

UTILIZING THE PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE
TO ANSWER POLICY AND PROCESS QUESTIONS

by

Michael A. Perfater
Research Analyst

(The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this report are those of the author and not necessarily those of the sponsoring agencies.)

Virginia Highway & Transportation Research Council
(A Cooperative Organization Sponsored Jointly by the Virginia
Department of Highways & Transportation and
the University of Virginia)

Charlottesville, Virginia

February 1978

VHTRC 78-R40

GENERAL GUIDANCE AND ADVICE ON THE RESEARCH REPORTED HEREIN HAS
BEEN PROVIDED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MR. E. T. ROBB, Chairman, Asst. Environmental Quality Engineer, VDH&T
MR. M. C. ANDAY, Assistant Head, VH&TRC
MR. R. E. BLASER, University Distinguished Professor, VPI & SU
MR. L. E. BRETT, JR., District Engineer, VDH&T
MR. W. L. BRITTLE, Location & Design Engineer, VDH&T
MR. A. R. CLINE, District Environmental Coordinator, VDH&T
MR. R. V. FIELDING, Materials Engineer, VDH&T
MR. R. L. HUNDLEY, Environmental Quality Engineer, VDH&T
MR. A. B. JOHNSON, Assistant Construction Engineer, VDH&T
MR. R. C. LOCKWOOD, Assistant Transportation Planning Engineer, VDH&T
MR. D. D. MCGEEHAN, Research Analyst, VH&TRC
DR. TOM STEPHENS, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, VPI & SU
MR. W. P. TUCKER, Right-of-Way Engineer, VDH&T
MR. R. G. WARNER, Assistant Construction Engineer, VDH&T
MR. ROBERT WELTON, Environmental Coordinator, FHWA
MR. J. E. YEATTS, Assistant Location & Design Engineer, VDH&T

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

2043

The public opinion questionnaire used in this study was designed to provide the Department information regarding public involvement procedures as viewed by the public, as well as to provide insight into citizen opinion regarding the specifics of the projects on which it was tested. It was found to serve both functions very well. The study has provided insightful information regarding the Department's meeting process, and at the same time has provided an indication of the potential for using the questionnaire both as a means of gaining needed information for the project file and as a device for continually monitoring public reaction to the Department's programs at public informational meetings. Respondents attending the public meetings were quick to point out any procedures or behavior with which they were dissatisfied.

The objective of the study was to evaluate the questionnaire as a tool for gathering information which would lead to improvements in the public meeting process. Included in the report are some specific recommendations regarding public meetings which are the result both of the author's observations at the public meetings and the information obtained on the questionnaires.

Perhaps the most important message obtained from respondents was that citizens attend public meetings to obtain information--which is the purpose for which meetings were intended--not to participate in debates or to protest. It is important to know what information the public desires before the meeting so that the Department is properly prepared at the meeting. While there are many ways to ascertain the type of information desired by citizens, a questionnaire such as the one used in this study certainly is one method.

The questionnaire, then, can provide reliable information as to community needs, goals, and values. It can open communication between the Department and the citizens, as it did in the three cases studied. It can provide the Department with a means for comparing its goals to the goals of the community. It can be used to educate the public of the Department's composite community involvement process and it can aid in resolving conflicts between the Department and the community about project alternatives and impacts. Finally, and most importantly, it was found that the public opinion questionnaire can aid in monitoring the Department's public involvement procedures. In this respect, any techniques or procedures which do not meet the goals of the community will be quickly pointed out by the members of the community. In short, the

2044

questionnaire can provide a way for citizens to give their opinions on the quality of involvement techniques and thus enable Department decisions regarding public involvement activities to be based on experience rather than on theory and supposition.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2045

The author's observations at the public meetings attended in connection with the study and the information obtained on the questionnaire have led to the following recommendations.

