

Pam Grove

From: Ken Bukowski
Sent: Saturday, December 13, 2014 1:27 PM
To: Pam Grove
Cc: Veda Florez [mtc]; Randy Rentschler; + A. Aguirre [mtc]; + Steve Kinsey [mtc]; + Sam Liccardo [mtc]; Teri Green; | Allison Brooks [ABAG]; Adrienne Weil; + Tom Bates [mtc]; | David Levin [mtc]; Allison Brooks; + Federal Glover [mtc]; Dorene Giacomini; + Dave Cortese [mtc]; + Amy Worth [mtc]; + Scott Haggerty [mtc]; + Mark Luce [mtc]; Ellen Griffin; + Jake McKenzie [mtc]; + Tom Azumbrado [mtc]; Stephen Wolf; + David.Campos [mtc]; | Ezra Rapport; Paul Campos; Paul Sedway
Subject: Public Outreach

Pam:

Please accept these comments, and the attached document, for the pending Public Participation Process. Could you please provide a copy of this email to all the members of the Policy Advisory Council, MTC & ABAG Board Members, and others who will be making decisions on the Public Participation Process.

Included in my archive of past information I found a transcript, which I prepared in April, 2002, of an MTC meeting where the consultant, hired for the 2001 RTP "public involvement process" presented their findings to the Commission. Did we learn anything from this past public process, which could be implemented for the Plan Bay Area public process..?

Most of the public outreach is in the form of a workshop. Since the Commissioners are not required to attend, it may create the impression comments made are not actually heard by the decision makers. It could be a problem..?

All of the public outreach meetings could be video recorded and posted on the web. If someone doesn't attend a meeting, the video is the next best thing to being there. The videos provide necessary evidence of the public meetings which are otherwise difficult to envision. Many people doubt they ever happened. The lack of seeing the needs of others makes it difficult to see the broader picture.

There is some confusion of roles and responsibilities between ABAG & MTC..? Perhaps that can be clarified. I hope this transcript can be helpful as we move forward. with the Public Participation process. Please don't hesitate to make me aware of public meetings which I can video record. Please accept these comments, and the attached document, for the pending Public Participation Process.

Sincerely

KEN BUKOWSKI

All the videos of MTC & ABAG public meetings are posted on
www.Regional-Video.com

Emeryville Property Owners Association
Consultant- Government Affairs
Videographer
www.EPOA.US
www.Regional-Video.com

MTC Planning & Operations Committee Meeting

Discussion of the 2001 RTP Public Involvement Process

NOT AN OFFICIAL MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

Meeting Location: MTC Auditorium, 101 Eight Street, Oakland, Ca, 94607-4700

Roll Call: Commissions Present (strikeout = absent)

Scott Haggerty (Alameda)

Tom Ammiano (San Francisco)

John McLemore (Santa Clara)

Sharon J. Brown (Contra Costa)

Steve Kinsey (Marin)

Bill Dodd (Napa)

Pamela Torliett (ABAG CC Petaluma)

~~**Ralph Appezzato**~~ (Alameda)

Jon Rubin (SF Mayor's Appointment)

James T. Beall, Jr. (Santa Clara)

Mark Desaulnier (Contra Costa)

Sue Lempert (San Mateo)

James Spering (Solano)

Barbara Kaufman (BCDC)(W. Brown)

Non-Voting Members

Dorene Giacomini (US Dept. of Transportation)

Keith Axtell (US Dept Housing & Urban Development)

CHAIRPERSON JIM SPERING: Discussion of the 2001 RTP Pubic Involvement Process.

UNIDENTIFIED: I can't hear you.

CATALINA ALVERADO: Good morning. I'm Catalina Alverado with MTC Public Information Office. I'm glad to say we have arrived at that point in the process of the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan where we can look back at what we did, and evaluate as part of our work. Our public involvement program included a set of measurable goals that this committee reviewed almost a year ago.

The measures include 24 targets, in 5 different areas. the consultant team that MC worked with throughout the public involvement effort is here today to present the findings contained in the attached report. entitled "Evaluation of the Public Outreach and Involvement Program."I'd like to introduce Carolyn <Grehein ?> of <Meg, Morris & Goldsmith> who will walk through the presentation along with Bruce Reardon.

