the 33 recommendations, Cechvala highlighted the following items in the "General Recommendations – 2013-2017 Transit Development Plan" (attached).

#1 Adopt Transit Service Planning Guidelines and Perform. Standards (in development), inc. ridership goals for routes, bus stop spacing, and service goals.

#4 Improve directness and frequency of routes.

#5 Extend service to peripheral areas, inc. new commuter express service.

#6 Improve service performance monitoring, inc. on-time performance; produce more detailed perform. reports (separate times of day, segment diametrical routes, combined paired one-way routes).

#11 Coordinate with Engineering, TE and others as plans developed for roadway changes (related to BRT efforts, bus-only lanes, signal priority).

#12 Do comprehensive bus stop inventory to track needs.

#13 Work with City and UW to locate inter-city bus terminal (which was moving forward as part of the separate process for Judge Doyle Square redevelopment).

#17 Adopt a bus stop consolidation program in central area corridors, to space stops out to a range of 3/16 to 1/4 mile (vs. current 1/8 mile).

#18 Increase size of bus garage or build new facility.

#19 Develop BRT concepts, with implementation within 5-10 years, pending results of BRT study.

#20 Expand Park and Ride at NTP.

#24 Diversify with 30- and 60-ft articulated for busy routes as well as smaller buses for smaller neighborhoods, pending Bus Size study.

#26 Modernize fare boxes to speed up boarding and provide more flexibility.

#27 Improve System Map and Ride Guide, to optimize legibility and accuracy.

#28 Expand online transit tracking and trip planning services.

#32 Continue efforts to move towards RTA, to provide a more efficient and equitable way to fund system and open door to BRT.

The TDP Steering Committee inc. Metro, DOT and UW and other stakeholders met once/month. Underlined items in the recommendations reflect additions at the Committee's last meeting. Members discussed the report and Cechvala responded to (member) questions and comments.

- Re: public or private financing of an intercity bus terminal, the Plan would not recommend how it would be funded; but rather would generally recommend that it be close to downtown and Campus, and on existing bus routes. It was expected that some ways to finance an intercity terminal would be part and come out of the JDS redevelopment project.

- Re: recommendation #2, Golden felt that Metro contract partners should be included in the review processes for transit-supportive development. Re: #5 and "peripheral areas", these should not just be the communities with

contracts, but should also include places like McFarland, Sun Prairie, and even Cambridge, since they were also close to the periphery now. Comments about partner involvement made by Steve Arnold at the rate hearing still resonated. This was no longer a Madison-only system; partners comprised 15% of the local share, and we needed to give greater respect to partners and include them in our plans. Bergamini agreed, and thought the way we think of peripheral routes might need to change (vis a vis certain Fitchburg routes, etc.)

- Cechvala said that the TDP classified "peripheral areas" as routes that went out from transfer points (vs. core or circulator routes); but that the verbiage standing on its own was maybe out of place.

Cechvala discussed the map (attached), which had been developed over a long period of time out of previous iterations, and showed potential future express service around Dane County.

- An inter-governmental coordinating committee had met, inc. DeForest and Stoughton, whose ideas were incorporated in the map.
- Express service would typically travel along these routes into central Madison in the AM and out in the PM, possibly with limited stops or no stops at all.
- They were commuter-designed routes.
- The blue "P" showed where new Park and Rides would be; and the various communities provided input on these.
- The red routes were the existing routes (for Epic and City of Monona express routes); while the other colors reflected routes to other communities, designed similar to those routes.

Subeck wondered if any thought was given to certain areas on Madison's periphery that were unserved, such as the north and south on Madison's west side. Cechvala said that the map was a Dane County map. But other parts of the report, "Potential Future Service Change Concepts" (chart and narrative attached), detailed the potential upgrades and extensions to existing service in the Madison area. These concepts were a sort of wish list of the MPO and Metro staff, which had costs associated with them and reflected what might be considered in the next five years and might make sense to do. This portion was not something that had typically been prepared as part of the TDP, but arose out of the discussion around the fare increase, which called for improvements to the Route 2, Route 18 and Owl Creek.

Cechvala described a few of the future service changes (shown on "Pages 1-8").

- Routes 2 and 3 (Pg 1): Currently these routes split and caused confusion for riders; would be restructured so the main routes would go the same way all the time.
- Routes 6 and 20 (Pg 1-2): Would restructure routes on the northeast side, by streamlining the Route 6 to get out to MATC and East Towne as fast as possible, and having the Route 20 pick up some of the loops and service area that was now served by the Route 6; and could form the basis of a BRT route.
- Establish an express stop pattern along University Avenue and E. Washington (Pg 3); for faster, more regional routes like the 70 series, Route 15 to the west, the Routes 14, 15, 27, 29 on E. Washington, which would benefit by being sped up. Establishing distinct express and local patterns would also help make routes easier to understand.
- Route 2 (Pg 3): Increase frequency of service.
- Extending service to Owl Creek and City View, and some other peripheral

areas of the city.

