



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

---

Tuesday, March 11, 2008

5:00 PM

Room LL110, Madison Municipal Building  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
(After 6 PM, use Doty St. entrance.)

---

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 PM.

**Present:** 7 -

Robbie Webber; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. Durocher; Gary Poulson; Sharon L. McCabe; Kevin L. Hoag and Duane F. Hinz

**Absent:** 2 -

Amanda F. White and Tim Wong

**Excused:** 2 -

Brian L. Solomon and Kenneth M. Streit

**Others present:** Ann Gullickson and Sharon Persich, Madison Metro Transit; Bill Knobloch, Parking Utility; Bill Fruhling and Ward Paxton, Planning Department.

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Poulson, seconded by Webber, to Approve the Minutes.  
The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A Roll Call is shown here to reflect that White arrived at 5:03 PM after the Minutes were approved; and Wong arrived at 5:15 PM, during discussion of Item D.1.

**Present:** 9 -

Robbie Webber; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. Durocher; Amanda F. White; Gary Poulson; Tim Wong; Sharon L. McCabe; Kevin L. Hoag and Duane F. Hinz

**Excused:** 2 -

Brian L. Solomon and Kenneth M. Streit

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Julia Sherman, Middleton resident, appeared before the group to discuss alcohol advertising on Madison buses. She noted that Miller Brewing would be withdrawing their advertising; but with the possibility of other prospective alcohol advertisers, she continued to have serious concerns about the impact of these ads on children. She distributed a report entitled, "The End of the Line for Alcohol Ads on Public Transit", prepared by the Marin Institute, which talked about communities that had successfully eliminated alcohol ads from their public transit systems. She said that she would like the issue of alcohol ads discussed before a new advertiser came along to purchase alcohol ads, especially since data showed an increase in drinking by youth because of such ads. In response to a question, Sherman said she had read the City Attorney's opinion but was told that this was an issue where lawyers could disagree. She also said that while she objected to alcohol ads of any kind or size, she was more offended by the full wraps, which, due to their sheer size, were overwhelming.

**D. TRANSIT AND PARKING REPORTS**

**D.1. [09453](#) Parking: January 2008 Revenue and February Activity Report - TPC 03.11.08**

Durocher explained that monthly reports would be abbreviated from now on, to reflect reports that were being prepared by staff for their internal use. Rather than making monthly presentations, staff would be available for questions about these reports. Starting in May, staff would present more extensive quarterly reports (based on the previous quarter), which should better serve to show trends. Poulson said this seemed reasonable, but hoped that staff would report any unusual or dramatic developments as they came up. Speaking for staff, Knobloch said that he would want to keep the Commission informed about important items that affected policy or had long-term impacts (inc. financial). However, he could see how the two occupancy reports, which showed data and trends for a 3-month period in the current and previous year, would be more appropriate for a quarterly report (and could be eliminated from the monthly report).

[Please note: Wong arrived at this point in the meeting.]

White imagined that different kinds of long-term information could be included in quarterly reports. Hinz/McCabe moved to receive the report. Wong asked if it was necessary to make a motion to receive the reports. Durocher felt that the relationship of the TPC to the two utilities was such that it was important to formally receive their reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other, with Wong abstaining.

**D.2. [09482](#) Metro YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 03.11.08**

Gullickson was available to answer questions. She said that she thought it was Kamp's intent to include the Customer Feedback report on a quarterly basis (rather than a monthly basis). In response to a specific question about complaints re: bus wraps, she said the numbers on the report reflected totals for the entire year (2007). She went on to say that Metro had not locked in on a new price for fuel. They had gone out to bid and had awarded a contract in which Metro was floating on the market, with the hope that by not being locked in for a long period, they would be able to lock in when they see prices going back down. In order to lock in, Metro would have to go out to bid again. Asked why Metro was not seeking to lock in now (with prices continuing to rise), Gullickson said it was very hard to know when to do so. Prices were at an all-time record high when they arranged their current (variable) contract, and Metro along with the Comptroller's and Mayor's offices decided to keep their options open. But time would tell whether this was the right decision.

