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Trusted Advocate Project Overview

Central Corridor Light Rail service is slated to begin in 2014. In preparation for the introduction of Central Corridor light rail, Metro Transit must conduct a transit study to integrate LRT and bus service and “maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of transit service” in the corridor.

Safe, efficient and equitable access to transit is a priority concern for the District Councils Collaborative of Saint Paul and Minneapolis (DCC). Noting the significance the Central Corridor Transit Study would have on improving and maintaining access for all neighborhoods in Central Corridor, the DCC approached Metro Transit to identify ways in which the organization could help support community engagement related to the service planning. Metro Transit communicated its interest and a desire to receive input from as many community members as possible so the proposed service plan takes everyone’s needs into consideration. However, the agency acknowledged that, although they gather great feedback from those who attend community meetings, it is often difficult to engage all constituencies in transit service studies.

In response, the DCC proposed adapting the Trusted Advocate community engagement model, as an approach to increasing input from diverse communities and ensuring they have a greater voice in the study process. Furthermore, this approach would create opportunities for Metro Transit to build long-term and sustainable relationships with all communities in the Central Corridor.
Background
The Trusted Advocates engagement model has been used successfully in Seattle. It grew out of Former Mayor Greg Nickels’ Race and Social Justice initiative (RSJI), an effort to change how the city government addressed the “needs of its racially, ethnically and culturally diverse population.”

Although Seattle had enjoyed fairly intensive public participation for a few decades, with a focus on transparency and fully engaging residents in planning and decision-making, much of this work was unable to reach communities of color and immigrant communities in the city. Consequently, as a part of RSJI, the mayor signed an executive order stating that city departments had to “perform outreach and public engagement activities in a manner that reflects the racial and cultural diversity of Seattle.”

When Seattle was preparing to update existing neighborhood plans as part of planning a new segment of the LRT system in 2008, staff worked with community members to develop a community engagement model that would comply with the mayor’s executive order. It was this effort that precipitated the concept of “Trusted Advocates.”

What are trusted advocates?
“A trusted advocate is a member of a specific ethnic, racial, cultural and/or other underrepresented groups who is perceived by other members as trustworthy, approachable and effective, particularly navigating distance between the group and the majority community.” — Innovative Public Tools in Transportation Planning: Application and Outcomes

Trusted advocates are chosen for their existing ties to the community and evidence of their ability to build relationships and serve as bridges, whether that be their formal or informal role in the community.
According to *Trusted Advocates: A Multicultural Approach to Building and Sustaining Resident Involvement*, the work of trusted advocates includes:

- Facilitating and organizing meetings, community forums and strategy group participation
- Outreach and Interpretation
- Service Provision, Advocacy and Planning
- Systems and Policy Advocacy and Change

**Adapting the Trusted Advocate Model for the Transit Service Study**

DCC staff and the Metro Transit outreach coordinator and senior planners assigned to the study met several times to adapt the model for transit service planning purposes. Metro Transit staff oriented DCC staff to transit service planning: the different planning phases, what type of information that Metro Transit needs, and when community members can have the greatest impact on the process and decision-making. Metro Transit staff also shared how the planning and approval process worked within their organization and the Metropolitan Council, which is the final decision-making authority.

DCC staff shared the feedback that it received from different organizations serving priority constituencies about this model and what they believed was needed to implement the core principles of the trusted advocate model and ensure meaningful community engagement. Out of these conversations, the DCC and Metro Transit crafted an engagement partnership based on several agreements.

- Metro Transit would reorder its planning process so that community input on transit use and needs preceded development of the concept service plan. This sequence would enable community members to have greater influence on the planning process and hopefully reduce the number of changes to the concept plan.
- Metro Transit would implement its own community involvement plan and integrate suggestions from trusted advocates as appropriate and feasible.
- Advocates themselves know best how to reach into the communities with which they are the closest. Therefore, the planning and engagement processes would
be kept as flexible and responsive as possible without jeopardizing final approval.

- Trusted advocates would not work against the transit planning process, rather encourage community members to participate and provide input in advocate led engagements as well as formal public meetings.

- Input into the planning process might take many forms. The DCC would work with advocates to synthesize and consolidate input so Metro Transit would be able to easily integrate the information into their study.

