City of Madison

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, June 11, 2014	**5:00 PM**	**215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.** **Room 260, Madison Municipal Building** **(After 6 PM, use Doty St. entrance.)**

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Bergamini called the meeting to order at 5:08 PM.

Present: 7 - Lucas Dailey; Chris Schmidt; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Kate D. Lloyd and Amanda F. White

Excused: 4 - Anita Weier; David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow and Gary L. Poulson

Please note: Schmidt arrived at 5:09 PM, after action was taken on the Minutes. Dailey arrived at 5:15 PM, at the start of Item F.1.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by White, seconded by Golden, to Approve the Minutes of the May 14, 2014 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.   34362   Parking: May 2014 Activity Report, April Revenue-Expense-Occupancy Reports - TPC 06.11.14

Members had no questions. Schmidt/Kovich made a motion to receive the reports. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

E.2.   34359   Metro: YTD Performance Indicators and Financial Reports, Performance Measures and Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Reports - TPC 06.11.14

Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp and Metro Planning & Scheduling Manager Drew Beck discussed the YTD variance in "Trips using Lifts" (in Fixed Route Statistics), which reflected more than a 10% increase.
● This measurement was started when buses actually had lifts, rather than floors that lowered.
● It was tricky measuring this number. Ramps were deployed in the garage to test them before leaving, which had to be accounted for. It was an estimating process and not an exact science.
● With the ease of deploying the ramps now, they were used more frequently

and for more than ADA purposes. They were deployed for grocery carts and strollers as well as for wheelchairs.
● Metro now had staff to perform in-person assessments for paratransit, which may provide a more accurate measurement as to how it was going with transitioning appropriate individuals from paratransit to fixed route.
● After looking into it, if staff found no use for this stat, then they might propose eliminating it.

Members commented.
● Initially this data was collected because lifts on fixed route buses were viewed as cost-saving compared to paratransit. The purpose for this info might now be lost.
● Perhaps staff could look into the way this info was being gathered, to determine if there'd be a better way to track it, or even to determine if the data was relevant at all.
● With snowbanks still at bus stops in April, lifts were frequently used to help people get on/off the buses more safely.

Schmidt/Kovich made a motion to receive the reports. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

F.   INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

F.1.   34360   Parking: Question and Answer Follow-up on Parking Sustainability Report, Phil Baron, Walker & Associates - TPC 06.11.14

Parking Operations Manager Tom Woznick introduced Phil Baron, Project Manager for Walker Parking Consultants, who summarized their work on the Study and how it fed into the Staff Report.
● The purpose of the Study was to look at how the Utility could address the impending financial challenges over the next 20 years, to look at options for achieving financial sustainability over that time.
● The process involved looking at the existing system and trying to find areas with opportunities to improve revenue, reduce expenses and expand the system, to find ways to optimize what currently existed; through the lens of operations, technology, hours of operations, staff, equipment, condition of facilities, lighting, quality compared to competitive properties, all in the context of the local market.
● They met with stakeholders and focus groups. Common themes they heard:
  ** They wanted the system to be equitable in that it served a broad market. Those who can pay a premium to park at premium locations, as well as options for those who were maybe more economically sensitive, to offer choices in the system.
  ** They also wanted access, to make sure supply was available. How would they create a system that ensured that at any given time, supply would be available within the core area of downtown?
● They then looked at existing management tools, such as rates and other policies, in order to develop some options. These were options, not recommendations.
● Their team had been instructed to provide a list of opportunities to Parking staff, who would then determine what was appropriate within the political context. The consultant team wouldn't have that knowledge, such as what was happening in other departments from a financial standpoint. So they just looked at the Parking Utility, as a stand-alone, and how they could make it

