

could be done for this project, it could be done for every project. The hotel should not receive special preference. Hamblin clarified that the intent was not to circumvent any approval processes the City required; rather it was more to facilitate or expedite the process. Golden had no objection to that.

*Noting that the report and resolution were before them without change, members voted to approve the report/resolution by a majority with Miller voting no.*

4. Madison Department of Transportation Organizational Issues, including Council Referral Report ID 17855 of Comptroller dated 7/13/95 re DOT organizational options

Members from the Pedestrian-Bicycle Subcommittee (PBS) in attendance initially were Shirley Lake and Ald. Judy Olson, while Tim Wong arrived later during discussion of the item. They were invited to participate in the discussion.

Mark Shahan (607 Piper Drive), representing the Transportation Alliance of Dane County, indicated he was attending primarily for information. However, based on his understanding of the proposal for shifting responsibility of traffic to the PBS, he expressed concern that traffic might dominate the activities of the new commission and requested that steps be taken to ensure the pedestrian and bicycle elements be on equal ground with traffic. This might be accommodated through membership by identifying advocates for pedestrians and bicycles being assured seats on the commission and having all three modes being reflected in the name of the Commission.

Tom Favour, representing the Dane County Regional Planning Commission, referred to his memo addressing concern about shifting Section 9 transit planning funds away from RPC as it related to the impact on RPC's transportation budget. Attachment 4 of the *1996 Unified Planing Work Program* included a contractual agreement between the State DOT, DCRPC and City of Madison (as the transit operator). It spelled out the goals for transportation planning for MPO, State and City and he suggested they look at this contractual agreement. Kennedy asked about other Section 9 funds that might be available. Favour responded that Section 9 monies to Madison Metro provided a certain amount of operating and capital funds and a portion of these might be used for transportation planning with the local areas to make this determination. Kennedy asked if the MPO could delegate more planning money from Section 9 capital money for the City. Favour said the funds going to Metro were committed to some extent for the purchase of replacement buses and other capital needs. But, he said it was a choice whether to devote some other monies for planning. If this were to happen, it would need to be in the work program and TIP program. Larrousse followed that as a part of the new Federal budget realities and funding under Section 9 (capital apportionment which comes to the City of Madison), the luxury of being able to use Federal funds for staff and capital needs could not be counted on in the future. After the 1996 construction of transit centers, he projected the amount of money available for capital replacement would become tighter and tighter. They would have to look at all things including Metro staffing as it relates to the funding of positions out of capital grant monies. How long they would be able to continue to use these monies for these purposes, he didn't know.

Shirley Lake commented that she was generally supportive of the plan, but she had concern about a plan which relied so heavily on Alderperson representation. She thought they might need to look to other ways to provide the intercommunication. She supported the team management idea for the Department to allow the City Traffic Engineer to be recruited and to have input in the process. She liked the idea of elevating the pedestrian-bicycle subcommittee to a commission status, and saw advantage in incorporating traffic with pedestrian and bicycle issues in terms of considering safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Golden explained that because of his concern that they "have something on the table" he had put forth the proposal outlined in his October 17 memo. He emphasized that the proposal should be considered as something to stir debate and discussion; that he was not wedded to any or all aspects of it. He said he could have as easily suggested keeping things as they are, and added that frankly there were many things that were appealing to him. Having been a member of the Strategic Planning Committee which worked on the "things which weren't quite right" with the Department and with his experience on the TC for the past seven years, he saw value in considering change, specifically in the commission/committee structure. He referred to concerns expressed in the past about having too much on the plate and not enough time to get into things in depth, items not coming to the commission because of the other business at hand (e.g., Metro issues). As he looked at it, he kept both the agency and policy making structure in mind and felt there needed to be symmetry between the two. He supported the staff recommendation relative to maintaining MDOT as a collaborative entity until the City Traffic Engineer was on board and able to provide input as innovative and referred to the effectiveness of this approach in Public Works. On the policy-making side, he felt PBS was not being used to the extent it could; that giving it commission status and having it focus on pedestrian, bicycle, and traffic engineering issues was needed and would permit the other half of the existing TC responsibilities to be handled by a commission dealing with the two utilities. The key loss he saw with the proposal was separation/division and it was something to be watched. He had made some recommendations to address this (e.g., cross membership) and whether this was adequate, or whether alders would be given too much power, he wasn't sure. He referred to Austin's comments and criticisms and felt they were legitimate concerns. Because of the concerns noted, he had suggested the Alderperson membership over citizen since he wondered too about the number of citizens willing to devote the amount of time which would be required for some of the models given. The area least resolved was long-range transportation planning. He wondered if greater sanction shouldn't be given to long-range planning. As a member of DCRPC, he was aware of their responsibilities and somehow that connection needed to be made in a more meaningful way. He emphasized that he didn't want it to be viewed as his plan, but rather something to stimulate discussion about issues.

