

TPC 03.08.17
ITEM 7.2
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.