



# 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](http://www.madisoncitychannel.com).

---

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 260, Madison Municipal Building  
(After 6 PM, use Doty St. entrance.)

---

### A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

**Present:** 7 - David Ahrens; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson;  
Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich and Kenneth Golden

**Excused:** 3 - Chris Schmidt; Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

Please note: There is one vacancy on the Commission, in the position of  
Second Alternate.

### B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to Approve the Minutes of  
the May 13, 2015 meeting. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Ayes:** 4 - David Ahrens; David E. Tolmie; Margaret Bergamini and Ann E. Kovich

**Abstentions:** 1 - Kenneth Golden

**Excused:** 4 - Chris Schmidt; Rebecca Kemble; Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

**Non Voting:** 1 - Gary L. Poulson

Please note: Kemble is marked excused on this vote, because she arrived just  
after action was taken on this item.

### C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

### D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Golden recused himself from any discussion about the parking ramp and future  
discussions of Judge Doyle Square, for reasons of conflict of interest. (Please  
note: Golden later clarified that he was referring to Gov East parking ramp,  
rather than the proposed Capitol East ramp.) Kemble disclosed she was a  
member of Union Cab, and recused herself from Item F.1., Union Cab's permit  
renewal. Bergamini said she would be abstaining from voting on any motions  
regarding the University's contracts with Madison Metro.

### E. TRANSIT AND PARKING MONTHLY REPORTS

E.1. [38783](#) Parking: May 2015 Activity Report, April Revenue-/Expense/Occupancy

Reports - TPC 06.10.15

Asst. Parking Utility Manager Scott Lee noted that staff did not have accurate financial statements currently; and it was unlikely they would have them until 2016, when they would be able to compare the current fiscal year to the next fiscal year. They had been unable to pull any reports to make comparisons; and the data from last year was contained in a different system, also making it difficult to compare the data. The first quarter had just been closed a week earlier. Kovich/Tolmie made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [38785](#) Metro: YTD Fixed and Paratransit Performance Indicators - TPC 06.10.15

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp said that Metro did not have a financial report for the same reason as Lee had mentioned. Staff would have the ten years of data (requested by Ahrens) available to everyone at the August meeting. Bergamini/Kovich made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [38613](#) Relating to Union Cab's 2015-2017 Taxicab Operators' License Renewal, pursuant to Section 11.06, Madison General Ordinances.

TE Transportation Analyst Keith Pollock he was happy that Union Cab was able to get their application in before their current license expired at the end of the month. He recommended approval. Both he and Paul Bittorf from Union Cab were available to answer questions. Kovich supported the renewal, and noted the comments that proposed the City provide adequate subsidies to Union Cab for their accessible fleet and services. This was an ongoing discussion, and Kovich asked that a report and discussion on the topic be put on a future agenda.

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Golden, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Ayes:** 5 - David E. Tolmie; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and David Ahrens

**Abstentions:** 1 - Rebecca Kemble

**Excused:** 3 - Chris Schmidt; Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

**Non Voting:** 1 - Gary L. Poulson

F.2. [36970](#) SUBSTITUTE - Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into a sole source contract with Trapeze Software Group, Inc. for a TransitMaster software and hardware upgrade at a cost of approximately \$147,600 and amending the Metro Transit 2015 adopted capital budget as appropriate.

Kamp said a Substitute had been created to clarify some of the technical description of the upgrade, which was key to Metro's automated vehicle locator (AVL) system, and to providing better access to app developers, who might want to develop applications on real time and scheduling data for

customers to use. It would also improve their radio reliability which was hooked into that. It was sole source because Trapeze had control over AVL systems related to their radio system, their scheduling system, and their real-time data. They were not practically able to change all of those systems for one contract. Staff was seeking approval to move forward with this.

Bergamini wondered if this was the most recent version of Transit Master. Kamp thought it was. When asked, staff said Metro was using Windows 7 operating system. Bergamini said she raised the question because support for Windows 7 was ending in the relatively near future.

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT (15 VOTES REQUIRED) - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [38142](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with the University of Wisconsin - Madison for the continuation of the provision of access by its students to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement to the transit utility for rides by UW - Madison students for academic years 2015 - 2016, 2016 - 2017 and 2017 - 2018 with two one year options to renew for academic years 2018 - 2019 and 2019 - 2020.

Without objection, Poulson combined Items F.3. and F.4., which related to Metro contracts with the UW. Kamp said both were 3-year contracts, with two 1-year extensions.

- Both contracts contained the same methodology, in which a 4-year floating ridership average was used that protected both parties: If there was an extreme increase in ridership, the UW would not have an immediate increase in cost; and similarly if there was a dramatic drop in ridership, it would protect Metro from a dramatic loss in revenues.
- For the last several years, UW ASM ridership had increased 4-5% per year, and UW Transportation ridership had increased in the range of 2-3% per year.
- The contracts continued the rate at the current level. (The possible rate change for WI-FI had been postponed indefinitely.)
- Metro recommended approval of these two important contracts, which constituted a significant portion of Metro's ridership.

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Golden, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Ayes:** 5 - Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and David Ahrens

**Abstentions:** 1 - Margaret Bergamini

**Excused:** 3 - Chris Schmidt; Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

**Non Voting:** 1 - Gary L. Poulson

F.4. [38534](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to enter into an agreement with the University of Wisconsin - Madison for the continuation of provision of access by its employees to Metro Transit fixed route and ADA paratransit services, with reimbursement to the transit utility for rides by UW and UW Hospital

employees and members of affiliate groups as designated by UW Transportation Services for academic years 2015 - 2016, 2016 - 2017 and 2017 - 2018 with two one year options to renew for academic years 2018 - 2019 and 2019 - 2020.

**A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Golden, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Ayes:** 5 - Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Ann E. Kovich; Kenneth Golden and David Ahrens

**Abstentions:** 1 - Margaret Bergamini

**Excused:** 3 - Wayne Bigelow; Kate D. Lloyd and Chris Schmidt

**Non Voting:** 1 - Gary L. Poulson

**F.5. [38469](#)**

Amending Sections 3.14(4)(a), (b), (d) and (e) of the Madison General Ordinances to add an elected official from a Regional Transit Partner to the Transit and Parking Commission.

**Kamp discussed the resolution from a staff perspective.**

- Through the Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee (CSOS), Metro worked with Middleton, Verona, Town of Madison UW, and all of their partners.
- This change would allow a voting member on the TPC.
- It would go to improving the regional relationship with Metro's partners, and was a very encouraging potential change.
- Others had worked on this, including Ken Golden.

