

Portland Area Comprehensive
Transportation System (PACTS)

Regional Transportation Plan Update
Meeting Report

Thursday, June 27, 2013, Portland, Maine

July 29, 2013



Good Group Decisions

Contents

About the Meeting	1
Attendance.....	1
Objectives.....	2
Welcome and Agenda Review	2
Ground Rules	2
Context	3
Key Trends	4
Most Significant Trends	4
All Ideas	4
Discussion	5
Key Themes for the Update	8
Top Conclusions	8
Discussion	9
Proposed Planning Process	13
Emerging Conclusions	13
Discussion	13
Closing Comments	16

This report is organized by topic, not necessarily the order in which things were discussed.

About the Meeting

Attendance

Name	Organization	Committee
Hank Berg	CBITD	Transit plus
Mike Bobinsky	Portland	Policy
Bob Burns	Gorham	Technical
Sara Devlin	Turnpike	Policy plus
Kevin Donoghue *	Portland	Policy
Marina Douglass	NNEPRA	Transit
Eric Dudley	Westbrook	Policy plus
David Galbraith	Gorham	Planning
Tex Haeuser	South Portland	Policy plus
Art Handman	Gorham	Interested Citizen
Theo Holtwijk	Falmouth	Planning
Molly Just	Westbrook	Planning
Bob Kahn	TrainRiders Northeast	Formerly Planning
Donna Larson	Freeport	Policy plus
Jeff Levine	Portland	Policy
David Marshall *	Portland	Policy plus
Rick Michaud	Saco	Policy plus
Tom Milligan	Biddeford	Policy Alternate
Brooks More	Windham	Planning plus
Nathan Poore	Falmouth	Formerly Policy
Judy Roy *	Scarborough	Policy Alternate
Duane Scott	MaineDOT	Planning
Herb Thomson	MaineDOT	Policy plus
Dave Tripp *	Saco	Policy plus
Penny Vaillancourt	MaineDOT	Planning
John Duncan	PACTS	
Carl Eppich	PACTS	
Paul Niehoff	PACTS	
Steve Linnell	GPCOG	
Craig Freshley	Good Group Decisions	
Kerri Sands	Good Group Decisions	

*Elected official

Objectives

- Shared understanding of the need for an update of the regional transportation plan and the planning parameters
- Identification of key trends relevant to the update
- Identification of key issues likely to be incorporated into the update
- Consensus on an efficient and timely process going forward that will result in a high quality update

Welcome and Agenda Review

- Dave Marshall, Policy Committee Chair, welcomed the group and introduced facilitator Craig Freshley.
- Craig explained a bit about his company Good Group Decisions, that his expertise is group decision processes, not transportation planning, and that the meeting would be a partnership where he managed the process and the participants contributed the content.
- Craig review the planned agenda.

Ground Rules

Craig explained the following ground rules, things to keep in mind for a more effective and efficient meeting:

- **What's best for the region** - We are all from different places, with different interests, but for this discussion let's consider what's best for the region as a whole
- **Understanding before judgment** - The timeless principle of open mindedness and hearing from each other before coming to conclusions
- **Stay on the high ground** - We can leave the details for the Policy Committee to work out later
- **Let Craig call on people** - To help make sure everybody gets a chance to speak, let me recognize and call on people; if two hands go up at once I'll call on the person we haven't heard as much from
- **Themes and conclusions documented** - I'll write summaries of emerging conclusions in the moment, show you on the screen and ask if I got it right. We'll also be preparing a full report of the meeting.
- **Neutral facilitation** - We are here to serve to group as a whole

Context

John Duncan, Director of the Portland Area Comprehensive Transportation System (PACTS), provided a brief explanation of the update process for the Regional Transportation Plan, known as “Destination Tomorrow”.

