

**DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE AND  
EFFECTIVE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN FOR  
THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND  
THE FEDERAL STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**Summary Report**

February 21, 2008



Prepared by:

MIG, Inc.  
800 Hearst Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94710

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for developing the Statewide Transportation Plan (CTP) and preparing the Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP), on regular cycles. Federal regulations, found in Federal Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration 23 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450.210, prescribe that these planning processes be undertaken with the broad, inclusive participation of key stakeholder groups as well as members of the general public

To ensure compliance with these regulations, Caltrans will be developing a comprehensive Public Participation Plan for gathering input and feedback on the CTP and FSTIP. As background for that Public Participation Plan, Caltrans engaged MIG, Inc. to perform research on public participation strategies that are meaningful, efficient, and effective.

For this research, MIG used several different methods to engage members of the public and key stakeholders and find out their knowledge of the CTP and FSTIP, their interest in becoming involved in the CTP and FSTIP processes, and if yes, how they wish to be involved. The methods used were phone interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups, focus groups of the general public, and a web survey of both the general public and stakeholders. The categories of stakeholder groups used in this research are those identified in the Federal regulations.

Findings from this research include a high level of interest in transportation planning and programming (particularly local and regional) among all groups, a lack of knowledge about how to find information or provide input, the desire to clearly understand the transportation system and its impacts, the desire to express opinions and have them matter, and the pervasive use of Internet communications by almost all groups and individuals.

As a result of this research, MIG is making a series of recommendations to Caltrans for an approach and specific methods of public participation in its plans and programs. These recommendations are responsive to the public's need for clear information as well as its preferred methods for providing input.

MIG recommends that Caltrans focus on Internet-based communications with the general public and stakeholders. Specific recommendations include a comprehensive, user-friendly website for the CTP and FSTIP and a "web-tree" system of e-mail communications with stakeholder groups, including public agency partners. Other recommendations are made about the general approach to providing information. Finally, MIG makes very specific recommendations for outreach to particular categories of stakeholders and the general public, using the categories listed in Federal regulations.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH..... 4**

**KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 5**  
Key Findings..... 5  
Overall Recommendations.....6  
Outreach Strategies Recommended for Specific Stakeholder Categories..... 9

## **ATTACHMENT A. FEDERAL REGULATIONS**

Federal Register, Federal Department of  
Transportation, Federal Highway Administration 23 CFR, Part 450.210.....14

## **ATTACHMENT B. METHODS AND RESULTS..... 16**

Stakeholder Phone Interviews.....16  
Focus Groups.....21  
Web Survey..... 26

## **ATTACHMENT C. PROCESS GRAPHIC..... 31**

## PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for developing the Statewide Transportation Plan (CTP) and preparing the Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) on regular cycles. State and federal regulations prescribe that these planning processes be undertaken with the broad, inclusive participation of key stakeholder groups as well as members of the general public. The specific regulations regarding the public participation requirement, addressing “Interested parties, public involvement, and consultation,” are found in the Federal Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration 23 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450.210 (Attachment A).

To ensure compliance with these regulations, Caltrans will be developing a comprehensive Public Participation Plan for gathering input and feedback on its plans and programs. As background for that Plan, Caltrans engaged MIG, Inc. to undertake research on public participation strategies that are meaningful, efficient, and effective.

In its research, MIG used several different methods to engage with members of the public and key stakeholders to determine

- Their knowledge of the CTP and FSTIP
- Their interest in becoming involved in the CTP and FSTIP processes, and
- For those who are interested, how they wished to be involved.

The methods used were:

- Phone interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups
- Focus groups of the general public
- A web survey of stakeholders and the general public

In addition, Caltrans staff gave briefings to several groups as a part of this process.

Now that this research is completed, MIG is making recommendations on strategic public involvement methods for the CTP and FSTIP that will be both strategic and comprehensive.

Individual summary reports have been separately submitted to Caltrans on each of the three research methods – the phone interviews, focus groups, and web survey – and a great deal of additional detail can be found in those summaries. This report synthesizes what has been learned from all three methods and applies the results so that Caltrans can effectively target its public involvement efforts to meet the expectations of each of the stakeholder categories and the general public.

High-level summaries of the three methods are found in Attachment B.

## KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Key Findings

During this process, MIG spoke in depth to many stakeholders and members of the general public. The web survey confirmed many of the conclusions that were reached using the interviews and focus groups.

#### Level of Interest in Participation in the CTP and FSTIP Processes

- **Overall, there is a high degree of interest in the state’s transportation system** – people want to learn about how it is planned, programmed, and funded. They want to be able to comment and know that this input is meaningful.
- **Stakeholder groups and Caltrans agency partners are unanimous about their interest in the CTP and FSTIP** and want to be actively involved with those processes, even if they haven’t been in the past. They all recognize the importance of their participation for meeting their own needs.
- **Members of the general public we spoke to are quite interested in the development of their local and regional transportation system**, especially if they feel they haven’t been consulted in the past or if they have particular issues with the transportation system. They acknowledge that not everyone will have a high level of interest, but they do feel it is important to be asked for input.
- **Stakeholders and the general public want their representatives to be involved on their behalf** (such as such as community groups, agency organizations, business organizations, or trade unions) even if they themselves don’t have the time or ability to advocate for their transportation interests at the statewide level.
- **Most of all, everyone wants easily accessible, high quality, and up-to-date information on transportation projects and programs.** They want Caltrans to practice “transparency” in letting the public know how the system works and the status of projects.

#### How People Communicate

- **The Internet has transformed communications with stakeholders, partner agencies, and the general public.** At this time, most people have access to the Web and use it as their main source of information. There are exceptions, so Caltrans will still need to use a multi-pronged approach to public participation in order to be inclusive, but the Internet will need to be the centerpiece of the strategy.

## Overall Recommendations

Based on the input we received from the public and stakeholders, MIG recommends the following strategic investments of Caltrans time and resources to assure a fully-compliant and comprehensive Public Participation Plan.

