



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

Thursday, September 4, 2008

5:00 PM

Room 260, 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 5:10 PM.

Present: 8 -

Margaret Bergamini; Brian L. Solomon; Jed Sanborn; Carl D. Durocher;
Duane F. Hinz; Sharon L. McCabe; Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 3 -

Robbie Webber; Amanda F. White and Gary Poulson

Sanborn arrived at 5:16 PM, and McCabe arrived at 5:45 PM.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Streit, to Approve the Minutes of the August 12, 2008 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

D.1. [11752](#) Parking: July 2008 Revenue Report and August Activity Report - TPC 09.04.08

Knobeloch responded to questions, saying that occupancy at Buckeye Lot had not increased overall (though the day of the survey showed a 92.5% occupancy rate). He also said that all the revenue from City citations (including parking citations) goes to the General Fund. The Parking Utility pays for salary, benefits and supervision of five of the twenty-seven meter enforcement staff. Streit/Hinz made a motion to receive the Report. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

D.2. [11753](#) Metro YTD Performance Indicator Reports - TPC 09.04.08

In response to a question, Kamp said that road calls were up over in 2008 vs. 2007 because of bad weather in the winter months; and recently, in July, road calls were up because of some specific hot engine issues, which were being addressed by the manufacturers (New Flyer and Gillig). Hoag/Streit made a motion to receive the Report. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

D.3. [11760](#) Metro: 2009 Budget Request - TPC 09.04.08

Kamp noted that there had been a request from the Wisconsin State Journal for budget requests of all City agencies that had been submitted to the Mayor, and Kamp wanted the TPC to see what was contained in Metro's request. He pointed out that the City's contribution to Metro's 2009 budget was \$10,592,523, the amount targeted by the Mayor, and represented less than a \$1 million difference from the 2008 budget. This amount included \$1 million adjustment for diesel fuel, and some reductions due to savings in workers comp and other areas. To achieve this target amount, the budget included the following:

- A Metro proposal to increase the standard fare from \$1.50 to \$1.75 with corresponding increases in other fare categories, which would raise \$400K additional revenues.
- An increase in expenses of \$150K for additional security at transfer points (in part funded through the fare increase).
- A \$300K reduction in expenses due to some shifts in paratransit contracts.
- No service reductions/increases.
- Diesel fuel expense based on a cost of \$3.75/gallon (vs. \$2.50 in 2008 budget and higher than \$3.25 in Mayor's \$1 million adjustment for fuel), and assuming the use of 1.3 million gallons/year.

Kamp remarked that WisDOT just issued guidance for 2009, allowing \$4.65/gallon. Kamp wasn't completely comfortable with \$3.75, but felt with a fare increase and some of the other actions listed, Metro could start with \$3.75. Metro was planning to go out to market and would know by early October if they could lock into a fixed price contract for approximately 15 months through 2009, and would see how close they could get to that number.

Though not shown in the document, Kamp highlighted three possibilities noted in the newspaper that were part of Metro's "5% reduction exercise" (equating to \$530K):

- \$315K could come from increasing fares to \$2.00.
- Eliminating holiday service (for 7 holidays).
- Using enunciation system on buses for advertising. Metro had some concerns about this, but it did help to reach the 5% reduction without having to look at any other services.

Kamp noted the chart showing how Metro's service breaks out: 82% for fixed route and 18% for paratransit. Among the items shown as "Major Objects of Expenditure", the largest increase was in "Supplies" due to ongoing increases for diesel fuel. Also shown here were total expenditures, which went from \$49,655,700 in 2008 Projected (inc. updated figures for diesel), to \$51,890.923 in the 2009 request.

Assuming that the request was purely informational at this stage, Hoag commented that if rate increases were going to be discussed, he hoped there could be some discussion of service increases as well, i.e., to provide Saturday and Sunday evening service. Also related to such a discussion of fare increases, he hoped that a citywide plan and funding could be developed to provide passes to people with financial need. Finally, he suggested that if funding for some of the recommendations found in the LRMTTP Report were not already included in the budget request, they should be – to respect the process just completed in the Ad Hoc Committee and to show forward movement on their recommendations.