- Rough schedule for the planning process:
 - Today - brainstorm and achieve consensus on strategic directions for the update
 - This gets the ball rolling
 - Results from today’s meeting will go to the PACTS Executive Committee; the hope is that we then have enough clarity to craft a scope of work for the planning process
 - Policy Committee approves the process in September and hopefully we can have a consultant on board in November
 - We also want to form a Destination Tomorrow Update Steering Committee in November or December
 - We are required to adopt an updated plan by the end of next year (2014)

The group watched a 7-minute video explaining Destination Tomorrow, which was produced after the 2010 update. The video can be seen at: <http://youtu.be/qApCRWVozpY>
Some key points in the video are captured below:

- About PACTS
 - 15 cities and towns (now 18) in southern Maine
 - We all have the common need of transportation
- Destination Tomorrow Plan
 - Looks at our transportation system and how it needs to be changed in the future
 - We are in good shape compared to other places, but our infrastructure is deteriorating rapidly
 - In particular our rail system has been neglected
 - Tries to tackle issues collectively
 - Scarborough example of collaborative efforts to develop a pedestrian plan
- Current transportation trends
 - An aging population relies more on bus transport
 - More people are choosing to live where we work and work where we live
 - More fuel efficient vehicles
- Funding is a challenge
 - Destination Tomorrow Plan needs \$1.5 billion over 20 years to maintain and improve system; we have \$500 million identified
 - However, less fuel use means less funding for the transportation system
- Potential solutions
 - Funding sources - taxes, fees, tolls, surcharges
 - Land use planning that promotes more cost effective transportation

Key Trends

The group discussed key trends to keep in mind (economic, demographic, political, transportation and other) when considering the update to the Regional Transportation Plan. A few trends had been identified prior to the meeting by PACTS staff and sent to all workshop participants (contact PACTS staff for those materials). Ideas from the full group were written on paper, discussed, and organized on the wall.

Most Significant Trends

- Increase in desire for alternative transportation
- Deteriorating infrastructure
- Declining revenues for transportation
- Demographics

All Ideas

- Changing lifestyles
 - Increase in desire for alternative transportation
 - Housing trends
 - Smaller
 - Urban
 - Increase in telecommuting
 - Lack of active public [public is less physically active]
 - Increase in walking, biking, and transit
 - Reduced car ownership
 - Demand for productivity
 - Demand for energy efficiency
 - Urban gentrification
 - More distracted driving
- Infrastructure
 - Deteriorating infrastructure
 - Lack of sustainability of current infrastructure
 - Technology changing
 - Traffic lights
 - Parking
 - AVL
 - Complete streets
- Financing
 - Declining revenues for transportation

- State/federal funding declining
- More emphasis on partnerships
- Increasing performance assessment
- Lack of equality
- Decreased (household) capacity to pay for transportation
- Demand for accountability
- Demographics
 - Aging population
 - Job growth
 - Young people's transportation choices
 - Population growth
- Increasing freight activity
- Increase in destination tourism
- Getting to/from work takes longer
- Severe weather impacts
- Increased regulations

Discussion

- Aging population means, among other things, loss of tax base and tax revenue
- There is a correlation between an increase in automotive trips and an increased waistline
 - People are driving very short distances for lots of errands
 - We are resistant to giving up driving
- Increases in walking, biking and transit may not be true throughout the region - maybe in urban cores
 - It's more a desire for more walking / biking / transit - some places want more but have no infrastructure or it's currently perceived as too dangerous
 - Lower car ownership is definitely true
 - Young people are more often choosing to live in urban areas and want to rely less on the car
- Severe weather
 - Climate change and sea level rise
 - The cost impact of storm events that impact infrastructure - our bridges are designed to last 20+ years are getting washed out every 5
 - Downeaster rail bed and other roads close to sea level
 - Do you have the science to support this?
 - Focus on the impact of severe weather on transportation infrastructure
 - We produced disposable infrastructure in the 50's - they didn't think we would need roads in 50 years back then!
 - It's a perfect storm of failing infrastructure and lack of funding
- We have moved away from rail which was much more sustainable
- High level of telecommuting in Portland - including taking more long trips to Boston,

New York, etc.

