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1. Introduction

A. Foundation of Public Participation in Transportation Planning

Public participation is based on the belief that people whose lives are affected by transportation planning and investment decisions have a right to be involved in the decision-making process and influence choices that are made. Directly engaging people in this process promotes successful problem solving, yields diverse voices and new ideas, and gives the public a sense of ownership of the developed solutions.

Public participation must be a proactive process in which governing bodies strive to find innovative ways to identify and engage the affected public, provide a wide variety of opportunities for interested parties to become involved, and create a meaningful process that is transparent and ensures effective communication about how public contribution influences decisions. It is also important that a public participation process be continuously evaluated and improved to ensure that under-represented communities are given a voice.

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) is committed to a public participation process that:

• Involves the public in decisions that affect their lives.
• Ensures that the public’s contribution will influence decision making.
• Communicates how the public’s contribution will influence decisions.
• Is adaptable and sensitive to diverse audiences.
• Promotes respect.
• Provides equal access to opportunities, information and education.
• Ensures timely response to participants.
• Is consistent and reliable.
• Promotes continued engagement.
• Allows for flexibility and use of creative approaches.
• Maintains honesty and integrity throughout the process.
• Continuously strives to educate and inform affected and interested parties to give them a more meaningful participatory experience.
• Encourages early and active participation.
• Involves process evaluation and monitoring tools.

B. The Role of Mid-America Regional Council

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) is designated by the federal government as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the bistate Greater Kansas City area. MARC is responsible for coordinating transportation planning activities within the MPO boundary which includes Cass, Clay, Jackson and Platte counties along with a portion of Ray county in Missouri, and Johnson, Leavenworth, Miami and Wyandotte counties in Kansas. MARC works with federal and local governments, state departments of transportation, transit agencies, area stakeholders, and the public to ensure that the plans and projects developed help move the region toward the goal of achieving a rising quality of life for everyone.
C. Purpose of the Public Participation Plan

MARC seeks to provide opportunities in the transportation planning process to interested parties as well as engage and involve members of the community who have not been traditionally involved. The purpose of this plan is to provide a framework from which to guide the public participation process in future transportation planning projects at MARC, such as the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and for a range of programs and special plans and studies. This plan specifies MARC’s underlying goals as well as strategies and techniques to be considered and employed in achieving the goals of the public participation process. The plan describes the importance of including those who are traditionally forgotten in the transportation planning process; it therefore includes a framework for inclusion of environmental justice in the planning process. Additionally, the plan describes how MARC will work to incorporate visualization and scenario planning techniques into its public participation process to better depict statewide and metropolitan transportation plans and studies.

D. Legal Framework and Plan Application

The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), was signed into law on December 4, 2015, and contains specific language outlining federal requirements regarding public participation processes and procedures. In general, FAST Act legislation built upon previous transportation legislation (ISTEA, TEA-21, SAFETEA-LU and MAP-21) to provide states and metropolitan planning organizations specific direction in conducting and promoting broad-based public involvement activities.

FAST Act Legislation (Public Law 114-94) requires metropolitan planning organizations to provide residents, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators and employer-based commuting programs such as carpool programs, vanpool programs, transit benefit programs, parking cash-out programs, shuttle programs, and telework programs), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan.

In addition, the Public Participation Plan:

• shall be developed in consultation with all interested parties; and
• shall provide that all interested parties have reasonable opportunities to comment on the contents of the transportation plan.

In carrying out these required elements of the Public Participation Plan, MARC shall, to the maximum extent practicable:

• hold any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;
• ensure those utilizing funds administered by MARC include goals and objectives of the Public Participation Plan into their public participation process;
• employ visualization techniques to describe plans; and
• make public information available online in an accessible format and means, such as the web, to afford
reasonable opportunity for consideration of public information.

Federal legislation requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations to produce documents that govern the regional transportation investments and planning activities, including the development of the Unified Planning Work Program, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program and the Public Participation Plan. This plan will apply to all these activities as well as any special studies conducted by MARC.

2. Goals For Public Participation

It is MARC’s goal to have significant and ongoing public participation in the transportation planning process. Education and public outreach are an essential part of fulfilling MARC’S desire and responsibility to successfully inform the public about the planning process at the metropolitan level. In addition to its informative roles, MARC also seeks to empower and improve opportunities for the public to voice their ideas and values regarding transportation. MARC strives to ensure early and continuous public participation in all major actions and decisions.

The following goals embody these ideas and set out to guide the participation process to successfully achieve the principles that have been outlined.

Goal 1: Inform and Educate the Public

It is MARC’s responsibility to make information accessible to the public and to provide timely public notice. MARC will provide information to the public that is accurate, understandable, and pertinent to regional transportation planning and engagement activities and will do so through the use of varied communication tools. In addition to informing the public, MARC will make every effort to educate the public about the planning process and provide supportive policy, program and technical information. Educating the public supports informed public contribution and continued engagement by the public. Education will be enhanced through the use of visualization tools that will help the public understand and relate to MARC’s various planning products and activities.

Goal 2: Reach Out and Build Connections

MARC recognizes that large segments of the population rarely participate in the transportation planning process, including disabled, minority, non-English speaking and low-income groups. It is a priority to increase the diversity and number of participants in previous engagement activities through building new relationships with organizations and communities that serve these under-represented populations.

Goal 3: Engage the Public and Encourage Continued Participation

MARC will encourage continued public participation by ensuring a meaningful engagement process. This includes providing various ways to engage and communicate with the public, responding to all comments and questions in a timely manner, presenting a clear process for incorporating public input into MARC’s plans, and providing other opportunities for further engagement and education.

Goal 4: Use Input to Shape Policies, Plans and Programs

MARC will document all input received from the public. This documentation will provide a record of received comments and will assist MARC staff and MARC committees in reviewing public input, which can then be used in the development of transportation plans and programs. The process of incorporating public input into transportation planning documents will be transparent and open to the public. MARC will inform the public of the decision-making process for each planning activity in which public comment is solicited. This will be presented to the public at the beginning of each planning activity and throughout the engagement process.
Goal 5: Evaluate Public Participation Strategies

In order to sustain best practices in public participation, MARC will continually monitor the public engagement process and create a framework for evaluating and improving this document and the strategies that guide how we engage the public.

Evaluating the public participation process is an essential part of the Public Participation Plan for many reasons. Effective evaluation supports continuous ongoing improvement of future processes and projects, helps MARC assess the performance of the process against its objectives, and supports improvement of the practice of public participation.

3. Specific Plan Processes

Public participation is a valuable tool used to shape plans that accurately reflect the goals and visions for the region. Public surveys indicate that people believe their participation is most valuable when developing the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and other plans for individual modes of transportation. MARC also recognizes that specific plans and studies with regional goals and objectives are more valuable with the community direction and support. The following plans are identified as MARC’s core plans with each public participation process identified. All of MARC’s core plans are available on the MARC Transportation webpage and available in hard copy at the MARC offices.

A. Unified Planning Work Program

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is a document that describes the transportation planning activities MARC and other agencies propose to undertake during the next fiscal year. Each major activity is described in enough detail to indicate who will perform the work, the schedule for completing it and what will result from the activity. The UPWP also contains information on the proposed budget for each activity. The UPWP is posted on the MARC website at marc.org/transportation/upwp.

MARC develops the UPWP with input from local governments, area transit providers, the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT), and the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT). When comments are being solicited during the public review period, information will be posted on the MARC web site and in MARC’s main office lobby. It should be shared with stakeholders through transportation mailing lists, the agency’s social media platforms, and in MARC publications. In addition, MARC may place notices in area newspapers (including a Spanish-language newspaper) as an additional means of notification.

All public comments received pertaining to the UPWP will be reviewed and considered. An effective means of incorporating public input into the UPWP is to review comments received the previous year that relate to similar new projects. When developing the work program, the UPWP project manager should take this public comment into consideration.

The UPWP is updated annually in August/September, and released for public review and comment for a minimum of 14 days. Final approval is made in November/December. Amendments are made throughout the year and are released for public comment when projects are either added or deleted, or when significant changes are made to the document.

B. Metropolitan Transportation Plan

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), called Transportation Outlook 2040, is the centerpiece of the metropolitan transportation planning process and serves as a blueprint for the management of the region’s transportation system. It identifies transportation improvements for, at minimum, a 20-year horizon. It articulates region-wide transportation goals, policies and strategies ranging from road and transit improvements to projects that enhance bike, pedestrian and freight movement.
The MTP is developed through an extensive public participation process that spans several months and involves thousands of individuals across the region. A series of public meetings will be held throughout the region for each complete update. Events will be publicized using display advertisements in *The Kansas City Star* and other community newspapers, like *The Call, Kansas City Globe, Dos Mundos, Northeast News,* and *Kansas City Hispanic News.* Opportunities for public participation do not stop with the adoption of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan; it will continue to evolve as additional needs are identified. The MTP must be completely updated at least every five years while in air quality attainment (four years when in non-attainment), but may be revised more frequently if necessary. Information about the next update of the MTP can be found on the MTP webpage or by contacting Transportation staff.

When a new update is being developed, a specific public participation strategy be developed to outline the public participation process. MARC should post drafts of chapters online throughout development, in addition to when it is officially released for public comment as a single document. In the past, presenting one or more chapters of the plan each month, allowed the Total Transportation Policy Committee (TTPC) and the public more opportunities to comment on the plan update as it was developed prior to its official release for public comment.

When comments are solicited during the public review period, information will be posted on the MARC website and in MARC's main office lobby. It should be shared with stakeholders through transportation mailing lists, the agency’s social media platforms, and in MARC publications. In addition, MARC may place notices in area newspapers (including a Spanish-language paper) as an additional means of notification. In the case of a newly developed MTP, MARC should send a press release to local news media. The public review and comment period will last at least 30 days, as federally required.

Amendments are periodically made, between major updates, to the MTP as new projects, funding, or programs arise. The process for MTP amendments is 14 days to allow for simultaneous public comment periods for amendments impacting both the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. Only chapters containing the proposed amendments are presented for public comment and approval. Prior to approval by TTPC, MARC staff will present the proposed amendments to the relevant modal committees for review.

**C. Transportation Improvement Program**

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) documents how Greater Kansas City will prioritize limited transportation resources to meet the needs of the region. The TIP contains major surface transportation projects planned to receive federal, state and local funding within the metro area that will be carried out in a five-year period. Project examples include new roadways, additional through lanes to existing streets, interchange construction or modification, improvements to intersections, transit amenities and bicycle/pedestrian facilities. MARC updates the TIP every two years and processes amendments on a quarterly cycle throughout the year. Special amendments may also be processed at other times throughout the year.

It is recommended that efforts to engage the public be made during the early stages of the TIP process, which includes the development of a new TIP and programming of new projects that will be included or amended into the TIP. Early and continuous public participation could be done for the TIP in the following stages: (1) Previous public comment from other projects should be taken into account and provided to serve as a tool throughout the entire TIP process. (2) When MARC solicits projects for the TIP from local governments or issues a call for projects for the programming of federal sub-allocated funds, public comment should be solicited. (3) If there is a declared emergency, public comment should be solicited for the emergency action.

**Comment period:** 30 days for plan adoption / 14 days for plan amendments

**Web page:** [www.to2040.org](http://www.to2040.org)

**E-mail:** transportation@marc.org

**Update schedule:** at least every five years

**Comment period:** 14 days for program adoption and amendments (7 days for declared emergency)

**Web page:** marc.org/transportation/tip.htm

**E-mail:** tip@marc.org

**Update schedule:** every two years
funds, an opportunity for public input and comment on these projects should be made. The website, newsletters, surveys, and other means of communication should be used to do this. (3) Additionally, when the projects recommended for funding are proposed, staff should present the full list of projects that were considered, as well as public comments, to provide a more informed basis to analyze projects.

When comments are solicited during the public review period, information will be posted on the MARC website and in MARC’s main office lobby. It should be shared with stakeholders through transportation mailing lists, the agency’s social media platforms and in MARC publications. In addition, MARC may place notices in area newspapers (including a Spanish-language paper) as an additional means of notification. In the case of a newly developed TIP, MARC should send a press release to local news media.

In the event of declared state and/or federal emergencies, or at the discretion of MARC’s executive director, MARC may elect to process any emergency-related TIP revisions through an expedited public participation process — a seven-day review instead of 14 days. Emergency-related revisions for which a formal amendment, as documented above, would be required under normal circumstances will also be ratified by the MARC Board of Directors at the next scheduled opportunity. Information will be posted on the MARC website and in MARC’s main office lobby. It should be shared with stakeholders through transportation mailing lists, the agency’s social media platforms, and in MARC publications.

D. Public Participation Plan

The Public Participation Plan provides a framework to guide the public participation process in transportation planning projects at MARC, such as the UPWP, MTP, TIP, and a range of programs and special plans and studies. This plan specifies MARC’s underlying goals, strategies and techniques to be considered and employed in achieving the goals of the public participation process.

The development of a new Public Participation Plan will itself involve an inclusive public participation process. The process shall meet the goals of the currently adopted Public Participation Plan and strive to employ new and/or underused methods for engaging the public, particularly to evaluate and validate the effectiveness of strategies outlined in the current plan.

Once a final draft of a new Public Participation Plan is complete, MARC staff will present it to the Total Transportation Policy Committee for its consideration and approval to release to the public for a 45-day comment and review period. All comments received by MARC will be considered in the final review by the TTPC, prior to its adoption.

During the public review period, MARC will post information on its website and in its main office lobby. It should be shared with stakeholders through transportation mailing lists, the agency’s social media platforms and in MARC publications. In addition, MARC may place notices in area newspapers (including a Spanish-language paper) as an additional means of notification.

