

**ASHLAND DOWNTOWN PARKING MANAGEMENT & CIRCULATION AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
August 13, 2014**

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. in Pioneer Hall, 73 Winburn Way
Regular members present: Pam Hammond, Michael Dawkins, Rich Kaplan, Dave Young, Craig Anderson, John Williams, Emile Amarotico (left at 4:55), Joe Collonge, Lisa Beam, Marie Donovan, Liz Murphy and John Fields (arrived at 3:42)

Regular members absent: Cynthia Rider

Ex officio (non-voting) members present: Sandra Slattery, Bill Molnar, Rich Rosenthal, and Lee Tuneberg

Ex officio (non-voting) members absent: Mike Gardiner, Katharine Flanagan, Mike Faught and Dennis Slattery

City of Ashland Staff members present: Tami De Mille-Campos

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of July 2, 2014

Minutes approved by unanimous consent.

PUBLIC FORUM

Email dated 8/6/2014 from Barb Barasa (included as attachment to minutes)

POLICY OPTIONS SURVEY RESULTS

Note: Detailed survey results may be found on the City's website under City Commissions "Downtown Parking Management and Circulation Ad Hoc Advisory Committee"

Survey Context:

Evaluated community support for various policy options

Administered May-June 2014

Distributed via e-mail, City's website, and through City Source newsletter (utility bill)

239 Total Respondents

Characteristics of Respondents:

Survey Respondent Type	Number	Percent
Employee	79	35%
Business Owner	43	19%
Resident	147	64%
Visitor	32	14%
Other	11	5%
Total Respondents	228	

Implications:

#1 Focus on incremental short-term strategies

- Respondents supported increases and improvements in wayfinding signage
- Respondents did not express clear support for one type of wayfinding signage
- Informational campaign should be coordinated and available through a variety of mediums
- Respondents support outreach programs to educate downtown employees about the value of parking

2 Effective Transportation Demand Management strategies will need to integrate a number of approaches

- Incentive programs are supported but responses suggest they may not be effective

- Majority supported satellite parking lots with trolley service
- Respondents did not express strong support for pedestrian infrastructure improvements

#3 Respondents think multi-modal infrastructure improvements should be focused on bicycles

- Bicycle infrastructure improvements are the preferred method for encouraging bicycling
- Many respondents indicated they would not use bicycle infrastructure improvements

#4 Regulatory, enforcement, and pricing strategies will be controversial

- Respondents were not supportive of increased regulation and enforcement
- Respondents supported changes to loading zone restrictions
- Respondents supported the development of another parking garage, though with varying support for time frames
- Metered parking strategies are not supported; many respondents said it would deter them from visiting downtown

Discussion: John Williams stated he wasn't surprised by the responses. They seemed somewhat unrealistic in several cases. Such as, having visitors pay for the shuttle, educating employers to get their employees to not drive to work etc. Rich said he was interested in the responses to the paid parking; specifically that paid parking would deter some people from actually visiting downtown.

CIRCULATOR TROLLEY (see attached trolley white paper for details)

Trolley Context:

- Discussions of trolley feasibility studies since 2001 Downtown Plan
- Initial route and cost estimates outlined in the 2012 Transportation System Plan (TSP)
- CPW conducted their own analysis of case studies and back of the envelope estimates based on survey data

Questions for Consideration:

- Who will the trolley serve?
 - Residents, visitors, employees, students
- With what frequency and where will the route run?
 - Dependent on riders
- How will the trolley be financed?
 - Initial (capital) costs
 - Operating Costs
 - Cost of ridership
- Who will oversee the operation of the trolley?

Needed New Route:

- Examined possibility of neighborhood circulator
 - Too many stops, too much distance to travel, and not enough riders for cost effectiveness
- Decided straight line from Exit 14 to Exit 19 is the best "bang for the buck"

Proposed Route Details:

- Would serve employee commuters, visitors, students and some residents
- Could serve the construction of satellite parking lots
- 11 mile round trip, frequency of 15 minutes
- Similar to Coral Gables and West Palm Beach trolley lines

Annual Costs:

- Didn't examine initial start up (capital) costs
- Operating costs estimated at \$1 million
 - Based on route length and number of stops from case studies

- Calculated how many riders are needed for a specific fare to cover operating costs

Revenue Estimates:

