



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

Thursday, October 2, 2008

5:00 PM

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

PLEASE NOTE: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:10 PM.

Present: 6 -

Margaret Bergamini; Brian L. Solomon; Robbie Webber; Carl D. Durocher;
Gary Poulson and Duane F. Hinz

Excused: 5 -

Jed Sanborn; Amanda F. White; Sharon L. McCabe; Kevin L. Hoag and
Kenneth M. Streit

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Hinz, seconded by Solomon, to Approve the Minutes of
the 09/04/08 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS

D.1. [12133](#) Parking: August 2008 Revenue & September Activity Report - TPC 10.02.08

Poulson/Hinz moved to receive the report. The motion carried unanimously.

D.2. [12121](#) Parking: 2009 Capital and Operating Budgets

Knobeloch began his report by talking about the Parking Utility's 2009 Capital Budget, as approved by the Mayor. He said that capital budget items or projects were big-ticket items, which cost more than \$50K, lasted more than 10 years, or involved borrowing money. For example, \$800K was spent in 2008 to fix garages; several of the ramps were more than 35 years old. All capital project funding came from Parking Utility resources.

Contained in the 2009 Capital Budget were the following:

- \$581K for parking garage repairs.
- \$1.2 million for planning the construction of a 570-stall garage on the back of MMB.
- The MMB garage would need to be ready for use before GE could be torn down.
- The MMB structure would require removal of some of the blond brick and

the new dock, and would go higher; would make a smaller footprint than GE.

- \$740K for parking revenue equipment: software conversion to Zeag and purchase of additional multi-space pay-by-space meters.

Members questioned Knobeloch about the role of TPC and the Council in making decisions about the three options shown in the budget. Knobeloch said that the budget was submitted in June when the three options all might have been a possibility, but now there was only enough money for one project to begin in 2009: the construction of the garage behind MMB. If the Council approved the Executive Budget, Parking would prepare an RFP to hire architects for MMB project planning, to be presented to the Council and TPC next year for consideration. Knobeloch added that the Parking Utility could have a tough time issuing bonds right now because of the tumultuous situation on the market. He thought the Parking Strategic Plan would become available soon. Webber expressed concern that the three options were not presented to the TPC to solicit its recommendations. Addressing a different question, Knobeloch said that the BOE had approved the Executive Budget.

Knobeloch went on to say that the Brayton Lot was another place where building might occur. Parking staff had been talking to Commonwealth Development and others about this. The 70 spaces (with an L shape) owned by the State created a stumbling block in this effort. He said it would be easier if the City could buy these spaces, or even possibly swap them for some space at the GE location. But the State had shown lukewarm interest. Knobeloch had talked to others about tearing down GE and putting various other things there (ex. retail or offices). But he wanted to have MMB ready beforehand.

Related to the multi-space equipment, Parking already had an RFP, and would see five presentations shortly. This was a \$1 million project; would take about 12 weeks to custom-build the system; could be ready by spring. The question would be whether to push this project back a year or not. He also talked about switching from CTR to ZEAG software and costs related to that.

Responding to questions, Knobeloch said that extra savings offset extra costs associated with running multi-space equipments. Boulder, CO had replaced all their single space meters with multi-space. Based on research of other cities, some revenue enhancers resulting from multi-space equipment were:

- Parkers cannot piggy-back off of the remaining minutes of the person who had parked in the space previously.
- Money could be collected from only those machines where it needed to be collected.
- Credit cards would be handy, and people would be able choose longer times than allowed by the cash/coins they might have available.

Turning to the Operating Budget and noting that Parking's budget was one budget, Knobeloch pointed out six highlights on page 2, which included: implementing multi-space equipment (i.e. installing the wiring, etc.), \$51K funding for TDM planning at MPO, a \$1.164 million PILOT payment, and a rate increase in 2009.

On page 4, he talked about the "Major Objects of Expenditure" table:

- 44% of the \$10.8 million represented salaries and benefits; \$2 million of which was for cashiers alone.