Based on yearly evaluations of the public participation processes MARC may undertake, MARC staff will decide at the time of the plan’s full review (every three years) whether an update or a full redevelopment of the plan is necessary. If only minor updating is necessary, MARC staff may choose to use TTPC and the final public comment and review period as the means for involving the public in the adoption of the updated plan.

The adopted plan will be posted on the MARC website and be available in both an English and Spanish version.

E. Amendments and Administrative Modifications

There are many factors that can require adjustments to transportation plans and projects, some which
may be considered minor and do not necessitate the full review required of amendments. In such cases, an administrative modification may be made. An administrative modification is a revision that does not require public review and comment, re-demonstration of fiscal constraint, or a conformity determination (in nonattainment and maintenance areas). Administrative modifications can only be made to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program and the Unified Planning Work Program. Such revisions may include minor changes to project costs, funding sources of previously included projects, and minor changes to a project’s initiation date.

MARC staff will follow established guidelines for each MPO product to determine whether proposed changes will be processed as administrative modifications or amendments and will proceed with the approval of MARC’s Director of Transportation.

Amendments to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, Unified Planning Work Program and administrative modifications will be listed on the MARC Transportation website.

F. Special Plans and Studies

MARC frequently develops or facilitates the development of special plans and studies beyond those that are federally required. This additional planning work may include developing a more detailed plan for a particular mode of travel, like a regional bike or freight plan, or assisting local governments in developing a corridor or area plan. The processes to develop these types of plans or studies will include a public participation process in most cases. Project managers will develop a public participation strategy with guidance from this Public Participation Plan and make it available on a special webpage dedicated to the project. A formal public review and comment period is not required for these plans and studies. However, in cases where the special plan would require changes to the UPWP, MTP, TIP or PPP, the project manager must include a public review and comment period in the public participation process.

Some special plans, like a regional bike or freight plan, are updated every few years depending on regional circumstances, like major shifts in socioeconomics or the political environment in the region. Project managers will develop email lists of prior participants for these projects to keep interested community members and stakeholders informed of plan updates and other relevant information. To learn about future plan updates, sign up to receive Transportation Matters email here.

Summary of Plan Update Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>UPDATE SCHEDULE</th>
<th>COMMENT PERIOD LENGTH</th>
<th>WEBPAGE</th>
<th>EMAIL FOR COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
<td>Annually (August/ September)</td>
<td>14 days for adoption and amendments</td>
<td>marc.org/Transportation/UPWP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:transportation@marc.org">transportation@marc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Plan</td>
<td>At least every 5 years</td>
<td>30 days for adoption, 14 days for amendments</td>
<td>to2040.org</td>
<td><a href="mailto:transportation@marc.org">transportation@marc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Every 2 years</td>
<td>7 days for adoption, amendments and declared emergency</td>
<td>marc.org/Transportation/TIP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tip@marc.org">tip@marc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation Plan</td>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
<td>45 days for adoption</td>
<td>marc.org/Transportation/Participation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ppp@marc.org">ppp@marc.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A variety of strategies and techniques will be used to encourage early and continuous public participation throughout the development of MARC’s core plans, including the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Unified Planning Work Program, the Transportation Improvement Program and the Public Participation Plan, as well as special plans and studies. As new plans are federally mandated and incorporated into MARC’s roles and responsibilities, MARC will continue to apply community engagement techniques to accomplish the goals outlined in this plan.

All internal planning work, MARC-administered projects, and contracted planning work that includes public engagement activities performed by consultants and managed by MARC will be held to the goals outlined in this plan. It is suggested that all requests for proposals include a project requirement specifically identifying MARC’s Public Participation Plan as a guiding document for proposed engagement strategies. Successfully identifying techniques that support all of MARC’s goals for public engagement will be beneficial to a proposal in a competitive procurement process. Example language for use in requests for proposals can be found in Appendix E.

As MARC continues to serve the Kansas City region, standards should be in place so that there is a level of consistency among the different planning efforts. At the same time, MARC recognizes that strategies and extent of public participation will vary depending upon the project.

Project managers are responsible for developing a unique public participation strategy for each project that uses appropriate techniques. The strategy should include a timeline showing engagement techniques and other relevant activities, and should outline target audiences and expected outcomes. The following techniques and strategies will serve as a guide for project managers to consider when developing the public participation component of their project. Finding a balance of various techniques and strategies will be key, resulting in a tailored mix of approaches that ensure early, continuous, and accessible public participation. A MARC staff member designated as the Public Engagement Coordinator will be available as necessary to aid this process.

MARC’s transportation staff will collaborate with the Public Affairs department and other transportation agencies to help deploy these techniques and strategies. Helpful tips for developing and deploying a public participation strategy can be found in Appendix B.

Title VI of the Civil Right Act of 1964

MARC’s planning activities and programs, including those for the purposes of public engagement, must be sensitive to the region’s diverse audience. MARC ensures that no person will — on the ground of race, religion, age, gender, disability, national origin, or economic status — be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any MARC program or activity. MARC also promotes the full and fair participation of all affected populations in the transportation decision-making process. Any information, education and participation opportunities will be equally accessible.

For additional information regarding the Title VI program and filing a complaint, please visit marc.org/transportation/equity
A. Strategies and Techniques

Where applicable, the following strategies and techniques will be incorporated into public participation strategies. Each strategy and technique supports one or more goals of the Public Participation Plan. The following icons reference the plan’s goals supported by the strategy or technique.

1. Visualization

Visualization techniques will be used in all core transportation plans, programs and projects. These techniques will better relate projects to regional goals and make documents clearer and simpler for the public and those who do not have a background in transportation planning. Effective visualization techniques help build consensus and clarify ideas between the public and decision makers. Tailoring visualization techniques for a specific document or population will help interested people understand transportation planning goals and activities. These techniques may include interactive maps of project locations, use of diagrams, photos, charts and tables, or other graphics that illustrate the impacts or benefits of alternatives and scenarios. MARC will continue to research best practices and develop additional methods that support education and engagement.

2. MARC.org Website

MARC’s website, www.marc.org, is host to a variety of information on all aspects of the transportation-planning process and can provide interactive activities to solicit feedback from the public. However, not all people have access or ability to use the Internet. Individuals without Internet access are encouraged to use a public computer at local public libraries. While it is an effective tool, MARC has a responsibility to also use traditional forms of public outreach that provide broad avenues for participation.

Although not federally required, MARC will continue to work towards better compliance with Section 508 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act to ensure people with disabilities are able to access technology. Every effort will be made to ensure special needs are met. The public is encouraged to contact the MARC offices if they encounter difficulties accessing information on MARC’s website.

Display of Documents

- MARC’s core plans and published documents are available in electronic format on the website. Documents pertaining to current studies in which MARC is a part of should be available online as well. Corridor, area, feasibility and alternatives analysis studies that MARC is involved with are posted online with summary descriptions and links to all relevant documents, schedules, maps and
contact information. If MARC is not the host of this information, an effort should be made to direct interested parties to the appropriate source.

Public Comment Opportunities

• The MARC website offers an easily identifiable place for public comment on MARC transportation projects and studies. When updates and amendments to programs and projects are released for public review and comment, MARC will make them available on the website at marc.org/input.

Advertisement of the MARC Website

• The MARC website address will be included on all MARC publications and advertisements, in addition to any materials related to core plans and studies.

Upcoming Events and Meeting Calendar

• A public meeting calendar is available on the MARC website. This calendar displays MARC’s regional transportation-related meetings and events that are open to the public. This includes, at a minimum, all of the regular monthly transportation committee meetings, MARC Board meetings and other relevant meetings that pertain to transportation-planning projects, policies and programs.

3. Other Web-Based Strategies

The Internet is a dynamic tool that allows MARC to reach a large cross section of people at times conducive to their schedule. Public surveys indicate that additional and innovative ways to use the Internet and other available technology would encourage more public participation. People have access to Web-based information 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Message boards, electronic mailing lists, blogs, discussion forums and social media sites can be used to inform, educate and start dialogues about transportation planning between users.

Social Media

MARC has several social media feeds that provide important information about events, projects and public comment opportunities. While MARC primarily uses these tools for communicating information to the public, the public can communicate back to MARC with comments or questions.

A Facebook page can be used to host project information to help educate the public, build connections with targeted stakeholders and community members and facilitate engagement. While continuing to maintain project information on the MARC website, project managers should consider using this feature as the primary information source for active MARC-led projects.

Additionally, many social networking sites now integrate live video, which can help promote and expand the reach of projects, potentially attracting new followers or group members. Project managers should consider using live stream video for presentations, events, “man-on-the-street” interviews, etc.

Social media platforms offer metrics that indicate how many impressions, or views, posts have received. It is recommended that these available metrics be used in evaluating the effectiveness of social media use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>POLICY MAKING</th>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>PROGRAMMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARC Board of Directors</td>
<td>Total Transportation Policy Committee, Air Quality Forum, Transportation Legislative Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian, Highway, Regional Transit Coordinating Council, Transit Stakeholder Forum, Goods Movement, Aviation, Management and Operations</td>
<td>Enhancements, Active Transportation Programming Committee, Special Transportation-Job Access Partnership, Kansas and Missouri Surface Transportation Priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To find MARC and MARC programs on social media, please visit marc.org/About-MARC/Find-Us/Social-Media

Other Digital Media

MARC staff should identify ways to incorporate digital media where possible in public participation. Digital media includes audio, video, or photo content that is published online and can easily be shared across computer networks. Digital media supports visualization strategies and attracts and encourages increased public participation. Digital media content can be shared through any web-based tool identified in this plan.

Online Engagement Platforms

In addition to in-person public engagement, online engagement techniques should be considered as a means to engage members of the public who would like to participate in a MARC engagement activities but cannot physically attend. Many times, if well-promoted, online engagement can yield stronger participation. Community members can participate in their own free time and provide more thoughtful input.

There are several platforms that offer online engagement, both free and for a fee. Many online engagement platforms offer visualization tools, communication between participants, surveys and polls, and can host documents.

Email

MARC will use email as a way to provide a direct and ongoing form of participation and communication for individuals, organizations, agencies and others who desire increased participation in MARC’s planning process. Additionally, MARC uses email as its primary method of communication for the stakeholder consultation process required in the FAST act.

MARC staff maintains multiple mailing lists that include the stakeholders groups required in of the consultation requirement.

MARC staff will issue a “Notification of Plan Update” to all individual contacts registered on the mailing lists as part of the consultation process. This notification will provide an overview of the proposed update process and will delineate the specific update timeline, outline general process activities, and describe public participation opportunities.

Intermediate communications may also be made to contacts on the consultation mailing list as needed throughout the planning process. The consultation process will conclude by providing notification to the contacts on the list of a completed process, and provide directions for accessing finalized plan updates.

Interested stakeholders not currently included in one of MARC’s transportation mailing lists may request to be added by emailing transportation@marc.org.

4. Publications and Mailings

MARC uses publications and mailings to inform interested parties about transportation-related issues and events. Also noted in these publications are comment periods, points of contact, updates on core plans and studies, and key information about how to get involved. A regular mailing/contact list of interested individuals is maintained and updated by MARC staff.

Electronic forms are available on MARC’s website, or interested parties can be added to any mailing list, free of charge, by calling 816-474-4240.

Speakers Bureau

Speakers are available to discuss transportation planning for the metropolitan area at local meetings and events.

To schedule a speaker or for more information, contact MARC’s Transportation Department at 816/474-4240.
The following publications can be used to help inform and educate the public about transportation planning and various activities.

**Guide to Transportation Decision Making**

MARC has developed a Guide to Transportation Decision Making, modifying a base guide from the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration to provide Kansas City-specific information. The guide describes how the transportation-planning process works, explains how to get involved, and provides information about where public comment is most appropriate. The guide is general in nature, and written in clear and simple language. The guide is distributed at speaking engagements, public outreach meetings, display tables, and is mailed in response to public inquiry. An online version can be found here.

**ReMARC**

MARC publishes ReMARC, a bimonthly newsletter that reports on issues important to cities and counties in the Kansas City metro region. Updates on regional transportation-related issues are often included in this newsletter.

**MARC Annual Review**

Every year MARC publishes a review of MARC’s current efforts to meet regional challenges in transportation planning, protecting the environment, developing a strong economy, providing efficient public services and assisting vulnerable populations.

**Transportation Matters blog**

Previously a newsletter, this blog is produced by MARC’s Transportation & Environment Department and provides information about major transportation plans and projects, upcoming meetings and public comment opportunities, activities, possible decisions and actions, and research. The blog is available at transportation.marcblogs.org and can be linked to from the MARC website. Readers can choose to subscribe to the blog and receive new posts through email. Subscriptions can be customized so that only posts relevant to the readers’ interests (i.e. transit) will be sent by email.

5. Public Interaction

An effective way to educate people about transportation-planning activities and create opportunities for the public to get involved is to meet with them face to face. MARC must take the attitude of “meeting the public where they are” instead of expecting the public to always come to MARC. The following strategies and techniques enable face-to-face interaction with the public.

**Information Displays and Pop-Ups**

MARC should capitalize on opportunities at events already taking place in the community, such as professional, college, and high school sporting events, community events, neighborhood association meetings and festivals, as well as going to area shopping centers and markets. A “traveling display” may be assembled that include surveys, mailing list sign-up forms, MTP and TIP summaries, and other information that may be of interest to the general public. This gives the public direct access to MARC, the planning process and its staff. While Information displays are generally used to provide information to the public, pop-ups are useful as a way to engage the community and obtain feedback on specific planning projects. Pop-ups are a great option “for going where the people are” and should be used as a complement to online engagement or public meetings.