Approximate Ashland visitors	350,000
Approximate Ashland employees	2,839
Fare per round trip	\$2.00
50% Ridership taking 3 trips per year	\$1,050,000
75% ridership taking 2 trips per year	\$1,050,000

Sources: Ashland Chamber of Commerce, Oregon QCEW, CPW Policy Options Survey

CPW Recommendation:

- Is it a feasible option?
 - Yes
- Does the math pencil out?
 - Maybe
- Recommend a full feasibility analysis be conducted

Creative Funding Strategies:

- Revenue from naming rights goes to endowment to pay annual operating costs
- Employers whom benefit help offset operating costs
- Saving money through trolley rentals instead of ownership
- Charter services can be used to help offset costs if trolleys are purchased

Discussion: Question was raised regarding how this might interfere with RVTD's bus route and it was stressed that it isn't intended to have any effect on RVTD; hopefully it would complement RVTD and provide another mode of transportation. The committee also raised concern regarding the trolley being able to handle, at times, approximately 2,000 attendees coming out of the Shakespeare shows around 11:00 pm. It was pointed out the trolley doesn't have to be designed to handle shuttling 2,000 people at a time. Many of the festival goers walk to their hotel/bed & breakfast. It is designed to provide another mode of transportation. There was some concern with the capital cost of the trolleys which the Transportation System Plan (TSP) estimated at close to three quarters of a million dollars each. Emphasis was given that the trolleys could be designed however they see fit. The Committee questioned whether a subcommittee might be necessary to vet the trolley details. A comment was made that this trolley idea keeps coming up and then it ends up fizzling out for a variety of reasons; Ashland doesn't seem to really support mass transit. If the City moves forward with the feasibility study there is hope that some research would be done to see why that is & why RVTD hasn't been very successful even when it was free. Also, what evidence is there that there is a tangible return on the investment to purchase and operate a trolley system. CPW remarked the feasibility study would get to that level. Chair Young pointed out the intent behind this trolley wasn't to be cute and fun. He said the committee hasn't even looked at the public/private partnerships which he had hoped they would. There may be hotels interested in participating in a partnership in lieu of running their own shuttles. Joe stated he would ride the trolley everyday if it were an option. Members of the committee are open to the idea of having an alternative mode of transportation but are concerned with cost, ridership etc. Michael added that during the Transportation System Plan (TSP) process there were a number of them that felt that what Ashland needed its own separate circulation system and use the bigger bus system to get people to the outlying cities. The committee would like to see data on how many fewer cars would be parking downtown if the trolley was implemented. CPW said they hadn't explored the impacts, but they can. The committee questioned what CPW thought about doing a pilot study in order to measure the success. CPW

stated the challenge of doing a pilot study for something like this is the capital cost involved. Lee pointed out that when we looked for comparatives, we didn't find any. He said it doesn't mean there aren't any out there but if nobody our size can afford one of these then we are already started up a hill. He also pointed out that when the City was spending a few hundred thousand dollars a year subsidizing RVTD it didn't make the parking problems go away. He said if you want to do a feasibility study that is great but he doesn't think it is going to be financially viable here with all of the conditions Ashland has. Rich Kaplan hopes that nobody will think the can is being kicked down the street. It is more about trying the low hanging fruit first (incremental changes) and then move on to the other options, if the low hanging fruit isn't sufficient. Craig is supportive of what the committee has been talking about but he would like to see employee parking incorporated; such as creating districts, where employees pay a monthly fee for parking.

Lisa/Marie direct CPW to move forward with strategies related to informational resources, wayfinding and regulation (this also includes creating benchmarks for measuring success) and defer the trolley and pricing (paid parking).

Pam, Rich, Dave, Craig, John Williams, Emile, Joe, Lisa, Marie, Liz and John Fields YES; Michael NO.

Motion passes.

Michael stated he voted no because he is a strong proponent of paid parking.

CPW explained they will come back in September to discuss informational resources and hopefully wayfinding in October. Lee added in order for the upcoming biennial budget to include any budget implications associated with these changes they would need to be included when the budget discussions take place around March, 2015. CPW added that by the end of the year they are hoping to have the finished report to present to the committee by November/December with the hope that it could be presented to the Council January/February, in time for the budget process.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Tami De Mille-Campos, Administrative Assistant

From: [Mike Faught](#)
To: ["Tami DeMille-Campos"](#)
Subject: FW: 3 ideas from Chicago about bike ridership
Date: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 3:48:12 PM

Hey Tami... Let's include this in the next downtown committee meeting...