CAROLYN G: Thank you Catalina. Good morning commissioners and staff, it's good to be here at the end of a long process in reaching out to the community to support and develop the RTP. Let me commend you on a great effort this time around and some very significant outcomes in the development in an attempt to update your RTP. All in all, a much expanded outreach and involvement program. We commend you on that. It was just a solid team effort to try to pull off something of this magnitude.

We very much appreciate the commissioners participation in many of the workshops, Sharon Brown, in particular was there, very-very often, and some others. It was excellent to have you there, and listening closely to input from your constituents

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

Great collaboration between the <MIG team> and Staff. I can't tell how much we worked on a daily, very close basis, with Ellen and Catalina, with Doug and Chris. <Randy> and Therese were at many- many meetings. Ann came to meetings. All of the Staff came out to several of the night meetings, and Steve gave us much of his time as well.

Great collaboration on our side, as well as, of course with staff, Bruce Reardon, our project manager, was really the glue that held the whole thing together, and did a lions's share of the work. supported by a number of associates at <MIG> who worked closely, in a very, very detailed level, to try and process every single comment that was received. Whether it was verbal or written, through the web, or by fax, or however it might be, so you would have complete documentation of the input and I appreciate the effort.

<Lisa Hale> is also on our team, She a great editor, and we appreciate the solid effort all the way around. We believe the RTP outreach effort was successful, all in all,

However, there's great areas for improvement. We believe that next time we can do an even better, perhaps much better job in reaching out to the community and involving them, and engaging them, in a meaningful way to update the RTP. Let me turn it over to Bruce, who will provide you with just highlights.

We have incredible documentation of the effort, in the form of all of these reports which I'm sure you've seen and have, and received throughout the process. We have the executive summary, which really expresses the essence of it, and then today, just highlights from the major findings, and recommendations for improvement next time. Thank you all, and we appreciate the opportunity to work with you..

BRUCE REARDON: Thanks Carolyn, Now, we're gong to do three things here with our brief presentation. Act one just to briefly summarize the outreach activities.

Second, look at the performance measures that were developed to evaluate the Outreach Program and the findings, that came from the evaluation, and then, third, to look at the recommendations for the 2004 outreach program,. Phase one was February through May There were 29 workshops, about 700 attendees, major use of the MTC web site about the Regional Transportation Plan, and about 1700 individuals participated in what we call a virtual tour of the RTP on the web site where they could look at materials, answer questions, and provide comments. This was something new done this year.

Pretty expensive media campaign to support phase one, And a regional telephone opinion poll with about 1600 registered voters who were polled. All of that was summarized in our phase one summary report, and every single comment that was received on the web, in workshops, and letters was contained in the appendices to that report.

Phase Two. August to December, was started after the draft RTP was released in August. We did an overview mailing of a draft condensed down to a reasonable size, an overview that went to 10,000 participants and others on MTC's Mailing List.

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

We did 8 workshops with about 370 attendees, again major use of the MTC web site in Phase 2 to present material. Extensive print and electronic news coverage, about 600 letters, faxes, and E-Mail's were received and responded to. Then a series of meetings, of both this committee and of the full commission in November and December to get even more input.

And Phase Two was summarized in a series of reports, and then in our appendices here, which total about 12 pounds, We have every single comment from the workshop, and the web and everything again.

Along with that there were some parallel outreach efforts going along at the same time. the Lifeline transportation network culminating in a report from the workshops. There were workshops for the regional bicycle plan. There were meetings and a summit for the pedestrian safety task force, and meetings of the environmental justice working group. Those were parallel efforts.

There were five performance measures that were designed to evaluate the outreach program and a set of 24 quantifiable indicators that went with them.

These are the performance measures here, they were approved before the program started. Accessibility, Reach, Diversity, Impact, and Participant Satisfaction. We did this evaluation in two meetings that we looked at those performance measures, one was an evaluation survey, that as sent out to about 1800 participants in the program. Evaluation survey was one. Second was a review of all the source documents, going back to phase one and phase two. So those were our two primary methods of conducting this evaluation.