**Committee Meetings**

MARC is host to several committees that provide an opportunity for stakeholders to discuss issues and coordinate transportation-planning activities. Planning committees establish strategies for managing the region’s transportation system. Programming committees establish funding priorities and review and score transportation project applications. Both make recommendations to the Total Transportation Policy Committee, which reports to the MARC Board of Directors for approval.
All of MARC's transportation committee meetings are open to the public. This provides a great opportunity for the public to stay informed and participate in the planning process.

Public notification of MARC Board and committee meetings will be given at the same time committee members are notified. Operating procedures (such as notification, impromptu meetings and changes in the agenda) for each committee vary. Details can be found in the bylaws or operating procedures of each committee. Notification is considered complete by posting a copy of the agenda or meeting notice, including the time, date, and place of the meeting, on the MARC website and meeting calendar, and by electronically notifying committee members, interested parties, and members of the news media who have expressed an interest in receiving such notifications. Each committee hosts its own Web page that provides this information. Hard copies will be distributed by request. A complete listing of MARC's committees can be found on MARC's website.

**Public Meetings**

Public meetings are a great way to inform the public of the planning process and to solicit ideas, input and feedback. It is important that MARC have open and honest communication and listen to the public. Public meetings should be held at multiple locations throughout the region when dealing with region-wide issues, plans and programs. Locations should be on "neutral ground," like libraries, community centers or schools, rather than municipal or state buildings. When possible, these locations should be accessible by transit and located at buildings that are compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. A meeting site inventory with facility information should be created and maintained as a staff resource. If a targeted population is located in one geographic area, then the meeting should be held in that area for the convenience of participants. Informed and approachable MARC staff should be readily available to answer any question people may have. It is important that information is presented in a format that is easily understood. Technical jargon should be avoided, and visualization techniques should be used to describe complicated ideas in an easy-to-grasp format.

Attempts to have elected officials present for public forums are highly recommended. Elected officials have been a consistent request of attendees in the past. Credible public relations firms and facilitators should also be considered when deemed appropriate. Meeting times should be appropriate for the area, so that the maximum number of attendees will be available.

Upon advance notice, hearing-impaired and language interpreters and Braille documents will be provided for public meetings. Advertising will include contact information for those needing these or other special accommodations.

MARC encourages the public to ask questions and voice their ideas and opinions about regional transportation activities at any time throughout the year. Comments received outside of the official comment period will be evaluated by MARC staff, incorporated where possible, and acknowledged in the same way the comment was received. To contact MARC transportation staff, please reference the contact information listed on the next page.

**Piggy-Back Meetings and Collaboration with Partner Organizations**

Cosponsoring meetings with groups such as businesses, environmental groups, and civic organizations should be used to develop strong participation and awareness. Community members have identified that they are more willing to participate in transportation discussions when part of an organization meeting (e.g., YMCA, neighborhood association, Rotary Club, etc.) rather than a more formal town hall meeting.

To ensure participation of traditionally underserved populations, marketing and advertising campaigns are vital. Specific community leaders should be involved in the advertising process when applicable (community leaders know best how to reach and involve their own residents), and services may need to be provided (child care, food, etc.). These relationships should be maintained for future partnerships in the planning process.

An effort should be made to collaborate with other organizations whenever possible. Examples of collaboration opportunities include working with other transportation agencies in advertising,
recruiting elected public officials to be present at public meetings, or working with a retirement center to involve a particular segment of the population. Joining other meetings already taking place within different communities should be considered whenever possible.

MARC encourages the public to ask questions and voice their ideas and opinions about regional transportation activities at any time throughout the year. Comments received outside of the official comment period will be evaluated by MARC staff, incorporated where possible, and acknowledged in the same way the comment was received. To contact MARC transportation staff, please reference the contact information listed on the next page.

**Involving Participants with Limited English Proficiency**

As a recipient of federal funds, MARC is responsible for involving and providing meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are considered limited English proficient (LEP). LEP persons are individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English. These individuals may be entitled language assistance.

In compliance with federal LEP regulations (Title VI of the Civil Right Act of 1964) and to guide MARC staff through assessing whether certain requirements for providing language assistance for any given public participation process is required, MARC has adopted an LEP plan for its transportation program. This LEP plan describes the analysis MARC staff must follow in order to assess what translation and interpreter requirements, if any, must be followed. If it is determined that special services are required, the LEP will also guide staff on the process for fulfilling these requirements. The LEP plan can be found on MARC’s website at marc.org/transportation/lep.htm.

MARC’s transportation-related public participation processes will strive to improve contact and communication with non-native English speakers. MARC will continue to identify and use channels of communication on which the community relies, including minority newspapers and radio stations. MARC will also continue to foster relationships with businesses and organizations that serve immigrant populations.

Interpreters and translating services should also be identified and readily available to serve the needs of this population. Tools will be used to help identify areas that predominantly speak other languages so they will have an equal chance to participate in planning discussions. These tools include the Modern Language Association Language Map and geographic mapping data available through the U.S. Census.

**Involving Environmental Justice Populations**

MARC recognizes that additional efforts must be taken to involve a broader portion of the population, including minority, and low-income populations. Ideally, the concerns of environmental justice — a holistic effort that deals with the inequitable environmental burden born by these segments of the population — will lead to better planning that reflects the needs of all people, designing transportation facilities that fit harmoniously into communities, as well as improving communication between MARC and underserved populations.

Environmental justice assures that services and benefits allow for meaningful participation by all and are fairly distributed to all individuals to avoid discrimination.

**Environmental Justice Principle**

- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process;
- To avoid, minimize or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority or low-income populations.
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority or low-income populations.
When targeting participation efforts towards communities with concentrations of low-income and minority populations, MARC will work to gain insight about how best to communicate and engage residents in these areas from community organizations and leaders within these communities. It is important to consider how and where advertisement and notifications of engagement opportunities are carried out. MARC will identify local publications and media outlets that are important to targeted communities. If applicable, MARC will identify bus routes for the distribution of on-bus flyers.

Public meeting locations should be in neutral locations that are frequented by community members in target areas, such as, churches, community centers, or libraries; and, these locations should be ADA-accessible and within walking distance of bus routes, if available. MARC should consider providing childcare and nutritious snacks at meetings, when applicable.

Building and maintaining trust among community members in environmental justice areas is essential in order to encourage continued participation in the transportation planning process. Past transportation decisions may have had negative impacts on low-income and minority neighborhoods; and, the perception that feedback will not be considered in future decision-making or that decisions have already been made is common. In order to build trust, project staff must be clear about project objectives, what kind of feedback can influence the project, demonstrate that feedback and concerns are being documented and communicated to decision-makers, and how feedback ultimately shaped final plans and studies.

Providing information about plans and projects and how decisions are made is also important. Documents should be made available in hard copy and digital formats, with hard copy documents being available at libraries or other convenient locations in target communities.

6. Media

Every effort should be made to use the media when involving the public. No single form will reach everyone, so it is recommended that MARC use a variety of methods. MARC should take advantage of opportunities with the media, therefore, press releases should be sent to radio, television and local newspapers. Press releases, when appropriate, should include information about MARC programs and activities, briefings, interviews, upcoming events and actions, as well as whom to contact as a regional resource for more information.

Newspapers should include both general circulation newspapers and minority-oriented newspapers. Opportunities should also be sought to advertise and publish in other newsletters produced by homeowner’s association, church groups, civic groups and others that have interest in MARC’s planning programs. Advertisements are made to notify the public of meetings and the availability of public documents. Newspapers should be used when conducting public participation activities relating to MARC plans and projects. Also, newspaper or utility bill inserts can effectively reach large audiences. Only very important projects would most benefit from large-scale insert distribution due to the large expense.

7. Mailings

Direct mailings should be used to target a particular audience to announce upcoming meetings, activities or provide information. Letters, fliers and postcards are best suited for this category. These should be used for project fact sheets, progress bulletins and overall updates to a planning process. An area that may be targeted may have a special interest in the project or be directly affected by it. It is key to ensure that all stakeholders within a project area participate in the planning process. Special studies and local planning activities that MARC is involved with should use this method more often.

8. Surveys

Surveys are an effective tool that can be used to generate a valid representation of public opinion and, when used in combination with direct public interaction, can reach a large audience. Surveys should deliver specific input from the public and contain consistent questions so that the results are easily compared. While hard copy surveys may be used, it is recommended that surveys be administered online and shared through many different online channels, including social media, to extend the reach. For a
small fee, Facebook and Twitter can promote and target posts including information about a survey to communities and persons within specific demographics, geographies and interest areas.

9. Comment Cards and Evaluation Forms

To make sure everyone has a voice in the planning process, comment cards and evaluation forms will be made available at all regular MARC meetings. Comment cards are an additional way for the public to share comments and provide feedback in a way that may be more comfortable than voicing an opinion during an open meeting. Evaluation forms let MARC staff know how effective each outreach event was in the eyes of the participants. Future events will be tailored or changed based on the comments received from the evaluation forms.

10. Document and Incorporate Public Input

MARC recognizes that, to foster a strong base of resident participation, it is important to respond to comments and questions that have been submitted to explain how they are reviewed and considered. It is MARC’s responsibility to respond to all comments received that apply to the UPWP, LRTP, TIP, PPP, special studies, and any other major projects that MARC undertakes. Draft responses will be prepared for consideration by the appropriate MARC committees.
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Appendix A. Evaluating Public Participation Strategies

1. Evaluation

It is critically important at the outset that project managers and the public engagement coordinator plan how a public participation strategy will be evaluated. The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) suggests that the following questions be answered as the strategy is being developed:

• What is success?
• What will measure success?
• How will we gather data?
• What does the data mean and how will we use it?

There will be two main areas of evaluation:

• The process and tools used to implement public participation, and
• The outcome of the public participation program.

The following table can help organize the approach for evaluating a single technique or the entirety of a public participation process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Step</th>
<th>Example Applications of Process Evaluations</th>
<th>Example Applications of Outcome Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is success?</strong></td>
<td>• Functional areas of program</td>
<td>• Public participation goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Best practices</td>
<td>• Public participation objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Core values</td>
<td>• Promise to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What will measure success?</strong></td>
<td>• Satisfaction of participants</td>
<td>• Level of public awareness of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfaction of participants relative to activity objectives</td>
<td>• Level of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfaction of public relative to goal/ promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall increase in organization credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How will we gather data?</strong></td>
<td>• Team debriefs after activities, milestones, project, and process</td>
<td>• Observing and documenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback forms</td>
<td>• Developing and maintaining appropriate records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informal chats with participants</td>
<td>• Administering statistically valid surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informal calls and meetings with key stakeholders</td>
<td>• Conducting formal interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observations at participation activities</td>
<td>• Using third-party program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer reviews</td>
<td>• Developing program logic and an outcomes hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What does the data mean and how will we use it?</strong></td>
<td>• Regular correspondence among team on evaluation results</td>
<td>• Formal program report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate modifications of process</td>
<td>• Mailing with decision and decision record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular feedback to the public meetings</td>
<td>• Case studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Documentation of Process and Performance

Evaluation of Individual Public Outreach Events

At the conclusion of each public engagement event or activity (public forum, open house, focus group, survey, etc.), MARC staff will compile an event or technique summary and evaluation. At a minimum, the summary and evaluation must include the following information:

• Name and date of event or activity
• MARC staff contact
• Description and context for the event/activity
• Description of target audience/stakeholders
• Evaluation of event or activities based on the five areas of evaluation and their respective performance measures.
• Identification of areas or techniques that could be improved upon and/or identification of techniques that would have ensured better results.
Evaluation of Public Participation Strategies for Core and Special Plans and Studies

Each final plan or study document must be supplemented by a public participation process evaluation. Through this evaluation, the manager of the public participation process for that plan or study must document the strategy for engaging the public in the planning process as well as evaluate the public participation process as a whole based on the evaluation areas identified above. Evaluations of individual techniques as outlined in Section 1 above should already be complete at this stage.

Annual Review of the Public Participation Process

Every year, the MARC transportation staff person designated as the Public Engagement Coordinator will compile evaluations for both individual techniques/events and full public participation strategies. This compilation of the Transportation Department engagement activities and evaluations will provide insight into areas that may need improvement. The Public Engagement Coordinator will recommend any improvements that should be addressed in future planning activities. These evaluations and recommendations will be reviewed through a peer review process at MARC. The peer review group will serve to deliberate and forward recommendations to an internal decision making body for any changes in the public participation process. Any changes directly affecting the content of this plan must pass through the standard approval process including approvals by the Total Transportation Policy Committee and the MARC Board of Directors.

Review of Public Participation Plan

- The Public Participation Plan will be reviewed every three years at a minimum. Annual improvement recommendations will impact this review and provide insight into which elements of the plan should be modified, with the ultimate goal of maintaining core principles and best practices in the context of our region.
- The evaluation process will require the continued used of current tools and the development of new tools that will help MARC staff track the effectiveness of public participation activities and techniques.
Appendix B. Public Participation Tips for Project Managers and Consultants

Tips for Creating a Public Participation Strategy

1. Identify specific questions or areas of input that will influence the plan or study, for each phase.
2. Identify your audiences (stakeholders, people in specific geographies, targeted population segments, etc.)
3. Identify appropriate communication and engagement methods for these populations.
4. Identify potential collaborations to help increase participation of identified audiences.
5. Identify budget.
6. Develop a project timeline that shows when the public can expect opportunities for participation.
7. Create a communications plan that includes the use of a variety of tools and clearly outlines key messages. Work with public affairs staff to develop this plan.
8. Identify procedures for documenting input from stakeholders and the public and how and when this information will be shared with decision makers.
9. Identify how public participation will be evaluated. Use Appendix A as a reference.
10. Make this strategy available to stakeholders and the public.