**When asked, Kamp said that currently there were no elected representatives from the partnering communities on CSOS. Mayor Steve Arnold from Fitchburg was recently on; and an alder from Verona who served as a substitute. Kovich wondered about the intention of the proposal with regard to the Alternate position. The resolution called for one member who would be the regional transit partner Member, and one who would be Alternate. As the proposal was written, it seemed that both Alternates would be able to vote no matter who was missing. She wondered if that was the intention; or was the intention that when the regional partner Member was missing, the regional partner Alternate would step in and vote. There was the potential for two regional transit partners to vote, depending on who was present and who wasn't.**

**Along with Kamp, Asst. City Attorney John Strange and Mayoral Assistant Anne Monks discussed this and other questions.**

- (Monks) She had been part of the discussion about the proposal, and had understood that potentially, one or two regional transit partners could vote. There was a significant desire to have more participation. And sometimes it could be one or two partners, or in some cases, none. The Commission could make a recommendation to improve that.
- (Strange) If the Commission wanted, language could be added to say there could only ever be one voting alternate member. But he didn't think that was the intent. (Monks) Rather, it was understood that the process for alternates filling in as voting members would follow normal procedures.
- (Kamp) In Appleton, the Fox Cities Transit Commission had three non-City of Appleton members on it. In his experience, this worked really well; there was

still a majority from the City of Appleton, but it allowed other members to participate. From a staff and from a cooperation perspective, he didn't see a problem if occasionally there were two (voting partners).

- (Strange) The intention was that the Alternate from a regional community would only vote on transit matters; this person would not be a full Alternate, and could only vote on transit matters.

Members and staff discussed the role of the regional transit partner members in determining quorum.

- (Bergamini) If the Commission needed the (transit) Member/Alternate to make quorum but they were not allowed to vote on 90% of the agenda at that particular meeting, that would be problematic.
- (Poulson) This would be especially true, if there were just five members present, which is quorum; and only three could vote on most matters.
- (Kovich) Usually, quorum was calculated on the persons present. Here where people would be restricted by matters upon which they could vote, they would have to consider what that did to their quorum requirement.
- (Monks) Because the number of members would increase from nine to ten, quorum would become six.
- (Kovich) That would depend on how many members were appointed. If the Mayor chose not to appoint someone and there was a vacancy, quorum would be based on the positions that were filled.

Bergamini asked about the other partners who were not municipalities, such as the school district, the tech school district and the University. Strange said the new positions were intended for those communities that had elected members (municipalities vs. communities). Monks said that they had discussed the other partners (represented on CSOS); but that for example, as a resident of the city/school district, a representative of MMSD could be appointed now as a regular member. However, residents of other cities could not currently be named.

Golden then turned to Sec. 2.(d)(2) of the proposal, which contained a provision he hadn't seen before: What was the rationale for the Mayor being able to simply not make an appointment? Strange said that adding a regional member to a City committee was a significant step; and they wanted the Mayor to first have the ability to make that appointment, but that if for some reason, s/he got a nomination that s/he didn't want or if s/he received no nomination, s/he could choose not to appoint. For the purposes of this ordinance, this would apply just to this Commission.

Members and staff began discussing Sec. 1.(a), related to language to clarify that the TPC was not a public utility (Transit Utility or Parking Utility).

- (Strange) City Attorney Michael May wanted these changes because the current ordinance talked about the TPC as a public utility, but it was not according to Wis. State Statutes. The language changes would make the ordinances consistent with what the State law allowed it to be.
- (Strange) For example, the Parking Utility was not a public utility under the State public utilities law; and the ordinances saying it was, didn't make it so.
- (Bergamini) She had read over the State Statutes and didn't see how the ordinances were inconsistent with them; in particular the Transit Utility seemed to fit under Section 66.0805, Wis. Stats. She wanted to know the specific ways the ordinances weren't consistent with State Statutes.

- (Bergamini) She also wanted to know what authorities/powers the Commission would lose or gain by these changes; would it still be able to set rates, and have bonding authority?
- Strange didn't think the Commission would lose any authorities, but could expand the Drafter's Analysis to address these questions.

Poulson said they might want to consider referring the item. Members could formulate their questions, and they could get a more thorough understanding of what was being attempted, esp. the Alternate member being all-purpose or not. Golden asked that they consider the two different elements of the resolution separately (the portion related to appointing a transit partner, and the portion related to language consistent with State Stats.) Poulson said unless there was an objection, he would rule that they would be able to separate the two sections.

Golden made a motion to refer to a future meeting the portion related to language in the ordinances and State Stats., when the City Attorney's Office could report further on it; and to consider the appointment portion of the resolution separately. Poulson reiterated and seconded the motion to refer the section on page 2 about ordinances and statutory language related to public utility status.

Kovich said she was hesitating because she had questions about how this would work, how they would figure out quorum for certain matters. She wanted everyone to understand that better, so they could act appropriately. Golden said he thought it likely they would end up referring both parts of the resolution, but it seemed to him that they were talking about two really different issues: one to create a seat for the contracting communities, the main thrust of the resolution; and a second to fix up ordinance language while in that area (for which they wanted more information).

Kemble said that the two sections were integral to each other. Did they want to bring a new member onto a board, where they weren't sure of its powers and were still debating that. Or should they just clean it up, get their answers, and then consider the whole proposal. Bergamini also pointed out that Section 66.0805(1), Wis. Stats. specifies that commissions have at least three, five or seven members.

A vote was taken on Golden's motion to refer the first portion of the proposal related to State Stats. and their authority: Ayes - Ahrens, Golden, Tolmie. Noes - Bergamini, Kemble, Kovich. Poulson broke the tie by voting aye.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Kemble, to also refer the other portion of the resolution related to appointing a regional partner. Bergamini didn't want to delay adding a regional partner on to the Commission, but she wanted to see that happen in an orderly fashion.

Golden said he wasn't surprised by the motion, because the questions that had been raised were quite consequential. The proposal had become way more complicated than his original idea was. He was one of the sitting members on CSOS, and the members from the other communities were generally staff from those communities. While he understood the motivation to have an elected person, nothing was diminished by having the particular staff that they did.