- Technology changes
 - Parking systems
 - Coordinated traffic signals
 - AVL (automatic vehicle location) - people go online and get transit information
- Revenues
 - State and federal resources are declining
 - Lack of buying powers
 - Increased emphasis on partnerships
 - At municipal level more finances are needed to sustain system
 - Everything is being limited
 - Affects state, federal, and local budgets - so roads are really affected
 - Coupled with increased pressure and demand for more sidewalks, bike lanes, trains, etc. and decreased capacity of household budget to pay for transportation
- Performance measurement is going to drive investment decisions more than in the past
 - This is being demanded at all levels of government - more than just transportation agencies
 - At every level, people are grappling with what it means to make a good investment decision over time
- Housing choice trends
 - People deciding to live in smaller units in urban cores rather than in suburbs
 - This is slowing a little bit
- Most people agree that traffic volume in general is increasing as our population increases
 - Turnpike saw a decline in 2010 due to gas prices, but has been going back up towards the max levels seen in 2007-08
- Decrease in equity
 - Meaning, equity in the usage of transportation alternatives
 - As public revenues decline we have to fund buses and trains etc. via pay-per-use and the lower echelon of society can't afford it
- Demand for energy efficiency and energy reduction
 - Smaller size of vehicles - not sure how it will impact transportation
- Demand for increased productivity
 - Our devices (laptops, phones, etc.) create more demands on us and driving a vehicle doesn't go hand in hand with safely being productive doing other things
 - Will that move us towards taking a bus or train rather than wasting that time driving a car?
- Tourism needs to be considered; we have more cruise ships and Portland is adding 700 hotel rooms
- Disagree with changes in lifestyle "choice"
 - For some, lifestyle changes are not a choice, they are responses to pressure
 - For example, the suburbanization of poverty as a response to urban gentrification
- Charlie Colgan predicted a build-out in Scarborough due to baby boomers

- Plans to reduce volume and speed on certain roads
 - Putting in rotaries
 - Turning two-way streets into one-way
 - “Right sizing” - adjusting if overbuilt or redundant
 - “Complete Streets”
 - We built roads for decades with no sidewalks and bike lanes - now people want those things
 - It’s about reconnecting to downtowns
 - A caution about data - a so-called “volume increase” can result from reducing a speed limit from 45 to 25 mph
- Increased regulations are killing us locally
 - They are not necessarily bad, but we still have to meet them
- I hear all the time, “It takes longer to get to and from work”. Call it increased congestion. If PACTS could get people to work and home quicker in next 10 years that would be great.
- Freight - is port activity picking up?
- Safety in general across all sectors - are we more safe? Are there less crashes?
 - John has seen statewide charts that show fatalities are generally down - though they tend to creep up and down
 - More deaths now from distracted driving than from drinking and driving
 - PACTS is now required to do a safety plan - we have to come up with measurements
- As you improve infrastructure, you improve public safety and hence reduce costs of fire, police, emergency services, etc.
- Strategic planning for transportation improves all these areas
- Aging of infrastructure - so many things are now due for replacement
 - Seems more prevalent now than 20 years ago
- Demographics
 - Young and old people are the driving force
 - Older people AND younger people giving up cars

Key Themes for the Update

The group discussed the following question: “What about the plan should change in light of the key trends?” and identified some strategic direction ideas to guide the Policy Committee. Prior to the meeting, PACTS staff had provided a starter list of some ideas for strategic direction (contact PACTS staff for those materials). The group refined the list on screen.

Top Conclusions

A. Engage the public

1. Establish a sense of urgency
2. Ask our customers
 - a. What they desire
 - b. What they are willing to pay for
 - i. Ask about trade off's
 - c. What can they afford
 - d. Ask reactions to alternative futures

B. Consider a bold project

1. Ideas for bold projects
 - a. Develop regional transit and regional land use recommendations.
 - i. Develop a transit service development plan and/or
 - ii. Regional transit oriented development plan framework.
 - b. Develop a remotely managed smart transportation system
 - c. Put resources into what is sustainable
 - d. Reduce congestion and prioritize projects towards that
 - e. Increase plug-in stations for cars
 - f. Inter-urban train service
 - g. Require transit planning and transit district participation for PACTS eligibility
 - h. Eliminate soft costs
 - i. Curb neighborhood-based planning projects
2. Bold doesn't necessarily mean big
3. Potential Bold Funding Mechanisms
 - a. Toll 295
 - b. Value capture (such as regional TIF)