Michael R. Faught
Public Works Director
City of Ashland
51 Winburn Way
Ashland, OR 97520
faughtm@ashland.or.us
541/552-2411
541/488-6006 Fax
800/735-2900 TTY

This email is official business of the City of Ashland, and it is subject to Oregon public records law for disclosure and retention. If you have received this message in error, please let me know.

-----Original Message-----

From: Barb Barasa [<mailto:barb@websitings.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 12:38 PM
To: barb@websitings.net
Subject: 3 ideas from Chicago about bike ridership

I can't say I'm a real bike rider. I'm trying to motivate myself to ride my bike more. When I do ride, it's as a "commuter" - I don't mountain bike or go on long rides for fun. I ride my bike to get somewhere.

It has bothered me for a long time that Ashland wants to be trendy and cool in all ways, and being "bike friendly" seems to be one of the latest things Ashland wants to be. Yet to me, it is not bike friendly at all. I don't feel I can safely ride down Main St. downtown. When I need to go thru that part of town, I ride in the alleys, even tho it's not all that convenient. Altho there's a "bike lane" on Siskiyou, I would never ride in it because I feel the cars zipping by are too close, so I ride on the sidewalks there.

Protected bike lanes:

I'm originally from Chicago. A friend of mine who has switched from mostly running to mostly biking sent me a link to an article about a new bike lane in downtown Chicago, which has been named the best bike lane in the country.

<http://www.chicagonow.com/show-me-chicago/2013/12/chicago-bike-lanes-dearborn-st-lane-named-best-in-the-country/>

The protected lane on Dearborn in Chicago has plastic posts separating the bike lanes from motor vehicles. THAT's what I would call bike friendly.

It seems to me that if the City of Chicago can risk alienating motor vehicles by converting one whole lane of traffic into a two-way bike lane with its own signals for over a mile in the most congested downtown area, maybe Ashland could look into a similar option for the few blocks of

downtown.

This other article he sent is about a study of how effective some protected bike lanes are in Chicago in increasing bike traffic.

<http://www.redeyechicago.com/news/local/redeye-study-praises-protected-bike-lanes-20140603,0,6015518.story>

"Ridership on Dearborn Street in the Loop increased 171 percent in the year after the protected bike lane was installed"

Bike rental:

Chicago also has a Divvy Bike business in operation, which my friend has also used.

<https://www.divvybikes.com/>

The valley probably does not have a population that could support this kind of business, but I don't know. Ashland tried the green bike program but the bikes were stolen or trashed. Divvy Bikes seems to have solved the problem of "responsibility" because you can't pick up a bike unless they "know where to find you". If this business has survived in Chicago as far as not having bikes disappear or be broken, I'm sure that aspect would work anywhere. The bikes are stored in locked "holders" at stations all around the city. You join, get a keycard, and can use any bike for half an hour. By traveling from station to station, you can get pretty much anywhere you want. I'm not sure how it could be scaled down to work in a very small town, but there must be a way. This would be great for tourists who want to get around town without a car!

Bike storage and repair (mainly for commuters):

I also have 3 photos I took when I went back to Chicago 10 years ago of the commuter bike parking and repair center that was put in under Grant Park where there was already motor vehicle parking. I'm afraid the email might get blocked if I attach the photos, but if you are interested, just let me know. This facility has secure double level bike storage, lockers, showers and changing area, and a bike repair shop!

I realize Ashland does not have the population to support something quite that sophisticated.

It took forever just to get a few bike racks over by OSF. But on the other hand, maybe more people would use their bikes for commuting from farther away if they knew they could safely and conveniently store their bikes and clean up before work, especially in bad weather. This could also greatly appeal to tourists who bring their bikes with them, and "long haul" bikers might be more likely to come thru Ashland if they knew there was a safe place to store their bikes while they stopped here.

Just a few ideas from the big city. Now if I can just ride my own bike more ...

Barb Barasa

**ASHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES
JUNE 24, 2014**

CALL TO ORDER: Chair David Young called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 E. Main Street.

Commissioners Present: Joe Graf, Craig Anderson, Corinne Viéville, Alan Bender, Shawn Kampmann (arrived at 6:10), David Chapman and David Young

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Scott Fleury, Mike Faught and Tami De Mille-Campos

Council Liaison Present: Carol Voisin

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Young apologized to the Commission for an email he had previously sent to them regarding the June agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Minutes – June 2014

Approved as presented.