Echoing Hoag's remarks, Solomon mentioned studies in other cities that had shown that fare decreases had actually increased ridership, and wondered if such an analysis had been or should be done in Madison. Kamp said that a specific review hadn't been done in Madison. A standard formula based on work by consultants, held that for every 10% decrease in fares, there was a 3% increase in ridership; and vice versa, for every 10% increase in fares, there was a 3% decrease in ridership. But he had heard anecdotally, that with gas prices going up, this standard formula wasn't working very well.

Sanborn pointed out that there was \$40K in the City's annual budget for a program for low-income bus riders. He went on to say that during the last round of fare increases, he heard people predict that ridership would go down if fares went up. This hadn't occurred; possibly because higher gas prices pushed people into transit use. While he was also interested in looking at data about the relationship between fares and ridership, he didn't think it panned out in reality that increased fares necessarily resulted in decreased ridership.

Kamp mentioned that Metro was anticipating a revenue increase with a fare increase – not a revenue decrease – because of all the factors involved. Following up on the questions about elasticity, Bergamini said that, as a long-time observer of TPC, behavior in Madison had been very different than the average, in terms of the response of the public to fare increases; Madison hadn't seen nearly the drops in ridership that would be projected by national models. She asked that if Metro were to do any research on the impact of fare changes, that Kamp share this information a few meetings ahead of bringing any fare proposals to the Commission. She felt it would be helpful for members to study this, particularly if Metro were working with economists doing work specific to Madison.

Kamp said that at the request of WisDOT, Abrams-Cherwony and Associates would shortly be conducting an every five-year management performance review at Metro. He would ask Ed Abrams, a recognized expert on fare elasticity, if he could look at how Madison may differ and the effect of current gas prices, and advise Metro as to how to adjust its fare elasticities. Appreciating Sanborn's comment that there was an existing \$40K fund, Solomon asked if, along with researching the elasticity issue, Metro also look at the idea of putting aside additional money; so that fares could be raised for those many Madisonians who wouldn't be impacted, but so there would also be a way to decrease the impact on those who couldn't afford them.

Streit wondered what percentage of Metro's revenues came from the passes as opposed to cash fares. Metro Finance Manager, Wayne Block, said that, of Metro's \$52 million total revenues in its 2009 budget, unlimited ride pass revenue accounted for \$4.8 million and "fare box" revenue (which included 10-ride tickets and monthly passes that people bought on their own) accounted for \$5 million. They were about equal in the amount of revenue they generated; and together, they (passenger revenue) made up roughly 20% of total revenues. In response to another question from Streit, Kamp said that current pass agreements varied in how long they extended out into the future: one-year agreements with one-year extensions, to three-year contracts with two one-year options. All agreements followed the fare schedule approved by the Commission: The schools, for example, had a fare of 88¢/ride during the past academic year (2007-08), which would increase to 95.2¢/ride for the

coming academic year (2008-09), and to \$1.00/ride in 2010. The new 2009 budget factored in both the fare increase as well as increases in ridership. Kamp confirmed that through the contracts, revenues from unlimited ride passes could be projected out through 2009.

Related to Metro's expense for additional security at transfer points, Bergamini asked if budgets for other agencies (such as the Police Department) had included money for this purpose. Kamp said that he thought only Metro had budgeted extra money for this; he wasn't aware of any other departments having done so. Solomon suggested (to the alders as well as Metro) that maybe this effort should be coordinated with the Police and the Schools, since many of the problems he'd heard about had occurred at school dismissal times. Kamp said that Metro was having regular meetings with the Schools and the Police Department on these issues; to explore, for example, whether (as in other communities) the transit system here would have a mechanism to use off-duty police officers to help with security (a longer-term change involving labor contracts).

In the short term, school principals were being asked to become more involved in disciplinary issues. Metro had already started providing certain principals with videos from transfer points, through which the principals could identify and talk to individual students about their conduct. Though not providing direct monetary assistance to Metro, these schools were expending time and resources on this, and it had been very helpful. Having already had success with this, Metro was planning to expand this effort to more schools, and was exploring many different ways to address the matter. People realized that this was not just one organization's issue – it was the community's issue.