1. It is recommended that a questionnaire such as those included in Appendices A and B of this report be utilized at public meetings to gain citizen input concerning the project and to monitor citizen reaction to the Department's public involvement programs. The questionnaire should be of the self-addressed, pre-stamped, pre-folded type.
2. It is recommended that the Public Involvement Section of the Department monitor public meetings where possible to help clarify and evaluate information obtained on the questionnaire.
3. It is recommended that one or more public meetings be held on all major projects since they are the type of forums which, in the citizen's opinion, are the most effective for the exchange of information. It is also recommended that the following be considered.
 - a. Use of a local highway official as moderator for all public meetings.
 - b. Extended use of radio and television in publicizing upcoming meetings and disseminating information.
 - c. Use of slides to accompany Department presentations whenever feasible.
 - d. Publishing of time and place of public meetings in all editions of the local newspapers.
 - e. Extensive training in communication for all individuals taking an active part in the Department's public involvement activities.
 - f. Establishment of a definite format for each Department representative's presentation.
 - g. Use of a hand-out containing a map of the alternates under consideration along with a brief discussion of the rationale for each.

UTILIZING THE PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE
TO ANSWER POLICY AND PROCESS QUESTIONS

by

Michael A. Perfater
Research Analyst

INTRODUCTION

Concomitant with the necessity to direct the development of highway improvement projects to the needs, views, and values of the people they serve, is the necessity for careful analysis of public attitudes and an accurate assessment of the social impacts of proposed projects. Among the tools utilized in making the analysis and assessment are various kinds of surveys, usually made with individually designed and tested questionnaires. While there is, then, a method for gathering information on public attitudes toward projects, methodologies for evaluating the public involvement activities of public agencies seem to be lacking. While it is probable that some criteria for successful public participation programs exist in the minds of agency officials responsible for public involvement activities, it is also probable that certain factors that influence the public's perception of the programs are not taken into account. There is a question, then, of how an agency is to know whether or not its public involvement techniques are deemed good or bad by the public it is trying to involve. One tool that can be utilized in answering this question is the same one employed for assessing attitudes about proposed projects; namely, the survey questionnaire. In fact, it would appear that information for both types of assessment could be obtained with a single, well-designed questionnaire.

In February 1975, the Virginia Highway & Transportation Research Council published a report describing many of the public involvement techniques used by state transportation agencies throughout the country.* That report described one technique being successfully used

*Perfater, M. A., "Citizen Participation and the Role of the Public Hearing," Virginia Highway & Transportation Research Council, February 1975, 24 pp. with Appendix.

by several agencies to gain early indications of public attitudes concerning specific projects. This technique calls for providing a questionnaire to all citizens attending pre-hearing informational meetings. In early 1976, the author initiated a study of the efficacy of this technique. A questionnaire was designed to allow citizens to comment upon both the specifics of a project and the citizen involvement process utilized in conjunction with the project. In October 1976, an interim report was published outlining the results of two field tests of the questionnaire. The current report discusses those and the results of additional field tests. Also included are findings, conclusions, and recommendations from an analysis of the data obtained during the study.

OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The overall purpose of the research was to evaluate the public opinion questionnaire as a means of determining wants and needs of citizens relative to proposed highway projects and to their involvement in the planning for those projects. Specifically, the three major objectives of the study were to--

1. gather information from citizens regarding their attitudes and perceptions of the project itself;
2. determine citizen desires regarding public involvement in highway projects so as to provide the Department an insight into which public involvement practices are useful and which ones are not; and
3. promote the development of an effective, definite format for the questionnaire itself.

The questionnaire was administered at three public meetings during late 1976 and early 1977. Although the working plan for the study called for the questionnaire to be tested at between six and ten public meetings, the author feels that it is in the best interest of the Department to terminate this research, since the testing has yielded sufficient data for the purposes of the study and since testing at three to eight additional meetings might extend the research for a year or more.