Re: express service, Golden asked whether data were available about how far people were going on the bus, to inform the discussion of express vs. local service; if for example, we saw only 2% of the riders going 3 miles on average, was express service needed? Cechvala said that though we had data about boardings, they didn't really know (with transfers, etc.) where people were getting off. Metro had gotten feedback that service needed to be sped up. Data showed that the West and North Transfers Points were busy; they knew of people making long trips who wanted to be sped up. Golden wondered if there were enough of them to warrant express service.

Transit Schedule Planner Colin Conn said there was a compelling need, and discussed a few routes relative to this issue.

- Route 38, loading along Tompkins, took an hour to get to UW Hospital.
- It took riders in the Southwest neighborhoods 20 minutes to get to the transfer point. These seemed to beg the need.
- Speeding up a trip by 3-4 minutes could reduce travel time by 10%, and create a positive impact.
- It was useful to develop an express design with an underlay of local service.

Cechvala said the final report would be on their website, and would made available to the group. Poulson said that the work done by Cechvala and Metro staff on the Plan was much appreciated.

F.4. [28577](#)

Proposed Metro fare increases: Discussion and action - TPC 12.12.12

Chair Poulson noted that Item F.4. had been included on the agenda because fares can be set by the Transit and Parking Commission. They could also be appealed to the Common Council and overturned. Discussion had centered not only on the fare increase, but also some of the discrepancies among different types of passes, and how these might be adjusted. He suggested the group start with questions, and then if it strayed into discussion, a motion could be made.

Poulson asked Metro staff (Kamp and Block) if they could talk about the ramifications of the budget decision: whether Metro would be able to meet its budget, and some of the service improvements Metro hoped to accomplish. Kamp summarized: The fare increase was rescinded in the final vote on the budget. \$150K was approved for additional service with a focus on Owl Creek, but with some understanding that if this could fund some other service, Metro would work through the Commission. Metro had updated its budget to reflect no fare increase and notified all of its partners since they had their budgets to move forward; not that the Commission couldn't change this, but finalizing the budget was part of the mechanics of this time of year. Block had a program to help look at different scenarios and how they would impact the budget.

Golden said that he had talked to the Chair about having this item on the agenda. After having had a hearing, he thought it was important for the Commission to close the loop (with discussion/action), even if the Commission decided to do nothing about fares. There had been three service changes that had been discussed as part of the fare discussion: expansion into Owl Creek, at the request of the neighborhood; and two other changes that were more Metro-driven, to fix things that weren't working well. While not wanting to do

anything to disrespect the Council's decision not to increase cash fares, Golden observed that during the fare discussion, they learned of one "broken" fare, the Senior/Disabled pass; which had played out differently than originally expected and which the group might want to remedy.

It seemed to Golden that the Commission could have a productive discussion around these issues. His particular questions were: Was the \$150K enough for Owl Creek, and would it be better to have "x" amount more? What would it cost to do the minimal version of the two fixes proposed by Metro staff? Did Metro have a different proposal, given the strong feedback that the Sr/Dis adjustment was too severe? Having asked those questions, it was clear they didn't have the revenues to address them. The question then became, was there anything on the fare tariff that might be minor adjustments? For example, looking at the deep discount between the tickets and the \$2 cash fare, what would happen if that tickets were kicked up 5¢, which would still be in the range of what the deep discount program recommends? Did the group want to raise enough revenue to do the fixes? Or, did the group want to do nothing; and perhaps Metro could steal some resources from some other routes (with lower productivity) to fix the problems? Doing nothing would be an acceptable outcome. But since the Commission was the group that oversaw service and fares (with appeal to the Council), he thought it was important to at least have a discussion.

White asked Kamp if \$150K was enough to provide service to Owl Creek, and what such service would be. Kamp said the \$150K was more than enough. He went on to say that the original proposal called for modifying Routes 11 and 12 (for Owl Creek), and included other changes to service between South and West transfer points and to University Avenue corridor to relieve overcrowding. Since making their original proposal for Routes 11 and 12, and following meetings with the Neighborhood Resource Team, staff had clearly heard that it would be a problem for Owl Creek students getting to/from LaFollette/Sennett to have to make a transfer. As a result, staff developed a stand-alone route that would travel from the East Transfer Point past LaFollette/Sennett to Owl Creek (which was a little more expensive than modifications to Routes 11 and 12). The \$150K would cover this stand-alone route, and would provide some extra money for some other improvements that staff had started to work on, since the budget was approved.

Kamp said an overarching issue was the constraint on buses: They really had to limit their expansion on services, which was driven as much by buses as it was by dollars. By adding four more buses at peak, they were flirting with that limit. The original 2013 budget proposal would have involved four more peak-hour buses. Right now, expansion to Owl Creek involved 1-2 more peak-hour buses. And since the budget was approved, Epic had approached Metro asking for more service because the Route 75 was overcrowded, which would add another peak-hour bus. The question was what to do with the flexibility, both with the money and the fourth bus.

