



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

PLEASE NOTE: This meeting can be viewed in a live webcast of Madison City Channel at
www.madisoncitychannel.com.

Wednesday, January 11, 2017

5:00 PM

201 W. Mifflin Street
Madison Central Library, Room 302
Third Floor Conf. Room

Please note: Items are reported in Agenda order.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM.

Present: 7 - Ledell Zellers; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow; Gary L. Poulson; Kenneth Golden and Kenneth M. Streit

Excused: 4 - David Ahrens; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich and Michael M. Johnson

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Zellers, seconded by Tolmie, to Approve the Minutes of the December 14, 2016 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.1. [45615](#) Parking: January 2017 Activity Report, November Revenue-Expense-Occupancy Reports - TPC 01.11.17

Asst. Parking Utility Manager Sabrina Tolley mentioned that page 2 of the Narrative (in the report attached) contained the updated schedule for the elevator at the Overture garage. Streit/Golden made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [45616](#) Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Financial and Performance Measures, Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Reports - TPC 01.11.17

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp noted that ridership trends were the same as before. Road calls were down because problems with clogged fuel filters had been resolved since the tanks had been relined. Though up, passenger accidents (similar to chargeable accidents) were mainly minor; and

were watched closely. Related insurance claims were not up to the same extent. Golden/Bigelow made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Items F.2., F.3. G.1. and F.4., before returning to Item F.1. and the remainder of the Agenda.]

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- F.1. [45285](#) Adopting Madison in Motion as the City of Madison's long-range transportation system plan, policy framework and resource for future transportation investments, as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item F.4.] Chief Transportation Planner and MIM Project Manager David Trowbridge reviewed the major transportation elements in the MIM long-range transportation plan (MIM PowerPoint attached), and answered questions.

- (Page 1) The Isthmus Freeway Plan from 1955 reflected the direction many cities took to serve their central districts. We now realized how this would have destroyed neighborhoods, State Street/the Square, and the entire character of the Isthmus.
- (Page 2) The resolution and plan recognized that we now must rely on other modes of transportation to provide mobility in the central city that included public transit, living close to destinations, bicycle transportation, and walking – important principles for MIM. Along with integrating MIM into the various neighborhood and City plans, the resolution called for MIM to provide realistic mode choices other than driving if possible.
- Draft Recommendations included: Policy statements, maps/routes that laid out networks for our transit and bike system in the long term; best practices for designing infrastructure and delivering transportation services, esp. in light of evolving technology.
- MIM was not a program of individual projects; those decisions were made as part of the capital budget process. Instead, MIM was meant to be a resource for the development of projects; and deferring to other more detailed plans, called for follow-up in connection to such plans as TDP and BRT.
- (Page 3) Outreach was made to a wide variety of stakeholders with varying needs, inc. senior and low-income groups, millennials, and others, collecting feedback throughout the process.
- (Page 4) Land use: As the city grew over the coming decades, we needed to be mindful of how and where we developed. The map showed areas where development were expected to occur, which needed to be part of neighborhood planning and link into the transportation system also. Large parts of the city and periphery were off-limits to development, such as single family neighborhoods that were stable, and large areas of farmland and environmental resources.
- (Page 4-5) MIM talked about Activity Center Planning, another name for what Planning had been doing for years: TOD, mixed land uses, good transit services to that, strong ped environment, and community services nearby. Hilldale and the East Rail Corridors were examples of larger-scale, higher-density Activity Centers with a mix of income groups and housing, retail, and employment. Smaller-scale nodes abutting neighborhoods were possibilities for Activity Center planning also.
- (Page 6) The map showed areas in the city where such Centers with a more urban form could occur, to consider transportation linkages when planning. The graph showed that 7/10 trips to work were made by automobile, whether

alone or car-pooling. The City hoped to improve the numbers for other modes.