Streit wondered where the budget process would be in a month. Kamp said by early October, the Mayor would have completed the 2009 Executive portion of Metro's budget, at which point the Board of Estimates and the Council would be able to see what the Mayor proposed in relation to Metro's request. Deliberations would occur throughout October, and the Council would act in mid-November. The Commission would be meeting on October 2nd before the Mayor presented his proposal on October 7th.

In response to questions from Bergamini about staffing, Block explained that a couple of positions had been re-categorized between last year and this, and the budget was "people neutral". Kamp went on to say that the Personnel Board had approved changing a half-time clerical position to a half-time IT position; because of adding security cameras and things like that, it became essential to do this. Metro was not able to add any new positions, and yet stay within its target. He did say however, that Metro had reorganized and converted existing positions by assigning different responsibilities to them: for example, previously, 19 operations supervisors reported to one operations manager; but now, 15 supervisors reported to three mid-level operations supervisors, who reported to the operations manager. This reorganization was designed to address effectiveness and efficiency issues, without adding any new positions.

Bergamini said that she raised these questions about staffing because she was concerned that technology was being added without the ability to analyze the data, or that current IT staff was being too stretched in terms of expecting them

to also continue to provide good data and reports about productivity, ridership, elasticity, etc. People had talked for a long time about giving current staff some help in this area, and she hoped this would remain in everybody's minds when considering and acting on the budget.

Durocher remarked that the budget was still evolving, and therefore Metro's request probably didn't require formal action by the Commission. However, he asked Kamp what the group could do to help. Kamp said he welcomed the comments and suggestions already made by members, and invited members to contact Metro with any additional input. Durocher concluded by saying that the TPC supported Metro's request, taking into account the comments that had been made.

Following discussion of Item D.3., Hinz asked Knobeloch to provide the Parking Utility's capital and operating budgets to the Commission at its next meeting.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

E.1. [10772](#)

Adopting the final report of the Long Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee and the recommendations contained therein.

Durocher mentioned some of the TPC members who participated in this committee, and who could speak to the contents of the Report. Kamp provided some background. The Committee started in 2007 and divided into five subcommittees (Service Improvements, Ridership, Marketing, Cost Management and Funding), which helped to develop the Report. Two series of public hearings were held in the summer of 2007 and the spring of 2008 (to solicit comments on the draft Final Report). Recommendations were presented as short-term – for implementation in 2008-09, mid-term – for implementation in 2010-12, and long-term—for implementation in 2013 and beyond. Kamp passed along regrets from Chair Mark Opitz, who had hoped to appear on this item. He noted that the Report had been referred to and reviewed by CSOS, BOE, ADATS, MPO, and LRTPC prior to coming to the TPC. He said that the Mayor had asked how the Report would be released to the public; staff was working on a press release that would come out of the Mayor's Office within the following two weeks.

Kamp related a comment made by Alder Rhodes-Conway: Although there is a focus in this Report on long-range funding, the focus is on the customer first and foremost. Kamp would have said that early on, people were looking at such things as the formation of a regional transit authority; but that too focused on the customer, by providing a stable local funding source and good regional transportation, to avoid the kinds of issues discussed in Route 13 and the Town of Madison. So ultimately, it does come back to the customer.

The Report covered issues ranging from customer amenities (such as the current pilot to provide trash receptacles on buses) to specific guidance for the formation of a regional transit authority. Kamp had been asked to serve on the RTA Study Council, and the Report (if approved) would give him some guidance to share with the group: ideally to form a county-wide RTA, but to look at some options if that was not possible.

Other long-term questions that were raised: Is Metro's facility located well? Should there be two garages instead of one? Do we have the correct size of

buses? Other short- and mid-term issues included in the Report (some based on public input): How can we improve times from north to south side, and east to west side? How do we integrate express services or even bus rapid transit; and while not to be viewed as competition to commuter rail, there was a network of potential corridors that could be used for bus rapid transit or bus express service.