PUBLIC FORUM

None

NEW BUSINESS

Commission operating policies and procedures discussion

Dave Lohman, City Attorney, informed the commission he would be discussing the new draft revisions to the uniform policies and operating procedures for advisory commissions and boards. He also will clear up any questions regarding who the Transportation Commission advises and give a few ethics and public meeting law reminders.

On the question of who does the commission advise, Lohman stated Council has ultimate authority to make decisions about transportation matters, except for State and Federal requirements. He read AMC 2.10.90 which states "With the exception of certain delegated quasi-judicial actions, most advisory commissions and boards do not make final decisions subject to appeal but rather make recommendations to, or act in an advisory capacity to the council. The City Council is the final decision-maker on all city policies and the use of city resources. Proposals by boards and commissions for endorsement or sponsorship of events, activities or programs must receive approval by City Council as provided by Resolution". He then went on to read AMC 2.13.040 which states "The Transportation Commission will review and forward all traffic implementation regulations to the Public Works Director for final approval and implementation of official traffic safety and functional activities". He discussed AMC 2.13.010 which are final, appealable decisions on other transportation related issues that must be made by Council. On those the commission is to advise the Council. There could be instances where the commission and Staff are not in agreement and both would advise Council and Council would make a final decision.

Chair Young would like to see a future agenda item for changes made to the Ashland Municipal Code to make the commission's duties and role clearer. Lohman agrees that there is certainly room for interpretation and cleaning that up would be a sensible thing to do.

Chapman asked Lohman if the new draft includes a definition regarding their relationship with the Planning Commission. Lohman answered "no". Chapman stated he remembers back when the commission was first formed there were certain things that the Planning Commission didn't do or didn't want to do and the intent was the Transportation Commission would review traffic related items for big projects (such as the Normal Avenue plan). The only thing included in the code now is the Transportation Commission will have input at the pre-app stage on type 3

planning applications; which he stated isn't very useful because you haven't seen the design yet. He pointed out the reason they have come into some issues is because they aren't included until it is too late to make any changes or suggestions. Lohman said that is a good point and the relationship between Planning and Transportation is almost inseparable.

Anderson remarked it was him who brought this issue up. There was an agenda item for a parking issue which included a recommendation from an Engineer to remove two parking spaces. The commission was considering the recommendation and he thought the commission's recommendation would then be forwarded to the Council but they were told (before voting on it) the recommendation was actually going to the Public Works Director, not Council. He stated it was a very confusing situation they were in, which led him to begin to research the code. He isn't sure what their role in policy making is if they are only to advise staff and staff makes recommendations directly to Council. He looked at the code and went through all of the other commissions and committees for the City and there are no other commissions and committees that don't have specific recommendation powers to the City Council. He said the Transportation Commission was the only one that had Powers and Duties broken down into the two categories of generally and specifically. In the initial statement the purpose of the mission is to advise Council but it's not carried forward into specific powers and duties. He feels if his time is going to be spent in a worthwhile manner he wants to make recommendations to Council, not just to staff, similar to all of the other commissions and committees.

Lohman stated he's not familiar enough with the details to be real helpful on this but it seems to him there are certain things that Council can't change and therefore the Transportation Commission making recommendations to them to change is superfluous and some of those things are things that an Engineer in the Public Works department has the responsibility for.

Chapman pointed out part of the specifics had to do with the fact that there are quite a number of things that the Council doesn't deal with things like removing a parking place.

Lohman briefly highlighted the changes in the draft Ordinance, amending Chapter 2 which is being presented to Council soon. During this conversation there was concern regarding the following change "The chair or staff liaison will be responsible for timely preparation and posting in advance the agendas of all meetings of advisory commissions and boards on the City's website. A member or staff liaison will be responsible for taking minutes and getting them be posted on the City's website, generally within a few days after the meetings." The concern raised was in regards to whether posting minutes within a few days after the meeting is achievable. Lohman and Voisin (Council Liaison) will share this concern with Council when the ordinance is presented to them.

Lohman then gave a few public meeting reminders & ethic's issue reminders:

*A quorum is $\frac{1}{2}$ of the total of authorized members (for the Transportation Commission it would be half of 7)

*If there isn't a quorum, it is not a public meeting.

