



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

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

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)

Please note: Items are presented in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:06 PM.

Present: 10 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Chris Schmidt; Lisa Subeck; David E. Tolmie;
Amanda F. White; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Susan M.
Schmitz; Kenneth M. Streit and Kenneth Golden

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

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Streit, to Approve the Minutes of the April 11, 2012 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Bergamini recused herself from discussion in Item G., regarding changes to bus routes. She asked to be able to stay in the room to listen to hearing comments. She was doing this as a function of her employment at the UW. [Please note: Without objection, the group took up Item F.1. out of Agenda order, to accommodate the needs of the presenters.]

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

E.1. [26262](#) Parking: April 2012 Activity, March Revenue/Expense & Occupancy Reports - TPC 05.09.12

Newly appointed Parking Operations Manager, Tom Woznick, highlighted the following items.

- With Bill Knobeloch's last day being June 1, Woznick had been having a very productive month, attending many meetings, meeting many City staff members and partners. He was impressed by the dedication and quality of City staff, and looked forward to working collaboratively to accomplish the Utility's mission.
- The Kimley-Horn master plan for Judge Doyle Square was set for introduction at the Council on May 15th, and would be coming to the TPC on

June 13th. Based on that report, the cost to replace Gov East still stood at \$41,618/stall, with 600 stalls costing \$25 million, which would be a challenge to the Utility regardless of future projects.

- The multi-space meters now had run 675K transactions, with 52% of those on credit cards.
- Park Now - Pay by Cell stickers were now being installed on signage at Buckeye Lot. (See attached.) Customers could use the "Scan & Park" QR code to download an app that would allow them to buy time on their parking space, or to top off their time without returning to the meter. A press conference to roll out this program was tentatively scheduled for June 6th or 7th. Staff thought customers would probably like this and find it convenient. The charge for this service would be 45¢ per transaction.
- Revenues YTD through March vs. 2011: Attended facilities were down \$221K; total revenues were down \$135K; largely due to the protests, which caused revenues to be unusually high in the first quarter of 2011. In future reports, numbers for 2010 would be provided for comparison to a more typical year.
- Occupancies at structures vs. 2011 ranged from 49% to 85%, which ideally would be 80%; work was needed on State St Cap (49%), State St Campus (55%), Overture (59%).
- Hovde Properties had inquired about leasing 40-60 stalls at Overture possibly in November, a good opportunity that would represent a 10% increase (up to 69% occupancy).
- Operating expenses were \$104K lower than 2011, mainly due to payroll and supply items. Overall operating income was just \$30+K (2.2%) less than last year, which was decent considering the difference in revenue between the two years.
- Capital costs through March were \$142K. A bid for garage maintenance at all six structures was being opened with four qualified bidders. Gov East would require the most remediation. The planned start date was June 15th, with completion at Campus ramps by Aug. 30th before UW starts, and completion at the other ramps by Sept. 30th.
- Parking would again be partnering with Art Fair on the Square (July 14-15). Artists would be able to pay \$40 to park at Brayton Lot for the weekend, which provided a service and a discount (if they were to park on their own).
- Electric vehicle charging stations at Wingra Lot and Overture Center: Parking was not being charged for electricity through 2013. A study of the electrical charging station at Overture found that other vehicles were parking there nearly all the time, preventing electric vehicles from using it. A work order had been issued to reserve the stall specifically for electric vehicle charging only. At least one electric vehicle owner had contacted staff to say they would like to be able to charge their vehicle at Overture. A follow-up study would be done to see how the station was being used, which would be reported.
- Staff was investigating the sale of Wingra Lot. The Finance Department had requested a staff comparison of revenue and expenses from 2008-2010. Updates would follow.
- Woznick had been accepted as a CAPP candidate (through IPI) and would be attending training sessions from June 8-13th. Though he would miss the June TPC, the regular reports would be available.

When asked why the estimated cost/stall at GE crept up from \$29K to \$41K, Woznick said that the deeper the new garage was expected to go into the water table, the higher the cost/stall got. The stalls at the fifth level down cost \$50+K while those at the top level cost \$20K, which averaged out at \$41K/stall. The estimated cost increased dramatically, the further down we went. If the final

garage didn't have as many as 1,300 stalls and didn't go so deep, the average cost would likely be less.

Streit/Tolmie made a motion to receive the Parking report, and to adopt the TPC resolution commending Bill Knobeloch upon his retirement. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: Being 6 PM, the meeting turned to Item G., the Public Hearing.]

E.2. [26266](#)

Metro: YTD Fixed & Paratransit Performance Indicators and Hybrid Stats Report - TPC 05.09.12

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item G.2.] Kamp pointed out the following items in the reports.

- For the 1st quarter, ridership on fixed routes was up 0.6% compared to last year, even with the additional ridership in Feb-March due to protests on the Square. March was down 26K, but the month had one less weekday and one extra Sunday. Metro continued on a strong path for ridership.
- Total vehicle accidents were down 17, passenger accidents were up 7. Staff monitored these to look for ways to add to their refresher training and for improvements to their safety program.
- Road calls were down significantly from 232 to 176. Maintenance had looked at measures to reduce road calls, which had cut this back.
- Ridership productivity: Total ridership had increased 0.6% from 4.13 to 4.16 million. Without Campus routes, ridership had increased by 3.4%, probably having to do with January and the start of UW school. Route 55 ridership was up 39%, and productivity was up 34%. Route 75 to Epic started from the Square on March 26th; and had picked up 276 riders (in five days). This was good ridership. Future reports would show more detail, and what impact this will have on Route 55.
- Trips using lifts had gone up 20%; would have an impact on timing on routes; would be explored further. The number was tallied automatically, and reflected the number of times a ramp was deployed (not when the bus was raised/lowered), not only for wheelchairs but also for strollers, grocery carts, luggage. There was no way to know what that mix was. It could reflect the number of people switching from paratransit to mainline service, as well as more courteous service by drivers. Looking at Paratransit, ridership was down 1,433, so there might be a correlation between this and the use of lifts on fixed routes.
- The variance in vehicle miles and revenue hours in March 2012 vs. 2011 likely had to do with the days in March 2012 (as above). YTD, the variance might be due to the fact that Metro was shut down one day in Feb. 2011 for a bad snow day.
- For Paratransit, passenger accidents were up by 4; vehicle accidents were down by 6. Though showing a slight increase in road calls YTD, this might level out over the course of the year. On-time performance was in the mid-90%'s, which was good.
- Hybrid stats showed hybrids again out-performing on miles/gallon and lower cost/mile.

Golden/Bergamini made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.2. and the remainder of the items on the Agenda.]

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. 26268

Discussion of transportation recommendations for Owl Creek, Twin Oaks, Liberty Place, and Lost Creek neighborhoods, as prepared and presented by neighborhood residents and the Owl Creek Neighborhood Resource Team - TPC 05.09.12

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item D.] LaFollette High School student, Nyataba Bading, 5215 Bliss Street, 53718, registered in support of bus service to Owl Creek. She talked about looking for work and having to rely on her parents to drive her. Because her parents wanted to save gas, her job search was very limited to places around her neighborhood. With a bus route, she could plan to work anywhere, which would open up new opportunities for her. She was not the only person in her family affected by the lack of a bus route. Both of her parents had recently had car problems, and had to carpool in order to get to work. If bus service were available, one of them could have taken the bus instead.

