

IPC 03.08.17
ITEM F.2
HAND-OUT

Benishek Clark, Anne

From: Ken Golden [kengofpluto@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2017 3:15 PM
To: Benishek Clark, Anne
Cc: Gary Poulson; Monks, Anne; Strange, John
Subject: HANDOUT FOR TONITES MEETING-PLEASE ALSO SECOMMISSIONERS

2017 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM REORGANIZATION
COMMENTS BY KEN GOLDEN March 8, 2017

In 1989, the Transportation committee structure consisted of an all modes, Transportation Commission (TC), a ped/bike subcommittee and a single overlapping member on the TPC and Plan Commission (PC). Over the next few years, this structure changed significantly in response to workload, neighborhood pressures for ameliorating traffic impacts, environmental concerns over street and highway capacity expansion, increased interest in expanding the City's bike network and the ADA.

Well I believe the needs addressed by the city's current committees have become institutionalized and a simplification of the committee structure is needed. I support the idea of the two committee structure though some of the more regional committees suggested in the ordinance may be good to create now. I do however have some significant concerns with the assignment of responsibilities.

1. The Transportation Planning and Policy Board (TPPB) has been assigned most of the responsibilities performed by the Long range TPC. However, it lacks the connection and membership of its predecessor. LRTPC was started by Jean McCubbin and me as a joint subcommittee of the older TPC and PC. Its purpose was to better jointly consider the transportation and land use nexus.

A year of experimenting with agenda items convinced all concerned that a permanent committee was appropriate. In addition though better connections with the Board of Public Works, the MPO, the county (which has a seat) and the RTA (when it was created) were made part of this committee. It was staffed by planning staff and was intended to give voice to transportation issues in neighborhood plans and those arising from a fast growing city that were landing on PC agendas.

The current proposal loses the different perspectives on transportation issues arising from land use changes. By creating such a free standing commission with separate appointments, I believe this inadvertently makes the proposed TPPB redundant to the Plan Commission. I suggest that the appointments to this committee be reviewed and changed to include plan and (new) TP Commission members, representative(s) from both the BPW and MPO (and RTA if created) and a regional rep who is an elected official or a member of a plan commission or committee that oversees transit. In addition, I suggest that no member be appointed who lacks transportation or plan connections. I also suggest this committee be primarily advisory to the PC, new TPC and /or the council depending on the nature of the issue referred to it, finally while the secretary can be from either Transportation or Plan department, staffing should come from both.

2. A second problem I see is with the assignment of responsibilities to the TPPB. The proposal separates policy, budget and fare responsibility service levels, schedules and route

approval and the general oversight and decision making dealing with the operations of Metro Transit. THIS IS A MAJOR EFFOR! One of the aspects of the current system is that the recommendations or decisions it makes about budget come from a body that has had monthly exposure to the details of how the system operates. For example, how can TPPB make a better or even an informed decision about Route 2 without knowing that day after day, full buses are passing prospective passengers. I recommend that the committee that sees these sort of things should be making budget recommendations. Also, ion the way written, the proposal unintentionally seems to preempt the BOE or at best is redundant to the BOE's financial oversight.

The recommendation could be resolved by reassigning the budget responsibility to the new TPC or by merging these committees. I prefer the former though if the PC is now capable to addressing transportation issues effectively and perhaps even as overlapping memberships, perhaps the two committes could be merged. Remember except for the PED/Bike Subcommittee, this is how it was in 1989!

3. I think the assignment of responsibilities for parking also need review. TPPB would be responsible for most of what needs to be done with the business aspects of our parking system. The proposal fails to clearly address whether and which committee is responsible for street parking issues throughout the city. The power and duty list in 33.56 (6) (b) amount to very little. I recommend that all parking responsibilities be assigned to one of the two committees. My preference is for TPC.

4. If it isn't obvious, the above recommendations make the TPPB primarily a transportation planning body. I think that is a good thing. Otherise, the TPC is not an all-modes commission and seems to be a subservient body to the TPPB.

5. There is no meaningful mention of the Paratransit system in the ordinance. I applaud the idea that all transit should address the needs of people with disabilities but there is a \$7 million system out there that often explodes into crisis from external causes. Family Care is the next one and mentioning that the TPC will be very busy with that issue would be a good thing.

