



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, September 14, 2016

5:00 PM

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

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Noting that a quorum was present, Poulson called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM. He thanked Bergamini for chairing the Commission's August meeting.

Present: 8 - David Ahrens; Rebecca Kemble; Wayne Bigelow; Gary L. Poulson; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden; Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 3 - Ledell Zellers; David E. Tolmie and Margaret Bergamini

Please note: Ahrens arrived at 5:01 PM. Johnson arrived at 5:03 PM, and Kemble arrived at 5:04 PM, after the Minutes were approved.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Kovich, to Approve the Minutes of the August 10, 2016 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None. [Please note: Agenda Item E.2. was taken up ahead of Item E.1.]

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.1. [44376](#)

Parking: September 2016 Activity Report, and July Revenue/Expense/Occupancy Reports - TPC 09.14.16

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item E.2.] Asst. Parking Utility Manager Sabrina Tolley addressed a question raised at the August meeting about a large increase in capital expenses reported for July. This was tied to the timing of a payment for the lighting project at Cap Square North that fell in July. Tolley then responded to questions and requests.

- Re: benchmarks for the Judge Doyle garage, the contract was being finalized, and they were beginning the pre-design phase, starting to define their needs.
- Re: data about revenues and utilization for Special Events, the financial system tracked Special Event revenue by facility. In the current reports, this

was tied into the daily visitor or cashiered info; but this could be pulled out and presented separately.

- Likewise, data about revenue and length of stay per entry could be pulled and provided periodically.

Kovich/Bigelow made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.1.]

E.2. [44378](#)

Metro: YTD Fixed & Paratransit Performance Indicators, Financial, Performance Measures, and Rider/Revenue/Fare Type Reports - TPC 09.14.16

Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp noted that about a dozen transit systems across the State had recently reported on their ridership changes, which showed trends similar to Metro: With an average of -5%, data points ranged from +1% growth in Milwaukee to -14% drop in Janesville, with Madison at -9% YTD. Kovich/Streit made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

F.1. [44379](#)

Metro: Advertising Update - TPC 09.14.16

Kamp said that staff was pleased by the implementation, growth and success of the program. Metro Marketing and Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch and Transit Advertising Sales Associate Peg Anthony discussed the report of Advertising Space Sales (attached).

- The program was doing well.
- While issues about ad content had come up in the past, this was now being handled internally and complaints had dropped to almost nothing.
- Revenue was starting to take off. Already booked for \$561K in sales through YE, the total could reach as high as \$580+K. With a record amount this year, the program would hit a goal set years ago by the Transit Ad Hoc committee of 1% of operating revenue. Continued growth was expected.
- Of the 60-65 clients, half were non-profit, City or UW-related agencies; many had not been customers previously, inc. smaller orgs who now had a chance to participate and get to know more about Metro.
- The transition had gone smoothly over the four years, with virtually no complaints.
- Metro worked with local vendor, Monarch, who did all of the production and installations.
- With ads being handled directly, staff could provide recommendations to alcohol advertisers, who were very agreeable.
- Sales staff had good working relationships with other City agencies and within Metro itself, who were taking more ownership of the program.
- The program had a local focus. It afforded orgs and businesses a close working relationship with Metro.
- Anthony did some prospecting, but this depended on incoming requests and her workload as the central person for all transactions and installations.
- Production sales were fees collected for production costs (printing of vinyl and installation).
- Customers reported that before the program was brought in-house, production charges had been steep.
- To keep ads affordable, Metro kept mark-up on production very low, and

instead tried to make their money in space.

- So the dollar amount shown for production sales was pretty much what local vendors would receive from Metro.

Kamp added that with 215 buses total, and 180 buses going out on the road every peak period, Anthony skillfully coordinated the installation of the ads with the Maintenance staff, who very much appreciated the way she did this.

F.2. [44382](#)

Parking: Update on 2017 Capital Budget - TPC 09.14.16

Tolley discussed Parking's 2017 Capital Budget, starting with the last page of the budget document (attached).

