



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes - Final
TRANSIT AND PARKING
COMMISSION

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Tuesday, June 14, 2005

5:00 PM

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

Items reported in the order listed on the agenda.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (notified absences: one vacancy)

Chair Durocher called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m.

Present: Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Carl D. Durocher, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag, Diane L. Paoni and Kenneth M. Streit

B. SPECIAL PRESENTATION: Discussion with Mayor Dave Cieslewicz regarding 2006 and future Metro budgets

Mayor Cieslewicz began by remarking that the City has a serious budget problem going into 2006, not only at Metro but overall. He believes it's manageable but wanted to make the TPC aware of the reality. He noted that in the 2005 budget, he proposed, and the Council supported, a 10% increase (\$745,000) for Metro in an environment where the overall City budget went up 3.7%. There's no question about the City's commitment to Metro.

Metro is facing a deficit of \$1.2 to \$1.4 million in 2006, and he felt there are five options:

- (1) Continue to work with the State legislature to get an increase in State transit aids. The 2% increase recommended in the Governor's budget made it through the Joint Finance Committee, and the Mayor was reasonably confident the increase will survive the rest of the budget process. While this is somewhat good news, Mayor Cieslewicz pointed out that Metro's expenses are going up 3-4% a year. But it's better than no increase, which is what happened in the last State budget.
- (2) Increase fares
- (3) Cut service
- (4) Find new revenue source(s)
- (5) Tap into the City's General Fund for another increase on top of the 10% increase in 2005.

Mayor Cieslewicz recommended that the TPC explore increased fares, and he supported the multi-year strategy proposed by Metro staff since it gives the City some certainty of revenues and gives the customers a sense of where fares are going. Even with the fare increase proposed by staff, the projected deficit in 2006 is \$479,000 and \$878,000 in 2007. Without a fare increase, the projected deficit is \$1 million in 2006 and \$1.9 million in 2007. Mayor Cieslewicz emphasized that increased fares have to be on the table.

The Mayor stated he would resist the option to reduce service. Faced with two bad choices of increasing fares or cutting service, he would prefer to increase fares. But he recognized that Metro may have to do both, and a modest reduction in service should also be on the table.

Mayor Cieslewicz stated that Metro must aggressively look at new revenue sources. He supported ads at bus shelters and the transfer points, but he personally did not like bus wraps. He has seen some shelter ads that enliven the shelters, and he noted that the City is not in a fiscal position where it can be snobbish about this. Metro needs to look for revenues wherever they can be found.

The Mayor emphasized that the General Fund subsidy to Metro was increased by 10% in 2005 while the rest of the City budget went up on average 3.7%. He also emphasized that the money is not there to have that kind of increase for Metro again in 2006. The City needs an additional \$9 million just to stay even and retain all the services it currently has. This would result in a 7% increase in the tax levy, whereas past two years have seen a 5.5% or 5.6% increase. Neither he nor the Council will pass a budget with a 7% levy increase. So the budget process starts out with a \$9 million challenge in the General Fund. The City needs to cut back from that before putting more money into Metro. Despite that, Mayor Cieslewicz guaranteed he will find some General Fund money to put into Metro, but it cannot fill the gap. To get at the gap and to keep the system sound, the TPC needs to

explore the four other options.

Sanborn questioned the Mayor's objection to bus wraps. The Mayor remarked he had a subjective, aesthetic opposition to wraps. He found most of them to be ugly and it feels like being in a cave when riding the bus. He noted that some alders oppose all forms of advertising. He has seen ads in bus shelters all over the country and actually likes them because they add vibrancy to the shelters.

Referencing a General Fund transfer, Paoni asked whether that would be much later in the year if it were to happen. Mayor Cieslewicz advised that his reference was to the 2006 budget, and if Metro needs additional revenues to fund the 2005 gap he assumed it would come from Metro's contingent reserve.

Golden remarked that in past years when the TPC wrestled with fare increases, one of the principal criteria often used by the TPC were the values reflected by the different fare choices. For example, if you raise the fare on tickets, the assumption is that you're raising fares on more regular riders. If you raise the cash fare, you're generally raising the fare for less frequent riders or those who don't plan ahead. If you raise the fare on monthly passes, you're probably affecting people who are totally transit-dependent. He acknowledged that some transit-dependent riders don't use the monthly pass because they can't afford to pay \$39 at one time. Other values come into play when dealing with the elderly and disabled riders and the issue of third-party payers. Golden had two questions for the Mayor: (1) to what extent does he think the value considerations should inform the TPC's fare decision; and (2) would he be willing to offer guidance to the TPC? Mayor Cieslewicz responded that the values mentioned by Golden should guide the TPC's discussion. He also stated he would be interested in having a conversation with the TPC, but he was more interested in hearing from the TPC.

Mayor Cieslewicz directed attention to fare structure draft 6b, which is estimated to generate \$548,000 in new revenues in 2006. He asked the TPC to aim for a target of \$500,000 in additional revenues from a fare increase. He was open to how the TPC does that and reiterated that the values laid out earlier make sense.

Hoag expressed surprise that the Mayor supported a multi-year fare increase. He was concerned about the level of unknowns, especially energy costs. Mayor Cieslewicz indicated a multi-year plan makes some sense, but he was not wedded to it. When the expenses are projected out, you can see the gap growing. When a fare increase is factored in, the gap grows at a lower level. He did not see expenses going down and in fact expected fuel prices to continue to escalate, and in fact the expense projection may be conservative. Rather than trying to fool ourselves that we may be able to get away without a fare increase next year, it makes more sense to come to grips with reality and project out the fare increases. The Mayor pointed out that even with a multi-year fare increase, there will still be a budget shortfall (projected at \$2.4 million in 2009). Even with the fare increases, Metro is looking at significant budget pressure. It's not realistic to think that there won't be a fare increase in multiple years. The fare increases could be reviewed each year, and if "something wonderful happens" and ridership goes through the roof or fuel prices go down, the increase could be suspended. But reasonable expense projections show a need for fare increases in the next three to four years.

Wong felt that an issue for the TPC is that, if you recognize the need for a fare increase, how should it be applied. He noted that from Dec. 2003 to mid-2008, the cost of tickets will increase 70% and monthly passes by 40.3% under the scenario proposed by staff, whereas the unlimited ride pass rate will increase only 15.2%. If a rider works for an employer with an unlimited ride pass agreement, they are in good shape. But other riders will have a big increase. He felt this is giving the message that Metro is trying to phase out the discount ticket riders, whom he saw as choice riders. His fare value is to avoid penalizing people who ride 3-4 times a week, those for whom the tickets are the best choice. He reiterated that the percentage increase is greatest for tickets. Some members are grappling with the issue but don't have a lot of options. Sanborn referenced the chart in Sharon Persich's memo that depicts the fixed route fare change history from 1989 to 2004. He noted that in the past, there were 3-4 year periods with no increase, and then a 25¢ increase. Depending on which year you use as your base year, the percentage increase can be distorted. For instance, the ticket fare saw no increase from mid 2000 through the end of 2003. He asked whether the Mayor preferred a gradual increase.

