



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Amended ADA TRANSIT SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE TRANSIT AND PARKING COMM

---

Monday, September 19, 2011

5:10 PM 15 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Room LL-130 (Madison  
Municipal Building)

---

NOTICE: Member Susan De Vos will be attending this meeting via telephone.

### 1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Also Present:** Jeanne Brunette-Tregoning

**Staff:** Crystal Martin, Ann Gullickson, Ann Schroeder

**Guests:** Michael Conley-Kuhagen, Todd Holman, Keith Pollock

**Chair Jacobs called the meeting to order at 5:15 PM.**

**Present:** 4 -  
Lorry Bond; Susan M. De Vos; Mary E. Jacobs and Carl D. DuRocher

**Absent:** 1 -  
Michael A. Huckaby

**Excused:** 3 -  
Ald. Bridget R. Maniaci; Kenneth M. Streit and Ida W. Nathan

### 2. PROPER MEETING NOTIFICATION

The meeting was properly noticed.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. DuRocher moved approval; Ms. Brunette-Tregoning seconded. Ms. Bond abstained. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### 4. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

There were no public appearances.

### 5. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Ms. Jacobs announced that she was familiar with our guests from Goodwill

Industries as they all work together. There were no other disclosures or recusals.

6. [23915](#)

Taxi Licensing Sensitivity Training - Administrative Changes

- a. Keith Pollock, Analyst, Traffic Engineering
- b. Todd Holman and Michael Conley-Kuhagen, Goodwill Industries

a. Keith Pollock, Analyst, Traffic Engineering – Ms. Martin asked Mr. Pollock to talk about the changes to the sensitivity training program that happened recently. Per federal regulations and city ordinance, taxi drivers are required to complete sensitivity training. Karl Schulte is no longer able to do the training as he took a position in Viroqua with Running, Inc. However, he didn't leave us high and dry. He talked to Goodwill and they immediately agreed to take over the training. Mr. Conley-Kuhagen has been a co-trainer with the program for the last year or more. He will be the lead teacher, and there will be some co-teachers from Union Cab. Training will take place the second Tuesday of the month at the Senior Center (depending on availability.) They've found this to be an excellent location with a staircase to aid in training.

b. Todd Holman and Michael Conley-Kuhagen, Goodwill Industries – Mr. Conley-Kuhagen said Goodwill has taken over the administrative and training functions. They have not made many changes. The next training is tomorrow at the Senior Center. There is access at the Senior Center for a chair and a there is a place with a little lip so people can experience lifting a chair.

Mr. Conley-Kuhagen said this fits in with Goodwill's mission because they provide help to people with disabilities getting housing and employment and getting people out in the community. Transportation is a really important part of that.

Ms. De Vos said Bill Tangney was very interested in safety issues. She wondered how much attention is paid to safety. Mr. Tangney talked about taking people on a really rough ride so they understood how it feels to go over a pothole in the back of a van. Mr. Conley-Kuhagen said one of the co-trainers from Union is their safety trainer, so he handles that portion, and it is covered very well. Mr. DuRocher said some cab companies, in addition to the sensitivity training, also have in-house training. This can include on the road experience.

Mr. Conley-Kuhagen said it is a four hour class. The first portion talks about laws like the Americans with Disabilities Act. The second hour is about what consumers are looking for and how to provide that appropriately and safely in terms of different disabilities and behaviors that might come up. The last part is how to provide service without hurting the consumer or yourself (the driver.)

Mr. Holman said we're looking forward to working with this training because it is something a little bit different. Union Cab was really great to work with as far as turning over materials. Goodwill doesn't anticipate making many changes at all because it was handed over so ready to go.

7. [23946](#)

Referral from the TPC Regarding MABA Budget Concern

Attachments: [De Vos-MABA Budget Comments.pdf](#)  
[Metro 2012 Budget Request to Mayor-Aug 2011.pdf](#)  
[Metro 2012 budget summary 09 02 11.pdf](#)  
[Metro 2012 Budget- fare increase options-Sept 2011.pdf](#)  
[Metro 2012 Budget-fare-service change impact summary-Sept 2011.pdf](#)

Ms. De Vos said the issue is pretty clear that some years ago we spent quite a bit of time dealing with the fact that we want to have an off-peak and peak kind of fare, but that we were limited to charging individuals this because for people with the MA waiver as payment, it didn't matter. They did not have to respond to any kind of differential pricing. She thinks that Metro is still recommending having one fare for both peak and off peak rides, which will increase the off peak fare from \$3.00 to \$3.50 and decrease the peak fare from \$4.00 to \$3.50. Given that we had talked about that before, it seemed it worth re-considering the whole thing. In addition, it seemed Metro talked about how the agency fare this time would not be have different peak and off peak prices but was considering next year's agency fare to have a differential. Is that correct? Ms. Martin said correct, we are talking about next year's fare.

