

**VOLUME III, SECTION VIII**  
**C 1. INTERVIEW RESPONSES**

**C1. Categories of Interview Responses and Percentages**

Three two member teams of graduate students in communication, geography, and law, supervised by one principal investigator, analyzed interview responses to identify the themes for each open-ended question. The themes, along with the percentages by individual MPO and all MPOs combined are presented in this section. The percentages represent percentages of responses (not respondents) since all ideas offered by a respondent (multiple ideas in an answer to a question) were coded.

These responses were derived from 57 interviews in Denver, 22 in Dallas-Ft.Worth, 44 in Seattle and 44 in Phoenix.

Two interview questions are not included in this section. One (question #18) asked respondents to give us their own definitions of “fairness” in a process. This was used to provide the research team with insights into possible differences between locations in how the MPO process might be judged. Our analysis disclosed no differences in any locations. The second question (question # 26) not included was a question which asked respondents to elaborate on a needed change in the MPO process. The question asked what the suggested change would accomplish. The question is not included because adequate reliability in coding the response to this question was never attained.

**C2. Reliabilities of Coders**

The two-member teams, which developed the categories for particular questions, were then compared in terms of their agreement on assigning ideas to categories. The statistic for assessing inter-coder preliminary was Cohen’s Kappa.

## C1. CATEGORIES OF INTERVIEW RESPONSES AND PERCENTAGES

**QUESTION #9: Do the elected officials in the MPO process reflect the needs of the Metropolitan area as a whole, or do they focus on the interests of the organizations they represent?**

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 15%                    | 15%           | 30%            | 9%             | 17%          |

Meeting Both Regional and Local Needs: This category describes a balanced approach to meeting transportation needs. It is characterized by fellowship, partnership, flexibility, and alliances between members in the MPO process that results in cooperation in recognizing and meeting both local and regional needs without conflict.

Examples of responses are as follows: There is an extremely high-degree of cooperation. Competing for funds by local areas is almost nonexistent; They focus on their organization, but as a group they tend to vote in the best interest of everyone; Policy leaders have strong respect for the technical process.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 2. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 70%                    | 17%           | 38%            | 6%             | 27%          |

Meeting Regional Needs: Respondents have clearly indicated that regional needs take precedence over local needs. Success in meeting regional needs is attributed to strong leadership and good communication.

Examples of responses are as follows: Most do a good job of representing the metropolitan area as a whole; They cooperate with each other; Most reflect region as a whole; They have a 6-year action strategy that is regional.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 3. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 10%                    | 19%           | 11%            | 15%            | 14%          |

Meeting Regional Needs with Exceptions: The general focus in the MPO process is on regional needs; however, specific exceptions are cited. Respondents occasionally described a conflict with local interests.

Examples of responses are as follows: They look at things regionally. But when things are broken down, they fight for allocations to their area. A majority are more regionally minded. There are always some who are there to advance the interests of their area alone. Overall, officials in the MPO process reflect the needs of the metropolitan area. Every now and then, officials focus on their own interests; They adequately focus on the needs of the region, yet sometimes the squeaky wheel gets the grease.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 4. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 5%                     | 30%           | 11%            | 24%            | 20%          |

Meeting Local Needs with Exceptions: The general focus in the MPO process is on local needs; however, specific exceptions are cited. Respondents occasionally mentioned incidents compelling a regional focus.

Examples of responses are as follows: Everyone looks primarily after their own backyard; They focus on the interests of the organizations they represent. Still, some give and take regarding both; Most definitely support the organizations they represent. Only a few take a regional approach. They are getting better though.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 5. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 0%                     | 19%           | 8%             | 47%            | 21%          |

Meeting Local Needs: Respondents have clearly indicated that local needs take precedence over regional needs. Competition and conflicting interests characterize this category.

Examples of responses are as follows: Over the past few years the struggle over freeway implementation has caused a surfacing of parochial interests, particularly between the east and west valleys; They represent their organizations. Elected officials are elected by their jurisdictions and are responsible for them.

Summary Table for Question #9

QUESTION #9: Do the elected officials in the MPO process reflect the needs of the Metropolitan area as a whole, or do they focus on the interests of the organizations they represent?

|  | <b>DFW</b> | <b>DEN</b> | <b>SEA</b> | <b>PH<br/>O</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>1. Meeting Both Regional and Local Needs</b>  | <b>15%</b> | <b>15%</b> | <b>30%</b> | <b>9%</b>       | <b>17%</b>   |
| <b>2. Meeting Regional Needs</b>                 | <b>70%</b> | <b>17%</b> | <b>38%</b> | <b>6%</b>       | <b>27%</b>   |
| <b>3. Meeting Regional Needs with Exceptions</b> | <b>10%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>11%</b> | <b>15%</b>      | <b>14%</b>   |
| <b>4. Meeting Local Needs with Exceptions</b>    | <b>5%</b>  | <b>30%</b> | <b>11%</b> | <b>24%</b>      | <b>20%</b>   |
| <b>5. Meeting Local Needs</b>                    | <b>0%</b>  | <b>19%</b> | <b>8%</b>  | <b>47%</b>      | <b>21%</b>   |

QUESTION #10Y: Is the MPO process able to meet rapidly changing transportation needs? (The following categories are for those who answered “Yes” to the question.)

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 30%                    | 39%           | 43%            | 27%            | 35%          |

Flexibility/Responsiveness: To meet rapidly changing transportation needs, an MPO’s process must be adaptable and rapid. When issues are identified, the MPO is able to gather information, adjust plans, allocate or divert funding, and solve problems creatively. The MPO must also be open to receiving new information that would contradict what has been accepted for a current or future

transportation plan. Such a response to new information may require a shift in priorities, policy, or even philosophy.

Examples of responses are as follows: ISTEA and TEA-21 facilitate flexibility, and the MPO tries hard to be flexible when changes are necessary; Dallas is growing quickly, both in terms of cars and people, and the MPO has responded fairly quickly given the funding constraints; An example is the recent move for rapid freight mobility. The corridor was identified and funds were quickly allocated to the project; The TIP is creative.

2. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 15%             | 0%     | 13%     | 9%      | 11%   |

Reliable Current/Projected Data: Part of what makes an MPO able to meet rapidly changing needs is its ability to see current trends and needs and to predict what will be necessary for addressing future transportation needs.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO stays current with demands and focuses on trends; The MPO generated models and committees recently to meet changing needs; No plan is forward-thinking enough, but the PSRC is as close as anyone; Long-term planning and focused thinking helps - problems are addressed as soon as possible.

3. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 9%              | 0%     | 7%      | 18%     | 9%    |

Staff Competence: The MPO staff must have a thorough understanding of the process and the needs of the region. Rapid responses also require that the staff be efficient and approachable.

Examples of responses are as follows: A big part of the MPO's ability to respond rapidly is that the staff is so good at understanding the needs and processes, and they quickly move things along; Yes, but it is very difficult because of the size of the MPO and the diversity of needs. But, the staff is able to accommodate.

4. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 9%              | 0%     | 13%     | 9%      | 9%    |

Cooperation Among Participants: The MPO involves many interests within its boundaries. These varied interests are often in conflict with one another. The ability of the MPO to respond rapidly is dependent upon cooperation between and among the participants representing these interests and the MPO staff itself. It may also include cooperation with members of the state legislature and/or the state department of transportation.

Examples of responses are follows: The relationship with the staff helps; When ISTEA was enacted, everyone came together to quickly change everything and get the process going. All of the players want to make it work; The state legislature wants a more direct role in which projects are funded and built. The MPO is respected and able to act effectively.

|    | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5. | 21%             | 39%    | 3%      | 14%     | 16%   |

Adequate Process With Limiting External Factor(s): The MPO’s process is adequate to address and respond to the rapidly changing transportation needs, but there is an external factor(s) that limits the implementation of such changes. These factors may include funding limitations, conflicting needs of participants, or unpredicted changes in legislation.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO process is able to meet rapidly changing transportation needs within the limits of funding and bureaucracy; The MPO does a good job given the limited resources and the extensive traffic needs; The MPO is capable of doing it, but whether it does or not is questionable; The MPO has the ability to move quickly, but it only does so if the issues interest them at the staff level; The public doesn’t understand funding problems.

|    | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 6. | 15%             | 8%     | 10%     | 0%      | 9%    |

Land Use Planning/Pro-Development: Rapid changes in transportation needs often accompany rapid growth. Where an MPO is philosophically opposed to growth, it may ignore the problem, figuring that heavy traffic volume will dissuade the public from further growth. If rapidly changing transportation needs are to be met, the MPO must be willing to make the changes. These issues may also be treated statutorily through land-use planning and similar types of legislative acts. The Growth Management Act in Washington is an example of such legislation.

Examples of responses are as follows: Yes, because planners here are not anti-development - they are often anti-development in other places; The Growth Management Plan at the state level forces timely changes, but the local plan must include that use. Growth can only occur in pre-planned areas.

|    | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 7. | 0%              | 15%    | 10%     | 23%     | 10%   |

Other: Here, the respondent answered the question in the affirmative but the subsequent response did not fit into another category or did not directly address the question.

Examples of responses are as follows: Yes. “Rapidly” means five years or less; I question the sanity of the R.C.T. High-speed rapid transit was voter-approved; Yes, in some areas. Transit for low-income people has been dramatically improved.

