Transportation Commission

**MEETING DATE**
Tuesday, May 9, 2017
7:30 a.m.

**MEETING LOCATION**
Tempe Transportation Center, Don Cassano Room
200 E. 5th Street, 2nd floor
Tempe, Arizona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
<th>ACTION or INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public Appearances</td>
<td>Don Cassano, Commission Chair</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Transportation Commission welcomes public comment for items listed on this agenda. There is a three-minute time limit per citizen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Don Cassano, Commission Chair</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Commission will be asked to review and approve meeting minutes from the April 11, 2017 meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Downtown Tempe Association Update</td>
<td>Kate Borders, Downtown Tempe Association</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Borders will provide an overview of the Downtown Tempe Association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. First Street, Ash Avenue, Rio Salado Parkway Realignment Concepts</td>
<td>Eric Iwersen, Public Works</td>
<td>Information and Possible Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff will provide information about a possible realignment of First Street, Ash Avenue, Rio Salado Parkway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Streetcar</td>
<td>Eric Iwersen, Public Works</td>
<td>Information and Possible Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff will present an update on the Tempe Streetcar Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff will provide information on possible projects that could receive funding through MAG design assistance grant opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tempe Involving the Public Plan</td>
<td>Shauna Warner, Community Development</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff will present information about the Council-adopted Tempe Involving the Public Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Department &amp; Regional Transportation Updates</td>
<td>Public Works Staff</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff will provide updates and current issues being discussed at regional transit agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Future Agenda Items</td>
<td>Don Cassano, Commission Chair</td>
<td>Information and Possible Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission may request future agenda items.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the Arizona Open Meeting Law, the Transportation Commission may only discuss matters listed on the agenda. The city of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. With 48 hours advance notice, special assistance is available at public meetings for sight and/or hearing-impaired persons. Please call 350-4311 (voice) or for Relay Users: 711 to request an accommodation to participate in a public meeting.
Minutes
City of Tempe Transportation Commission
April 11, 2017

Minutes of the Tempe Transportation Commission held on Tuesday, April 11, 2017, 7:30 a.m., at the Tempe Transportation Center, Don Cassano Community Room, 200 E. Fifth Street, Tempe, Arizona.

(MEMBERS) Present:
Ryan Guzy  Lloyd Thomas
Shereen Lerner  Susan Conklu
Brian Fellows  Kevin Olson
Charles Redman  Cyndi Streid
Jeremy Browning  Shana Ellis
Nigel A.L. Brooks  Charles Huellmantel
Bonnie Gerepka  Paul Hubbell

(MEMBERS) Absent:
Don Cassano (Chair)

City Staff Present:
Shelly Seyler, Deputy Public Works Director  Joe Clements, Transportation Financial Analyst
Sue Taaffe, Public Works Supervisor  Laura Kajfez, Neighborhoods Services Specialist
Chase Walman, Transportation Planner  Mike Nevarez, Transit Manager
Robert Yabes, Principal Planner  Mackenzie Keller, Public Information Officer
Sam Stevenson, Senior Planner  Julian Dresang, City Traffic Engineer
Scott Balck, Transportation Facilities Supervisor

Guests Present:
John Federico, resident  Jason Harington, Harington Planning and Design
Nicolas Smart, resident  Tristan Black, resident
JC Porter, Arizona State University

Commission Vice Chair Guzy called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Public Appearances
None

Agenda Item 2 – Minutes
Vice Chair Guzy introduced the minutes of the March 14, 2017 meeting and asked for a motion. A motion was made to approve the minutes.

Motion:  Commissioner Charles Huellmantel
Second:  Commissioner Kevin Olson
Decision: Approved

Agenda Item 3 – Commission Business
Vice Chair Guzy introduced newly appointed Commissioner Paul Hubbell. Commissioner Hubbell provided a brief background of his experience. The Commissioners introduced themselves to Commissioner Hubbell.

Agenda Item 4 – McClintock at Rio Salado MUP Underpass
Robert Yabes made a presentation about the design concepts for the underpass at McClintock Drive and the Rio Salado multi-use path. Topics of the presentation included:

- Project Overview
- Funding
- Existing Conditions
- Design Alternatives
- Public Outreach

The Commission asked the following questions, and staff responded as follows:

- How does working with the Army Corps of Engineers affect the project and alternatives? Both alternatives require the approval of the Army Corps of Engineers, but staff does not expect any significant comments from them since both alternatives have minor impacts to the area.
- Can President Trump cut the funding? There is always a chance.
- Will the Army Corps of Engineers have concerns about the trees along the lake? All the trees are on private property and the project will not affect existing trees.
- Is there a design preference that does not damage the levee and habitat as much? Yes, 1B affects the levee less by cutting into the area by eight feet.
- Why is no additional seating proposed for the east side of the bridge similar to the plaza on the west side? The land on the east side is owned by Tempe Marketplace not the city. However, this could always be added later as part of an agreement with Tempe Marketplace.

A motion was made to support design alternative 1.

Motion: Commissioner Charles Huellmantel
Second: Commissioner Kevin Olson
Decision: Approved

Agenda Item 5 – Country Club Way Bike/Ped Project
Robert Yabes, Brian Fellows and Jason Harrington provided an overview of the design concepts for the Country Club Way Bike/Ped project. Topics of the presentation included:

- Project Overview
- Funding
- Existing Conditions
- Opportunities and Strengths
- Design Concepts
- Public Outreach

The Commission asked the following questions, and staff responded as follows:

- What is the funding that staff is applying for in August? Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funding for 2021-2023.
Has staff discussed the bridge concept with the police department? Staff has not discussed the idea of an underpass or bridge with the Tempe Police Department. Staff did consider building a bridge over the railroad tracks, but the preferred design option is constructing an underpass 18 feet underground rather than 28 feet above the tracks.

How long in length would the underpass be under the railroad? 98 feet.

Is that railroad abandoned in that area? Yes.

**Agenda Item 6 – ASU Bike Registry Outreach Efforts**

JC Porter with Arizona State University discussed ASU’s bike registry program. Topics of discussion included:

- Bike Valets
- Card Access Bike Storage
- Online Registration
- Abandoned bicycles

The Commission asked the following questions, and JC Porter responded as follows:

- Do students need to register each year? The registration is valid for five years.
- How does ASU coordinate with the Tempe Police Department? ASU Police Department coordinates with the Tempe Police Department regularly and both are looking at integrating their two systems.
- How long does ASU give the bike owner before cutting the bike lock from an unauthorized location on campus? One to two hours and then the bike is removed if they do not remove it.

**Agenda Item 7 – Maintenance of Multi-use Paths and Bus Stops**

Mike Nevarez discussed the maintenance schedule and other aspects of Tempe’s multi-use paths, bus stops, facilities and right-of-way maintenance.

The Commission asked the following questions, and staff responded as follows:

- What is the best way to report a problem? Calling 350-4311.
- How does Tempe handle shopping carts left at bus stops? Passengers should call 350-4311 or the contractor who cleans the shelters will relocate the shopping carts back to the business.
- Does the terrazzo flooring near the elevators require special maintenance? Not normally, but that type of material is made to be high gloss and indoors. It is scheduled to be replaced in 2018.

**Agenda Item 8 – Department & Regional Transportation Updates**

Shelly Seyler introduced new staff member Sam Stevenson, who will be working in transit operations.

**Agenda Item 9 - Future Agenda Items**

The following future agenda items have been previously identified by the Commission or staff:

- May 9
  - Streetcar
  - DTA Update
  - Tempe Involving the Public Plan
  - MAG Design Grant Applications
  - First, Ash, Rio Salado Parkway Realignment Concepts
- June 13
  - McClintock Drive
  - Road Construction Traffic Mitigation
- July 11
  - Autonomous Vehicles
- Western Canal Expansion MUP Final Design
- Highline Canal MUP Final Design

- August 8
  - Leading vs. Lagging Left Turn Signals
  - Bus Security Program
  - Plan for Expansion of Bicycle/Pedestrian Paths
  - Streetcar

- September 12
  - Fifth Street Project Update
  - Annual Report
  - North/South Railroad Spur MUP

- October 10
  - Annual Report
  - Alameda Drive

- November 12
  - Bike Share Update
  - Streetcar
  - Speed Limits

- December 12
  - TBD: Bicycle/Pedestrian Signal Activate Operations Update
  - TBD: Small Area Transportation Study
  - TBD: Prop 500

The next meeting is scheduled for May 9, 2017.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 a.m.

Prepared by: Sue Taaffe
Reviewed by: Shelly Seyler
DATE
May 2, 2017

SUBJECT
Downtown Tempe Authority Update

PURPOSE
The purpose of the presentation is to provide the Commission with an update on the Downtown Tempe Authority (DTA).

BACKGROUND
Kate Borders, DTA Executive Director/President, will discuss the state of the downtown. The Downtown Tempe Community is a private, non-profit organization that works in partnership with the City of Tempe to increase the value of the Mill Avenue District through enhanced management and promotional services on behalf of DTC members and other downtown stakeholders.

FISCAL IMPACT
None

CONTACT
Shelly Seyler
480-350-8854
shelly_seyler@tempe.gov

ATTACHMENTS
PowerPoint
Where is "Downtown"?
Climate Change

Mobility

Social Equity

Homelessness

Civil Unrest

Arts/Music/Placemaking

Race Relations
LIVING TOUR
THE DOWNTOWN
Live Downtown Macon
walkable • bikeable • livable • lovable
RUPPIES are "Retired Urban People."

Choices For Urbanites In Dallas

Modern Urbanites ... Retire Downtown -
By Kyle Ezell (Andrews McMeel Publishing) The Lifestyle Destination for Active Retirees and Empty Nesters. Ruppies (Retired Urban People) are a rapidly growing, active group of people who understand that living in the right location—not plastic surgery, therapy, or pills—is the most overlooked secret to staying young. After all, the sixties are the new forties, and America’s lively downtowns have become the new fountains of youth.

Teaching the urban lifestyle to America: "Who would have guessed that a record number of empty-nesters are looking to downtowns in their own cities instead of a beach resort or an old-folks home for their retirement?" -- The New York Times

As time passed, the so-called 'empty nesters' or as Kyle Ezell named them 'Ruppies', discovered they no longer needed or enjoyed the big house in the 'burbs'; and the second phase of the movement was off and running. Ezell describes this emerging niche group, that is gravitating toward downtown and all the cultural opportunities it entails in his book, Retire Downtown: The Lifestyle Destination for Active Retirees and

Retire Downtown demonstrates how potential Ruppies can make the move downtown and lead a New York lifestyle in any city. Author and noted city planner Kyle Ezell has assembled information on finding urban housing, shopping, eating at exciting local restaurants, getting around, staying active, finding community, downsizing to one car, saving money on gasoline and conserving energy, volunteering, keeping faith alive and
URBAN

The 'G' Word: A Special Series on Gentrification

Gentrification has accelerated in recent years, creating challenges for local leaders for years to come.