- DCC staff would attend staff meetings to provide progress updates, bring forward information gathered by the advocates, and share their insights understanding of working with diverse communities.

- Metro Transit core staff would interact with the advocates throughout the project to receive first-hand information from the advocates and share with advocates their knowledge and experience with service planning.

- The DCC would seek advocates that have extensive personal experience with public transit and knowledge of the transit system as well as deep connections into their respective communities.

- The DCC would retain final decision-making authority regarding the selection of and the contract with the trusted advocates. The DCC would work closely with Metro Transit staff throughout the advocate selection process.

- Trusted advocates would not represent themselves as employees of Metro Transit or the DCC.

- The DCC would be responsible for addressing community concerns raised about the trusted advocate project. The DCC would consult with Metro Transit about concerns as appropriate.

- The DCC and Metro Transit would seek each other’s input into written materials and presentations about the trusted advocate project.
Funding

The Central Corridor Funders Collaborative awarded the DCC a grant to implement the pilot project. The proposal for funding received full support from Metro Transit and Metropolitan Council's Central Corridor Project Office.
Application and Selection Process

Identifying individuals with a strong connection to their communities, a background in community engagement, and the ability to advocate and educate are central to the success of the Trusted Advocate Model. In order to find such individuals, the DCC took several steps to reach the diverse communities along Central Corridor.

The first step was to speak with community-based organizations that work closely with constituencies for whom intensive outreach was deemed vital. This included organizations that worked specifically with communities of color, low-income families and individuals, and the disability community. Overall, the DCC made contact with nearly 20 organizations to get feedback on use of the Trusted Advocate model itself and suggestions on how to reach out to their respective constituents about the project. Importantly, the DCC asked these organizations to nominate individuals whom they considered to be a great trusted advocate candidate.

Qualifications for being a trusted advocate included, having confirmable experience in organizing or advocacy, having lived or worked within Central Corridor or having significant verifiable ties to a neighborhood or community in Central Corridor, experience using public transit or having a history of using transit for a considerable amount of time, and having a strong connection with an underrepresented community. The selection process focused on finding individuals who had these qualifications and demonstrated other skills that would allow them to complete the work. Special consideration was taken to ensure that collectively the trusted advocates possessed connections to underrepresented constituencies all along the Central Corridor. The selection committee included two DCC staff members and one staff person from Metro Transit who was advisory to the selection and decision-making process.

There were over twenty applications submitted in the three weeks that the request for candidates was publicized. Sixteen individuals were selected for interviews. Most of those selected had been nominated by a community, neighborhood, or advocacy
organization. From those interviews, nine individuals were identified to be trusted advocates.

**Trusted Advocate Project Preliminary Networking**

As indicated earlier, the DCC reached within Central Corridor communities for input and advice about the Trusted Advocate model and adapting it for the transit study. A list of the organizations includes:

- **Advocating Change Together (ACT)**
- **Asian Economic Development Association (AEDA)**
- **African Development Center**
- **Aurora St. Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation (ASAN DC)**
- **St. Paul Black Ministerial Alliance**
- **Citizens Consortium for People with Disabilities**
- **Confederation of Somali Community of Minnesota**
- **Epilepsy Foundation**
- **Glendale Townhomes Community Council, Minneapolis**
- **Hallie Q. Brown Community Center, St. Paul**
- **Hmong American Partnership**
- **Hmong Organizing Project**
- **Housing Preservation Project**
- **Karen Organization of Minnesota**
- **Saint Paul Mayor’s Council for People with Disabilities**
- **Skyline Tower / Union Park District Council, St. Paul**
- **Minnesota State Council on Disabilities**
- **Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity**
- **West Bank Community Council, Minneapolis**
List of Advocates and Constituencies

Suado Abdi, suado@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
Saint Paul: Somali community and small businesses*

Hadi Abdidubul, hadi@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
Saint Paul: Skyline Tower residents*

Mee Cheng, mee@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
Saint Paul: Southeast Asian community*

Sulekha Diriye, sulekha@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
West Bank – Cedar-Riverside, Minneapolis and the Somali community*

Anne Gomez, anne.g@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
West Bank – Cedar Riverside, Minneapolis*

