



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.**

Tuesday, May 11, 2010

5:00 PM

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

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 9 -

Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Jed Sanborn; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Margaret Bergamini

Absent: 1 -

Amanda F. White

Please note: Sanborn arrived at 5:08 PM during Agenda Item D.2., and Solomon arrived at 5:16 PM during Agenda Item E.1. Also, there is one vacancy on the Commission.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Hinz, seconded by Schmidt, to Approve the Minutes of the April 8, 2010 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY/QUARTERLY REPORTS

D.1. [18381](#) Parking: February 2010 Revenue, January Occupancy and April Activity Reports - TPC 05.11.10

On behalf of the Commission, Hinz congratulated Bill Knobloch, Parking Operations Manager, on attaining CAPP (Certified Administrator of Public Parking) certification. Streit/Schmitz made a motion to receive the Parking reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

D.2. [18382](#) Metro: YTD Performance Indicator Reports and 2009 Year-End Financial Report - TPC 05.11.10

Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp and Metro Finance Manager Wayne Block discussed the Metro reports:

- For year-end 2009, Metro came in under budget; \$394K would be added to the \$478K in the contingency reserves (at the end of 2008).
- Revenues were under budget despite fare increase; staff had anticipated

ridership to stay higher than it did.

- Expenditures were under budget for total salaries/benefits even with OT issues, and for energy/fuel costs esp. for natural gas. Also Metro received twice the usual dividend (\$200+K) from its liability insurance carrier, based on its (good) accident experience in 2009.
- First quarter 2010 financials would hopefully be ready for the June meeting, along with a new report format showing ridership for individual routes.

Bergamini requested an elasticity analysis, to include a report showing ridership/revenues by fare category, from April 2009 (when fares increased) through March 2010. Schmidt/Streit made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

E.1. [18200](#)

Low Income Bus Pass Program Committee Final Recommendation to the Madison Common Council

Low-Income Pass Program Committee Member Alder Bidar Sielaff (District 5) and Committee Chair Steve Schooler spoke in favor of adopting the Committee Report recommendations (Item E.1.) and the accompanying resolution to implement the recommendations, Leg. File 18340 (Item E.2.):

- The Committee, which in part arose out of the April 2009 fare increase, had met since last summer to develop a permanent program.
- In the 2009 budget, the Mayor committed \$100K to a pilot program to allow low-income people to purchase a monthly pass for half price. (See page 3 of the attached Report for sales statistics since last April.)
- Revenue was reduced by riders shifting from full-price to half-price passes, with a loss of \$25/pass.
- Most people purchasing the half-price pass shifted from using a full-price monthly pass, rather than shifting from some other configuration of tickets; though with opening up eligibility beyond Quest card holders, this might not remain so.
- During the pilot, the Committee found that using the Quest card to determine eligibility was unduly limiting for people who didn't use food stamps; a self-declaration was implemented instead.
- The final report did not recommend increasing the total number of passes that would be available (300/month) at this time.
- To avoid creating unnecessary trips to more than one location, rather than having non-profits get involved in determining eligibility, people would be able to fill out their eligibility forms at the locations where they purchased passes.
- Once established, eligibility would be valid for six months; passes would still need to be purchased every month.
- Passes were not "free"; people purchased them for \$27.50.
- (Voluntary) survey questions were added to the eligibility form.
- After lengthy discussions, Committee members thought that most people would not abuse the program, esp. with the impact of having to step forward to declare themselves below poverty level; members felt that people should be treated with respect and their declarations honored.
- Members also did not think it feasible in this tight economy for non-profits to help fund or sustain the program.

Lisa Subeck, a Citizen member of the Committee, thanked the Commission for its past support, asked for the approval of the report and resolution, and made

the following remarks:

- The Committee had worked hard to develop workable recommendations for the program, which essentially was a continuation of the pilot.
- With a low-income population greater than the number of participants and the limited number of passes available, the program would not meet the entire need in the community; however, the recommendations did not expand the program at this time.
- At some later date, she wanted low-income passes expanded to become part of the fare structure which would be built into budgets, rather than to be treated as a separate program.
- She wanted people to keep looking for other (additional) funding sources.
- Referring to such programs as "Transit for Jobs", she also wanted the City to conduct a comprehensive review of the transportation needs for low-income residents who relied solely on buses, to figure out if we were doing the right combination of things.