Since he was no longer on the Council, he would defer to the wisdom of elected officials; and this was better than what they currently had. There were several things that were not quite right about, that needed to be fixed. He did not like and would propose deleting the language that would allow the Mayor to just sit on it. If the Mayor didn't like who was sent forward, let the Mayor send it back. With 20% of Metro's budget being provided by the partnering communities, and as a matter of discretion, those folks might not be represented, ran counter to the whole purpose of having this in the first place.

Poulson asked if there was further discussion about the motion to essentially send the entire proposal back to the City Attorney's Office. Poulson also asked members to organize their questions and send them on, so they would not have a repeat of this at the next meeting. Golden asked if it was the intent of the proposal to allow a substitute member to be a non-CSOS member. Whether yes or no, this should be made more explicit. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.6. [38795](#)

Metro: Request for public hearing at July TPC meeting, to hear public comment on removal of the bus stop at the top of State Street - TPC 06.10.15

Kamp said there was a City initiative to look at the bus shelter at the top of State Street just before Carroll, which served routes traveling inbound toward the Capitol. The routes that stopped at this location would now stop at the shelter on Carroll and Main, about 250 feet away. Metro was not leading the initiative, but the elimination of the stop could help them with time constraints on some of the routes. Metro was requesting a public hearing at the July meeting about removing the bus stop. Golden asked for a brief MPD report as to where they think the activity will move once the shelter is moved.

A motion was made by Kovich, seconded by Tolmie, to Approve Metro's request for a public hearing at the July meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

G.1. [38791](#)

Parking: Proposed Capitol East Garage - TPC 06.10.15

Asst. Parking Utility Manager Lee presented some information about the proposed Capitol East garage.

- Preliminary discussions were being held about a potential garage in the Capitol East District at the MG&E site on the corner of E. Main and S. Livingston. A draft Memo of Understanding was being circulated among all the parties.
  - The Parking Utility had developed a basic design lay-out for an approximate 650-stall, six-level above-ground structure that would potentially include a commercial component, but that component would not be owned or operated by the Utility.
  - The initial cost estimates for the Parking component were approx. \$13.5 million, fully paid by using TIF funds, which would be turned over to the Utility to own, operate and maintain going forward.
  - Staff had developed a preliminary pro forma. Several important factors needed to be understood when considering this.
- \* Parking rates that would be set there for leasing would be market rates for

that particular area, which wouldn't necessarily correspond with the rates at the Capitol Square; they'd probably be less.

\* In order for this garage to operate efficiently and for the Utility to own and operate it, it has been determined that it would have to be a fully automated garage, meaning it would not have cashiers on site, but would instead have more of an ambassador type person, who would float around doing maintenance, making sure everything was functioning and assisting customers to use the pay-on-foot or the automated exit pay-with-credit-card.

\* Even with the fully automated system that would reduce their costs, it would likely require that the Parking Utility be granted a waiver or a partial reduction of the PILOT payments in the initial period of operations.

Matt Mikolajewski, Director of Economic Development, provided a brief overview of Capitol East District initiatives, the opportunity for development of the 800 South Block, and the potential parking facility. (See attached PowerPoint.)

- The Cap East District was the area of E. Washington Avenue from the Square to the Yahara-First Street area, on both sides.
- The City had undergone a 10-year planning and implementation effort to transition this corridor into a transit-oriented, mixed-use neighborhood with a focus on housing and employment.
- Employment had been a key theme that had been woven through all of the planning and implementation work.
- Working with the adjoining neighborhoods, the City had done substantial planning, with the Capitol Gateway Corridor BUILD Plan adopted in 2008, the Urban Design District #8 plan, and adjacent neighborhood plans, which focused on returning employment to the central area of the city.
- They had had some success in this regard: Shop-Bop had relocated its facility in the old Marquip building; the Constellation project was constructed; the Galaxy project was currently being constructed; improvements to Breese Stephens Field had been made.
- The 800 South Block redevelopment: The Block was on the southeast corner of Livingston and E. Washington Avenue, and was part of the former Don Miller holdings.
- The City currently owned this two-acre parcel, purchased as part of the Don Miller holdings. It was part of an RFP process soliciting proposals for the site from developers. Through this, they received a proposal from Otto Gebhardt and Gebhardt Development, who developed the Constellation and the Galaxy.
- The Gebhardt proposal called for a home for StartingBlock, an entrepreneurial center primarily for entrepreneurs in the IT sector, but would also have a project called Sector 67, a hacker maker space for people to experiment with building products and prototypes.
- A couple months ago, American Family Insurance announced that they would provide the primary financial backing of the StartingBlock project; and since then, they have decided they would like to located offices within the facility as well, which was a great opportunity for the city.
- Also being proposed for the facility was a concert venue, a potential culinary training center, and other office and retail space.
- Potential impacts: >250,000 SF of new development, all retail, office and commercial, and no residential; >600 jobs, >\$50M tax base; ability to incubate new companies, ability to relocate AmFam downtown; and grow a transit and mixed-use district.
- Potential Parking Facility: Could be constructed on a portion of MG&E



holdings on Main and Livingston, just east of the power plant. The 800 Block development would be to the north of the potential structure across Main Street. MG&E had expressed some interest in partnering on this project.

- As a public structure, it would provide an exciting opportunity on weeknights and weekends to make use of the facility to serve some of the other great amenities in the District, inc. Breese Stephens Field and Central Park, as well as the growing retail and restaurants along Willy Street. Parkers would pay an hourly rate just as did in other facilities.

- Parking facility details: 600-650 stalls, 2.5 stalls/1,000 SF of space, 600 stalls leased to developer for weekday use by 800 South Block tenants at \$60-70/month.

- Office users usually called for 4-5 stalls/1,000 SF, but given the transit and bike amenities in the area, the developer felt fewer would serve their needs. Also, the developer was not asking for free parking, but was willing to pay, although not as much as the City received for its existing downtown structures.

- As the District continued to grow, it was advantageous to have such shared parking arrangements at different times of the day and week.

- Capital costs would be funded through TIF, at ~\$12-13M. \$12M was already in Parking's CIP budget.

- What was needed to make the structure work for the Parking Utility: An automated ticket system with limited staffing; reduced or no PILOT in the first years of operation, in order to see what the actual revenue would be (esp. evenings and weekends), and to allow demand to build in the District; as the facility began to generate additional revenue, PILOT could be increased.

- These features were critical on the operating side to ensure the Utility was made whole, even though the tenants would not be paying the same rates as those at the downtown ramps.