In response to another question from White, Kamp described how the Senior/Disabled pass had evolved. As a pilot, they had estimated what ridership would be; and in the first year, the ridership was close to their estimate. Now they were estimating 600K for Sr/Dis rides in 2013, which just 3-4 years ago was half that. There had been a significant shift from Adult 31-day, which used to be over 1 million rides, to 900K rides now. In the context

of the original fare proposal and as part of the 5% target in the Mayor's budget, they had proposed an increase to the Sr/Dis pass by a larger % because there were more rides from it and they lost more revenues than they had originally anticipated. The proposed increase still reflected a \$22 discount vs. the proposed 31-Day pass. Per the Council's budget decision, the Sr/Dis fare remained \$27.50.

White asked if staff would recommend any changes to fares. Kamp said that if there were to be a fare change, they would look at having a single fare for Paratransit. Staff probably wouldn't ask for this, if that were the only change to be made. But if other changes were to be made, they would want to include this; which could be revenue-neutral and would eliminate the complication of having two separate fares. When asked if staff was otherwise comfortable with fares as they were for 2013, Kamp said yes.

Schmidt made a motion to reaffirm the current fare structure, which was seconded by Subeck. Schmidt said that since they were going to go into discussion, for procedural reasons, he preferred to have a motion on the floor.

Subeck said she supported the motion she seconded. Thinking of the possibilities, part of her was tempted to support an increase. But being in tough financial times and having heard from bus users, she felt they could meet the goals they set out to meet without a fare increase because of the additional money budgeted by the Council. She was comfortable keeping fares where they were at, for now. Some day, a fare increase would be inevitable; but she had rather they figure out what they hoped to accomplish before they even considered a fare increase. She preferred not to come up with something piecemeal; but rather to think in terms of a long-term strategic plan that may/may not involve fare increases or may involve other funding sources. She wanted to have those kinds of goals before considering an increase.

Conn addressed the group. He said he was more or less responsible for loading on buses. The comment about doing nothing, though understandable, was not really applicable. He couldn't do nothing. When he received reports of a bus regularly passing up passengers over a period of a couple of weeks, he assigned an "Extra" bus to that route. And that Extra bus still cost money. While it made the people on that bus happy, because now they had a place to stand, this did nothing to improve the general health of the system. They had consistent overloads on Route 2. They regularly cycled Extra buses on the route. Ridership was still going up on Route 2, even though they lost passengers when the VA Hospital built its new parking ramp. So they were still attracting passengers to the route, and they were fixing the problems. But if they could invest some more money, they could make a significant improvement to the route, with 15-minute service to the west side all day long that would attract more casual ridership and add more ridership to the system in general.

Conn said that was how he looked at things. What was the point? They had put on a million passengers over the past year. But that wasn't free; it came with a price. There was an expense to the passengers, who ended up with a longer trip and a more crowded bus. If they were not making consistent improvements to the system where they were needed, this prevented the system from growing and improving. Without a fare increase, they didn't have the pieces to work with. As a result, they had to start looking at the dot map



(showing boardings), and looking at where the dots were the smallest and figuring out how to reapply that service. There was a penalty to not increasing the fare. A sort of "back door" expense was still there, without necessarily making a significant improvement to the quality of service.

Poulson asked staff what the dollar amount would be to go from passable service to an improved Route 2. Kamp said that in the original budget, they had \$218K in service improvements (to address the overcrowding issues, provide better service between the South and West TP's, and expand into Owl Creek.) That was the target amount to fit within four buses. That was a \$68K more than what the Council approved.

Golden asked staff what they thought it would take to reach \$68K to have the system running the way they'd like, if the Commission were to tinker with fares. Golden said that once they had this info, they would need to weigh the political cost, before taking a vote; and would like to hear from the Alders about this. He did not want it to seem that the Commission was disrespecting the Council's decision.

Having anticipated this question, Kamp said staff had run some numbers and found that the following adjustments would help reach about \$65K.

- Raise the 31-day Adult Pass from \$55 to \$58 (still deeply discounted).
- Raise the Senior/Disabled Pass from \$27.50 to \$29 (still half the other pass, but adding some to revenues).
- Raise the Commute Card from \$1.15 to \$1.25.

Staff would also ask for one revenue-neutral Paratransit fare; i.e., \$3.25, as shown on the attachment, "Impact of Fare Increase Proposal".

Kamp said these were not the only possibilities; but these would still provide deep discounts and didn't touch any of the cash fares (student, senior, regular). The Epic changes would not add to these revenues, because another entity would be paying for that.

Bergamini said that it was never easy to raise fares and tweak service; there really was never a good time to do it. While she respected the Mayor's prerogative to put out the first draft of the budget and ask his managers to provide suggestions/wish lists, she was no more comfortable with that than with waiting for a financial crisis and having to change routes and make cuts. When they made changes, she preferred it to be as deliberative a process as possible. They had just reviewed a document from Cechvala that was a 5-year plan, with much more specific recommendations than she would have expected in a 5-year transportation plan. She had no doubt that tweaks could be made here and there that wouldn't get them to actual service improvements. But what she felt looming was the specter of the State budget and what would happen to transit aid; she didn't imagine it would be good.

