

July 8, 2011



Public Participation Plan



San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	i
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART).....	1
B. Purpose of the Public Participation Plan (PPP).....	1
C. Process to Develop the PPP	2
D. Low Income, Minority and LEP Population in BART Service Areas.....	5
F. Definitions.....	9
II. GOALS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES.....	11
A. Goals	11
B. Guiding Principles	12
III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION STRATEGY DESIGN FACTORS	13
A. Introduction	13
B. Target Populations and Needs	13
C. Partnerships with Community-Based Organizations (CBOs).....	14
D. Translation and Interpretive Services	14
IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS	17
A. Introduction	17
B. Methods Suggested by Target Populations.....	17
C. Menu of Public Participation Methods.....	20
D. BART’s Ongoing Public Participation Methods.....	37
V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION STRATEGY EXAMPLES	38
A. Example of Public Participation Strategy for BART Projects	38
B. Specific Project Examples	40
VI. PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND OBJECTIVES	48
A. Monitoring and Tracking	48
B. Public Participation Outcomes.....	49
C. Conclusion	49

APPENDIX A:	POPULATION-SPECIFIC FINDINGS FROM PPP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS SURVEYS
APPENDIX B:	BART COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION PARTNERS
APPENDIX C:	BART MEDIA OUTLETS – JUNE 2011
APPENDIX D:	BART LEP ASSESSMENT FINDINGS
APPENDIX E:	FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH LEP INDIVIDUALS
APPENDIX F:	BART'S LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE SERVICES
APPENDIX G:	LANGUAGE TRANSLATION THRESHOLD ANALYSIS
APPENDIX H:	SERVICE AREA MAPS
APPENDIX I:	CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN EXCERPT
APPENDIX J:	MINORITY AND LOW INCOME BART SERVICE AREA CENSUS TRACTS
APPENDIX K:	PPP PROCESS – TOPICS OF ONGOING INTEREST
APPENDIX L:	SAMPLE PPP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS SURVEY
APPENDIX M:	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Public Participation Plan (PPP) is a guide for San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District's (BART) ongoing public participation endeavors. Its purpose is to ensure that BART utilizes effective means of providing information and receiving public input on transportation decisions from low income, minority and limited English proficient (LEP) populations, as required by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its implementing regulations.

Under federal regulations, transit operators must take reasonable steps to ensure that Limited English Proficient (LEP) persons have meaningful access to their programs and activities. This means that public participation opportunities, normally provided in English, should be accessible to persons who have a limited ability to speak, read, write, or understand English.

In addition to language access measures, other major components of the PPP include: public participation design factors; a range of public participation methods to provide information, to invite participation and/or to seek input; examples to demonstrate how population-appropriate outreach methods can be and were identified and utilized; and performance measures and objectives to ensure accountability and a means for improving over time.

Summary of Findings

In general, PPP development participants requested that BART offer a variety of community meeting formats, from large group discussions to one-on-one interviews. They also are interested in utilizing methods other than community meetings, such as smaller focus groups, surveys, or a telephone line, to provide their input to BART. They further requested that meeting formats be tailored to specific public participation goals. Many participants stated that convenient meeting times and locations, plus amenities such as child care and refreshments during meetings, were helpful in encouraging diverse meeting attendance and participation.

The PPP development process revealed population-specific findings for low income, minority and LEP communities, demonstrating that effective public participation strategies make use of a variety of methods in order to reach the greatest possible diversity of participants. These findings are discussed in detail in Section III, "Public Participation Strategy Design Factors," and Section IV, "Public Participation Methods."

Comments and survey data from the PPP development process are used throughout the document in support of both general and population-specific

findings. Note that these comments and data are based specifically on PPP community meeting and survey participant responses, and are in no way meant to generalize views based on an individual's membership in a protected group. The surveys conducted during the PPP development process were not intended to be statistically valid, but were included as additional support to public input which was primarily received through verbal and written comments.

Summary of Process

In order to engage low income, minority and LEP populations in the development of the PPP, BART conducted two rounds of multi-lingual community meetings (29 total) throughout the BART service area in spring 2010. BART coordinated with community-based organizations (CBOs), offered translation services in 10 languages, and collected more than 1,350 surveys and 750 written comments through evaluation forms and wallgraphic notes recorded during meetings.

BART supplemented the extensive public participation process by conducting informational meetings with CBO stakeholders serving LEP populations in the BART service area. In May 2010, outreach that included telephone interviews and focus group meetings was conducted throughout the BART service area. In the fall of 2010, 19 LEP focus group meetings were conducted and attended by well over 400 LEP persons. The CBOs represented the following language groups: Chinese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog and Vietnamese. Finally, an internal BART stakeholders' meeting was convened in May 2011 to review and reflect on internal stakeholders' experience with the PPP.

A database containing contact information for more than 1,000 individuals and more than 400 CBOs was created from outreach, surveys and sign-in sheets at the community meetings held throughout 2010, and will continue to be updated.

The input from these meetings validated the most successful practices that are described in this PPP. It also suggested revisions and enhancements based on lessons learned from the public participation methods conducted over the past year.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)

BART is a rapid transit system that travels through 26 cities and a four-county service area, including Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco and San Mateo counties. BART has 104 miles of track, 44 stations and an average weekday ridership of 360,000 passengers. During peak transbay commute hours, more than 50,000 people ride BART. BART provides discounted fares for seniors, persons with disabilities, students and qualified educational groups. Children ages 4 and under ride free.

BART opened in September 1972 and is governed by a directly-elected nine member Board of Directors serving four year terms.

BART provides a variety of written and oral language assistance services. These are identified in Appendix E: Frequency of Contact with LEP Individuals.

B. Purpose of the Public Participation Plan (PPP)

BART developed the PPP to guide public involvement efforts and enhance access to BART's transportation decision-making process by low income, minority and limited English proficient (LEP) populations. Based on both input collected from these populations regarding effective public involvement and on BART's experiences, the PPP describes the overall goals, guiding principles and appropriate outreach methods that BART could use to reach out to low income, minority and LEP populations.

Pursuant to Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Title VI regulatory guidance, federal funding recipients and subrecipients should seek out and consider the viewpoints of minority, low income and LEP populations "in the course of conducting public outreach and involvement activities." (FTA Circular 4702.1A) This guidance also requires that an agency offer "early and continuous opportunities for the public to be involved in the identification of social, economic and environmental impacts of proposed transportation decisions at BART." To meet these requirements, BART developed the PPP, a document intended as a guide for how BART will deepen and sustain its efforts to engage diverse community members throughout its service area. The PPP also includes example public participation strategies, designed using the PPP goals, principles and methods.

The PPP aims to offer early, continuous and meaningful opportunities for the public to be involved in the identification of social, economic and environmental impacts of proposed transportation decisions at BART. The PPP is intended as a guide for how BART will deepen and sustain its efforts to engage diverse community members throughout its service area. The PPP also includes example public participation strategies, designed using the PPP goals, principles and methods. These examples have proven successful for BART in doing outreach to these populations.

BART may continue to modify its public participation methods over time based on feedback from the low income, minority and LEP populations, including customer and community-based organizations, about the effectiveness and inclusiveness of the PPP. The PPP is intended to be a living document and may be updated periodically to reflect community preferences, changing demographics and transit services, as well as respond to new communication and outreach methods.

C. Process to Develop the PPP

To develop the PPP, BART hosted 22 community meetings throughout the BART service area between March 31, 2010 and April 21, 2010. The meetings were held to determine how BART could best provide information and receive public input on transportation issues from low income, minority and LEP populations.

Based on the feedback received, BART developed a draft PPP. BART mailed the draft PPP to all participants who provided their addresses on the sign-in sheets at the community meetings. The draft PPP was sent to participants in their preferred language, as indicated on the sign-in sheets, and in Braille to participants with visual impairments. BART also distributed the draft PPP to community-based organizations (CBOs) and posted it on the BART website. A printed comment form was included with the draft PPP.

BART conducted a second round of 7 meetings to discuss the draft PPP during the first three weeks of May 2010. The PPP incorporated the feedback and suggestions received during the community meetings, comments received through the website, written comment forms, letters and verbal comments expressed during the BART Board of Directors meeting held on May 13, 2010.

BART supplemented the extensive public participation process by conducting informational meetings with CBO stakeholders serving LEP populations in the BART service area. In May 2010, outreach was conducted that included telephone interviews and focus group meetings conducted throughout the BART service region. In the fall of 2010, 19 LEP focus group meetings were conducted and attended by CBOs serving LEP populations, as well as over 400 LEP persons. The CBOs represented the following language groups: Chinese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog and Vietnamese. These six languages were identified as the most prevalent languages in the BART service area. They provided feedback on how to improve language assistance measures at BART, including use of BART fare equipment, safety and security, awareness of current language assistance measures, and improvements to BART's language assistance measures. In April and May 2011, BART conducted outreach to LEP populations to review BART's Language Assistance Plan (LAP) in preparation for inclusion in the PPP. Through each of these efforts, more than 400 people provided feedback on how to improve understanding and increase use of the BART system by persons with limited English proficiency.

Public Participation Survey

In addition, BART distributed a public participation survey at the PPP community meetings and to CBOs in the following languages: Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Russian, Korean and Vietnamese, and, in response to community requests for additional languages, in Laotian, Cambodian and Portuguese. The survey was also provided in Braille and posted on the BART website. BART received more than 1,350 responses to the survey. The survey queried participants regarding their preferences for public participation processes.

BART hired a consulting firm, MIG, Inc., a planning, design and communications firm in Berkeley, California, to assist with the development of the PPP. During development of the PPP, MIG staff served as neutral, third-party facilitators and recorded comments expressed at the community meetings. MIG transcribed and compiled the comments submitted in writing, tallied the meeting evaluation responses and transcribed participant contact information from the meeting sign-in sheets. MIG also assisted BART with the development of the PPP survey.

MIG provided an objective review of the findings from the meetings, comment cards and surveys; these findings and analysis were used to develop this PPP. MIG has compiled a PPP Development Summary Report on the Plan development outreach process, which includes the following appendices: a database of all public comments submitted; a tally and analysis of meeting evaluation responses; and a tally and analysis of survey responses.

Responses to surveys were tallied and analyzed by calculating the percentage of respondents who gave each possible multiple-choice answer. This analysis was performed both on overall data and on data from low income, minority and LEP respondents in order to determine where the preferences of those populations differed from or matched the overall results.