Staff clarified that members would continue to receive the regular monthly reports and that staff would be available every month to answer questions about them. Staff would also present more in-depth summaries based on the monthly reports, on a quarterly basis. A suggestion was made that perhaps staff could footnote any outliers in the monthly reports, to preclude the need for questions about them. Knobloch said the process would probably be refined based on member feedback. In subsequent discussion, members generally agreed that they hoped the new quarterly approach would streamline reporting from each

agency and be more useful in showing long-term trends. Members also hoped that the new approach would not create additional work for staff, because the time and money would be better spent elsewhere.

Poulson/Webber moved to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

## E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

### E.1. [09456](#) Parking: Proposed Monthly Premium Pass - TPC 03.11.08

Eugene Devitt, 28 E. Gilman Street, 53703, appeared before the group in support of the proposal for a premium parking pass. He said that we encourage people to live downtown, but have no good parking choices for them. He thought the premium pass would be a way to provide long-term parking for residents who live downtown. His experience was that downtown residents generally did have cars, though they didn't use them that often. Even parkers with 48-hour residential parking stickers, could use such a pass; not only students, but also for long-term residents who live downtown. In response to a question, Devitt said that residents would be willing to walk 6 to 10 blocks for such parking. He thought that people would hop on the bus to go to premium parking places (even to a distant spot); and felt that the availability of premium parking would help with snow removal issues too.

Knobeloch outlined the abridged plan, which now entailed 25 spaces at Overture only. One question was whether there was a market for premium passes. He thought the likeliest market would be downtown residents. Another question was whether special event patrons would be turned away. In reviewing a seven-month period between October-April 2007, there had been seven events with a total of 4.5 hours, when people would have been turned away at Overture because of spaces allocated for premium pass holders.

Knobeloch said that the proposed prices for passes would be \$145/month for residents, \$160/month for non-residents (vs. \$103 and \$118 for regular monthly parking at Overture now). Looking at condo parking, typically, one stall was bundled with the condo, while second stalls were priced to get construction cost back, with prices ranging from \$116 to \$291/month. The condos at W. Washington and Broom charged \$90/month. Dane County charged \$145 for 24-7 parkers. Knobeloch thought it better to start high and then come back to TPC if it didn't work, adding that \$145 would be a lot cheaper for condo owners than buying a second stall for \$200/month. He said that an hourly parker would pay \$257 if they parked 24-7. With 25 spaces at \$145/month, \$43K/year would be generated. He pointed out that Parking had lost money at Overture every year between 2000 and 2005, losing \$476/stall. The only other location losing money was Cap Square North. All the other ramps were making money (Gov East was earning \$169/stall). The "per stall" calculation included all expenses including capital costs.

Responding to Hinz, Knobeloch said that all monthly passes were sold now at Overture, though the waiting list was small and it sometimes took a week to fill (monthly) vacancies there. Hinz said he supported the proposal but had some reservations about the impact of having the "Full" light come on more frequently. In supporting such a trial, he said he would like to see data tracking how much

more the "Full" light came on, and tracking complaints. He wondered if the trial should be held at Cap Square North, which could be marketed to residents in that area. He had fewer reservations about Cap Square North than Overture, because it wouldn't create a lack of space for nighttime events.

Knobeloch said that a trial could be held at both ramps, though he had planned to hold a trial at only one location initially. Responding to questions, Knobeloch said there were some but very limited 24-7 parking options downtown. He felt there was a demand for this based on customers who said they didn't purchase a pass at Overture because of the early stopping time of 6 PM (which wasn't competitive with others). Knobeloch also said that there had been entire months when the "Full" light had never come on at Overture at any time/for any event(s).

