

**Hillsborough's Transpotation Future
Public Outreach Meeting Evaluation
Response Summary**

Webb Middle School

Thursday, May 28, 2009

Total Number of Responses Received - 8

Total Number Attendees - 39

| | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) | Rating Average | Response Counts |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. How well were the objectives of the workshop met? | - | - | - | 42.9% | 57.1% | 4.57 | 7 |
| 2. How well was the session facilitated? | - | - | - | 50.0% | 50.0% | 4.50 | 8 |
| 3. How effective did each agency share its information? | | | | | | | |
| TBARTA | - | - | - | 62.5% | 37.5% | 4.38 | 8 |
| MPO | - | - | - | 42.9% | 57.1% | 4.57 | 7 |
| HART | - | - | - | 57.1% | 42.9% | 4.43 | 7 |
| 4. Overall presentation was | - | - | - | 62.5% | 37.5% | 4.38 | 8 |
| 5. Do you now have a better understanding of Hillsborough County's transportation initiatives? | - | - | - | 37.5% | 62.5% | 4.63 | 8 |
| 6. How can we improve the workshop? | | | | | | | |
| <p>1. The objectives were not clear to me. If the only objective is to inform residents of what TBARTA, MPO and HART are doing and talk about coordination, then I think you did that. This was not an effective presentation on why we would support or consider a 2010 referendum or funding mechanism. More specific examples of improved transportation times (less delay) could reinforce the need for BRT and Light Rail.</p> <p>2. Have food.</p> <p>3. Connection to land use - density not a four letter word - necessary for ridership. We will earn transit by improving walkability indicators.</p> <p>4. The devil is in the details, the actual cents. They are very complex.</p> <p>5. None needed. Very well constructed and really drives home point that we are way behind our counterparts in other major cities across US. Fabulous visual aids. Thank you so much. Very eye opening.</p> <p>6. Invite Florida's Turnpike Enterprise and the Tampa-Hillsborough County Expressway Authority. Determine whether one or both of these agencies could: Index their tolls to inflation; eliminate the Sun Pass discount; Use the increased revenue to both improve FTE/THCEA roads and other (non-toll) major roads.</p> <p>7. This is the second meeting I've attended (Citrus Park Extension being first) and find them quite well organized and informative. Good outreach.</p> | | | | | | | |

**Hillsborough's Transportation Future
Public Outreach Meeting Evaluation
Response Summary**

Jan Platt Regional Library

Monday, June 01, 2009

Total Number of Responses Received - 24

Total Number Attendees - 69

| | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) | Rating Average | Response Counts |
|---|----------|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. How well were the objectives of the workshop met? | - | - | 31.8% | 45.5% | 22.7% | 3.91 | 22 |
| 2. How well was the session facilitated? | - | 4.2% | 12.5% | 54.2% | 29.2% | 4.08 | 24 |
| 3. How effective did each agency share its information? | | | | | | | |
| TBARTA | - | - | 33.3% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 4.00 | 24 |
| MPO | - | - | 20.8% | 41.7% | 37.5% | 4.17 | 24 |
| HART | - | - | 12.5% | 45.8% | 41.7% | 4.29 | 24 |
| 4. Overall presentation was | - | - | 25.0% | 41.7% | 33.3% | 4.08 | 24 |
| 5. Do you now have a better understanding of Hillsborough County's transportation initiatives? | - | - | 16.7% | 50.0% | 33.3% | 4.17 | 24 |
| 6. How can we improve the workshop? | | | | | | | |
| 1. If the presentations are to be so short, provide more printed materials that flesh out what you are racing through via your Powerpoint presentation. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Make Q/A session more fair, moderated, (timed?) so more people can comment, ask. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Need limits on questions/comments - too few speakers took too much time. | | | | | | | |
| 4. Collective presentations could be extended a few addtl minutes to allow absorbtion of material. | | | | | | | |
| 5. Less slides - spending more time on critical slides. Should have broken up group after presentation for questions on an individual one-on-ones. There were folks who asked to speak that really confused the whole presentation... it was a shame they took this "soapbox" approach! Please do not allow "soapbox" folks to talk and waste others time when we would like to ask real questions and not just talk! This ruined the overall workshop in many people's eyes! | | | | | | | |
| 6. Well organized and interactive. I do not have recommendations at this time. Great venue. | | | | | | | |
| 7. Start in a timely manner. | | | | | | | |
| 8. Limit time on speaking and comments. | | | | | | | |
| 9. Don't put 5:30 on this sign when it starts at 6:30. | | | | | | | |
| 10. Emphasize the cost of building more roads in comparison as well as the fact that roads can only be widened so much and not more. | | | | | | | |
| 11. Time limits on speakers? Seemed to skirt the real issue - referendum for money until the question portion. Where do we get to write our comments? I don't want to talk, really, but have comments. If we all talked we'd be here all night. | | | | | | | |
| 12. Have comment sheets for those who don't want to speak. | | | | | | | |
| 13. Speak about financing issues of implementing light rail transit. Discuss economic development opportunities that projections show jobs, company relocations, etc. | | | | | | | |

