

**TRANSPORTATION**  
**2035**  
**CHANGE IN MOTION**

**Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area  
Public Outreach and Involvement Program**

**Draft Evaluation Report**

May 2009



**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700

510.817.5700   PHONE  
510.817.5769   TDD/TTY  
info@mtc.ca.gov   E-MAIL  
www.mtc.ca.gov   WEB

**Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area  
Public Outreach and Involvement Program  
Draft Evaluation Report**

**Table of Contents**

I. Introduction ..... 1

    A. Overview .....1

    B. Public Involvement Guiding Principles .....2

    C. Transportation 2035 Public Outreach Targeted Performance Measures.....3

II. Evaluation of Select Outreach Activities..... 6

    A. Public Workshops.....6

    B. Bay Area On the Move Regional Forum.....7

    C. Joint Advisor Workshops .....9

    D. Community-Based Focus Groups ..... 12

III. Key Findings for Targeted Performance Measures ..... 13

    A. Diversity ..... 13

    B. Reach..... 13

    C. Accessibility ..... 14

    D. Impact..... 15

    E. Participant Satisfaction..... 17

IV. Recommendations ..... 18

    (NOTE: This section will be completed after presentation to the MTC Planning Committee on June 12, 2009.)

V. Appendices..... 18

# I. Introduction

## A. Overview

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) regional transportation plan is the Commission's principal long-range planning document. The Transportation 2035 Plan, adopted by the Commission in April 2009, specifies investment strategies for maintaining, managing and improving the surface transportation network in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area with local, regional, state and federal funds that are projected to be available over the next 25 years.

Public participation is essential in developing planning and funding priorities for the plan. An extensive public outreach and involvement program for the 2035 Plan was conducted in three phases and spanned some 24 months. Phase One focused on the plan's vision and goals; Phase Two considered investment tradeoffs; and Phase Three included release of the Draft and Final Transportation 2035 Plan. MTC retained the consulting firm PMC to assist in the development and implementation of a comprehensive multi-phase public involvement program.

Thousands of Bay Area residents from all walks of life helped shape the Transportation 2035 Plan. Throughout 2007 and 2008, MTC reached out to its regional constituents by means of a regional forum; numerous public workshops and smaller discussion forums; two statistically valid telephone polls (conducted in three languages); Web surveys; "person on the street" (field) interviews; focus groups, including focus groups hosted by community-based organizations; and via in-depth discussions with members of MTC's three advisory committees.

The three-phase comprehensive public involvement campaign can be summarized as follows (details can be found in the Transportation 2035 Public Outreach and Involvement Program Report):

- "Bay Area on the Move" Regional Forum (700 participants)
- 11 MTC advisory committee workshops
- 2 roundtable discussions with key "Three E" leaders
- 13 workshops around the region (650 participants)
- 2 public hearings (80 participants)
- 2 statistically valid telephone surveys, offered in three languages (5,400 respondents)
- 2 Web surveys (over 3,000 completed surveys)
- 130 person-on-the-street, multilingual interviews
- 9 focus groups, one per county (some 100 residents)
- 10 multilingual focus groups with non-profits in low-income communities and communities of color (150 residents)

The Commission adopted a set of goals for outreach and public involvement for the Transportation 2035 Plan process, as well as performance measures for those goals. The measures include quantifiable targets for performance, based on MTC's aspirations for meaningful public involvement, tempered by reasonable assumptions and time and budget constraints.

This evaluation report details actual performance and reviews results of nearly 450 evaluation forms from outreach participants that were returned and tabulated.

## B. Public Involvement Guiding Principles

In 2007, MTC adopted a public participation plan for involving the people of the nine-county Bay Region in its key transportation policy and financial decisions. The Public Participation Plan, a federally mandated document, served as the basis for the public participation element of the Transportation 2035 Plan.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's public participation procedures are built on the following guiding principles:

- Public participation is a dynamic activity that requires teamwork and commitment at all levels of the MTC organization.
- One size does not fit all — effective public participation strategies must be tailored to fit the audience and the issue.
- Citizen advisory committees can be used to hear and learn from many voices in the Bay Area.
- Engaging interested citizens in 'regional' transportation issues is challenging, but possible.
- Effective public outreach and involvement requires relationship building.
- Create an open and transparent public participation process that empowers low-income communities and communities of color to participate in decision making that affects them (MTC's Environmental Justice Principal #1, adopted March 2006).

In addition to guiding principles, MTC uses the following tactics to ensure reaching the largest number of Bay Area residents in the most effective manner:

### Early Engagement Is Best

MTC structures its major planning initiatives and funding decisions to provide for meaningful opportunities to help shape outcomes.

### Regional Transportation Plan Is Key Policy Document

Because it is the blueprint for both new policies and investments for the Bay Area, MTC's regional transportation plan updates are one of the best places for interested citizens to get involved.

### Communication Is a Two-Way Street

MTC pays close attention to the views of the public. MTC is committed to responding to every letter, fax and e-mail sent by members of the public directly to MTC.

### Inform Commissioners and Public of Areas of Agreement and Disagreement

MTC staff summarizes comments heard by various parties so that the Commissioners and the public have a clear understanding of where there is consensus on a given issue and where there is not.