C. Blend long-range plan with short-term project planning

1. Tighten up the relationship between the Plan and what happens at PACTS
 - a. Require that large projects be in the Plan
 - b. Better connection between Planning and Programming
2. The PACTS MPO allocation “set aside” budgets should directly reflect the

recommendations of the long range plan

Discussion

- To a large extent the Regional Transportation Plan is not tightly relevant to what goes on with PACTS in terms of projects and funding
 - It's a big plan with a lot of goals
 - We put in a huge plan update effort every 3-4 years, but it's not how projects actually get funded
 - We get points when apply for funding and projects, but the important decisions at PACTS don't relate tightly
 - Would like to tighten up relationship between plan and projects
- Are projects over a certain size required to be mentioned in the plan?
 - No, currently
 - Maybe large projects should be required to be in the plan
- Long term view - 50 years seems too long
 - 20 years seems like you can get your arms around it - even with that amount it's hard to be rational and realistic and be able to predict trends
 - A lot more can change in 50 than 20 years. Your visioning is different - you can imagine a bigger difference and how to get there.
 - Planning for next 50 years is not correlated with how PACTS works; it's usually more like a 2-year horizon
 - It's hard to know what to plan for at the 50 year level
 - Our comprehensive plan has to be written every 10 years and even that feels extreme
- What's an example of a "major project"?
 - Spending \$10-30 million on one big item, like the Franklin Street corridor
 - Or, adding bus or rapid transit for a suburb
- I take issue with having a prejudice towards large projects
 - Instead, we should ask what are the transportation and land use demands?
- Distinction between planning and programming - there is a disconnect
 - You go from a 20 year vision to having to fund programming
- We should be thinking about congestion - we should prioritize projects so they decrease congestion
- Funding for big projects
 - The plan should consider how to finance a big project
 - Is it true that we can't "bank" money or do a bond issue with PACTS projects?
 - If we wanted to do something big, how would we finance it?
 - Does GPCOG have the authority to float a bond?
- The needs list from the 2010 plan suggested that we needed to go get the rest of the money, bringing funds from \$500 million to \$1.5 billion. Instead maybe we should accept that we're not going to get the rest of the money and think about a mechanism for prioritizing. What do we need the most? How do we make investment decisions?
 - Accept rather than bemoan
 - And whittle down our list

- Talk to our customers to determine needs
- We used to think about how do WE get to our destination and now it's how do I get there
 - There used to be light rail (trolley, subway) in every community - and it worked
 - We could build light rail 5-10 miles out of town and add parking lots
 - Build rail along 295 and the Turnpike
 - Instead we just keep building more roads and bridges
- It's like landscape gardening - sometimes you have to cut off the dead stuff and put resources into the "trunk"
- Put our resources into what is sustainable and stop trying to maintain what is not sustainable
- I like the idea of prioritizing. For example if we prioritized transit, bike, and pedestrian, then we could say that we are going to focus our paving efforts on those roads that have transit, bike and pedestrian components
- 50 year planning is not that crazy. Look at our failing infrastructure. You might have to plant a seed now that will take effect in 50 years.
- I hope that we can do a check-in in 4 years to see if this plan made a difference
- I want a highly effective document and also one that results in improved customer satisfaction with the system, and allows us to measure that
- We are municipality-centric and have to change our land use to match transportation planning. I would like to engage the public to develop more prescriptive recommendations.
- Focus on a bold approach
 - We are limited in how we change market forces and culture
 - I don't want to spend all the transportation plan consultant money just to tweak our allocations slightly - it's a shell game
 - What if we asked customers about a particular bold idea? Like free, convenient transit - but only for those communities who agree to a prescriptive land use plan. Ties land use planning to use of roads.
- Faster commute times maybe should not be the goal
- I don't agree with reducing congestion as a goal of the plan - it's too reactive
- We need to step back from these assumptions and ask what our customers want
 - I maybe think that an increased emphasis on transit is the right thing to do
 - We need more interaction with users of the system
- Remember that the money coming to us is not universally eligible for transit uses - it's primarily for highway and bridge
- I like the idea of coming up with a bold idea - but we should come up with a list of them, not just one. Like:
 - Plug-in stations for electric cars
 - Interurban train
 - Fixed guideway on Forest Avenue
- Maybe accompany bold ideas with bold funding sources
 - Like tolling on 295
- Don't forget we still have to maintain the road network even with bold ideas