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire similar to that shown in Appendix A of this report was distributed to all individuals attending three informational meetings on two major highway projects. Two of the meetings involved the highly controversial Powhite Parkway project in Chesterfield County and the third involved improvements to Route 42 in Rockingham County. The questionnaire was developed by R. H. Blackman of the Department's Environmental Quality Division, who was team leader for the projects, and the author. Meeting #1 was attended by 82 persons, 17 of whom filled out and returned the self-addressed, postage-paid questionnaire for a response rate of about 21%. Meeting #2 was attended by 300 persons, 56 of whom returned a completed questionnaire for a response rate of about 19%. Meeting #3 was attended by 100 persons, 43 of whom returned a completed questionnaire for a response rate of 43%. Since the question chronology and wording were identical on the questionnaires distributed at all three meetings, the results were combined and, except where noted, are reported here in that form. Thus the total response rate was 116/482, or roughly 24%, which is about average for mail surveys.

Before an analysis of the data is presented, a word about the setting for each meeting seems appropriate. The two meetings involving the Powhite Parkway project (hereinafter often referred to as Sample 1) were attended by some 382 persons, many of whom were either confused or displeased regarding the proposed improvements. The project had received much coverage by the media prior to the meetings and was one which had been the subject of controversy for several years. The overall mood of those individuals attending the two meetings could be classified as one of anxiety. The atmosphere for the meeting involving Route 42 (hereinafter referred to as Sample 2) was not nearly as tense. This is probably attributable to the nonpolitical nature of the Route 42 improvement as well as the excellent pre-meeting preparations carried out by Department staff. Thus the reader should take note that, at times, responses to certain questions on the Powhite surveys may be tainted by the tone of those meetings. Where such occurrences are suspected, they are pointed out and discussed. Such discussions may also provide insight into reasons behind the more positive nature of meeting #3 versus the negative nature of meetings 1 and 2.

RESULTS OF SURVEYS

The Process

The questionnaire distributed at the first two meetings contained 13 questions, while that distributed at the third meeting contained 19. Two questions which appeared on surveys 1 and 2 did not appear on survey 3. Eight questions appeared on survey 3 which did not appear on surveys 1 and 2. All questions used were designed to obtain information regarding either the Department's public involvement practices or the public's attitude about the project. Here, each of these questions is addressed separately.

Respondents to each survey were first asked why they had come to the meeting. Almost 90% indicated they had attended to obtain information. Only 10% reported the reason for their attendance as being to protest one of the alternates under study. It is interesting to note that 14% of those attending the Powhite meetings viewed their participation as being protest oriented, while only 5% of those attending meeting #3 felt this way. While it is difficult to ascertain the exact reasons for this difference, it is believed that certain elements may have had effects. First, the Route 42 project did not have the political controversy surrounding it that the Powhite project did. Secondly, and more important, however, in this writer's opinion, the pre-meeting publicity efforts of Department staff as well as a better format for meeting #3 over meetings 1 and 2 had a tremendous effect on the respondents in how they viewed the meeting. In short, the Department merely may have done a better job of publicizing and presenting the program for meeting #3. To further ascertain whether these meetings had been sufficiently oriented for sending and receiving information, respondents were asked their opinions of the adequacy of the information presented by the Department. For the three meetings, 47% said too little information was presented, 49% felt the amount of information presented was "about right", and the remaining 4% did not respond to the question. Again, the data are slightly tainted by the fact that for Sample 1 52% said too little information was presented and 44% felt the right amount of information was presented. The same figures for Sample 2 were 40% and 58%, respectively (Table 1). Moreover, while 73% of those attending meetings 1 and 2 felt the representatives from the Department had talked about the right amount, 93% of those attending meeting #3 felt the same; 15% of those attending meetings 1 and 2 said representatives didn't talk enough, while only 5% attending meeting #3 felt the same way (Table 2).