- (Page 7) The blue Transit map showed that in some areas of the city, as many as 30% were using transit due to relatively short travel times, the cost and lack of parking, and high levels of transit service. They were hoping that if these conditions could be replicated in other areas of the city, more people would make these choices.
- (Page 8) Public Transit recommendations included BRT and local bus coordination; and the roles played by Park & Ride, First Mile/Last Mile, as well as more robust and sustainable regional financing to allow for growth and keep up with inflation.
- BRT would include articulated buses, nice stations/amenities, and new technology.
- (Page 9) The map showed areas of low-income housing in the city circled in red. People who were dependent on low-income housing were becoming more and more dispersed, further away from core transit areas and from jobs within 30 minutes of where they lived. Low-income and people of color had to transfer 1-2x to get to work.
- To gather information, staff talked to people at Transfer Points and heard unbelievable stories: One-way trips of 90 minutes; jobs that started so early that Metro couldn't serve these riders, who had to take cabs instead. These people were trying to get to jobs and turn their lives around, and the transportation system and location of housing didn't work for them. The City wanted to rectify that moving forward.
- Benefits of BRT included faster, more frequent service, and off-board fare payment, which would save a lot of time.
- (Pages 10) Maps included potential BRT routes in every direction, connecting to partnering communities to help create a regional system, and connecting to many areas with job density.
- (Page 11) However, BRT did not address housing location for people who needed to access jobs, as shown by the First Mile/Last Mile map. If people didn't live right on the corridor, then they had to travel a mile to get to a corridor. It was costly to run a fixed route bus to circulate through these areas, not to mention having to go through a Transfer Point. People might go out of their way to use BRT, but First Mile/Last Mile planning needed to be refined.
- The Park and Ride map showed untapped potential for transit use. BRT will be fast, but how would people get to it? One way would be drive. People were now parking in neighborhoods to the chagrin of some residents. But perhaps Park and Ride could be formalized to identify areas with free parking, to encourage more transit use. A follow-up Park and Ride study was being recommended.
- Regarding reconstituting Transport 2020 into a new committee to begin planning for BRT, it was possible the City could move forward on its own without the County and WisDOT, who could assign some remaining funds to the City.
- (Page 12) While ridership was growing, level of service was not, because we couldn't afford to add service to meet the demand. Non-local shares of funding were flat/shrinking, and the local share (property tax) was picking up the slack just to cover inflationary growth, not to mention growth of service to peripheral areas. Metro had a funding crisis, and a stable regional source of funding was needed to allow the City to grow with its partners.
- (Page 13-15) MIM recommended a process be started to look at some sort of regional entity to pay for and govern Metro; and look at possible other funding sources (user/developer/infrastructure fees, bonding, public/private

- partnerships, etc.) MIM also recommended TDM's and TMA's be pursued.
- (Page 16-17) Opportunities for express bus service existed, esp. through a regional transit entity. Locations for an intercity bus terminal (at Beford and now at Lake) had been discussed. Like the terminal at LaCrosse, it would be desirable to have some other land use above ground. In the heart of the Campus, the Lake Street location showed some promise, esp. if the City could partner with the UW, and if the bus companies would use it.
 - (Page 18-19) Next steps would be to measure how we were doing over time. This year, a national household survey would be conducted to see how people were making decisions about trips for work, shopping and recreation. This would be tracked over time.
 - Previously, a goal had been 20% bicycling citywide by 2020. But now they would drill down further, by creating zones throughout the city and applying different numeric goals based on conditions there. If they felt there was more opportunity to get a higher mode split in some zones due to service there, this should be reflected in performance monitoring.
 - Technological changes: These should adapt to the urban environment we would like to create. People wanted to walk and bike, and have a liveable environment. For example, we didn't yet know how/when the technology of driverless cars would advance, but weren't designing our city around them. The City would monitor changes (payment cards and electric bikes), and consider pilot projects for them.