LaFollette High School Sophomore, Nancy Garduno, 5122 Unity Way, 53718, registered in support of bus service to Owl Creek. Having long hoped for bus service in her neighborhood, she was glad she could finally be "making a difference" (as printed on their t-shirts). As a teen, she had trouble waking up in the morning and had routinely missed the school bus. Her dad had been taking her to school, making him late for work and getting him into trouble at his job. Her Mom, who was already taking care of a large family, was now driving her to school instead of her Dad. If bus service were available, maybe this wouldn't be happening. Also, she sometimes wanted to hang out with her friends after school, but there was no way for her to get home on her own. She didn't even know how the bus system worked. She looked forward to the day when she could take the bus, and her brothers and the others in the neighborhood wouldn't have to go through what she was going through.

LaFollette High School Junior, Julie Maisee Vue, 22 Kanazawa Circle, 53718, registered in support of bus service to Owl Creek. She was part of the LHS organizing group, and they were all there to help make a difference. She said her neighborhood's #1 issue was transportation. Her group had taken a petition door-to-door and around school, and had collected over 300 signatures (attached). They would be talking to the Mayor and attending a Common Council meeting to advocate for a bus route. She hoped to get a job soon, and she too relied on her parents to take to/from school. Due to their work schedules, Julie would often arrive at school very early or leave very late. This made it difficult to participate in extra-curricular activities. If bus service were available in the morning and evening, it would really help current and future students a lot and make a difference in their lives. She hoped the Commission would help them make a difference.

The three students answered questions. Their parents worked all over the city. If they could have extra service, they would want it around 8:15-8:30 AM and 5:30-6:00 PM on school days; and on the weekend. Poulson thanked the students for their comments, and noted that Taylor Gleason, 4213 Owl Creek Drive, 53718, who did not wish to speak, had also registered in support of bus service to Owl Creek.

Madison/Dane County Public Health nurse and member of the Neighborhood Resource Team (NRT), Kim Neuschel, 415 Ludington Avenue, 53704, registered in support of bus service to Owl Creek, and answered questions. Bergamini noted that Metro was sometimes able to offer new service by combining

different agency resources. Given that this was a public health issue, she wondered if there might be any public health funding or national grants available to help support bus service to the neighborhood. Neuschel said some new public health funding had just become available but she wasn't sure if this could be used to specifically support bus service and fund Metro.

Bergamini said this might be an area to explore, to perhaps talk to the Community Block Grant staff. Neuschel said she might talk to Judy Olson, new grant writer for the City. She agreed this was an underlying public health issue with implications for the health of the neighborhood. When talking to Metro, they had asked how these things might be funded. Trying to think creatively, they had asked if, for example, some of the businesses around Dutch Mill which might benefit from service, might help subsidize it. They were told this was generally not how things were done within the normal framework for the City. Bergamini said that sometimes people could go outside the framework through novel sources of funding; esp. since this seemed to be an employment issue and a "reverse commute" issue. Neuschel said a whole group of residents did not have adequate transportation, who did not have cars at all. This had a real impact on the neighborhood, by how isolated it was. The police could attest to this as well.

Bergamini noted the community had some alternative transportation programs aimed at low-income kids, and wondered whether biking would help address any of these issues. Neuschel said there was no safe bike or walking route. Unfortunately, the route went under the Stoughton interpass, and there were no sidewalks from Owl Creek/Twin Oaks to the interpass. There was a bike route very far off, which was considered unsafe. The Stoughton interpass was going to be redone, and the NRT had put forward a proposal and the Mayor had been advocating with DOT to include bike and walking routes as part of that renovation that would happen in future years. After doing a walking audit and a photo mapping with the students, Neuschel could easily say it was scary crossing the interpass to get to the one walkable food source; it took multiple lights and it was horrible standing on the island between Stoughton Road and Voges with cars zipping by. This was a huge barrier for neighbors to even access food without transportation.

Subeck noted that the NRT assessments indicated that the transportation issue affected the entire neighborhood, not just the students. She wondered what Neuschel would consider ideal transit service if money were available. Neuschel felt it important to have regular service Mon.-Fri. focusing on morning and after work/school hours; and weekend service. The kids were completely isolated, esp. on weekends. There was no youth programming in the neighborhood; the kids had nothing to do. There had been increases in youth violence and juvenile delinquent behaviors. The kids had no way out to do productive things. The student organizing group were wonderful to work with. But there were real barriers for kids to attend extra-curricular activities and employment. Neuschel noted that Drew Beck was on the NRT.

NRT Leader Mary O'Donnell, 610 Chatham Terrace, 53711, spoke in support of bus service to the neighborhood. When asked, O'Donnell said that she had not heard of any specific information about resources available for projects like this, outside of the traditional Metro funding stream. Her understanding was that the Mayor wanted to hear what the NRT's thought the neighborhoods needed, and wanted them to make other City departments and committees

aware of those needs as well. But no specifics had been mentioned about funding sources.

Given limited resources and in order for staff to cost out options, Golden asked that the NRT prioritize needs for service: Was it to serve the worker population, the student population? O'Donnell said that youth had hit the nail on the head: service was needed in the morning time, the late after school-early evening time, and the weekends. With only one school bus in the morning, and unless parents could drive, certain before-school activities were out, such as swimming, drama. And of course, if they missed the bus, they missed school. Likewise, afternoons were important, when neighborhood students couldn't get help from their teachers or participate in after-school activities. Some students did make the bike trek down Hwy. 51 and across industrial areas. Weekends were important if students wanted to work. Commuter needs coincided with these students times really well. In their interviews and assessment of Owl Creek in particular, they found that most adults had some means of transportation, because if they didn't, they were entirely isolated. The problem was when their car broke down or their ride fell through, or when family members needed to be at different places at the same time. When looking at whether neighbors needed vans for food access, they found most people had some sort of regular transportation. But many of the people signing the petitions said they would use the bus for work, if one was available (vs. driving to UW or downtown).

O'Donnell added that the Owl Creek NRT sent a memo (attached) to the Mayor with their recommendations about the DOT project to re-do the Voges/Beltline/Hwy. 51 area, to make it more pedestrian and bike friendly, and to better connect the neighborhood to the north side of the Beltline and the west side of Hwy. 51. Not knowing how input about transportation projects like this was communicated by different groups to influence the direction of the projects, she wondered what would be appropriate. Poulson and Golden discussed this, and suggested that another presenter attending the meeting, Mike Chekvala from Planning, could communicate what he had heard. Also, related to this, an environmental impact statement would need to be prepared about the effects of the project on surrounding areas. White also mentioned the City's Complete Streets policy that DOT would have to address. Bergamini also mentioned the press release published that week by Traffic Engineering, soliciting ideas for ped/bike projects. Golden also noted that there was nothing stopping DOT from making some interim improvements, to fund and create a bike/ped shoulder on Hwy. 51, for example, as an interim measure until the larger project began when Complete Streets came into play. With DOT representation on the MPO, perhaps it would be helpful for the TPC and others to communicate that, along with transit connections, ped/bike connections were needed as well.

In further discussion, Routes 11 and 12 were identified as the nearest routes to the neighborhood. White mentioned that the City budget had a \$75K line item for Safe Routes to School, which though not a huge amount, would allow some interim things to be done, such as signals, signage, crossing guards. She recommended that the NRT contact David Dryer and Arthur Ross in Traffic Engineering, because they were always looking for good projects to fund through that line item.

LaFollette Nurse Jill Aruguete spoke in support of service to Owl Creek. She

offered examples of problems caused by lack of service.

