



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, January 11, 2011

5:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 PM.

Present: 9 -

Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Jed Sanborn; David E. Tolmie; Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Duane F. Hinz; Kenneth M. Streit and Jay B. Ferm

Excused: 2 -

Susan M. Schmitz and Margaret Bergamini

Please note: Ferm arrived at 5:04 PM, Solomon arrived at 5:05 PM, Schmidt arrived at 5:08 PM, and Sanborn arrived at 5:10 PM, after the Minutes were approved. Also, Schmitz arrived at 5:43 PM just before adjournment, and is therefore marked excused.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Hinz, to Approve the Minutes of the December 7, 2010 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.1. [20978](#)

Parking: December 2010 Activity Report, and November Revenue/Expense and Occupancy Reports - TPC 01.11.11

Parking Operations Manager Bill Knobloch responded to questions:

- Average transaction amounts had been increasing over time since the multi-space meters were introduced.
- Most recent credit card transactions were now averaging \$2.16 (up significantly from \$1.84) since the graphics problem with nickels was corrected.
- Parking enforcement officers reported better compliance with the multi-space meters, probably because people were using credit cards.
- PEO's were still using two devices (one for multi-space and one for single meters) rather than just one handheld, and enforcement was still somewhat cumbersome; however, once they went to one handheld and could check

entire blocks at once, enforcement would become more efficient.

- It wasn't certain that enforcement time and the number of PEO's would be reduced due to multi-space meters; perhaps longer and different types of enforcement would result.
- The drop in occupancy at State St Cap in November compared to Nov. 2009 likely reflected a monthly fluctuation; YTD numbers were more representative.

Tolmie/Schmidt made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [20979](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 01.11.11

Members had no questions. Streit/Tolmie made a motion to receive the reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [20863](#)

Authorizing the execution of an Offer to Sell Real Estate with the State of Wisconsin for the purchase of four State-owned lots located at 302, 312, and 314 East Main Street and 21 South Butler Street for the expansion of the Brayton Parking Lot, a lease with the State of Wisconsin for spaces for its share-ride vans in the Parking Utility's downtown parking facilities and the amendment of the 2011 Parking Utility Capital Budget for the acquisition of the lots.

Knobeloch discussed Items F.1. (Leg. File 20863) and F.2. (Res. No. TPC-39) together. He thanked Don Marx and the Office of Real Estate Services for helping put together the deal. In 2007, Parking had \$2 million in its budget for the purchase of the State's portion of Brayton Lot. Due to the sluggish real estate market, Parking would now be paying \$1.387 million.

The State needed spaces for their share-ride van program, which included 29 vans, most of which were parked at Brayton Lot. Most of the vans were too high and long to fit in a parking structure; in fact, the area of Brayton where they now parked had no islands, to accommodate the size of the vans. The vans stayed parked all day at the Lot and were used only for the program. The cost of operating the vans (lease rate, gas, etc.) was paid entirely by the users. The State was concerned that these vans had a place to park downtown. As part of the deal, Parking suggested that the vans could lease spaces in their surface lots, which could accommodate them. Parking would allow 60 days after the sale to work out the lease arrangements.

Since most of the vans would likely stay at Brayton, Parking needed to set up rates at Brayton. Resolution No. TPC-39 would set two rates at Brayton: \$121/month for residents, and \$145/month for non-residents. With occupancy high at Brayton, Parking had never previously sold monthly permits at Brayton because they never needed to. If permits were not needed, it was better to sell at an hourly rate, which at Brayton was \$1.35. Parking would gain 74 more stalls, 29 of which would be designated for the vans. If overall occupancy at Brayton were to drop a bit, perhaps more spaces would be designated for monthly parkers.

Because the vans would lease on a long-term basis for so many spaces, the lease would be in perpetuity, as long as the program existed. Either party could cancel out on the lease for the 29 spaces, but Knobeloch expected it to last a

long time. The Wilson and Blair Lots could also accommodate the vans.

Noting that BOE and the Planning Commission had already approved it, Knobloch asked the Commission to approve Leg. File 20863, authorizing purchase of the State's portion of Brayton Lot and the associated lease under the terms negotiated (per Exhibit B attached to the File). He also asked for approval of TPC-39, setting monthly rates at Brayton.