- The total budget request was \$32.325M; with \$7.665M in new funding for 2017; the other \$24.660M were for reauthorization requests.
 - ~\$19.6M would come from Parking reserves (for reauthorizations @\$17.95M and new projects @ \$1.665M); with \$6.708M reauthorized and \$6M new funding from TIF-GO borrowing (for Cap East).
- (Re: projects on pages 3-6) The budget included seven projects and three ongoing capital programs (recurring cap projects that were standing items in their budget).
- Asset Management System: Reflected Parking's portion of this city-wide project.
- Proposed Cap East Structure: Funded by TIF-GO borrowing; no Parking reserves allocated. If approved, construction would start late spring-early summer 2017.
- Garage Lighting Replacement: Cap Sq North and State St Campus-Lake had been completed. Overture and State St Cap would be completed in 2017, and State St Campus-Frances in 2018. Significant savings (\$1K/month) and reductions in electrical use were already being seen at Cap Sq North. At Lake, only the lighting was replaced, not fixtures, at a relatively minor cost of \$10-15K, which would be recaptured over 1-2 years.
- Garage Wayfinding Signs: At State St Cap-Lower Level, arrows would show direction to take for open spaces. At JD, visuals of rows would show open spaces. Would be esp. helpful at high usage facilities.
- Judge Doyle (JD) Garage: Expected to start in 2017, funded by \$13.1M Parking reserves with the rest mainly TIF.
- Overture Center Elevator: Starting at end of 2016-early 2017, the 5-8 week project would significantly improve the reliability of the elevator. For folks who need to use the elevator, money had been included to speed up the project, which would be done at slowest time of year to limit impact on customers as much as possible.
- Overture Ctr Customer Service Center: Would provide a central office with cameras for staff (vs. in-lane cashiers), who could be more mobile to assist customers and offer additional services like permit sales. Project included a stormwater diverter; construction to start in 2018.
- Garage Repairs: An annual program for maintenance and inspections.
- Revenue Equipment Replacement: A contract with HUB was being finalized, and would be brought to TPC/CC. New equipment would be completed in all the garages in 2017, exc. JD to be done when built.
- Sayle Street: Renovation there was an ongoing project.
- Single Space Meter Replacement: Should be done by 2018; with pilot this winter of Single Space Smart meters that contain occupancy sensor to clear meter when space vacated.
- Vehicle Replacement: Previously in operating budget, now in capital, to

better reflect operating costs. This would help timing issues with purchasing as well.

- Parking had \$34M in total reserves as of YE 2015. Using \$19M in 2017 for reauthorizations and new projects, Parking would have ~\$15M reserves remaining after 2017. Also, \$4-5M was generated annually in additional reserves.

Ahrens pointed out that page 2 omitted all the reauthorization money, which made the numbers harder to understand. The \$13M for Cap East was in flux: some ~\$4M was GO borrowing, some was Parking reserves. Things were up in the air even though lots of money was being spent on design. It wasn't clear whose pocket the money was coming from. He hoped they would have a better fix on this before moving forward too much.

F.3. [44383](#)

Metro: Update on 2017 Capital Budget - TPC 09.14.16

Kamp discussed Metro's 2017 Capital Budget document (attached), and answered questions.

