



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, May 10, 2017

5:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 201, City-County Bldg.
Common Council Chambers

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Present: 9 - David Ahrens; Arvina Martin; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich and Kenneth Golden

Excused: 2 - Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

Please note: Kemble arrived at 5:04 PM, during Item E.1. Ahrens arrived at 5:13 PM, during Item E.2.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Bigelow, to Approve the Minutes of the April 12, 2017 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Bigelow, to Approve the Minutes of the April 20, 2017. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Arvina Martin; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow; Margaret Bergamini; Ann E. Kovich and David Ahrens

Abstentions: 1 - Kenneth Golden

Excused: 2 - Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

E.1. [47145](#)

Parking: May 2017 Activity Report, April Revenue/Expense/Occupancy Reports - TPC 05.10.17

Parking Engineer Bill Putnam highlighted items in the Reports (attached), and answered questions.

- YTD revenues showed an increase of \$682,220 or 21% compared to last year, primarily due to the rate increase last June.
- Occupancies were down at most facilities, except for the State Street Cap garage, which showed an increase of 14% in occupancy due to the relocation of MMB staff to 30 W. Mifflin as well as lowered rates there. Drops in occupancy were typical following rate increases, which then built back up.
- Facility projects included PARCS equipment replacement, annual repair/maintenance at various garages with a focus on Cap Square North, and lighting and electrical upgrades/improvements at State Street Cap (inc. ADA door openers). Low bidder Morse Electric was still getting final qualification per Civil Rights requirements. If they ended up not qualifying, Parking would re-advertise and go out for bid on the project.
- Beyond these projects were the much larger Judge Doyle and Cap East garages.
- With difficulty getting parts to do the repairs, work on the elevator at Overture garage would start in the Fall.
- Expenses were fairly well on track compared to Budget, and staff would be looking into providing this info in future reports.

Kovich/Bigelow made a motion to receive the Reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [47146](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicators, Financial, Performance Measures, Rider-Revenue-Fare Type, Hybrid Stats, Customer Feedback & Incident Reports - TPC 05.10.17

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted items in the Reports (attached), and he, Finance Manager Wayne Block and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck answered questions.

- YTD Fixed ridership was down 2.2%, smaller compared to last year; and in fact, March 2017 ridership was up 74K or 5.9% vs. March 2016.
- YTD passenger accidents (slip and falls) were up. Chargeable/preventable accidents were down substantially. Road calls were down. Inspections were down slightly because mileage was down; these tracked together closely.
- YTD Paratransit ridership was up 3.9%; with similar trends in safety and maintenance.
- Financials: The fare change implemented last year was causing an increase in passenger revenues, and was ahead of budget. Total revenue was ahead of budget also (by \$127,611).
- Total operating expenses were over budget (by \$152,274), which could be due to having reduced budget estimates for salaries and OT. Because salaries were estimated for each month of the year, perhaps those for the first three months of the year were understated and should have been higher; while estimates for the remaining months of the year should have been lower; something to investigate, esp. since OT was underbudget for the first quarter.
- After moving \$5M over to Fleet Services to help them replace their Fleet replacement reserve, Metro's reserves were still a healthy amount, at \$2,481,652.
- Route 19 was now identified as the Dunn's Marsh bus, to match up the destination sign with the Ride Guide.
- Fixed Assets /5310 passthroughs: In the past, they bought fixed assets with a 10-year life or more through the Capital Budget; which meant they were borrowing the local share, and the bonds that the City sold were 10-year bonds (which couldn't be applied to any items with less than a 10-year life). For items with less than a 10-year life, they would use Operating funds to apply to the local share; which is what the Expense would be.
- Federal grant funding for fixed assets/5310 passthrough consisted of the 80% funding that would be applied to fixed assets purchased through the feds.
- Now, most fixed assets regardless of their useful life would be purchased with debt.
- "5310" referred to the Mobility Management Grant from the feds. Metro administered the grant, so all this grant revenue flowed through Metro; but the majority of it flowed out again to other orgs, primarily Dane County. Because Metro was getting the money, it was shown in the report as in inflow and outflow. It was a wash.
- For example, Metro had coordinated with Stoughton and Sun Prairie to help them purchase their shared-ride taxi vans, and to help the YWCA purchase vehicles for their Job Ride transportation program. Some money was also used by Metro for their Paratransit Assessment person.
- But Metro didn't decide who got the money. The MPO did, through a competitive application process.

Poulson paused to welcome new TPC Alder, Arvina Martin. A motion was then made to receive the reports, but Bergamini pointed out that they had only heard part of the report.

Kamp and Metro staff continued with their highlights.

- Route productivity was down 2.8%, due in part to changes in service. For example, weekend service was added to Rt. 17 (which traveled between two Transfer Points). Though ridership was up 17%, productivity was down 19% due to lower ridership on Sat/Sun. Likewise, service was added to Rt.31, where ridership was up 49%, but productivity was down 7%. Both routes addressed important coverage issues, and showed how ridership and productivity didn't always go hand in hand.
- Average weekday ridership in March 2017 was 53,655 vs. 50,556 in March 2016.
- In Performance measures, "Combined" numbers: Metro outperformed peers in 5 out of 6 categories (even after four years); the exception being cost/revenue hour @ \$104.92 vs. peer @ \$97.57. But the peer number was four years old. Once WisDOT updated these numbers, that comparison would be more accurate. "Combined" reflected both fixed and paratransit numbers, which is how WisDOT presented the peer numbers. All the systems in the comparison were required to provide complementary paratransit service.
- Notably, Metro had 52.08 passenger trips/capita vs. 37.63; and a cost/passenger of \$3.63 vs. \$4.46.
- Fixed Route Revenue and Rides % Changes (page 10): While ridership was down 2.2%, revenues were up by 2.2%, reflecting the targeted fare increase.
- Cash fares, which weren't changed, were up 6.1%. Based on the model used by Metro, when cash fares weren't touched, some seepage from one category to another occurred.
- MATC and Edgewood numbers were down for various reasons: Shuttle services, lower gas prices, fewer students attend the MATC downtown campus and campuses on the periphery had free parking. Less importantly, ID's were periodically being checked to validate passes.
- Paratransit Performance Indicators: YTD Ridership was up, from 70,710 to 73,487; Leave Attended Trips were about 20K of that 73K, an important number to track over the next couple years following recent changes; Door-to-Door (D2D) Trips were 69K out of 73K total trips. These numbers gave a sense of how Metro provided a higher level of service than the minimum required by ADA.
- Contractors provided about 75% of the Paratransit service, for which numbers were shown for rides, complaints, and on-time performance, which happily was at 90+% performance for all contractors.
- Hybrid stats: Newer hybrids continued to perform better. Re: cost/mile, the 10-year old hybrid were comparable to diesel. Both sets of hybrid had higher MPG.
- Customer feedback: Comments went from 964 in 2016 to 1037 in 2017, partly due to late reports for Paratransit. Prompt response at 95+% was very good.
- Driver Reported Incidents (provided by category) were flat 2017 vs. 2016. Staff was paying attention to school numbers since fighting on school dodger buses was up; and was working with the school system to address that.
- No uptick in weapons on buses had been seen since the Court ruling. Metro would be disseminating info about the new policy taking effect on June 1st, to explain that weapons were still not allowed on vehicles unless allowed by State law. It would be up to individuals to figure that out, not the drivers.