Summary Table for Question #10Y

**QUESTION #10Y: Is the MPO process able to meet rapidly changing transportation needs?** (The following categories are for those who answered “Yes” to the question.)

|  | DFW        | DE<br>N    | SEA        | PH<br>O    | TOTAL      |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>1. Flexibility/Responsiveness</b>                 | <b>30%</b> | <b>39%</b> | <b>43%</b> | <b>27%</b> | <b>35%</b> |
| 2. Reliable Current/Projected Data                   | 15%        | 0%         | 13%        | 9%         | 11%        |
| 3. Staff Competence                                  | 9%         | 0%         | 7%         | 18%        | 9%         |
| 4. Cooperation Among Participants                    | 9%         | 0%         | 13%        | 9%         | 9%         |
| 5. Adequate Process With Limiting External Factor(s) | 21%        | 39%        | 3%         | 14%        | 16%        |
| 6. Land Use Planning/Pro-Development                 | 15%        | 8%         | 10%        | 0%         | 9%         |
| 7. Other   | 0%         | 15%        | 10%        | 23%        | 10%        |

**QUESTION #10N: Is the MPO process able to meet rapidly changing transportation needs?** (The following categories are for those who answered “No” to the question.)

| 1. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 62%             | 13%    | 35%     | 11%     | 21%   |

Inadequate Resources/Unattainable Task: The MPO process is not blameworthy in its inability to meet rapidly changing transportation needs. The problem is insufficient funding to meet such needs, which are often associated with explosive growth and development in a particular area. The MPO is alerted to the upcoming needs, but it is unable to respond.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO is fairly progressive, but there is no way to keep up; Funding is a major limitation.

| 2. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 38%             | 35%    | 31%     | 22%     | 31%   |

Complex Process/Time-Consuming: The MPO’s processes for planning and project selection involve many steps. Input must be received from the multiple interests represented within the MPO, as well as citizen groups, federal agencies, business leaders, and the like. It is a bureaucratic process and, by its very nature, it takes time to reach an agreeable decision. Statutory and regulatory mandates by Congress and state legislatures, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other regulatory entities add additional complexity to the processes.

Examples of responses are as follows: Regulations don’t allow for a quick reaction; The government doesn’t meet anything rapidly; It’s more methodical than rapid; The MPO cannot respond rapidly. It takes about one year to get projects through the process.

| 3. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 0%              | 21%    | 8%      | 7%      | 12%   |

Unpredicted Growth/Inaccurate Data: The information used by the MPO is inadequate to identify current and/or future transportation needs. Sometimes

information is obtained after a problem has occurred because the modeling used to predict transportation needs is inadequate. Other times, the information is not gathered at intervals that are frequent enough to adequately address rapid-growth areas.

Examples of responses are as follows: The technical staff is very good, but the transportation modeling is out-of-date. It doesn't consider land use planning enough; The MPO is responding to growth after-the-fact. It is responding to needs after they become apparent; The census doesn't keep-up with change-there is lag; They haven't been very good at reaching out to understand the community. The technical data and modeling are out-of-date.

4.

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 0%              | 8%     | 19%     | 22%     | 14%   |

Conflicting Interests/Lack of Cooperation: Each MPO must consider a broad array of interests, including those of the jurisdictions represented, special interest groups, citizens, and businesses, to name a few. It is difficult for all participants to have a common vision on which to base decisions. In an MPO where the participants are not regionally focused and do not share a common vision for meeting current and future transportation demands, the lack of cooperation adds time to the already complex and lengthy process. Some respondents believe that the MPO should not act rapidly because the democratic nature of the process would necessarily be eroded.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO has the ability to respond rapidly, as structured, but as it has played out it has not been able to combat increasing parochialism among participating members. . .the political and business communities contribute to fragmentation; Because the MPO represents so many large interests, it cannot shift rapidly. It may not even be a good idea to shift rapidly.

5.

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 0%              | 15%    | 4%      | 37%     | 15%   |

MPO Will Not/Cannot Address Needs: Each MPO has its own "personality." Some MPOs are more resistant to change and suggestion than others. This can cause inflexibility, precluding rapid and appropriate responses to transportation needs. The organization structure is important as well. The MPO staff and other decisional bodies have a significant degree of control over whether or not a project or issue will be addressed adequately, if at all. When an issue is addressed, the solution generated by the MPO may be inadequate or inappropriate. Also included in this category are responses that "rate" the MPO process generally.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO is reluctant to put in the extra work; In the MPO process, when a problem is "solved," they think it is fixed for life, as opposed to shifting with changing needs; A lot of it has to do with the entrenched approaches of the staff, who have a hard time responding to change;

The long-range planning is controlled by the Executive Board (regional council of mayors) and goes no further than the next election; On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 meaning “completely meeting needs,” I would give it a 6; Institutional inertia.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 6. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 0%                     | 8%            | 4%             | 0%             | 8%           |

Needs are not adequately met, no elaboration: Participants do not believe rapidly changing transportation needs are being met, but there is no elaboration.

Summary Table for Question #10N

**QUESTION #10N: Is the MPO process able to meet rapidly changing transportation needs?** (The following categories are for those who answered “No” to the question.)

|   | <b>DFW</b> | <b>DEN</b> | <b>SEA</b> | <b>PH<br/>O</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. Inadequate Resources/Unattainable Task       | <b>62%</b> | <b>13%</b> | <b>35%</b> | <b>11%</b>      | <b>21%</b>   |
| 2. Complex Process/Time-Consuming               | <b>38%</b> | <b>35%</b> | <b>31%</b> | <b>22%</b>      | <b>31%</b>   |
| 3. Unpredicted Growth/Inaccurate Data           | <b>0%</b>  | <b>21%</b> | <b>8%</b>  | <b>7%</b>       | <b>12%</b>   |
| 4. Conflicting Interests/Lack of Cooperation    | <b>0%</b>  | <b>8%</b>  | <b>19%</b> | <b>22%</b>      | <b>14%</b>   |
| 5. MPO Will Not/Cannot Address Needs            | <b>0%</b>  | <b>15%</b> | <b>4%</b>  | <b>37%</b>      | <b>15%</b>   |
| 6. Needs are not adequately met, no elaboration | <b>0%</b>  | <b>8%</b>  | <b>4%</b>  | <b>0%</b>       | <b>8%</b>    |

**QUESTION #11: How well do the MPO and the regional transit agency work together?**

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 66%                    | 11%           | 35%            | 17%            | 27%          |

Excellent: The MPO and the regional transit agency (RTA) work well together. Respondents noted good coordination, cooperation, and communication. The staff works well together through the sharing of information, options, ideas, and technical assistance. Good collaboration occurs because members serve on both the MPO and Regional Transit Boards.

Examples of responses are as follows: Good collaboration in the planning process; The MPO provides much technical assistance; The staff works well together. There is a fair amount of board member overlap; Terrific! Political members get involved in both agencies because they recognize the importance of this. There is good communication between the two; There is cooperation with RTA and support through the provision of information and education. We have built collaborative relationships over the last 25 years.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 2. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 0%                     | 26%           | 39%            | 20%            | 24%          |

Good: Overall, the comments were positive but not exceptional. The respondents occasionally mentioned that while one entity was stronger than the other, they managed to work together with little disagreement.

Examples of responses are as follows: The working relationship between the organizations is good, due largely to the MPO staff. Members of the MPO staff used to work for this regional transit agency; They don't see regional issues well. COG has showed them how regional planning is done; Pretty good. County transit has been the primary leader of a MIS transportation corridor; The two agencies work fairly well together. There is some good regional planning going on.

3. 

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 10%                    | 45%           | 16%            | 31%            | 30%          |

Fair: The MPO and the RTA work together; however, respondents noted room for improvement--for instance, poor communication and lack of representation. Under the present circumstances, the process works as good as can be expected.

Examples of responses are as follows: We work as well as we know we can; We try to work well together. Combining the two different agencies isn't making imminent problems worse; PSRC makes every attempt to get the transit agencies to work together.

4. 

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 0%                     | 9%            | 3%             | 14%            | 8%           |

Poor: Respondents clearly stated that the MPO and the RTA do not work together to adequately address specific transit needs. No cooperation and lack of effort or attention to local interests were cited as primary causes.

Examples of responses are as follows: There are cities that aren't willing to do what it takes to make public transportation work; The MPO process is inadequate in addressing ferry transit issues.

5. 

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 24%                    | 8%            | 8%             | 17%            | 12%          |

Other: This category describes respondents who opted to make no comment; respondents who didn't address the question; or respondents who felt unqualified to answer the question.

Examples of responses are as follows: This participant doesn't know; This respondent is not sure because of limited awareness and exposure; Can't say.

Summary Table for Question #11

**QUESTION #11: How well do the MPO and the regional transit agency work together?**

|              | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|--------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 1. Excellent | 66% | 11% | 35% | 17%     | 27%   |
| 2. Good      | 0%  | 26% | 39% | 20%     | 24%   |
| 3. Fair      | 10% | 45% | 16% | 31%     | 30%   |
| 4. Poor      | 0%  | 9*% | 3%  | 14%     | 8%    |
| 5. Other     | 24% | 8%  | 8%  | 17%     | 12%   |

**QUESTION #12: How well do the MPO and the state department of transportation work together?**

| 1. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 67%             | 2%     | 41%     | 6%      | 22%   |

Excellent: The MPO and the state department of transportation work well together. Respondents cited good working collaborative relationships, diversified competence, cooperation, and technical foundation as characterizing this category. Respondents also indicated that each agency sought to understand the issues and needs of the other, provided support and information, and engaged in open communication.

Examples of responses are as follows: The state commission is very open and supportive. We are partnering with the state commission on many projects; They don't seem to bicker much. They back each other up. Here there is trust; The MPO backs-up state design standards; The two agencies work very, very well together; Both agencies try to understand the issues of each district. Both agencies are very responsive on all levels; They work together extraordinarily well; The state department of transportation representative sits on the MPO board and is active. Another representative sits on the transit board. There is an ongoing exchange that is beautiful to both organizations.

| 2. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 24%             | 15%    | 27%     | 17%     | 20%   |

Good: Overall, the comments were positive but not exceptional. The respondents cited reluctance to work together on occasion. Despite differences in process, both the MPO and the state department of transportation were able to function without undue disagreement.

Examples of responses are as follows: The two agencies work together fairly well. The state doesn't like to work through the MPO; Overall, the two agencies work together pretty well, with some rough spots along the way; They work together reasonably well. The state has their own agenda. They have their differences on occasion; They work together, but the state has their own project prioritization process, and this doesn't often match well with the MPO process.

3.

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 10%                    | 36%           | 24%            | 37%            | 30%          |

Fair: Respondents indicated that the working relationship between the MPO and the state department of transportation are mandated and therefore must work together. Both agencies try to work together; however, there are conflicts. The working relationships are uneven. Sometimes they work well together, and sometimes they don't.