Mayor Cieslewicz indicated he had an overall budget number of \$500,000 that he wanted the TPC to address; he was leaving it up to the TPC as to how to reach it. He preferred a gradual increase over a number of years, since he felt this would have less of a negative impact on ridership.

Paoni confirmed that to address the 2006 shortfall, both a fare increase and service reductions need to be on the table. Noting that the expense projection shows a gap even with a fare increase, she asked whether it was the Mayor's understanding that there will be service reductions. Debo directed attention to the revised Revenue and Expense Projection and Public Subsidy Computations charts that were handed out. The new charts include the 2% increase in State aid. It was her view that with the new State aid and a fare increase, Metro will accomplish the task for 2006. But there will be cost increases for Metro partners including Madison, although she felt the increases will be manageable. She emphasized that it depends on whether the 2% increase in State aids is realized. Mayor Cieslewicz stated that the bottom line for 2006 is that with a fare increase, a 2% increase in State aid, and an adjustment for Metro's partners, Metro will need an additional \$230,000 from the City's General Fund to close the gap.

Golden respected the fact that the Mayor gave the TPC a budget instruction. One of the problems he has with the situation is a multi-year fare increase structure. He agreed with the logic of the Mayor's comments in support of it, but a multi-year increase for transit doesn't work for him the way it does for parking fees. It seemed to Golden that regular fare increases in alternate years might be more acceptable to the public, as well as keeping the cash fare in 25¢ increments so riders aren't fumbling around for nickels and dimes. Golden mentioned that a bigger concern is to understand this in the complete context of the City's budget. Over the years, Metro has often gone to the General Fund for more funding than other City agencies. He recognized that the TPC needs to come up with \$500,000 package. But when making a budget decision at the Common Council level, he would like to see a better presentation of the entire budgetary context. The fact that Metro got 10% last year is a persuasive argument, and he recognized that Metro cannot receive increases like that every year. But the Council expresses its priorities by what it funds, and how does Metro relate to some of the other budget priorities? At some point during the TPC's debate and discussion, he will ask

City Comptroller Brassler to attend and provide the budget context. Mayor Cieslewicz stated he has not dug in on a multi-year fare increase; however, he felt it's a rationale approach and believed that "eased in" fare increases are better than a jolt.

Radomski asked the timeframe for the TPC to make a decision on Metro's 2006 operating budget. Debo replied she hoped for a public hearing on fare increases in July, which is when Metro starts putting together its operating budget. The budget will go to the Mayor in August. She emphasized that she had hoped to implement the fare increase in August to help address the fuel overrun in 2005 - year to date (March) fuel costs are 40% higher than in 2004. The projection is that by the end of 2005, Metro's fuel deficit will be \$421,000. This is despite the fact Metro increased the amount for fuel in the 2005 budget.

Durocher relayed the TPC's appreciation for the Mayor's comments and his priority for a good public transit system. He hoped that the Mayor appreciated the TPC's position - there's an increasing demand for transit, and the TPC has to look at options like fare increases or service cuts, and this isn't a position the TPC wants to be in. Mayor Cieslewicz realized that. He noted that Madison has a great transit system and ridership is going up. But in the face of tough budget times, there needs to be a multi-prong approach to managing the system, and the Mayor appreciated the difficult position of the TPC.

C. ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

C.1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to nominate Carl Durocher as Chair.

There were no other nominations for Chair.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to close nominations and to cast an unanimous vote for Carl Durocher as Chair; motion carried.

Motion by Golden/Sanborn to nominate Chris Carlsen as Vice-Chair.

There were no other nominations for Vice-Chair.

Motion by Golden/Sanborn to close nominations and to cast an unanimous vote for Chris Carlsen as Vice-Chair; motion carried.

C.2. Approval of Rules and Procedures, including regular meeting date/time

Referencing the composition of the Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee (page 4), Golden wondered if there was a benefit to adding a member from the Metropolitan Planning Organization. He felt that Metro will continue to grow through its contracts with other communities, and having a metropolitan perspective would be valuable. Durocher advised that when he was a member of the CSOS, a MPO staff member typically attended the meetings. Golden pointed out that there's a difference between MPO staff and a MPO member; members are policy-makers. He indicated that the MPO rep on the CSOS could be either voting or non-voting. Putting the CSOS on the MPO's screen will make the MPO more cognizant of the regional nature of transit and perhaps improve intergovernmental cooperation. Debo noted that the ordinance would need to be amended, and she offered to bring a revised ordinance to a future TPC meeting. She mentioned there are some other "housekeeping" changes she would propose to the ordinance as well. Radomski commented that the idea of a MPO rep seems logical but wondered whether there should be a provision that the MPO rep would not be from a municipality already represented on the CSOS. Golden didn't think this was necessary at this point and noted that some MPO members may already be on the CSOS. Debo advised that one of the changes she wanted to make would be to drop the member from the Village of Shorewood Hills since no one has ever attended and it poses a quorum problem. She also asked that Golden check with the MPO to see if there's interest in having representation on the CSOS. Golden stated he would test the waters and then introduce an ordinance amendment for referral to the TPC. He will check with Debo as to the other changes she'd like to have in the ordinance.

Golden also directed attention to the paragraph on page 2 re: Joint Transportation Subcommittee. He remarked that this procedure has not been used very much. One critique of the City is that it has a lot of process. Golden also noted that consultants are paid a high hourly rate to appear at multiple meetings. He didn't have a specific idea for a joint meeting but wanted to find a way to use this joint meeting procedure to make the overall City process more efficient. Sanborn commented that a joint meeting makes sense if there is a specific item.

Paoni had some proposed changes. (1) Page 6, Agenda, it currently states that the agenda shall be mailed "no later than four days in advance of scheduled meeting." Paoni felt that in order to provide enough time for members to review the materials and to follow up with staff before the meeting, the time period should be changed to "no later than five business days." This might help the meetings move along more quickly because members could get some questions clarified by staff ahead of time. (2) Page 6, Agenda, it currently states that the agenda shall be prepared by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the Chair. Paoni noted that it's the Transit and Parking Commission, and she felt the manager of each utility should have an equal say. She suggested changing it to say the agenda shall be prepared by the Chair, in consultation with the Executive Secretary and Parking Manager. Debo pointed out that this will require an ordinance amendment. Radomski clarified that Paoni was trying to ensure that the Parking Manager is involved with agenda preparation. (3) Page 6, add a new section stating that the agenda and accompanying materials will be posted on the City's web site three days before the meeting.