**Hillsborough's Transportation Future
Public Outreach Meeting Evaluation
Response Summary**

Ragan Park Community Center

Wednesday, June 03, 2009

Total Number of Responses Received - 6

Total Number Attendees - 22

| | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) | Rating Average | Response Counts |
|--|--|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. How well were the objectives of the workshop met? | - | 25.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | - | 3.25 | 4 |
| 2. How well was the session facilitated? | - | - | - | - | 100.0% | 5.00 | 5 |
| 3. How effective did each agency share its information? | | | | | | | |
| TBARTA | - | 20.0% | 0.0% | 80.0% | - | 3.60 | 5 |
| MPO | - | - | - | 100.0% | - | 4.00 | 5 |
| HART | - | - | 20.0% | 60.0% | 20.0% | 4.00 | 5 |
| 4. Overall presentation was | - | - | 20.0% | 60.0% | 20.0% | 4.00 | 5 |
| 5. Do you now have a better understanding of Hillsborough County's transportation initiatives? | - | - | 16.7% | 66.7% | 16.7% | 4.00 | 6 |
| 6. How can we improve the workshop? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Don't use jargon or terms that the average person wouldn't understand - capacity ratio, multiplier effect, local match dollars, enhanced roadways, light rail/BRT, acronyms TTF, BOCC. 2. Explain difference between LRTP, TIP, Needs Assessment, Cost Affordable and how they are developed. 3. I had no idea what to expect. Outreach failed. Everyone presented too quickly. | | | | | | |

**Hillsborough's Transportation Future
Public Outreach Meeting Evaluation
Response Summary**

Bruton Memorial Library

Thursday, June 04, 2009

Total Number of Responses Received - 6

Total Number Attendees - 40

| | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) | Rating Average | Response Counts |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. How well were the objectives of the workshop met? | - | - | 16.7% | 83.3% | - | 3.85 | 6 |
| 2. How well was the session facilitated? | - | - | 16.7% | 83.3% | - | 3.83 | 6 |
| 3. How effective did each agency share its information? | | | | | | | |
| TBARTA | - | - | 16.7% | 66.7% | 16.7% | 4.00 | 6 |
| MPO | - | - | 16.7% | 83.3% | - | 3.83 | 6 |
| HART | - | - | 16.7% | 83.3% | - | 3.83 | 6 |
| 4. Overall presentation was | - | - | - | 100.0% | - | 4.00 | 6 |
| 5. Do you now have a better understanding of Hillsborough County's transportation initiatives? | - | - | - | 100.0% | - | 4.00 | 6 |
| 6. How can we improve the workshop? | | | | | | | |
| 1. Advertise meeting starts after open house. | | | | | | | |

**Hillsborough's Transportation Future
Public Outreach Meeting Evaluation
Response Summary**

Cross Creek Library

Tuesday, June 09, 2009

Total Number of Responses Received - 14

Total Number Attendees - 72

| | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) | Rating Average | Response Counts |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. How well were the objectives of the workshop met? | 7.7% | - | 15.4% | 46.2% | 30.8% | 3.92 | 13 |
| 2. How well was the session facilitated? | 7.7% | 7.7% | 7.7% | 15.4% | 61.5% | 4.15 | 13 |
| 3. How effective did each agency share its information? | | | | | | | |
| TBARTA | 7.7% | - | 15.4% | 53.8% | 23.1% | 3.85 | 13 |
| MPO | 7.7% | - | 15.4% | 53.8% | 23.1% | 3.85 | 13 |
| HART | 7.7% | - | 15.4% | 46.2% | 30.8% | 3.92 | 13 |
| 4. Overall presentation was | 7.7% | - | 30.8% | 30.8% | 30.8% | 3.77 | 13 |
| 5. Do you now have a better understanding of Hillsborough County's transportation initiatives? | 7.7% | - | 23.1% | 15.4% | 53.8% | 4.08 | 13 |
| 6. How can we improve the workshop? | | | | | | | |
| 1. Better advertisement, clearly more defined what the topic of discussion will be. Didn't know what the public meeting was regarding until walked in. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was not able to stay for the full presentation. However, all representatives were able to answer my questions. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Start on time. Called for 5:30, didn't start till ?? Poor, poor P.R. | | | | | | | |
| 4. Enjoyed the money game! Good job! | | | | | | | |
| 5. Invite comments. | | | | | | | |
| 6. Stop with the acronyms already! | | | | | | | |
| 7. By making these transportation benefit to the environment and all people. | | | | | | | |
| 8. Not sure. Maybe a few jokes... | | | | | | | |
| 7. More information on immediate local impact. | | | | | | | |