- 15% went towards purchased services; 2% went for supplies.
- Of the \$1.1 million in interdepartmental charges, \$430K went to the Police Department for five meter enforcement staff; \$235K went to Traffic Engineering; \$158K went to the Treasurer for accounting services; Parking paid 15 different departments.
- \$2.574 million was applied to debt (principal and interest), PILOT and reserves.
- Looking at interagency billings, which represented the revenues Parking received from customers: in 2007, Parking came out ahead by \$2.2 million; in 2008 and 2009, it was breaking even.

Discussing a likely rate increase, Knobloch said that 40 variables had to be considered, such as what to do with meter fees themselves, or whether to extend hours of enforcement. The Memorial Union charged until 10 PM (vs. 6 PM for City meters). Business groups would rather raise rates than extend hours. The biggest change would be for monthly cardholders, with possible increases as follows (only rates for residents are shown):

- GE had a waiting list of 148; rates there could go from \$133 to \$175.
- State Street Cap could go from \$113 to \$136.
- A new monthly rate for State Street Campus could be \$171.
- Overture would remain the same at \$103.

Proposed changes at some cashiered facilities could be:

- \$1.10/hr to \$1.40/hr at GE
- \$1.10/hr to \$1.30/hr at State Street Campus
- \$0.80/hr to \$0.95 at Cap Square North

These roughly 20% increases would reflect rates lower than street meters, and more expensive than monthly permits.

Knobloch said the new rates would probably need to go into effect in spring, especially if revenues continued to be "soft." He said that he was working with Gordon Graham and was coordinating these changes with those at the UW.

Hinz/Webber moved to receive the report. The motion carried unanimously.

At the conclusion of Item D.2., Webber/Poulson moved to suspend the rules in order to proceed to Item F.1., out of Agenda order. The motion passed unanimously.

Following Item F.1., the meeting returned to Item D.3., and completed the remainder of the Agenda in agenda order.

D.3. [12122](#) Metro YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 10.02.08

Bergamini/Webber moved to receive the report. The motion carried unanimously.

E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

E.1. [12123](#) Metro: Management Performance Audit (WisDOT Requirement) Overview by Owen O'Neil of Abrams-Cherwony & Associates - TPC 10.02.08

Kamp introduced the item by saying that WisDOT required the Management Performance Audit (MPA), which are conducted every five years for all transit systems in the state. The last Metro audit was conducted in 2003-2004. The information from Owen O'Neil was part of a series of updates that Metro would be presenting about the MPA.

Owen O'Neil of Abrams-Cherwony and Associates described the audit process. Noting that the MPA was conducted every five years, as required by statute, he said that WisDOT selected his firm, which was based in Philadelphia. The three elements of the MPA were:

- Policy and decision-making review: how Metro's governing structures work; its relationship to the Mayor and the TPC.
- Peer and trend analysis (as presented in the Draft Interim Report).
- Functional areas review: how Metro's operates in the areas of planning, scheduling, IT, HR, labor relations, etc., based on detailed interviews with staff and data collection.

Following the analysis, which compared Metro to peer transit systems, Metro was given the chance to respond, at which point the audit recommendations might change. From the study, Metro would then develop an action plan, which would be reviewed in five years, at the time of the next MPA. Data was based on 2006 numbers, the latest year for which data was available for all the peers.

O'Neil highlighted the following items about Metro compared to peers:

- Identified as the Service Level Peer Group (SLPG), eleven transit systems were selected with service levels comparable to Metro's.
- But because these eleven systems served larger populations, eight other transit systems were selected with comparable service area populations, identified as the Population Peer Group (PPG). This group was compared to Metro only in the area of per capita performance.
- Metro provided a significant higher level of service to the residents in its service area on a per capita basis than the average of the PPG.
- As a result of this high service level, Metro showed the highest cost per capita among the PPG and Madison residents used transit more than the peers: Metro carried almost three times as many passengers as the peer average.
- When looking at SLPG, Metro was smaller in terms of revenue miles and revenue hours, and showed lower operating costs and lower operating revenue. But at the same time, Metro carried significantly more passengers than the peer average.
- There was a "riding habit" in Madison.

O'Neil then talked about funding sources for Metro compared to peers, and pointed out that 41% of Metro's operating funding came from local funds (mostly from Madison's general revenue fund) vs. 15% for its peers. However, some of the peers receiving operating funding from directly generated tax revenue generated by local sales tax or local property tax. Metro has not been granted this ability. When asked, O'Neil said he would investigate whether some peers were non-attainment areas and therefore some of their federal funding might be coming from the CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality) Program.

