



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, February 9, 2010

5:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 PM, with White chairing.

Present: 6 -

Chris Schmidt; Jed Sanborn; Amanda F. White; Duane F. Hinz; Susan M. Schmitz and Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 5 -

Brian L. Solomon; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Kenneth M. Streit and Sharon L. McCabe

Please note: Bergamini arrived at 5:10 PM, during presentation of Item D.1.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Hinz, to Approve the Minutes of the January 12, 2010 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

17356

Parking: December 2009 Revenue and January 2010 Activity Report - TPC 02.09.10.

Noting that the year-end December numbers were pre-closing, Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobeloch pointed out the following items in the reports:

- 2009 YTD revenues were up \$330.5K over 2008, with on-street meters up \$96K.
- However, these revenues were \$314.5K below budget projections, which had been a bit overly optimistic.
- Because of changeover to ZEAG in December, occupancy numbers for December were not available.
- Cashiered facilities were \$172K below budget, probably due to two fewer revenue-generating days in 2009 (no Feb. 29 and snow day on Dec. 9), and lower occupancy, likely due to rate increases and the economy.
- Special event revenue was down, probably due to fewer events and fewer people attending events (as evidenced by parking not being maxed out even for big events); also, private lots were "getting into the act" esp. during big events (like the Art Fair).

- Construction-related revenues had really suffered and were \$73.9K below budget YTD, reflecting an 80% decline.
- While expecting some fallout in monthly parking due to rate increases, the impact at Gov East was unexpected: GE had 21 openings at end of December; private sector was underselling them there, and perhaps GE was a little overpriced. Other locations were doing fine, with short or no waiting lists.
- The \$64K decline in miscellaneous revenue from 2008 to 2009 was a result of 40.8 K of unexpected FEMA money in 2008, and the loss of Adams advertising revenue in 2009.
- RP3 permit sales were up over 2008, with 186 more permits for the calendar year, after a 5-year decline.
- Revenues had been estimated to increase by \$773K, and actually increased by \$330+K, which was good but not as much as expected.
- Investment revenue fell way short by \$300K.
- However, by paying off bonds, now would be saving on costs of bond service.
- Because of some cost-cutting efforts, variable expenses could come in \$1 million under budget.
- When asked, Knobloch said that these reduced expenses would not balance out the \$314K budget shortfall, because of the \$3 million used to pay off bonds. Budget projections for an increase in revenues of \$600K in 2010 were probably too optimistic; no one expected the grip of the poor economy to last so long.

Turning to other items, Knobloch noted the following:

- With enforcement directly related to turnover and revenue, Parking periodically checked 400-500 meters to gather enforcement data, which was also used by MPD (who were paid \$500K by Parking to provide enforcement).
- YTD 2008 vs. 2009, parkers at meters displaying Dis/Vet went from 13% to 15% -- high compared to other communities; can be spotted next to most large buildings downtown.
- "Meters occupied but expired" stayed about the same, from 8% to 7%; which was okay.
- "Tickets observed" went from 15% to 18%.
- Not a lot of change, but over the years trends could be seen, such as rise in number of Dis/Vet parkers (which correlated to increase in rates).
- Gov East monthlies had moved to Cap Square North, where waiting list was 14; elsewhere the waiting lists were negligible.
- With the highest number of monthly vacancies at Gov East, signs had been put up there to advertise. Nonetheless, 80 customers still bought monthly permits there.

Knobloch remarked that a business had recently requested a number of permits at Overture, but was turned down due to caps. He said that next month, he would discuss suggestions to make permitting more business- and customer-friendly, esp. in view of the increased availability of spaces, outdated rules governing the permit process, and increased competition in the private sector.

Commenting on the enormity of the changeover to the new multi-space meters, Knobloch invited members to a "ribbon-cutting" event for them on March 3rd. He also talked about a few problems encountered in switching to Zeag revenue software, and how "tweaks" always have to be worked out whenever changes are made to systems like this. The selection of an engineering consulting firm

would soon be announced.

Regarding YTD Revenues Budget vs. Actual, Knobloch pointed out the following:

- Cap Square North actuals exceeded budget by \$68.8K (11%), while Gov East was off budget by \$82.4K (5.6%).
- Wingra Lot was 31% (\$3K) off budget; the library had been closed for remodeling.
- On-street meters were holding up well, only 1.59% off budget.
- Construction meter removal was off budget \$90K (87%).
- Gov East monthly permits were off budget 9.5%; due in part to privates, which were skimming off monthly parkers; monthly parking was much easier and less costly to provide than hourly parking (as the Utility did).

