



RP3 Working Group
Friday, February 17, 2017 – 10:30 am
Hillsborough County Center
18th Floor, Planning Commission Manatee Room
Tampa, FL 33602

Meeting Minutes

Working Group Members Present:

Michael Case, TBARTA
Anthony Matonti, TBARTA (via phone)
Manny Lajmiri, Pasco MPO
Johnny Wong, Hillsborough MPO
Hilary Lehman, Forward Pinellas
Hugh Pascoe, Pascoe Planning, TBARTA
Rich Clarendon, Hillsborough MPO (alternate)
Dave Hutchinson, Sarasota/Manatee MPO (via phone)
Ronnie Blackshear, Polk TPO (arrived at 10:35 am)

Working Group Members Absent:

Dennis Dix, Citrus/Hernando MPO
Steve Diez, Citrus/Hernando MPO (alternate)
Ryan Kordek, Polk TPO, (alternate)
Justyna Buszewski, Pasco MPO (alternate)
Leigh Holt, Sarasota/Manatee MPO (alternate)
Chelsea Favero, Forward Pinellas (alternate)

Call to Order

- Mr. Case, TBARTA, called the meeting to order at 10:30 am.

Approval of minutes from January 13, 2017

- Mr. Case asked members if there were any revisions or additions; there were none
- Minutes approved

RP3 MOE Progress Report

- Mr. Case presented information about the Progress Report
- TBARTA has initiated Visibility and Productivity Objectives
 - Engaging BIG Sea / Think Tank for website analytics
 - Currently reviewing effectiveness of meetings, publications, and processes including LEP Title VI
- Next meeting will include a draft report of progress for review by the group.

Presentation/Discussion Items

➤ ***Summary of Recent National Transit Institute (NTI) Public Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making Seminar, Hilary Lehman, Forward Pinellas***

Ms. Lehman discussed the 3-day workshop and takeaways on how transportation entities should conduct public involvement activities, including techniques and conflict resolution; and, use-interest based problem solving strategies.

- Mr. Pascoe commented that sometimes you get public comment after the plan has been made. Ms. Lehman agreed and stressed that is why those early stages are so important in gathering public comment and earning public trust. Giving the stakeholders a chance to provide meaningful comment that can impact the plan is important.
- Mr. Clarendon asked about differences in the processes when long term plans are involved

versus short term plans and how the public process changes depending on what level of government is handling the process. Ms. Lehman stressed that transparency is key and making sure that the public understands the time frame. Mr. Lajmiri agreed that the public can be impatient and he notices at MPO meetings that the public wants the projects to happen now, not 20 years from now. He added that TIP plans are 5 year plans and that can help solve the disconnect along with explaining why we need to set priorities 20 or 30 years out. Mr. Pascoe agreed and said that trying to explain the transportation planning process can be difficult, especially at the regional level.

- Mr. Pascoe added that DOT should be involved in this working group. Mr. Case responded that FDOT has been invited to participate, but has not responded, but he will continue reaching out.
- Mr. Blackshear commented that we should look at projects from the past and prove to the public and policy makers that we've learned from lessons of the past. Mr. Clarendon added that having the information be as simple and transparent as possible, but you still will have critics. TBX was brought up as an example – the public commentary period was 30 years ago, but the project was shelved due to funding. Mr. Pascoe added that we need to stress the “local hook” for each project and figure out how to present that to the public.
- Mr. Hutchinson asked about the requirements for the regional public involvement. Will these efforts replace the MPO requirements of public involvement?

➤ **Overview of Public Involvement Strategies and Process Measurement from Southeast Florida Transportation Council (SEFTC), MetroPlan Orlando, and Hillsborough County MPO, Hugh Pascoe, TBARTA**

- Mr. Pascoe presented the different strategies and process measurement tools from different regional public involvement plans around Florida.
 - He noted the 18-page document in the packet with facts and figures about the different programs and requirements.
 - He added that it's important to address the relevancy of the project to the local population and address the ways the project will affect them, both positive and negative (local hook).
 - Mr. Clarendon added that the people that can make it to the meetings are not representative of the whole and that the average citizen probably doesn't know the MPO exists. Mr. Pascoe agreed and added that he likes the term “public engagement” better than public involvement. Mr. Hutchinson commented that some of the umbrella agencies have local money that has more flexibility in how it can be spent. For example, they can buy refreshments for their meetings.
 - Mr. Pascoe noted that even with the best processes, sometimes people just don't show up to meetings. He added that a regional working group can be the most effective. Mr. Clarendon clarified that some events are planned by the community and planners should take the opportunity to try to get on the agenda and speak at those meetings. Mr. Pascoe agreed and added that linking activities and meetings is a useful strategy as well. He also added that tailoring the strategies to your area and sharing the results with this working group are a good process.
 - Mr. Pascoe stressed that we shouldn't get locked up in quantification of performance. Officials and government professionals know if their strategies are working or not.
 - Ms. Lehman agreed and stated that the questions she gets about the public involvement processes have changed to more results oriented and less number oriented.
 - Mr. Blackshear asked if all MPOs have traditional CACs. Mr. Pascoe answered that for most MPOs, the CAC is the public involvement group. Mr. Blackshear discussed the Advisory Forum that they have in Polk County in place of the CAC. Each forum has a specific focus like bicycle/pedestrian issues and senior safety. Mr. Pascoe requested more information on that process and the results and Mr. Blackshear agreed to distribute that information. Mr. Hutchinson asked if there was opposition to disbanding the CAC and maybe the Forum model could be more efficient. Mr. Blackshear stated that the Federal government liked that process.

- Ms. Lehman added that clarification on where local public involvement crosses over to regional public involvement needs to be outlined in the final joint public participation plan.

➤ ***TBARTA-CCC 2013 Joint Public Participation Plan Effort and Results, Rich Clarendon, Hillsborough MPO***

- Mr. Clarendon summarized the effort and the process that went into creating the plan. The document was drafted in July 2013 and was approved by the CCC, but never approved by the TBARTA Board.
 - He added that the brand phrase One Region, One Plan, One Voice is still in use, but the decision-making structure has changed: the JCAC was replaced with the TBARTA CAC and the CCC is now a subcommittee of TBARTA.
 - Mr. Hutchinson asked if the budget is included in the decision-making process. Mr. Clarendon clarified that these numbers were tied the selection of strategies in the toolbox and to public involvement efforts for the Master Plan update, and that costs were expected to be modest in years between. The thought was for CCC members to split the cost for TBARTA to conduct regional public involvement tasks either in a separate agreement or within the staff services scope between the two bodies.
 - Mr. Case asked what was the relationship between the 2012 MOE and the draft document. Mr. Clarendon responded that the 2013 document did try to build off it. Mr. Case asked if there was a working group for this plan. Mr. Clarendon responded that there was a working group that helped with the project. Mr. Pascoe added that it takes the right people to work together and cooperate, as public engagement requires a lot of work, and the regional level, it is key have interagency coordination know who is responsible for what. Mr. Case agreed and added that the budgetary concerns need to be addressed, and that strategies and target measures should be representative of what we can do and what is needed. Equitably sharing federal resources to adequately fund public participation would be a necessity.

General Discussion/Roundtable

- No additional questions or comments.

Next Meeting Date and Location

- TBARTA Office, May 19, 2017 at 10:30am

Adjournment 12:08 pm