work.
● In some cases, their options may seem aggressive; but that was to model and see where the stress test was within the market. It came down showing the data and comparing current conditions, to (for example) show that raising rates by $20/month would achieve X or Y.
● This helped the staff rule out options. So even though some of the options presented in their report weren't in the Staff Report, that didn't mean they didn't serve a purpose. Listing all the options helped put things in context in order to determine that some of them wouldn't be right for the community.
● The Report included a lot of granular analysis. But to add a caution, they were still doing the Study with a mindset of a strategic plan. To get to the strategic plan, they had to do granular analysis, to identify what was plausible and what wasn't.
● Behind him were a team of experts in technology and operations, and engineers who were restoration specialists and new design specialists; as well as the Parking staff, who lived the system every day and whose fingerprints were on the document.
● They made sure their report was vetted properly before they released any of the information. They scrubbed the numbers; and felt confident that they provided some options that were plausible.
● Regarding the Executive Summary prepared by staff, they supported the initial recommendations for strategic items. They were the low-hanging fruit that required little capital investment but could yield some positive results.
● In the long term, to maintain financial solvency, would require that system had its policy house in order. Part of that involved addressing the smaller items, be they hours of operation, special event rates (knowing competitors were charging more), and others that would be easy to implement from an operations standpoint. The challenge was getting policy approval.
● From their perspective, they supported the initial steps advised by staff in their Executive Summary, but knew that policies and procedures for implementation would need to be addressed before they could actually take place.

Baron responded to a question from Bergamini, regarding the info on page 46 (handout attached) and the prudence of stretching out the lives of old facilities 20 years beyond their "useful lives".
● In initial meetings with staff, questions were raised about different scenarios.
● Exhibit 40: Showed expenditures if Gov East were replaced right away, but that was all. The rest of the facilities would be maintained on an annual basis and kept up to the best standard possible, by investing in capital repairs.
● Exhibit 41: Showed another scenario where on a scheduled basis, the facilities would be replaced over a 20-year period. To save space on the page, the info had been condensed. But as an aggregate and factored into financial models shown later in the Report, it reflected a replacement schedule in line with their restoration engineer's recommendations.
● The reality was that the Utility would find a solution somewhere in between, which would be financially and market driven.
● Whether the facilities would be replaced on a 20-year period or a a 30-year period, the fact was that some action would need to be taken on the properties.
● The timing would likely be different than shown, but for modeling purposes, they needed to cast this first set of numbers down and then reflect them within their model.
● Millions could be invested that would allow a facility to limp along and buy time, by targeting the greatest need (joints, full slab replacement). A lot of

money can be invested doing this (vs. replacing the entire facility if perhaps enough capital isn't available). Cities did this often. It usually involved a disruption in revenue stream, because part/all of the facility had to be shut down for public safety. But it could be done.

● For this Report, their restoration specialists reviewed the annual condition appraisals and talked to the structural engineers contracted by the Utility to get a level of confidence that the facilities would not fall down within the next 15 years. After this review, they felt the facilities could be maintained with the proper capital investment; though not into perpetuity. Like any other structure, the entire facility would end up being rebuilt because of replacing all its different parts.

● The newest facilities in the best condition could probably be extended out the longest, possibly another 35-40 years.

● But the reality was that the average age of the Parking system's structured assets was 44 years; built in a time when technology was different. Facilities built now with new technology and approaches extended their useful lives out to 65-75 years.

● In preparing their charts, they knew they working with an aging system and scheduled the replacement of the facilities in responsible way, both financially and structurally (not to the point where the facilities would be on their very last legs).

Woznick noted that Parking had had an annual remediation schedule for decades, by means of 3-year contracts with structural engineers who were very knowledgable about what needed to be done to extend the lives of facilities. Because of investing in these contracts and in this level of expertise, the Utility now had some extra flexibility. If this hadn't been done, a garage like Gov East would now require major remediation, and we'd be forced to choose between $5M for remediation or $15M for replacement. Instead, the Utility had built a foundation over time, which now provided these alternatives. But then it became a financial consideration: Do we invest $8M over the next 20 years to maintain Gov East, or do we spend $18M now to replace it?

Referring to page 35, Kovich said that the cost of replacing all the facilities was staggering. Each situation called for a cost-benefit analysis, also taking into account air rights and other options, such as other developments: what we might do with Judge Doyle Square or a transit center at Lake Street. Taking these other options into account presented a whole different picture than the one presented in the Report.