### General Approach

- **Generate excitement.** Normally, when the public is invited to comment on transportation plans and programs, the sheer volume of routine material as well as the amount of complexity discourages people from further investigation. In its summary materials, Caltrans can point to global and statewide trends and how this plan or program addresses them, or can identify particular issues or concerns to stimulate interest. Issues of general interest to the public are public transportation, traffic congestion, and the impacts of transportation on the environment and health (such as air quality). The public is clearly very interested in local or regional projects – what’s planned, when the projects will be built and how they’re paid for, and how area residents (or their grandchildren) will be affected by these projects. Topics of particular interest to specific stakeholder groups are found in the section “Strategies Recommended for Specific Stakeholder Categories” starting on page 9.
- **In all outreach materials about the CTP and FSTIP, focus on transparency.** Help the public understand this very complex transportation planning and programming process. Caltrans needs to present simplified educational materials to the public and refer people who are interested in more detail to more complex reference documents. Most people will not need the greater level of detail, however.
- **In all public participation products, the following questions must be succinctly addressed so that public expectations can be managed appropriately, and people can feel that their input is meaningful:**
  - What is the CTP or the FSTIP? Why are these documents important to the State, to the Region, to the City, to me?
  - What is in the document? How is it organized? How can I find out about a particular project or what’s being planned for my area?
  - How does the CTP or the FSTIP fit in with local and regional plans and programs? Isn’t it too late for my input at the statewide level?
  - How do these projects get paid for?
  - What type of input does Caltrans want from me, and by when? Do I have the ability to change the details of a project that’s in the FSTIP?
  - Why is commenting on this CTP or FSTIP worth my time?
  - How will Caltrans address my comments?
- **In all outreach materials (web-based or printed), Caltrans should focus as much as possible on visuals rather than written text** – charts, graphs, drawings, photos, photo simulations, and process graphics (an example of a process graphic can be found in Attachment C). Because transportation planning and programming is so complex,

visuals can help many people understand the process more easily. It's also easy to overuse or misuse graphic materials, so they must be chosen carefully to enhance the messages of the plan or program.

- **Always follow up when a group or individual comments on the CTP or FSTIP.** Thank them for their input, let them know what happened with their comment, and give them the next steps in the process.

### Specific Outreach Methods

- **Create a world-class, user-friendly, attractive Caltrans website for all information needed for someone who is interested in transportation plans and programs in California.** This website should have the following features:
  - A logical and simple organization - don't bury information through too many linked pages.
  - A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) page
  - Information on statewide, regional, and local transportation planning and programming and how they all fit together
  - A summary of the CTP or FSTIP that focuses on hot-button issues for Californians – such as energy reduction, land use, alternatives to driving alone, highway congestion, air quality, transportation funding, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, High Speed Rail, etc.
  - A Table of Contents of the document, with separate links for individual chapters
  - A searchable database of projects (*see below*)
  - GIS maps of projects
  - Public comment forms, with responses delivered in a timely manner
  - Timelines
  - Next Steps
  - Signup forms for further information and updates via email
  - A format that can be linked to software for the visually impaired
  - Translation into Spanish, and other languages as feasible (at the least, summaries can be translated)
  - The offer of an alternative format, for instance a printed and mailed version of the website material
  - Continual updating.
- **Create a searchable online database of projects, organized by region.** People are interested in knowing as much as possible about their local projects, then their region, and finally, statewide projects. Keep the database up-to-date with project status (planned, programmed, expected completion dates) similar to how legislative bills are tracked through an online database.
- **Create an updated and comprehensive database of stakeholder groups, including groups that are normally overlooked as well as from under-represented communities.** Because it is often difficult to get the attention and comments from those who normally don't participate, include disproportionately more of these groups in the database to increase the odds of receiving comments. This database should include

only statewide or regional-level groups (see next bullet), so should not be difficult to keep updated. Caltrans District offices are a good source for the names of key groups and contact people.

- **Leverage the power of the Internet by creating a “web-tree” of partner organizations that can pass along information and invitations to comment on the CTP and FSTIP.** Because all stakeholder organizations now have email lists, e-newsletters or listservs, they will spread the word about commenting on the CTP and FSTIP as long as the emailed materials are interesting and compelling and the website they are asked to visit is user-friendly. By focusing on key “umbrella” or statewide and regional organizations, Caltrans will not have to keep track of the email addresses of all individual organizations, but can just keep updated on the “connectors.” Caltrans can also request that the connector organizations gather comments before submitting them back.
- **Use newspaper announcements, flyers, posters, and other printed materials to publicize the Caltrans website.** The website won’t be useful to the general public if they don’t know it is there, so getting the URL out in a number of different formats is important.
- **Continue to hold statewide meetings in several different locations.** There is still a place for person-to-person contact in the Internet age! These meetings have been effective in the past, and there is no reason to discontinue them. The best format is to make a presentation and then allow public comment, either in a forum or with an open house. These meetings can be designed to encourage the maximum amount of public interaction and comment. The meetings can be publicized through e-mail to organizations as well as through newspaper announcements. Some groups will require hard-copy notification. Meetings should be held at convenient times for the public and stakeholders, in ADA-accessible locations and close to public transit. Caltrans should offer translation and sign-language services to those who reserve ahead of time. These meetings can be tailored to the type of document that is being reviewed; for example, a newly updated CTP would require a more elaborate meeting structure than a routine FSTIP amendment.
- **Make presentations to local or statewide stakeholder groups.** Again, this leverages Caltrans by presenting information to connectors, who in turn pass it to their constituents. Getting onto the agendas of social equity and community groups (or their statewide equivalents, such as NAACP or Lung Association) is often needed, since it is very difficult to interest the participation of these groups in other ways – they have many issues to deal with, and are spread very thin. A much more proactive approach works best, where Caltrans approaches the organization on its own turf.
- **Develop a relationship with the press.** Coordinate with the Caltrans Public Information Office to cultivate reporters who cover the transportation beat in key newspapers or radio stations by providing them with high-quality information and access to Caltrans staff. They can generate interest in the press in transportation plans and programs or in particular projects that is very helpful.

### Avoid These Methods

- **Passive outreach**, such as public hearings, meeting announcements on websites (without any publicity), flyers, and information-only workshops.
- **Surveys.** Most people don't like them much, especially phone polls, but they can be useful for very specific issues. E-mail questionnaires have a higher level of buy-in.

Following these recommendations for providing high-quality information and a transparent process will go a long way toward educating the public and stakeholders, as well as gaining the trust that their input will be taken into consideration. The focus group results showed that some members of the public are distrustful of government in general, and are particularly concerned about the long time it takes to implement transportation projects and how their tax dollars are spent. Well-presented information and opportunities for meaningful input are very important for everyone, but the benefits will be particularly helpful to those who are distrustful.

### Outreach Strategies Recommended for Specific Stakeholder Categories

Based on input from stakeholders and the general public during this research, MIG makes the following recommendations as appropriate public involvement strategies for specific categories included in the federal regulations:

#### General

- Caltrans should update its database of key statewide stakeholder groups, who can then become connectors between Caltrans and their organization's constituents. (The "web-tree").
- Caltrans needs to keep updated its e-mail lists of federal, state, regional, and local agencies.
- Caltrans needs to compile the "hot button" issues, or issues of highest interest to each group, so that presentations can be tailored to fit those interests. One way to do this would be to interview leaders in advance of the meeting. The matrix that starts on page 10 gives specific important issues that were identified during stakeholder interviews and focus groups.