Members asked questions and made recommendations:

- (Zellers) Page 11, Action Items: The timeframe for the update/implementation of the Comprehensive Plan should be 1-5 years.
- (Zellers) Page 13: Car-sharing could go a long way in reducing individual cars in denser areas, but it had not been happening. How might they get this off the ground? Companies like Cars-2-Go hadn't shown any interest since the issue with State regulatory hurdle had been resolved. Developers could help by providing both a spot and a car for car-sharing.
- (Trowbridge) The City would need to start working with these companies again; perhaps to find spots for them in private developments, or to figure out the parking issue.
- (Zellers/Trowbridge) Page 14, Action Items: Along with targeting larger employers to use transit passes, smaller employers/groups could conglomerate through TMA's to do this (as the plan recommended).
- (Zellers/Trowbridge) The plan did not discuss minimizing one-way streets, which had pros/cons; and their applicability in certain geographic and urban contexts varied. To look at specific changes or improvements like that, a corridor plan with surveys and modeling and a high level of detail was needed, and that was called out in the plan.
- (Kemble) Paratransit and land use were connected, and funding was shifting. This was something we should explicitly and specifically plan for.
- (Trowbridge) Page 14 talked about improving access to affordable housing and employment, which was a place where the plan could say transit-dependent and paratransit-dependent persons should be integrated into housing strongly served by transit. This was not purposely omitted, but it could be called out more.
- (Golden) The plan should make some mention about maintaining paratransit services above the minimum. Some reference should be made to the Bus Study and the recommendation to use articulated and small buses. If the planning horizon was 30-40 years, perhaps the plan should mention that.

- (Trowbridge) The plan referred to "6-10 years and beyond".
- (Golden) It would probably be a good idea for the different recommendations in this plan be conveyed to the MPO so that they could be reflected in the MPO's plan (i.e. the next TDP). It also wasn't clear as to how this plan would fold into the Comprehensive Plan.
- (Trowbridge) The resolution said MIM would be a supplement to the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- (Golden/Trowbridge) Re: how MIM would be worked into the TDP (in order to pursue alternative funding beyond property tax), MIM needed to keep a delicate balance, so as not to supersede the TDP. MIM didn't talk about roadway capacity planning, because the MPO maintained the regional model. But MIM did talk about looking at innovative ways to provide First Mile/Last Mile, and maybe that could be emphasized in the TDP.
- (Golden) Governance (esp. intergovernmental) wasn't really discussed in the plan. Though an RTA was not an option, it was possible under the Statutes to make inter-governmental agreements if it involved the County, to create something that quacked a bit like an RTA. Given the current and likely future shape of the Legislature, the plan should explore governance (whether through the MPO or a different body) of how transit collaboration should be handled.
- (Golden) A County committee that he chaired had come up with \$1.5M of capital funding. But the County Attorney said the County couldn't fund transit, which wasn't really the case, esp. in light of how the County already funded a lot of transit.
- (Golden) Regardless, the County role in partnering and mainline funding should be pursued, given the property tax base they had compared to us. The historic role of counties was to connect communities. Some placeholder language should be added to MIM to address governance and intergovernmental cooperation.
- (Trowbridge/Golden) The bottom of Page 2 (Action Items) contained some language related to regional transportation and transit governance in the Madison metro area and Dane County. This could be expanded.
- (Trowbridge) A resolution had just been introduced related to regional transit, which was referred to the TPC.

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Golden, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion); and to document Commission comments on the MIM Correction Sheet. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.5.]

F.2. [45508](#)

Authorizing the execution of a Purchase and Sale Agreement with Madison Gas and Electric Company for property at the intersection of South Livingston Street and East Main Street; and, authorizing the execution of a Memorandum of Understanding with Madison Gas and Electric Company regarding future municipal uses within the Capitol East District.

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item E.2.] Economic Development Director Matt Mikolajewski recapped info related to the Capitol East development and the Parking Utility garage planned there. He then discussed the resolution.