### Notify Public of Proposed or Final Actions

MTC staff makes every effort to ensure that meeting minutes reflect public comments and document how comments are considered in MTC's decisions. We strive to inform citizen participants on how public meetings/participation are helping to shape or have contributed to MTC's key decisions and actions. When outcomes don't correspond to the views expressed, every effort is made to explain why not.

### Access to All

MTC works to provide all Bay Area residents opportunities for meaningful participation, regardless of disabilities or language barriers. Further, we recognize that one should not need to be a transportation professional to understand our written and oral communications. In this spirit, we strive to communicate in plain language, and use visuals to translate detailed data into information that is more readily understood. In addition, we provide auxiliary aids or interpreters to persons with disabilities or language translation barriers.

## C. Transportation 2035 Public Outreach Targeted Performance Measures

MTC's Public Participation Plan calls for setting and measuring progress on goals for involving the public in MTC's regional transportation plan. In October 2007, the Commission adopted the following set of goals for outreach and public involvement for the Transportation 2035 Plan process.

- *Diversity:* Participants must represent a range of socioeconomic, ethnic and cultural, geographic and user (mode) groups. They must also include a range of people with varying interests: social service, business, environment, social justice/equity, etc.
- *Reach:* The program should make every effort to include the greatest number of people possible. Different levels of participation will make it more inviting for people with a range of involvement preferences to join the discussion.
- *Accessibility:* Every effort should be made to ensure that anyone who wants to participate can do so. This goal can be met by taking the participation activities to where people already are located, whenever possible. It can also be met by providing ways to participate, regardless of individuals' language or ability to attend a meeting, access to the Web, etc.
- *Impact:* The feedback received through this Outreach and Involvement Program should be analyzed and provided to the Commission policy makers wherever appropriate. Interested participants should be informed of Commissions actions. Decisions to not incorporate recommendations should be noted, with a rationale provided and ready to be discussed.

- *“High-quality” Input and Participation:* Focus on receiving comments that generate discussion, add value to the process and help to build consensus.
- *Education:* This outreach program is an opportunity for MTC to educate a wide range of people about transportation issues in the Bay Area, as well as the link to climate change and smart growth, among other issues. Each step of the process should include an educational element, whether it is about Bay Area transportation in general, specific projects being considered for inclusion in the long-range plan or background on the outreach results to date.
- *Participant Satisfaction:* People who take the time and energy to participate should feel it was worth their while to join in the discussion and debate.

MTC staff devised performance measures for the above-identified goals that include quantifiable targets for performance, based on MTC’s aspirations for meaningful public involvement, tempered by reasonable assumptions and time and budget constraints.

Except where indicated by an asterisk (\*), measures are true guides of outputs and outcomes, rather than inputs or efforts. Data collection methods include participant evaluations of individual events and meetings as well interviews of MTC’s citizen advisors.

The following targeted performance measures are associated with each of the goal topics.

#### Diversity

- The demographics of targeted groups (age, ethnicity, income, geographic location, disability) roughly mirror the demographics of the Bay Area’s population.\*
- Participants represent a cross-section of people of various interests, places of residence and primary modes of travel, as reported on evaluation forms distributed at meetings.

#### Reach

- 2,500 or more comments are logged.
- 2,500 individuals actively participate in the Transportation 2035 Outreach and Involvement Program, as measured by survey responses and meeting attendance (excluding repeat attendance).
- There are 30,000 visits or “views” to the 2035 section of the MTC Web site during active periods of the public outreach and involvement program.
- The 2035 Plan or elements of it are mentioned in at least 70 radio or TV broadcasts, newspaper articles, editorials, commentaries, or other printed media.

#### Accessibility

- Meetings are held in all nine counties.
- 100 percent of meeting locations are accessible by transit.\*
- Meetings are linguistically accessible to 100 percent of participants, with 3 working days’ advance request for translation.\* (Meeting announcements will offer translation services with advance notice to participants speaking any language with available professional translation services.)
- All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).\*

### Impact

- 100 percent of written comments received are logged, analyzed, summarized and communicated in time for consideration by staff or Commissioners.
- 100 percent of the written comments are acknowledged so that the person making them knows whether his or her comment is reflected in the outcome of a Commission action or, conversely, why the Commission acted differently.

### Participant Satisfaction, “High-quality” Input and Education

- 60 percent of participants “*strongly agree or agree*” with statements that rate the Transportation 2035 Outreach Program. The statements cover the following performance dimensions:
  - Accessibility (meeting locations, materials presented in appropriate languages for targeted audiences, with sufficient advance notice, etc.)
  - Sufficient opportunity to comment
  - Clear information at an appropriate level of detail
  - Educational value of presentations and materials
  - Understanding of other perspectives and differing priorities
  - Quality of the discussion

## II. Evaluation of Select Outreach Activities

### A. Public Workshops

Public workshops were a key part of the Transportation 2035 public involvement campaign, used to gather public comment at key points in the development of the draft plan. Four public workshops held during the Phase I outreach program involved about 200 participants. Nine workshops, one in each Bay Area county, drew over 450 attendees during Phase Two. Finally, two public hearings/workshops were held during Phase Three and drew 80 participants. The evaluation results from the Bay Area on the Move Regional Forum, held October 2007, are not included here; the forum is reviewed in the next section of this Evaluation Report.