TABLE 1

Sufficiency of Amount of Information Presented
(Numbers of Respondents in Parentheses)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Sample 1</u>		<u>Sample 2</u>		<u>Samples Combined</u>	
Too Much	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)
Too Little	52%	(38)	40%	(17)	47%	(55)
About Right	44%	(32)	58%	(25)	49%	(57)
No Response	4%	(3)	2%	(1)	4%	(4)
Total	100%	(n=73)	100%	(n=43)	100%	(n=116)

TABLE 2

Completeness of Department's Oral Presentations
(Numbers of Respondents in Parentheses)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Sample 1</u>		<u>Sample 2</u>		<u>Samples Combined</u>	
Too Much	8%	(6)	0%	(0)	5%	(6)
Not Enough	15%	(11)	5%	(2)	11%	(13)
About Right	73%	(53)	93%	(40)	80%	(93)
No Response	4%	(3)	2%	(1)	4%	(4)
Total	100%	(n=73)	100%	(n=73)	100%	(n=116)

When asked whether anything about the meetings disappointed them, 70% of the total number of respondents replied "yes" and 30% replied "no". Of the 70% answering affirmatively, more than half explained that they were expecting to receive more information than was provided. The respondents for Sample 1 listed various other disappointments with the meeting, including the inadequacy of the meeting room and the visual aids, the fact that the residents were unaware of the multiple alternatives until recently, and the fact that nothing was resolved at the meeting. The respondents in Sample 2 listed none of those items mentioned by the people in Sample 1. Of the 22 persons listing any specific disappointments with meeting #3, 13 felt more information was necessary, 6 felt the Department should expedite the project, and the remainder felt there weren't enough alternates considered. Thus it can be seen that other than the information item, those attending meetings 1 and 2 had very different concerns than those attending meeting #3.

Eighty-three percent of the Sample 1 respondents did feel that the meetings were beneficial from the standpoint of making them more knowledgeable about the project and the procedures of the Department. It is interesting to note that 100% of the Sample 2 respondents viewed that meeting as beneficial.

When asked for suggestions for improving public meetings, only 33% replied in Sample 2 as compared to 48% in Sample 1. Suggestions from the combined samples included more specific data (42%), better meeting accommodations and sound and visual equipment (24%), better trained or impartial moderators (16%), more vocal representation from county officials (4%), more and smaller meetings (9%), and the elimination of repetition (2%). In addition, 67% of the respondents in Sample 1 indicated that they felt such meetings were an effective means of allowing expression of opinion, 16% felt they were ineffective, and the remainder either weren't sure or didn't respond. However, it appears that the attitude toward meeting #3 differs markedly from that for meetings 1 and 2. Ninety-eight percent of those in Sample 2 indicated that they felt such meetings were an effective means of allowing expressions of opinion, none felt they were ineffective, and 2% didn't respond (Table 3). Finally, 94% of all respondents indicated they would attend another meeting on the project if one were held.

The reader will remember that one of the objectives of this study was to develop a definite format for the questionnaire through testing, so that those questions which provide useful information can be used and those which do not can be discarded. While the questionnaire used for Sample 1 provided a great deal of data, it

TABLE 3

Overall Feeling Regarding Effectiveness of Meeting
in Allowing Expression of Opinions
(Number of Respondents in Parentheses)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Sample 1</u>		<u>Sample 2</u>		<u>Samples Combined</u>	
Very Effective	40%	(29)	49%	(21)	43%	(50)
Rather Effective	27%	(20)	49%	(21)	35%	(41)
Rather Ineffective	11%	(8)	0%	(0)	7%	(8)
Very Ineffective	5%	(4)	0%	(0)	3%	(4)
Don't Know	14%	(10)	0%	(0)	9%	(10)
No Response	3%	(2)	2%	(1)	3%	(3)
Total	100%	(n=73)	100%	(n=43)	100%	(n=116)

appeared to lack the elements necessary to obtain the desired input about the specifics of the performance of Department staff people at public meetings. For this reason eight questions in addition to those asked in Sample 1, were included on the questionnaire distributed at meeting #3. All were concerned with the citizens' opinions of Department procedures at the meeting and are discussed in the following paragraph.