Examples of responses are as follows: For the two agencies, working together is mandated because they plan together; The relationship between the two agencies has its ups and downs; Both agencies try to work together. The state wants more control. There are some conflicts between the two agencies.

4.

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 0%                     | 43%           | 3%             | 37%            | 25%          |

Poor: Respondents clearly stated that the MPO and the state department of transportation do not work together to adequately address specific transportation needs. There is animosity between the state department of transportation (which is influenced by legislature) and the MPO.

Examples of responses are as follows: The Arizona Department of Transportation is controlled by the governor, who has been hostile to the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). A lot of legislators hate MAG. MAG has been an easy target; The relationship is not real good; They squabble over how money is allocated from the state; The relationship is unfavorable; There is a lot of pushing and pulling that goes on; Neither one tries to understand the needs of the other. Neither looks at the issues from a larger perspective.

5.

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 0%                     | 4%            | 5%             | 3%             | 3%           |

Other: This category describes respondents who chose to make no comment, respondents who did not address the question, or respondents who felt unqualified to answer the question.

Examples of responses are as follows: This respondent doesn't really know; This respondent has no personal knowledge.

Summary Table for Question #12

**QUESTION #12: How well do the MPO and the state department of transportation work together?**

|              | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|--------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 1. Excellent | 67% | 2%  | 41% | 6%      | 22%   |
| 2. Good      | 24% | 15% | 27% | 17%     | 20%   |
| 3. Fair      | 10% | 36% | 24% | 37%     | 30%   |
| 4. Poor      | 0%  | 43% | 3%  | 37%     | 25%   |
| 5. Other     | 0%  | 4%  | 5%  | 3%      | 3%    |

**QUESTION #13: How well does the MPO process satisfy your needs in the following areas:**

1. 

|                        |               |                |                |              |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| 76%                    | 31%           | 38%            | 49%            | 43%          |

Additional Transportation Capacity - Generally Positive: This category includes responses expressing general satisfaction attributed to factors such as technical support, competent staff, collaborative efforts, and planning.

Examples of responses are as follows: Fine; Moderately; Fairly good job; Pretty good; Better than average- the MPO is doing a good job; Very good. The MPO helps move projects forward; The MPO does an excellent job; The MPO provides technical assistance.

2. 

|                        |               |                |                |              |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| 5%                     | 31%           | 14%            | 29%            | 23%          |

Additional Transportation Capacity - Generally Negative: This category includes responses expressing general dissatisfaction attributed to factors such as a slow process, unaddressed interests, and lack of support.

Examples of responses are as follows: its such a slow process, not much is getting done; Could be better; The needs aren't being met.

3. 

|                        |               |                |                |              |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| 10%                    | 10%           | 19%            | 0%             | 10%          |

Additional Transportation Capacity - Insufficient Resources/Satisfaction: This category includes responses expressing satisfaction despite limited resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: Within the funds available, the MPO does a good job, but funds are inadequate; Pretty well . . . dollars never set aside enough right-of-way; Good, given the resources.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 4. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 5%                     | 5%            | 5%             | 3%             | 5%           |

Additional Transportation Capacity - Insufficient Resources/Dissatisfaction: This category includes responses expressing dissatisfaction due to limited resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: Not very well. There just isn't enough funds; They can't. There's no money.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 5. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 5%                     | 23%           | 25%            | 20%            | 20%          |

Additional Transportation Capacity - Other: This category includes responses that were descriptive, uncertain, or suggested that the respondent was not equipped to make an evaluation.

Examples of responses are as follows: It's a debate they are having now . . . past plans have assumed very limited general purpose highway capacity.

Summary Table for Question #13

**QUESTION #13: How well does the MPO process satisfy your needs in the following areas:**

|  | <b>DFW</b> | <b>DEN</b> | <b>SEA</b> | <b>PH<br/>O</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. Additional Transportation Capacity - Generally Positive                     | <b>76%</b> | <b>31%</b> | <b>38%</b> | <b>49%</b>      | <b>43%</b>   |
| 2. Additional Transportation Capacity - Generally Negative                     | <b>5%</b>  | <b>31%</b> | <b>14%</b> | <b>29%</b>      | <b>23%</b>   |
| 3. Additional Transportation Capacity - Insufficient Resources/Satisfaction    | <b>10%</b> | <b>10%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>0%</b>       | <b>10%</b>   |
| 4. Additional Transportation Capacity - Insufficient Resources/Dissatisfaction | <b>5%</b>  | <b>5%</b>  | <b>5%</b>  | <b>3%</b>       | <b>5%</b>    |
| 5. Additional Transportation Capacity - Other                                  | <b>5%</b>  | <b>23%</b> | <b>25%</b> | <b>20%</b>      | <b>20%</b>   |

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 6. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 63%                    | 31%           | 19%            | 44%            | 36%          |

Roadway Construction - Generally Positive: This category includes responses expressing general satisfaction.

Examples of responses are as follows: Very Well. The MPO does well in all areas; Very high degree; Above average. The MPO is constantly evaluating placeholder status and are ready with backup projects; The MPO does very well with new roads, but there's not much space left.

7. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5%              | 33%    | 8%      | 18%     | 19%   |

  
Roadway Construction - Generally Negative: This category includes responses expressing general dissatisfaction.

Examples of responses are as follows: We rarely get new roads; Behind the curve on highway capacity.

8. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 9%              | 5%     | 19%     | 0%      | 8%    |

  
Roadway Construction - Insufficient Resources/Satisfaction: This category includes responses expressing satisfaction despite limited resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: Planning is excellent. The problem is funding the selected projects; “Process yes, funding no.

9. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 0%              | 3%     | 11%     | 3%      | 5%    |

  
Roadway Construction - Insufficient Resources/Dissatisfaction: This category includes responses expressing dissatisfaction due to limited resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: Constrained by money; Funding is the biggest problem. It’s not adequate.

10. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 23%             | 28%    | 43%     | 35%     | 33%   |

  
Roadway Construction - Other: This category includes responses that were descriptive, uncertain, or suggested that the respondent was not equipped to make an evaluation.

Examples of responses are as follows: Most roadway construction is an expansion of existing systems; The MPO doesn’t work much with the state department of transportation in this area; The MPO does not have a lot of control over this; Not much new with roadway construction.

Summary Table for Question #13

**QUESTION #13: How well does the MPO process satisfy your needs in the following areas:**

|  | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|--|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 6. Roadway Construction - Generally Positive                     | 63% | 31% | 19% | 44%     | 36%   |
| 7. Roadway Construction - Generally Negative                     | 5%  | 33% | 8%  | 18%     | 19%   |
| 8. Roadway Construction - Insufficient Resources/Satisfaction    | 9%  | 5%  | 19% | 0%      | 8%    |
| 9. Roadway Construction - Insufficient Resources/Dissatisfaction | 0%  | 3%  | 11% | 3%      | 5%    |
| 10. Roadway Construction – Other                                 | 23% | 28% | 43% | 35%     | 33%   |

| 11. <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----------------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 74%                        | 38%    | 38%     | 35%     | 43%   |

Operational and Safety Improvements - Generally Positive: This category includes responses expressing general satisfaction.

Examples of responses are as follows: Good job on those; Very well; Moderately well; Above average; Here, it's like everybody is winning; Give it a high rating; Operational, especially in air quality is extremely good. Lots of safety progress too.

| 12. <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----------------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 4%                         | 25%    | 5%      | 18%     | 16%   |

Operational and Safety Improvement - Generally Negative: This category includes responses expressing general dissatisfaction.

Examples of responses are as follows: Poor. When there's a traffic jam, operations go out the window; Those criteria are abused, mislabeled, and oversold; Not very well.

| 13. <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----------------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 4%                         | 8%     | 22%     | 21%     | 14%   |

Operational and Safety Improvements - Insufficient Resources/Satisfaction: This category includes responses expressing satisfaction despite limited resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: Given funding limits, very well; Process, yes. Funding, no. Project by project basis.

|     |                        |               |                |                |              |
|-----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 14. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|     | 0%                     | 0%            | 3%             | 0%             | 1%           |

Operational and Safety Improvements - Insufficient Resources/Dissatisfaction: This category includes responses expressing dissatisfaction due to limited resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: They can't. There's no money.

|     |                        |               |                |                |              |
|-----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 15. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|     | 17%                    | 28%           | 32%            | 27%            | 27%          |

Operational and Safety Improvements - Other: This category includes responses that were descriptive, uncertain, or suggested that the respondent was not equipped to make an evaluation.

Examples of responses are as follows: The state handles this. The MPO works with the state to develop a list of projects, and safety is an important criteria; The MPO strongly supports both, from traffic signal improvements to innovative transportation systems. It is a component of travel demand management; There is a whole program devoted to this, especially safety and transit development. There is lots of research done on this.

Summary Table for Question #13

**QUESTION #13: How well does the MPO process satisfy your needs in the following areas:**

|  | <b>DFW</b> | <b>DEN</b> | <b>SEA</b> | <b>PH<br/>O</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 11. Operational and Safety Improvements - Generally Positive                     | <b>74%</b> | <b>38%</b> | <b>38%</b> | <b>35%</b>      | <b>43%</b>   |
| 12. Operational and Safety Improvement - Generally Negative                      | <b>4%</b>  | <b>25%</b> | <b>5%</b>  | <b>18%</b>      | <b>16%</b>   |
| 13. Operational and Safety Improvements - Insufficient Resources/Satisfaction    | <b>4%</b>  | <b>8%</b>  | <b>22%</b> | <b>21%</b>      | <b>14%</b>   |
| 14. Operational and Safety Improvements - Insufficient Resources/Dissatisfaction | <b>0%</b>  | <b>0%</b>  | <b>3%</b>  | <b>0%</b>       | <b>1%</b>    |
| 15. Operational and Safety Improvements - Other                                  | <b>17%</b> | <b>28%</b> | <b>32%</b> | <b>27%</b>      | <b>27%</b>   |

|     |                        |               |                |                |              |
|-----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 16. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|     | 46%                    | 27%           | 49%            | 15%            | 32%          |

Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Generally Positive: This category includes responses expressing general satisfaction.

