



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
130 WEST CONGRESS, 10TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
P.O. Box 27210
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85726-7210

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES

Prepared for the Joint City / County
Water and Wastewater Oversight Committee

April 18, 2008

- Pima County: Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan
- East Valley Water Forum
- TREO Economic Blueprint
- PAG 2030 Regional Transportation Plan "Program for Active Community Engagement"
- Tucson Water: Mid-Sized – Avra Valley Citizens Oversight Committee
- Tucson Water: Large – Decision H2O
- City of Tucson: Public Safety Impact Fees
- Pima County Inclusive Home Design Ordinance
- Pima County Bond Program

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES
April 16, 2008

NAME OF PROCESS: TREO ECONOMIC BLUEPRINT	
Contact:	Laura Shaw, Senior Vice President of Corporate and Community Affairs / 243-1940
Who Participated?:	46 member steering committee Stakeholder Groups: Business, transportation and infrastructure, higher education, education K-12, media, financial organizations, jurisdictions, economic development groups, community foundations and organizations, human capital and workforce, healthcare, environment, tourism, arts and culture, tribal nations, real estate, technology businesses, TREO Investors, Entrepreneurship Development
Study Area	Pima County specific (no adjoining counties)
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	Develop a common vision and framework to move forward together. Develop a long term economic development strategy and prioritize money and staff resources. What should TREO focus on in terms of targeted industries?
Public Information Methods	Summary Report, Fact Sheets, Blueprint Analysis, Videos, Website, Media Relations (editorial board meetings)
Participation Methods	Steering Committee One on one interviews Focus Groups (e.g. young professionals) Work Groups (12 separate groups) Surveys
Positive Outcomes	Implementation plan / mobilization teams Report card on community measures
Lessons Learned	Worked well to have one big, inclusive event at beginning and one at end – sent the message that this is an open process Important to track everyone who participated
How staffed?	Nancy Smith and Joe Snell full time. Several others on senior team also heavily involved. Consultant (250K) – K&K Consulting.
Timeframe (start / end dates)	9/06 – 3/07

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES
April 16, 2008

NAME OF PROCESS: EAST VALLEY WATER FORUM	
Contact:	Theresa Makinem, Executive Director -- (602) 421-3069
Who Participated?:	Technical stakeholders community, e.g. water resource planners, engineers, water providers
Study Area	Gila River to Scottsdale / E. of Apache Junction to just W. of Tempe (a little portion of Phoenix included)
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	Go beyond ADWR Third Management Plan to examine water resource management at a more localized, specific level, e.g. in terms of where groundwater is withdrawn and where it is recharged. Desired outcome was to develop a Water Management Plan based on technical analysis at a localized level.
Public Information Methods	A website was maintained throughout the study process to keep members informed. An extensive email list also was used for meeting announcements and to promote good communication and feedback among members. Once the technical study was completed, now they are developing public info documents, e.g. brochures, DVD.
Participation Methods	Many meetings. Some sub-groups established to do specific pieces such as writing the plan, assessing infrastructure, modeling different scenarios.
Positive Outcomes	Got everyone talking to each other – resulted in improved trust. Participants came a way with a shared recognition of the importance of recharge and its link to water withdrawal.
Lessons Learned	The hardest thing was keeping everyone informed and involved at the level they wanted to be. To help make the process open – they changed the locations of the meetings sometimes so they were held in different geographic areas. Some meetings needed to be long – e.g. 3.5 hours – in order to get to meaningful outcomes. Found they needed flexibility – better not to make it too tightly scheduled.
How staffed?	One coordinator (Theresa) and staff (e.g. hydrologists) from ADWR and Bureau of Reclamation.
Timeframe (start / end dates)	Unclear