- Performance based measures must be incorporated
- When we ask public what they want be sure to ask what they are willing to pay for
- We should be more focused on a future that's not just about roads getting longer and longer and wider and wider - we can't sustain it
 - For example, maybe a toll on 295 pays for free bus service
- Nothing is free, wherever the funding comes from. Make sure people know where a service is funded from.
- Value-capturing ideas
 - Such as a key transit hub to attract transit development
 - Brunswick and Freeport were developing around their train stations before the rail was even there
 - Maybe develop a regional transit TIF - a new idea
 - Right now TIFs are done town by town; we could propose a value-capture with regional emphasis
- User fees - people don't think it costs anything to drive out of your driveway and down the roads. They don't think about gas tax, excise tax, etc. The only user fee they see is highway tolls.
- Maybe in order to be eligible for PACTS-related highway funding you have to be part of, and paying into, a transit district
- Does "whittle down the list" conflict with "go bold"?
- I disagree with strong emphasis on transit - meaning buses, vans, carpools, trains. Transit is a solution. Instead we need to define the problem. I do support transit but it represents something around 5-10% of the travelling public, and that seems misguided. We should ask the public what to do to make their travels better.
- We need to keep in mind that it's not only the users of transit who see the benefits. Even as a car commuter, I know what I want for the system.
- When engaging the public, use successful examples to bring public along. Examples from Maine and from elsewhere.
- First ask, what is it you desire and what will you pay for? Then develop bold ideas, then ask for reactions.
 - For example, Zoom was projected to have 30,000 riders per month. It has 3,000. It is a success for taking some cars off the road, but it's not a success in terms of what was planned for.
- Deemphasize regional transit
- Develop remotely managed smart transportation system
 - Like ability to control traffic lights from a dispatch center
- When we ask the public, we need to ask young people if they would rather save the money spent on a car and spend some of it on transit instead
- I like the way the list is developing, but with all due respect, we need to actually do something on the ground to generate excitement
- Sometimes what people want is not what's good for them! We need to show the public how what they want is costing us in terms of sustainability. What can we afford as a society?
- Show examples of what will happen if we continue on the current sprawl trend

- Commuting time, roads, etc.
 - Establish a sense of urgency
- Start eliminating soft costs unless it's truly a regional study
 - Eliminate neighborhood-based town planning projects
 - We have all these plans and then there's a perpetual queue of projects
 - We can plan a lot faster than we can implement
- We already have money allocated so we are debating about how to spend it
- Regarding "bold ideas", we are in the enthusiasm stage - we haven't come to a fork in road yet
 - Bold doesn't have to be massive or large - you can be bold with any project
 - Bold ideas are because we are continuing to get less and less money

Proposed Planning Process

The group reviewed a sketch process proposed by the Executive Committee (contact PACTS staff for those materials), and discussed ideas about a new planning process going forward.

