



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

PLEASE NOTE: This meeting can be viewed in a live webcast of Madison City Channel at www.madisoncitychannel.com.

Wednesday, December 9, 2015

5:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Having quorum, Chair Poulson called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

Present: 8 - David Ahrens; Chris Schmidt; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich and Kenneth Golden

Excused: 2 - Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

Please note: There is one vacancy on the Commission in the position of Second Alternate.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Poulson made a note of the new abbreviated minutes (per a memo from the City Attorney), and suggested that in the future, members make a point of asking that specific statements be put in the minutes if they wanted them in the written record. Items that required follow-up would also be included. Kovich asked that the November minutes be amended to add that a future update had been requested for Item F. 1. A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Ahrens, to Approve the Minutes of the November 18, 2015 meeting, as amended. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 - David Ahrens; Chris Schmidt; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Margaret Bergamini and Ann E. Kovich

Abstentions: 1 - Kenneth Golden

Excused: 2 - Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

City Traffic Engineer David Dryer introduced the new Asst. Parking Utility Manager, Sabrina Tolley, who would be returning to the Utility on 12/21/15. Dryer also thanked Interim Manager Bill Putnam for his help during the transition.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

- E.1. [41037](#) Parking: Verbal Report Only (Due to timing of the November and December meetings, the November Activity Report and the October Revenue/Expenses Report have already been reported) - TPC 12.09.15

Having no new report, no action was required.

- E.2. [41039](#) Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Financial, Performance Measures, and Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Reports - TPC 12.09.15

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp answered questions. Some diesel tank contamination had been discovered and cleaned up. If the tanks needed to be replaced earlier than anticipated, they might be included in the 2017 CIP. By member request, staff would discuss the reason for the increase in Paratransit "No Shows", as part of the Quarterly Reports. Golden/Kovich made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. **NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

- [41019](#) Congratulating Ann Gullickson on her retirement and thanking her for almost 19 years of exemplary service to the City of Madison.

Poulson read the attached resolution, thanking Gullickson for her dedicated service. Gullickson said it had been a pleasure to work with such thoughtful, interested members.

- [40231](#) Creating Section 12.138(14) of the Madison General Ordinances to reduce commuter parking impact and promote the use of off-street parking.

Interim Asst. Parking Utility Manager Bill Putnam described the ordinance change and answered questions.

- **It would simplify eligibility for RP 3 permits, codify current practice, and minimize the impact of large developments and related commuter parking in high density, downtown RP 3 areas.**
- **Alders in these areas hoped the change would help preserve some parking availability for residents in single-family or 2-unit housing.**
- **It had been common in recent years to apply the criteria (in the proposal) on new multi-unit developments, unless the development provided more than one parking space/unit.**
- **The new zoning code did not require any off-street parking for many of the new developments. It was left up to the developer.**
- **Given that the extremely low cost of a permit helped create the incentive for a secondary market, the Utility had looked into increasing the fee. But, State law only allowed the Utility to charge what it cost to administer the program.**
- **Taking into account all relevant costs, the fee would increase only slightly; certainly not to market level. Re: enforcement, it was hard to pull out just the RP 3 portion of costs. For similar reasons, snow removal was not included in costs at this point.**
- **It was difficult to collect data about what residents did on their own volition. Residents and landlords were not required to report whether they were selling spaces to non-residents or commuters.**
- **This criteria could only be used for new developments because the original conditions of approval in the agreements with existing developments would apply.**

Members commented.

- (Ahrens) This changed the metrics for eligibility (# of residential spaces vs. the size of the development itself). It seemed to give vested rights to people who already lived in an area (inc. homeowners). How would this be addressed in an equitable way?
- (Kovich) Data was needed to know how this change would impact current and new development, residents and commuters. More data would help to make sure they were doing it the right, with no adverse impact.
- (Bergamini) This was a complex issue. In planning and in looking at how to increase density, why did we tie the # of parking spots in a development to the number of people living there, if the parking was not actually going to residents?

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Schmidt, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER.

Golden explained his position.

- In high density areas like the downtown, many more people competed for parking spaces than were available.
- The City had been trying for years to ban the practice of landlords selling parking spaces to non-residents, thereby dumping residents on the street.
- City ordinances aimed to have fewer cars per unit downtown. If interior parking was available, residents would use that. With this measure, incentives for outsiders to displace residents would be gone.
- The ordinance change was a tweak, not a solution; but it would likely improve things. Gathering data wasn't likely to reveal more than they already knew.
- If a rehab was sufficient to require Plan Commission approval, a condition could be placed on the building.
- The permit program started with everybody in an area being eligible, but then made buildings ineligible so the people in them would not add to the commuter-impacted areas.

Bergamini and Kovich had concerns about the definition of "new development"; and how the criteria would apply to rehabs, or to a building originally used for one purpose that would now be used for another. Ahrens was reluctant to vote for the measure without knowing more about zoning requirements for new developments: Were builders required to provide a parking space for each unit? If not, this would prevent residents from parking on the street even when they had no place to park in the building.