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES
April 16, 2008

NAME OF PROCESS:	
City of Tucson - Public Safety Impact Fees	
Contact:	Nicole Ewing Gavin, City Manager's Office 791-4204
Who Participated?:	Process was open to all "interested parties" – there were 25 regular participants throughout the process representing real estate/builders/developers, non-profit builders, interested citizens and staff from relevant city departments
Study Area	City of Tucson limits
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop and implement a fair and acceptable impact fee program to generate public safety revenue to fund infrastructure and facilities to serve new growth • The Tucson City Council requested stakeholder input as part of their consideration of the new impact fees.
Public Information Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An impact fee study formed the basis for the process. The study was presented in a clear and simple manner to facilitate stakeholder understanding. • The input given by stakeholders at each meeting shaped the agenda for future meetings. For example, stakeholders wanted specifics on how the impact fees would be used, and city staff worked to develop a 10 year conceptual project plan and map showing how and where impact fees would be spent. • An issue tracking sheet was used throughout the process to keep track of issues raised, their status, and if not yet resolved, when they were scheduled to be discussed again.
Participation Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of six open stakeholder meetings were held between March 21 and May 23, 2007. The meetings were led by Nicole Ewing Gavin, a project manager with the City's planning department who conducted the impact fee study. • The invitation list for the meetings included approximately 50 people who had participated in previous impact fee stakeholder processes, or had expressed interest in participating in the current discussions. The meetings

	were also mentioned in an <i>Arizona Daily Star</i> article.
Positive Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders expressed satisfaction with the process at the Mayor and Council public hearing on the proposed fees • The impact fees were adopted • Changes and compromises were made to the original study and proposed ordinance based on stakeholder input – the ultimate product was made better as a result of the public process
Lessons Learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The keys to the success of this process were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Bringing data, information, and knowledge to bear on the discussions (this often meant many hours of research between meetings) ⇒ Allocating sufficient time for dialogue to discuss alternatives, raise concerns, ask questions, etc. ⇒ The strong commitment by a diverse group of participants to move forward and reach common ground ⇒ Tracking givens/resolved issues and yet-to-be discussed/outstanding issues helped keep discussion of a complex topic organized and the process moving forward ⇒ A tight timeframe and end date set by the City Council was helpful in moving through the process in an efficient manner
How staffed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Planning staff conducted the study and facilitated the stakeholder process • A consultant was used as a 3rd party reviewer of the study and attended stakeholder meetings to provide a 3rd party perspective on questions and issues that arose
Timeframe (start / end dates)	Stakeholder meetings were held March – May 2007

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES
April 16, 2008

NAME OF PROCESS:	
Pima County Bond Election Planning Process – on going	
Contact:	Nicole Fyffe, County Administrator’s Office
Who Participated?:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 member Bond Advisory Committee • Subcommittees of the Bond Advisory Committee • Other standing County committee’s and commissions • Representatives from cities, towns, and tribes • Written comments received from 2700 people to date • Public at open houses and neighborhood meetings • Public at committee meetings
Study Area	County-wide, including incorporated jurisdictions and tribes
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	A Bond Advisory Committee recommended list of bond projects to be included in a future bond election.
Public Information Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • web site • notices and articles in newspapers • email distribution list
Participation Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public comment periods during all committee and subcommittee meetings • open houses in various locations • neighborhood meetings • email address for comments • written comments • phone comments
Positive Outcomes	Public has assisted Bond Committee in prioritizing the list of proposed bond projects
Lessons Learned	Better turn out at regular neighborhood meetings versus holding open houses
How staffed?	Coordinator from the County Administrator’s office, and County staff from departments requesting bond projects. No external consultants.
Timeframe (start / end dates)	November 2006 to April 2008 and on going