Henry Keshi, henry@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
Minneapolis: Prospect Park and Glendale Townhomes residents and low-income families*

Sheronda Orridge, sheronda@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
Saint Paul: Frogtown neighborhood, low-income families and individuals*

Tim Page, tim@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
Saint Paul: African Americans, Youth and low-income families*

Kjensmo Walker, kjensmo@dcc-stpaul-mpls.org
Disability community and transit-dependent individuals*

* These descriptions represent primary focuses and are not meant to indicate full scope of outreach either geographically or demographically
Training and Orientation

Once selected, the trusted advocates were asked to complete six hours of training and orientation conducted by the DCC and Metro Transit. The content of the training included:

- An overview of the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project
- An orientation about the DCC and neighborhoods in the Central Corridor
- Transit Planning 101 – A three-part training conducted by Metro Transit senior service planners to orient the trusted advocates to transit service planning principles and process, how planning decisions are made, and what the Central Corridor Transit Study would entail.
- Data collection
- Engagement methods
- Documentation
- Developing a work plan

After the training was completed each advocate was asked to create a personal work plan, detailing how they would reach out to their respective communities and outlining the resources they would need to complete the work. They were also asked to develop target engagement goals, in terms of the number of contacts they believed they could reach and the number of engagement sessions they intended to conduct. These work plans are being used as tools to review completed work and to mark progress over the course of the project.
Scope of Work – Phase 1

The Trusted Advocates were tasked with connecting to individuals who lived, worked, attended school or participated in other activities within the Central Corridor Transit Study area delineated by the map below. By conducting engagement sessions, the advocates reached out to community members and gathered information regarding transit trips in the corridor, where trips began and ended, and on what day of the week and at what time trips were taken. The advocates also gleaned information about perceptions of transportation options, such as bus versus car, bus rider experiences, and barriers or deterrents that kept community members from utilizing public transit.

Trusted advocates were asked to document this data and submit it to the DCC, which then organized and forwarded it to Metro Transit. They were also asked to attend periodic project meetings to share their experiences, to exchange ideas about engagement activities and/or challenges, and to report on their progress. There was no numerical goal given to the advocates in terms of how many surveys or how much information was to be collected; emphasis was placed on the quality rather than the quantity.
Methods of Engagement

By design, the project allowed for a great deal of flexibility so Trusted Advocates would have the necessary freedom to develop engagement strategies as they saw fit. The thought was that the advocates themselves would best know how to reach into the communities with which they were closest. The term “engagement session” was defined within the Trusted Advocate Project as any strategy used to reach into the community, gather data and build relationships. A range of strategies have been used by the advocates thus far, including, but not limited to:

**One-on-One Interviews** – Face-to-face contact with one individual either in a structured interview or informally. The conversation can be planned in advance or can be spontaneous, for instance striking up a conversation with a friend or a person you meet on the bus.

**Door Knocking** – Going door-to-door sharing information. This method is probably most useful for inviting individuals to an event or sharing flyers or one-page information sheets.

**Tabling** – Having a table at an event or in a heavily trafficked location to share and/or gather information.

**Kitchen Table Meetings/Home Visit** – Holding an informal gathering at someone’s home, or perhaps a smaller community space such as a church.

**Small-Group Meeting** – Holding a formal meeting of three or more participants with a specified agenda for discussion.

**Community Gatherings** – A gathering of 10 or more participants with a focus on community building and/or celebration.
Documentation

Information to be documented during the Trusted Advocate project was grouped into four types: 1) raw survey data and community feedback; 2) outreach geography and demographics; 3) project process; and 4) trusted advocate experience.

Raw survey data was defined as the information that is essential to Metro Transit’s data collection process for the transit survey. This includes origin and destination information. Community feedback was defined as information outside of the scope of the transit study, but still related to transit experience and Metro Transit’s operations.

Outreach geography was defined as the place where engagement sessions were held. Demographic information to be collected included engagement session participants’ age ranges, ethnicity, languages spoken, as well as whether participants were transit users or non-transit users.

There were several ways by which this information was documented. These include:

- **Engagement Documentation Form**
  The DCC developed a form to provide a record of each engagement session conducted by the trusted advocates. The form documents the location of the outreach, numbers of participants, the demographics of the participants, community feedback, and raw survey data.