Ms. De Vos said the reason for the differential fare was to try to even out the peaks during the day. If you don't charge a different fare and if there is a real spike in demand at certain times, people could end up waiting forever for rides. There are different ways of dealing with that – you can either modify demand through pricing or by telling people they have to wait. It's a matter of philosophy about how you want to deal with that.

Ms. Martin addressed the issue by breaking it into the two parts: the off peak and peak fares for the cost, and then the other issue is whether or not to introduce peak fare for the agency fare. Right now Metro is going through this process where we are preparing to have the ability to use a standardized agreement with smaller agencies in contrast to larger agency agreements that took a lot of time to develop. At the last Common Council meeting, The Common council approved our ability to have a standardized agreement to sell tickets at the agency rate. The big deal isn't whether we are getting peak or off peak fares, but that these agencies are starting to buy tickets at \$29 instead of \$3. That's a big change. Agencies have been anxious for this resolution to go forward so that they can get tickets. They've been supporting us; it hasn't been contentious. This is a big leap in terms of budget needs for next year. For a lot of these agencies they will be passing along the tickets to people who need to take trips at a certain time. A small differential would not induce them to change ride times. We are just in such a fortunate position right now having the support of these agencies; including peak or off peak prices is not something we had discussed. We are just developing these relationships, and the agencies are standing behind us. A peak or off peak differential would be negligible.

Ms. De Vos asked how many agency rides are for employment purposes. Ms. Martin said it's mostly people on the MA waiver program, which is about 60%. Even if the price is increased by a peak or off peak differential, it wouldn't change the ride behavior which is why Metro started the Long Term Assignment (LTA) program. About half of the LTA trips are work trips. Ms. De Vos said there could be a \$4 or \$5 surcharge for agency trips with some

mechanism to waive the surcharge if it is a work trip.

Ms. Bond said that is penalizing people who aren't working or don't work. Ms. De Vos said you can go at a different time. Ms. Bond said doctor's appointments are sometimes between 2:00 and 4:00. Alder Maniaci came in and said she was needed for quorum at another meeting and would discuss this meeting with Ms. Martin later.

Ms. De Vos said she is pushing this because Metro needs revenue, and they need to raise fares. For example, you either raise taxes by disenfranchising people or by some other way. It's not whether to raise taxes, but it's how you do it. It's not fair to say paratransit is not part of the whole system; it is. Mr. DuRocher said he sympathizes with Ms. De Vos's goals but he is having trouble following. The peak/non-peak differential was set up to try to influence times of travel. But the \$29 fare goal is totally different; it is to recoup the total cost of the ride. If she wants a surcharge on top of the \$29, that is recouping more than the cost of the ride. Ms. De Vos said there are different kinds of costs – making someone wait for a ride or costing more money. You are exchanging time for money. Which way do you want to have people pay the cost? It's not an issue of whether there is a cost or not. There is. The question is whether the cost is monetary or time. Mr. DuRocher said by raising peak hour fares do you think that would have an effect on scheduling for agencies? Ms. De Vos said that is the idea. Ms. Martin is suggesting it won't make a difference; I am suggesting it will. We don't have proof unless we experiment and have a sunset clause for a surcharge. Ms. Bond said maybe send out a questionnaire about why people are taking rides when they do. But that costs money too.

Ms. Bond said she wasn't sure about agency rates until this meeting. Knowing they are paying \$29 for a ride compared to her \$3 or \$4 – the agencies are hurting financially too. Ms. De Vos said they can ameliorate that by scheduling them at a different time. Ms. Bond said she didn't think that was fair. Ms. De Vos said if you want to show up on time to doctor's appointments, you might need to pay the monetary cost rather than the time cost. Ms. Bond said it has worked so far. Ms. De Vos said a surcharge would exchange the waiting time for the money. It's called rationing – it's either time or money. One way or the other it's going to be a charge.

