MEETING SUMMARY

Date: October 8, 2013

Time: 10:00 a.m. to Noon

Location: Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission

Speakers: Scott Phinney, ODOT
Dave Moore, ODOT
Chuck Dyer, ODOT
Ken Rich, Consultant Team

ForFormat: PowerPoint Presentation

Handouts:
PowerPoint slides
Draft Plan
STS Map
Regional Profiles
MindMixer Postcards

Steering Committee Attendees:
See attached list

Project Team Attendees:
Scott Phinney, Ohio Department of Transportation
David Moore, Ohio Department of Transportation
Andrew Hurst, Ohio Department of Transportation
Andrew Shepler, Ohio Department of Transportation
Chuck Dyer, Ohio Department of Transportation
Leigh Oesterling, Federal Highway Administration
Frank Burkett, Federal Highway Administration
Paul Hershkowitz, Access Ohio Study Team
Suzann Rhodes, Access Ohio Study Team
Ken Rich, Access Ohio Study Team

SUMMARY (see attached PowerPoint presentation)

General Comments:

- Nick Gill – Within each plan recommendation, consider changing the 2040 goals to be more short term. Many of the recommendations point out things to be done by 2040, but they can and should be done sooner.
- The Plan needs more specifics.
- Change the cover to something brighter and "happier"
- Thanked ODOT for recognizing the need for a transit survey. Shows team was listening
- The tech memos should better highlight the recommendations.
- The intercity bus listing on page 5 of the plan should include something about other services like Greyhound and Megabus.
- "SIP" was changed to "RTN" (Regional Transportation Needs).
- Consider whether the plan is readable and easy to understand.
- Comments by Lou Gannazzo of ORDC but they do not represent the official position of ORDC – only his personal opinions.

- Supporting info nice but could be more succinct, a little heavy on conceptual background.
- Desired outcomes could use added specificity.
- Add something equivalent to a goal for the Desired Outcomes (Desired Outcome are akin to objectives. Goal really focuses shared understanding).
- The report doesn't support or explore what state law changes may be necessary.
- Easy to read but most words are vague. Much more is typically presented on the past (supporting info), but there's much less presented and very little specificity on the desired outcomes and costs.
- Goals or more specific outcomes might help. "Save cost," "increase pavement life to 5%," "reduce maintenance cost/VMT 10%." In particular, it seems appropriate to include metrics other than in desired outcomes under Performance Management. How does a "robust performance management process" get measured? How does the reader know it's succeeded?
- Consider identifying the speed and efficiency of business recommendations that are adopted that fully qualify for public/social costs of public expenditures and user fee and public impacts of various modes and project choices.

    a. Cost-benefit of choice/expenditure
    b. Reduce congestion, increase reliability
    c. Multimodal connectivity
    d. Safety per person – mile or ten-mile
    e. Bottom line impact – financial, environmental, social
    f. Economic development

    Consider articulating how each recommendation helps one or more of these goals.

Recommendations:

1. Performance Management:

- Tony Pagila – Be more specific about the modes
- Kate Moening – Agreed with Tony above and added "Performance Management" is confusing and pretty general.
- Art Arnold – Conceptually nice, but lacks specifics. Plan recommendations should answer how it will be used and what performance measures.
- Lou Gannazzo – Sounds very bureaucratic – the general public does not know what MAP 21 is.
- Bill Lowe - Process versus contexts, give examples or show the general buckets.
- Art Arnold – Regarding the data, Art pointed out that ODOT eliminated the minimal data collection on special permits. ODOT no longer collects individual trip data for all permits.
- Perhaps unintentionally, this measure makes it sound like ODOT didn't have any science/performance measures in the past. Sounds like a lot more administration and bureaucracy to determine where the potholes are and where traffic is backed up.
- Measures should be more specific/relevant! Industry sorts of standards.
- Use less jargon – more lay language. Identify the modes in the initial statement.
- Change format to common language using bullet points instead of narrative(s).
- In desired outcome section, maybe include a statement that ODOT is or should continue to be reporting performance measures, but expand it to cover additional modal areas.
- The recommendation is in line with MAP-21 goals. Clearer text is needed to illustrate what measures are needed for modes outside of highways. Also, clarification is needed to define ODOT's role in collecting data and decision making based on data collected and goals that come from the data collection effort.
- Concept is good but description is vague. Get to the point in the summary then expand in the narrative. By the way, why is performance measurement good policy and why will it be a benefit to the taxpayer?
- Perhaps list the categories in which each of the performance measures will be created. I believe this recommendation has the potential to enhance my organization's mission but it depends on the area/activities that ODOT decides to measure. A good performance management system will improve transparency and accountability as well as reinforce/reveal areas/activities that should be funded.
- More specific information/examples of performance pressures. Also, more specific information on how ODOT wants to strategically use the data to guide its work.
- This appears to conflict with current proposed actions by ODOT on collecting data. ODOT is preparing to propose rule changes to eliminate data collection on usage of special permits.
- See general comments on performance management related to Overweight permit process, use, impact/costs on approved routes vs. load info and trip counts. This is low-hanging fruit and perfect for this section (OW permits are a privilege and not a right and

it's reasonable for citizens to know exactly how many loads at what weights use their public property).

- Understand context – are we discussing process or specific items?
- Overall – in terms of outcomes – especially for process – put dates that are intermittent.
- Reflect data consistent with leadership.

2. Leveraging Resources:

- Bill Harris – ODOT is a leader on national partnerships and this should be recognized.
- Kate Moening – Partnering is not ideal for underserved communities, these communities won't have the funds for a match. Need to have a system that is flexible.
- Bill Lowe – FHWA trust fund is not stable and is supported by the GRF, this is worth mentioning.
- Bill Lowe – Selling bonds without life cycle is a bad idea. Basically the turnpike is not a good idea.
- For the record – ORDC and its predecessors have been doing "leveraging" and PPP's for nearly 40 years!! A shout out to existing programs that leverage private funds (like ORDC) would be helpful and much appreciated. A must do for ODOT.
- Not just leverage available but also take advantage of new opportunities, maybe even creating those opportunities or encouraging their creation.
- Desired outcome sections (in general) sounds like ODOT is not currently doing this in any capacity. Not sure if it needs to be renamed or if there should be a quick statement about what is currently being done.
- The "Next Steps" discussion includes items that have been or are currently underway. Examples include turnpike bond sale, freight plan, requiring local participation in projects. Multiple ODOT programs already require local participation – safety, transportation alternatives, LPA programs. In general, the "Next Steps" are well underway or are part of a current ODOT process/program.
- Recommendations were well developed.
- What's the process/mechanism for determining how much revenue from leveraging assets will remain in the region they are derived from versus other regions, as well as what mode(s) it will support.
- Local, underserved communities may not have local match. Also consider private leveraging.
- Recognition of areas without available funding to match (poor and rural parts of the state)
- Public benefits should be considered – see ORDC model.
- Financial Analysis: Projected needs/assumptions, projected revenue/assumptions.
- The only aspect of this recommendation that I disagree with is increasing the sale of bonds to generate short-term funding for projects (high priority – perhaps politically motivated) without regard to infrastructure life-cycle (maintenance and repair/replacement costs).

- Include in supporting info discussions of how ORDC and Economic Development funds leverage private transportation infrastructure funds. Include in supporting info examples/discussion of Ohio's leadership in PPPs, particularly for freight rail. Yes, metrics are desired outcomes! Nice. Consider metric for amount of private spending leveraged vs. just revenue (and is the "revenue" user fees?).
- Shoutout for private/public partnerships.
- Clarify ODOT/Ohio Turnpike Commission coordination.
- Indicate that the Federal Highway Trust Fund is already insufficient.

