

Golden, seconded by Ellingson made a motion to accept the Interim Report and to forward to the Lead all the comments made, as expressed in the Minutes, as follows:

- Bigelow: He was not surprised by where the geographical pockets (of barriers) were (shown on Slide 20). These were areas where Section 8 housing was located. Zoning had probably helped in the past to create some of these areas. Now that the zoning was there, they were not likely to get rid of it.
- Golden: With 21% of the future population being seniors, one of the assessments should be to find naturally occurring areas where seniors concentrate, such as the Hilldale area and others. Rather than steering people to areas, this would help identify where certain targeted services might have the most benefit.
- Golden: The TDP's 5-year plan contained an initiative related to bus stop spacing, intended to speed up service. But if changes were made in an area where seniors lived, they might create greater distance to the stops. They might like to inform that study to avoid doing this in areas with lots of seniors/disabled; in fact, we might want to increase the number of stops in such areas.
- Golden: Some years ago, the Paratransit program had service routes. Borrowed from Sweden, the concept was to run small buses on side streets, in areas where people with disabilities and seniors with mobility challenges lived, charging a lower fare. People would be able to get around their neighborhoods to doctor's appointments, etc. With Hilldale as an example, perhaps such service routes should be considered again. The program didn't work at that time, but perhaps it could be done differently now.
- Golden: The population cohort for people who provide home care was too small to take care of the number of seniors/disabled who required home care. This would probably result in an increase in the pay for care providers, to attract people into that type of work; which could create some job opportunities, albeit with a lower wage level now, that might turn into a higher wage level. That would be a double socio-utility model to explore for some of the young people who were having difficulty.
- Golden: Regarding the need for transit for people who worked 2nd and 3rd shifts, the YWCA Transit program should be part of their focus there, since they provided transit at times and to places that regular transit didn't.
- Golden: Though very supportive of transit-oriented housing for seniors, while on the Plan Commission, he saw project after project that put seniors on the edge of town outside of transit routes, which he voted against (unpopular as that was). Perhaps, the Plan Commission should be informed that seniors should be located where they had access to transit.
- Golden: Regarding the Zoning Code, in the old Code, he had established a permitted use in single-family neighborhoods for adult family homes and other forms of supportive housing that would be contrary to the family definitions in the single-family code, that essentially allowed people with disabilities to live together in numbers that would not otherwise be legal, but that would make the community accessible for seniors/disabled.
- Golden: If we wanted to make the community more mobile for youth, perhaps we should have youth fare reductions, or some form of subsidized fare support to youth.
- Golden: Regarding Recommendation #2, there were hundreds of better ways to organize the assessments than by alder district; such as census tract, neighborhoods, corridor, etc. Alder districts were put together to equalize population; some had three neighborhoods, some had thirteen, and it didn't really make sense to do it this way, even though the Alders would want this.
- Golden: They may not want to do the assessments in just one way, particularly if they were looking at areas with multiple jurisdictions. For example, they may want to include the Town of Madison in this, even though it wasn't part of the City yet.
- Weier: In doing assessments by alder district, they would certainly end up focusing on neighborhoods within the districts that might have problems or needs. Alders were certainly familiar with the areas too, which would be helpful.
- Ellingson: For Recommendation #1, she wished the Group had focused on transportation and not housing. Housing for seniors was not the important issue here: It was housing for people who didn't have enough money. If it was about being affordable, that should be the focus, not the senior part. She understood the point of the recommendation, but she didn't agree with it. She didn't think rich seniors would need senior housing; but even rich seniors would need transportation. If Recommendation #1 were really about seniors, then it should be about transportation and how we can address the many transportation needs that seniors were going to have.

