Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to invite you to complete a survey concerning the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (LARRMP). This survey is part of a research study being conducted by José Chiucheng Chen, a Fulbright Scholar from National Chengchi University in Taipei, Taiwan who was a visiting Scholar at the USC School of Policy, Planning, and Development. This research is being funded in part by the National Science Council in Taiwan.

As you know, the LARRMP addresses the long-term processes and consequences of revitalizing river-adjacent areas in the city of Los Angeles. This survey instrument focuses on the institutional arrangements through which decisions related to the Plan have been made. The results of this research will help to identify key factors associated with the development of effective participative procedures through which to engage stakeholders in such planning efforts. The findings from this study will highlight lessons learned from this significant planning experience that could be incorporated into a similar planning process in the city of Taipei, Taiwan.

We are particularly interested in obtaining your responses to this survey due to your participation in one of the community workshops and/or other specific committee meetings. The survey has been designed to gather all the data necessary to achieve the study objectives while requiring a minimum amount of your time. Based on our experience in the pre-test phase of developing the survey, the average amount of time required to complete the survey instrument should be about 20~30 minutes. We would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the survey prior to “October 15.” Finally, we would welcome any comments that you may have relevant to the LARRMP planning process.

We want to assure you that your survey responses will be held in strictest confidence. Also, we will be happy to send you a summary of the survey results if you so desire. In advance, thank you very much for your cooperation on this important project.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Robertson
Associate Professor
SPPD, USC
Introduction

Department of Public Administration
College of Social Science (CSS)
National Chengchi University (NCCU)
Taipei, Taiwan

September 27, 2007

Dear Sir/Madam,

As you may know, the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (LARRMP) planning process was launched in August 2005. After 17 community workshops plus 3 public hearings and numerous committee meetings, the LARRMP draft plan was submitted to the City Council in April 2007. On May 9th, 2007, it was approved by the City Council.

The City’s "LA River Team" was in charge of producing governance proposals, land use recommendations, an economic analysis of proposed alternatives, and a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). This team was led by the City’s Bureau of Engineering, funded by its Department of Water and Power, supported by a Citywide Interdepartmental Task Force and a team of private consultant firms. The planning process included a series of Community Workshops, a Stakeholders Committee, an Advisory Committee, a Peer Review Committee, the monthly Task Force, and more than 40 meetings with various community groups.

The LARRMP is an example of cross-sectoral governance, large in scope, complex, and long-term. It is intended to change the River-adjacent communities along the 32-mile stretch of the River within the City of Los Angeles, bringing positive change and raising some negative sentiments as well. My research will investigate the collective planning process, which was introduced by the City government and which emphasized public participation.

Based on my observation and official documents reviewing, I realize that your opinions are critical to this research. I appreciate your assistance in answering the survey, and expect you can complete it at your convenience prior to “October 15.” Thank you so much! With your help, this research could come out many valuable conclusions and workable suggestions for similar public projects in my country.

Sincerely Yours,

José Chiucheng Chen
2006-2007 Fulbright Visiting Scholar at USC
Ph.D. Candidate, National ChengChi University, Taiwan

g1256501@nccu.edu.tw
Instruction

Please read the instructions carefully before you start to complete this survey.

---The survey requires about **20-30** minutes for completion.

---Each item is set up with a “required answer function.” You will be unable proceed to next page until all items of a page are completed.

---There will be a reminder (This question requires an answer!) in red shown above certain question item when it is not completed.

---The survey allows your responses to be edited; you may go back and update existing responses until the survey is finished.

---The survey tool saves a page or response whenever the "Next or Done" link is clicked.

---During answering the survey, you can leave it by clicking the “Exist this survey” in the right-up corner of each page.

---Clicking "Done" indicates that you have finished the survey. After clicking “Done” you will not be able to re-enter the survey.

---Multiple respondents can complete the survey using the same computer and/or Internet Protocol (IP) address.