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Hinz, to Return Leg. File 20863 to the Lead, the BOARD OF ESTIMATES, with the Recommendation for Approval. The motion passed by voice vote/other. See Item F.2. for the motion to approve Resolution No. TPC-39.

F.2. [20975](#) Resolution No. TPC-39, setting monthly parking rates for Brayton Lot - TPC 01.11.11

A motion was made by Solomon, seconded by Tolmie, to Approve Resolution No. TPC-30. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [20976](#) Metro: Commute Card 2010 Year-End Summary - TPC 01.11.11

Metro's Transit Marketing and CS Manager Mick Rusch and Transit Ridership Improvement Specialist Peg Anthony joined General Manager Chuck Kamp to discuss the Commute Card program and ridership report for 2010.

- The program was one year old and now included 70 businesses and non-profit organizations.
- The VA Hospital had come on board in November; thus the bump in ridership in that month.
- Having originally estimated 5-10 participants, the results were much higher than expected.
- As part of its metrics, Metro would over time see if, with more new customers, ridership and revenue, the program could become self-sustaining.
- Marketing had included traditional methods and personal contacts: a TV campaign, radio blitzes, marketing at theaters, bus and outdoor billboards, outreach to businesses through DMI and the Chamber of Commerce, as well as directly to individual businesses through emails, letters and phone calls. Just that morning, Metro had attended a Sustain Dane gathering of 125 people, to discuss the program.

Kamp said staff was working through some issues that could possibly lead to some proposals for program modifications.

- The program was originally designed for smaller organizations, but now Metro was receiving inquiries from larger organizations as well. Should the program be modified to include larger org's?
- A related issue was that some employers treated the program as a targeted benefit rather than an employer benefit, as originally conceived.
- A big issue in selling the program was transfers: When an org had many employees who transferred a lot, the Commute Card became less attractive. This was the same comment heard from large unlimited ride pass partners.
- Staff was looking at the transfer issue to see if changes were needed. The \$1.15 rate was based on an average transfer rate (as agreed upon with partners). Staff wasn't sure how the unlimited ride pass program and the Commute Card program would work together relative to the transfer issue.

Kamp welcomed member feedback about these issues and the program as

Metro tried to move the program into another phase. White wondered how many new riders the program had brought in vs. riders who had changed from other fare/pass types to this program. Anthony said that though she had no statistics to support this, she found some people who switched to the program and were not necessarily high-end users, took the pass as security. She found people were more open to using it because they only got charged when they used it. There was really no risk in just having the pass. As a result, some businesses were adding riders. Anthony also said that as employers became more educated about the Commuter Choice program, whereby the pass could be offered as a pre-tax payroll deduction, they were more willing to add transit as a new benefit. Though she didn't have statistics to back it up, she was finding new riders.

White was interested in seeing data on how many new riders the program was bringing in, which might be substantial. Anthony mentioned an example where an org that was initially leery about the Commute Card program because of the transfer issue, purchased 31-day passes instead – bringing in all new riders and revenue. Later, they switched to the Commute Card program.

When asked about the transfer issue, Kamp explained that the rate of \$1.15/ride for unlimited ride passes was calculated based on an average amount of transferring. Some riders transferred every time they rode to/from work/school, and swiped their pass to make the transfer, costing \$2.30 each way. Pass users did not use transfer slips. But staff wondered if this was the best way for the pass programs to work; maybe they should be changed.

Observing that many of the Commute Card participants were located downtown, Ferm thought it would be good to plot their locations on a map, to see which parts of the city were participating and which were not. Anthony had just developed a chart; 75% of the participants were located in the downtown-Campus area, probably due to the good, direct service to these areas, requiring fewer transfers. Businesses on the city's periphery, who had more employees needing to transfer, were more likely to opt for the 31-day passes. Kamp said that added to this map would be a red-dot map showing where the most boardings/alightings occurred; he predicted there would be a close correlation.

Being an informational item, no action was needed.

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- G.1. [20977](#) Metro: Update on Metro Stroller Policy - TPC 01.11.11

As background for new members, Kamp mentioned the Commission had held a public hearing, where concerns were raised that Metro have a more lenient approach to enforcement of the policy for strollers and carry-ons (inc. grocery carts and luggage). Following this, Metro began public outreach. After reflecting on these developments, Metro decided that instead of focusing on the issue of folding/stowing strollers, it would look at its insurance company's policy that children not be left in strollers, as shown in the Transit Mutual Insurance "Securement Policy" (attached). He said TMI's policy would likely be what Metro brought back as a recommendation, i.e., to require children be removed from strollers, for safety reasons.