Examples of responses are as follows: Quite good; Very well; Excellent job. They recognize the need and support it through a selection of projects that support

those needs; We're getting there. A number of cities don't participate in transit but are starting to because of MPO efforts; Good job with funding.

|     |                        |               |                |                |              |
|-----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 17. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|     | 5%                     | 29%           | 3%             | 50%            | 24%          |

Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Generally Negative: This category includes responses expressing general dissatisfaction.

Examples of responses are as follows: No good; Horrible. The MPO is only responding to the people; people don't want it. Still, it is short-sighted.

|     |                        |               |                |                |              |
|-----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 18. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|     | 0%                     | 8%            | 5%             | 0%             | 5%           |

Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Insufficient Resources/Satisfaction: This category includes responses expressing satisfaction despite limited resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: As well as they can given legislative requirements.

|     |                        |               |                |                |              |
|-----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 19. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|     | 5%                     | 3%            | 0%             | 0%             | 2%           |

Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Insufficient Resources/Dissatisfaction: This category includes responses expressing dissatisfaction due to limited resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: They can't. There's no money.

|     |                        |               |                |                |              |
|-----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 20. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|     | 46%                    | 32%           | 43%            | 35%            | 37%          |

Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Other: This category includes responses that were descriptive, uncertain, stated that the MPO was not responsible for this area, or suggested that the respondent was not equipped to make an evaluation.

Examples of responses are as follows: Not the role of the MPO; MPO doesn't do it. It's done from local tax base; The expansion of transit service is emphasized but isn't a pressing issue; This isn't really the MPO's job. The MPO just fills the gaps; That's being done by the regional transit agency, not the MPO.

Summary Table for Question #13

**QUESTION #13: How well does the MPO process satisfy your needs in the following areas:**

|  | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|--|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 16. Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Generally Positive                     | 46% | 27% | 49% | 15%     | 32%   |
| 17. Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Generally Negative                     | 5%  | 29% | 3%  | 50%     | 24%   |
| 18. Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Insufficient Resources/Satisfaction    | 0%  | 8%  | 5%  | 0%      | 5%    |
| 19. Investment in Transit and Bus Service - Insufficient Resources/Dissatisfaction | 5%  | 3%  | 0%  | 0%      | 2%    |
| 20. Investment in Transit and Bus Service – Other                                  | 46% | 32% | 43% | 35%     | 37%   |

| 21. <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 50%                        | 46%           | 44%            | 40%            | 45%          |

Investment in Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities - Generally Positive: This category includes responses expressing general satisfaction.

Examples of responses are as follows: Excellent; Very well; Very supportive; That’s increasing all the time. It’s very good; Good. Lots of investment. Better than satisfactory; Highest degree of praise on that; Great job. MPO works with local environmental groups to include them in long range and TIPs.

| 22. <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 18%                        | 24%           | 7%             | 23%            | 20%          |

Investment in Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities - Generally Negative: This category includes responses expressing general dissatisfaction.

Examples of responses are as follows: Needs work; This jurisdiction is not given high priority; Maybe not so well.

| 23. <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 31%                        | 28%           | 48%            | 38%            | 35%          |

Investment in Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities - Other: This category includes responses that were descriptive, uncertain, or suggested that the respondent was not equipped to make an evaluation.

Examples of responses are as follows: MPO is active and provides assistance when needed; No opinion because I have not had enough contact with these facilities; That is just now starting to be discussed; Lots of projects are being funded and it’s encouraged; It’s an extensive program and those facilities are pushed; Lot’s of funding for multi-use trails.

Summary Table for Question #13

**QUESTION #13: How well does the MPO process satisfy your needs in the following areas:**

|  | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|--|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 21. Investment in Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities - Generally Positive | 50% | 46% | 44% | 40%     | 45%   |
| 22. Investment in Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities - Generally Negative | 18% | 24% | 7%  | 23%     | 20%   |
| 23. Investment in Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities – Other              | 31% | 28% | 48% | 38%     | 35%   |

**QUESTION #14: How desirable or acceptable to you is the idea of having multiple MPOs operating within your metropolitan area?**

| 1. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 82%             | 69%    | 80%     | 70%     | 74%   |

Undesirable: Multiple MPOs would create additional administrative burdens, depleting the pool of scarce transportation resources. Furthermore, it would cause increased fractionalization among jurisdictions operating in the same geographical area. The effects would be harmful to the efforts of improved transportation for the region.

Examples of responses are as follows: The thought of it makes my blood run cold. There are already too many hurdles and hoops to jump through. We don't need any more; It is not a good idea. The whole idea is to have regional planning. To further fractionalize it would be a mistake; It would defeat the purpose, within federal law, of fairly allocating limited funds. It would not be good for regional planning; It is not desirable at all. We are trying to move away from parochialism. Having multiple MPOs would encourage parochialism. We need to learn to work cohesively within one MPO.

| 2. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 18%             | 15%    | 5%      | 13%     | 13%   |

Unsure/"Yes" With Qualifiers: Respondents were unclear in their opinion of whether or not multiple MPOs would be better. There is typically a qualifying statement if the response is that multiple MPOs might be desirable. Some participants viewed the notion as a desirable one but were unclear as to how to implement it.

Examples of responses are as follows: For unique situations, it would work; It's fine if multiple MPOs will help with proportional representation; This MPO is too big, but it would be hard to break it up; Multiple MPOs would be a last resort. If MPOs cannot meet the needs of fast-growing areas, we are headed in that direction; I am against multiplying agencies. That is not the preferred solution, although it may be better than DRCOG.

|    |                 |        |         |         |       |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 3. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|    | 0%              | 9%     | 5%      | 8%      | 7%    |

Desirable: The idea of multiple MPOs, without qualification, is perfectly acceptable or desirable.

Examples of responses are as follows: An opportunity exists to change and use that format. The shape of the MPO was changed in 1991 to allow for sub-areas; I like it. It should be divided into smaller areas to reduce competition for smaller players so that they have a better change of getting funding for projects.

|    |                 |        |         |         |       |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 4. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|    | 0%              | 7%     | 11%     | 8%      | 7%    |

Other Alternatives: Suggestions were made as an alternative to multiple MPOs, including no MPOs, separating transit agencies from the MPOs, and creating regional substructures within the MPOs. Also included in this category are responses that demonstrate a misunderstanding of what a COG is.

Examples of responses are as follows: It would be better if the MPO and the transit agency were isolated. That would divide some of the decisions; What about no MPOs? The way it is set-up now, it would be better than the one we have now; Substructures would be fine, but multiple MPOs wouldn't work. The jurisdictions need to work together toward regional goals; We have that now--RTD, CDOT, and DRCOG--even though they don't call it that. It is tough to coordinate, but regional needs predominate.

Summary Table for Question #14

**QUESTION #14: How desirable or acceptable to you is the idea of having multiple MPOs operating within your metropolitan area?**

|                                 | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH  | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 1. Undesirable                  | 82% | 69% | 80% | 70% | 74%   |
| 2. Unsure/"Yes" With Qualifiers | 18% | 15% | 5%  | 13% | 13%   |
| 3. Desirable                    | 0%  | 9%  | 5%  | 8%  | 7%    |
| 4. Other Alternatives           | 0%  | 7%  | 11% | 8%  | 7%    |

**QUESTION #16: Is there a single group of participants in the MPO decision-making process that holds the power to decide critical issues? If yes, who are they?**

|    |                 |        |         |         |       |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 1. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|    | 18%             | 29%    | 5%      | 25%     | 32%   |

Board of Elected Officials (Board): This board is also termed Board of Directors, Executive Board, or Regional Council. This Board consists of elected officials from each county and/or municipality represented by the MPO.

Examples of responses are as follows: Mayors; Governing Board, County executives; Council of Governments (COG).

2. 

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 0%                     | 24%           | 0%             | 3%             | 9%           |

Transportation Committee (TC): In Denver, this committee is a ten-member group. All transportation proposals must come from this committee before going to the Board for approval. Four (4) representatives are from the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG). Three (3) representatives are from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). Three (3) representatives are from the Regional Transportation Department (RTD).

3. 

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 47%                    | 15%           | 7%             | 11%            | 16%          |

Transportation Policy Committee (TPC): In Denver, this committee is comprised of policy representatives from each county and city represented by the MPO plus additional members representing business, trucking, environmental groups, and air quality council representatives. Similar variations of this committee in other cities are the Transportation Policy Board, the Regional Transportation Council, and the Management Committee.

4. 

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 0%                     | 0%            | 0%             | 3%             | 1%           |

Transportation Technical Committee: This committee is also termed the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), the Regional Project Evaluation Committee, the Surface Transportation Technical Committee, or the Transportation Review Committee. This committee is comprised of technical representatives from each county and city represented by the MPO.

5. 

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 6%                     | 7%            | 17%            | 11%            |              |

Staff: Some respondents stated that the staff has influence over the decision-making process.

Examples of responses are as follows: The staff has a lot of power; No one group holds the power to decide critical issues, except the staff is unusually strong and greatly influences the process; The MPO staff shapes and influences the information received; City engineers.

6. 

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 6%                     | 7%            | 17%            | 39%            | 19%          |

Larger Municipalities: Respondents claim that the larger municipalities with larger populations, greater representation, and greater resources hold the power to decide critical issues.

Examples of responses are as follows: It's population-proportional; The central city has more power; Large cities have much more influence.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 7. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 12%                    | 12%           | 7%             | 6%             |              |

Individual: This category is defined by individual characteristics that allow individuals to exercise more power in the decision-making process.

Examples of responses are as follows: Wealthy members; Natural leaders; The most knowledgeable people can influence decisions; Strength of personality and participation; Committee chairs.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 8. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 6%                     | 5%            | 0%             | 3%             | 3%           |

Varies: Respondents claim that no one single group always holds the power to decide critical issues. Depending on the circumstances, the power shifts from group-to-group.