If you understand the instructions above and are ready to proceed with completion of the survey, please click "Next."
Section I: Institutional Arrangements & Problems
The questions in this section focus on your observations or opinions about what happened in the LARRMP meeting(s) you attended. After a set of general questions, there are a few questions about each of the different types of meetings involved in the LARRMP process. For these, you should answer only the questions about the type(s) of meetings you attended. Let's start from these questions for all respondents, although you might have attended different LARRMP meetings. Please answer the questions below based on your understanding of LARRMP.

# measure scale: 1=Not really; 2=A little; 3=Some; 4=A lot; 5=Completely

➢ Common Questions for All Respondents
Let’s start from these questions for all respondents, although you might have attended different LARRMP meetings. Please answer the questions below based on your understanding of LARRMP.

1. The interests of minority groups were discussed in the LARRMP planning process.
2. The distribution of the five recommended opportunity sites supports the goal of equitable development in Los Angeles.
3. The planning process of LARRMP was transparent.
4. The reasons why some opportunity areas were omitted from the plan were explained to participants.
5. The LA River Team members had sufficient interaction with the affected population in the LARRMP planning process.
6. All the stakeholder groups with an interest in the LARRMP were well represented in the planning process.
7. The LARRMP planning meetings were well-attended.
8. Communication in the LARRMP planning process was two-way.
9. Participants at the meeting(s) I attended actively offered their recommendations concerning the LARRMP plan.
10. Representatives from the public agencies involved in the planning process had NO preconceived ideas about the LARRMP plan before public input about the project was articulated.
11. There was sufficient discussion of the criteria used to select the opportunity areas included in the LARRMP plan.
12. Planning for the LARRMP was shaped through a participatory process.
13. There was a clear accountability structure in the LARRMP planning process.

➢ Community Workshops
These questions are only for those who attended any LARRMP "Community Workshops."

14. Did you attend any "Community Workshops"?
15. Which community workshops did you attend? (Check all that you attended.)
   □ 10/15/2005 (Weddington Recreation Center).
   □ 10/22/2005 (Goodwill Work Source Center, Cypress Park).
   □ 1/21/2006 (Reseda High School).
   □ 1/24/2006 (International Community Center at Exposition Park).
16. The eviction of homeless encampments was discussed at the workshop(s) I attended.
17. The issue of gentrification was addressed at the workshop(s) I attended.
18. At the workshop(s) I attended, an explanation was given for why the 20 opportunity sites were chosen for discussion.
19. At the workshop(s) I attended, the duties of the consultant team were explained.
20. The priorities regarding the LA River revitalization that were presented at the workshop(s) I attended matched those of the stakeholders present.
21. The "table exercise" at the workshop(s) I attended was helpful for receiving information from stakeholders.
22. At the workshop(s) I attended, there was discussion about how to resolve the homelessness problem in the planning area.
23. At the workshop(s) I attended, there was discussion about how to resolve the gang violence along the River.
24. The facilitator(s) at the workshop(s) I attended allowed adequate dialogue between planners and participants in the Q&A session.

Advisory Committee
These questions are only for those who attended any LARRMP "Advisory Committee" meetings.

25. Did you attend any "Advisory Committee" meetings?
26. At the Advisory Committee meeting(s) I attended, suggestions were made for reducing existing inequities among different planning zones/neighborhoods/communities.
27. At the Advisory Committee meeting(s) I attended, there was discussion of how the plan would impact minority groups.

Peer Review Committee
These questions are only for those who attended any LARRMP "Peer Review Committee" meetings.
28. Did you attend any "Peer Review Committee" meetings?
29. The membership of this committee included representatives of a variety of different professions.
30. Peer review of the plan helped to increase the extent to which it addresses the public interest.
31. The prerequisite for being invited to serve as a member of this committee was having a relevant professional background.

➢ Stakeholders Committee
These questions are only for those who attended any LARRMP "Stakeholders Committee" meetings.

32. Did you attend any "Stakeholders Committee" meetings?
33. Conflicts of interest among participants were represented at the Stakeholders Committee meeting(s) I attended.
34. A prerequisite for being invited to serve as a member of this committee was having a background working on environmental issues.

➢ Task Force Meetings
These questions are only for those who attended LARRMP “Task Force” meetings.