Emerging Conclusions

- Do a statistically significant, random-sample public opinion survey that:
 - Starts with baseline information about the current situation
 - Takes advantage of previous public survey in order to do longitudinal analysis
 - Asks for reactions to specific ideas
- Blend the long range Regional Transportation Plan process with the short-term project planning process
- Ask sub-regions for input on their most important regional projects
- Establish a mechanism to match projects to funding availability
- Build in evaluation of the implementation – performance-based measures

Discussion

- What are the must-haves?
 - Plan update must be done and adopted by December 31, 2014
 - And even then, PACTS could provide the federal government with a plan update that will satisfy requirements even if more time is needed to complete specific tasks
- We've already done some public outreach and engagement. 2 years ago we did workshops on transit planning - is that information going to be used in this process?
 - 120 people came together in a charrette
 - The consensus from that is documented - it's not a plan itself but a collection of key pieces
 - We could use it in framing a survey or to provide support for the ideas from today
- Encourage everyone to look at and understand what's in the public opinion survey from 2008. We should do another one but it's important to see what people already said.
- There's a difference between just updating the plan, and changing the way we fund projects and allocate funds
 - Destination Tomorrow is a like a comprehensive plan; it covers a lot of topics in

- a similar manner
 - 15 years ago PACTS aimed for tightening up the connection between planning decisions and funding decisions. This is really hard to do.
 - We have a TIP Process Committee
 - They will meet for first time next month and for the next 6 months; the charge is to refine the way we allocate MPO allocation funds
 - They will do their work by the end of December - right when the Destination Tomorrow plan process will be starting up
- I would like assurance that this isn't a pro forma exercise and the real planning process happens in the allocations
 - We would have to merge the groups - Destination Tomorrow Update Committee and the TIP Process Committee
- There is no connection right now. We are focusing on immediate needs. We have collector roads to deal with or we get fired, and all other things in the plan take a back seat.
- We have to deliberately decide if there is going to be a relationship between planning and funding projects
- Let's not lose sight - it may not be a direct relationship but we do talk about Destination Tomorrow when we talk about set-asides. A Destination Tomorrow priority is infrastructure - which is why we pave collector roads.
 - It's not a total disconnect
 - We actually have relied on the plan to build the TIP
- The 2006 plan covered TIPs in 2007 and 2009; the 2010 plan focused on the 2011 TIP. If we do a 2013-14 TIP it would still rely on 2010 plan. The timing is off.
- I see the key decisions as:
 - What percent of money available are you going to designate for collector roads, intersections, "non-transit" transit (like highway money for transit; bike, pedestrian), managed control, etc.
 - Are these the right allocation percentages?
 - We don't deal with these questions from the Regional Transportation Plan to the TIP
 - You either assign the allocations OR you set goals and have the TIP Committee decide the allocations based on the goals.
 - My preference is that the plan assign allocations so we don't waste time wordsmithing
- The plan needs to have 50% of its effort on implementation
 - One old version listed 50 projects but nothing came of it because there was nothing in there for implementation
 - The Turnpike has a 20-year plan saying what they will spend money on - lanes, bridges, toll barriers
 - Don't forget that the Turnpike is more constrained and so it's easier to look long range
- It's a good idea to assign spending in the plan - but then we can't do a 50-year plan
 - We can't be too specific too far out
- Our outlook is more changing - it's a good idea to connect the plan to projects, but

funding formulas can change

- We need flexibility to change priorities or funding mechanisms somehow
- I agree with a blended TIP process and plan update committees. This would eliminate a whole other PACTS process.
- I agree and I especially like the idea of a shorter range plan within a longer range plan
- It would be good if the public could actually engage. So far this has been a system that is run by people who are paid to go to meetings.
- This can also help provide feedback for performance measures
- PACTS needs to have its set-asides established by end of this year, so we can solicit proposals from committees for 2014, and score them.
 - So, a new blended committee process wouldn't work for this immediate round
 - Is the scoring based on Destination Tomorrow plan at all?
 - Yes, currently, and we expect in the future
- We need a fourth public meeting in the fourth sub-region
- What is the job of the consultant for the plan update?
 - Help with discrete pieces
 - Such as:
 - Outreach
 - Performance measurement - there are new requirements
 - Freight
 - Safety
 - Congestion management
 - Transit service development plan
 - Scenario planning
 - Any other expertise we don't have in-house
- Should there be a fishing expedition early in the process?
 - We could we ask towns and sub-regions to tell PACTS what they think their most important regional project is
 - When you get info back from all of them, see if there is a theme
- Speak with the membership, who are speaking on behalf of what they hear from the public
 - Doesn't mean that what we hear automatically goes in the plan
 - Just see if there are common thoughts among the regions
- Let's not nail down too tightly what the public process is right now
 - Public forums are notoriously poor for getting great info, so let's have an open mind and not get too locked into plan for public forums
- Web-based info gathering
- Ask the business community
- Should we do a public opinion survey?
 - Yes, definitely
 - We need a scientific random sample. It's worth the money.
 - Ask what they want and how much they will pay - you can do that with this survey
- A reminder that in 2008, one of the questions asked how much would the price of gas