Bergamini/Kovich made a substitute motion to refer the item to the TPC Subcommittee.

Golden opposed this.

- The Plan Commission, which typically covered zoning issues, had voted 7 to 1 to approve the ordinance change.
- The TPC Subcommittee would deal with the RP 3 program regarding availability and revenues. This ordinance wouldn't have any effect on that.
- Four alders had sponsored the item. Referring it to a subcommittee could delay the item, and would be disrespectful to the alders.
- If they had to, he preferred to re-refer it to the full TPC to vote yea/nay.

Poulson echoed Golden's comments.

Schmidt opposed any referral at all.

- The proposal reflected common practice for larger developments already. This was done with regularity at the Plan Commission.
- It competed with another goal they had. On the one hand, they wanted to reduce dependence on automobiles; so they eliminated requirements for building more parking.
- But the flip side of that was developers who underbuilt their parking deliberately because it was cheaper, and they knew people could park on the street.
- From this came the push to disallow RP 3 permits for large multi-unit developments. He couldn't think of a time when they didn't put this condition on a major multi-family project in an RP 3 zone.
- A condition was placed on re-zonings (and sometimes conditional use permits) for large multi-family projects in RP 3 zones that said "residents of this project cannot apply for a permit".
- The proposal simply codified what they had made a practice.

In response to Kovich, Schmidt said that in his experience, situations which required re-zoning or conditional use, would fall within the definition of new development. Hearing this made Kovich more comfortable with the proposal. When asked by Ahrens if this was consistent with what Plan Commission had been doing, Deputy Mayor Anne Monks said her understanding was as Schmidt described: In recent years, a development requiring a new major permit (conditional use/re-zoning) would trigger the use of this criteria.

Bergamini and Kovich offered to withdraw their substitute motion. Without objection to this, a vote was taken on the original motion, which passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 - Chris Schmidt; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and David Ahrens

Abstentions: 1 - Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 2 - Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

F.3. [40852](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Edgewood College, Inc. for the provision of access by Edgewood students and employees to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement per trip for the contract period.

Kovich/Golden made a motion to recommend approval. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.4. [41044](#) Metro: Request to hold public hearing in January, to discuss service changes to Routes 55 and 75 - TPC 12.09.15

Kamp said that the proposed changes not only added service to Route 75, but also involved some adjustments to Route 55; which was why staff felt a hearing was in order. If approved, the changes would take place in March. Kovich/Golden made a motion to approve the request for hold a public hearing at the January meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

- G.1. [41040](#)** Family Care and its Impact on Transportation, presented by Lynn Green, Director, Dane County Dept. of Human Services, and Fran Genter, Division Administrator, Adult Community Services - TPC 12.09.15

Lynn Green, Director, Dane County Dept. of Human Services, and Fran Genter, Division Administrator, Adult Community Services discussed Family Care and its impact on Medicaid Waiver funding for Paratransit.

- For 30+ years, Dane County had operated its Medicaid Waiver program, which provided long-term care services to older adults and people with developmental disabilities, physical disabilities or chronic health conditions.
- Thru the Waiver program, counties were given a fixed amount of state and federal money. Additional federal money was available thru matching: Each local dollar was matched by \$1.50 from the feds (40% local, 60% federal).
- At one time, Madison Metro absorbed 100% of the cost of Paratransit services. In 1996, Dane County incorporated Paratransit into its Waiver program; and the City began providing local money to capture matching federal dollars. For every \$2 from the City, the County gave back \$5.
- Since then, \$135 million dollars had been captured; nearly \$3 million in 2015.
- In 2005, Family Care was introduced in the state as another way to deliver and fund long-term care services. It used a risk-based, managed care model. Counties had to volunteer to join Family Care; 60+ counties had done so.
- Dane County opted not to join because their entry fee would have been very high, and an actuarial showed that their customers would see a 25% reduction in their level of care.
- In their 2015-17 budget, the State mandated that Family Care would be statewide effective 1/1/17 (i.e., no longer voluntary).
- Through RFPs, the State would choose at least two managed care organizations (MCOs) to run Family Care in Dane County. The County would no longer be involved in family care contracting or oversight.
- MCOs could be for-profit/not-for-profit, Wisconsin/national corporations; would be run like insurance companies, regulated by the Insurance Commissioner, and would require a risk reserve.
- MCOs ran on a capitation model, with a fixed amount for each person served which could not be supplemented.
- Whether Metro would receive any \$ beyond the fare would depend on the MCO and what agreement they might reach with Metro. The MCO was under no obligation to support a public utility.
- The Waiver program would be gone along with the \$3 million/year Metro received.
- Some other County's services would continue: The City/County arrangement for 85.20 and 85.21 funding, group transportation for seniors, and certain specialized transportation programs. But these weren't as big as the \$3 million/year loss.

Golden mentioned a federal rule that prevented social service agencies from dumping their financial obligations onto transit systems. Currently, MCOs in other counties were paying Metro the full fare for services to their clients living in Dane County. He predicted the MCOs would likely pay the full fare, but that there would be fewer rides. People who were now going to supported employment 5 days/week, would instead go 2-3 days/week.