Durocher advised that he works with both Debo and Parking Manager Dryer on the agenda; the Parking Manager is not left out of the loop. He felt Paoni's

proposal is already being done. As far as the advance mailing, it's a question of staff time to prepare the reports, and Durocher noted that the information is continually changing. Also, the TPC needs to wait for the actions from the other referral bodies. He remarked that given the somewhat universal tendency to postpone things, some members won't review the packet until shortly before the meeting anyway. Golden noted that the alder packets are delivered to the Common Council office and asked when the citizen members typically receive their packets. Members stated on Friday or Saturday. Golden explained that the four-day timeframe was implemented in response to a problem with materials being handed out at the meetings of the former Transportation Commission, giving members no time to review the information before having to take action. Wong stated that if the agenda packet was available even one day earlier, it would be helpful to him since he has less time on the weekend to read it.

Motion by Paoni to change the advance mailing requirement to five business days

Wong pointed out that having a requirement of five business days actually means seven calendar days before the meeting.

There was no second to the motion so it failed.

Motion by Paoni/Golden to add a section that the agenda and materials be posted on the City's web site at least three business days before the meeting, but failure to do so would not result in canceling the meeting.

Paoni accepted Golden's friendly amendment to change it to "four days" to make it consistent with mailing the agenda packet.

Golden suggested changing it to say that staff will endeavor to do this, rather than making it a mandate. Durocher noted that the agenda and minutes are currently posted on the web site, and Paoni clarified that her motion also included the agenda enclosures. Recording Secretary Phillips indicated that she was unsure whether non-Legistar items could be posted on the web site. Sanborn asked if there's been a problem with getting the agenda posted and did not want to adopt the motion unless there's an identified problem. Hoag opposed the motion. Staff is working extremely hard on the budget and he did not want to impose another burden.

Amended motion by Golden/Hoag to refer to staff to identify what can and can't be done easily and to recommend a low-cost way of addressing the intent expressed at the TPC meeting; carried unanimously.

[Ed. note: The TPC agenda is posted on the City's Legistar web site the Thursday before a Tuesday meeting. For TPC agenda items which are referrals from the Common Council through the Legistar system, the public can click on the Legistar ID number next to the agenda item title and it will open up the accompanying document(s) for that item. The question of whether it's possible to post non-Legistar materials will be discussed at a meeting of the Legistar Users Group sometime in July.]

Motion by Radomski/Sanborn to adopt the Rules and Procedures as submitted and to reaffirm the regular TPC meeting date of the second Tuesday at 5:00 p.m., carried unanimously.

C.3. Rescheduling of 12/13/05 meeting due to conflict with Common Council meeting

Due to the number of items on the TPC's agenda, members agreed to postpone this item.

Motion by Radomski/Carlsen to table item C.3., carried unanimously.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 5/10/05

Motion by Paoni/Carlsen to approve the minutes.

Wong directed attention to page 26 and the statement he made about "four times a month." He clarified that he meant to say four times a week to and from, for a total of eight trips a week, which is a number of trips where the price of a monthly pass would not be an economically good choice.

Motion carried unanimously.

E. PUBLIC COMMENT

Margaret Bergamini, representing the Associated Students of Madison, 800 Langdon Street, stated she has been advising the ASM on the bus pass program since 1998. The ASM is the student government and exists via independent statutory authority, and it has independent taxation authority. The ASM agreement is the largest of the unlimited ride pass agreements, with about 42,000 students. Ms. Bergamini stated that the students comprise 20-30% of Metro's monthly ridership and they averaged 22% of revenue ridership in 2004. UW staff and faculty accounted for 9% of revenue rides, MATC was 2.5%, and Edgewood was less than 1%. This shows the importance of the ASM to Metro, as well as Metro's importance to the ASM. In the 2003-2004 school year, the cost of the agreement was \$1.3 million. For the current academic year, the cost was \$1.953 million, a 41% increase due to increased ridership and an increase in the estimate of the average adult fare. The pass programs were designed from the start to be revenue neutral and to hold both parties harmless.

Motion by Wong/Hoag to allow the speaker two more minutes, carried unanimously.

Ms. Bergamini stated there was no intent by either party that ASM get a "freebie," but rather that ASM pay its fair share for increased ridership. Every student gets charged for the pass, regardless of whether they use it. The heart of the negotiations is about the number and the accuracy of projections. She hoped that the new fare collection equipment will help settle some of these issues. The ASM has not argued for a volume discount. The intent is to create a win/win situation for ASM and Metro. The agreement provides Metro with stable revenue, benefits land use, helps the environment, and the student government doesn't advocate for more parking stalls. The bus pass program has a 96% approval rating among the student body and is the most popular program offered to students. Ms. Bergamini recognized that the TPC has a heavy responsibility in terms of making decisions about keeping the system solvent. She felt it was foolish to consider service cuts when the City should be encouraging more ridership. She indicated her remarks were to clarify discussion at the last TPC meeting.

Wong referenced Ms. Bergamini's comment about being revenue neutral and noted that in the proposed fare structure, the unlimited ride pass rate is much less than that for tickets. He was also curious about her comment comparing ASM ridership with other unlimited ride pass agreements. Was she making an economic argument that the ASM should have a different rate? Referencing the comparison to the ticket rate, Ms. Bergamini replied that beginning in 1996, the ASM asked for a weighted average that was based on the existing fare structure and the type of fare media used by the general adult transit population. They came up with a weighted average based on how many people used tickets, passes, or cash. If the fare mix changes or the fare rates change, then the behavior might change and they will need to model that. Ms. Bergamini stated she wasn't trying to argue that the ASM should be treated differently but was just trying to emphasize the importance of students to Metro and vice versa.

Jack Longert stated he was appearing as a representing of the Dane County Homeless Services Consortium and Porchlight, Inc., 306 N. Brooks St. The Consortium is comprised of over 40 agencies serving low income and homeless clients. He distributed a letter from Adam Smith, Chair of the 2005 Homeless Services Consortium. Mr. Smith urged the TPC not to raise fares due to the

negative impact on the poor and the agencies that provide cash fares/tickets to the poor and homeless. Mr. Smith also urged the TPC to authorize the use of a bulk-purchasing discount to allow the participating members of the Consortium to provide more rides.

Mr. Longert identified himself as the manager of Porchlight's men's drop-in shelter and the Hospitality House, a daytime resource center for low income and homeless people. He indicated that the Consortium has been seeking a bulk discount rate on bus tickets. The Consortium spent more than \$25,000 on bus tickets for clients. If they didn't do this, the clients would not have transportation to work, school, housing, medical appointments and other events. Mr. Longert stated that the Consortium tried to provide a shuttle van but it doesn't address the need. Other entities have unlimited ride pass agreements, and the Consortium would like a bulk rate discount for purchasing tickets. It would not be a revenue loss because their clients would not be riding the bus otherwise.

Mr. Longert stated he had been informed that the tickets are being replaced by a card system. This will pose a hardship for the Consortium agencies since they most often use tickets. Debo stated that Metro will continue to sell tickets to non-profit agencies for distribution (not for resale).

