**Sounding Board Meeting # 8 Summary**

**Meeting Date**: 08.29.2018

**Meeting Time**: 5pm-7pm

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

## Attendance:

Sounding Board Members:

* Steve Baker, UO
* Mike DeLuise, ATC
* Amy Walsh, Human Rights Commission
* Sue Wolling, Sustainability Commission
* Jennifer Webster, Lane County Public Health
* Bill Randall, Planning Commission
* Tim Shearer, LTD Accessible Transportation Committee
* Pete Barron, LTD Accessible Transportation Committee
* Gerry Gaydos, Strategic Planning Committee

Staff:

* Terri Harding, City of Eugene
* Sasha Luftig, LTD
* Therese Lang, LTD
* Jeanne Lawson, (Facilitator) JLA Public Involvement
* Adrienne DeDona, JLA Public Involvement

## Welcome & Introductions - Sasha Luftig (LTD) & Jeanne Lawson (JLA Public Involvement)

Sasha welcomed the group to the meeting and asked members to introduce themselves. Sasha announced that Terri Harding would be re-joining the project management team to take Zach Galloway’s place. Zach is leaving the City to take a local position with an architecture firm. Terri has previously served on the project management team and currently serves as a project sponsor.

Jeanne reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting. The agenda was as follows:

1. Provide an update on the project and the engagement strategy
2. Preview draft outreach materials and discuss how they’ll be used
3. Discuss next steps and project timeline

## Update on Engagement Strategy – Sasha Luftig (LTD)

Sasha recapped the previous sounding board meeting and explained that the feedback from the Sounding Board helped to inform changes to the engagement approach moving forward. She explained how things have changed, specifically, with regard to the open houses – the focus will be on the corridor options for this first set of open houses, and the second round of outreach will focus on the possible investment packages. Sasha explained that the community input received during this first round of outreach would help shape the potential investment package options that will be shared during the second phase of outreach.

Questions from the Sounding Board Members included:

* How will the route service being considered through Transit Tomorrow shape the outcomes of MovingAhead? *Sasha responded to say that Envision Eugene helped determine the corridors that will have the most frequent transit service. MovingAhead focuses on implementing the multi-modal travel goals outlined in Envision Eugene. Sasha added that Transit Tomorrow is scheduled to wrap up prior to MovingAhead* and is focused on short-term (three-year) transit service changes where.

## Preview Engagement Materials – Adrienne DeDona & Jeanne Lawson (JLA Public Involvement)

**Executive Summary**

Sasha handed out copies of the Draft Executive Summary and Adrienne explained its purpose. The Executive Summary captures the details of the Alternatives Analysis report in a more distilled version. The engagement materials (video, open houses) take that information and present it in refined formats for the public to generate awareness of the project and encourage participation.

Comments included:

* + “Development Impacts” in evaluation criteria tables for each corridor option isn’t the right title for all criteria listed under that subheading. Consider calling it Property and Development Impacts?
* The Jobs and Population Served evaluation criteria is confusing. Can we cite a reference to the research where the ¼ and ½ mile served originates from (or some other clear description)? Consider changing it to “Working People and Population Served.”
* Add a sentence about the transit travel time frequency (current and future) in each corridor overview (differences in modes for each corridor). For example, add a bullet under Enhanced Corridor and EmX Options stating frequency: “Typically a bus every 15 minutes; Typically a bus every 10 minutes.”
* Consider including language about future congestion with the no-build option.
* Add content about additional features included with EmX and EC options, such as sidewalks, curb cuts, bike and pedestrian facilities, and investments in the streetscape, i.e. lighting and landscaping.
* Add content under “What we heard” for Hwy 99 that speaks to previous opposition to EmX Investments within the boundary of the Jefferson Westside Neighborhood (JWN). *Sasha replied that the EmX Alternative is routed along 6th and 7th Street and no infrastructure improvements are proposed along 11th and 13th Street as part of the Enhanced Corridor Alternatives Alternative- to address JWN concerns.*
* Add a statement about Environmental Criteria being applied, noting that no significant differences were found between options.
* Add “safety” to the Bicycle and Walking Criteria, i.e. “New Bicycle/Pedestrian Investments & Safety Improvements”.
* Consider changing the title of the “Build Option Corridor Tools” on page 6 to something along the lines of “Tool Box for Enhanced Corridor and EmX Options”.

**Overview Video**

Adrienne shared the draft overview video with the group, explaining that it would be used to generate interest and promote participation in the project. She added that the video will be made available on the project website and at community presentations and events, such as at the open houses. She asked the Sounding Board members for their ideas on ways the video could be used to help promote participation in the project.

Feedback and ideas from the Sounding Board included:

* Share the video with groups and organizations, such as:
	+ Neighborhood association’s social media accounts via the City webpage
	+ The Planning Commission
	+ The Active Transportation Commission (ATC)
	+ Groups like the United Way, Shelter Care, and Looking Glass
	+ Organizations with the transit passport program
* Tap into existing meetings or events occurring in the Santa Clara/River Road community as part of the ongoing revitalization effort
* Play the video on a loop in the Lane County and City lobby areas
* Put the video on the bus
* Add the MovingAhead web address in the video
* Add captions in English and Spanish

**Online Open House**

Adrienne shared the draft online open house with the group and explained that it will mirror the physical open houses in terms of the materials presented and questions asked. She asked the group to focus on whether the questions being asked were clear and appropriate and whether the materials were understandable.

Feedback and ideas from the Sounding Board included:

* In the opening section, preview a few of the first words of the project goals to entice people to read more.
* Show local examples of the Enhanced Corridor if possible. Additionally, consider adding visuals with the options, such as the graphics used in the Executive Summary (i.e. the axonometric graphics, a queue jump video, or a link to the page in Executive Summary).
* Say “up to 45 points” in the evaluation criteria scoring/rating.
* Add the total number of evaluation criteria to score in the instructions for rating the evaluation criteria.
* What is the methodology for scoring the evaluation criteria? Why 9 points? *Follow-up:* *These values are a function of the number of available options: 9+8+7+6+5+4+3+2+1 = 45. This approach tries to allow respondents the most versatility in expressing their preferences. For example, they could divide all their points evenly, (five points each), or rank them 1-9 in order of preference. They could also dump all their points into their top five choices and leave the others at zero. The 45 points is the fewest number of points that allows this range of options. Limiting the number of points that can be put into any given category encourages participants to weigh in on multiple topic areas instead of allocating all points to one favorite.*
* Try and get all the questions on one screen with the description to avoid having to scroll down the page.
* For the corridor options questions, change the question response from “no opinion” to “neutral.”
* For the corridor options pages, try to create an option to open the evaluation criteria matrix and the corridor maps at same time.
* Solicit volunteers to beta test the online open house.
* For the corridor options pages, providing some narration explaining the corridors could be beneficial to participants. Consider providing narration in Spanish.
* In the investment package criteria section, people won’t likely know what Environmental Justice means. Use plain language whenever possible.
* Compress the evaluation criteria questions to one set to include the criteria used for the corridors and the investment packages and emphasize how feedback will be used
* Share the online open house with UO and LCC to encourage student participation.

## Next Steps – Sasha Luftig (LTD) & Jeanne Lawson (JLA Public Involvement)

Sasha reviewed the project timeline moving forward. She explained this committee would meet again in the fall to hear the results of the community engagement efforts and prior to the next round of outreach focused on the investment packages. Following this meeting with the Sounding Board, the project team will meet with the LTD Board and City Council to provide them with an update on the project.