Golden/Tolmie made a motion to receive the Reports. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [46817](#)

Repealing Section 12.76(4)(f), renumbering Section 12.76(4)(g) to (f), creating Section 12.793, amending Sections 12.128(14), 12.141(1), 12.145(3) (c) and 1.08(3)(a) of the Madison General Ordinances to prohibit moped parking on the public Sidewalk and Terrace Area except in Moped Parking Areas and establish a bail deposit for violation thereof.

Poulson invited registrants to speak.

1) Jack Steinberg, Birch Avenue, 53711, spoke in opposition: Not all moped riders were students. People would stop using their mopeds to patronize businesses downtown or to commute to work, and would use their cars instead. It would be better to step up enforcement of current ordinances to solve the few problems they had. The proposal was a solution in search of a problem. It would needlessly inconvenience moped and vehicles drivers, hurt moped dealers and repair shops, and would put more cars on road, creating more pollution and traffic and parking congestion.

2) Patricia Sammataro, Birch Circle, 53711, spoke in opposition: At first glance, some might think the ordinance affected only the Campus area, not the entire city. The Ad Hoc Committee started out presuming there was a problem, and the Report was unbalanced. A city-wide ban was overreach; there was no evidence to show there was problem city-wide. If there were problems on Campus, deal with those. Ordinances about (mopeds and bikes) blocking sidewalks already existed, and just needed to be enforced. The proposal would inconvenience those who abided by the rules. Mopeds would take spots away from vehicles. Scooter businesses would go out of business, if riders now needed to pay for parking.

3) Peter Sammataro, Birch Circle, 53711, wrote in opposition: This was a solution in search of a problem, that will not address aesthetics, but will impose a "tax" on citizens, esp. downtown residents and students.

4) Randy Knudson, E. Dayton, 53703, registered in opposition.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Coordinator Arthur Ross provided background about the proposal.

- **Prior to 2011, State Stats considered mopeds to be bicycles for parking purposes and allowed them to park anywhere a bicycle could be parked.**
- **In 2011, State Stats were changed to allow local jurisdictions to regulate moped parking if they so desired.**
- **In 2012, the Mayor appointed an ad hoc committee on moped parking, made up of three downtown alders, a rep from PBMVC, reps from UW, as well as moped and bicycle users.**
- **After several meetings and studying the issue, the Committee issued their Report (attached), which recommended treating mopeds as Type 1 motorcycles (as permitted by State Stat).**
- **An ordinance was drafted at that time, but was not introduced. It was recently resurrected; and three downtown alders (Dist. 2, 4 and 8) came together with staff, the Mayor's and City Atty.'s office to draft the new ordinance before them now.**
- **In 2011-12, the University started changing their moped parking process. They implemented a moped permit program, whereby permitted mopeds could park anywhere in any designated moped area. But because students rode their moped between various parts of Campus, creating safety issues, the program was then changed so that permits were restricted to a particular Lot. Riders had to park and leave their moped there.**
- **This led to mopeds being parking in the city, off University property, south of**

University Avenue mainly, as close to Campus as they could get.

- Zoning has been requiring new developments in the downtown area around Campus to provide moped parking. But many mopeds were still being parked outside of those buildings, in part because landlords charged students to park inside the building; and students were choosing to park outside vs. paying to park inside.
- Downtown Coordinating Committee and PBMVC had recommended adoption of the proposal.

Ross answered questions.

- Per the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee, the ordinance proposed that mopeds could not park on terraces city-wide. But the City could do whatever it wanted to, inc. restricting it to a certain part of the city. It would probably be simpler to have a city-wide ban in terms of educating people, signage and enforcement.
- Privilege in streets applied to the right of way. The privilege in streets system was used for private property owners who wanted to install bike racks on the terrace in front of their property. A fairly simple process, this did not go to a committee. If a request for moped parking came in, the person worked with Real Estate, who would then send the request to Traffic Engineering for review to see if it was appropriate location. The process was done at a staff level.
- As far as using this system for requests from outside the downtown (vs. proposing a city-wide ban), some alders were amenable to moped parking on the terrace in their district and some were not.
- TE would only permit parking on a terrace where the terrace was paved. There were really no areas outside of the downtown where this was the case.
- Zoning was applying standards to downtown developments oriented particularly to student tenants, requiring parking in those developments. Some developments were coming in outside of the normal zoning process (conditional uses, etc.), where everything was on the negotiating table.
- Zoning code had some specifications such as sizes of spaces, and trade-offs like providing so many moped spaces vs. automobile spaces. The issue of moped parking would arise early in the development process, esp. if the building was oriented to students.
- Mopeds can park where any other vehicle parked: They could park on the street, up to three Type 1 motorcycles (mopeds) in a single automobile space. Moped/motorcycles spaces were available in all the ramps, many of which were not used/filled. They were parked elsewhere, but few parked there. More such on-street spaces were being planned for the downtown area.
- Commuter moped parking was mainly a problem in the Campus area; and some concerns had arisen about parking on MLK Blvd. and on the Square.
- Staff had been trying to get data from WisDOT re: the number of mopeds in the city, but had not received it yet. They also did not have data about the distribution of mopeds outside of the study area in the Report.
- Complaints about moped parking would normally go to the Mayor and Alders. Ross himself did not normally get complaints but he had heard from bicyclists about mopeds blocking their parking, as well as from the University.
- It was hard to gauge what the impact of the ordinance would be. This was what the Mayor and Council recommended.
- Re: impact on parking and availability of parking, staff expected much of the parking outside of residential buildings to move inside those buildings, rather than to affect ramp or on-street parking. Mopeds on Campus would probably start parking in their designated permitted Lots.