FEBRUARY 2015

Photos by David Kidd
LET'S FILL IN THE BLANKS.
WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF STREET ART ON REAL ESTATE PRICES?

Graffiti & Street Art: Elena Martinique

SHARE
FOOT TRAFFIC AHEAD: 2016

The end of sprawl is in sight. For perhaps the first time in 60 years, all 30 of the largest metros are gaining market share over their surrounding areas, showing substantially higher rental premiums.

Foot Traffic Ahead: 2016 shows that metros with the highest levels of educated and wealthy (as measured by GDP per capita)—and, by extension, the most walkable—are gaining market share over their surrounding areas. This trend is significant because it suggests that the end of sprawl is in sight.

Key findings
There are 619 regionally significant, walkable urban places—regionally significant walkable urban areas (RWUAs). These 30 metros represent 46 percent of the 314 million U.S. metropolitan areas. These 30 metros represent 46 percent of the 314 million national population and 54 percent of the national GDP.

The 30 metros are ranked on the current percentage of occupied family rental square feet in their WalkUPs, compared to the balance of their metro area. The six metros with the most walkable urban spaces are New York City, Washington, DC, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Economic performance
There are substantial and growing rental rate premiums for walkable units, and rental multi-family (66 percent) over drivable single-family units. Walkable units have a 74 percent rental premium over drivable units.

Walkable urban market share growth in office and multi-family units in the largest metros between 2010-2015, while drivable sub-urban market share growth in office and multi-family units were the same. This indicates that walkable markets are growing faster than drivable markets, and that walkable urban spaces are becoming more attractive to residents.
RESIDENCES ON FARMER
MOBILITY
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
Following a three-year study that evaluated high-capacity transit improvements, a streetcar project in the Mill Avenue corridor was adopted locally and regionally into the Regional Transportation Plan in 2010.

In June 2014, the Tempe City Council supported a route recommendation for a three-mile Tempe Streetcar project, shown below.

**BENEFITS**
Tempe Streetcar will increase transit ridership in central Tempe, connect neighborhoods to downtown activities and provide greater mobility to a growing number of students, employees and visitors. It will also support the revitalization of neighborhoods and attract development.

**UPDATE**
- Project was included in the President’s proposed FY17 budget submitted to Congress. The FTA released their Annual Report on Funding Recommendations for FY17 that indicated the project received a Medium-High project justification rating.
- Valley Metro plans to issue a Request for Quote (RFQ) for vehicle procurement, including soliciting options for off-wire application.
- Preliminary engineering and design efforts continue, moving toward the procurement of a finalized design team and contractor.
- Valley Metro and the City of Tampa have agreed to pursue a Construction Manager at Risk project delivery method, with a key goal being continuous coordination with the public and project stakeholders.

**BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
<td>$9,335,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$151,300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$177,360,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,335,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include financing cost.
**Estimated as of March 31, 2016.

**ROUTE MAP**

**SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Development</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Project Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREND 5: Shifts in Transportation & Mobility

1,000 cities now have bike share programs, making this the fastest growing mode of transportation in human history.
HOMELESSNESS
PAY TO THE ORDER OF Mission Campaign
Five Thousand Dollars and $500.00/100

Ryan Hsibert - CEO, Riot Hospitality Group

RHO
Riot Hospitality Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC Hotel</th>
<th>Kiewit/Sundt Joint Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacus Brothers</td>
<td>Mission Palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blasted Barley Beer Company</td>
<td>Ncounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>NYPD Pizza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard Marriott</td>
<td>Pedal Haus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Arden Red Door</td>
<td>Postino Annex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Peaks</td>
<td>Residence Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzzy’s Taco Shop</td>
<td>Revel Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius Monkey</td>
<td>Riot Hospitality Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Biersch</td>
<td>Shady Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Construction</td>
<td>Spinelli’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grill on Mill</td>
<td>Tempe Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gringo Starr</td>
<td>US Fries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Tricks</td>
<td>Zipp’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLACEMAKING
Creative Placemaking

… is the act of people coming together to change overlooked and undervalued public and shared spaces into welcoming places where community gathers, supports one another and thrives.

Places can be animated and enhanced by elements that encourage human interaction – from temporary activities such as performances and chalked poetry to permanent installations such as landscaping and unique art.

- Springboard for the Arts
Lowly, unpurposeful, and random as they appear, sidewalk contacts are the small change from which a city’s wealth of public life must grow.

– Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities
A STRATEGIC PLAN FOR PROGRAMMING AND ACTIVATING DOWNTOWN TEMPE’S PUBLIC SPACES

PREPARED FOR THE DOWNTOWN TEMPE AUTHORITY
Programming Pyramid

Everyday Amenities

Core Programs

Weekly Programs

Monthly/Semi-Monthly Programs

Special Events

Ping Pong, Foosball, Board Games, Reading Room, Art Cart, History Panels, Horticulture Information Signs, Ice Cream and Candy Carts, Movable Seating, Movable Tables, Umbrellas, Wi-Fi Internet, Bike Racks, Flower Stall, Rotating Exhibits

Creative Writing Workshops, Mommy and Me Fitness Classes, Yoga, Zumba, Boot Camp, Cardio Classes, Art Classes, Soloists, Artist-In-Residence, Walking Club, Tai Chi, Meditation, Photography Classes

Author Readings, Small Musical Series, Acappella Groups, Dance Bands, DJs, Juggling Lessons, Knitting Classes, Salsa Dancing, Children’s Storytime, Movie Nights, Farmers’ Markets

Cooking Classes, Nature Classes, Juggling Performances, Specialty Markets, Nutrition/Wellness Seminars, Magic Shows, Book Clubs

Large Concerts, Holiday Events, Festivals
GATEWAY PLAZA
HAYDEN STATION
HAYDEN AMPHITHEATER
5 ½ STREET
AMC PLAZA
MISSION ALLEY
“Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody.”

– Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities
Looking Forward…

STAKEHOLDER SURVEYS & FOCUS GROUPS

1

2

STREETCAR 101 GUIDE
REPORTS – HOW DOES TEMPE MEASURE UP?

IMPROVED EVENTS

EXTENSIVE VOLUNTEER OPPS
WAYFINDING

NEW FUNDING STREAMS
DATE
May 2, 2017

SUBJECT
1st Street / Ash Ave / Rio Salado Parkway Intersection Realignment

PURPOSE
The purpose of this memo and PowerPoint is to provide an update on the possible realignment design concepts and public input regarding the 1st Street / Ash Ave / Rio Salado Parkway Intersection.

BACKGROUND
This project was identified in an effort to explore options for better connectivity to neighborhoods and development west of the intersection. Until approximately 1985 the intersection had direct access east and west; today there is not direct westbound travel for vehicles. A feasibility study was conducted in 2009, outlining preliminary alignment alternatives and projected impacts on mobility, development, cost and right-of-way. The project was not advanced into formal design. Impacted by the eventual Tempe Streetcar alignment, consideration to revisit the project as a concurrent effort was reintroduced, with City Council approving funding for design in the CIP FY 2017 budget.

DESIGN ALTERNATIVES & PUBLIC INPUT
City staff worked with consultants to develop design alternatives for the intersection, which were presented alongside a ‘no build’ option during a public meeting on April 17.
Additionally, feedback was gathered from stakeholder meetings and an online comment period from April 14-28. Responses from the online surveys, public meeting and stakeholder meeting produced 23 total votes:

Public response indicates a clear preference for a no-build scenario, though the sample size is small.

As part of the staff evaluation staff and designers looked at cost, right of way impacts and functionality and traffic impacts for all modes of travel.

The summary of advantages and disadvantage, related costs and traffic estimations for each design includes the following:
Summary of the Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Traffic Analysis (2035 Volume) AM</th>
<th>Traffic Analysis (2035 Volume) PM</th>
<th>East-West Connectivity</th>
<th>Streetcar Compatibility</th>
<th>Construction Cost ($)</th>
<th>R/W Impacts ($)</th>
<th>Total Cost($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Built</td>
<td>Overall D</td>
<td>Overall D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$106,968</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$106,968.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$502,587</td>
<td>$716,550.00</td>
<td>$1,219,137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$980,025</td>
<td>$1,350,509.00</td>
<td>$2,330,534.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$727,800</td>
<td>$418,800.00</td>
<td>$1,146,599.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the right of way costs (approx. $130/sq ft) for each option, staff researched the overall property cost of the north east corner of the intersection (pennysaver property). That total cost is estimated at $10 million.

CONTACTS
Eric Iwersen
480-350-8810
eric_iwersen@tempe.gov

ATTACHMENTS:
Public Comment Summary
**Overview**

A public meeting was held on April 17, 2017 to get feedback on proposed design concepts for the intersection. Eight people attended the meeting. Surveys were available at the meeting and online from April 14 through April 28, 2017. Twenty-three responses were received, 5 at the meeting and 18 online.

**Responses**

1. Of the four options shown for the treatment of the intersection of 1st Street, Ash Avenue and Rio Salado Parkway, which do you prefer?

![Pie chart showing survey results.]

- Option 1: leave as is (12) 52%
- Option 2: add westbound through (4) 13%
- Option 3: roundabout (4) 17.5%
- Option 4: add east and west through (3) 17.5%

Total responses: 23

2. Why did you choose this option?

1. I am a Planner and Landscape Architect that works at 120 Ash and I am directly impacted by this interchange. The existing configuration allows for the safest flow of vehicular traffic to my office. There is also a significant amount of pedestrian traffic at this intersection area due to the offices, restaurants, and the park in the area. The existing configuration is by far the best and safest configuration for pedestrians.

2. I work at 120 S. Ash Avenue (LVA).....all other options would not work well.

3. #4 improvement with least cost; crosswalk on north side of intersection. Important to consider safety for bikes and pedestrians. #3 roundabout is unsafe for pedestrians and bikes, people don't really understand roundabouts so potential for gridlock with trains on 1st.
4. Do nothing option does not solve current access issues w/ 1st St, Option 3 and 4 looked like conflicts with pedestrians, bikes, streetcar and confused drivers. Option 2 seemed the most straightforward, easy to follow and least accident prone, while providing the most access and greatest flow of traffic.