Durocher asked whether Mr. Longert's request was for a discount on tickets for the Consortium agencies. Mr. Longert replied yes and would like this on a future agenda.

Ald. Brenda Konkel, District 2, wanted to speak briefly about agenda materials. She stated that the one of the functions of the City's new Legistar system is to make materials available to the public. She advised that instead of waiting for the agenda packet to be delivered on a Saturday, TPC members could check the TPC's on-line agenda on the Thursday before the meeting and access the Legistar enclosures. However, she noted that non-Legistar items (such as the fare proposals and the draft policy re: misbehavior on buses) are not currently available on-line, and she urged the TPC to work toward making as much of their information available to the public on-line as possible. The Legistar system is a work in progress.

F. OLD BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. Transit fare proposal(s)

Durocher explained that the TPC was not taking action on a fare increase tonight; if a decision is made to propose a fare increase, a public hearing will be held.

The TPC first heard from the registrants.

William Patterson, 1014 Williamson Street, opposed a fare increase

- A fare increase is an economic issue. He distributed a copy of a paper by the Brookings Institution presented to the City of Philadelphia Committee on Commerce and Economic Development that shows that poorer people pay more for basic services.
- He gets a free bus pass as a UW employee but was concerned how the proposed fare increase would affect low income riders.
- A city needs lower paying jobs that provide services for the higher-paying jobs; many of these service employees work downtown and use transit.
- Many people whose incomes aren't increasing depend on Metro; need to keep in mind that many people are transit dependent.
- Urged the TPC to keep in the mind those who are less well off when discussing a fare increase.

Ron Richardson, 216 N. Dickinson Street, opposed a fare increase

- It's a social justice issue.
- When government needs money, it takes money or services away from people who can least afford it, and a fare increase will impact those populations more than others.
- A change in public policy should not be considered if it hurts those most at risk.
- Any other solution is preferable to a fare increase.
- In talking about a multi-year proposal, the Mayor had mentioned that maybe "something wonderful" will happen, like ridership "going through the roof." What will make that happen is capturing the choice riders and people who are thinking about using transit. One way to dissuade them from using transit is to raise the fare, whereas one thing that would entice them to use it or use it more frequently would be to decrease the price.
- In terms of the budget, a fare decrease might seem bizarre but if you decrease the fare for a few years and combine that with an aggressive promotion of the transit system and additional revenue sources (ad space at transfer points), over the years you may be surprised by increased ridership that goes through the roof.
- In response to Wong's question, Mr. Richardson stated he did not have a specific proposal to fix the \$500,000 budget hole for 2006.
- In terms of the long-term health of the city and the targeted populations, he hoped the City could fund the initial shortfall by means other than a fare increase. Over the long term, fix the problem through an aggressive program of alternative revenue programs and decreased fares to increase ridership. But he was not sure how to fill the first year's shortfall.

Lisa Subeck, 818 S. Gammon Rd. #4, opposed a fare increase

- She is a non-profit service provider and the cash fare increase will severely impact the homeless population she serves.
- Most of the clients at the homeless shelter use the cash fare because they can't afford the upfront extra cost to use other fare media (tickets or pass).
- Need to think about fares and how they impact the poorest riders.
- As prices go up, social agencies have less money to buy tickets to distribute to their clients.

- Not sure why the fare increase is proposed to be implemented in August 2005 if it's being done to address a 2006 budget shortfall.
- The automatic multi-year fare increase is not looking at the whole picture.
- City needs to prioritize transportation as a public service.
- City needs to look at alternate revenue sources instead of taking it out of the pockets of those least able to pay.
- Suggested getting money from the General Fund in addition to ad revenues.
- Her clients cannot afford the fare increase.

Golden recognized that it's difficult to save the money to buy a pass. What about a program (not run by Metro) , but what if the service agency could buy the first monthly pass and the client basically bought it back with the cash fare they would have been spending. Once the pass is paid off, they would end up saving and could qualify for another monthly pass. He was not sure who would administer such a program. But this would get some people out of that cycle. Ms. Subeck felt it would be a good idea for the working poor but would not help those who are job hunting or traveling to social services. Some of the clients get cash for bus fares from panhandling or from family and friends, or get tickets from social service agencies. Golden suggested opening up a dialog with people serving the targeted populations to get an idea of the numbers involved with the working poor. Ms. Subeck indicated that Homeless Consortium might be a good starting point. Golden stated he was trying to get an idea of the numbers and the money needed. It would be better if there was a way to get the working poor to stop using the cash fare.

Referencing Ms. Subeck's comment about using the General Fund, Sanborn asked if she was suggesting cutting other services or raising taxes. Ms. Subeck replied that it depended on what would be cut. She would rather see a different approach than a fare increase, and she would support wrapped buses and other advertising. The General Fund is another option. Sanborn noted that going to the General Fund would hit anyone who owns a home or rents. Ms. Subeck thought it would hit those who can afford it more. The cash fare would have a 10 % increase in August, but people's rent doesn't go up 10% a year.

Jack Longert, representing the Dane County Homeless Services Consortium and Porchlight, Inc., opposed a fare increase

- He represents people who have to scrape to even get \$1.50 or get a ticket from a social service agency.
- The Hospitality House distributes 17 bus tickets a day but the need is for double or triple that.
- The bigger the fare increase, the harder the hit on agencies serving the low income and homeless.
- The agencies currently only serve one-fourth of the need for tickets. If they could have a bulk discount rate, they might be able to meet 30-40% of the need.
- The current cash fare of \$1.50 is too much for most of the people they serve.

Golden asked whether many of the clients had access to Medicaid to pay for appointments. Mr. Longert replied that most of the clients are not eligible but the agencies do use Medicaid if it's available.

Michael Jacob, 410 Russell Street, opposed a fare increase

- Suggested that Metro and the TPC take a fresh look at the contract with the UW and other bulk contracts. The current agreement is a good deal for UW

employees and staff. The UW pass agreement is 82.5¢ per ride compared with \$1.50 for the cash fare and is a tremendous deal. Increasing the rate to \$1.00 or \$1.25 would be good. If the UW says they can't afford it, encourage the UW to talk to employees about paying a portion, such as \$5 or \$10 a month. He felt a lot of employees would be willing to chip in.

- Felt this discussion should be part of the overall city budget. Need to talk about Metro in the context of other City services. Should not be having this conversation in a vacuum.
- Don't go with a fare increase that is more than one year. It's important for the Mayor, Metro and the TPC to talk to the public each year if a fare increase is needed. A multi-year fare increase dodges the conversation and the City's funding priorities.

Robert Paolino, no address given, registered in opposition to a fare increase but had left by the time his name was called.

Ald. Brian Benford, District 12, opposed a fare increase and was available to answer questions.

Larry Jensen, 1618 Jenifer Street, opposed a fare increase but did not wish to speak.