6. There is no mention of the impacts of the transportation system on quality of life at the neighborhood level. I suggest this purpose be added to the TPPB purpose and that the Neighborhood Traffic Management System be mentioned. That said, most of the issues contained in the list of responsibilities pn page 10 in 33.56 (5) (c) should be handled by staff and do not rise to the need for commission involvement. The appeal process is also cumbersome and too time consuming. If a neighborhood wants to appeal the elimination of a crossing guard, I recommend that a small group of say 3 commissioners should be empaneled to hear the appeal and make the final decision on how it should be handled. We do this for cab driver rejection appeals.

7. I suggest the ordinance be amended to include a provision which details the role of any committee member who serves on two committees. This provision should include an expectation/responsibility to communicate to each commission the highpoints of the activities of the other commission. This could be a staff responsibility or staff could merely provide support to the member. Otherwise, why require overlap? I believe this has been a weakness of the current system.

8. I think we know enough to create the Regional Transit Subcommittee. It should be composed of elected officials from entities that contract with Metro for service. I would let the communities decide who is appointed. This committee should report to the TPC.

(PC 04.12.1)

HAND-OUT

Benishek Clark, Anne

Subject: FW: A couple of items related to TPC mailing packet

ITEM.F.2,
[LEG. FILE 46248]

From: Ann Kovich [mailto:sawney@charter.net]

Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 1:18 PM

To: Benishek Clark, Anne; Ahrens, David; Beck, Drew; Block, Wayne; 'David Tolmie'; 'Gary Poulson'; Kamp, Charles; Kemble, Rebecca; 'Ken Golden'; 'Kenneth Streit'; 'Margaret Bergamini'; Martin, Crystal; May, Neil; 'Michael Johnson'; Monks, Anne; Putnam, William; Rusch, Mick; Schroeder, Ann; Tolley, Sabrina; 'Wayne Bigelow'; Zellers, Ledell

Subject: RE: A couple of items related to TPC mailing packet

Hi, everyone. Following are some comments regarding the proposed new Department of Transportation, and they range from very broad issues to very detailed observations. I feel we still need a lot of information and discussion before acting on these ordinances. Here is a summary of my thoughts and questions on this topic. I apologize for sending this the same day as our meeting, but for some reason I was under the impression that we would not be taking this up again for discussion until the May meeting in order for all input to be gathered from all relevant parties. Any thoughts which can be shared in writing are appreciated. I look forward to hearing everyone's input.

1. As mentioned by everyone, this is a comprehensive and significant change being proposed, and we need to be certain we cover all the bases in the discussion and drafting process.
 - a. I may have missed it, but don't believe I saw feedback from the ADA Transit Subcommittee.
 - b. I would like to hear more details about the discussion regarding possible changes that occurred at LRTPC.
 - c. Minutes from the CSOS indicated that staff would consolidate comments in a memo for member review so there can be feedback to the TPC for the May meeting. I may have missed it, but I don't believe I saw this memo.
 - d. In his email Ken mentioned the importance of paratransit services and consideration as new the proposed new structure. Was there discussion and review of the proposed changes at the Ad Hoc Metro Paratransit Medicaid Waiver Funding & Policy Review Committee?
2. I would like to see a summary of what was included in the prior ordinance(s), but is no longer included in the current ordinance(s) – and why not included.
3. Are we best served by all the referenced subcommittees being disbanded? There are overlapping memberships which reduce the total count of participants (on a net basis).
4. When we mention transit under the purpose of the Department of Transportation, should we also mention paratransit?
5. Under duties of the Department of Transportation (2e) and duties of the Board (6c), shouldn't we be more positive and generic: "Work to eliminate any disparities with respect to the city's transportation policies, programs, services and destinations."
6. In several places there is reference to "people of color and people of low income." I find this limiting and restrictive. If we open our minds – what about people with disabilities, single women, the elderly, children, etc. etc. How can we better word this throughout the ordinance?
7. I find it very difficult to separate the duties and responsibilities between the Board and the Commission as written. Dynamics of managing the process requires combining service and operational concerns with budgeting, fare/rate setting, etc. I would find it easier if the Board had responsibilities limited to long term planning, leaving budget oversight and decisions, rate/fare setting, accepting grants/money, agreements that relate to finances, license approvals, making recommendations on new bus acquisitions, parking ramp design, bus advertising revenue decisions, etc. to the Commission.
8. Observations on the composition of the Board:
 - a. Could be as many as 6 council members (including the 2 alternates).
 - b. Why is the regional representative designated as an elected official, as this could be restrictive?
 - c. Couldn't there be quite a bit of turnover, which could have a negative impact on Board. Can terms be staggered to avoid turnover?

