

---

# Sounding Board Meeting # 7 Summary

**Meeting Date:** 06.11.2018

**Meeting Time:** 5-7pm

**Meeting Location:** Next Stop Center, 1099 Olive Street, Eugene

## Attendance:

Sounding Board Members:

- Gerry Gaydos, Strategic Planning Committee
- Rick Satre, Strategic Planning Committee
- John Jaworski, Planning Commission
- Bill Randall, Planning Commission
- Thomas Price, Sustainability Commission
- Bob Beals, ATC
- Mike DeLuise, ATC
- Jennifer Webster, Lane County Public Health
- Tim Shearer, LTD Accessible Transportation Committee
- Pete Barron, LTD Accessible Transportation Committee

Staff:

- Chris Henry, City of Eugene
- Zach Galloway, City of Eugene
- Sasha Luftig, LTD
- Therese Lang, LTD
- Shareen Springer, (Facilitator) JLA Public Involvement

## 1. Welcome & Introductions - Chris Henry (City of Eugene) & Shareen Springer (JLA Public Involvement)

Shareen reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting:

- Highlight role of Sounding Board as liaison between committees/commissions and community
- Review and confirm outreach strategy, key messages and infographics
- Review and discuss key takeaways from the evaluation of Investment Packages

Shareen asked members to introduce themselves, and Chris welcomed the group and thanked everyone for their time and willingness to share their expertise with the project team.

Shareen referred to the meeting summary from the previous meeting in the Sounding Board materials, and provided time for Sounding Board members to review and provide feedback on that meeting summary.

## 2. Outreach Strategy, Events and Informational Materials – Shareen Springer (JLA Public Involvement) & Zach Galloway (City of Eugene)

Shareen provided an overview of the outreach strategy and preliminary outreach calendar for events over the summer. She explained that outreach was focused on the following goals:

1. Broaden awareness and promotion of the project, as well as community feedback opportunities
2. Test values, priorities from previous phases of outreach and from the community opinion poll
3. Learn more about the corridors, and what options are most important to the people who live and work there
4. Hear from the community about preferences on the sequence of the investment packages

**Key Messages:** Shareen directed the group to the key messages – providing an overview of the purpose of the messages. She invited the group to provide feedback or highlights from the key messages, specifically asking if they felt the key messages served as a useful tool to support Sounding Board members in their role as liaison to their respective committees and communities. She also asked the group to weigh in on the terminology within the key messages – highlighting the phrase ‘investment packages’.

Suggestions and comments from the Sounding Board Members included:

- Overall positive reaction to the phrase Investment Packages – Investment package sounds positive rather than spending money – conveys an investment into the community.
- Sensitivity to the phrase “great neighborhoods” - that it might imply other neighborhoods are not great
- Concern that the ‘Mix and match’ language could suggest an over-promise to the corridor communities that only the options they like would be selected
- Desire to see economic investment and development emphasized in the return on investment description
- Confusion on what is considered in the investment package, and how those packages were selected
- A desire to articulate that ‘starting point’ of the investment packages in more detail in the key messages

There was discussion between Sounding Board members and the project team on the investment packages, and the context/input used in establishing the packages presented in the Sounding Board packet. Sasha explained that there would be time later in the agenda to dive into more detail about the packages themselves.

**Outreach Calendar & Sequencing of Engagement:** Shareen provided a brief overview of the outreach calendar for the next phase of outreach – emphasizing corridor specific events and opportunities for engagement, and how and where the broader community would review and provide feedback on the investment packages and enhancement options.

She asked the group to share insight and recommendations on strategies to engage with specific populations and neighborhoods. She referenced that the project team was looking to the Sounding Board to bring information about where/when we should bring information to the community and

committed to being back in touch with Sounding Board members as dates for outreach activities were finalized.

Sounding Board members provided the following comments and recommendations on outreach and engagement:

- Encourage the project team to provide Spanish translation, and to consider engaging existing community based organizations on strategies to best engage Latino populations, and to help promote engagement opportunities among Spanish speaking populations.
- Desire to ensure that tabling events are not concentrated around the urban core.
- Suggestion to work with the schools in the Bethel community to engage residents, comment that the community park does not accurately represent the Bethel community, and encourage staff to look to other locations or opportunities to engage Hwy 99 users and community members.
- A Sounding Board member suggested that outreach to the Coburg community would need to involve some additional clarity and/or description as the maps presented in this phase differ from the first iteration.