- State Stats defined two types of mopeds. More modern mopeds tended to have an automatic transmission and no pedals, with an engine up to 50 cc's in size that couldn't go beyond a certain speed limit. Mopeds under 50 cc's had to be licensed through the State and needed a registration plate. Mopeds started out as being a bicycle-type vehicle, with an integral motor of up to 130 cc's that couldn't go faster than 30 mph.
- As defined by State Stats, E-bikes were not considered mopeds. For parking purposes, an E-bike was just like an other bicycle. Electric bicycles were considered bicycles.
- A brochure was being prepared, news releases would be issued, a list of moped owners was being gathered to send them info as well as to moped dealers and repair shops, and word would be spread through the University to their permit holders before next academic year. If the proposal were passed soon, info could be disseminated to students before they left for the summer. People most impacted would have info as quickly as possible and as long as possible before the implementation date.
- As for which of three moped drivers paid for parking: For single pole meters, if the meter expired, all three parkers would be ticketed. For a multi-space meter, each person would need to pay for their vehicle.
- Using staff review, the privilege in streets approval process was relatively simple and reasonably quick, 2-4 weeks. Placing signs and markers might take a little longer.
- Alders were involved in the review process. Whether new concrete terraces could be installed in the downtown area, would depend on the district alder. Some alders were not interested in seeing more concrete laid.
- Costs were \$200 for a sign, and an annual fee for a privilege in streets permit.

Members commented.

- Golden: With lots of development occurring in certain areas (such as E. Washington) where there could be a high demand for mopeds, It seemed the proposal put off into the future establishing moped requirements related to land use. Why not have the requirements come with the ordinance change? Also, he wondered about the role of alders in the privilege in streets request process.
- Ahrens: Wouldn't it be good to know how many mopeds were in the city and where they were distributed to know more about the impact on them, before making recommendations about them?
- Kovich: With many unknowns and questions being asked and an effective date of mid-August, how hard would it be to adequately educate people about what this actually meant? It seemed some things needed to be ironed out more.
- Kemble: Why was critical info in the Editor's Notes not placed in the ordinance? It would help to include statutory language to clarify that a moped did not include a motor bicycle.

Though he did not draft the proposal, ACA Strange noted that definitions of State Stats were often found in the Editor's Notes, but not necessarily put inside ordinances. That didn't mean they couldn't be. Ross said the City adopted State Stats by reference; because as State law changed, the City wasn't then compelled to immediately change their ordinances. He said that the State could soon be changing the motor bicycle definition.

Golden/Bergamini made a motion to recommend adoption of the resolution.

Golden said he would vote against his own motion for the following reasons.

- The “privilege in streets” process should be city-wide.
- Criteria/standards were needed for what was approvable and not approvable, so this didn’t become a political process with alders. If a request met the standards, then it should be approved. Alders should not get into administration of what was done.
- A fee should be mentioned, to cover the costs of applying, a sign and administrative time.
- An appeal process was needed when an application was denied, and reasons should be given for the denial.
- The fine should be doubled if someone attached their moped to a tree.

Having said that, Golden felt a problem existed. At Dayton and Randall, he saw moped parking in front of a building, which was a mess. It would be good to have the parking regulated in some way, with standards for the spaces (such as 3 mopeds to 1 vehicle space). He could support various parts of the proposal, but didn’t think it was ready. With three downtown alders on the Committee, the perspective of the rest of city was lost. He didn’t entirely agree that this was a solution in search of problem, but felt the proposal was overdone. He wanted to see the item brought back with some of these issues rectified.

Kemble/Golden made a motion to amend the proposal in 12.793 MOPED PARKING, as follows:

- In subsection 1, strike all of paragraph 2 related to “Moped Parking Consideration Zone”, so there would be no such zone but so that anyone in whole city could apply for privilege in streets.
- In subsection 2, add language after the first sentence: Moped does not include a motor bicycle.

Ahrens said he would vote against the amendment.

- One of the major problems with the proposal was the application of this policy to the entire City, when based on examples, anecdotes and the study itself, the problem was located in the Moped Parking Consideration Zone.
- Rather than address the problem at this particular location, which consisted of one part of one aldermanic district, this would change everything for an unknown number of people; we had no data on how many people would be affected, and how it would impact other parking users.
- He didn’t want this applied outside of this area.
- He hadn’t heard of a moped problem, certainly in his district. Staff had said that the impact of this was uncertain.
- The study had data that appeared to be made up. It said that there was one moped for every seven residences in the city; we didn’t know the basis for that. If that wasn’t an exaggeration, then the impact would be enormous. But he thought that was not the case.
- If this was an issue for two or three downtown alders, it should be addressed as such.

Kemble said she didn’t like making ordinances that applied to just one area of the city. If something was good in principle, it should be applied everywhere. If it wasn’t a problem in the rest of the city, then it would not become an issue.

She supported the proposal, but felt it could be improved. Bigelow and Kovich said they would prefer to defer.

