

HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant

Consortium Summary – Tourism, Arts, Culture

July 22, 2010

MODERATOR: Jeff Hammond, P.E., RPM Transportation Consultants

Stakeholders Present

Seab Tuck – Tuck-Hinton Architects

Kimberly Ely – Cheekwood

Perceived Value/Benefits of Regional Vision (O2)

- Physical or conceptual!
- Opportunity to craft transportation goals specifically supportive of tourism: Easily accessible; Readily available' Nashville is the "hub" – center of culture scene; Suburban / rural tourism – accessible; Marketing, awareness
- Finding/documenting common objectives between related disciplines (ex. wayfinding, ease of travel, etc., are both transportation and tourism objectives)
- Vision would regionally support Nashville as hub of region culturally
- Highlight suburban/rural tourism and arts objectives
- Provide greater awareness of cultural amenities of region – feed into larger cultural marketing strategies
- Define arts/culture as critical components of economy (tourism mentioned as second leading industry in Nashville)
- Process would quantify importance of Nashville as "Music City" (jobs, economic stimulus, etc.)
- Middle Tennessee's universities fit where? Seen as cultural powers that should be promoted (impact arts, workforce development, quality of life, etc.)
- Allowance of pooled cultural resources – synergy btw similar institutions (multiplicity of playhouses, Civil War sites, etc.)
- Regional Culture/Arts Master Plan has been discussed – vision could move creation of such a plan further along

Obstacles to Vision Development/Adoption (O3)

- Economic impacts on arts organizations (current lower public and private funding levels)
- No real competition over patron funding (uniquely positive to our region as found in arts commission reviews)
 - A- economic stability restored (economic viability)
 - B – poor economic conditions
 - ⇒ Fear that economic conditions may not be sustained
- Arts commissions reviewed – Tennessee has high degree of cooperation among arts organizations
- Funding based on size of art institution
- Contribution levels reflective of the economy (recession has lent low numbers of contributions, & vice versa)

Obstacles to Vision Alignment with Organizational Goals (O4)

- Many arts organizations have 3-5 year plan that would require restatement (not necessarily problematic)

Implementation Strategies (O5)

- Did not discuss

Steering Committee Member (O6)

- Recommended Jennifer Cole, Metro Arts Commission

HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant

Consortium Summary – Health & Environment

July 22, 2010

MODERATOR: April Grant, Lose & Assoc. - Landscape Architects

Perceived Value/Benefits of Regional Vision (O2)

- City trees, water, open space
- Value of organization – supplement planning efforts to increase green infrastructure – urban trees, OS, stream sides
- Can provide info on tree benefits / requirements, species selection, care, planning, stream preservation & improvement, wildlife habitat, access to some government grants, plans for tree planting, tree canopy measurements, tree ordinances, site evaluation, maintenance, risk, involving P.C.
- Soil stability, stream watershed source areas, logging practices, habitat size in rural areas

Obstacles to Vision Development/Adoption (O3)

- Lack of awareness in education
- Attitude in short-term thinking; short-term economic pressures
- NIMBY
- Private property rights
- Lack of uninterested parties / advocacy
- Jurisdictions, cities, counties – different views & growth boundaries conflict.
- Lack of time to implement mass transit – protection of natural resources will need time, implemented together
- Budget cuts – reduce available expertise
- Sumner County Plans → run into lack of advocacy: conflict of interest; private land rights (affects connectivity)
- HEALTH
 - Blood pressure
 - Link trees/nature with IQ
 - Jogging trails – bike trails
- Lack of local knowledge, willpower to implement structures & parks
- Lack of awareness / education to link green with health

Obstacles to Vision Alignment with Organizational Goals (O4)

- Too much turf!
- Lack of contact between local jurisdictions & state agencies
- Corporate culture in state depts. → needs to expand to multiple resource management
- Lack of communication between players & community development
- Lack of direction & staffing → need more people involved: field people, experts
- Barriers to interagency – lack of cooperation; SO many orgs & non-profits; no clearinghouse or central coordination; lack of committed individuals

Implementation Strategies (O5)

- Think LONG-TERM: Grassroots involvement in education is crucial
- City P.C. Planners; County Planners; stormwater; COC; Rotary Clubs; State; DOT
- Find committed individuals & give them tools to go out and talk to communities
- Systematic networking between agencies
- Data on forest cover & rare species
- Linking green with health: could be taken to county governments by proponents

Steering Committee Member (O6)

- Dwight Barnett, Area Forester & Certified Arborist, State of Tennessee Ellington Agricultural Center

HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant

Consortium Summary – Transportation & Land Use and Utilities & Infrastructure

July 22, 2010

MODERATORS: Mary Vavra, MV Design Studios and Jay Everett, Lose & Assoc. - Landscape Architects