3. <u>Future Funding:</u>

- Tony – Instead of being engaged in the national conversation, Ohio should be the leader in the dialog!!
- Mark Donaghy – Agrees ODOT should be the leader in the national dialog on transportation funding.
- Kate – Understand the interdependence of all modes, example investing in transit could relieve highway congestion.
- Bill – Are users paying for their use of the road? Ohio is a donor state we need to invest in the network that provides the most benefit to Ohioians.
- ATM – consider environmental justice issues of pay as you go lanes. I agree with Bill Harris/NS that various vehicles (i.e. trucks) need to pay their fair share for maintenance especially considering that Ohio is a through traffic state. This should include advocating for funding levels necessary to implement needed projects.
- Mention modal – December 15, 2015 – Will we be able to include transit in the report recommendations?
- Remove "managed lanes" from next steps.
- Agree that Ohio (not just ODOT) should be a leader in discussions nationally.
- How can limiting VMT and shifting some capacity to other modes reduce/negate the need for more funding for the road system?
- Advocate that additional sources of revenue are needed to meet needs for all transportation modes. Funding needed for maintenance as well as additional capacity.
- Advocate, educate. Rural transit needs seem secondary. FTA – Change law so transit fares count towards "local match." Increasing state share in rural transit is needed.
- ODOT should examine "user pays", especially where commercial users of assets are involved.
- How to fix transportation funding in Ohio - Dec. 2014. ATM - managed lanes = lower user fees.
- AMT asks users to fund capacity for access to peak load. Consider asking users to fund design, construction and maintenance costs associated with their use. Look at how each mode is funded and what is the social transportation cost-benefit of current funding vs. user fees? Are user fees justified? How much is through traffic subsidized? Use this to ask for added general highway funding.
- Clearly identify the $14 Billion funding gap
    - Advocate for $14B needs
    - Address funding gaps for all modes

- Layout plan to meet funding needs

4. Asset Management:

- Nick Gill – This section is consistent with Performance Management.
- Use locally developed asset management plans, see suggested language change/and addition.
- In the desired outcome section, the term "functioning" is not the best term, maybe use "modernized" or "enhanced".
- Asset Management efforts are in line with current ODOT efforts and MAP-21 requirements.
- This recommendation is rather vague and could be more specific or understandable.
- Calculate in greater detail the future costs of creating additional assets (e.g. additional costs associated with the expansion).
- Need to make these tools and data calculable to RPOs/MPOs to assist with long range regional planning.
- Identify differential costs to manage pricing/user-fees and use. How much would car-only lanes cost to design and build and maintain? What's the differential cost to accommodate other vehicles. Who pays for that differential? See prior rec. on OW truck routing, trips, loads, and road/bridges maintenance and management. Prioritize congestion, safety impacts, environmental impacts, etc., as well as road costs to prioritize projects.
- Asset Management is closely related to Performance Management.
    - What is duplicative? What is supportive?
    - This directs funding

5. Freight Management:

- Lou – Suggest ODOT consider/address incorporating occasional passing lanes for the 2 lane network.
- Lantz Rapp – Second the idea of adding truck lanes for passing trucks.
- Bill Harris – Shout out for Ohio's work to support and develop intermodal facilities.
- Art Arnold – Who will pay for the expansion of ITS, the cost to make the data readily available? Art suggested this cost should be paid for by the users of this data.
- Mark Dongahy – The travel time data could also be used by the transit agencies.
- Nick Gill – Found this recommendation to be the most confusing. Mixing too many dispersed parts together and hard to follow.
- Comments in the room focused on safety. Safety in this case is primarily related to driver behavior. Enforcement could reduce aggressive behavior in the corridors but not sure if commercial vehicles would like this. If you say safety, plan on figuring out a measurable way of analyzing it.
- The benefit-cost of expansion of an ITS should be examined. Background/further discussion is needed to support the need to analyze the freight movements of 2-lane corridors.

