



Final Results

Results as of 2/19/09
2/27/09

April 22, 2009 Public Participation Presentation Pre-presentation questionnaire

Help us tailor this presentation to better meet your needs. This presentation will be designed to share best practices and methods in public participation and involvement. Please complete this short questionnaire and return it to Terri Bridges, e-mail address: terri_bridges@dot.ca.gov or fax number (916) 653-4570. **Please respond by Friday, February 27.**

The questionnaire is designed to provide our presenter with information about your experience with public involvement and give you an opportunity to identify topics of particular interest.

Please circle or place an X next to the letter that best matches your response:

1. What is your level of experience with public involvement?

- 26 ~~23~~ A. I work with the public on a regular basis (at least once a month)
- 23 ~~17~~ B. I work with the public on a semi-regular basis (once every couple of months)
- 16 ~~13~~ C. I seldom work with the public (once a year or less)
- 5 ~~7~~ D. I have not yet worked with the public

2. How would you describe your experience working with the public?

- 19 ~~17~~ A. Positive: Caltrans was successful at getting productive input from the community and the process went smoothly
- 29 ~~21~~ B. Moderate: Caltrans was successful at getting useful information, but the process could have been improved
- 7 ~~6~~ C. Fair: Caltrans got some feedback, not all of it useful, and we could have improved the process substantially
- 0 ~~0~~ D. Poor: Caltrans was not successful and we are hesitant to go out to the public again on this project and/or related issues
- 4 ~~3~~ E. Other: (please describe) - *N/A*

3. What do you want to learn more about? *Please circle all that apply*

- 36 ~~27~~ A. Workshops/Community Meetings
- 25 ~~20~~ B. Stakeholder Interviews
- 20 ~~14~~ C. Surveys
- 20 ~~13~~ D. Focus Groups

- 23 ~~17~~ E. Media relations
- 36 ~~25~~ F. Outreach/publicity techniques
- 15 ~~9~~ G. Print materials
- 28 ~~21~~ H. Websites
- 35 ~~25~~ I. Techniques that work best in rural areas
- 13 ~~10~~ J. Small group discussion exercises
- 3 ~~2~~ K. Others: (please describe or list below)

4. What specific issues and challenges related to public involvement are you most interested in? Circle or place an X next to all that apply

- 17 ~~14~~ A. Environmental Justice
- 6 ~~5~~ B. Working with non-traditional communities
- 8 ~~5~~ C. Working with non-English speaking communities
- 32 ~~26~~ D. Increasing attendance at meetings or required public hearings (especially for non-controversial projects)
- 37 ~~32~~ E. Overcoming local resistance to projects
- 26 ~~23~~ F. Managing meeting participation for controversial projects
- 25 ~~24~~ G. Generating usable information for decision-makers
- 27 ~~25~~ H. Achieving consensus or majority agreements
- 2 ~~2~~ I. Other (please describe)

5. Do you have any current or future projects that may require or benefit from public involvement? If so, please describe the project here.

See Table

6. Would you be willing to share your project example during the presentation for use as a case study? Please check yes or no

~~12~~ Yes ~~15~~ No

~~Friedman, Arnoco, Scott White,~~
~~Tamy Quisley, Melissa Jashi,~~

See CHART

7. How many years have you worked with Caltrans?

See Table

DAN
Kopulsky
909-383-4557
LD-IGR+CP

8. What is your Caltrans Position/Classification/Division District?

See Table

Thank you and we look forward to your participation on April 22nd.