Hoag expressed concern about creating a premium pass and said he would vote against the proposal. The pass might generate revenues, but he wasn't sure this was the business Parking should be in. The Parking Utility was in sound financial shape. But even if it wasn't, he was not certain this was the right revenue generator. He was troubled that this was a violation of the mission of a public parking facility, to serve the greater good of the residents in the entire community rather than taking a portion of a facility to serve a few. Even though a pilot, he was actually concerned it might be successful, and as a result, might change Parking's mission. Even with the push for more downtown residents, he felt that others could meet the demand for this kind of parking. He'd prefer to leave the ramps empty overnight.

McCabe supported the premium pass, because parking promoted vitality downtown. Like Hinz, she had reservations about using spaces at Overture for this because of the possibility of creating longer lines for parking at Overture. Overall, she thought it good to utilize surplus space in ramps. While she supported holding the pilot at Cap Square North, she wasn't sure how big the market was in general, and at Cap Sq North specifically. She noted that one new location was getting \$300/month for parking, so there seemed to be a demand. She wondered if students were considered residents because they might be a likely market. Knobeloch said they were considered residents, and noted that he had just had a student in the office that day, who wanted 24-7 parking and had the money to pay for it. Knobeloch said the \$145/month would compare to buying a (condo) stall for \$35K. McCabe said she saw the premium pass program as a continuation of service. But she wanted to make sure it didn't hurt people coming downtown to Overture for events.

Poulson/Sanborn made a motion to approve the Parking Utility undertaking the pilot, as outlined in the staff report. Recognizing Hoag's concerns, Hinz said the Parking Utility had two roles: to provide service and to stay in the black. He thought it more important to provide service, because it was possible to control staying in the black through price. He reiterated his concern that the proposed program would double the occurrences when Overture would be full, and preferred holding the pilot at Cap Square North.

Knobeloch said that monthly passes were counted in occupancy rates as 100% occupied (even if all spaces were not filled at a given time). Durocher said he sensed support for a pilot but not at Overture, and asked if Knobeloch would consider another location. Ruling out certain ramps due to high levels of occupancy and equipment issues, Knobeloch said that if the Commission wanted

to suggest another facility for the pilot, he could research it. Still needing to resolve some issues about passes, Knobloch said that it would take some time to implement the pilot.

During discussion about occupancy levels at Overture during different times of day, Wong observed that there seemed to be two types of customers using the facility: Overture event parkers at night, and commuters during the day. Wong said that he could more easily support utilizing an expensive ramp like Overture to meet the needs of downtown residents with cars than to meet the demand of these other parkers, who apparently hadn't learned to walk, bike or bus. Hinz felt it was important to promote a vibrant downtown and to use the Parking Utility to facilitate that, which meant that these other groups (i.e., non-bus riders) had to be considered as well. While she understood the proposal was an effort to correct the losses at Overture, White said that she couldn't support the proposal. She opposed developing more parking downtown. She feared that shortening the supply of current parking spaces would promote the idea that more parking was needed. Wong said that he would like to see the concept priced out at Cap Square North.

A substitute motion was made by Webber, seconded by Hoag, to Refer to a future meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION, in order to give staff the opportunity to explore the alternative location of Cap Square North. Webber liked the idea of having some 24-hour access, but felt it should be at the least-used ramp. She was also concerned about displacing people who were trying to get to a premiere downtown attraction (Overture), by making it harder to use the ramp(s) nearby, esp. if they were unfamiliar with the downtown. Downtown residents were likelier to know their way around. She said she would be interested in seeing an analysis of the marketability of Cap Sq North, which might allow certain members to more readily support a premium pass pilot. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Excused:** 2 -

Brian L. Solomon and Kenneth M. Streit

**Ayes:** 6 -

Robbie Webber; Jed Sanborn; Amanda F. White; Sharon L. McCabe; Kevin L. Hoag and Duane F. Hinz

**Noes:** 2 -

Gary Poulson and Tim Wong

**Non Voting:** 1 -

Carl D. Durocher

## F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [08820](#) Creating new Section 12.1335(4)(d), renumbering current Section 12.1335(4)(d) to Section 12.1335(4)(e), 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.