- Provide live data feeds with current travel times to busier logistic systems – found that to be not understandable. What would you be doing and why?
- Eliminate dangerous curves where accidents frequently occur. Travel times for just in time inventory (extend to 2-lane). Real-time data.
- This is extremely highway-centric. Missing big picture at both macro- and micro- level.
- Include assessment of other options, including short-lived RRs to avoid wasting assets on redundant infrastructure.
- Need to say STS v Freight network are the same.
- This recommendation is confusing since it combines many different things, and some wondered what makes the 2-lane corridors more important than the other corridors. It was mentioned that Michigan has passing lanes about every 5-10 miles on two-lane roads to make it easier to get around trucks, and Ohio should have more of these. Canton, Mt. Vernon, Leipsic, and other towns with lots of freight – have no 4 lane roads – 2 lane initiative should consider passing lanes – i.e. a third lane every 5 or 10 miles to alleviate congestion and keep fluidity.
- Another suggestion included adding an extra, tolled lane on interstates specifically for trucks. Users should have to pay for direct data feeds. It was also pointed out that transit agencies in Cincinnati used Artimis speed data to route buses, and this is similar to the live data feed recommendation.

6. Transit Needs:

- Bill Lowe – Include the human service agencies within the Transit Needs Study.
- Pedestrian is a mode – how about a "safe routes to transit" effort?
- Should include re-building transit service levels to pre-recession conditions and determining future growth needs based on relevant economic forecasts. Requires funding levels to implement determined needs should be a component.
- Tie to project selection and funding opportunities.
- Need to add text to define and convey specific goals and desired outcomes of transit study.
- Determining transit needs is fine but Ohio still needs to figure out how to provide better funding that makes sense for the future transit needs.
- Need to focus on what system would work best for rural areas/coordination with human service agencies and private transportation.
- Coordinate all HHS agencies to pass $'s to for solving rural transit needs. However, I do believe there are already credible studies available that demonstrate the need for additional public transit funding – i.e. enhanced services.
- Integrate with JobsOhio, Department of Development.
- It was suggested that the Transit Needs Study be coordinated with human services agencies like ODJFS, and it was pointed out that these groups will be represented on the steering committee for this study.

- Will pedestrian access to transit would be included in this study? It was mentioned that a survey is being conducted as part of the study and that may indicate pedestrian access to transit should be studied in further detail.

7. Climate Variability:

- Consider whether the plan is readable and easy to understand?
- ODOT should be commended for recognizing global warming/global wording – even if the plan does not use the term(s).
- And do what with this info?
- Not excited about this one. Study will have unrealistic goals that are likely unachievable. Targeted approach might be more appropriate.
- Look at the converse relationship also – how are transportation projects and the resultant emissions affecting climate disruption/variability. These impacts should be considered when doing project selections and creating policies.
- Is this a real need? Aren't these locations already known and addressed under basic infrastructure needs and covered by STS?
- Hire RR engineers. They have been building above flood plains for 100 years.
- I was moved to strongly agree after your explanation which perhaps indicates that the recommendation needs to be revised to clarify how the collection of data/resources will improve the project selection process.
- The potential results and responses to climate variability should be discussed more in this recommendation.
- Options analysis for infrastructure and flood management.
    - Include ice storms and other non-flood events
    - Include specific actions

8. Bicycle Network:

- Tony – Recommend ODOT should foster why we want counts.
- Kate – This data could be used by partner organizations in promoting their bike needs.
- Ronda – Language is still a little off, the current language promotes the image problem that bike transportation is a recreation issue and bike is not a real mode choice.
- Ronda – "What is the point of counting a bike route if nobody will use it?" This is an issue of the chicken or the egg. If you designate it and nobody rides on it what is the point, or do you count to identify where to designate?
- Ronda – Request the language gets revised to allow bike lanes and accommodations get installed regardless.
- Ronda – This seems like the focus should be more on locals and maybe the language needs to reflect this (partnerships).
- Ben W. – Add language to work with locals.
- ODOT is doing well by including bike transportation – and it is transportation. Should bike – vehicle safety be somehow addressed? Bike paths keep young people in Ohio

because they are cool! Perhaps safety could be included in study to highlight the need for off road – off state route bike paths.