#### Outreach to Specific Groups

The following matrix provides public involvement strategies and other information specific to the categories of interest groups that are listed in federal regulations. In the case of targeted groups, these examples are stakeholder groups that were interviewed as a part of this effort; there are many other appropriate groups and organizations that can be identified by Caltrans District or Statewide staff.

| CATEGORY   | TARGETED GROUPS   | RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES   | SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS   | TOPICS OF HIGH INTEREST  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <b>General Public</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any and all residents of the State who are not affiliated with a particular interest group</li> <li>• Targeted by geographic area.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional media releases announcing the website and public meetings</li> <li>• Use the communications departments of RTPAs and MPOs to disseminate information (through newsletters and e-newsletters)</li> <li>• Signup on the Caltrans website for e-mailed updates</li> <li>• Strong relationship with transportation reporters in the regional media</li> <li>• Meet with regional newspaper editorial boards</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assurance that input will make a difference</li> <li>• Specific information about how projects will impact their lives</li> <li>• Particularly interested in local and regional projects</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local transportation projects</li> <li>• Regional transportation projects</li> <li>• Public transportation</li> <li>• Traffic congestion</li> <li>• Impacts of transportation on the environment and health</li> <li>• The process of transportation planning, timing, and funding</li> <li>• Effectiveness of the CTP and FSTIP</li> </ul> |
| <b>Local, Regional, State and Federal Agencies and Organizations</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal transportation agencies</li> <li>• State historical and resource agencies</li> <li>• Caltrans Districts</li> <li>• Regional transportation agencies</li> <li>• City and County Public Works Agencies</li> <li>• California State Association of Counties</li> <li>• California League of Cities</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree of that group</li> <li>• Use the communications departments of RTPAs and MPOs to disseminate information</li> <li>• Presentations made to key groups by Caltrans HQ or district staff</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be informed and included in the public participation processes</li> <li>• Understand key messages that are relevant to the work of these agencies</li> </ul>                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate change and other environmental issues</li> <li>• Water</li> <li>• Growth</li> <li>• Land use and transportation</li> <li>• Aging infrastructure and how to pay for maintenance and rehabilitation</li> <li>• How to pay for new facilities</li> <li>• Urban-rural fair share of transportation resources</li> </ul>                 |

|  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Affected Public Agencies, Groups, and Individuals</b>                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ports</li> <li>• California Highway Patrol</li> <li>• Safety Center</li> <li>• Governor’s Office of Emergency Services</li> <li>• California Transit Association</li> <li>• California Association for Coordinated Transportation</li> <li>• California Automobile Association</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree of that group</li> <li>• Presentations made to key groups by Caltrans HQ or district staff</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be informed and included in the public participation processes</li> <li>• Understand key messages that are relevant to these organizations</li> <li>• Make sure major stakeholders are all included</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• ADA enforcement and interpretation</li> <li>• Congestion relief</li> <li>• Automated enforcement</li> <li>• Keeping road system running smoothly</li> <li>• Offering alternatives to driving</li> </ul>               |
| <b>Business Organizations</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>• Other statewide and regional business groups</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree of that group</li> <li>• Presentations made to key leadership groups by Caltrans HQ or district staff</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business groups are particularly time-sensitive and like to use the website and e-mail more than meetings</li> <li>• Understand key messages that are relevant to business</li> </ul>                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goods movement</li> <li>• Adequacy of transportation infrastructure</li> <li>• Funding and how it’s raised</li> <li>• Removal of barriers to transportation development, such as litigation</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Representatives of Users of Pedestrian Walkways and Bicycle Transportation Facilities</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Walks</li> <li>• California Bicycle Coalition</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree of that group</li> <li>• Ask for Caltrans staff to give briefings to statewide and regional groups, tailoring the briefings to the issues most important to those groups</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feeling included at all levels of transportation planning and programming</li> <li>• Knowing that their input is heard and makes a difference</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of walking and biking,</li> <li>• Fairness of funding for those modes compared to other modes</li> <li>• Development of complete streets</li> <li>• Safety; speed management</li> <li>• Design and enforcement</li> <li>• Effectiveness of the CTP and FSTIP</li> </ul> |

|  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Community and Environmental Groups</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sierra Club</li> <li>• Planning and Conservation League</li> <li>• American Lung Association and Breathe California</li> <li>• American Association of Retired Persons</li> <li>• Housing California</li> <li>• Latino Coalition for a Healthy California</li> <li>• Caltrans Nat. American Advisory Committee</li> <li>• NAACP</li> <li>• Urban League.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree of that group</li> <li>• Provide printed materials upon request if e-mail is not available</li> <li>• Use ethnic media to publicize meetings</li> <li>• Ask for Caltrans staff to give briefings to statewide and regional groups, tailoring the briefings to the issues most important to those groups</li> <li>• Ask to be on the agendas of community leadership groups</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community groups often require a very pro-active approach to public participation</li> <li>• Personal contacts important to community groups</li> <li>• Include a larger list of community groups to target so as to assure adequate representation</li> <li>• These groups need to feel included at all levels of transportation planning and programming</li> <li>• They need to know that their issues are understood and that they have a voice</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental groups – environmental sustainability, fighting sprawl and pollution, promoting alternatives to driving, health related to transportation, safety.</li> <li>• Community groups – environmental justice and transportation equity, alternatives to driving, health related to transportation, housing for low-income and homeless persons, safety.</li> <li>• Link issues to people and the environment; explain why it is important to be involved</li> </ul> |
| <b>Representatives of Public Transit Employees</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amalgamated Transit Union</li> <li>• United Taxicab Workers</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree</li> <li>• Ask for Caltrans staff to give briefings to statewide and regional groups, tailoring the briefings to the issues most important to those groups</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have been active at regional level, want to participate at statewide level</li> <li>• Taxi companies want to be seen as public transit</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding of public transit</li> <li>• Operations and expansion</li> <li>• Improvements to transit, particularly in suburban areas</li> <li>• HOV lanes</li> <li>• Road maintenance</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Freight Shippers</b>                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Trucking Association</li> <li>• Burlington Northern Santa Fe</li> <li>• CA Aviation Alliance</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree of that group</li> <li>• Ask for Caltrans staff to give briefings to statewide and regional groups, tailoring the briefings to the issues most important to those groups</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want to understand the larger view in relation to their interests</li> <li>• Want to know the different levels of local, regional, and statewide plans</li> <li>• Want the public to understand freight issues</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goods movement capacity</li> <li>• Regulations</li> <li>• Tolls</li> <li>• Development of inappropriate land uses around airports</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Private Providers of Transportation</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SuperShuttle</li> <li>• MV Transportation</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree of that group</li> <li>• Ask for Caltrans staff to give briefings to statewide and regional groups, tailoring the briefings to the issues most important to those groups</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They bring a different perspective to the table because they work with so many different clients</li> <li>• They feel they offer a public transit service, but are treated as private vehicles on HOV lanes and at airports</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic congestion, particularly in large urban areas</li> <li>• Use of HOV lanes when vehicles are empty</li> <li>• Road quality</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Representatives of Users of Public Transportation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Transit Coalition (LA)</li> <li>• San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee</li> </ul>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail notifications of website, newsletters, and meeting announcements, requesting that they be forwarded to the web-tree of that group</li> <li>• Ask for Caltrans staff to give briefings to statewide and regional groups, tailoring the briefings to the issues most important to those groups</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the groups interviewed in this research, rail is the big issue.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail, at different levels</li> <li>• Better performance out of the existing system</li> <li>• Additions to service throughout the state</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Representatives of the Disabled</b>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Californians for Disability Rights</li> <li>• Protection and Advocacy, Inc. (Sacramento)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email notifications of website, newsletters and meeting announcements</li> <li>• At public meetings, accommodate all needs for accessibility (sign language for hearing-impaired, or assistants for visually-impaired).</li> <li>• Make documents available immediately in accessible formats (such as PDF and HTML for the visually-impaired)</li> <li>• Give briefings to statewide and regional groups, tailoring the briefings to the issues most important to those groups.</li> <li>• These groups like face-to-face meetings; consider focus groups</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility of all documents and meetings</li> <li>• Timeliness of meeting or document summaries in accessible formats</li> <li>• They need to know that their issues are understood and that they have a voice and are respected</li> <li>• Want to be assured that progress is being made on their needs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility of the transportation system to people with physical, cognitive, and psychiatric disabilities</li> <li>• Availability and rules of paratransit</li> <li>• More public transit for everyone</li> <li>• Affordability of transit</li> <li>• Relevance to future generations</li> </ul> |