- There would be no debt service; the capital costs of the ramp would be entirely funded through TIF, which based on initial calculations would be generated by the development project on the 800 South Block.

- Parking Facility Alternative: The developer could construct a private structure on 800 South Block; resulting in a smaller building (less jobs/tax base) to accommodate parking; the City would likely need to continue TIF support; evening/weekend parking would be operated by a private operator.

- Staff preferred a public parking facility. It would allow for greater density on the 800 South Block. And since the City would likely need to provide TIF support to a private ramp, philosophically, there were some benefits if the City were to provide funding, that the City continued to own and operate the structure. This provided greater flexibility for evening/weekend parking.

- The City was still in negotiations with the developer.

- Next steps: Approval of development proposal by Cap East Committee for 800 South Block; refinement of plans and tenants by Gebhardt Development; refinement of the cap costs and TIF underwriting; refinement of operating assumptions by the Utility; continued discussions with MG&E on how transaction would occur between them, the City and the Utility, with people now leaning toward a long-term lease; ultimately the Council would have to approve the proposal, and would likely refer it to the TPC for action.

Mikolajewski said that at this juncture, they were looking for guidance and direction from the TPC. What was their comfort with this concept? Was this something they wanted City staff to continue to explore with Gebhardt and MG&E?

Members discussed the proposal and asked questions.

- Kovich said she would be interested in hearing more about the proposal, but before offering her support to move the project forward, she would want more information to better know the impact on the Utility and City in terms of financing, etc.
- Golden wanted to make the group aware of an idea being discussed as part of the Madison in Motion plan, for a parking facility at the east end of an expanded downtown that went through the Cap East District, to get congestion out of the downtown; and to explore the possibility of having a park and shuttle (he had envisioned the facility being on Thornton Avenue by the State property).
- (Golden) If the 800 South Block proposal were to proceed, and if the Madison in Motion idea would become connected to it, that would require a few more stalls based on the estimate of that additional use (perhaps a 100+). He thought staff working on this project should be in touch with staff working on Madison in Motion.
- Ahrens confirmed that the facility would be constructed, owned and operated by the Utility 24/7, where certain stalls would be leased to tenants for certain hours on weekdays, but which would open to the public (through leasing or hourly rates) during the evenings and weekends.
- Related to other land uses in the area, Golden asked that staff working on this proposal consult with the Planning staff who were involved in the Cap East Plan, to try to project timing, demand and efficacy of expanding the ramp to accommodate additional uses in the area that might be built (with less parking) because they could rely on having some public parking.
- (Golden) The advantage of this ramp (vs. one at Thornton Avenue) was that it was fairly centrally located in that developing area, and so was an attractive site.
- Golden's other questions: Was this being conceived of, as only a ramp; or could was there a possibility for first-story retail? What would it look like from the outside; would there be any way to beautify it?
- Kovich was interested in the financial feasibility of the garage in terms of long-term strategy; and hoped, for example, there be a very long-term lease with developer to have a commitment that would take them out through the time needed to pay for the ramp.
- Bergamini asked how the number of 600 stalls was determined? Also, was this a brown-field site, and if so, had it been remediated? Because whether owned or leased, they would probably want to negotiate the cost of such remediation.

Lee addressed some of the questions.

- To respond to Golden's question, Parking's preliminary architectural lay-out included commercial space on the East Main side, potentially on the first two floors. Because of the functional lay-out of bays in a garage and its footprint, Parking's plan took this off of Livingston and put it all on Main, which was why the numbers shifted a bit.
- As Kovich was suggesting, staff was trying to right-size the garage. They weren't yet sure of the footprint they would have; and they were working with the developer to get a number, while he was trying to nail down projected tenants and their needs. It was a very fluid situation.
- They were working on laying out the design for future need as well; for potential future additions, it was likely they would not go up but would go out horizontally, so they wouldn't have to shut down.

Mikolajewski said they didn't know for sure if the area was a brown-field site, but they would be exploring that with MG&E. Poulson thanked staff for the presentation, and said the group would look forward to an update on this matter.

G.2. [38789](#)

Metro: Audible Turn Signal/Alert System - TPC 06.10.15

Kamp introduced staff and provided some background about the issue.

- In 2011, Metro had a serious accident that sparked Metro to look at ways to minimize chances of having the type of accident they had at Lake Street and University Avenue and a left-hand turn maneuver.
- At the same time, they had been collecting an inventory of data of both more minor accidents and close calls that informed their decision-making in this process.
- Metro had had a press conference with the Mayor and the MPD in November 2014, when they talked about the issues they were seeing and showed some of the close calls and some of their concerns. (Video of this is available at MyMetro.com.)
- The item was placed on the agenda in response to Alder Zellers and others, who asked why Metro hadn't taken more formal input from the public, which was a good point.
- In terms of the data Metro had, it was limited. Only a handful of transit systems were beginning to move in this direction to deal with busy streets.
- Metro also wanted to discuss alternatives.
- So it made sense to have an informational meeting to start this discussion. Members had copies of the ordinance and some materials related to measurements and feedback in their packets (attached).

Metro Transit Service Manager Ann Gullickson, who oversaw operations and maintenance, made the following remarks.

- When Metro first started the project, they installed audible left-turn signals on three buses; and then tested them in their yard and in the community.
- Dave Rihn from the City Safety Office brought a decibel reader, and helped Metro learn how to set the readings and what to set them at, to evaluate what the experience would be before they put them in service in the public, to experiment with what the audible signals would sound like.
- They tested the signals on the three buses for a year. First they placed them on left-turn mirror, then on the left-front bumper, then the right-front bumper, and finally ended up putting them on the roof.
- They got feedback from drivers, who were listening to the audible signals for their entire driving shift; and they heard from customers and members of the community.
- When they ended up placing them on the roof and setting them at a decibel level that did not seem to be disruptive to people, they weren't getting the same feedback from the community, drivers and customers that they had initially. After that year of experimentation, they moved forward.
- The Measurements info provided the readings they got at different times over the multi-year period, to test the experience of riders at the bus stop. They wanted them to be aware at the bus stop that the bus was pulling in, so that they would step away from the curb.
- Along with riders and drivers, they tested the experience of residents along the routes, for which they used the City ordinance, to test the decibel level 50 feet away from the bus.

- The second page of the sheet provided a summary of customer feedback. The first year the alarms were in place on only three buses (out of 214 in the fleet), they received 32 items of customer feedback. They learned from that experience.
- Metro now had them on ~200 out of 214 buses, with a goal of completing installation by the end of the summer, going into the school year.