The surveys also included space for respondents to identify alternatives to the options given, as well as make general comments on the public participation process. Comments submitted in writing as well as graphic recordings of comments made during the meetings were compiled into a database. The comments were tracked by meeting location, source (whether from an online or print survey, comment card or meeting wallgraphic) and preferred language. Comments were categorized by both major themes and sub-themes developed with reference to meeting agendas and questions asked on the surveys. An example survey from the PPP development process is included as Appendix L.

Target Audience Identification

BART determined geographical areas where meetings would be held through a mapping analysis of Bay Area communities based on income and race. Using the results of the mapping, BART identified and contacted CBOs located in BART's four service

areas to determine their interest in assisting with outreach to these residents. The CBOs that BART contacted serve a broad range of community interests.

Community-Based Organizations

CBOs played an important role in the development of the PPP. BART worked with a variety of CBOs, including: ethnic cultural centers; churches and faith-based organizations; geographic-specific such as tenant associations; neighborhood and community groups; civic groups; business organizations; educational facilities including schools providing English as a Second Language programs; service providers for children, youth, families and persons with disabilities; recreation; environmental; political; youth- and senior-oriented organizations; and many others. Many CBOs were receptive to BART's request for assistance and BART staff worked closely with the CBOs to schedule and conduct outreach for the PPP meetings. The CBOs assisted BART by selecting meeting venues, recommending languages for translation and interpretive services, providing refreshments and childcare assistance, and helping to publicize the meeting and recruit participants. BART arranged and supplied staff support, interpreters, meeting materials, supplies and equipment for all of the meetings. The contacts and relationships established through the meeting planning process helped to renew and expand some of the partnerships BART had in place and provide a good foundation to implement the PPP over time. A comprehensive list of these CBOs can be found in Appendix B: BART Community-Based Organization Partners.

Notification Methods for PPP Community Meetings*

- CBO Newsletters
- CBO Mailing Lists
- Direct Mail
- Ethnic Media
- Paid Advertisement
- Flyer Distribution to CBOs
- Flyer Distribution at BART Stations
- Flyer Distribution on BART Car Seats
- Posting on the BART website (www.bart.gov)
- Offices of city and county elected officials

Translation Services

Translated materials and interpretive services were available for every PPP community meeting in the nine languages already identified above under "Public Participation Survey," plus Braille. Written comments received in these languages were translated after the meetings and were included in the comments database (included as an appendix to the PPP Development Summary Report).

The PPP reflects participant preferences for how BART should invite, listen to and respond to all residents when making decisions that will affect them. The PPP identifies a menu of public participation methods to consult in the future. The plan and menu of methods was developed based on a review and analysis of comments expressed orally during the 29 community meetings, more than 750 written comments submitted on comment cards or evaluation forms and expressed during the meetings, and the results of more than 1,350 surveys.

The PPP also draws on the LAP. As part of the LAP development, the importance of BART services to persons with limited English proficiency was evaluated. LAP outreach activity findings highlight opportunities, challenges and access needs for public participation from and public outreach to LEP populations. One of the common themes that emerged from interviews conducted with CBOs and focus groups was that LEP community members were often unaware of BART's public participation due to the lack of translated information.

D. Low Income, Minority and LEP Population in BART Service Areas

BART periodically identifies the number and proportion of low income, minority and LEP population distribution in the four-county region that BART serves. BART uses the following thresholds to identify census tracts in the service area that are predominantly minority, low income and LEP:

- **Low income:** Using 2000 U.S. Census data, low income is defined as less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level.¹ The 200 percent threshold was used to account for the high cost of living in the Bay Area compared to the rest of the country. The 200 percent threshold is also consistent with the assumptions employed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in its February 2009 Equity Analysis Report. The percentage of low income population within BART's four county service area was determined to be 21.6 percent.
- **Minority:** Using the year 2000 Census data, 52.7 percent of the total population living within the BART service area are minority. This includes persons who self-identified as Black or African American, Asian or Pacific Islander, Native American or Alaska Native, Hispanic or Latino, and those persons who identified themselves as some other race or two or more races.
- **Limited English Proficient (LEP):** are persons for whom English is not their primary language and who have a limited ability to speak, understand, read, or write English. This definition includes people who reported to the U.S. Census that they do not speak English well or do not speak English at all. BART's analysis of 2000 U.S. Census data showed that LEP populations represent 18.6 percent of the total BART service area. Of the LEP populations, the largest

¹ As a reference, for a single person household, 200% of the federal poverty level in 2008 was \$21,982. For a two-adult, two-child household, the 200% threshold was \$43,668. (Note that the data mapped are based on 2000 Census data as these are the only such data available at the tract level.)

groups are Spanish-speaking (43%), Chinese-speaking (27%), Vietnamese-speaking (4%), Russian-speaking (2%), and Korean-speaking (2%).

The methodology for low income and minority population identification is included in Appendix J: Minority and Low Income BART Service Area Census Tracts.

Appendix H: Service Area Maps illustrates the location as of 2010 of the following populations in the BART service area:

- Minority populations predominantly;
- Low income populations predominantly;
- LEP populations who do not speak English or do not speak English at all;
- Spanish-speaking LEP populations;
- Chinese-speaking LEP populations;
- Vietnamese-speaking LEP populations; and
- Korean-speaking LEP populations.

Low Income Population by Home-Origin BART Station

The number and proportion of low income populations by home-origin BART station were assessed for BART’s 2008 Station Profile Study. The table below illustrates the home-origin BART stations with the largest percentage of low income customers.* Data is based on weekday usage.

Home-Origin BART Station	% of Low Income Customers*
Powell St	45%
Balboa Park	38%
Richmond	37%
Coliseum / Oakland Airport	37%
Downtown Berkeley	37%
Civic Center	36%
12th St / Oakland City Center	34%
19th St / Oakland	31%
Lake Merritt	31%
Ashby	30%
MacArthur	29%
Fruitvale	28%
Hayward	27%
El Cerrito del Norte	26%
Pittsburg/ Bay Point	26%
Bay Fair	25%

Home-Origin BART Station	% of Low Income Customers*
San Leandro	24%
16th St Mission	24%
24th St Mission	23%
Colma	23%
Daly City	22%
South Hayward	22%

* Note: In this table, "low income" includes those with annual household incomes under \$25,000 (regardless of household size) and those with annual household incomes of \$25,000 - \$49,999 with household sizes of two or more people. In certain cases, this may be a broader definition than the threshold described in Section D (200% of the federal poverty level) where low income is defined as \$44,700 for a household size of 4.

Minority Population by Home-Origin BART Station

The number and proportion of minority populations by home-origin BART station were assessed for BART's 2008 Station Area Profile Study. The table below identifies the 17 home-origin BART stations with the largest percentage of minority customers.* Data is based on weekday usage.

Home-Origin BART Station	% of Minority Customers*
Coliseum / Oakland Airport	82%
South Hayward	79%
Union City	78%
Balboa Park	77%
Richmond	74%
Pittsburg/Bay Point	73%
South San Francisco	73%
Hayward	71%
Fremont	70%
Colma	68%
El Cerrito del Norte	68%
Daly City	67%
Bay Fair	67%
12 th Street/Oakland City Center	66%
San Leandro	65%
San Bruno	59%

Home-Origin BART Station	% of Minority Customers*
Lake Merritt	57%

* Note: BART's 2008 Station Area Profile identified 56 percent of the population in its service area as non-white based on U.S. Census Bureau 2006 to 2008 American Community Survey (ACS) 3-Year Sample data.

Limited-English Proficient Population within BART Service Area

The number and proportion of persons with limited English-speaking proficiency and their language characteristics likely to be encountered within BART's four-county service area were assessed for the LAP. Both the U.S. Census and ACS data sources identify the top six languages spoken by LEP persons in the BART service area as the following: Spanish, Chinese (Cantonese and Mandarin), Vietnamese, Tagalog, Russian and Korean.

Primary Languages Spoken in the BART Service Area, Census 2000		
Language	Population Speaking Non-English Languages	Percent of Total Population
Spanish	517,983	14.24
Chinese	282,398	7.76
Tagalog	141,341	3.88
Vietnamese	37,785	1.04
Russian	28,993	0.80
All Other Languages	332,738	9.14
Total Speaking Non-English Languages	1,341,238	36.86

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 3 (SF 3), 2000, Table PCT.10

F. Definitions

To ensure consistent use of terminology in the PPP, the following definitions are provided.

- **Community Partners:** Any organization or group that desires to work with BART to help facilitate participation by their members in a BART-sponsored participation strategy method. Community partners are also stakeholders and play a critical role in helping to reach target audiences.
- **Language Assistance Plan (LAP):** A tailored plan that describes BART's self assessment which identifies appropriate language assistance measures needed to improve access to BART services and benefits from limited English proficient persons.
- **Limited English Proficient (LEP) population:** Those persons who reported to the U.S. Census Bureau that they do not speak English well or who do not speak English at all.
- **Outreach:** An effort by individuals in an organization or group to share its ideas or practices, to educate or inform, and to engage and seek input from other organizations, groups, specific audiences or the general public.
- **Outreach Methods:** Methods that identify and invite target audiences and stakeholders to participate in a public participation opportunity.
- **Public Information:** A one-way communication from BART to the public with the goal of providing clear and objective information about a policy, project, program or activity.
- **Public Input:** Participation methods that seek community feedback on a policy, project, program or activity. A response is required from the public.
- **Public Participation:** Any process that seeks to inform, collect input from or involve the public in decision-making processes. Public participation is an umbrella term that describes methods including: public information, education, outreach, input, involvement, collaboration and engagement, and communication from the public to BART.
- **Public Participation Plan (PPP):** A tailored plan that describes how BART may undertake public involvement, information, education, participation and/or outreach methods.

- **Public Participation Strategy:** A specific program of participation methods tailored to meet the participation needs and preferences of a specific geographic area or cultural group. The public participation strategy is informed by BART's overall PPP, as defined above, but is adapted for that geographic area, specific group and/or issue at hand.
- **Public Relations:** The dissemination of information to the media and the public with an emphasis on the promotion of a particular policy, program, project or activity.
- **Target Audience and Participants:** Low income, minority and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) populations.
- **Government and Community Relations (GCR):** BART's Government and Community Relations Department serves as a direct liaison to the community and local, state and federal elected officials and their staff representing the San Francisco Bay Area on all issues related to BART.
- **Office of Civil Rights (OCR):** BART's Office of Civil Rights oversees and monitors BART's Civil Rights compliance ensuring all BART policies, practices and procedures are free from discrimination, harassment and retaliation and to coordinate BART's Title VI compliance.

II. GOALS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

A. Goals

The PPP endeavors to offer meaningful opportunities for the public, including low income, minority and limited English proficient populations, to be involved in the identification of social, economic, and environmental impacts of proposed transportation decisions at BART.