Baron said that as he had stressed with staff, what they had before them was a fairly static document. But the Parking system was a living organization, which would have movement on a monthly and quarterly basis: New tenants coming in, potential new development activities that would drive decisions. Flexibility was key, and the Report served the Utility by providing context for decisions that would be made. The costs shown on page 35 could change, if air rights were sold to a developer who wanted to build mixed-use above the garage, which would affect the foundation and associated costs. A lot of factors played into costing. What they provided were generous estimates, knowing that the cost of facility would include some mixed-use development, which was in line with the vision of the master plans. No longer would we have free-standing, utilitarian structures.

Discussion followed.

● **(Kovich) As pointed out, though replacement would be expensive, it may be more economical in the long haul compared to the costs of remediation. This would have to be analyzed on a facility-by-facility basis.**

● **(Woznick) Also, a new facility could be built much "greener" now, with lighting and protection systems that would have immediate operational impacts, though we wouldn't know how much impact until they were installed. We could save a lot with more efficient lighting in Gov East, but it probably wouldn't make sense to make a big investment in this when the facility was slated to be replaced shortly. However, it made sense to install $500K+ of lighting at State St Cap where it would last for the next 25 years and would pay off.**

● **(Kovich) This was an example of how technology would come into play.**

● **(Baron) The existing footprint and depth, which included the current partial below-grade floors, were used as the basis for the above-ground estimates. The Report based costs on replacing the existing supply. (Though efficiencies might cause some net gains in spaces, these wouldn't be material.) Costs were leveraged in cases where floors were partially below-grade.**

● **(Baron) Below-grade estimates were based on construction being fully below-grade, with the surface at podium level. The rooftop would be a ground level with a membrane separating above- and below-grade, and separating ownership rights as well. For these estimates, they had worked with local engineers and their own staff around the country, where actual projects were underway. Having been cautioned by stakeholders not to be too high in their below-grade costs, they were comfortable with their numbers which were based on industry research.**

● **(Baron) Many cities had the vision of below-grade parking in their master plans; or that placed parking in an area that wasn't a focal point of their downtowns where they wanted high density, walkability, connectivity, and where the facility was not a pedestrian wasteland. But when these plans went to the finance department, things changed. These cities ran into similar challenges: how to design a facility that met architectural treatment standards, was positioned in a good location, and worked with the community, with mixed use at grade level; to find ways to modify the facility so it fit within their budget but still achieved most of the master plan objectives.**

● **(Dailey) Regarding demand, what assumptions were used in terms of population growth and mode-share, car ownership rates?**

● **(Baron) They had used a very conservative model. Its purpose was not to ID future need, but instead to ID how to maintain a financially sustainable system. From a conservative standpoint, they looked at the existing demand base. Demand was adjusted when they looked at different pricing models, using elasticity demand factors derived from research. So their numbers were very conservative; they hadn't added the layer of unknowns (like population growth, etc.).**

● **(Baron) They kept in mind that Parking and Transit were combined in one Commission. Many times, building more parking induced people to use more parking. Madison was unique, different from other cities which built their way out of challenges (with more parking). Madison had solid public transit, cycling, and quality alternatives to parking. So when they looked at solvency, they kept in mind assets currently in place, and how they supported growth in the other areas and use of other modes.**

● **One way to do that was to set policies for parking that incentivized people to consider other options, whether it was user groups for different facilities, pricing, or hours of operation. Staff had conveyed that an important character in Madison was to have options for alternative modes of transportation; that**