A roll call vote was taken on Kemble's motion to amend, with the following result: Ayes - Golden, Bergamini, Martin, Kemble. Noes: Tolmie, Kovich, Bigelow, Ahrens. The Chair broke the tie by voting aye. The motion passed by a vote of 5 to 4.

Golden/Tolmie made a motion to add language to double the fine for mopeds attached to trees, based on what was shown for other proposed fines (apparently, from \$60 to \$120); by adding "mopeds attached to trees" to the list in Sub. (2)(a), and by including the fine information in the Schedule of Deposits.

A roll call vote was taken on Golden's motion, with the following result: Ayes - Tolmie, Kovich, Golden, Bigelow, Ahrens. Noes: Bergamini, Martin, Kemble. The motion passed by a vote of 5 to 3.

Golden made a motion to create a section that would establish a fee for applying for privilege in streets, with staff determining the amount. Kemble pointed out that there was already a fee for privilege in streets: a \$750 non-refundable application fee, and a minimum annual fee of \$500 or greater, based on land value. Golden withdrew his motion.

Golden/Bigelow made a motion to create a section that would establish an appeal process for applicants who were denied. When asked, ACA Strange said he didn't handle privilege in streets. But as staff mentioned, it was a staff process, and he said he didn't know if there was a specific procedure for appealing a staff decision.

Golden said that in case an appeal process wasn't already in the ordinances, he would move forward with his motion. It seemed that we had a staff process that was politically influenced by alders. He would rather some criteria were established. He wasn't prepared to suggest what those would be, but hoped that if the item were deferred, staff could work on this. He wanted to provide a remedy for those who might be denied even when they had met certain, required standards.

A roll call vote was taken on Golden's motion, with the following result: Ayes - Kovich, Golden, Bigelow. Noes: Tolmie, Bergamini, Martin, Kemble, Ahrens. The motion failed by a vote of 5 to 3.

To follow up on the first motion to amend, Kemble/Golden made a motion to strike language referring to the Moped Parking Consideration Zone: In subsec. 2, paragraph 1, sentence 2, which said "within the Moped Parking Consideration Zone"; and subsec. 3(b), which said "located in the Moped Parking Consideration Zone".

Ahrens said he held the opposite of Kemble's position. If this was a problem, then they should shrink it down to its smallest possible size. A vote was taken, and the motion passed by voice vote/other.

Bigelow/Kovich made a motion to refer the item as amended back to the TPC,

to allow the City Attorney's Office to create language as suggested by Golden. Poulson clarified that the motion to refer would pass, it would supersede the original motion to adopt.

In further discussion, Golden said he wanted to see criteria created for the application process. He wondered if he should contact the drafter of the proposal to work on this. ACA Strange said this would be fine, but that Golden would have to find a sponsor for his amendment/proposal, which depending on the sponsor, would make it either a Substitute or an Alternate. Strange said another option would be to refer the ordinance back to the Committee that created the ordinance and ask them to work on Golden's recommendations to create another ordinance. Golden wondered if he should add staff to the referral motion to so he could work staff to bring a proposal back to the next meeting.

Kemble wondered if the level of detail needed for developing application information and process wasn't at the level of staff process, not at the ordinance level. She mentioned the ACA who authored the proposal, and the sponsors. If Golden's amendments failed here, he could take his amendments to the sponsors to see if they were interested. But she wanted them to be debated at the TPC, which if the motion to refer passed, could be done next month. In response to a question from Bigelow, ACA Strange said that Golden could certainly work on preparing amendments for the next TPC, which if they passed, could be part of the recommendations the TPC made to the Council.

A vote on the motion to refer was taken, and the motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.2. [46736](#)

Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into an agreement with RNL Design Inc. to provide professional predesign and schematic design architectural and engineering design services for the Metro Transit Nakoosa Trail Satellite Bus Facility in the amount of \$428,545.

Kamp pointed out the diagram (attached) showing the plan for a Fleet Services facility and a satellite bus garage at the Nakoosa Trail site, which had been purchased by the City. Metro had been working with City Architect Jim Whitney on TIGER grant applications and in consultation with RNL to get them up to this point. And now they hoped that with approval of the resolution, they could move forward with the process.

City Architect Jim Whitney with City Engineering provided some background, and he and Kamp answered questions.

- In 2013, a Master Plan was developed for a Fleet Services building at the site, at which time a large corner of the Lot was identified for use as a Metro satellite bus facility.
- Now, they wanted to proceed with some initial planning for the bus facility, to identify programming elements and space needs and move into preliminary floor plan and elevation designs, in order to reach a level of 20% completion of the overall design.
- They would stop there; and once funds were available through TIGER or BRT Small Start grants, they would come back for authorization to complete the drawings at a later time.
- They felt moving forward with these preliminary plans would help with the grant applications and advance the project.
- The \$428K spent on this would count as the City's match for a Small Start grant. Also, grants typically looked at shovel-readiness, so having the progress on the designs would improve their competitiveness. This work would be cumulative of work already done on the site.
- More money had been budgeted for this project, but because of delay in TIGER grant funding, the strategy was to complete the 20%, and if they saw another grant cycle coming, they could come back to ask to go beyond that. So this request was within the budget.
- The plan was to use this building for the longer, articulated buses to be used for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).
- The diagram reflected the footprint being planned. All 36 articulated buses would be stored here. The current E. Wash. garage wasn't big enough for the longer buses to maneuver, and the maintenance bays weren't big enough to hoist them up as well. Nakoosa would be the BRT facility.
- The 36 buses would likely be enough for the next 10-20 years. BRT plans called for four phases. As they began the first phase of BRT, they could foresee using some articulated buses on certain overcrowded non-BRT routes as well.

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

F.3. [46649](#)

Amending Metro Transit's 2017 Operating Budget to appropriate up to \$16,000 of TID 32 funding to purchase two bus shelters for the 600 block of East Washington Avenue.