Specific goals and outcomes include:

- **Quality Input and Participation**
Comments received by BART are useful, relevant and constructive, contributing to better plans, projects, strategies and decisions.
- **Consistent Commitment**
BART communicates regularly, develops trust with communities and builds community capacity to provide public input.
- **Diversity**
Participants represent a range of socioeconomic, ethnic and cultural perspectives, with representative participants including residents from low income neighborhoods, ethnic communities and residents with limited English proficiency.
- **Accessibility**
Every effort is made to ensure that opportunities to participate are physically, geographically, temporally, linguistically and culturally accessible.
- **Relevance**
Issues are framed in such a way that the significance and potential effect is understood by participants.
- **Participant Satisfaction**
People who take the time to participate feel it is worth the effort to join the discussion and provide feedback.
- **Clarity in Potential for Influence**
The process clearly identifies and communicates where and how participants can have influence and direct impact on decision-making.
- **Partnerships**
BART develops and maintains partnerships with communities through the methods described in the PPP.

B. Guiding Principles

Effective public participation should be based on the following principles:

- **Flexible**
The engagement process should accommodate participation in a variety of ways and be adjusted as needed.
- **Inclusive**
BART should proactively reach out and engage low income, minority and LEP populations from the BART service area so these groups will have an opportunity to participate.
- **Respectful**
All feedback received should be given careful and respectful consideration.
- **Tailored**
BART's public participation methods should be tailored to match local and cultural preferences as much as possible.
- **Proactive and Timely**
Participation methods should allow for early involvement and be ongoing and proactive so participants can influence BART's decisions.
- **Clear, Focused and Understandable**
Participation methods should have a clear purpose and use for the input, and should be described in language that is easy to understand.
- **Trustworthy**
Information provided should be accurate and trustworthy.
- **Responsive**
BART should strive to respond and incorporate appropriate public comments into transportation decisions.
- **Transparent in Impact**
BART should communicate the results of the public's input in terms of the impact on decisions at a broad summary level, providing the major themes, the decisions reached and rationale for the decisions.
- **Authentic and Meaningful**
BART should support public participation as a dynamic and meaningful activity that requires teamwork and commitment at all levels of the organization.

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION STRATEGY DESIGN FACTORS

A. Introduction

The following factors will guide BART in designing an appropriate public participation strategy and determining which methods should be employed in relation to transportation decisions which include major service changes, fare changes or construction projects. Strategies should be scaled in intensity, duration, number and frequency of methods used, with consideration of the following:

- Scale of plan or project (region-wide, county level, neighborhood level)
- Level of potential impact
- Cost of potential decision for BART, taxpayers and customers

The PPP includes methods that are tailored to achieve participation from specific geographic areas or communities and are culturally sensitive and inclusive of low income, minority and LEP populations. FTA guidelines provide BART "wide latitude to determine how, when and how often specific public involvement measures should take place, and what specific measures are most appropriate. Recipients [of federal funds] should make these determinations based on the composition of the population affected by the recipient's action, the type of public involvement process planned by the recipient, and the resources available to the agency."

Project-specific public participation strategy development will take the following into consideration: target populations and needs, partnerships with CBOs, and translation and interpretive services.

B. Target Populations and Needs

To reach low income, minority and LEP populations within BART's service area, a geographically focused public participation strategy will be needed to achieve the desired participation outcomes. BART staff will work with community partners and stakeholders to identify the most effective methods to support participation within a particular area or cultural group. For example, during the PPP development process, participants suggested specific meeting locations, meeting times, community-based organizations and media outlets that work best in their particular area. One community member illustrated the importance of tailoring each public participation strategy specifically to the project and community, asserting "in reaching out to minority and limited English language populations, you have to meet them where they are...to gather and communicate in the way that these various communities are accustomed to doing so. This may mean by unconventional methods."

Public participation outreach methods and strategies will likely vary depending on the nature and location of the project. For example, participants in PPP development

activities suggested a number of public participation methods other than traditional community meetings, such as: walking tours of specific stations conducted by BART Directors or staff; development of a “roadshow” with representatives staffing tables at community events such as fairs and festivals and locations such as malls, local supermarkets and BART parking lots; making suggestion boxes or comment cards, surveys on kiosks, or even a BART representative available at stations in order to gather feedback; surveying riders on BART regarding their needs; and sending representatives to city council and other regularly-scheduled community governmental meetings on a regular basis.

C. Partnerships with Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)

Based on past experience, BART finds that strong partnerships result in more participation, better meeting locations and better meetings overall. The CBOs provide a bridge between BART and the community, which helps to build and deepen trust. For example, the Lao Family Development Center in central East Oakland hosted a PPP meeting with BART and their locally-elected representative from the BART Board. The Center’s outreach methods helped attract over 200 center members to participate in a community meeting.

CBOs can be helpful in clarifying the best outreach strategies for their constituent community. For example, Russian American Community Services noted that their Russian community members tend to have internet access and prefer to receive information online.

CBOs that serve persons from multi-lingual/multi-cultural groups have been helpful in hosting meetings that ensure participation by low income, minority and LEP populations. Methods at these locations can be both targeted and open to the public. The Native American Intertribal Friendship House located in Oakland is an example of one such location.

BART will continue to communicate with partner CBOs and take advantage of CBOs’ ability to support BART public participation methods. However, care should be taken to consider the most strategic and targeted use of CBOs’ resources so as to avoid placing an undue burden on the same organizations.

D. Translation and Interpretive Services

BART staff will work with CBOs to identify the specific language services that community members may expect to be provided. When BART is hosting public meetings in a particular geographic area with a known, significant LEP population, the following should be done:

1. Meeting notices should be produced and distributed according to the language translation threshold in the LAP², encouraging community members to participate. In addition, participants can request interpreter services 48 hours in advance of the meeting, if needed; and
2. BART will provide at least one qualified interpreter at these meetings who is fluent in the designated LEP language(s).

PPP Survey Results and Community Input

Community input in the form of comments received during the PPP process indicated that LEP PPP development participants support translation and interpretive services when possible to encourage their participation in BART-related public participation methods. PPP development survey results indicated the following population-specific findings regarding translation and interpretive services:

- More than 50% of PPP survey respondents were LEP. Among LEP survey respondents, some LEP language groups had stronger preferences for the presence of an interpreter at meetings than other language groups:
 - 63% of 193 Spanish-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 69% of 67 Chinese-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 77% of 320 Vietnamese-speaking PPP survey respondents
- 56% of 193 Spanish-speaking PPP survey respondents preferred having translated written material available at community meetings.

Targeted translation and interpretive services outlined in the LAP inform the PPP's targeted public participation methods. LAP translations and interpretation requirements and services are described at length in the LAP.

Vital Documents

BART will take reasonable steps to ensure that LEP persons receive the language assistance services necessary by translating "vital" written materials into the Language Translation Threshold in the LAP.

Vital documents are defined either as (1) any document that is critical for obtaining services and benefits, and/or (2) any document that is required by law. The "vital" nature of a document depends on the importance of the information or service involved, particularly the consequence to the LEP person if the information is neither accurate nor timely.

The designation of a document as "vital" may not mean that a word-for-word translation of that document will be required. In some cases, a vital document may be

² The language translation threshold consists of a minimum of four languages (Chinese, Spanish, Vietnamese and Korean), with the possibility of up to twenty-two additional languages, depending on the circumstances (the "Language Translation Threshold").

translated by providing a summary of the key information in the document. In other cases, notice of the availability of language assistance services may be sufficient.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS

A. Introduction

BART will be successful in reaching out to low income, minority and LEP populations by utilizing a variety of methods to provide information, invite participation and seek input. Regardless of the method, BART will select the most appropriate and feasible methods to support each public participation activity from the methods suggested by participants in the process of developing the PPP and determined by the LAP. Care should be taken to ensure that the selected methods are implemented in a manner that specifically targets the participation of low income, minority and LEP populations as well as the general public. It should also be noted that there is no “golden rule” as far as the preferences of any given population are concerned, so circumstances influencing participants affected by a particular project, as well as other factors such as geographic location, need to be considered.

B. Methods Suggested by Target Populations

I. Methods and Considerations for Enhancing Participation from Low Income Populations

The majority of PPP survey respondents were identified as low income, with an annual household income (before taxes) of less than \$40,000. Of 1,140 respondents who answered the question regarding income, 890, or 78% of all respondents, were low income. In addition, input from CBOs serving low income populations was also solicited at focus group meetings held in April 2010. Following is a summary of methods suggested by CBOs or low income participants for enhancing participation from low income populations.

1a. Meeting Considerations

Focus group and survey respondents suggested that meeting organizers carefully consider meeting location and time in order to enhance participation from low income communities. Many low income participants were concerned with transportation to and from BART meetings. Some participants asked that BART “coordinate meeting times with transit schedules,” ensuring that evening meetings occur “before the last bus” leaves. The vast majority of low income PPP survey respondents (65% or 488 respondents) also indicated a preference for weekend meetings over weeknight evenings or during business hours. Other participants asked that meetings be held in accessible meeting locations, near or even at a BART station, or that free transportation from BART to/from a meeting location be offered. One participant explained that many “can’t budget the extra trips.” Another participant also suggested that BART consider “pay[ing] for focus groups,” offering some compensation to public participants who provide feedback on BART decisions. Finally, a few meeting participants asked that meeting organizers carefully consider the safety of a meeting location, requesting that meetings be located in an area considered “safe for all of us.”

Another significant group of comments related to meeting amenities. Refreshments and childcare were ranked as among the top considerations that most low income respondents identified as “very important” or “somewhat important” in their decision to attend a meeting.

1b. Methods for Publicizing Participation Opportunities

Both low income meeting participants and survey respondents suggested that publicity at BART stations or trains would be one of the more effective methods for publicizing participation opportunities to low income populations. Survey respondents also suggested direct mail as an effective method. At a focus group meeting hosted by BOSS (Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency), an organization that serves low income populations, advocates from BOSS and other CBOs noted that BART seat drops were one of the more effective outreach methods. Other effective notification methods that were cited included flyers at turnstiles and advertisements on BART trains. Many participants also suggested that BART consider publicizing opportunities on local buses or at local bus stops.