The Committee did not want implementation of additional services to come at the expense of existing services, and that message had been received loud and clear. Recalling issues surrounding recent service changes and recognizing that Metro was not an RTA, Kamp allowed that individual situations might call for recommendations not consistent with the long-range plan, though hopefully these would be minimal. As Metro's General Manager, Kamp was pleased to have a blueprint like the Report, which was already providing guidelines and substantive background for staff to use in discussion with policy makers and leaders. It was also already raising questions about why some short-term recommendations for service enhancements in 2009 were not included in the budget, and causing conversations that might address them. Kamp felt that Metro would use the Ad Hoc Plan for years to come, to guide them in service decisions, Park and Ride lot decisions, in bus size decisions, and other important strategic decisions.

A motion was made by Hoag, seconded by Solomon, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Members requested that Metro staff prepare an outline of the (50) recommendations contained in the Report, with expected dates for implementation and the agency or agencies responsible for initiating and implementing each recommendation.

Kamp said he had heard suggestions from other committees that staff keep the TPC informed of the progress of the Plan, and he would be happy to outline a process for doing so, identifying key individuals involved and estimated timeframes. Along with providing periodic updates to the TPC, Kamp said he would be happy to tweak this reporting process when/if members felt it was needed. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [11754](#)

Parking: Resolution No. TPC-36, regarding permanent removal of five or more on-street meters due to projects - TPC 09.04.08

Durocher directed opening comments to Hinz, who had prepared some changes to the draft proposal. Because he had several comments related to wordsmithing and inconsistencies in the resolution, Hinz suggested that perhaps the item could be referred to the next meeting so that he and Knobeloch could meet to discuss his comments. When asked, Knobeloch said there was no urgency for the group to act immediately on the item, and thought it would be a good idea to meet with Hinz before proceeding further.

Streit/Sanborn made a motion to refer the item to the next meeting.

Members shared some of their questions and concerns to be considered when preparing new wording for the resolution. Hoag was concerned with the implication that without exception, if a project required the removal of meters, other spaces for meters would have to be found or the developer would have to replace the revenues. He wasn't sure if this requirement would always be in

the best interest of the city. For example, what if a street around Campus became a green space and place for pedestrians, which would be for the greater good? He felt it was important to consider alternative transportation modes and ways the central city might evolve over time. With higher fuel costs, it was possible there would be less parking.

Hinz shared Hoag's concerns, and invited comments from other members in order to make the re-write more effective. Bergamini observed that the next item on the Agenda related to a comprehensive transportation and parking design, and felt that consideration of the proposed resolution was perhaps premature; that it should be considered in the context of an overall plan. She agreed with the idea that people need not view the current number of parking spots on the street as the number that should exist. She almost preferred that the proposal be referred until the comprehensive plan was prepared. McCabe agreed with Hoag; she didn't like an absolute. She thought there could be better uses, which might mean that parking had to come off the street, and where it would be an added burden to put it back. Perhaps each situation should be considered on a case-by-case basis. In general, she felt that the proposal should be viewed in a larger context.

The motion to refer passed unanimously by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [11560](#) Creating and implementing a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation and parking design for central Madison.

Patrick McDonnell, 441 N. Paterson, 53703, representing the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association, provided a statement in support of the resolution. [Electronic or hard copies of this statement are available by contacting the Recording Secretary, Anne Benishek-Clark, at 267-8751.] Durocher read McDonnell's statement, which said that a comprehensive multi-modal transportation and parking design for central Madison was consistent with the transportation recommendations in the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan; and responded to needs expressed by the Marquette, SASY, Capitol Neighborhoods and to a recommendation in the East Washington Capitol Gateway Corridor BUILD Plan. The statement went on to say that the resolution would serve to integrate and implement recommendations from several mode-specific studies into a comprehensive design; and acknowledged that the resulting task might be costly, but that the potential benefit to the vitality and economic development of Madison was huge.

Susan Schmitz, 210 Marinette Trail, 53705, representing Downtown Madison Incorporated (DMI), spoke before the Commission. While registered neither in support/against the resolution, she very much supported it and thought it well written, but was concerned that the proposal was moving too fast, getting ahead of some other initiatives that needed to be completed first. She pointed out that the Parking Strategic Plan was not yet been finished and had not been presented to the TPC. With DMI supporting regional transportation solutions such as an RTA, she thought the proposal represented an important piece, but that it had to fit into something that DMI thought was more regional in scope, vis á vis connectors and other issues. She didn't want the community to get ahead of itself on this.