So, what did we find..? Let's look at each of the 5 performance measures briefly. and the indicators that went with them. The first one was access. There were four indicators. the performance measures were met on three, with the checks. 100% of the meetings were transit accessible. 100% were ADA accessible, and 100% were linguistically assessable. The one that we were slightly under here, was meetings were to be held in NINE counties, and we had meetings in eight counties.

Next on Reach. How many people did we get to... How far out into the community did we go... ON the right you will see in parenthesis, the goal for each of these indicators.

Our goal was 2000 comments, We received 4,900.

Our goal was 1800 participants in the process. We had a little over 2200.

You'll see the web site visits. We took a guess. This was the first time through it. We guessed 1,000, and we had about 40,000 web site visits. It was quite successful.

The goal was 30 newspaper articles, again phase one and phase two, we had about 90. On opinion pieces, and editorial comments, we were aiming at 5 and we got 24.

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

The one that we had a little trouble with. It's the last one here. with radio and TV Broadcasting. the number are a little hard to pin down, due to rebroadcast, and other information, and also right in the middle of Phase two when we were mounting the biggest part of the media campaign we had September 11th, which tended to make it more difficult to talk about these issues with radio and TV..

Next, on Diversity. workshop demographics. We do not have precise data because we did not collect it at workshops. but if you look at the indicator here as to roughly the diversity and the demographics of the Bay Area in the workshops. We succeeded in this by taking the workshops into communities where we have not been with the planning process before. In north Richmond, East Palo Alto, a variety of low income communities. We went with four different digital scopes to put up. we worked with senior, elderly and disabled groups to put on workshops, and then we ran a series of about 10 or 12 open workshops. So, roughly the demographics matched. We can do some improvement this next time but we were much better this time than prior efforts.

Second, 70% of targeted groups would participate in the targeted workshops, it was really closer to 100%, and Third, a cross section of <?> residences primary modes, again by taking the workshops out into the community, and not holding them in the usual kinds of places, and by partnering with community groups, and business groups and others, we succeeded in getting a much broader cross section. Getting quite a few people who have never participated in this kind of effort before.

Next, is Impact. A few indicators. 100% of all comments were logged, analyzed, summarized, and communicated., This was done on all comments received, and again they're in the appendix. Again they were summarized and communicated to the Commission and the staff in as series of memo's, and reports, in of each of the phases. Consecutively, 100% of all written comments, were acknowledged. All of the 600 written comments that were received were acknowledged with letters back from MTC.

Finally, **Participant Satisfaction**: These were done in a slightly different way. In a survey that we did of participants, having received a little over 300 of the surveys back, we did them in, "agree, disagree" scales. So, a (4) would be a perfect, it would be a strongly agree, a (3) is an agree, with a statement. A (2), going down, was a disagree, and a (1) is a strongly disagree. So, the higher score the better.

And, you can see these were relative to each, this first group. We did pretty well with this group. These are agree's or slightly under the agree average.

Barriers of Participation in the Workshops, there was sufficient ability to comment, what participants thought they learned, about transportation from the workshops, and the other activities, that they gained a better understanding of other view points, the workshops were clear, the information was detailed enough, and that the web site is clear and useful. These are all pretty good scores.

When we look at the next set, these scores are somewhat lower on participant satisfaction. We'll go down them. People had a little more trouble agreeing with the statements that, (1), they understood what issues were up for

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

discussion, which <?> was spoken for, either by law or by ballot measure. People had a little more trouble with that one it's (2.74) a slightly lower score, again, (3) would have been a straight agree, so these are slightly below that.

The same thing for understanding the, **choices and tradeoffs**. People had some trouble understanding it, the workshops. and on the web, some of the choices between **maintenance and expansion**, and others that we were presented. Still, it's close to an agree. but these scores are somewhat lower.

They did a little better on understanding the **transit choices**, This was all about Regional Transit Expansion Program. So, those three were slightly lower than the ones on the previous page.