# ATTACHMENT A FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Federal Register/Vol. 72, No. 30/  
Wednesday, February 14, 2007/ Rules and Regulations

## § 450.210 Interested parties, public involvement, and consultation.

(a) In carrying out the statewide transportation planning process, including development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP, the State shall develop and use a documented public involvement process that provides opportunities for public review and comment at key decision points.

(1) The State's public involvement process at a minimum shall:

(i) Establish early and continuous public involvement opportunities that provide timely information about transportation issues and decision making processes to citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, providers of freight transportation services, and other interested parties;

(ii) Provide reasonable public access to technical and policy information used in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP;

(iii) Provide adequate public notice of public involvement activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including but not limited to a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed long-range statewide transportation plan and STIP;

(iv) To the maximum extent practicable, ensure that public meetings are held at convenient and accessible locations and times;

(v) To the maximum extent practicable, use visualization techniques to describe the proposed long-range statewide transportation plan and supporting studies;

(vi) To the maximum extent practicable, make public information available in electronically accessible format and means, such as the World Wide Web, as appropriate to afford reasonable opportunity for consideration of public information;

(vii) Demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input during the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and STIP;

(viii) Include a process for seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services; and

(ix) Provide for the periodic review of the effectiveness of the public involvement process to ensure that the process provides full and open access to all interested parties and revise the process, as appropriate.

(2) The State shall provide for public comment on existing and proposed processes for public involvement in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP. At a minimum, the State shall allow 45 calendar days for public review and written comment before the procedures and any major revisions to existing procedures are adopted. The State shall provide copies of the approved public involvement process document(s) to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes.

(b) The State shall provide for nonmetropolitan local official participation in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP. The State shall have a documented process(es) for consulting with non-metropolitan local officials representing units of general purpose local government and/or local officials with responsibility for transportation that is separate and discrete from the public involvement process and participation in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP. Although the FHWA and the FTA shall not review or approve this consultation process(es), copies of the process document(s) shall be provided to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes.

(1) At least once every five years (as of February 24, 2006), the State shall review and solicit comments from nonmetropolitan local officials and other interested parties for a period of not less than 60 calendar days regarding the effectiveness of the consultation process and any proposed changes. A specific request for comments shall be directed to the State association of counties, State municipal league, regional planning agencies, or directly to nonmetropolitan local officials.

(2) The State, at its discretion, shall be responsible for determining whether to adopt any proposed changes. If a proposed change is not adopted, the State shall make publicly available its reasons for not accepting the proposed change, including notification to nonmetropolitan local officials or their associations.

(c) For each area of the State under the jurisdiction of an Indian Tribal government, the State shall develop the long-range statewide transportation plan and STIP in consultation with the Tribal government and the Secretary of Interior. States shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process(es) that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with Indian Tribal governments and Federal land management agencies in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP.

# **ATTACHMENT B METHODS AND RESULTS**

## **Stakeholder Phone Interviews**

During October and November 2007, MIG undertook a phone survey of 41 representatives of stakeholder organizations (public agencies, non-profit organizations, and the private sector) from around California. The organizations, which represented the broad categories listed in 23 CFR, Part 450.210, are listed below:

---

### **Local, Regional, State and Federal Agencies and Organizations**

Federal Highway Administration  
Federal Transit Administration  
State Department of Water Resources  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
State Historic Preservation Office  
Regional Council of Rural Counties  
Amador County Transportation Commission  
Regional Transportation Planning Agency Group  
Caltrans District 12  
California State Association of Counties  
California League of Cities  
City of San Jose Public Works Department  
Shasta County Public Works Department

### **Local Business, Pedestrian and Bicycle Advocacy and User Groups**

California Chamber of Commerce  
California Walks  
WalkSacramento  
California Bicycle Coalition  
San Diego Bike Coalition

### **Community and Environmental Groups**

Sierra Club – San Diego  
Sierra Club – Bay Region  
Planning and Conservation League  
Housing California  
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California  
Caltrans Native American Advisory Committee

### **Affected Public Agencies, Groups, and Individuals**

Port of Los Angeles  
California Highway Patrol  
Safety Center – Sacramento  
California Transit Association  
California Association for Coordinated Transportation

The California Automobile Association

**Representatives of Public Transportation Employees**

Amalgamated Transit Union  
United Taxicab Workers, San Francisco

**Freight Shippers**

Network Public Affairs (maritime shipping consultants)  
California Trucking Association  
California Aviation Alliance

**Private Providers of Transportation**

Super Shuttle  
MV Transportation, SF Bay Area

**Representatives of Users of Public Transportation**

The Transit Coalition (Los Angeles)  
San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee

**Representatives of the Disabled**

Californians for Disability Rights  
Protection and Advocacy, Inc.