Workshop participants were asked to indicate on a meeting evaluation form their level of agreement with statements that cover specific performance dimensions. The summary results below represent input from approximately 350 forms returned at the public workshops held throughout Phases One, Two and Three of the outreach campaign:

#### Transportation 2035 Workshop Evaluation Forms

Evaluation Form Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1. I had the opportunity to provide comments.	53%	36%	5%	3%	2%	1%
2. I found the meeting useful and informative.	22%	50%	17%	7%	3%	1%
3. I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities.	23%	49%	20%	5%	3%	0%
4. The information presented was clear and had an appropriate level of detail.	10%	40%	22%	20%	8%	0%
5. A quality discussion on key issues took place.	9%	46%	20%	17%	6%	2%
6. I learned more about transportation planning in the Bay Area by participating.	11%	45%	25%	13%	5%	1%
7. There were no barriers (language or other) that prevented me from participating.	57%	35%	4%	3%	1%	0%

The evaluation form asked participants if they agree or disagree with positively-worded statements about the workshops. The table above shows that a majority of respondents did strongly agree/agree with each statement. The two measures receiving the lowest agreement were "The information presented was clear and had an appropriate level of detail" (50% strongly agree/agree) and "A quality discussion on key issues took place" (55% strongly agree/agree).

## B. Bay Area On the Move Regional Forum

A joint regional land-use and transportation forum — titled “Bay Area on the Move: Connecting Transportation, Land Use and Climate Protection” — cosponsored by MTC and its sister regional agency, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), drew some 700 Bay Area residents who previewed some of the major decisions anticipated as part of the update to MTC’s long-range transportation plan. The day-long forum was held on Friday, October 26, 2007, at the Oakland City Center Marriott and Convention Center to discuss the future of the Bay Area’s development patterns, environment and mobility.

Participants came from every corner of the Bay Region and represented a wide range of interests and professions. At the start of the forum, participants used on-the-spot electronic voting to indicate what county and interest group they represented. The following tables provide a representative breakdown by county and interest.

### REGIONAL FORUM PARTICIPANTS

County	Percentage of Total
Alameda	32%
Contra Costa	17%
Marin	7%
Napa	2%
San Francisco	15%
San Mateo	6%
Santa Clara	8%
Solano	5%
Sonoma	4%
Other Locales	3%

Interest Group/Profession	Percentage of Total
Business Persons	9%
Community Advocates	14%
Concerned Individuals	10%
Elected Officials	12%
Environmental Advocates	7%
Public Sector Staff	39%
Social Justice Advocates	4%
Other	5%

At the conclusion of the forum, participants were asked to complete a Meeting Evaluation Form; approximately 100 forms were returned and used to compile these next two statistics. The regional forum drew a good number of individuals attending their first public meeting or workshop. When asked “Have you attended a public meeting or workshop in the Bay Area before?” 17 percent replied this was their first public meeting, and 83 percent had previously attended a public meeting or workshop. Additionally, when asked if they used public transit regularly (at least 1-2 times a week), 62 percent of the respondents replied yes, and 38 percent replied no.

**Bay Area on the Move Participant Evaluation**

The following tables provide a breakdown of participants’ overall impressions of the Bay Area on the Move forum. Approximately 100 Meeting Evaluation Forms were returned and used to compile these results.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1. I felt I had the opportunity to ask questions in the break-out sessions.	25.7%	55.2%	12.4%	1.9%	4.8%
2. I had the opportunity to provide comments.	40.0%	53.3%	2.9%	0.0%	3.8%
3. I found the meeting useful and informative.	39.0%	54.3%	2.9%	0.0%	3.8%
4. I gained a better understanding of other people’s perspectives and priorities.	25.7%	58.1%	7.6%	0.0%	8.6%
5. The information presented was clear and contained an appropriate level of detail.	22.9%	57.1%	14.3%	1.9%	3.8%
6. A quality discussion on key issues took place.	14.3%	66.7%	11.4%	1.9%	5.7%
7. I learned more about transportation and land use by participating today.	21.0%	57.1%	12.4%	0.0%	9.5%
8. There were no barriers (language or other) to my participating.	45.7%	47.6%	3.8%	0.0%	2.9%

**Bay Area on the Move Evaluation - Written Comments**

In addition to specific questions to evaluate certain aspects of the forum, the Meeting Evaluation Form provided participants the opportunity to add comments on how to improve the meeting. Below is a small sampling of comments received. See the Appendix at the end of the report for a complete list of comments:

- Be clearer on what the next steps for the RTP process will be. Be clearer on how community participation at the meeting today will be used.

- Loved the voting opportunity.
- Location near BART and bicycle parking great!
- Morning session was great. Break-out was disappointing – didn't feel the questions led to productive discussion or recommendations.

### C. Joint Advisor Workshops

MTC conducted numerous joint advisor workshops involving members of its three citizen advisory committees: MTC Advisory Council, Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC) and Minority Citizens Advisory Committee (MCAC). PMC, a public outreach consultant retained by MTC, conducted interviews of advisors in May 2009 to obtain feedback about their experience during the joint advisor workshops. Twelve joint advisor workshops were held: three workshops were held in 2007, seven in 2008 and two in 2009.

