


Draft Recommended Implementation Tools Review

After reviewing the draft recommended Implementation Tools document, are you satisfied that this document provides adequate information?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I'm satisfied	82.9%	29
I'm not satisfied	17.1%	6
If you're not satisfied, please tell us why:		9
<i>answered question</i>		35
<i>skipped question</i>		0



After reviewing the draft recommended Implementation Tools document, are you satisfied that this document provides adequate information?

Number	If you're not satisfied, please tell us why:
1	This doesn't provide any middle ground between satisfaction and not so I chose the latter while my concerns place my thoughts more in the middle. See answers in question #3 below for an explanation. I think this is all so generalized planning jargon that it really needs a scrub to provide some regional examples otherwise this document could be from Cincinnati, Columbus or Spokane.
2	Good tools for MVRPC, but not sure how they directly advance Going Places.
3	would like to see more detail about the tools and how they will be used. At this point many of the tool descriptions are very broad and, in some cases, difficult to distinguish from what MVRPC already does or tools that are already available elsewhere.
4	Document provides sufficient information for decision making. However eleven tools far exceeds MVRPC staff ability to implement without compromising prime responsibilities such as transportation, water quality and air quality.
5	I would have like to see some basic direction that is obviously needed now.
6	Draft of Implementation Tools provides enough detail at this juncture but needs more focus and much greater detail for final recommendations.
7	Way too much here, involving millions of dollars of time and investment. Needs to be way more focused. Way too much duplication of existing efforts. D=B, I=C, K=D
8	Never thought this was a wise use of resources and still don't. Fear it will be used as a hammer down the road for funding highway projects.
9	Will gather dust on the shelf!


Draft Recommended Implementation Tools Review

From the list of recommended tools shown below, are there any tools that you think we must remove from consideration?

Answer Options	Keep this Tool	Remove this Tool	Response Count
Tool A	30	0	30
Tool B	23	8	31
Tool C	25	6	31
Tool D	25	5	30
Tool E	28	2	30
Tool F	31	0	31
Tool G	26	5	31
Tool H	24	7	31
Tool I	29	2	31
Tool J	27	4	31
Tool K	26	4	30

If you think we need to remove a Tool, please tell us why you think it should be removed and what we should do

answered question 31
skipped question 4



Number	If you think we need to remove a Tool, please tell us why you think it should be removed and what we should do instead.
1	Tool B will be costly to maintain quality and accurate data, providing outdated or inaccurate data is worse than not providing any data at all.
2	ED is already too fragmented. DDC should take the lead. MVRPC could assist only if DDC desires.
3	<p>No need to substitute removed tools.</p> <p>Tool B: Remove. Should be responsibility of of each individual jurisdiction.</p> <p>Tool C: Remove. Analysis should be responsibility of each individual jurisdiction.</p> <p>Tool D: Remove. Identification of assets should be responsibility of each unit of local government Each unit is unique and should determine what's to be developed or preserved. One size doesn't fit all. Workforce, education et al should be left to agencies actively engaged and charged with development.</p> <p>Tool G: Remove. Insufficient staff time to implement.</p> <p>Tool H: Remove. Redundant. Many jurisdictions already have "Leadership" programs unique to their communities.</p> <p>Tool I: No need for cash prizes.</p> <p>Tool J: Title should be: "Promote Innovative Solutions for Natural Resources Enhancement". Also note that managing stormwater runoff requirements by OEPA are already in place. No need for cash prizes.</p> <p>Tool K: This should be support role only with statistics which is MVRPC strong suit.</p>
4	Tool J is too broad and most local jurisdictions already regulate these issues sufficiently.
5	<p>Tool B- There are too many properties that change too often- must be done locally</p> <p>Tool C- Return on investment differs greatly- not just financial- and return differs between goals of different organizations</p> <p>Tool D- Need to be more specific about what regional assets would be analyzed and how this would be used-indication is not just on strengths but also on weaknesses</p> <p>Tool G- Concern is that the background suggests discussion groups but tool description also includes prioritizing regional projects. It appears to suggest that groups under direction of MVRPC would be selecting local projects.</p> <p>Tool H- there are many other organizations doing this. Does not appear to be area of expertise for MVRPC.</p> <p>Tool K- Good project for MVRPC to support but there needs to be another organization in the lead.</p>

Number	If you think we need to remove a Tool, please tell us why you think it should be removed and what we should do instead.
6	<p>E - What kinds of funding is possibly being envisioned here? Earmarks? All other types of funding are either coordinated already or competitive within the region by their nature - example MVRPC STP funds and OPWC funding.</p> <p>G - Establishing sub-groups by its very nature works against regional collaboration. What school district doesn't communicate with its local jurisdiction?</p> <p>H - MANY leadership training opportunities already exist. No significant cost - REALLY?</p> <p>I is almost the same as C - combine them.</p> <p>J - We already have an abundance of natural resources protection. The Ohio Farmland Preservation Program, MetroParks, ODNR, USCOE, EPA, numerous local city and township parks. This could be just another layer of bureaucracy.</p> <p>K - This overlaps with D and should be combined.</p>
7	<p>B. Economic Development site selection databases already exist. I think this is redundant.</p> <p>C. See B, I believe this is redundant to existing resources that perform this function.</p> <p>H. There are already current regional leadership program.</p> <p>K. Not within the structure of the MVRPC.</p>
8	<p>I say remove the whole concept. It is for the City of Dayton and not useful for smaller jurisdictions. Will be used as a tool to funnel more money into Dayton and will be the excuse. Smaller areas are already being stepped on by the City.</p>
9	<p>B, c, d and h are already being done or are beyond mvrpcs capabilities and/or mandate. G is good IF the first bullet in the background is eliminated. I needs to be toned down. In J, need to change "preservation" to regional enhancement. K is being done by others. We can keep it as a tool provided Mvrpc should strictly be supportive in providing data to those others to validate efforts.</p>
10	<p>G: I don't really understand this tool, nor its value.</p>
11	<p>On Tool E, I would be ok with keeping it, if further criteria are applied as to which projects we will assist on- details in the next question below.</p>