---

The interviews, which took about 15-20 minutes each, were intended to find out if these groups have been involved in the process of developing the CTP or FSTIP in the past, if they want to stay or become involved, and if so, what are the most effective methods to use for meaningful input. A memo on the results of these interviews, with documentation of each category of stakeholders, was submitted to the Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning on December 6, 2007. Transcripts of each interview are also available.

In most cases, the interviewees were executive directors or other high-level staff who have a direct interest in transportation. The list is representative, and not exhaustive, but it yielded a good number of valuable suggestions from a broad variety of stakeholders.

Although MIG had great success reaching targeted stakeholders groups, the following community groups were never reached for an interview despite 3-4 phone calls and messages:

- American Lung Association, California Office
- American Association of Retired People
- Young Men's Christian Association
- Latino Issues Forum
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- Urban League

What this suggests is that the Caltrans Public Participation Plan must include very proactive and tailored approaches to reaching these groups for their input on the CTP and FSTIP.

The following is an overall summary of the stakeholder comments:

**Many of those interviewed were aware of the CTP or FSTIP, and some of the public agencies have been very involved in the process in the past.** All indicated an interest in being included in future outreach efforts and would need background education on the purpose of the documents and where they fit in the levels of transportation planning and funding in California.

**Caltrans needs to communicate the value of the CTP and FSTIP and what these documents signify not only to the stakeholder groups, but to general public.**

- What kind of input does Caltrans seek on the documents?
- What are the most relevant parts to comment upon?
- What is the relevance to our specific interests and to the state as a whole?
- Why is it important for us spend time and energy reviewing these documents?
- Where and how in the process can we affect change in transportation decision making?

**There are a large number of hot-button issues for these stakeholder groups; public education and outreach activities should call out these issues and specify how the CTP and FSTIP would address them.** Some potential topics included: the effects of the transportation system on environmental sustainability and climate change, effects on safety and health, maintenance and rehabilitation of the aging transportation infrastructure, how funding is distributed to rural and urban areas, goods movement, congestion relief, alternatives to driving alone (transit, walking, biking, and rideshare), funding of public transit operations, High Speed Rail, and the accessibility of the transportation system to those with disabilities. Call out the more interesting projects, or controversial projects to stimulate interest (or have other organizations do this).

**When developing lists of who to target for comment on the CTP and FSTIP, include all stakeholder groups and normally overlooked or under-represented communities.** Federal agencies noted that the stakeholder groups listed under the SAFETEA-LU regulations is a beginning, and that Caltrans needs to go beyond these regulations to include other groups that are or could be interested in the State's plans and programs. For example, groups that may not have been involved in the past include taxicab and shuttle companies, public health interests, youth and retiree organizations, recent immigrants, and non- or limited-English speakers. Those from Indian reservations, low-income communities, rural communities, and disabled persons feel excluded from transportation decisions, and a special effort must be made to include them in meaningful ways and address their expressed needs. Although everyone should be invited to comment on the CTP and FSTIP, extra efforts should be made to involve representatives of these groups. It is asking a lot to expect taxi drivers to attend night meetings, for example, but their union representatives would probably be willing to participate.

**Most stakeholder groups have an organized network of information dissemination that can be leveraged by Caltrans.** By indentifying the key umbrella

organizations or coalitions, or the key people within organizations (“connectors”), Caltrans can send out information and invitations to comment on the CTP and FSTIP and the word will be spread very effectively. These connectors can also be used to collect comments to be given back to Caltrans. When asked about critical participants, the interviewees listed their members or staff, their Boards, their key committees, their partners, legislators, funders and many others, including the general public for some. The point is that by using connectors within stakeholder groups to disseminate information, Caltrans can reach critical participants.

**E-mail is the most common form of communication for stakeholder organizations, both internally and externally.** Nearly every interviewee said that e-mail, e-newsletters, and listservs have replaced or minimized paper-based communications. E-mail can be used to alert a large number of people very quickly about an issue, or to direct them to a website where there is further information. A danger mentioned by some of the interviewees is that e-mail can be over-used and ignored. However many said that if an issue is of interest, an e-mail can be easily forwarded by a person to others who are interested, especially if they are asked to spread the word.

**CTP and FSTIP information needs to be presented in user-friendly and accessible formats.** Many people noted that being presented with a large, dense document and asked to comment on it was daunting and should be avoided. It is important to consider that the time of stakeholders and the public is valuable, and they will need to have important information from the documents called out in some type of summary format. One suggestion was that the website version of the FSTIP, for example, include a searchable GIS database of projects, so that people can easily see the descriptions, costs, and timelines for their local projects. Accessible formats would include using HTML format that can be read by software for the sight-impaired, meetings that offer translation services for non-English speakers, sign-language interpretation services for the hearing-impaired, and meeting locations that are accessible to wheelchairs and are near public transit. Meetings should also be held in public locations that are open and well-known, such as community centers and library rooms.

**Caltrans needs to take the chance of letting people engage in a meaningful way with the CTP and FSTIP.** A number of interviewees commented that it would go a long way with many people if Caltrans would accept changes to these documents that are the result of public comment, or at least acknowledge that the comments are heard and there is a commitment to address them.

**There was some difference of opinion on when to obtain input from stakeholders and the public.** Some think that it is important to get input early in the process when a plan or program can be shaped, and other think that there needs to be a plan or program first so that it can be commented upon, but not so late that there is no chance to make changes.

**The Public Participation Plan should include a toolbox of methods that is tailored for different groups.** The methods used for different groups should depend on their needs and wants, as well as on how they typically receive information and

engage in public discussions. For example, e-mail doesn't work for groups without computers or where they don't use a lot of written materials. Radio and personal contacts may work better for these groups. A number of people said that the more outreach the better.

**Caltrans should avoid passive outreach methods** such as traditional public hearings (especially if it's only one covering the entire state, or if the hearing goes too long), announcements that appear only on the website, paid newspaper ads, flyers that sit on tables, and information-only workshops. Some interviewees also mentioned that mailed newsletters aren't cost-effective.

**People mentioned surveys as powerful tools, but that they need to be well-designed and used sparingly.** Some people said they don't really like surveys -- "get too many of them"-- or find them frustrating because of the limited choices they present. A number of people said that surveys (either phone or e-mail) can be very helpful in finding out about specific issues, though.

**Make websites user-friendly.** Make sure the information on the CTP and FSTIP is easy to find, and not buried on the website. Internet users don't usually have a lot of patience in navigating a website to look for something specific, and will easily give up if faced with barriers. When sending an e-mail that tells of a website link, a PDF of the document can also be attached if that is more convenient for people to access.