Brad Murphy, Planning Division Director of the Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development, was invited to speak before the Commission about the resolution. He said staff was not involved in the drafting of the resolution and had no input into it, so wasn't sure if he could speak to the intent of the resolution. But he said he could fill people in on what was contained inside the City's Comprehensive Plan and the E. Washington Capitol Gateway Plan, and offer some comments on the proposed resolution.

The City's Comprehensive Plan included a recommendation to update the 1979 Traffic Redirection Study for the isthmus. In addition, the desire to prepare a comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan was also included in the E. Washington Capitol Gateway BUILD (EWCGB) Plan, in response to concerns expressed by neighborhoods about the potential magnitude of development that might occur as a result the scale and massing recommendations contained in the E. Washington Plan.

As a part of the preparation of the EWCGB Plan, documents were provided to Plan Commission and the Common Council, which outlined some of the elements that might be included in a comprehensive transportation plan for the central city, and some of the potential cost and staffing implications of undertaking such a project. Murphy agreed with McDonnell that it would be major project and multi-year effort, and would require the allocation of significant staff resources to the project, as well as the hiring of consulting services in order to complete the project. Planning would recommend that adequate funding be provided at the outset of the project, and adequate budget authority to undertake and complete the project. It wasn't clear what the budget authority might be and how much. During the discussion of the EWCGB Plan, Planning contacted the City of Denver, which had prepared a comprehensive transportation plan for their downtown, for which they budgeted and spent about \$1 million. About a third of that was spent on traffic modeling of intersections and streets that comprised the circulation system within the downtown. Murphy said that in order to update the Traffic Redirection Study of 1979 and to fully evaluate alternatives and potential modifications to the circulation system, a detailed operational model would be needed at the intersection level, prepared and calibrated so that alternatives could be considered and evaluated, and good, hard recommendations could be made. This would not be an inexpensive undertaking, and adequate funding would have to be considered.

Murphy then commented on timing, wondering whether this was an appropriate time to start a project like this, given the availability of staff to support the effort. The resolution indicated that the Planning Division would provide staffing for the project along with Traffic Engineering support. Planning was currently involved in several major planning initiatives (preparing a downtown plan, rewriting the City zoning code, as well as preparing some major neighborhood plans throughout the City). The availability of Planning staff to support this effort was very limited, and Planning was concerned that staff might not be able to devote the type and kind of attention to the effort that it deserved. While not arguing that this was a desirable project that should be undertaken, Planning was concerned about the timing of the project and the availability of adequate resources to get it done.

Murphy responded to questions. He didn't know what the difference would be between a "transportation design district" and a "transportation plan". He wondered about this as well, and could only speculate as to what it might be. To him, "district" implied it would be a geographic area, within which there would be some special initiatives or funding available or assessments or requirements that didn't now exist. He thought of "overlay districts" in terms of zoning, where there might be basic zoning such as residential, which then might be overlaid by an urban design district, having additional regulations and requirements that would then be put in place. Flood plain districts were also examples of overlay districts. He wasn't sure if this was what the resolution had in mind or not. He wondered if it might be a tool to be used to implement recommendations that may be included in the plan. But to include this implementation tool as a given, before the plan was prepared, seemed to pre-judge the recommendations that would be included in the plan, and the assessment of alternative methods that might be used to achieve the recommendations.

Durocher appreciated the caveats expressed by Murphy regarding the resolution, and invited members to comment on the item. In discussion about the committee referrals and the referral process, Solomon observed that one of the secondaries, LRTPC, had referred the item back to itself. Noting that he and David Dryer attended the August meeting and offered similar comments, Murphy said that the LRTPC took this action because none of the sponsors were available at the meeting to discuss the item. Solomon hoped that some of the concerns raised about the resolution might be addressed (perhaps at LRTPC) before the TPC took action on it.