Draft Recommended Implementation Tools Review

Do you have any other comments or recommendations?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	16
<i>answered question</i>	16
<i>skipped question</i>	19

Number	Response Text
1	<p>All the tools would be better supported with specific examples whether inside our outside the region. For example Took K is currently underway for regional trails through a committee facilitated by MVRPC. Why not mention that (and others).</p> <p>I think all the tools would also be better supported by identifying partners, current or otherwise, that would be involved in the task. For example Dayton Development Coalition and/or I-75/I-70 Development Association would be involved in for Tool B I presume and SWOGIS for Tool A. Other groups to consider coordinating with would include the Dayton Area Manager's Association since their membership parallel's the region's leadership. I think the regional leadership program is great however I think it would be helpful to identify partners on this project and also existing programs. With regard to the former, for example, APA-Ohio and its excellent local section program an element of a leadership academy in the form of planning and zoning workshops and training. The Miami Valley Communications Council, while not a universal agency, provides training to member communities on a range of topics. The point is don't duplicate existing efforts.</p> <p>Tool I: avoid use of the word Sustainable. It's overused, misunderstood and the flashpoint for opposition to regional planning efforts.</p> <p>WEW needs to be defined in the document if it is to continue as a stand-alone piece.</p> <p>In closing I think this survey provides an unsatisfactory means to communicate concerns about the recommended tools specifically and is an inadequate means to provide feedback from member a community.</p>
2	Care must be taken with each tool to recognize other regional efforts on similar initiatives and duplication must be eliminated. Each tool should be implemented only after agreement with all regional stakeholders.
3	good ideas, just would like to know more details.
4	Important to emphasize that these are "tools" only, not "rules".

Do you have any other comments or recommendations?

5	A tool that we didn't directly address- We need a watershed plan. We do not need a study to see if we need it (tool I). Checking other regions the watershed plan is important etc. By the time we get around to addressing the problems that are obvious, more land will be developed that should be saved. Watershed plan is just one that should apply now not medium term.
6	I am confused as to how Going Places fits into the MVRPC Strategic Plan- which is a well-thought-out and well written document. I would recommend that the organization have just one Plan. Also, the tools represent too much work to be taken on effectively.
7	This is so cumbersome, MVRPC and the region will be overwhelmed and nothing will be accomplished.
8	Each tool's implementation contributes to the objectives, so all should be kept.
9	Scrap the program before we flush more money down the toilet.
10	Many tools may be improved with wording clarity and /or modification of a part of the tool. My concern is if all tools are implemented, it could very well change the role of staff and/or increase the staff. One final thought; does this document fit our strategic plan and vision?
11	Objectives are all well intentioned but we need to steer clear of reinventing the wheel and instead focus on mvrpc's core competencies

Do you have any other comments or recommendations?

<p>12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Overall, this is an excellent plan! However, I am concerned that it is overly ambitious and is more work than the MVRPC can accommodate given existing resources.* I LOVE the data tools in A, B, C, and D! Will be of great use to local jurisdictions.* Tool B: this will have to be CONSTANTLY monitored to make sure it is ALWAYS current and moves "at the speed of business". Will that be cost-prohibitive? And isn't this redundant with what the DDC and the myriad of other ED organizations in the region/state do?* Tool C: given the condition of local budgets, doubtful that "membership fees" will be acceptable* Tool D: who makes the final decision on what constitutes a "regional asset"? If it will be decided by the MVRPC like the DDC does with the regional priority process, then politics, agendas, and egos will doom this to failure as a fair and equitable process.* Tool E: will be of great benefit to local jurisdictions.* Tool H: will this be redundant or conflict with existing leadership training programs?* Tool K: I like this idea, but only think it should be undertaken if it CONSOLIDATES other similar efforts by the various ED organizations in the region. The story needs to be told by ONE voice...as it is now, the story gets lost in the noise of too many messages.
<p>13</p>	<p>We have to look further into the future. consolidation by attrition. We need to bring the Springfield Region into our planning. They are to close to WPAFB not to have their input.</p>

Do you have any other comments or recommendations?

14	<p>Before starting work on Tool A, I'd suggest speaking to the Coalition and the the city of Dayton, since both already have online site selection tools.</p> <p>On Tool E, if we keep it, I would suggest including a guideline for MVRPC involvement that prohibits assisting jurisdictions with any project or infrastructure that will duplicate a capability that already exists in the region, or that is intended to poach businesses or other enitites or resources from other municipalities in the region.</p> <p>Also, I believe Tool K is already the job of the Convention and Visitors' Bureaus. I think we should support them and help them to communicate, but not take over their efforts.</p>
15	All looks good
16	<p>I believe there needs to be discussions with the Dayton Development Coalition regarding Tool B. As a state all of our sites are supposed to be inputed into the State of Ohio's site database so the State and DDC have access to this information when leads pop up. Tool B is useful, but there is no need duplicating efforts already underway. The tool should complement or enhance the system that we as ED professionals are required to use.</p>

Draft Recommended Implementation Tools Review

Please tell us how you have been involved with Going Places. Please check all that apply.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Going Places Steering Committee	45.7%	16
Going Places Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)	31.4%	11
MVRPC Board of Directors	40.0%	14
MVRPC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	31.4%	11
answered question		35
skipped question		0