though this was a parking study, it shouldn't be done in a silo, alone.
● They had assumed the worst-case scenario, that demand for parking would remain stable.
● (Dailey) What were the odds of that being perhaps the best-case scenario, into the more distant future? Based on their national expertise, what were their projections for self-driving cars to change car ownership in the future?
● (Baron) Based on research just recently published that looked at demographics and age groups, car ownership was decreasing.
● (Baron) Developers for a new residential housing project in Seattle had built no parking onsite; and instead put in more quality units with great amenities. They had a waiting list. Pittsburgh, a city with a driving culture, had brought in Google with 350 employees, many of whom owned Vespas and bikes rather than cars. They would be using a "zip car" that Google kept parked outside their site. The developer had built a 1,000-car garage according to code, that was sitting largely vacant. The City had asked Walker to start looking at more localized reduction of code or perhaps even elimination. Before taking such a big leap, the City would likely wait and see what was working in other cities.
● Developers didn't usually put together a model that was unfeasible or destined to fail. They put together business models they believed would work. typically on the residential side, car ownership and driving were dropping. But for retail, developers were still pushing to make sure they remained competitive with the suburbs. On the other hand, certain hotels were greatly reducing their parking. One hotel that had just built 250 rooms, had just 14 spaces for parking; on the assumption that people would park on-street or take taxis to the hotel. They were taking an aggressive, urban sustainable model.
● They did not anticipate any radical disruption. Owners were putting more bike parking in their facilities, moped/motorcycle parking, and even starting to charge (now the norm on the coasts). But they weren't seeing any major cultural shifts.
● (Bergamini) The Report did refer to the new City zoning code that had dropped the minimum requirement for parking. And they were in fact seeing some developments, for example on E. Wilson, that would have fewer than one parking stall/unit; lower than it would have been, had the code not changed; and low enough that it had engendered community discussion as to whether that was adequate and how that need would be satisfied (if not by the new building itself).
● (Baron) When code changes like this one (for parking) were made, quality alternatives were needed, perhaps by adjusting policy. On-street parking might be an alternative, unless it was full all the time. Then the question would be what policies would help create better access to supply; and that related back to the public parking system and not the private developer. Policies had to be synchronized to maximize resources.
● (Baron) For a high density downtown area with quality developments, it was preferable not to have a third of the property used for parking. But if there weren't an option to offer residents who had cars, developers were put in a difficult position. In discussions with staff, they had agreed that a synchronized dance needed to happen with polices to shift demand from where people were currently parking and finding it was not as easy to access as they wanted; to create alternatives for them to make a choice that hopefully would better fit their needs, whether that be financial or times of operation.

Kovich/Dailey made a motion to accept the Report. Schmidt pointed out that this was a Q&A session, and didn't require a motion. He had been coordinating with Anne Monks at the Mayor's Office and Woznick, as to how they might go

on with next steps; and a discussion about the (scope of the) Report could be part of that. Kovich withdrew her motion.

Golden requested copies of the TPC Minutes from (May) 2013, which contained the discussion about the scope of work for the sustainability study.

Members and staff discussed the Report further.
● (Golden) The Report was substantially different than what the Commission had originally expected, which he believed the Minutes would show. Though the Report was competent, it didn't contain the variables needed to make policy and provide policy direction.
● (Golden) It wasn't clear who was making that policy. He thought they (the members) were the Parking Utility, but it seemed these decisions were not being made at the Commission. If this was the case, then they might as well just accept the Report rather than pretending that they were in charge of something.
● (Golden) If there was a direction to be taken and there were other variables that he believed should be considered but weren't in the Report, or if it was now being decided retroactively that such variables (in the earlier Minutes) would not go into the Report, then they didn't have enough to go on.
● (Golden) The Report assumed that we would rebuild everything the way it currently is if we could afford it, and that the world really wouldn't be changing very much, because we would build roughly the same facilities. What about the larger downtown: What was our role in the E. Washington corridor and in the Park Street corridor?
● (Golden) Who was the market they were serving? They were planning to rebuild the Lake Street ramp. As mentioned by Woznick at the previous meeting, while utilization %'s were not high there, the ramp was needed for events with overflows, to support the Kohl Center, Memorial Union and other facilities nearby. When making a mental list of these facilities, the UW came to mind; so why was the Utility providing the UW parking facilities? Though not suggesting this as a recommendation, these were the kinds of policy initiatives the Report specifically didn't cover.
● (Golden) The Commission needed to have those policy discussions, if they were to do a competent job of managing the Utility. If they accepted the Report, then things would just happen. Their generation of Commissioners would see the rebuilding of Judge Doyle Square/Gov East; but there would be 11 new people at the Commission for the next one, who wouldn't have the history.
● (Golden) Though not trying to sound angry or bitter, something was bothering him at the end of the last meeting. Then he realized, why were they even considering this? Why not just ship the Report off to the Council and the Mayor's Office, and go on about their business because they were not really participating in this in any meaningful way.
● (Schmidt) The follow-up currently being discussed would involve a Ad Hoc Parking Strategic Plan Committee with 3 alders, 3 TPC members and 3 citizens who would have various designations. Its goal was to address the kinds of questions raised by Golden. He had been asking the same sorts of things at the end of the last meeting, after which Monks had suggested they talk.
● (Schmidt) Whether the Report they got was what they asked for and as for what they should do with it, he didn't know. Perhaps they would need to answer that as part of the next step.
● (Golden) He wasn't just trying to do an "I told you so", that they had an expectation and didn't get it. His point was that they had had very revealing discussions about the scope of things they needed to consider, for the future

of the Parking Utility. So he wondered if they needed all that, what was the best way of pursuing that?