Examples of responses are as follows: Everyone is not participating equally. The group that holds the power fluctuates and varies.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 9. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 6%                     | 0%            | 0%             | 0%             | 1%           |

Other: This category describes respondents who chose to make no comment; respondents who did not address the question; or respondents who felt unqualified to answer the question.

Summary Table for Question #16

**QUESTION #16: Is there a single group of participants in the MPO decision-making process that holds the power to decide critical issues? If yes, who are they?**

|  | <b>DFW</b> | <b>DEN</b> | <b>SEA</b> | <b>PH<br/>O</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. Board of Elected Officials (Board)    | <b>18%</b> | <b>29%</b> | <b>5%</b>  | <b>25%</b>      | <b>32%</b>   |
| 2. Transportation Committee (TC)         | <b>0%</b>  | <b>24%</b> | <b>0%</b>  | <b>3%</b>       | <b>9%</b>    |
| 3. Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) | <b>47%</b> | <b>15%</b> | <b>7%</b>  | <b>11%</b>      | <b>16%</b>   |
| 4. Transportation Technical Committee    | <b>0%</b>  | <b>0%</b>  | <b>0%</b>  | <b>3%</b>       | <b>1%</b>    |
| 5. Staff                                 | <b>6%</b>  | <b>7%</b>  | <b>17%</b> | <b>11%</b>      | <b>%</b>     |
| 6. Larger Municipalities                 | <b>6%</b>  | <b>7%</b>  | <b>17%</b> | <b>39%</b>      | <b>19%</b>   |
| 7. Individual                            | <b>12%</b> | <b>12%</b> | <b>7%</b>  | <b>6%</b>       | <b>%</b>     |
| 8. Varies                                | <b>6%</b>  | <b>5%</b>  | <b>0%</b>  | <b>3%</b>       | <b>3%</b>    |
| 9. Other                                 | <b>6%</b>  | <b>0%</b>  | <b>0%</b>  | <b>0%</b>       | <b>1%</b>    |

**QUESTION #17: Do you think the process used by the state department of transportation to allocate transportation dollars is better or worse than the MPO process?**

1. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 9%              | 19%    | 11%     | 22%     | 16%   |

Better: Respondents indicated that the state department of transportation has a better process for allocating transportation dollars because it is more objective, less competitive, and responds well to MPO needs.

Examples of responses are as follows: The state is more objective, more “cut and dry,” and less subjective; The Texas State Department of Transportation has responded very well to the MPO; The state is better because it is probably less competitive; The state holds more public hearings and has better public involvement.

2. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 32%             | 9%     | 24%     | 14%     | 17%   |

Neither: Respondents indicated that the state department of transportation’s process was neither better or worse than the MPO process due to the notion that the entities could not be compared. Reasons given for their incomparability were that the two entities were either very different with different criteria, processes, needs, and agendas or they appeared about the same.

Examples of responses are as follows: Each agency is more equal than anything in that both use a different process and criteria and focus on different needs; The state does a good job and the MPO does also; They both have their plusses. It’s a toss-up; Neither; The state department of transportation must follow certain criteria. This criteria is almost the same as that used in the MPO process; There is no major difference; The different projects have different selection criteria, so you cannot really compare the two.

3. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 36%             | 30%    | 32%     | 19%     | 29%   |

Worse: State is More Political: Due to political pressures from the state legislature, the effectiveness of the state process is reduced. These pressures included competing interests which impacted funding allocation. Some respondents indicated that the process is closed and hidden.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO process is better because of the involvement of legislature in the state department of transportation process; There is a strong legislative transportation committee that tightly controls funding, and therefore is more political than the MPO process, which is more balanced; The state process is dominated by elected officials. Legislators get involved in the process and pick projects. They get involved in decisions in which they should not be involved; The transportation committee is great, but their decisions get

muddled up by the legislature; Funding gets tied to the politics of legislature. Priority is given to certain projects without proper justification.

4. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 14%             | 20%    | 24%     | 17%     | 19%   |

Worse: State Lacks Regional Focus: Respondents indicated that the state lacked a regional focus and ignored public interest and input in making decisions. The state did not address local needs. The focus is on the short-term.

Examples of responses are as follows: The state is only in the business of building roads; The state cannot address local needs. The closer you get to local decision-making and input the better; It is frustrating to have the state make local decisions without considering the effects. The MPO is closer to the metro area and knows more about it; The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has the responsibility for the entire state. ADOT’s process for the metro area needs improvement.

5. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5%              | 9%     | 11%     | 14%     | 10%   |

Worse: Ambiguous Criteria: Respondents cited a lack of confidence in decisions made without regard to a formal set of criteria. For instance, the state follows its own guidelines and lacks an allocation process.

Examples of responses are as follows: The state is less open. Not many people are involved in the decision process and not many know the criteria; It is difficult to follow the state’s logic. Their criteria are not as fair; There is a need for better criteria definition between the state process and the MPO process; The state’s process seems inflexible. There is too much power in the hands of too few; Not confident that decisions are made on good criteria.

6. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5%              | 13%    | 0%      | 14%     | 9%    |

Other: This category describes respondents who chose to make no comment, respondents who didn’t address the question, or respondents who felt unqualified to answer the question.

Examples of responses are as follows: This respondent is not too familiar with either process and does not know enough to answer; This respondent is not in a position to answer this question; The local jurisdiction knows best what the needs are.

Summary Table for Question #17

**QUESTION #17: Do you think the process used by the state department of transportation to allocate transportation dollars is better or worse than the MPO process?**

|                                      | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 1. Better                            | 9%  | 19% | 11% | 22%     | 16%   |
| 2. Neither                           | 32% | 9%  | 24% | 14%     | 17%   |
| 3. Worse: State is More Political    | 36% | 30% | 32% | 19%     | 29%   |
| 4. Worse: State Lacks Regional Focus | 14% | 20% | 24% | 17%     | 19%   |
| 5. Worse: Ambiguous Criteria         | 5%  | 9%  | 11% | 14%     | 10%   |
| 6. Other                             | 5%  | 13% | 0%  | 14%     | 9%    |

**QUESTION #20: Now, I'd like you to think about some specific incidents or happenings in your experience with the MPO. Think of a time when you thought to yourself: "This is a good process; it's fair; it works." Think about it. Can you remember such a time. Tell me about it.**

| 1. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 14%             | 14%    | 7%      | 27%     | 15%   |

Fund Allocation: Funding decisions are based upon a regional vision, and there is a balance of programs. Allocations result from the application of objective criteria to ensure equity. The MPO is flexible in its ability to shift funds when necessary, particularly where critical projects are identified. Fund allocations are made in order to maximize the use of finite resources.

Examples of responses are as follows: We identified a critical project in the city, which was seen as critical for the region. We got money through DRCOG to make it happen. If we had to score it, we might not have been able to make it happen; Development of flexing funds to transit was good because it was about maximizing precious resources. This shows that people are taking a collaborative approach to help the region to the greatest extent possible; This year's TIP was balanced to a greater extent than in previous years; Jurisdictions that put money up-front for projects, and have permits and plans ready, are recognized for that effort. Those projects are chosen over others.

| 2. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
|    | 17%             | 29%    | 14%     | 17%     | 20%   |

Fair and Equitable Decision-Making: Decision-making is objective and apolitical but may include weighted voting. In creating objective project selection criteria, decisions must be made prior to a call for projects. Upon reaching consensus regarding the criteria, those criteria are consistently applied to ensure that projects are selected on their merits. The MPO must be willing to look at all sides of an issue and be willing to change its mind. It must have the ability to objectively resolve disputes in favor of what will best benefit the entire region.

Examples of responses are as follows: The development of the MPO project selection criteria was hammered out so that everyone was happy with it, and then it was applied consistently; There have been times when two cities could not agree on the placement of regional roadways. An informal committee was set-up to resolve the issue to the best benefit of all; It's never "out of kilter." I got to help with fine-tuning in order to make and keep the process fair--to make it better.

3.

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 23%             | 16%    | 15%     | 19%     | 18%   |

Cooperative Effort/Regional Approach: There is a cooperative effort among each stakeholder to address all aspects of regional transportation planning. Decision-making includes the various jurisdictions represented by the MPO, as well as citizen groups. Project prioritization is based upon regional need and impact, and members are willing to give up local funds in order to address a more critical regional need. Jurisdictions often collaborate on projects and coordinate efforts. In many instances, voting on issues is unanimous.

Examples of responses are as follows: There was a DRCOG meeting in which there was unanimous vote for a multi-modal plan. It was cohesive. It was a good process; The Reverse Commute Welfare Transit Program is well-coordinated. It utilizes funds from different areas, and it requires multiple agency coordination; A citizens advisory committee was established. The committee gave input on available federal funding to the MPO. The committee was comprised of a broad set of individuals and groups; In reaching a decision on a highly controversial issue, the MPO brought people and information together to reach a decision. Only one participant was unhappy with the result.

4.

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 9%              | 12%    | 27%     | 4%      | 14%   |

Open Process: Decisions are made only after all information is presented. Funding criteria are published and well-understood by all participants. The process is open to the public, including non-traditional groups, and their input is given serious consideration. All issues are on the table, and there is an open dialogue.

Examples of responses are as follows: In the TIP process, each project is ranked after all of the information is presented to everyone, and there is a chance to address any disagreements. The process is fair, and the criteria are fair; Regional funding criteria are well published. There is plenty of time to understand them, to make applications, to discuss issues in technical terms, and to develop consensus about which projects should go forward.

5.

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 9%              | 11%    | 25%     | 2%      | 13%   |

Individual Interests are Heard: The individual interest, jurisdiction, or agency is given ample time to voice opinions or dissensions. When another group(s)

attempts to silence such a voice, the MPO keeps the individual interest on the table until it is equitably resolved. There is adequate representation of interests within the MPO structure and, when necessary, seats are added to ensure inclusive decision-making. The MPO attempts to reach out to its members to gain broad participation. When individual needs are not met, there is an objective appeals process.