Florence Zmudzinski, 110 S. Henry Street #510, opposed a fare increase but did not wish to speak.

Julie Spears, 2681 Milwaukee Street, opposed a fare increase but did not wish to speak.

Marsha Rummel, no address given, opposed a fare increase but did not wish to speak.

Ald. Austin King, District 8, provided a memo in which he encouraged the TPC to avoid a fare increase. He noted that many citizens are transit dependent, and for those on the economic margins, a fare increase will consume an increasingly large part of their income. He asked that the TPC consider a fare increase as the absolute last resort in closing Metro's budget gap. If the TPC finds a fare increase necessary, Ald. King ask that they approve a one-year increase. The public should have an opportunity to give input on each and every increase.

There were no other registrants

Debo directed attention to the updated charts that were handed out. Taking into account the increase in State aids approved by the Joint Finance Committee, Metro's projected 2006 deficit is just over \$1 million. A fare increase would reduce this to \$479,000. Between a fare increase and an increase for Metro's partners, including Madison, expenses could be covered in 2006. Debo then directed attention to the two fare proposals included in the agenda packet. Draft 6b has a per trip increase of 10¢ or less. Many fares are tied to the adult cash fare. The lower left corner shows the estimated new revenues and projected ridership loss through 2009. Estimated new revenues for 2006 are \$548,749 which meets the Mayor's \$500,000 target.

Draft 8 evens out some of the fares and spreads out the increases over time, like

the youth convenience fare. No increase is higher than 10¢ per trip. Draft 8 estimated new revenues (\$509,00) also meet the Mayor's target.

Golden failed to see the logic of the monthly pass rate, if the cash fare is used as the denominator. The current \$39 pass assumes 26 trips at the \$1.50 cash fare. In 2007, the pass rate assumes 29 trips. The rate is increasing faster than the cash fare. Under Oram, the assumption is that cash fares are used by the less frequent riders and the monthly passes are used by more frequent riders. This scenario seems to say that we'll really hit the pass riders. Most people work 20+ days a month. Why go after the best customers? Debo replied that staff tried to even out increases across the board in both 6b and 8. Under Oram, the monthly pass discount should not be greater than 40% of the cash fare. It's currently at a 52-55% discount, which is much deeper than recommended. Staff is trying to catch up to a reasonable discount. Golden asked if staff is trying to do to monthly rates what it did to ticket rates in the last increase, and Debo replied yes. The monthly pass would go up to level where the discount is adequate but not too deep. Golden noted that the monthly passes are the most frequent riders. When Metro first implemented the Oram strategy, the idea was to make the infrequent rider subsidize the system more than regular riders. From the standpoint of who Metro would be affecting by the fare increase, it appears to be the best customers will be affected the most. Sharon Persich, Metro staff, pointed out the both the ticket and monthly pass rates would maintain the Oram discounts. Golden wondered whether the Mayor would support the TPC looking at a fare package with certain fares in mind, such as an advantage to the transit dependent populations and the regular riders. Oram is something different and for now he's putting it aside; he didn't want to get obsessed with it. When Metro went to Oram in the 1990s, the idea was that the discount would serve the most frequent riders.

Durocher pointed out that the purpose of the proposed fare structure is to generate revenues. The TPC needs to look at how much revenue will be generated. Staff has gone through a complex formula to come up with a proposal that is estimated to generate sufficient revenue. It would be difficult to push down the cash fare. Golden responded that he was simply asking to the TPC to consider what it is doing.

Wong was frustrated that he has not yet seen materials on either Oram or the deep discount strategy. He noted that the fare proposal increases the rate for monthly passes and tickets the most whereas the unlimited ride pass only goes up 22%. If you raise the fares for people who are most likely to make a choice in using transit, you will need to raise fares even more the next year to make up for mistakes made with this fare increase. He felt that each proposal from Metro has basically been the same with only a little tweaking. Wong understood Metro's strategy to increase the number of unlimited ride pass agreements but at some point, almost all the ridership will come from those agreements and the rest of the riders will be insignificant. Wong stated he has asked for information on ridership by type of fare (not just the revenues by fare type) but has not received it. He was also concerned that the TPC is not getting alternatives to Metro's proposal - they keep getting the same proposal, and it seems flawed to him. He wanted to see an alternative that generates the same revenue numbers but without a big hit on the ticket users, who are the choice riders. Ticket riders are the core of the system, and the fare proposal is wrong to have such a negative impact on them. Persich confirmed that the bulk of adult fares are tickets and

monthly passes, and these are the fares that need to be increased in order to reach the Mayor's target revenue increase. She indicated that 16% of riders pay cash. She noted that monthly pass riders are also choice riders.

Wong asked if information is available re: ridership by fare type. Debo replied yes, but when an unlimited ride pass agreement is implemented, there's a drifting from other fare types. Metro has seen an increase in ridership and revenue, but there's been a major shift from tickets and monthly passes to unlimited ride pass agreements. City of Madison employees will soon have an unlimited ride pass agreement, and most of them now use tickets but will move to the unlimited ride pass. She felt the information Wong was seeking would not be meaningful. Wong replied that he would prefer to see the information and judge for himself whether it's meaningful.

Hoag remarked that as the TPC gets into details of a fare proposal, it presupposes that there will be a public hearing and a fare increase. He felt this ignores the speakers heard tonight. Are there other revenue generating options to consider instead of moving ahead with a proposal that has the level of pain mentioned by some of the speakers? He strongly felt the TPC needs to look at other sources. For example, bus wraps get taken off the table too quickly. Everything should be on the table before moving down the path of a fare increase. Hoag felt the Mayor and Common Council need to look at other options to help Metro, e.g., a congestion tax on commuters to fund public transportation.

Motion by Hoag/Wong to table the fare proposal until the TPC has the data it has requested and an open discussion on bus wraps and advertising at bus shelters and transfer points and the impact on revenues.

Golden did not support tabling the matter because the advertising revenues will be petty cash compared to the amount the Mayor has charged the TPC with generating. He remarked that public hearing speakers will be preaching to the choir, but the Mayor has asked the TPC to come up with a certain amount. If the TPC doesn't get this money from fares, then how? The City doesn't have legislative authority to impose a congestion tax. If the TPC ignores the Mayor, the Mayor will put something in his budget but then the fares would not be set by the TPC. They will not find \$500,000 at the Council. However, the Council could put forward a comfort resolution that \$500,000 is too much. He urged the TPC not to table the issue.

Wong stated the purpose of his motion was to delay a decision until the TPC gets a sense of how much could be generated from ads and wrapped buses. Is there a valid estimate of what Metro could get from ads? Also, does the revenue projection anticipate a certain amount from ads at shelters and the transfer points?