* Commissioner's may broadcast things via email but there is not to be any crosstalk.

*Gifts are not just presents. A gift is ok if it is something that is available to any citizens. If there is no legislative or administrative interest in the decisions of the Commission then it is not a gift as defined under state law.

*If you are acting on behalf of the City in an official capacity at a ceremonial event you can accept the gift; such as a hotel room at a conference or a meal at a presentation etc.

*Conflicts come up in the decisions. The question is; is there any financial benefit or detriment to you, relatives or associated businesses. If there is, you have to ask yourself if there is a definite benefit or a potential benefit. If there is a definite benefit, you have to announce what that conflict is and not participate in the decision at all (maybe even leave the room entirely). If there is just a potential benefit, you have to announce what that conflict is and you can participate. If you think there is any possible conflict, you ought to announce it and explain why you think there might be a conflict.

Anderson presumed there is a difference between the purpose and mission of a committee/commission and what it is specifically empowered to do under 2.13.040 and 2.13.010. He stated their role is to advise the Council on funding but he doesn't see that they are empowered to do that. He doesn't see that they are empowered to advise the Council on anything. He remarked this is the main thing that raised the issue. He stated they have a plan they are

overseeing; the Transportation System Plan and in that plan there are millions of dollars worth of projects but not enough revenue to cover those projects so it seems to him that one of the main goals of the Commission should be to balance that portion of the budget (assigning priority to what projects they want to implement). With that said, there isn't anything within the code that empowers them to do that.

Lohman responded that item 3 under section 2.13.030 talks about funding and says that the Commission is to make recommendations to the City on Cities Transportation section of the Capital Improvements Program. The recommendation is being made to both staff and the budget committee/council.

Anderson replied, he has been involved in Transportation Commission's for over twenty years and he has never seen a situation where there is a commission that doesn't make recommendations to a policy body. He's never seen a commission make recommendations to staff who then makes a final recommendation. He added, as someone who is going to potentially continue to participate on this commission he needs to see that changed. He needs to see that he is spending his time making recommendations to a policy body, not to staff. He will continue to participate in this if that happens but if it doesn't this isn't a good expenditure of his time.

Chapman is concerned about the change to the Liaison language. He pointed out Carol comes to the meetings most of the time unless she has a conflict so she can liaise. If you may come or seldom come, he feels it is a worthless position. Voisin agreed with that statement. He stated when he was a Commissioner he and Greg Lemhouse had a deal with each other that if they couldn't attend they would call each other for backup and that worked great. He isn't sure how you can tell Council what is going on with your Commission/Committee in which you are a liaison to.

Lohman responded that was a decent point. He said the concern is it wasn't physically possible with the proliferation of ad hoc meetings. He thinks it is a point worth bringing up when they take it to Council. Voisin pointed out that was her concern too.

Faught commented this can certainly be brought back as a future agenda item. The Commission would also like to have Lohman come back as a future agenda item to discuss what is happening on the State Transportation Commission level, which he is a member of.

Traffic Crash Summary

Young mentioned what struck him is that out of the 13 crashes listed 7 of them seemed pretty clear that the law was broken and no citation was issued. MacLennan said there are very few accidents he goes out on where he doesn't issue a citation. He believes their job is enforcement and correction of driving habits. He stated he has spoken to the Chief about this and he has said many times that he isn't going to force officers to cite people because it is officer discretion and once you start taking away officer discretion it creates issues. He agrees with the concern but isn't really sure what he can do about it.

Geneva Park parking space elimination request

Fleury stated back in January Commissioner Chapman received the initial email from a resident of Geneva park which is located on B Street and then forwarded that to staff to begin looking into it. Chapman pointed out he wasn't sure if that was him but maybe he doesn't remember. Fleury said he contacted the resident that had raised the concern and he and Brad Barber from the Public Works Engineering Department, went out to take a look at the issue. Their issue is egress from their driveway location to the residential complex. He mentioned this particular resident was involved in an angle crash, making a left hand turn movement out of the driveway and was struck by a driver heading east towards Mountain. He crept out of the driveway and when he finally went there was a car there. They talked about the sight distance, specifically looking west. He discussed the memo/pictures that are included in the Transportation Commission packet. The sight triangle included in the picture basically goes through the vegetation and there are two trees which basically block the view through the park row area and when there are cars parked on both sides you can't see anyone in that area. Staff has driven through there multiple times and they have observed the traffic through there. He pointed out the street section through there is only 27 feet wide, which per the adopted street standards that only allows for street parking on one side of the street. This street is based on the street standards prior to the current street standards being adopted. He included the accident data for that area in

the packet. The accident data shows 15 accidents between this section and Emerick and the majority of those were accidents involving striking parked vehicles. He told the HOA that he would bring this forward. This is the initial discussion and if there is a desire to move forward on this agenda item staff would need to notify residents.