- It approved the terms of the purchase and sale agreement with Madison Gas and Electric, to purchase a portion of their property upon which the Parking

structure would be built

- The resolution also authorized the City to execute a memo of understanding with MG&E regarding future municipal uses. MG&E was concerned that the City not bring other City uses to the District (beyond those already there and identified), without first consulting them.

Mikolajewski answered questions.

- The "as is" clause meant that City would be purchasing the property in its current condition, which included some contamination that would need to be managed as part of the structure.
- MG&E had done boring samples of the property below two feet, which were already available and showed just a trace presence of PCB's. City Engineering thought that what was missing were results from 0-2 feet; and that the City would want to do its own testing in that zone.
- The City would still be allowed to back out of the deal, if total costs to remediate would exceed \$500K.
- Re: the as-yet-to-be-determined size of the property and associated cost: The length of the rectangle along Livingston to the south could increase, depending on the design of the parking structure (such as length of drive aisles); and if needed, whether the City could purchase the additional land near MG&E's rail spur to the south. Money for this would come from the Land Acquisition Fund.
- No federal funding was being sought for remediation, because it was likely that DNR only would require a simple cap. The structure would serve as this cap / the remediation. The only soil that would need to be removed would be for the footings of the structure. One caveat: If they did identify higher-than-acceptable level of PCB's in the 0-2 feet of soil, which had to be taken to a special landfill and involved additional costs, they would then examine what approach to take with the property.
- DNR would issue a Closure Letter with parameters to say that if at sometime in future the parking structure would need to be disturbed, then the City would need to revisit the situation with DNR. In other words, they would need to maintain the cap, or pursue remediation.

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Golden, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [45581](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into a contract on behalf of the City with HUB Parking Technology USA, Inc. for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of a Parking Access Revenue Control System.

Tolley said that after an extensive RFP process, HUB had been chosen for the PARC replacement system. HUB had the low bid and was the existing vendor for the equipment and software. This was the access revenue control system, inc. gates, pay-on-foot stations, pay-in-lane stations, computers and related software. The current system was reaching the end of its life. The resolution also allowed them to continue to sign service agreements with HUB for the lifetime of the equipment.

A motion was made by Streit, seconded by Zellers, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item G.1.]

F.4. [45617](#)

Metro: Full Wrap Ad Proposal - TPC 01.11.17

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item G.1.] Marketing and Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch joined Kamp to discuss the proposal. Kamp reminded members of the Council's direction in the budget, for staff and the Commission to explore a potential revenue increase through the exterior wrap advertising program.

At last month's meeting, staff had talked about exercising a little flexibility over the past year, having 20+ wraps in certain months; and had gotten the sense that this was acceptable as long as the average over the entire year was 20/month, or 240 wrap months in a year. Some months, they would have more than 20 wraps, and some months, they would have less. Per the attached proposal, the additional revenue that could be generated would be \$25K.

Based on feedback from alders who did not favor increasing the total number of wraps, members felt that this proposal would strike a balance. Bigelow said he didn't like the wraps, but if they were making money, why not increase the number to 30? Whether more could be sold, Rusch said what they really needed was leeway in the 4th quarter to sell more than 20, rather than to leave money on the table.

Zellers/Bigelow made a motion to approve new policy language to say: The amount of allowable full wrap advertising be at or below an average of 20 full wraps per month. The motion passed by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.1.]

F.5. [45618](#)

Metro: Proposed Leave Attended Policy - TPC 02.08.17

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item F.1.] Kamp was joined by Paratransit Program Manager Nancy Senn and Transit Service Manager Crystal Martin to discuss the proposed policy.