Members commented, and Gullickson, ACA John Strange and other staff responded to questions.

- (Kovich) Looking at the chart in the ordinance and the maximum dBA levels for residential, most of the levels tested seemed to be above the 65 dBA. Safety was very important to her, but she was trying to weigh the annoyance, the alarm fatigues people mentioned, and all of the factors people raised, so they could get it to a point where it was safe but didn't cause distress, and where it wasn't so loud that it was too loud.
- (Strange) The ordinance did set the level at 65 dBA, but it specifically exempted safety equipment; so for this particular device, the ordinance didn't apply. That didn't mean members couldn't inform their discussion with the ordinance, or determine what was reasonable for people on the street.
- (Kovich) The 65 dBA limit must have come from some place; somebody must have said this was the comfort level for residential areas. So even though the limit didn't apply from a safety standpoint, she was thinking about it in those terms.
- (Kamp) Some of the measurements were what maintenance used when six inches away from the signal. And the ordinance talked about measurements at 50 feet away from the vehicle and up four feet. Looking at the last box on the info sheet re: experience of residents, the sound levels were 67 and 68 dBA using the criteria of the ordinance for taking a measurement.
- (Gullickson) Another page of the ordinance discussed decibel levels at 50 feet away, which were the levels the signals were supposed fall within, for the sake of comparison to Metro's numbers. She couldn't explain why there were different numbers from page to page in the ordinance, and how they applied.
- (Strange) He couldn't speak to the science behind how the Council arrived at the numbers in the ordinance. When they adopted the ordinance, the Council talked about what the purpose was, and arrived at a number based on the science they referenced in the purpose. He wasn't an expert on decibels or that science.
- (Ahrens) As mentioned, the decibel level would be exempted because of safety. And he thought there would be a presentation as to whether this created a safe environment. He was looking for info that this was evidence-based, that putting the signals on buses had a demonstrable effect in terms of reducing pedestrian accidents. If they didn't have that evidence, then the basis for this being a safety device in some way, no longer applied. Then it was just an annoyance.
- (Ahrens) There were two measures for sound: one was decibel, which the ordinance reflected; and the other measure was frequency level. Based on the feedback they had received and in his own experience, it wasn't how loud the signal was, it was the frequency. It was a high "beep, beep, beep", which had a certain quality to it different from just a normal low frequency sound, which wouldn't wake people up in the morning.
- (Ahrens) There was quite a bit of evidence now that the beeping of trucks backing up, was no longer an effective measure on construction sites, in terms of being a warning because on large construction sites, there was always

beeping. So the sound didn't mean anything to people anymore. He hoped staff could address some of these points.

- (Kamp) Alder Zellers had likewise raised the question of what was the data on this. When they began project, they reviewed other transit systems who had experienced serious accidents, and were beginning to look at alternatives to the standard. While buses were generally loud, the hybrid-electric buses were quieter, which was kind of a mixed thing to keep in mind.

- (Kamp) General Operations Supervisor Phil Gadke's task was to reach out to other systems, which were beginning to collect data. In fact, Portland, OR had received a \$300-400K grant to study this, because there was a lack of data. And yet, there were serious pedestrian and bicycle accidents in the transit industry. Metro staff felt they needed to do something and collect data, as opposed to waiting for another transit system or the industry to provide that data to them. It was a bit of a "Catch-22", and they decided to try this with that issue in mind.

- (Ahrens) The issue was that Metro had experienced a tragedy and felt they needed to do something. But the bottom line was that no transit system had collected data in a systematic fashion to show a demonstrated effect from using this particular alarm system.

- (Kamp) He said it was the tragedy, but it was also the growing awareness of how many close calls they had had. The insurance industry talked about how for every accident, there were dozens of close calls. Now that Metro had cameras they could review, they saw those close calls.

- (Kamp) Some of the transit systems were beginning to report out on this, so he would ask the Commission for some time to try to answer some of their questions if they could. He hesitated to say they would have scientific-based conclusions for them, but that's what they would be looking for.

- (Poulson) If and when the TPC revisited this issue, it might be helpful for them to see the video, which was very revealing about some of the close calls Metro encountered on nearly a daily basis.

- (Golden) Regarding the science behind how the Council set the decibel level in the ordinance, both he and Poulson were on the Council at the time, and the science was what got eleven votes. There was a lot of give and take; and it was political not scientific. He gave an analogy: When there were more than 25 kids crossing an intersection with a certain volume of traffic, the City placed a crossing guard there. When there were five kids crossing an intersection with a lower volume of traffic, those kids were on their own. He wondered about when staff programmed the signals and talked to the drivers, what were the instructions?

- (Gullickson) The alarm was connected in with the turn signal; so the drivers didn't actively turn it on/off. As soon as a turn signal was turned on, the audible signal was activated, and was on as long as the turn signal was on. The purpose was to alert people in the area that the bus was there, so if there were blind spots, they would be alerted that the bus was there. The alarm went off every time a turn signal was used, regardless of the number of people in the area or the location of the turn (side street or busy intersection).

- (Tolmie) As someone who relied heavily on his hearing, he greatly appreciated the device. As pointed out, the hybrid buses, esp. when there was additional traffic in the area, could sneak up on a person. He couldn't see the buses, so the audible signals to him were a blessing, esp. since the hybrids could be exceedingly quiet. Even standing too far out, a person could get hit by the mirrors, which actually happened once. And the odds of hearing a lower frequency alarm in heavy traffic (with semi's or trains) were very low. The higher pitch made it stand out.

