

Go OHIO Transportation Futures Plan (TFP)
Steering Committee Meeting #1
Interagency Working Group Meeting #1

Wednesday, November 18, 2009, 1-4 pm
Department of Administrative Services Center
4200 Surface Road, Columbus, Ohio

Meeting Report

This was the first meeting of the newly appointed Steering Committee and Interagency Working Group teams for the Go OHIO Transportation Futures Plan. Over sixty invitations were extended to stakeholders and state agency representatives. Forty-seven attendees signed in.

The purpose of the meeting was to introduce members to the Statewide Transportation Futures Plan, Go OHIO; explain its relationship to the 21st Century Transportation Priorities Task Force; and outline Go OHIO roles, purpose, and expected outcomes. Another goal of the meeting was to obtain advisory input on policy choices that will set the direction of the plan.

Ms. Marie Keister of Engage Communications and facilitator for the meeting welcomed members and asked each person to introduce him/herself and share a fact from the Task Force report. She then explained their roles and introduced a video produced by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) on multimodal transportation.

Ms. Mandy Kisling Bishop, co-Deputy Director of ODOT, highlighted the Task Force work and informed the group that the Statewide Transportation Futures Plan was a primary recommendation of the Task Force report. She stated that the plan was about developing a transportation system to support population and economic growth for Ohio. She thanked the group for coming and encouraged active participation throughout the Go OHIO Transportation Futures Plan process.

Mr. Marc Cutler of Cambridge Systematics and Project Manager for Go OHIO gave an overview of the project. He explained that the outcome of the study will be to transform Ohio's air, rail, highway, pedestrian, bike, bus and maritime transportation networks into one powerful integrated system. The goal is to bring safety, economic development, and quality of life to the forefront of transportation decision-making. He discussed the phases of plan development, schedule, and process. (See PowerPoint presentation slides 13-18.)

Ms. Beth Easterday of Triple-e Strategies and project team member explained the stakeholder interview process initiated in September 2009. She reviewed the interview questions, key themes, and sample recommendations. (See PowerPoint presentation slides 19-22.)

Ms. Keister explained the stakeholder and public engagement plan for the Go OHIO project. (See PowerPoint presentation slide 23.) She then gave the group an opportunity to ask questions; none were asked.

Mr. Hugh Louch of Cambridge Systematics explained the policy plan component of the Go OHIO plan. He recapped that the policy plan will be a strategic guide for ODOT, which will define policy direction, detail specific policy initiatives, and develop a platform to establish a multi-modal strategy across the state. He shared an Ohio map that showed the multi-modal transportation system in Ohio. (See PowerPoint presentation slides 28-33.) Mr. Louch reviewed a draft vision statement for the policy plan (slide 34) which included what Ohio's transportation system must do and how ODOT will achieve it. He stated that the project team needed the group's input to identify the vision for key issues that are bigger than ODOT. Mr. Louch went through examples on safety, economic development, community livability/land use, environmental stewardship and coordination. (See Slides 35-40.)

Ms. Keister then divided the group into eight sub-groups for discussion purposes. Topic areas were: Economic Growth, Community Livability/land use, Environmental Stewardship and Cooperation/Collaboration. Each topic had two small groups of six to eight people assigned for group discussion.

The following summaries are highlights from each break-out group discussion.

Economic Growth, Group #1, Joe Guerre, facilitator, Cambridge Systematics:

The ODOT representative was pleased with the recommendation that the Futures Plan directly support ODOT's strategic plan. The entire group liked the vision defined in ODOT's plan.

It was suggested that a cost of transportation component be added to the ODOT's vision/objectives. This concept addresses the personal cost of transportation for Ohioans. If the total cost of transportation goes down, people would have more disposable income.

The group discussed two approaches for determining how transportation investments can support economic growth - top down analysis based on industry needs and bottom-up analysis focused on specific needs/opportunities. They felt both should be pursued.

Economic development and livability are interrelated. Livability is another way of getting to economic development, because firms will relocate to Ohio if people really want to live here. The group felt that traditionally, people picked a job and then relocated to work there. They now feel that more people are more likely to pick where they want to live and then look for a job. When deciding on the relative priorities among goals the group focused on economic growth

and livability as priorities when deciding where to invest in transportation. Then when it gets down to a specific project, it should be built in a way that maximizes safety and minimizes the impact on the environment. On a scale of 1 to 100; the group rated the current state of economic development in Ohio as between 25 and 50.