Also, like most survey respondents, low income respondents ranked receiving information on public participation opportunities via “postcard or letter in the mail” as the preferred notification method (when compared to newspaper ads, announcements made through a CBO, BART’s website, email, or telephone). However, if meetings were to be publicized through newspapers, low income participants suggested that BART use free neighborhood weekly newspapers because many consider them to be the best source of information and events in local areas. Finally, some CBOs suggested that BART publicize participation opportunities through social service agencies that serve low income populations. For example, BART could explore adding publicity to the monthly rent notices sent out by local housing agencies. A large number of PPP survey respondents (65% of 756 respondents) also indicated involvement with religiously-affiliated CBOs, as contrasted with 5%-13% indicating involvement with other types of CBOs. They also suggested CBOs that specifically serve low income communities. Therefore, these organizations may be helpful in suggesting effective outreach methods for any low income communities they may serve.

1c. Other Considerations

Many of the survey respondents among PPP development participants who were identified as low income also identified themselves as LEP. Among PPP survey respondents, the majority (78%) of low income participants were also LEP, and 84% ranked the availability of translation services as “very important” or “somewhat important” factors in their decision to attend a meeting. Because of this, public participation methods targeted towards low income populations may also need to consider the translation/interpretation needs of LEP populations. Also, a number of low income and/or LEP participants were illiterate and depended on CBOs to help them learn about topics and issues of interest, as well as to help them fill out sign-in sheets

and surveys at meetings, so methods targeted toward both these populations may need to take this into consideration as well.

II. *Methods and Considerations for Enhancing Participation from LEP Populations*

Well over half of PPP survey respondents were identified as LEP. Of 1,227 respondents who answered the question regarding the language they prefer to communicate in, 774, or 63% of all respondents, were LEP. In addition, input from CBOs serving LEP populations was also solicited at focus group meetings held in April 2010. The availability of interpreters at meetings and translated outreach materials is crucial to enhancing participation from LEP populations. Following is a summary of additional methods suggested by CBOs or LEP participants.

2a. *Meeting Considerations*

As with low income participants, focus group and survey respondents suggested that meeting organizers carefully consider meeting location, time and accessibility in order to enhance participation from LEP communities. However, since many LEP participants are not low income, they had additional suggestions as well. Some LEP participants echoed the same concerns with convenient transportation to and from BART meetings that were voiced by low income participants. Others clearly had their own transportation, but asked that meeting locations have “better parking.” In addition, several LEP participants suggested that meetings have a live online video feed so that those who cannot conveniently travel to the meeting location could still participate.

Preferences for meeting time varied between different LEP populations. While Vietnamese (94% of 401) and Chinese (56% of 66) PPP survey respondents indicated a preference for weekend meetings over weeknight evenings or during business hours, Spanish PPP survey respondents (61% of 188 respondents) preferred weeknight evenings. This suggests that preferences for meeting time may be influenced by income and other factors in addition to the language spoken. Therefore, outreach efforts targeted toward LEP populations need to clarify the preferences of the specific group.

As with low income PPP survey respondents, refreshments and childcare were ranked as among the top considerations that most LEP respondents identified as “very important” or “somewhat important” in their decision to attend a meeting.

2b. *Methods for Publicizing Participation Opportunities*

LEP meeting participants and survey respondents, like low income participants, also suggested that publicity at BART stations or trains would be one of the more effective methods for publicizing participation opportunities to LEP populations.

LEP survey respondents also ranked receiving information on public participation opportunities via “postcard or letter in the mail” as the preferred notification method. However, LEP participants were also much more likely to suggest using ethnic media

sources and online notices to publicize meetings. Since a number of LEP meeting participants were illiterate, outreach methods that do not depend on reading, such as announcements on ethnic TV or radio stations or through CBOs, may be considered. At a meeting hosted by the Lao Family Development Center in central East Oakland, several participants suggested that phone calls in Nepalese would be most effective.

Like low income survey respondents, a much larger number of PPP survey respondents indicated involvement with religiously-affiliated CBOs rather than with other types of CBOs. They also suggested CBOs serving particular neighborhoods with a high population of LEP persons. Therefore, these organizations may be helpful in suggesting effective outreach methods for any LEP communities they may serve.

III. Methods and Considerations for Enhancing Participation from Minority Populations

The majority of meeting participants and PPP survey respondents were low income and/or LEP, but there was also significant participation from minority community members who were English-speaking and came from a variety of economic situations. At most of the focus group meetings where minority populations were predominant, including meetings in Richmond, in the San Francisco Tenderloin, at Pittsburg High School, and at the San Leandro Library, participants recommended ethnic media as one of the best methods to reach out to the public. In addition, minority participants and survey respondents suggested doing outreach at community events and through neighborhood notices, such as postings on store windows. Many participants also stressed the importance of developing a long-term relationship with community organizations that serve minorities. Some suggested that developing a community advisory committee would be the most effective means of creating such a relationship. This theme was emphasized in meetings at the South Berkeley Senior Center and the El Cerrito Community Center, in the San Francisco Mission District, and in West Oakland.

Minority PPP survey respondents had a much greater likelihood of being involved in a variety of types of CBOs including political, environmental, regional or urban planning as well as religiously-affiliated CBOs. In addition to those specifically serving minorities, the most common factor was geographic. CBOs suggested by minority meeting participants often served a particular neighborhood or region with a large minority population.

C. Menu of Public Participation Methods

The following menu of methods includes those used to inform (Public Information), reach out and invite participation (Outreach), and those to seek input (Public Input). The menu identifies how each method could best be used and is based on input collected from the community and BART staff experience. The methods are not listed in priority order, and are summarized in a matrix on page 35.

Population-specific findings from surveys conducted during the PPP development process are excerpted throughout this section; the complete data can be found in Appendix A: Population-Specific Findings from PPP Development Process Surveys. In analyzing these findings, the following definitions were used to determine low income, minority or LEP status:

- PPP survey respondents were considered to be low income if they replied to the question, "What is the total annual income of your household before taxes?" by indicating that they have an annual household income (before taxes) of less than \$25,000.
- PPP survey respondents were considered to be minority if they responded to the question "What is your race or ethnic identification?" by indicating any race or ethnic identifications other than "White."
- PPP survey respondents were considered to be LEP if they responded to the question, "In which language do you prefer to communicate?" by indicating any language other than English.

1. Printed Materials Produced by BART

(Public information and outreach)

Outreach information can be publicized in print materials produced by BART such as newsletters, flyers and posters. BART newsletters include the monthly BART Times and the quarterly Fleet of the Future newsletter. BART flyers include periodic one-page Passenger Bulletins distributed at fare gates and in trains. Per the LAP, vital information in printed materials must be translated into Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Korean and, potentially, into additional languages as needed. If all information cannot be translated, notices could offer translated tags, describing where to obtain translation/interpretations. LEP survey participants indicated in significant percentages a preference for translated information.

Many participants noted that the most effective notification method is the distribution of flyers/notices on or at BART trains and stations. Based on its experience, BART has also found that notices and flyers can also be effectively distributed through community partners.

PPP Community Input – Printed Materials Produced by BART

A PPP development participant emphasized the effectiveness of flyers to reach communities: "Too many of these questions assume the people who [they] are trying to reach can use the Internet. Most do not. They even have a hard time seeing a newspaper. Use TV and flyers." Community members recommended locations such as the bulletin board at local branch libraries, YMCAs, supermarkets and coffee shops.

2. Printed Materials Produced by Other Organizations

(Public information and outreach)

Coordinating with community partners can be cost-effective and can help partner organizations provide information that is of interest to the groups they represent. Information can be publicized in local and regional community newsletters, church bulletins, flyers and other publications.

2a. Local Service Providers

Local service providers regularly communicate with community members through their newsletters to provide information about local services and activities of interest. For example, Housing Authorities communicate regularly with the community they serve through rent notices. Other service providers identified by community members included: emergency food and housing centers, daytime drop-in service providers, food banks, travelers' aid groups, veterans organizations and drop-in service providers.

2b. Local Schools, Community Colleges and Universities

BART may be able to reach parents of school children by coordinating with local schools. Notices and flyers can be provided to the school, with students taking the notices home to their parents. BART may also provide translated materials as recommended by school officials. Community members who were parents or guardians of school-age children identified this as an effective method for getting information to them. Community members also suggested local universities and community colleges in order to get information to college-age students and their families.

3. BART Website

(Public information, outreach and public input)

The BART website, www.bart.gov, is a communications tool that provides substantial information about BART policies, strategies, plans and methods. BART's website offers the BART Rider Guide translated into Chinese, Spanish, Japanese, Korean, German, French and Italian (<http://www.bart.gov/guide/index.aspx>). BART also uses social networking applications such as Facebook and Twitter.

It should be noted that many community members have cell phones that can receive text messages, but not necessarily smart phones with internet service. Text messages may be a more effective means of sharing BART information than smart phone applications.

Many community members are not aware of the volume of information available on the BART website. Informing community members of what is available on the website is an important element of public outreach, especially outreach to LEP populations.

There were many comments from participants requesting more translated information on the BART website; for example, one Chinese-speaking LEP participant requested that BART "email in Chinese" or "use the web" because "30-40% of [LEP Chinese] use

the web. However, there was also a large number of low income, minority and LEP participants and survey respondents who do not have convenient access to the internet. Therefore BART should ensure that information and participation methods available on the website are available in alternative locations and formats so that users without access to or who prefer not to use the internet can participate. CBOs can be helpful in identifying their constituent communities' communications preferences.

4. Webcast Meetings

(Public information, outreach and public input)

BART, in venues with high-speed web-access, can webcast meetings and public participation methods to allow remote viewing and participation. Informational materials and videos can be posted online for advance review. Webcast meetings may include opportunities for web participants to ask questions or make comments through email or other web-based applications. BART currently webcasts BART Board meetings in English and is exploring the webcasting of meetings in multiple languages.

5. Postcards and Letters Distributed by Mail

(Public information, outreach and public input)

Participation methods can be publicized by letter or postcard distributed by mail. While it is costly for BART to contact all interested persons by mail (regardless of their communications preference), it can be the most effective method for reaching a specific geographic area or population group. For example, sending a postcard in English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and/or Korean to promote a participation activity may be an effective and cost efficient manner to reach members of a specific community who may be directly impacted by a specific activity.

PPP Survey Results and Community Input – Postcards and Letters Distributed by Mail

Comments made by community members throughout the PPP development process emphasized the effectiveness of direct mailings to publicize participation opportunities. Survey results received during the PPP process indicated population-specific findings regarding the use of postcards and letters distributed by mail to publicize participation opportunities.