YTD revenues were up \$330.5K over 2008, with some highlights as follows:

- Cap Square North was up \$75K, while Overture was down \$10K despite no rate increase there.
- Brayton Lot-Machine was up \$26K (7.89%).
- Campus Area meters were up \$33K (15.8%), probably due to popularity of new 3-hour meters.
- Schenks Area meters were up \$5K (30%), with an increase from 50¢ to \$1.00.
- With increases at some locations and no increases at others, monthlies were up \$56.8K (8.93%) overall, which was pretty good.

Knobloch talked about Revenue/Space/Day 2008 vs. 2009:

- Brayton Lot Paystation, 24-hour facility, went from \$7.00 to \$7.60; this showed what happened when you increased enforcement times.
- Buckeye Lot, with good location and occupancy, and a decent rate, went from \$8.32 to \$8.47 -- the highest of all the lots.
- The break-even cost/space was \$2.40, so any space earning less than this was being subsidized by the rest of the system and needed to do better.
- Gov East went from \$8.65 to \$9.19; with the highest rate and 85% occupancy, apart from its age, the situation at this facility was ideal.

After explaining the methods for conducting occupancy counts, Knobloch pointed out the following about December 2008 vs. 2009 occupancies for Lots:

- Buckeye Lot went from 71% to 81%, which was great.
- Brayton Lot Parkmaster went from 100% (which was not desirable) to 97% (which was still too high); would prefer this to be 85% max, so parkers would not always find it full.
- MMB Lot went from 88% to 82%; very often the 25+-minute meters were filled with Dis/Vet parkers, so occupancy here had little to do with revenue.

Schmitz/Hinz made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

[17344](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 02.09.10.

Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted the following items in the Fixed Route reports:

- December ridership was down 55K rides compared to Dec. 2008; average daily ridership was 50-60K, and Metro did not operate one entire day -- the snow day on Dec. 9th.
- YTD ridership was up 180.8K over 2008; 38K more than Metro's Madison

Measures estimate.

- Passenger accidents went down from 127 to 103; total vehicle accidents went down 80, from 263 to 183; notable among these were chargeable accidents, which went down 39, from 85 to 46.
- Road calls dropped 199, from 1,020 to 821 -- good to see.
- Inspections remained on schedule.
- Total 2009 ridership of 13,588,428 was highest since 1997 (with only one year higher during 1970's); three months before and three months after the fare increase were record highs, with five second place finishes after the increase.
- Even with the addition of Route 84 and 85, Route 80 continued to have the highest productivity at 109 rides/hour; staff was looking at possibility of using a larger (perhaps articulated) bus on this route to relieve overcrowding/turning riders away.
- Ridership went up 1.4% in 2009, but with added services, productivity was relatively flat.

Turning to the Financial statements (which, like Parking, were as yet unaudited), Kamp pointed out the following items:

- Passenger revenues were \$1 million+ over 2008, but were under budget by \$845K. This in turn was driving the amount of reserves used over budget (to \$451.9K), which meant that Metro would likely be dipping into their contingency reserves by \$140.5K (which at the beginning of 2009 were \$478K).
- Between now and the audit in April, Metro was expecting \$50-70K in ad revenues beyond the minimum, which would improve the situation.
- Recent events in December: final assessments for snow removal came in larger than estimated; included under salaries/wages was a \$137K sick leave payout.
- As a result, the offset in salaries/wages that had been covering OT was now short by \$130-140K.

Finance Manager Wayne Block commented as follows:

- Revenues for unlimited ride passes went down a bit from November vs. budget, because Metro paid out a \$37K refund for the overcounts that had been occurring on Route 80, resulting in a negative impact on revenue in that category.
- Natural gas showed a considerable positive variance from budget because a 25% increase in rates (predicted by MGE) never occurred.
- Electricity also reflected a positive variance because rates decreased (usage did not).
- There was an unanticipated positive variance under Parts as well, whereby the purchase of spare parts for the new buses was expensed out entirely in 2009 due to the way a federal grant worked.
- Interdepartmental Charges were over budget due to much higher costs for snow removal than had been calculated (by averaging costs from prior years).
- Capital Debt was \$81K over budget because of the refinancing done citywide by the Comptroller's Office, which resulted in more favorable rates but required a higher-than-anticipated payment to principal.

Kamp reviewed reviewed Year to Year Comparisons for Fixed Route Revenue and Ridership by fare categories:

- While total fixed route passenger revenues were up a \$1million+ over 2008, but short by \$800K from what was budgeted.
- Total fixed route ride numbers for 2008 had been adjusted by the 30K overcount on Route 80 (to 13,405,714); 2009 numbers had also been adjusted.