Zach provided an introduction to the purpose and context of a series of draft infographic concepts that would be refined to accompany outreach activities and would aid in the presentation of the Alternatives Analysis key findings.

Sounding Board members asked several clarifying comments on the metric and methodology presented in the graphics. Staff responded with clarification and explained that the review of evaluation key findings would help clarify the methodology in more detail.

Shareen asked for insight and feedback on the infographics – reminding the group that they would have the ability to comment on the specific evaluation findings, and how the infographics work to convey that information again at the end of the meeting.

Sounding Board comments and suggestions on the infographics included:

- Strong support for the isometrics diagrams.
- Positive reaction to the color coding/scale – specifically that lighter colors are negative/darker is positive – helps tell story and to see numbers. Categories are great.
- Request for brighter colors, and more connection to the terms and measures outlined in the key messages. Scale on diagrams difficult – could they be bigger or thicker lines?
- Request for bike facilities to be more distinct.
- Request to include an easy to read descriptions of metrics – explanation or key for metrics and descriptions for trade-offs.
- Request to have the methodology explained in more detail.
- Also make sure that safety information comes through in the trade-offs language.

There was some confusion expressed about what the project team was attempting to achieve with the presentation of the packages to the corridor communities. There was feeling among Sounding Board members that there was a lot of information, and a suggestion was made for the project team to focus on the corridor specific information rather than the investment packages for the five

corridors together. There was a feeling that people would be most interested in their neighborhood and their community – and that the presentation of packages and the overall system might be too much information.

The project team responded and asked Sounding Board members for recommendations on messaging that would help balance a desire to present the potential options for the overall system while at the same time sharing and soliciting feedback from the community about the corridor options that matter to them most. Staff stressed the desire to present information about corridor options, highlight corridor input, and also share with the broader public how specific choices affect the system as a whole.

### **3. Investment Packages – Sasha Luftig (LTD)**

Sasha provided a review of the key findings from the evaluation of the investment packages. Sounding Board members asked for clarification on the methodology and the evaluation process.

Following the presentation of key findings, the group was asked to return to the infographics presented, and to provide insight and feedback a second time, after having more context for the findings.

Overall, Sounding Board members highlighted the opportunity to tie key messages in with the metrics in the infographic, as well as remaining consistent with color coding and presentation of information between the Alternatives Analysis report summary graphics and the infographics.

There was a concern or question expressed by a Sounding Board member around how costs were presented/represented in the graphics, and how that might be interpreted by different audiences.

Sounding Board members highlighted a desire to ensure that messaging allowed the community to know that decisions had not been made, and that input was being sought at a very high level with ongoing opportunities for feedback as the process moves forward.

Sounding Board members expressed support for condensed versions of key findings from the Alternatives Analysis– but also emphasized a desire to not take away access to the full document, and specifically the environmental information.

There was a remaining concern expressed by some Sounding Board members around the presentation of packages to the community. Sounding Board members suggested potentially renaming the investment packages so that there wasn't any possibility to interpret a 'ranking scale' (i.e: Package A vs Package C).

The review of key findings closed with a discussion and sharing of observations and take-aways from Sounding Board members, providing additional feedback on promotion and the presentation of project information.

Comments included:

- A strong recommendation to focus information on specific corridors
- Consider the sequencing of graphics, and the audiences for outreach and decision making – providing graphics that highlight the system as a whole to the broader community, presenting the infographics that highlight the investment packages trade-offs to decision makers, and

providing corridor specific information that highlights previous engagement/community input for corridor communities.

- Present where the project started, what was heard, and then introduce infographics that highlight the combination of environmental analysis and community input.
- Suggestion for a video presentation that could provide information in a quick, positive, and engaging way. Recommendation for the presentation of information to be interactive so that the public can go through the choices, etc.
- Encouraged promotional activities to point the public to the website for more information.
- Explain the “why” first and then delve into the details of the specific corridors and the system as a whole.
- A comment/reminder that there might be a possibility that Coburg residents have different expectations on routes from previous engagement efforts, and that the project team would want to be prepared to speak to that.

#### **4. Next Steps – Sasha & Shareen**

Shareen provided a recap of the key comments and take-aways from the meeting. Sasha talked about when and how the Sounding Board would be involved moving forward. She shared that the project team would review the comments and feedback from this meeting and would look at possible modifications to the outreach and summer schedule to adequately respond and revise materials to be responsive to the suggestions and requests from the group. The project team committed to being back in touch with more information, dates, and next steps involved in the roll-out of community engagement activities.