Kennedy saw a need to reorganize at the policy-commission and staff levels. Two problems he saw were: (1) Not getting a strong enough connection with the bicycle-pedestrian policy/recommendations/decisions and this somehow had to be integrated. He was concerned that traffic might swallow up the pedestrians and bicycles and wanted to make sure steps were taken to avoid this. (2) Not having a serious commitment at the policy and staff levels for transportation planning. He acknowledged staffing limitations restricted its ability to do the job adequately and thought it needed to be remedied. He did not want to draw funds away from RPC if it could be avoided, but at the same time, he suggested they were facing big enough problems in the City, that these issues had to be dealt with. He cited an example being the Target store siting on the East Side, and the traffic implications this had for East Washington, etc. He said a full time staff person was needed to look

at these things. He also saw the Joint TC/PC needing to expand its scope of responsibility and expand its membership base, meeting schedule, etc. He wasn't sure the structure was in the proposals put forth. In general, he supported the staff report but saw follow up needed on the transportation planning activity at both the policy and staff levels.

Referring to the Joint TC/PC, Falconer said when they formed on an ad hoc basis, the subcommittee set their mission at their first meeting. Part of the time was to be spent on major issues assigned by either the parent commissions (e.g., USH 51/USH 151 area development) and the second half to talk about and explore new areas (e.g., should street standards be changed). She said both of these elements were important and agreed that there were more concrete projects that the Joint TC/PC could be asked to review, but she would hate to lose the forum of hashing over in-depth issues that neither of the parent commissions had time to deal with.

Miller said he supported the staff report and considering the other materials provided, he wondered what was expected of the Commission on this item. Golden explained that he had requested staff to provide with the mailing all the background material and said technically the Staff 1/18/96 report was what was before the body. Miller echoed some comments made, particularly the Commission Policy recommendations, e.g., integration of pedestrian, bicycle and traffic and allowing transit and parking to have more time devoted to its areas of interest.

Holtzman concurred and said he supported the structure laid out. He wondered about Metro+Plus, was it recommended to be a part of the Transit Commission? Golden clarified that it was an issue to be dealt with and at some point it might be incorporated into the Commission. Larrousse pointed out that the ADA Paratransit Plan had been submitted to the Federal government without coming before the TC because of timing and other TC business considerations. He saw a need to continue to have a forum for people with disabilities relative to the paratransit service (now done through ADA paratransit oversight subcommittee), but in the long run, he suggested that as the rest of the country complies with ADA, the issues would "evaporate because in theory everything would be level" and at that point the ADA Paratransit Subcommittee might be folded into the Commission. In time, he felt the distinction between fixed route and paratransit would become blurred.

Holtzman referred to the team relationship which had formed since the retirement of the Director of Transportation and he saw Option 4 being the organizational structure most closely representing that. He wanted to acknowledge staff not only for the report, but for the team work they mustered to make things work.

Rosas commented on the Joint TC/PC by noting that his district had a large smorgasbord of issues and he appreciated the involvement of the commissions; it was not something one Alderperson could deal with, but was one that several committees could work on. He saw the need to not lose sight of involving all the affected parties.

Kennedy said if they created three separate policy groups, would they end up operating in somewhat of a vacuum, where would decisions lie on issues needing multi-mode considerations, and how might this be addressed?

Hanson supported the staffing recommendations in the 1/18/96 report. However, on the commission/policy side, he had some concerns. He preferred to see a one commission structure for

transportation and land use and wondered if it might be doable. He suggested that while some of their business was policy, the TC was also involved in some management issues. If there was a stronger focus on policy and less involvement in management, he thought a one commission model was workable. Golden asked if he was suggesting that the Planning Commission exist and there be a single Transportation Commission or was he envisioning combining the two. Hanson responded there would be one commission under which Planning and Transportation Planning would be.

