



POLICY COMMITTEE

August 7, 2015
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

**Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
August 7, 2015 Utilities Conference Room**

Policy Committee minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Audio recordings are on file with the City of Bloomington Planning & Transportation Department.

Attendance:

Policy Committee: Scott Thomas, Ellettsville Town Council; Bill Williams, Monroe County Highway Department; Sarah Ryterband, Citizen's Advisory Committee; Jack Baker, Bloomington Plan Commission; Andy Ruff, Bloomington City Council; Geoff McKim, Monroe County Council; Susie Johnson, City of Bloomington; Jason Banach, IU; Richard Martin, Monroe County Plan Commission; Mark Kruzan, City of Bloomington; Tony McClellan, INDOT

Others: Larry Jacobs, Chamber of Commerce; Lisa Ridge, Monroe County Highway Department

MPO Staff: Josh Desmond, Anna Dragovich

- I. Call to Order
- II. Communications from the Chair- None at this time
- III. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - a. Citizens Advisory Committee- There was no meeting in July.
 - b. Technical Advisory Committee- There was no meeting in July.
- IV. Reports from the MPO Staff
 - a. TIP Administrative Modification- Anna Dragovich reported on an administrative modification we sent around by email. The reason we can do this is it's a very minor shift in funding. The public participation plan allows us to approve this modification with the signature of the Policy Committee chair and the MPO director. The process goes, we send out what the changes will be and the Policy Committee has three days to approve it or deny it. We heard no objections so the modification was approved.
 - b. Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year 2015 Quarterly Report- Dragovich presented. The last Quarterly Tracking meeting was on July 8. We have a number of new projects that are just now starting to be tracked. The tracking form is included in the packet. All the existing projects are shown with the normal reporting where we show the project progress as well as the cost tracking. There are no red flags. All the projects are on track for their letting dates. She requested input on the tracking process and how information is presented in the report.

Ruff said he went through the report. It did take a lot of time, but I don't know what you're going to do? Are you going to put a lot of time to come up with a summary?

Ryterband added it's part of their job.

V. Old Business

VI. New Business

- a. Complete Streets Policy Review- The Complete Streets Policy was adapted in 2009. The policy dictates we reevaluate it at the same time we are redeveloping the MTP. Staff is undertaking that project concurrently with rewriting the MTP. I'm starting that process and taking the policy through the committees. I'm anticipating it to be a lot of work for the TAC and the CAC to vet ideas and priorities and then report to the PC each month. I'm hoping to have a new policy adopted by the end of December, but we'll see how that goes. To kick off this evaluation, I wanted to solicit some feedback from the PC. I sought the guidance of a group called Smart Growth America. They're a national non-profit made up of several organizations. One of their organizations is the National Complete Streets Coalition. They've been a really great resource. They have a document for the 2014 Best Complete Streets policies. I included a link in your packet. Every year they grade every Complete Streets policies in the nation. We are one of them. It was great to be able to see where we were lacking and where we could do better in comparison with our peers. I'd like to run through those with you.

Ruff said in all the categories where we didn't get all the points except for one there was an explanation why we didn't get the points, but on one of them.

Dragovich said the first category we could use some work according to Smart Growth America would be the All Projects and All Phases category. Our policy right now says it will apply to reconstruction and new construction of projects. We could include projects that need maintenance.

Ruff asked for examples of what you would do during maintenance to make the project a complete street.

Ryterband said we did it on Rogers where a bike lane was added when a project was resurfaced.

Dragovich said there are advantages and disadvantages to doing that. For instance, that project didn't use federal funding. We tend not to use federal funding for pavement projects. We would have to have a greater discussion about the limitations and advantages of including maintenance and operations in our complete streets policy.

McKim said it doesn't seem to be saying every repainting or minor repair would have to involve construction of some elaborate additional facility for other modal users. I think it's just the idea that you use it as an opportunity to see if there's something else you can do. So even if it's just something as simple as resurfacing, might you also be able to stripe a bike lane? Are there just some minor design changes you could make that would make it easier for people with disabilities?

Dragovich said you could do things like curb ramps or reconstructing an adjacent side walk. That would definitely be an advantage of including these things in our complete streets policy.

Martin said the difficulty will be keeping the same kind of waiver we have for new construction. There we have to explicitly state why we're not doing a complete street. If we start including all these maintenance tasks and we end up having to write waivers for all those, I think over time that would diminish the value of a complete streets policy because we would be waiving it so much. If we're going to do something that adds those other categories of expense, we don't want to treat them in the same way we treat the reconstruction so we have to have waivers all the time to actually get anything done.