- Bus Rapid Transit was shown in the budget for the first time; scheduled for 2019-2021.
- The Satellite Facility had been moved back a year to 2018-2020.
- The hope was that the Satellite garage would be finished, then the BRT would be finished, with BRT service available in late 2021 or 2022.
- A primary focus of the budget was on maintaining what they had now.
- Transit coaches were shown every year, with 2018-19 a bit higher when Paratransit vehicles would be replaced.
- (Re: projects on pages 3-4) Bus Rapid Transit: The FTA was persuaded that the \$2M remaining in Transport 2020 grant funds originally for commuter rail could be used for BRT (high-capacity transit), starting with an alternatives analysis in 2017-18.
- If the feds liked their alternatives analysis, then through Small Starts funding, they would move into project development and construction phases in 2020-21.
- The strategy would be to use the ~\$17.5M in local funding planned for the TIGER grant bus garage, to do an 80/20% grant for Small Starts and BRT, and to do an 80/20% for the bus garage in future TIGER grants. The fact that the garage was for BRT could work to show a greater commitment, as could the fact that BRT was included in the CIP for the first time.
- In their earlier TIGER application for funding for a garage that was rejected, Metro had beefed up the local share from 20% to 50% to improve their chances for getting the grant.
- Since then, the City had started looking into a separate federal program called Small Starts, which was geared toward projects under \$100M, such as BRT. Staff had seen other cities approved for Small Starts BRT projects, with 80% federal funding.
- Now the idea was to take the \$17.5M previously planned for a 50/50 grant for a garage, and use it as the 20% portion of a TIGER grant for a garage, as well as to use it as the 20% portion of a Small Starts grant for BRT.
- The corridor for the first phase of the BRT had not yet been selected. This would be part of the alternatives analysis. The cost in the budget reflected what it would take to build an 8- to 10-mile corridor. The decision as to which corridor would be done first, would be made later. The TPC could be involved in that discussion and make recommendations.

Acknowledging that capital budget decisions were under the purview of the

Council, Golden was troubled that the TPC hadn't had any direct involvement in it, because it was so important to transit's future. While feeling that as elected officials, the Council should make budget decisions, he felt that the TPC should be more involved because they oversaw transit operations on a more detailed basis. He thought the Council might benefit from their advice.

Ahrens asked what the terms of that involvement would be. Golden said that each June, the managers of Parking and Metro could present to the TPC the projects that they thought were really needed and wanted to pursue. That would give Commissioners a chance to express their priorities. In some cases, reality would dictate the order of things (Ex. A garage was needed before more buses were purchased). But regarding the importance of one item or another (BRT, bus replacement, etc.), the TPC could give some good advice. They weren't the deciders, but their insight should be utilized.

F.4. [44384](#)

Metro: Update on Leg. File 44205 budget amendment to support bus purchase - TPC 09.14.16

Kamp said that this item for information only was a little different than in the past; and complied with guidelines. Metro wanted to pay their vendor for buses that had been delivered and were out in revenue service.

Metro Finance Manager Wayne Block said that when preparing their capital budget, they had calculated the cost of buses as what they paid the previous year + 3% for inflation. Some improvements to the buses added to the cost of the buses this year, more than budgeted estimates. This had happened in the past, but things were evolving in the Finance Department.

Metro had been able to generate a new purchase order in MUNIS for the extra costs back in January. But when they came to pay the bill, MUNIS blocked all their efforts to pay invoices. It turned out that a new feature in MUNIS would not let them pay anything in excess of what was shown in the capital budget. Even a dollar more could not be paid without Council approval.

Metro told Finance how serious this was: They couldn't expect their vendor, Gillig, to wait a month to be paid \$6.5M. The Finance Director agreed to override MUNIS, which allowed Metro to pay the bill. Afterward, the additional \$43K went to Council for approval. Block said that situations like this would likely happen more frequently among all agencies, since budgets were set a year and a half before some bills were paid; and any amounts in excess of budget would require Council approval.

Kamp mentioned that staff reviewed the improvements added to the buses; and they were relatively minor in nature. The overage was just .07% of total cost. To avoid this in the future, Kamp said that in their next round of 5-year contract for bus procurements, they might ask for a contingency and work with MUNIS to see if there was a way to put it in the system. Metro had a very close relationship with this vendor, and to have \$6M held up in their cash flow, put a strain on their otherwise constructive relationship. [Please note: Since it was not yet 6 PM, the meeting proceeded to Item H.1. and the remainder of the agenda.]