Sample 2 respondents were asked their opinion of the moderator's performance. Twenty-three percent rated it excellent, 70% good, and 5% fair. The moderator at this meeting was a resident engineer, and thus a local resident known by many of the citizens attending the meeting. Two questions regarding the engineering presentation were asked of respondents. Eighty-one percent indicated they felt that the engineering information was presented in an understandable manner. When asked to pick from a list of terms the ones that best described the engineering presentation, 18 individuals said it was interesting, 23 that it was clear and concise, 14 that it was relaxed, and 3 that it was complete. (Multiple responses were allowed, as shown in Table 4.) The only negative comments were by 9 individuals who felt the presentation was incomplete. This finding is consistent with the previously mentioned feeling on the part of some of the respondents that more information would have been desirable. Respondents were also asked whether or not environmental information was presented in an understandable manner. More than 93% responded positively to this question. In addition, respondents were asked to characterize the environmental presentation from the same terms provided for the previous questions on the engineering presentation. (Again, multiple responses were allowed.) As shown in Table 4, 40 respondents characterized the environmental presentation as having positive features. Specifically, 15 felt it was interesting, 14 that it was clear and concise, 6 that it was relaxed, and 5 that it was complete. Only 13 respondents associated negative terms with the environmental presentation; more than half of these felt the presentation was somewhat incomplete. It appears, then, that the public's view of the Department presentations was a positive one at meeting #3. Even more positive was their view of the visual aids made available at that meeting. Of the 43 respondents, not one had a negative opinion regarding the visual aids. It should be noted that a fine slide presentation included in the environmental presentation probably had a great deal to do with the positiveness of the response to this question. In fact, several respondents commented to this effect on the questionnaire.

To ascertain an "overall attitude" of the public attending meeting #3 regarding the Department's overall

Table 4
 Terms Best Describing Engineering
 and Environmental Presentations

<u>Term</u>	<u>Engineering Presentation</u>	<u>Environmental Presentation</u>
Interesting	18	15
Boring	0	2
Clear and concise	23	14
Too long	0	2
Confusing	0	0
Complete	3	5
Incomplete	9	7
Relaxed	14	6
Tense	0	2
Other	0	1
No response	2	1
Total Negative Comments	9 (13%)	13 (24%)
Total Positive Comments	58 (84%)	40 (73%)

performance at the meeting, two additional questions were asked. When asked if they felt the Department had done a good job in explaining the proposed project, all but 2 of the respondents replied in the affirmative. Similarly, the public was asked to rate meetings of this type as to their usefulness in obtaining public input. Fifty-one percent of the respondents rated such meetings as excellent, 26% as good, 19% as fair, and only 3% (one respondent) as poor. The responses to these last two questions again seem to point out that while Department procedures are far from perfect, as far as this particular meeting was concerned they met the public's needs rather adequately.

The Project

Answers to Specific Questions

One of the objectives of the study was to develop and evaluate a questionnaire format which would help to determine the public's perceptions of the Department's public involvement and planning process. A second objective, which is addressed in this section, was concerned with the development and evaluation of the same method for making determinations relative to citizens' perceptions and attitudes about the project itself.