PPEC QUESTIONNAIRE	
2E	Sometimes I answer "Red Folder" letters, generally the public is writing to complain.
2E	I do not work with the public, I work with other government agencies.
2E	The type of project often determines the success of working w/public. The more controversial the project the more contention with the public.
3K	Outreach for planning documents and procedures instead of capital projects
4I	How to create desirable outcomes
4I	Having funding support/resources added to produce better marketing tools (A/V graphics, publishing software/printing) in planning
4D	Including planning non-capital efforts
QUESTION 5	
PROJECTS THAT BENEFIT FROM PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT	
5	<p>I'm writing the CSMP for SR-57. The "public involvement" is focused on participation of local government, particularly the Public Works departments of cities and Orange County, in reviewing the Plan and providing information about arterial roads paralleling the highway.</p> <p>2. As Bicycle Coordinator for the District, I've begun putting together a Bicycle Advisory Committee as recommended in DD 64 R1. So far, outreach has been to our RTPA and to the cycling community via advocacy groups. I have a sizeable email list, but attendance at the few meetings has been sparse. I'm not sure if this is connected to my outreach, or the fact that some of the members have "day jobs" from which they can't escape for a mid-day meeting.</p> <p>3. I have previously been the planning grants manager, and still assist the newly-appointed planner doing this job. We could use some innovative ways of reaching possible applicants. Currently, we send emails to former applicants, many of the Local Assistance branch contacts, and to the Orange County Council of Governments for them to send to their members. Response was better this cycle, but I suspect that's more due to the economic downturn than to anything we at District 12 are doing anything different. (Barbara Gossett)</p>
5	Outreach with modeling tools and decision makers..Greater-Eureka Area Partnership and Wine Country Partnership
5	Route 12 MIS & CTP Outreach
5	While nothing is specified, we do deal with public involvement as a part of the environmental review process. Opportunities are continuous.
5	TCR Updates
5	<p>Future projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How to better focus our PIO efforts more strategically and effectively maximize public engagement efforts. ii. Continued efforts to establish local bicycle and pedestrian representation iii. Achieve better public engagement on many of our large capital projects iv. Better inform the public on transportation funding challenges – so they don't set their expectations at level that cannot be achieved.

	Current Projects Our bicycle public engagement efforts/products
5	SR-49 TCR/CSMP SR-120 TCR/CSMP
5	I currently serve as Community Planning Liaison by representing the District on community planning meetings and technical working groups, mostly on outreach for the Transportation Planning Grant program. As an example, I sit on the stakeholder committee for the Barrio Logan Community Plan Update, partially funded by a CT Environmental Justice planning grant.
5	Yes, outreach with modeling tools and decision makers..Greater-Eureka Area Partnership and Wine Country Partnership
5	Exposition LRT project.
5	WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF CARRYING OUT PHASE ONE OF THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT EFFORTS FOR THE 101 CSMP ALONG WITH DISTRICT 5 PERSONNEL. THIS PROJECT IS JUST IN ITS BEGINNING STAGES.
5	I have worked with other agencies on constructing a Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP), which is a requirement for receiving the Proposition 1B funds. We worked with city officials, county representatives, and internal CT staff. We brought together ideas, which were incorporated in the CSMP document. Much positive feedback was received for going beyond the usual interaction from Planning.
5	CSMP's
5	Community based transportation grants for Valley Springs—there have been concerns with public involvement.
5	All system planning activities in the districts involve public outreach at some level.
5	System Planning Products Coordinator, Transportation Planner, D1
5	Int 80 HOT Lane Study (Jeff Pulverman)
5	We are involved in a process that identifies the right-of-way needed for the future ultimate long-term needs of the State highways in order to preserve the corridors. We will need the help of our local partners during their land use decisions to incorporate our plans by requiring the building envelope outside this predetermined corridor where ever it is possible.
5	ATP
5	ATP
5	All CBTP projects have an extensive public involvement component. (Friedman)
5	We want to improve the website and other outreach materials for our grant program. Granters are directly engaging the public. We want the tools to help them. (Marilee Mortenson)
5	DSMP – District System Management Plans
5	Park and Ride Needs Assessment
5	CTP 2035
5	D3 has a variety of projects/efforts where extensive public outreach efforts have taken place. Kroy Pathway (Sacramento), Fix I-5 (Sacramento), Ylo 16 Safety Project (Copay Valley) early 200's, etc. If HQ is looking for a