- (Kamp) Though a hard issue, this was an important issue to address from a staff perspective in terms of running the Paratransit service.
- As mentioned earlier, Metro went above/beyond the ADA in certain areas; this was one.
- Leave Attended pertained to customers who couldn't be left alone at the end of the ride. They needed to be met and attended by someone.
- The failure for someone to meet/attend customers occurred enough that it disrupted service, primarily to other customers, who were made late for their appointments and destinations.
- In terms of process, ADATS had had some quorum issues; but it had gone back to them since TPC requested this in August. Staff hoped TPC could move the proposal along to take care of the operation of the Paratransit.
- (Senn) The proposed policy was similar to the No Show policy that was in effect: It adopted the strategy of warning the client when they were violating the parameters for Leave Attended services, with steps that escalated to a suspension of service. It also contained a strategy for bringing someone back into service after a suspension.
- Currently, 400 individuals had Leave Attended status.
- ADATS felt that the consequences to the client were a bit severe and were felt by the client/passenger, who wasn't necessarily the person who could correct the issue. ADATS thought the non-presence of the attendant was the

real problem.

- The proposal represented an implementation of strategy for deterring Leave Attended issues and correcting that.

Staff answered questions.

- (Martin) Two changes to the No-Show policy were an improved method of notifying people; and a reduced penalty schedule. In terms of results, for some people who were going to improve their behavior because they were aware, it helped. Others who had issues, continued as before, because in some cases, it was beyond their control. And these folks went through the process and experienced the consequences.
- ADATS expressed concern that the individual rider would have the consequences rather than their staff or vocational support. But Metro had no control or relationship with vocational staff; the relationship was with the individual in order to have any control over the consequences.
- Metro could ask for voluntary compliance, and had been working with Dane County over the years, since most of the Leave Attended people were part of the Medicaid Waiver program. The problem with voluntary compliance was that it was voluntary; it didn't produce a lot of adherence to Metro's request for follow-through.
- The method for bringing people back into service was already being used for other situations (Ex. disruptive rider).
- Of the 400 Leave Attended riders, the people with issues were familiar to staff. On a revolving basis, 10-15 individuals/attendants were involved; and this could be cyclical depending on the agency serving that client.
- The No-Show policy was rolled out over a period of months. Staff worked with people to get them up to their best selves. So by the time the policy was implemented, they had a high level of compliance. Metro would follow the same model of notifying everyone, esp. Leave Attended people, about the new policy and working with them to bring them into compliance, before imposing the full effect of this policy.
- (Senn) Staff and ADATS had worked on the issue intermittently over the past couple of years, starting in 2015. After a lag in ADATS meetings, Senn made her informational presentation to TPC in June, with plans to return. After this, things went awry.
- (Martin) Staff and ADATS had discussed imposing a fine, but found they couldn't enforce collection of it. It wasn't permissible.
- The issue really was the impact on the other riders, who were left stranded on the bus. For example, if a UW student on their way to a final exam missed the exam, they blew it for the entire semester. And what could staff say to a fellow passenger who was upset because they missed a doctor's appointment that took 3 months to get?
- Metro did their best to get people to these important occasions. It wasn't easy to implement something as stern as this, but it was necessary. With the staff they had, they needed a process that they could manage.
- In order to suspend someone's service, things had to be well documented to ensure that they were observing their civil rights to appeal, that they were not suspending them prematurely, and they were observing their rights under the law.

Golden said he hated this issue. While he disagreed with staff, he understood why they constructed the proposal they way they did.

- From Metro's perspective, the rider was their client/consumer, the person

they had to deal with. All the things around that person was irrelevant.

- However, the clients themselves (with intellectual and developmental disabilities) probably weren't even aware that they were violating the policy when they couldn't get off due to lack of attendant care. The idea of being punitive to the client didn't seem to be the appropriate way to handle this.
- When this was discussed at the two ADATS meetings that had been held, his impression was the members didn't like the policy because it didn't deal with the persons who were messing up.
- Metro had a contractual relationship with the County, and Metro could ask for some provisions in that contract. The County had a contract with the provider, and it was the provider in these instances who had messed up.
- The direction ADATS wanted to go was to use the County's considerable clout with the provider to motivate the provider to come into full compliance and better performance. The evolving approach seemed to be towards the County penalizing the provider significantly enough so as to motivate high compliance.
- We were dealing with people whose entire lives were predicated on the effective performance of providers (residential, vocational, attendant care). Any poor performance by any of those providers would disrupt that person's life. Punishing that person wasn't the way to go.
- To address the harm done to other riders, the buses shouldn't wait, but should continue on. If the provider hadn't called ahead, that's on them. The client would still be disrupted because of the ineffective performance of the receiving provider (which the policy would try to penalize).