Examples of responses are as follows: Our city council was concerned about a project on the TIP that ranked #1 for new projects. Because of another project in the metro area, we almost lost the funding. We fought for it and did receive the money. Good representation was the key; A seat was added to the Transportation Policy Board so that a representative from Kitsap County could participate in policy-making; In a pricing study, a Sierra Club representative felt that he should be allowed to file a minority report. He was given more than ample time to be heard; The MPO was able to keep Irving’s interests in mind even though Dallas was looking out for themselves. The MPO kept Irving’s needs on the table.

6.

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 29%             | 6%     | 9%      | 4%      | 10%   |

Excellent Staff: A professional, competent, approachable MPO staff facilitates a fair process. The staff conducts workshops, distributes updates and clarifying information, offers technical expertise and partnering to jurisdictional staff members, and keeps the focus of the participants regionally based. The staff focuses on the needs of the stakeholders and presents those issues to MPO committees in an equitable manner. Finally, the staff has flexible rules and works with members when there is a problem (i.e. an application submitted shortly after a deadline).

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO offered to make the grant application simple and to help in filling it out. They tried to include regional goals (Metrovision 2020) with all applications. The 2020 plan is good; The staff tries to present issues to the Transportation Policy Committee in a fair way-- in an equitable way; The MPO handles calls for projects very well. They give updated planning workshops. Everyone gets updates regarding information given in the workshops, even if they don’t attend; Four or five years ago, we submitted a couple of projects. The submission was past the deadline due to a misunderstanding between us and the COG staff. They allowed it to go forward, even though it was technically late. The COG has rules, but they are flexible.

7.

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 0%              | 12%    | 3%      | 27%     | 11%   |

Other: Respondents either believe that the process is unfair, or they are unable to recall a specific instance of fairness.

Examples of responses are as follows: It works well for the cities and towns, but because the reservation doesn't pay taxes, it isn't treated in the same way; No, there isn't one.

Summary Table for Question #20

**QUESTION #20: Now, I'd like you to think about some specific incidents or happenings in your experience with the MPO. Think of a time when you thought to yourself: "This is a good process; it's fair; it works." Think about it. Can you remember such a time. Tell me about it.**

|   | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|---|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 1. Fund Allocation                      | 14% | 14% | 7%  | 27%     | 15%   |
| 2. Fair and Equitable Decision-Making   | 17% | 29% | 14% | 17%     | 20%   |
| 3. Cooperative Effort/Regional Approach | 23% | 16% | 15% | 19%     | 18%   |
| 4. Open Process                         | 9%  | 12% | 27% | 4%      | 14%   |
| 5. Individual Interests are Heard       | 9%  | 11% | 25% | 2%      | 13%   |
| 6. Excellent Staff                      | 29% | 6%  | 9%  | 4%      | 10%   |
| 7. Other                                | 0%  | 12% | 3%  | 27%     | 11%   |

**QUESTION #22: Now, think of a time when you thought to yourself: "This is not a good process. It's not fair. It isn't working." Think about it. Can you remember such a time? Tell me about it.**

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 4%                     | 17%           | 13%            | 15%            | 14%          |

Inappropriate Priorities/Project Selection: There is an emphasis on roadways, increased capacity, and sometimes, on aesthetic improvements. Projects addressing other concerns, such as air quality, safety, and congestion management are passed over. Often, there is insufficient emphasis on transit funding and projects.

Examples of responses are as follows: Funding allocations are always skewed toward highways. The MPO tries to be fair. It's just that the process and the emphasis are wrong. The criteria are skewed toward roads. The "Virginia V" project was a project to restore an historically significant boat in transportation in the Seattle area. While it met the criteria, there were pressing needs that were not being met because of it. It didn't advance basic transportation needs; The point values in the TIP criteria are weighted too much toward the long-range regional plan.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 2. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 23%                    | 13%           | 10%            | 28%            | 17%          |

Unfair Fund Allocation: Projects are often selected for political reasons, rather than on the basis of objective criteria and point allocation based upon those criteria. Complaints include allocations both from the state to the MPO and

within the MPO itself. Sometimes, projects that don't address basic transportation needs are selected prior to all basic needs being satisfied. Funds earmarked for certain uses may be used for unapproved uses, or funding categories outlined by federal law may be dramatically restricted by the MPO. When funding is allocated, sometimes it is pulled in the "eleventh hour."

Examples of responses are as follows: Decisions are made by the MPO to disallow funding where the FTA would. Something that is eligible under the law may not be eligible for funding because it's a regional decision; The allocation of enhancement grant funds, for all the criteria and weighting involved, is largely political. Allocation is based upon political strength rather than merit.

3. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 8%              | 14%    | 10%     | 17%     | 13%   |

Blocking Access to Process/Individual Interests by MPO/MPO Staff: A minority interest can be silenced by MPO staff and thereby locked-out of the process. Staff can be inflexible if it doesn't want an issue to go forward, and it does not always adequately serve the needs and interests of its members. One way this may happen is by failing to update census and traffic volume figures so that projects cannot be included in transportation plans. Another way is to withhold information, dialogue, and inclusion to block selected interests. A common problem is that transit agencies are not given an equitable voice in the process.

Examples of responses are as follows: At a Citizens Advisory Committee, a man tried to testify, but he was inappropriately stopped. The Committee won't listen to eccentric, individualistic people. The Committee gave an inappropriate response by shutting him out; The MPO was not fair on the Regional Transportation Plan. It would not give information out. We could not apply for the TIP because the Metrovision 2020 is tied to the funds. We are not able to communicate with them. Our own staff hasn't been able to represent the city at every meeting and is not included in all documents. This inhibits our ability to participate in the process; Highway plans are made through the Indian Reservation without regard to the needs and decisions of the Reservation; There was a possibility of passing power to Sound Transit, but it didn't happen.

4. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 8%              | 13%    | 6%      | 0%      | 8%    |

Inconsistent Application of Rules/Policies: The MPO uses flexibility or rigidity in applying rules and policies either to further the agendas it favors or to squelch the agendas it disfavors. For instance, sometimes firm time deadlines are violated. Other times, projects violating MPO policies and environmental concerns are pushed forward anyway by elected official.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO, at the last minute, "scrapped" the last two years of the five-year plan. So, projects in the last two years became ineligible; We had a call for projects. Several cities missed the deadlines. We set-up rules for firm deadlines. That dissolved; There was an unfair alteration of

the MIS for the I-25 SE corridor. DRCOG varied from the MIS by adding an extra lane to the project after the MIS was approved. Then, when I wanted to add a different feature, they said, “no we can’t vary from the MIS.” That is an unfair enforcement of rules. There is rigidity when it pleases DRCOG to be rigid.

5. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 8%              | 7%     | 1%      | 2%      | 5%    |

Inappropriate Use of Information: Information is not accurate or is given too late to be useful to the members. Projections are not always used (or even determined) for future growth. Politicians in the system sometimes don’t understand the issues and, through dissemination of misinformation, push the public into a stance that is harmful to regional transportation planning. Unfair publicity is also used to undermine projects or programs, particularly high-speed transit.

Examples of responses are as follows: We get stuff too late to review for technical issues; Sound Transit has taken some unfair hits. They have tough decisions to make, and they have made them. There is some unfair publicity to try to undermine them; At times, the MPO doesn’t take projects, or consider projections, in terms of future growth.

6. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 12%             | 13%    | 8%      | 2%      | 9%    |

Inefficient Process: It takes too much time for project approval, selection, and funding to meet the needs of the region. There is not enough time for discussion of real issues. There is little assistance provided by MPO staff to help facilitate an efficient process, and efforts are often duplicated for the TIP and STIP. Additionally, there is poor coordination between the MPO and state processes. On the federal level, legislation often forces “cookie-cutter” decisions that cause local jurisdictions to have to jump through many unnecessary hoops. Finally, when the MPO does make a decision, it may leave many questions open, thus causing confusion among members.

Examples of responses are as follows: The COG is always driven by time lines. Funding deadlines are the ultimate imperative--good sense, fairness, validity, and the implementation of goals go out the window. There is no time to deal with real issues in the end. There is no meaningful grappling with issues. This is very frustrating. We asked if we could extend the process and were not permitted to do so. We are cut off at the knees by artificial deadlines. COG staff cares about a meaningless deadline; The MPO and the state process, particularly in coordinating priorities, are incompatible. They need to mesh better; Project approval, selection, and funding take too much time to meet the needs of the region. It is unfair to those who have the need.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 7. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 8%                     | 12%           | 10%            | 19%            | 13%          |

Behind the Scenes Dealings/Closed Process: This involves behind-the-scenes deal-making and decision-making in which decisions are a foregone conclusion. Private agendas are advanced. Jurisdictions get together to block agendas of other jurisdictions, and large jurisdictions’ needs dominate those of the smaller jurisdictions. The MPO may play a similar role by disregarding agreed upon TIP criteria and policies when it comes time for creating the final version of the TIP.

Examples of responses are as follows: Every time this small city applies for funds, it is turned down because all the money goes to large cities; One part of the region does a power play over another part using legislation; The MPO disregards the adopted TIP criteria and policies of the Transportation Policy Committee when they come up with the final version of the TIP.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 8. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 31%                    | 11%           | 40%            | 17%            | 22%          |

No: Participants did not believe the process was unfair, could not think of a specific instance, relayed that the problem had been fixed, or recalled a happening that turned out to be fair. Some reported instances in which a process was not fair, but it was not an MPO process.

Examples of responses are as follows: There was a push to take funds away from the Washington DOT; DRCOG took the position of evaluating CDOT projects using the same criteria that are used to evaluate local projects; . . .It ended up being pretty fair.