Hoag stated that he had mixed feelings about the resolution:

- The resolution would create a new group to work on this issue and which in some ways seemed redundant of the work of other groups, such as LRTPC. He questioned the idea of creating an ad hoc group to do that. In general, he was concerned about the hidden costs involved in this; though not paying people to do the work over and above what they got paid, there were hidden costs because other things were not getting done. Plus, all the listed representation was either represented at LRTPC, or had the opportunity to speak there.
- He was concerned that apparently staff had not provided input into the resolution.
- Though valuable, creating circulation and intersection models was very expensive. He observed that fuel prices had probably not yet peaked yet, but when they did, they would have a big impact on traffic patterns. He was concerned about spending a lot of money on things that could change very quickly; even with good consultants and modeling, the models would come apart when energy prices went up at a faster rate than now.

As a result, he too was comfortable with deferring action on the resolution.

Bergamini said she wanted to suspend discussion and refer the item. Streit suggested that the action to refer be conditional, until a fiscal estimate was provided. And if there weren't extra money, he wanted to know what other projects would not get done, and to what extent the proposal overlapped. He felt that members were not ready to discuss the item until at least those three

things were addressed. Bergamini then suggested some language for the motion: To refer until such time a fiscal analysis has been completed and staff has been consulted about a reasonable implementation schedule for conducting such study. Sanborn thought it might be difficult for staff to track and determine when these conditions had been met. He suggested that the item be referred to the next meeting, and if the action requested by members wasn't taken, then the item could be referred again.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Solomon, to Rerefer to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. Hinz offered a friendly amendment that the Chair send a letter to the Lead committee (DCC) to relay the various concerns expressed by members.

Durocher echoed previous comments, as follows:

- He found it difficult to support anything that appears to be replicating other bodies and efforts that are already under way.
- As the Transit and Parking Commission, the TPC by its very title and charge, had some responsibility for taking the overview that this study committee would attempt to take.
- There might be some sense of usurpation of responsibility by setting up something, to do what the TPC had been set up to do, in a more difficult sort of way because of the replication in that additional committees did require more staff time.
- He was completely supportive of the idea of taking a look at parking in a more comprehensive way than looking at one ramp and its merits, at a time.
- He was aware that there were competing ideas about moving people around in public transit – BRT, commuter rail. So the idea of having a comprehensive overview of transportation and multi-modal approaches was understandable.
- However, he was not entirely convinced that yet another body was needed to do that. He thought people could move ahead with those questions with the commitments that had been made in existing bodies.

A vote was taken and the motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2. [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.

Staff explained that the Mayor's Office had asked that the TPC refer the item to its October meeting, so that the secondary referrals could act on the item before the Commission (as Lead) acted on it.

A motion was made by Solomon, seconded by Sanborn, to Rerefer the item to the October meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION.

Though the item was being referred, Hoag mentioned some comments he wanted considered when action was taken. He found archaic the current provisions for alternate side parking in the winter. Madison was on the edge of becoming a non-attainment zone for air quality, which would be highly undesirable. Starting up a car to move it and shutting it off again was one of

the worst things to do from an emissions standpoint. Most of the emissions from automobiles occurred during cold starts, simply dumping them into the air.

As a progressive, environmentally friendly city, Hoag felt we should not have a plan that made everybody, regardless of the weather, start up their cars and move them to the other side of the street all through the winter months. He could not support making another change in regulations, while still having this archaic provision in them. He said he would prefer taking the definition of snow emergency that is used for the downtown area and extend it to all alternate parking areas; i.e., so that alternate parking would be in effect only in a snow emergency. He saw no point in starting a car even when the streets were just fine. He urged everyone not to pass any further resolutions that keep the awful rule intact.

A vote was taken and the motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [11807](#)

ADATS recommendation re: Segway Policy - TPC 09.04.08

As a long-time member of ADA Transit Subcommittee, Durocher provided some background on the item. Four years ago with the emergence of Segways as personal transportation devices and at the recommendation of ADATS, the TPC adopted a Metro policy that Segways would not be taken onboard buses, and drivers would be advised to call a supervisor. The rationale behind this was that such a device would occupy one of the two wheelchair tie-down spaces in buses, and it was not a good idea to use that capacity for Segways.