- A student who had missed the one AM school bus repeatedly, may now go into truancy.
- A mom called to ask school staff to come and pick up her children who had missed the bus; because one of the students needed to graduate, the staff did.
- Students who were sick at school couldn't go home, so they sat in the office all day, waiting for the bus home. This had happened during H1N1 flu, which was not a good situation.
- A student got a job at Menard's and had to walk down a scary path to catch the Dutch Mill bus. The student's mom didn't think was safe.
- Students recommended to attend summer school could not attend, because they couldn't get to a bus that would take them to East High School (where summer school was held). This had a huge effect on learning.

Aruguete said she would make bus service for students the top priority. She pointed out that there were 47 students at LHS and half that many students at Sennett Middle School. Social contact was also limited because family and friends couldn't come into the neighborhood by bus. Aruguete mentioned the NRT report and the potential schedules (attached). She said weekend service was very important, in order for students to work on weekends and participate in athletics. Related to service at peak periods, to better serve the students, she would start an hour later than shown (at 5:45 AM); and likewise to start PM service an hour later (at 4:45 PM). Aruguete asked the students to present their petitions to the Commission (attached).

Poulson said that this item would be placed on a future agenda, for which Metro would prepare costing info and possibilities for service; at which point a priority list for service (from the neighborhood) would be critical. The discussion would not end at this meeting.

Maniaci asked about what she might be seeing in terms of proposed routes and schedule. Aruguete said she understood the proposals were based on a single route from the South Transfer Point to East Transfer Point, which would travel throughout all the neighborhoods. (See map attached.) Metro Scheduling Manager Drew Beck said the proposed route would originate in the Owl Creek area and travel past the high school and up Monona Drive past the Walgreen's on Cottage Grove Road, over to the East Transfer Point, to connect with the rest of the service there. Beck said this was an early proposal. Metro was now looking at utilizing other routes already out there, like Routes 39, 11 and 12, to get the most efficient use out of those routes. White suggested that Metro might talk to the employers in the area to pre-sell the small business bus pass, to get some of that money up front. Poulson thanked all the presenters for their comments. [Please note: At this point, the meeting turned to Agenda Item E.1.]

F.2. 26269

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO): Reporting on the Transit Development Plan Update 2013-2017 - TPC 05.09.12

Mike Cechvala of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO) reported on the 2013-2017 TDP Update (attached).

- The plan was a short- to medium-term plan to steer the investments in transit service and facilities, and was a responsibility of the MPO.
- One meeting was held of the steering committee that guided the Plan, which focused on Metro boarding and service data.
- The memo outlined the major issues of the TDP, inc. the three top issues

(page 1), followed by details of some other things they would look at (pages 2-4).

- System Data: Most of the weekday frequency was 30-minute (blue bands); and most of the weekday service was 60-minute (grey bands), a more skeletal system. Some of the routes had splits in them. For example, the Route 30 with 30-minute service had splits in it, so most of the route was two 60-minute routes (i.e., the route wasn't entirely 30-minute service).
- Scheduled Distribution: Showed distribution of buses stopping at some of the common stops (Sheboygan Av, Gorham/Ingersoll). Though we had different routes (Routes 9, 10, 2, 5, 14, 15) with 30-minute service, many meshed together to form more frequent service.
- Bus Stop Spacing: Showed the distribution of stops in various corridors, with increments of distance = 1/16, 1/8, 3/16, 1/4 mile. Industry-accepted distance was 1/4 mile maximum. Somewhere between 1/8 and 1/4 mile was where we liked to be; the red circles were in the 3/16 to 1/4 mile range. They would further develop those standards. Generally, Metro had shorter distances between stops (more stops) than the industry standard, which had its pluses/minuses: It slowed service down and made it less reliable. But it was a trade-off between speed and reliability, and walking access to the system. They would be looking at that trade-off in more detail.
- Travel Times showed weighted average of scheduled travel times. So if you have 30-minute service, you would have an average-weight time of 15 minutes. The chart showed the order of magnitude with travel time in the mid-day (blue) and PM peak (red), and travel times by car (green).
- Ridership Data: The TDP would get into more detail, as far as looking at time of day, and combine one-way paired routes, such as 37-38, 56-57. For example, routes went out as 37 and came in as 38, so it was really one route. Looking at annual ridership back to 1970, the chart highlighted the gas crisis of the late 70's and early 80's. We saw a big "blip" industry-wide and all over the country, of people trying avoid standing in line at gas stations. If we were to follow this back in time, we would see another "blip" at WW II. In the mid to late 80's, MATC left downtown and moved out to Truax. In 1998, Metro put in the transfer point system. In 2008, the flattening in ridership was probably due to a combination of fare increase and the recession (transit in Seattle dropped off substantially around that time as well).
- Comments by others: (Kamp) Re: the drop in 1980, there was a 13-week strike that year. (Bergamini) There were slight increases in ridership between 2008-2010, though nothing like the rapid growth in the 2000's when unlimited ride pass programs were being added.
- Growth in ridership was pretty much a straight line (upward) since the late 90's.
- Fare Payment, Average Weekday & Boardings by Route Type: Boarding data from 3 weeks in October was used since it was one of the busiest months in the fall for Metro. Three of the biggest wedges on the right of the pie chart, roughly 55%, had to do with the UW: UW employee=10%, ASM pass=20%, free ride Campus circulators=24% (inc. the Route 80's). The "Other" wedge 5% included such groups as City employees, Metro retirees, hospital employees, etc. Remaining wedges were MATC=5%, MMSD=15%, and the standard Metro fare types, inc. 31-day, 10-ride, cash and transfers.
- (Maniaci) It would be interesting to see how much was being invested in infrastructure for cash fares = 4%, such a small usage of the population.
- (Kamp) Metro was about to purchase fare boxes, the focus of which would be on passes. They would still have cash ability, but the scope of work was being designed so they would have the housing and hook-ups for smart-card

technology. No major transit systems had gone completely cashless, but many were talking about it for just the reason mentioned. (Subeck) It would be good to know the demographics of the folks using cash fares also, to the extent we could determine; esp. if we were looking at eliminating cash, in order to know not only how many riders used cash, but also who used cash. She was glad to hear the new boxes would still accept cash.

- **Boardings by Route Type:** On weekdays, 70% boarded Regular routes 1-74, 22% boarded Campus circulators 80-85, and 9% used supplemental School service. With no School service on weekends, 90% boarded Regular routes, and 10% boarded Campus circulators.
- **Monthly Boardings-2011:** March and October were peak months (which depended on the number of days in the month, when spring break and holidays occurred). Clearly, ridership nearly doubled when the UW was in session vs. in the summer recess, also when people chose other modes of transportation like biking/walking.
- **Ridership, Sunday through Saturday, Oct. 1-21, 2011:** Wednesday was highest. Slightly lower ridership on Monday and Friday might reflect when riders might be taking 3-day vacations. Also, UW had different schedules on Friday. Because of variables like these, subsequent charts focused on Tuesday through Thursday, which were more standard weekdays.
- **Time of Day Distribution (from 4 AM to 3 AM the next day):** The blue bars were ridership per hour block, for weekdays Tues.-Thurs., and Saturday and Sunday. Metrics on the axes: on the left was Daily Boardings (total boardings within the hour); and on the right was number of Buses in Service (total number in service within the hour), represented by the red line. The three graphs were on different scales, but the ratio of the left axis to the right axis on all three was 40. Where the blue bar touched the red line, Metro was doing 40 boardings per hour per bus systemwide throughout that hour. The blue bars and the red line followed the same pattern. Service and ridership ramped up at the peaks, went down in the mid-day, and trailed off in the evening, which showed that Metro was trying to match service with ridership.
- **Saturday afternoons showed service productivity that was in line with rush hour,** because there was quite a bit less service on the weekends when ridership was lower. Where the red line was higher than the blue bars, there were more empty buses; and when the blue bars went above the red line, the buses were fuller.
- In the peaks, the service was more directional, coming into Madison in the AM and going out in the PM. So it was concentrated, with buses that were crammed coming into town and more empty as they were going out of town. As a result, the system "felt" more productive in the peaks because whatever bus a rider was on was probably full.
- In the middle of the day and on weekends, service was more two-way (traveling to the malls, etc.).
- This data included the riders on the "extra" routes, but didn't include the service on the "extra" routes. The intent was to show that when an extra bus was used, it was because there was an overloading problem; there was such high productivity, that Metro was overcapacity. This showed that if Metro had 80 people on a bus, it had to be accommodated by using two buses. If this wasn't shown, it would mask the problem and show there were 80 people on two buses and no problem.
- This data did not include school service. It reflected fixed route service only. The peak to base ratio (the number of buses in service during the peak of the peak vs. mid-day) was 2, and did not include the extra buses. If the extra buses were included, the ratio would go up to 3.