Knobloch reported that three other committees had not acted on the resolution, because of lost quorums and because some issues had been raised about the

current proposal; and TPC was the Lead. The Mayor's Office and others wanted to review and modify the item. Webber added that she was tempted to place the item on file, because it was likely that the proposal would be made part of a larger set of recommendations. However, she opted to simply re-refer it.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Hinz, to Rerefer to a future meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2. [09234](#)

Adopting the Regent Street - South Campus Neighborhood Plan and the goals, recommendations, and implementation steps contained therein as a supplement to the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Bill Fruhling of the Planning Division said the resolution proposed adoption of the Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan, and presented some background to the Plan:

- The Regent Street-South Campus Steering Committee met from January to November 2007.
- The Plan covered the area bounded by Regent Street (both sides) on the south, East Campus Mall (inc. Park Street) on the east, W. Johnson Street on the north, Monroe/Randall streets on the west; essentially the area between Camp Randall and the Kohl Center.
- The area didn't really hang together well, with a hodgepodge of land uses (industrial, retail, housing, UW facilities).
- However, the area had a lot of potential for redevelopment (and was the focus of a lot of development proposals recently), which would be much higher density and bigger in scale than had been seen in the past.
- With proximity to UW, downtown, the two hospitals, the area would be appropriate for higher density development.
- But as individual projects developed, it was important to have a planning framework for the area, in order that it evolve as a complete and vibrant neighborhood, with Regent Street remaining a viable business location.

Sub-areas were identified around which to build recommendations and enhancements:

- the neighborhood shopping district, between Randall and Mills on Regent (with smaller scale retail uses);
- the primary pedestrian route along Orchard Street, between Union South and the Regent Street shopping district and neighborhoods;
- the Southwest bike path;
- the Park Street corridor; and
- the Regent St. business district (with office and employment uses.)

Fruhling discussed the Executive Summary and Transportation section of the Plan. Based on neighborhood meetings, the area seemed to be quite well served by transit. Related to supporting infrastructure, folks wanted to see a more pedestrian-friendly environment, to encourage people to walk more, esp. by providing safer crossings on Regent. They also wanted to see enhancements to bike facilities.

However, Parking was a significant issue in the discussion. Most commonly, some thought there was not enough parking; others thought there was too much, mainly by virtue of having too many surface parking lots, which was not an efficient use of land. The Plan proposed the following recommendations related

to Parking:

- Some type of parking facility, for customers of the Regent shopping district. It was not clear whether it would be a structure or a small lot.
- Parking meters on Regent Street, to create more turnover and more opportunities for parking by businesses. Parking on Regent was not metered now. With first come first served, a single parker could park all day long.
- New development should provide parking enough to accommodate the demands of such development, to keep parking out of adjacent neighborhoods.
- Look for partnership opportunities for parking, specifically with UW. For example, UW had plans to move some physical facilities to Block 51 and build a ramp, where maybe some public metered parking could be incorporated.

In response to questions, Fruhling pointed out 3 possible locations for parking structures: Block 51, 20 S. Park (as part of a new Meriter campus plan), and one more north of Regent somewhere between Charter and Randall, where business owners said more public parking was needed (though no Parking surveys were done). Two “transit stops” shown along the old rail corridor represented rail stops identified in a Transport 2020 plan. A bike path was planned along the old rail bed, going from the Southwest Path to a new path north of Camp Randall (from Park Street to University Avenue/Campus Drive).

Fruhling said the Plan not only aimed to consolidate surface parking into ramps, but it also proposed increasing the number of parking spaces in the area as new development occurred, to meet the demand of such new development. With many Community Car vehicles located in the area (Area 7), White wondered if car-sharing, which could reduce the need for cars and parking spaces esp. in new developments, was considered in the Plan. Fruhling said a generic statement in Plan recommendations mentioned reducing parking through increased transit use, shared parking facilities, and TDM’s, but not car-sharing. However, he suggested that this could be part of the Commission’s motion.