The 31 advisors chosen to be interviewed attended a least four of the joint advisors workshops. Of the 31 advisors, 22 were available to be interviewed, including the chairpersons of all three advisory bodies. Those advisors unable to be contacted by telephone were contacted by e-mail. Two e-mail responses were received. The breakdown of respondents includes ten Advisory Council, nine EDAC and six MCAC members. Three of the advisors interviewed are serving concurrently on more than one advisory body. The advisors were asked a series of seven questions about their experiences.

1. *Did you find it useful to learn about and discuss the long-range transportation issues in a joint forum? If so, why? If not, how did it fall short?*

	Number	Percentage
Yes	21	95%
No	1	5%

An overwhelming majority of advisors surveyed felt that the joint forums were a useful tool to learn about and discuss long-range transportation issues. Most concurred that the forums allowed members to hear different perspectives about mobility and to see the whole picture. One EDAC member felt the process was “informative” rather than helpful. Another thought it was educational. One MCAC member supported the joint forums but was unsure about the format reaching a broader base of residents from across the Bay Area and felt that better coordination was needed. The only dissenting opinion was from an Advisory Council member who felt that the process was biased toward highway projects over rail and transit. An EDAC member felt the meeting times of the joint forums conflicted with other meetings.

2. *Did you find it useful to have a wider range of stakeholders with different voices and opinions at the table?*

	Number	Percentage
Yes	21	95%
No	1	5%

Reflecting the response to the first question, a majority of advisors felt that it was useful to have different voices and opinions at the table. Most attendees found it helpful to hear diverse opinions and perspectives. The only dissenting opinion was from an Advisory Council member who felt that the public participation process does not attract stakeholders who are politically savvy.

3. *Did you feel that comments from the advisors were conveyed to the Commissioners?*

	Number	Percentage
Yes	12	55%
No	3	14%
Unsure	7	32%

The responses to this question were fairly mixed. Slightly over half of the advisors surveyed thought that their comments were being adequately conveyed to the Commission. However, about a third of those surveyed indicated their uncertainty as to whether their comments reached the Commission since nothing was reflected back to them. In essence, they expressed some concern that nothing was presented about the Commission response to the advisors' comments and suggestions.

One EDAC member stressed the importance of the Commission validating comments made by the advisors and felt that the Commission tended to be condescending at times. One Advisory Council and EDAC member felt that the comments conveyed to the Commission were "highly processed." One MCAC member expressed some level of frustration that the plans did not mirror the input. He mentioned that the MCAC identified five to six issues that were conveyed to the Planning Committee. One Advisory Council member stated that the Commission does a good job of listening.

4. *Have you participated in a previous update of the regional transportation plan whether as an MTC advisor or as an interested citizen? If yes, do you think you had more or less of an impact this time around, or about the same?*

	Number	Percentage
Yes, participated in a previous update	11	50%
No, did not previously participate	11	50%

Half of the respondents indicated that they have participated in a previous update of the regional transportation plan. Of these, most did feel that they had more of an impact during the T2035 process, in part due to the joint advisors workshops. The overall view was that the Transportation 2035 outreach process was more thorough and that staff did a better job of documenting responses.

5. *Do you have any comments you would like to share about other elements of the Transportation 2035 public outreach campaign, such as the public workshops held in each county, the Web surveys, or the October 2007 regional summit held at the Oakland Marriott hotel?*

Respondents' comments about the other elements of the Transportation 2035 public outreach program were fairly mixed and offered suggestions for improvement. One Advisory Council member felt that the Bay Area on the Move regional summit was the most informative forum on future transportation plans and needs ever attended. One MCAC member felt that the public workshops were very good but suggested that it would be a good idea to survey people who do not use transit and find out why.

Other comments expressed concern that not all stakeholders were represented, in particular community-based organizations (CBOs). One MCAC member felt that the outreach effort was not front-loaded as it should have been and had expressed concerns in an e-mail to MTC staff to this effect. One Advisory Council member thought that the response to the public input was selective. Another Advisory Council member expressed concern about the limited participation of small business owners and business associations. This advisor noted that the data presented does not adequately reflect businesses impacted by major transit projects. Outreach and focus should be targeted to local and regional businesses, vendors, start-ups and disadvantaged businesses.

An EDAC member enjoyed the process, but felt that most of the changes came about for political reasons and not because the joint advisors wanted it to happen. He cited the example of HOT lanes, which have the support of the Commission. One Advisory Council member thought that MTC failed to present a "real smart-growth alternative," and felt that MTC should do a better job in attracting business people, elected officials and average citizens, who often do not come to public meetings.

6. *In the future, would you find it useful to discuss other issues of mutual interest to the advisory committees in a joint forum?*

All of the advisors interviewed felt that the joint forum format is a useful tool to discuss other issues of mutual interest. The overall sentiment was that the joint forums should be held often so each advisory group could understand the other groups' positions and needs. The cross-fertilization of ideas and perspectives was quite helpful.

Additional issues of interest cited include emergency preparedness, global warming (AB 32/SB 375 conformity), goods movement, effective outreach strategies to low-income and minority communities, pedestrian safety, and high school internship programs. Several advisors emphasized that joint forums would be more effective at the subcommittee level working closely with MTC staff.