- G. 6:00 PM -- PUBLIC HEARING: To hear public comment on proposed changes to Special Event parking rates and to hourly rates at State Street Capitol-Lower Level, effective November 1st and at other times as described.

- G.1. [44385](#) Public Hearing on proposed parking rate changes to Special Event rates and rates at State Street Capitol-Lower Level - TPC 09.14.16

[Please note: After a short recess following Item J.1., the meeting resumed at 6:00 PM to conduct the Public Hearing, Item G.1.] Tolley discussed the parking rate change proposal (shown in the attached press release and staff memo), and answered questions.

- A system-wide rate change approved earlier in the year went into effect on June 1st.
- Some concern was raised about the flat Special Event (SE) rate of \$8 proposed at that time, that it would have a significant impact on short-term, non-event parkers. So it was decided that the SE change would wait and be considered at a later date, once the TPC Subcommittee and staff had worked through some options to provide additional short-term parking for non-event goers.
- Implementation and timing for the new SE proposal were unique, having no specific effective date due to the possibility that on-street meter enforcement hours could be extended to increase short-term parking availability.
- The change at State St Cap (SS Cap)-Lower Level was another option to address short-term parking. SS Cap-Lower Level had two bays of metered parking, and a gated section (of 106 spaces) used mainly for permit parking. Over the years, permit parkers had been shifted from the lower to upper levels, with the intent of expanding short-term parking in the Lower Level.
- To discourage long-term and SE parkers from using the Lower Level, and to avoid the need to enforce time limits, a higher tiered-rate was being proposed.
- In July, the Subcommittee approved a tiered schedule for SE rates (vs. one rate fits all), that would depend on anticipated attendance at the events. State St Campus was severely under the market rates charged in the UW area of \$10-15 (vs. \$5).
- Tier I events (@ \$8) would be used for the vast majority of special events/garages. Essentially, this was the SE base rate for all garages and Brayton Lot. It would be mainly used at Overture and SS Cap, since they were affected by 95-98% of all special events. Typically affected by larger events, State St Campus (SS Campus) was not likely to use the Tier I rate of \$8.
- Tier II events (@ \$10) would be used for larger sold-out events downtown or at the Kohl Center (under 10K), and would mainly apply to OC, State St Cap and SS Campus (basically the base level rate here).
- Tier III events (@\$15) would be used for highly attended Camp Randall or Kohl Center events, and would apply to SS Campus.
- Garages not near the event would be available at their normal rates. So for example, an MATC student who would normally park at SS Cap, could park at Cap Square North (CSN) to avoid SE rates.
- This SE pay-on-entry (POE) rates were only used to facilitate egress, when large numbers of people exited at one time. For example, such events as Art Fair, Maxwell Street Days were large events, but not everyone left at once, and SE rates were not used. On the other hand, for such events as Concerts on the Square, a SE rate was used at Cap Square North.
- Tier II and III rates would take effect at SS Campus on November 1st; Tier I and II implementation would depend on other conditions (as described on page 3 of staff memo).

Poulson called registrants forward.

Registrant Alexis Turner, Richie Road, Verona, 53593, neither supporting/opposing, spoke as follows: A Parking Utility employee for 23 years, Turner did not ever recall a special event POE for football. Turner felt such a fee wasn't practical.

- * The event was day-long; some people came in the night before; the ramp was often full, long before a game. SE fees were usually collected two hours before the start of an event. For a Noon game and fee start time of 10 AM, maybe a hundred people would pay the SE fee. The revenue wouldn't be worth the risk of annoying parkers who were not attending the game.
- * Businesses on State Street could be hurt. \$15 was too much; \$8 would be best.
- * The UW charged more, but they also had the option of removing vehicles parked past 6 AM. With 1,000 spaces and 24/7 and night permit parkers, how could the Campus garage be cleared for only SE parkers?
- * Parkers would also question why fees varied between \$8, \$10 or \$15.
- * It wasn't clear how much revenue would be generated.
- * Re: SE rates at SS Cap: Some MATC students might not feel safe walking the distance at night to Cap Sq North (as suggested). Plus it was staffed only to 6 PM, which might not be as comforting. Likewise, Overture volunteers who paid their own parking might not be able to park near Overture anymore.
- * When downtown orgs and businesses did well, the ramps did well. These groups could suffer from higher rates of \$10 or \$15.
- * POE fees helped with exiting, more so previously with the old equipment.