Referring to the written staff engineers' comments, Dettmann noted the presence of Walsh and McCormick who could provide input as well. He emphasized a couple of points. Item 2a. spoke to the linkages between the elements of planning and operations. While looking to strengthen the relationship between land use planning and transportation planning, they didn't want to lose what existed now in terms of the linkage between planning and operations. For 2c, they saw a need to define what was meant by long-range transportation planning and what wouldn't be long-range. As an example, he referred to the Target Store on Lien Road and pointed out there had been a lot of operations input into the review as was planning review and coordination. Kennedy asked for an opinion about keeping the transportation planning staff person being recommended in Traffic Engineering vs. Planning Unit to allow for the operations/planning coordination. Dettmann responded it would make their linkage easier to accomplish, but inevitably there needed to be that coordination with Planning as had occurred between Traffic Engineering and City Engineering. He added that with Nelson overseeing both agencies, Nelson had an opportunity to tie the linkage between the two units and Dettmann saw it as helping for years to come since both had learned from the experience. Kennedy wondered if the coordination might come at the commission/policy level through, for example, the Joint TC/PC which would be staffed by both a transportation planner and planner. Dettmann saw the difficulty being more the total amount of work to be done by one person and the priority given to short-term, immediate needs.

McCormick saw coordination as key. Planning became involved first with any development activity and from there coordination with other agencies was critical. Presently, this was accomplished through the routing of plans from Planning to the various agencies for comment/input. This held true for the plans (neighborhood, master plan, peripheral development plan) which were generated by Planning. Critical in the review was the operations element to avoid future problems. He suggested that even if a person were dedicated to long-range transportation planning, it might not be enough at the staff level to accommodate the desired goals; there would still need to be the coordination with other agencies. He saw the need to address coordination, resources, definition and structure and the decision making at both the staff level and policy level. He acknowledged that the Joint TC/PC was a valuable resource that probably wasn't being taken advantage of; rather things were going directly through the Plan Commission.

Holtzman did not feel a super-commission was humanly possible; the closest proposal he'd seen to provide for coordination was with the overlapping memberships, but he then too questioned if that wouldn't require an extraordinary commitment.

Nelson focussed the issue on the concept of the "Cain and Abel" relationship between operations and long-range planning. The needs of the moment drive staff away from long-range planning. As an example, he said the Target Store on the East Side would change the land use and with that came the transportation impacts. He referred to the long-range issues already decided for the Target

Store, e.g., area behind the Target was almost a third wetlands and a study hadn't been required when this land use proposal came through, because they had done it 25 years ago. He pointed out long-range planning was in place for this. He argued that long-range planning needed to be looked at from a more holistic approach, like they had done for drainage and sanitary sewer and wetlands. He said they had the same problem with ongoing debate regarding light rail; staff was not currently committed to this, even though staff was attending meetings and was on as-time-is-available basis and work on the Kohl Center would knock this right off the timetable. He summarized it was not so much a question of policy as it was between short-term operations and long-term planning. It would take a lot of discipline to set up resources for long-range planning.

Hanson agreed with comments made by Nelson. Referring to the DOT organizational options which had been presented in July, he suggested that Option 5 came close to what he was thinking about, which showed a plan commission and it might be modified to focus on long-term. With that option, he saw a lot of the operational aspects going to the Board of Public Works. A modification he'd suggest would be to be very explicit and show long-range transit planning as a parallel element to the transportation planning. From a practical standpoint, he wasn't sure one commission would work, but he was concerned about long-term planning and its integration into land use/transportation activities. If long-term and operational/shorter term issues couldn't be separated, he saw them probably needing a Plan Commission, Pedestrian/Bicycle/Traffic Commission and Transit/Parking Commission. He was looking to get at the long term issues in an integrated fashion, e.g., through a single commission.

Kennedy said he found the ideal to be a joint commission which made the decisions on land use and transportation, but practically he didn't see how it could be done under the committee structure. He wondered if more than one position in long-range transportation/land use planning were needed. A compromise he saw was to have a separate Joint Transportation Commission/Plan Commission working on long-range issues; it needed to meet more often and be more active; more staff was needed. He referred to lack of comment on the proposal to have a separate transit and parking commission. He wanted emphasis to be on transit and wondered if this proposed makeup would ensure that. He noted the parking area had never presented much of a workload for the TC, and favored joining the two (transit and parking) at some point.