5. The City of Tempe "cannot" move east/west traffic west of Ash on 1st Street - there is a UP rail line, light rail line and an intersection at 1st St/Farmer comes to a T!

6. Will slow traffic down. Easier and safer access to Riverside neighborhood from Rio Salado (east) west bound get to avoid Mill Ave. More opportunity for art, banner for entering neighborhood.

7. Safest, simplest and least confusing option presented.

8. An east/west through is desirable; I have never liked roundabouts. Existing junction is a disaster. I don't like roundabouts (too confusing). #2 seems simpler than #4.

9. Option 4 takes up too much land and doesn't make sense. It also cuts into the pedestrian walkways and adds a lot of unnecessary medians. Option 3 roundabout doesn't seem good because people who aren't familiar with Tempe will not be able to figure out the multiple lanes of roundabout. Also, the streetcar looks like it's cutting right through the median instead of circling it and then cutting across multiple lanes of traffic. That's a mess. Option 2, like option 3, takes up land that could be used for development, it's expensive, and it doesn't seem like there's enough traffic to make this construction worth it. Also, the signals seem confusing and aren't indicated well on the map. Leaving the intersection as is seems the most viable. You don't get the westbound access, but it's the simplest to understand from a driver's perspective and it's clear how the streetcar will fit into traffic.

10. I work at 120 S. Ash Avenue. I think the current lack of connectivity keeps the traffic on Rio Salado and out of the neighborhood.

11. As a resident of the Farmer Arts District and employee of LVA, I spend almost all of my time in and around this area. I realize the intersection is currently unusual, but it does work. The three build options all seem problematic in one way or another. I see no reason to change it when there isn't a better solution.

12. Although it requires more r/w and construction costs than the other options, the design will stand the test of time as far as efficient movement of all modes of traffic (bike, pedestrian, train, cars) is concerned.

13. I work in DT Tempe, and occasionally take walks along this route during lunch. Option 4 appears to provide the best pedestrian experience.

14. It makes the most sense of the available options.

15. I work at 120 S. Ash, LVA

16. Work at LVA

17. Less disruptive. While all options seem feasible, the existing conditions seems to provide the best traffic control

18. I own the property at the northwest corner of this intersection, which is impacted by a couple of these options. I selected Option 1 as I have not heard of any reason why this change should be considered, other than rumors that our city council made commitments to the restaurants on Farmer Ave. that the city would increase access to their businesses. Staff has told us that they know of NO safety issues or accident history that is driving this study. I selected option 1 as this is the most stewardly option given the cost studies that were done the last time the city considered this, and, because all of the other options impact my property and my existing access.
19. Low impact to surrounding properties. Cheapest option of #2, 3 and 4. Concerned that drivers won’t be able to navigate the roundabout (#3).

20. With the development along 1st St. currently under way, the volume of traffic will increase 10X++ and a roundabout is likely the best option to handle the heavy volume coming from Rio Salado during peak hours and future heavy volume from 1st St. More traffic lights will just create traffic jams, hassle and air pollution from idling cars and deter travel into Tempe from neighboring areas. I work in downtown Tempe near Rio Salado and owned a business on Mill for many many years. Now have have business interests on Mill and Rio Salado travel north to 5th St. and then double back south thorough the neighborhoods to get home. The traffic signals are cumbersome now and any more will not be welcomed. You stated you would be working with the streetcar project to incorporate this but none of this was shown on your diagrams and it will have a big impact worth considering. The improvements to this intersection will create better access to Mill and reduce congestion. However if you overlay streetcar tracks and create more congestion and traffic hassles or delays for people driving you have defeated your purpose. People prefer to drive and that will likely not change. With the implementation of new public transportation technologies like Uber with their "ride on demand" and their competition, all arriving within in minutes for customer service, no waiting for public transportation, no schedule, robotic cars (going mainstream soon) and electric cars (Ford is building a huge plant in MI at this time). A fixed track system with a timetable schedule is obsolete technology and will go by the wayside sooner than later. This is 1890's technology and the reality check is that it is obsolete at this time for an "around town" travel option. Therefore, Please include flexibility in your plan regarding the streetcar tracks that when they are no longer needed we, the tax payers, are not stuck with a massive expense to remove the track system from this intersection. Be smart about it!! There is a very high probability the streetcar will not be able to compete long term with the private sector and the new travel options coming to market, and will .... sooner than expected.... cease to operate.

3. Additional comments

1. Due to the amount of pedestrian traffic at this intersection area you have to eliminate the roundabout in option 3. Roundabouts are great for moving vehicles around but are dangerous for pedestrians. The point of a round-about is for the free flow of vehicles, and pedestrians interrupt that making them less effective. Additionally, the traffic lights at Mill and 3rd Street create a condition called platooning which dumps a bunch of cars all at the same time at this intersection making the roundabout less effective as well. Options 2 and 4 are also not as safe as option 1 for pedestrians as both of these proposed options add an additional lane of traffic to cross with multiple islands adding additional distance to cover in the short time allotted to cross the street. Option 4 restricts access to 120 Ash, or at the very least confuses people on how to access the site. This configuration also creates more opportunities for a vehicle to drive down the wrong side of the road. The diagram even shows "striping" of the lanes/travel paths going to the wrong side of the street. The left turn lane for west bound Rio Salado is drawn going into the east bound 1st Street lane. If a traffic engineer can get confused by this then the lay person most likely will.

2. 2nd choice is #2. Safer access to Riverside neighborhood from westbound then existing.
3. I live in the Regatta Pointe complex that is between 1st St and Rio Salado. Residents have always wanted to go straight thru from Rio Salado to 1st Street. There is a second advantage that may not be obvious: Every car that uses the realigned junction from Rio Salado to 1st St, is one less car that goes thru the tight 90 degree turn underneath the Railroad bridge. That tight turn causes crashes on a weekly basis and results in excessive noise from drivers accelerating wildly out of the slow corner. It is likely that the reduction in crashes under the RR bridge will more than offset any increase in crashes from the Ash/Rio realignment. When a freight train is crossing, there is limited space east of the track for a line of cars to wait behind the RR barrier. I can suggest a variation of option 2 or 4 that would give twice as much space for cars to back up behind the RR barrier while giving two other advantages: If the section of Rio Salado Pkwy going north from the Ash/Rio junction is realigned eastwards, to be up against and parallel with the old disused bridge abutment, we get the following: 1) The realigned Ash/Rio junction would be further away from the RR track, giving more backing up room behind the RR tracks. 2) In addition, it would create a fully right angle junction, giving the streetcar an easier, shorter turn. 3) It would allow for the opening up of the tight curve under the RR bridge to a much smoother and safer curve that can be taken at a higher speed. My proposed wider curve would occupy the north end of the existing parking lot (east of RR bridge) and could also have a camber to further smooth's the curve. That is a significant enlargement to your project, but am bringing it up since there is a close connection to your existing project. It would involve land purchase, but would create an equal area of land where the road currently exists. In effect, my hypothetical road alignment would switch places with the existing parking lot. The ugly/unused building would be demolished. Finally, it is hard for drivers to see cyclists and skateboarders, who often break all the rules while whizzing thru the Ash/Rio junction. They often have no reflectors/lights and wear dark clothing. Can improved street lighting be incorportated into the junction redesign? As a pedestrian, I was almost hit by a car that only saw me at the last moment.

4. I've worked at LVA for over four years, and I've lived in the Farmer Arts District almost as long. I'm all for improvements in this area, but only if they make sense and don't cause new problems. I'd rather stick with what is currently there, since I don't think it isn't working.

5. I work for LVA at 120 S. Ash Avenue, Suite 201 Tempe, AZ 85281

6. I work at 120 S Ash Ave, LVA urban design studio.

7. If the city decides to move forward with other options, I respectfully request that you only consider option 3 and ONLY if you can shift it north and east so that it does not impact my fee property and does not take any access away from the existing full access. Macayos blocks off my access from the south several times a week and our only other access is this intersection. The previous study by KHA recommended Option 3, but the project was shelved due to lack of funding. We will oppose option 4 as it takes our access to the intersection away by restricting our access to and from Rio Salado and Ash Ave.
DATE
May 2, 2017

SUBJECT
Tempe Streetcar Update

PURPOSE
The purpose of this memo and PowerPoint is to provide an update on the status of the Tempe Streetcar Project and introduce upcoming efforts and critical decisions related to project development.

BACKGROUND
The Tempe Streetcar Project is a 3 mile urban circulator rail transportation technology with 14 stops, six vehicles and two connections to light rail. The project will connect Tempe Town Lake and the development along Rio Salado Parkway, through the downtown core, linking ASU and Tempe’s oldest neighborhoods. A public meeting was held April 19 to provide an update on: streetcar vehicles; early design, including lane and trackway configuration options on Mill Avenue and Rio Salado Parkway; and early construction opportunity.
Vehicle Procurement & Wire/Wireless Segment Analysis
The Valley Metro Board on April 20 approved a contract with Brookville to manufacture six streetcar vehicles, which will be battery hybrid capable and 69-feet in length, a size that fits the pedestrian scale and character of downtown Tempe.

Based on Council direction in December and February, four options were reviewed by Tempe, Valley Metro, Brookville and the Centers for Transportation and the Environment (CTE) for possible wireless segment integration.

Analysis of the four options was presented to the City Council at the April 6 Issue Review Session, with “Scenario 3” (above) identified as the preferred option for wireless operation, with direction to also review feasibility of adding wireless operation along the “Gammage Curve” (between Mill Avenue/Eleventh Street and Apache Boulevard/College Avenue). The results of the ongoing analysis will be presented to City Council in May for final decision on wireless operation.

Vehicle Color Scheme
Valley Metro and Tempe have been working to develop color scheme and design options for the Tempe streetcar vehicle, along with input from the vehicle manufacturer. Three vehicle paint scheme options were produced based on visibility and safety, unique identification and consistency with Valley Metro’s current transit system color palette. The options were presented at the April 19 public meeting and are available online for public input; they will be presented to City Council in May.

Project Design & Public Art
Local firm Stantec has completed 30 percent design concepts for all 14 stop locations, track alignment and landscaping, working closely with Valley Metro and Tempe staff, as well as the five artists selected to develop public art for the four design zones along the streetcar route. A public meeting will be held June 7 to present design and art concepts and gather public feedback. Final plans for the project will be complete by the end of 2017.