Registrant June Goglio, E. Dayton Street, 53703, opposed \$15 SE price for UW football, spoke as follows: A Parking Utility employee for 20 years, Goglio echoed Turner's comments, and hoped they would reconsider the football fee.

- * They had never charged for football, which was a different event from basketball or hockey, where people attended the event and left. Football was more of an all-day event, where people came to shop, eat, tailgate, and shop some more. There was no rush of people leaving.
- * People were likely to arrive earlier, to avoid the excessive fee. In her experience, SS Campus was full, two hours before the game started. They would not be charging people actually going to the game. As a few spaces opened up, they would be used by people who worked or shopped in the area. They would be the ones nailed by the fee.
- * The high fee would likely just push people to the other ramps, where they could pay less.
- * She asked that the fee for football be reconsidered, which was really the only part of the proposal she opposed.

Registrant Jo Vukelich, Hintze Road, 53704, spoke in opposition, as follows: A former Monona Terrace employee and now a Parking Cashier, she enjoyed her parking customers. As a public servant, she worked to serve people; not to lose money, but also not to gouge people.

- * At SS Cap, it used to cost \$15 to park for the weekend. After the latest increase, it now cost \$24, a huge raise.
- * We needed to look at all the ramifications. To build/sustain retail on State Street, parking costs needed to be considered, esp. with many retail areas having free parking.

- * Many people were experiencing economic hard times. We didn't want parking to become a luxury, elitist.
- * Out-of-towners were confused by different rates being charged in different areas of the ramps.
- * The proposal should be put on the back burner; if she had her way, the SE fee would not be increased.
- * MATC students, some who were moms, didn't have time to look for cheaper parking. Also, female students felt safer parking closer to the school.
- * It would be good to know how much revenue had been generated since June 1st.
- * Some UW parking was free at certain times.
- * With egress sometimes taking an hour after an event, how could we charge \$15 for that?
- * To be customer-friendly, we should deal with people as they were, and not just consider the stats. She had gotten to know her customers, and cared about them.

Registrant Celia Klehr, N. Fair Oaks, 53704, representing Forward Company, a Resident Company of Overture, spoke in opposition, as follows: She came to represent her artists, who made \$12/hour.

- * Her company was working hard to bring diverse, low-income people; to get away from the elitist label given to them.
- * They provided (subsidized) \$10 tickets; and she would find it really ironic if these customers paid \$15 for parking for an event they were struggling to provide to their customers. If rates were raised, she hoped the City would find ways to help provide parking for the Overture Resident artists and their guests.
- * The artists arrived three hours before a play and often left around midnight. She was uncomfortable with the idea of them walking across the Square for the sake of cheaper parking locations.

Streit pointed out that garages near Overture would rarely charge \$15 for SE parking, because attendance levels rarely got that high.

Registrant Ted DeDee, Comanche Way, 53704, representing Overture for the Arts, spoke in opposition, as follows: He represented the other (9) Resident Companies at Overture, as well as the non-resident orgs that used Overture throughout the year, which were subsidized/provided the use of the building at a very low cost.