Golden recommended that this be placed on file and that ADATS try to craft a policy asap. Hopefully they could get a quorum at ADATS at their next meeting. Not yet having a motion on the table, Poulson invited staff to respond to Golden's comments and member questions.

- (Martin) Re: the County's Purchase of Service agreement with agencies providing services to the riders, this policy wouldn't prohibit that. It would certainly help with implementation if the County followed through on that asap.
- But the problem was what would happen in 12 months when Family Care came, and the County was not longer the agent, and this went to the MCO. They would still have this issue.
- At that time, clients would experience a lot of change. Incremental, gradual change (vs. radical change) would be more beneficial for them.
- Re: the number of agencies who were creating the problems for the revolving 10-15 clients, several dozens were involved. They weren't always the same ones. Also, various care providers worked with each client, and it was difficult identifying which one failed to show up.
- (Senn) Another difficult operational issue was to ensure that Metro had the current contact info; this info changed all the time.
- When the attendant failed to show up, the dispatcher immediately got on the phone to try to round up somebody. In the meantime, the driver was anxious to know what to do; after five minutes, they were supposed to move on. Dispatch kept checking. But what if the next rider being picked up, needed the space being taken by the unattended rider? Sometimes the driver could not go to the next pick-up, until the first rider left the vehicle.
- (Martin) Re: whether all the agencies received the notice, each individual may be supported by a vocational support agency, a residential support agency, a case manager, parents or guardians. Metro asked the rider to pick

one, who would interact with Metro and communicate with the team on the other end.

- Notices weren't sent to the rider's home. Staff worked to find the responsible liaison, whether it was the vocational or residential agency; sometimes staff worked with the County to determine who this was. Metro updated the County every week, and followed up with the responsible parties. But even so, they still saw the same clients.

Streit asked if perhaps the responsible person could be required to provide a remediation response within 30 days; and whether staff could send an email to all the agencies that might be involved, to put them on notice. Martin said they could do that. But they were trying to introduce a process that they could manage and implement.

- The challenge was what they could do with one dedicated staff person, to administer this and contracting oversight. By comparison, Milwaukee County Transit provided twice as many one-way rides, but had 12 dedicated staff people.
- It could sometimes take a week to document and identify the responsible person, not to mention preparing and sending a letter, which could take another week to deliver.
- Without a doubt, to implement this policy, staff had to make contact with a responsible individual who could act in the interest of the rider.
- As far as putting these people on notice, they were sent a warning after the first occurrence. While the letter didn't specifically require them to submit a plan, it was in their own best interest to create a plan to prevent this in the future, because the next time this happened, there would be a penalty, the potential loss of service for failure to correct the problem.
- Instead of putting staff in the position of having to evaluate plans, the policy put them in a position of asking people the result of their plan; had there been another occurrence.

Kemble asked about the impact of delaying a decision on the policy to ask ADATS to modify some of the language. Martin said there would be the continuing impact on other riders and on day-to-day operations. Also, the role of the County would be moot in a year; and since ADATS had had quorum issues, they couldn't know when things would move forward. They might be able to pull together an ADATS meeting in January; but the concern was that they might end up delaying to the point where they were feverishly working on family care implementation, with a lot of upheaval happening at the same time.

Re: other questions from Kemble, Martin said the rides were standing orders; and they worked with Dane County to keep the contact info up to date. Dane County kept the databases for the 800 Leave-Attended clients and their providers; and the two org's regularly exchanged spreadsheets. But this didn't always get staff the info when they needed it.