Schmitz thanked Subeck for her hard work on this issue. The Chair also thanked Schooler and the Committee for their efforts and the report.

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Solomon, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**. The motion passed by the following vote:

Absent: 1 -

Amanda F. White

Ayes: 7 -

Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Jed Sanborn; David E. Tolmie; Duane F. Hinz; Susan M. Schmitz and Kenneth M. Streit

Abstentions: 1 -

Margaret Bergamini

Non Voting: 1 -

Gary L. Poulson

E.2. [18340](#)

Adopting the report and recommendations of the Low Income Bus Pass Program Committee (see Legislative File ID# 18200)

Please see Agenda Item F.1. for remarks related to this item.

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Schmitz, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**. The motion passed by the following vote:

Absent: 1 -

Amanda F. White

Ayes: 7 -

Chris Schmidt; Jed Sanborn; David E. Tolmie; Duane F. Hinz; Susan M. Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Brian L. Solomon

Abstentions: 1 -

Margaret Bergamini

Non Voting: 1 -

Gary L. Poulson

PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G.1. and G.2. at this

point.

F. 6:00 PM -- PUBLIC HEARING: To hear public comment on proposed change to Routes 51 & 57

F.1. [18383](#) Public Hearing to hear comments on proposed change to Routes 51 & 57 - TPC 05.11.10

PLEASE NOTE: This item followed some announcements in Agenda Item I.1.

Metro's Transit Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck discussed the proposed changes:

- Routes 51 and 57 would be moved two blocks north off Hammersley at Brookwood to Piping Rock, in order to avoid the increasingly hazardous northbound left turn from Hammersley onto Whitney Way.
- The new left-turn bay at Hammersley and Whitney Way had made it harder for driver's to see fast-moving traffic coming from the right down the hill on Whitney Way.
- Passengers were walking in the street to get to/from the bus stops on Hammersley.

For the safety of passengers and buses, Metro was asking that the proposal be adopted. Responding to questions, Beck said that Metro had voiced some concerns to Traffic Engineering that the new left-turn bay might cause some difficulty (with the sight line and snow removal). Beck had gotten no reaction from TE regarding the proposed route change.

Registrant Pamela Rogers, 5709 Hammersley Road, 53711, spoke in opposition to the proposed route change. A bus rider for 25 years who took the bus to work every day, Rogers wanted the routes to remain as they were, and questioned Metro's logic as follows:

- Hammersley had a six-foot lane for people to safely walk to the bus stop; at the stop, riders could wait on a sidewalk located on Whitney Way. To get to a new bus stop on the other side of Whitney Way (at Montauk), people would have to cross fast-moving traffic and walk further; not safer, esp. in the winter.
- She wondered if there was data to show how hazardous the turn really was. The new left-turn bay at Hammersley/Whitney Way now provided a safe waiting place for buses. But at Piping Rock, there was no turn lane and the intersection was wider; buses stopped in the middle and hung over into the southbound lane while waiting to complete their turn; and with a curve, she wasn't sure the sight line was better.
- The route change added two more turns, and Brookwood and Piping Rock were smaller residential streets, often with parked cars, less safe than the straight route on Hammersley.
- She was concerned about the safety of children who played at a park on Piping Rock, who sometimes darted across the street. She felt that if asked, residents on Piping Rock esp. those with children would oppose the change, and questioned the statement that people preferred the new route.
- When asked, Rogers said there were no painted cross walks or curb cuts on Whitney Way.