- Weekend service was about half of the mid-day service. There were about 107 buses in service during the peaks (not inc. extras), about 55 during mid-day, and about 30-34 on weekends. If all the extras and school trippers were included, buses in service would be 175. (Kamp) The bus garage was crowded on Sunday nights, when all the buses came in; it was a problem.
- Productivity (with data that reflected different times of day on weekdays, and Saturday mid-day): The graph reflected boardings; the Blue bar=boardings along the route, grey bar=boardings at a transfer point, white bar=boardings oncampus/CBD (Central Business District). The data tried to address certain questions: We might have a lot of boardings along a certain route, but was that because it happened to go through Campus at the time when everybody got on at Randall and then got off at Charter? Also, a lot of people went from transfer points to downtown, who several choices of buses; it might be meaningful or it might be random which bus they ended up on. Sorting the data by boardings along the route provided another layer of analysis. Routes were identified directionally by N, S, E and W.
- Mid-Day Productivity: Routes 80 and 85 boardings, most of which was within Campus/CBD, were off the charts. Route 2 East had a lot of CBD boardings, perhaps because students used it. Routes at the top (22, 67, 6E, 2W, 50, 16) were busy routes. Route 17 went from transfer point to transer point, so it had very few boardings along the route, but that didn't necessarily make it a bad route. Some of the routes towards the bottom (20, 39, 73, 52), though having low productivity, were at the minimum services levels they could be (mostly hourly). Though we could try to push them up, if they were eliminated, we would be cutting off service to areas of the city that depended on those routes.
- Routes at the bottom represented routes where riders didn't have more of a choice and had to have some service to get them to their jobs. Routes at the top were more the efficient, mass transit work-horses of the system. And everything else was in between.
- Morning Peak Productivity: At the top were such routes as Routes 28E (Campus through Johnson/Gorham to North TP), 2W (through the westside corridor). Some of the services had been combined; Routes 37 (going out), 38E (coming back) was at the top, and routes 37, 38W was towards the bottom, to better compare "apples to apples".
- Saturday Mid-Day Productivity: At the top were Routes 22, 6E, 2W, 67 (to West Towne Mall, with high productivity, high ridership). Saturday didn't have as much circulation downtown, so this was sorted by total boardings vs. along the route.
- Red-dot Map: This showed weekday boardings by intersection throughout the system on fixed routes. This combined all the boardings at an intersection; for example, five bus stops at an intersection were combined, which could result in a pretty big dot. Like the 2005 map, this showed strong ridership throughout the Campus/downtown out to the hospital and Eagle Heights; included Campus circulators. Pink dots represented transfer points, to show the many boardings were mostly transfers. West Towne, East Towne, MATC, Northport, some of the schools had larger dots. Some of the boardings were spread out along the line. Epic had a major dot, so they were really filling those buses. The dots near LaFollette reflected the Route 16 only (no school service).
- To find the complete version of the TDP presentation, people could go to the MPO's website, and click on "Planning Projects, Additional Plans".

Kamp noted that there were seven transit studies underway, inc. the TDP, Transportation Master Plan, Bus Size Study, Bus Rapid Transit Study, UW Campus Route Study, internal Metro Facility Study, and an Intercity Bus

Terminal team. But the TDP was a key study for Metro's mid-term planning. Bergamini noted that the Council approved a new study through Traffic Engineering involving a joint study between Shorewood Hills, UW and the City, related to the Old University corridor as well as the UWH area; \$40K was transferred from the contingency fund to TE to bid out the project; its description included the words transportation and transit. Kamp said Metro would check into this.

Since the TDP presentation was informational, no motion was needed.

F.3. 26270

Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee recommendations regarding service partner contract guidelines - TPC 05.09.12

Kamp and Metro Finance Manager Wayne Block discussed the memo from CSOS regarding Service Partner Contract Guidelines (attached). Review of the methodologies began after the Ad Hoc plan was completed in 2008. This work was suspended in 2009 during the time the RTA was being developed; and began again after the RTA effort ended in 2011. Most of the contracts with partners were 10-20+ years old. So Metro had updated the methodologies over the last 4-6 months, and was recommending approval of them.

Staff answered questions about the recommendations.

- Issue 2b – "lost" revenue: Staff thought this was related to an old "L" Line subsidy. Staff couldn't figure out the history and methodology to justify it; and since there was nothing in writing, they thought it should be eliminated. Bergamini added what she knew: Students with ASM passes paid 25¢ to get on the L Line (now the Route 80's), even though they could use their passes and pay nothing extra on any of the other routes. For the cost of covering the fare box equivalent, they preferred to just pay it as one lump sum, and let people get on the bus. Transportation Services decided to do the same with passes for faculty and staff. As a result, an internal agreement was made whereby ASM would compensate Transportation Services for that fare box revenue. Bergamini and another person sat down to estimate what they thought ridership would be for the next year, and then came to an agreement on it. This was an offset that was taken care of internally, but somehow ended up in Metro's budget, even though it made no sense to be there. It should be pulled out.
- Issue 4 – contingent reserve: Paragraph 3 said contingent reserve funds would be invested. Metro had started collection contingency from partners several years ago when they were working on this, because Metro's reserve was near zero. There was some concern that no interest was being earned on the contingency that Metro was keeping for each municipality. Metro met and will work with Dave Schmiedicke in Finance to provide an allocation of the City's interest revenues that will be the proportionate share to each partner's contingency reserve level, and make sure those interest revenues are reflected to partner's contingency reserve.

Subeck/Streit made a motion to approve the recommendations. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.4. 26271

Metro: Update on VA Pass - TPC 05.09.12

Metro Marketing and Customer Services Manager Mick Rusch updated members on the survey and recommendations prepared by Metro (attached), regarding a request for a free pass for disabled vets.

- 180 people filled out the survey; 163 said they were service-connected vets; 129 said they would take advantage of such a pass. There was a great deal of interest in this pass.
- Metro was not recommending that such a pass be provided, because there were many other worthy groups that would like a free pass also.
- Three transit systems in the state offered a free disabled vets pass: Superior, Green Bay and Oshkosh. Eight other systems did not.
- Lots of programs existed that could fund transportation for service-connected vets: Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative (federal program), and RSVP's Vets Helping Vets (local program).
- USDOT just put out a notice that there would be an ongoing, month-long national dialogue on how to improve transportation options for disabled vets, and Metro would get involved with this and provide info about what's going on in our area. So the idea was being recognized on a national level, and from this dialogue a report would be produced, which Rusch would pass along.

