

**New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force  
Meeting #2: Evaluation Sheets Tally**



A total of 18 Evaluation Forms were received.		Agree	Disagree	No Comment
1.	The objectives of this meeting were clearly articulated.	14	2	2
2.	The stated objectives for this meeting were met.	9	4	5
3.	I felt that my time was valued and utilized well.	9	6	3
4.	The handouts/presentations were appropriate and helpful.	15	2	1
5.	The information from speakers/presenters was clear and informative.	12	1	5
6.	The facilitator was well prepared and fair to all viewpoints.	17		1
7.	The facilitator was helpful in framing the issues and process of the meeting.	15	1	2
8.	I believe the topics were covered adequately in the time available.	7	6	5
9.	There was sufficient time for public comment.	6	5	7
10.	Task Force communications (i.e., materials, calls, logistics and other information) are being handled effectively.	12	2	4
11.	The meetings are convenient and conducive to our work (i.e., meeting time, meeting length, location, audio visual, acoustics, overall meeting space).	13	2	3
12.	The overall process that the Task Force is using is effective in bringing diverse views together to come up with recommendations for inclusion into the Draft Study Report.	9	1	8

**Comments:**

- We have work to do! After three months of Task Force meetings we are still talking about procedures of how we are going to work. Nothing has been DONE and if the meetings are continued the same way nothing will be DONE. A little better after 7:30.
- As in the last meeting, too much time spent on how and why we are to proceed with our task. We should get to work and deal with problems with procedure as or if they arise. Public attendance was low – probably bored by the first meeting. Half of this meeting time was wasted on junk.
- (“Time issues” to question #2. “N/A” to question #5. Comment below in response to question #12.) As a group we are being asked to evaluate a process – not the actual Loop concept and it I sense a real frustration about this on part of some participants and our “public” guests. Who, finally, makes the decision to look at other options/alternatives to the Loop concept? These might be more effective discussions if this was clarified?
- “Ran out of time” to question #2.
- Task Force needs to stay on task to allow for public comment – so that we are not required to sit here after 8 o’clock. Finish the housekeeping items so we can work.
- Things were better this time, but still a bit redundant and cumbersome. Seems to be moving in a more positive direction will get there in June! (“Somewhat” to questions #2, #8 and #11) – Rusty Brockman

- Seems like we get stuck on some of the items too long. Please let's get the meeting going and need to stick to the agenda and not let some people ask or take time to speak their peace. I probably can not make next meeting. June 15<sup>th</sup>. Sorry, I have other meetings to make that day. I also wish that the citizen's comments need to be short and to the point and not the family story and from the people from CASE!!!
- More productive than last month. Enjoyed the comment section and getting minutes to refer to before and after the meeting. I hope things get resolved. ("More time may be needed" to question #11)
- ("Somewhat" to question #3 and #5. "Can not tell yet" to question #12.)
- Task Force members should be provided verbatim comments from interviews. These were recorded and this would be more transparent. Summary has each category ending with a positive spin and needs to be more complete. Transparency is paramount.

RJ RIVERA stated that they used Comal and Guadalupe tax records for database of affected property owners. This is in direct conflict with what has been previously stated that only aerial shots could be used and it would be too time consuming to use tax records.

Regarding public involvement, public has never been given information on other motivations for this loop such as it being a toll road and for the General Land Office property on I-35. Public notice was violated in that the final route maps were not available on the website until 1 business day prior to end of comment period.

Meeting should adjourn at the scheduled time.

("Some postponed" to question #2. "Should have been given small group questions" to question #4. "Meeting ran too long" to question #9.)

- I felt that more information is being shared and becoming more organized in presentation of a lot of information. I still like to invite more official personnel who will clarify facts to why the outer loop is necessary to build.
- Prefer that we knock procedural and process issues in the head quickly and spend our time on substantive issues. Prefer to understand plan for meeting over charge and how each area of study will be addressed by the Task Force. – Tipton Ross
- Mr. Rivera – once again talking the attendance into submission.
- It is my understanding that the material info presented at each meeting can be carried forward to another meeting as more info is presented. In other words topics presented will not be closed after that meeting – but can be discussed again.
- When will we get to see the final report? The information presented tonight was very vague and not useful. When will we have access/be presented the detailed information such as the reports from the Technical and Community work groups? I want to read all of the details for myself. Who specifically commissioned the outer loop task force and why? What were the specific issues that caused the outer loop task force to be formed.