

I would be interested in participating in a similar project as the Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment in the future.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Additional feedback about the Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment?

Thank you for participating in the Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment and for completing this form!

Appendix B: Evaluation Form

Gateway Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit Health Impact Assessment Evaluation April 2016

Please complete this evaluation form if you participated in the Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment. The form should take 2 minutes to complete.

Please answer the following:

1. I am a participant in the following Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment committee:
 - Gateway Gold Line Policy Advisory Committee
 - Gateway Gold Line Technical Advisory Committee
 - Living Healthy in Washington County
 - St. Paul—Ramsey County Community Health Services Advisory Committee
2. Because of the Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment, I have increased knowledge of how health, transportation, and land use are related.
 - Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
3. Because of the Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment, I have a better understanding of how cities can use planning processes to support health.
 - Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
4. The Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment process was responsive to my interests and concerns.
 - Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
5. The information presented as part of the Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment has been useful for me, my organization, or both.
 - Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

(over)

Appendix A: Minimum Elements

Comprehensive Health Impact Assessments (HIA) should include the following minimum elements, which together distinguish HIA from other processes used to assess and inform decisions:

1. HIA is conducted to assess the potential health consequences of a proposed program, policy, project, or plan under consideration by decision-makers, and is conducted in advance of the decision in question.
2. HIA involves and engages stakeholders affected by the proposal, particularly vulnerable populations.
3. HIA systematically considers the full range of potential impacts of the proposal on health determinants, health status, and health equity.
4. HIA provides a profile of existing conditions for the populations affected by the proposal, including their health outcomes, health determinants, and vulnerable sub-groups within the population, relevant to the health issues examined in the HIA.
5. HIA characterizes the proposal's impacts on health, health determinants, and health equity, while documenting data sources and analytic methods, quality of evidence used, methodological assumptions, and limitations.
6. HIA provides recommendations, as needed, on feasible and effective actions to promote the positive health impacts and mitigate the negative health impacts of the decision, identifying, where appropriate, alternatives or modifications to the proposal.
7. HIA produces a publicly accessible report that includes, at minimum, documentation of the HIA's purpose, findings, and recommendations, and either documentation of the processes and methods involved, or reference to an external source of documentation for these processes and methods. The report should be shared with decision-makers and other stakeholders.
8. HIA proposes indicators, actions, and responsible parties, where indicated, for a plan to monitor the implementation of recommendations, as well as health effects and outcomes of the proposal.

Responses were generally positive with more respondents selecting “strongly agree” or “agree” for each question. The least positive response was to the statement “The Gateway Gold Line health impact assessment process was responsive to my interests and concerns.” Unfortunately no one who marked “neutral” or “disagree” submitted a comment to provide additional insight. Project team members thought the responses could be attributed to a couple of themes that came up through the HIA process. First, the connection between health, transportation, and land use decisions was not easily understood by all participants. Some comments made during the project were outside of the project scope —such as the need for childcare access and police surveillance—were unlikely to be influenced by land use decisions. When these items were not included, it could have appeared the project team was unresponsive to stakeholder comments. Second, some participants were not in favor of the overall Gold Line BRT project itself. Many of these concerns were instead captured as part of the DEIS underway to identify the environmentally preferred alternative.

Opportunities for Improvement

- **Discuss project team expectations** related to time commitment from each staff person and to establish how to streamline comments at the beginning of a project.
- **Contribute more resources to stakeholder engagement** to ensure adequate time is available for participants to understand the project and to incorporate all perspectives.
- **Understand data limitations** as early as possible to guide scoping and assessment. This includes reviewing available data and understanding what geographic units data is available (e.g., county, city, census block, etc.).
- **Hire a writing professional** to translate technical information for general audiences.