Metro did not recommend creating this pass. Chair of the Dane County Veterans Service Commission John Hofer was sent the meeting materials and invited to the meeting, and Rusch had received no response from him. Rusch reaffirmed that while it might be a good idea, other options were available for the vets to explore. Re: the USDOT dialogue, Metro would relay the info they had gathered to help with their research, and suggest that federal funding might be made available for this type of situation; but that it was not something the City would fund. Based on the number of vets who were interested and using the cost of the 31-day pass for Senior/Disabled of \$27.50, Rusch estimated that the cost of such a program would be \$33K/year. Subeck said that some members of the Dane County Board on the Vets Board had expressed interest in this at the County level. Staff thought the County was aware of Metro's efforts to survey and review the request, esp. since they were involved in distributing the survey. Golden suggested that Metro convey the information they had gathered to Congresswoman Tammy Baldwin, who had a major interest in veterans issues. Kamp said they would set up a meeting to share the data.

Maniaci/White made a motion to accept the report. Subeck offered a friendly amendment that Metro come back to the group in July to update the Commission on the action steps discussed. Poulsen said that this might instead be among the suggestions for future agendas, and an amendment was not needed. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G. 6:00 PM – PUBLIC HEARING: To hear public comment on proposed service reductions on Campus routes, and adjustments to Routes 11 and 25.

G.1. 26272 Metro: Public Hearing on proposed service changes to Campus routes, and Routes 11 and 25 - TPC 05.09.12

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item E.1.] Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp discussed the agenda materials, which included a summary of three proposals for route changes on Campus, as well as info re: two minor changes to Routes 11 and 25. Because of their significance, the focus at this meeting would be on changes to the Campus routes. Along with the three proposals previously discussed at a Campus hearing a week earlier, new proposals would be presented, which had been prepared by Metro and UW staff in response to the feedback received at that Campus hearing.

UW Transportation Services Director Patrick Kass made the following comments.

- **Transportation Services was a revenue program department, and thus did not receive any State or University funding. All their revenue was derived from what they received from their users.**
- In recent years, the department had been running a structural deficit, and they had been looking at different ways to stabilize their program; and had been looking to their users to better fund the services provided.
- In the past two years, they had made a lot of program changes, increased their rates, and asked people who weren't paying for parking to start paying for parking.
- They had also been looking at some other options, one of which was the Campus bus.
- Currently, the Campus bus was a \$1.7 million/year expense, funded in part by University Housing, Transportation Services (TS) and the Associated Students of Madison (ASM). Housing paid for about 6% of the program, and the remainder was split between ASM and TS.
- TS was getting their funding through permit sales and visitor parking revenue.
- TS had had discussions with student government, who wanted to maintain their level of funding, which meant TS was looking at a cut, given their budgetary situation.
- TS was looking at about a 10% cut, roughly 3,200 hours of bus service.
- Timeline: TS sent info to student government last December, about different ways to fund and maintain bus service. Through negotiations, an agreement was reached in March between ASM and the UW, in which ASM would maintain their funding and TS would cut their funding by 10%. A public meeting was held May 3rd on Campus, where they received some recommendations that would be reflected later in the presentation.
- Current UW bus service: 2.5 million rides/year, with no fare charged; three daytime and two nighttime routes; service varied from 7 buses on Route 80 and one bus on both Route 82 and 84. Service extended up through Eagle Heights, SE portion of Campus, and at night extended out east of the Capitol; service ran from 6 AM through 3 AM. Majority of service was on Route 80, the main Campus bus east-west (19K hours), out of 30K hours/year total; 76% of ridership was on Route 80, with over 2 million students/year.
- When looking at possible cuts, TS looked at where the majority of the ridership was for each of the routes, to see how effective they were. TS also looked at revenue per passenger hour, and found 4 out of the 5 Campus routes were among the top five Metro routes. Route 81 was #31, which was why it was one of the routes being considered for change.
- With the high levels of service and riders, TS understood that any cut would have an impact, and looked at areas of service where changes would impact the fewest number of people, esp. on the fringe. TS wanted to maintain their hours of operation (early start and late ends). Originally, they talked about no change to the recess service; however, based on some feedback, they were now looking at an option with a recess service change. They wanted to leave Routes 82 and 84 alone, because there was only one bus on those routes; any change there would eliminate the service.
- They looked at efficiencies and capacities with Route 81; and the Route 82 at night, serving the Campus and SW Campus, which currently had 30-minute headway.
- They created roughly five alternatives to reach their goal of 3,200 hours:

removal of one of the Route 81 buses, taking the headway from 15 to 30 minutes; removal of one of the Route 85 buses in SE Campus, taking service from 10 minutes to 20 minutes; removal of one of the Route 80 buses, taking headways from 7 to 10 minutes; a Route 80-85 combo, which could save a bus, and looked at recess service.

- None of the alternatives were stand-alone, but would have to be packaged together in some way to comprise the 3,200 hours in service cuts.

Metro Transit Schedule Planner Colin Conn presented the following information, using maps, schedules and hand-outs (attached).

- Route 81 had a 30-minute cycle, two-bus rotation with 15-minute service and a nice one-seat ride from Linden Drive to Memorial Union, and went all the way out to Johnson/Gorham corridor to Patterson (with a possibility of going to Ingersoll). This was an alternative Patrick Kass had mentioned, to take one bus out of the rotation. Looking at page 1 (Alternative A), the current Route 81 schedule started at 6:37 PM with one bus going in one direction and another going the other direction, until 3 AM. By eliminating one of the buses, the service times in the gray areas would disappear, resulting in half the current schedule.
- Route 85 on page 2 (Alternative B) was one of the more heavily ridden Campus routes, with a two-bus rotation, which traveled from Memorial Union up Observatory Hill and down Charter to University Av, Randall, Dayton, Mills, Regent, up Park to Dayton, Lake and the Union again. This option called for removing one bus rotation after 10 AM. Looking at service stats, there was some concern about passenger counts that would result going to a 20-minute headway. By going from 46 trips to 23 (-50%) after 10 AM, and assuming that many riders would walk, the max load was projected to go from 69 to 89 (+130%), though in reality, 70 is about as many passengers as a bus can reasonably transport. The average load would jump by 10 passengers. With fewer opportunities to ride the bus, ridership would go down 34%, and passengers/hour would jump from 100 to 132, again an impossibility.
- Page 4 showed current Route 80 (with two variants, one going to Eagle Heights and one going to the UW Hospital (UWH)) and 85 (in the SE Campus). This nicely provided 12-minute service to Eagle Heights; and 6-minute service from Union to UWH, and from UWH to Charter.
- Page 5 showed an alternative that was reviewed at the Campus meeting. After hearing from a driver about the difficulties and delays when driving on Campus, Conn decided this was not a good idea and created an adaptation of it, shown on page 6.
- Page 6 showed the new adaptation (Alternative D), which had the same essential schedule structure as the current Route 80. Right now, the Route 80 provided 7-minute service to the entire Campus during peak periods (generally speaking). In the middle of the day, this option would pull one bus out of the Eagle Heights loop and be re-focused on UWH-Union run, creating 6-minute service to the UWH and throughout entire route (to Union South and down Dayton). Essentially, this option would get rid of Route 85, and the students living in the SE dorms would make a 2-block walk (.18 of a mile) to Dayton & Park. This seemed like a reasonable trade-off, and represented a significant savings in cost. Currently, Metro had six buses on Route 80, on a 42-minute cycle, netting out a 6-minute headway. Two buses now ran on Route 85, with a 10-minute headway. This option would eliminate some duplication of service caused by Route 85, and would pull a bus out of that rotation and reapply it into the larger rotation, to net out the levels of service.
- Re: Alternative D and the capacity of Dayton, staff was not concerned about

shifting buses from multi-laned Johnson to narrower Dayton. A bigger concern was the right turn from Charter onto University (where buses couldn't easily turn on red, and students walked on the right-turn arrow). Dayton was actually pretty good. It would be nip and tuck. It would be nice to have another three minutes on both routes.