Ms. Martin said some of the guidelines we've used in establishing the agency rate is to cover our costs. We've been as clear as we can be about our formula - taking the previous year's cost and making some adjustments for things we know increase like fuel and wages. Ms. De Vos said Ms. Martin is talking about Metro's cost, but she is talking about the riders' cost. Ms. Martin said we base the cost on the formula and that's how we've described it to the agencies. You seem to be talking about a premium for anyone or for the agencies for traveling at peak travel times. I think perhaps that would be outside of how we've discussed agency fares.

The second part of the question was about off peak and peak fares for the cash fare. One of the proposals for changes in fares for next year is what amounts to an increase in the paratransit fare. You can't increase the \$4 fare because it can only be two times the adult cash fare. Even if we reduce the peak fare down to \$3.50 the net result even for someone who decides to travel off peak is

that it will be a part of the fare increase.

Ms. De Vos moved that there be a surcharge on the agency fare of \$4 or \$5 that would be charged if the ride were at peak hours and that there be a differential in the individual fare so that the peak fare is \$4 and the non-peak fare is \$3.25 and there be a possibility of a waiver if the person can say the trip is to or from work.

Ms. Bond and Mr. DuRocher suggested separation of the motion into three motions. There was no objection.

Ms. De Vos moved that there be a surcharge on the agency fare of \$4 or \$5 that would be charged if the ride were at peak hours. The motion died for lack of a second. Mr. DuRocher said in defense of not supporting the motion, he thinks that we're taking a leap by creating agency fares the way they are and recovering the cost of trips.

Ms. De Vos moved that there be a differential in the individual fare so that the peak fare is \$4 and the non-peak fare is \$3.25. The motion was seconded by Mr. DuRocher. He said he seconded not because he necessarily supports it but so it can be discussed. The importance of the motion isn't the specific amounts but whether to have different fares during peak and non-peak. Ms. Bond wouldn't support that because when you are talking about having anything but bills it's really hard to keep track of. When you have bills they are bigger, you can see them. She can't tell the difference between a quarter and a nickel. She can see and feel the dollars. Also, the yellow tickets are worth a dollar. Ms. De Vos asked how Ms. Bond would deal with \$3.50. Ms. Bond said she would prefer \$3. She doesn't like any parts of dollars.

Mr. DuRocher asked why staff thinks this might be a time to consider not having peak/non-peak. Is peak time demand flatter than it used to be? Peak/non-peak was a TPC argument long ago. Ms. Martin said she remembers a long time ago when the peak fare idea came up before she worked at Metro. Things have changed a lot since then. We know a lot more about our ridership. Sixty percent of rides are on MA Waiver and their trip behavior doesn't have anything to do with what the fare is. They can get their tickets from an agency. There are some agencies that we haven't had an agency fare relationship with who just bought tickets. Or sometimes, family buys tickets for riders. So their trip request times aren't really influenced by that. We've also introduced LTA for high utilization riders. They aren't generally influenced by the fare differential because they have a very busy, scheduled day. That has been very effective in helping control the peaks and providing consistency. We also worked with the MARC centers that allows us to negotiate trip times so their trips are either before or after peak. That has made a huge difference in being able to control the peak hour travel that helps productivity and costs. That has also affected many more individual trips than having peak or off peak fares. Those are the things that this committee has done over time and that Metro has implemented that have had much more influence in being able to stabilize ridership compared to having a fare differential.

Mr. DuRocher said if a paratransit eligible rider has an employer pass such as UW, what is the employer charged? Ms. Martin said just for the fare, either

peak or off peak.

Ms. Brunette-Tregoning asked whether the fare is \$3, \$3.25 or \$3.50, would the increase in price to agencies of \$29 compensate Metro's budget that the tickets could be at \$3 and \$4 and leave it. Ms. Martin said they are not related.

Ms. Gullickson said another point she would throw in about having a single fare rather than the different fares is looking at what we've done here at this committee in introducing a \$29 fare which is an extraordinary change. Agencies haven't let a huge hue and cry about this change. Ms. Martin has been able to explain how this is part of how we're able to keep the transportation agency together in light of Family Care and managed mobility. Agency concern is being able to use the tickets and have that ease. It is a fare increase for individuals who are able to travel off peak. But it is similar to increases for fixed route. It will simplify things.