- Ellingson: She didn't see the difference between livability assessments and neighborhood indicators. The Report should talk about that more, what we did already, how the assessments were different, and what we would do with them.
- Ellingson: Recommendation #3 was great, and we should go for it.
- Ellingson: The greatest threat to the city that wasn't pursued, was perhaps the most important one: to attract and keep young families. Esp. if we weren't to become a city of rich and poor, which so many cities were these days, that issue was real trouble for us.
- White: She appreciated Ellingson's comments about needing affordable housing in general, and transportation focused on seniors. However, she did find the rise in the senior population eye-opening and thought perhaps seniors had needs that other age groups didn't have. When it came to housing, whether that was a senior housing project or whether it was an affordable housing project that had senior components to it, this group had special needs that we should consider.
- White: Early childhood education was a huge focus of all levels of government; and was a big gap she was seeing. For children of color and children of poverty (and for all children), early childhood education was a huge milestone for their development. They were finding that children in low-income areas had poor early childhood education, if any at all. She would like to see something in the Report that addressed that.
- White: The city was missing a component for keeping young people and families, downtown especially. Daycare downtown was next to impossible to get. People were getting on waiting lists before they were pregnant. Her 18-month old son was on a waiting list with 69 children. This wasn't solely a low-income issue: If we wanted to attract and keep young families, we needed quality daycare and early childhood education.
- Weier: The Work Group tried not to do what other groups were already doing. For example, the City already had an Early Childhood Education and Care Committee. And there were efforts between the City and the School District to help with out-of-school time. The Work Group didn't want to focus on things that were already being emphasized.
- Weier: There were a lot of poor seniors in the city. When going door to door, she found many seniors who were terrified of losing their houses.
- Kovich: Related to housing and transportation issues, was the idea of helping seniors to transform their homes so they could stay in their homes; because so often houses weren't built with that in mind. Many seniors wanted to stay in their homes and liked their neighbors, which brought them back to the transportation issues discussed earlier, that the sort of transportation they needed was available to get them where they needed to go, either in their neighborhood or in the city.
- Kovich: Along with internships for youth in the city, mentoring was a great way to help young people move forward. That didn't mean a person had to hire them, but that people within the city in different professions could volunteer their time directly. Though shown as an Action Step, it should be brought forward and included in their recommendation, because mentoring was such a positive way to accomplish their goals.
- Bigelow: He agreed with Ellingson that it was about income, whether or not a person was poor, and not so much about being a senior. He lived downtown in a building of 180 units; 80 of which had residents over the age of 60. Nearby was Capitol Lakes, a major development taking up a city block with three different levels of living within it, all senior. Also nearby was a four-story building of condos, almost all senior. The issue wasn't whether seniors had a place to go if they had the money; the issue was whether they had the money to afford a place that was designed so they could utilize it if they had medical problems.
- Bigelow: He was interested in knowing where the senior complexes in Madison were located. Those located in the middle of nowhere were there usually because zoning allowed large multi-family complexes in these areas. Half of those he knew about had private transportation to take residents where they needed to go, to shop or see a doctor. He wondered where the distribution was and where the Group's target was, because he hadn't heard anything about income and seniors in the analysis. We had a general sense of where the more well-off parts of the city were vs. others, but it would be interesting to see if that bore out for seniors as well.
- Bergamini: Regarding seniors and income and affordable housing, what we were seeing and what we could expect to see more intensely was a class split. For some people, adverse incidents or health problems would throw them from one group into the other.

- Bergamini: Already what we saw were developments like the one represented earlier in Public Appearances and others throughout the County, where senior complexes were located on the edge of the City. This was so, not only because zoning allowed it, but also because the land was cheaper because they were building in corn fields (essentially sprawl development). And only after the fact, did they come and say they wanted Paratransit. What the developers and the residents did not anticipate was the expense of providing Paratransit.
- Bergamini: Members of the Transit Commission fully understood that expense, which led her to the following question: When the Work Group suggested creating zones for senior housing, were they actually suggesting zoning changes?
- Bergamini: If they were making specific recommendations for affordable housing options, they had a project like this, Union Corners, which was languishing and going through several permutations. This would be a good location for aging populations. She was not familiar enough with the new Zoning Code to know if changes were needed in the Code to permit this.
- Bergamini: She would recommend being pro-active. Until the financial resources were available to build out the transit system, the building of multi-family, senior-oriented housing should not be permitted in areas that we could not serve with transit.
- Bergamini: On LRTPC, she had a policy of not voting for plans that involved building in areas where transit was needed, but where Metro didn't serve. She didn't think we should build neighborhoods without transit any more than we should build in neighborhoods without sewer and water; especially when it came to elderly houses. This had been a contentious issue on the west side along Old Sauk Road, and was an issue a lot of communities were facing.
- Golden: Though the City had roles to play, the County (with Child Protective Services and with aging and long-term care programs), had historically been the lead in the areas the Report covered, and some interaction with the County was appropriate.
- Golden: The Report needed to watch itself in terms of steering people to places. It was one thing to have a naturally occurring retirement community, or to have Catholic Social Services develop a complex for senior housing. But if we started to as a matter of policy to say that certain kind of people should live in a certain place, we might run into problems with the Fair Housing Amendments Act.
- Golden: With regard to private transportation that occurred around senior projects, and his idea about service routes, these might not have to be just public service routes. Perhaps the public routes could be in an area where the income was appropriate. But private services could also be coordinated; not only private services like those connected to where people lived (Oakwood, Capitol Lakes buses), but also food providers (Metcalf's) or medical providers could perhaps have shuttle service. So his idea regarding services routes could be qualified to include both public and private.