



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved TRANSPORTATION ORDINANCE REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE

Tuesday, February 14, 2017

5:00 PM

Parks Conference Room
Room 108, City-County Building
210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 5:07 PM.

Present: 4 - Denise DeMarb; Steve King; Rebecca Kemble and Mark Clear

Absent: 1 - Paul E. Skidmore

Excused: 1 - Ledell Zellers

2. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Kemble, seconded by Clear, to Approve the Minutes of the February 6, 2017 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

3. Public Comment

46140 Public Comment Registration - TORC 02.14.17

Registrant Grant Foster, Anchor Drive, 53714, reiterated his support for having committees responsible for both policy and implementation, vs. a separate policy board; thought it would be hard for all the modes to be contained in one broad committee; preferred a Director of Transportation over a Coordinator/Manager, and felt that gaps existed between Planning, TE and Engineering, and doubted a Coordinator could bridge them. Who would be responsible for implementation of plans, such as MIM? Engineering had a 5-year construction plan. But gaps in the network weren't being addressed.

4. Disclosures and Recusals

None.

5. 46079 Continue to review and discuss draft structures, and prepare recommendations - TORC 02.14.17

Members and staff talked about some of the issues that had been raised. With regard to gaps in the bike network, these were discussed in transportation committees and in City plans. Major engineering projects were driven by the budget; improvements were made as streets needed to be rebuilt. Trade-offs took place as plans were executed. Certain constituencies weren't always satisfied.

Re: a Director or a Transportation Policy and Planning Manager, Kemble felt that planning wasn't missing, but wondered where the high-level ownership and accountability for the various plans existed; who was the leader with whom the public could interface. Demarb agreed that this wasn't apparent. Clear thought the Mayor and his staff played this role, and wondered what value a new position would add/create. With the position of Mayor being elected every four years and being a political job, Kemble thought a high-level professional, an urban planner was needed, to make decisions over the long term about long-term plans.

Asst. City Attorney Strange described how the new draft added a Transportation Policy and Planning Division and Manager, whose duties were reflected under Section 3.14 (2), (3) and (4)(d), and included serving as the Executive Secretary to the Transportation Policy and Planning Board (TPPB) and working to ensure transportation systems supported land use decisions. In Section 33.55 (6)(i), the TPPB would continue to consider the option to hire a Director (starting in 2019).

Dept. of Planning, Community and Economic Development Director Natalie Erdmann responded to questions. Currently, as plans crossed over into implementation, cross-agency teams were set up. When it came to larger, regional issues, it might be useful to have someone who thought about all the systems and modes, and handled competition among them. For example, with no project manager, how would BRT be advanced? She didn't see policy or planning gaps, but an implementation gap.

When asked who acted as champions in efforts like this, Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp said the MPO, CARPC and the Mayor had played a role. Cities like Grand Rapids or Oakland who had directors were regional operations. Though eventually regional in scope, the initial phase of BRT was city-based.

Acknowledging that larger regional issues would likely require an RTA, Committee members noted that the draft proposal called for DOT/the Manager to "work with surrounding local governments" and to coordinate plans. Other elements of a Manager's job such as to hold a wider-range vision and to implement plans, could be defined in a position description (rather than in the ordinance). In response to the request from MATPB Transportation Planning (MPO) Manager Bill Schaefer (handout attached), members asked that language be added to the draft to say that DOT would work with the MATPB/MPO to make sure plans and policies were coordinated and consistent with those of the MPO.

6. 45759

Address specific remaining questions pertaining to staffing, appeals, and board and commission composition - TORC 01.25.17

Registrant Margaret Bergamini, N. Few Street, 53703, UW rep on CSOS, spoke in support of continuing the Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee (CSOS) as it was currently constituted, within the new committee structure. This might be a simple solution to how to integrate regional partners into the new structure. A group composed of representatives of Metro's transit partners, CSOS was mostly a staff committee with some electeds intermittently involved, who helped hammer out contracts and agreements. The communities

represented on CSOS had learned work together, to see how changes in one part of a service area affected another. It was a sort of embryonic regional planning commission, the only place where all the communities gathered to make things work. Bergamini also felt that a more conscious effort should be made to reach out to these folks about TORC.

Members and staff discussed the proposal to have a regional transit partner on the TPP Board, and how this person's voting would be handled. Kamp favored the idea of having a partner on the Board, and felt it would further build on the relationships and trust that had been established, esp. as the TPP Board moved BRT forward. He noted that the idea had come out of TPC (Chris Schmidt and Ken Golden), who wanted to further institutionalize regional relationships and efforts, and create a basis for a regional org.

Committee members raised some concerns, that only one regional partner would be represented on the Board, and that this non-resident regional representative would be voting on such things as City budgets.

Re: the single regional representative on the Board and broader participation of partners, members discussed the idea of maintaining CSOS as a stand-alone sub/committee that would hold its own meetings, and would also meet jointly with the Board once/twice a year. Continuing as a separate formal sub/committee would allow for continuing representation from all the regional partners with its current blend of staff and electeds; and through formal agendas/minutes, transparency and the group's visibility and importance would be maintained.

Re: how voting would work for the regional rep, members discussed a couple of ideas. One idea was to create a separate Transit Commission (one of two commissions that would do both policy and implementation), where a regional member would be voting on only transit items. Based on their previous recommendations, Racial Equity staff felt that the current draft calling for one Transportation Commission would better support multi-modal perspectives and balance in discussion and deliberations about street uses. Other comments: Along with Metro's transit agreements with community partners, Traffic Engineering also had inter-municipal agreements. Since the inclusion of a regional partner on a City committee was essentially experimental, and they were dealing with regional systems, perhaps this person could be allowed to vote on everything, not just transit.

At the end of discussion, the Committee asked Strange to add language to establish a Transit Partners Subcommittee to the TPP Board, which would make recommendations to the Board; and for which the Transit General Manager would be the convenor.

Members then discussed the list of Specific Questions (attached).

#1-Number and make-up of the resident members on the Commission: It was proposed that there be two alternates on the Commission; and that along with having a multi-modal perspective and knowledge of equity issues/marginalized communities, the resident members would include people knowledgeable about issues facing transit, bikes, peds and the disabled.

#2-Appeal language: It was proposed that a resident member of the Board and Commission could also initiate an appeal.

#3 thru #6: Approved as drafted.

Strange asked members to review remaining Questions 7 and 8 for discussion at the Committee's next meeting, inc. the Manager's duties and the Commission's powers and duties.

7. General Announcements by Chair/Future Agenda Items

None.

8. Adjournment

A motion was made by King, seconded by Clear, to Adjourn at 7:53 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.