

Agenda
Gateways Workgroup Meeting
12/14/2004
5:30 PM – 6:30 PM

I. Introduction

Andy Fraizer explained that Carolyn Coleman would be a few minutes late due to her commitment to meet with the City-County Council. Andy welcomed the workgroup members and initiated the meeting by asking those present to introduce themselves. The purpose of the meeting is to review the public comments we have received, discuss the Workgroup findings/toolbox document and the timeline for preparing the document.

II. Public Input Received

Carole Darst provided a summary of comments received from the public meeting held on November 9, 2004 at the Arts Garden and also the Gateways website. Over 80 people attended the public meeting and provided constructive comments. The meeting was successful at engaging a diverse group of individuals with ranging areas of expertise. As may be expected, there were many ideas expressed, but most importantly, there was a high level of interest. It was noted that the comment process was not scientific and results should not be interpreted in that manner. Workgroup members noted their appreciation for the website and their desire to continue supporting the website as gateway activities progress toward implementation.

III. Findings/Products & IV. Additional Considerations

David DiMarzio presented an outline (attached) of the proposed content and organization of the Workgroup report and the Gateways Toolbox that will be combined into a single document. The document will provide background and an overview of the process the Workgroup used to develop the 15 priority locations. A list of the preliminary sites considered by the Workgroup committees will be included. The document will also note the outlying "entry point" (interstate and major thoroughfare) gateway opportunities at the edges of Marion County.

The next steps of the process will rely upon interested persons and organizations moving forward on the questions of concept and scale - the remaining significant aspects of developing a viable gateway. Carolyn Coleman led the group in this discussion. Workgroup members considered:

- the case for and against trying to incorporate a single, unifying design feature, such as an icon, graphic logo, or other element into every gateway project

- the desire to coordinate the overall gateway development effort and avoid mismatched, disjointed, or overstated results
- in the absence of a single oversight authority regarding gateway activities to be undertaken in the public right of way, a set of minimum requirements or standards that must be met by each project in order to be considered
- the limited sources to fund gateways projects

Although these considerations were not fully resolved, they will need to be addressed in the future.

V. Timeline

Andy Fraizer presented the following timeline for the remaining work to be performed.

- January:
 1. Prepare Draft Toolbox Document Containing Complete Listing of Sites and Priority Sites Identified by Workgroup.
 2. Prepare Any Additional Findings Re: Item IV

- Early February:
 1. Forward (Email) Draft Toolbox Document to Workgroup
 2. Edit and Finalize

- Late February: Print/Issue Toolbox

The Workgroup agreed that their remaining work of reviewing draft documents and corresponding with staff will be best accommodated by email and phone correspondence. In additional discussion, Carole Darst overviewed the Rotary Club's plan for use of the gateways work performed to date. The co-chairs and staff thanked the members for their work, interest and participation. The meeting was concluded at 6:50PM.

GATEWAYS REPORT AND DEVELOPMENT TOOLBOX OUTLINE

1. Introduction

- City-Rotary Collaboration
- Workgroup Involvement
- Website

2. Gateway Defined

- General Definition
- Landmark
- Multiple Landmark
- Corridor
- Common Components

3. Planning Process

- 5 Study Areas
- Location Map of Study Areas
- Data Considerations
- Emphasis on Location versus Concept, Scale, etc.

4. Gateways Announcing the Community as a Whole

- Discuss Entry Points to the County as Potential Gateways
- State Timeframes for Interstate Improvements (When Known)
- Reference I-465 Westside Project as an Example

5. Gateways Announcing Smaller Areas Within the Community

- List all of the Identified Locations
- Describe the Criteria For Selecting Top 3 (Include Evaluation Sheet in Appendix)
- Specify the 15 Priority Locations (Use the Storyboard PDFs)
- Public Input From Community Meeting and Website

6. Toolbox

- Conceptual Diagram of a Typical Gateway Development Process
- Discuss the Key Components and Possible Approaches to be Considered
- Resource Directory and Frequently Asked Questions
- Challenge to Gateway Developers