- (Bergamini) When Metro was considering this device, which other systems in the state or country did they talk to?
- (Gullickson) No other systems in the state used alarms. Two systems using devices were Portland, OR, and Cleveland, OH.
- (Gadke) Des Moines, IA, and Richmond, VA, were using alarm systems also. It was difficult to find this info; but he had found news articles about Portland and Cleveland. Significantly, Cleveland had had a reduction in pedestrian fatality accidents. Other large communities were researching and thinking of implementing similar systems as well.
- (Poulson) Could the devices be turned down; was there a way to lessen the sound?
- (Gullickson) The first devices installed had a dial that could be set, which was periodically checked to make sure they were still set at a certain level and weren't changed when for example the roof of the bus went through the bus washer. The newest buses had a different device, which was adjustable also.
- Maintenance Manager Jeff Butler said the first 200 buses had an alarm with a variable resistor in the horn (the sound-emitting device), which was set at 95 dBA on the top of the bus when it was installed. The fifteen new buses had a different type of horn on them. When looking at the top of the bus, a person couldn't see the device; it was covered by a shield. This was a different noise-emitting device, because the other type of horn was not being made anymore. The new device didn't have a variable resistor to adjust; it had a window on it that could be closed (like a window in a house, if we didn't want air coming in). The device was adjusted by closing the window so it didn't emit as much sound.
- (Kamp) Looking at the Measurements with 50 feet/4 feet, one number showed the dBA from an alarm on an old bus and the other number was an alarm on a new bus = one decibel difference.
- (Butler) The alarms on all the 214 buses were set at 95 dBA; and were inspected before they left.
- (Bergamini) Weren't other changes made to the buses after the accident, such as the position of the mirrors? Also, what had the conversation with the insurance company been around this issue; was this something they suggested or had an opinion on?
- (Gullickson) Other modifications included changing the way the mirrors were attached. They now hang down from the roof and have clear space below the mirrors, which helped the drivers with visibility. Re: blind spots, the drivers still needed to use a "rock n roll" movement, and move in their seat to look around at they made turns, to improve their visibility.
- (Gullickson) She had been a member of Board at Transit Mutual Insurance Corp-WI (TMIC) for over a decade. No other transit systems in the state were doing this; they had not recommended this but they were very interested in what Metro's experience was. She saw a lot of accident data from around the state that came through on a quarterly basis, and the #1 accident cause was left turns. So anything that could be done to reduce accidents involving left turns was what they were seeking.
- (Kamp) The former Safety Director at TMIC, who had served on many regional and national panels on various safety issues, could be invited to a future meeting to help inform this discussion if people wished.
- (Ahrens) Looking up the issues in Portland, he found a headline read, "Portland Neighborhoods Complaining about New Pedestrian-Warning Technology". One difference was that both Portland and Cleveland used a woman's voice that broadcasted through a speaker repeating twice,

"Pedestrians, the bus is turning!" They had lots of complaints that they couldn't shut off the voice, which ran continuously as the bus drove through the neighborhood.

- (Kovich) As she looked through the issues and the comments that people got too used to hearing it, the alarm didn't afford a person the warning it should. When people heard it all the time, they didn't pay as much attention to it; they developed alarm fatigue. When Metro researched the effectiveness of this, she would be interested in thoughts about this as well. She didn't want to be relying on this system, and making the investment, and then have it lose its impact over time because people were ignoring it.
- (Kemble) Speaking of investment, what was the cost of the devices themselves, ongoing maintenance costs, software licensing costs. If the alarms were already installed as part of the new buses, was their cost integrated into the cost of the bus?
- (Gullickson) The cost of the alarms was \$200/bus, with the total cost for all the buses between \$40-50K. (Butler) As far as ongoing maintenance, they were really reliable and there was no software involved.
- (Golden) He asked staff if they could find out from the manufacturer if the devices could be modified retroactively by some exceptional method; or could a version of this device be created to have more user control over when the audible signal happened. Then if they wanted to, was there a phase besides on or off, or a way of doing something else, per the time of day, volume, etc. Would the manufacturers be able to produce this, and what would be the cost?

Poulson said the group would probably revisit this issue because of all the points that were raised; and suggested they listen to the people who had registered to speak about the audible signal program.

Julie Younkin, S. Baldwin Street, 53703, asked that the program be stopped (written statement attached): She and her young family lived where three routes traveled from morning to night. While initially regarded as a boon, the buses were now a continuous and alarming presence in their lives. She worked at home and was forced to hear the alarms every 10-20 minutes. Even staying in their house with fans/AC running, they couldn't block the sound. She wondered how their new baby would be able to sleep. With the few pedestrians in their neighborhood, she questioned the constant use of the alarms except perhaps at rush hour. She tried to find evidence for the efficacy of the alarms to reduce death/injury, but found none. Instead she found evidence that alarms didn't work for distracted walkers or those using cell phones. In fact, it seemed that people had negatively adapted to the alarms. Among other things, studies showed people adapted to repetitive alarms, and began to ignore them. She asked that the program be stopped until its efficacy could be proven; or to consider using them only during rush hour in busy downtown areas, where there was a proven need.

Michael Barrett, Sommers Avenue, 53704, opposed the noise, and wrote:  
Please keep our city audibly beautiful!

Lori Grapentine, Commonwealth Avenue, 53726, opposed the use of alarms: The sound was not a chirp; it was an alarm. She wished that Metro had done a better job of alerting people this topic was going to be on the agenda. She lived near the intersection Commonwealth and Allen, where the signal went off every time a bus turned, pulled over or simply sat at the stop sign. The

neighborhood was active, and buses had long traveled through it. But the new audible alarms were an unacceptable noise and she wanted them eliminated. She was sorry for the death of the person hit by a bus; and appreciated the difficulty faced by Metro, and their desire to have that never happen again. She didn't want anything like this to happen to her family or neighbors. But the detrimental impact of the program on everyone's lives and health was too great. What would happen if we put alarms on all vehicles, in order to prevent another pedestrian death? Imagine the cacophony of noise. She felt most people would find this unacceptable. It wasn't just about the decibel or the frequency, it was also about the quality of the noise.

Keith Callfas, Huxley Street, 53704, opposed the use of alarms: Callfas read from the ordinance, "Noise: any sound which annoys or disturbs humans or which causes or tends to cause an adverse psychological or physiological effect on humans" is banned; and further, "Signaling Devices. It shall be unlawful for any person to operate any horn or other audible signaling device on any motor vehicle except in an emergency." He lived directly across the street from the North Transfer Point, and was bombarded by the noise from 6 AM to 11 PM, constantly. The sound was like a French police horn; it penetrated into the house. He asked if the issue had been brought to the TPC in the first place. The quality of life in the city had been diminished. As an electrician, he knew that an on/off switch could be added, perhaps for use only during rush hour. If something wasn't done, he felt his only recourse would be to file a law suit.

Poulson said the TPC knew that the signals were being added to Metro's safety program, though the group wasn't aware of the level or duration and other factors.