Tips for Communications and Final Products

1. **Develop a communications plan as part of the public participation strategy.**
   Effective communications techniques require thoughtful planning, and in many cases, a lot of time to execute. By pairing appropriate channels of communication to the desired stakeholders, messages are more apt to be received. Be sure to identify key milestones in the planning process when certain communications will be needed. If social media will be used, prepare a separate plan that includes a timeline and what kinds of posts will be sent out. These details will allow communications staff to prepare well in advance and apply more creative approaches.
2. **Develop a recognizable logo or logotype for the plan that can be easily recalled by the public and catch attention.**
3. **Use Associate Press (AP) style when writing.**
   MARC uses AP style in all materials. Consultants should also use AP style in all deliverables.
4. **Use plain language that everyone can understand.**
   Avoid using industry jargon and undefined acronyms.
5. **Create fact sheets and executive summaries whenever possible.**
   Develop easy to read fact sheets that help educate the public about specific issues. Executive summaries are also important as most people will only read this portion of the plan. Use visualizations whenever possible to explain complex ideas and concepts.

Tips for Social Media Use

Social networking sites like Facebook or Twitter are powerful tools for communicating strategic messages, sharing interesting information and engaging the public. Social media should be included in all communication and public participation strategies.

1. **Make a social media plan that includes key messages and content that reinforces those messages, the types of content that will be shared and a timeline for posting.**
2. **Develop a comment policy for how to handle unsolicited comments.**
3. **Include varying types of media (images, audio, video, etc.) to increase interest and engagement.**
4. **Establish roles: who will develop, approve and post content.**
5. **Identify who has access to social media accounts and develop a plan or routine for coordinating the use of the accounts if there are multiple users.**
6. **Use live video feeds for presentations and events to amplify your reach.**
Appendix C: Consultation Process

In addition to actively engaging the public in MARC’s transportation planning activities, MARC also actively engages regional transportation stakeholders and stakeholder agencies in the development of MARC’s core and special transportation plans. This appendix outlines MARC’s consultation process.

Consultation within Transportation Committee Structure

MARC’s extensive structure of committees is essential to bringing together regional stakeholders from transportation or other relevant industries. The committees are responsible for providing oversight and/or guidance in the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program, the Unified Planning Work Program, Public Participation Plan and a number of modal plans and studies. The committees are also intended to promote cooperation and coordination between the local governments and agencies.

While the MARC Board of Directors provides final oversight and approval on MARC planning products, the Total Transportation Policy Committee (TTPC) provides significant policy guidance on all transportation activities and is central to the consultation process.

The TTPC includes the representatives from the following local governments or agencies:

- Counties in the MARC region.
- Five largest cities in the Kansas City region.
- Kansas Department of Transportation.
- Missouri Department of Transportation.
- Kansas City Area Transportation Authority.
- Federal Transit Administration.
- Federal Highway Administration.
- Related organizations.

Additionally MARC has five separate mode-based planning committees:

- Regional Transit Coordinating Council
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Goods Movement Committee
- Highway Committee
- Aviation Committee

The membership structure of these committee can be found at marc.org/Transportation/Committees

During MARC’s consultation process, the committees are provided important information about core planning activities, including opportunities for participation, primarily through email notifications. While not all required consultation stakeholders are represented directly on committees, these representatives are included within the committee mailing lists. These lists are periodically reviewed to ensure contacts are current. Many committees also receive presentations and staff engages members in discussion to solicit feedback. Any interested parties may request to be added to mailing lists and receive notices for these various open committee meetings. Committee managers send out meeting notices seven days in advance of the meeting, allowing enough time for special accommodations to be made to ensure anyone can attend.
Other Consultation Efforts
MARC’s consultation efforts go beyond that of the transportation committee structure to ensure other relevant groups are informed and provided with opportunities to contribute feedback on MARC plans. Groups outside of the transportation committee structure help ensure MARC staff is considering different perspectives and producing more comprehensive, relevant plans. These groups may include:

- Air Quality Forum
- Sustainable Places Policy Committee
- Regional Workforce Intelligence Network
- Regional Equity Network
- Aging Commission
- First Suburbs Coalition
- Chambers of Commerce and Economic Development Corporations

Plan Specific Consultation Lists
MARC maintains contact lists of individuals who have expressed interest in specific plans or planning products or who have previously participated in public participation activities in the past, like public meeting or surveys. During a plan development or update process, MARC will use these lists to inform interested member of public and other stakeholders of important milestone within the planning projects, including ways to provide feedback.
# Appendix D. Spectrum of public participation from the International Association for Public Participation

## Increasing Level of Public Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public participation goal</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.</strong></td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Promise to the public | We will keep you informed. | We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision. | We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision. | We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible. | We will implement what you decide. |

| Example techniques | • Fact sheets • Web sites • Open houses | • Public comment • Focus groups • Surveys • Public • meetings | • Workshops • Deliberative polling | • Citizen advisory committees • Consensus building • Participatory decision making | • Citizen juries • Ballots • Delegated decision |

© International Association for Public Participation, www.iap2.org
### Appendix E. Example techniques from the international Association for Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Always think it through</th>
<th>What can go right</th>
<th>What can go wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Printed Public Information Materials** | • Fact sheets  
• Newsletters  
• Brochures  
• Issue papers | • KISS! - Keep It Short and Simple. Make it visually interesting but avoid a slick sales look  
• Include a postage-paid comment form to encourage two-way communication and to expand mailing list  
• Be sure to explain public role and how public comments have affected project decisions. Q&A format works well. | • Can reach large target audience  
• Allows for technical and legal reviews  
• Encourages written responses if comment form enclosed  
• Facilitates documentation of public participation process | • Only as good as the mailing list/distribution network  
• Limited capability to communicate complicated concepts  
• No guarantee materials will be read |
| **Information Repositories** | Libraries, city halls, distribution centers, schools, and other public facilities make good locations for housing project-related information | • Make sure personnel at location know where materials are kept  
• Keep list of repository items  
• Track usage through a sign-in sheet | • Relevant information is accessible to the public without incurring the costs or complications of tracking multiple copies sent to different people  
• Can set up visible distribution centers for project information | • Information repositories are often not well used by the public |
| **Technical reports** | Technical documents reporting research or policy findings | • Reports are often more credible if prepared by independent groups  
• Provides for thorough explanation of project decisions | • Can be more detailed than desired by many participants  
• May not be written in clear, accessible language |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Always think it through</th>
<th>What can go right</th>
<th>What can go wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advertisements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid advertisements in newspapers and</td>
<td>• Figure out the best days and best sections of the paper to</td>
<td>• Potentially reaches broad public</td>
<td>• Expensive, especially in urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magazines</td>
<td>reach intended audience</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows for relatively limited amount of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid rarely read notice sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newspaper Inserts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A “fact sheet” within the local</td>
<td>• Design needs to get noticed in the pile of inserts</td>
<td>• Provides community-wide distribution of information</td>
<td>• Expensive, especially in urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td>• Try on a day that has few other inserts</td>
<td>• Presented in the context of local paper, insert is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more likely to be read and taken seriously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides opportunity to include public comment form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature Story</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused stories on general project-</td>
<td>• Anticipate visuals or schedule interesting events to help</td>
<td>• Can heighten the perceived importance of the project</td>
<td>• No control over what information is presented or how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related issues</td>
<td>sell the story</td>
<td>• More likely to be read and taken seriously by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognize that reporters are always looking for an angle</td>
<td>public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Stuffer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information flyer included with</td>
<td>• Design bill stuffers to be eye-catching to encourage</td>
<td>• Widespread distribution within service area</td>
<td>• Limited information can be conveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monthly utility bill</td>
<td>readership</td>
<td>• Economical use of existing mailings</td>
<td>• Message may get confused as from the mailing entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Press Release</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fax or e-mail press releases or media kits</td>
<td>• Informs the media of project milestones</td>
<td>• Low media response rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foster a relationship of editorial board and reporters</td>
<td>• Press release language is often used directly in</td>
<td>• Frequent poor placement of press release within newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for technical and legal reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Always think it through</td>
<td>What can go right</td>
<td>What can go wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>News Conferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make sure all speakers are trained in media relations</td>
<td>• Opportunity to reach all media in one setting</td>
<td>• Limited to news-worthy events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Television</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television programming to present information and elicit audience response</td>
<td>• Cable options are expanding and can be inexpensive</td>
<td>• Can be used in multiple geographic areas</td>
<td>• High expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Check out expanding video options on the internet</td>
<td>• Many people will take the time to watch rather than read</td>
<td>• Difficult to gauge impact on audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information centers and field offices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices established with prescribed hours to distribute information</td>
<td>• Provide adequate staff to accommodate group tours</td>
<td>• Provides opportunity for positive media coverage at groundbreaking and other significant events</td>
<td>• Relatively expensive, especially for project-specific use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use brochures and videotapes to advertise and reach broader audience</td>
<td>• Excellent opportunity to educate school children</td>
<td>• Access is limited to those in vicinity of the center unless facility is mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider providing internet access station</td>
<td>• Places information dissemination in a positive educational setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Select an accessible and frequented location</td>
<td>• Information is easily accessible to the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides an opportunity for more responsive ongoing communications focused on specific public participation activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert panels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meeting designed in “Meet the Press” format. Media panel interviews experts from different perspectives.</td>
<td>• Provide opportunity for participation by general public following panel</td>
<td>• Encourages education of the media</td>
<td>• Requires substantial preparation and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have a neutral moderator</td>
<td>• Presents opportunity for balanced discussion of key issues</td>
<td>• May enhance public concerns by increasing visibility of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agree on ground rules in advance</td>
<td>• Provides opportunity to dispel scientific misinformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Always think it through</td>
<td>What can go right</td>
<td>What can go wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefings</strong></td>
<td>Use regular meetings of social and civic clubs and organizations to provide an opportunity to inform and educate. Normally these groups need speakers. Examples of target audiences: Rotary Club, Lions Clubs, Elks Clubs, Kiwanis, League of Women Voters. Also a good technique for elected officials.</td>
<td>• KISS - Keep it Short and Simple</td>
<td>• Control of information/presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use “show and tell” techniques</td>
<td>• Opportunity to reach a wide variety of individuals who may not have been attracted to another format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bring visuals</td>
<td>• Opportunity to expand mailing list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central point of contact for information</strong></td>
<td>Identify designated contacts for the public and media</td>
<td>• If possible, list a person not a position</td>
<td>• People don’t get “the run around” when they call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Best if contact person is local</td>
<td>• Controls information flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Anticipate how phones will be answered</td>
<td>• Conveys image of “accessibility”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Make sure message is kept up to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Websites</strong></td>
<td>A web site provides information and links to other sites through the World Wide Web. Electronic mailing lists are included.</td>
<td>• A good home page is critical</td>
<td>• Reaches across distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Each web page must be independent</td>
<td>• Makes Information accessible anywhere at anytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Put critical information on the top of page</td>
<td>• Saves printing and mailing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Always think it through</td>
<td>What can go right</td>
<td>What can go wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical information contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing access to technical expertise to individuals and organizations</td>
<td>• The technical resource must be perceived as credible by the audience</td>
<td>• Builds credibility and helps address public concerns about equity</td>
<td>• Limited opportunities exist for providing technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be effective conflict resolution technique where facts are debated</td>
<td>• Technical experts may counter project information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information hotline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a separate line for public access to prerecorded project information or to reach project team members who can answer questions/obtain input</td>
<td>• Make sure contact has sufficient knowledge to answer most project-related questions</td>
<td>• People don’t get “the run around” when they call</td>
<td>• Designated contact must be committed to and prepared for prompt and accurate responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If possible, list a person not a position</td>
<td>• Controls information flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Best if contact person is local</td>
<td>• Conveys image of “accessibility”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Easy to provide updates on project activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one meetings with stakeholders to gain information for developing or refining public participation and consensus building programs</td>
<td>• Where feasible, interviews should be conducted in person, particularly when considering candidates for citizens committees</td>
<td>• Provides opportunity for in-depth information exchange in nonthreatening forum</td>
<td>• Scheduling multiple interviews can be time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides opportunity to obtain feedback from all stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be used to evaluate potential citizen committee members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Person Surveys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one “focus groups” with standardized questionnaire or methodology such as “stated preference”</td>
<td>• Make sure use of result is clear before technique is designed</td>
<td>• Provides traceable data</td>
<td>• Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reaches broad, representative public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Always think it through</td>
<td>What can go right</td>
<td>What can go wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response sheets</strong></td>
<td>• Use prepaid postage&lt;br&gt;• Include a section to add name to the mailing list&lt;br&gt;• Document results as part of public participation record</td>
<td>• Provides input from individuals who would be unlikely to attend meetings&lt;br&gt;• Provides a mechanism for expanding mailing list</td>
<td>• Does not generate statistically valid results&lt;br&gt;• Only as good as the mailing list&lt;br&gt;• Results can be easily skewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Mailed surveys and questionnaires** | Make sure you need statistically valid results before making investment<br>• Survey/questionnaire should be professionally developed and administered to avoid bias<br>• Most suitable for general attitudinal surveys | Provides input from individuals who would be unlikely to attend meetings<br>• Provides input from cross-section of public not just activists<br>• Statistically tested results are more persuasive with political bodies and the general public | Response rate is generally low<br>• For statistically valid results, can be labor intensive and expensive<br>• Level of detail may be limited |