Green explained that the newest version of Family Care would integrate primary and acute care into the current program for behavioral health and long-term care. She speculated that since they had figured out how to control long-term care costs with the current model, and since they were running huge deficits for primary and acute Medicaid expenses, they wanted to combine the two to control that side of the equation. MCOs would now need to be HMOs, which would usher in large national HMOs to run the system.

Green said the County expected the program to be implemented by the end of 2017. With only 8 counties on the old legacy waivers, the State would not keep those waivers going; and the feds were not interested in running two different programs in the state, and had wanted Family Care statewide a while ago.

Kamp said Metro was currently negotiating its agreement with the County. The ADATS Subcommittee would look at any policy changes that might be needed, and pass them on to TPC. Metro wanted to be ready by 2017 to implement Family Care from a Paratransit perspective. The \$3+ million was shown in the Financials under Misc. Revenue-County. Because of the good, long-standing coordinated arrangement with the County, Metro provided Paratransit service to 630 people, to get them to jobs and medical appointments, to lead more satisfying lives. The situation was going to change, and it would be challenging. Metro would continue to do its best to serve the community.

G.2. [41041](#)

Presentation on the Metro Transit Onboard Survey, presented by Mike Cechvala, MPO Transportation Planner - TPC 12.09.15

Kamp said the 2008 survey had to be updated in order to retain some remaining federal and state funds for Transport 2020, which they now hoped to apply to high capacity transit (BRT). MPO Transportation Planner Mike Cechvala presented the attached PowerPoint and answered questions.

- HB University = student (not UW employee).
 - Transit Access: Bike would likely go up in warmer weather. Those with Vehicle Available were more likely to do Park and Ride.
 - Fare Type, HH Income: HH <\$35K were more likely to use Cash, which was more expensive than other types; important re: Equity lens.
 - People in peripheral areas were more likely to be low income.
 - Demand Flows lined up with potential BRT routes.
 - Out-of-Direction and Extreme trips raised the question of how the rider might be served better.
 - Staff was asked to compare the data between the 2008 and 2015 surveys: How the questions, responses and trip purpose had changed; how "medical" rides broke out among workers, patients, visitors.
- [Please note: Golden left at this point in the meeting, at 6:40 PM.]
- The survey was done now because money was available; one hadn't been done in a while; and FTA-Title VI asked transit systems to look at how minority groups were being served.
 - Members asked for staff follow-up on their plans to address bus cleanliness and overcrowding, and safety at Transfer Points, in particular to bring MPD staff to report on their work at TPs.
 - * The number of buses had increased, while the number of cleaners had remained the same. Metro just got approval for two additional PT bus cleaners.
 - * Overcrowding was one reason why they were looking at BRT.
 - * Metro paid \$100K to MPD to have officers at TPs from 3-5 PM, esp. during warmer months.

Members and staff appreciated the good information in the survey. It would help inform recommendations for fare changes and focus their efforts.

G.3. [41042](#)

Summary of Field Trip to Peer Transit Agency, Grand Rapids, MI, presented by Mike Cechvala, MPO Transportation Planner - TPC 12.09.15

Kamp noted that Metro had started visiting other transit systems in the Midwest that were doing interesting things related to funding sources, technology, sustainability. Like Madison, Grand Rapids was the 2nd largest city in their state, and had fairly recently formed an RTA. Cechvala presented the attached PowerPoint.

- Made of six cities, their RTA was called "The Rapid". The Silverline was their new BRT, with branded buses and enhanced shelters.
- With Grand Rapids in the center, they had a radial system with relatively straight and direct routes.
- Key transportation sites were centralized just south of downtown: Central Station - intercity and local bus terminal, Rapid Administration, Wealthy Operations Center - bus storage and operations facility, and the Amtrak Station. The garage, bus terminal and Amtrak Station were all built by the RTA.
- Having the train station near the bus station helped travelers. The central Operations Center reduced cost for dead-heading. Due to the freeway and arterials, getting from the Market to the other locations was rather roundabout.
- (Kamp) In the future, intensive urban architecture to reduce surface parking, and a centralized garage to reduce dead-heading would be important efficiencies. It might mean additional investment upfront.
- Silverline features were impressive; and saved 30-40% in travel time.
- Funded by FTA Small Starts and the State, the BRT was built with no direct capital cost to The Rapid. It was possible that Metro could seek 80% federal funding through Small Starts also.
- Fare recovery numbers did not include capital.
- The Operations Center had several amenities: Green roof, underground parking, exercise facility for drivers.
- Staff was asked to report the RTA's property tax rate.

G.4. [41043](#)

Annual Statement of Interests Form: Please complete and submit this to the City Clerk's Office by Tuesday, January 5, 2016.

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

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
TPC Subcommittee (to review issues outlined in Leg. File 37359)

I. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

I.1. **General Announcements by Chair: Happy Holidays!**

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Bergamini requested a report from B-Cycle, inc. the status of their contract.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Ahrens, to Adjourn at 7:01 PM.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.