	completed example.
5	Broadway feasibility study – plan for future of Route 101 4 lane signalized corridor improvements will affect many stakeholder groups – optimum solutions will anger all a little.
5	ATP
5	Transit, Rail, and it’s departments under SB 375
5	Deputy District Director, Transportation Planning
5	MPO & RTPA Blueprint & SB 375 update of the RTP Guidelines (Office Chief of DOTP sent this)
5	Transportation Concept Reports
5	California Transportation Plan
5	Unmet Transit Needs, Los Angeles County TDA Crenshaw transit corridor
	QUESTION 6 WILLING TO SHARE PROJECT EXAMPLE DURING PRESENTATION
6	Eric Friedman, (Complete Streets), Gary Arnold – IGR, Scott White, Tamy Quigley, Melissa Joshi, Dan Kopulsky (909) 383-4557,
6	Bicycle Transportation Partnership Workshops and District 2 Cycle Guide–facilitated by Task Orders under the Planning Public Engagement Contract. (Scott White)
	QUESTION 7 Years at Caltrans
7	21, 17, 9, 25, 20, 20, 10, 2, 25, 27, 8, 21, 12, 10, 2, 25, 8, 18, 9, 10, 9, 1, 10, 30, 2, 28, 20, 16, 20,29, 9, 20, 3, 27, 10, 10,10, 35, 9, 4, 10, 17, 20, 20, 20, 2, 1, 9, 16, 1, 9, 25, 1, 10, 9, 9, 9, 8, 8
	QUESTION 8 CALTRANS POSITIONS
8	Associate Transportation Planner (ATP) /Regional and Transportation Planning Branch, District 12 (Barbara Gossett)
8	Senior Transportation Planner / District 3 (Takhar)
8	Deputy District Director Planning and Local Assistance
8	Deputy District Director – District 10
8	District 7 – Transportation Planner
8	District 7 – Technical Planning Transportation Engineer
8	HQ/DOTP/OCP/Statewide LD-IGR Coordinator/Associate Transportation Planner
8	Senior Transportation Planner, District 8, Traffic Forecasting and Analysis
8	Transportation Planner
8	Deputy District Director, Planning and Local Assistance, District 2 (Redding)
8	Associate Transportation Planner
8	Associate Transportation Planner
8	Associate Transportation Planner/District 11 Planning
8	Deputy District Director Planning and Local Assistance
8	ASSOCIATE TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

8	ASSOCIATE TRANSPORTATION PLANNER, DISTRICT 7, ADVANCE PLANNING
8	Associate Transportation Planner
8	Deputy District Director, Planning and Local Assistance, District 12
8	TP, District 3
8	TP
8	Supervising transportation planner.
8	Senior Transportation Planner (Supervisor -- Chief, Transit Grants/Mass Transportation Programs), Division of Planning, Public Transportation & Local Assistance, District 7
8	Transportation Engineer (Civil)
8	? TET (Mr. Pastore)
8	ATP
8	Associate Transportation Planner/OCP/DOTP
8	ATP Advanced Planning, District 7
8	ATP, System & Advanced Planning, District 10
8	Transportation Engineer, PE, Local Assistance, Planning
8	Regional & Public Transportation Branch Chief/Senior TP, Planning District 12
8	District 10 – ATP IGR Metropolitan Planning
8	D3 – STP
8	Transportation Engineer, PE, Local Assistance, Planning
8	Senior TP, District 7
8	Office Chief – DOTP
8	Transportation Planner – Public Transportation – District 7
8	Civil engineer transportation planning – District 3
8	Senior Environmental Planner
8	Associate TP, Planning – District 1
8	TP HQ Planning Division
8	Transportation Planner, Div of Planning, District 7
8	LD/IGR and Community Planning Chief, Senior Transportation Planner, District 8
8	Four ATPs, one Senior TP. Office of System Planning, District 2.