When prioritizing investments between distressed and thriving areas; the group felt both are important, but that investments should not be spread around simply for equity's sake. It is important to allocate resources strategically. When investing in distressed areas, it is important to do it in a way that is most likely to produce results. The same approach should be taken when investing in thriving areas. The ODOD Ohio Hubs program is an excellent example of this type of strategic approach, representing a balance between distressed and thriving areas. Investments are made in very specific thriving areas that are within a larger distressed area.

Economic Development, Group #2, Marc Cutler, facilitator, Cambridge Systematics

Affordability of transportation is the most important element, not how much transportation there is, or system expansion.

Transportation investments should be density driven, both in urban areas and where pockets of density exist in rural areas. The success of investments should be measured by economic metrics, not traditional transportation metrics like Vehicle Miles Traveled and Vehicle Hours Traveled.

Most transportation is local in nature so we should focus on this, the last mile.. It is important to "fix it first" in our old dense urban areas, before building new connections.

Community Livability/Land Use, Group #1, Cynthia Bowen, facilitator, RW Armstrong

The group ranked the current state of Ohio's land use policies at about 25 on a scale of 100. Some individual communities in Ohio are more progressive, but the state is less so. Two state programs were highlighted as progressive --Ohio's farmland preservation initiatives and the Clean Ohio program. Cities that are growing have a tendency to undertake more planning.

The group was split on the desired geographic level for planning in Ohio. Most group attendees, however, agreed that some state level planning should occur including transportation, agriculture and the environment. Additionally, the group felt strongly that the state should set priorities and values regarding how regions and local government agencies should plan. One telling comment was that it was hard for the group to reach consensus and since the members basically represent the state, this shows why nothing has or can be done.

The group agreed that strides could be made in regional planning with the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). The focus of regional level planning would be to help all the jurisdictions in each region; including counties, municipalities and villages, collaborate on the best use of resources and to build understand that planning shouldn't stop at a jurisdiction's boundary. The group agreed that zoning should be left to the municipalities. Rural counties will not want any type of state control regarding planning and zoning. Urbanized areas are more supportive of

state programs because economic development activities are located there and they often don't have to compete for state and other resources.

More planning and collaboration occurs near state boundaries than interior urbanized areas of the state. However, jurisdictions along state boundaries will not support increase regulation for fear that it would hinder development at the border.

While planning is not necessarily working at the local and regional levels, the group was not sure it would be supported at the state level. Most cities grow because of annexation, so the group wanted to know how balance would be achieved with regional planning. Regional planning is needed due to annexation and competition for economic development. Those areas with a major city and first ring suburbs could conduct regional planning instead of annexing.. This could be a good starting point for regional planning. Cleveland and its first ring suburbs is a good example.

The group suggested that transportation, environment, and agriculture should be planned at the state level. Resolution would be needed on how local control of water and sewer would fit into regional or state planning. Every other type of planning should be at the regional or local level.

Most felt that a state plan could take a long time to create because there is not enough local support, even if the plan was very broad (urbanized vs. rural areas, targeting growth and economic development resources). Some areas, especially rural areas, might felt left out. Politics would be the biggest barrier. In theory most citizens and politicians support planning, but implementation never happens because consensus cannot be reached.

Planning at the state level could work if buy-in at the regional level were attained and an understanding were reached that it would save taxpayer money. Planners could validate this approach and educate politicians and citizens on the impacts that planning and lack of planning will have on the infrastructure and social systems.

Land use is inherently linked with economic development and therefore should be the driver for promoting economic development. Urban areas should be kept intact, while rural areas should be protected from development to preserve farmland. Transportation should be used to "connect" rural areas; however development should be confined to urbanized areas to limit impacts on the cost of maintaining transportation. Rural areas must be connected to urbanized areas so they don't die. There needs to be a statewide master plan to drive business into Ohio and limit competition between municipalities and regions.

The group viewed land use planning separately from community livability, which is much more comprehensive. Livability encompasses all elements related to having a high quality of life including walkability, biking, and opportunities for all ages (including teens and twentysomethings), cultural opportunities, strong economic development, aesthetic qualities, strong parks and recreation, and a jobs base. Education of the public and elected officials about livability is needed, especially since the state must have the support of the legislature. Some requirements (in particular safety) dictate or impede good planning/community livability.