Allison Smith, Langdon Street, 53703, opposed the alert system: She distributed emails from people on listservs regarding this issue, and made a statement (attached). She lived at Kennedy Manor, where the Route 81 bus passed every half hour until 2:30 AM weeknights and 3:30 AM on weekends. Metro's decision to install the system was based on good intentions; safety was important. However, there was no way to measure the effectiveness of the system. And we did know that many people were upset by the noise, which disrupted sleep, peace of mind, and business. It was a health and quality of life issue. Studies had shown that extraneous noise led to negative health consequences. Other solutions should be considered. The 2011 accident was the result of human error. Metro's safety record had been pretty good.

Melanie Foxcroft, Lakeland Avenue, 53704, opposed the program: When she first heard the noise, she asked did it work, had it been tested, what was the evidence for it? She did some research, and found eight places where it had been implemented on a test basis: Cleveland, New Jersey Transit, Washington Metro, Culver City, Boston, York Bus Canada, MTA Maryland and Portland, OR. Only Cleveland had finished their test period and had data. The alarms were part of several steps in a comprehensive safety program (inc. training, repositioning mirrors, etc.), to promote a safety culture. They hadn't teased out the effectiveness of the audible bus turn signals, which was embedded in this comprehensive program. Data showed ped/bike accidents had been reduced, but it wasn't clear which parts of the program were responsible for this. She felt there was no evidence to support the installation of the system we had



now. Since pedestrians had the legal right to be in crosswalk, what message was the alarm sending them (get out of the way)? It was as if we were asking pedestrians to take some action, whereas it should be the bus drivers who were taking some action. Listservs showed extensive opposition to this noise. Her neighborhood association would probably be registering their opposition. It seemed a lot of people couldn't tune the noise out. She asked that the experiment not be continued.

John Coleman, S. Dickinson Street, 53703, wrote in opposition: As a biker, I find the constant beeping from buses stressful and distracting. I view the use of the audible turn signal system as a safety hazard for me because of increased noise creating confusion while biking.

Karen FASTER, Ohio Avenue, 53704, opposed the use of the audible turn signal alarm system: She expressed appreciation for the bus drivers. A Metro Transit customer since 1995, using the bus in the winter and sometimes in the summer, but lately not so much, just to avoid the turn signal alarm. Drivers and passengers could hear the alarm inside the bus. She submitted a log of her experiences with the alarm since December (attached). For those living along core routes, the alarm was non-stop. She found the alarm stressful, as a passenger, biker and pedestrian. She couldn't imagine it wasn't hurting businesses (streetside cafes or B&Bs). She urged that turn signal alarms not be installed anymore.

Representing Kennedy Manor and Fred Mohs Land Co., Kristi Solberg, Langdon Street, 53703, stated her opposition to the alarms and submitted a letter from Fred Mohs (attached), which offered an alternative to the signals. As manager of Kennedy Manor, she had received many complaints from her tenants. She had her office right there and conducted showings. She kept a bus schedule to avoid doing showings when the Route 81 was passing by, because it was annoying to have to explain it to people. Also, a lot of people didn't know what it meant. In Mohs letter, he stated that over the 50 years of doing business in the neighborhood, they had promoted the idea that good neighbors made good neighbors. He felt the alarm system was not the best solution, because it was annoying, damaging to peace and comfort, and not the most direct, effective solution to the problem, which was that the person might get in front of the bus without the driver seeing them. Mohs offered an alternative solution of blade signs. (See letter and picture attached.) By contrast, the audible alarm did not send a clear message. He urged that something like his alternative be implemented.

Brook Seeliger, Langdon Street, 53703, opposed the use of the bus alerts: She had lived downtown for many years, willingly living with traffic, buses and people. It was the responsibility of each person out in public to pay attention what they were doing, and what was going on around them. They did not to be babysat by an alarm system that was used indiscriminately everywhere, whether it was needed to not, whether there was a safety issue or not. She walked a lot downtown, inc. Lake and University, and felt that intersection had many safety issues that had nothing to do with buses, and that the police had failed to address. One phenomenon was "car creep": When there was a green light, cars and buses crept up behind pedestrians, waiting for the peds to finish crossing in order to zoom forward and make the light. This behavior could have been part of what happened in the 2011 accident. Pedestrians have the

green light at the same time as vehicles and they have the right of way; so to say that every intersection, every corner in all the neighborhoods had to have a turn signal, was disingenuous. It was causing a significant decline in the quality of life. Even living in a busy area, people should be able to go home and count on having respite from all the noise, and the stressors that brought on. She didn't want to have to listen to the piercing, discordant alarm signal until 2-3 AM in the morning. Most downtown properties were much closer than 50 feet from each other and the buses. She had frequently observed the alarms going off with no one around at all.

Robert Klebba, E. Gorham Street, 53703, opposed the alert system: He commended Metro for their efforts to improve safety after the event in 2011. Staff showed a sincere and quick response to that event. But the audible alarm system had failed. First, the droning of the alert system had become just part of the urban noise-scape. The system had become yet another contributing decibel to the noise pollution that everyone was trying hard to ignore. We had become inured, so it didn't have the effect it might have initially had. Second, the system detracted from the quality of life downtown, near bus stops or intersections around the city. He ran a B&B near the intersection of E. Gorham and Blount, and had six bus routes stopping right in front of their house. They heard the alert system as the buses were approaching from 30 meters away, while the bus was stopped, and as the bus was leaving. Repeat that scenario 10-11 times an hour. This was what they experienced in their front yard and in their house. The alert system had significantly affected their ability to provide a peaceful environment for guests. Metro had invested significant resources in the system. But with respect to investing in a better quality of life in our community, it was time to stop throwing good money after bad.

Former TPC member Tim Wong, Jackson Street, 53704, opposed the program: People had raised a lot of serious and good issues. While sensitive to many types of noise (power lawn mowers, car alarms), he didn't think this beep to be the absolute worst. He didn't know what they did, but he agreed with those who said the more we heard them, the more we knew a bus was in the vicinity. But that was all. He didn't think it would prevent any collisions or crashes. While in DC recently, he rode the buses extensively, and he didn't hear anything. So if DC had an alert system, Metro might want to see what they had. It was good that Metro was trying to respond to the pedestrian death, but he didn't think the system was effective. More noise pollution didn't do it. Metro should look into on/off buttons, because he heard alarms when no one was around.

District 2 Alder Ledell Zellers made the following remarks.