Ms. De Vos said the whole reason for the agency fare in the first place was LogistiCare taking over and Metro wanting to protect itself. She is not hearing a lot of concern about riders waiting. One of the reasons she didn't come in person to the meeting is that it would be half over before she got here. Ms. Bond said just have your pick up time earlier. Ms. De Vos said she is not willing to do that; her time is too valuable. Ms. Bond said that's what paratransit users have to do. Ms. De Vos said she is trying to minimize the time paratransit riders have to wait for a ride. Mr. DuRocher said on time performance has always been a value of service. He doesn't know that peak/off peak would solve that. We've had that fare differential for a long time and he doesn't think that it has a big effect for on-time performance compared to these other things that have been introduced. He doesn't think that arguing against the motion is arguing in favor of not improving on-time performance. He is influenced by the idea of simplifying the fare. Monitoring on-time performance is on-going and a separate thing. He doesn't think the fare differential is the solution or the cause. Mr. DuRocher asked the current status of differential fares. Has it been acted on by TPC? Ms. De Vos wanted to make sure we commented on it before the TPC acts. Ms. Gullickson said it was shared with the TPC and given to the Mayor as part of Metro's budget proposal. He hasn't decided. Mr. DuRocher asked Ms. De Vos if her reason for having \$4 and \$3.25 was for budget enhancement. Ms. De Vos said Metro is proposing to raise all the fares. It can't raise the maximum of \$4 but it could raise the minimum.

Ms. Brunette-Tregoning asked what a single-price ticket would cost. It would be \$3.50 if it ends up in Mayors budget and approved by TPC. Ms. Bond said that would make life easy. Mr. DuRocher said a \$7 round trip no matter what time of day is still pretty steep. He seconded the motion but he can't support it. He just wanted to discuss all the angles. \$3.25 in the day to day on the road implementation is problematic. Ms. Bond said it's also easier for the drivers to keep track of dollar bills. Mr. DuRocher said he wishes we didn't even have to consider \$3.50 across the board. But with printed tickets that amount would be easier. Ms. Bond suggested having more than just a few places where you can purchase paratransit tickets. Push that with the businesses that are selling the regular tickets. If people go to buy the tickets, they'll go shop there. Right now there are only a handful of places where you can buy paratransit tickets. A vote was taken on the motion. Aye - Ms. De Vos. Nay - Ms.

Brunette-Tregoning, Ms. Bond, Ms. Jacobs, Mr. DuRocher. The motion failed.

Ms. De Vos moved that there be a possibility of a waiver if the person can say the trip is to or from work. Mr. DuRocher seconded the motion so it could be discussed. The Code of Federal Regulations said long ago we cannot make trip assignments based on purpose. That's not a can of worms we want to get into – asking for trip purpose. We don't do that. Ms. Jacobs agreed. Ms. Bond said if it's against regulations, we can't. Also, are you going to tell me I have to pay more to go to church than to work? I can't work.

Ms. Gullickson said this doesn't speak specifically to the fare differential we're talking about, but the law is clear saying we can't prioritize one type of trip over another. This would make us as a city vulnerable to a rider saying the fare differential is prioritizing. She doesn't know how the law would rule on that, but it could create a perception that we're booking your trip based on your trip purpose. A vote was taken on the motion. Abstentions - Ms. De Vos. Ayes - None. Nays - Ms. Brunette-Tregoning, Ms. Bond, Ms. Jacobs and Mr. DuRocher. The motion failed.

Mr. DuRocher moved that ADATS let the TPC know that it supports the elimination of the paratransit fare differential and creation of a single paratransit fare in between the current peak and off peak fares. Ms. Brunette-Tregoning seconded.

Mr. DuRocher said it might be helpful to address the need to have a timeline for the sunset of the old tickets. Ms. Gullickson said on a staff level we haven't gotten that far to even thinking about that. The earliest a fare increase would go into effect is January. There is time to flesh this out a little more as this goes forward. We'd like feedback from this committee, but it is early for this level of detail.

A vote was taken on the motion. Ayes - Ms. Brunette-Tregoning, Ms. Bond, Ms. Jacobs and Mr. DuRocher. Nays - Ms. De Vos. The motion passed.