35. Did you attend any "Task Force" meetings?
36. In their discussions, the Task Force put a high priority on meeting the public’s needs.
37. At the Task Force meeting(s) I attended, participants were clear about who would be held accountable for the consequences of the planning decisions.

Section II: Outcome of Governance
The items in this section ask for your opinions regarding the LARRMP draft plan. We assume you are familiar with the plan since you participated in one or more of the meetings addressed in the previous section.

# measure scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4=Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree.

38. The $3 million spent preparing the LARRMP draft plan was a worthwhile expense.
39. I am satisfied with the goals of the LARRMP. (They are to revitalize the river, green the neighborhoods, capture community opportunities, and create value.)
40. I support the "three-tiered river management structure" included in the LARRMP draft plan.
41. The "three main selection criteria" for "the 5 ultimately-chosen opportunity areas" addressed in the LARRMP draft plan are appropriate.
42. I am satisfied with the alternatives proposed in the LARRMP draft plan for each opportunity area.
43. The distribution of parkland and open space among the River-adjacent communities addressed in the LARRMP draft plan is appropriate.
44. I believe the economic benefits estimated in the LARRMP draft plan will be achieved.
45. The five chosen pilot "Opportunity Areas" addressed in the LARRMP draft plan
are appropriate. (They are Canoga Park, River Glen, Taylor Yard, Chinatown-Cornfields area and Downtown Industrial area.)

46. The "LA River Team" has the legitimate authority to propose the 239 potential projects that are identified in the LARRMP draft plan.
47. I believe the funding resources identified in the LARRMP draft plan are sufficient to implement it.
48. It is good to see the City Council had approved the LARRMP draft plan.
49. I am satisfied with the extent to which public comments were included in the LARRMP draft plan.

Section III: Principles of Governance
The questions in this section focus on your beliefs regarding principles that should be reflected in the process of planning for public projects.

# measure scale: 1=No, it isn’t important; 2=Sometimes, it depends; 3=Usually, yes; 4=Definitely, always.

50. The first priority of a planning process should be to maximize the public interest.
51. A public plan should aim to reduce existing inequities among different planning zones/neighborhoods/communities.
52. "Transparency" is a key to obtain public support in a public project.
53. The interest of minorities should be protected in the planning process of public policy.
54. It should be clear who is accountable for public decisions.
55. All public needs should not be ignored by related public projects.
56. Active participation should be promoted in the planning process.
57. Sustained interaction with the affected population should be an important feature in a public project.
58. It is important for planners to receive information from stakeholders in a public meeting.
59. Local residents should participate in the process of making planning decisions that affect them.
60. The vision of a public project should reflect what people want.
61. A basic requirement for a public plan is that it should reflect the different interests of various stakeholders.
62. There should be two-way communication between planners and stakeholders in the planning process.
63. Diverse participants should be represented in planning processes.
64. It is necessary to set up an accountability structure for a cross-section involvement project.

Section IV: General Participation Questions
In this section, the items are used to evaluate the general participation experience of individuals.

65. How would you describe the LARRMP decision-making process? (Check all that apply.)
   □ Due process.
   □ Collaborative process.
   □ Biased process.
Opportunity for public inputs.
Raising public awareness.
Other (Please specify.)

66. How did you acquire information about the LARRMP meetings? (Check all that apply.)
- Official notification from an LARRMP committee.
- Working on the LARRMP.
- Notification at a public library.
- Mail from “LA River Team.”
- Email from “LA River Team.”
- Website of “LA River.”
- Friend(s) told me.
- Newspaper.
- Other (Please specify.)

67. Which of the followings do you think have been the main sources of momentum keeping the LARRMP project moving forward? (Please rank the top three in order, identifying your biggest concern with a 1, your next biggest concern with a 2, and your third concern with a 3.)
- Entrepreneurial interests.
- Nonprofit organizations.
- Governmental policy.
- The LA City Council's Ad Hoc River Committee.
- Support of local residents.
- Other (Please specify.)