Kamp said staff had worked with Alders Rummel and Zellers on this. The bus shelters would be located at the day shelter being planned for E. Washington. The model of the shelters would be similar to the green shelters currently found along E. Washington. A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Kovich, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.4. [46995](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute an agreement with Mead & Hunt for an Existing Facility and Life Safety Assessment, including conceptual design documents, maintenance plan, upgrade plan, phasing and capital budget planning of the Metro Transit Bus Barn at 1101 East Washington Avenue.

Recommend to Adopt Substitute (Version 2). Members agreed with the new language about the RFP process, which was added at Finance Committee.

Kamp said that 10+ years ago, Metro was envisioning locating all 285 buses at the E. Wash. facility. Now that they were going ahead with Nakoosa, they realized they would not be remodeling everything at the E. Wash. for that number of buses. But they still needed to review plumbing, fire alarm, HVAC, bus washing systems, as well as the roof, to address critical operational and safety needs. Kamp referred members to the handout with the heading "Scope of Work" (attached).

Jon Evans from Engineering's Facilities and Sustainability staff provided background information.

- In evaluating the condition of the roof, Engineering staff discovered cascading issues connected to the roof, and realized that a comprehensive assessment of the facility was needed.
- In a competitive RFP process, several issues were identified and Mead and Hunt were selected.
- Metro would be in the building for the long haul, and the City needed to invest in the facility to make it workable for Metro.
- Being used for a 24-7 operation, the building presented some challenges. It was at capacity, with little room to move things around.
- They had found a consultant that worked on a lot of complicated transportation projects.
- About 25% of the effort would be identifying ways to be more efficient in the building.
- Another large part of the project would be figuring out how to implement and phase the building to keep it operational while completing the work.
- The end goal was an actionable report, focusing on #6-8 in the Deliverables: estimated cost, maintenance plan for over 20 years, and a cap budget plan.
- Page 2 showed the consultants who would be involved and the schedule, with completion hopefully by the end of 2017, to be ready for the next budget cycle.
- Of the \$276K fee, 80% would be federal funds, 20% would be GO borrowing.

Kamp and Evans answered questions.

- The project was in the TIP, but may not have been in the TDP (which covered 2013-2017).
- Re: a solar array, the roof was about an acre in size, which could provide about a Megawatt of electricity. Metro's electrical usage was the second highest in the City. This would definitely be explored in the study.

Bergamini was surprised and uncomfortable to see the City would be borrowing for its share of this. She felt it would be more appropriate for it to come from the contingency fund or somewhere else. Kamp said they were using contingency for a lot of different things; and this worked so they were moving ahead with this plan.

A motion was made by Bigelow, seconded by Kovich, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER, Substitute (Version 2, with the new language about the RFP process, as recommended at Finance Committee).

Golden said he would vote no, because he thought the City should be doing a study to determine when it would be appropriate to sell this land and redevelop a new facility at a different site. This facility was located in an area that was prime for development, with potential property taxes and revenues from sale of the property, making it worth thinking of a different approach. The resolution was an investment for a long-term occupancy, which he thought was the wrong direction to go. While concerned about the safety issues involved, he would cast a symbolic no on the item.

The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - David Ahrens; Arvina Martin; Rebecca Kemble; David E. Tolmie; Wayne Bigelow; Margaret Bergamini and Ann E. Kovich

Noes: 1 - Kenneth Golden

Excused: 2 - Michael M. Johnson and Kenneth M. Streit

Non Voting: 1 - Gary L. Poulson

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

G.1. [46249](#)

SUBSTITUTE Recreating Section 3.14, creating Sections 33.55 and 33.56 of the Madison General Ordinances to update the Department of Transportation and create the Transportation Policy and Planning Board and the Transportation Commission.

Golden/Kovich made a motion to forward member comments with the ordinance, and make no recommendation with regard to passage, since their comments were substantive. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Registrant Ann Schroeder, representing the City's Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative, spoke in support of the racial equity elements of the proposal, and addressed some of the concerns raised by TPC members.

- **Regarding specific language [Examples: TPP Board Sec. 33.55, the word "equitable" in subsec.(2) under Purpose; and the entire phrase related to "eliminating disparities that people of color and low income people experience" in subsec.(6)(c) Power and Duties], it was important to name race rather than being generic about it. (Please see RESJI staff memo prepared for TORC, attached.)**
- **Otherwise, when things were done to be beneficial to marginalized communities, they could sometimes not helping people of color and end up helping white people, making racial disparities worse.**
- **Other parts of the proposal talked about people having "knowledge of equity issues and the needs of marginalized communities", specifying people of color and people of low income who use transportation.**
- **It was important to have this overarching language. But because the proposal gave certain slots to certain users (such as pedestrian, transit user, parker, etc.), RESJI staff wanted to have at least one person who was specifically looking out for racial equity issues and people of color. If the draft were changed so that specific slots were not identified, then we would still want to retain the language that people be overall knowledgeable about the different transportation modes and equity issues related to them.**
- **The consolidation of the commissions, boards and committees was important, because very few people had a lot of time to give to a whole host of boards and commissions. For marginalized people and people of color to involved in a meaningful way, it would be beneficial to shrink down the number of meetings they had to attend and the length of the meetings, in order to allow more people to be involved.**
- **Regarding sentence 2 in Section 33.56, subsec.(3)(a)-Commission Composition, it was intended that preferences for "remaining members" include an additional user from among people of color and people of low income. The wording there could probably be made clearer.**

District 1 Alder Barbara Harrington-McKinney appreciated that representatives of the work group specifically looked at equity as the guiding principles of this going through the equity lens. But if she had not been present to hear Schroeder's explanation or was not part of the deliberations that made the language solid, and if she was a new alder, there was nothing to say what process was used. She wondered if there were any information about who was giving the input. She always wanted to know who was at the table, who was paying particular attention to the language, and that the equity lens was incorporated and part of the analysis. Nothing was attached to show this analysis.

Schroeder said the resolution establishing TORC, specified that members of

the Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative (RESJI) Core Team attend every meeting. ACA John Strange added that ordinance language did not ordinarily call out who was on the Committee that worked on the ordinance. But as the Drafter of this, he provided the Drafter's Analysis attached to the ordinance, which talked specifically about the RESJI staff, the comments that were made and the language that was included because of that. This was a part of the legislative record and history, though not a part of text of the ordinance.