7. *Is there anything we missed?*

Most of the respondents surveyed felt that nothing was missed and enjoyed the joint advisor format overall. However, there were some suggestions on how the process could be improved. One advisor felt that the Early Dialogue Workshops worked better and that the later joint advisors workshops were rubber-stamped. Another was impressed with the involvement of MTC senior-level staff in the process. One EDAC member thought that the earlier joint advisor forums facilitated by MTC staff were too wonkish, analytical and lacked a big picture perspective. He expressed the importance of having MTC senior staff members provide a broader overview of the issues. One MCAC member expressed that it took a while

for the advisors to understand what the RTP process was all about. He suggested that objectives and goals should have been more clearly defined from the beginning.

#### D. Community-Based Focus Groups

MTC continued its practice of developing partnerships with community-based organizations to assist with public involvement in communities of concern (identified as communities with thresholds of at least 70 percent minority or 30 percent low-income residents as of the 2000 Census). The Transportation 2035 outreach included 10 focus groups facilitated by community-based organizations, nine (90%) of which were in areas previously identified by MTC as communities of concern.

A Request for Proposal was issued on February 26, 2008, and sent to community-based, not-for-profit, and faith-based organizations throughout the region inviting them to assist MTC in developing a focus group in their area. The primary objective of the community-based focus groups was to ensure that a range of Bay Area low-income communities and communities of color had a chance to comment on the Transportation 2035 plan.

While participants of the 10 community-based focus groups were not provided with evaluation forms at the conclusion of the focus groups, staff of the community-based organizations, as well as focus group participants, expressed appreciation for MTC's initiative in seeking to involve their communities. One North Bay participant commented that residents in his area feel removed from the rest of the Bay Area, and appreciated MTC taking the time to solicit opinions from the northern part of the region. Many other participants also gave positive feedback on being included, but some expressed a desire to be involved earlier in the process.

In addition, some of the community-based organizations' staff observed that their clients often feel disenfranchised from many key policy decisions. Given that transportation and mobility are integral to the quality of life of community residents, they appreciated the opportunity for their constituents to share their views with the Commission and partner agencies.

### III. Key Findings for Targeted Performance Measures

#### A. Diversity

MTC sought to involve people from all walks of life in the nine-county Bay Area in developing the Transportation 2035 Plan, including people of different ages, races, ethnicities, incomes and places of residence.

##### Measures:

1. The demographics of targeted groups (age, ethnicity, income, geographic location, disability) roughly mirrors the demographics of the Bay Area's population.
2. Participants represent a cross-section of people of various interests, places of residence and primary modes of travel, as reported on evaluation forms distributed at meetings.

##### Outcome: All Measures Achieved

- Two statistically valid telephone polls were conducted (in the fall of 2007 and in the spring of 2008) that reflected the demographic characteristics listed above. Both polls were offered in English, Spanish or Cantonese.
- Throughout the development of the Draft Transportation 2035 Plan, meetings were held in all nine Bay Area counties.
- A series of focus groups were held in each Bay Area county, while a parallel round of focus groups was done in conjunction with nonprofit organizations representing low income communities and communities of color. Of the 10 focus groups facilitated by community-based organizations, nine (90%) were in areas previously identified by MTC as communities of concern (identified as communities with thresholds of at least 70 percent minority or 30 percent low-income residents as of the 2000 Census).
- Data collected at the September 2007 regional summit showed that participants came from all over the Bay Area and represented a range of interests (see p. 7 of this document for click voting results from the summit).
- "Person-on-the-street" interviews were conducted in 31 locations (including transit hubs, shopping centers, senior centers, farmers markets, etc.) to seek out views and ideas from those who do not participate in meetings.

#### B. Reach

MTC made an effort to involve a large segment of the Bay Area population in the transportation choices surrounding the 2035 Plan. To do so, MTC identified four specific indicators having to do with reaching out to Bay Area residents.

##### Measures:

1. 2,500 or more comments are logged.

2. 2,500 individuals actively participate in the Transportation 2035 Outreach and Involvement Program, as measured by survey responses and meeting attendance (excluding repeat attendance).
3. There are 30,000 visits or “views” to the 2035 section of the MTC Web site during active periods of the public outreach and involvement program.
4. The 2035 Plan or elements of it are mentioned in at least 70 radio or TV broadcasts, newspaper articles, editorials, commentaries, or other printed media

Outcome: All Measures Achieved

- Throughout the 2035 Plan’s development, MTC received nearly 100 letters, 165 email comments, some 3,000 completed Web surveys and some 570 completed comment forms from various meetings. In addition to these written comments, staff logged oral comments received at all workshops, public hearings and roundtable discussions; joint advisor workshops; as well as comments heard from the 250 focus group participants, from the 130 “person on the street” interviews, and the 5,400 residents surveyed by the two statistically valid telephone polls. All together these far exceed the goal of 2,500 or more comments.
- Some 1,100 people participated in 2035 Plan workshops as well as the Bay Area on the Move event (excluding repeat attendance by the same person at multiple meetings). Additionally, there were another 250 focus group participants, 130 “person on the street” interviewees, 5,400 residents surveyed via telephone poll and 3,000 responses to two Web surveys. This exceeds the goal of 2,500 participants.
- Some 3,000 Web surveys were completed (two separate surveys) on the Draft 2035 Plan.
- MTC’s Web site received some 153,000 “hits” to Web pages relating to the 2035 Plan. Data for page “views” — our identified performance measure — were not available on a consistent basis. Web “hits” include any time an individual “clicks” a link on a page, whereas page views includes all activity, including multiple clicks, on a given Web page. Consequently, the number of hits is a larger number; page views is a smaller number. However, based on the number of hits, there appears to be robust Internet participation and interest in the 2035 Plan.
- The 2035 Plan was covered nearly 90 times in the media, including radio and TV broadcasts, newspaper coverage, printed newsletters as well as electronic media (including newsletters and blogs). This exceeds the goal of 70.