Bergamini said she would hate to see them make changes now, and then six months from now, have to come back and make another set of changes. She felt members should be anticipating that changes would be forced by the State budget; and therefore, they should be looking at efficiencies, partnerships, lengthening distances between stops, etc. They should be anticipating they would need to tighten things up as if the system wasn't already tight.

White thought that Bergamini made a good point about the State budget, and wondered if there were any operational costs involved in making the changes outlined. Kamp said that for all practical purposes, like four years ago, Metro wouldn't show a cost for implementing the changes; it would be part of staff's regular duties. Though understanding the value of relieving overcrowding, White felt that the amount of money (to be gained) was rather small, compared to all the different people who would be upset by the changes (the riders affected, the Common Council). She didn't feel comfortable making changes at this time.

Golden made a motion to amend the main motion, to adopt the fare adjustments that Kamp had outlined (above), to reach \$65K. Schmidt seconded Golden's motion.

Though he rarely disagreed with Bergamini, Golden felt there was no way to know what would happen in the future, the magnitude of it; whether it could be of such a magnitude that it would lead to a transformational change or whether it would amount to a rounding error. He was concerned however, with not offending the Council, if the Commission were to adopt this. He also wanted to respect staff's thoughts about the benefits of making improvements. What a wonderful problem to be facing: overcrowding. Having this issue out in front of them, if they were to vote the amendment down, they might want to at least look at how they might adjust other less significant service and where to go to fix it.

Having been a regular bus rider before retirement, Golden felt that the changes could be defined as a fare adjustment, reflecting a few minor changes to a couple of fares. The main "headline" fares were not being touched; which would respect the Council's intent. Even if the Commission voted the amendment down, it was important to have it out on the table, to show they considered it; and show that they needed to consider ways (other than more money) to make the fixes.

Block pointed out that the \$65K was predicated on making the fare adjustments on 1/1/13. This effective date was probably beyond their capabilities at this (late) date; and the further out in the year the changes went into effect, the more this would reduce the amount.

During budget discussions, Schmidt said he and others tried to make sure that the Council left some leeway for the Commission to address these issues, because focusing only on Owl Creek was perhaps inadvisable, given the sorts of situations that had been described with Routes 2 and 18. Adjustments had already been made to Route 18 in the past year; and he didn't want to tell Metro not to worry about it. As important as Owl Creek was, it was on the table because it had been brought to them; but they had other needs to address as well. Schmidt felt it wouldn't be a shock to his colleagues on the Council if the Commission were to make some small adjustments like those proposed; because he had raised just such a possibility during discussion. The Senior fare had been pointed to, because of the size of the proposed change, that there was a problem with that fare. He didn't think the Council would be particularly upset, though he couldn't say for sure whether they would disagree. But the magnitude of the change was not so great, that he would be especially concerned about it. Schmidt felt the Council had left some leeway for the Commission to deal with it.

Subeck said she didn't think the Council would be shocked or offended; though she didn't think that they wanted to necessarily see this. By adding General Fund money to Metro, the Council had sent a message that they were doing everything they could to avoid a fare increase. She didn't know if the Council would be really upset if the Commission were to make small adjustments; probably not. But their intent was really to avoid a fare increase. As sympathetic as she was to the problem with Route 2, she felt there were other options available. In talking about individual routes, they were starting with the hand they were dealt; but they were missing all the other priorities that could perhaps be bigger or smaller. They tended to be reactionary in some ways. This was not to say that staff didn't do amazing work with limited resources.

Subeck felt that given the Mayor's guidelines, staff had come up with what would make that work, which was what they should have done. But she didn't feel this addressed the broad, longer-term planning priorities that they should be addressing, where they should be focusing. Maybe there were other adjustments that could help, some other ways to produce cost-savings as well (as outlined in the TDP earlier). Maybe they should look at those, if it was urgent to relieve crowding on the Route 2. Every time they approached these issues, she felt it was so haphazard (perhaps because she wasn't involved in it every day); but she really wanted the group to speak to a plan, to make decisions based on a plan, not based on the crisis of the day. In general, Subeck felt the will of the Council was to make no fare increase; but she didn't think it would be devastated if the Commission made some small adjustments.

Bergamini said that Golden had persuaded her; and wondered what adjustments would be needed if things couldn't be implemented until March or even June of 2013.

With regard to Subeck's comments, Conn said that when Metro proposed changes in response to crises, they always had an eye down the road; how things would be impacted if for example, service were expanded east out beyond the Interstate to City View, or to expand out into the Southwest side. Because this was a system with interdependency between routes, they always had to keep this in mind. When staff didn't get what they requested, they simply worked with what they had. It wasn't as haphazard as it might sometimes appear.