Summary Table for Question #22

**QUESTION #22: Now, think of a time when you thought to yourself: “This is not a good process. It’s not fair. It isn’t working.” Think about it. Can you remember such a time? Tell me about it.**

|   | <b>DFW</b> | <b>DEN</b> | <b>SEA</b> | <b>PH<br/>O</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. Inappropriate Priorities/Project Selection                       | <b>4%</b>  | <b>17%</b> | <b>13%</b> | <b>15%</b>      | <b>14%</b>   |
| 2. Unfair Fund Allocation   | <b>23%</b> | <b>13%</b> | <b>10%</b> | <b>28%</b>      | <b>17%</b>   |
| 3. Blocking Access to Process/Individual Interests by MPO/MPO Staff | <b>8%</b>  | <b>14%</b> | <b>10%</b> | <b>17%</b>      | <b>13%</b>   |
| 4. Inconsistent Application of Rules/Policies                       | <b>8%</b>  | <b>13%</b> | <b>6%</b>  | <b>0%</b>       | <b>8%</b>    |
| 5. Inappropriate Use of Information                                 | <b>8%</b>  | <b>7%</b>  | <b>1%</b>  | <b>2%</b>       | <b>5%</b>    |
| 6. Inefficient Process  | <b>12%</b> | <b>13%</b> | <b>8%</b>  | <b>2%</b>       | <b>9%</b>    |
| 7. Behind the Scenes Dealings/Closed Process                        | <b>8%</b>  | <b>12%</b> | <b>10%</b> | <b>19%</b>      | <b>13%</b>   |
| 8. No   | <b>31%</b> | <b>11%</b> | <b>40%</b> | <b>17%</b>      | <b>22%</b>   |

**QUESTION #24: To what extent to you believe the institutional structure and decisional process in this MPO meets the long-term transportation needs of this region?**

1. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 77%             | 8%     | 29%     | 13%     | 24%   |

Very Well/Well Without Qualifiers: Responses are favorable, often suggesting reasons for success but never adding limitations, qualifiers, or suggestions.

Examples of responses are as follows: Overall, it works well; They have a very good long-range plan. It's very comprehensive for the entire region. They monitor a lot of different demographic aspects.

2. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5%              | 18%    | 10%     | 13%     | 13%   |

Adequately to Well With Qualifiers: The MPO is doing a reasonably good job of meeting regional needs, but respondents limited their answers by offering qualifying statements, making suggestions, or identifying problems. Responses are more favorable than not. When many respondents identified the same issue as problematic for accomplishing long-range planning, a separate category is listed. These issues include the following: (1) funding limitations; (2) difficulty in managing all interests/members effectively or adequately; (3) inappropriate focus; and (4) specific organizational issues.

Examples of responses are as follows: Very well in the short-term. They will evolve to meet future needs as necessary because the staff and participants stay on-top of things and make changes as needed; It's fairly adequate; To a great extent it does meet regional needs. But it's tough to marry technical issues with political issues; It's working.

3. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5%              | 13%    | 24%     | 8%      | 13%   |

Funding Limitations: The MPO cannot meet long-term transportation needs if it does not have adequate funding. It must also create a realistic budget, otherwise the planning is meaningless. The general tone is favorable to highly favorable.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO meets them very well. The only concern is funding for the long-term; Until there is a better process--and I don't know that there is a better process--the structure and process are just okay. That is due to the tax structure and the like. I don't know how we can better divide limited resources. That is the major problem.

4. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5%              | 7%     | 10%     | 18%     | 10%   |

Difficulty in Managing All Interests Adequately or Effectively: This is not necessarily a commentary on the efficacy of the MPO process itself. Often times,

the problem is in reaching a consensus due to the sheer number of interests/members involved. This makes aspects of the process unmanageable and may cause fragmentation within the MPO. Furthermore, when there are so many interests involved, it is sometimes the case that not all participants have a voice in the process or their voice is not proportional to the size of the population they represent. Finally, sometimes one or more contentious members will attempt to stall or derail the process.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO structure is the best that it can be on this job. It is difficult to get a consensus with 49 municipalities; The newest plan is the best yet. It isn't the fault of the process but of the people involved; It doesn't meet them very well. There needs to be a new structure in DRCOG. Everyone needs to have a voice; The representation and structure is wrong. It must be proportional to the population.

5. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5%              | 16%    | 2%      | 16%     | 11%   |

Inappropriate Focus: A regional focus is not maintained or certain aspects of planning are not being addressed, and needs are not being met in some jurisdictions. Sometimes the focus is short-term rather than long-term. Other times, the focus is on individual interests or political will simply predominates.

Examples of responses are as follows: Long-term needs are met moderately. Ferry service is a primary concern for me, but there is no planning or concern by the MPO around the issue; A non-holistic approach is being taken with planning that does not link all aspects of transportation and land use adequately; The focus is short-term. There is a lack of land use planning and a lack of a "holistic" approach to transportation and transit; Some cities' needs aren't being met, while others' needs are being met; It has fallen short. The problem is not necessarily one of structure but one of political will. It needs more vision in terms of decisions that affect the region as a whole, instead of parochially. They need a stronger political will and private sector support for regional decision-making.

6. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 0%              | 26%    | 5%      | 11%     | 14%   |

Structural/Authority Problems: Needs are not met because the MPO does not hold the power to resolve long-term issues or to implement goals, the MPO is not accountable for its actions, or the structure and process are inconsistent. Also included in this category is a weak relationship with or inadequate support from the state transportation department.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO is structured to continue as is, not to implement stated goals; The MPO doesn't meet the needs well because there is no ultimate responsibility; I don't think it meets those needs. It's only advisory and is therefore a pretty weak structure; Other than a lack of support from the state, it is adequate.

|    |                 |        |         |         |       |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 7. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|    | 0%              | 8%     | 5%      | 13%     | 7%    |

Not At All: Respondents said that long-term transportation needs of the regions are never met.

Examples of responses are as follows: Long-term needs are not met at all. Transit needs aren't addressed; Long-term needs are not met at all. There is a lot of dissatisfaction within the MPO community.

|    |                 |        |         |         |       |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 8. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|    | 5%              | 5%     | 14%     | 8%      | 8%    |

Other: Respondents gave no response, gave a response that is negative without elaboration, said that time would tell, or responded in a way that did not answer the question.

Examples of responses are as follows: It's the only game in town. What alternative do we have; It's better than in the short-term because it takes so long to plan and fund projects.

Summary Table for Question #24

**QUESTION #24: To what extent to you believe the institutional structure and decisional process in this MPO meets the long-term transportation needs of this region?**

|   | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|---|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 1. Very Well/Well Without Qualifiers                              | 77% | 8%  | 29% | 13%     | 24%   |
| 2. Adequately to Well With Qualifiers                             | 5%  | 18% | 10% | 13%     | 13%   |
| 3. Funding Limitations  | 5%  | 13% | 24% | 8%      | 13%   |
| 4. Difficulty in Managing All Interests Adequately or Effectively | 5%  | 7%  | 10% | 18%     | 10%   |
| 5. Inappropriate Focus  | 5%  | 16% | 2%  | 16%     | 11%   |
| 6. Structural/Authority Problems                                  | 0%  | 26% | 5%  | 11%     | 14%   |
| 7. Not At All   | 0%  | 8%  | 5%  | 13%     | 7%    |
| 8. Other  | 5%  | 5%  | 14% | 8%      | 8%    |

**QUESTION #25: If you could change one thing that would make the MPO process, in your opinion, better, what would you change?**

|    |                 |        |         |         |       |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 1. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|    | 30%             | 3%     | 13%     | 4%      | 9%    |

No Change Needed: The process is working well. Respondents could not think of anything to improve the process or gave reasons why the process works so well.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO does a good job, but I wouldn't want it. I am able to give input with the present structure; I'm not sure there is anything that needs/should be changed. One thing is the burdensome nature and frequency of MPO meetings. These meetings, however, are necessary.

2.

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 13%                    | 19%           | 15%            | 9%             | 15%          |

Funding Issues: Funding issues revolve around how resources are distributed and generated. Distribution ought to be regional and need-based, and there ought to be more flexibility in utilizing various types of funding, which is currently available only for specific uses. There are also policy discrepancies in fund allocation. For instance, some respondents believe that transit should be emphasized or should receive less funding. Others would set limitations on growth to allow the region to use resources for the current infrastructure.

Examples of responses are as follows: We have a hard time convincing people in this area to use transit. We must keep that in mind as we allocate funds. We must be mindful of the cost of transit versus the cost of highways; Give the power to set growth limitations; More funds for public outreach and education.

3.

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 8%                     | 17%           | 11%            | 13%            | 13%          |

Streamline the Process: Make the process faster, better coordinated, and efficient. Reduce the complexity of the criteria and the layers of administration. These changes would save valuable resources, including both time and money, and would increase accessibility and understanding of the process for all members.

Examples of responses are as follows: The bureaucracy needs to be reduced; Reduce the number of committees or areas that the MPO gets involved in; Have more on-line information available to reduce meeting time. Some information could be posted on the web.

4.

| <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 13%                    | 13%           | 17%            | 13%            | 14%          |

Open Process/Full Information/Understanding of Process: Open communication between all members of the MPO and the MPO staff about the process and how the process works increases participation, understanding, and good decision-making. The MPO staff needs to explain the process and information in a non-technical way so that everyone understands and can make better decisions. Decisions need to be made with all available information. There should be no "back office" deals or decisions.

Examples of responses are as follows: Add more staff to the TIP process and encourage more direct coordination with the FTA; Increase staff accountability; Make all regular council members more aware of the role they could play, and get them to focus a little bit more. They need to be more involved than simply

showing up for meetings; Increase understanding. Use less technical jargon and bring people from the outside up to speed; Meetings could be more frequent (better information flow).

5. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 8%              | 6%     | 9%      | 20%     | 10%   |

Change Voting/Representation Structure: All governments, including Indian tribes, and all interests must have a voice in the system. What weight that voice should be given is debatable. This category includes complaints about the voting structure. Some feel the voting ought to be weighted proportionally to the represented population, while others believe that there should be no weighting at all.

Examples of responses are as follows: The MPO should include Indian tribes as equal governments; There must be equal representation from the cities; Develop a true form of weighted voting based on the population.

6. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 8%              | 7%     | 20%     | 7%      | 10%   |

Expand Involvement and Participation: Get the members interested and invested in the decisional process. If members attend meetings consistently and actively seek to obtain and understand information, better decisions will be generated. Involvement must also include businesses, the community at large, non-corridor agencies, and any other interested party.