McKim said this wouldn't say you have to.

Martin said that's the way it's worded now, so we'd have to figure out a different kind of language for those projects.

Ryterband said we could probably find people who could manage to do that. Our LPAs would consider those things and would be prepared to answer questions when they're raised by the CAC or any other citizen forum. I don't think it would have to be worded in a way that demanded those things happen every time we do a maintenance project.

Martin said he thinks we should be considering it, we just have to be careful about how we do it. We don't want to be driving up our expense of preparation which only results in a waiver. That's doing something that doesn't have a positive outcome.

Ryterband doesn't want us to be buried in paperwork because nothing gets done then either, but she does want to raise the specter of possibility in everyone's mind along the way.

Martin asked who would be the appropriate body for wording something like that.

Dragovich said Smart Growth America could probably do everything for us. They have a lot of great resources that provide sample language from other policies across the nation. I would encourage us to make it our own.

Ryterband said the CAC started our Complete Streets policy and fostered it along the way. Along with using Smart Growth, I could see CAC taking a big piece of this as our challenge.

Dragovich would like to provide the TAC and CAC with some sample language, see what it would look like and have further discussion.

Baker asked if the CAC and the Bike and Pedestrian Safety Commission could meet together about this. The Bike and Ped group has a lot of depth and has worked on this before. They may be able to give some positive language.

Susie Johnson asked what maintenance items any LPA has ever taken on that wasn't new construction that's funded by the MPO.

Bill Williams said the State of Indiana doesn't allow it.

Johnson said we're creating an enormous amount of work for something that doesn't happen. The LPAs don't come to the MPO for maintenance funding.

Dragovich said they have the option and it might be safe to have the language in the policy so when it does happen we know what to do and we can have that larger conversation.

Baker asked Johnson if the LPAs don't come to us because these aren't federally funded projects.

Johnson said that is right. The only time we've used MPO funding for a maintenance project was when we repaved S. Walnut with ARRA funding. I think if there are projects the MPO wants to work on and put resources towards, it should be something that's really going to happen.

Baker said that begs the question of whether we should continue to limit Complete Streets to federally funded projects or expand them to all projects.

Johnson said the MPO doesn't have any jurisdiction over that other funding.

Baker said the MPO doesn't have jurisdiction over operations, maintenance and repaving because it doesn't come in to the MPO.

Dragovich said that leads me to the next section of the policy. In some policies it expresses the need to work with area jurisdictions to encourage them to adopt and carry out their Complete Streets Policies and include that in their projects. Our policy doesn't state that, but that could be something that would be easy to do that could strengthen it. The next category where we could use a little work is the performance measures area. This would be doing things like counting miles of bike lanes, number of upgraded curb ramps, number of new bus stops, things like that. For our MTP we have to include performance measures. We could maybe carry some of those over into our Complete Streets policy if we wanted to. Right now, we don't have any performance measures in our policy. Finally are the implementation steps. This is a pretty big one. We don't have much that outlines how we will execute our policy. We do have one thing that's pretty great in our policy and that's that it says our LPAs will report to the committees of the MPO twice a year in how their projects have complied with the Complete Streets Policy. That's kind of changed lately, because we have rolled it into our Quarterly Tracking Process and so they're actually doing it four times per year, but we could do more. Smart Growth America makes really great suggestions. I wanted to include some examples of implementation. I've seen some communities where they have a specific Complete Streets implementation committee that meets often and discusses projects before conception. They're made up of stake holders, MPO committees, everybody involved in a project. This has probably its own pros and cons when you have a big group, but it would be one way that, if we were interested, we could help to implement the policy and make sure everyone's interests are at the very least heard. I would love to gather more examples for you, too, as time goes on.

Ruff said this seems like a significant short coming. Is there anything we should be thinking about in the interim?

Dragovich encouraged them to read the guide. This implementation piece is a really big piece we're missing. I think it's great our policy now mandates we evaluate it periodically. This can also be considered implementation.

Baker said he's looking at item 4 which is for developing and implementing a better way to measure performance and collect data. That's being done regularly by Planning and the MPO. It seems to me we just need to slide that in to the Complete Streets Policy pretty much as is. Couldn't we do that? Or are we not doing it well enough?