**Use public meetings or workshops,** as long as they include enough background information, invite attendees to participate, and aren't used only to disseminate information. Many people said that the most valuable form of public engagement is to discuss issues with others in some type of public meeting, where there is the opportunity to listen to others, express one's own opinion, and see where the consensus lies. These kinds of meetings build community as well as provide feedback to the sponsors. One person said that it is important not to over-structure a meeting at the beginning, and allow people to more easily express themselves. Also, information given in workshops needs to be relevant to the local area.

**Make presentations to local or statewide stakeholder groups.** Having a captive audience guarantees feedback.

**Develop a relationship with the press.** Use press releases and work with knowledgeable reporters who can provide good information to the public through interesting stories. Meet with editorial boards of major newspapers.

**Provide feedback and follow-up to all who participated,** letting them know the results of their comments and the next steps in the process.

**Consider using new high-tech methods, such as webinars and webcasts** instead of meetings. These can incorporate e-mailed or phoned-in comments and questions.

**Model the Public Participation Plan after MTC's or SCAG's.** These plans have been adopted and found to comply with SAFETEA-LU.

**A successful outreach process can be measured by the process and the product,** including

- whether or not all members of the public and stakeholder groups had an opportunity to participate in some way,
- that everyone involved was respected and feels they had a voice,
- by the level of understanding of the issues,
- by Caltrans having responded to all comments, and
- by satisfaction with the final product.

Interviewees generally thought that the number of attendees at meetings and the number of comments made, while interesting, weren't particularly informative measures.

### **Focus Groups**

Whereas the stakeholder interviews were intended to assess the knowledge and interest of particular interest groups in transportation plans and programs, the focus group meetings were held to find out the same information from a cross-section of California residents. A detailed summary of the focus group results was submitted by MIG to the Caltrans Division of Planning on January 30, 2008.

Four focus group meetings were held in the month of December 2008, one each in the cities of Oakland, Sacramento, Fresno and Long Beach. MIG recruited the participants by placing an advertisement on Craigslist, [www.craigslist.org](http://www.craigslist.org), in each of the four communities. MIG's goal was to recruit 12-15 diverse participants in each location. The ad offered a \$60 stipend for participating, and specified that we were looking for active participants with an interest in learning about issues and stating their opinions. By using screening questions, MIG was able to recruit 46 participants for the four meetings (11 in Fresno, 12 in Sacramento, 13 in Long Beach, and 10 in Oakland). A profile of the participants shows that the goal of diversity was met.

---

### **PARTICIPANT PROFILE**

#### **Age**

Less than 21: 1  
21-40: 20  
41-65: 24  
Over 65: 1

#### **Gender**

Female: 26  
Male: 20

#### **Residential Area Size**

Large Urban (>250,000): 27  
Moderate Urban (50,000 - 250,000): 13  
Small City or Town (<50,000): 4  
Rural: 2

#### **Race**

African American/Black: 9  
African American/Hispanic: 1  
Asian: 4  
Asian/Other Pacific Islander: 1  
Hispanic/Latino: 8  
Hispanic/European: 1  
Hispanic/Native: 1

Native American: 2  
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: 1  
White (non-Hispanic): 16  
White/Hispanic: 1  
Other (unidentified): 1

## Education

High School Graduate: 3

Currently in College: 6

Some College: 4

Assoc. Level Degree or Technical Cert.: 9

Bachelor's Degree: 17

Post-Graduate Degree: 6

Missing information: 1

---

The focus groups were held from 6:30 to 8:30 pm on a weeknight at a local community facility, and each was staffed by a facilitator and an assistant who took notes. They were also attended by one or two Caltrans staffers who were introduced as interested observers but who did not participate in the conversation.

Participants were invited to sit around a conference table in comfortable chairs, with the facilitator and assistant at one end, and observers positioned outside the table. The facilitator opened the sessions by explaining the purpose and structure of the meeting and describing the ground rules for participation. Attendees were then invited to introduce themselves and say a little about what community they live in, how long they've lived there, and what transportation issues they're particularly interested in.

Next, the level of participant knowledge was assessed by asking what they knew about how transportation projects are prioritized and funded in their region and statewide. After they'd done so, the facilitator made a brief presentation explaining the CTP and FSTIP using a process graphic (Attachment B).

The presentation was followed up by a series of questions regarding the degree of interest the participants have in these processes, what would motivate them to participate, what participation methods would be most attractive to them, and which method of informing them of participation opportunities would be most useful. They were also asked how interested they thought others in their community would be, and what methods of recruitment, information, and participation would work best for others. Finally, they were asked to state how, if they were responsible for getting people to participate in these processes, what they would do, and encouraged to add any further comments.

Participants gave feedback both by filling out a written form and also by participating in discussion. At the end of the session, the sponsor of the effort was revealed as Caltrans, and the Caltrans representatives introduced themselves, spoke briefly about the history and details of public participation in these processes, and invited questions or comments from the group.

The following is a high-level summary of the responses of the focus group members to the questions that were posed:

**Approximately half of the participants in all groups said that they knew nothing, or very little, about how transportation projects are planned.** Some knew more than

others, and most participants either knew or guessed that local, state and/or federal governments have planning authority, and that funding comes primarily from taxes, as well as being raised through bond measures, and that some federal funds are available. A few were aware that input is gathered from the public regarding transportation planning. Some cynicism with the process was expressed, with a few participants mentioning a sense that taxpayers support a disproportionate percentage of the burden, that the process is slow and contractors overpaid, and that the needs of higher-income areas are prioritized over those of lower-income areas.

**The majority of participants were interested in the CTP process.** Nearly all stated that they were very interested or somewhat interested. Only three participants described themselves as somewhat to fairly disinterested, and only one was not at all interested.

Those who were interested gave one or more of the following reasons:

- They would like the opportunity to inform transportation planners of a specific area needing improvement, and were aware that these needs might not be met if they didn't speak up.
- They would like to be better informed about how transportation projects are planned and prioritized, whether planning is consistent and equitable for all areas.
- They are aware that transportation needs to improve to keep up with California's economic and population growth and the rising cost of oil.
- It affects their everyday life.
- Their areas need better public transportation.
- They were pleased to learn that involvement is possible on a higher than local level.
- They are concerned about the impact of transportation on the environment.

Those whose interest was somewhat qualified mentioned the following concerns:

- Feeling that their input won't make a difference
- Distrust of the government
- Length of CTP timeline – how long projects take to get completed
- The process needs to be made comprehensible. Except for the outcome of votes on bond measures, the process is mysterious to most people.
- The appeal of getting involved in the process is limited to those who benefit from it; it must be relevant to their specific interests.

Reasons for disinterest included not trusting the government, only being interested in the local process rather than the state, that it would take too long to research and wouldn't affect their way of living, or that transportation just wasn't interesting.