Audible pedestrian signal buttons

Fleury shared that about \$20,000 has been spent so far on the project and there is about \$6,000 in grant money left. Vieville provided some possible locations for installation. He has requested a quote from Advanced Traffic Products to purchase more. Some of the possible locations include: Laurel/North Main, Lithia/East Main, Main/Maple, Main/3rd, although Vieville shared will Fleury that Walker/Siskiyou would be better served rather than Main/3rd. Fleury said he is hoping to have those ordered and here within the next month and a half and then we'll have ODOT's Electric crew start working on installing them. He added ODOT has made a few repairs and changed the attenuation on a few of them (Walker and Siskiyou). Vieville mentioned she is going to send an updated list of possible locations to Fleury. Faught thanked Vieville for all her hard work on this! Fleury added the news contacted him about doing a blurb on this within the next week or so. The Commission resolved that Vieville will speak to the news on behalf of the Commission.

OLD BUSINESS

None

FOLLOW UP ITEMS

Bicycle Education Class

Fleury stated staff researched this and this was not discussed at any of the Transportation Commission meetings last year, it was the year before. Rachel Dials', Recreation Superintendent, understanding was that it would be continually funded without them having to request it each year. However, after reviewing the minutes from the meeting in 2012 that wasn't what was motioned so they will come back each year and provide an update along with making a request for additional funding.

Signal Timing Discussion

Fleury emailed Dan Dorrell after the May meeting and shared with him that the Commission would like to have him come back and discuss signal timing and also to come back on an ongoing basis to provide the Commission with updates and answer questions regarding local/regional ODOT projects.

N. Main restriping

Faught shared ODOT came through and put permanent striping down on all of the sections that they had asked to have changed but they didn't do the Maple change which is awaiting approval from Salem. Kim Parducci is still working on the pedestrian crossings. She has been working with Dan Dorrell on this.

Downtown parking study

Anderson gave an update on the June meeting. They shared that at the last meeting they did an electronic straw poll to get a better understanding of how the committee feels about certain policy decisions. At the June meeting the consultants provided the committee with an interim report and a matrix which shows various policy options.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Action Summary

Oregon Impact June Newsletter

COMMISSION OPEN DISCUSSION

Anderson stated he feels a little bit of ownership on the first agenda item (Commission operating policies and procedures discussion). When he originally raised his concerns Voisin indicated that it was a good time to discuss changes to the municipal code since Council was going to be drafting changes but now it is four months later and Council has already had first reading and that concerns him. Faught explained that Legal isn't amending the actual code that relates to the Transportation Commission. Lohman is recommending the Transportation Commission spend some time on this before recommending the changes. He added they will add this as a future agenda item so

they can do that. Anderson would also like to know if Council has any direction for them. He pointed out a while back Voisin had sent an email out regarding the Normal Avenue Plan. He found it a little ironic that Council had concerns about the same issues as they did and ultimately has formed a subcommittee to address those concerns the Transportation Commission previously discussed at length. His understanding is that Council was only informed of the action the Transportation Commission took but not their concerns. Faught added the Council does receive the minutes for every commission/committee meeting. Planning took the Transportation Commission's action forward to the Council. Chapman pointed out he had talked to the Mayor about why the Transportation Commission wasn't represented on the subcommittee & the Mayor indicated they hadn't thought about it but were welcome to attend the meetings and the subcommittee might listen to them. He did add some of the Transportation Commission's concerns did make it into the findings by way of Planning Commissioner, Michael Dawkins.

Graf gave an update on the System Development Charge review committee. They haven't finished up water and sewer but once those are wrapped up they will move onto Transportation.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

Transportation Safety Public Outreach
SOU Multi-Modal Future
Stop sign at Sherman/Iowa
Sign Education (Regulatory/Informational)

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:29 pm
Respectfully submitted,
Tami De Mille-Campos, Administrative Assistant