- * Many of these groups sold tickets for \$10. Over 220,000 people were served the past year, with low-cost or free programs at Overture, which wasn't always about high ticket prices. Much was being done to make Overture affordable and accessible. What would happen to those people when parking rates went up? Would they stop coming?
- * Tier III events did kick in at Overture. On game days at UW, overflow parkers from SS Campus garage did park at the Overture (OC) garage. If Tier III rates were applied at other garages downtown, those parkers would migrate to OC or SS Cap garages, where \$8 might be charged for events at Capitol Theater or Overture Hall. Where would their people go?
- * Overture had over 500 volunteers, who worked without pay and paid for their parking. Raising their rates will send them to the County ramp or to the street meters, affecting residents. Also, Overture could lose volunteers, many of whom were retired, on fixed incomes. Some volunteers helped out 2-3x/week. They might decide they couldn't afford to volunteer anymore.

* What would happen to their customer base, if rates to them were raised by 60%? Not only would it impact the Utility, it would impact Overture also, esp. with the customers they wanted to attract and with their volunteers, who helped make this resource available to the community. With five theaters, they frequently had nights when they had events at Capitol Theater and Overture Hall, as well as the other theaters there; (in effect) making rates discriminatory.

Registrant Amelia Zirkle, Turner Avenue, 53716, spoke in opposition, as follows: Zirkle read the Utility's mission statement: To provide safe, convenient and affordable parking. She felt the proposal went against those goals.

* A Leadworker for the Parking Utility, she worked Saturday AMs, Monday and Tuesdays PMs, and dealt with football and special events and all the issues around that.

* She wasn't comfortable suggesting to an MATC student to park at Cap Sq North esp. on a sub-zero night.

* When SE fees were used at SS Cap, it was good to be able to offer the students the regular hourly rate of \$1.80 on the lower level, which less costly than the SE fee and diverted them from the SE traffic. Raising the rate to \$2.00/hr could end up costing them as much as SE rate if they parked for 3 hours, and they would take spaces away from the SE parkers.

* On football days, the SS Campus ramp was full by 8 AM, well ahead of the start time for SE parking. With a full ramp, paying four extra cashiers to come in for two hours to collect for SE was a waste of money.

* Waitresses and retail workers on State Street were already finding it hard to pay \$8, much less to now pay \$15.

* Having not been asked about the proposal, she was glad to have the chance to speak here. As someone with her feet on the ground for every shift she worked, she had a good handle on how this operated.

* She thought the proposal was bad for the community, bad for State Street, and bad for the Utility's public image in order to compete with the UW, whose parking was geared towards campus events. SS Campus provided parking for the entire community inc. the businesses in the area.

* Being on the ground, she and other Cashiers heard the complaints and took the brunt of them.

Registrant Greg Frank, Wallingford Circle, 53717, neither supported/opposed the proposal, and spoke as follows: A downtown business owner (Food Fight partner), Chair of the Downtown BID, Vice-Chair of Conv. & Visitors Bureau, and DCC Member, he heard a lot about parking and had an interest in it. The issues were not easy or straightforward.

* Maintaining short-term parking was important, esp. during special events, to ensure that non-event goers knew parking was available.

* While not over-the-top in favor of increasing rates for anything, he understood the need for the Utility to raise revenue to maintain the ramps and put new projects into play.

* Consider the impact of raising rates at a time they were studying how to bring more people downtown and the unintended negative impact on retail vitality downtown at this critical time. It would be a shame if the perception that parking wasn't available became a reason for them to stay home.

* Messages to downtown guests needed to be clear and understandable, not confusing.

Having no other registrants/speakers, Poulson closed the Public Hearing at 6:46 PM, and proceeded to Item G.2.

G.2. [44391](#)

Deliberation and action on proposed changes to parking rates for Special Events and State Street Capitol-Lower Level - TPC 09.14.16

Poulson noted that the Agenda provided for the possibility of the body acting at this meeting. Otherwise deliberation would go to their next meeting.

Members commented, and asked questions.

