

1. The process improved communication among key parties.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	50.0% (10)	45.0% (9)	4.40	20
	Comments						1
	answered question						20
	skipped question						0

2. The process helped build trust among participants.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	20.0% (4)	40.0% (8)	40.0% (8)	4.20	20
	Comments						1
	answered question						20
	skipped question						0

3. The process provided opportunities to learn for all parties.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	35.0% (7)	65.0% (13)	4.65	20
						Comments	1
						answered question	20
						skipped question	0

4. The process was efficient. It was time and money well spent.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	31.6% (6)	31.6% (6)	36.8% (7)	4.05	19
						Comments	2
						answered question	19
						skipped question	1

5. The final recommendations include all perspectives brought up during the process.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	45.0% (9)	45.0% (9)	4.35	20
						Comments	2
						answered question	20
						skipped question	0

6. Participants had access to the information needed to make good decisions.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	5.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	25.0% (5)	60.0% (12)	4.35	20
						Comments	6
						answered question	20
						skipped question	0

7. The REF model was a useful tool for informing analysis and decisions.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	10.0% (2)	10.0% (2)	15.0% (3)	35.0% (7)	30.0% (6)	3.65	20
						Comments	6
						answered question	20
						skipped question	0

8. The general public was able to review and comment on the process and outcome.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	15.0% (3)	35.0% (7)	45.0% (9)	4.20	20
						Comments	1
						answered question	20
						skipped question	0

9. The feedback provided by the public was helpful in the decision-making process.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	40.0% (8)	30.0% (6)	20.0% (4)	3.60	20
	Comments						2
	answered question						20
	skipped question						0

10. The staff from TJPDC provided adequate guidance and support.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	95.0% (19)	4.95	20
	Comments						1
	answered question						20
	skipped question						0

11. The facilitation team from UVA provided adequate facilitation.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	90.0% (18)	4.90	20
	Comments						2
	answered question						20
	skipped question						0

12. Participants' questions, needs, and concerns were taken seriously.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	15.0% (3)	85.0% (17)	4.85	20
						Comments	0
						answered question	20
						skipped question	0

13. The Free Bridge Area Stakeholder Advisory Team included a diverse array of perspectives.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (5)	75.0% (15)	4.75	20
						Comments	1
						answered question	20
						skipped question	0

14. I improved my understanding about the issues and others' views and values.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	40.0% (8)	60.0% (12)	4.60	20
						Comments	0
						answered question	20
						skipped question	0

15. I actively sought to understand other people's concerns and interests.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.3% (1)	15.8% (3)	78.9% (15)	4.74	19
	Comments						0
	answered question						19
	skipped question						1

16. I actively sought to find ways to address the concerns and interests of other parties.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	30.0% (6)	60.0% (12)	4.50	20
	Comments						0
	answered question						20
	skipped question						0

17. Stakeholder Advisory Committee members participated effectively.

	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	40.0% (8)	50.0% (10)	4.40	20
	Comments						3
	answered question						20
	skipped question						0

18. What were the best parts of the Free Bridge process?

Response
Count

15

answered question

15

skipped question

5

19. What were the worst/most difficult parts of the process?

Response
Count

16

answered question

16

skipped question

4

20. How could this process be improved?

Response
Count

11

answered question

11

skipped question

9

21. Other comments?

Response
Count

8

answered question

8

skipped question

12

Page 2, Q1. The process improved communication among key parties.

1	Best yet!!	Dec 15, 2014 4:04 PM
---	------------	----------------------

Page 2, Q2. The process helped build trust among participants.

1	Trust is not built on words in a closed room, but on actions out-of-that room.	Dec 15, 2014 10:06 AM
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

Page 2, Q3. The process provided opportunities to learn for all parties.

1	Not enough time to discuss things.	Dec 19, 2014 12:04 PM
---	------------------------------------	-----------------------

Page 2, Q4. The process was efficient. It was time and money well spent.

1	A lot of money was spent. Glad that the volunteer members were volunteers.	Dec 15, 2014 10:06 AM
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

2	Meetings were long and began during normal working hours which made it difficult to attend for those who work until 5+.	Dec 15, 2014 9:44 AM
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------

Page 2, Q5. The final recommendations include all perspectives brought up during the process.

1	I'm not sure I've reviewed the final recommendations yet, as I think those will be included in the final report. I also think it's unlikely that the final recommendations will "include" all perspectives brought up during the process, but I can say that all perspectives were welcomed during the process that led to final recommendations.	Dec 22, 2014 10:45 AM
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

2	The final recommendations are starting points for further scrutiny.	Dec 15, 2014 10:06 AM
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

Page 3, Q6. Participants had access to the information needed to make good decisions.