- Receiving a postcard or letter by mail was by far the most popular method for publicizing participation opportunities among low income, LEP and minority PPP survey respondents, as follows:
 - 54% of 727 low income PPP survey respondents
 - 44% of 98 American Indian or Native PPP survey respondents
 - 61% of 551 Asian or Pacific Islander PPP survey respondents
 - 39% of 222 Spanish, Hispanic or Latino PPP survey respondents
 - 43% of 187 Spanish-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 59% of 66 Chinese-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 64% of 410 Vietnamese-speaking PPP survey respondents

- Although this represents less than a majority (50% or more) of respondents in several cases, that was more than twice the number of those who preferred any of the other options given.
- Black/African American PPP survey respondents preferred receiving emails to other methods. Although only 41% of 59 respondents chose receiving emails as their preference, that was more than twice the number of those who preferred any of the other options given.

6. Station Information Resources

(Public information and outreach)

Many community members expect BART stations to provide information about BART public participation methods, beyond basic fare and schedule information. Using station information resources allows BART users to stay up to date on BART public participation methods while they wait for their train. Providing this information in multiple languages assists those with limited English proficiency. BART currently provides multilingual brochures in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Korean on such subjects as safety guidelines and evacuation procedures.

Information resources located in BART stations that are used to communicate schedule and service information can be used to conduct outreach. The Destination Sign System (also referred to by community members as electronic information signs) can provide important information combined with train and other community announcements. BART newsletters, bulletin boards, information kiosks and other information stations should also be used to promote participation opportunities.

7. Media Targeted to Ethnic Communities

(Public information and outreach)

Participation opportunities can be publicized through radio, television and newspapers that serve both English speaking and language-specific audiences, including Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Korean.

Some local news or radio shows and local publications, such as free neighborhood weekly papers, are considered to be good sources of information and events in the immediate area. BART should tailor its message to the appropriate audience and remind participants that they can contact BART and receive information in their preferred language. BART should continue outreach to numerous media outlets in the Bay Area that are targeted or appeal to ethnic communities. A listing of media outlets is attached as Appendix C: BART Media Outlets.

PPP Survey Results and Community Input – Media Targeted to Ethnic Communities

Survey results and community input received during the PPP process indicate that the majority of minority and LEP community members are likely to learn about BART-related methods through ethnic media such as television, radio and newspapers.

BART could continue and expand advertising and outreach to local and ethnic media sources, including TV public service announcements, radio, print and web-based outlets. Community participants also suggested that in-person appearances by BART staff or Directors on local media outlets would be particularly effective. Specific media outlet suggestions are compiled in Appendix C and designated by population, language, and/or geographic group. These suggestions will be used to inform future participation strategies.

8. Coordination with Community Events

(Public information, outreach and public input)

In cooperation with community organizations, BART should continue its current practice of hosting information tables that provide materials about BART service and outreach methods at community events and activities. These events can range in scale from large city-wide events to localized activities. CBO representatives and community members recommended that outreach be conducted in locations where people already gather, for instance, at community events such as fairs and festivals. Most community events can help BART reach specific audiences such as seniors, youth, families with children, commuters and others. Community members suggested that BART use assistance from bi-lingual community partners to ensure that LEP persons receive adequate and accurate information in their language.

Community Input – Coordination with Community Events

Community input in the form of comments received during the PPP process indicated that low income, minority and LEP participants supported BART's efforts to coordinate public participation methods with community events. PPP participants suggested the following specific events for future BART coordination: the El Sobrante Stroll, El Cerrito 4th of July, Solano Stroll in Albany, the El Cerrito Farmers Market, the San Mateo County Fair, Cinco de Mayo, and soccer games hosted by the Liga Latina Soccer League in Concord.

9. Coordination with Other Agencies

(Public information and outreach)

BART may develop partnerships with agencies that regularly communicate with local residents. BART could identify agencies in the project area by considering who serves the population and where they convene. BART may consider the following types of agencies to comprehensively reach low income, minority and LEP populations: faith-based, geographic-specific such as tenant associations, neighborhood and community, education, social services, recreation, environmental, political, youth- and senior-oriented organizations.

BART can work with these partners to provide information about public participation opportunities, included in notices and regular mailings sent by these agencies.

10. Government Meetings

(Public information and outreach)

BART can continue to provide updates on its plans and projects to federal, state and local elected officials through regularly scheduled government meetings. BART regularly sends letters and emails that summarize decisions and potential decisions. BART will need to contact these entities in advance to ensure they are on the agenda and that any helpful information can be included in the meeting packet.

11. Regular Meetings of Civic and Community Organizations

(Public information, outreach and public input)

BART can provide updates on its policies, projects, strategies and methods by participating periodically in scheduled meetings of local civic and community organizations. These gatherings provide an opportunity to make a presentation and answer questions. Depending on the meeting format, BART may also be able to solicit public input at these meetings.

12. Public Participation at BART Board Meetings

(Public information, outreach and public input)

Currently, to comment at a meeting of the BART Board of Directors, a participant must complete and submit a speaker card. Individuals are then called on in the order the speaker cards were received and are allowed to speak for a limited amount of time, usually 2-3 minutes.

BART will continue its current public participation rules, which help the Board manage the high level of participation that often occurs at BART meetings.

13. Participation by BART Directors

(Public information, outreach and public input)

Community members expressed a desire to see their local BART Directors take a more active role in all public participation methods. Community members also asked for a report of BART Director activities in their Districts as a part of each Board meeting.

Currently, calls and emails to a Director all go to one centralized phone number and email address. Some participants expressed a desire to reach their elected representative directly, similar to the way they can reach their supervisor or council person. BART staff could work with the Directors to enhance direct communication.

BART Directors could continue their efforts to attend as many public participation methods as possible and be available to communicate with residents. Community members want BART Directors to be kept fully informed of the results of public participation methods. BART staff may summarize the issues discussed and the results of public participation methods and share the information with the BART Board and the public.

14. Community Meetings

(Public information, outreach and public input)

Community members have a variety of preferences for public input opportunities at community meetings. Meeting formats should be tailored to help achieve specific public participation goals. Some meetings are designed to share information and answer questions. Others are designed to engage the public in providing input, establishing priorities and helping to achieve consensus on a specific recommendation. It is important to create an agenda that works to achieve BART's goals but is relevant to and not overwhelming for the public.

For all meetings, the venue should be a facility that is fully accessible for persons with disabilities and, preferably, is served by public transit. The venue should be a location that is familiar and comfortable for the target audience. If a series of meetings are scheduled on a topic, BART may consider different meeting locations, since no one location is usually convenient to all participants.

14a. Community Meeting Formats

i. Open House

(Public information, outreach and public input)

This format provides opportunities for participants to receive information at their own pace by visiting a series of information stations that may include table top displays, maps, photographs, visualizations and other tools. Individual questions are responded to by staff and technical experts. Some open houses include a short educational presentation and comment period at a designated time. Participants are often given comment cards so they can provide written comments. Staff may be assigned to take verbal comments and transcribe them to provide a written record. The Open House Format can be effective when BART is seeking to introduce a new concept or when a lengthy process has been finalized and BART is sharing the final results.

ii. Workshops

(Public information, outreach and public input)

Workshops feature an educational presentation designed to orient participants to the issue being discussed. Workshops often include break-out or discussion groups, where participants have the opportunity to discuss topics in small groups. Participants can share their feedback orally during the small group discussion and in writing on comment cards.

Workshops include the use of tools that promote interaction and may include: electronic or show-of-hands polling, mapping exercises, discussion questions, priority setting methods and other techniques to promote dialogue and discussion.

iii. Large Group Discussion

(Public information, outreach and public input)

These meetings are usually focused on a specific topic and feature an informational presentation followed by a comment period. The comment period can be formal or informal depending on the number of participants and the meeting venue. Individual comments are often limited to 2-3 minutes, especially when there are a large number of people wanting to comment. This format can also include some interactive techniques suitable for a large group such as electronic or show of hands polling or short questionnaires or surveys.

PPP Survey Results and Community Input – Community Meeting Formats

Survey results received during the PPP process indicated population-specific findings regarding community meeting formats. Note that this data is not meant to indicate that only the method receiving the largest number of votes should be used in isolation – a variety of methods is important.

Participants in the PPP development process were given a list of input methods and asked to select one or more of the methods that they thought would help them express their views at meetings. The most popular methods among PPP survey respondents for expressing their views at community meetings were as follows:

- Low income (57% of 756 respondents), Asian or Pacific Islander (65% of 575 respondents), Spanish, Hispanic or Latino (58% of 230 respondents), Spanish-speaking (63% of 193 respondents), Chinese-speaking (69% of 67 respondents), and Vietnamese-speaking (77% of 413) PPP survey respondents indicated that they preferred to express their views through having a translator present at community meetings.
- Spanish-speaking (63% of 193) PPP survey respondents also preferred to use written translated material at community meetings.
- American Indian or Native (51% of 101) PPP survey respondents preferred large group discussions to express their views at community meetings.
- Black/African American (52% of 64) PPP survey respondents preferred small group discussions to express their views at community meetings.
- Electronic voting was the least preferred method of expressing views at community meetings for low income and LEP PPP survey respondents, as follows:
 - 4% of 756 low income PPP survey respondents
 - 5% of 193 Spanish-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 6% of 67 Chinese-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 2% of 413 Vietnamese-speaking PPP survey respondents

- A low income PPP development participant emphasized the importance of weighing all input, including community comments and surveys. He stated, "My main concern with voting methods such as electronic or voting by hand at public meetings is being forced to choose options that no one agrees with. There should always be the option for people to express alternatives, or not agree with any proposals presented."

Participants in the PPP development process were also asked to select one or more preferences from a list of methods for having detailed materials presented to them for a meeting. The most popular methods among PPP survey respondents for having detailed materials presented to them for a meeting were as follows:

- Spanish-speaking (58% of 193 respondents), American Indian or Native (53% of 101 respondents), Black/African American (53% of 64 respondents), and Spanish, Hispanic or Latino (57% of 230 PPP survey respondents indicated that they preferred to have detailed information presented to them at community meetings via a live presentation.
- Vietnamese (59% of 413) PPP survey respondents preferred to review information online before a community meeting.

14b. Community Meeting Considerations

i. Scheduling

BART staff could coordinate the scheduling of community meetings with community partners to minimize conflicts. However, some scheduling conflicts may be unavoidable when a public participation activity is urgent or linked to a time-sensitive topic.

ii. Meeting Locations

Convenient and comfortable meeting locations are key to soliciting active public participation, particularly in low income, minority and LEP communities. BART can host meetings in venues recommended by community members who understand their community dynamics best.