The ideas hadn't sounded haphazard to her, but Kovich felt that, from what she had heard and read, they should be very deliberate in what they chose to do and how they chose to go about it, in order to give careful consideration to all the impacts, including what could be a negative impact on ridership and growth if they didn't do something to fix those routes, and there continued to be issues and more crisis-type management. If they could ask for a plan that was perhaps more long-term and more deliberate, they would have a more mapped-out rationale for whatever decision they would make.

Golden asked that if the body agreed, his amendment be modified so that implementation be done at the earliest possible time (in relation to when the fares would begin and the revenues would start accruing), so they didn't spend more than they got in. He further noted that he was on the MPO and advisory committees that worked with Cechvala on the TDP, and when he was a Planning Commissioner, he recalled they always laid out transit routes in

neighborhood plans where there was not yet development. In other words, a lot of advanced planning went into these efforts. But as good as these plans were, they didn't always get it right every time. In this case, it wasn't that people didn't get it right, it was that they were overwhelmed with business and needed to do something about it. If the Commission decided to vote the amendment down, they could later look at the dot map and decide which routes to cannibalize; that was a viable option. But if instead the Commission were to do something to fix this, it was not part of their planning role; it was part of their oversight role and in recognition of the fact that they wanted the system to work the way it was supposed to.

Poulson asked staff when the changes could be implemented, if the amendment were to pass. Kamp thought Metro could shoot for February implementation, announcing the changes through flyers, the website etc., with the Ride Guide being updated by March. (Staff later clarified that with February 1st falling just before a weekend, the changes would be implemented on Sunday, February 3rd.) With implementation in February vs. January, the estimated annual revenues of \$65K would be reduced by 1/12th.

Not necessarily disagreeing, Kovich said she wanted to make sure that the rationalization and justification was spelled out and presented to them in such a way that it would appear to be a logical decision, which could be communicated to the Council and anyone else, as to why they were making these changes: i.e., because of the positive impact, that fixes were needed because of ridership increases, and that this was exactly the right fix. And this would provide adequate money to do that. Rather than simply discussing the ideas at the table, and if this was something to which they should be giving careful consideration, she felt it would be better to come to them in a more mapped out proposal.

When asked Kamp said there were 80-90 partners in the Commute Card Program. Rusch said that the contracts renewed every year, and he wasn't sure they cited a specific rate or if they generally cited "the current rate"; and perhaps the new rate wouldn't be implemented until January 2014. Bergamini noted that this uncertainty spoke directly to Kovich's point about doing this in a deliberate fashion. The Program had been enormously successful, and Bergamini thought they needed to be deliberate.

Subeck pointed out that the increase on the Commute Card represented a 8.7% increase – a fairly substantial increase in the cost of something they wanted to continue to market. For the 31-day Adult and the Senior/Disabled cards, it would be 5.4% increase. In the current economy, that's pretty big; esp. if people had many of their other costs going up that much. This was not what people were expecting right now. In some ways, by picking out a couple of fares to increase, the percentages were bigger than they would have been if the increases had been spread across the board.

Poulson reiterated that the motion before the group was to implement the three pass increases (and the single rate for Paratransit), to be implemented on 2/1/13 (later determined to be 2/3/13).

Poulson said that while he appreciated Kovich's comments, he felt these routes really needed their attention, and this was a way to do it. He said he wouldn't vote, unless there was a 4-4 tie.

Schmidt said the Council tried hard to find the money to do these extra adjustments, on the night they made their decision. His sense of the Council was that while they might feel some discomfort, they wouldn't feel that the Commission had not been deliberate. They were not talking about sweeping changes. He was comfortable with the proposal; but if it didn't go forward, they should not drop the ball, but should figure out something else to do.

Block added that whenever they prepared Budget Supplementals, which these changes were originally, the City asked that the numbers be annualized, to show the impact on the following year's budget (2014). The fare increase would take effect Feb. 1st, and the service changes were originally scheduled to take place Sept. 1st. The gap between the funding being discussed, and the increase in cost to provide the additional service would be larger once they went into the following year.

A Roll Call vote was taken on Golden's amendment, as follows: Ayes - Streit, Schmitz, Golden, Schmidt. Noes - Kovich, Bergamini, Subeck, White. Poulson voted aye to break the tie. The amendment passed 5 to 4.

A Roll Call vote was taken on the main motion as amended, as follows: Ayes - Streit, Schmitz, Golden, Schmidt. Noes - Kovich, Bergamini, Subeck, White. Poulson voted aye to break the tie. The amendment passed 5 to 4.

Golden suggested that as a courtesy, a report be sent to the Council, with a narrative as to why they made the fixes they did and why it was important.

Subeck said she wasn't sure they could do what they had just done. She thought they could, that it was probably legal, but it made her very uncomfortable. She believed that the public thought this was a done deal, when the Council voted on this. She was uncomfortable with the fact that they had voted on some very specific fare increases. Though they had held a public hearing prior to the Council taking this up, the public wasn't really informed that the Commission might be raising fares at this meeting.