1	early work on the environmental rating system was very poor. participants did not have the tools they needed to make the decisions requested of them.	Dec 29, 2014 6:52 AM
2	Best yet, thanks!	Dec 19, 2014 12:22 PM
3	The process would have benefited if traffic projections were more in line with actual project specific traffic information.	Dec 16, 2014 11:51 AM
4	I would have found a better definition of the problem helpful	Dec 15, 2014 2:22 PM
5	Actual costs for the various plans and the desires of local private property owners were unknown	Dec 15, 2014 10:12 AM
6	Further Analysis use Deterministic or simulation tool would have provided a better analysis of the various scenarios	Dec 15, 2014 9:58 AM

Page 3, Q7. The REF model was a useful tool for informing analysis and decisions.

1	I don't believe that the REF model gave any information that wasn't already known.	Dec 29, 2014 6:52 AM
2	it is a good tool but not the most appropriate in an area with our population density	Dec 29, 2014 6:23 AM
3	As we discussed during a few meetings, it potentially adds some useful information and perspective worth considering. However, rather than eliminating subjectivity from the process of comparing the environmental impacts of different alternatives, it instead seems to shift it to the REF methodology and the assumptions and values incorporated therein.	Dec 22, 2014 10:48 AM
4	I think this would be excellent for planning something like the proposed pipeline in Nelson, or a longer road segment, but was not quite suited to the small study area for Free Bridge.	Dec 15, 2014 11:45 AM
5	Once we got past the first few meetings which were devoted to issues which I think were not helpful.	Dec 15, 2014 10:12 AM
6	To the extent it was able again further analysis using a deterministic toll would have been very helpful for the traffic analysis	Dec 15, 2014 9:58 AM

Page 4, Q8. The general public was able to review and comment on the process and outcome.

1	Very little media coverage.	Dec 15, 2014 10:14 AM
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------

Page 4, Q9. The feedback provided by the public was helpful in the decision-making process.

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | red and green dots need to be augmented with more thoughtful input | Dec 29, 2014 6:24 AM |
| 2 | There was so very little public knowledge of the issues which were considered. | Dec 15, 2014 10:14 AM |

Page 5, Q10. The staff from TJPDC provided adequate guidance and support.

- | | | |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | TJPDC staff did a great job, particularly considering the staff transition that occurred fairly late in the process. | Dec 22, 2014 10:50 AM |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|

Page 5, Q11. The facilitation team from UVA provided adequate facilitation.

- | | | |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | IEN's mediation was outstanding. They created a comfortable environment for people to share varied perspectives and ideas. | Dec 22, 2014 10:50 AM |
| 2 | worked extremely well at managing the diverse group. | Dec 15, 2014 9:59 AM |

Page 6, Q13. The Free Bridge Area Stakeholder Advisory Team included a diverse array of perspectives.

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | More property owners in the geographic area would have been helpful. I wonder why there are certain organizations which are always on every planning group and others which are never invited to participate. | Dec 15, 2014 10:19 AM |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|

Page 6, Q17. Stakeholder Advisory Committee members participated effectively.

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | There was a subset of very involved members. Those who did participate consistently did so effectively and respectfully. | Dec 22, 2014 10:52 AM |
| 2 | Most did, some did not. | Dec 15, 2014 10:19 AM |
| 3 | Overall good attendance, but meeting time and length made it difficult for some to attend. | Dec 15, 2014 9:45 AM |

Page 7, Q18. What were the best parts of the Free Bridge process?

1	dialogue	Dec 29, 2014 6:54 AM
2	facilitators from UVA	Dec 29, 2014 6:27 AM
3	The general tenor of the meetings was one of diverse interests coming together to evaluate a common problem. The mediation enabled that to go surprisingly smooth, and a unique spirit of collaboration developed.	Dec 22, 2014 10:59 AM
4	The open discussions between stakeholders	Dec 22, 2014 10:44 AM
5	Surprisingly, the best part was the walk along the Rivanna River. It opened my eyes to important possibilities.	Dec 22, 2014 7:21 AM
6	Diverse membership.	Dec 19, 2014 12:26 PM
7	IEN were great facilitators. Staff were good.	Dec 19, 2014 12:20 PM
8	concepts of alleviating traffic	Dec 16, 2014 11:01 AM
9	Participation of all members.	Dec 15, 2014 4:10 PM
10	Staff work was extremely helpful	Dec 15, 2014 2:24 PM
11	Analyzing the creative thoughts going around the room	Dec 15, 2014 11:46 AM
12	We had civil group discussions and the cost of the various ideas were discussed	Dec 15, 2014 10:35 AM
13	folks who disagree on most everything found common ground here on this issue	Dec 15, 2014 10:32 AM
14	The approach to completing environmental assessments before moving forward. Often, a great deal of planning work gets completed on a project and then the process becomes bogged down, often for years, over environmental concerns that weren't effectively addressed. It appears this process gets to those concerns up front.	Dec 15, 2014 10:27 AM
15	Our initial drawings during the out-of-the box phase was really interesting. Well-run meetings, pretty good diversity of interests, learning new ways of evaluating projects	Dec 15, 2014 9:46 AM

Page 7, Q19. What were the worst/most difficult parts of the process?