Strange, John

From: Sally Lehner [sa_lehner@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 07, 2017 11:49 AM
To: Kemble, Rebecca; Zellers, Ledell
Cc: Rummel, Marsha; Strange, John
Subject: Requests/comments re TORC's re-write of transportation ordinance

Dear Rebecca & Ledell,

Thank you for your work on the TORC and the transportation ordinances re-write. In addition to the comments I made during our PBMVC hearing last week, I want to provide the following comments and requests, and I also ask that these be provided to all alders.

I understand from the PBMVC hearing on 3/28/17 and 4/25/17 that the TORC was instituted to create a forum for discussing the transportation ordinances in order to make any necessary revisions to better serve our city. As part of its work, we were told the TORC decided that it was critical to conduct this review using the city's equity lens to ensure that the city's transportation system supports marginalized communities, specifically people of color and people of low income. However, I was stunned to learn during questioning at our 4/25/17 PBMVC hearing that the city's equity lens, the RESJT, was never in fact used.

Therefore, I am specifically requesting that the RESJT analysis be completed and that this written analysis accompany the Expanded Drafter's Analysis dated 3/3/17 (which was sent to all alders) and the TORC's final report. As the PBMVC learned at our RESJI presentation by Ms. Pettaway of the Mayor's office, the RESJ analysis should be completed by people with different racial and socio-economic perspectives.

It was also clear from our 4/25/17 hearing that, not only was the RESJ tool not used, but the TORC forum did not include people of color with diverse perspectives in its discussions, review, and analysis. This legislative re-write is a major policy initiative that attempts to address the persistence of racial and social inequities in the transportation arena; it is critical that those marginalized communities which the TORC is attempting to support be included in the discussion in order to create truly effective solutions.

Therefore, my second request is that the TORC forum include a public information process with specific engagement with communities of color and communities of low income and that this forum be conducted in an accessible manner, i.e. in the neighborhoods where our most marginalized and vulnerable community members live and that the results of these forums be included in the TORC's final report.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, Sally Lehner (PBMVC)

REPORT

TO: TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION and COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FROM: Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee (CSOS)
SUBJECT: Feedback Regarding Transportation Ordinance Changes
DATE: 4/20/17

At the March 9, 2017 meeting, members of the Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee discussed the draft changes to the Transportation Ordinance put forward by the Transportation Ordinance Review Committee. The following changes to that draft ordinance were requested and concerns were noted.

- Enabling language for the Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee and membership specifications should be codified in the ordinance – in essence “port over” the existing CSOS into the new ordinance rather than just recommending that the Council establish such a committee
 - Keep the composition, appointment process, etc. the same
 - Include language in the ordinance that the purpose of the group is to ensure contracting partners have a voice, ensure fairness in contracting matters and help coordinate transit service across the region
- Include language in the ordinance guaranteeing no meeting gap during the transition from current practice to the new ordinance
- One regional representative on the TPPB would not know the issues of other regional partners, therefore, one regional representative would be unsuccessful
- Don't require the regional representative to be an elected official
 - Perhaps it would be better to remain silent on what specific position the regional representative has to have other than to specify the person represents a contracting partner
- Having policy and operations separated into two bodies could create a disconnect or a lot of “catch up” between policy makers and people in operations
- 6. In 33.55 Section 6 (h) use “contracting partners” instead of “governmental entities”

At the April 13, 2017 meeting, CSOS members approved this memo as their feedback to the TPC about TORC and recommended that the TPC integrate input from all transportation related committees and forward that to the Council Executive Committee.