- She asked that for all the people who spoke so effectively, there were dozens of others who felt similarly.
- She had done some research and found that alarm fatigue was real. People started tuning (the sound) out. One of the reasons was that it didn't mean anything 99% of the time. It alerted people to no danger; it was just a noise.
- As several people had noted, the alarms caused confusion and stress; they started and looked for a danger that wasn't really there. This was detrimental; not positive.
- She was surprised to hear how many people were avoiding riding the bus because of this noise. She hated to hear this. We had an outstanding bus system and service. She thought highly of management and drivers of the bus

system.

- The single biggest reason for people moving out of the Isthmus (after expecting to stay for the long term), was noise. Among the many urban noises people complained about, complaints about the bus beeping were the most she had ever received. She was surprised by the level of outcry, and began to think about why.
- The sound was incessant, it was not effective, and it was the City doing it (vs. a neighbor's noise or traffic noise). People felt the City should not be imposing that kind of thing.
- If she thought it was effective in improving safety, she would not say this: It simply wasn't doing what we had so hoped and intended it to do.
- Perhaps there were other options. Metro had made some other improvements at the same time as they did this, which would clearly help, esp. reducing the blind spot, a big factor in the 2011 accident. Had she been in the crosswalk and heard a bus beeping, she probably wouldn't have reacted, because of being in the crosswalk and expecting to be seen.
- As a result, she leaned toward suspending the use of the alert system. She didn't think she would get to this point, but she now thought it was just not the answer. She added that Capitol Neighborhoods had put out a statement (attached).

District 6 Alder Marsha Rummel commented as follows.

- She found it interesting that the people for whom the alarm was intended, didn't hear it. But the people who lived next door to it, heard it incessantly. That was the thing she (as an alder) had found out about noise: It was like a creature we couldn't control.
- As mentioned, the measurements were taken from 50 feet away, but many residences were only 12 feet away from the street. So people were not getting 65 dBA; the sound level was almost as high as audible sound went, which was a dangerous level; 95 dBA was not safe for humans.
- The basic question was, how do we disable this and when?

Poulson noted that this was an informational item, and asked Metro to come back within a month or two, with some responses and further research, at which point it would be an action item.

Please note: A Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Ahrens left the meeting at this point in the proceedings.

**Present:** 6 - Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich and Kenneth Golden

**Excused:** 4 - David Ahrens; Chris Schmidt; Wayne Bigelow and Kate D. Lloyd

## H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- H.1. [38793](#) Metro: Action of Proposed Service Changes to Routes 6, 10, 11, 12, 25 and 59, to go into effect August 2015 - TPC 06.10.15

Transit Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck and Transit Marketing and Customer Service Manager Mick Rusch, updated the group on the changes made to the proposal in response to public feedback. (See attached document.)

- Route 11 and 12: The original proposal was withdrawn. They might look at it in the future; it was in a couple neighborhood plans. They hadn't gotten the

word out and drummed up support for the change; but they had heard opposition to it.

- Route 6/25: The original proposal was withdrawn. The AM/PM trip(s) between the Capitol Square and American Family would remain.
- New Route 25 proposal: To do this, they would need to shorten the loop out around the American Center, in order to allow the bus to get back into town to start its next assignment, Route 10, which had been chronically late. By eliminating this (yellow) portion of the loop, they would gain three minutes. The Route 26 would cover this area.
- Route 6: The current routing on Dwight Drive would remain the same. They nixed the idea of getting off of Dwight Drive, because they found there was no place to site a bus stop on the East Towne Mall side of E. Washington. and then have the bus cross four lanes to get into the left-turn lane. But coming back into the Mall, they were still proposing to bring it down off of the Frontage Road onto E. Washington and have it turn directly in on Independence Lane, which would save a couple of minutes, and result in fewer turning movements and not having to sit through an extra traffic signal to get into the Mall.
- Route 10: The original ideas were still being proposed. West end would be expanded to serve UW Health Digestive Clinic for people traveling between UW Hospital and the Clinic. The bus would turn around at the Clinic, where the drivers were given a chance to make a rest stop. The trade-off for that would be that service on Division and Rutledge would be eliminated (with the bus on Winnebago like the Route 4). The furthest walk would be from Jenifer Street Market stop to Winnebago, a good 1/4 mile. They would be adjusting the schedule to take the load off of overcrowded Route 2. Trips would be added, only operating when UW classes were in session.
- Route 12: Waunona Way loop was still being proposed for elimination, which would save 2-3 minutes.
- Route 59: As originally proposed, the route would operate on two new streets, Spoke and Sprocket. The route operated as push/pull service between the movie theater and the Allied/Dunns Marsh neighborhood, traveling on McKee to Hy-Vee and Super Target. Fitchburg was all for it.

Regarding Route 10 and removal of service on Division-Rutledge, the Route 3 traveled on Rutledge during the middle of the day also. It was hourly service and longer service, not as nice as the Route 10. Maybe at some point, they could look at the current off and on situation between Winnebago and Rutledge, and perhaps run on Rutledge. Kamp said staff felt service to the Digestive Clinic outweighed the other concerns; and felt this new service would be a trip generator. Regarding Route 11 and public comment to keep it going to the West Transfer Point, staff would keep this in mind when they revisited the route. The west end of the Route 11 and 12 would remain the same for the coming year. If they didn't get enough support from the neighborhoods for changes there, staff might not bring it back at all and just leave Route 11 as is.

Kovich/Golden made a motion to approve the proposed changes as presented. The motion carried by voice vote/other.

## I. ORGANIZATIONAL ACTION ITEMS

### I.1. Appointments to TPC Parking Subcommittee

Poulson identified five Commission members who had expressed interest in serving on this Subcommittee: Wayne Bigelow, Ken Golden, Ann Kovich, Kate Lloyd, and Gary Poulson. He asked that a vote was taken by the body to ratify these nominations. Golden/Tolmie made a motion to approve ratification of the five people being named to the Subcommittee. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Golden asked Poulson to convey to the Mayor that he hoped his appointment wouldn't jeopardize his chances to be named to a recreated Transport 2020 committee.

**I.2. Possible change of start time for July 8th meeting (due to conflict with Special BOE meeting)**

Members agreed by consensus that the start time of the July meeting be moved to 5:30 PM.

**J. 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 Commission  
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee  
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee  
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)

**K. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**K.1. General announcements by Chair - None.**

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

Kovich and Bergamini asked that a discussion about the JDS Judge Doyle Square proposal, especially as it pertains to Parking, be scheduled for the July meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Tolmie, seconded by Bergamini, to Adjourn at 7:50 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.