- For Passenger Ridership % Changes, the biggest change was the 21% drop in Cash Fare ridership; Day pass ridership dropped by 17.4% and 10-ride pass/ticket ridership dropped by 12.7%; probably due to the economy as well as the fare change.
- Unlimited ride pass ridership was up for all groups except the City of Madison, esp. St. Mary's (22%) and Edgewood (9.6%); and even with restricted summer ridership at MATC, there was no change in their ridership numbers and their revenues still went up 8.7%, due to newly negotiated rates.
- Overall, passenger revenues were up 10.6%, and ridership was up 1.4%.

When asked about the 517% increase in revenues for EZ Rider, Block said he had underestimated how many of these passes would be distributed by the Madison School District on a monthly basis (starting in September). Revenue from this was backloaded into December's numbers. Also revenues were going up in this category because of the major rate increase to the District in 2009, which basically caught MMSD up to the regular pass rate, per an old agreement that they would eventually pay the "going" rate. Block said that very small increases in ridership/revenue had been budgeted for 2010, which were based on what was happening at the time the 2010 budget was being prepared (not based on previous 2009 budget estimates).

Kamp summarized the Paratransit reports, as follows:

- Ridership went up 0.8% in 2009.
- No Shows, which cause a disruption in scheduling and orderly planning, were down 127 -- an encouraging trend.
- Total passenger and vehicle accidents as well as road calls were down, and vehicle maintenance was on schedule.

PLEASE NOTE: Schmidt excused himself from the meeting at this point, in order to attend a neighborhood meeting.

Kamp reviewed an updated, unaudited Paratransit Performance Indicator report distributed before the meeting, as follows:

- While fixed route YTD operating cost/passenger trip had increased from \$2.97 to \$3.04, paratransit had increased from \$28.14 to \$28.43.
- Even during the challenging month of December, On-time Performance had stayed in a good range of 86% to 97%.
- 23% of paratransit service was provided in-house, and 77% provided by contractors.

Kamp talked about the many interesting pieces of data that could be found in the Ridership by Route and Fare Category report. He pointed out the school dodgers (the route 90's) at the bottom of the report, which primarily served the middle and high schools. The data found there was helpful in demonstrating (to the Feds) that these buses also served the general public, as evidenced by the numbers for adult cash fares.

Bergamini/Schmitz made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

E.1. [17135](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to sign an agreement with JBM Patrol & Protection Corp. to provide security and parking fee collection services in the Parking

Utility facilities.

Knobeloch said that this item was Parking's hourly security contract, costing about \$180K+/year. After issuing the RFP and receiving several replies, the current contractor, JBM Patrol and Protection Corp., came back with the best proposal. When asked about using the service to place parking fee due notices on vehicles, Knobeloch said this was only being done at Lake/Frances on weekends; and would shortly be phased out even there. When gates were put down there, they were routinely broken; but now changes were being made to address that problem. Changes to security assignments occurred throughout the year, depending on what was needed and where. Costs for this service came in \$4K under budget in 2009, reflecting a pretty good estimate of service hours.

A motion was made by Hinz, seconded by Schmitz, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [17334](#)

Metro: Recommendation from the Low Income Bus Pass Committee regarding the pass eligibility requirement - TPC 02.09.10.

District 5 Alder Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, member of the Low Income Bus Pass Program Committee, appeared before the group to support the proposal to change the eligibility requirement for the pilot low-income pass program, to require a person to either show a Quest card or to self declare their income at or below 150% of federal poverty level. Though it had hoped to be completed with its work by now, the Committee was still working diligently to develop a permanent pass program to recommend to the City Council, and proposed to change the eligibility requirement for the pilot program until the permanent program was ready to go.

Bidar-Sielaff expressed the following concerns about the current criteria requiring a person to show a Quest card to be the proxy for eligibility for the pilot program:

- The Quest card was provided to people who qualified for the federal Food Share (food stamp) program managed by Dane County Human Services.
- Besides an income requirement, other criteria to qualify for Quest included U.S. citizenship and certain categories of alien status.
- Some people who might otherwise be low-income may not wish to participate in the Food Share program and therefore wouldn't have a Quest card.
- The Quest card was being used to determine income eligibility for the pass program, even though it was designed for a completely different program and purpose, which had nothing to do with City business or Metro's business.
- An unintended consequence was the disparate impact on people in immigrant communities, who may not have Quest cards and who were not coming forward to get low-income bus passes even though the need was there.
- National origin was a protected class under City ordinance and federal law, which raised issues related to using a card given only to certain people based on their citizenship/status.
- The Quest card did not have an expiration date on it, so it was possible for people to have a card even though they may no longer be income eligible for the pass.

Bidar-Sielaff concluded by asking the Commission to approve the

recommendation to change the current low-income bus pass eligibility requirement so that people could either show a Quest card or self-declare their income at or below 150% of federal poverty level -- the same income level to qualify for a Quest card.