Turning to financial measures, O'Neil noted the following:

- Metro had the lowest cost per passenger, which was the lowest (best) among the peer group: 26.4% lower than the average (due to carrying more riders and having lower operating costs).
- Revenue per passenger was 22.4% lower than the peer group because of Metro's free and discounted fares. But because of higher ridership, Metro was 2% higher in fare box recovery.
- Metro's general administrative costs were 24% lower than its peers, raising the questions: Was Metro more efficient, or were they perhaps short-staffed?

In looking at transportation performance, Metro spent more of its expenses on operations than its peers, showing a focus on providing the greatest amount of service possible. However, Metro had a below average vehicle hours per operating employee ratio. This raised the questions: Was this due to more supervisors and dispatchers? Were there more senior drivers getting more vacation, or were there more people out on sick leave? The ratio of supervisors to operators, and the HR issues of sick time and family leave would need to be reviewed. Metro's maintenance costs were lower than its peers, which could mean either that Metro was more efficient or that things needing to get done were not getting done – issues that would also be reviewed.

O'Neil responded to questions. He said that before the final analysis, he would be looking at more recent data for Metro, but more up-to-date information would not be available from peers. It was suggested that O'Neil look at average fares and rate changes in unlimited ride pass contracts that occurred since 2006.

O'Neil wondered if anything had happened regarding splitting the Commission into two commissions (one for transit and one for parking). Durocher said though a question before the group, it was not directly pending. When asked how other systems operated, O'Neil said that most were separate bodies. There were more county systems around the country, operating as transit authorities with a transit board. But in Wisconsin, he saw more city systems. Members noted that there was discussion in the state Legislature about setting up RTA's; and that the predecessor to the TPC was the Transportation Commission, which had three subcommittees: Transit, Parking and Pedestrian/Bicycle.

Related to how Metro calculated ridership, O'Neil remarked that nationally, "trips" were counted "unlinked" in order to assure uniform reporting (to the National Transit Database). Because there were so many different fare systems across the country, counting unlinked trips was the only way to keep comparisons fair.

Durocher thanked O'Neil for his presentation, which was taken as an informational item and needed no action.

E.2. [12124](#)

Metro: Plans for public hearing in November regarding proposed fare changes under consideration in the 2009 budget

Kamp pointed out that the Mayor's budget request for Metro included a 50¢ fare increase, to \$2.00/ride. Kamp said that in order to stay on schedule, the Commission would need to hold a hearing in November. Following this, Metro would bring their recommendations back to the TPC in December, and the final proposal would go into effect in March 2009. He noted that the weighted

average cost per gallon was now \$3.40/gallon.

Kamp then outlined the Mayor's recommendations as contained in his October 2, 2008 letter to the Commission. In the letter, the Mayor discussed the sharp increase in fuel costs in recent years and the fact that fares had not increased since 2005. He also talked about his reasons for supporting a 50¢ increase rather than a 25¢, and how combined with the \$409K from the general fund, the additional money could be used. These included: expanded service, a new staff position for marketing, additional security at transfer points, doubling funding (to \$80K) for Transit for Jobs or similar programs for low-income riders, the creation of a reserve fund as cushion against increased fuel costs.

Members discussed the different roles of the TPC and the Common Council. Webber said the TPC set fares for Metro, but the Council determined the budget for Metro (in November). Based on this, TPC would need to figure out how to help make up this budget. Durocher added that some members in the past had questioned taking up the issue of fares, which then relieved the Council of its duty to provide public subsidy. Bergamini observed two oddities at play: The Mayor had instructed agencies to come up with 5% cuts, and some had not done so; and the Mayor had presented the Capital Budgets to BOE, but only now, operating budgets were coming out. Webber said that some budgets were sent back to those agencies that didn't do what was asked; and yet it was also true that some agencies tried to exercise austerity and while others didn't. Everything was fluid and the timing was accidental. Bergamini noted that some agencies were not utilities though.