**Opinions regarding the interest of others in the CTP process were somewhat more variable than participants' assessment of their own interest.** Those participants who expected others in their communities to be disinterested in the CTP process thought that many people are either apathetic or cynical about whether their input will make a difference.

They said that people are too busy with their own lives and prefer to leave planning for transportation to the experts. However, some focus group participants thought that in general others would like the chance learn about transportation plans, learn about how tax money is spent, and to state their opinions. They perceive a general dissatisfaction with transportation -- especially crowded freeways, the need for better public transportation in their areas, and the impact of transportation on the environment.

**The majority of participants were also interested in the FSTIP process.** Participants gave the following reasons for their interest:

- They wanted more information on what transportation projects are planned, especially for their region. They would like to know how these projects will influence their lives, how projects are prioritized and why, how the list of projects changes, and where their tax dollars are going.
- They wanted the opportunity to voice their opinions.
- They felt there was more immediacy to the planning at this level and greater possibility of being effectual.
- It seemed that there would be more interpretation offered with this document than with CTP.

**Participants' interest was qualified by the following concerns:**

- Cynicism as to whether their input will make a difference or how effective it will be in the short term.
- They would want to be assured that their region was included in the plans.
- They are more interested in short-term results than in plans for 20-25 years in the future.
- They want the document to be comprehensible.

**Once again, there was greater divergence of opinion among participants as to how interested others in their communities would be in the FSTIP process.** The reasons participants thought that others in their communities would be interested were much the same as with the CTP: getting their opinions heard, receiving more information on what projects are under construction, how they would change the landscape, and the impact on their quality of life; and learning how tax dollars are spent. They felt that greater awareness of the process and its effect on short-term plans would help increase interest in it.

Most participants thought that others would only be somewhat interested in the FSTIP because they have limited time and only care about their own areas; they're curious about the outcome but not interested in the process; they might have difficulty understanding the document.

**When asked what it would take to get them to participate in the CTP and FSTIP processes, the same four major themes were repeated:**

- **They need to be clearly informed about the process**, with information given in a clear and comprehensible fashion, before they would get involved.

- **They would need to be assured that their input would make a difference**, that they would have access to decision-makers, and to understand how their input would be taken into account.
- **Public engagement would have to be made convenient.**
- **They would have to know how the projects being discussed affected them personally.**

Specific methods suggested included announcements on public access TV or discussion on talk radio, emails, surveys sent through the mail (the more topic-specific, the better), distributing DVDs, an interactive website with a Q&A section and maps, and meetings or forums. Another participant suggested a citizen review panel be randomly selected, in a manner similar to the jury selection process, which would ensure a broad range of Californians giving input.

Participants were asked what forms of participation would be the most attractive to them. **An interactive website was the most preferred method of participation overall, with email running a fairly close second.** These more “high-tech” methods were seen as offering convenience – they can be done on one’s own time - and appealing to the majority who prefer electronic communication. **Opinion on the other methods was quite divided. A fair number of people ranked mail-in questionnaires as second or third choice, but no one named it their first choice.**

**Many other participants felt that community meetings and presentations to community groups were effective methods for getting people involved on a local level,** and liked that they are somewhat more personal than electronic communications. **A phone poll was probably the least popular method.**

Other methods were suggested, including chat groups, electronic voting, text messages, billboards, TV, radio, newspapers and other media, and focus groups.

**There was no one feature or format for community meetings that was most appealing to participants.** Structured presentations were the most popular, but not by very much. **Many seemed to feel that using multiple methods would be most effective – for instance, a structured presentation followed by electronic voting.** Many liked structured presentations with community discussion, the open house format, and small group discussions because they allow citizens to actively engage; whereas those who favored electronic voting appreciated the ability to vote right then and there yet remain anonymous. Participants liked the visual aspect of interactive graphics, which allows them to filter information well.

**Email was clearly participants’ first choice for letting them know about participation opportunities, by a wide margin (approximately 75% of responses).** A mailer was the second most popular choice – for a few it was better than email. It seemed that both emails and mailers would need to be employed to catch everyone. Newspaper announcements were the third most popular choice. Several mentioned not looking at newspapers because they get their news online. Less than a quarter of all participants listed “other” as a top choice; the alternative methods they suggested included phone calls, TV or radio ads,

announcements on public transit, Craigslist, billboards, and contact from a person in their area.

**Email was clearly the most popular method for keeping participants informed about the CTP and FSTIP. A mailer was a strong second choice, and newspaper ads were the third choice.** Many also suggested alternatives, such as a website (possibly along with mailing a postcard with the website link), TV ads or public service announcements, phone calls, announcements on public transit, billboards, Craigslist, and other media

As a final question, participants were asked what they would do if they were responsible for getting people to participate in these planning processes.

**Participants suggested a mixture of methods to target different groups of people. They overwhelmingly emphasized the importance of informing the public about these processes, giving them ongoing opportunities to participate, keeping communication going, and making it clear that their involvement would make a difference.** They felt that the public will respond when given an opportunity to contribute their input. They would seek support from local and regional leadership programs, homeowners' associations, cities and counties, church groups, and neighborhood organizations in speaking to people one-on-one and encouraging them to participate. Door to door campaigns, setting up booths at public events, tying into community or neighborhood activities, and using the college system to raise awareness were suggested as further methods of reaching the public. Repeating focus groups similar to these was seen as useful.

**There was some disagreement as to the use of incentives,** such as cash, gas cards, a tax break, a FasTrak or public transportation passes. Some thought it would be necessary, at least until people develop a genuine interest in the issues, and that capturing the largest possible participant pool would be a useful budget expenditure. Others didn't like the idea of incentivizing involvement.

## **Web survey**

The purpose of the website survey was to use yet another means to gather input from the public on the same range of questions that were covered by the interviews and focus groups. The web survey summary report, including survey instrument and tallied results, is forthcoming to Caltrans.

The survey was designed by MIG with the look and feel of a Caltrans web page, uploaded onto an MIG server and linked to the Caltrans website home page. Anyone visiting the home page could click on the link and fill out the survey during the month of January 2008. MIG sent e-mails announcing the survey to addresses supplied by the Caltrans Division of Planning, and the Caltrans Division of Programming sent similar e-mails to Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies throughout the State.

