



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

Tuesday, June 10, 2008

5:00 PM

Room 201, Common Council Chambers
City-County Building
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 7 -

Robbie Webber; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. Durocher; Amanda F. White; Sharon L. McCabe; Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 3 -

Brian L. Solomon; Gary Poulson and Duane F. Hinz

PLEASE NOTE: Sanborn arrived at 5:05 PM, after the Chair was elected.

B. ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

B.1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Durocher noted that members could nominate people who were not present, with the understanding that nominees could later accept or decline the position.

Webber/McCabe nominated Durocher for Chair. Durocher asked three times if there were any other nominations. Streit/White moved to close nominations. The motion passed. Members then voted unanimously for Durocher to be Chair, for another one-year term.

Webber/McCabe nominated White for Vice-Chair. Durocher asked three times if there were any other nominations. Streit/Webber moved to close nominations. The motion passed. Members then voted unanimously for White to be Vice-Chair, for a one-year term.

B.2. Appointments to other committees

Durocher asked if any members wanted to be relieved of their current appointments. Hearing no such requests, Durocher said that all existing appointments would continue.

Durocher then conditionally reappointed Duane Hinz to the Parking Council for People with Disabilities, pending Hinz's acceptance of the reappointment.

Noting the vacancy (left by Tim Wong) on the Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission, Durocher stated that with no one volunteering to fill the vacancy at this time, he would leave this appointment until later, perhaps until after the LRMTTP Committee disbanded.

B.3. [10791](#)

Approval of TPC Rules and Procedures, including regular Meeting date/time and proposed ending time, in Sec. II (C) (2) - TPC 06.10.08

Streit/Webber made a motion to endorse the current language in Section II – Meetings, (C) (2) of the Rules and Procedures, to continue to hold the regular monthly meetings on the second Tuesday of the month, with the exception being certain meetings in the fall months when conflicts with holidays and budget deliberations arose. The motion passed unanimously.

McCabe/Webber made a motion to amend Section I – Membership and Officers, (A) (3) concerning CSOS membership to reflect newly revised ordinances, by adding “one member representing the City of Verona, one member representing the Madison Metropolitan School District, and one member representing Madison Area Technical College,” and removing “one member representing the Village of Shorewood Hills”.

Durocher clarified the process of accepting a friendly amendment. Because a motion is the property of the whole body, an amendment to a motion only became friendly if there was no objection to it from any member, not just from the person who made the motion. If there were an objection from anyone, then the amendment would have to go to a vote.

Citing the example of other bodies, staff reviewed a proposal to create a rule to end Commission meetings at 8 PM unless members voted to suspend the rule and continue, at which point, a 5-minute recess would be taken. Webber called the proposal pointless, because other bodies invariably voted to continue their meetings, and noted that the Council had a custom of taking breaks as needed. Streit noted that staff didn’t have the option of taking a break. Durocher suggested that the group could find an appropriate time between items to have recesses, should a meeting run long. No motion was made to adopt the proposed change.

B.4. Discussion about the process for public input to Commission members

Durocher provided some background to the current policy regarding requests from the public to copy and disseminate written materials to Commission members. Because of requests in the past to copy extremely long documents, the Commission has had a policy of not using City time and resources to provide this service. Instead, requestors have been invited to come to the meetings to hand out copies they have made, or to mail such documents to members. Durocher also noted that the Mayor had a policy of not publishing email addresses in the committee rosters on the City website, so that private, volunteer citizens serving on these committees wouldn’t get bombarded (by spam or unfiltered emails). Unlike private citizens, alders however did receive emails from the general public, through the City’s email system.

Durocher said that the issue of forwarding emails from the general public to Commission members came up when bus drivers requested that their emails about route changes be sent directly to members rather than being relayed through Metro’s feedback system. Because the drivers were not members of the general public but a specific group with a need to communicate to the Commission, an exception to the existing policy was made, and their emails were forwarded to members.

However, Durocher said the question arose as to whether or not members wanted to change current policies, deciding between being accessible vs. being overburdened, looking at issues related to City resources and personal time, and the possibility of compromising personal privacy on some level. He also pointed out that alders have an email address provided by the City for governmental business. And, publishing email addresses of citizen members would disclose addresses used for private or business purposes.

Webber said she felt it important for members of the public to be able to communicate with Commission members, but did not expect private email addresses to be published. While agreeing with the policy of not making hard copies to disseminate to members, she thought it appropriate for the public to send emails to staff to forward to members (as done in the Council Office), or for staff to scan and send electronic documents related to an agenda item.