8. [23916](#) Update Pending List

**Attachments:** [Pending List 09 19 11.pdf](#)

**This was tabled until the next meeting.**

9. [23917](#) Reports
- a. Transit & Parking Commission
  - b. Commission on People with Disabilities
  - c. Dane County Specialized Transportation Commission
  - d. Other Community Meetings
  - e. Performance Indicators
  - f. Report from the Chair
  - g. Staff Report

Attachments: [Para Indicators June11.pdf](#)  
[Para Indicators July 2011.pdf](#)

- a. Transit & Parking Commission – Mr. Streit was not available to give the report. It appears they talked about budget proposals.
- b. Commission on People with Disabilities – No report. Ms. Bond couldn't make it to the last meeting.
- c. Dane County Specialized Transportation Commission – No meeting since our last meeting.
- d. Other Community Meetings – Ms. Martin said there are meetings that are coming up for the Area Agency on Aging. The Madison City Clerk will hold voter ID workshops at locations around Madison to cover recent changes in the law. There is a list posted on the City of Madison website. It looks like there are about 10 meetings just in September. There are still at least 8 coming up this month and one in October. Ms. Bond said there are none downtown. Ms. Martin said that one had already passed. Ms. Bond said so they are not accessible. Ms. Bond said she would like to get the message to the people setting up the meetings that they are not accessible to the widest number of people.
- e. Performance Indicators – Ms. Martin said the July indicators were exciting. Ridership figures were down about 1% for the year. It's a change for us. We had one provider, Abby Vans, that was attempting to work with the new Medicaid transportation broker, Logisticare. For the first 6 months of the year in terms of complaints and late service complaints, Abby Vans performed at a higher rate compared to the last transition with Badger Bus. The experience we had up to June was pretty good. Then July came. We anticipated that any contractor would be going through some growing pains with that transition at the state level. It showed in the numbers for Abby Vans. Complaints per 1000 customers went up by a point. Late service reports per 1000 customers also got a significant bump. On-time performance went from 94% in June to 88% in July. The best part of the numbers is that in August they improve. There was a dramatic change happening that any number of providers could have been involved in. We are glad to have had some limited experience.

Ms. Bond asked why that one month was harder. Ms. Martin said because they were providing trips for the start up of the Medicaid brokerage, LogitiCare, in our area. Start ups are very difficult. Badger Cab had initially started working with LogistiCare and Abby Vans and some other companies continued to work with them through the process to provide services. Abby Vans understood if they turned rides down, those trips might not be provided at all. We've worked through the feedback that came in during that time. They've worked with LogistiCare. We are going into our busy time. We changed all of our contract start up dates to July 1st for next time. Abby Vans tested that for us and the quick recovery is a good sign that we have a healthy system overall.

Ms. De Vos said the indicators in July said there were 0 fixed route trips using lifts or ramps which would mean she didn't exist in July. Ms. Martin said we'll let our statistician know that we left off that number, and we'll get it to you.

Ms. De Vos said she does look at those numbers. It does make a difference. Mr. DuRocher said he looks at them too. Ms. Bond said it's refreshing to know that Abby Vans bounced back quickly from the LogistiCare situation. Ms. De Vos said she is concerned about the proportion of trips that Badger Bus provides. It is 40% of all rides. Ms. Martin said they do that over two contracts – LTA and regular service. It's probably 20% and 20%. Ms. Bond said they are also the only provider for non-ambulatory service on the weekends.

f. Report from the Chair – No report.

g. Staff Report – None.

10. [08706](#) Other Transit Related Announcements

Ms. De Vos said quorum is always an issue. Since other committees have two alternates, she suggested we talk about having alternates for ADATS too. It's something to bring up when Alder Maniaci is around. Mr. DuRocher said quorum has become more of an issue lately than it has in the past, so it's worth a discussion.

Mr. DuRocher said the budget letter to Mayor Soglin explaining that the state aid cut of \$1.8 million and the fuel increase says we're trying to cover a \$3 million shortfall. If you go over the cuts/fare increases it only adds up to \$1 million. Are there other things we're looking at?

Ms. Gullickson said Mayor Soglin absorbed into the overall city budget the \$1.3 million in lost aid and \$1.5 million in fuel increases. So our local share started out by jumping significantly, so our cuts do not have to include that. It is a tremendous show of support for transit. Mr. DuRocher said it's a painful list to look at but still it is only 1/3 of what we are losing.

Ms. Bond said last weekend there were some route changes to route 4 because of the Willy Street Fair and that was not noticed on the buses at all she was told by riders. It was not posted that there was a route change. Especially when you are disabled and you expect a bus to be at one spot it's hard to run around.

Ms. Gullickson said generally when it is just a one-day change notices aren't put on buses that then have to get pulled down after a day. Ms. De Vos said Ms. Gullickson is missing the point. Notice needs to be given. Ms. Gullickson asked if there were notices on the bus stop poles. Ms. De Vos said she saw no notice and sometimes the bus drivers didn't even know. Ms. Gullickson said she would check into that.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DuRocher moved to adjourn; Ms. Bond seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 6:44 PM.