In response to questions, Kamp said that the effective date for new fares could be moved to an April/May timeframe. He said the \$682K figure cited in the Mayor's letter was provided by Metro, and included only cash, tickets, passes to determine this figure, not the revenues derived from ride pass agreements. He said that Metro was assuming some elasticity would occur, and would check with Abrams-Cherwony about this while they were here doing the MPA.

Solomon was concerned about the impact of the shaky economy, and wondered how many people would lose their jobs if they couldn't afford the fare increases. He hoped the group could get some data on this. Kamp said he would look into having Abrams-Cherwony contact the MPO for information like this, as well as contacting WisDOT to see what information they might be able to provide.

Bergamini wondered if the Commission should hold a hearing in November or at all. She wanted operating budgets to be completed before the TPC talked about fares, maybe in December. It seemed to her that when there was a public hearing on a possible rate increase, this usually meant an increase was coming. She honestly didn't know if the TPC should do that.

Durocher mentioned the hearings in spring and how some service that had been on the chopping block had been salvaged, and he thought things had been stabilized. Now only a half-year later, the Commission once again had to consider holding a hearing. He wondered however if the group might be limiting their options if they didn't schedule one. He suggested that Metro provide three scenarios: one with no increase, one with a 25¢ increase, and one with a 50¢ increase. Then people could weigh in on service reductions vs.

fare increases.

Webber/Poulson moved to schedule the hearing at a date to be determined. Webber said that once the budget was done, the TPC would have some decisions to make to raise fares or cut service. She thought both things could be discussed at one hearing.

[PLEASE NOTE: Poulson left the meeting at this point, at 7:14 PM, before the vote was taken on this item, and before discussion/action on the remaining Agenda Items E.3., F.2. and F.3. Poulson was present for the vote on Agenda Item F.1., which was taken out of order and considered earlier in the meeting.]

Solomon wondered if the hearing would be about fares and the budget. After some discussion, Kamp suggested that the topic of the hearing could be Metro service and fare proposals. He said holding the hearing around November 20th offered the advantage of allowing staff to prepare its recommendations based on hearing input for the December 9th meeting.

Webber then suggested that the hearing dates to consider should be November 17th, 19th, 20th and 24th, and members should be polled for availability. The motion carried unanimously.

E.3. [11790](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an on-going agreement with the Madison Gas and Electric Company for the purchase of electric service for Metro Transit at One South Ingersoll Street at a discounted rate in exchange for the ability of Madison Gas and Electric to interrupt Metro Transit's electric service. During such interruption, Metro's generator will keep the electrical output level until normal service is resumed.

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

[PLEASE NOTE: Following Item E.3., the meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.2.]

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [08820](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Creating new Section 12.1335(4)(d), renumbering current Section 12.1335(4)(d) to Section 12.1335(4)(e), creating Section 12.1335(6), amending Section 12.1339, amending Section 12.141(2), creating new Section 12.141(3), renumbering current Sections 12.141(3)-(9) to Sections 12.141(4)-(10), and amending Section 1.08(3)(a) of the Madison General Ordinances to further deter snow parking violations and more efficiently allow for cleaning of the streets.

[PLEASE NOTE: This item followed Agenda Item D.2.]

Ray Harmon of the Mayor's Office and Al Schumacher of the Streets Department appeared before the group. Harmon said the resolution was the result of a joint effort of the Mayor, alders and City staff. Sponsored by the Mayor and Alders Rummel and Rhodes-Conway and supported by Alders Webber and Konkell, Harmon sought approval from the Commission.

Schumacher described the legislation, which it was hoped would deter snow parking violations and better allow clearing streets of snow during a snow emergency, by increasing fines to \$60 city-wide, both within the snow emergency zone and outside of it on streets with alternate side parking. The current fine of \$20 would remain for alternate side parking violations when there was no snow emergency. He said measures would be taken to provide more off-street parking for residents:

- By extending free parking hours in the City ramps;
- By clearing snow out of parking lots at various parks, including Tenney Park, Burr-Jones and Olbrich Beach so people could park at these locations;
- By setting up a text-messaging system for those who requested it;
- By working with the UW to see if their email system could help alert students, at least once a year to inform them of winter parking rules and options.