Poulson said that he attempted to open the public hearing by saying that the TPC could act on this; and that the Council was the appellate body if anyone would want to appeal any kind of decision the Commission would make. A lot of people probably did not know the intricacies of the Commission's authority vis a vis the Common Council, as was likely true for other bodies as well. Subeck said when the Council made its decision, the newspapers had reported there would be no fare increase. She hoped people would think about what they had just done; and she wished she had brought it up sooner, but it hadn't dawned on her. She felt they had done this without the public really knowing or having input into it.

Streit asked that the media release not describe their decision to raise the additional \$65K as simply due to buses being crowded and riders not being able to sit down. It was because buses were having to go past people, who missed their bus altogether; and because buses were running so late that people were missing their transfers. Not to downplay Owl Creek, but his guess that this fix would have more impact on more people than the number of new riders they would get out of Owl Creek. He understood the need to embrace Owl Creek. But he also understood the dilemmas created by picking up

everyone, which then caused delays in the schedule and people missing their transfers. The issue needed to be framed so that people understood it wasn't just a question of a slight bit of overcrowding; rather it was the issue of a totally missed bus. Conn noted that two or three years ago, they were adding 40 Extra buses a day to pick up extra riders; last year that number had climbed to 103 Extra buses. Streit wanted them to emphasize the huge impacts it made when buses passed up riders.

Kovich reiterated that she didn't necessarily disagree with the thought process behind the decision, but she wished they could have had the info that they were gathering now in front of them when they made their decision.

Subeck called a point of order. She wondered if she could change her vote at this point. What she hoped to do was to cast a vote on the prevailing side, so that she could call for reconsideration at the next meeting, so the public could have some notice. She wondered if it would be legal for her to change her vote.

Golden said he objected to the line of reasoning Subeck was taking. This had been a legally noticed meeting, and they had held a public hearing. The Council took some actions, and the Council made the newspaper; while the Commission did not. That was not the Commissions' problem. They had put verbiage on the agenda that said that the Commission might take action. They had done their due diligence. It was not appropriate to suggest that the Commission was sneaking in a fare increase. The public was not aware of most of what the Commission did, even though it had impacts on the public. He said he was perfectly prepared for his amendment to go down 8-0 when he started; they had had a very good discussion; various members probably disagreed with various other members, and that was fine. He thought they needed to move on. From a parliamentary standpoint, someone from the prevailing side would have to make the motion to reconsider. But in general, you win some, you lose some.

Subeck said she didn't think that anyone tried to sneak anything past the public, but it was something they had done unintentionally. She didn't want anyone to feel insulted.

Poulson said that as Chair, he ruled that Subeck could not change her vote just to be on the prevailing side. But someone on the prevailing side could move reconsideration.

Having previously been through a fairly ugly battle about fare increases, Bergamini hoped that no one would move to reconsider. The body made its decision; it was properly noticed. Perhaps they would have shouted it a bit louder from the rooftops, but what was done was done, and she didn't want them getting torn up in fancy parliamentary maneuvers that would stretch out over months and push the timeline back. Even though she voted against it, the decision was made and the fares should go up.

Poulson asked Metro staff to prepare a report about the Commission's action, and what it did with the fare proposal that had been presented at the hearing. This would be forwarded to the Common Council as a courtesy. Kamp said they would review this report with the Poulson before sending it to the Council.

F.5. [28575](#)

Metro: Update on Logisticare, presented by Crystal Martin, Paratransit Program

Manager - TPC 12.12.12

Metro Paratransit Program Manager Crystal Martin updated members on the status of Logisticare, the statewide Medicaid brokerage for the State.