### C. Accessibility

MTC made every effort to ensure that meetings were accessible to a broad range of Bay Area residents. The performance measures set by MTC called out four points in particular.

Measures:

1. Meetings are held in all nine counties.
2. 100 percent of meeting locations are accessible by transit.
3. Meetings are linguistically accessible to 100% of participants, with three working days' advance request for translation.
4. All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Outcome: All Measures Achieved

- Throughout the development of the plan, meetings were held in all nine counties. The following table breaks out meeting locations by county for the general public workshops as well as the general and community-based focus groups.

County	Phase One Locations	Phase Two Locations	Phase Three Locations
Alameda	2	5	1
Contra Costa	1	4	
Marin	1	2	
Napa		2	
San Francisco		4	1
San Mateo		3	
Santa Clara	1	3	
Solano		3	
Sonoma		2	

- All meetings were accessible by transit.
- Meetings were linguistically accessible to participants, with three working days' advance request for translation. All meeting notices provided instruction on how to request interpreters or auxiliary aids.
- All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

#### D. Impact

MTC made every effort to ensure that the feedback received through this Outreach and Involvement Program was analyzed and provided to the Commission policy makers wherever appropriate, and that interested participants be informed of Commissions actions. The performance measures set by MTC called out two points in particular.

Measures:

1. 100% of written comments received are logged, analyzed, summarized and communicated in time for consideration by staff or Commissioners.
2. 100% of the written comments are acknowledged so that the person making them knows whether his or her comment is reflected in the outcome of a Commission action, or, conversely why the Commission acted differently.

Outcome: All Measures Achieved

- A summary of oral comments heard was prepared for each workshop, focus group, as well as at the regional Bay Area on the Move forum. See the appendix of the main report, "Transportation 2035 Public Outreach and Involvement Program Report," for the summary notes.
- Comments hear from the public were communicated to the Commission at regular intervals:
  - Staff presented the comments heard at three June 2007 workshops to MTC's Planning Committee on July 13, 2007.
  - The fall 2007 telephone survey results and a summary of comments heard at the Bay Area on the Move regional forum were presented to the Planning Committee on November 9, 2007.
  - A summary of comments heard from the fall 2007 outreach activities (3 public workshops, a joint advisor workshop, fall 2007 telephone poll and Bay Area on the Move forum) were reviewed at a Commission Workshop in late November 2007.
  - Results from the "man-on-the-street" interviews were presented to MTC's Planning Committee in December 2007.
  - Preliminary results from the May workshops were presented to the Commission at a special workshop in May 2008.
  - More detailed key messages from the various outreach methods employed during the second phase of outreach were presented at the Commission's June 13, 2008 meeting of the Planning Committee.
  - Staff presented the advisors' input on Transportation 2035 Plan projects, policies and the financially constrained plan to the Commission three times during Phase Two, at the May, June and July 2008 Planning Committee meetings.
  - Staff presented the key messages heard from Phase Three events (two public hearings; two joint advisor workshops; a roundtable discussion with stakeholders, commissioners and partners) as well as staff responses to those key messages, at the February 13, 2009 Planning Committee meeting.
  - Written correspondence received on the Draft Transportation Plan was transmitted to the Commission at the February, March and April 2009 Planning Committee meetings.
- All writers who submitted a written letter or e-mail on the Draft Transportation 2035 Plan received a specific letter in reply from MTC.
- Participants who commented through workshops and the Web site could track progress on the development of the 2035 Plan by reviewing MTC's Web site, by

attending Commission meetings, or by listening to audio casts of Commission meetings either live or on the Web.

## E. Participant Satisfaction

MTC made every effort to ensure that people who took the time and energy to participate felt it was worth their while to join in the discussion and debate.

### Measure:

60% of participants “*strongly agree or agree*” with statements that rate the Transportation 2035 Outreach Program. The statements cover the performance dimensions shown below.