Kovich felt that it was important to be inclusive of everybody, and said that her comment related to the fact that she found the language limiting because there were other groups who might be considered as well. She thought it important to think of these groups, and everyone else as well. She loved words and felt it was important to think carefully about words when they were that important.

ACA Strange provided some background, and discussed the proposal and process used to develop it.

- TPC was the last of several committees to consider the proposal.
- For a number of years, the City Attorney's Office had noticed some parts of the current ordinance that either weren't consistent with how we were doing things, or that weren't consistent with State law; and felt that it would be good to clean some of this up.
- About 1-1/2 years ago, the TPC asked that a regional rep be added to the TPC, and they went through a process of drafting several ordinance iterations that ended up at the Executive Committee, where it was recommended that they shelve what they had, and take a step back to look at the entire Section 3.14 to look at all the transportation commissions and committees.
- The Ad Hoc Transportation Ordinance Review Committee (TORC) was created, and met eleven times starting in early 2016. TORC looked at the entire ordinance, and asked what they would want to change, to position the City, its transportation committees and Dept. of Transportation, to pivot towards a future that better represented where it wanted to go from a transportation perspective.
- Currently the ordinance contained seven commissions/sub/committees, with 59 voting members. The proposal called for a two body structure, the Transportation Policy and Planning Board (TPPB) and the Transportation Commission (TC), each with nine voting members and two alternates.
- One of the first questions TORC asked was where did people go, where was there a single transportation policy and planning body in the City. TORC felt there wasn't one. TPC, PBMVC, LRTPC all talked about policy at times; but there was no single place. TORC felt it would be advantageous to have a specific place.
- TORC also looked at consolidating committees to a smaller number, to form bodies where all the elements of transportation system were considered at one time. So it proposed the TPPB, Which would consider transportation policy and planning issues for all elements of the transportation system; and the TC, which would consider transportation issues enumerated in the ordinance related to specific project implementation and questions.
- TORC also looked at the Department of Transportation (DOT), Section 3.14, where it listed a Director of Transportation, even though the City had not had a Director for many years, and discussed how they would envision this going forward.
- The new DOT would include the current divisions, Traffic Engineering,

Parking and Transit; but also added another, the Transportation Policy and Planning Division, and added a Manager, to help fill the gap of making sure that transportation policy and planning was being done on the large level, with staff and a board to get some things done with respect to that.

- The proposal didn't call for a Director, but had a provision that the City could hire one at any time (including immediately if that was what the Mayor and Council preferred).
- At the end of the Committee process, the proposal was introduced. It has now traveled through all the secondary referrals, where Strange had taken notes about recommendations and suggestions, that he would take to TORC, which would likely be reconvened to consider a Substitute Ordinance that would then go to the Council for consideration. All the comments collected along the way would be considered by TORC.

Strange and members discussed the proposal further.

- (Strange) On-street parking was not mentioned in the proposal because they were done by ordinance. In the proposal, the TPPB had specific authority to review any transportation ordinances. The City had always placed on-street parking in Chapter 12. Ultimately it was the Council who set those rates, but any transportation ordinance, inc. on-street parking would go through the TPPB.
- (Bigelow) Because the proposal contained so much about transit and off-street parking rates, it would probably make sense to bring up on-street parking because it was a big part of what we had in downtown Madison.
- Regarding what was in the old ordinance compared to what was in the new one, Strange referred people to the color-coded spreadsheet produced for TORC, showing issues and who handled them; i.e., TPPB, TC, Combo, or Management.
- (Kovich) It was hard to separate what was under the Board vs. under the Commission. Many decisions were listed under the Board. When making decisions about items connected to responsibilities of the Commission, they needed to think about both. She found it hard when we had one body looking at an item, and another body would be looking at the same thing or related things. Some items overlapped. Here, one body looked at service standards, and the other looked at fees. In her experience with the TPC, these issues needed to be considered together. She would be more supportive if the Board were more focused on long-range planning, and the Commission handled everything else. So when budgeting and setting rates, they would think about service and operational issues as well.
- (Strange) Her feedback would be taken back to TORC, with respect to what was policy and what was implementation.
- (Kovich) In some places, the ordinances were very, very specific about responsibilities. But TPC considered many different things that weren't addressed in the ordinances. Recently, the TPC had accepted grants that were coming in, but this wasn't addressed anywhere in the proposal. Which one of the groups would that go to? She worried that some things were left out, because of the proposal was so specific about dividing things up in a way that was difficult to understand.
- (Strange) TORC created the TPPB and gave it authority to consider all policy and planning issues related to all elements of the transportation system. So any policy issue would be considered by the Board. That presented two options: One, to try to list every single possible item that could come before the Board, or the Board was given general grant of power. The decision was to

give them a general grant of power; because the current ordinance had a very specific list. But the current Commissions did things that weren't shown there, and vice versa, things were shown there that the Commissions didn't currently do.

- (Strange) For the TC, the idea was to create a body that was focused on implementation-focused issues, day-to-day issues. There, more specific items were provided, and each category had a catch-all to allow staff to bring any other item to the TC.

- (Strange) In terms of how TORC created the list for the TC, a list was created of what was contained in the current ordinance, put it on a spreadsheet, and worked with staff to see how those issues were handled now, to see what should be carried over into the new ordinances.

- (Strange) All the different issues/duties for TPC and PBMVC in the current Sec. 3.14, were shown on the spreadsheet. Staff provided input on how frequently those issues arose, and where those issues were handled now. For example, an "M" indicated something that was handled by management; they didn't come to the current bodies for specific action points. Then they decided how they wanted to carry items forward. Those shown as crossed out, such as "transit performance targets" identified as an "M", didn't need to be assigned to the TPPB or TC. So that item disappeared. If something got carried over to the new ordinance, TORC identified that item as either a policy issue assigned to the TPPB, or as an implementation issue assigned to the TC.