Most committees shown on the City's website had the name and email address of a staff person. Webber expected that if someone sent an email comment to the staff's address with a request to forward to members of the committee, that the email would be forwarded to members. She thought there was a difference between printing/copying and email, which except for issues of bandwidth and staff time, had no cost. She also felt it very important that people have the opportunity to comment on agenda items without having to appear at a meeting, because that was difficult for many people.

Webber believed that forwarding emails was relatively simple and appropriate. In talking about scanning, she mentioned the City's Natural Step program, and noted that some committees didn't disseminate hard copy meeting packets, unless requested. It was expected that anything related to an agenda item would be scanned in order to make it part of the public record. Sending electronic copies of scanned items would be an appropriate intermediate step in lieu of distributing hard copies. She reiterated that it was appropriate and important to forward in some way, any citizen communication about current or future agenda items.

McCabe said she would like to limit email as much as possible, because during the school year, she had as many as 300 students emailing her. While she didn't want private email addresses published, she agreed that members should have a way to hear from the public. She preferred to have such items go through the Chair, who could decide whether or not they should be forwarded to members.

Knobeloch cited the City Attorney's opinion about copying and distributing documents from the public, created in response to a situation in the past when someone wanted entire books scanned/copied and distributed to the Commission; and in this particular instance, the books were related to agenda items. He noted that there was a difference between solicited and unsolicited feedback. In the recent case of the bus drivers, the Commission had solicited their feedback. Knobeloch felt the issue needed careful thought because of how easily things could be abused; i.e., a request to electronically distribute a long document or book could lead to a huge scanning project.

Durocher recalled the specific situation described by Knobeloch, from which a

more limiting copying/distribution policy was born. He said that people seemed to be saying that they didn't want private email addresses published. But that in order to have some avenue of input from members of the public regarding agenda items, he sensed no objection to having the Chair or a single staff person using their discretion to filter email to decide whether or not to forward them to members. He said that if he were the filter, he would likely pass things on, because he wouldn't want to be an editor of public input.

Webber made the distinction between copying a published item (probably illegal to do), and forwarding a first person, personal opinion. At the Council Office, people who wanted to distribute copies of things were asked to bring 20 copies to the Office, which were then placed in the Alder's mailboxes. If someone wanted to provide copies of a publication (newsletter, pamphlet, etc.) or lengthier documents, those could be distributed at the meeting. But she expected that an email directed to a staff person with a request to forward to the Commission, would in fact be directly forwarded on, esp. if it did not exceed a certain bandwidth and it was electronic (with no copying cost). In her opinion, this was part of the open records and public input. She said she would be shocked if such communications were not forwarded, and clarified that she would not have the items go through the Chair.

Streit said that, trusting that the Chair would have a generous filter and would take out anything slanderous, abusive or irrelevant to the Committee, he was be willing to take his chances with forwarded email, until/unless things became overwhelming. Like McCabe, he felt that once things got filtered out, and as long as dozens of emails weren't involved, he could go along with the approach that Kamp and Durocher would discuss items as needed and decide whether to forward them. Durocher noted that Kamp was listed as the contact for the Commission on the City website.

Durocher then delineated the two approaches that had been discussed: one in which an email sent to Kamp would be directed on to members; and the other in which an email sent to Kamp would be forwarded to Durocher, who would pass it on or not. Kamp said he interpreted current discussion to mean that he could send any emails related to Commission business directly on to members, but if there were any question as to the appropriateness of an email, he could touch base with Durocher. Durocher then commented that over the years, he had received phone calls and letters, and that any Commissioner listed in the Madison phone book was accessible by these methods as well.

White wanted any email received by staff or by Durocher, which related to the TPC -- whether coming out of left field or simply offering an idea or comment -- to be forwarded to her. She wanted to see these items, because they might contain some good ideas and she would hate to miss them. She agreed with Streit that she would prefer to get most emails, unless the volumes got too high or there were other problems, at which point the Commission could address the situation.

Durocher summarized what he thought was being suggested: That any email sent to staff would be sent on to him, which he would pass it on to members, unless the item were something egregious. This would give members access to public input but without anyone's personal or business email being published.