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES
April 16, 2008

NAME OF PROCESS: SONORAN DESERT CONSERVATION PLAN	
Contact:	Nicole Fyffe, Pima County Administrator's Office
Who Participated?:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 84 steering committee members representing environmental groups, real estate development and housing interests, the business community, ranchers, neighborhood associations, mining interests, and people not aligned with any particular interest group. 2. General public at open houses and public meetings 3. Technical experts
Study Area	Pima County
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	Develop a plan to balance continued economic development with conservation of natural and cultural resources.
Public Information Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website (as of 2004, 27,000 users accessed the site) • Newsletters • 13 educational sessions held over 8 months.
Participation Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee of 84 members – all meetings open to the public, average attendance 115 people, including 13 educational sessions. The Board accepted anyone that asked to be on the Committee. • 2 comment periods on draft versions of the plan that included open houses and solicitation of written comments – over 200 written comments • 2 sets of additional open houses not associated with the release of particular documents • All technical team meetings were open to the public. • 7 sub-regional land use panels and 300 panel members associated with the Comprehensive Plan Update • Kids educational effort • Over 400 public meetings were held. • The Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update included 7 sub-regional land use panels. Over 30 meetings took place at the land use panel level involving over 300 panel members, including 40 of the SDCP Steering Committee members.

Positive Outcomes	A plan was adopted that was supported by the Steering Committee, and the plan is currently being implemented throughout the County. Over 125,000 acres are now in conservation status via the County's open space bond programs and set-asides via the development process.
Lessons Learned	Conducting an extensive public outreach effort led to a successful and well supported plan, and has assisted with long term implementation efforts.
How staffed?	<p>Program Manager and Assistant from County Administrator's office, along with a team of staff members from several other County departments.</p> <p>Outside consultant facilitated the Steering Committee for 2 years</p>
Timeframe (start / end dates)	1998-2003

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES
April 16, 2008

NAME OF PROCESS: INCLUSIVE HOME DESIGN ORDINANCE	
Contact:	Carmine DeBonis, Director, Pima County Development Services
Who Participated?	Disabled community, homebuilder community, architects
Study Area	Unincorporated Pima County
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	Develop standards for accessibility for single family housing
Public Information Methods	Meeting agendas Meeting minutes
Participation Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder forum • Series of meetings held with stakeholder groups and County Building Codes staff
Positive Outcomes	<p>Significant progress made to bring different interests closer to agreement</p> <p>An Ordinance was adopted establishing requirements for single family residential housing to provide for amenities or accessories to serve disabled people.</p>
Lessons Learned	Differences worked through in a prioritized manner to reach an acceptable set of standards
How staffed?	Building Safety Official and Development Services Department Director primarily
Timeframe (start / end dates)	?

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES
April 16, 2008

NAME OF PROCESS: LARGE – Decision H2O	
Contact:	Mitch Basefsky, Tucson Water
Who Participated?	Tucson Water customers and members of general public
Study Area	Tucson Water Service Area
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	<p>As more Colorado River water enters our drinking water supply, mineral content will rise. A decision must be made as to whether to allow the rise to proceed naturally, or to build and operate a treatment facility to stabilize mineral content.</p> <p>The Decision H2O Outreach program was designed to provide customers with opportunity to learn more about mineral content, the costs and benefits related to both sides of the decision (to treat or not to treat). Blind taste tests of the two blends were offered and a survey conducted to determine consumer preferences.</p>
Public Information Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printed materials – Bill inserts, informational flyers • Electronic – Public Service Announcements (Eng/Span) • Earned Media –extensive interaction with all local media • Web-based information – A unique web site was developed with all information, including weekly updates on survey results and a comment/question hyperlink • Consumer Panels – essentially focus groups to refine taste-testing methods, informational materials, messages • Informational/Taste-testing kiosks in two regional shopping malls and two mobile kiosks used throughout the service area • Surveys at all public venues to record consumer preferences • All materials carried a series of underlying messages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliability ○ Sustainability ○ Collaborative Decision Making ○ Appropriate Investment
Participation Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shopping mall and mobile kiosks • Surveys at all public kiosk/taste test locations • Web based comment/question hyperlink • Taste tests at community events, service and business group meetings • Comment cards to ensure unanswered questions were