The next two were the lowest in the survey. "**Quality of the discussion**" and "**is my input heard by decision makers**". We had quite a few comments if you read through the report that we've given you and the comments that are in the back of the report that are all repeated, about both of these. These scored the lowest of any of the ones that we had, in terms of participant satisfaction.

Both, in terms of feeling there was a quality discussion of the issues. So, if you look back at the previous ones here. They thought the issues were really clear, they were presented well, and that they had a chance for input and comment, **but actual discussion**, people felt was a bit more lacking...

In terms of input heard...there were quite a few comments and you can see them in the report, Again, a (2.46) is close to, kind of half way between the bottom and the top here. (2.5) is the absolute middle score. So, you could say that you had about 50% either way, saying their input was heard, and about 50% saying they didn't believe their input was heard.

Finally, two more positive numbers there at the end. A (2.86) for feeling that the outreach program made a positive contribution for the Regional Transportation Plan development this year, and (2.70) for a good job of involving the public in the plan.

On our parallel efforts, just briefly, so you get much more on this in the report, we're just doing highlights. And these are the main scores for each of the parallel efforts. You can see a (3.10) on lifeline would be the highest. on down through the Regional Bike Plan, Pedestrian Safety Summit, EJ <environmental justice> working group with a lower score there. And then there are more details on performance measures with those in the report.

Finally, **Recommendations**; Each one of these processes is a learning opportunity. We've learned a lot this year. We think a lot went well. There are some recommendations here that we'd like to talk with you, before we get ready for the 2004 Plan.

The first, there are two things that really worked well, that we have to make sure and to experiment, and that would be the workshop partnerships with community groups. We thought it really went well, and it really got us out, again, in the communities where planning for transportation has not had a big presence before.,

Second, we would definitely recommend more of that in the future. Secondly, to expand the use of the web site. It

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

was terrific way to increase participation. To increase the number people who can't come to workshops, who could participate in the process. Both in terms of getting information and, in terms of providing guidance and comments back to all of us.

Next set, A couple of things that we think would make a big improvement next time. **One, have in integrated regional outreach program. One program for the entire plan, that will encompass both the CMA process, and MTC.**

It's a regional plan, it is our regional plan. We believe strongly there should be one process. The public doesn't care who we are, when we're out there. They just want input on the plan, and they want to see a series of coordinated workshops. We did a better job this time, but there's much we can do to improve that.

And another is to start earlier. Our process really started in late February. early March. The CMA's were already well underway. This would, if we could start earlier with the planning, in 2003, and start the process in 2003, again we can present a coordinated, integrated program for the public.

Last set of recommendations. Back to a couple of those that scored lower in the participant survey, in terms of quality of discussion and input being heard.

We think there's some opportunities that we could design better was, particularly in phase two, for some more meaningful facilitated discussion, between groups with opposing view points on various key issues that have been identified in the draft.

We don't mean free for all's. We mean facilitated... we mean thoughtful... we mean pulling together groups to have more meaningful and interesting discussion on key items that you need more input on. At the same time, we think we could design some ways that we could do that between groups and commissioners, in phase two in particular.

When we've gotten down to the hard choices, and the difficult decisions., the tradeoffs, in particular. Second, improved and better use of advisory committees. We have some ideas on how this might work. This fits with one of the recommendations in the Redwood Report last year on public involvement.

We think in particular, with this one... some on-going panels that you would be working with, like the advisory committees, before you get to the RTP. would inform and create a more knowledgeable group that you can work with on considering discussions and tradeoffs once you get to the RTP, and we can talk more about that later.

Finally on that final commission meeting, we think some work could be done, in terms of presentation of materials, time, location, rules of behavior, and a number of things on both sides that could really work so that we could set those up, so that those meetings, where there is now tremendous interest in the RTP, and certain issues, as you saw this year. That we could set up a structure that could lead to more dialogue and more discussion back and forth on key issues. Thank you very much, and we'd be happy to take any questions....

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

JIM SPERING: For Staff. Seems like this might be a pretty good forum to start introducing the land use element's of the plan, and some of our new, **possibly expanded responsibilities**. Would this be a good forum for that..? It just seems like it would be.