Carlsen felt the TPC is well beyond the point of no return. While he didn't like to raise fares, he didn't want to reduce service. He had advocated for wrapped buses the last time they were discussed at TPC, but he recognized there are problems with them. But the TPC needs to do something or the whole system will fail. Debo advised that the idea of wrapped buses had been brought to the TPC twice but both times it failed to pass. Metro currently has a three-year contract for advertising, and she is prepared to sit down with the vendor to see if they can find additional ad revenues. She pointed out that the ad bid came in less

than budgeted and the vendor is having a very difficult time making a go of it and may come up short. Ads at shelters are illegal under State law and City ordinance (the city of Milwaukee has chosen to ignore the statute). A committee has been convened to study the issue and Metro is working on the idea of shelter ads. She will bring forward some revenue estimates when it's clear that it's legal to proceed with that approach. She strongly urged the TPC to go forward with a public hearing. Wong asked if there's a revenue estimate for wrapped buses, and Debo replied that it's up to the advertiser and she did not know what portion Metro would get. Wong asked for at least a ballpark estimate. Ald. Robbie Webber was present and asked if Metro has investigated the possibility of leasing space at the transfer points for vending, kiosks, food carts, or something like that . She realized that Metro doesn't want people drinking or eating on the bus, but they could put up signs. She has asked about this for the past four months but has not heard whether anyone is investigating it. Debo advised that Metro has gone out for bids for vending machines. It took a long time to get the RFP through the City Attorney's office. The revenue estimate is a very small amount. Due to the low volume of foot traffic, vendors were not interested in a "live" cart. Ald. Webber remarked she was shocked that no vendors wanted to do a kiosk.

Friendly amendment by Paoni to get information on vending.

Paoni felt the TPC is once again in a crisis situation where they have to make a decision without having complete information. Once the crisis decision is made, the TPC never gets the rest of the information. She commented that tabling the issue seems like an awful way to get the information, but everything seems disjointed and the TPC needs to look at this in terms of identified values or policies. She wanted to look at all possibilities before going to a public hearing.

Sanborn remarked that one of the advantages of a multi-year fare increase is that the fares are raised in small increments. He felt the TPC could do a fare structure now and change it later depending on ad revenues.

Radomski preferred not to table an informational item. The TPC will be talking about fare increases in concert with other options like service cuts, additional revenues, etc. Hoag was concerned that if they don't table the issue, there will be a motion to proceed with a public hearing and he was not comfortable doing that without having additional information. Durocher confirmed that if the motion to table fails, he expected a motion to do something, such as move to public hearing .

Golden suggested creating a TPC subcommittee as a way to end up with a fare proposal they could vote on, something that is the TPC's fare package rather than staff's. He felt the TPC has already passed the timeframe for implementation in 2005 and is probably looking at January, meaning Metro will lose whatever increased revenues they had hoped to receive to offset the 2005 fuel overrun.

Motion failed to carry.

Motion by Golden to create a subcommittee of at least five members, with the Chair to be designated by Durocher, to create a revenue package.

Sanborn wanted to know why a subcommittee was necessary. Golden indicated that a subcommittee could focus on all the aspects of the issue (single vs. multi-

year, values, etc.) and he just felt it would work better.

Golden withdrew his motion.

Golden stated he will work on his own revenue package and encouraged other members to do the same. Sanborn noted that if members have alternatives, they need to get with Metro to “plug” the numbers into the formula an estimate of new revenues and projected ridership loss. He was willing to work with Golden on ideas but emphasized the need to also work with Metro. Debo pointed out the need to address certain principals in generating revenues. Paoni stated she would only support going to public hearing if there are actual fare proposals under consideration so the public can offer input on the different options.

Sanborn observed that one problem is the manner in which fares were raised in the past. He referenced the fare change history chart included in Persich's memo . If you look at the period 1996-2003, tickets only went up 5¢, which is much less than the cash fare increase. From 1996 through the projected fare increases in 2008, the monthly pass rate goes up 3.3%, cash goes up 4.4%, and tickets go up 3.6%. Looking at increases over a longer period of time gives a better sense of what has happened with fares. Debo did not find percentages to be particularly meaningful since if you're dealing with a small number, a small increase will result in a big percentage. She preferred to show the cent increase per trip. Sanborn remarked that the analysis is good but you need to look at what the increase means in terms of “on the dollar.” He felt that percentages are important to some extent.

Streit mentioned that the UW staff and employee pass program generates almost 1 million rides. There is a huge range of income among UW employees. He suggested a marketing approach asking pass holders to voluntarily throw in a quarter each time they board. There are a lot of people who value the unlimited ride pass and could afford to make a voluntary contribution. He suggested that Metro implement something quickly to see if the idea catches on and the type of revenue it generates. It might be as much as could be generated by bus wraps. Debo indicated it's an interesting idea and something she will think about. She is meeting tomorrow on the UW unlimited ride pass agreement. Last year, the TPC set a rate and terms of how to negotiate the agreements. She mentioned that the UW would like to pay less. She will negotiate on the basis of the 82.5¢ rate and if they do a multi-year agreement, she will look at a higher amount for subsequent years. Her preference is to go with a one-year agreement. Debo stated she needs to know whether she can retain the premises previously adopted by the TPC regarding all unlimited ride pass agreements. Golden stated that at some point he would like an agreed-to formula that recognizes what the partner is buying versus what it would cost them without the agreement, apply a discount, and that it be base on how the regular market behaves.

Golden advised that one of the reasons that tickets did not increase over the years is that the former Transportation Commission consensus was that tickets were the “beacon” fare. Although the cash fare may have gone up, the discounted fares used by the majority of riders did not go up. Golden felt that the following values/considerations went into past fare increases: (1) Minimize ridership loss; (2) Provide an advantage for regular riders and if there needs to be a disadvantage, it should be for the less frequent riders. This is the premise of Oram, and there was a very conscious decision by the Commission to help the

regular riders. That is why the cash fare crept upward but tickets remained stable, eventually leading to where the discount was too deep. (3) Minimize impact for low income and paratransit riders. (4) Consideration of third party payers - for instance, in paratransit, one-third of rides are paid by Medicaid. (5) Convenience, including whether riders need odd change, i.e., \$1.85 cash fare requires nickels and dimes. Sometimes a 25¢ jump every three years might be better than a smaller increase more often.

Golden believed the current fare proposal started with an assumption of the revenue it was necessary to generate, and the next modifier was Oram, and he was not sure that staff looked at other considerations. He wants to see a proposal that, in addition to Oram and revenue, looks at these other considerations. Durocher noted that these are all issues that can be discussed at a public hearing and before voting on a fare proposal. He pointed out that the TPC needed to move on since there were other agenda items.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen that at the next TPC meeting there be a decision item for going to a public hearing that includes a recommended staff proposal and that staff also develop a one-year proposal. Further, that a proposal be developed that might be different from the one now before the TPC that addresses some of the items mentioned tonight like the five values outlined above, and also includes a part two and part "x, y, z" for the various alternate revenue schemes with as good an estimate as possible (some may be precise, some may be ballpark) for wrapped buses, vending, ads and any other ideas.

