

FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

Online Responses = 53
Get-Together Attendance = 49

CRCSD BACK & BETTER GET-TOGETHER #3	OPTION 4a: 1800 51st St. NE “former Econofoods”			OPTION 4b: 3750 Williams Blvd. SW “former Target”			OPTION 5a: 2933 Ellis Rd. NW “District-owned property”			OPTION 5b: 12th St. / 26th Ave. SW “land for sale”		
	FOR	AGAINST	MORE INFO.	FOR	AGAINST	MORE INFO.	FOR	AGAINST	MORE INFO.	FOR	AGAINST	MORE INFO.
COMMENT CATEGORY*												
TOTAL # OF CARDS/SURVEYS*	14	46	3	12	44	1	51	19	4	30	30	5
SOCIAL												
A Educational Benefits		3			8		13			3		
B Employee Environment		5			10		13			3		
C User/Employee/Customer Needs		3			9		14			4		
D Civic Strength		1			2			1		1	1	
ECONOMIC												
E Project Cost	2	9			9		5	1		1	10	
F 50-year Cost		15			11		16			2	2	
G Effectiveness/Productivity	1	2			6		19	2		9	1	
ENVIRONMENTAL												
H Location Considerations	15	11		11	17		26	17		12	14	
I Transportation Options	13	5		5	2		2	12		11	4	
J Ecological Considerations	4			3			1	5		1	2	
General Comments	2	23		7	14		13	8		13	15	

*NOTE: A feedback card or online survey response was either for an option or against an option, and/or might request additional information. Comments tended to discuss pro’s and cons of each option rather than state an absolute preference. A response that didn’t obviously state a preference about the option was counted as either “For” or “Against” based on the number or syntax of pro or con statements. For example, a card with three positive and two negative comments was counted as “For” the option. This means a responder could be “for” multiple options.

A feedback card or survey response may have multiple comments. All pro and con statements were tallied in the For and Against columns regardless of the feedback card or survey response disposition. For example, if a card with three positive comments also has a concern about location, the response was counted as “For,” but a tally was added to the Location Considerations field in the Against column.

Comments in **favor** of Option 4a like the low project cost, re-use of an existing building, location and accessibility. Comments **against** Option 4a cite the age, quality and building’s original purpose being unable to meet district needs, the high 50-year cost, and the distance from the District Transportation Center. Additional information included whether the building could be torn down and build all District support facilities at this site.

Comments in **favor** of Option 4b like the re-use of an existing building, location and accessibility, and that the building was constructed for longer term use than Option 4a. Comments **against** Option 4b cite the building’s age and original purpose being unable to meet District needs, the high project and 50-year cost, and the distance from the Transportation Center. Additional information included whether the project would meet the FEMA time line, have excessive additional unidentified costs, and if using this location could help revitalize Westdale.

Comments in **favor** of Option 5a like the 50-year cost, single location of all support facilities, ability of new construction to meet all District needs, and that the property is already owned by the District. Comments **against** Option 5a cite the property size may not allow future growth, flooding of the access roads, and traffic congestion on Edgewood Road. Additional information includes whether Edgewood Road is a truck route.

Comments in **favor** of Option 5b like the location and accessibility, ability of new construction to meet all District needs, and room for future growth. Comments **against** Option 5b cite the high project cost and distance from the District Transportation Center. Additional information included whether the project would meet the FEMA time line, and that the District should not invest in more property.