Webber preferred there would not be a second person to go through. Kamp had offered to simply forward agenda/business items, without sending them through Durocher. In order to avoid delays, she thought this the appropriate action. She said that Commission members were the governing board for two utilities, and that's what members had signed up for. She felt members should be seeing communications from the public. She later added that should items go to the Executive Secretary, Recording Secretary, or Chair with a request to distribute them to the TPC, she would expect that to happen. After asking if there were any counterpoints to Webber's proposal and hearing none, Durocher said that this would be how the Commission would proceed.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Hoag, to Approve the Minutes of both the 5/13/08 and the 5/27/08 meetings. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

D. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

- E.1. [10793](#)** Parking: Revenue-Expense Summary 2002-2006 & Parking: April 2008 Revenue and May Activity Report - TPC 06.10.08

Knobeloch said the Revenue/Expense Summary helped to show which Parking entities were contributing to reserves and which were not, and their relative importance. He talked about the need to create reserves, in order for the Parking Utility to continue operating. In looking at the Revenue/Expense Summary 2002-2006, he pointed out the big variances among the ramps in Net Revenue (Exp) per Space, and said that ramp revenues were currently contributing to reserves, because of the reduction in Parking's debt service. But as Parking began its building projects, it would again incur high debt service and ramp revenues would no longer go into reserves; and in fact, street meters would be subsidizing ramps. Even though certain lots showed some losses and could use some rate adjustments, overall, lots contributed towards reserves.

Knobeloch pointed out the following items with regard to Net Revenue (Exp) per Space in ramps and lots:

- Cap Sq North had operated every year at a loss, and was at the bottom of the list for ramp revenues.
- In 2006, Gov East had \$626 Net Rev per stall, a big contribution towards reserves.
- After losses in previous years, Overture had started showing revenues in 2006, because it had no more capital expenses; though it had low occupancy, it had high special event revenue.
- State St Campus (combined) was #1 in revenues, even with capital expenses, with \$1,445 Net Rev per stall in 2006.
- Blair Lot contributed \$85 per space towards reserves.
- With high rates and occupancy, Brayton Lot had had solid revenues for several years, contributing \$746 per space towards reserves in 2006.
- Buckeye Lot had had high revenues over the years because it had no

capital expenses; and it had high rates, high turnover and relatively high occupancy.

- Losses shown for Evergreen Lot reflect the period before Trader Joe's arrived, when nobody parked there; but these numbers would pop up in 2007 and 2008.
- Lot 88 (MMB) showed losses due to free disability hangtag parking there.
- Given recent losses at Wilson Lot, rates would need to be adjusted there.
- Wingra Lot was not a very active lot; different approaches had been tried; Parking hoped to eventually partner with some development there.

Knobeloch briefly touched on the monthly report, noting that YTD on-street revenues were down due to eight snow emergency days; he hoped these numbers would improve in May. He mentioned that all Parking structures would be undergoing concrete remediation this summer. Webber/McCabe moved to receive the report. The motion carried unanimously.

E.2. [10792](#)

Metro YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 06.10.08

Kamp pointed out the Revenue/Expense financial summary handed out at the meeting. Noting Metro concerns regarding diesel fuel through 2008, he cautioned people about using the YTD (through April) overrun of \$334K for "Fuel, Oils & Lubricants" to calculate total fuel costs for the year. This figure was artificially low based on having fixed fuel prices of \$2.41/gallon through January. The difference between revenues from increased ridership and expenses from increased fuel costs created a total overrun of \$43K through April, but Metro expected this to increase over the course of the year, due to continued increases in fuel costs.

Streit observed that unlimited pass holders would probably be more likely to use their passes over the coming year, and wondered how locked in the agreements were, relative to minimums and maximums. Kamp said that in the unlimited pass agreements with UW, Edgewood and MATC, the cost per ride would be going from 88¢ in the past school year to 95.2¢ in the new school year. Metro had seen an increase in ridership, and all of the agreements, which contained an increase in cost per ride, were multi-year agreements through the end of 2009. Kamp noted that MATC had asked for a review of its current agreement probably because they were hitting their maximums; and Metro had pointed out to them that what had been negotiated earlier was working in their favor. He anticipated that others would approach their maximums as well, and that Metro would still have ranges in growth of revenues of between 8% and 16% from these schools with unlimited ride pass agreements. He went on to say that because of the maximums in the agreements, Metro could potentially see capped growth in revenue, but would not see revenue growth percentages drop to 0% for at least a couple of years.

Hoag wondered if Metro and Parking were seeing any trends because of rising fuel prices, such as an increase in bus ridership and a reduction in commuter parking. Based on articles tracking ridership nationwide, Kamp said that Metro's 6.3% increase in ridership YTD might be a little bit above the trend, but certainly was within the range of what he saw nationally. Knobeloch said that though Parking's April revenue figures were almost back to normal in the area of cashiered parking, other revenue areas were still a little below. And even though things were returning to normal, he felt the situation was a little soft; that with \$4/gallon gas added to parking costs, it would set into people's minds

that they might have to start thinking of something else.