The group discussed potential creation of a state office of planning. The group agreed that the role of such a department would have to be very specifically defined. Most agreed that a state planning office should focus on planning education, outreach, incentivizing planning, advising larger agencies on how land use planning is impacted by decisions in their departments,

allocating state funds towards urbanized areas that will increase in density and determining the priorities for growth areas within the state. All group attendees agreed that ODOD has a competing agenda regarding land use planning as do other agencies; therefore a separate office likely would be needed to facilitate these balancing these competing agendas.

Discussion about multimodalism included that the port facilities in Ohio are obsolete which could hinder economic development. There is a great opportunity for rail development in Ohio as well as an opportunity for improved passenger rail and the bus system. However, in both cases these modes need to be convenient. Urbanized areas need higher density in order to enable transit oriented development.

The focus for rail should be more on freight rail than passenger rail. More state dollars can be accessed for commercial than passenger rail. Additionally, the permitted uses of the gas tax currently in the constitution hinder the funding of passenger rail.

Community Livability/Land Use, Group #2, Audrey Wennink, facilitator, Cambridge Systematics and Jenelle Collins, facilitator, RW Armstrong

To frame the discussion, participants asked the group facilitators to explain the difference between planning and zoning. Many communities have zoning, but do not realize this does not represent planning for the community's future. Often residents do not realize the long-range community livability impacts of current trends and zoning.

Given local land use control, communities may develop their land in a way that commits state resources with no input from the state. For example, when communities locate residential subdivisions on one end of a city and commercial development/employment centers on the other end, linking the two with a state highway, this commits the state to building/maintaining transportation infrastructure without state input.

The group agreed that planning at the regional level with state oversight would be the ideal. In terms of land use/transportation planning, Ohio should be a leader, not just catch up with other progressive states. Ohio should choose its direction and become a national standard.

Instead of mandating comprehensive planning, the state should use incentives to encourage increased efficiency at a regional level. MPOs can provide the regional structure in urbanized areas, and county government can serve as the structure in rural areas. It is important that planning happen at the regional level and that plans not stop at the city limits because fragmented planning often results in inefficient use of resources. Planning at only the local level would likely result in just zoning.

It will be most effective to use incentives such as funding to drive regional planning. A state organization could offer development guidelines for comprehensive plans for communities to use as a framework for local efforts. These guidelines should outline plan criteria including a guideline about assembling an inventory of local resources and infrastructure. Guidelines should provide guidance and best practices to support regions and locals in successful planning. "What helps locals helps the state." The idea of creating a new state agency/entity/organization to develop these guidelines and review regional/local comprehensive plans, was discussed and interest was shown by the group, but no consensus was reached.

It will be important to offer local communities a range of options to implement comprehensive plans. Theoretically, everybody “gets it” in terms of reasons to plan but getting these changes to actually happen is the issue. A system should be created to ensure implementation occurs. It is also important to empower the implementers (e.g. local jurisdictions). There are requirements (in particular safety) that dictate or impede good planning/community livability that need to be reconciled with the desire for more progressive land use and community planning.

Planning is a tool for developing and communicating a vision. By including economic development in planning efforts (including livability) communities are “planning for survival.” It is critical to plan for economic sustainability and a diversified tax base. Communities should plan for various scenarios so they are prepared to handle future change.

The group chose not to prioritize the five Go OHIO goals. Of the five, safety and economic development were discussed as the most important, but the group decided not to choose one over the others since all five are highly related. None of the five goals can work in isolation – a positive relationship and balance is needed among all five.

Biking and walking were mentioned as critical for livability, which impacts economic competitiveness. For example, one group member noted that young professionals are reluctant to locate in cities that do not have good bike and pedestrian networks. The emerging Complete Streets policies were noted as important; a culture change is needed to get these policies implemented. It was noted that while many entities are supportive of other modes, when it comes to implementation – integrating them into new infrastructure -- often engineers find this difficult. This difficulty is often rooted in engineers not having training in this area or because they rely on manuals or guidance that do not provide sufficient information to help them implement the change. Training and support to help change the culture is needed.

Environmental Stewardship, Group #1, Hugh Louch, facilitator, Cambridge Systematics

The group had a hard time agreeing on what the state vision should be and really didn't think it was up to them to define a vision. In general they were not comfortable with ODOT taking a lead role on environmental issues.