This package would be before the TPC for tweaking and the TPC would then take action to go to public hearing.

Debo asked whether it would be of value to bring back a scenario that includes two fare increases, one in 2006 and one in 2008. Golden accepted this as another option. A number of speakers tonight opposed a multi-year proposal, and he wanted to make sure that the public has a proposal for a one-time increase. If there are other fare packages that have a four year or two year increase for contrast, that's fine. Debo mentioned that when staff worked on the fare proposal, they looked at what happened if it was done in one year or two years. The clumped scenarios resulted in less revenue and greater ridership loss. She also wanted to point out that the TPC has asked that fares not be raised for choice riders and transit dependent riders - that is 100% of the population who use transit! She also pointed out that the TPC had asked for a break for people who use transit a lot and for people who use it a little - and that is 100% of the population. There's no one left, there's no solution. That is why staff had proposed an across the board fare increase.

In terms of making a decision, Wong felt more information would be helpful and he would like to see Metro's spreadsheet. Is there data on ridership by fare type over time? He wants to see those numbers and felt it would be very interesting. Staff could note when certain unlimited ride pass agreements took effect. Debo stated that the information was available for 2002 and 2004 but she cautioned that it would not be an apples-to-apples comparison.

Wong mentioned that whatever package the TPC comes up, he expected to hear from the public about the 82.5¢ per ride rate for unlimited ride pass agreements which increases to 95¢ in 2009 compared to \$1.53 for tickets. Is there something that staff can come up with in the proposals that will anticipate that complaint?

Sanborn commented that as far as more information, tonight there was input about the cash fare increase hurting low income people. Could staff put together something that shows what happens to the other fares if tickets are raised at a smaller level; what happens if the cash fare stays at \$1.50, what if cash went to \$1.75 immediately, etc. Some of the options would likely be weeded out right away. As part of these scenarios, what happens to the revenue projection. That's the type of information he would like to see, might be more stark, but would show things like what would happen to the other fares to compensate for a smaller increase in tickets.

Motion carried unanimously.

G. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- G.1. [01238](#) Authorizing the City of Madison to implement an Unlimited Ride Pass Program for City Employees. Terms and Conditions of the Program, described in Addendum A to this Resolution: Report: Metro Transit Unlimited Ride Pass Program, have been reviewed by the Mayor, Comptroller, and Interim Human Resources Director. The Unlimited Ride Pass Program would operate initially on a pilot program basis with the opportunity for program continuation through the normal legislative process.

A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER for June 21, 2005 Debo stated that the program attached to the resolution is the equivalent of a contract. The TPC had previously decided that all agreements would be set up in this fashion. Every trip will be billed at a certain rate and that rate will be consistent across the contracts. The minimum reimbursement to Metro is based on estimated ridership, and each trip beyond that will be paid at the rate in question, up to a maximum specified in the contract. Metro will also be reimbursed for paratransit trips.

For Madison, the 2005 contract amount is the amount that Metro is now getting from City employees using tickets and monthly passes. The contract goes through December, and then the City and Metro want to get on a budget cycle. The terms will carry through to future years, although the contract amount will change. In response to a question from Paoni, Debo explained that the City's 2005 budget anticipated paying the existing employee subsidy for tickets and monthly passes for the period January 1 through July 31, and covering the cost of unlimited ride passes from August 1 through December 31.

The motion passed by acclamation.

Enactment No: RES-05-00572

- G.2. [01227](#) Amending Section 3.38(30) of the Madison General Ordinances to provide unlimited ride bus passes to employees under the City's Unlimited Ride Pass Program.

A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER for June 21, 2005 The motion passed by acclamation.

Enactment No: ORD-05-00120

- G.3.** [01241](#) Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Edgewood College for the provision of free fare access by its employees and students to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services through an Unlimited Ride Pass Agreement, with reimbursement to the transit utility for employee and student trips for the period August 31, 2005 through May 12, 2006.
- A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Carlsen, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER for June 21, 2005** In response to Wong's question, Debo stated that the unlimited ride pass rate for 2005 was previously set by the TPC. Most agreements are single-year contracts except for the UW students, which doesn't expire until August 2007. Edgewood's agreement is for the period August 31, 2005 through May 12, 2006.
- The motion passed by acclamation.
- Enactment No:** RES-05-00573
- [Durocher left at 8:30 p.m. and Vice-Chair Carlsen assumed the Chair duties.]**
- G.4.** [01191](#) Revising the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) to allow for the use of speed humps on local or collector streets with volumes of 5000 vpd or less
- A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Ald. Sanborn, to Rerefer to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION** The motion passed by acclamation.
- Present:** Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag, Diane L. Paoni and Kenneth M. Streit
- Absent:** Ald. Kenneth Golden and Carl D. Durocher
- G.5.** [01281](#) Determining a Public Purpose and necessity and adopting a Relocation Order for the acquisition of Plat of land interests required for planned improvements of the Mid-State Street Parking Ramp in part of Block 58, Madison Original Plat, City of Madison, Dane County, Wisconsin and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to sign all necessary documents necessary to accomplish the acquisition of land interests. (4th AD)
- A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Ald. Sanborn, to Rerefer to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION** The motion passed by acclamation.
- Present:** Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag, Diane L. Paoni and Kenneth M. Streit
- Absent:** Ald. Kenneth Golden and Carl D. Durocher
- G.6.** [01259](#) Amending Section 11.03(1) and (2) of the Madison General Ordinances to include the transfer point as an area of lawful use and to require posting of this subsection by an official sign and not by police officer notification.

A motion was made by Ald. Sanborn, seconded by Ald. Radomski, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER for June 21, 2005** Debo explained that the ordinance change will include transfer points in the section regarding lawful use of bus shelters. The change also removes the necessity of notifying a police officer and instead allows the area to be signed with the no trespassing restriction. The motion passed by acclamation.

Present: Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag, Diane L. Paoni and Kenneth M. Streit

Absent: Ald. Kenneth Golden and Carl D. Durocher

Enactment No: ORD-05-00119

G.7. Draft Metro policy document: misbehavior on buses, at Transfer Points, etc.

Motion by Paoni/McCabe to move up items G.7 and G.8, carried unanimously.

The TPC first heard from the registrants.