Registrant Neil May, 5709 Hammersley Road, 53711, spoke in opposition to the proposed route change. A long-time rider with issues similar to Rogers, May commented as follows:

- While wondering why Metro and Public Works hadn't worked things out better

- beforehand, he didn't see why buses couldn't navigate the turn. It was safer to pull half-way out, since Whitney Way was so busy.
- If traffic (on Whitney Way) was going too fast, then it should be slowed down (inc. at Toki) vs. moving the routes.
 - The area along the new route was more residential with more children; and the turns would be more difficult.
 - Either way, he would have to walk along the street; but now would have to cross Whitney Way and walk further; all less safe in the winter.
 - No hard data, only anecdotal evidence supported the change; if actually asked, parents on Piping Rock would be opposed because of the hazards to their children.
 - Hammersley was set up to be a connector road, where mass transit should go.
 - When asked, May said there were three riders who waited at his stop.

With no other registrants, Poulson closed the public hearing. Metro staff answered questions from members:

- The new route was preferable to drivers and Operations staff, because the left turn at Piping Rock was clearly much easier; Metro had received no feedback from residents on Piping Rock during the summer detour.
- Staff didn't know if there were curb cuts at the corners along Brookwood, Piping Rock and Whitney Way.
- The original plan was to move Bus Stop #8633 further north on Whitney, but it might make more sense to locate a stop on Piping Rock at Whitney.
- The detour ran for 10 days in July; drivers had not complained about turns or parked cars on the narrower, residential streets; there had been no winter experience with these issues.
- An internal team of Operations, Planning and Marketing staff had looked at options/alternatives for the detour and then for the proposed change, and felt that the detour had worked very smoothly from an operations perspective.
- An especially important data point was driver feedback, indicating an improvement in terms of their perceived safety.
- Operations and Planning staff had checked all this to make sure they were not missing other ways to serve the area and keep the route on time, and felt that the proposal was the best recommendation if buses were to go off Hammersley.
- Brookwood south to Dorset had not been considered because it increased the distance and time.
- There had been no bus accidents at Hammersley since the intersection had been changed.

Please see Agenda Item F.2. for member remarks about the proposal.

F.2. [18384](#)

TPC Action on proposed change to Routes 51 & 57 - TPC 05.11.10

Streit/Hinz made a motion to adopt the proposed route changes as presented.

Hinz said he traveled through this area frequently, and completely understood safety concerns about the left turn at Hammersley and Whitney, which would be even more difficult for buses. Even in a car and using mirrors, it was very hard to see what was coming from behind once in the new left-turn bay. Regarding the proposal to reconfigure the intersection, Traffic Engineering had done a good job informing residents in surrounding neighborhoods of the three alternatives. When he reviewed the options on paper, the left-turn bay

looked like a really good idea; it wasn't until he had to start using it that he saw how unsafe it was. Hinz often took the alternative route being proposed for the buses because he found it safer and easier to see traffic coming from the south at Piping Rock. The intersection was wide there and he could use the median to shadow his car when he stopped in the middle.

Solomon commented that the option of a south route on Brookwood/Rae Lane/Dorset would take buses very much out of their way. In response to a question about Hempstead, Kamp said that the Operations staff had looked at several alternatives in terms of turns, ease of passage, timing and safety, and Piping Rock met all the criteria. Solomon said he would support the motion because of safety concerns, with some reservations due to the public testimony. Assuming that the Montauk stop met distance criteria, he hoped buses would be able to make the left turn and still safely get over to the new Montauk bus stop on the right. Streit thought that the distance between Bus Stop 8207 (at Brookwood) and the new Montauk stop was more than a quarter mile and hoped Metro would explore adding stops along the new route. Kamp said that staff would do so. Tolmie was concerned about curb cuts along the new route, and wondered if Hammersley would be plowed sooner than Piping Rock in the winter. Kamp said that when the Operations staff looked at the alternatives, they considered whether a route would work year-round. Staff felt that the new route would work.

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- G.1. [18385](#) Metro: Update on near-side bus stop pilot program - TPC 05.11.10

Kamp explained that Alder Verveer had proposed the pilot consisting of ten kinds of near-side bus stop configurations, in the 2010 budget. The typical near-side stop was a one-pole configuration, in which the pole was placed where the no parking area began, confusing riders as to where to stand. Also the size of the no-parking indicator was small, causing problems for parkers.