	captured
Positive Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer preferences collected from nearly 14,000 Tucson Water customers • Broad visibility of campaign – even those who did not participate were aware they had the opportunity • Provided forum to discuss other water related issues (e.g. other quality issues, resource management, conservation) • Visible demonstration of Tucson Water’s commitment to engage customers in important decisions about water • Participating staff received broad education in issues of concern to consumers • Participating staff received training in successful public interaction • Tucson Water received national attention for public involvement effort
Lessons Learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary research was critical to providing accurate information to target audience and general public • Determine what you want to learn from audiences and what you want them to ‘take away’, and then develop your involvement materials and surveys • Generating enthusiasm among participating staff is an important step <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staffing such a large and labor intensive effort proved very difficult and expensive ○ Significant effort needs to be made to ensure that impacts to core functions of the organization were minimized ○ Training staff in both subject matter and public interaction is required ○ Timing of campaign (over Holiday season) reached a larger audience, but required extended staffing hours • Consumers are eager to participate in decision process • Consumers are fairly divided on preference for mineral content – approx 50% for and against mineral control • Simple messages and graphics helped inform consumers • Providing regular feedback to customers helped generate enthusiasm and credibility in the process.
How staffed?	Assigned staff from within Tucson Water. In an effort to reduce overtime, hourly staff were assigned to outreach schedules during normal working hours – or flex hours. Evening and weekend hours were assigned to overtime exempt staff. More than 150 Tucson Water employees spent nearly 4000 hours participating in outreach activities
Timeframe (start / end dates)	Outreach campaign – October 2006 through January 2007

NAME OF PROCESS:	Mid-Sized – Avra Valley Citizens Oversight Committee
Contact:	Mitch Basefsky, Tucson Water
Who Participated?:	Residents neighboring CAP Recharge and Recovery Facility
Study Area	Same as above
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	To interact with and gain support of residents neighboring the planned Central Avra Valley Storage and Recovery Project Ultimately, to prove to those residents – who are not customers of Tucson Water – that their interests were being considered and protected as part of the planning, construction and operation of the facility
Public Information Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An open-ended outreach to the residents in the valley surrounding the recharge and recovery project was begun in June 1996. • A Neighborhood Contact Team went door-to-door and met with hundreds of area residents or left a project information sheet which included a phone number to call for more information. • More than 2,900 residents received a mailed invitation to attend an Open House to learn about the project, view conceptual plans, and give feedback to the utility. • At the Open House, interested citizens were given an opportunity to join an Avra Valley Citizens’ Oversight Committee (AVCOC). Other citizens could volunteer their private wells for future monitoring. • Printed materials
Participation Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open House • Dedicated project phone line • Project site tours • Monthly AVCOC meetings with Tucson Water and the project contractors 1996 – 2002. Milestone meetings thereafter. • The 31 Committee members represented the concerns of the citizens to the City, and act as the City’s ambassadors in distributing information and answers to their neighbors.
Positive Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The citizens, who initially were opposed to the project, gradually began to believe that their concerns were, indeed, being addressed, and that honest responses to their concerns were available. • Numerous changes to the design of the project were negotiated in response to Committee requests, including dust and noise mitigation, mosquito control, and sampling of private wells near the project site that might be affected by long-term operation of the project.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By negotiating these citizen-led improvements, Tucson Water was able to generate buy-in to the project as a whole. • Ultimately, the members of the Citizens' Oversight Committee became supporters, willing to speak out and write articles in the local newsletter on behalf of the project.
Lessons Learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff and leadership must commit to support true public involvement – not just public information • Tucson Water had to listen and take appropriate actions in response to AVCOC concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This may cost money and effort • Bringing in unaffiliated experts (sound design, mosquito control) helped build credibility • A facilitator was very helpful in assuring meetings were functional, action items recorded and addressed, minutes were taken and distributed, and participant issues were included in agendas • Transparency about what is and isn't possible, and follow-through on the possible is critical to build trust • Build toward a common purpose – the AVCOC came to believe that the success of the project was in their best interests, and members became personally committed to the project • Don't sweat the small stuff – spending an additional \$5,000 to address a neighbors concern was a sound investment in this \$75 million project
How staffed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Information staff, a facilitator and the contractor representatives attended every meeting • Staff representing project planning, hydrology, construction, operations, and water quality participated at various times throughout the life of the AVCOC.
Timeframe (start / end dates)	<p>First neighbor contacts 6/96 Town Hall 6/96 AVCOC meetings monthly 8/96 – 3/02, milestones thereafter through 2007</p>

