

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Ann Kovich <annelizabethkovich@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 4, 2023 9:25 PM
To: All Alders; Rhodes-Conway, Satya V.
Subject: Comments regarding Amendments to the Transportation Demand Management Ordinance – Item #100 - Leg File 80662

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello, Alders. I am Chair of the Transportation Commission (TC), but I am not representing TC with these comments as they are my own personal opinions and observations.

I am writing to support the TC recommendation made regarding the amendments to the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) ordinance – MGO Section 16.03 (#100 on the Common Council agenda – Leg file 80662). Motion passed at TC on 11/29/23 was “McCahill moved to recommend the approval of the ordinance changes minus the exemption for City wholly owned properties, seconded by Martinez-Rutherford.” Motion was passed unanimously.

At the Plan Commission meeting on 11/27/23 there was quite a bit of discussion regarding the proposed exemption for “Wholly City-owned property.” As noted by one member of the Plan Commission, it was hoped that TC would review this potential exemption further.

At the TC meeting on 11/29/23, members were in full support of the proposed amendments except for the proposed exemption for “Wholly City-owned properties.” There was significant discussion regarding the justification for the proposed exemption for “Wholly City-owned property.” Since the City clearly supports TDM, why should City owned properties be exempt? Why shouldn’t the City be held to the same TDM standards? There were also questions and discussion about how TDM would be applied to projects where the City owns the parking and a significant number of parking stalls would be reserved/leased to a privately owned development. Questions were also asked about how TDM requirements applied to properties owned by other governmental entities.

After the extensive discussion about existing and proposed exemptions, TC members wondered why some of the existing exemptions were included in the ordinance. TDM staff mentioned that Madison has more exemptions in its TDM ordinance than other cities. It appears we should be considering removing some of the TDM exemptions rather than adding to them. TC members asked that when the TDM program is reviewed next summer after a full year of use (TDM ordinance went into effect 6/15/23), that all the exemptions be reviewed, as well as the mitigation measures, etc. This full review of TDM could also result in additional proposed amendments to the TDM ordinance.

There may need to be procedural adjustments made for how a TDM plan should be developed for a City owned project; but that could be addressed in the TDM program.

I urge you to support the TC recommendation – Approving all of the recommended amendments to the TDM ordinance Sec. 16.03 of the MGO except for the proposed additional exemption in subsection (4)(f) “Wholly City-owned property.”

Thanks and best regards,
Ann

Ann E. Kovich
(she/her/hers)
2605 Golden Gate Way
Madison, WI 53713
Email: annelizabethkovich@gmail.com
Mobile: 608-886-2556

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10