The new two-pole configuration (featured in the attached photo provided to members) had been piloted in higher-density, core service areas, where parking was an issue. With the new configuration, a larger "No Parking" sign was now located where the old near-side bus stop sign used to be; and the bus stop sign was now located at the corner where riders stood. Also, on the back of these signs were the words "Bus Stop", so that people approaching from the other direction could see that it was a bus stop sign. The new configuration was part of the LRMTTP Committee's recommendations. With the pilot now completed, Metro was getting good preliminary feedback from people, including drivers, who said that this was really helping with the parking situation. Metro would keep the Commission informed as things proceeded. Because the Agenda Item was informational, no action was needed on it.

- G.2. [18386](#) Metro: FY 2010 FTA Triennial Review - TPC 05.11.10

Referring to the Summary of Findings on pages 14-15 of the FTA Triennial Review and focusing mainly on items identified as deficient, Kamp made the following remarks:

- Every three years, the Federal Transit Administration visited transit systems across the country to conduct a review.
- Importantly, federal funding was contingent on satisfactory compliance with the 24 items in the review.
- The 04/25/10 response date shown was supposed to be 07/25/10; and Metro would easily be in compliance by 7/25th.
- Item 3, Technical - This was corrected quickly by preparing a plan for how Metro assigned their own labor to be charged to certain capital projects.
- Item 6, Procurement - This related to spare part kits included in bus procurements, and how some of the parts were changed in the kits (for legitimate reasons) as they went along. Metro Parts and Finance had just completed a review of every item purchased off the list, and would be providing a complete reconciliation to the FTA. The changes (made by part number) arose out of upgrades to various parts, which had been assigned new part numbers and were more appropriate to be included in the kit. This was an honest mistake, which would be corrected. Starting immediately, Metro would not purchase any spare parts until the reconciliation process was done. And with little savings involved, Metro was also thinking about discontinuing the practice of lumping kits into procurements, and instead buying spare parts one batch at a time.
- Item 7, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise - Procurement was working with the Civil Rights Department to develop procedures to document Metro's efforts to get disadvantaged businesses to bid on their procurement proposals; Metro would have no problem complying with this.
- Item 8, Buy America - This related to one procurement a year ago, of overhead garage doors. Budgeted for under \$100K, the actual bid came in over \$100K. The FTA required a Buy America certificate for all construction projects like this of \$100+K. Though the vendor was U.S., Metro hadn't gotten a certificate. To remedy this, all future capital construction transactions would include the certificate.
- Item 12, Title VI - Already corrected by the Marketing staff, Title VI language had been included in the Ride Guide and on the Metro website to describe the process to file a complaint about discrimination.
- Item 15, ADA - This involved two medium-sized deficiencies. The first issue related to making customer service hours more available to the public to better reflect normal business hours. Currently on Sundays, customer service didn't start until 11:30 AM. Starting on July 1st, customer service would be available at 9:00 AM on Sundays and holidays. The second issue related to the 3/4-mile boundaries of paratransit service that extended around regular service areas. Because campus Route 80's were free, Metro would need to provide free ADA paratransit service to folks in the area in/around Route 80 service areas. Metro was working on this issue with the UW, to try to come into compliance by July.
- Item 17, Tripper Violations - Kamp felt this was the largest issue among the items; reflected a different interpretation of past roles used by transit systems. Though the deadline was July 25th, Metro had requested an extension to June 2011, because changing the number of tripper (dodger) routes to come into compliance could take several months. Metro wanted more time to review this issue, and to provide time for the school district to figure out what if anything they would need to contract out, if it came to that. To be compliant, tripper routes must have only "de minimus" deviations from regular fixed routes. This wording had not appeared in regulations or guidelines anytime in the past. It did appear on a policy statement in 2008 as part of a notice to transit systems of proposed rule-making to define "de minimus" deviation, but then the proposed regulation was withdrawn with a new presidential administration.