Rusch discussed Metro's outreach efforts. In going out into the community to explain the safety issues, Marketing staff had gotten the same general response: While understanding the safety issue, riders with 2-3 kids said they simply couldn't fold their stroller and carry their kids on. They asked that Metro not make a policy where they couldn't bring their stroller on buses, because then they couldn't ride, which they really needed to do. Though everyone agreed it was a difficult issue, no one had any suggestions. The TMI policy was the closest they had come to a compromise.

Kamp said Metro's current policy was that children must be removed from strollers, and strollers must be folded. On the practical side, the policy was not being enforced, and the issue was being reviewed to determine what the policy should be. Whatever the policy might be, it should be enforced.

As a rider with a stroller, Ferm was glad the policy was not being enforced. He wondered what the safety problem was; how many children were injured every year in the US because they were in a stroller. Kamp said they had asked TMI for such information. He talked about the video shown at the hearing of a serious accident in Oshkosh, where a child was not injured because s/he was being held. The current policy was based on actual situations of what happened to children in strollers in serious accidents, as well as TMI's advice that children be removed from strollers.

Kamp said that recommendations of insurance companies were sometimes based on statistics, and other times based on actual experience, i.e., what happened in the center aisle when serious crashes occurred. He thought he might ask Metro's insurance safety director to attend the meeting when Metro brought its recommendations back to the group. TMI advised transit systems to adopt their policy, or opt for a 7.6% surcharge to their premiums. Recognizing this was a tough issue, Metro was leaning towards compliance with TMI's policy on the policy.

Ferm thought that some might argue a child would be safer in a stroller than sitting in a seat without the parent holding on. It wasn't at all clear what was safest and felt the decision should be based on good data. This was also a ridership issue: If he had to follow the policy, he would drive and not take the bus.

Streit thought TMI's 7.6% surcharge seemed rather specific, and confirmed that Metro had not been paying the surcharge because of its current policy. He wondered if Metro or any other system had ever filed a claim when the policy was not being enforced, and TMI had tried to wiggle out of the claim. Kamp said this had never happened to Metro, but couldn't speak to other systems. Kamp said 7.6% translated into several tens of thousands of dollars.

Solomon asked if staff knew or could find out which systems TMI insured and whether other transit systems had similar insurance and stroller policies. Rusch said Waukesha had a policy of not allowing strollers on buses at all. Kamp said that TMI insured 20+ transit systems around Wisconsin; Milwaukee was the only system with buses they didn't insure. Solomon wanted to know more about Milwaukee, and about peer systems nationally. He was very concerned about adopting TMI's policy; many transit-dependent riders would be forced to stop using transit.

Solomon asked about configurations on the average bus for wheelchairs and/or strollers. He wondered if it would be possible to secure strollers in a wheelchair spot, with the child in it; and how often wheelchairs filled the space, which would prevent strollers from boarding and using it. Kamp mentioned the few new hybrids that had perimeter seating, in part to help address the stroller issue. Though allowing more room for strollers/carry-ons, several seats were lost. Though not statistically significant, most of the few comments about the configuration had been negative. However, Metro was continuing to look at the configuration perhaps for future procurements. Though seats were lost, flow was improved. Staff had videos to show how significant the issue of flow could be on buses with people with mobility aids and more than one parent with strollers. The problem of flow was growing as ridership grew. Metro was sensitive to the ridership issue. Staff believed the conflict between individuals with strollers and others with mobility devices or standing, was likely to grow, and wanted to help manage that.

Echoing Ferm's request, Solomon observed that, except for infants, children often sat next to their parents and were not held. He wanted safety data that compared seated children vs. those secured in a stroller. Kamp said staff would check with TMI on their safety data and how they came up with the 7.6% rate. Since this was an informational item, no action was needed at this time.

**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 said that work was continuing on the TDP and routes, and a report would be presented shortly. Tied with the RTA, the TDP would provide a good idea of what the future held for bus service in/around the community.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Tolmie/Schmidt, moved to Adjourn at 5:45 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.