During discussion, the following comments were made:

- While there were other methods for proving income levels, these posed problems for City staff currently distributing the passes, whose regular business did not involve checking eligibility.
- For the permanent program, it was likely that social service agencies would be checking income eligibility, after which Metro would issue the pass.
- Documented/legal immigrants were being prevented from getting a pass because of criteria/waiting periods related to acquiring a Quest card.
- The Ad Hoc Committee had hoped to prepare a proposal for a permanent program by the end of December, but it now looked like it might be April; the current recommendation grew out of the fact that the pilot program would be running longer than expected.
- One might argue that it wasn't the task of the TPC to consider eligibility requirements.
- Because the pilot program was set up vis a vis the budget process, it wasn't clear whose purview it was to change criteria for the pilot; people on the Ad Hoc Committee thought it appropriate for the TPC to consider the issue.

Kamp, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, stated the reasons why he voted against the Committee's recommendation to change the eligibility requirement for the pilot program:

- He had understood the mission of the Ad Hoc Committee to be that of developing a proposal for a permanent program, and that the pilot program would remain in place until that happened; this change was not really within the Committee's purview.
- The eligibility process for the permanent program would be different. So, rather than going from Quest to an interim measure to a permanent measure, for staffing purposes, things would be best organized by sticking with the Quest card for eligibility until the pilot was done.
- He liked the idea for the permanent program that non-profits and others would be involved in eligibility.
- With this temporary change, staff at the window (at Metro, the Treasurer's Office and the Job Center) would be put in the position of reviewing self-declarations to determine eligibility, and Kamp preferred they not have to do this.
- With pass sales approaching the budgeted amount of 300/month limit for the pilot program, he thought it better to wait for the permanent proposal rather than change the criteria now.
- As the program became more familiar to people over the past 8-9 months, he thought most knew that they needed a Quest card to get the pass, and as a result, few if any people were turned away.

Bidar-Sielaff said that some low-income people in the community were not trying to get the pass because they already knew a Quest card was needed. This didn't mean that they didn't need the pass, and would not otherwise qualify. If the criteria were changed, she felt that word would spread without any special effort to publicize the change. On a personal and moral level, Bidar-Sielaff did not want to ignore any element in the current program that was having a disparate effect, and wait for the permanent program to change

it.

She said Committee members understood that passes were capped at 300 and were available first-come, first-served. But the intent of the program was to provide the passes on the basis of income eligibility, not on the basis of food stamp eligibility (as it was now). Committee recommendations would probably be ready by April; and a permanent program could possibly be ready to go by July, after passing through the City referral/approval process.

Schmitz/Bergamini made a motion to approve the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation.

During discussion, Sanborn said he was inclined to vote in favor of the recommendation because of its temporary nature, but expressed the following concerns about it:

- There was the possibility of people in the country illegally receiving a taxpayer benefit and crowding out people who were here legally if more than 300 people wanted passes.
- Since it wasn't certain how long it might take for the permanent program to be ready, Metro staff and/or the Ad Hoc Committee should report on effects of the change, whether demand for the passes increased over time as more people became aware the new criteria.
- Without any concrete evidence of income levels, some people might take advantage of the situation.

Sanborn said he would vote to approve the motion, but requested that Metro staff and Bidar-Sielaff keep the Commission informed about what happened, esp. if it developed that people were being turned away because passes ran out.

Hinz/Sanborn moved to amend the motion to require a staff report on the pass program numbers at each of its meetings until the permanent program was in place.

Hinz hoped to further fashion the motion to allow the Commission to immediately act to change the rules (rather than to have to wait a month to put it on the agenda), if concerns arose based on the reports.

When asked if she considered this a friendly amendment, Schmitz said she considered it separate from the original motion.

After further discussion, Hinz said that rather than making his additional proposal part of the motion, he wondered if the report could be put on each monthly agenda in such form as to allow discussion and action on the program without waiting a whole month. He (later) said that he was not promoting this as part of the amendment.

In response to a question, Kamp thought action could be taken to the change the program without a full month's notice, since this dealt with eligibility rather than with the tariff.

Bergamini said that typically action was not taken on items identified on the agenda as reports; reports were either accepted or sent back with questions. And usually a specific proposal to change policy was presented as New/Old

Business on the agenda in order for the Commission to take action on it and to give proper notice to the public.

Regarding the amendment to the motion, Bergamini said she had no problem with the idea of requiring a monthly report, but she did want to see it under New Business every month.

A vote was taken on the amendment to the motion, which passed by voice vote/other. A vote was then taken on the motion as amended, which passed by voice vote/other.

**F. 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.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

G.1. General announcements by Chair - None.

G.2. Commission member items for future agendas - None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Schmitz, seconded by Hinz, to Adjourn at 6:30 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.