68. Which of the following observations of the LARRMP planning process, you agree with? (Please check “agree” or “disagree” for each statement)
- The plan is probably biased towards certain interests.
- Don't know who is accountable for the decision.
- My (Our) needs have been left out.
- Many of the decisions seemed to be prearranged.
- There was inappropriate representation in the process.
- Only a few local residents attended the meetings.
- It was hard to integrate the conflicting interests into the plan.
- Other (Please specify.)

69. Please describe what you believe is/are the most important accomplishments of the LARRMP planning process? (Please specify.)

Section V: Demographic Questions
This section asks you to answer questions related to your demographic characteristics which will help with the analysis. We guarantee that your responses will be used for academic purposes only and will adhere to the rules concerning research ethics at the University of Southern California.
70. What is your gender?
   □ Female.
   □ Male.
71. What is your age? (Please specify.)
72. What is your race/ethnicity?
   □ Caucasian.
   □ African-American.
   □ Latino.
   □ Asian/Pacific Islander.
   □ Multi-racial.
   □ Prefer not to say.
   □ Other (Please specify.)
73. What is your highest level of education?
   □ Some High School or less.
   □ High School graduate or equivalent.
   □ Some College or Vocational School.
   □ College graduate.
   □ Graduate education.
   □ Prefer not to say.
74. Which sector are you most closely affiliated with?
   □ Governmental Sector.
   □ For-Profit Sector.
   □ Non-Profit Sector.
   □ None of the above.
75. Which of the following describes your current status? (Check all that apply.)
   □ Public manager/Government worker.
   □ Elected official.
   □ Private consultant.
   □ Investor/developer.
   □ Community planner.
   □ Environmentalist.
   □ Local resident.
   □ Neighborhood council board member.
   □ Non-profit organization member.
   □ Student/Teacher/Researcher.
   □ Other (Please specify.)
76. Are you currently employed? (Please choose and specify.)
   □ No.
   □ Yes. (If yes, please identify the agency/organization you work for. For instance: Bureau of Engineering, City of Los Angeles.)
77. Which of the following “Los Angeles river channel reaches” do you live in or
near?
- Canoga High School to Sepulveda Basin.
- Sepulveda Basin.
- Sepulveda Basin to Tujunga Wash.
- Tujunga Wash to Barham Blvd.
- Barham Blvd. to Burbank Western Channel.
- Burbank Western Channel to Taylor Yard.
- Taylor Yard.
- Taylor Yard to 1st St.
- 1st St. to Washington Blvd.
- None of the above.

78. Which “Opportunity Area” do you live in or near?
- Canoga Park.
- River Glen (Verdugo Industrial Green Park).
- Taylor Yard.
- Chinatown-Cornfields area.
- Downtown Industrial area.
- None of the above.

79. How long have you lived in the Los Angeles area? (For example: 3 Years and 6 Months)

80. When did you first get involved in the LARRMP planning process? (For example: May 2006)

81. What are your main concerns about the Los Angeles River? (Please rank the top three in order, identifying your biggest concern with a 1, your next biggest concern with a 2, and your third concern with a 3.)
- Safety.
- Homelessness.
- Gang violence.
- Graffiti.
- Access to the river.
- Wild habitat.
- Trash and other pollution.
- Water quality.
- Public awareness.
- Aesthetic design/public art.
- Amenities.
- Open space.
- Gentrification.
- Maintenance.
- Other (Please specify.)

82. Why are you interested in the LARRMP process? (Check all that apply.)
I live near the river.
☐  I have a business within the plan area.
☐  I care about the river.
☐  My work is related to the LARRMP process and its implementation.
☐  Other (please specify)

83. Would you be willing to be interviewed about these issues for this study? (Please choose and specify.)
☐  No
☐  Yes (If yes, please provide your contact information.)

84. Do you know of anyone else who might be willing to participate in this survey? If so, could you please provide their email address and/or other contact information.

85. Your overall comment for this questionnaire?

Thank you for completing our survey!
I appreciate your assistance very much. If you have any questions and/or recommendations, please contact me through "g1256501@nccu.edu.tw".

Take Care and Best Regards,

José Chiucheng Chen
2006-2007 Fulbright Visiting Scholar at USC
Ph.D. Candidate, National ChengChi University, Taiwan
Phone: +886-4875-3795 (Taiwan)