Mill Avenue Lane Configuration
With recommendation from City Council to advance designs for a wireless configuration (Mill Ave & Intersections), staff was asked to revisit consideration for the placement of track along Mill Avenue between University and Rio Salado Parkway.
During late April, Tempe and Valley Metro staff held five focus groups at the Downtown Tempe Authority community room, targeting downtown stakeholders, including DTA merchants, business/property owners and residents, to gather feedback on the Mill Avenue Lane configuration options. Findings will be presented in May at a City Council Issue Review Session.

**Rio Salado Parkway Trackway**
The project design team is continuing to evaluate track alignment options to optimize traffic flow and streetcar operations. City staff is continuing to work with neighbors, Parks staff, major stakeholders and businesses, the Hayden Flour Mill developers and ASU, as well as coordinating with Tempe Historic Preservation and the tribal communities of Ak-Chin, Tohono O’odam, Gila River and Salt River Pima Maricopa on issues related to the Hayden Butte/Preserve and the final design of track along Rio Salado Parkway.

**Early Construction Update**
In response to desire from the community to mitigate disruption and traffic congestion, Streetcar construction contractor Stacy & Witbeck and staff are advancing a work package for early construction, with utility relocation in the downtown area beginning in June and extending to mid-August 2017. It is also anticipated that the majority of the work on Ash and Mill avenues between University Drive and Rio Salado Parkway to occur during the summer months when ASU is not in session and traffic is lighter. The work on Mill Avenue will occur during non-peak business hours and will still maintain traffic movement in both directions for autos, bikes and pedestrians. This schedule will also help to control project costs.

**Business Assistance**
Valleymetro and Tempe staff is developing a customized business assistance plan to support businesses impacted by construction. The plan includes a variety of tools to help minimize construction impacts, establish lines of communication and provide a one-stop shop for business to get assistance. Elements of the program include:

- 24-hour hotline
- Shop On campaign
- Business access signs
- Marketing
- Events
- Partnerships
- Financial coaching
- Website implementation/development
- Facebook implementation/development
Public Outreach & Next Steps
A public meeting was held April 19 to share project status, construction timeline, preliminary stop design, track alignment, vehicle status and next steps for the project. About 35 people attended the meeting and provided feedback on Mill Avenue lane configuration and vehicle pain schemes.

Efforts to inform and include the public about the project, including early construction, include:

- Public meetings (April 19 and June 7)
- DTA merchant committee meetings (monthly)
- 5 Focus groups at DTA community room (week of April 24) with stakeholders including: DTA merchants, business/property owners, residents
- Email (ongoing beginning late April)
- Website
- One-on-one canvassing (ongoing beginning late April/early May) with Tempe and VM staff walking the street going door to door to inform and get feedback from Mill Avenue stakeholders
- Open houses (monthly beginning mid to late May)
- Social media
- 24-hour hotline (beginning late May)
- Postcards/flyers
- Traffic restriction notices

FISCAL IMPACT
N/a

CONTACTS
Eric Iwersen Amanda Nelson
480-350-8810 480-350-2707
eric_iwersen@tempe.gov amanda_nelson@tempe.gov

ATTACHMENTS
None
DATE
May 1, 2017

SUBJECT
Maricopa Association of Governments 2017 Pedestrian Design Assistance Grants

PURPOSE
The purpose of this memo is to provide the Commission with a review of the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Pedestrian Design Assistance Grant Funding and recommend a project for the 2017 submittal.

BACKGROUND – DESIGN ASSISTANCE GRANTS
The Maricopa Association of Governments Pedestrian Design Assistance Program is an annual grant source specifically targeted at funding the first phase concept work of pedestrian-oriented projects in the region. The program has existed since 1996 and assists in getting projects started and positioning them for federal construction grants. The intent of the program is to stimulate integration of bicycle and pedestrian facilities into the regional transportation infrastructure. Tempe has successfully received design grants for nine projects since the program inception (the most of any city in the region), and all but one of the projects has gone on to receive federal funding for construction. The deliverable work product from a successfully funded project is a concept detailed enough to use for pursuit of federal construction funds. Additionally all environmental concerns or other project constraints would be identified in this phase.

The Tempe projects that have received past funding include:
- 1996: 5th Street Traffic Calming (Farmer – Priest)
- 1999: Mid-Block Crossing Study (which became the HAWK signals at the Western Canal Path)
- 2003: Rio Salado Pathway (Priest Drive - Phoenix border @ SR 143)
- 2011: Rio Salado Pathway (McClintock - Mesa border @ 101 & 202 ADOT Interchange)
- 2014: Highline Canal Path (Baseline – Chandler border)
- 2014: North South Rail Spur Path (Tempe Beach Park – Chandler border)
- 2015: Alameda Drive Bicycle Blvd & Streetscape (48th St – Rural Road)
- 2016: “The Missing Link” Brake BIKEiT Route (Western Canal – Highline Canal Path Connection)
- 2017: Country Club Way Streetscape, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Improvement Project (seven miles from Warner Road- ASU Research Park to Tempe Marketplace generally along Country Club Way)

Funding available for the region this year is $400,000. Typically cities can request up to a maximum of $100,000, which is sufficient for concept design of a project, however, smaller funding requests are more common. Last year Tempe was awarded $82,500 for the Country Club Way project.

Consistent with City Administration and City Council Policy, projects are identified in concert with the Tempe Transportation Master Plan and the General Plan. Projects that are included in the City’s Capital Improvement Program are also considered eligible for application.
Below are three projects that Staff has identified for consideration for the MAG grant funding application:

- **Upstream Dam Pedestrian Bridge over Town Lake at the Dorsey Lane Alignment (Chain BIKEiT route)**
  - Project involves completing a bike/ped. bridge linking north and south banks of Rio Salado.
  - Project would link to recently completed pathways linking to Mesa and Scottsdale.
  - Project would be similar to downstream dam bridge.

- **Tempe Canal Multi-Use Path from Union Pacific Railroad to US 60**
  - Project involves completing the length of Tempe Canal in Tempe along the Mesa border.
  - Project links to existing completed path; University to Union Pacific Railroad.
  - Project connects two parks and Tempe neighborhoods.

- **Dorey (Chain BIKEiT route) Bicycle Pedestrian Improvements /Streetscape (nine miles La Vieve to McKellips)**
  - Project involves creating a design for road and path improvements to connect the Dorsey Lane north/south alignment.
  - Project would be similar to Country Club Way, College Avenue, Alameda Drive streetscape improvement projects.

Staff will share project location photos to assist the Commission in selecting a project for submittal.

**FISCAL IMPACT**
Eventual project construction requests and federal grant applications are anticipated.

**RECOMMENDATION**
Identify priority project for staff to coordinate submittal by May 22, 2017. For information and action.

**CONTACTS**
Robert Yabes                  Eric Iwersen
480-350-2734                  480-350-8810
robert_yabes@tempe.gov         eric_iwersen@tempe.gov

**ATTACHMENTS**
PowerPoint
2017 MAG Design Assistance Grant
Call for Projects
Transportation Commission
May 9, 2017
Proposed Projects

• Upstream Dam Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge
• Tempe Canal Multi-Use Path
• “Chain” BIKEiT Boulevard Streetscape/Dorsey Lane
**Direct Existing & Future Connections**

### Indian Bend Wash MUP, Scottsdale
- Chain Bike Blvd Route
- Rio Salado MUP, Mesa

### Western Canal MUP
- Spoke Bike Blvd Route
- Alameda Streetscape Project / Wheel Bike Blvd
- Light Rail
- Sprocket Bike Blvd Route
- Rio Salado MUP
- Borders City of Scottsdale & Chandler

### Sprocket Bike Blvd Route
- Alameda Streetscape Project / Wheel Bike Blvd
- Light Rail
- Borders and travels through City of Mesa
- Ehrhardt Park, Victory Park, & Friendship Village
Upstream Dam Bridge

- Approximately 0.2 miles long
- 10-14’ wide path
- Lighting & public art opportunities
- Would complete Tempe Town Lake loop
- Provide direct north/south connection to Rio Salado Path system to Scottsdale, Phoenix and Mesa
  - North to Rio Salado Path: Indian Bend to McClintock (in design)
  - East to McClintock Underpass (in design) to Mesa (complete)
  - West to Priest Underpass (near completion)
  - West to SR 143 Underpass (construct in 2018)
Existing Conditions
Precedent
Chain BIKEiT Boulevard Route

- Approximately 9 miles long (bordering Scottsdale/Chandler)
- The final North/South BIKEiT Blvd route
- Streetscape project including traffic calming, bike/ped improvements, public art, lighting, and landscaping
- Provide a more comfortable, low-stress, on-street bike/ped corridor connecting to other existing regional facilities
  - Connects to Western Canal MUP & Rio Salado MUP
  - Generally follows the Lakeshore Dr & Dorsey Ln Alignments
Existing Conditions
Existing Conditions
Precedent
Tempe Canal Multi-Use Path

- Approximately 2.9 miles long
- 10’ wide concrete path, replacing degrading asphalt
- Opportunities include, landscaping, lighting, public art, and street crossings
  - Existing street crossing at Apache
  - New crossings at UPRR, Broadway, Southern
- Last canal path in Tempe left to be improved
  - Borders and travels through Mesa to the east.
- Connects Ehrhardt, Daumler & Victory parks
Existing Conditions
Precedent
ACTION

- Upstream Dam Bike/Ped Bridge
- Chain BIKEiT Boulevard/Dorsey
- Tempe Canal MUP
DATE
May 1, 2017

SUBJECT
Tempe Involving the Public Manual

PURPOSE
The purpose of this memo is to provide an overview of the city’s Tempe Involving the Public Manual as well as the process for creating public involvement plans for Transportation projects.

BACKGROUND
The Tempe Involving the Public (TIP) Manual was first adopted by Council resolution on August 16, 2007, with a revised version adopted on January 8, 2015, as a guideline for public involvement processes. The Manual was the result of a collaborative effort and input received from residents, the Neighborhood Advisory Commission, various other Boards and Commissions and city staff. The Manual reflects Tempe’s belief that community members should be engaged early on in decisions that affect them and demonstrates a commitment to maximizing public input and engagement in planning activities.

Key revisions made in 2015 include: 1) rearranging the TIP Manual to have three sections, including the ability to have Section II and III as stand-alone documents and 2) Section III creates a private development section of the document targeting developers of projects that require neighborhood input as outlined in the Zoning and Development Code (ZDC). The corresponding Zoning and Development Codes were amended at the December 4, 2014 City Council meeting.