● (Golden) Not to critique of the process outlined by Schmidt, he wondered if 3 citizen members could fairly represent all the stakeholders constituencies, in view of the current and potential scope of the Utility; with all the neighborhood associations near E. Washington and Park Street, with DMI, BID, UW, and other facilities that relied on the Utility. Maybe more than three were needed.

● (Golden) They had also received a communication from DMI, that he had helped to write because he agreed with it, which called for a Strategic Parking Task Force just to do this strategic thinking. He hoped the different proposals could be brought together rather than dealing with them piecemeal.

● (Schmidt) That was the process they were trying to undertake. Though he hadn't looked at the DMI proposal recently, the goal was similar.

● (White) The new committee brought to mind the previous (2006) Parking Strategic Plan Committee that included TPC, alders, DMI and others. Not to say that another group wasn't needed, but hadn't they already had some of these conversations? What happened with that group; was there a report?

● (Woznick) The work of that committee never resulted in an actual report; but basically created this process. The Walker Report and Staff Report were kind of the culmination of the eight years between then and now. The question before them now was, what was the strategic plan?

● (Woznick) He agreed with Schmidt: In his discussions with the Mayor's Office, they were trying to create what Golden was asking for. What they wanted to do now was to embark on the policy discussions, and to create the body to facilitate that process.

● (White) She hoped they could move the current process forward, because having had similar conversations a couple times before, this felt like deja vu.

● (Kovich) Having previously discussed how critical it was to develop a strategic plan, Schmidt's proposal would be an excellent way to move things forward and to keep on task to make sure a plan was developed. Relative to any kind of work done by a consultants, they had to start with assumptions. Based on her own experience with sensitivity and scenario analyses, she knew that assumptions had to be made in doing any kind of projection or study. A study couldn't take everything into account and vary everything, unless a very, very extensive study was done.

● (Kovich) Having a base case, having the numbers with an understanding of what went into those numbers, as well as having the choice to do other studies on a facility-by-facility basis, she felt they had the base information to move forward. She supported the direction Schmidt was discussing, which the Commission should pursue and be very actively involved in.

● (Golden) He had heard people use the word "we". He didn't know what "we" they were talking about.

● (Golden) He hadn't heard anything about the 2006 Strategic Plan until he read the Staff Report. By contrast, the Ad Hoc Transit committee had had a level of visibility, and had been carried into the future. Referring to page 2 of the Staff Report and the status of five issues identified by the 2006 Ad Hoc Parking committee, he felt it was like looking through the wrong end of a telescope. It wasn't very bold (though he wasn't saying they needed bold).

● (Golden) As a member of the Parking Utility, a) he didn't have a sense of where they were going other than to continue and replace what they had; and b) he didn't have a sense that, (whether it was a good direction or not, he wouldn't debate because he wasn't really sure what it was), they as the Utility were essentially even participating increating that direction. If that's what people wanted, he wasn't elected anymore; so he had to take what he could

get. Apparently this was something he wasn't going to get.

● (Kovich) She verified with Schmidt: The plan was to create a strategic plan with the TPC well-represented; the TPC would be part of the process; this was important for them to do; and all of the info from the Report and all of the TPC members would be involved. Knowing this, she was supportive and thought they were headed in the right direction in trying to accomplish what she had heard everyone say they wanted to accomplish: to have a strategic plan that used the info as its foundation upon which they could build, and that the TPC would see that this happens.

● (White) While supportive of what people were saying, she felt there were other issues that needed to be addressed. She also cautioned that they didn't get caught up in the process (such as the number of stakeholders). She had heard the same conversation in 2006. She urged that they just discuss the issues and develop a plan.

