

## Going Places – Tools for Consideration Revisions (2<sup>nd</sup> draft) Exit Survey **Results from Board and TAC**

*The following summarizes the results of the survey of Board of Directors and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members regarding the revisions made to the Going Places Implementation Tools. These revisions were presented to the Board on February 6, 2014, and to the TAC on February 20. Both bodies also had an opportunity to complete the same survey online.*

*This document compiles the results of all surveys received as of February 28, 2014. Written comments are included below as provided by survey respondent; where necessary, comments or clarifications have been added in [bracketed italics]*

*-Della Rucker, Consulting Team Project Manager*

### 1. How do you feel about the committee's recommendations? Do you agree with them?

#### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS:**

\_12\_ Strongly agree

\_17\_ Somewhat agree

\_1\_ Neutral

\_1\_ Somewhat disagree

\_1\_ Strongly disagree

#### **TAC**

\_1\_ Strongly agree

\_6\_ Somewhat agree

\_6\_ Neutral

\_0\_ Somewhat disagree

\_1\_ Strongly disagree

### 2. Do any of the recommendations raise significant concerns for you that need to be addressed?

#### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS:**

\_26\_ No

\_4\_ Yes

What needs to be addressed?

- If all the tools are implemented, it could change the role of MVRPC staff, increase staff, and require acceptance and understanding of “outside” powers.
- Too many tools. Need to be combined and/or eliminated. Previously Commented on specifics.
- Support means ? Can MVRPC staff act as planners for smaller jurisdictions?

- The set of tools are ambitious and will be difficult for staff to implement in a reasonable amount of time. This may result in their delay and lack of confidence in their usage and staff ability to apply.
- Tool D: COMMENT: What about Potential Partners that can represent the natural environment? Partners for the Environment, Ohio EPA, land trusts, Five Rivers MetroParks, Miami Conservancy District. What about Potential Partners that represent the active lifestyle assets? Park Districts, etc. Tool I: COMMENT: Dayton Regional Green Initiative, and the colleges and universities have a Sustainability Managers group. COMMENT: How will you determine the "necessary data, analysis, and research?" Tool J: Innovative Solutions for Natural Resources MVRPC would research best practices for natural resources preservation. COMMENT: How about researching practices that specifically can be used for transportation projects? Given the issues identified to date, this effort would focus on strategies COMMENT: Is the goal to "improve" strategies? Or "increase"? for low impact development, managing stormwater runoff, and groundwater quality management. COMMENT: Green Infrastructure COMMENT: It is the Three Valley Conservation Trust - not Twin Valley. COMMENT: MCD's program is called "Building our Future" not "Low Impact Development".

#### TAC

  7   No

  2   Yes

What needs to be addressed?

- Sustainability is a widely used term across many disciplines today. Please clarify what it means in terms of development and community livability.
- Stop the madness and forget you ever started this
- Really stress the fact that these are strictly tools – not obligations being put on the public.

### 3. Based on the presentation you heard today, are there any tool(s) that you think need additional clarification?

#### BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

 27  No

  4   Yes

What clarification does it need?

- [B,C, H]: Financial Commitment, possible redundancy, better defined, with possible examples.

- See Above [second bullet under Board, question 2 above]
- How the tools will be used. Will Tool C be used to select/reject funding for projects?
- It is unclear where MVRPC will get funding to take on these additional activities. There is also a great risk of duplication of services already offered by other agencies. MVRPC's proposed role for all the tools needs to be better defined and vetted by "potential partners".
- How do these Tools related to the "GP Vision" document? There seems to be a disconnect between the two phases.
- Good explanation

**TAC:**

\_10\_ No

\_1\_ Yes

What clarification does it need?

- [K] – need info. on appropriate entities – possibly a list of possible entities

**4. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about?**

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS:**

- Keep the theme "Tools Not Rules" (build acceptance). Going Places has a potential, positive benefit to our region.
- Not enough comments were received from Board members outside of committee  
*[NOTE: this appears to refer to January survey regarding first draft. Please let us know if that interpretation is incorrect].* Based on percentage of response not on the committee and percent of disagreement with certain tools, a significant percentage of respondents not on committee disagree with some tools.
- I still feel MVRPC staff will be stretched thin trying to accomplish these tools successfully. MVRPC budget can't increase *[word unclear – appears to be consistently or concerned]* to implement these tools.
- With all the discussion, think MVRPC really turned this around into a very positive tool box.
- Suggestion to reach out to I70/I75 Development Association to present Going Places presentation.
- Good job!!
- Not at this time.
- Public awareness of meetings is important.

- Excellent Plan! Let's hope it is embraced and implemented – region-wide!
- I appreciate the hard work and persisting commitment to this project. I am very encouraged how helpful these tools will be for us.
- There are a lot of tools. Are you going to lose the core of transportation in the organization.
- Great job, very happy about the “tools” concept.
- Far too many tools for MVRPC staff to implement without compromising primary responsibilities.
- Figure out your niche. Such as mapping and data services. Applying best practices to TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS. Get them to clean up their practices. Maybe MVRPC should focus on improving and expanding their current services rather than taking on new services.

**TAC:**

- In RE: H – Cooperation/collaboration may be most fruitful if moderated/arbitrated by a third party. May be worth considering.
- I don't see how this addresses the fact that we are all competing against each other. It sort of glazes over the fact that the region identified that it wants development to go where infrastructure already exists, yet communities have little opportunities to increase (and in almost all our cases replace) revenue except to grow our tax bill and redevelop.

*Thank you very much to everyone who responded. The Committees will meet **on March 5, 2:00 PM in the CRC**. All are welcome.*