- On 7/1/11, Logisticare began service to the rest of the state other than the six counties around Milwaukee, which was followed by an implementation period, as reflected in the feedback with Abby Vans in trying to work those rides into a coordinated system. And they got over that hurdle.
- On 9/1/12, Logisticare also won the contract for the six counties around Milwaukee, a service area with a much higher density population, which proved quite daunting.
- On 10/18/12, the State Senate Committee on Health, Revenue, Tax Fairness and Insurance held a hearing in Milwaukee attended by about hundred people. Riders testified that they weren't getting rides, and providers testified they weren't getting ride assignments. Logisticare stated that they had miscalculated and did not have enough vehicles to provide the service; that it had been difficult to estimate this because of the info given to them by the State's in its RFP.
- Brett Davis, the State's Dept. of Health Services (DHS) Medicaid Director, spoke about how they were working quickly to address these issues.
- Disability Rights Wisconsin attended with their legal representation, and discussed the issues that could be litigated and needed to be addressed. They had been invited to the table with DHS and Logisticare and had started working on those, and stated that this had been going well. There were issues about an independent ombudsman: The complaint-taker for Logisticare was employed by Logisticare vs. having an independent ombudsman.
- The Center for Medicaid Services (CMS) weighed in on issues related to pharmacy trips, which identified a rolling group of different folks, inc. vets and others, who weren't receiving services because of some differing interpretations about the populations to be served.
- Out of the hearing came assurances that things would improve.
- In late November, Logisticare gave 90-days notice of termination to the State for both contracts, indicating there wasn't sufficient information provided to them initially in order to properly cover their expenses for reimbursement.
- On 11/21/12, DHS issued a press release, indicating that they had plan for continuous service (per the email attached); that they would be issuing an RFP and would sign a contract asap; and that there would be facilitated transition; apparently to dispel uncertainty about the stability of the program.
- Though it was rumored that Logisticare might leave the state, in fact they were submitting a new proposal.
- The criteria by which bids would be evaluated (lowest cost and other qualifications), would not necessarily include the ability to perform the service.
- DHS would be sticking to the current model: a flat rate per member per month that was paid out whether the person requested transportation or not. They paid a flat rate for however many people were in the program. While other models existed, at this point, DHS seemed to be committed to the same model.
- It depended on what DHS put out for the RFP. They might just put out a bid, and ask only for price quotes. If it were proposals, it would be a broad array of criteria. The RFP hadn't been put out yet, so it wasn't yet known how it would be done.

[Please note: Golden and Kovich left at this point in the meeting, at 7 PM.]

- DHS didn't have a lot of time to look at making changes to the RFP, except for issues that could be litigated; which they would want to address. They were under a lot of pressure, so they would be moving as quickly as possible.
- Part of Logisticare's contract with the State said that they had to continue

providing services even beyond the 90 days, until either a new contractor was in place and ready to assume responsibility for the trips, or DHS itself assumed responsibility for the service. It wasn't clear what rate would be paid to Logisticare if the situation went beyond the 90 days; this would likely be negotiated. This was not likely to be made public any time soon, even though this would be informative to potential bidders.

- On 12/5/12, a coalition of service providers and others met in Stevens Point, to discuss such items as recommended changes to the RFP. One recommendation would at least allow Wisconsin-based companies to bid on the project; vs. what was in the initial proposal, whereby bidders had to have been providing services to a large number of population groups in other states, to demonstrate their ability to provide services in Wisconsin. (See the letter to Sec. Dennis Smith attached, which shows the various recommendations and identifies the groups attending the meeting.)

- The USDA attended the meeting also, to support the discussion about co-ops. A part of meeting was spent talking about how to put together a cooperative, to be able to have the technical and vehicle capacity for a Wisconsin-based company to perform the services. This was in motion now. So hopefully, if there were some changes, there could be a Wisconsin-based response to the RFP. If the RFP didn't change, DHS might still get a submission anyway that didn't meet their criteria, but would be a Wisconsin-based organization.

- This same coalition had organized an event for 12/19/12 at the Capitol to inform legislators about their recommendations for the RFP, and their initiative for a Wisconsin-based company to provide the service.

- A bi-partisan petition signed by 51 co-signers had been submitted to the legislative Audit Committee to pursue an audit. The Committee then sent a letter of inquiry to DHS, which didn't result in new info. But the coalition was still requesting that the audit be pursued, that there be a delay in issuing a new RFP, and that public input into the service and the RFP become part of the process.

- Locally, people were not getting rides and local contractors were not getting paid. Their capacity to provide service had been diminished; they had laid people off or made pay cuts. Where were these trips going and who was providing them, no one knew. Not only did Logisticare keep their (negotiated) rates confidential/proprietary, they also wouldn't reveal who they were working with. So these companies couldn't be contacted, in order to try to coordinate trips with them.

- Metro used to have a coordination agreement with Dane County as the administrator, the loss of which cost Metro \$100K in annual revenue that had helped share the cost of those trips.

- Metro was working hard to maintain productivity, but it wasn't as it had been. Paratransit ridership was down.

- Anecdotally, some riders were having difficulty getting rides from Logisticare and were paying cash out of their pocket to ride Paratransit to get to their doctor's appointments.

When asked why Metro had its own paratransit service and contracted with three others, Martin told people that this was why: when one company was struggling, you had others that could move in and pick up the slack, and kept the providers competitive. Without info from riders or Logisticare, the State wasn't really in a position to determine what was going on.

Martin answered questions.



- It was possible the State would continue to have two contracts (one for the six Milwaukee counties and one for the rest of the state).
- Martin had been in touch with Nick Zavos, the City's legislative liaison in the Mayor's Office, who had let the City's delegation know what the local concerns were.
- As to what members could do, they could alert appropriate groups to take the opportunity to educate legislators, who esp. wanted to hear about specific issues affecting their constituents.
- Re: the impact on medical providers such as dialysis centers, the Nephrology Nurses Association had sent a 10-page letter in support of the audit, which included page after page of issues they had (inc. problems with standing rides).
- Also, people weren't showing up for doctors appointments at clinics and these clinics weren't getting reimbursed for Medicaid services.
- There had also been problems with how many people could travel with a patient, which affected children who needed rides and their care-givers, who sometimes didn't have child care set up for their other children and had to travel along.