- Coordination with local agencies in identifying what/where to collect data and make infrastructure investments. Focus should be given to local agencies that are currently investing in infrastructure. Instead of "peanut butter" approach.
- Recommendation showed that by not doing bicycle counts it will foster more advanced bicycle planning.
- Expand ODOT's relationship with locals and meaningfully solicit and apply their resource needs input to guide ODOT's funding decisions. Look at how funds can be flexed to provide more resources.
- Field verification and coordination with regional planning organizations and local communities is needed to better define routes. This needs to be accomplished prior to counts being taken. Need to define safe route and connectivity first.
- State should work with local government and assist in developing local routes with focus on safety after establishing local needs meeting.
- Stronger language is needed. There is a problem with current bike routes. This is a transportation issue. Local and regional funding should be increased to affect change. Increase local/regional efforts.
- The count method proposed does not necessarily quantify the demand because people do not ride on many roadways due to safety concerns. Can ODOT folks consider a complete streets model for new/repair projects? Particularly on state maintained low volume roads – a biking infrastructure that is a legitimate means of travel is good for all Ohioans.
- This recommendation should clearly discuss partnerships with locals, and list the reasons for collecting better bicycle data. ODOT should develop count standards. This recommendation also should emphasize the use of bicycles for transportation, and that local roads should be used rather than state roads to improve bicycle linkage.
- Don't be limiting as "Local".
    - Consider as a bona fide mode of travel
    - Counts may not reflect use early on
- Engage ODOT District Offices more.
- Include language emphasizing regional and local planning partnerships.
- Once networks are established money should follow.
- AO40 will hopefully move bike routes off dead center.
- Need to coordinate local/regional efforts.

9. Planning Partnerships:

- ODOT should be sure to emphasize that ODOT and MPO's already coordinate a lot now – but can do more so folks don't think we never planned in the past.
- Locals are the best source of local information.
- Local strategic highway safety plans are also being developed.

10. Strategic Transportation System:

- Bill Harris - Incorrect and missing intermodal facilities.

- Marianne Freed – Include the transit agencies on the STS map to be complete.
- The black triangles for rail/truck intermodal facilities confuse me. There are 12 (13 counting Neo modal) IM facilities in Ohio. Your map has 15 or 16. ORDC has an intermodal map you all could use.
- Clarification needed for "ODOT programs." Will preservation program be included or only major (TRAC, rehab, bridge, etc.) programs? Current policies in preservation programs do not differentiate between bridges on interstate/priority system versus two-lane system.
- There are 62 local transit agencies not identified on map; they receive ODOT funds. The transit systems should be better indicated on the Strategic Transportation System map either on the same map or a separate map.
- Please include the city of Warren on the NE regional transportation profile. It was left out while a smaller city like Alliance was included. Warren remains a central community in the Mahoning Valley besides Youngstown.

11. Regional Transportation Needs:

- Thanks for including the 286K issue!! Note! There are other needs – i.e. branch line rehabilitation that have deferred maintenance and special projects – i.e. – capacity improvements - especially in shale areas.
- These might be used better to determine project funding. Business data in the current process might not be the best way to identify commerce.
- The needs of SE section do not appear to be fully addressed especially related to shale development.
- Bike-ped and transit needs must be established, identified, and addressed.
- Why did locks and dams show up on S.E. Regional Profile?
- Profiles to be updated periodically to be more modal inclusive.
- Address the list of regional transportation needs (RTNs) based on condition, demographic, and economic data along with stakeholder input and additional statewide studies.