As a member of the Steering Committee, Webber said concerns about parking had to do with providing more parking for people passing through the area, i.e., restaurant customers and shoppers. She said that committee members emphasized (to business owners) that they didn’t anticipate the City would build another ramp; and if they wanted more parking, somebody besides the City would have to pay for it. In response to a concern expressed by McCabe about street-activating uses at the bottom of parking ramps, Fruhling said that there was a statement in the Land Use and Urban Design section of the Plan, which emphasized this concept.

Knobeloch said that when asked if Parking would build a ramp north of Regent, he had replied that he doubted that there would be enough demand to warrant one, and folks would want a demand study before doing anything. He noted that there were no meters between Park Street and Camp Randall on Regent, because businesses had never asked for them, otherwise they’d be there. Also, any Parking structure would have to be paid for by the business calling for it.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Hinz, to Return to Lead with a recommendation to adopt, with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION: Car-sharing should be included among the transportation management strategies. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

03.11.08

Ward Paxton, Transportation Planner from the Planning Department, talked about the TDM User Surveys related to parking and TDM incentives that were distributed the first week of February 2008 at Overture, State Street Cap and Cap Square North. Parking ramp cashiers handed out 500 surveys at each ramp during weekdays and weeknights. The survey was similar to one distributed a year ago (at three other ramps), but with one small change to question #4: The "purpose of trip" (work, school, meeting) was now listed separately on the 2008 survey.

Approximately 20% of the surveys were returned, as follows: 90 from Cap Square North; 89 from State Street Cap; 55 from Overture. "Full time" parkers were those who had parked for at least six hours, based on answers to question #3. Paxton said he had a better chance of matching up options and triggering a shift to alternate transportation among these parkers.

Paxton said the percentages didn't add up to 100% because not every parker was a 5-day a week parker. Paxton said that the largest number of parkers were workers, with a large number of students parking at State Street Cap across from MATC.

Thinking about this from a TDM point of view and seeing the many work trips, Paxton hoped to attract some of these parkers to some of the alternatives, such as commuter buses and van pools. For those full time employees working regular office work hours, he thought TDM efforts could do some good, and could offer some incentives to make these alternatives a little more flexible and therefore a little more viable.

Looking at the Incentives on page 2, the incentives ranked highest were the occasional parking type incentives and the guaranteed ride home. Among those expressing interest in the incentives, some commented that they liked a flexible system; others said that cost was a concern so occasional parking cards at reduced prices were good. Those who didn't think any of the incentives would help said they needed a car for their job during the day, or that they didn't have alternatives (no bus routes nearby, the vans didn't meet their schedule). Several respondents said they liked the parking cashiers.

Webber noted that one important incentive was missing, for those people who need a car for work and would commute by an alternative means if they had a corporate car or car-sharing available at work (perhaps provided by their employer). She wondered what an employer would do if they required a car for work but their employee didn't own a car: Would the employee be fired?

Knobeloch pointed out that the report reinforced what Parking already knew, that it had lost many of its full time 8.5-hour weekday parkers. The length of stay had been dropping, and the Utility had lost customers to private parking, the University, buses, bikes, etc. The report also reinforced what Parking had found, that most of its customers (70%) were workers. Knobeloch said that Parking relied heavily on these workers, many of whom were part-timers not parking 8.5 hours/day, Monday through Friday, like they used to. Without this customer base, Parking would be hurting.