Community members identified locations specific to their area including the local branch libraries, YMCA, local school or community college, churches and many others. It is important that meetings are held in different venues since it is unlikely that no one location is ideal for all community members. Meeting locations can be rotated to ensure access for as many community members as possible. Community partners should be reminded that regardless of the popularity or convenience of a venue, BART is required to conduct all public participation methods in locations that are fully accessible to persons with disabilities and, preferably, the venues should be served by public transit.

iii. Meeting Times

A convenient meeting time is important to low income, minority and LEP survey participants. Public participation methods can be scheduled at varying times of day and on different days of the week. Survey data indicates that the majority of community members prefer meetings to be held on weekends. Weeknights after traditional work hours are also acceptable. Fewer community members can participate during the workday; however, seniors are more likely to attend daytime activities scheduled during the week.

PPP Survey Results and Community Input – Meeting Times

Survey results received during the PPP process indicated distinct population-specific preferences regarding meeting times among PPP survey respondents, as follows:

- Low income (65% of 746 respondents), Asian or Pacific Islander (80% of 470 respondents), Chinese-speaking (56% of 66 respondents), and Vietnamese-speaking (94% of 411) PPP survey respondents prefer meetings to be held on weekends.
- Spanish-speaking (61% of 188 respondents), American Indian or Native (51% of 100 respondents) Black/African American (72% of 64 respondents) and Spanish, Hispanic or Latino (61% of 225) PPP survey respondents prefer weeknight meetings.

iv. Number of Meetings

Some transportation decisions require more meetings than others. BART has held anywhere from two to more than twenty meetings for system-wide decisions. For decisions that affect one or two existing stations, BART has held anywhere from one to three meetings. The number of meetings will depend on the project.

v. Childcare and Refreshments

Many adults with childcare responsibilities can only participate if childcare is provided. Childcare services can be available on-site and provided by a community partner staff or volunteers who are screened to work with youth and have appropriate training. Bi-lingual childcare providers may also be needed, depending on community interpretation needs. BART will need to receive requests for childcare at least 72 hours in advance. Community members suggested that many community members are more likely to attend if refreshments are provided, especially if the meeting is held close to meal time.

PPP Survey Results – Childcare and Refreshments

Survey results received during the PPP process indicate the following population-specific findings regarding childcare and refreshments being provided at meetings:

- Childcare was identified as a “very important” or “somewhat important” factor in their decision to attend a BART-related meeting by low income, minority and LEP PPP survey respondents, as follows:
 - 82% of 331 low income PPP survey respondents
 - 76% of 89 American Indian or Native PPP survey respondents
 - 67% of 163 Asian or Pacific Islander PPP survey respondents
 - 67% of 55 Black/African American PPP survey respondents
 - 89% of 205 Spanish, Hispanic or Latino PPP survey respondents
 - 94% of 168 Spanish-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 85% of 33 Chinese-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 68% of 59 Vietnamese-speaking PPP survey respondents
- Refreshments being provided at meetings was identified as a “very important” or “somewhat important” factor in their decision to attend a BART-related meeting by low income, minority and PPP survey respondents, as follows:
 - 92% of 676 low income PPP survey respondents
 - 87% of 90 American Indian or Native PPP survey respondents
 - 92% of 508 Asian or Pacific Islander PPP survey respondents
 - 73% of 55 Black/African American PPP survey respondents
 - 86% of 199 Spanish, Hispanic or Latino PPP survey respondents
 - 86% of 162 Spanish-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 84% of 60 Chinese-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 96% of 365 Vietnamese-speaking PPP survey respondents

15. Focus Groups

(Public information, outreach and public input)

BART will continue to host discussion groups held with small, targeted groups of participants. Focus groups can provide in-depth information about projects, plans or issues that may impact a specific group or community. These groups can be both formal and informal and can be conducted in a specific language. BART will proactively include low income, minority and LEP communities.

PPP Survey Results and Community Input – Focus Groups

Many participants expressed discomfort with large meeting formats. Survey results received during the PPP process indicate the following population-specific findings regarding focus groups:

- Focus groups were identified as one of the best methods other than a community meeting to provide input to BART by low income, minority and LEP PPP survey respondents as follows:
 - 86% of 329 low income PPP survey respondents
 - 50% of 101 American Indian or Native PPP survey respondents
 - 88% of 191 Asian or Pacific Islander PPP survey respondents
 - 84% of 51 Black/African American PPP survey respondents
 - 92% of 162 Spanish, Hispanic or Latino PPP survey respondents
 - 97% of 128 Spanish-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 87% of 39 Chinese-speaking PPP survey respondents
 - 95% of 88 Vietnamese-speaking PPP survey respondents

16. Special Events

(Public information, outreach and public input)

BART can develop special events to announce, highlight or kick-off its outreach about a policy, program, project or activity. Events can be region-wide or focus on a specific station or geographic area. An example might be to convene town hall meetings in each Board member's district. Along with providing information and/or collecting input, the events should include something interactive and/or entertaining to attract participation.

17. Walking Tours and On-Site Meetings

(Public information, outreach and public input)

BART can host walking tours and on-site meetings specific to locations that interest the public, in order to highlight an initiative, project or facility. Walking tours can be primarily educational and BART may ask participants to complete a survey or questionnaire during or after the tour. Walking tours may be helpful in helping BART collect community opinion on issues such as station improvements and proposed extensions. BART can work with community partners to host language specific meetings. For example; meetings can be held for specific populations in Spanish-only, Chinese-only, Vietnamese-only and Korean-only.

18. Key Person Interviews

(Public information, outreach and public input)

BART staff and Directors could continue to meet individually with community leaders and stakeholders to exchange information and gain early insight into upcoming outreach and engagement methods. BART will specifically include low income, minority and LEP populations. Interviewees are asked the same set of questions to allow BART to compare responses and identify key themes and issues. BART may contact interviewees throughout the span of a project or activity to keep them engaged in the public participation process.

19. Surveys

(Public information, outreach and public input)

BART may conduct surveys in print, by telephone and online to collect public opinion on specific topics or issues. Web surveys provide general qualitative data, since it is difficult to control who responds. Print surveys can also provide substantial information, but response rates are typically low.

Depending on the data being collected, BART should consider methodologies that provide statistically valid data when possible. BART should also consider strategies for letting people know that surveys are available in multiple languages, so as to increase the response rate from low income, minority and LEP populations.

20. Telephone Information and Comment Line

(Public information, outreach and public input)

All BART Station Agents, BART Police and Call Center Operators have access to Language Line Services (LLS), which is an over-the-phone language interpretation service. The Service allows BART Station Agents to call the LLS number when a customer is unable to speak English. The professionally trained and tested LLS interpreters listen to the customer, analyze the message and accurately convey its original meaning to the BART staff member, then respond to the customer in his/her own language. The LLS offers interpretation in 170 languages.

Non-English speaking attendees at community meetings advocated strongly for future BART messages in more languages. BART could work not only to translate future BART messages into these languages, but also to ensure that it better promotes the services currently available to non-English speakers, such as LLS, to make the system more accessible and user-friendly to all communities. New Language Assistance Services outlined in the LAP aim to increase LEP population access to services and benefits in the BART system.

PPP Survey Results and Community Input – Methods of Providing Input to BART Other than Community Meetings

Participants in the PPP development process were asked to rank various methods of providing input to BART in addition to community meetings by indicating whether they were “very likely,” “somewhat likely,” or “not likely” to use a particular method.

Survey results indicate the following population-specific findings regarding most preferred input methods:

- Low income (73% of 468 respondents), Asian or Pacific Islander (74% of 322), and Vietnamese-speaking (92% of 205) PPP survey respondents prefer writing a letter to BART in order to provide their input.
- Spanish, Hispanic or Latino (75% of 162 respondents), Spanish-speaking (80% of 128) and Chinese-speaking (73% of 37) PPP survey respondents prefer participating in focus groups in order to provide their input to BART.
- American Indian or Native PPP survey respondents (44% of 101) prefer providing their input to BART via mail-back surveys.
- Black/African American PPP survey respondents (63% of 52) prefer providing their input to BART via online surveys.

However, because all respondents did not necessarily rank all methods, the sample size varies greatly from method to method. Also, in many cases the distinction between preferences is not particularly great. Therefore, a variety of methods for providing input to BART should be made available to community members.

21. Community Advisory Committee on Title VI Compliance

(Public information, outreach and public input)

Several community groups, minority and LEP participants recommended that BART develop a local advisory group to provide advice on public participation methods. BART believes that the creation of a Title VI Community Advisory Committee (CAC) has merit and can consider the feasibility of such a committee, given capacity and availability of resources. Currently, BART supports three community advisory groups: the Business Advisory Committee, Citizens Oversight Committee for the Earthquake Safety Program and the Citizen Review Board of the BART Police Department.

BART Public Participation Plan - Toolbox of Public Participation Methods

Public Participation Method	Printed Materials	BART Website and Social Networking Methods					Postcards and Letters Distributed by Mail			Email			Media Targeted to Ethnic Communities*			Partnerships with CBOs			Coordination		Participation by BART Directors	Community Meetings										Community Meeting Considerations					Surveys	Telephone information and comment line	Community Advisory Committee	Key Person Interviews	Station Information Resources	Government meetings	Regular meetings of civic and community organizations	Public participation at BART Board Meetings					
																						Open House	Workshops				Large Group Discussion	Special Events	Walking Tours and on-site meetings	Focus Groups	Available translation services	Translated written materials	Scheduling	Convenient meeting locations	Meeting Times - weekends	Meeting Times - weeknights									Childcare and refreshments	Printed and mail back	Online		
Low income																																																	
Low income	●	●	●	○	○	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	-	●	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	●	●	○	-	●	●	○	-	-	-	-	-	-
Minority																																																	
American Indian or Native Alaskan	●	●	-	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	-	-	-	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	●	○	○	-	●	○	-	-	-	-	-	
Asian or Pacific Islander	●	●	-	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	●	○	○	-	●	○	-	-	-	-	-
Black or African American	●	●	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	●	○	○	-	●	○	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	●	●	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	●	○	○	-	●	○	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited English Proficiency																																																	
Spanish-speaking	●	●	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	●	○	○	-	●	○	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Chinese-speaking	●	●	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	●	○	○	-	●	○	-	-	-	-	-	
Vietnamese-speaking	●	●	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	●	○	○	-	●	○	-	-	-	-	-	
Korean-speaking	●	●	-	-	-	-	-	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	○	○	○	-	○	○	-	-	-	-	-	-
Russian-speaking	●	●	-	-	-	-	-	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	○	○	○	-	○	○	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tagalog-speaking	●	●	-	-	-	-	-	-	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-	-	○	○	○	-	○	○	-	-	-	-	-	-

* Ethnic Media Resources include:

	Television	Newspaper
Spanish-speaking	Telemundo 18, Univision 14	El Mensajero, El Tecolote
Chinese-speaking	Channels 8 and 26	Sing Tao Daily, World Journal
Vietnamese-speaking	Cable 6, Channel 26	Mo, Thoi Bao, SaiGon Nho
Korean-speaking		Korean Times, Korean Daily Times
Russian-speaking	Channel One Russia	Russkaya Zhizn, New Life, Vzglyad
Tagalog-speaking	Channels 8, 23, 26 and TFC	Philippine News, Philippines Today

Legend

- = Public participation method preferred by PPP development participants
- = Public participation method not preferred by PPP development participants
- = Public participation method with no strong preference or not discussed by PPP development participants

This page deliberately left blank

D. BART's Ongoing Public Participation Methods

(Public information, outreach and public input)

BART will continue to promote and enhance the use of its ongoing public participation methods to reach out to low income, minority and LEP populations. BART will conduct proactive outreach to expand the reach, inclusivity and effectiveness of these ongoing methods. Many community members participating in the development of this plan are not fully aware of these resources and BART should conduct specific methods to promote their use. Examples of these existing methods include:

- BART website (www.bart.gov)
- BART Facebook page
- BART communications via Twitter
- Regular newsletters distributed through BART stations
- Regular communications with media
- BART Board meetings
- Key person interviews
- Focus groups
- Partnerships with CBOs
- Communication with elected officials
- Press briefings and news releases
- Regular emails to community members
- Participation in community fairs and festivals
- Sponsorship of major community events
- Passenger bulletins in stations
- Mailings to neighbors of stations
- Educational tours and briefings
- Language Line Services (LLS)
- Language interpreters at public meetings
- Written language assistance services

BART is committed to reducing the barriers encountered by LEP persons in accessing its services and benefits, to the extent resources are available. BART will also evaluate how to consolidate its language assistance measures to deliver the most cost-effective services.

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION STRATEGY EXAMPLES

During the PPP review process, community members expressed requests for a more tailored public participation strategy for their community or neighborhood.

The following public participation strategy examples can be utilized as guides to develop a project-specific, tailored strategy, once a project is identified as having impacts on low income, minority and LEP communities. The following examples demonstrate the level of specificity BART could provide when developing a public participation strategy at the community level.

The following public participation strategy examples include an example strategy useful for a variety of BART project types and strategies created and implemented utilizing the principles of the PPP for specific BART projects. Each strategy example is detailed to demonstrate how population-appropriate outreach methods can be and were identified and utilized to develop and conduct transportation decision-specific outreach strategies. Each strategy follows basic public participation steps:

- Identify target populations and public participation needs;
- Coordinate internally to identify methods and develop public participation strategy;
- Coordinate with CBO partners;
- Conduct outreach;
- Identify language needs per the LAP;
- Implement public participation strategy; and
- Compile, review and report results.

These strategy examples may be used to guide, rather than prescribe, the development of future targeted outreach strategies.

A. Example of Public Participation Strategy for BART Projects

This example could be adapted for a variety of scenarios such as a construction project, service change or fare increase.

The public participation strategy for the example project would be communicated broadly throughout the BART service area. BART would use its ongoing tools, which are well-established and reach a wide audience. There would also be significant public participation activities focused in the different communities, especially those most impacted by BART's proposal.

At the community level, BART would take the following steps to implement a geographically focused public participation strategy:

Identify Target Populations and Public Participation Needs

- Perform demographic analysis of the population.
- Identify significant populations for targeted outreach.

Coordinate Internally

- Government and Community Relations Department (GCR), Office of Civil Rights (OCR), and the project team determine the most appropriate form of outreach to be meetings and determine the goals and objectives for the meeting.
- Develop a draft public participation strategy.

Coordinate with CBO Partners

- Identify all CBO partners by considering the following in the project area: who serves the population and where they convene.
- Consider the following types of CBOs to comprehensively reach low income, minority and LEP populations within the project area: faith-based, geographic-specific such as tenant associations, neighborhood and community, education, social services, recreation, environmental, political, youth- and senior-oriented organizations.
- Clearly explain the desired outcomes for the different public participation methods such as sharing information, collecting input and setting community priorities.
- Identify the best way to publicize the public participation methods, select meeting dates and venues, and determine translation needs. The community advisors can help BART avoid potential scheduling conflicts and take advantage of existing events where they can easily reach a significant number of community members.
- Identify the recommended participation methods to achieve these outcomes. For example, a CBO may recommend a meeting format that allows small group discussion so that participants have an opportunity to discuss and understand the information being presented. For a construction project, BART might host some on-site informational tours to help community members better understand the impact the project would have on their immediate neighborhood.

Conduct Outreach

- Work to publicize the activities, identify performance measurements and set targets for participation from the area.
- Ensure that flyers, notices and other outreach methods clearly describe the issue and purpose of the meeting or public participation activity.
- Identify a specific number and sequence of public participation methods and clearly communicate how BART decision makers would use the public input.

Identify Language Service Needs

- Identify language interpretation needs, translate outreach documents, and provide language interpretation services at the activity.

Implement Public Participation Strategy

- Implement the methods identified in the public participation strategy.

Compile, Review and Report Results

- Continue to review the participation goals established at the beginning of PPP strategy development and monitor progress and performance.
- Regularly update the community on the status of the issue and identify additional opportunities for community input.
- Make sure the community is aware of key decision-making activities, such as Board meetings, where action would be taken, so community members can see how the decision was made.
- Communicate the results back to the community, providing a record of the number and characteristics of participants and date, time and location of meetings, and describing the rationale for how and why suggestions made through community input were or were not implemented.

B. Specific Project Examples

Specific Project Example 1

This project is a 10-mile extension eastward from the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station near Hillcrest Avenue. Construction began in late 2010. Service opening is scheduled for 2015 and will coincide with the completion of the widening of State Highway 4.

In July 2010, BART hosted three meetings to solicit input from East Contra Costa County community members regarding station access, span of service, fare and travel times.

Identify Target Populations and Public Participation Needs

- Performed demographic analysis of the population within the project corridor.
- Identified significant populations for targeted outreach; low income, minority and LEP populations.

Coordinate Internally

- GCR, OCR, and the project team determined the most appropriate form of outreach to be meetings and determined the topics.
- Determined the locations for three meetings to cover the entire corridor based on the demographic analysis and recommendations from community leaders. Meetings were scheduled in the cities of Pittsburg, Antioch and Brentwood.
- Developed public participation strategy.

Coordinate with CBO Partners

- GCR researched and identified the following specific, local organizations through which to conduct targeted outreach to Blacks, Hispanic and Latinos, Asian and Pacific Islanders, low income and Spanish and Chinese language

speaking corridor residents: ALIVE – Futures Explored, Inc. (developmentally disabled community); NAACP, Antioch; Monument Community Partnership, Concord; La Clinica, Pittsburg; West County Toxics Coalition, Dr. Henry Clark (multi-racial, low income); Contra Costa Interfaith Supporting Community Organization (CCISCO); Antioch Church Family; Holy Rosary Church, Antioch; Antioch Christian Center; Community Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg; Immaculate Heart of Mary, Brentwood; and Golden Hills Community Church, Brentwood.

Conduct Outreach

- Meeting agenda produced in English, Spanish and Chinese.
- Created a meeting notice in multiple languages (English, Spanish and Chinese) for conventional mail distribution and circulation at community and civic organizations.
- Mailed multi-lingual meeting notice to a half-mile radius around each meeting location, as follows: Antioch, Nick Rodriguez Community Center, 625 notices mailed; Pittsburg, Pittsburg Senior Center, 1,550 notices mailed; Brentwood, Brentwood Senior Center, 1,200 notices mailed.
- GCR, OCR and Planning drafted a meeting survey instrument which was produced in English, Spanish and Chinese.
- Distributed multi-lingual meeting notices to environmental advocacy groups in the corridor: Transform, Sierra Club, East Bay Bicycle Coalition and Sustainable Contra Costa.
- Posted meeting flyers at Senior Centers, Community Centers, Libraries, City Halls, Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station and on cars at Brentwood and Antioch Park and Ride lots.
- Informed the staffs of the following City, County, State and Federal elected officials of upcoming meetings and asked them to share the information with their constituents: City Councils and Mayors of Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood; Contra Costa County Supervisors; State Assembly members and Senator; and U.S. Congressional Representatives.
- Contacted local City Managers and Planning Commissioners to inform them of meetings.
- Contacted local transportation planning agency/groups and requested that meeting flyer be distributed among members (CCTA, 511.org, TRANSPLAN).
- Contacted and informed other transit agencies in the corridor (Tri Delta, AC Transit, County Connection).
- Requested all cities, county and chambers of commerce to post the meeting notice on their website.
- Electronically posted meeting notice including: BART website, project page, Facebook and Twitter.
- Advertised meetings in local newspapers including: Contra Costa Times, Antioch Press, Brentwood Press, and El Mundo, among others.

- Utilized an email list/database created through the project to send out meeting notice via email blast.

Identify Language Service Needs

- Spanish language interpretation was requested for one meeting and translation services were provided.

Implement Public Participation Strategy

- Implemented public participation strategy, which included three public meetings.

Compile, Review and Report Results

- Compiled and reviewed results.
- Reported results.

Specific Project Example 2

BART is preparing a station access plan for the Daly City BART station area. The plan focuses on key elements including the bus intermodal facility; bike, pedestrian and station circulation issues related to access and safety; and consideration of possible amenities including wayfinding signage and real time technology. The plan area encompasses a half-mile radius around the station and straddles the southern edge of San Francisco and the northern edge of Daly City.

In Spring 2011, BART hosted two community meetings to solicit input from Daly City and San Francisco community members who live in the study area. The study continues through 2011, with a third meeting planned for Summer 2011. Completed study / final report is anticipated in Fall 2011.

Identify Target Populations and Public Participation Needs

- Performed demographic analysis of the population within the study area.
- Identified significant populations for targeted outreach; low income, minority (Asian, Hispanic) and LEP (Tagalog) outreach to a large Pilipino population and smaller Spanish speaking population.

Coordinate Internally

- GCR, OCR and Planning determined the most appropriate form of outreach to be meetings.
- Determined the meeting locations would be central, accessible and walkable to the study area.