1	initial work on weighting ranking systems and not being able to model requested items	Dec 29, 2014 6:54 AM
2	TJPDC meeting facilities	Dec 29, 2014 6:27 AM
3	I felt like the explanation of the values and assumptions that were incorporated into the REF tool was too superficial, and from what I was able to gather, there's still quite a bit of subjectivity involved in ranking resources and weighing impacts. That said, I can certainly appreciate that a more technical explanation of the REF methodology would have been very dull and bogged the committee down. However, based on what was shared with the reviewers, I did not leave the meetings with a high degree of confidence in using the REF tool to make decisions.	Dec 22, 2014 10:59 AM
4	Trying to implement the model to an urban transportation issue.	Dec 22, 2014 10:44 AM
5	The knowledge that our results would be non-binding, and unclear of the true value of the process.	Dec 22, 2014 7:35 AM
6	Eventually there must be an "Eastern connector" between US 29 north and Pantops. But, positions to prevent this have been frozen. Until this solution can be accepted, there can be no progress. Unfortunately, the project did nothing to change the status quo.	Dec 22, 2014 7:21 AM
7	Time (4-7) for the meetings, but I I'm at a loss for an alternative.	Dec 19, 2014 12:26 PM
8	People quit. The group at the end was a fraction of what it was at the beginning. Why? I felt quite miffed that people who initially came didn't follow through with the commitment to attend and contribute. Need more time for conversations about the issues/problems/possibilities.	Dec 19, 2014 12:20 PM
9	the possibility of nothing ever coming to pass for varied reasons that have nothing or little to do with the project	Dec 16, 2014 11:01 AM
10	Time	Dec 15, 2014 4:10 PM
11	The images projected and the hand hounds could have been improved	Dec 15, 2014 2:24 PM
12	3 hour meetings	Dec 15, 2014 11:46 AM
13	Tthe environmental impact was not relevant to the final choices we discussed. The questionnaires were not germane.	Dec 15, 2014 10:35 AM
14	no funds to do anything	Dec 15, 2014 10:32 AM
15	Trying to decide the best way to address anything in this corridor. It is congested, sure, but our options to effectively address this are very limited.	Dec 15, 2014 10:27 AM
16	The long span of time between meetings meant I forgot some of the preceding topics. Plus I had to miss the last couple of meetings, so am lacking the sense of completion.	Dec 15, 2014 9:46 AM

Page 7, Q20. How could this process be improved?

1	make and archive audio recordings of the proceeds	Dec 29, 2014 6:27 AM
2	The process itself would be difficult to improve. It would have been nice to have more consistent participation from all members (myself included).	Dec 22, 2014 10:59 AM
3	Expanding the transportaton model to include additional protections such as historic places and areas, neighborhood needs.	Dec 22, 2014 10:44 AM
4	The process was as good as could be expected, given the current political climate.	Dec 22, 2014 7:21 AM
5	More time needed to understand the tool.	Dec 19, 2014 12:20 PM
6	You did a wonderful job!	Dec 15, 2014 4:10 PM
7	The hand out were too small type or pictures to read well	Dec 15, 2014 2:24 PM
8	not sure, it seemed pretty good overall	Dec 15, 2014 11:46 AM
9	Begin with identifying the problem with exactly the available data and go from there.	Dec 15, 2014 10:35 AM
10	This process is data and information driven, to me. The only way to improve upon it, then, would be to provide more data and information on the area and all options available and any barriers to action that exist.	Dec 15, 2014 10:27 AM
11	It's hard to think how	Dec 15, 2014 9:46 AM

Page 7, Q21. Other comments?

1	thanks!	Dec 29, 2014 6:27 AM
2	A sincere "thank you" to both the TJPDC and IEN staff for doing such a great job shepherding us through this exercise!	Dec 22, 2014 10:59 AM
3	A very local project was analyzed, yet the GIS & other data used for ecological assessments were regional or state level data, and of questionable value. Tapping local experts and data is critical, even if the data is not in digital form.	Dec 22, 2014 7:35 AM
4	Origin-Destination studies for our area are sorely needed. They would be worth the money spent.	Dec 19, 2014 12:20 PM
5	A good expeerience	Dec 16, 2014 11:01 AM
6	Great process. I highly recommend	Dec 15, 2014 2:24 PM
7	None	Dec 15, 2014 10:27 AM
8	Thanks to the team from the Institute and TJPDC	Dec 15, 2014 9:46 AM