The survey was filled out by 307 persons during the time it was activated on the Web. The following is a demographic profile from demographic data provided in these 307 surveys:

- 56% are male, 37% are female
- 83% are between the ages of 21 and 65, and 11% are over 65
- 66% are White, 18 % don't state race, 7% are Asian, 4% Hispanic, 2% African-American or Black, 3% Other
- 80% have college or post-graduate degrees
- 69% commute to a job or school. Of those, 42% drive alone.
- The following counties are represented in the zip code information (17 people did not give a zip code, and 7 people who put down zip codes were from outside of California):

| <b>COUNTY</b>   | <b># OF RESPONDENTS</b> |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Alameda         | 16                      |
| Contra Costa    | 12                      |
| El Dorado       | 4                       |
| Fresno          | 10                      |
| Humboldt        | 1                       |
| Inyo            | 1                       |
| Kern            | 4                       |
| Lake            | 1                       |
| Los Angeles     | 13                      |
| Madera          | 1                       |
| Marin           | 6                       |
| Mariposa        | 1                       |
| Merced          | 4                       |
| Monterey        | 2                       |
| Nevada          | 1                       |
| Orange          | 8                       |
| Placer          | 4                       |
| Plumas          | 33                      |
| Sacramento      | 20                      |
| San Benito      | 1                       |
| San Bernardino  | 2                       |
| San Diego       | 49                      |
| San Francisco   | 7                       |
| San Joaquin     | 2                       |
| San Luis Obispo | 5                       |
| San Mateo       | 4                       |
| Santa Barbara   | 1                       |
| Santa Clara     | 50                      |
| Santa Cruz      | 3                       |
| Shasta          | 3                       |
| Solano          | 5                       |
| Sonoma          | 2                       |
| Tulare          | 2                       |
| Ventura         | 2                       |
| Yolo            | 4                       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | <b>283</b>              |

The respondents seem to be skewed towards college-educated, white commuting males, probably because the e-mails that encouraged people to take the survey were sent to stakeholders who are professionally associated in some way with the transportation system. However, half of those who filled out the survey say they have never heard of the CTP or the FSTIP. Although this survey was not designed to scientifically represent a cross-section of California residents, it does provide valuable input on what public participation methods might work for people who have never been involved, or even have been previously involved in the statewide transportation processes. MIG looked at the results separately for those who have heard of the CTP and those who haven't, and found little substantive difference.

The following are some overall results from the survey.

### Knowledge of the CTP and FSTIP

- Of the half of the respondents who have heard of the CTP, 65% have never commented on it.
- Fewer than half have ever heard of the FSTIP, and of those who have, 70% have commented on it (and 30% have never commented on it)<sup>1</sup>
- 81% of all respondents would be interested in learning about the CTP and providing comments, and 85% would be interested in learning about the FSTIP and commenting on it.

### Topics of Interest

Respondents were asked to check off all of the transportation topics that are of interest to them. The order of interest, in terms of number of times checked off, is:

| TOPIC   | % OF RESPONDENTS WHO CHECKED THIS TOPIC |
|---|---|
| Local transportation  | 65%                                     |
| Regional transportation                                     | 61%                                     |
| Public transit  | 50%                                     |
| Bikeways and pedestrian facilities                          | 48%                                     |
| Transportation funding                                      | 45%                                     |
| Highways and freeways                                       | 41%                                     |
| Statewide transportation                                    | 38%                                     |
| The connection between transportation and land use          | 37%                                     |
| Statewide rail and bus connections                          | 37%                                     |
| New transportation technology and information systems       | 36%                                     |
| Environmental issues such as air quality and global warming | 35%                                     |
| Preservation of agricultural land or open space             | 32%                                     |
| Methods to reduce driving, including rideshare programs     | 31%                                     |
| Safety programs   | 26%                                     |
| Carpool lanes   | 24%                                     |
| Toll roads  | 17%                                     |

<sup>1</sup> Caltrans staff question the 70% number as too high. It could be that respondents were recalling comments they had made on regional, and not state, transportation programs.

Other topics written in are transportation security, congestion pricing, information on driving conditions, maintenance, transportation for seniors and the disabled, ferries, enforcement, carsharing programs, rural highways, historic preservation, high speed rail and monorail, landscaping, and bus lanes.

### Public Participation Methods

Respondents were asked if they are interested in different methods of providing public input on the CTP and FSTIP, with these over all results in rank order of popularity:

| METHOD                            | YES | NO  |
|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|
| E-mail survey                     | 81% | 6%  |
| Interactive website               | 71% | 7%  |
| Mail-in questionnaire             | 40% | 28% |
| Community meetings                | 30% | 31% |
| Presentations to community groups | 26% | 34% |
| Phone poll                        | 15% | 56% |

Other ideas offered are Caltrans workshops with university research partners, stakeholder meetings, World Café (<http://theworldcafe.com>), formal agency comments, and written comments.

### Community Meeting Formats

When asked about different formats for community meetings, respondents register these opinions, in order of popularity:

| MEETING FORMATS                                   | YES | NO  | NO ANSWER |
|---|-----|-----|-----------|
| Structured presentation with community discussion | 59% | 6%  | 25%       |
| Open House – drop in as you can                   | 37% | 10% | 35%       |
| Interactive graphics                              | 38% | 11% | 34%       |
| Electronic voting                                 | 34% | 12% | 36%       |
| Small group discussions                           | 29% | 17% | 34%       |

Although these methods are ranked in order of yes/no, many respondents did not answer, suggesting a lack of clarity or opinion about meeting formats.

### Preferred Communications Methods

| METHODS                  | PREFERRED | LESS EFFECTIVE | NOT EFFECTIVE | NO ANSWER |
|--------------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|-----------|
| Email                    | 90%       | 3%             | 2%            | 6%        |
| Postcards or newsletters | 20%       | 38%            | 10%           | 31%       |
| Newspaper announcements  | 7%        | 19%            | 41%           | 33%       |

Although email appears to be the most popular method to know about the CTP and FSTIP, some people clearly prefer more traditional mailings of postcards or newsletters. Newspaper ads and announcements are ranked very low in effectiveness by almost all respondents.

## **Conclusions**

A link to the web survey was sent out broadly to Caltrans partners and transportation stakeholders within California, as well as being placed on the Caltrans homepage for the general public to fill out. Most respondents appear to be professionals, and many have some knowledge of the CTP and FSTIP. Here are some basic conclusions from the survey data:

- There is a high degree of interest in learning about, and commenting on the CTP and FSTIP
- People tend to be more interested in their local transportation system, then the regional system, and finally the statewide system.
- They are also very interested in public transit, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, funding, and freeways, in that order. Least interesting are toll roads and carpool lanes on freeways.
- E-mail and interactive websites are the most popular forms of learning about transportation planning and programming for this group of respondents, followed by mail-in questionnaires.
- These respondents are ambivalent about community meetings (about 30% are interested in them and 30% not interested in them).
- If community meetings are held, most people prefer structured presentations with community discussion.
- The great majority of respondents prefer keeping in touch with planning and programming processes via e-mail, and some people prefer postcards or newsletters. Newspaper ads and announcements are not considered effective.

# ATTACHMENT C PROCESS GRAPHIC