- Bigelow said he was annoyed to hear several speakers raise concerns about safety downtown at night. He and his wife had lived downtown for thirteen years, and they had never had a single incident when they felt threatened. Such comments weren't fair to downtown Madison, and they weren't true.
- Streit said he understood why they might charge more because others charged more. But for simplicity's sake and to avoid parkers shifting to different locations, he asked about revenue projections for applying a flat SE rate of \$8 vs. variable rates.
- Streit observed that a key purpose for POE was to reduce congestion, and that basketball and hockey goers exited the facility all at once after a game, while football goers didn't. But it was possible that basketball/hockey parkers would complain if they were charged, and football parkers weren't.
- Expressing appreciation for the people who came out to speak, Kemble said she was not ready to vote on the proposal, and would vote against acting on it at this time.

Tolley answered questions.

- Staff had looked at revenue projections when they first proposed a flat rate of \$8 back in January. The main goal of varying the rates was to be more in line with what was charged at adjacent facilities (esp. UW), which had been market rates in the area for a number of years.
- The Campus garage filled up quickly with football-event goers. It wasn't done with the idea of driving away non-event goers, some of whom probably got into the garage before it was filled.
- A higher rate on football days would have a significant impact on Special Event revenue at this facility. But in the bigger scheme, it probably wouldn't have a huge impact on total Utility revenue.
- SE POE fees had not typically been charged at the Campus garage. Higher staffing levels were needed for POE, and though the costs weren't huge, higher rates would help cover that.
- Because the Utility had significantly lower rates than other facilities, the main purpose for applying SE fees on football days would be to charge the going, market rate, not to expedite exiting.

[Please note: Kemble left at 6:50 PM, at this point in the meeting.]

Golden felt that they could not vote on the proposal at this time, for a number of reasons.

- More info about the fiscal implications was needed.
- Speakers raised some important points that needed to be addressed.
- Football was a different animal, and it wasn't yet clear how to deal with it.
- More hard data was needed on the impact of fees on various facilities. For example, Overture garage should be considered as part of the SE package for basketball events (since people would move there).
- The Utility needed to replace three facilities, and money was needed for this. This was important because Parking was not subsidized; it paid for itself. Did

we need the revenue here?

- What events made these garages full?
- A decision-making report was needed.

Ahrens echoed Golden's comments. More data was needed: Current fees compared to prospective fees; prospective increase of revenue (probably hard to pin down due to parkers moving around); whether revenue increases would offset the negative effects raised by speakers. [Please note: Ahrens left at 6:55 PM, at this point in the meeting.]

Bigelow/Golden made a motion to refer the proposal back to the TPC Subcommittee.

- Bigelow said he heard things tonight that had not come up at the Subcommittee, such as the finances involved and how particular facilities actually operated. A report that covered all the bases was needed. They couldn't expect staff alone to put something together; the Subcommittee needed to take another look, and specify what info they needed.
- Golden thought it would be helpful if members of public attended the Subcommittee.
- Streit hoped that the Subcommittee would take into account communicating the final package to the public.
- Poulson clarified that the motion did not include a timeline, but felt that sooner would be better than later.

With Kemble and Ahrens excused, the motion carried by voice vote/other.

H. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- H.1. [44202](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Meriter Health Services, Inc. for the provision of passes to its employees and volunteers for Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement to the transit utility for employee and volunteer trips for the period December 1, 2016 through November 30, 2017 with one automatic renewal for the period December 1, 2017 through November 30, 2018.

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

I. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only; no action required. (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 Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
TPC Subcommittee (to review issues outlined in Leg. File 37359)
Ad Hoc Transportation Ordinance Review Committee
Ad Hoc Metro Paratransit Medicaid Waiver Funding & Policy Review Committee

J. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
(For information only; not for discussion)

J.1. General Announcements by Chair

Poulson and Kamp noted that for the October meeting, Metro was planning to bring updates on the Contingency Reserves and Leave Attended Policy. Golden suggested that summaries of business at other TPC-connected committees would be useful. At 5:53 PM, Poulson recessed the meeting until the Public Hearing at 6 PM.

J.2. Commission member suggestions for items on future agendas

None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Bigelow, to Adjourn at 6:57 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.