

TPC 04.12.17

HAND-OUT

**Benishek Clark, Anne**

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

ITEM.F.2.  
[LEG. FILE 46249]

**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?

- d. With one council member and one resident member serving on both the Board and the Commission, this limits the diversity.
- 9. Following terminology is used in several places, and we should be very clear as to definitions of important terminology: "individuals with a multi-element perspective who have knowledge of equity issues and the needs of marginalized communities."
- 10. Observation regarding the composition of the Commission:
  - a. I found it limiting to be so restrictive, with consideration for just summarizing and saying that we are looking for representatives who have experience with the various listed issues.
  - b. Shouldn't there be staggered terms, so not all turnover at once?
- 11. Regarding the Powers and duties of the Commission, see #7 above. In addition, I found the duties as written too specific, leaving out certain responsibilities I think would naturally fall to the Commission. Example is a reference to transit service standards – but no mention of transit service issues (including safety). "Horse-drawn vehicles were included in the past – and they can still be a factor?? Parking and Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Motor Vehicle issues are also too limiting in the description.

Ann E. Kovich  
Kovich Consulting, LLC