<p>| <strong>Telephone surveys/polls</strong>        | Make sure you need statistically valid results before making investment&lt;br&gt;• Survey/questionnaire should be professionally developed and administered to avoid bias&lt;br&gt;• Most suitable for general attitudinal surveys | Provides input from individuals who would be unlikely to attend meetings&lt;br&gt;• Provides input from cross-section of public, not just those on mailing list&lt;br&gt;• Higher response rate than other communication forms | More expensive and labor intensive than mailed surveys |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Always think it through</th>
<th>What can go right</th>
<th>What can go wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet surveys/polls</td>
<td>• Be precise in how you set up site, chat rooms or discussion places can generate more input than you can look at</td>
<td>• Provides input from individuals who would be unlikely to attend meetings</td>
<td>• Generally not statistically valid results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides input from cross-section of public, not just those on mailing list</td>
<td>• Can be very labor intensive to look at all of the responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher response rate than other communication forms</td>
<td>• Cannot control geographic reach of poll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Results can be easily skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-based polling</td>
<td>• Appropriate for attitudinal research</td>
<td>• Provides instant analyses of results</td>
<td>• High expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be used in multiple areas</td>
<td>• Detail of inquiry is limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Novelty of technique improves rate of response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilitators</td>
<td>• Define roles, responsibilities and limitations up front</td>
<td>• Promotes community-based participation</td>
<td>• Can be difficult to control information flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Select and train facilitators carefully</td>
<td>• Capitalizes on existing networks</td>
<td>• Can build false expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhances project credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>• Conduct at least two sessions for a given target</td>
<td>• Provides opportunity to test key messages prior to implementing program</td>
<td>• Relatively expensive if conducted in focus group testing facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use a skilled focus group facilitator to conduct the session</td>
<td>• Works best for select target audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative polling</td>
<td>• Do not expect or encourage participants to develop a shared view</td>
<td>• Can tell decision-makers what the public would think if they had more time and information</td>
<td>• Resource intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hire a facilitator experienced in this technique</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Often held in conjunction with television companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2–3 day meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Always think it through</td>
<td>What can go right</td>
<td>What can go wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simulation games</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Exercises that simulate project decisions | • Test “game” before using  
• Be clear about how results will be used | • Can be designed to be an effective educational/training technique, especially for local officials | • Requires substantial preparation and time for implementation  
• Can be expensive |
| **Tours**               |                         |                   |                   |
| Provide tours for key stakeholders, elected officials, advisory group members and the media | • Know how many participants can be accommodated and make plans for overflow  
• Plan question/answer session  
• Consider providing refreshments  
• Demonstrations work better than presentations | • Opportunity to develop rapport with key stakeholders  
• Reduces outrage by making choices more familiar | • Number of participants is limited by logistics  
• Potentially attractive to protestors |
| **Open houses**         |                         |                   |                   |
| An open house to allow the public to tour at their own pace. The facility should be set up with several stations, each addressing a separate issue. Resource people guide participants through the exhibits. | • Someone should explain format at the door  
• Have each participant fill out a comment sheet to document their participation  
• Be prepared for a crown all at once — develop a meeting contingency plan  
• Encourage people to draw on maps to actively participate  
• Set up stations so that several people (6–10) can view at once | • Foster small group or one-on-one communications  
• Ability to draw on other team members to answer difficult questions  
• Less likely to receive media coverage  
• Builds credibility | • Difficult to document public input  
• Agitators may stage themselves at each display  
• Usually more staff intensive than a meeting |
| **Community fairs**     |                         |                   |                   |
| Central event with multiple activities to provide project information and raise awareness | • All issues, large and small must be considered  
• Make sure adequate resources and staff are available | • Focuses public attention on one element  
• Conducive to media coverage  
• Allows for different levels of information sharing | • Public must be motivated to attend  
• Usually expensive to do it well  
• Can damage image if not done well |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Always think it through</th>
<th>What can go right</th>
<th>What can go wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee klatches</td>
<td>Make sure staff is very polite and appreciative</td>
<td>Relaxed setting is conducive to effective dialogue</td>
<td>Can be costly and labor intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small meetings within</td>
<td>Make opportunities for one-on-one meetings</td>
<td>Opportunity to get on the agenda</td>
<td>May be too selective and can leave out important groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood usually at a</td>
<td>Relaxed setting is conducive to effective dialogue</td>
<td>Provides opportunity for in-depth information exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person's home</td>
<td>Maximizes two-way communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with existing</td>
<td>Understand who the likely audience is to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td>Make opportunities for one-on-one meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small meetings with</td>
<td>Opportunity to get on the agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing groups or in</td>
<td>Provides opportunity for in-depth information exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunction with another</td>
<td>in non-threatening forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web-based meetings</td>
<td>Tailor agenda to your participants</td>
<td>Cost and time efficient</td>
<td>Consider timing if international time zones are represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings that occur via the</td>
<td>Combine telephone and face-to-face meetings with web-based</td>
<td>Can include a broader audience</td>
<td>Difficult to manage or resolve conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet</td>
<td>meetings and plan for graphics and other supporting materials</td>
<td>People can participate at different times or at the same time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-facilitated</td>
<td>Understand your audience, particularly the demographic categories</td>
<td>Immediate graphic results prompt focused discussion</td>
<td>Software limits design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshop</td>
<td>Design the inquires to provide useful results</td>
<td>Areas of agreement/disagreement easily portrayed</td>
<td>Potential for placing too much emphasis on numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any sized meeting when</td>
<td>Use facilitator trained in the technique</td>
<td>Minority views are honored</td>
<td>Technology failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants use interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responses are private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology to register</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levels the playing field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearings</td>
<td>Avoid if possible</td>
<td>Provides opportunity for public to speak without rebuttal</td>
<td>Does not foster constructive dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal meetings with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheduled presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Always think it through</th>
<th>What can go right</th>
<th>What can go wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design charrettes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redesign project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Best used to foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants may not be seen as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>representative by larger public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be clear about how results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes joint problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and creative thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants may not be seen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as representative by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consensus-building techniques</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on project decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as criteria and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative selection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often used with advisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques include</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi, nominal group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technique, public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value assessment and many others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use simplified methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allow adequate time to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reach consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider one of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computerized systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that are available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define levels of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consensus, i.e. a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not have to agree entirely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upon a decision but rather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree enough so the discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can move forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages compromise among</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides structured and trackable decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not appropriate for groups with no interest in compromise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clever parties can skew results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does not produce a statistically valid solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consensus may not be reached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders assembled to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide public input to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define roles and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility up from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be forthcoming with information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use a consistently credible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interview potential committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members in person before selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use third party facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides for detailed analyses for project issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants gain understanding of other perspectives, leading toward compromise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General public may not embrace committee’s recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Members may not achieve consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sponsor must accept need for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give-and-take</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time and labor intensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task forces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders formed to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop a specific product or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtain strong leadership in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make sure membership has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credibility with the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Findings of a task force of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent or diverse interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will have greater credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides constructive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity for compromise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Task force may not come to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consensus or results may be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too general to be meaningful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time and labor intensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Always think it through</th>
<th>What can go right</th>
<th>What can go wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group assembled</td>
<td>• Must appropriate to show different news to public</td>
<td>• Provides opportunity to dispel misinformation</td>
<td>• May create unwanted media attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to debate or provide input on specific issues</td>
<td>• Panelists must be credible with public</td>
<td>• Can build credibility if all sides are represented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• May create wanted media attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen juries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group of</td>
<td>• Requires skilled moderator</td>
<td>• Great opportunity to develop deep understanding of an</td>
<td>• Resource intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinary residents</td>
<td>• Commissioning body must follow recommendations or explain why</td>
<td>issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compelled to learn about an issue, cross examine witnesses, make a recommendation. Always non-binding with no legal standing</td>
<td>• Be clear about how results will be used</td>
<td>• Public can identify with the “ordinary” citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pinpoint fatal flaws or gauge public reaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role playing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants act</td>
<td>• Choose roles carefully. Ensure that all interests are</td>
<td>• Allow people to take risk-free potions and view situation from other perspectives</td>
<td>• People may not be able to actually achieve goal of seeing another’s perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out characters in predefined situation followed by evaluation of the interaction</td>
<td>• People may need encouragement to play a role fully</td>
<td>• Participants gain clearer understanding of issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be used with 10 to 500 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Samoan circle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Works best with controversial issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaderless meeting</td>
<td>• Set room up with center table surrounded by concentric</td>
<td>• Dialogue can stall or become monopolized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that stimulates active participation</td>
<td>circles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need microphones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requires several people to record discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Always think it through</th>
<th>What can go right</th>
<th>What can go wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open space technology</strong></td>
<td>• Important to have a powerful theme or vision statement to generate topics</td>
<td>• Provides structure for giving people opportunity and responsibility to create valuable product or experience</td>
<td>• Most important issues could get lost in the shuffle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need flexible facilities to accommodate numerous groups of different sizes</td>
<td>• Includes immediate summary of discussion</td>
<td>• Can be difficult to get accurate reporting of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ground rules and procedures must be carefully explained for success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshops</strong></td>
<td>• Know how you plan to use public input before the workshop</td>
<td>• Excellent for discussions on criteria or analysis of alternatives</td>
<td>• Hostile participants may resist what they perceive to be the “divide and conquer” strategy of breaking into small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct training in advance with small group facilitators. Each should receive a list of instructions, especially where procedures involve weighting/ ranking of factors or criteria</td>
<td>• Fosters small group or one-to-one communication</td>
<td>• Several small-group facilitators are necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to draw on other team members to answer difficult questions</td>
<td>• Builds credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximizes feedback obtained from participants</td>
<td>• Maximizes feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fosters public ownership in solving the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future search conference</strong></td>
<td>• Hire facilitator experienced in this technique</td>
<td>• Can involve hundreds of people simultaneously in major organizational change decisions</td>
<td>• Logistically challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can lead to substantial changes across entire organization</td>
<td>• Individuals are experts</td>
<td>• May be difficult to gain complete commitment from all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can involve hundreds of people simultaneously in major organizational change decisions</td>
<td>• 2–3 day meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Example Language for Requests for Proposal

The following language should be used as a template within a Request for Proposal in order to ensure public participation strategies are developed in accordance with MARC’s Public Participation Plan and federal requirements by consultants:

Scope

The consultant will prepare a detailed public participation strategy in accordance with MARC’s Public Participation Plan and in compliance with federal transportation legislation requirements identified in the plan. The strategy must answer the following questions:

A. Which stakeholders and populations need to be engaged?
B. What communications tools and techniques are best for informing and educating these stakeholders and populations about the project?
   1. Are the particular barriers that will need to be considered?
   2. Is translation of written materials and interpretation of presentations needed?
C. What are the phases or points of engagement and what methods will be used for each?
D. How will input and comments be catalogued, tracked and communicated back to stakeholders and the project team?
E. How will successful public participation be defined?
F. What metrics will or could be used to evaluate the public participation process?