Dragovich agrees. We don't have it written in to the policy. We do collect things like traffic volume but we could do a better job of collecting data. The MPO doesn't define what data we want to collect which gets back to we don't have any performance measures that we're collecting. We would have to set up the processes to do that, which is part of implementation as well.

Baker said he is thinking about the Long Term Plan and getting ready for the testing on the Travel Demand Model, there was a lot of data being collected. It seems that could be part of the data collection process for Complete Streets. I think it fits not only automobile data, but I think there was also some pedestrian, transit, and so on collected as part of that.

Dragovich said that is a great place to start. We could take the performance measures we gathered for the MTP and include them in our Complete Streets policy. The thing is, we would decide if we want to continue to collect that data going forward.

Ryterband noticed in the implementation steps it suggests to offer workshops and other training opportunities to transportation staff, community leaders, and the general public so everyone understands the importance of the vision. We currently have webinars. We may not have communicated it to the community or let them know their opportunity for participating, but we are doing that and we have been for several years. We might have another point there.

Dragovich said that is one point I heard from the TAC and the CAC that they wanted more education opportunities. Someone had brought up that they feel there's a misunderstanding of what Complete Streets are. It's such a broad topic that it can be interpreted in a number of ways. The CAC suggested we all get on the same page about what it means to have Complete Streets.

Martin said the webinars we've been offered in the past are more ad hoc opportunities rather than instituted programs and workshops, which is maybe what they're looking for, so it may not qualify under this criteria.

Baker said it seems within the MPO we have some statements that we are using- or will use- up-to-date, modern design criteria. If we're already doing that within the MPO guidelines, is it a matter of simply moving that in to the Complete Streets? We're already doing it, so let's put some verbiage in there that gives us some credibility.

Dragovich said it seems like there are some things we're doing already that we can solidify by putting language into the policy. In regard to best practices, we could even just call out specific guidelines, like ASHTO guidelines. This is a big project and we'll keep you updated.

Martin asked what the next action would be with regard to this.

Dragovich would like to go through the comments from the TAC and CAC and prioritize those items. We received a lot of comments. I want to go through and refine that list and determine where we want to focus our energy.

- b. 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan- Desmond presented. What you found in your packet under the 2040 MTP section is three different pieces. We're working on a big document. At some point, hopefully later in the fall, we'll be coming to you with the complete document to review and adopt, but we didn't want to just drop it on you without any preparation. We felt it was important to bring a few pieces for you at first before we

start the MTP adoption process which will be a challenging process in and of itself. These are three pieces that staff has been working on, some with the consultant and some just with MPO staff.

The model is finally all corrected and fixed from the issues that popped up several months ago. It's been validated in terms of giving the type of results we expected to get under the different scenarios. Our consultant is now running those initial 10 or 12 scenarios we asked them to do. Those should be done by the end of next week, so we should be getting some results pretty soon. We'll finally get some outputs and start understanding what the future may hold for our transportation system. Once those are prepared, our consultant is going to come and install the model locally and train our MPO staff so we have the ability to run further scenarios. I'm certain the first ones we ran will probably not be enough. We'll have to run some other combinations and other ideas to help pinpoint where we think we're headed in terms of the performance of our transportation system for 2040. I think we're getting a pretty great product at the end of that process.

The first piece we want to provide to you is a proposed document outline. The way we're developing the document, which we have tentatively titled Transform 2040, is to try to find a balance between providing a technical foundation- all the data that is the foundation for all our decisions- with being a user-friendly document, as well as making sure we hit all the planning requirements from all the federal regulations. There's a balance we have to strike between making sure we meet all our marks from a regulatory standpoint, making sure we have all the technical data properly documented for people to review, and making sure the plan itself is very clear and easy to use. We want to make sure folks like you, who are making decisions on things over the next several years under this plan have the clear and direct guidance you need to make those decisions and that folks from the public really understand what the plan's all about if they pick it up. So, having never read a plan, they can easily get from point A to point B and understand this is why we wrote the plan, this is what we're hoping to do in the future and this is how we're going to do it. It's a tough balance but we think we have an outline that's going to get us there. This is the outline we're working on right now, but it's all in flux. We're open to comments and suggestions as we go along.