THERESE MCMILLAN: Commissioner, are you referring to using RTP process as a way of bringing that>>**Interrupt.....**

JIM SPERING: Yes.

THERESE MCMILLAN: I would imagine, certainly. Excuse me. Therese MacMillan, deputy director of policy. That it's pretty clear on a number of different tracks that the next Regional Transportation Plan is going to be incorporating much more of the land use oriented things.

Specifically, we'll need to respond to the outcome of the smart growth project that many of you, in fact, the Commission ultimately will be involved in, so I think that's going to be a forum to address a number of issues and that, in particular.

JIM SPERING: Especially, on the outreach side it just seems like this would be the one vehicle that we could get outreach into the all nine counties, Steve

Steve Kinsey: I appreciate that, Jim. Steve Kinsey, Marin county I think that what we're saying is let's do a walk race instead of a sprint next time, too. This idea of getting started, and sort of getting an understanding of this public outreach, and the integration process... and issues like land use fits right into that...

Generally, I want to just say thank you. I think this is a helpful evaluation, and I appreciate the fact that somebody at the front end of this thing did build in the opportunity to evaluate how we did along the way. It looks like useful information to me.

I think the recommendations seem generally positive. **I particularly appreciate the recognition that we need to get the CMA's into our planning process the next time around**, and you couldn't start too soon on that idea, just to be able to get the volume we are going to want.

Lastly, I think that some of the things that are suggested there do reflect there is going to have to be some increased effort on the part of the Staff... And I also think there's a part of it that says we, as commissioners, are going to need to do a better job of explaining the considerations that we go through on what we finally determine to do. So, I think there is something for each of us.

MARK DESAULNIER: This is Mark Desaulnier, Contra Costa County, and I just want to ditto what both the previous speakers said. I'm particularly interested in learning the rules of behavior, as they develop, and how they might apply to us, and me specifically,>>**Interrupt.....**

STEVE KINSEY: We've got a custom contract for you Mark...

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

MARK DESAULNIER: I was going to say child psychologist might be a good idea, In terms of instituting the recommendations, maybe just some feedback from staff...And the earlier we get started, I think, the better.

JIM SPERING: Sharon..

SHARON BROWN: Sharon Brown, Contra Costa County. One of the things, when they're reporting the number of people that we reached. I think the was many-many more people. I don't know about the rest of you, but I talked about this at every Mayor's Conference... I know Mark must have talked about it at the Board of Supervisors, I would assume. Local meetings, <?> meetings, chambers of commerce, city council's. I went to a number of meetings, in addition to the one's we had scheduled here. and talked about the process... So, it was heard by many-many more people, and there's no way to quantify all that..

JIM SPERING: OK, Other Commissioners... David Schonbrunn do you want to come up.....

DAVID SCHONBRUNN: Thank you very much. Mr Chairman. I'm David Schonbrunn, President of Transdef. I wanted to speak particularly to the recommendations section of this evaluation, but before I do that, I want to commend the Chair's suggestion about bringing land use into future discussions, I think that is exactly, right on...,

In particular, what I wanted to do... I'm not going to be presenting, basically, my opinion... I'm going to be attempting to connect dots that are present in the evaluation document itself. and in particular call to your attention s fundamental disconnect in the operation of the Commission, in relation to public input.

Towards that end, I would comment to you that a primary recommendation ought to be to bring Berkeley Professor's Innus and Groober in to speak to the entire Commission on their massive study of the functioning of MTC. In particular, what they concluded, and again, I want to stress.... this is not my conclusion, this is the professor's conclusion from the Institute of Governmental Studies..

They concluded that there are four different kinds of decision making and MTC functions in... and I've forget the term they invented for it, but it's basically political horse trading. I'm not basically casting aspersions on that role. It's a real thing, and that's how the Commission has operated.

The point that I want to call to your attention is that-that process does not involve public input, and MTC has functioned, more or less, without public input, even though it has conducted a very extensive public input process.