Qualifications

MARC seeks a consultant (or sub-consultant) that has a proven track record of engaging communities in the discussion of __________. The consultant must have the skills to communicate effectively with project stakeholders and the public, develop and implement innovative public participation strategies, develop visuals that aid in communicating complex ideas and concepts, and track and summarize stakeholder and public feedback in a way that helps shapes final deliverables.
## Appendix F. Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)</strong></td>
<td>The legislation defining the responsibilities of and requirements for transportation providers to make transportation accessible to individuals with disabilities. (FTA1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternatives Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Understanding how the transportation system and its components work such as information on the costs, benefits and impacts of potential chances to the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attainment Area</strong></td>
<td>An area considered to have air quality that meets or exceeds the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) health standards used in the Clean Air Act. Nonattainment areas are areas considered not to have met these standards for designated pollutants. An area may be an attainment area for one pollutant and a nonattainment area for others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor</strong></td>
<td>A broad geographical band that follows a general directional flow connecting major sources of trips that may contain a number of streets, highways and transit route alignments. (APTA1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor Studies</strong></td>
<td>The usual purpose of the corridor study is to determine the best way to serve existing and future travel demand. These studies define alignment, mode(s) and facilities between activity centers or other logical termini. Corridor planning is accomplished using a long-range outlook (at least 20 years, but sometimes longer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong></td>
<td>The act of consulting or conferring; deliberation of two or more persons on some matter aimed at ascertaining opinions or reaching an agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Transportation (DOT)</strong></td>
<td>Establishes the nation’s overall transportation policy. Under its umbrella there are ten administrations whose jurisdictions include highway planning, development and construction; urban mass transit; railroads; aviation; and the safety of waterways, ports, highways, and oil and gas pipelines. The Department of Transportation (DOT) was established by act of October 15, 1966, as amended (49 U.S.C. 102 and 102 note), “to assure the coordinated, effective administration of the transportation programs of the Federal Government” and to develop “national transportation policies and programs conducive to the provision of fast, safe, efficient, and convenient transportation at the lowest cost consistent therewith.” (OFR1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Justice (EJ)</strong></td>
<td>Environmental justice assures that services and benefits allow for meaningful participation and are fairly distributed to avoid discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility Studies</strong></td>
<td>Study in which a potential strategy or project is further studied to determine if a solution is feasible in light of environmental, engineering, budgetary, and community constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</strong></td>
<td>A branch of the US Department of Transportation that administers the federal-aid Highway Program, providing financial assistance to states to construct and improve highways, urban and rural roads, and bridges. The FHWA also administers the Federal Lands Highway Program, including survey, design, and construction of forest highway system roads, parkways and park roads, Indian reservation roads, defense access roads, and other Federal lands roads. The Federal agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation responsible for administering the Federal-Aid Highway Program. Became a component of the Department of Transportation in 1967 pursuant to the Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. app. 1651 note). It administers the highway transportation programs of the Department of Transportation under pertinent legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Transit Administration (FTA)</strong></td>
<td>A branch of the US Department of Transportation that is the principal source of federal financial assistance to America's communities for planning, development, and improvement of public or mass transportation systems. FTA provides leadership, technical assistance, and financial resources for safe, technologically advanced public transportation to enhance mobility and accessibility, to improve the Nation's communities and natural environment, and to strengthen the national economy. (Formerly the Urban Mass Transportation Administration) operates under the authority of the Federal Transit Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. app. 1601 et seq.). The Federal Transit Act was repealed on July 5, 1994, and the Federal transit laws were codified and re-enacted as chapter 53 of Title 49, United States Code. The Federal Transit Administration was established as a component of the Department of Transportation by section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968 (5 U.S.C. app.), effective July 1, 1968. The missions of the Administration are 1) to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private. 2) to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private. and 3) to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such systems, to be operated by public or private mass transportation companies as determined by local needs; and 4) to provide financial assistance to State and local governments to help implement national goals relating to mobility for elderly persons, persons with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged persons. (OFRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Groups</strong></td>
<td>A small group selected from a wider population and sampled, as by open discussion, for its members' opinions about or emotional response to a particular subject or area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Generalized statements that broadly relate to the physical environment to values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internet</strong></td>
<td>A vast computer network linking smaller computer networks worldwide. The Internet includes commercial, educational, governmental, and other networks, all of which use the same set of communications protocols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)</strong></td>
<td>A document resulting from regional or statewide collaboration and consensus on a region or state's transportation system, and serving as the defining vision for the region's or state's transportation systems and services. In metropolitan areas, the plan indicates all of the transportation improvements scheduled for funding over the next 20 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Investment Studies</strong></td>
<td>A study, similar to an Alternatives Analysis (AA), which was previously required by federal regulation. It reviewed and evaluated a range of alternatives for proposed transportation improvements in a corridor or subarea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Planning Area</strong></td>
<td>The geographic area in which the metropolitan transportation planning process required by 23 U.S.C. 134 and section 8 of the Federal Transit Act (49 U.S.C. app. 1607) must be carried out. (23CFR420)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)** | 1) Regional policy body, required in urbanized areas with populations over 50,000, and designated by local officials and the governor of the state. Responsible in cooperation with the state and other transportation providers for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning requirements of federal highway and transit legislation.  
2) Formed in cooperation with the state, develops transportation plans and programs for the metropolitan area. For each urbanized area, a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) must be designated by agreement between the Governor and local units of government representing 75 percent of the affected population (in the metropolitan area), including the central cities or cities as defined by the Bureau of the Census, or in accordance with procedures established by applicable State or local law (23 U.S.C. 134(b)(1)/Federal Transit Act of 1991 Sec. 8(b)(1)). (FHWA2) |
| **Nonattainment Area (NAA)** | Any geographic area that has not met the requirements for clean air as set out in the Clean Air Act of 1990. |
| **Public Meeting or Hearing** | A public gathering for the express purpose of informing and soliciting input from interested individuals regarding transportation issues. |
| **Public Participation** | The active and meaningful involvement of the public in the development of transportation plans and programs. |
| **SAFETEA-LU** | The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was enacted as the nation's principal transportation funding law in 2005, SAFETEA-LU authorizes the federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for 2005 to 2009. It continues and builds upon many of the essential features of its predecessors, TEA-21 and ISTEA, including those pertaining to MPOs. |
| **Section 508, Rehabilitation Act** | An Act amended by Congress in 1998 to require Federal agencies to make their electronic and information technology accessible to people with disabilities. |
### State
Any of the 50 states, comprising the United States, plus the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. However, for some purposes (e.g., highway safety programs under 23 U.S.C. 402), the term may also include the Territories (the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands) and the Secretary of the Interior (for Indian Reservations). For the purposes of apportioning funds under sections 104, 105, 144, and 206 of Title 23, United States Code, the term “State” is defined by section 1103(n) of the TEA-21 to mean any of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

### Surveys
A sampling, or partial collection, of facts, figures, or opinions taken and used to approximate or indicate what a complete collection and analysis might reveal.

### Title VI
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Prohibits discrimination in any program receiving federal assistance.

### Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
A document prepared by a metropolitan planning organization that lists projects to be funded with FHWA/FTA funds for the next one- to three-year period.

### Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
The management plan for the (metropolitan) planning program. Its purpose is to coordinate the planning activities of all participants in the planning process.

### Visioning
A variety of techniques that can be used to identify goals.

### Visualization
Formation of mental visual images, or the act or process of interpreting in visual terms or of putting into visual form.

### Website
A connected group of pages on the World Wide Web regarded as a single entity, usually maintained by one person or organization and devoted to a single topic or several closely related topics.

*Adapted from the FHWA definitions*
Appendix G. Development of Public Participation Plan

A. Flow Chart of Public Participation Process
As demonstrated in the flow chart, MARC has incorporated a consultation component to the traditional participation process in an effort to further promote and encourage early and continuing public participation opportunities and engagement throughout the entire planning process. The specifics of the consultation element and other elements are detailed in Section 7 of the plan.

B. Development of the Public Participation Plan
Although the Public Participation Plan is mandated by the federal government, providing opportunities for public participation is a valued way for MARC to ensure efficient use of state and local funds and create results that are meaningful to all stakeholders. In an effort to create a framework that better affords a more meaningful public participation process and in compliance with the FAST Act’s consultation requirements, MARC staff developed a process that employed a series of surveys and focus groups. Both tools served to inform the development of this plan by accomplishing the following goals:

- Recognizing the current level at which the public participates;
- Discovering how MARC can better inform the public of participation opportunities;
- Finding the preferred methods for responding to the public’s comments and questions;
- How to make better use of the public’s input; and
- Discovering obstacles that prevent interested parties from participating.

The graphic on the following page represents the process of developing this plan. Every step allowed for contribution by the public. Public and stakeholder input was directly solicited by MARC staff in the Assessment and Review steps.

Step 1: Assessment – Survey and Focus Group Component of Update Process
The Assessment step was developed to acquire as much input from stakeholders as possible. This step, involving surveys and focus groups, is depicted below.

Surveys
- Surveys were administered to MARC’s committee members and internal staff, as well as to the public. The committee and staff surveys focused on evaluating current public participation practice, while public surveys focused on how to reach out to those not traditionally involved, how to better engage and provide opportunities for those who are already engaged, and gained a better understanding of what motivates people to get involved in transportation issues.

Focus Groups
- Focus groups were used as tools to address many of the same issues — but at a deeper level — and also discuss participation barriers and possible solutions. The Engaged Public Focus Group, made up of people who are already taking part in MARC’s transportation-planning activities, told staff how they became involved and what barriers they faced in participating and feeling comfortable during the
process. This group was asked to help focus a survey that would be administered on a larger scale to the general public. After the public survey was administered and collected via paper and online formats, including a Spanish-language version, the Public Participation Plan Team contacted those who noted in the survey their interest in further participation. The Public Focus group helped to generate more in-depth information about the difficulties of participating, and brainstormed ideas for how MARC staff could make the process easier and more useful to the public.

- The collective responses identified ways MARC could improve current practices to make the public participation process more transparent, understandable and meaningful. Surveys, survey summaries, and focus group notes are available later in the appendix of this plan.

**Step 2: Exploring Alternatives**

During this step the Public Participation Plan Team explored strategic alternatives and policy changes. Survey results were compiled and acted as the foundation for additional staff research. The team explored best practices of other MPO public participation plans that would help address issues and concerns that surfaced in Step 1 and could be applied to the Kansas City Region’s planning process.
The team also began to review the existing process that guides public participation in its own plans. Additionally, comments received during the staff focus group were examined to identify where changes could be made.

**Step 3: Redefining Direction**
The Public Participation Plan Team used this step to examine the plan at a broader scale. Using the changes and best practices discovered in Step 2, the team reorganized the overall framework of the plan, noted other areas where additional information was needed, and began to incorporate specific examples from the research conducted in Step 2. The focus was geared toward identifying and defining goals and strategies for the plan.

**Step 4: Developing the Plan**
The team continued to incorporate research, staff, committee and public comment into a draft plan. The direction and vision set forth in Step 3 guided the style and content for the first draft plan. This step allowed MARC to compile everything learned in previous steps into a consistent voice organized around a series of defined goals. Many additional internal meetings took place and a draft plan was developed.

**Step 5: Informal Review of Draft Plan**
The MARC staff focus group reconvened to discuss changes made in the Public Participation Plan. Each staff member was given a copy of the draft plan that was developed in Step 4 for review before the focus group met. At the focus group meeting changes were identified and discussed. Staff examined how each aspect of the plan fit within the current process as well as identified how the changes would affect the process. MARC staff members provided additional comments and concerns, in which additional research and discussion took place within the project team. Comments were addressed and changes were incorporated into the plan. A final draft plan was produced.

**Step 6: Formal Review of Draft Plan**
This step set forth a formal comment period in which the public had 45 days to review and comment on the final draft plan. Every effort was made to notify previous participants and the public of this opportunity to provide input, including advertisements, website postings, and e-mail notices.

**Step 7: Finalize and Adopt Plan**
This step incorporated changes made as a result of the public comment period in Step 6. The public participation plan team revisited the document a final time and constructed a final version of the plan. The plan was released to the Total Transportation Policy Committee and MARC Board of Directors for approval and adoption.
C. Public Participation Survey Results

Citizen Engagement in Transportation Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Web Survey</th>
<th>Paper Survey</th>
<th>Total Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>TOTAL 107</td>
<td>TOTAL 305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What area of transportation is most important to you? Choose ONE.
Total responses: 226

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintaining existing roads and bridges</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commuting/ridesharing</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bicycle/pedestrian</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land use/zoning</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Freight/rail</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What motivates you to become involved in transportation issues?
Total responses: 183

- I am going to be a transportation planner. Also I want to affect change to create a better metro region.
- I am actively involved in climate protection issues and better transportation policies are a must.
- Frustration over the city’s lack of good and safe options for bicycles, pedestrians, and public transportation.
- A project impacting my day-to-day travel.
- I want public transportation that I can actually use to go to work and visit my family.
- Traveling to other cities and seeing how well mass transit works.
- The fact that it affects the quality of life for people throughout the area.
- Convenience and environmental impacts.
- Community engagement.
- Economy.
- I often ride the bus to work.
- Public transportation in Kansas City needs improvement — cyclists and pedestrians are not safe due to unavailability of passageways.
- Vital contribution to public safety, economic development and access to services/quality of life.
• I want to see more bike commuting. There are so few bike lanes; I can only commute on the trolley trail, and am fortunate to live nearby.
• The connection between land-use patterns and transportation infrastructure — the opportunity to positively change people's quality of life through the responsible and joint planning of both.
• I am concerned about urban sprawl in the metro area.
• Economic opportunity.
• Help improve the quality of the environment by relying less on personal transportation and utilizing mass transit systems.
• I don't drive so issues pertaining to pedestrian traffic can affect me. Being a pedestrian, all issues (auto, bus, bicycle, etc.) can affect my day-to-day travel.
• Potholes; little to no street maintenance in my neighborhood.
• The lack of viable transportation options in Kansas City.
• Helping the environment.
• I am a student studying planning and I live in North Kansas City where public transportation is scarce.
• Desire to improve the roadways for bicycles and improve traffic flow.
• Need for alternative transportation sources.
• Lack of good connections from northland area to south areas.
• I am a transportation/traffic engineer.
• Self-interest and an appreciation of public transportation in other cities.
• Accessibility to businesses in the metropolitan area.
• Unsafe dependence on foreign energy sources, unwise use of resources (environmental impacts, waste, etc), community development around public transportation.
• A background in transportation planning and land-use planning. Seeing how important it is to the community to have a diverse base of transit modes.
• Commuter issues and better public transit.
• I'm concerned for the well-being of not just my family, but others. What a pity it is that you can't even walk outdoors without the likelihood of smelling auto exhaust. Yuck.
• Neighborhood involvement over Mission Rd. bridge.
• Not having a vehicle.
• When roads are not maintained properly.
• Cost of fuel.
• Helping the environment.
• Understanding the process of community decision making.
• My commute from the north.
• We have poor public transportation compared to cities of similar size.
• Road conditions.
• I want to minimize the amount of pollution I personally contribute. I also want public transportation to be affordable and convenient for all KC residents. Finally, I want KC to have a great national reputation. To do that, it needs to attract tourists who are impressed with how easy the city is to access, i.e., great public transport.
• Environment, commute.
• Global warming.
• If it's going to help move traffic along better during rush hour or after large events.
• Probably self-interest — I’ll get involved if the issue could benefit me.
• Environmental concerns and my desire to see a robust, fortified urban core; additionally, a better unification of suburban areas with the urban core will benefit everyone in the metro area.
• Transportation is important to economy and quality of life.
• I want light rail to work in Kansas City.
• KC’s mass transportation is a joke! We need commuter rail from Johnson County, light rail through central KC, and buses connecting it all. The lack of good mass transit is really holding KC from becoming a great city once again!
• Good alternative transportation, less dependency on foreign oil, reduce auto emissions, create community.
• If it would affect my house or my commute to work.
• Wide impact, useful plan.
• I-35 gridlock.
• I would like to help my community in any way possible.
• The environmental impacts.
• A desire to find alternatives to dealing with sprawl, congestion, and poor air quality.
• Social equity and environmental impacts.
• My need to be transported.
• A friend.
• Traffic jams and concern about environmental impact of them.
• Cost savings. Environment. Making better use of my commuting time.
• A very long commute.
• Providing a cleaner and greener environment for myself, family and community.
• Environmental concerns.
• Public transportation is a success factor in communities. I feel my community seriously lacks public transit for being such a rail area no less. I prefer to walk, bike, or take the bus (I have never had light rail, etc avail to me, but I would use it) rather than drive. Driving creates stress, laziness, and more pollution than necessary. Only problem is even within walk zones and a pedestrian walk signal, drivers will nearly run a cyclist/walker over and act as if we were in the way.
• I want us all to need less of it, and I want all the transportation that we do need to work well as a system.
• The future of Kansas City and the region, higher tourist draw, more jobs in the urban core, and eco-friendly.
• Seeing other cities be more progressive than us makes me concerned. Having no other option than a car to get around is a problem. We need efficient rail and bus transportation.
• Making our transportation options (car, bike, bus, rail) more like a city like Seattle, San Francisco or San Diego.
• My family doesn’t own a car — public transportation is our primary means of transportation. We try whenever possible to support clean, safe, frequent, and accessible public transportation.
• I’d like to know more about it.
• Safety and better traffic flow.
• Environmental impacts.
• Our metro highways can barely handle the load. The demand on the highways increases. Commercial truck traffic clogs the interstates, repair work is never-ending and creates never-ending havoc with
traffic, and most importantly public safety.