Respondents were asked how they were affected by the project. For Sample 1, 80% of the respondents indicated they would be adversely affected by lines M and/or A if either were constructed. Only 3 respondents reported that line E would adversely impact them. For Sample 2, 63% of the respondents indicated they would be adversely affected by proposed improvements to Route 42. The point to remember here is that the majority of the respondents attending all meetings (72%) were threatened by being adversely affected by the proposed improvements. Answers to the question regarding the respondents' reason for attending the meetings corroborated this finding. For the three meetings, more than two-thirds of the respondents indicated they had attended the meeting because their property was affected by various proposed improvements. Concerning alternate preferences for Sample 1, 74% of the respondents favored line E, 5% favored line M, 4% favored line F, 3% favored the widening of Route 60, 3% favored the "no-build" alternative, and only 1 respondent favored line A. For Sample 2, 49% favored Alternative 1, 40% favored Alternative 2, none preferred Alternative 3, 7% favored the no-build alternative, and a little more than 4% felt that none of the alternatives listed were satisfactory. It can easily be seen, then, that the respondents in Sample 1 were heavily in favor of one alternative while those in Sample 2 were basically split between two alternatives.

While the foregoing represent the responses to specific questions, it might now be worthwhile to turn to some of the additional comments which accompanied these specific responses.

Additional Respondent Comments

Many of the respondents took advantage of the opportunity to enter additional comments concerning the meeting itself, the Department's highway development process, and/or the Powhite and Route 42 projects. These comments were, in many cases, enlightening, especially from the Powhite meeting, in that they provide underlying reasons for public dissatisfaction regarding both the project and the process. Interim Report #1 from this study provided a discussion of these comments; so rather than repeating the discussion verbatim here, a brief summary will be given.

Comments from Sample 1 respondents were grouped under three headings: (1) lack of specific information; (2) withholding of certain facts and decisions; and (3) addition of alternates to presupposed routes. At meeting #1, the greatest source of dissatisfaction among respondents was lack of information regarding relocation. At meeting #2, the relocation information imparted by Department representatives was more detailed than that at meeting #1, and this improvement was reflected by respondents in that no respondent surveyed at meeting #2 commented on a lack of relocation information. There was also sentiment among Sample 1 respondents that information was being withheld or that decisions had already been made and that attitudes displayed at the meetings would have no bearing on the decisions. Finally, there was much comment from that group concerning the fact that the addition of alternatives to line E came as a complete surprise and was contradictory to all that local residents had been told previously concerning the extension of the Powhite Parkway.

Few of the respondents attending meeting #3 took advantage of the comment space on the questionnaire. Negative comments such as those in the preceding paragraph were decidedly absent. In fact, of the 9 individuals who chose to make comments, all but 2 gave suggestions for variations of the alternates listed; the additional 2 were short statements criticizing the original corridor planning for Route 42 and admonishing the planners to study the existing facility in-depth before making improvements which might prove to be inadequate in a few years.

PROBING THE CAUSES OF PUBLIC DISCONTENT

Interim Report #1 from this study included a section discussing many suggestions for improving the communication and information dissemination techniques of the Department both prior to and during public meetings. Indeed, the things cited as sources of dissatisfaction by the respondents in Sample 1 were not and never will be conducive to effective public participation. The report pointed out that many obstacles such as those encountered during the Powhite meetings can be removed through better techniques in communication and information dissemination. Since public meetings are an important way of communicating with interest groups or gatherings of independent citizens, it is necessary that individuals from the Department be accomplished communicators. Moreover, it was recognized that since public participation also involves producing information and making it available on a wide basis, the Department's techniques for disseminating information should also be top-notch. In the author's viewpoint, and as was brought out in the questionnaires returned by Sample 1 respondents, the lack of emphasis on skills in communication and information dissemination, along with some basic inconsistency in Department philosophy regarding public involvement, were the items in need of immediate review. Some basic guidelines for communicating and informing were presented in the interim report. Items addressed included the need for empathy, trust, and credibility on the part of all individuals making presentations at meetings on behalf of the Department. A discussion of visual aids put special emphasis on the importance of slides in providing clarity in the Department's technical presentations.