- Current Route 80 schedule (attached): This had a 6-bus rotation, provided 122 trips (not inc. Route 85); with 7-minute headways in the AM, then 6/12-minute mid-day service (12-min. for Eagle Heights), then 7-minute service again at afternoon peak times, followed by 15+ service until 9 PM and 45-minute service after 9 PM.
- Route 80-Remove one bus option (attached): This proposal would take the 6-bus rotation to 5-bus rotation, back to the original route they had. This would tend to put much heavier loads on buses, so the cycle time of the route would have to be expanded to about 50 minutes; would produce a 10-minute headway, which would run until 5:30 PM, with 15-minute service to 9 PM and 45-minute service after 9 PM; would provide 90 trips.
- Route 80 "Via Dayton/Langdon" option (attached): This proposal was a combination that would have a 7-bus rotation until 6 PM, providing 124 trips. The 122 (currrent) and 124 (this option) didn't really compare because it ignored the trips on Route 85. But the service distribution was the same: 7-minute (early), 6/12-minute (mid-day), 7-minute (afternoon), 15+-minute service (nighttime).
- One other option connected to the Route 80 recess schedule: Currently, this had 3-bus rotation on Route 80, netting out 15-minute service and 45-minute cycle, plus one bus on Route 85 – a 4-bus rotation. To save money, maybe this could be a 3-bus rotation; trips would be reduced and frequency would change from 15 to 17-minute service, with no service to Southeast dorms.

Metro and UW staff added some comments and responded to questions.

- Route 81 reconfiguration (to create 20 minute frequency on Route 81) discussed after the Campus meeting: Staff looked at this extensively, and the more they looked at it, the less they liked it. Would save only 290 hours, and wouldn't add much to a package of 3,200 hours.
- Referring to page 6 (attached), in a recess schedule, the "red" loop disappeared, and there was no short-turn loop; every bus went to Eagle Heights and back to the Union.
- On page 10, the chart titled "Service Reduction Alternatives" (attached) showed the hours saved by each alternative. Alternatives D and E could be added together.
- Page 11 (attached) showed the ridership and productivity for the Campus routes.
- Staff's expectation was to continue to refine the alternatives and bring a recommendation to the June TPC.
- The role the TPC played in changes to service for partners was a delicate one. Ultimately, the decision would be the TPC's. But Metro tried to make recommendations consistent with the partner's budget needs. Once recommendations for workable route changes were identified, the TPC would choose which change(s) to make.
- Re: capacity issues and the role of articulated buses, Metro was currently working with the MPO, and had just started a study to look at Metro's fleet in the long term, both short and long buses. The study would affect decisions for bus procurements five or six years down the road. It would not affect things in the short term, because of a number of operational issues today. But articulated buses were in the mix for consideration in the long term.

- By combining Route 80 and 85 (thru Alternatives D and E), the goal of 3,200 hours would nearly be reached; there would be no Route 85; and the split times would be essentially the same as now. Also, as a result, Alternatives B and C would be off the table.
- Re: the combined Route 80/85 via Dayton and Langdon, and service to Eagle Heights: The combo actually eliminates the "via". Right now, a short-turn (Route 80) bus went up Park Street over Bascom Hill. One bus went out to Eagle Heights, and the next one bus short-turned back at the UWH returning to the Union. A nice thing about the geographics was that it takes about 12 minutes to get from the UWH to Eagle Heights and back; creating a nice, compact little route that functioned in the middle of the day. This allows the service to shift and be concentrated in service zones with class breaks and heavy ridership. Then when the need for service was more pressing for Eagle Heights, service adjusts to a 7-minute frequency with a more expansive route (similar to current Route 80). This option would take the route from a 42-minute cycle to a 48-minute cycle to facilitate the route's expansion to Dayton and Lake Street.

Registrants were invited to speak. (Please also see registration slips attached.)

Laura Checovich, 244 W Gilman, 53703, representing Associated Students of Madison (ASM), 333 E. Campus Mall, 53706, registered in opposition to cuts to safe night time service, and wrote: While students did agree to a cut in service, as the majority funding body, ASM does not accept cuts to SAFE service.

Checovich also spoke, as follows: ASM opposed any cuts to Route 81, as shown in many of the options. Students were not as concerned about low ridership on the nighttime SAFE buses, and were much more concerned with the fact that they provided a safe ride home at night. The students were the ones who initially asked for these routes to even happen; they went late into the night, and obviously were not part of any daytime service. They would hate to see them go. Reductions to recessed service, when students were not on Campus, would be a great option. With other cuts to safety programs, such as the possible loss of Safe Cab, ASM was even more concerned about safety and making sure students got home safely, even if it meant more students needed to walk up Bascom Hill.

Checovich responded to questions.

- There were three programs: Safe Bus, Safe Ride (cab), and Safe Walk. The Safe Walk program saw the least usage, probably due to a student culture issue; people preferred to take a cab vs. having two strangers walk them home, regardless of the safety. UW Transportation Services had disallowed ASM from administering the Safe Ride (cab) program, and ASM would no longer be running the program.
- The Spring Street area was one of the least safe areas (had the most crime and muggings this year); and along Regent Street from Mills to Park. It wasn't only walking home that was an issue; it was also standing in one place too long, like waiting outside a house party for much as 25 minutes. The areas mentioned were along Route 82. But Route 81, which traveled into Maniaci's district, ran along the lake with areas that were really dark, and which was populated with undergrads and grads who threw parties, and where it was important to have buses that ran frequently so that students were never standing and waiting. For ASM, "frequent" would be every 15 minutes.
- Re: the new alternative (#3?) presented, ASM had not had enough time to

review it. They had just received the information the day before the hearing, even though Metro and the UW had had the info two days before. This was troubling, because the students were the majority funding party in the entire operation and yet were not being allowed at the table. Checovich was uncomfortable given a response to the new options on behalf of all students, because her group, the Student Transportation Board, had not been able to go over them. However, it seemed that Metro had gone back to the drawing board and she was glad to see that there were more options, some of which seemed to be better than what had been proposed originally.

Allison Stephenson Haus, 22 University Houses B, 53705, Chair of the University Apartments Assembly, representing 3,000 people living in Eagle Heights and Univ. Houses and Harvey St. Apartments, registered in opposition. She wrote: Please do not cancel any (service on) Route 80. Residents in Eagle Heights and Univ. Houses are totally dependent on the bus to get to Campus. Many of the residents do not have cars, are international; many have families; some have kids in daycare on Campus. 3,000 residents in Univ. Apartments need those buses and depended on regular service.

Stephenson Haus had heard from some of the residents in her community, who were pretty upset. She read an email from a resident, Alex Kovell, who was also active on the Board: As a daily rider of Bus 80, with four trips minimum per day, I can say that reducing service by another bus (which the speaker thought might be Option C? on the sheet), thus increasing wait times and the number of people packed onto each bus, is one of the worst ideas I've heard in a long while. As it stands, almost every bus during morning and evening rush hours is standing room only, before even finishing the loop through Eagle Heights. Some people get off at the Hospital, but the two stops near Lakeshore residence halls bring the buses beyond capacity on a regular basis. What I mean by "beyond capacity" is that there are people on the stairs as well in the front of the standing line, in an attempt to get everyone on the bus. On rainy and snowy days, it can be even worse.