- Saving time and safety.
- The benefits to the urban fabric of Kansas City and its sustainability.
- Seeing a transportation system that works for the entire area and encourages dense development.
- I live in a town with a jail which releases prisoners with no transportation. If they hitchhike, they'll be picked up again. Their only hope is to get a ride to the airport where they can catch a bus.
- I live/work/play in the River/Crown/Plaza strip and would like to see it accessible by foot any time of day.
- The cost versus effectiveness of the proposed plans.
- I'm a member of a local planning and zoning board.
- Living a fair distance from both work and our children's school (9+ miles).
- The need to get from one part of town to the other in a safe and relatively quick manner.
- The metro and surrounding cities does not have enough convenient and reliable public transportation.
- To make a better community.
- Recognition that we are depleting the planet's resources.
- Environmental: use of natural resources, air quality, sprawl.
- I'm very concerned about our air quality, the environment, our use of fuel, and the ethical issue of access for those who cannot afford to own a car. I've visited a few cities with fantastic public transportation — I realize this must be balanced with population density — but believe that we can create a meaningful system to augment other forms of transportation, including walking. At one point I had a health issue and was advised not to drive for 3 weeks. I went to the KCATA website, and learned that it would take 2.5 hrs to commute by bus from south Kansas City (64131) to my office in North Kansas City, usually a 30 minute commute.
- Overall safety issues.
- To help protect our environment.
- Request of a friend.
- Living in Europe for many years. I would love to see KC have a viable public transportation system that goes well beyond bus routes, similar to what you see in large cities in Europe.
- The fact that KC is so far behind other cities in regards to public transportation and the mindset of Kansas Citians seems to be car driven — excuse the pun.
- Economic and environmental issues.
- Quality of life.
- Importance to future environment of good decisions now.
- Nothing at this time.
- Concern for the appearance and reputation of our community.
- Environmental concerns.
- Proximity to my travel routes.
- Helping build a more comprehensive public transportation system that better serves workers and tourists.
- Need.
- I'd like to see Kansas City get to the next step and support its residents with a transportation plan that is accessible, affordable and well maintained.
- Cheaper, cleaner alternative to driving solo.
• Long-time resident seeking better public transportation.
• If we could streamline our transportation, we could be efficient on so many levels: energy, emissions, time, and many more I probably can’t even think of that would trickle down and have a positive effect.
• Fuel prices.
• I want to see Kansas City move forward and become a leader among other cities. Not just trying to play catch up.
• I want to not own a car and save money.
• Ease and cost-effectiveness of commute to work.
• The desire for Downtown Kansas City to increase pedestrian-friendly, walkable environment and to decrease cars and air pollution in the urban core.
• Home ownership.
• Self-interest.
• I feel that the region doesn’t believe that public transportation is a necessity. But it is, and could be more valuable to increased development, better quality of life, environmental betterment, etc.
• Inability to seek employment in certain parts of the metro because of lack of adequate public transportation.
• I would like a safer environment for cyclists in KC, particularly in Overland Park.
• Dissatisfaction with current availability of public transit.
• Effective usage of natural resources and better service for the public.
• Concern for environment and bicycle safety.
• Environment, cost of gasoline, congested traffic, cost of automobile, lack of public transportation.
• Traffic is outrageous — constant road construction, need rail system, visit St. Louis, Chicago, New York — any transportation is great, bus system doesn’t cut it!
• Price of gas, emergency, evacuation issues (e.g. New Orleans after Katrina)
• Almost zero public transport in this area.
• They are not easily available or accessible.
• Safety for our elderly and our young adults that need to ride the bus.
• I am motivated by the need for the improvement of public transportation in KC metro.
• I’m not sure I’ve ever been involved in transportation issues.
• See workers at the Legends unable to get home from work at night because no buses run late at night. Workers on Leavenworth Rd. You can get to the Legends but no return route. No Sunday service from the Argentine. Very difficult to get to downtown KCK or KCMO or Johnson County.
• I have to walk everywhere I want to go and can’t go most places because the bus system in Johnson County is so complicated, disjointed and unreliable.
• I am about 86; have no car and no desire to own one, and shouldn’t be driving anyway at my age. Public transportation is almost nil in Johnson County, because people don’t use it. If it were available, it would be too costly; maybe $1.50. I used to ride streetcar or bus for 7 cents until 1957. Embittering! I did not cause inflation; why should I be made one of its victims. Despite the wording of the Pledge of Allegiance, justice is rare or nowhere. The above is written, of course, in a lost cause.
• I honestly don’t have much motivation to becoming involved in transportation issues. It seems to me that KC doesn’t respond well to its request on public transportation issues. Example: light rail. It finally passes, but how long will it take the city to do anything with it? It’s been such a long road for the light rail, I’m not confident that it will be implemented in a timely manner. I would definitely utilize public transportation more in this city if it was more efficient and accessible.
• Wanting easier, non-car access to downtown, KCK, and suburbs.
• Environmental issues.
• The imperative need to have transportation that is available to the public north to south and across state lines!
• So you don’t have to pay for gas.
• Helping others to their destination.
• When people learn how to drive.
• Potholes, drivers disregard for traffic laws running stop signs and stop lights, speeding in and out of traffic.
• More drivers, some more challenged than others, bad roads and bridges.
• After seeing the film “An inconvenient Truth,” by Al Gore. I feel like it’s important to address this issue.
• Needs of lower income people.
• With more population, too much congestion on roadways and high cost to maintain, adds to personal stress and anxiety.
• I don’t know.
• When it affects me and my commute.
• I have no running car.
• I’m a conservationist and cyclist.
• Because you need to be able to get where you need to go on weekends too.
• Too old to drive and I only go to places within the city to do shopping.
• The lack of transportation available in Kansas City metro area.
• Global warming — destruction of planet.
• Potential light rail throughout the metro area.
• Environmental and humanitarian concerns — I believe quality public transportation is essential both to alleviate pollution and to provide equal access to goods and services.
• Lack of available hours after 7:00 p.m. for the auto-less and poor, elderly and handicapped.
• Future needs and growth of our community.
• I do not like car culture — the pollution, expense, road rage, etc.
• I want to promote environmentally friendly public transportation options for the Kansas City metro area.
• I would like for Truman Rd. bus to run on Sundays and 109 Winchester to run on Sundays and Saturdays.
• To get transportation improved.
• La seguridad en cuanto caminos, y stacionamentos y la buena idea de compartir el carro para trabajo. (Safety on all roads, parking, and the great idea of carpooling to work.)
• Asegurarse que tengamos un medio de transporte seguro y que protega nuestro medio ambiente. (Assurance that we will have a safe, environmentally friendly form of transportation.)
• Para poder. Tener un mejor servicio en la ciudad. (For power. To be able to have better service in the city.)
• Para cuidar el medio ambiente. (To care for the environment.)
• Pues que participando podemos mantener el transporte. (By participating, we can maintain the transportation system.)
• La seguridad automovilistica. (Driver safety)
• Porque es una encuesta muy importante para la ciudad. (Because this survey is very important for the cities.)
• Conocer los planes y proyectos de transporte acerca de nuestra region. (To become familiar with the transportation plans and projects around our region.)
• Por las problemas del medio ambiente. (Environmental problems (issues).)
• La seguridad. (Safety.)
• El mejorar el servicio a mas gente que lo necesita. (Improving service and serving more people that need it.)
• Me motiva a participar porque necesitamos mas seguridad en las calles o en los vecindarios. (I’m motivated to participate because there is a need for improved safety on the streets and in the neighborhoods.)
• La necesidad tan indispensable que es para todos. (It needs to be for everyone.)
• Mejorar el servicio. (To improve service.)
• Para tener una mejor transportacion. (To have a better transportation system.)
• El poder transportarse mejor a otros lugares. (Better transportation options to other places.)
• Me motiva cuando mi hijo viaja. (I’m concerned for the safety of my son when he travels.)
• La seguridad de mi familia. (My family’s safety.)
• Por que me gustaria que mis hijas pudieran usar el bus para la escuela. (Because I’d like my daughters to be able to ride the bus to school.)
• Para mejorar el medio ambiente y tener el mejor servicio. (In order to improve environmental quality and get better service.)
• Mejorar el uso del transporte en nuestra area. (To improve transportation in our area.)
• El medio ambiente, seguridad. (The environment, safety.)
• Tener participacion en la toma de desiciones para los futuros proyectos de transporte. (To participate in making decisions regarding future transportation projects.)

3. What prevents you from becoming involved in transportation issues? Choose ALL that apply.

Total responses: 202

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do not know how or when to get involved</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think decisions are being made behind closed doors</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not think my input will matter</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The meeting locations or times are not convenient for me</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not understand the issues</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not feel the issues will have an impact on me personally</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Responses to “other”:
• More pressing demands on my time/energy.
• I am involved.
• Distance between home and work (commuter).
• As a full-time student, mother and wife I don’t have the time right now to get involved.
• Primarily, lack of time.
• Basically lazy.
• I moved to KS, where transit is not a high priority.
• Extremely busy schedule.
• No time.
• Busyness/laziness.
• I need more info before getting “loud” about anything.
• Power brokers are all auto centric.
• Time.
• Actually never been asked.
• Most decisions have been satisfactory.
• Lack of time.
• I don’t have time.
• I have conversed several times with The JO, and they make me feel my experience/opinions do not matter.
• I am actively involved and am not sure it matters.
• I do get involved.
• I find out about a lot of decisions after the fact. I fear original ideas from an individual will only receive a patronizing acknowledgement.
• Apathy.
• Time constraints.
• Time.
• Lack of interest.
• I am currently living outside the area.
• I am really busy.
• Lack of funding.
• Nothing.
• Busy lifestyles — work full time.
• Time.
• Time.
• My plea that people use the bus, and that the fare be reasonable, will fall on deaf ears.
• I need info on meeting dates and times.
• Changes will raise taxes again, again and again.
• Not enough time.
• I have not made the effort to get involved until now.
• No conocía el tema nunca había oído hablar de esto. (I’m unfamiliar with the subject; I’ve never heard anyone talk about this.)
• Nunca he oído de este tema. (I’ve never heard anything about this topic.)
• Ninguna. (Nothing.)
• Nunca nadie me ha invitado a algo referente al transporte. (Nobody has ever invited me to anything related to transportation.)
4. **What are the best ways to communicate with you about regional transportation issues and ways you can get involved?** Rank the following list from 1 to 11, with 1 being most effective, and 11 being least effective.