Stakeholders Present

Phil Armor & Tim Roach – GNRC

Joe Horne – Williamson Co. Government

Nick Lindeman – Nashville Area MPO

Eric Howell – Nashville Area MPO

Fred Rogers – City of Hendersonville

John Fenderson – TN Division of Forestry

Bob Withofer – Metro Public Works

Rick Gregory – City of Goodlettsville

Will Hager – City of Lebanon

Liza Joffrion – Multimodal Research

Reem Abdelrazek & Libby Thurman – TACIR

Brian Zralek – Community Food Advocates

Erin Reinders – City of Franklin

Sam Wible – Tuck-Hinton Architects

Perceived Value/Benefits of Regional Vision (O2)

- Products: What possible products?
- TN Forestry: greater involvement in local land use planning. Preservation of open space. Flood mitigation.
- Dollars tied to regional efforts – partnerships
- Development & regulation & government boundaries: uniformity of regulations regionally
- Acknowledgment of differences
- Networking of people & resources
- Avoid counter-productive efforts
- Competitive effort

THE GREAT MERGE

- Utilities & Infrastructure
- Freight mobility & TOD: commonalities not acknowledged, differences highlighted – sustainable transport
- How do we retain our individuality as communities, yet cooperate and enhance regionally?
- Recognize neighborhood uniqueness & community
- Look at fc of land use beyond local community – NIMBYs – lack of regional vision at local level

Obstacles to Vision Development/Adoption (O3)

- Fear of loss of local control
- How to make all of this work?
- Politics & changing tides
- Grassroots support
- Compromised vision vs. idealized vision
- Lots of support vs. little support
- State regs & legislation: “lack of teeth”
- Inter-city collaboration
- Utilities vs. land use vs. transportation planning
- Planning not loved in the hinterlands
- Local/small scale – water/sewer (little State oversight)
- How provide other gov’t/utilities?
- Home development flows to unregulated areas
- State needs to jump off the homebuilder bandwagon and develop top-down oversight
- Long-term costs as a result of inefficient development
- Architect: punishment vs. incentives to guide development
- Lack of a crisis (or, was the flood?). How do we convey the problem before it becomes a crisis?
- Inundation → floodplain in Davidson Co. but development occurred on these areas. Land (individual rights) trump state regs.

- Power of inexpensive housing & good schools vs. long commutes
- The region rests on a household – each household. And households don't see the costs of our development pattern (hidden costs)
- Cost of our choices: long-term vs. short-term

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Who isn't here? (See Fred for utilities contact)
- Political obstacles – state level. Additional tools
- “underserved populations”
- Local priorities vs. regional
- Short-term \$\$ concerns vs. Long-term (grant & savings \$\$)

Implementation Strategies (O5)

- Include State legislators
- Flood presents an opportunity: regionalism personified. Regional planning can help abate flooding.
- Must be grassroots – people will support
- Quantify benefits of the Plan - \$\$ per household; make that connection.

ADDITIONAL NOTES BY NICHOLAS LINDEMAN (MPO)

- Planning region to capitalize at a local level (perceived as a roadblock)
- Homebuilders placing business in a non-vulnerable, growing opportunity
- With “top-down” infrastructure (from State) is key
- Utilities (and State) recognized flood plane but still allowed development
- “Fiscally constrained” is common language when determining strategies
- Development of a regional agricultural plan
- Adopt “Achievable Measures” to serve as reminders
- Recognize possible parties who may not be actively involved in HUD application / planning process
- Political considerations (roadblock)
- Loss of local control (perhaps lack of business?)
- Perhaps comprehensive planning is not a holistic involvement
- *Need unified approach: some smaller towns want growth, while other larger cities fight growth*
- *Level of sophistication in regards to planning, stormwater design, etc. vary greatly across the communities*
- *Stricter controls on growth in some areas and not others pushes development to the latter*
- *Benefit of having a regional approach: It would provide a forum to share knowledge between communities*

Steering Committee Members (O6)

Tim Roach and Phil Armor, Greater Nashville Regional Council

HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant

Consortium Summary – Housing & Community Development

July 22, 2010

MODERATOR: Kim Hawkins, Hawkins Partners Inc. - Landscape Architects

Stakeholders Present:

Mary McLennan – THDA

Joyce Searcy – Belmont University, Community Relations

Kevin Chastine – City of Gallatin, Planning

Angie Hubbard – MDHA

Judith Tackett – Metropolitan Homelessness Commission

Lee Stewart – Metro Social Services

Leah Smith – Nashville Area Habitat for Humanity

Emily Stewart – Vanderbilt intern for Nashville Area MPO

Ron Yearwood – Nashville Civic Design Center

Greer Broemel – GNRC

Obstacles to Vision Development/Adoption (O3)

- Poorer populations live far away from good-paying jobs
- Transportation & Housing Costs: We drive everywhere; reliance on cars
- Absence of walkable neighborhoods
- Differing definitions of “affordable” – there’s low-income housing and then there’s housing
- Gap/disconnect between jobs/wages & affordability (lack of enough workforce / affordable housing)
- Fear of DENSITY: policies that relate to low-density → prohibit mass transit
- Additional costs of low-density development patterns
- Limited housing types/choices
- Lack of willingness by communities (citizens and leadership) to consider options (density / type)
- Too focused on single land use