Stephenson Haus said this was one person's perspective. She also knew that residents did not want to see a reduction in service during the recesses, because many of them did not return home to their home countries and remained dependent on Bus 80 to get to the lab or their offices to do their work, aside from their cramped apartments filled with their families. These residents were dependent on the bus because they lived far enough away that esp. in the winter, they used the bus. All the data showed Route 80 was the most used bus out of all the routes. She hoped the Commission would decide to keep the Bus 80 running as much as possible, with very little time between buses.

Stephenson Haus answered questions. Re: the new alternative (the combination, Option #3?) presented, she agreed with Checovich that it was difficult to represent 3,000 people, but it seemed that eliminating one Bus 80 all day, would make a 10-minute wait longer. It would be best if they could keep that to a minimum during the really crunch times to allow people to still get the labs/offices. She was asked about the equity issue related to the fact that riders in many non-Campus parts of Madison waited 25 to 30 minutes every day for a bus; and even with the proposed change, the wait on Route 80 would extend to only 17 minutes. Stephenson Haus said she would have to continue to support no reductions, but that she understood the issue. She added that

they were a little pocket of people, who lived far away from Campus and didn't have cars; so they were really dependent on transit.

Nick Haus, 22 University Houses B, 53705, registered neither in support/opposition, and made the following remarks. It didn't tell the whole story to look only at bus frequency. It was one thing for buses leaving Eagle Heights, and another for those coming back. The buses were often so loaded that riders were unable to board. A 17-minute frequency for a bus didn't always mean a 17-minute pickup of the residents. He wondered how people would deal with a situation where a rider with children was left standing at a bus stop, esp. in the winter. He wondered if people would consider an ID service for residents on that route, so riders would not be stranded. When stranded, 30-minute waits could turn into an hour. Often, these were international people. Also, undergrads were more rambunctious and would cut in front of others who were boarding. For those boarding at the Union, often the bus was already full and riders to Eagle Height couldn't board; so by increasing the load, chances of missing the bus were greater. Haus asked if an ID or priority pass could be created for University housing residents.

Kamp said that Metro Transit was a common carrier; and unlike a privately contracted bus service, they were not able to give priority boarding to certain groups (unless designated under ADA). He could see some legal issues with asking someone to get off the bus to make room for someone with a priority pass. Identifying a bus solely for Eagle Heights residents would create problems, because of federal guidelines related to common carriers. Maniaci said that only a privately funded service could do this (perhaps by residents banding together to fund it); but this couldn't be done in the public realm.

White remarked that members understood about the capacity issue, and were all committed to finding a better solution. Golden added that the study about bigger buses, which would help alleviate capacity; but this would not happen in the short-term. Kamp mentioned the possibility of using articulated buses in the future.

Susan Nossal, 15D University Houses, 53705, registered in opposition. A scientist in atmospheric physics, she was concerned with cutting bus service, in general. Echoing other speakers, she felt the issue for the Route 80 bus was capacity, in some ways more than frequency. She rode the bus frequently, and very often, it was crowded. Fortunately, she was someone who could stand up, and was concerned about others who might not be so able to stand. She had seen the bus pass people by, esp. in the winter. Sometimes, she had been able to get on the bus at Eagle Heights, but by the time it got to Campus, it was so crowded, she couldn't get off at her stop, and would have to go several more stops in order to get off. She tried to time things so she wouldn't have to take the more crowded buses, but sometimes she had to and got stuck. She was concerned about cuts to Route 80, and hoped service could be preserved. Route 84 had been a wonderful addition, and had helped, esp. in the winter and on return trips home. Nossal also hoped there could be more weekend service, because of the time it took to get back and forth across town, which was a big deterrent to travel on weekends.

From a climate change perspective, Nossal thought it urgent to make swift and deep cuts in emissions of green house warming gases to avert the most severe impacts of climate change. Recent data from US Dept. of Energy

showed global carbon dioxide emissions in 2010 were 6% more than in 2009, the largest jump in any single year. Also, green house gases are higher than the worst-case scenario outlined by climate scientists on the last intergovernmental panel on climate change. As someone studying climate change, she was concerned that we would not be able to make the necessary changes to avert the worst impacts of climate change because of the way our society was moving. She would support anything we could do to maintain and increase bus service, even including paying more; though if passes were to cost more or if taxes were raised, she hoped it would be for people above a certain income level. She did not support raising the fare per ride.

Paul Evans, Director of the Division of University Housing, 625 Babcock Drive, 53706, registered neither in support/opposition, and made the following comments. Some of these changes impacted a number of their customers, including those on Route 85 on Park Street, inc. Smith Hall across from Spring Street. But he was most concerned about the Route 80 out to Eagle Heights. For the past couple of years, residents had paid additional money to UW Transportation, in order to maintain Route 80 services at the levels it had. For this fiscal year, this was about \$111K, coming directly from the rents. This was done to prevent cuts to the 80's that were proposed during the time they were looking at ways to save. Even though residents didn't have a lot of extra money, they were so concerned about service to Eagle Heights that they were willing to add this \$100+K to their rents, to kick in the extra amount. So they would be very concerned about any cut to this service; which would reduce savings as well, because if service were reduced, they would reduce the amount they paid. They wanted to try to maintain the service.

Evans said they were not aware of the new Alternatives D and E until the meeting, but was interested in them, even though the elimination of Route 85 would change some service to a residence hall with 400 students in it. It was not an unreasonable alternative to look at, and they would most likely have no opposition to that change. They would weigh maintaining the frequency of Route 80 higher than keeping service to the front door of Smith Hall. Proposal D and E was worth consideration, and he hope this would take any reduction to 80 off the table. The reduction of Route 81 and safety to their residents was of utmost importance, and something his residents would be concerned about. The timing of the meeting was bad for students, who were in the last week of finals and had short notice. But he thought had more student able to come, they would echo the concerns mentioned about safety at night. The UW harped on students to be safe, ride the bus, and not to walk alone. So they needed to make sure they provided ways for them to do that.

Evans said they recognized the need to reduce costs, and there was potential in alternatives like D and E that might work out alright, which would allow them to keep Route 81 and 80 how they were, which would be a win for a lot of people. He couldn't indicate "support" until he knew which alternative was being proposed. Re: service levels for the rest of the city vs. Campus, he said there were some unique features about Eagle Heights; such as families with kids where both parents were grad students trying to piece together schedules to/from Campus. Route 80 service was really critical, which was why they paid money to maintain the service. Re: recess service, with mostly grad and post doc students, Eagle Heights was a 365 days/year operation; residents needed to get to/from Campus to do research all year long. Past meetings with the Assembly and UW Transportation about the recess schedule showed this was

a concern. Not to minimize this, but some compromises would have to be made. Not having had a chance to look at the new proposals and the recess, they would want to discuss ways to run the recess buses to see how this could help out Eagle Heights during recess; i.e., to eliminate some other parts of Campus during that time, where there were few people around. There was a lot of work that could be done potentially on the schedule that they hadn't had a chance to do. But any service reduction to Eagle Heights, they would want to look at seriously and would want to look for alternatives to that.

Having no other registrants, the public hearing was closed.

Conn discussed proposed changes to the other two routes shown on the agenda, Routes 11 and 25.