Now, in the evaluation document does this very carefully by identifying that the lowest scores of support were to the statement "my input was heard by decision makers." That's only natural because the decision makers were deciding on projects based on criteria that had nothing to do with the input that was received from the public. I can document this, by pointing to the RTP itself, the Sections... pages 2, through 5, point out what the messages heard from the public were....I think this is accurately transcribed.

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

If you review closely, what's from the RTP response, to a lot of fudging, a lot of obfuscation, and some out-and-out incorrect statements... I believe that's because the agency has not come to terms with the structure of decision making, as represented in the four options presented by Innus and Groober, and that's why I'm strongly urging you to bring them in so you can look at how does this Commission function, in terms of decision making. In any case, you do, in fact, want to bring the public more into the process.

Now, I'd like to call your attention to the other major finding, which was the Environmental Justice Report made a positive contribution to the 2001 RTP. That received the lowest supportive score of any of the four subsidiary reports that went along with the RTP.. This is only natural given that the RTP developed a lifeline transit program, and then you didn't fund it. You're getting very real and useful feedback here that I think is very worthy of your attention.

So, In particular, the recommendation about debates that you've heard, on policy issues, this really goes to the heart to the question of... Does the Commission function basically as a horse trading marketplace..? or Does it function ...to which the answer is Yes. and the question is... is the Commission interested in transitioning into a policy based organization... one that sets up actual goals, and then attempts to implement them....?.

Frankly, the public is urging you to go in the latter direction, that's I believe the major message that you're hearing, is we want to see results, in terms of transportation systems, that's an entirely different process than satisfying some Mayor of San Jose or whatever..

Along those lines I believe that the most unloaded method of dealing with this issue would be to bring in Innus and Groober. Obviously, when I come before you, the fact that we have three lawsuits underway, doesn't help you hear me, but if you were to listen to objective.... and I'm not saying that I'm not objective, by the way, ... but if you were to being in clearly objective personnel who, from an academic point of view, have analyzed this in great depth, I believe that would help lead you to a recognition, or perhaps, a realignment of how this commission functions.

And, if there were to be debates on specific policy items, I would love to see Commissioners disagree with each other. That's a very different process than having Staff conduct the horse trading and have you come and ratify it.

So, again, what the public wants, I believe, is to see the Commissioners have policy prospective, have actual debates, and make decisions in contested debate, and come up with solutions that really do benefit the region. Thank you very much.

JIM SPERING: Just for my reference can we have a show of hands of the people in the room who were interviewed by Mr. Groober from Berkeley. <No hands raised> Isn't it amazing the speaker wants us to entertain someone to analyze us... you know he criticizes us for not taking input before we make decisions, but yet he expects us to speak to someone who hasn't taken any input from the people, he's saying, makes these decisions in a political forum. It's mind boggling to me...It's double standard, I say.

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

You know I think this process has been a very healthy one, and I think it's been an eye opener for the Commission and I think the deficiencies we've had in the public process are now being addressed. I think this really has brought us forward in dealing with some of the issues. The one issue that I've always been concerned about is we haven't done a good job of saying that we disagree. The perception was, we were just ignoring people, and I think that finally we're coming to the point

where we're saying we don't agree with you for these reasons, and I think that that has been a tremendous stride dealing with the public. so they can respond to us in a more meaningful ways, when we're at the point where we actually disagree, and so I think that's been very meaningful out of this whole process.

The other question I had.... is when you talked about the redesign of the final commission meeting, can you give some more definition of what that means...?

BRUCE REARDON: Consultant on the Project. WE thought, at the November and December meetings... and thought that after all of the public input that had gone on, that we could have structured those meetings in a way that encouraged back and forth... and more dialogue between the Commissioners, and the hundreds of the members of the public who were here to talk about specific issues.

Some of that you tried, I think, in those meetings in November and December, but we thought there could be further work done, in terms of, looking at the agenda. if you have a hundred people here for a certain that there may be ways that that could be approached and they could be heard, and they could <?> I think you tried a couple of different methods, in both November and December

We think that.. again, looking at a structure that would allow some back and forth, and not just hearing public input, which is what you need to do, but there could be some structure that could be facilitated for that kind of thing.