In effect, then, Interim Report #1 pointed out that the Powhite meetings were not used effectively and up to their potential. The questionnaire brought forth that information rather forcefully. On the other hand, the information received on the Sample 2 questionnaires revealed that many of the Department's shortcomings pointed out by the citizens at the Powhite meetings were not observed at meeting #3. Identification of the reasons for the absence of a preponderance of negative responses from Sample 2 might help to curb public discontent at future meetings. First, admittedly certain aspects of the Powhite project differed greatly from those for the Route 42 project. The Powhite project involved an urban improvement potentially impacting an old established neighborhood and many adjacent housing developments; Route 42 involved a rural improvement potentially impacting a few residences along its route, some of which were of historical significance. Decidedly, the urban project was ripe for controversy. Secondly, the Powhite project

involved a new location whereas the Route 42 project included upgrading of the existing facility as one alternative. New locations, especially in urban areas, are often more controversial than upgrades of existing facilities. Last, the question of the need for the Powhite project had been a political issue and subject of local concern for many years; the Route 42 project had also been the subject of local concern for a period of years, but for a different reason. The latter facility was seen as being in need of improvement due to the increased traffic on it and the resultant safety hazards. The point to be made here is that these comparisons indicate that the projects themselves were different in certain respects. Therefore, to make exact comparisons between the meetings held for the two projects would not be valid. However, there are certain comparisons which can be made relative to procedures used and the performance exhibited by Department people at both meetings.

First, the pre-meeting coverage for meeting #3 was superior to that for the Powhite meetings. Undoubtedly, the press was kinder to the Department in its publicity about Route 42 than for the Powhite project. More important, however, was the fact that the Department also approached and utilized the radio and television media to publicize the Route 42 meeting and to provide information about the project. Television coverage for the Powhite meetings was minimal and was done through requests from citizen groups rather than from the Department. The reader will remember that the respondents in Sample 1 were not pleased with the information they received regarding the Powhite project. One can perhaps surmise that pre-meeting publicity for the Route 42 meeting helped to eliminate this type of displeasure as reflected in the comments of the respondents in Sample 2. Using the media to disseminate information, then, appears desirable, and results in a better informed and consequently less negative public to contend with at meetings. Second, to say that communication was more effective at meeting #3 would be an understatement. Both this writer's observations and those of the respondents revealed that all Department speakers did an admirable job of explaining the project and the Department's procedures. The principal communicator, the moderator, was the local resident engineer, who was known by many of the citizens attending the meeting. While not necessarily a skillful communicator, this individual did present himself as "one of the folks", while not totally relinquishing his Department badge. In effect, he was able to assume a dual role: that of a Department representative and that of a meeting facilitator. This, along with the fact that he was able to establish rapport and credibility, show empathy, and apparently gain the trust of the citizens, certainly helped to reduce citizen dissidence. Furthermore, the

presentations by other Department people at this meeting also recieved positive comments from respondents. Information was imparted clearly and concisely. In no instance did information appear to be withheld, in no instance did the questions of citizens appear to be hedged, and in no instance was there any condescension on the part of Department speakers. Finally, visual aids for meeting #3 were superior to those used at the Powhite meetings. It is desirable to use several types of visual aids at public meetings in order that a clear, concise visual representation of the project be given to interested citizens. While displayed visuals for all meetings were adequate, slides were used during the environmental presentation much more effectively at meeting #3 than at the Powhite meetings, and the result, as indicated by the respondents, was a better understanding of the environmental considerations. Slides used at meeting #2 were, for the most part, illegible to people seated in the rear of the room. Also, most of the basic principles for slide design regarding wording, emphasis, and color were violated. Those used at meeting #3, on the other hand, provided an excellent aid to the environmental presentation. Indeed, the complexity of this subject often necessitates the use of slides to make it clearly understandable to citizens. Continued and perhaps increased use of slides at these meetings, then, would appear to be important means of reducing citizen confusion and often resultant dissatisfaction.