Golden suggested a process, if members decided to put the proposal on file. Recognizing that ADATS had had quorum issues, he would authorize staff to work with ADATS if they could get quorum, or on their own, to craft a policy asap. In response to questions that had been raised, he described his sense of what the policy should look like:

- It wouldn't work without some form of partnership with Dane County, which

could involve contractual provisions between Metro and the County, and between the County and the providers.

- A single point of contact was needed, whether for the dispatcher or the driver. The point of contact could be a broker or care giver, who had to have an active cell phone that got answered. The contact could be the guardian as well, but it would probably be better if it were a paid staff person.
- Staff shouldn't be burdened with review of corrective action plans. That should be on Dane County, not Metro. The County should be responsible for fixing the problem.
- The punitive action needed to be directed to the agency that messed up, to motivate the County and the provider. He would even say they couldn't ride anymore this year without an attendant. A person from the receiving agency needed to be there.
- Such a policy could be developed with Doug Hunt.
- The policy needed to be shown to be effective over the next months, for when they had 2-3 MCO's and Family Care.

Golden/Bigelow moved that the policy be placed on the table, with the recommendation that staff, working with either ADATS or staff at Dane County, prepare and return in a timely manner with a revised policy, that included a partnership with Dane County, contractual obligations to the County and providers, a single point of contact with a live cell phone (not necessarily part of the policy and something that could be done immediately). Bigelow questioned whether current contracts that ended on 12/31/17 could be changed at this point. Golden thought they could.

Zellers asked about impacts and if the motion were workable. Martin said that in terms of the value of where they focused resources and because contracts ended 12/31/17, she thought the status quo would continue. Golden disagreed with this, based on the open discussion with Doug Hunt at ADATS, where Dane County showed some willingness to pursue some of what had been discussed. Martin noted that the County wasn't prohibited from doing that now. Golden hoped the response from the County would be better than what staff had experienced. If not, he would make a motion himself to approve the current proposal. Bigelow said that whether it worked well with the County for the next 12 months, this would be a good starting point for dealing with MCO's after 2017. It might provide some ideas of where to set those contracts up, down the road.

Kemble confirmed with Golden that his motion didn't require contracts with the County be renegotiated, that it was a recommendation; that staff could determine it wouldn't be a good use of their resources to put that in the policy; but that they would do some of the other things suggested. Poulson confirmed with Golden that the timeframe for returning the policy would be a month.

The motion carried by voice vote/other. [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Item G.2.]

G. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

- G.1. [45619](#) Parking: Pre-design Report for Parking Garage Block 88 Judge Doyle Square - TPC 01.11.17

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item F.3.] Using the attached In Progress report dated Dec. 9, 2016, Tolley walked members through the design concept for the garage.