Metro was led to understand that the feds needed more time to determine if the new administration wanted to define tripper service in this way. Metro would be meeting with the FTA in Chicago to try to clarify the meaning of "de minimus" deviation. Metro had also contacted transit systems throughout the state, and found that none had received a fault in this area of their recent Reviews. So this appeared to be something new and different, which needed further investigation. Metro would keep the group posted. Metro also needed to resolve a different, smaller issue. Currently, students on dodger routes could flag their stop; but to be consistent with fixed routes where flagging was not allowed, the issue of signage would need to be addressed.

· Item 21, Drug and Alcohol Program - Based on their last Review, Metro thought they were supposed to inspect contractors on-site once every contract for compliance with rules re: drug and alcohol programs; but the FTA clarified that this needed to be done once a year with every vendor. Metro had already visited all of their paratransit contractors. To address the second citation, Metro would also be updating its drug and alcohol program, and would bring some minor but important changes to the June meeting. Metro had already resolved the third item by setting up procedures to annually monitor the vendor that collects specimens.

· Item 22, EEO - Metro was working with the Civil Rights Department and would shortly be in compliance.

Because this was an informational item, no action was needed. PLEASE NOTE: Alder Schmidt left the meeting at this point, at 5:50 PM. The meeting proceeded to Agenda Items H. and I. because it was not yet time to open the hearing.

**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
Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Parking Strategic Plan
Low Income Bus Pass Program Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

No action was needed on these items.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Poulson asked Solomon to report on the Wingra Lot next to the Monroe Street Branch Library. Located across the street from Solomon's district in Alder Kerr's District 13, the Lot was small and not very profitable. Over the years, there had been talk about mixed-use development in the area where Affordable Futons, the Library and the Lot were situated. A recent proposal with apartments above the Library and parking underground, called for five stories. But the Monroe Street Plan capped building heights at four stories, which

would make it very difficult to get approval. The developer withdrew his proposal. Solomon would inform everyone if something else happened with the site.

Poulson reported on what he had learned about bond issuance/redemption. There had not been a bond issuance in many years. When bonds were issued (for improvements), that item would come before the Commission for approval. Knobloch had previewed the 2009 bond redemption in October, and reported its completion in December. According to the City Attorney's Office, redemption was an administrative action to reduce expenditures, needing no budget amendment or approval from the Council or Commission. Poulson thought it odd that the Commission didn't get involved when bonds were retired early, but this was the interpretation that had been given. It was up to members if they wanted to pursue this further.

Hinz said that even though it was not legally required, he would like the Commission Rules and Procedures to say that bond redemptions would be reviewed by the Commission before the bonds were called. Bergamini added that the rule should define what this review process entailed. She also recalled a similar situation with the Library, where the City Attorney had said a transaction was administrative and that a budget amendment wasn't needed; but some alders had felt differently. Poulson said he would draft something for the July organizational meeting.

Per Tolmie's suggestion to open up communication with drivers, Poulson had attended a brown bag lunch with Metro employees in order to hear from drivers, which had been very useful. Poulson talked about his role and the role of the Commission, and took questions. Lots of good ideas were brought up. Poulson said he would like to do this again, even if only to sit in the audience. At such time, he would apprise members.

PLEASE NOTE: Being 6:00 PM, Poulson called the Public Hearing to order, and the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.1. Sanborn left the meeting at this point.

Following Agenda Item F.2., the meeting returned to this portion of the agenda. Poulson mentioned that at the Metro lunch, he expressed appreciation of Metro employees on behalf of the Commission, for their safety record that had garnered Metro an extra \$200+K (mentioned earlier), and for their work ethic and what they do for the city. He also provided his email address for employees/drivers to communicate with him, and said he would forward any info he received.

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Solomon thought perhaps the Commission should start a conversation about a long-term strategy for dealing with low-income ridership issues in the city, which eventually could be taken up by a committee created by Common Council/Mayor. Streit asked for an update on the (Gannett-Fleming) 2009 Management Performance Audit. Bergamini requested an update (perhaps closed-door) on negotiations with the Union. Poulson said he was planning to put this on the agenda in June/July, which could include a presentation on OT as well.

ADJOURNMENT

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