Sharon Williams, 327 E. Bluff

- She is a Metro driver.
- She started noticing behavior problems in 1999, although she read from a 1996 communication from former Transit General Manager Paul Larrousse in which he stated Metro needed to act now before a major problem existed with behavior.
- Her bus has been shot at twice and her life has been threatened.
- Vulgar language by children is a big problem.
- Other drivers have told similar behavior stories.
- Cameras would help identify the perpetrators.
- The majority of drivers are in favor of cameras and so is the Police Dept.
- Bus drivers want the same safe working environment that other City employees have.
- Surveillance cameras are not a union issue.
- She would like cameras at all transfer points and eventually on all buses.
- Cameras will make a positive difference for both drivers and passengers.
- She is asking for help from the TPC.
- Distributed a note from Metro maintenance staff regarding items cleaned up at the transfer points, including vomit and human fecal matter

Georgian Springen, 6211 Bridge Road

- She is a Metro driver
- From January-April 2005, there were 145 reported physical assaults and two shots fired at a bus.
- Drivers have been spit on and had objects thrown at them.
- Drivers want their work place to be more safe and secure.
- Drivers support management's proposal to put cameras at the South Transfer Point and limited use on buses.
- Ann Gullickson's cover memo mentions ongoing meetings between Metro and the MPD and School District, and drivers would like to be more involved and have input.
- If the TPC approves the policy, it should be reviewed after six months to a year, with driver input.

Paoni asked whether additional training for drivers would be useful. Ms. Springen replied yes. There was a new training program in 2002 but not all current drivers have received it. Drivers need to learn how to defuse incidents on the bus. Sanborn asked whether the problems are widespread, and Ms. Springen replied that the problems are caused by a small percentage of the ridership. Most of the problems seem to be related to certain routes and certain schools. Most problems occur at the South Transfer Point, and drivers with STP routes have the most problems. Referencing Ms. Springen's appearance at last month's TPC meeting, Sanborn asked if she was representing the other drivers. She indicated that many drivers are working at night and cannot attend the TPC meetings.

Scott Spore, 240 Bunting Lane

- Metro drivers have no legal right to refuse service to someone who engages in disruptive behavior or who is eating/drinking on the bus, nor is there a legal right to ban that person from the bus.

- The draft policy is a step in the right direction but drivers are being requested to be enforcement officers so training will probably be needed.
- Driving the bus is different than it used to be, and how is the driver supposed to handle the situations without further training.
- Related an incident where the police were called to a transfer point but did not approach the disruptive person. Having the MPD take a greater role might be beneficial.

Greg Knowles, OmniPresent Systems LLC, 529 State Street

- He has a surveillance camera business and passed around a brochure showing vandal-proof cameras.
- Many customers feel safer at stores with cameras
- With recent publicity, it seems that a lot of people don't feel comfortable riding the bus. Some positive media coverage and cameras would help people feel safer, especially in targeted problem areas.
- He estimated that 15 buses, with four cameras on each bus, would cost less than \$40,000.

Ald. Brian Benford, District 12

- He rides the bus daily
- He has observed "insane" and inappropriate behavior on the buses
- When talking to focus group at the Boys & Girls Club and asked where to look for gangs, first response was the South Transfer Point
- His first reaction to cameras was to say no, but after further discussion he changed his mind. There are other locations with cameras (banks, ATMs, etc.).
- He feels cameras would be a deterrent to bad behavior
- It's very disturbing that some drivers and passengers have been put at risk
- He realized that surveillance cameras is a difficult issue and there is also the fiscal aspect
- Drivers are on the front line and he urged the TPC to keep an open mind toward use of cameras
- This is a transportation issue as well as a huge public safety issue

Golden suggested sending a report to the Common Council that indicates the TPC is considering the use so video surveillance cameras with the intent of having the Council accept the report. He did not want the TPC to spend a lot of time and effort on the draft policy if the Council is going to reject it. He thought the Council would support limited application of cameras; but given the Council's past experience with this issue, he didn't want to waste staff time on the policy if he's proven wrong. In the past, the Council's debate was on the general use of cameras, not the specifics.

Motion by Golden/Radomski that the TPC send a report to the Common Council indicating the TPC's intent to develop and implement a plan for security and safety in Metro facilities that will involve the use of video surveillance cameras, and the TPC seeks the Council's concurrence with that strategy. The plan is not yet developed but the TPC wants to know whether the Council supports the use of video cameras.

Friendly amendment by Paoni to change the word "will" to "may." Golden indicated he was trying to preempt any ambiguity that the TPC wants to use cameras, and he wants the Council to be on record as approving cameras. Paoni noted that the TPC had not yet discussed the draft policy, so she was not sure

about saying "will."

**Amended motion to change "will" to "may" and to add the following statement:
Approval of this report will be taken by the TPC as authorization to proceed with
consideration and possible implementation of security cameras.**

Sanborn agreed with the need to make it clear to the Council. Wong asked who would pay for the cameras, but Golden indicated the discussion is not that far along.

Motion carried unanimously.

Present: Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag, Diane L. Paoni and Kenneth M. Streit

Absent: Carl D. Durocher

G.8. [01481](#)

Report dated June 15, 2005 re: surveillance cameras in Metro facilities.

**A motion was made by Ald. Golden, seconded by Ald. Radomski, to
RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS -
REPORT OF OFFICER for June 21, 2005 [See discussion under agenda item G.7
.]**

At its meeting on 6/14/05, the Transit and Parking Commission unanimously adopted the following motion by Golden/Radomski: That the Transit and Parking Commission send a report to the Common Council indicating the TPC's intent to develop and implement a plan for security and safety in Metro facilities that may involve the use of video surveillance cameras, and the TPC seeks the Council's concurrence with that strategy. The plan is not yet developed but the TPC wants to know whether the Council supports the use of video cameras. Approval of this report will be taken by the TPC as authorization to proceed with consideration and possible implementation of security cameras. (This motion constitutes the report to be sent to the Council.) The motion passed by acclamation.

Present: Ald. Kenneth Golden, Ald. Noel T. Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanborn, Chris R. Carlsen, Tim Wong, Sharon L. McCabe, Kevin L. Hoag, Diane L. Paoni and Kenneth M. Streit

Absent: Carl D. Durocher

[Golden left at 9:00 p.m.]

G.9. Metro Annual Report

Motion by Streit/Sanborn to refer item G.9., carried unanimously.

G.10. Progress updates: Facilities Needs Analysis/Master Plan, Sun Prairie, West-side Study

Motion by Streit/Sanborn to refer item G.10., carried unanimously.

H. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

H.1. Parking April 2005 Revenue Report

Motion by Streit/McCabe to accept report H.1., carried unanimously.

H.2. Transit YTD April Performance Indicators

Motion by Streit/McCabe to accept report H.2., carried unanimously.

I. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES/COMMISSIONS/AD HOC GROUPS (presented for information only)

Motion by Streit/McCabe to accept reports I.1 through I.7, carried unanimously.

I.1. ADA Transit Subcommittee - 5/5/05 minutes

I.2. Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee - 5/26/05 minutes

I.3. Parking Council for People With Disabilities - 5/17/05 minutes

I.4. Long Range Transportation Planning Commission - May meeting was canceled

I.5. Mid-State Street Parking & Mixed-Use Facility Evaluation Team

I.6. State Street Design Project Oversight Subcommittee

I.7. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

J. GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS

J.1. General announcements by Chair

J.2. Commission member items for future agenda

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Hoag/Sanborn, the meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.