There will be an executive summary at the beginning, but that will just be a summary of everything that's in the plan as those usually are. We've divided the plan into four sections that we think are pretty simply defined. Number 1, Who We Are, Number 2, Where We Are, Number 3 Where We're Going and Number 4 How We're Going to Get There. These are the four basic steps that lead us from what we're doing today to what's going to happen tomorrow and how are we going to best develop the transportation system for the future. The first section is going to describe the plan itself, what it means, why we're doing one, what it's all about, what are the planning requirements we're trying to fill as well as our overall vision, goals and objective for the MPO and for the transportation system in our region. Where We Are is going to get a little more specific about the region we serve, give us a little more background in the profile of our communities and region, give a good description and analysis of all modes in our transportation system- what we have in terms of services now- and what is the state of those services in our region right now. Where We're Going is where we're going to start getting in to our future projections in terms of population growth, employment growth, travel growth and how those three factors relate to each other. What we think the future transportation conditions are going to be as a result of that growth and change as well as what the anticipated needs for our system are going to be as a result of all that. Finally, How We Get There is where we're really making the plan. We're talking about performance measurement, what's our financial outlook- how much we can actually

afford to invest- which is a key part of this process, what are our infrastructure and service investments we want to make, what is that plan for the next 25 years and what are some additional policies and strategies we need to implement to make sure we're meeting all of our marks as far as our vision and our goals for the region and our transportation. That will include things such as our performance measures, such as our Complete Streets policy and any other things we think are applicable as part of this process. We are working on several pieces within this outline trying to get a lot of different pieces done while we wait for the model to come in and get to the heart of the matter. Like I said, this is just an outline. It can be tweaked and fixed and moved around a little bit. This is not the first outline we've written up. It's evolved over time as we've looked at the various things we need to include in the document. We think we have a pretty good basis going forward now, but we're open to change as we get input from folks like yourselves and our other committees.

There's some really good information in the Vision Statement, Goals and Objectives. Hopefully you will find that to your liking. This is one of the first sections staff tackled. We actually wrote a lot of this a long time ago and have refined it since. We spent a lot of time talking with our MTP task force to figure out what the vision statement is going to say and what the goals and objectives related to the vision statement need to be. This is a situation where we're just getting initial early feedback on this. It has come a long way from where those discussions started but we still have some time to go and we're certainly open to hearing your comments and thoughts on what we've included there. The vision, goals, and objectives is one of our key decision making tools as we write the document. Hopefully, we can all agree on what our vision is for the future of our MPO area and then we can use that vision and the goals we set based on that vision to help make our decisions in terms of where we invest our transportation dollars in the future and are we investing in things that are going help us achieve our vision somewhere down the road. I won't read every single statement. There's a lot in there and hopefully you've had the chance to review some of it. I will review the five main categories of goals we've set up which came from conversations with our task force and the rounds of public input we've done over the last couple of years. That where we get the foundation of the vision, the goals, the objectives, etc. The five categories are mobility and accessibility, transit, community, safety, and then a category called rebuild and renew. Those are focus areas we really heard from the public and our task force and then tried to get a little more fine grained in what those categories really mean and what should we be trying to achieve. You will notice this section is dressed up in a document format to give you an idea what the possible look and feel of the new plan might be. Hopefully you're familiar from earlier in the year with what our existing 2035 LRTP looks like. This is a little different from that. The cosmetic stuff is always subject to change, but we thought we'd at least give you an idea of how this might look when you see the final document.

We are developing a brand new travel demand model to replace the one that is 10+ years old now that was used for the previous plans. The new model is much more sophisticated, more sensitive to different factors we can test, and it provides us with a lot more useful data we can use as part of our decision making process. We run a lot of scenarios, we look at different growth and development scenarios for the future- fast growth, slow growth, dense growth, sprawl growth- and we look at different project scenarios, what type of projects should we be doing. Do we invest heavily in transit and not a lot in roads, do we do a lot of new roads and not a lot of bike and ped stuff? Which of those combinations really make the most sense when you compare them with the growth and development we think is going to happen through the year 2040. In order to really evaluate those scenarios, we need to have a common set of data outputs so we have some sort of semi-objective basis to judge which scenario is going to be the best one. It's still going to require a lot of judgment on our part in terms of defining which