Hoag/McCabe moved to receive the report. The motion carried unanimously.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [10397](#) SUBSTITUTE - Authorizing Metro Transit to amend its 2008 Operating Budget to increase expenditures by \$78,606 \$52,606 funded with Transit reserves in order to support urgently needed route and schedule changes.

Kamp reported that BOE had recommended reducing the amount of money to be drawn from the Metro contingency fund to \$52, 606; and to use the newly found funding of \$26K for the proposed Option 2 of Route 13. Durocher informed the group that the Town of Madison had agreed to contribute \$17K and the County had agreed to contribute \$9K in order to continue Route 13, and as a result, the route had been saved for the current cycle.

Sanborn proposed a substitute resolution, to change any references to dollar amounts in the resolution to \$52,606, to reflect the fact that the Town of Madison and Dane County would be contributing \$26K to support Route 13, Option 2. As a result, this \$26,000 would not have to come out of Metro's contingency fund. References to a search to find funding for Route 13, Option 2, would also be struck from the resolution to reflect that such funding had been found.

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

G. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

G.1. [10330](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into a three-year agreement for drug and alcohol testing services for Metro Transit with Kroll Laboratory Specialists, Inc., with one two-year extension option.

Kamp noted that some small editorial changes had been made at the BOE, to cite Kroll's complete corporate name in the resolution. Kamp said the contract with Kroll would allow Metro to do drug and alcohol testing services in compliance with Federal Transportation Administration regulations on pre-employment, post-accident, random and other federally required drug and alcohol testing.

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

G.2. [10790](#) Discussion of the Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Long-Range Metro Transit Planning - TPC 06.10.08

Kamp said that the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee had asked Kamp and Alder Rhodes-Conway in conjunction with the Mayor's office to issue a news release and to hold a new conference announcing the release of the Final Report. The Report had been sent to the TPC for preliminary review, and would be formally referred to the group in the form of a resolution

in July. Metro was using the report to guide it in its preparation of its 2009 capital budget.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, White said the LRMTTP had worked hard and longer than expected to create the Report, and she and other committee members were happy with it. The Committee had created three subcommittees to look at Marketing, Ridership and System Improvements, and Funding and Cost Management. Recommendations in the Report were grouped by the timeframe the Committee wanted them be addressed: short-term (2008-2009), mid-term (2010-2012) and long-term (2013 and beyond).

Webber/Sanborn moved to refer discussion of the Report to the July meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

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

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee
Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Parking Strategic Plan

No one had anything to report from these committees.

However, Webber wanted to share some info from the MPO. Through serving on the MPO, Webber knew of a federal grant, which went through the WisDOT out to MPO's, called, "Job Access and Reverse Commute". She thought Metro was receiving some of this money to provide service for Verona. There was only one other applicant, to help low-income people buy cars – an effort Webber did not favor. With only two applicants, Webber wondered if there was a way to leverage more of that money; there was a requirement for a 50% match, and a requirement that the money be used for new service. Not being on the agenda, this was not something that could be discussed at this time. But with all of the discussion of scarce funding for new service, Webber hoped Metro could look into leveraging more of this money perhaps by offering more service extensions either by time or by location.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

I.1. General announcements by Chair

Durocher updated members about BOE action on Legislative File 10204, related to partial and full bus wraps. BOE recommended a different plan than the substitute for 20 full wrapped buses, approved by the TPC at its May meeting. BOE proposed that there be no full wraps on buses, only King Kong and partial wraps. The City Attorney had been asked for an opinion to sort things out with the Council. Durocher noted that this was not a done deal yet.

White wondered if others could overrule the TPC decision, because the

Commission is the governing body for Metro Transit. Sanborn said that the BOE actions were recommendations and did not overturn the Commission's action; the BOE recommendations would be put into the form of an Alternate and presented to the Council at its next meeting, along with the TPC's substitute.

Webber noted that there was an ongoing question about how much authority the TPC vs. the Council has, and this might be the time when this would get resolved. Because the Transit Commission was a required state commission, it had more authority than a normal City committee. She thought the issue would probably come up again and there might need to be a change in the legal status of the TPC, because the Commission was not quite officially the way the State wanted it to be. Kamp said he would defer to the Attorney's Office because the rules in every community are each interpreted a little bit differently. Metro was working with the Attorney's Office to understand their interpretation.

Durocher concluded by saying that this was a question subject to various interpretations, with state law coming into play and three bodies (TPC, BOE, CC) dealing with a fairly significant, high profile public issue (fully wrapped buses), and it wasn't clear how this would be resolved. The City Attorney had provided his opinion about how the Council should handle this, but this might not be the final word, since this was clearly a process.

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by White, to Adjourn at 6:35 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.