1. Who are the stakeholders?
   - How to reach traditionally underrepresented groups?
   - Grassroots (through Community Based Orgs) vs. Grass Tops (Community Leaders)?
   - Is the goal to engage transportation advocates, broader community groups or the general public?
     Steve: implementing partners vs. stakeholders who won't be implementing
     Jessica: who are they as we select and prioritize vs. time for implementation (program development vs. project development)
     John: stakeholders should be grasstops
     Seleta: who can do/is capable of legitimate outreach?
     Jessica: impacts communities so need grasstops in 5-year program, but what to do when groups don't exist?

2. What roles do COGs, cities and stakeholders play in community engagement?
   - Karen: relationship to process; coordinator and normalizer; rely on cities to do outreach because they've already done it; priority setting is primary issue
   - Hilary: consumers have different perspectives about involvement and roles; need early outreach as part of project vetting process
   - Jessica: who decides who gets to come to the table? Who decides program development?
     Decision-maker vs. facilitator/consensus-builder?
   - Steve: committees are the venue for setting priorities and then Board makes decision, but no guiding framework; if cities haven't set their priorities
   - Seleta: transparency needed; map projects
   - Steve: COGs need to set criteria for making decisions and involving stakeholders in the criteria development

3. What type of engagement is needed for developing and updating a five-year program versus individual projects?
   - John: existing COG process makes sense for 5-year program, but projects need more input through cities
   - Seleta: concern about slush funds that toggle between programs and projects and pressure for programs to fill gaps on projects (programs are categories) (Metro allows flexibility to move funds between modes if COG agrees)
   - Joann: grasstops should be involved in setting criteria (program); projects need to be in context of regional goals
   - Steve: pick list (common framework) for COGs and decide how to weight criteria based on their subregion needs

4. What are the “standards” for community engagement we are trying to achieve while allowing flexibility to accommodate the distinctive characteristics of each sub-region?
   - Steve: a challenge to come up with standards because of great diversity in needs/wants; process and methodology--as long as you go through that, everyone will understand it, but OK to have different rules within consistent process that's transparent; help the deliberative process; grasstops to participate in setting standards
   - Seleta: where are we on the IAP2 spectrum? Power to select projects? Power to inform process? At least need to document engagement process; could be a simple checklist to demonstrate what and how we did
   - Karen: could be consistent to use Metro's performance metrics
   - Hilary: give time on what they want to see

5. How much education is important for obtaining effective input?
   - Hilary: important outcome to achieve an interconnected system
   - Jessica: what are standards and role of COG staffer in educating and facilitating input? Hard to
engage with every city, can that be done with COGs?
Seleta: what do we really want from people and when; be clear about that? Framework vs. project; a lot of work to do on engagement topic; get on same page about fundamentals

6. Are MSP Funds eligible/available for community engagement?
Metro: maybe
Karen: yes, it would be helpful to have funding for education and engagement
Jessica: needs to be available during implementation of projects
Seleta: yes, to be effective; but need to get training as condition for funding; capacity building

RESOURCE:

Themes:
1. Process and decision-making transparency would facilitate understanding and effective engagement
2. Clarity of roles and responsibilities would facilitate effective engagement
3. Basic, uniform standards for process, engagement and decision-making would be helpful, as long as COGs had flexibility for customization to address sub-regional needs and distinctiveness
4. COGs are willing to improve the process and achieve a minimum level of consistency
5. Engagement on priority-setting guidelines, rules and metrics will be different than engagement on programs and projects

CALL PAC ATTENDEES
Steve Lantz (South Bay COG), jurisdiction
John Bwarie (San Fernando Valley COG), jurisdiction
Jessica Meaney (Investing In Place), consumer
Bryn Lindblad (Climate Resolve), consumer
Joanna Hankamer (Westside Cities COG), jurisdiction
Seleta Reynolds (LADOT), jurisdiction
Hilary Norton (Business), consumer
Angela George (County of LA), jurisdiction
Marianne Kim (Auto Club), provider

OTHER ATTENDEES
Karen Heit (Gateway COG), jurisdiction
David, provider
Paul, jurisdiction

EMAILED COMMENTS PRIOR TO CALL
LADOT through Seleta:

• Comment on Step 2: Suggest a checklist to demonstrate that projects that have already gone through public vetting and outreach do not require an additional public participation process. Previously approved city plans and programs that went through rigorous outreach helped inform the improvements identified during the Mobility Matrix process. Will Metro offer assistance with the public participation and outreach?

Jessica M., Investing in Place:

• We want to make sure that the community engagement discussion is focused on how community groups will have input at the policy/program level for project selection/prioritization. How to support this happening?
Trolis Niebla, City of Lancaster & North County COG:
Some of the stakeholders are pushing for extensive public participation/outreach during the development of the 5-year project plan. The North County COG feels Cities that make up the COG are the best place for public input to happen. It is important to note the projects making up the 5 year project list were/are not created in a vacuum, but are often synthesized from other city planning and prioritizing efforts. For instance, the City's strategic plans, Active Transportation plans, and other planning processes include public input. City Councils and staff hear from residents about important issues, including safety, congestion, and accessibility. Furthermore, each project would likely have a public input process of its own.