The group likes the idea of taking small steps towards being more proactive on environmental issues. It was suggested to the group that perhaps some set of state agencies (EPA, DNR, Agriculture) should put together an “environmental strategic plan” and the group liked that idea as a way to have a state vision on the environment. The group did not think there was a comprehensive set of documents that provided such a vision now.

The group felt the best thing that Ohio could do to help the environment was to change the gas tax to allow it to fund any mode of transportation. In addition, there was a lot of interest in alternative energy, both for the ODOT/state fleet of vehicles, building energy use, and also using the ODOT right-of-way.

Environmental Stewardship, Group #2, Jason Miles, facilitator, Parsons Brinkerhoff

The group covered three topic areas: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, the ODOT Project Development Process (PDP), Climate Change, and ODOT operations.

NEPA/PDP

The primary issue identified with the NEPA and PDP processes is that they are time consuming and therefore expensive. The group set about trying to identify what makes these processes so time consuming and attempted to determine how they could be streamlined.

Stakeholder Involvement: Stakeholders who are invited to the process early on but who fail to participate should be prevented from holding up the process later on, should they choose to participate. This could be accomplished by refusing to revisit issues previously decided and not reviewing how the decisions had been made for the sake of the absent stakeholder.

An agreement could be created and signed on a project by project basis outlining the process, how decisions will be made, and agreeing that once a decision has been made that decision shall remain in effect (no regressing).

Intra-Agency Relationships: Developing strong relationships within an agency, such as ODOT, can assist in speeding up the process through communication and coordination. This could be accomplished by creating working groups within the agency to focus on project communication.

USDOT Intra-agency Coordination: For multimodal projects in particular, the various USDOT agencies including FRA, FHWA, and FTA, often appear to have different processes and standards.... Better coordination of the process between these agencies would allow for the smoother development of multi-modal projects or any projects which involve more than one USDOT agency. Sharing project funding between USDOT agencies would assist in streamlining the process.

ODOT - Project Development Process (PDP): The PDP was identified as being lengthy. The primary solution to this would be to move forward with multiple steps concurrently where feasible. However, no specific steps that could run concurrently were identified during the discussion.

Private Industry: The group sought to identify what could be learned from private industry to streamline the process." The group generally rejected such an approach as private industry doesn't typically have to follow NEPA or a similar environmental clearance process.

Climate Change

Regarding climate change the group decided to take into account both mitigation (greenhouse gas [GHG] reduction) and adaptation (preparing infrastructure for climate changes).

Lack of GHG Measurement: Currently air quality for the NEPA process takes into account only particulate matter, which is generally within tolerable levels and is decreasing significantly due to recent USEPA regulations, and ozone gases. There is no direct measurement for the primary GHGs: carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide. Methods and practices are available that measure these gases, which could be implemented both at ODOT and across the state. Beginning with these measurements, limits on GHG emissions could be created.

Multi-Modal Systems Approach: Taking into account a full multi-modal system, the most efficient and least polluting means of transporting people and freight across the state/region could be identified and utilized.

CMAQ Funding: The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides funding to areas that do not meeting the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) (nonattainment areas) as well as maintenance areas (areas currently in compliance but previously in nonattainment). CMAQ funding can be used for projects that will ease congestion or lower emissions in a given area. The issue is that often this funding looks only at a very limited area and does not consider the larger impacted area. For example, moving freight from trucks to barges would reduce roadway congestion and associated emissions, but if the project at a port of transfer is located beyond the boundaries of the area in non-attainment, the project would not be considered eligible for CMAQ funding. A solution could be to allow projects within attainment areas to be eligible for CMAQ funding if it can be shown that the project will reduce congestion within a nonattainment area.

Update Design Standards: As a means of adapting to climate change design standards should be changed and assumptions modified to accommodate a changing climate. For example, roads in Miami have different design standards than those in Toronto; our design standards should be revised to account for a wider range of temperature extremes, better storm water management, and flooding prevention. Assumptions that have been used in the past for 50 year and 100 year storm events need to be revisited as severe storms become more common.