Paxton discussed some of the incentives that were being implemented: the Share

and Park service, the Guaranteed Ride Home coupon, and a free 10-ride Metro pass. They would be putting up tables and talking to parkers in the ramps during the summer and fall. Webber was struck that Tuesday seemed to be the most popular day to drive, and was surprised by the number of "auto solo" drivers, who apparently didn't get parking through their employers. Hoag noted the high percentages of people who saw the cost of commute as a major problem. He predicted that rapidly rising energy costs would have a big impact and would drive changes in commuting behavior. Paxton agreed, and said that \$3+/gallon gas was doing more than any of his incentives. Paxton described the Share and Park service, where participants in any of the alternatives (bus, car/van pool, bike, walk) could receive 7 days of parking for \$25; so that on days when the alternative wasn't do-able, they could park. Participants were not guaranteed a space, but the coupon could be used in any ramp.

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

F.4. [09484](#)

Metro: Discussion of proposed Monthly Free Fare Day (deferred from February) - TPC 03.11.08

A motion was made by Poulson, seconded by Sanborn, to Rerefer to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. White talked about the Report of the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Committee and the work of the Marketing Subcommittee on this issue. She hoped Metro Marketing staff would start the discussion on the issue, to provide information about how much such a program would cost, and how many times a year it could occur (esp. as it might relate to the 2009 budget). Durocher commented that, unlike Clean Air Action Days, pre-scheduled free fare days could possibly attract more riders to the bus because they could plan ahead of time. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.5. [09457](#)

Metro: FTA Charter Regulations and Special Event Shuttle Service - TPC 03.11.08

Ann Gullickson said Metro wanted to make the Commission aware of changes that staff anticipated would have to be made to Metro's special event service. For years, there have been federal regulations defining charter service, which were designed to protect the private sector from competition with municipalities that are subsidized for the cost of public transit. As a result, Metro had been prohibited from providing charter services in ways that would compete with the private sector

Gullickson said that there had been an ongoing concern in the private motor coach industry about special event service, which many public transit systems had been doing for years. As a result of discussions between the public and private transit systems over the past two years, new regulations were developed and issued in January 2008.

These new Federal Transit Administration charter regulations defined charter service more broadly and included under the umbrella of charter service what we referred to as "special event service." This would include Bucky Buses, service to the Kohl Center for hockey and basketball events, shuttle buses to WIAA events and Rhythm and Booms. Special event service had been characterized by something that served the general population, where the community parked at a large lot/facility and took a shuttle to an event (Ex. Shuttles from Lot 60 to Camp Randall, from Alliant Center to Kohl Center, from MATC to Warner Park.)

Metro had not been using state and federal assistance to subsidize its costs, but instead had set special fares (\$4/round trip) for the cost of the service. One criteria now defining "charter service" (and making it prohibitive for Metro to provide special event service) would be to charge a premium fare. Another criteria now defining "charter service" would be a service paid in part by a third party. Gullickson said that the UW Athletic Department had in fact been helping to subsidize Kohl Center shuttles to keep fares down.

After reviewing the new regulations with the City Attorney's office in February, Metro had sent letters to the major vendors who had been using these services – UW Athletic Department, the WIAA, Rhythm and Booms – to share their interpretation of the new regulations and to alert them. The new regulations go into effect 4/30/08, so everyone would be able to close out the season of events, and give these groups a chance to look at other options for the future.

The letters had sparked a lot of interest. There had been ongoing discussions at the staff level to look at creative ways to perhaps continue the service, esp. at the UW. Metro had gotten in touch with peers at other Big Ten universities to see if they had any ideas. But staff didn't want to mislead anyone into expecting a positive outcome; it wasn't likely that Metro would be able to continue to offer the service.

Durocher said that this had serious ramifications in Madison, not to be able to use its buses for such things as Rhythms and Booms. Responding to questions, Gullickson said that if the city chose to subsidize these services, Metro could charge its regular fare and continue to provide the service. She noted that Metro had lost money on the UW football shuttles over the course of the season, as determined by the cost analysis done after each special event. Costs (for drivers, supervisors, and weekend staff) were compared to what was received in fares. But the new rules about third parties would prohibit the UW, for example, to pick up any loss Metro incurred. She said that to continue the service, the City would have to choose to use property tax dollars now being used for regular transit to subsidize the special event service, which would involve a policy decision. Even to charge the regular fare for a one-time special event like Rhythm and Booms, it would be hard to prove that this was part of Metro's regular scheduled service and not a special service.

