

## 11-14-16 PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING WORKSHOP - FEEDBACK

### **Was the information presented today clear? If not, please describe what part of it was confusing:**

- Yes, but a bit more explanation of the process and the definitions.
- Yes, the information was presented clearly and any questions were quickly cleared up with informative answers.
- It took me a minute to figure out the matrix. More explanation of planning factors would have been helpful.
- Yes (x3)
- Yes, but I think more explanation/thorough definitions would be helpful to facilitate the goal scoring
- Some planning factors seemed very similar – hard to select one over the other.
- Clear for the group, the MAP21 and FAST information may need to be pitched better to citizens, like the way scoring was shown with ice cream, simplicity of understanding.
- No mention about mode neutrality. If mode neutrality is not feasible, at least say there are not mode neutrality and say why (conventional highway approach).
- Why transportation cost is not associated with housing?
- Continue to further define/separate out MAP21 national goals as a few of them are very similar.
- Yes, very well articulated. Slides were a bit illegible. Handouts were excellent.
- For the most part, clarifying the definition would help significantly.

### **How can this presentation/process be improved to facilitate decision maker involvement:**

- Provide close up graphics on the three facilities discussed.
- As discussed, clarifying the goals and the implications of each goal and its weight is really important.
- Understanding context.
- Providing clear details of the specifications used to decide and evaluate applications will benefit
- Clearer definitions and more explanation on how the map relates to the goals.
- Clearer distinctions between planning factors.
- Maybe a “big group” scoring to facilitate conversation and definition of goals/planning factors.
- Where to go with this process because you measure what you want/can! What you do not measure – Transit??
- Grass roots education to policy makers/elected officials so they can be informed and not “swayed” by politics. Emphasis on importance of supporting the process rather than creating their own.
- Discussion with examples of what each planning factor is intended to address.
- Defining the factors will help the process.

### **Which, if any, of the information/process presented today will be objected to by decision makers:**

- In the selection of regional networks to be evaluated as community facilities, make it clear that there are a few exceptions (e.g. Honore Ave from University Parkway to Fruitville Rd).
- I think it will be difficult for many decision makers to make decisions needed to weight the goals because a) the goals are interconnected and could benefit from better clarification and b) I would tend to think that decision makers would tend to not place much above public health and safety, which could have broad implications in how that goal and others are weighted.
- Rural economic development
- Decision makers might have different opinions on which goals to prioritize.
- Decision makers will need to understand the roadway designation and the funding impacts to the facility.
- Roadway network.
- Potentially wanting more roadways to be classified as regional/community rather than just regional. It will be helpful to define what is meant by “regional” in this context.

- It doesn't allow for elected officials to hijack the planning process (and construction process) during an election cycle to gain votes by doing improvements in "concentrated areas".
- None to my knowledge. May find some discussion or debate about specific corridor classification by type.
- It will depend on the metrics and how these factors will be weighted.

**Describe your impression of performance based planning. Please be specific about pros and cons:**

- This is useful in the prioritization of scarce resources.
- I think metrics are crucial, of course, as long as they are well designed and clear. One con is that the metrics could be misleading and achieve something you're not going for if they are misunderstood.
- More emphasis should be placed on multimodal facilities.
- I believe it gives a better view of what is actually happening on the highway system. Additional details and specifications need to be defined.
- It works if the applicable data is available.
- Objective – less scrutiny. Less political/funding less jurisdictional
- What the feds want, the feds get. Data and measurements are essential for 21<sup>st</sup> century and future planning.
- Believe it is a helpful exercise to determine priorities in a very objective manner.
- Pros: Casts a vision for fair and equitable project implementation over the long term. Cons: Limited in ability to fairly evaluate and rank projects given current state or condition of roadway based on previous improvements (or lack thereof).
- Without knowing the metrics of how the factors will be measured makes this difficult to answer, but a good start.

**Other comments:**

- Great presentation, looking forward to working with you all!
- Transportation systems well planned and maintained less likely to receive funding – perceived as punishment for doing a good job.
- Overall great job and exercise, would be very valuable for others throughout Tampa Bay Region.