Examples of responses are as follows: It should be more of a Board, rather than a staff, driven process; There needs to be more aggressive involvement by local elected officials; Membership would no longer be voluntary. State law would mandate membership; The Policy Board should meet on a more regular basis; Make the 49 municipalities aware of the true value of participation in the process.

7. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 0%              | 20%    | 4%      | 26%     | 15%   |

Cooperative/Regional Approach: A regional approach must be taken in the MPO decisional process, and considerations such as land use planning and the long-range plan must be kept in mind. There is a cooperative, rather than an adversarial environment. Committees should be structured to allow for a true regional result and cooperative effort. Allocations are based upon need and the long-range vision adopted by the MPO.

Examples of responses are as follows: Give an enormous amount of centralized power to the MPO. Representatives and directors of the MPO would then be regional instead of municipal and/or tribal; Get politics out of transportation planning and look at what will work; Get the “right” kind of people elected (regionally focused people); The TIP and long-term plan development needs a

more “holistic” approach. The adversarial nature should be turned into a cooperative effort.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 8. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 8%                     | 13%           | 9%             | 7%             | 10%          |

Legislative Issues: The state legislature must be willing to allow the MPO to function completely, without interference and without fear of having plans changed at the “eleventh hour.” There must be confidence that the work involved in creating plans will not be undone or changed dramatically. Such interference by a legislature or governor undermines the entire MPO process and violates the intent of United State Congress to have certain transportation planning and funding decisions made at the local level. Some respondents complain about the numerous federal mandates and complex federal legislation.

Examples of responses are as follows: We need a miracle. The legislature must be willing to delegate authority on transportation decisions; The legislative (U.S. Congress) process should give us some predictability as to timing.

|    |                        |               |                |                |              |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 9. | <u>Dallas-Ft.Worth</u> | <u>Denver</u> | <u>Seattle</u> | <u>Phoenix</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|    | 13%                    | 3%            | 2%             | 2%             | 4%           |

Other: Responses include the desire to eradicate MPOs altogether, no responses, or a response that does not easily fit into any other category.

Examples of responses are as follows: Pay the staff more because it is very difficult to keep professional staff if their pay structure is tied to the state; Re-designate the MPO to the Arizona Department of Transportation; Throw the whole thing out.

Summary Table for Question #25

**QUESTION #25: If you could change one thing that would make the MPO process, in your opinion, better, what would you change?**

|   | <b>DFW</b> | <b>DEN</b> | <b>SEA</b> | <b>PH<br/>O</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. No Change Needed                                       | <b>30%</b> | <b>3%</b>  | <b>13%</b> | <b>4%</b>       | <b>9%</b>    |
| 2. Funding Issues   | <b>13%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>15%</b> | <b>9%</b>       | <b>15%</b>   |
| 3. Streamline the Process                                 | <b>8%</b>  | <b>17%</b> | <b>11%</b> | <b>13%</b>      | <b>13%</b>   |
| 4. Open Process/Full Information/Understanding of Process | <b>13%</b> | <b>13%</b> | <b>17%</b> | <b>13%</b>      | <b>14%</b>   |
| 5. Change Voting/Representation Structure                 | <b>8%</b>  | <b>6%</b>  | <b>9%</b>  | <b>20%</b>      | <b>10%</b>   |
| 6. Expand Involvement and Participation                   | <b>8%</b>  | <b>7%</b>  | <b>20%</b> | <b>7%</b>       | <b>10%</b>   |
| 7. Cooperative/Regional Approach                          | <b>0%</b>  | <b>20%</b> | <b>4%</b>  | <b>26%</b>      | <b>15%</b>   |
| 8. Legislative Issues                                     | <b>8%</b>  | <b>13%</b> | <b>9%</b>  | <b>7%</b>       | <b>10%</b>   |
| 9. Other  | <b>13%</b> | <b>3%</b>  | <b>2%</b>  | <b>2%</b>       | <b>4%</b>    |

**QUESTION #27: Knowing what this research is about, and what we’re trying to find out, what would you tell me that I should know, but I haven’t asked you about?**

1. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 18%             | 41%    | 29%     | 30%     | 32%   |

Organizational/Structural Considerations: This category describes the need for an understanding of the regional project evaluation process and how the MPO and other committees function within this process. Overall, respondent comments are positive regarding the structure and organization of the process and the representation of the different interests within it; however, a few cite that some of the interfaces between the different entities need to be reworked for better efficiency.

Examples of responses are as follows: You need to understand the function of the regional project evaluation committee--it’s makeup and function. It is a key to the success of this MPO; It is important to know how the budget is created and allocated and how the organization is structured; An effort to disband the MPO is destructive. When there is a problem, all members must come together and work things out; The most important aspect of this MPO and COG is that it represents so many different and significant interests; Sometimes the staff doesn’t communicate ideas to the committee board before acting. DRCOG has been very ineffective and irrelevant most of the time. It needs to be re-born and reconstituted; A big problem in the MPO process is that not all major investment studies are coordinated through the MPO. In addition, there is a need to provide a mechanism for the private sector to participate to compliment the public sector.

2. 

| Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 23%             | 14%    | 32%     | 19%     | 21%   |

An inclusive, regional perspective: This category describes the need for a clear vision that is inclusive of all the constituents within the region. Overall, respondent comments cited a regional perspective as key to their success.

Examples of responses are as follows: One of the things that has worked well with the allocation of funds is that there is a lot of trust among elected officials: There is a regional focus by all in the planning and allocation processes. Regional planning organizations are extremely important. The federal process should allow them more authority to make decisions and to have a greater control of funds; The MPO is only as strong and productive as its membership. All the stakeholders need to be involved in the process to make it work; The biggest mistake is to have multiple MPOs in one area. There needs to be regional cooperation and vision. A regional approach by all jurisdictions is critical to a well-functioning MPO.

|    | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 3. | 27%             | 2%     | 15%     | 3%      | 9%    |

Competent leadership and staff: This category describes the success of the MPO process as a function of good, competent leadership and staff. Respondents cited egalitarian leadership as the necessary ingredient to create trust that binds staff members and constituents within the region into an effective cooperative process.

Examples of responses are as follows: The executive leadership in an MPO is critical to its success. We need facilitators for the region, not dictators; You need to have the right leaders; The executive director needs to keep things egalitarian; The success of the MPO here is attributed to good leadership in the organization. Good leadership fosters trust and allows this complicated process to function well; A critical component of why the MPO works so well is because of the leadership and the staff.

|    | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 4. | 5%              | 17%    | 10%     | 14%     | 13%   |

Legislature, politics, power relations: This category describes the relationship between the state legislature and the MPO and the individual personalities that make-up the legislature, MPO, and staff. Most respondents cite some friction between the State Legislature Transportation Committee and the MPO. In addition, some comment that the staff has grown too large and a few “more senior” members are too set in their views and are difficult to work with. Others indicate a need for the MPOs to develop a method to handle the power they have been invested with.

Examples of responses are as follows: PSRC benefits from the State Growth Management Act. The state support gives PSRC authority they would not otherwise have; It seems like there is a lot of friction between the State Legislature Transportation Committee and the MPO; We should have delivered to us from the federal legislative process how we can meet local needs. Uncertainty as to when funding, values, and regulations will be forthcoming reduces trust in the government; The relationship with the state legislature needs to be studied. There’s something like a cult of personalities that has petrified this agency. People have been here for 20 to 30 years who are hardened in their habits and serving their own agendas; Whenever entities distribute money, there is power that comes with it. Others desire this power-base, and they will go after it and take it away; MPOs have to deal with how they are going to handle the power that ISTEA and TEA-21 have provided

|    |                 |        |         |         |       |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 5. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|    | 5%              | 7%     | 7%      | 5%      | 6%    |

Transportation Issues: This category describes environmental concerns such as air quality, traffic congestion, and growth management.

Examples of responses are as follows: The biggest transportation problem is between planning, construction, fund allocation, traffic congestion, and growth management; An important part of the MPO's success is meeting environmental problems like air quality. Most MPOs view environmental problems as an evil, a burden, an afterthought; Funding should go where the highest vehicle miles are traveled and to the areas with the most congestion.

|    |                 |        |         |         |       |
|----|-----------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 6. | Dallas-Ft.Worth | Denver | Seattle | Phoenix | Total |
|    | 23%             | 19%    | 7%      | 30%     | 19%   |

Other: This category describes respondents who chose to make no comment, respondents who did not address the question, or respondents who felt unqualified to answer the question.

Examples of responses are as follows: No; The San Diego MPO is similar if you want to work; I go to Seattle less often now because someone else from the staff goes there more often; Nothing; I've shared everything I want to talk about.

Summary Table for Question #27

**QUESTION #27: Knowing what this research is about, and what we're trying to find out, what would you tell me that I should know, but I haven't asked you about?**

|   | DFW | DEN | SEA | PH<br>O | TOTAL |
|---|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| 1. Organizational/Structural Considerations | 18% | 41% | 29% | 30%     | 32%   |
| 2. An inclusive, regional perspective       | 23% | 14% | 32% | 19%     | 21%   |
| 3. Competent leadership and staff           | 27% | 2%  | 15% | 3%      | 9%    |
| 4. Legislature, politics, power relations   | 5%  | 17% | 10% | 14%     | 13%   |
| 5. Transportation Issues                    | 5%  | 7%  | 7%  | 5%      | 6%    |
| 6. Other                                    | 23% | 19% | 7%  | 30%     | 19%   |

**VOLUME III, SECTION VIII.**  
**C2. RELIABILITIES OF CODERS**

Levels of agreement between pairs of coders classifying interview responses in the categories presented in the preceding section, D1, were checked using Kappa. The SPSS Base 90 Applications Guide suggests the following ranges for interpreting Kappa: values greater than .75 = excellent agreement beyond chance; .40 to .75 = fair to good; values below .40 = poor agreement.

Three pairs of coders were employed in this research. Pair one achieved average Kappas of .927. Pair two achieved average Kappas of .813. Neither pair coded any question with below .40 level of agreement. Pair three achieved marginal levels of agreement (average Kappa = .489). After two additional reliability checks, all levels of agreement were above .40 except for one question, #26. This question was dropped from analysis.