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES
April 16, 2008

NAME OF PROCESS: PAG 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN “Program for Active Community Engagement”	
Contact:	Melaney Seacat, formerly PAG Public Involvement Manager, 740-6517
Who Participated?:	<p>Representatives from each of PAG's member jurisdictions, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and a cross section of community stakeholders representing business, freight, transit, environmental, neighborhood, low income, minority, elderly disabled interests served on a Task Force to guide the development of the RTP and the larger public involvement process for same.</p> <p>Over 800 people from throughout the PAG region participated in community roundtable discussions held to obtain input on quality of life values, transportation goals, needs and strategies. Participants included technical stakeholders (e.g. Sun Tran / Transportation engineers), neighborhood & homeowner associations, and diverse groups serving business and environmental interests, low income, minority, disabled and elderly, civic organizations, and schools (7-12).</p> <p>A statistically valid survey sample, socio-demographically representative of the population in Pima County</p> <p>The general public through on-line surveys, speakers bureau presentations and PAG committee and Task Force meetings</p>
Study Area	PAG region including all of unincorporated Pima County, the incorporated jurisdictions of Pima County and the Tohono O’odham and Pascua Yaqui Tribal Nations
Goal of Process / Desired end product or outcome	Obtain broad, regionally dispersed participation in developing the plan including significant participation from traditionally under-served groups. In Phase I develop the RTP vision and goals using the results of a values-based needs assessment; In Phase II, identify alternative transportation and funding scenarios considering the input on priority needs and strategies obtained during Phase I; In Phase III, Solicit public comment on the final draft plan
Public Information Methods	Video, website, Reports to Community (i.e. newsletters), speakers bureau, Facilitator’s Guidebook, Transportation Vision and Goals document, brochures, fact sheets, posters, newspaper insert, bus cards, mobile displays, public service announcements, media relations

NAME OF PROCESS: PAG 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN “Program for Active Community Engagement”	
Participation Methods	<p>Task Force set up to guide the development of the RTP and to consider public input results. Early and on-going input obtained through diverse methods tiered to different audiences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning retreats with decision makers • Statistically valid telephone survey • On-line questionnaire • Peer facilitated community roundtables • Professionally facilitated community roundtables • Open Houses • Task Force meetings • Public Hearings (PAG Regional Council meetings)
Positive Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer facilitated roundtables provided thoughtful input that was useful in developing goals and helped extend the reach into the community by engaging traditionally under-served audiences • Confirmation of values reflected in the adopted 1990 Vision Statement and linkage of role of transportation systems in achieving quality of life values • Creation and adoption of transportation vision and goals statement for the 2030 RTP based on Phase I public input • Identification of priority transportation needs and possible solutions based on broad, meaningful public input • Substantial, geographically broad and socio-demographically diverse public input data (Telephone survey results were highly correlated with results from community roundtables) • Reports to the Community on what was heard, and how input was used in decision making helped build credibility of process
Lessons Learned	<p>Getting media interest at the outset and throughout the process is critical to gaining visibility and credibility and in promoting an inclusive process. The media can make it “real” to the general public about why this is important to individuals and households. A high profile media campaign was considered for Phase I but was deferred until Phase II in order to avoid confusion with other high profile planning efforts underway.</p>
How staffed?	<p>One project manager; Consultants for public information products and for facilitation; several technical staff from PAG</p>
Timeframe (start / end dates)	<p>This was designed as a multi-year, three phased public process to begin January 2002 and conclude September 2005.</p>