● (Bergamini) It sounded like some group of people had been talking about next steps, with the study being one of the building blocks. She wondered if they might expect a proposal constituting an ad hoc parking committee (like the ad hoc Long-Range Transit Planning Committee) to be on the July agenda.

● (Schmidt) There were different ways this could be approached. Anne Monks was recommending that an ad hoc committee be created by the Council and appointed by the Mayor. This would require a Council resolution, which could be introduced at the 7/1 Council meeting and brought to the July TPC, which would be the vehicle containing a description of who would be on the committee and what its goals would be. He didn't think the TPC needed to create its own agenda item, because this would be coming from the Council.

● (Schmidt) His question to the members: Did they want this to be a subcommittee of the TPC or an ad hoc committee? The logic for forming an ad hoc committee was that it would offer the opportunity to bring in stakeholders who were not members of the TPC. (Though they could indeed do all the work, he wasn't sure if that would be the best approach.)

● (Schmidt) The balance of membership could be figured out. He was not wedded to what he was seeing on the draft proposal, which he had received just before the meeting (and had briefly described earlier). The draft did contain parameters about timelines, which was found to be useful in keeping ad hoc policy committees focused.

● (Kovich) She like the idea of an ad hoc committee because it would have a broader stakeholder base, visibility and public deadlines, and would help bring forward concerns that they had. As long as the TPC was well-represented and involved in the process, it would accomplish what they wanted and would raise to a higher level of importance and visibility.

● (Schmidt) The proposed committee would not be a child of the TPC, for reasons related to how Legistar works. He wanted this to be a Legistar body, with Legistar control ofthe agenda items; this was sort of a technicality. But since they had members coming from outside of TPC, it was probably better to make it an ad hoc committee that the Council created.

● (Bergamini) The Long-Range Metro Planning Ad Hoc Committee had been a very large committee, which produced a long list of recommendations. TPC was essentially its Lead. In terms of how the document was used, it had become the bailiwick of Metro to reference those items from time to time. Planning was reiterative. Would it make sense to use that model, where many reps from community groups and City committees might be involved, but that the committee would report back to the Parking Utility and those responsible for it?

● (Schmidt) There was no reason the committee couldn't report back to the

Parking Utility (TPC).
● (Golden) He wasn't sure if this element would address his concerns; he would have to see the actual proposal.

Bergamini thanked Baron for his work and presentation, and asked staff to distribute the 2013 Minutes containing the original discussion about the scope of work for the study.

F.2.   34361   Update from TPC Subcommittee to Review Taxi Regulations & Shared-Ride Services, Chair Wayne Bigelow

Subcommittee Members Amanda White talked about the 6/2 meeting of the Subcommittee, along with Ann Kovich and Kate Lloyd, who made additional comments.
● The meeting began with a public hearing, with 15 members of the public speaking and quite a few more who were in the room.
● About a third of the 15 speakers were in support of Uber/Lyft, inc. a couple of students who used the service.
● The other 10 or so speakers, many of whom were cab drivers, spoke in opposition.
● Similar to testimony at the Commission, speakers had concerns about fairness to other cab companies and the fact that Uber/Lyft were cab companies that weren't local and weren't covering the entire city, 24-hour access, insurance, public safety.
● Mayor Soglin discussed the social role cab companies played, and expressed concerns that Uber/Lyft could not guarantee full coverage of the city and 24/7 access in some of the more underserved parts of the city, who will be underserved by Uber/Lyft.
● Other of his concerns: whether vehicle warranties would be in effect for drivers using their personal vehicle, since they were using them as commercial vehicles; and that any vehicle used as a taxi had to be disclosed as such when it was sold, but this was unlikely to happen.
● The Attorney's Office had decided that Uber/Lyft did qualify as cab services; and the Subcommittee would probably be proposing some small but important changes to the ordinances describing what taxis are, to better reflect the current situation.
● Re: risk management and insurance, they heard from both Uber and Lyft (with a speaker from San Francisco), who gave more feedback on their insurance and how their coverage worked.
● City staff indicated that the companies would probably meet the $1M insurance policy requirement and some others.
● But questions around insurance remained as to how the drivers would be registered as cab companies: Would Uber/Lyft apply or would the individual drivers be required to apply? This raised such issues as how we would ensure that they had insurance, and whether the coverage would be up to par for what the City required.
● A lot of questions remained related to the registration of individual drivers and how the insurance coverage worked.
● One big issue the Subcommittee would be tackling: The companies did provide $1M coverage for the drivers as long as the drivers had confirmed a pick-up; they had to be en route to pick up that passenger. The gray area was when the app was turned on but they had not confirmed a pick-up, then the $1M policy would not cover them. Both companies were now offering a supplemental policy for that instance, but it was only $50K.
● Another big issue they'd be addressing was fairness to the cab companies;