Again, I think laying down some ground rules for these kinds of things that may not <?> be said, but what can be said, and some responsibility, really, for that. We had a whole number of issues, do you want to....>>Interrupt.....

JIM SPERING: Some of it, you know., I think you have to be careful when you are talking about ground rules. Some of the meetings that we had, they were looking for the ground rules so that they could actually break those rules. So, you have to be careful how you structure that, because that becomes the issue for them, is how they can disrupt a meetings, and do it in opposition to the way you've got it organized to take input.

BRUCE REARDON: We're not sure that we could make a big difference in this>>Interrupt.....

JIM SPERING: OK

BRUCE REARDON: But, we had some ideas that would be worth exploring, with Staff, about possible ways it could be done.

MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

JIM SPERING: I don't think that could be done, is when we have meetings like that, that we get a broader input from other organizations, other than MTC, that have an opinion on that subject. I think if there's one place that we were lacking, is it almost appeared as if it was us against them, and a lot of our partners, who were in agreement on both sides of the issue, didn't participate at all. So, I think there can be a way to renew that participation, because that's going to bring the stability. When they hear individuals from their own jurisdictions talking about the problem, <?> solution, and how their working with MTC, so I think that-that is an area where we have to work much harder that can deal with some of the disruptions in the meetings.

THERESE MCMILLAN: It's the consultant's recommendation for a coordinated program between the congestion management agencies and MTC on the outreach process. We also begin to set up a as to particularly that many of the local elected officials be involved with many of the decisions that ultimately, come through the process of the RTP, needs to be engaged with their constituents, as well as with your's, in the debate of what is considered and what was not, and how the choices have been made.

JIM SPERING: What I'm talking about here, is actually formalizing how they input in the meetings. In other words, we would actually have agendaized, where that particular partner, or CMA organization, actually would respond, even if they got up and said, "we don't have a response" that they would be expected to participate in that discussion, and that process, So, I think that-that is what I would like to see formalized.

MARK DESAULNIER: I just wanted to thank Staff. I know you always remember that pregnancy.. <everybody laughing>

The Staff did a great job, and when you consider what the commission asked you to do, and everyone who was involved with it you really did a remarkable job, and when I think back to the last RTP that I was involved with, and how far we've come, I think you've done a terrific job. I think there's work to be done, as was said I think we have to acknowledge, and not forget what a good job you did under the circumstances. So, thanks

JIM SPERING: it was a job well done, and very well presented too. and I do appreciate that every comment was documented. I think that is one of the criticisms we had, so I think that was very well done.

STEVE KINSEY: Just one final comment, I wanted to say...This is really good stuff. This is exactly what we're doing in response to the fundamental issues that we saw raised, we are going introspective, which is good, and I appreciate constructive suggestions. I thought, on a rating of one to ten. Mr Schonbrunn's comments were presented in a tone that I would appreciate actually being able to hear him, and consider them. So even though I agree with your assessment that we don't want double standards in responses, I think that many of the comments and recommendations spoke exactly to the kinds of things that he mentioned, so, that's also a good sign. If we can imagine it,, thank you

**MTC Program & Allocation Committee Meeting
Evaluation of the Public Involvement Process for the 2001 RTP**

NOT AN OFFICIAL, MTC DOCUMENT

April 12, 2002

By: KEN BUKOWSKI

JIM SPERING: Thanks for those comments. OK

<END DISCUSSION>

DECLARATION

I, Ken Bukowski, am a citizen of the United States, and a resident of the County of Alameda, in the City of Emeryville, California.

I hereby certify that the foregoing 13 pages of this report is, to the best of my knowledge, an accurate reflection of the words spoken at the public meeting, or event, described herein.

This is an independent report, prepared at the sole discretion of the undersigned. It is NOT an Official Report of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, or any other public agency. This document may NOT be used in a court of law without the written permission of the undersigned. Such consent shall not unreasonably be withheld.

An official recording of this meeting should be available for public review at the Metropolitan Transportation Public Affairs Office, 101 Eight Street, Oakland, California, (510) 464-7700.

Attest:

*Ken Bukowski - 547-2101
5880 Doyle Street
Emeryville, Ca. 94608*