To: Transportation Ordinance Review Committee

From: Anne Benishek-Clark, Christy Bachmann and Ann Schroeder
RESJ Core Team Representatives

Date: September 21, 2016

Re: Naming Race and Amplifying Marginalized Voices in the Revision of the Transportation Ordinance

The words “equity” and “equitable” can mean many things. Without agreeing upon a common definition, well-meaning people can be working at cross purposes. The City of Madison, through their Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative (RESJI) has adapted the definition from policylink.org:

*Equity is **just** and **fair** inclusion into a society in which all, including all racial and ethnic groups, can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential. Equity gives all people a just and fair shot in life despite historic patterns of racial and economic exclusion.*

The stated mission of RESJI is to “*Establish racial equity and social justice as a core principle in all decisions, policies and functions of the City of Madison.*” The City of Madison has chosen to lead with race and be specific. Studies have shown that diversity and other efforts that don’t specifically name race fail to benefit people of color and sometimes even make the existing inequities worse.

This excerpt from the Government Alliance on Race & Equity (GARE), of which Madison is a member, explains.

Why Lead with Race?

The Alliance leads with race, with the recognition that the creation and perpetuation of racial inequities has been baked into government, and that racial inequities across all indicators for success are deep and pervasive. We also know that other groups of people are still marginalized, including based on gender, sexual orientation, ability and age, to name but a few. Focusing on racial equity provides the opportunity to introduce a framework, tools and resources that can also be applied to other areas of marginalization. This is important because:

- To have maximum impact, focus and specificity are necessary. Strategies to achieve racial equity differ from those to achieve equity in other areas. “One-size-fits all” strategies are rarely successful.
- A racial equity framework that is clear about the differences between individual, institutional and structural racism, as well as the history and current reality of inequities, has applications for other marginalized groups.
- Race can be an issue that keeps other marginalized communities from effectively coming together. An approach that recognizes the inter-connected ways in which marginalization takes place will help to achieve greater unity across communities.

The Portland, OR Metro Strategic Plan says, “By addressing the barriers experienced by people of color, we will effectively also identify solutions and remove barriers for other disadvantaged groups.” (See plan excerpt attached.) If we are going to include racial equity in all decisions, policies and functions of the city as stated in the RESJI mission, we must make this clear and use consistent language in policies such as ordinances.

Another critical factor for including racial equity in this ordinance review is to keep in mind methods to amplify voices that are often marginalized. We can't just include the term "racial equity," we have to include strategies that will work toward racial equity. One primary way to do this would be to include people of color, people with low incomes and transit dependent people as specified members of transportation related boards, committees and commissions. This might require thinking about committees in a different way (i.e. accessible meeting places, support services such as child care or taxi vouchers, etc.) In addition, streamlining boards/committees/commissions would facilitate meaningful participation as much as possible. There are few people who have unlimited time and resources to devote to serving on committees, their subcommittees and study groups. When we operate in that structure, only people with the ability to devote that kind of time are involved, and those are not the only people we need to hear from. By using various methods to streamline committee work, more people can be meaningfully involved. This will also help committees set priorities across different transportation modes to benefit our community the most rather than create transportation mode silos. Some ideas are:

- Combine committees (subcommittees, commissions, etc.) wherever possible
- Decrease frequency of meetings and limit length of meetings. This can be done by:
 - Strong committee leadership
 - Efficient agendas
 - Focused discussions
- Broad representation on committees with representation from:
 - People of color
 - Various income levels
 - Types of transportation used (i.e. transit dependent members)

While it can be difficult to recruit members for city committees, using the racial equity analysis tool to review our recruitment process and considering these suggestions could help:

- Targeted recruitments valuing community knowledge and experience equal to historical technical knowledge in order for a balanced committee
- Consider term limits of less than 10 years that are uniformly enforced so more voices are included

Finally, consider ad hoc committees to study an issue and make recommendations as needed rather than having standing committees that meet regularly for specific issues.

For the most part, the City of Madison has taken a traditional approach to community engagement. We have meetings convenient to us and make people come to us if they want to provide feedback within our specified parameters. Racial equity requires us to move beyond this inform/consult model.

Added for TPC 5/10/17: Changing this engagement model could include making it possible for different people to be involved as city committee members such as offering child care, transportation assistance (taxi vouchers), stipends, having meetings in different locations and going to existing community meeting for feedback about specific items.