### Outcome: All Measures Achieved

- **Accessibility (meeting locations, materials presented in appropriate languages for targeted audiences, with sufficient advance notice, etc.)**  
Nearly 450 meeting evaluation forms (returned after public workshops as well as the regional forum) were tabulated and indicate that 92% of respondents strongly agree or agree that there were no barriers (language or other) that prevented them from participating in the discussion.
- **Sufficient opportunity to comment**  
Some 400 meeting evaluation forms (returned after public workshops as well as the regional forum) were tabulated and indicate that 91% of respondents strongly agree or agree that they had the opportunity to provide comments.
- **Clear information at an appropriate level of detail**  
Some 440 meeting evaluation forms (returned after public workshops as well as the regional forum) were tabulated and indicate that 57% of respondents strongly agree or agree that the information presented was clear and contained an appropriate level of detail. This statement received the lowest level of agreement; MTC must continue to strive for clear writing and elimination of bureaucratic jargon.
- **Educational value of presentations and materials**  
Nearly 450 meeting evaluation forms (returned after public workshops as well as the regional forum) were tabulated and indicate that 77% of respondents strongly agree or agree that they found the meeting useful and thought provoking. In addition, 62% of respondents strongly agree or agree that they learned more about transportation by participating in the workshops.
- **Understanding of other perspectives and differing priorities**  
Nearly 450 meeting evaluation forms (returned after public workshops as well as the regional forum) were tabulated and indicate that 75% of respondents strongly agree or agree that they gained a better understanding of other people’s perspectives and priorities.
- **Quality of the discussion**  
Some 400 meeting evaluation forms (returned after public workshops as well as the regional forum) were tabulated and indicate that 62% of respondents strongly agree or agree that a quality discussion took place.

## IV. Recommendations

(This section will be completed after presentation to the MTC Planning Committee on June 12, 2009.)

## V. Appendices

### A. Bay Area on the Move Regional Forum: Evaluation — Written Comments

At the conclusion of the forum, participants were asked to complete a Meeting Evaluation Form; approximately 100 forms were returned and tabulated. In addition to specific questions to evaluate certain aspects of the forum, participants had the opportunity to add any comments on how to improve the meeting. Below is the list of comments received:

- In breakout sessions it would be great to work at small groups, then joining the bigger group.
- Too much for people who served the food. Probably serving salad and setting a buffet line for people to serve themselves.
- Shorter speeches please. There were no people of color on the panel discussion. Stuart Cohen brought up great points from a community, social equity and environmental perspective, but there needs to be a representation from a highly impacted low income neighborhood.
- Need much more baselining of who's in the audience and how much they know before you dive into the focus groups!
- Bathroom accessibility difficult for wheelchair users – door next to impossible to open for such persons – need directions to more accessible facility.
- Location near BART and bicycle parking great!
- The questions for discussion and ranking were too structured – would have liked working around a table focusing on the info from the morning and crafting how to move forward. We discussed the questions but some felt unsatisfied as if we were pushed to an answer. Looking at where the issues are within our communities and how to overcome them would have been helpful. Great morning. Great speakers and great data!
- Provide better background training to the meeting facilitators and MTC/ABAG staff in break-out sessions.
- I liked the first lecture of ABAG & MTC's executive directors but the rest was too general to be helpful. It was preaching to the choir. I wanted more info and detail and how to implement. The breakout session wasn't useful. It seemed more of a time to just give ABAG feedback, not to expand knowledge.
- The meeting was very positive, which is a good start. Future meetings should discuss open discussion about the difficult trade-offs between the transportation investment approaches. I'd like to see an option that emphasizes smaller scale widespread

improvements in existing transit, and adding pedestrian and biking options, car share, and other options, contrasted to the bigger capital alternatives we see. We should also consider re-visiting the prior highway projects that are in the RTP, but perhaps do not take us where we are trying to go. For the future meetings, more hands on techniques would be useful – planning tools, and more discussion.

- Handouts were not used efficiently – people didn't know about agenda, breakout group sheets, and comment form for panel. Need to tell people about these at beginning.
- Best part – intro speaker (Dr. Pastor) and MTC/ABAG presentation. I didn't find the rest as enlightening.
- I thought the break-out session was not particularly useful or inspiring. An alternative would have been to take one of the questions (#6 is my recommendation) and have the group address it using the world café model. Ranking is traditional and didactic. We needed a more interactive critical thinking and communicative way to work on these issues. The morning session was exceptional. I wish the break-out session had mirrored the “out of the box” approach of the morning. Excellent keynote speaker. Exceptional panel (with exception of Marin County Supervisor). Great vegetarian lunch. Thank you.
- The FOCUS plan is not very clear.
- I was very bored in break-out session East A, as I could not hear most questions/comments from participants. Facilitator did not repeat comments even though I requested that be done before we started. Without amplification, I will probably leave until lunch in the future.
- Food service was very poor. Waitpersons had no idea of color coding on name tags. I ordered seafood and it was not available. They ran out. Next time I attend I will go out and get seafood (if not available) and bill MTC/ABAG. Overall more bad than good.
- Thank you for a great morning and afternoon. The materials are great. Good job.
- Great job. The morning sessions (lecture, panel) were absolutely excellent.
- Loved the voting opportunity.
- Need more use of Internet collaboration to facilitate quality discussion of issues. Suggest a Yahoo! Group for each issue so all concerned citizens have an opportunity to make comments. Meeting is still required face-to-face but should be supplemented by electronic communications in an open and transparent way. Yahoo! Groups can fill that need.
- Great job.
- More public input is needed – I think based on the electronic voting results this meeting was a bit too much “preaching to the choir.” Public input would allow a more diverse idea pool and feedback for planning purposes.
- Less assumption that all know full detail of key terminology. Regarding questionnaire for break-out sessions -- wording baffled many; most in room not clear about intent of question. Brief explanation of how to use e-vote device.
- Thanks – nice discussion. Focus on jobs/housing balance when considering transportation policy. Be like China/Europe – develop a Bullet train.