- (Kovich) Regarding her comment about including everybody, she found limiting the way that the qualities of the various members would determine who could be chosen. Regarding multi-modal transportation, people needed to be knowledgeable about the various means of transportation. It was important to look for people who were experienced as they could be. We shouldn't look for somebody who only knew about bikes; we should look for somebody who knew about bikes and other things. The overarching language about members having a multi-element perspective was good, but then said to look for somebody with a certain kind of knowledge. It would be better to say they needed to have at least that knowledge, but that they should be experienced as they can be with everything.

- (Kovich) She was a pedestrian, she biked, she drove a car, she parked. But that likely wasn't why she was asked to be on the TPC. It was probably because of her background in business and finance, and her experience serving on a lot of City boards/committees/commissions. Was this general information that we should always consider when choosing committee members? She found the designations limiting.

- (Kovich) It was limiting and restrictive for the regional representative to be an elected official (only).

- (Kovich) Weren't horse-drawn vehicles still potentially an issue? It seemed some things were left out. These were really important changes that they were making. She wanted to make sure that we didn't miss anything.

- (Kemble) TORC would be reconvening to consider all the comments and emails that had been presented. She herself had raised the issue of fares and who should set them. This would probably be moved down to the Commission level, because of a federal regulation that said that routes and fares couldn't be considered separately. Then that would likely affect where the regional rep/elected person would sit, because the whole point was for that person to be on the body that made those kind of decisions.

- (Kemble) As far as the regional rep being an elected official, that was purely a strategic decision around the potential of creating an RTA. The majority party

at the State Capitol who might vote for an RTA, have said the only way it would pass, would be if the RTA was composed of elected officials from the region. Re: a comment from CSOS about a reference to governmental entities, the proposal said "representatives of entities that contract with the City of Madison".

- (Kemble) It was important for people to submit all their detailed comments because this was not the end of the process; it was the beginning of the final phase. She clarified that the proposal would not come back to the TPC. TORC would deal with all the comments collected so far. Everyone was welcome to attend the TORC meetings to have their say, which had been the case all along.
- (Ahrens/Strange) Re: the concept of street project review and development review, these were identified as things commissions currently did. For example, development review projects that came out of the Planning Division maybe for conditional use review or rezoning sometimes went to commissions for recommendations related to such things as traffic issues. These included projects like Judge Doyle Square, which would impact traffic.
- (Strange) Street project review occurred when streets were re/constructed. BPW typically was the Lead, but they also came through PBMVC to solicit their recommendations when the spec's were at 30%. PBMVC's role was advisory with regard to plans and specs, as would be the role of the Transportation Commission. The creation of a project, funding, bidding, etc. was done by BPW and Engineering and ultimately by the Council. The proposal wouldn't change any of this, except to ask the TC (vs. PBMVC) to make recommendations.
- (Strange) The TPPB might create a policy related to the usage of streets; for example to say that in street re/construction, more concrete would be dedicated to the usage of transit and bikes. Then when the spec's came to the TC, they would make sure the plans were consistent with the policy.
- (Strange) Budgets for the various transportation divisions, inc. the new Trans. Policy and Planning Division, would be reviewed by the TPPB.
- (Ahrens) Like Kovich, he had concerns about the broad language for the Board to make policies. Maybe that needed more meat. Right now, it was subject to interpretation. On the other hand, the Commission had very specific activities. It was clear what it was supposed to do.
- (Strange) Among its duties, the Board would be empowered to work with various agencies to create the Transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan. That would have to be adopted by the Council. But the Board would have the authority on its own to adopt transportation policies for the various transportation elements without going to the Council for further adoption. But the ordinance did have an appeal procedure. The point of the change was to give the Board some real authority to create policies that could go right into implementation phase. And to have the staff and Commission to help that implementation along.
- (Kemble) Re: the Jeffy Trail question, the meat of the proposal was the new Policy and Planning (P & P) staff. Right now, we weren't sure where the decisions were coming from. Under the proposal, the P&P staff would have the authority to make decisions about what made sense transportation-wise, given the multitude of plans in the City (the Comp Plan, the Sustainability Plan, etc.) It would be up to the P&P staff to sort through all this with whatever the Board had for policy, to avoid fractured decision-making processes around use of right-of-way or land use for transportation.
- (Golden) He urged TORC to look for items that could be taken away from all

the commissions, and simply be done by staff, as a way of efficiency. For example, TPC did taxi licensing. Could that be delegated to staff, who could apply whatever policy we had to issue the license. They could use an appeal process if needed. Another example was bus shelters. A policy for shelters could be established, and staff could apply it. The same approach could be used for crossing guards, Neighborhood Traffic Management, stop sign assignment, which would only need to be taken to the Commission if a staff decision was appealed.

- (Golden) A major omission was no mention of the responsibilities currently done by the ADA Paratransit Subcommittee. These needed to be examined and placed on the spreadsheet. Members of this Subcommittee wondered where they fit in. Some of what ADATS did was really important and needed to be reflected.
- (Strange) An item on the spreadsheet identified as "transit for people with disabilities" was assigned to the Transportation Commission, and reflected in the proposal.
- (Golden) He still wondered about such issues as the Leave Attended Policy, and whether that would be handled by the Board. Generally, he would ask that TORC look at whether certain things be done at all, and if they should be done, where should they be done. And if it was assigned somewhere, did it make sense in terms of other things assigned elsewhere?

Poulson asked Kamp for his comments, in particular related to bus shelters.

- Although at first he questioned whether transit performance standards should be crossed off and assigned strictly to management, since they now were part of Metro's performance reports to the TPC, he was fine with that.
- Having worked in various places, he knew there was more than one way to do things. But he also knew there was a human element at play in this.
- Re: the idea that Management should make the decision on bus shelters (based on policy/criteria), he would say the same thing should be done for bus stops. No matter how well these things were delineated in the ordinance, he would use some discretion as to when to bring discussion about them to the Commission. He was willing to say that there might be more than one way to do it, and he wasn't sure what the right way was.
- He appreciated how Strange had to take the ideas from all the other agency heads and put together a quite meaningful way to look at this in trying to make a decision.