Total responses: 230

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Kansas City Star newspaper</td>
<td>City government sites, local news sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mailings</td>
<td>Escuela (school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Internet Sites Listed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Internet sites</td>
<td>Kansascity.com, kcata.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City or neighborhood newsletter</td>
<td>cnn.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other local newspaper</td>
<td>WyCoKCK website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mid-America Regional Council (<a href="http://www.marc.org">www.marc.org</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **What is the best way to engage you in regional transportation issues? Choose ONE.**

Total responses: 226

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A written survey sent to my home</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Internet discussion forums</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Informal meeting in my neighborhood or at my church</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A public meeting at city hall</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Responses to “other”:
  - E-mail, I believe
  - Public meetings in different areas of the community would be great
  - Create an ambassador program via online and provide consistent tools for us to better communicate the issues to others
  - 1. Informal meetings 2. Public meeting @city hall 3. Internet discussion forums
  - I’m not interested in being involved
  - Convince me public involvement is more than just for show.
  - Send me an email survey
• Either internet or written survey to home
• Invite e-mail membership with notices of meetings and on-line referendums/petitions
• Moderated listserv
• I need to know when/where meetings occur that I can attend.
• Undecided
• Internet or Email Survey
• A public meeting at the Kauffman Foundation
• Email survey sent to my home
• Indicate that people are going to ride the buses; charge a reasonable fare. Stop inflation!
• Literature for educational purposes
• Television
• This survey and invitations to meetings about public transportation and bike issues

6. Where do you think citizen involvement and input is most valuable? Choose ONE.

Total responses: 227

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Developing the region’s long-term transportation plan</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developing individual plans for each mode of transportation</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Developing the values on which we base transportation decisions for the region</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Developing specific programs, projects and studies</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Responses to “other”:
  • All of the above.
  • In addition to the citizens’ role in the basis of regional transportation “values,” planners need to gauge the preference toward/against a LRTP.
  • Neighborhoods.
  • I can’t choose just one: all of the above are equally important.
  • They are all important.
  • I’d like to know any of the plans that involve the area.
  • It’s not. Citizens are idiots, don’t involve them in decisions.
  • I do not know.
  • The need.
  • This is a poorly framed question.
  • Federal level.
  • The buses don’t run long enough.
7. **How should MARC share the comments it receives from the public? Choose ALL that apply.**

Total responses: 235

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public comments should be posted on MARC’s website</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public comments should be discussed at working sessions and committee meetings</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public comments should be made available at public meetings</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final projects should include a section for a public comments and/or a summary</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Responses to “other”:
  - Public comments should be included at every step in the process.
  - *The Kansas City Star* local section.
  - Sharing doesn’t accomplish much. You must INCORPORATE! Use the information, don’t just regurgitate it.
  - Consider setting up a blog section on website.
  - E-mail.
  - Publications — be it on Internet, journals, newspapers, etc.
  - Newspaper.
  - The public should always get to know what the public has to say.
  - All of the above.
  - Share with newspapers and Internet news sites.
  - Consumer-friendly position paper, press release on same.
  - www.kcata.org
  - *The Kansas City Star*, KCUR.
  - TV/radio.
  - E-mail.
  - Telemundo.

8. **Are you familiar with the Mid-America Regional Council?**

Total responses: 238

- Yes 134
- No 104
9. If you answered “yes” to question 8, what MARC activities and programs are you familiar with?

Total responses: 101

- LRTP, TIP, Creating Quality Places, One KC Voice, Metro Dataline, Transportation Matters newsletter.
- Regional Transportation planning; long-range planning; regional emergency response coordination.
- Orange alerts, carpooling.
- Transportation planning, RideShare.
- Long-Range Plan, Commuter rail studies.
- All.
- Emergency management, Mid-America Medical Reserve Corps.
- Stop/oats buses.
- Bike trails map.
- MetroGreen, First Suburbs and Great Places Coalition, etc.
- First Suburbs coalition, MetroGreen, other programs at MARC.
- Environmental planning, community development, transportation planning.
- Neighborhood association communications.
- I know it is a federally mandated council that controls all transit issues for the metropolitan area.
- RideShare, MetroGreen, online surveys, KC Rain Gardens
- Lectures and award banquets.
- All transportation programs.
- Various.
- Data collection and maintenance, MARCIT insurance.
- RAMBIS.
- RideShare carpooling program.
- MSAG; MAP-IT.
- Long-range planning, RideShare.
- Transportation, environmental, continuing education, public affairs.
- RecycleSpot, AirQ, Government Training Institute.
- Training specifically.
- First Suburbs Coalition.
- None — I just know what it is and some stuff it does.
- Rain gardens.
- RideShare.
- Cooperation with KCATA.
- Transportation planning.
- I am aware of MARC through a friend who works there. I have just recently started checking the MARC website. I know there are programs for the elderly and for transportation, but not in detail.
- Consulting at University of Missouri-Kansas City, elections.
- I know someone who works there.
- No programs specifically. I know that MARC is an umbrella organization for many government-funded agencies.
• Noting specific.
• RideShare, recycling, joint purchasing, MAGWeb, RITMA.
• KC Scout, library consortium, local government Web manager group.
• RideShare. Those signs over the highways.
• Recycling (but this needs to be pushed a lot more, and green buildings too!!).
• Transportation, environmental programs, regional forecasting, community development; less familiar with aging, emergency response, daycare.
• Recycling, transportation, urban planning issues.
• Bridges, light rail.
• Transportation, bicycle planning
• MetroGreen and Smart Moves.
• Transportation primarily.
• Online resources about various communities and initiatives.
• Mostly transit related. I have looked at others casually to see what linkages exist to transit commuter issues.
• The Smart Moves concept.
• Ozone alert days, Smart Moves.
• Department of Aging.
• Transportation plan.
• Computer training, RideShare program.
• All environmental-related programs.
• I am familiar and most appreciative of the recycling programs, and attended a rain barrel workshop last summer.
• Metropolitan Council on Early Learning.
• I just have a friend who works there. I know that they are involved with long-range planning for the metropolitan area.
• Website.
• Green initiatives, early child development, environmental activities.
• Only vague general knowledge.
• Work in a delegate agency.
• Air quality monitoring, 9-1-1, childcare, transportation planning.
• Familiar with a MARC employee — thus the organization.
• SmartMoves, Metro Dataline.
• Smart Moves
• Greenspace programs and bike paths.
• Smart Moves and bicycling projects.
• Can't think of a specific program.
• None.
• Aging, Regional Planning.
• AirQ.
• Just through the website.
• Government employee training, metro and regional statistics, recycling information.
• None.
• Not relevant to the issue of public transportation.
• Newsletter, training opportunities, people who work there, publications, recycling info, regional studies.
• MetroGreen initiatives, Smart Moves.
• Bike maps.
• Environmental planning activities.
• Newsletter.
• Recycling/transportation information.
• Highways.
• Presentations.
• Acquaintances.
• In-home services transportation senior food programs.
• Air quality, recycle.
• MARC grant.
• Was once a city government employee, I am aware of MARC activity.
• I have completed a couple of surveys mailed to me and I participated in the automotive air pollution study.
• List of public officials.
• Library.
• Metro Council on Early Learning and aging services.
• Transportation.
• Public transit initiatives.
• No conozco ninguno. (I do not know of any.)
• Ninguna. (None.)
• Ninguna. (None.)
• Ninguna. (None.)

10. **What MARC meetings or events on transportation issues have you attended?**

Total responses: 31
• LRTP 2030 Update (2005).
• Paseo Bridge open house.
• As many as I can when time allows — First Suburbs and MetroGreen.
• Metro Green Bike Ride, public input on bridging the Missouri River meeting.
• Quite a few.
• I-35 Corridor Study / Alternatives Study.
• Years ago when there was discussion about taking out the trolley tracks, which I thought was a mistake as I’ve been a proponent of light rail for 10 years.
• Don’t have a car and don’t know when/where to go or what my role would even be. I would LOVE to get this place more connected with light rail (there’s enough track…), better bus systems, bicycle friendly roads, and alternative vehicle fueling locations.

• TTPC, Transit, Bike/Ped, AQF, various transportation study meetings, occasional OGL and STP/Bridge committee meetings.

• Never been to one because I find out after the fact. I did attend a transit public forum in the summer of 2005 at Johnson County Community College about Smart Moves.

• When are they?

• None. Times and location are inconvenient.

• Haven’t — don’t know when they occur.

• I attended a meeting once but I can’t remember what it was about.

• Fundraisers.

• Annual meeting.

• I attended a session a few years ago with the federal highway administration and MARC, but don’t remember the content.

• None — not aware of meetings.

• Smart Moves meeting and bicycling meetings.

• Independence Memorial Building, late 2005 or 2006.

• Private meetings with Regional Transit Alliance and MARC.

• None. I don’t know when and where they meet. I didn’t know the public was invited.

• None that I know of, though I would have had I received a mailing notice.

• Schooling.

• Prior years, 1998-2000.

• No he tenido la oportunidad de asistir a ningún evento. (I have not had the opportunity to attend any events.)

• A ninguno, la razón es que es la primera vez que tengo información del tema. (None, because this is the first time I’ve ever had any information on the subject.)

11. **Would you be more willing to participate in transportation discussions if they were included as part of a local town hall meeting or an organization meeting?**

Total responses: town hall 205; organization 212

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Town Hall Meeting</th>
<th>Organization Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. What zip code do you live in?

Distribution and Density of Survey Respondents by Language

13. Would you be willing to participate in a future focus group to discuss ways to strengthen citizen engagement in values discussions and transportation decision making for the Kansas City region?

Total responses: 305
Yes 105
No 200

Public Focus Group Notes

Staff Focus Group
November 7, 2006

Notes:

- Priorities Committee may bump up projects making for shorter public comment periods. TIP amendments must have a comment period; timing and length of comment periods are flexible.

- TIP comments are not always the type of comment that can affect change, poor timing, people don’t know what they should comment on. How can we better present TIP to public? What kind of comments do we want at specific times? This will change with each project. We need to provide more context and visualization. Where should TIP comments go? Some are more appropriate at municipal levels.
• Would groups be able to request longer comment periods, interest groups, for instance, where 15 days would not be enough?
• Stakeholder meeting, listening sessions very effective.
• Interactive maps for TIP must be accompanied by ads directing people to site. Using tools together.
• For public focus group: Dean’s engagement groups. Piggyback or form new focus group. Use as test group and have them come up with public questions/take survey.
• Public needs more specific questions.
• ATA has their own citizens group, try chamber lists.

Public Focus Group: Engaged
December 7, 2006
Questions and Summarized Answers:

What is Public Participation?
• Putting information out there for comments and response.
• Get feedback from public.
• Availability of information.
• Theoretically: hear from John Q. Public, now we hear from interest groups.
• Engaging people not typically involved in governance.

Involvement
• We should be careful how we identify stakeholders.
• Stakeholder and public are not the same.
• NIMBYs (Not in My Backyards) with direct impact take on representing entire region. Broad public is not well-represented. Is this right?
• Interest groups should be more involved to better represent the region.

What gets you involved?
• To make something happen long term.
• Frugality — Tax money invested wisely.
• Professionally, then led to investment as an expanded stakeholder.
• Involved because of values.
• Environmental concerns — to help the process — see it move forward and not get bogged down.
• To enhance the project.

Education
• Issues can be explained better electronically — more “understandable”
• Inform/educate with long and complicated legal documents — “I know nothing more now than I did before.”
• Public doesn’t know how to get involved;
• There is a huge learning curve to get to where you can even comment/ can not comment when you do not understand.
• Honest information needs to be put into perspective where the public can understand.
• Informed Consent — Is that public involvement?
**Communication / Forums**

- Open forum meetings — you don’t know whether you were heard, you don’t get to hear what each other says — no feedback from public.
- Websites will generate more comments, but comments from face-to-face conversation are higher quality.
- We need to expand electronic communication but maintain face-to-face.
- Web — you don’t always know who made the comment.

**Motivation**

- How can we get public to be more aware of issues beyond their own neighborhood?
- How can we get citizens to stick around through the length of a project?
- John Q. Public will not be interested if there is no direct impact.
- “Stakeholder” participation process: in reality you have to have a reason to care about it.

**Values**

- MARC’s main role should be to establish regional values.
- Values should be established up front — before project is defined. Smart Moves as example.
- Values can be so broad sometimes that they can be interpreted any way — not as they were really intended.
- Disconnect between values and when project is put out there — feeling ineffectual.
- People come to meetings with values but are not necessarily informed.
- Engineers do not understand values.
- Putting a plan out in the guise of public participation.
- Public thinks the decisions are made before or without public participation (no values discussion).

**Survey**

- When should public participation start? Timing.
- How should public notices be sent out?
- How long is too long for documents?
- How well has MARC done to educate you?

**Public Focus Group: General Public**

**March 15, 2007**

**Notes:**

**Concerns and motivations**

- Low-cost transportation options
- Urban sprawl
- Transit
- Care for economically challenged
- Transportation as the lifeblood of economy
- Commuting alternatives

**Ideal Situation for Engagement**

- Starting different conversations through online blogs. Must be transparent and friendly. Probably would attract a younger age group.
- Website dedicated to transit issues — not from MARC (most people are not familiar with MARC).
- Getting involved at “ground zero,” but the ability to enter at any point should be an option.
• “Sub-ground zero” — Online blog for ideas — possibly on MARC’s website.

**How do you let people know about this?**

• People who are not able to use the Internet.
• How do you give elderly people a voice?
• How do we address bilingual?
• Connect with neighborhood organizations, churches, community centers, Spanish newspapers/radios, etc.
• Target audience should influence how information is communicated.

**At what point do people want to know about things?**

• Stop sign issues may not be as important as changes to a central or main street.

**Individuals' needs are not being heard**

• A single individual’s needs should have as much weight to their input as an organization — the ideal is that you wouldn’t have to be under the organization to have weight.

**Would you know whom to contact for certain issues?**

• We cannot assume everyone know who to contact.

**Barriers (completed an Affinity Diagram)**

• Access/Process
• Timeliness
• Confidence/Impact
• Disjointed
• disenfranchisement

**Solutions**

• Access/Process
• Regional Access point person who would direct/manage questions from citizens, 411-type number. 311?
• Regional database of current activities and contacts on district by district basis. This could be accessible through the web or by phone.
• Start educating children in schools about transportation issues.
• Timeliness.
• People can try to be in touch but if information isn’t there, then they will not be informed. Use organizations to funnel timely information.
• Focus on partnership with the community from start to finish.
• Confidence/Impact.
• No form response, need to contact from a real person via phone, real-time on-line help, post acknowledgement on blogs.
• disenfranchisement.
• Surveys — surveys on buses.
• More frequent polling, snail mail.
• Communicate through employers.
• Need more local champions to lead big issues.
• Disjointed.

**How big is your “backyard”?**

Interests go across state lines, very broad in this group.