- Be clearer on what the next steps for the RTP process will be. Be clearer on how community participation at the meeting today will be used.
- Breakout was not as successful as could be – our session was not moderated well (east hall B); very difficult to hear; several times the comment sent very off course (i.e., what happens when you use 511.org or why TransLink® isn't on BART yet) and moderator didn't re-focus the discussion.
- Mayor Newsom was a terrific speaker, as was Manuel Pastor. Jane Brunner was a downer. She is my councilmember and absolutely does not acknowledge those residents who do support the new projects on Telegraph Ave. and elsewhere [she stated that all the neighbors oppose these projects]. Terrific presentation by the rest of the panel and by Henry G. and Bill Dodd.
- I'm so pleased to see the evidence of the efforts of collaboration between MTC and ABAG. I hope the rest of the RTP process continues with this collaboration and with the targets/goals set out in today's vision.
- Morning session was great. Break-out was disappointing – didn't feel the questions led to productive discussion or recommendations.
- Good to see what is happening. I think more is needed, but I'm glad to see the start. Let's DREAM BIG. There is no time to waste.
- Some questions were not yes/no or A, B, C, D. Some were 'other.' Careful wording might help but also steers to get the answer you want.
- Thank you for holding the conference. Thank you for providing bike parking. It gave me the optimal way to get to the event.
- Dedicate some funding generated by new revenues to upgrade the existing system, repair and maintain. Fix what we have in place first.
- Some introduction to the RTP process and the overall purpose of the meeting would have been useful. I don't think people understood the purpose of the break-out sessions and how participatory (or decision-making) they should be.
- Bill Dodd could have been quicker in presenting and reviewing the polling.
- Disabled issues need to be addressed. Low income too.
- I was pleasantly surprised to hear health included in some of the presentations. Please include it in the dialogue as this movement goes forward. I think it is an issue close to the hearts and minds of the public. Many local health departments are working on related (land use & transportation) issues. We are strong on health issues and community involvement. This can help shift the balance toward smart growth in the mind of the public.
- Panel discussion was excellent. Break-outs not so good. Poor listening conditions, groups too large. I attended a climate protection conference in late September in San Francisco that had a good break-out format at our 8-chair tables. Ok that most of the input is written. The large group format didn't work to engage attendees with JPC staff – it was more of a soapbox affair.

- I think it is unfortunate that not everyone who wanted to attend could attend due to space limitations. Maybe part of the meeting could have been scheduled for an auditorium setting that could hold more people (possibly without the lunch).
- We need to discuss necessary changes to values: consumerism, conservation, morality, concern for future v. present, cost v. quality.
- Considering what you were trying to accomplish today, you did a great job. I was surprised by how well the break-out sessions went. Mayor Newsom was great. I'm not sure how accessible this material is to people not deeply involved in transportation issues, but it's clear MTC/ABAG is trying! Well-organized, great materials. Thanks for staying on schedule! Wonderful job with logistics for so many people.
- May need to have multi-sites to maximize numbers of community participants ((not only government staff turnout) by using telecast/simulcast, which Sacramento Council of Governments had used for their "Tall Order" regional conference. Public comment period is short with the amount of participants. If there is multi-sites, more public comment and participants can be accommodated.
- Needed to explain FOCUS and PDAs at or before break-out sessions. People were confused. Great speakers. Break-out sessions least useful, except for opportunity to ask questions.
- PowerPoint on Goals/Targets/Strategies was very good, with intriguing data about what could cut emissions, what wouldn't. Excellent speech by Manuel Pastor. Like to hear more about transition of region to center of a megalopolis. Very well organized event, good pacing, and lots of interesting presentations.
- Utilize and integrate Internet or LAN network into audience interactions. Use wi-fi in-house for interaction.
- The hotel's convention hall and break-out rooms were cold! Location was great because it allows for public transportation.
- Improve quality of lunch service. Not a big deal given that the rest of the meeting went fine.
- One of the smoothest-run meetings I've ever been to.
- It was a helpful discussion of what we could and need to do in the future, but the ideas aren't anything new. However, it's important to have frequent gatherings of people in the entire region and have this dialogue. There should have been more discussions of the FOCUS process and specific next steps with the PDAs and funding.
- Gavin Newsom was great!
- The Marriott's service was poor. Waiters were rude, understaffed.
- Great job! Well-organized. Well run, on time. Good content. Interesting speakers. Fantastic, time well spent!
- The break-out sessions really wasted a lot of time. People in the audience were not educated or informed well on the acronyms and projects (i.e., 2035, FOCUS, etc.) Therefore, many ideas and comments were not heard. Need to include feedback from break-outs & comments from these forms since time didn't allow for true communication exchange. I can help you in the future.

- More discussion of trail networks for non-motorized transportation and recreation as a stand-alone authority or Federation of Jurisdictions. The adoption of the California Cross State Bike Route by those affected in the creation of a non-motorized r-o-w from the Bay Trail to the Tahoe Rim Trail, which would parallel I-80 from American Canyon's wetlands Edge Trail to the Green Valley Trail in Cordelia. This is a local which has immediate needs of a Class I trail to reach high ground upon occasion and transportation, recreation, therapy, ecotourism, etc. on all other days. Transit needs better and more uniform accommodation of bicycles and bicycling info, accurate maps and signage which is legal and correct within the entire region. Not just those that are enlightened with county transtaxes.