Coordinate with CBO Partners

- GCR researched and identified specific, local organizations through which to conduct targeted outreach low income, Asian, Hispanic and Tagalog and Spanish language speakers in the study area: North Peninsula Neighborhood

Services Center; El Concilio of San Mateo (Spanish speakers, low income); Pilipino Bayanihan Resource Center (Asian, Tagalog and Spanish speakers); North Peninsula Food Pantry & Dining Center of Daly City; Liwanag Kultural Center (Asian); Daly City Community Service Center (multi-cultural); Filipino Community Center (Asian, Tagalog speakers); Pacifica Resource Center (Asian, Hispanic, low income, Spanish and Tagalog speakers); St. Bruno's Catholic Church (multi-cultural, low income); Legal Aid Society of San Mateo; Samaritan House (low income); Merced Extension Triangle Neighborhood Association; Doelger Senior Center; City of Daly City Planning Department; City of San Francisco Office of Supervisor Sean Elsbernd; War Memorial Community Center; Westlake Community Center; Colma Community Center; Lincoln Community Center; Parkmerced; San Francisco State University (multi-cultural, low income); Alma Via of San Francisco (senior housing).

- Partnered with local community-based organization (Pilipino Bayanihan Resource Center to conduct extensive outreach and host community meeting).

Conduct Outreach

- Created and hand-distributed first meeting notice to BART passengers who use the Daly City BART Station during morning and evening peak commute periods, as well as conventional mail distribution, and circulation by hand to local organizations, community leaders, businesses and community-based organizations
- Created multi-lingual meeting notice for BART passengers who use the Daly City BART Station during morning and evening peak commute periods, as well as conventional mail distribution, and circulation by hand to local organizations, community leaders, businesses and community-based organizations.

Identify Language Service Needs

- Translation services were offered but no requests were submitted.

Implement Public Participation Strategy

- Implementing public participation strategy, which includes three community meetings.

Compile, Review and Report Results

- Will compile and review results.
- Will report results.

Specific Project Example 3

The purpose of this project is to implement BART's Strategic Maintenance Plan and to accommodate an expanded fleet. Project construction will take place in two Phases, with Phase 1 construction potentially beginning in 2012.

In October 2010, BART hosted a public meeting to discuss and solicit input from community members regarding the proposed project.

Identify Target Populations and Public Participation Needs

- Performed demographic analysis of the population surrounding the project area (Hayward and Union City).
- Identified significant populations for targeted outreach: low income and LEP persons (Spanish, Chinese and Tagalog language speakers).

Coordinate Internally

- GCR, OCR and project staff determined the most appropriate form of outreach to be a meeting and determined the goals and objectives of the community meeting.
- Developed public participation strategy.

Coordinate with CBO Partners

- GCR researched and identified specific, local organizations through which to conduct targeted outreach to low income and Spanish- and Tagalog-speaking area residents.

Conduct Outreach

- Created a meeting notice in multiple languages (English, Spanish and Tagalog) for conventional mail distribution and circulation through community and civic organizations.
- Mailed a multi-lingual meeting notice to approximately 4,600 residents and 600 businesses within a one-mile radius of the project.
- Posted a multi-lingual meeting notice on BART website and distributed it to the following community and municipal organizations: Afghan & International Refugees Support Services, Alameda County One Stop Career Center, Centro de Servicios, Continental Mobile Home Park, Daison Japan (Asian and Pacific Islander Market), Eden Area YMCA, Hayward City Hall, Hayward Day Labor Center, Hayward Family Resource Center, Hillview Baptist Church, Hillview Crest Elementary School, Kennedy Community Center, La Familia Counseling Services, Lincoln Child Center, Marina Food (Asian and Pacific Islander Market), Masjid Abubaker Siddiq (Islamic Mosque), New Haven Adult School, Nichiren Buddhist Center International Center, Our Lady of the Rosary Parish, Rental Housing Owners Association of Hayward, South Hayward Parish, Spanish Ranch Mobile Home Park No. 2, Tiburcio Vasquez Health Center, Union City Library, and the City Hall of Union City.
- Advertised meetings in local and ethnic newspapers including: Tri-City Voice, Sing Tao (Chinese), Philippine News (Tagalog), and Philippines Today (Tagalog).

Identify Language Service Needs

- Chinese language interpretation was requested for one meeting and translation services were provided.

Implement Public Participation Strategy

- Implemented public participation strategy, which included one public meeting.

Compile, Review and Report Results

- Compiled and reviewed results.
- Reported results. Project information on the comment period and meeting was made available on the BART website in English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese and Tagalog.

Specific Project Example 4

This project is a 5.4 mile extension of the end of the line in Fremont to a new station. Construction is underway and anticipated to be complete in late 2014.

In April 2011, BART hosted two public meetings to solicit input from southern Alameda County and northern Santa Clara County residents on key station elements including access, parking, fares and amenities. Express bus riders along the corridor were also surveyed.

Identify Target Populations and Public Participation Needs

- Performed demographic analysis of the population within the corridor.
- Identified significant populations for targeted outreach: Hispanic, Asian and Pacific Islander and LEP persons (Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Korean language speakers).

Coordinate Internally

- GCR, OCR and project staff determined the most appropriate form of outreach to be two meetings and a field survey.
- Determined the locations for two meetings within the corridor based on the demographic analysis and recommendations from community leaders. Meetings were scheduled in Fremont and Milpitas.
- Developed public participation strategy.

Coordinate with CBO Partners

- GCR researched and identified the following specific local organizations through which to conduct targeted outreach to Spanish-, Chinese-, Vietnamese- and Korean-speaking corridor residents: Fremont Family Resource Center; Bay Area Immigration and Refugee Services (BAIRS); South Bay Chinese Club; India Community Center; Milpitas Food Pantry; The Family Giving Tree; Jain Center of Northern California; LIFE Eldercare.

Conduct Outreach

- Performed field surveys in Downtown San Jose and at Fremont BART Station of express bus riders along the corridor.
- Contacted and worked with Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA) staff to inform them of the outreach process and determine what outreach they have done for the VTA BART extension project.
- Created a meeting notice in multiple languages (Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Korean). Also, included a tag line in Persian and Hindi informing the speakers of those two languages that translation services and child care can be made available if requested 72 hours in advance of meeting time.
- Mailed multi-lingual meeting notice to a half-mile radius around each meeting location, as follows: Fremont, Warm Springs Community Center, 1,752 notices mailed; Milpitas, Milpitas Community Center, 893 notices mailed.
- GCR, OCR and project staff drafted a meeting survey instrument and field survey instrument which was produced in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Korean.
- Informed City staff and County elected officials of upcoming meetings and asked them to share the information with their constituents, including: City Councils and Mayors of Fremont and Milpitas, Local Chambers of Commerce, and Alameda County Board of Supervisors.
- Contacted local City Managers and Planning Commissioners to inform them of meetings.
- Electronically posted meeting notice including: BART website, project page, Facebook and Twitter.
- Advertised meetings in the following newspapers: Milpitas Post, Fremont Bulletin, Tri City Voice, India West, Vision Hispania (Spanish), Kyocharo News (Korean), World Journal (Chinese) and Vietnam Daily News (Vietnamese).
- Contacted local neighborhood and business groups to request the distribution of the multi-lingual meeting notice, including: Irvington Business Association, Warm Springs Business, Community Association, Niles Main Street and Avalon HOA.
- Called and visited local community-based and faith based organizations including: South Bay Community Church, Fremont; First Baptist Church, Fremont; Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Fremont; Warm Springs Church, Fremont; Cross Point Church of Silicon Valley, Milpitas; Saint John the Baptist, Milpitas; Milpitas Community Church, Milpitas; India Community Center, Milpitas; Barbara Lee Senior Center, Milpitas; League of Women Voters; National Federation for the Blind; Fremont/Newark YMCA, California School for the Deaf, Fremont; Irvington Community Center, Fremont; Bay Area Community Services Center, Fremont; Warm Springs Community Center, Fremont; and Northwest Polytechnic University, Fremont.
- Contacted and informed other transit agencies in the corridor (AC Transit, VTA).

Identify Language Service Needs

- Korean language interpretation was requested for one meeting and translation services were provided.

Implement Public Participation Strategy

- Implemented public participation strategy, which included two public meetings.

Compile, Review and Report Results

- Currently compiling and reviewing results.
- Will report results.

VI. PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND OBJECTIVES

A. Monitoring and Tracking

Public Participation Plan

Community members emphasized accountability during the process of developing the PPP. BART's Office of Government and Community Relations will monitor and track its public participation methods and share results in a transparent way. This includes being clear about process timelines and changes at BART that affect public participation methods.

BART already has some information about the reach of its ongoing methods. For example, BART currently tracks how many people receive notifications by email or text and through its Facebook page. BART also tracks website hits, telephone inquiries, the number of newsletters distributed through its stations and other measures of community contacts. BART staff track the number of inquiries and comments they receive by phone, email and in-person.

These numbers can help track communication methods, but additional measurements will be needed to determine if public participation goals are being met. Depending on the nature and scale of the topic or decision at hand, BART will identify specific measurable objectives for public participation methods.

Some measurable performance objectives BART will consider include:

- Number of participants attending a participation activity.
- Percent of the participants from a specific geographic area.
- Number and percent of participants providing feedback in languages other than English (identify number of respondents by language).
- Number and percent of responses received to a survey or questionnaire.
- Number of webpage downloads occurring during a specific time period.
- Number and percent of participants signed up to receive web, phone, or mail-based communications as a result of a participation activity.
- Number and percent of contacts updated (on a monthly or quarterly basis) to ensure participants continue receiving notices and announcements.
- Number and percent of participants expressing satisfaction regarding the process or results of a participation activity.

Other Methods

Community partners may be able to help BART identify baseline information and other data to help determine additional performance measurement methods. It is also

important to ask community meeting participants how they heard about the meeting so as to determine how best to target outreach efforts.

B. Public Participation Outcomes

After each public participation strategy implementation, community members have expressed an expectation and preference that BART share what it has learned from the community, and how it took that information into account. BART should be able to demonstrate to the community that it has considered and explored the direction recommended by the public and taken that into account as part of its overall analysis. BART should explain its rationale when, for example, a highly popular suggestion was not implemented because it was found to be technically unfeasible or cost-prohibitive. BART staff and Directors need to report back on the results of the analysis for methods for which public input was sought.

C. Conclusion

The BART Public Participation Plan is intended to be a living document that will be informed by current and future practices, successes and lessons learned. BART could continue to adapt and modify its public participation practices and language assistance services over time.

The more than 1,000 community members who gave so graciously of their time during the last few months told us that not only must BART do a better job of reaching out, but we must also better define the services that we already have.

Through this process of asking the community to help us to create the most effective Public Participation Plan possible, we have learned that building bridges and trust among people who have historically felt excluded from real institutional decision-making is a journey that will take time and a redoubled commitment from all of the staff at BART.