Solomon brought up the written comments from Hoag, who raised concerns about continuing the practice of requiring alternate side parking even when there was no snow, and needlessly throwing high levels of emissions into the air when cars were started. In his comments, Hoag urged changing the ordinance to require alternate side parking when there had been a snowfall to avoid damaging air quality and running the risk of becoming a non-attainment region.

Harmon thought the resolution should be kept separate from the issue raised by Hoag. Schumacher added that he had met with Webber regarding this issue as well, but was concerned that there wasn't enough time to address it before November 15th. People wondered if more time should be taken to discuss the idea of expanding the snow emergency zone, etc.

Members were concerned that people be properly informed of the large increase to a \$60 fine from \$20. Schumacher described the citywide public information campaign being launched by George Dreckman, which included flyers on Metro buses and special info on the City website, esp. a new winter web page, point of purchase displays at libraries, and a press event.

Webber talked about her involvement in discussions about the resolution. She had registered her concern about requiring people to move their cars when there was no snow. However, she had no problem addressing the issue separately, and hoped she would receive support from the Council when it came before them. She liked the idea of signing people up for email or text-message alerts, and also thought it important to alert people about the increased fines. She thought word would circulate quickly. Especially concerned about communicating with those in the snow emergency zone, she thought it would be no problem with the new technology.

Durocher said that Hoag's concern was mainly about air quality, which could possibly be mitigated by adding some qualifier, for only those times when there was snow. Or he thought it might also be okay to separate the issues; but if so, something was needed on a future agenda regarding a system-wide exemption except when there really was snow.

Webber made a motion to recommend adoption of the resolution, but with the additional comment that it was the opinion of the TPC that the Common

Council be urged to work towards expanding the snow emergency zone or eliminating alternate side parking when there was no snow emergency. She could see the need to pass the resolution now, but wanted movement on the other issue as well.

Poulson didn't want alternate side parking eliminated completely, and didn't buy into the idea that people were inconvenienced since they usually parked where they needed to when they got home. He felt that people could learn to park on the correct side. Webber recognized that not everybody would support expansion of the snow emergency zone, but could see good reasons to do so in her district. Hinz said he would like to urge the Council to look at ways to reduce the need to move vehicles, but preferred not to limit the discussion to two options.

Solomon offered a friendly amendment to Webber's comments in the motion, to say that the Common Council be urged to review the potential benefits of expanding the snow emergency zone or eliminating alternate side parking when there was no snow emergency. Bergamini called the question, and a vote was taken.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Solomon, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER, with the following comments. It was the opinion of the TPC that the Common Council be urged to review the potential benefits of expanding the snow emergency zone or eliminating alternate side parking when there is no snow emergency.

The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: 5 -

Jed Sanborn; Amanda F. White; Sharon L. McCabe; Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

Ayes: 4 -

Margaret Bergamini; Brian L. Solomon; Robbie Webber and Duane F. Hinz

Noes: 1 -

Gary Poulson

Non Voting: 1 -

Carl D. Durocher

[PLEASE NOTE: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item D.3.]

F.2. [12125](#)

Parking: Draft Resolution No. TPC-36 (revised), regarding removal of five or more on-street meters due to projects - referred to TPC 11.06.08

[PLEASE NOTE: This item followed Agenda Item E.3.]

Webber/Hinz moved to refer the item to the next meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

F.3. [11560](#)

Creating and implementing a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation and parking design for central Madison.

Webber said that LRTPC had a long discussion about this item. She thought the LRTPC would take this effort on, as the committee to do this. LRTPC had members from various key committees, so could represent all of them. She

said that the resolution was not about doing a study; it was about what should be done by a study. She said this issue would be clarified by LRTPC.

Durocher suggested that with other committees still working on the proposal, the Commission could refer the item. A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Webber, to Rerefer to a future meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

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

07828

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee
Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Parking Strategic Plan

No action was needed on these items.

H. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

H.1. General announcements by Chair

H.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Durocher reiterated the request from earlier in the evening that the Commission look at the issue of alternate side parking. Bergamini asked Kamp if Metro could provide more data on elasticity and methodology used to determine how fares affect ridership and revenue.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Solomon, seconded by Hinz, to Adjourn at 7:33 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.