have to be before you will park your car and use the transit system - and the answer was \$15 per gallon!

- So, what are really the urgent questions?
- We could ask the question differently, like “How much are you willing to pay annually to keep your car on the road?”
- We should still do a survey to touch some of the same data points as we did in 2008
- We should do a survey in reaction to something - like sprawl trends, or other specific visions of the future
 - For opinions to mean anything they need to be informed. We need to get word to people about how serious our infrastructure sustainability issues are
- The last survey did 600 calls, proportional to the towns. We put 10 prototype projects in the survey and asked people to react.
- What about going out to the four regions with public forums?
 - We are moving toward elected officials being majority of PACTS now - that’s how it should be
 - What if we have joint elected official meetings - in place of public forums?
 - Have a joint meeting with presentation and facilitated discussion
 - Invite the public to come - that way even if you don’t get the participation numbers from the public you still have public representation
 - It is important to have a professional run these meetings, to take the pressure off the PACTS staff - and also the public sees the facilitator as someone without an ax to grind
- How is survey info weighted vs. the public forum info?
 - They are just two parts of the process - it’s not that one or the other generates more useful info
 - Some public meetings are loaded with town government or other officials - we are trying to get the “average Joe” to comment

Closing Comments

Each person had a chance to offer a closing comment, such as a reflection about the meeting or a particular hope or concern going forward.

- We need legislative (federal and state) reform in regard to the revenue. If we want to be faithful to alternative transportation, but funded by modally focused means, we have to get at flexibility and revisit the revenue system set up in 1990s.
- Thanks John for organizing this process
- Hope for a positive attitude and getting the public involved in opportunities, not problems
- The bold idea approach rather than piecemeal projects is encouraging
- I like the bold ideas concept, but don’t throw out the baby with the bathwater. We better have creative funding mechanisms - make a move on fuel tax.

- Heard a lot of good discussion. Appreciate the opportunity. How can we move the needle? If this plan is design to create a better transportation system, then it will be a good plan.
- A good process. I like the idea of blend funding with the regular plan. I like the idea of looking at short-term pieces rather than the 50 year piece.
- This was a great planning process headed in direction of a great plan.
- I wasn't bored. Thanks.
- Impressed by how the local county and state are willing to work together. No turf wars. We can work out how to use our money.
- Great process. The key trends show us how complicated it is and how many pieces we need to make it work. The old ways aren't necessarily bad, just need to be tweaked. Be careful how we set up a public survey - can inadvertently influence results. We want regional results.
- Great process. We want more facilitated forums among professionals. Stay at the high level. Use as few experts as possible. Spend money on public outreach. We could do this in 3-4 sessions which also coordinate the public outreach.
- I like the idea of intending to have a results-based plan. It will force this same group to work through tough choices and not leave them for someone else to sort out.
- We've been bold and brave tonight and I hope we pursue seriously the TIP as an incremental plan within a 4-year document.
- We should do more of this type of workshop - thanks to everyone.
- It's going to be hard, but connecting the planning with the funding is very exciting

Dave Marshall closed the meeting with the following remarks:

- Thanks to everyone for coming and participating
- We gained a lot of ground and we have a general framework for moving forward
- Thanks to Craig
- Its' great how everyone's really harnessing a time of change right now
- I hope when we get into sub-regions we can encourage our elected officials and community members to show up and participate
- Thanks everyone for taking the time today.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00pm.