and how did these new companies fit into the requirements the City currently had.

● **(Kovich) Another insurance issue: While the individuals had personal insurance, most of those insurance policies wouldn't cover them when they were using their car for commercial use. The Mayor raised some interesting questions, whether those drivers understood the impact of this activity on the value of their car, on their insurance coverage, among other things.**

● **(Kovich) They had had a lot of discussion about public safety, and when in the process was the driver actually working in a commercial manner, since the process included having the app on, accepting the ride, and then actually having a passenger in the vehicle. These were issues were complex, as were the definitions.**

● **Staff clarified that Subcommittee minutes were being taken by TE's Keith Pollock, and that the minutes from the previous meeting were published when the new agendas were published.**

● **The group was meeting about every three weeks, with the next meeting planned for 6/26.**

General discussion followed.

● **(Golden) Since the drivers were also Madison residents, the gray area could be that the companies' insurance wouldn't cover them when their app was on but they weren't doing something; but it may be that their personal insurance wouldn't cover them either. In his experience with people doing adult foster care, they were required to have homeowner's insurance. But when their insurance company found out about the foster care, they considered it commercial use of the home and there was no on/off switch; the homeowner was not covered at all. The Uber/Lyft drivers may find that even when the app was off, they may not be covered. The Subcommittee may want to probe this coverage question more; and if needed, perhaps look at some sort of informed consent requirement, where the companies would have to inform the drivers of coverage parameters.**

● **(Lloyd) Most of the drivers were not telling their insurance companies what they were doing.**

● **(White) They had looked at Alder Resnick's proposal, and she didn't think most of the companies would agree to quite a few of the changes.**

● **(Lloyd) They discussed the 24/7 enforcement issue, and the fact that the Uber/Lyft app simply said they were "not available". They could say they were available 24/7, but it would hard to determine if this were true.**

When Subcommittee members were asked for the Subcommittee's take on the Resnick resolution, Schmidt called a point of order because the Resnick resolution hadn't reached the Commission formally yet. It was okay to report on what happened at the Subcommittee, but not to discuss an item that was going to be on the (TPC) agenda.

Please note: A Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Schmidt left the meeting at this point, at 6:27 PM.

Present: 6 -   Lucas Dailey; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Kate D. Lloyd and Amanda F. White

Excused: 5 -   Chris Schmidt; Anita Weier; David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow and Gary L. Poulson

F.3.   **34374**   Metro: Summary of Public Input Sessions held in October, 2013 - TPC 06.11.14

Kamp said that the Summary would be a guiding document in developing Metro's 2014 budget. Beck outlined the issues and the biggest challenges for Metro.(See bullet points of the Summary, attached.) Comments from the input sessions were similar to feedback they received normally. Staff responded to questions and expanded on the issues and challenges.

● Staff wasn't planning to hold another input session before the budget was presented. This first session had been a pilot. They hoped to hold an input session once a year. Perhaps they could do it in the pre-budget cycle.

● Overcrowding: Safety and on-time issues were involved. They used to call in an Extra to help relieve highly overcrowded routes; but now they couldn't find a bus anywhere. Every available bus was out on the street. Because of overloads, people were getting passed up and there was nothing they could do about it.

● Requests from Epic: Existing trips on the Route 55 had evened out. But Route 75 (that came directly from the Square to/from Epic) was especially scary. The extra trip in the PM, which was timed well, had helped. But in the AM when they were pounded with school trips and commuters, there wasn't much they could do. Though Epic would pay for the extra service, they didn't have the extra buses or a place to keep them.

● Staff had gotten creative juggling buses and drivers, sometimes timing switches down to a minute or two.