About a year and half before the issuance of the new regs, a notice of proposed rule-making was sent out. A number of public transit systems responded with comments; Metro shared some the proposed rules with the UW, who sent written comments to the FTA in 2006-7. But after all that, the FTA didn't respect the positions of these users of the service, and instead chose to broaden the definitions of "charter service."

Webber assumed that private bus companies, who wanted the business, motivated the changes. Noting that there were undoubtedly private companies to provide the service, she wondered if there was an advantage to Metro to continue the service, besides that of getting people to use the bus and maybe to then decide to take it work. Gullickson said the advantage was to be seen as part of a community event (to be extremely visible at an event like Rhythm and Booms). Though hard to quantify, the shuttles very likely worked as a marketing tool to get folks on the bus that didn't ride regularly, which could only help.

Commenting that shuttles benefited the entire community by cutting down on congestion, Webber wondered if the private sector would step up to provide the service. Gullickson thought it very likely, but expected that things would not be done the same way. Maybe one of the sponsors would have to hire and pay for the shuttle service. Maybe private buses wouldn't want to handle cash (like Metro who had secure cash boxes and staff that could handle \$1,000's in cash). Metro had provided 9,000 rides to Rhythm and Booms, and she really wasn't sure how event organizers would now provide this service. Durocher was concerned about the impact on the local population, who had previously paid \$4 and would now maybe have to pay \$15. Gullickson said there would be no affect on Metro's bottom line, because they had been charging only enough to cover costs. She agreed with Webber that perhaps Metro could add buses to certain regular routes, along Regent Street or Warner Park, to help move people around.

Gullickson said that there wasn't much that the TPC could do at this time; but if Metro came up with some different strategies or options later on, they would bring them before the group. No action was needed.

F.6. [09485](#)

Metro: Plans for public hearing regarding proposed schedule/route changes - TPC 03.11.08

Registrant Cathy Casper, Red Arrow Trail, Madison, appeared before the group in response to a news article about the route changes. She said that she was a seven-day/week rider of buses. She felt that the whole system was in crisis, and more than a few routes needed to be reviewed. Drivers couldn't eat their meals or even get up and stretch, and some drivers drove up to 17 hours/day. She thought the City should be setting an example, and this was no way to treat employees. Casper felt that drivers were the system's biggest asset. She also reported that she had been left at a bus stop on the West side at 1 PM on a Saturday because the (Route 67) bus was full. She was concerned about workers, families and the disabled along the route, who might also be left. She concluded by saying that the whole system needed to be reviewed for quality improvement; and people needed to be listening to the drivers and customers.

In response to a question about limits on the number of hours drivers could drive (for safety reasons), Gullickson said that public transit drivers were exempt from hours limitations found in the federal Motor Carriers Safety Act (that covers long-haul truck drivers and those who drove across state lines). Also, there were no state requirements. There were limitations in the local contract as to how many hours a driver could work straight through, and how many hours they could be asked to work in a day. But the final decision was up to the driver. Drivers couldn't be asked to work more than 12 hours/day, unless they agreed to it. Metro was obligated to offer drivers any overtime, and it was up to the drivers to turn it down. Over the years, Metro hadn't been able to come to any agreement with the Union about hours limitations related to safety standards (such as those in the federal law).

Sharon Persich of Metro appeared before the group to explain the action timeline and to give a rationale for what Metro was proposing and why. She said that a public hearing would need to be held in April in order to implement the changes by August. Metro would be publishing draft maps and schedules, and issuing a public notice of the hearing. Just prior to the hearing, Metro was planning to hold an information session, at which staff would detail the route and

schedule changes. A detailed budget analysis would also be provided at that time.