Public Involvement Plans for Transportation Projects
Every project is unique, the Manual serves as a framework for engagement, but the development of a project specific public involvement plan allows for outreach to be structured in a way that best suits the project and area of impact. Neighborhood Services meets with the project team to discuss scope of the project, funding sources, and other parameters in order to tailor an approach that best engages the target audience. The level of community engagement follows the definitions identified in the International Association of Public Participation’s (IAP2) Public Participation Spectrum (see Appendix B in the TIP Manual attachment).

The Public Involvement Plan components include:
1. Project Description and Background
2. Public Involvement Objectives
3. Stakeholder Analysis
4. Involvement Techniques and Communication Approach
5. Project Timeline
6. Public Meeting, Scheduling, Location & Access
7. Responsible Documentation
8. Process Evaluation and Conclusion
A copy of the project’s public involvement plan is available on the project’s website. The information provided to Council includes an overview of the outreach as well as all input and comments received through all available methods.

FISCAL IMPACT
No fiscal impact.

CONTACT
Shauna Warner
shauna_warner@tempe.gov
480-350-8883

ATTACHMENTS
TIP Manual
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I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Tempe values resident input and believes that community members should be engaged early on in decisions that affect them. When done effectively, public involvement fosters cooperation and collaboration among individuals with differing viewpoints to find common ground. Rather than treating involvement as a process of competing interests, it is viewed as a forum where the public learns, forms opinions and preferences, and decides together.

Overview and Purpose

The Tempe Involving the Public (TIP) Manual was developed by the City of Tempe, in collaboration with the Tempe Neighborhood Advisory Commission, a 21-member citizen commission advising Mayor and Council on issues effecting neighborhoods, to maximize public input and engagement in planning activities. The goal of the manual is to provide a range of options for including citizens’ voices in decision making for a variety of projects.

There are four different project types: private development, capital improvement planning, service planning, or long-range planning.

1. Private Development Projects: The level of public involvement in these projects will depend on how much change is being requested and how broad an impact.

2. Capital Improvement Projects: These are projects undertaken by the city to improve infrastructure and facilities such as streets, parks, sewers, fire or police stations. The public will have the opportunity to get involved when the five-year Capital Improvement Budget is considered. As specific projects are initiated, citizens provide input on project design. The size of the project and the type of project will influence at what level citizens get involved.

3. Service Planning: The city’s primary purpose is to supply and deliver a wide range of public services. These include police, fire, planning, transportation, parks, utilities, courts, human services, trash, libraries and recreation. Public input is sought, gathered and analyzed prior to making service changes. The public can also address the City Council, pertinent Boards and Commissions and Council Committees.

4. Long Range Planning: These are plans that consider issues impacting the whole community and/or that have a multi-year timeline. The goal is to provide a participatory planning process that will educate and involve the public and ensure that the planning process is open to all impacted stakeholders.

This Manual outlines how to design an appropriate public involvement process detailing what to expect as well as when and how participants can provide their input for public and private...
development projects. However, some degree of flexibility and generality is necessary because the type of public involvement designed will vary depending on the project’s scope, budget, and the level of expected public interest or project impact. Use of this Manual is required for developers as they conduct their neighborhood outreach prior to the public hearing process.

**Participants Roles and Responsibilities**

In all public decision-making processes, everyone is welcome to participate. Participants have increasing levels of influence on the decisions made depending on their role in the project. Roles and responsibilities of participants are described below.

**Decision-Makers.** Decision-makers are those with the legal or legislative authority to make decisions. This might include City Council, authorized City Staff, Boards and Commissions, or other government regulators or funding authorities.

**Impacted Constituents.** Property owners, residents, business owners, homeowner associations, neighborhood associations, business associations, community organizations, service user groups, and other constituents who have an interest in the process or who may be impacted by the project are usually the most active participants. They should be notified and involved in the planning process in an appropriate manner.

**Technical Reviewers.** Professional staff members from the City and other regulatory bodies provide technical and legal review and feedback to plans either during the planning process or its acceptance, adoption, or ratification.

**General Public.** Beyond impacted constituents, there may be others who are interested in the project, but not significantly impacted by it.

**Levels of Public Influence**

The level of influence public input has on decision-making is based on the degree to which authority is given to the participants. At the start of every project, this level of authority must be determined and confirmed with participants. It is possible that levels of influence will change during different project phases. The following International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) levels of public involvement assumes a hierarchical form where the activities included in each level are included in the one above. Refer to Appendix B for the IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum.

**Inform.** The Inform level is the least engaging of the various levels of participation. It offers one-way communication to participants. Its purpose is “to provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives, and/or solutions.”

![Diagram of IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum: Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate, Empower]
Consult. The Consult level provides information and gathers feedback from participants, but may not use that input in decision-making. It typically consists of a series of one-way communications. Its purpose is “to obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions.”

Involve. The Involve level directly engages the public. Communication is typically through two-way, open dialogue. Its purpose is “to work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public issues and concerns are consistently understood and considered.”

Collaborate. To Collaborate means to engage the public in decisions made during each step of the project, including defining the issues, developing alternatives, formulating recommendations, and sometimes even implementing recommendations. Its purpose is “to partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.”

Empower. The Empower level gives the public the authority to make decisions that will be ratified by the City of Tempe and implemented according to the plan. Its purpose is “to place final decision-making in the hands of the public.”

II. CITY OF TEMPE PROJECTS

Public Involvement Plan Components

The intent of the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) is to create an open and transparent process to guide the design of public projects resulting in a shared community vision. The role of a public involvement process is to provide objective information to assist the public in understanding the proposed project, to seek and encourage the involvement of all community members, to provide a variety of ways for the public to contribute ideas and offer feedback through all phases of the process, to make the process accessible and engaging to interested community members and to consider the public input in the design of the project.

All PIPs used in the City of Tempe must be developed according to this section of the TIP unless other specific regulatory requirements are mandated. The PIP will remain on file with the City and made available upon request.

There are eight components in a Public Involvement Plan, which are listed in the adjacent box. The Public Involvement Plan may evolve as conditions change, input is received or additional resources become available.
1. **Project Description and Background**

The Project Description and Background clearly and succinctly describes the project for which the PIP is being developed and its background. The narrative should answer the following questions:

- What is the project or program? What are the project boundaries?
- Who initiated the project?
- Why and how did the project come to be?
- What other projects or planning processes might be relevant, associated, or impacted?
- Who does the project impact (e.g., area or constituent groups)?
- Other pertinent information

2. **Public Involvement Objectives**

Public Involvement Objectives describe the expected level of public influence in the public involvement process.

An effective public involvement process for a capital improvement project considers the size and scope of the project. The level of involvement also depends on the type of project. Highly technical projects such as reconstruction of a sewer pipe may have very limited public involvement opportunities due to the project’s inflexible nature. The design of a park and its amenities provide much greater opportunity for interested citizens to collaborate during the planning process.

**Capital**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of influence in Service Planning should be Involve at minimum or Collaborate when possible. The level will depend on the technical or regulatory flexibility involved in decision-making. For example, the delivery of safe water must be left up to qualified experts, thus community members would not play a role in this service. On the other hand, determining library hours could involve significant public input. This input would play a part in the decision-making process.

**Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long-range planning requires a high level of public involvement. State law requires voter ratification of municipalities’ general plan documents every 10 years. Therefore, all long-range plans, and particularly those relevant to the Tempe General Plan 2040 or the Zoning and Development Code as amended should seek the Involve level of influence at minimum. In planning for more specific areas and neighborhoods, the City should seek to Collaborate. This
manual does not replace careful review of the requirements for Tempe General Plan 2040 adoption and amendments included in the *Tempe General Plan 2040* and *ZDC* as amended.

### Long Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Stakeholder Analysis

A Stakeholder Analysis identifies the community members that have an interest in the process or project in addition to their preliminary concerns or opinions. During the outreach effort, stakeholders should be informed about the general purpose of the planning process, invited to participate, and queried in regard to potential issues and types of concerns.

Internal and external community members that may have an interest in the city’s planning processes are listed below:

**Internal**
- Mayor and Council
- Interdepartmental Staff
- Boards and Commissions

**External**
- Residents
- Property owners
- Neighborhood and Homeowners’ Associations
- Civic, Non-profit and Religious Groups
- Educational Groups (PTAs, school districts, community colleges and ASU)
- Businesses

#### 4. Involvement Techniques and Communication Approach

Public involvement and communication techniques will vary depending on the type of planning process and the stakeholders (see Appendix C). The approach will be to facilitate working directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that the community’s concerns and vision are consistently noted, understood and considered.

While traditional methods (meetings, presentations, and hearings etc.) still play an important role in public engagement, new participation and communication tools will also be extensively used to disseminate information and broaden outreach.

Some or all of the following methods will also be used to achieve broad and continuous public participation:
- Documents will be posted on the project website and made available at the City Clerk’s Office and the Tempe Public Library.
Comment forms will be available at public meeting(s), design charette(s), hearing(s), presentation(s), and on-line.

Community survey(s) of residents, businesses and other interested parties.

Online dialogue and interactive activities. These will include the Tempe Forum powered by Peak Democracy, which was founded to provide an online platform for citizen engagement designed to have the order and decorum of government meetings.

Presentations to stakeholder Boards and Commissions

Dedicated websites and online URLs will be used to share information and to collect feedback throughout the process

Neighborhood Workshops

Focus Groups

Lecture Series

Activities: Visual Preference Survey; Photo Safari; Placemaking Game; Character Area Community Walk / Ride; Self-guided Walking or Biking Tour; Dining Map Punch Card; Meeting-in-a-Box

Web-based Activities; Virtual Meetings (online); WikiMaps Input; Google Earth

Open Houses

Communication methods used may include:

- Press releases
- Tempe Today articles
- Water bill flyer insert
- Brochures and posters placed in common public areas
- Door hangers
- Mailed Notice
- Social media
- Tempe 11 video/banners
- Advertising
- Partner communication vehicles - work with the Neighborhood and Homeowners’ Associations, Tempe Chamber, Tempe Tourism, the Downtown Tempe Community, Arizona State University, the school districts and others to include information in print newsletters, e-newsletters and online.

5. **Project Timeline**

The project timeline will clearly define the various steps to be taken to implement the project and carry out the PIP’s objectives. The timeline should identify key milestones, how and when involvement will occur as well as decision points. Clarity on the anticipated timeline and stakeholder roles is important so that participants know what to expect in regard to next steps in the process as well as an overall time commitment for participation.