Obstacles to Vision Alignment with Organizational Goals (O4)

- Lack of examples/case-studies to show the public (which *could* build buy-in)
- Self-imposed isolation (silo)
- Community/neighborhood uniqueness has encouraged elitism
- Outreach | engagement
- Different funding strategies from all different agencies / different rules
- Different oversight
- Isolated bureaucracy
- Competition for funding
- Physical obstacles based on jurisdiction (multi-jurisdictional)
- Metro: number of Council-members
- Term limits

Implementation Strategies (O5)

- Buy-in to where it becomes commonplace → our lawmakers know what “infill” means. Buy-in through \$\$-dollars
- Toolbox to show application of housing/community-development in each situation in region
- Well-organized, intentional community education, then engagement (how is it relevant to them?)
- Coherent group that stays together to advocate for state law changes, or among cities & counties
- Identify our best examples: repetitive, long-term PR to build excitement about these ideas
- Tell our story / build excitement
- Be transparent in the process (find the venues / find the “communities” / all languages / diverse, non-traditional populations → age, race, ethnicity). If they don’t think that it touches them, they won’t care.

Steering Committee Member (O6)

- Angie Hubbard, MDHA | Technical – Mary McLennan, THDA

HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant

Consortium Summary – Education & Workforce Development

July 22, 2010

MODERATOR: Gary Gaston, Nashville Civic Design Center

Stakeholders Present

Ginger – TSU – HUD

Carrie Brumfield – Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce

Cindy – Belmont, Dir. of Sponsored Programs

Jennifer Moody – Asst. City Manager, City of Columbia

Perceived Value/Benefits of Regional Vision (O2)

- Using outcomes of grant to plug in student / university resources (service, research etc)
- Help in planning future programs / areas of focus
- Identifying educational needs / workforce needs for creating jobs
- Creating self-sustainable communities that function as a part of the whole region
 - Jobs
 - Housing (range of \$)
 - Education
 - Retail / shopping
 - Access to transit
 - Safety / Security
 - Workforce housing close to jobs
 - Schools / Parks / open space
 - Health care
 - Training close to homes
- Spirit of cooperation by communication within region (collaboration)
 - Cities with local universities
- Ammunition for exploring additional funding utilizing research
- Link decision-making
- Communicating to the public

Obstacles to Vision Development/Adoption (O3)

- No formal oversight structure → regulatory agency? Signing agreement?
- Politics / elections change things
- Behavioral practices
- Not a good “history of,” of consistency → PR & marketing behind an idea...
- Competition among regional communities
- Not enough linkages between workforce needs and educational opportunities

Implementation Strategies (O5)

- Link community development & health
- Identify specific policy directions within area
- Short-term: PR/marketing/educational component piece – tailor the message to the audience
- Long-term: Educating on “values” of the plan in elementary/middle schools’ education system (curriculum)
- Public participation = political accountability
- Successful implementation projects accomplished quickly!
- Pilot projects in demonstration areas
- As a regional vision: systematic approach to incentives – “rewarding good behavior / acceptance of the plan”
- T3 Initiative = Nashville Tech Council & Belmont signed
- Link between government \$\$-investment and THE PLAN

Steering Committee Member (O6)

TBD

HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant

Consortium Summary – Economic Development & Prosperity

July 22, 2010

MODERATOR: Kevin Tilbury, Senior Assoc., Gresham Smith & Partners

Stakeholders Present

Dave Keiser, Cumberland Region Tomorrow
Debby Dale Mason, Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce
Ben Stewart, Greater Nashville Regional Council
George James, City of Springfield
Diane Thorne, The TMA Group
Andrew Orr, City of Franklin

Perceived Value/Benefits of Regional Vision (O2)

- Data: jobs, educational attainment → use it for recruitment / marketing
- Will help us get a comprehensive plan for the *region* with benchmarks
- Strengthen the region
- Highlight the central needs for economic development [opportunities to improve our capacity to pursue economic development (infrastructure)].
- Comprehensive approach to economic development
- A rising tide raises all boats → education, jobs, housing, etc.
- Regional Vision, but differing local needs

Obstacles to Vision Development/Adoption (O3)

- Lack of trust from past experiences: lack of trust in government, in planning
- Targeted approaches for the various industrial clusters & sections
- Definition of “economic prosperity” → different for everyone and for different parts of the region
- How do we retain & expand current businesses?
- Infrastructure will limit economic development
- Middle TN needs to align itself with *broader* region of the state’s strategies

Obstacles to Vision Alignment with Organizational Goals (O4)

- Affordable agency implementation – differs across the region
- Look at Tennessee Valley corridor group for examples
- Non-Attainment will create more hoops
- WATER

Implementation Strategies (O5)

- Use incentives for local government & agencies to work together (similar to TN-ECD 3-Star Program)
- Has to be more than “just another plan”

Steering Committee Member (O6)

- Ben Stewart, GNRC