Golden said that he trusted that staff knew when things were bubbling up, and they should bring the issue to the Commission.

Bergamini commented that the Commission didn't currently shape the budget. The budget was a Mayor-driven system. When staff put together their budget proposals, they went to the Mayor's Office, not the TPC. It was reviewed with the Commission, and staff did a great job trying to keep a budget in line with the priorities articulated at the TPC. She wondered if the proposal would change the current practice.

Strange said TORC's intent for the Board to give recommendations on the budget, was not to change the current process. But in general, the idea was to create a Board that had more gravitas, in terms of having more alders on it. Who knew how that would play out. The Board could end up having more influence on how those things that went through. Bergamini wondered what the relationship would become between the TPPB and the Finance

Committee. Strange noted that, per Golden's comment at LRTPC with respect to budget, it might be a good idea to have a joint meeting of the Board and the Commission, because of related issues between policy and implementation. This might create more momentum for their recommendations. There might be other instances when the Board and Commission might want to come together as well.

Poulson said they had no motion on the floor. They had three related items, one that created the new system, and two that repealed existing ordinances in two parts, one part that was charter ordinance driven. The proposal would be going back to TORC regardless. Since this was going to TORC, Bergamini wondered if they needed to make a motion.

Golden said that based on his experience, overlapping membership among committees was a failure. He didn't have an answer. When cross-communication was needed, how should we get it done? In his opinion, when coordination was needed, it should be written in. Coordination was needed between TPPB and the Finance Committee on budget-related items, and between TPPB and the Plan Commission because of statutory responsibilities that went to Plan Commissions (because another committee couldn't be created to do their work). When the Transportation Planner was created, there was never any question that it would go anywhere but Planning. If you were going to change things, do it with your eyes wide open.

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Kovich, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the COMMON COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: To forward member comments with the ordinance, and make no recommendation regarding passage, since their comments were substantive. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G.2. [46376](#)

Repealing Sections 3.14(1) through (3) and 3.14(4)(k) through 3.14(11) of the Madison General Ordinances to update the Department of Transportation Department ordinance.

Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the COMMON COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: To forward member comments with no recommendation regarding passage. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Kovich, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the COMMON COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: To forward member comments with no recommendation regarding passage. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G.3. [46377](#)

CHARTER ORDINANCE - Repealing Section 3.14(4)(a) through (j) of the Madison General Ordinances to restructure the Department of Transportation.

Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the COMMON COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: To forward member comments with no recommendation regarding passage. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Kovich, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the COMMON COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: To forward member comments with no recommendation regarding passage. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G.4. [47147](#)

Metro: Action on proposed service changes effective August 27, 2017 - TPC 05.10.17

Kamp noted that members had received an updated version of all public comment (attached). Staff would focus on the handful of proposed changes where there was controversy. Metro Transit Planning and Scheduling Manager Drew Beck joined Kamp to discuss these routes.

- Route 14: In moving the route from Farmington Way to Tree Lane, the concern was added walking distances, and boardings along the current route. Off-peak service now ran on Tree Lane. Having it go there on the new route all day long would shorten the (non-commute) off-peak and evening walk for Farmington Way.
- The new signal planned for Colony and Gammon would likely not be installed by August 27th when new routing would be implemented. As a result, until the signal was available, the route would be detoured during the 3-hour PM commute (only), whereby the route would travel down from Offshore to Mineral Point, then up Gammon to Tree Lane.
- The change added service further west along Randolph because of high-density housing located there, expanding the service area a bit.
- Route 56-57: Currently, buses made a left turn from Stonecreek to go west on McKee; which was do-able, but not really safe. The new routing involved taking the bus off Stonecreek Drive and moving it over to Maple Grove Drive, because the intersection at Stonecreek/McKee was being reconstructed to add a median there, which would prevent buses from making the turn there. Also, the Maple Grove/McKee intersection had a signal, making the turn much safer.
- Route 35: At the hearing, they had heard the testimony of a particular business located in the Atlas Avenue/Argosy Court area, asking Metro to provide service there for dozens of its employees. Since then, Economic Development had also requested this. Metro has agreed to do so: The bus would leave the ETP travel south on Hwy. 51 to exit east on Cottage Grove Road. At Atlas Avenue, the bus would travel north to make a loop on Neptune and Argosy Courts, turning south on Atlas to Cottage Grove, to continue its regular morning route through the eastside neighborhoods and back to the ETP.
- For the afternoon commute, it would do the opposite, and travel to the neighborhoods first, then the Argosy Court area, then back to the ETP.

Members commented and staff responded.

- Route 14-Golden: Given that Tree Lane is 1/2 mile or more away for people on Farmington, and that 4-5 people used the Farmington stops, what were the reasons for the change? Kamp said they were doing this for safety purposes, to use the new signal; and to expand service to more people further west, which would likely increase ridership. Beck also noted that Route 15 was on Old Sauk Road (just above Route 14) about a 1/3 of a mile from Farmington; and folks there could use this route instead.
- Bergamini noted that the Route 15 route seemed rather convoluted. Tolmie agreed, but said that service was consistent throughout the day. However, it was standing room only at certain times of the day.

Kovich/Bigelow made a motion to approve the changes as recommended. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

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

[07828](#) REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only
(Most recent meeting minutes attached, if available)
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)
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

Poulson asked that TPC rules be suspended to take up a resolution not shown on the Agenda, related to the retirement of Recording Secretary Anne Benishek-Clark. Poulson read the resolution expressing appreciation for Benishek-Clark's service to the Commission and City. Members then endorsed it by acclamation. At a loss for words, Benishek-Clark simply thanked everyone.

[47322](#) Resolution No. TPC-05-10-2017, related to the retirement of TPC Recording Secretary Anne Benishek-Clark - TPC 05.10.17

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

None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Martin, seconded by Kovich, to Adjourn at 8:36 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.