**Hillsborough's Transportation Future
Public Outreach Meeting Evaluation
Response Summary**

Brandon Regional Service Center

Wednesday, June 10, 2009

Total Number of Responses Received - 3

Total Number Attendees - 34

| | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) | Rating Average | Response Counts |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. How well were the objectives of the workshop met? | - | - | - | 66.7% | 33.3% | 4.33 | 3 |
| 2. How well was the session facilitated? | - | - | - | - | 100.0% | 5.00 | 3 |
| 3. How effective did each agency share its information? | | | | | | | |
| TBARTA | - | - | - | 33.3% | 66.7% | 4.67 | 3 |
| MPO | - | - | - | - | 100.0% | 5.00 | 3 |
| HART | - | - | - | - | 100.0% | 5.00 | 3 |
| 4. Overall presentation was | - | - | - | - | 100.0% | 5.00 | 3 |
| 5. Do you now have a better understanding of Hillsborough County's transportation initiatives? | - | - | - | - | 100.0% | 5.00 | 3 |
| 6. How can we improve the workshop? | | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | | |

**Hillsborough's Transportation Future
Public Outreach Meeting Evaluation
Response Summary**

Carrollwood Cultural Center

Monday, June 15, 2009

Total Number of Responses Received - 10

Total Number Attendees - 44

| | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) | Rating Average | Response Counts |
|--|--|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. How well were the objectives of the workshop met? | - | - | 50.0% | 30.0% | 20.0% | 3.70 | 10 |
| 2. How well was the session facilitated? | - | - | 10.0% | 50.0% | 40.0% | 4.30 | 10 |
| 3. How effective did each agency share its information? | | | | | | | |
| TBARTA | - | - | - | 55.6% | 44.4% | 4.44 | 9 |
| MPO | - | - | - | 30.0% | 70.0% | 4.70 | 10 |
| HART | - | - | 20.0% | 30.0% | 50.0% | 4.30 | 10 |
| 4. Overall presentation was | - | - | 20.0% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 4.20 | 10 |
| 5. Do you now have a better understanding of Hillsborough County's transportation initiatives? | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 60.0% | 4.00 | 10 |
| 6. How can we improve the workshop? | <p>1. I liked the format. Name tags are needed for the individuals that are giving presentations and talked about the map.</p> <p>2. Stop being so defensive. Condescending will not gain any votes.</p> | | | | | | |

**Hillsborough's Transportation Future
Public Outreach Meeting Evaluation
Response Summary**

Riverview High School

Tuesday, June 16, 2009

Total Number of Responses Received - 5

Total Number Attendees - 23

| | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) | Rating Average | Response Counts |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. How well were the objectives of the workshop met? | - | - | 60.0% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 3.60 | 5 |
| 2. How well was the session facilitated? | - | - | 40.0% | 40.0% | 20.0% | 3.80 | 5 |
| 3. How effective did each agency share its information? | | | | | | | |
| TBARTA | - | - | 20.0% | 80.0% | - | 3.80 | 5 |
| MPO | - | - | 40.0% | 40.0% | 20.0% | 3.80 | 5 |
| HART | - | - | 20.0% | 60.0% | 20.0% | 4.00 | 5 |
| 4. Overall presentation was | - | - | 40.0% | 40.0% | 20.0% | 3.80 | 5 |
| 5. Do you now have a better understanding of Hillsborough County's transportation initiatives? | - | - | 40.0% | 40.0% | 20.0% | 3.80 | 5 |
| 6. How can we improve the workshop? | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More bus service in Brandon would help to sell additional tax initiative. Also ratio of percentage of tax revenue raised in area should stay roughly in the area which pays the tax. 2. Have everybody here including County Commission. 3. Refreshments. | | | | | | | |