- The development on Block 88 would include the fully underground public parking garage, bicycle center, retail and apartments.
- Block 105 would have another apartment complex and hotel with all private parking to serve them, which would be owned and operated by the private development.
- Block 88 would have a separate section of above-grade private parking to serve the apartments there.
- Gov East would not be torn down until the new parking in Block 88 was open and available to the public.
- (Page 2a) The primary entrance to the Block 88 public garage would be on Wilson Street (next to MMB). To the right of that would be a loading dock area. On Doty would be a one-way reversible lane; which during peak hours would serve as either an "In" in the AM or an "Out" in the PM (and also adjustable for Special Events or an emergency closure on Wilson, as needed). The Doty entrance would also be used for apartment parking.
- (Page 2b) The preliminary concept for Pinckney Street showed a fountain in the median, still under review by TE and Engineering.
- (Page 3) Showing the lowest level of the public parking garage (U5), this was one of the items not decided yet, awaiting updated cost estimates. An initial question was whether fire code would require that the entire level be wrapped over to the fire access elevators.
- Ramping down to U5, all of which was below the water table, made things considerably more expensive to build and maintain. To get the number of stalls they wanted with the desired long span by reducing the number of columns to make it seem more open and user-friendly, would increase the thickness of the floors and bring them down lower.
- One option being considered: To avoid having to wrap the level around, the Fire Dept. said the ramp might end at the place where the aisle began to wrap around (at #7 shown in diagram); or at mid-aisle (where white abutted red in diagram). They would pick up 18 additional stalls, putting the total close to the 600 stalls they wanted, without incurring significant expenses. With the bottom aisle to the fire elevators, the number of stalls on U5 would be 57. They were waiting for cost estimates before deciding.
- At 837 feet elevation, the entire level was below the water table. They preferred to stay above 846 feet. The construction cost and associated operating costs would have to be weighed against the extra space.
- The Utility's contribution to the project would be \$13.1M, regardless of these particular costs. But overall project costs would be lower.
- As for 75-80% occupancy at Gov East currently, and whether parkers would travel down five levels to reach these spots, it was possible they would. On-street parking in the area was going to be lost. They wanted to get as close to 600 stalls as possible.
- (Pages 4 & 5) U4 and U3 were identical. (Page 6) U2 was the level where City fleet vehicles were currently sited. A full level of parking was a floor above this; so while convenient for City fleet, it didn't use the prime spaces where public would be parking on the first full level. The right of the diagram showed a potential access control system as well.
- Cost-sharing for the fleet parking, for operating cost/maintenance, hadn't yet been discussed. Golden wanted the issue of cost-sharing brought to the TPC. He didn't think the Utility should absorb maintenance and depreciation costs

for other agencies using this area.

- (Page 7) U1 was the first full underground level.
 - (Page 8 & 9) U0 was a "half level", which had ramps for cars entering/exiting from and to Wilson and Doty. The garage Customer Service office would be located next to the Wilson Street entrance, and equipped with a transaction tray. A Customer Service Ambassador would work out of there. The ped walk-way ran along side of the windowed office.
 - The Wilson entrance would have three lanes: one entrance, one reversible, one exit.
 - (Page 10) The green area next to Doty showed the entrance and exit ramps for the private development, which flanked the reversible entrance (in red). The configuration allowed turning movements that would keep conflicts between the private and public parking traffic to a minimum.
 - Retail was shown in blue, the bike center in the middle, and access to additional retail and loading dock on the right along Wilson.
 - (Pages 11-15) Apartment parking one and two levels up was shown in green; with apartments and amenities above that (Levels 5-Roof).
 - (Pages 16-18) Cross sections of the ramping were shown.
 - (Pages 19-22) Views from each street around the development were shown.
 - The bid documents would go out in May; ground-breaking would begin in the fall.
 - Proposals for the bike center were due back December 19th. None were received. Currently, staff was going out to interview people who had expressed interest, to find out what the barriers were.
- [Please note: The meeting proceeded to Agenda Item F.4.]

G.2. [45620](#)

Metro: Update on Intercity Bus Location Change - TPC 01.11.17

[Please note: This item followed Agenda Item F.5.] Kamp said that the intercity bus location had been changed in the first week of January. There had been some transitional issues, with complaints about idling, snow removal, and where to park vehicles. Metro was working through those issues, passing information along to the bus companies as appropriate, and working with the UW. Not having to cross the bike lane twice, their 350 riders and many passengers thanked the Commission for listening. Though not a perfect solution, they would work to make things the best they could.

H. **REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only; no action required.**
(Most recent meeting minutes electronically attached, if available)

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee
Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long Range Transportation Planning Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
TPC Subcommittee (to review issues outlined in Leg. File 37359)
Ad Hoc Transportation Ordinance Review Committee
Ad Hoc Metro Paratransit Medicaid Waiver Funding & Policy Review Committee

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

I.1. General announcements by Chair

None.

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

None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Zellers, seconded by Tolmie, to Adjourn at 7:14 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.