Larrousse commented on the report by indicating that the staff report was a consensus of what was felt to work best under the current city administrative staffing; it was not viewed as a permanent solution. The idea was to allow the City Traffic Engineer to come on-board and be involved in the decision making process and this was driven more by the relationship of where Traffic Engineering ultimately would go in the organizational structure. Key to him was that the Metro organization be separate and noted it was the third largest City Unit (next to Police and Fire). Metro's operations did not fit well with public works nor with transportation. Decisions to bring Metro into Transportation occurred prior to his being a part of the agency and evolved from purchase of the privately owned company, to bringing employees under City Civil Service, to transferring of Planning and Administrative functions which were in DOT to the Transit Manager, and lastly the actions to bring management of Metro from contracted service to City service. For the long-range, he saw Metro separate and a key recommendation was never to fill the Director of Transportation position, possibly removing the position from subsequent budgets. He referred to the major reorganization which was to occur at Metro and as the manager he was concerned that the Commission and in fact Council was not being involved to the extent he would like to see in the

decisions being made by staff. He said the "policy ownership" needed to be by the Commission, who in turn would report to the Council. He had seen this a major shortcoming of present conditions and in fact was a factor in "holding Metro back from achieving even more greatness." He saw a shortcoming being the lack of long-range budget planning (five years or so) so that they could be looking at the decisions which would need to be made as to what the transit system was to look like faced with future budget cuts, e.g., were buses needed on nights and weekends? He emphasized, too, that he wouldn't want to see the subcommittee structure as existed when he first was employed with Metro returned since it basically was a rubber stamp from the subcommittee to the Commission and misused staff resources. He summarized that he would like to see a strong policy body for transit. The proposal for transit and parking was primarily because of their being enterprise agencies.

Falconer said in thinking back on why the three units were combined, she said it had been a recognition of some deficits in the way things were being done and bringing them together they thought would correct the deficits in communications. Now, basically they were saying this may have helped but not enough. Referring to comments on short-term projects and reactions, she thought the information which was now coming to the Plan Commission was timely, informative and much more regarded than had been in the past. She acknowledged the unified aspect probably wasn't there, and she saw a need to address the direction of the city for the long range; e.g., will streets be widened to accommodate commuters destined for the downtown, will neighborhoods be preserved? She saw a need for transit and other transportation issues to be incorporated into these discussions. She saw it as a planning function needing to be coordinated very closely with activities of the Plan Commission and other agencies.

McCormick interjected that they might want to try their theory on "how it should be" or "how it would work" by using the High Point Development plan as a case study, since it had the long range picture and the short term action elements with development ready to occur. Larrousse wasn't sure it would be a good example since transit planning had not been involved and he pointed out a senior housing site which would present financial/physical problems for Metro to serve. McCormick added the area was regional because of the park feature, glacial Drummond trails, etc. and RPC had been involved in some of the activities. Favour said RPC staff had dealt with some of the issues for some time (e.g., extension of High Point Road from Midtown to PD) and noted the ongoing issues since as early as 1973 with the inadequacies of the officially mapped road to serve areas to the north.

Hill said the thought of an Outer Beltline of M and PD would be something that would need to be faced and integration is needed with RPC. She asked what the engineering needs were for transit; Larrousse said they did not have in-house engineering staff and they had a particular one-time need to coordinate with Traffic Engineering on the development of the transit transfer points. In terms of interaction between the two agencies, he speculated it was less than 1% of Metro activities.

Hill asked what transportation operations experience meant. Dettmann responded that operations would entail someone listening to customers and who could take a plan like the Kohl Center and review it in light of customer needs. For example, in the Kohl plan, it did not appear pedestrian flow was considered, peaking characteristics especially after the events were not addressed, etc.

Hinz said that although no one had commented on parking, he would pass along a few comments. When asked where parking belongs, he had responded it could go either with traffic engineering or transit. In cities throughout the country where the transit operation was regional, coordination between transit and parking didn't exist; for the most part, parking is over built, which is detrimental to parking, to transit and to overall transportation operations. By having the three units together in Madison, he felt they had been able to avoid this and parking hadn't been over built. He had tried to keep a perspective of transit's importance in the transportation picture. He wasn't sure if this tie-in was more important at a policy level than at the operations/administrative level. However, parking also worked closely with traffic engineering with primarily street parking. He reiterated if a separation were to occur, there was logic to having transit and parking utilities working under one commission and yet there was logic to traffic and parking being coordinated at the staff level.