6. **Public Input Scheduling, Location & Access**

Public input opportunities need to be scheduled at times and in various locations in the city that help maximize attendance, should be held in locations accessible to persons with disabilities and should be held as near as possible to transit routes when possible.
With 48 hours advance notice, special assistance should be provided for persons with sight and/or hearing impairments; translators should also be made available for meetings when needed.

If required to meet the Arizona Open Meeting Law, agendas for public meetings must be posted at City Hall at least twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the public meeting. (Refer to Arizona Revised Statutes § 38-431.09 for specific requirements.)

7. Responsible Documentation

Documentation of all phases of the process will occur for future use and understanding of how the program worked, what comments were received and how the results of the public involvement were used in the development of the project.

Documentation will include:
- The adopted Public Involvement Program
- List and samples of outreach and communication documents
- Database of participant contact information
- All public comments made
- Results of Surveys

8. Process Evaluation & Conclusion

The City of Tempe seeks continual improvement of all of its activities. Evaluation will be performed throughout the public involvement process to ensure the Public Involvement Program is meeting participation requirements. Feedback opportunities related to public involvement techniques will be provided through the website and meetings and continuously reviewed.

Public Involvement Program’s may change as conditions change or additional resources become available. The most current information about upcoming meetings and comment opportunities will be available on the dedicated website.

III. PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

This Manual provides instructions for private applicants to create a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) after the Site Plan Review comments have been addressed and the project is ready for formal submittal. The purpose of the plan is to ensure that applicants pursue early and effective resident and property owner participation in regards to their land use applications in order to mitigate any real or perceived impacts their application may have on the community. This enables applicants to better comprehend the community’s needs, resolve concerns at an early stage of the process and to facilitate ongoing communication between the applicant, interested citizens, property owners, City staff and elected officials throughout the application review process.
The planning of these projects is primarily conducted by the applicant and through a process required by the City of Tempe Zoning and Development Code (ZDC) as amended. The ZDC as amended explains approval and appeal authorities, detail requirements for application submittal and review, public notice and staff reports, public meetings and public hearings, conditions of approval, re-application and reconsideration of decisions, appeals and time extension, revocation, and transfer of permits/approvals.

Key steps in the public involvement process include: preparing and submitting a PIP to the city for review; implementing a PIP upon approval by the city; and preparing and submitting a Public Involvement Final Report after the implementation of the PIP has been completed.

**Public Involvement Plan**

The completion of the following is necessary for approval of a Public Involvement Plan (PIP). Each item listed below must be addressed in the PIP:

1. Attach a cover page titled “Public Involvement Plan,” which lists information such as the project name, address, general cross streets, and case number(s), if assigned at this time.

2. Provide a brief description of the proposed project, including the specific entitlement request(s).

3. Include a draft copy of your notification letter and sign text in the Plan.

4. Describe the proposed format of the neighborhood meeting.

5. Assess whether language translation is needed for the notification and/or neighborhood meeting.

6. Notification:
   - Include the notification area map and provide a list of the property owners within the area who will be notified.
   - List any Registered Neighborhood and Homeowners’ Associations, and their representatives, who will be notified.
   - Notification must occur a minimum of 15 days prior to the neighborhood meeting.
   - Confirm the date of the neighborhood meeting to ensure City Planning staff attendance whenever possible.

7. Identify to the best of your ability the stakeholders who will be directly and indirectly affected by your proposal and some of the concerns or issues these individuals may have.

8. State how individuals will be informed of any significant changes or amendments to the proposed development after the applicant’s neighborhood meeting (notification by mail, a second neighborhood meeting, etc.).
9. Prepare a schedule with estimated dates for completion of the Public Involvement Plan. This should include:
   - The date the Public Involvement Plan will be submitted to the project planner for review.
   - The estimated date of notification mailings and posting of site.
   - A submittal date for the Public Involvement Final Report (within 5 business days of the neighborhood meeting).

10. Receive sign-off authorization from the assigned Planner for the project, prior to mailing the notifications and posting the sign.

**Public Involvement Final Report**

Following the neighborhood meeting, a Public Involvement Final Report must be submitted. Each item listed below must be addressed in the report.

1. Attach a cover page titled “Public Involvement Final Report,” which lists information such as the project name, address, general cross streets, and case number(s), if assigned at this time.

2. List dates that notification letters and meeting notices were mailed, newsletters, other publications were posted and/or advertised and signs were posted.

3. Attach a map of the notification area.

4. List the names of registered neighborhood and homeowners’ associations that were notified.

5. Identify dates and locations of all meetings where citizens were invited to discuss the proposal. Include a description of the format of the neighborhood meeting.

6. Provide the total number of individuals noticed and the number of people that actually participated in the process. This includes individuals who attended the meeting(s), provided written comments, or phone calls.

7. List concerns and issues expressed by the participants and specify how each has or has not been addressed and why.

8. Attach copies of letters, photos of signs posted, affidavits, meeting invitations, newsletters, publications, meeting sign-in sheets, petitions received in support or against the proposed project, and any other materials pertaining to the public involvement process.

9. Submit Final Report to the assigned Planner for review.
IV. CONCLUSION

Recognizing the importance of informed decision-making, the City of Tempe, through the *Tempe Involving the Public Manual*, has sought to create a document that defines the City’s public involvement processes.

The *Manual* sets expectations for the public on how they can provide input into public and private projects as well as establishing standards for conducting public involvement processes. As noted in this *Manual’s* purpose section, it is important that the public involvement process remain open and flexible. Whether it is a matter of further planning or ongoing regulatory maintenance, it is vital to keep residents and interested parties informed about and engaged in the process.

For more information or assistance, please contact the Neighborhood Services Division at 480-350-8234 or neighborhoods@tempe.gov

An electronic version of the *Manual* is available at www.tempe.gov/TIPManual

The City of Tempe would like to thank the Neighborhood Advisory Commission for its dedication to and hard work on this project.
# APPENDIX A

## Overview Matrix

The Overview Matrix provides general insight into how types of planning, participants, and levels of influence all contribute to the type of public involvement plan that is designed for a given project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLES OF EFFORTS</th>
<th>PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS</th>
<th>CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (CIP)</th>
<th>SERVICE PLANNING</th>
<th>LONG-RANGE PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>Tempe General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Water/Sewer</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Plan 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Character Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO TO INVOLVE</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td>constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacted constituents</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>Impacting</td>
<td>City Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTENTIAL LEVEL OF PUBLIC INFLUENCE</td>
<td>Inform if according to all existing ordinances</td>
<td>Consult to Annual CIP Plan and Budget</td>
<td>Involve up to Collaborate</td>
<td>Involve up to Empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consult or Involve if in need of variances or other special requests</td>
<td>Involve for specific projects</td>
<td>Collaborate for specific project design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLES OF INVOLVEMENT TECHNIQUES*</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Fact Sheets</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Public Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Meetings</td>
<td>Open Houses</td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Design Charrettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>Website Information</td>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informational Meetings</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FEDERAL, STATE, OR LOCAL REGULATIONS MAY DICTATE ADDITIONAL TYPES OF INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION PROCESSES.
# APPENDIX B

## IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum

Developed by 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>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.</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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE TOOLS:</th>
<th>Fact Sheets</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Citizen Advisory Committees</th>
<th>Citizen Juries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Sites</td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Deliberate Polling</td>
<td>Consensus-Building</td>
<td>Ballots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Houses</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory Decision-Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated Decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Techniques to Share Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Think It Through</th>
<th>What Can Go Right?</th>
<th>What Can Go Wrong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Stufflers</strong></td>
<td>Information flyer included with monthly utility bill</td>
<td>Design bill stuffers to be eye-catching to encourage readership</td>
<td>Widespread distribution within service area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economical use of existing mailings</td>
<td>Limited information can be conveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Message may get confused as from the mailing entity</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 Use “show and tell” techniques Bring visuals</td>
<td>Control of information/presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to reach a wide variety of individuals who may not have been attracted to another format</td>
<td>Project stakeholders may not be in target audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to expand mailing list</td>
<td>Topic may be too technical to capture interest of audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar presentations can be used for different groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Builds community goodwill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Information Contacts</strong></td>
<td>Identify designated contacts for the public and media</td>
<td>If possible, list a person not a position Best if contact person is local Anticipate how phones will be answered Make sure message is kept up to date</td>
<td>People don’t get “the run around” when they call Controls information flow Conveys image of “accessibility”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert Panels</strong></td>
<td>Public meeting designed in “Meet the Press” format. Media panel interviews experts from different perspectives. Can also be conducted with a neutral moderator asking questions of panel members.</td>
<td>Provide opportunity for participation by general public following panel Have a neutral moderator Agree on ground rules in advance Possibly encourage local organizations to sponsor rather than challenge</td>
<td>Encourages education of the media Presents opportunity for balanced discussion of key issues Provides opportunity to dispel scientific misinformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An IAP2 Tipsheet provides more information about this technique. Tipsheets are included as part of the course materials for IAP2’s Techniques for Effective Public Participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Think It Through</th>
<th>What Can Go Right?</th>
<th>What Can Go Wrong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEATURE STORIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused stories on general project-related issues</td>
<td>Anticipate visuals or schedule interesting events to help sell the story. Recognize that reporters are always looking for an angle.</td>
<td>Can heighten the perceived importance of the project. More likely to be read and taken seriously by the public.</td>
<td>No control over what information is presented or how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIELD OFFICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices established with prescribed hours to distribute information and respond to inquiries</td>
<td>Provide adequate staff to accommodate group tours. Use brochures and videotapes to advertise and reach broader audience. Consider providing internet access station. Select an accessible and frequented location.</td>
<td>Excellent opportunity to educate school children. Places information dissemination in a positive educational setting. Information is easily accessible to the public. Provides an opportunity for more responsive ongoing communications focused on specific public involvement activities.</td>
<td>Relatively expensive, especially for project-specific use. Access is limited to those in vicinity of the center unless facility is mobile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOT LINES</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. If possible, list a person not a position. Best if contact person is local.</td>
<td>People don’t get “the run around” when they call. Controls information flow. Conveys image of “accessibility.” Easy to provide updates on project activities.</td>
<td>Designated contact must be committed to and prepared for prompt and accurate responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION KIOSKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A station where project information is available.</td>
<td>Make sure the information presented is appropriately tailored to the audience you want to reach. Place in well traveled areas. Can be temporary or permanent.</td>
<td>Can reach large numbers of people. Can use computer technology to make the kiosk interactive and to gather comments.</td>
<td>Equipment or materials may “disappear.” Information needs to be kept up to date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Techniques to Share Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Think It Through</th>
<th>What Can Go Right?</th>
<th>What Can Go Wrong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Repositories</strong></td>
<td>Make sure personnel at location know where materials are kept</td>
<td>Relevant information is accessible to the public without incurring the costs or complications of tracking multiple copies sent to different people</td>
<td>Information repositories are often not well used by the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, city halls, distribution centers, schools, and other public facilities make good locations for housing project-related information</td>
<td>Keep list of repository items</td>
<td>Can set up visible distribution centers for project information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track usage through a sign-in sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lистserves and E-mail</strong></td>
<td>People read and share e-mail quite differently from hard copy mail. Thus you must write messages differently.</td>
<td>As an inexpensive way to directly reach stakeholders</td>
<td>Can be difficult to maintain accurate, current e-mail addresses as these tend to change more frequently than postal addresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both listservs and email are electronic mailing lists. With listservs, anyone can register on the listserv to receive any messages sent to the listserv. With e-mail, someone needs to create and maintain an electronic distribution list for the project.</td>
<td>Augment with hard copy mail for those who prefer it or who don't have ready e-mail access.</td>
<td>When you hope people will pass on messages to others since electronic-based mail is much easier to share than hard copies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To share information of any sort including notifying stakeholders when new material is posted to a Web site, inviting them to upcoming meetings, including comment and evaluation forms, sharing summaries of meetings, comments and input, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>News Conferences</strong></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>Newspaper Inserts</strong></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>A “fact sheet” within the local newspaper</td>
<td>Try on a day that has few other inserts</td>
<td>Presented in the context of local paper, insert is 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>
</tbody>
</table>
### PRESS RELEASES & PRESS PACKETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</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>Press packets (provides resource and background information plus contact information)</td>
<td>Foster a relationship with editorial board and reporters</td>
<td>Pressreleaselanguageisoftenused directly in articles</td>
<td>Frequent poor placement of press release within newspapers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRINT ADVERTISEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid advertisements in newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>Figure out the best days and best sections of the paper to reach intended audience</td>
<td>Potentially reaches broad public</td>
<td>Expensive, especially in urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid rarely read notice sections</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allows for relatively limited amount of information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRINTED PUBLIC INFORMATION MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fact Sheets</td>
<td>KISS! Keep It Short and Simple</td>
<td>Can reach large target audience</td>
<td>Only as good as the mailing list/distribution network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Make it visually interesting but avoid a slick sales look</td>
<td>Allows for technical and legal reviews</td>
<td>Limited capability to communicate complicated concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>Include a postage-paid comment form to encourage two-way communication and to expand mailing list</td>
<td>Encourages written responses if comment form enclosed</td>
<td>No guarantee materials will be read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Papers</td>
<td>Be sure to explain public role and how public comments have affected project decisions. Q&amp;A format works well</td>
<td>Facilitates documentation of public involvement process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A form of documentation that provides feedback to the public regarding comments received and how they are being incorporated</td>
<td>May be used to comply with legal requirements for comment documentation. Use publicly and openly to announce and show how all comments were addressed</td>
<td>Responsiveness summaries can be an effective way to demonstrate how public comments are addressed in the decision process.</td>
<td>With a large public, the process of response documentation can get unwieldy, especially if Web-based comments are involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TECHNICAL INFORMATION CONTACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>TECHNIQUE</td>
<td>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 REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical documents reporting research or policy findings</td>
<td>Reports are often more credible if prepared by independent groups</td>
<td>Provides for thorough explanation of project decisions</td>
<td>Can be more detailed than desired by many participants. May not be written in clear, accessible language</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. Check out expanding video options on the internet</td>
<td>Can be used in multiple geographic areas. Many people will take the time to watch rather than read. Provides opportunity for positive media coverage at groundbreaking and other significant events</td>
<td>High expense. Difficult to gauge impact on audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLD WIDE WEB SITES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Each Web page must be independent. Put critical information at the top of page. Use headings, bulleted and numbered lists to steer user</td>
<td>Reaches across distances. Makes information accessible anywhere at any time. Saves printing and mailing costs</td>
<td>Users may not have easy access to the Internet or knowledge of how to use computers. Large files or graphics can take a long time to download</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Techniques to Compile and Provide Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Think It Through</th>
<th>What Can Go Right?</th>
<th>What Can Go Wrong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail-In forms often included in fact sheets and other project mailings to gain information on public concerns and preferences. Can provide a Web-based or e-mailed form.</td>
<td>Use prepaid postage. Include a section to add name to the mailing list. Document results as part of public involvement record.</td>
<td>Provides input from those who would be unlikely to attend meetings. Provides a mechanism for expanding mailing list.</td>
<td>Does not generate statistically valid results. Only as good as the mailing list. Results can be easily skewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer-Based Polling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys conducted via computer network.</td>
<td>Appropriate for attitudinal research. Provides instant analyses of results. Can be used in multiple areas. Novelty of technique improves rate of response.</td>
<td></td>
<td>High expense. Detail of inquiry is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilitators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delphi Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A method of obtaining agreement on forecasts or other parameters by a group of people without the need for a face-to-face group process. The process involves several iterations of participant responses to a questionnaire and results tabulation and dissemination until additional iterations don't result in significant changes.</td>
<td>Delphi processes provide an opportunity to develop agreement among a group of people without the need for meeting. Delphi processes can be conducted more rapidly with computer technology. You can modify the Delphi process to get agreement on sets of individuals to be representatives on advisory groups, to be presenters at symposia, etc.</td>
<td>Can be done anonymously so that people whose answers differ substantially from the norm can feel comfortable expressing themselves. A Delphi process can be especially useful when participants are in different geographic locations.</td>
<td>Keeping participants engaged and active in each round may be a challenge.</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 results is clear before technique is designed.</td>
<td>Provides traceable data. Reaches broad, representative public.</td>
<td>Expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNIQUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>THINK IT THROUGH</strong></td>
<td><strong>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</strong></td>
<td><strong>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNET SURVEYS/POLLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web-based response polls</td>
<td>Be precise in how you set up site; chat rooms or discussion places can generate more input than can be reviewed</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><strong>INTERVIEWS</strong></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 non-threatening forum</td>
<td>Scheduling multiple interviews can be time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one meetings with stakeholders to gain information for developing or refining public involvement and consensus-building programs</td>
<td>Provides opportunity to obtain feedback from all stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can be used to evaluate potential citizen committee members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAILED SURVEYS &amp; QUESTIONNAIRES</strong></td>
<td>Make sure you need statistically valid results before making investment</td>
<td>Provides input from individuals who would be unlikely to attend meetings</td>
<td>Response rate is generally low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiries mailed randomly to sample population to gain specific information for statistical validation</td>
<td>Survey/questionnaire should be professionally developed and administered to avoid bias</td>
<td>Provides input from cross-section of public, not just activists</td>
<td>For statistically valid results, can be labor intensive and expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most suitable for general attitudinal surveys</td>
<td>Statistically valid results are more persuasive with political bodies and the general public</td>
<td>Level of detail may be limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENT FEEDBACK REGISTERS</strong></td>
<td>Think through what terms the participants should have. In the United Kingdom, 2 years is common.</td>
<td>Useful in gathering input from “regular” citizens, on an ongoing basis, instead of just from representatives of interest groups or those who more typically come to meetings, participate on advisory groups, etc.</td>
<td>Panel may not be credible with the larger community if people feel they have not been selected fairly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A randomly selected database of residents created to give feedback to an agency, business, or organization about its services, priorities, project or contentious issues.</td>
<td>Using an independent company to select the participants will help allay any cynical concerns of “handpicking” residents to get the answer sponsors want</td>
<td>Provides useful input without requiring people to come to meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TECHNIQUES TO COMPILE AND PROVIDE FEEDBACK

#### TELEPHONE SURVEYS/POLLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sampling of population by telephone to gain specific information for statistical validation</td>
<td>Make sure you need statistically valid results before making investment</td>
<td>Provides input from individuals who would be unlikely to attend meetings</td>
<td>More expensive and labor intensive than mailed surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey/questionnaire should be professionally developed and administered to avoid bias</td>
<td>Provides input from cross-section of public, not just those on mailing list</td>
<td>Higher response rate than with mail-in surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most suitable for general attitudinal surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Techniques to Bring People Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Think It Through</th>
<th>What Can Go Right?</th>
<th>What Can Go Wrong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appreciative Inquiry Processes</strong></td>
<td>Requires “whole system” involvement; participants should be a microcosm of the potentially affected public. Process requires an especially high level of engagement by core team members.</td>
<td>Creates high level of engagement and commitment to change as an ongoing process, not a one-time event. Fosters positive, grassroots level action Connects the community by celebrating stories that reflect the best of what is and has been.</td>
<td>Participants need to “own” and co-create the process. Core team members may burn out. Given the high level of engagement, people expect to see changes as a result of the process. The sponsor of the process needs to be truly committed to the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charrettes</strong></td>
<td>Best used to foster creative ideas Be clear about how results will be used</td>
<td>Promotes joint problem solving and creative thinking</td>
<td>Participants may not be seen as representative by larger public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen Juries</strong></td>
<td>Requires skilled moderator Commissioning body must follow recommendations or explain why Be clear about how results will be used</td>
<td>Great opportunity to develop deep understanding of an issue Public can identify with the “ordinary” citizens Pinpoint fatal flaws or gauge public reaction</td>
<td>Resource intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coffee Klatches – Kitchen Table Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Make sure staff is very polite and appreciative</td>
<td>Relaxed setting is conducive to effective dialogue Maximizes two-way communication</td>
<td>Can be costly and labor intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer-Assisted Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Understand your audience, particularly the demographic categories Design the inquiries to provide useful results Use facilitator trained in the technique and technology</td>
<td>Immediate graphic results prompt focused discussion Areas of agreement/disagreement easily portrayed Minority views are honored Responses are private Levels the playing field</td>
<td>Software limits design Potential for placing too much emphasis on numbers Technology failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>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>DELIBERATIVE DIALOGUES</strong></td>
<td>A systematic dialogic process that brings people together as a group to make choices about difficult, complex public issues where there is a lot of uncertainty about solutions and a high likelihood of people polarizing on the issue. The goal of deliberation is to find where there is common ground for action.</td>
<td>Considerable upfront planning and preparation may be needed. The deliberation revolves around 3 or 4 options described in an Issue or Options booklet. Process should be facilitated by a trained moderator. Deliberation should occur in a relatively small group, about 8 to 20 people. A larger public may need to break into several forums, requiring more moderators.</td>
<td>Participants openly share different perspectives and end up with a broader view on an issue. A diverse group identifies the area of common ground, within which decision makers can make policies and plans. Participants may not truly reflect different perspectives. Participants are not willing to openly discuss areas of conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **DELIBERATIVE POLLING PROCESSES** | Measures informed opinion on an issue. More Info: The Center for Deliberative Democracy http://cdd.stanford.edu | Do not expect or encourage participants to develop a shared view. Hire a facilitator experienced in this technique. | Can tell decision makers what the public would think if they had more time and information. Exposure to different backgrounds, arguments and views. Resource intensive. Often held in conjunction with television companies. 2- to 3-day meeting. |

| **DIALOGUE TECHNIQUES** | An intentional form of communication that supports the creation of shared meaning. Dialogue requires discipline to intentionally suspend judgment and fully listen to one another. Participants need to be open to communication that engages both thinking and feeling. Participants need to feel safe to speak truthfully. It is important to carefully craft questions to be addressed in dialogue. | The group engages in “the art of thinking together” and creates shared meaning on a difficult issue. A new understanding of a problem or opportunity emerges. Participants are “ready” to engage in dialogic communication. They may not able to move from individual positions and reflectively listen to each other. |