Persich said the proposed plan was a major improvement plan, which added new service hours in order to address schedule and capacity issues that had degraded in recent years. Previous restructuring plans revolved around budget reductions and route eliminations (including Routes 10 and 11 in 2004, and Route 8 in 2006). While trying to put a positive spin on things, many changes were developed to reduce service hours. Metro was now seeing the ramifications of those reductions, in some very serious schedule adherence problems (as mentioned by Casper in her comments.)

Also, overloads were getting worse because trips had been eliminated in some of the major central area corridors. Referring to Page 2 of her handout, Table 1 showed the number of daily bus trips that had been eliminated in the central corridor between 2000 and 2008 (roughly 200). [Electronic or hard copies of the handout are available by contacting TPC Recording Secretary, Anne Benishek-Clark at 267-8751.] It was in these corridors where Metro now had to add buses and where the time that these buses were on the street was increasing. For example, along the Johnson/Gorham corridors, Metro started adding buses the day after the Campus started up; bigger loads were no longer just a cold weather phenomenon. There were 1.6 million more trips to the Campus since 2000.

Persich said that the proposal was a comprehensive plan to address the schedule problems and capacity issues. She highlighted the following items:

- Route 6 was the most critical problem; the longest route with one of highest riderships, it was hard to schedule. The severity of the problem was related to a budget reduction change made in 2002, at which point it had some extra recovery time at East Towne, which was used to expand the route to the City View thereby eliminating Route 30. The proposed change would once again terminate the route at East Towne, add two new routes to the City View area, and expand mid-day service to the American Center at no cost.
- As part of Route 6 changes, Route 20 to the airport would be improved to provide service every half-hour weekdays (vs. hourly), hourly service at night, and weekend service.
- To balance loads and relieve overloads in the Isthmus, Metro was proposing to bring back Routes 10 and 11, not exactly in their original form, but very similar.
- Other proposed productivity improvements included expanding direct peak-hour service to MATC from the East Transfer Point, the biggest revenue generator on the east side.

Persich said that Metro would provide a budget analysis at the next meeting, which would show the added costs associated with these changes. Persich listed the "Benefits and Efficiencies" of the proposed changes, shown on Page 4 of the handout. She explained that "improved corridor phasing" meant buses would be more evenly spaced during peak and off-peak hours. She also noted the productivity-driven reductions, as shown on Page 4 of the handout. She said that some reductions were the result of route realignments and some reductions were being made to address on-time performance, as shown on Pages 4-5 of the handout. She talked about how Metro might address the issue of budget reductions in the Town of Madison, by eliminating the part of Route 13 that

operates within the Town, essentially the portion south of Olin Avenue; which would have negative consequences (i.e., no service to Huber Center, the Department of Revenue, and a section of Badger Road).

Gullickson commented that because of the lateness of the report, Metro was only just beginning to talk about details with the Mayor's Office and what the cost might be. She said that before the hearing in April, Metro would be talking more with the Mayor's and Comptroller's offices to get a sense of what funding is available in order to make changes in September. These changes were not in the current budget, so working with the TPC, Metro would need to prioritize the changes to see which could be put into effect in 2008, and which could be put in a supplementary budget request for 2009. In other words, not all of the changes included in this comprehensive plan would be implemented in September. Persich said that the proposed changes were already available to the public and the press, and would also be made available electronically and on the buses within the week.

Durocher proposed that a public hearing be held at the TPC's April 15th meeting. A motion was made by Sanborn, seconded by Hinz, to endorse the concept of the route changes, to encourage staff to move ahead with the them, and to Approve plans to schedule a public hearing at the April meeting. 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 discussion or action was needed on this item.**

**H. GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**H.1. General announcements by Chair**

Durocher received a letter from a driver, which contained illustrative anecdotes about her difficulties of staying on time during the bad weather. He suggested that when members look at the proposed route changes, they not just consider the do-ability and efficiency of routes, but that they also consider human factor in executing the routes.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by McCabe, seconded by Wong, to Adjourn at 8:01 PM. The**

motion passed by voice vote/other.