Now, a rider was using a Segway as a necessary mobility aid to compensate for physical impairment. The rider had met with Metro, and had been able to use the bus to secure and tie down his Segway using bungee cords not normally available on the bus. To accommodate this person, the ADA Transit Subcommittee prepared its recommendation. This was the only instance of such a request in four years that challenged the policy, and it didn't appear to present a major problem. Durocher thought there might soon be new ADA guidelines coming out of Washington to address Segways. ADATS was recommending that the TPC temporarily suspend its existing policy regarding Segways.

A motion was made by Solomon, seconded by Hoag, to Approve the ADATS recommendation to temporarily suspend the Segway policy. The motion failed by the following vote:

Excused: 3 -

Robbie Webber; Amanda F. White and Gary Poulson

Ayes: 6 -

Brian L. Solomon; Jed Sanborn; Duane F. Hinz; Sharon L. McCabe; Kevin L. Hoag and Kenneth M. Streit

Noes: 1 -

Margaret Bergamini

Non Voting: 1 -

Carl D. Durocher

- F.4. [11703](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Meriter Hospital, Inc. for the provision of free access by its employees and volunteers to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement to the transit utility for employee and volunteer trips for the period December 1, 2008 through November 30, 2009 with an option to renew for one additional year.

Kamp said the resolution authorized an unlimited ride pass agreement with Meriter Hospital, which was modeled after the agreement with St. Mary's. It was a one-year agreement with a one-year extension. Meriter was enthusiastic to begin the program. The contract would start in December and would follow the fare tariff approved by the TPC related to unlimited ride passes.

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

- F.5. [11496](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with Dane County Human Services to provide RSVP Driver Escort Services for the City of Madison for the calendar year 2008.

Kamp said the resolution authorized Metro to enter into an agreement with Dane County for RSVP driver escort services, to help individuals who need a little additional assistance. The program had been in place for several years, and provided an example of good coordination between the County and the Transit system to provide extra assistance to individuals with disabilities or older adults. Metro was seeking approval of the dollar amount, and to continue this long-standing arrangement.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Solomon, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. 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 the reports.

H. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

H.1. General announcements by Chair - None.

H.2. Commission member items for future agendas

Durocher noted that there had been some items referred to future meetings, and invited members to suggest other items they would like on future agendas. In conjunction with Item F.2., Leg. File 08820, related to snow parking violations, Streit acknowledged that there was nothing more frustrating than having to move a car when there was no snow on the ground. He wondered if someone could investigate whether other cities had a mid-level system for snow removal: a system for removing snow without making cars move every night for 4-6 months (or without waiting until a full snow emergency to require cars to move, as suggested earlier, which could present a different set of problems). Durocher suggested that perhaps someone from the Streets Department could provide some information about this, since in our own city, we had some areas where cars had to move only in a snow emergency and other areas where they had to move every night. He also thought it would be useful to hear Streets' response to some of the proposals, because of their experience in different parts of the city and because they would have to live with any changes. Kamp said he would relay these questions to Al Schumacher at Streets, who was already planning to attend the October meeting to discuss Leg. File 08820.

Bergamini had a suggestion for some future agenda to discuss the expected loss of \$1.6 million in Medicare/Medicaid program funding in support of transit. Kamp said that a meeting had been set up in late October with the Mayor and the County to discuss this loss and when it might occur. He thought that in a few months, staff could bring more concrete information about a timeline, financial impact, and a preliminary plan to do this so that it serves the community well. Durocher added that the impact of this on the budget came through the paratransit service delivery, and as a result, ADATS had been following the issue closely. So much of this had to do with the still-formulating plans on a state level regarding family care and how it was going to shift around the use of federal Title 19 money as it came into Wisconsin. Durocher felt that we had been using the money well and wisely when it came to transportation, but now we may lose some of it. So many things were still unknown that it would be hard to put it on the agenda until more became clear.

In response to a question, Kamp said that Metro was investigating when the Square might once again be open to buses. The original target date was sometime in October.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Solomon, to Adjourn at 6:55 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.