<p>| <strong>FAIRS &amp; EVENTS</strong> | 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. Conductive 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. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Think It Through</th>
<th>What Can Go Right?</th>
<th>What Can Go Wrong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISHBOWL PROCESSES</strong></td>
<td>A meeting where decision makers do their work in a “fishbowl” so that the public can openly view their deliberations.</td>
<td>The meeting can be designed so that the public can participate by joining the fishbowl temporarily or moving about the room to indicate preferences.</td>
<td>Transparent decision making. Decision makers are able to gauge public reaction in the course of their deliberations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUSED CONVERSATIONS</strong></td>
<td>A structured approach to exploring a challenging situation or difficult issue by using a series of questions arranged in four stages: Objective — Review facts Reflective — Review emotional response Interpretive — Review meaning Decisional — Consider future action</td>
<td>Plan the series of questions ahead of time and don’t skip a step. May be used in many different settings, from debriefing a process to exploring the level of agreement on a given topic. Be clear on the intent of the conversation.</td>
<td>People learn new information and insights on a complex issue. People learn to respect and understand other views. The decisional steps leads to individual or collective action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUS GROUPS</strong></td>
<td>Message testing forum with randomly selected members of target audience. Can also be used to obtain input on planning decisions</td>
<td>Conduct at least two sessions for a given target Use a skilled focus group facilitator to conduct the session</td>
<td>Provides opportunity to test key messages prior to implementing program Works best for select target audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE SEARCH CONFERENCES</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on the future of an organization, a network of people or community More Info: Future Search Network <a href="http://www.futuresearch.net">www.futuresearch.net</a></td>
<td>Hire a facilitator experienced in this technique</td>
<td>Can involve hundreds of people simultaneously in major organizational change decisions Individuals are experts Can lead to substantial changes across entire organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEETINGS WITH EXISTING GROUPS</strong></td>
<td>Small meetings with existing groups or in conjunction with another group’s event</td>
<td>Understand who the likely audience is to be Make opportunities for one-on-one meetings</td>
<td>Opportunity to get on the agenda Provides opportunity for in-depth information exchange in non-threatening forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TECHNIQUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONGOING ADVISORY GROUPS</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A group of representative stakeholders assembled to provide public input to the planning process. May also have members from the project team and experts.</td>
<td>Define roles and responsibilities up front</td>
<td>Provides for detailed analyses for project issues</td>
<td>General public may not embrace committee's recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be forthcoming with information</td>
<td>Participants gain understanding of other perspectives, leading toward compromise</td>
<td>Members may not achieve consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use a consistently credible process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor must accept need for give-and-take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview potential committee members in person before selection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time and labor intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use third-party facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OPEN HOUSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN HOUSES</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An open house encourages the public to tour at their own pace. The facility should be set up with several informational stations, each addressing a separate issue. Resource people guide participants through the exhibits.</td>
<td>Someone should explain format at the door</td>
<td>Foster small group or one-on-one communications</td>
<td>Difficult to document public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have each participant fill out a comment sheet to document their participation</td>
<td>Ability to draw on other team members to answer difficult questions</td>
<td>Agitators may stage themselves at each display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be prepared for a crowd all at once — develop a meeting contingency plan</td>
<td>Less likely to receive media coverage</td>
<td>Usually more staff intensive than a meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage people to draw on maps to actively participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set up stations so that several people (6-10) can view at once</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OPEN SPACE MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN SPACE MEETINGS</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants offer topics and others participate according to interest</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>
</tbody>
</table>

## PANELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PANELS</th>
<th>THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A group assembled to debate or provide input on specific issues</td>
<td>Most 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></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>TECHNIQUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>THINK IT THROUGH</strong></td>
<td><strong>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT?</strong></td>
<td><strong>WHAT CAN GO WRONG?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC HEARINGS</strong></td>
<td>Formal meetings with scheduled presentations offered. Typically, members of the public individually state opinions/positions that are recorded.</td>
<td>May be required by sponsor and/or legal requirement</td>
<td>Provides opportunity for public to speak without rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC MEETINGS</strong></td>
<td>An organized large-group meeting usually used to make a presentation and give the public an opportunity to ask questions and give comments. Public meetings are open to the public at large</td>
<td>Set up the meeting to be as welcoming and receptive as possible to ideas and opinions and to increase interaction between technical staff and the public. Review all materials and presentations ahead of time.</td>
<td>Participants hear relevant information and have an open opportunity to ask questions and comment. People learn more by hearing others’ questions and comments. Legal requirements are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVOLVING CONVERSATIONS (ALSO KNOW AS SAMOAN CIRCLES)</strong></td>
<td>Leaderless meeting that stimulates active participation</td>
<td>Set room up with center table surrounded by concentric circles Need microphones Requires several people to record</td>
<td>Can be used with 10 to 500 people Works best with controversial issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDY CIRCLES</strong></td>
<td>A highly participatory process for involving numerous small groups in making a difference in their communities.</td>
<td>Study circles work best if multiple groups working at the same time in different locations and then come together to share. Study circles are typically structured around a study circle guide</td>
<td>Large numbers of people are involved without having them all meet at the same time and place. A diverse group of people agrees on opportunities for action to create social change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYMPOSIA</strong></td>
<td>A meeting or conference to discuss a particular topic involving multiple speakers.</td>
<td>Provides an opportunity for presentations by experts with different views on a topic. Requires upfront planning to identify appropriate speakers. Needs strong publicity.</td>
<td>People learn new information on different sides of an issue. Provides a foundation for informed involvement by the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Think It Through</th>
<th>What Can Go Right?</th>
<th>What Can Go Wrong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Forces – Expert Committee</strong></td>
<td>Obtain strong leadership in advance</td>
<td>Findings of a task force of independent or diverse interests will have greater credibility</td>
<td>Task force may not come to consensus or results may be too general to be meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of experts or representative stakeholders formed to develop a specific product or policy recommendation</td>
<td>Make sure membership has credibility with the public</td>
<td>Provides constructive opportunity for compromise</td>
<td>Time and labor intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tours and Field Trips — Guided and Self-Guided</strong></td>
<td>Provide tours for key stakeholders, elected officials, advisory group members and the media</td>
<td>Know how many participants can be accommodated and make plans for overflow</td>
<td>Opportunity to develop rapport with key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan question/answer session</td>
<td>Reduces outrage by making choices more familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider providing refreshments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrations work better than presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can be implemented as a self-guided with an itinerary and tour journal of guided questions and observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Meetings</strong></td>
<td>A group meeting format where people come together as equals to share concerns.</td>
<td>Town meetings are often hosted by elected officials to elicit input from constituents.</td>
<td>Views are openly expressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are cultural and political differences in the understanding of the term “town meeting.” It may be interpreted differently wherever you are working.</td>
<td>Officials hear from their constituents in an open forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web-Based Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Meetings that occur via the Internet</td>
<td>Tailor agenda to your participants</td>
<td>Cost and time efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combine telephone and face-to-face meetings with Web-based meetings.</td>
<td>Can include a broader audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan for graphics and other supporting materials</td>
<td>People can participate at different times or at the same time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TECHNIQUES TO BRING PEOPLE TOGETHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Think It Through</th>
<th>What Can Go Right?</th>
<th>What Can Go Wrong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></td>
<td>Ability to draw on other team members to answer difficult questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Builds credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximizes feedback obtained from participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fosters public ownership in solving the problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLD CAFES</strong></td>
<td>Room set-up is important. The room should feel conducive to a conversation and not as institutional as the standard meeting format. Allows for people to work in small groups without staff facilitators. Think through how to bring closure to the series of conversations.</td>
<td>Participants feel a stronger connection to the full group because they have talked to people at different tables. Good questions help people move from raising concerns to learning new views and co-creating solutions.</td>
<td>Participants resist moving from table to table. Reporting results at the end becomes awkward or tedious for a large group. The questions evoke the same responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE
May 2, 2017

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items

PURPOSE
The Chair will request future agenda items from the Commission members.

BACKGROUND
The following future agenda items have been previously identified by the Commission or staff:

- June 13
  - McClintock Drive Street Configuration
  - Road Construction Traffic Mitigation
- July 11
  - Autonomous Vehicles
  - Western Canal Expansion MUP Final Design
  - Highline Canal MUP Final Design
- August 8
  - Leading vs. Lagging Left Turn Signals
  - Bus Security Program
  - Plan for Expansion of Bicycle/Pedestrian Paths
  - Streetcar
- September 12
  - Fifth Street Project Update
  - Annual Report
  - North/South Railroad Spur MUP
- October 10
  - Annual Report
  - Alameda Drive
- November 12
  - Bike Share Update
  - Streetcar
  - Speed Limits
- December 12
- TBD: Bicycle/Pedestrian Signal Activate Operations Update
- TBD: Small Area Transportation Study
- TBD: Prop 500
RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information only.

CONTACT
Shelly Seyler
480-350-8854
shelly_seyler@tempe.gov