- Route 11: The bus that stopped at WPS would be pulled, and would be left on Broadway, so that people that lived north of Broadway could ride the bus back downtown without having to find a stop that dove into WPS. The stop averaged 1.3 passengers/trip. With a route a little tight, the change would save 2-3 minutes and put the route back on time for other passengers along the route.
- Route 25: The route currently provided back-door service to the Alliant Center, which they originally thought would garner significant ridership. This was another route that could use 3 more minutes. The stop averaged 0-2 passengers/trip. Also, there were problems pulling in/out of the driveways there; the grade separation was not kind to buses making turning movements. The distance from the Center to the bus stop on Biltmore Lane was about the same as walking out to a car in the parking lot. This would put a bus back on time without necessarily changing the schedule.

Re: Route 25: Maniaci wondered if a shelter at the stop on Biltmore would be advisable, given our winters. Re: Route 11: When asked about the walk for employees from WPS to Broadway, Conn said there was a door on the Broadway side of the WPS building. Riders were currently dropped off on Broadway in the AM. The stop in front of WPS was a holdover from the days when Broadway was a two-lane dirt track, and the loop was created so riders wouldn't have such a dangerous crossing. When Broadway was reconstructed, Metro agreed to let the bus continue to stop at WPS in the afternoon so people wouldn't have to cross Broadway to catch the bus. But now, with traffic signals, there were more pedestrian improvements.

Re: Campus routes: The UW hoped to save \$180K with a reduction of 3,200 hours.

G.2. [26273](#)

TPC Discussion and Action on proposed service changes to Campus routes, and Routes 11 and 25 - TPC 05.09.12

Chair Poulson noted that the Commission would be dealing with the Campus routes in June. Metro thought that Routes 11 and 25 could wait until June in order to take action on all the routes together. Maniaci/Tolmie made a motion to refer the item to the June meeting.

Maniaci thanked Metro and the UW staff for sitting down, working hard and looking at the numbers (following the Campus meeting a week earlier). They had come at things with a more inventive, creative take. She was much more comfortable with many of the options now on the table, and felt that solutions were more readily at hand. Alternatives D and E were pragmatic, reasonable

options. Based on discussions with her constituency on Route 81 inc. the neighborhood associations in the State-Langdon, Mansion Hill, Tenney-Lapham areas, it was clear that maintaining Route 81 was paramount to a lot of different people. So she was happy to think (changes to) this might be off the table. Alternatives D and E came to 3,116 hours. To nudge the total up, Maniaci wondered if Metro could explore the effect of starting the Route 81 at 7 AM vs. 6:30 AM. Conn said that he might run into shift issues with a change like this, so he would have to look into it more.

Re: the Route 80-85 combo, Kass said they would need to vet this proposal more, to see if it would really be 3,100+ hours. Having just seen it, he wanted to hold off on a position. Maniaci asked Conn who would be affected by a change to 17-minute frequency during recess time, in Alternative E. Depending on which route they went with, Conn said they now had a 3-bus rotation with 15-minute service. The new option would go to a 3-bus, longer route 17-minute frequency, and the loss of the Route 85, which would generate the savings there. Though probably negligible, Maniaci said she was concerned about the impact on residents of Eagle Heights. Conn said the expanded Route 80 would hold Eagle Heights harmless: they would lose one time around 3 PM but would gain one at 9:20 PM. The recess reflected about a 11% decline, from 15- to 17-minute service, which would probably be noticed across the whole route. Maniaci said she would like to know how many riders might be affected. Kamp said Metro had data on the Campus routes during recess months, and could do an estimate for June of what the impact would be.

Streit noted that Route 80 riders rode free and were on the honor system; and wondered if Route 81 might potentially have riders who were non-students, because it might be an attractive way to move around without having paid an ASM fee. UW staff said that they had surveyed this, and found that over 85% of the Route 81 riders were University-related riders.

Given that the issue seemed to be more about capacity than a frequency, White asked if Metro could move forward more quickly on other bus options. Kamp said Metro was waiting until the bus study was completed; but they also had some engineering work to do: Could Metro accommodate articulated buses in their garage, which currently was packed? Conn pointed out larger buses not only increased capacity, but they also increased loading time, which reduced frequency and slowed down the bus.

A vote was taken, and the motion to refer the item was passed unanimously by voice vote/other. When asked, Poulson said that as long as the proposals brought to the June meeting were similar to those presented at this meeting, another public hearing would not be needed. However, people would be welcome to come and speak on the proposals, as they would for a regular agenda item. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item E.2.]

H. 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
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

No action was needed on these items.

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

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

Poulson asked that Metro prepare a response to the request for service to Owl Creek, knowing that this was a larger issue. He expressed concern that development area was allowed to go forward without consideration of this, similar to another neighborhood siphoned off a highway.

Golden shared what he knew about the process. He recalled that people were very concerned about how isolated the development might be because of its location. In fact, the bridge over Marsh Road was a consequence of those discussions. DOT made commitments to that bridge. Golden felt that Planning staff needed to also be involved in any future discussion; to give the background of why this was a logical, infill neighborhood (they convinced an entire Common Council to support the development); esp. in view of how this and other peripheral developments often lacked bus service as they were being built out (due to lower ridership and extremely high cost). Golden also noted how multi-family, lower-income housing was often easier to put in before the wealthier folks came in, which resulted in isolated, lower-income housing that didn't have access to transportation. This was a worthwhile, but complicated issue.

Bergamini mentioned how this issue related to Pioneer Neighborhood and also to the University/Research Park 2, where many residents would be bus pass holders; where there was supposed to be combined-class housing plus economic development, with links to Research Park 1 and the Hospital. She wanted to hear a presentation from Planning about this.

Bergamini also asked about the status of the Zoning Code re-write, vis-a-vis parking stall requirements for office spaces/apartments, which fed in here, to know the implications of the new zoning. Schmitz said a draft had been completed and would be making its way through the committees.

Kamp said the Mayor had 3-4 dozen priorities in 2012, which included expanded bus service. The Mayor had asked staff to look at the priorities, and Metro was looking at the other neighborhoods mentioned here. As seen in the TDP, overcrowding on buses in the core area was a significant issue. Policy decisions needed to be made when an important social issue like periphery service arose; though ridership in these areas produce a small "red dot", there was a need. Metro was working on the Mayor's task and items for the budget. Staff was looking at 15-20 service scenarios (inc. Owl Creek). So Kamp hoped there might be some flexibility about scheduling a follow-up presentation.

Poulson announced that a Second Alternative would be named to the Commission soon.

I.2. Commission member items for future agendas

With the approach of budget season and considering the many issues raised at the meeting with fiscal implications, Maniaci hoped to hear from Metro once they had a sense of their parameters and where they were headed.

Kamp said that along with fiscal issues, Metro was dealing with physical issues related to the size of their facility. With the Mayor's approval, Metro had begun looking at leasing space (for 5 years or so); and had already started to talk to property owners about areas to park buses.

Golden asked for an update on discussions with communities like McFarland and Sun Prairie about transit service.

Subeck asked for a follow-up on the disabled vets item. Also, she had received a letter re: lack of bus service to Park Ridge and Olson Elementary. The Southwest NRT was looking at this and might want to speak to the TPC. Olson School was located in Hawks Landing, where there was no bus service. Students were (school) bused from low-income Park Ridge, Park Edge, Willow Point Apartments. With no transit service, parents in the area couldn't attend parent-teacher conferences; they had formed their own PTO.

White asked for an update on the Ad Hoc Committee, and which priorities from the report Metro was currently focused on.

Maniaci mentioned an item brought up at BID re: a night-time economy study and recommendations. She thought there would be some interplay with transit, and thought this might be ready for broader discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

Schmidt/Maniaci made a motion to adjourn at 8:35 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.