Renewable Energy on ODOT Land: ODOT could use, and possibly sell or lease, the right-of-way and other real estate that ODOT owns for the development of renewable energy such as solar panels and windmills. This could increase ODOT revenue by (1) selling or leasing the property rights and (2) selling electricity back to the grid. Such a program would be great for public relations and set an excellent example for the public. This would help to reduce ODOT's carbon footprint, and would meet the electrical needs of many of ODOT's facilities and operations. This could also help support the governor's renewable energy portfolio standard.

ODOT Operations

The third area examined was how ODOT can improve its operations to reduce its impact on the environment while reducing its carbon footprint and hopefully saving money.

Reduce Salt Usage: The group agreed that reducing the amount of salt used on Ohio's roadways by ODOT would be beneficial. The state should find an alternative to using salt such as the beet juice used last year, spraying brine, or possibly incorporating some type of ash.

Methane as a Fuel: The Solid Waste Authority of Central Ohio (SWACO) runs its trucking fleet on methane generated from the landfill south of Columbus; perhaps ODOT could contract with SWACO to use the methane from this facility for its own trucks. ODOT's trucks would need to be converted to use the methane. Using methane instead of gas would reduce ODOT's carbon footprint, save on fuel costs, help to develop a new technology (using landfill generated methane), and utilize a GHG for fuel that would have otherwise been released into the atmosphere.

Warm Asphalt: Warm asphalt is asphalt that does not require being heated to nearly as high of a temperature as traditional asphalt prior to use. Using warm asphalt would save energy,

reduce emissions from both the cost of heating the asphalt and putting down traditionally hot pavement on the roadway. Using warm asphalt should, in the long-term, save money due to reduced energy costs.

Chemical Sprays: The group brought up the point that has previously been made by Director Molitoris and was later reiterated by Deputy Director Bishop that ODOT has reduced by 98 percent its use of chemical sprays.

Reduce Mowing: Reducing the amount of mowing that ODOT does within highway medians and along highways could save energy, reduce emissions, boost wildlife habitat, enhance storm water retention, and reduce erosion. It was mentioned that the general public has viewed these un-mowed stretches of highway as unkempt and dirty, like a bad neighbor who refuses to mow their lawn. As an alternative it was suggested that ODOT plant native flowers and plants that are more aesthetically pleasing in these areas, citing Virginia as an example.

Teleconferencing / Video-Conferencing: Already implemented by ODOT to a large extent, teleconferencing and video-conferencing save on energy costs, emissions, and time over in person meetings.

Alternative Work Schedules / Tele-Commuting: Implementing alternative work schedules and telecommuting could reduce emissions associated with employee commuting and would reduce congestion in communities where ODOT operates.

Coordination and Communication, Group #1, Erika Witzke, facilitator, Cambridge Systematics

The group discussed that the state vision should be a standardized protocol for communications across the state for ease in communicating with citizens and businesses. The state needs to use communication as a strength, and not let it be a weakness. Go OHIO may want to take the lead from the Executive Order issued by Gov. Strickland related to coordination across agencies, integration into all practices, and avoiding stand-alone policies. The Common sense business practices Executive Order is available at:

<http://governor.ohio.gov/Portals/0/Executive%20Orders/Executive%20Order%202008-04S.pdf>

Among the five Go OHIO goals – safety, economic development, community livability, environmental stewardship and coordination the group discussed where they would rank coordination (#1 = highest priority; #5 = lowest). The group decided coordination and communication was a top priority but should not be considered as a separate policy category. Instead, the group felt coordination and communications should be a foundation for each of the other elements in order to achieve success.

The biggest coordination and communication challenges interfacing with state agencies include inconsistent processes across agencies/districts and the need to re-learn processes depending on who you are working with --the ease of doing business is achieved by dealing with same people and working through their way of how to do business. Ohio is lacking a one-stop-shop, or online resource “playbook”

The group felt that there was no need to re-district each state agency’s regions. But in the short term a “One-Stop-Shop” Resource Center and resource manual by county could be used. The manual would include standards for communication related to 1) process, 2) turnaround time and 3) expectations. Each district would give the same directions and follow a consistent

process regardless the geographic location of the office. In addition, standard communications training for all staff is necessary. It should be gradually integrated into existing processes to enhance interagency/interdepartmental communication

Over the long term, integrated communications/collaboration would become second nature. ODOT should consider the idea of a transportation ombudsman for overall and project specific assistance.

The resources to draw from for statewide policy related to coordination and communication are personal relationships, on-line tools, and social networking. By building on what works well in certain districts best practices can be expanded to all districts.