Poulson said the Commission was fortunate to have someone as knowledgeable as Martin monitoring the situation. Martin said Metro was lucky to have such good service providers and direct service drivers.

Please note: Golden and Kovich left the meeting at 7:00 PM, during Agenda Item F.5. Without objection, a vote was taken collectively on Agenda Items F.6., F.7. and F.8. Subeck left the meeting briefly while this vote was taken. Attendance is shown here to reflect who was present at the time of the vote.

**Present:** 6 -

Chris Schmidt; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Susan M. Schmitz and Kenneth M. Streit

**Excused:** 5 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Lisa Subeck; David E. Tolmie; Kenneth Golden and Ann E. Kovich

**F.6.**     [28237](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into agreements with Monarch Media Designs, LLC, SpeedPro Imaging of Madison, LLC and Tingalls Dzyn , LLC for transit advertising production and installation services. Monarch will be the primary vendor; SpeedPro will be a secondary vendor and Tingalls Dzyn will be used on a project basis. These contracts will be for an initial term of two (2) years (2013 and 2014) with up to three options for one (1) year renewals by mutual agreement of the Parties.

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

**F.7.**     [28229](#)

Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facility, State of Good Repair, Discretionary public transit capital grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

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

- F.8. [28359](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the 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 2013, 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 2013.

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

**G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS**

**Please note: Subeck returned to meeting at the start of Agenda Item G.1.**

**Present:** 7 -

Chris Schmidt; Lisa Subeck; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Susan M. Schmitz and Kenneth M. Streit

**Excused:** 4 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; David E. Tolmie; Kenneth Golden and Ann E. Kovich

- G.1. [27594](#) Metro: Update on the Final Report of the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee - TPC 12.12.12

**Poulson noted that a few of the current Commissioners had been on this Ad Hoc Committee. Noting that the Committee's report had been broken up into short-term, mid-term and long-term recommendations, Kamp highlighted the following items.**

**SHORT-TERM GOALS:**

- (Pg. 3) **Customer service:** CS hours had been expanded on Sundays and holidays (also consistent with ADA requirements to expand service hours). Despite new Google Maps and Smartphone apps, customer calls had gone up. In the most recent month, calls had gone from 19K to 21K from the same month a year before. But the questions were of a different nature; they were calling to ask how to use the apps. So the calls were more targeted. Also, the average hold time had been reduced: In August 2011, 46 seconds was the average. Despite a 2K increase in calls, the wait time had dropped to 38 seconds.

- **Service changes:** A Metro Service Development Committee met every two weeks, as part of Metro's regular staff meetings; to discuss such things as overcrowding and Epic service requests.

**MID-TERM GOALS:**

- (Pg. 28) **Making the schedule easier to read:** Along with the new apps, they now had QR bar codes to provide schedule and real-time info for a specific stop.

**LONG-TERM GOALS:**

- (Pg. 41) **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT):** A full-scale study was underway that was looking at how they might purchase larger vehicles, use signal priority, dedicated lanes, and branding. This continued to gain momentum.

- (Pg. 44) **Facilities:** Metro had received some funding in its 2013 budget to look at land purchase, after they completed a site analysis. If federal funding was sufficient, they might be able to take some action on that.

**Poulson said that though the report was a long-range plan, he appreciated that Metro was actually going through it and updating it, and tackling some of the issues. Obviously, Metro took this seriously, and wanted to improve the**

system.

**H. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only  
(Most recent meeting minutes attached, if available)**

[07828](#)

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

**No action was needed on these items. Staff noted that the minutes of the Bus Study Size Committee was handed out to members, and would be included in future packets.**

**I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

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

Poulson noted that after taking a survey of members, the group would be meeting in Room 260 MMB, unless there were room conflicts or unless Room 201 CCB was needed for some special purpose.

**I.2. Commission member items for future agendas**

Poulson asked Kamp to prepare something about Metro's discussions with people about the homeless. Kamp said he had also received some inquiries about the possibility of expanding the Low-Income program, and would bring an update on both. Anything affecting the fare tariff would need to come back to the Commission.

Bergamini asked if Metro could at some point provide some specifics about Owl Creek. She had heard so much about other partners and providers, during the Council debate. She hoped they could get back to the big picture of what they were trying to do there, inc. info from Metro's Drew Beck about the Neighborhood Resource Team and how that was working out.

Subeck asked that Metro report back to them if the \$1.15 rate for the Commute Card program could be raised to \$1.25, per the current contracts with organizations. Kamp said they would bring back an update on this and all the fare changes. He was mindful that the numbers they had provided were estimates, and some might be a little low or high. They would work to make things work. Subeck said it was also a question of whether current contracts could be changed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Subeck, to Adjourn at 7:20 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**