scenario and which combination of projects we think is the best for our region. It will probably be impossible for a single scenario to win on every single performance measure. There are going to have to be some tradeoffs in terms of which performance measures we want to prioritize so we can determine which is the most successful scenario we could select. We might add a lot of capacity in terms of roadways to bring down our travel times and increase our travel speeds, but that might emit a ton of greenhouse gasses, which goes against another principle we're trying to do in terms of the environmental performance measures. So what is the tradeoff, what is the balance between things like that? Every choice we make is going to have benefits and cost. The model is a decision making tool, it is not the decision maker. We, as policy makers, are the absolute decision makers. The model will inform those decisions. Likewise, our vision and goals will inform those decisions. We want to make sure when we select our projects and our strategies we're doing things that are not only performing well on the performance measures of the model, but also meeting the vision and goals we set out at the beginning of this process. I put a list of those proposed performance measures in there. That list is a little dated. I was able to get a more updated list from our consultant in the last couple of days which I outlined in a technical memorandum. He will give us a series of technical memorandums that document how the model was built, what choices were made, where the data came from, what performance we're measuring. There are five categories of performance measures we're going to be looking at, each with several actual performance measures within it. Some of them are pretty straightforward while others will required more explanation. The five categories are travel demand, system efficiency, safety, environment, and economic. We've got a wide variety of pieces of data that will come out for every single scenario. We can line them up on a spreadsheet with scenarios 1-10 with performance measures down the side to see how each scenario performs to figure out which one is the best fit. Most of the performance measures are pretty straightforward. In travel demand we have the following performance measures: vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled (how much time people are spending on the road within our network), work trip vehicle occupancy (the average number of vehicle occupants for work trips), total person trips regardless of mode, transit share (the share of people riding transit versus other modes of travel), daily ridership on transit, number of transit trips, transit person miles and transit person hours, what is the non-motorized share of transportation, total non-motorized trips, non-motorized person miles and non-motorized travel hours. System efficiency has the following performance measures: vehicle hours under delayed conditions, average pm peak speed, average auto trip length, lane miles at level of service (LOS) E or worse (when using an A-F system to grade miles we typically we look for an LOS D, so this is to see how many roads are below that level), transit accessibility to residences, transit accessibility to jobs, average wait time for transit, urban design score (more information on this will be provided under another category), and non-motorized accessibility (how many jobs are accessible within 20 minutes travel by non-motorized mode). Safety is obviously a huge factor in any community. We will measure for expected fatal accidents, expected injury accidents, expected property damage accidents, and then there's a bike suitability factor that measures both bike and pedestrian accidents. We'll come back to that one, too, but it's basically looking at roads and corridors and determining how suited they are for a bicyclist or pedestrian to use as their travel mode. Environment, we wanted to touch on vehicle emissions in terms of greenhouse gasses. Economic has some interesting factors as well including roadway user costs (monetizing the time spent in travel as well as the operating costs of owning and operating a vehicle and what increasing costs may impact our travel network), capacity added to meet standards (how many lane miles we would need to improve to get all lane miles that do not meet LOS D up to that level of service), total cost of capacity improvements (how much will it cost to get to the point where all lane miles meet LOS D), prosperity index (housing costs plus transportation costs in each of our Travel Analysis Zones compared to the regional average as well as to each other

so we can see if we are disproportionately affecting certain regions with difference scenarios), regional GDP change (how our transportation investments are affecting the economy in certain areas), regional personal income change. The bicycle and pedestrian suitability factor is looking at roads, the speeds of vehicles, how much room there is on the roads, what's the comfort level provided for a bicycle or pedestrian, are there actual facilities like a sidewalk or bike lane, etc. The urban design score is called 5D because there are five areas of analysis which all start with the letter "D" including density, diversity, design (how far people have to travel and how easy it is to get to your destination), destinations (how many commercial establishments are within a 10 minute walk), distance to transit. Those all combine for an overall urban design score. We can see how each output is functioning in terms of urban design and connects to the goals laid out in our vision.

We're going to produce and analyze the initial scenarios and we hope to present those to you next time. The performance measures may be more understandable with actual data so you can see what that output looks like. We'll get the model installed in the office, we need to do our financial forecast through the year 2040 to make sure we understand what we have to invest over the next 25 years. We also need to come up with a project cost estimation methodology so we can take our list of projects and have an easy methodology to say we want to build a road here for x distance, it's going to cost us this much money so we can use those numbers versus our financial forecast so we can understand when and where we need to make our investments. We may not have enough money for all the projects we want to do, so then we'll have to do some tradeoffs and prioritize what's really important to us and how soon we need to get those things built. Those things will start to come together more once we get through the scenario work and start understanding what direction we want to start going in terms of our investments.

McKim asked if Desmond will be sending the technical memorandum.

Desmond said that will be provided.

Ryterband had questions about the urban design variables. In destinations, it says commercial establishments and jobs within a 10 minute walk. In italics it says 0.1677 miles, which is a 1 mile per hour walking rate. Is that a standard walking rate?