Coordination and Communication, Group #2, Beth Easterday, facilitator, Triple-e Strategies

The group discussed the vision for the state regarding coordination and felt that Ohio needs to look at successes both internally and externally. Within Ohio, various groups have come together around a common goal and have been successful. Examples cited were the “Small Communities Environmental Funding Group” and the “Brownfields Funding Group.” The group felt that learning from successes and benchmarking is the first step to collaboration/communication needs.

The group brought up the fact that business needs to knock on a lot of doors to get answers. It was discussed that there should be no artificial borders with districts. Having multiple state, federal and local decision making offices throughout the state can hamper the needs of new or expanding businesses. The group discussed that with technology so much can be done online, do we need regional delineation?

In addition, the topic of training was discussed in depth. Local resources/advocates who are trained to assist people through various state agencies are needed. The group felt that there is a lack of communication as well as a lack of resources. If people are properly trained to understand where the resources are, a cultural change will happen and better collaboration among agencies will occur.

In the short term the group felt Go OHIO should focus on communication among agencies to better understand each other’s roles. It is important to ensure qualified personnel are staffing regional offices and are properly trained. In addition, local knowledge is very important when making certain decisions on investments and should be taken into consideration. (e.g.: Ohio Public Works Commission process.)

In the long term, the group would like to see an evaluation of regional district overlap. The discussion centered on larger districts versus multiple districts, as well as the idea that central offices do not need to be located in central Ohio.

The overall goal of Go OHIO was discussed and while certain project decisions need to be made on a local level, the group believed that creating an intermodal system needs to be done on a statewide basis. Buy-in needs to be achieved at all levels for an intermodal system, but the overarching direction needs to come from the state.

Ms. Keister asked each sub-group to identify a spokesperson and report out to the larger group.

Ms. Keister then asked for comments on safety. Mr. Matt Dietrich, Executive Director of the Ohio Rail Development Commission, stated that multiple, complex issues exist regarding rail safety. Specifically, technology interfaces can sometimes hinder the safety goals. Mr. Jeff Stephens, Director of Consider Biking, stated that interactions between bikes/pedestrians and motorists can be catastrophic. He stated that the number of crashes has been consistent, and maybe even has gone down over the last few years. Mr. Bill Dingus of the Lawrence County Chamber of Commerce stated that while regulated by the Federal government, port safety needs to be considered. There is a lack of good training for port employees on regulations, and equipment at the ports can be inferior due to age. With Ohio seeking to boost intermodalism, training needs to be increased for ports.

Ms. Keister discussed the project schedule and next meeting date. She indicated that the Steering Committee would meet in the morning and the Interagency Work Group would meet in the afternoon of December 16, 2009.

Ms. Kisling Bishop thanked the attendees for coming and participating in the meeting. She assured the group that their work and time commitment to the Go OHIO Transportation Futures Plan would result in a product that would not sit on a shelf. She stated that ODOT plans to use this strategic guide to further the department and Ohio. Ms. Kisling Bishop shared that she looked forward to seeing participants on December 16, 2009 at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Additional comments on the vision received after the meeting included the following:

Comment #1:

- I would like to see a commitment in the statement to use products made in Ohio and using Ohio Union labor when working on any existing structures or any new construction. That would be a vital element to any plan to revitalize Ohio's economy.

Comment #2:

- Consider adding bullets under "ODOT will achieve this by" such as:
 - Ensuring the development of a fully integrated multi-modal system that is not dominated by any single form of transportation.
 - Enabling coordination among transportation, land use and economic development planning and investments.
- Consider whether "Coordination and Communication" is as important as the other four key issues. Our breakout group wondered whether this issue was more fundamental (e.g. good business practice) vs. a policy area.
- Regarding a future state (or ODOT) role regarding land use, this will be a topic of much discussion. It strikes me that the state can play a role in better defining the components of good land use planning, as well as providing "carrots" through transportation funding that ensures facility investments further sound land use/transportation/economic development goals. The state might even need to go so far as prepare Development

Goals (instead of a development plan) that would help to provide a policy framework and benchmarks.

Comment #3:

- Respect our streets, waterways etc....as “public spaces” and hence accessible to all users. For example, we’ve given our streets to motor vehicles. This was not the case in 1900—or in many current European/World Communities.