Kennedy thought they were close to reaching consensus for the time being. He thought there was general agreement that the Director of Transportation position was not needed and possibly it should be removed from the organizational structure. There was a need for a transportation planner on staff, which he thought should remain under transportation so the operations and planning connection could be maintained. Coordination with Planning would occur because of necessity. He was convinced more attention needed to be given to transit and he liked the comments from Hinz relative to parking and transit fitting together. He supported the idea of forming a pedestrian/bicycle/traffic commission, and designating two of the seats for pedestrian and bicycle activists. Additionally, the charge and amount of activity for the Joint TC/PC was needed. With a new City Traffic Engineer and a transportation planner, they might be able to get ahead of the game in long-range planning. He encouraged that they move forward as quickly as they could in getting these things in place.

Golden said he was pleased by the comments which he saw as an overall acceptance with some reservations. He concurred with Kennedy and he saw two aspects of the plan requiring further time and attention. He generally supported comments re. no Director of Transportation, need for transportation planner and he could "live with" the position being in transportation, although he could "live with" it being in Planning. Further attention needed to be given to the charge to the commissions, particularly the TC/PC which should likely be expanded to include long-range transportation planning and expanding its membership. He thought the committee had worked well because it was made up of members from other committees and it might be appropriate to designate appointees. The relationship to the RPC is important and he wondered about the policy level synergy and thought follow up was necessary. The other thing he saw a need for follow-up was in the overall coordination issues, including not necessarily long-range issues alone but he cited the example with the Kohl Center group which included representatives from various city reviewing commissions and he felt they needed to "debrief" after the experience to see if there was something that could be learned from it. He supported having the City Traffic Engineer on board and able to participate in the follow up decisions. He emphasized that he heard no support for a Director of Transportation and he was comfortable with the proposed organization for an interim period and also with Metro spinning off as a free-standing department. In terms of traffic engineering and parking, he thought it somewhat depended on the Mayor. He pointed out the positive effects he had seen with Nelson overseeing both Engineering and Traffic Engineering and whether this needed to be expressed organizationally or in some other coordinating fashion, he didn't know.

*Motion was made by Kennedy to approve the report and forward it to the Council with the understanding that acceptance of the report authorizes the Transportation Commission to consider the introduction of a variety of ordinances to implement it over time. The following amendments to the report were made: (1) TC goes on record that there will be no Director of Transportation recruitment and would in fact contemplate removing the position from the budget; (2) A long-range transportation planner position is strongly recommended;*

In discussing Kennedy's preference to keep the Transportation planner in transportation, it was suggested and agreed to be silent on this aspect because of the need to have follow-up discussions with George Austin and Brad Murphy, including connections with land-use planning, funding options that might be available if the position were in Planning vs. transportation, etc.

*Golden said they should defer commenting on the assignment location for the Planner and to just say that it is critical that the position facilitate the coordination between transportation planning and land use planning and whatever else it might do. (3) The charge of the TC/PC be modified to include long-range planning with emphasis on integration of land use and transportation planning and advisory to the Plan Commission. It would be understood that the membership should be expanded. (4) That for the to-be-formed Pedestrian/Bicycle/Traffic Commission some seats for members be designated with both pedestrian and bicycle interest members.*

Golden referred to the follow-up activities that would be involved assuming the report was accepted by the Council.

McCormick asked if the definition for the transportation planner would identify the relationship between it and traffic engineering and transportation planning functions. Golden said it would be something to be clarified in drafting of the changes but added the need to be cautious since they would be setting a course of action which could have a decade's worth of momentum. Golden further clarified that the long-range planning responsibilities being referred to for the Joint TC/PC was in addition to what they were doing.

*Motion was seconded by Miller; carried unanimously.*

5. **TO ADOPT** Ordinance ID 18907 amending 9.13(6)(d)7.b., 9.13(7)(e) to increase vending fees for annual, monthly and daily licenses and to increase license fees for High Density Vending Areas and Ordinance ID \_\_\_\_\_ (yet to be assigned) amending 9.13(7)(e)1 to conform the high density vending year to the vending year for other vending licenses and extending existing high density vending licenses for one month to April 14, 1996

*Motion was made by Kenned/Rosas to adopt the ordinances.*

Knobeloch reviewed his staff report noting changes recommended would change the annual vending year licensing to begin April 14 to coincide with the Mall/concourse vending year. Additionally, although the team had looked at a number of ways to fund increasing administrative costs, vending