The foregoing point out several obvious reasons for the difference in citizens' reactions to the Department procedures for the Powhite meetings as compared to the Route 42 meeting. Indeed, these items should be taken into account when planning for future meetings as any one of them might be useful in reducing citizen discontent. In the final analysis, the questionnaire helped disclose what to do and what not to do at future meetings, as evidenced by the changes made in certain procedures for the Route 42 meeting. One might question if there was any single item which accounted for the positive tone of meeting #3 as opposed to the negative tone of the Powhite meetings. The most reasonable answer is that rather than any single item, the experience gained from the Powhite meetings led to a better job for the Route 42 project. In short, experience may have been, and may continue to be, the best teacher.

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE
AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE PROVIDED

2061

1. Why did you attend this meeting?

2. How did you learn about this meeting?

3. How are you affected by this project?

4. How effective do you think meetings of this type are in allowing people to express their opinion?
() Very effective () Rather effective () Rather ineffective () Very ineffective () Don't know
5. In your opinion, did speakers from the Department talk too much, not enough, about right? (circle one)
6. In your opinion, were citizens given sufficient, insufficient opportunity to speak? (circle one)
7. In your opinion, was too much, too little, about right, amount of information presented? (circle one)

8. Did anything about this meeting disappoint you?

9. Do you feel this meeting was beneficial to you? () Yes () No Explain

10. What would you like to see covered at future meetings which was not covered at this one?

11. Are there any changes you would suggest for improving these meetings? () Yes () No Explain.

12. Based upon what you've heard tonight, please indicate your preference for an alternative for an extension of the Powhite Parkway to Route 60. A E M F (circle one)
13. If another meeting is held on this project will you attend? () Yes () No Explain

(Additional comments may be entered on the back of this sheet)

THANK YOU FOR TAKING AN ACTIVE PART IN THIS PROJECT

APPENDIX B

ROUTE 42 QUESTIONNAIRE

2003

Please Answer the Following Questions and Drop in Mailbox within Five Days
No Postage Required -- One Per Family Please

Why did you attend this meeting?

How did you learn about this meeting?

How are you affected by this project?

How effective do you think meetings of this type are in allowing people to express their opinion? () Very Effective
() Rather Effective () Rather Ineffective () Very Ineffective () Don't Know

In your opinion, did speakers from the Department talk too much, not enough, about right? (circle one)

In your opinion, was too much, too little, about right, amount of information presented? (circle one)

What was your opinion of the moderator's overall presentation? (circle one) Excellent Good Fair Poor

Was engineering information presented in an understandable manner? () Yes () No

Which terms best describe the engineering presentation? (circle one or more) Interesting, Boring, Clear and Concise,
Too long, Confusing, Complete, Incomplete, Relaxed, Tense, Other _____

Was environmental information presented in an understandable manner? () Yes () No

Which terms best describe the environmental presentation? (circle one or more) Interesting, Boring, Clear and Concise,
Too Long, Confusing, Complete, Incomplete, Relaxed, Tense, Other _____

Were visual aids (slides, plans, mosaics, etc.) easily understandable? () Yes () No Explain

Did anything about this meeting disappoint you?

Do you feel this meeting was beneficial to you? () Yes () No Explain

Do you feel the Highway Department has done a good job in explaining the proposed project? () Yes () No

Do you feel that meetings of this type are excellent, good, fair, poor as far as getting public input is concerned? (circle one) Why?

Do you have any suggestions for improving these meetings? () Yes () No Explain

Based upon what you've heard tonight, please circle your preference for an alternative regarding the Route 42 improvement.
Alternative 1 - Proposed Relocated 42 (Red Line), Alternative 2 - Existing Route 42 (Green Line), Alternative 3 - Combination
Orange and Red Line), Alternative 4 - No build, Alternative 5 - None of the above (Comments?)

If another meeting is held on this project will you attend? () Yes () No Explain

(Additional comments may be entered on the back of this sheet)

THANK YOU FOR TAKING AN ACTIVE PART IN THIS PROJECT

Name (Optional)

2064