● With new service to the new UW Hospital East, staff was busy trying to figure out how to do this most efficiently. They were tentatively planning to run a full-size bus on weekdays; and possibly provide some sort of demand-response service on weeknights and weekends, perhaps use a small rather than big bus (though the difference in savings might be negligible).

● Some efficiences might be gained through the Route 25, currently a commuter run with two trips in the AM and two in the afternoon; and through the Route 26 out of East Towne during the middle of the day.

● Regarding planning for possible garage facilities at Nakoosa Trail (previously discussed at the April meeting), Metro was in the "mix" for space, as was a bio-digester, the Library and the Monona Terrace. The Plan would be done by fall, and Metro was hoping they could get 40-50 buses out there as a satellite facility.

● In two out of their last four budgets, they had had supplemental requests for leasing space as a short-term option. The supplementals hadn't been approved; but that was a back-up plan. (One possibility had been a location near MATC, which would have housed 15-20 buses.) They would continue to work with the Real Estate staff to look for space, both for the short- and medium-term.

At the request of members, Kamp said Metro would have future agenda items to update them on facility review processes (short and long term), Epic, and the capital budget proposal.

G.   NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

G.1.   34309   Amending Sections 23.561 and 1.08(3)(a) of the Madison General Ordinances to reflect changes to Wis. Stat. § 349.13(3m) related to trespass parking and to establish bail deposits for violating this section.

Bergamini noted that a change in a State Statute had necessitated a change in the Madison Ordinances. A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Dailey,

to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G.2. **34167**   Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a Section 5307, public transit capital, capital maintenance, and capital planning grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

Bergamini mentioned this item came up annually. A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Kovich, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G.3. **34241**   Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Madison Area Technical College (Madison College) for provision of access by Madison College students to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement for student trips during the contract period.

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

G.4. **34262**   Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute an agreement with Lamers Bus Lines, Inc. to help defray maintenance costs for the Dutch Mill Park & Ride lot for a term of three years (April 1, 2014 - March 31, 2017) with an option for one three-year renewal (April 1, 2017 - March 31, 2020) to be exercised administratively by the Metro Transit General Manager.

Bergamini pointed out a typo on page 2, which named Greyhound rather than Lamers. Staff would fix this before returning the item to Council. When asked about the dollar amount, Kamp said it depended on the number of pick-ups and drop-offs per day. They used a range for charges, depending on whether buses were there 8-10 times vs. 4-6 times per day. They tried to keep the ratio roughly the same; a little negotiation went on. This reflected the average rate for pick-ups/drop-offs per day. In terms of agreements, they had lost Badger, but had picked up Greyhound and now Lamers. Four of the past six years they had made more revenue than expenses. This had worked well for them.

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

H.   UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

H.1. **34373**   Metro: Staff recommendation re: ADATS motion to expand service - TPC 06.11.14

Beck discussed the staff recommendation. To meet the request, they would have to expand Route 15 further west on Old Sauk Road and into the neighborhoods north of Old Sauk. Their first thought was that this might make commuter service viable out there, peak hour only, but not all day, as would be required by ADA reg's. It would get expensive to stretch Route 15 anymore because they would have to add a bus into the rotation, costing $100K's. Also,

Metro had had no other requests to expand service into the area, except for The Jefferson. Alder Skidmore had asked Metro to go and talk to the residents, which they did. It would be nice to do it, but it would be costly. So staff was recommending against it. Golden/Kovich made a motion to endorse the staff recommendation. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

I. **REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only**
   (Most recent meeting minutes electronically 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
      Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
      TPC Subcommittee to Review Taxi Regulations & Shared-Ride Services

      No action was needed on these items.

J. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

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

      Bergamini noted that the Organizational Meeting would be held at the July meeting. The current TPC Rules and Procedures would be sent out to members electronically, and if members had any suggestions for changes, they could submit them to staff by June 30th. Members were also asked to review the private roster sent to them.

J.2. **Commission member items for future agendas**

      Dailey mentioned that he needed to attend a Monroe Street Reconstruction meeting on July 9, and would not be able to attend the July TPC.

  ADJOURNMENT

      A motion was made by White, seconded by Golden, to Adjourn at 6:50 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.