Desmond said that is what was provided by our consultant. I'm assuming that's a standard they generally use in that calculation.

Johnson asked if that was slow.

Ryterband said most people probably walk 2 miles an hour. The other question is distance to transit. In units, the description is number of stops within 5 miles via transit. I wasn't sure where that is being measure from. From any given spot or from a home or from a destination?

Desmond said destination is the key part of that. When we're doing a model we're looking at trips from home either to work or to shop. So it's probably looking at employment locations or retail locations and saying, from those locations what is the diversity of stops. I think there's a separate factor that looks at distance from home to transit. This is looking at the distance from transit to the final destination.

McKim asked if you distinguish between different store types when you look at access to shopping. For example, it would be more important to have access to a grocery store than a clothing store.

Desmond doesn't believe it distinguishes between different types of stores. We wouldn't break down the type of employer, either.

McKim asked how private shuttle buses, for example nursing home buses or apartment complex shuttles, are categorized in the model.

Desmond said we haven't accounted for private services. We have RT, BT, and IU's transit service fixed in, but shuttles aren't necessarily fixed routes.

Johnson said that is an excellent question. Often there are planning variances given based on the fact there is a shuttle.

McKim asked how taxis were accounted.

Desmond said those are included as "premium transit". That was one of other updates we did.

Martin said we've spent a lot of time collecting the data to do this model. When we adopt this plan we'll be obligated to update it in 5 years. Some of these measures are easy to take but others are hard to get and they can be expensive to get. Are we committing ourselves to doing this whole process again in 5 years? Some of the easy measures you can keep track of, some of the harder one's you're not going to keep track of because we're not going to give you the money to do it. How do we get all of these various performance measures back in sync? They all have an impact on the outcome of any of these modelling scenarios.

Desmond said we will have to continue to maintain and update as we go forward. The 5 year review of the plan is not typically as in depth as the full writing of the plan if we feel conditions on the ground haven't changed enough to alter our conclusions. That's what we did last time around. We will have to be much more on top of our data collection and making sure we keep the inputs to the model fresh and relevant so the outputs are still relevant as well.

Martin said it might be worth doing some early model runs with the harder measures removed to see what impact not having that information might have on the model. That's a more likely scenario for us to be using the future when we don't have that up-to-date information. I'd like to see how performance measures are aligned with the objectives. It would be nice to know what's being considered as relevant to each of the objectives you identified.

Ruff said what Martin says is so important. Your anticipated needs are going to be largely set on what your goals and priorities are. If you don't make that connection and make it really explicit and then you have a break down, then there's a lot of waste time.

Desmond showed a matrix that outlines how the categories of goals and categories of performance measures tie together.

Martin said he would like to see the goals broken down to the individual objectives. If some of the objectives have no performance measures, we're going to have a more difficult time determining whether or not we've met that objective.

Ryterband asked if the MTP task force would meet again.

Desmond said it's time to get all the committees involved in the conversation as we roll out draft material in the interest of time. That way when we have a plan ready to adopt everyone is up to speed.

Ryterband asked when this will go to the public.

Desmond said we're waiting on the results from the model first to make sure it's worth putting out for public comment or if we still need to do more work. Hopefully sooner rather than later, but we don't have a date just yet.

Martin said under environmental we're only talking about greenhouse gasses. One of the things that constantly comes to us in the planning and zoning arena are surface drainage issues that are caused by impervious surfaces. Roadways are the primary impervious surface we have. Is there any consideration being given about how we manage surface drainage? I know we have various strategies we employ in the county, which may be different than those that are being employed in the city but I think it's an issue that might be worth thinking about in terms of a transportation plan.

Desmond said he's not sure there's anything we can do with the model, but certainly from a policy and recommendation perspective we can talk about that and how it relates to the projects we do.

- VII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*) - Martin said the County is getting very close to a new comprehensive plan for the Monroe County Urbanizing Area Plan. That plan will have implications for transportation. It might be good that you notify all of the MPOS there will be a hearing on August 24th and the document is available on the County's planning website. They ought to take a look at it with respect to transportation issues that are of interest to them because it does outline increased transportation activity in some areas.
- a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas

VIII. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – August 26, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – August 26, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)
- c. Policy Committee – September 11, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

**Action Requested / Public comment prior to vote (limited to five minutes per speaker)*

These minutes were adopted by the Policy Committee at their meeting held on September 11, 2015 (EJEA).