- **Metro Transit’s Survey Form**
  This was the formal survey distributed by Metro Transit. Many of the advocates used this survey during their outreach.

- **Individualized Survey Forms**
  A few of the trusted advocates developed their own survey forms.
• **Check-In Meetings and Work Plan Reviews**

Periodic group and individual meetings were held during which the advocates discussed their experiences, shared community feedback, and identified lessons learned thus far. These meetings were recorded in notes or by video.
Progress Toward Project Goals

Goals for the Trusted Advocate Project were defined as quantifiable indications of outreach success. Each trusted advocate was asked to estimate the number of engagement sessions they planned on conducting over the course of the project and the number of contacts or individuals they believed they would be able to reach. The total number of engagement sessions estimated by each advocate ranged from 6 to 20. The total number of individuals to be reached by each advocate ranged from 60 to 200.

Trusted advocates were asked to document each engagement session on a form developed by the DCC. The advocates also had the option to have participants complete surveys. The total number of engagement sessions, engagement session participants and surveys submitted to date are totaled below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trusted Advocate Project By The Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of engagement sessions by all advocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of engagement session participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of transit users amongst participants*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of non-transit users amongst participants*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of survey information submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This information was not available for all engagement sessions.

Geographical Placement of Engagement

The trusted advocates held engagement sessions throughout the transit study area, but concentrated along the corridor. In all, engagement sessions were held in over 40 locations throughout the study area, including Cedar/Riverside, Prospect Park, Summit-University, Frogtown, Union Park, Como Area and Macalester-Groveland.
Trusted Advocate Outreach

The trusted advocates were able to reach a wide range of individuals during their engagement sessions. Engagement session participants included a variety of age groups and people of diverse racial, ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds. Each advocate had a specified focus for outreach, but they reached beyond their focus area to interact with all people in their communities.

Below are the specific organizations and geographical locations at which engagement work was done. These engagement sessions might have been formal presentations, small gatherings, kitchen table meetings or one-on-ones. Trusted advocates were not required to report the names or contact information of individuals with whom they met, allowing individuals to feel safe when sharing information and thoughts. However, advocates were asked to provide general information about who was present at the session; including information about the number of attendees, age ranges, racial or ethnic background, and other pertinent information.

Groups, Organizations and Institutions

A-atqwa Islamic Center – Saint Paul
Act for Equity
ADAPT MN
Ahmed Ibn Hanbal - Minneapolis
Al-Ihsan Mosque - Minneapolis
America Votes – Saint Paul
American Oromo Community – Saint Paul
Cedar-Riverside AFTER School - Minneapolis
Confederation for Somali Community – Minneapolis
Consortium of Citizens with Disabilities
Dar-al-Hirjah Mosque and Civic Engagement Society – Minneapolis
Epilepsy Foundation – Saint Paul
Frogtown District Council – Saint Paul
Gordon Parks High School – Saint Paul
Immanuel Church – Saint Paul
Korean Service Center – Minneapolis
Mac Groveland Community Council Transportation Committee – Saint Paul
Metropolitan Center for Independent Living
Midway Chamber of Commerce – Saint Paul
Minnesota Dawah Institute – Minneapolis
Oromo American Twhid Islamic – Saint Paul
Skyline Tower – Saint Paul
St. Agnes Church – Saint Paul

Locations

Brian Coyle Center, Minneapolis
Dorothy Whitaker Building
Hmong Market on Como, St. Paul
Horn Towers, Minneapolis
Kings Crossing, St. Paul
Louis Park Apartments, Saint Paul
Luxton Park, Minneapolis
Macalester College, St. Paul
Metro State University, St. Paul
Minnehaha Rec Center, St. Paul
Overflow Café, Minneapolis
Riverside Cedar C-Building, Minneapolis
Rondo Library, St. Paul
Sheraton Place Apartments, Saint Paul
St. Paul College, St. Paul

Specific Geographical Locations

1243 Hewitt Avenue – Kitti Anderson Youth Science
1600 block on Blair St, St. Paul – Private Residence
19th Avenue and S 5th St, Bus Stop, Minneapolis
565 Aldine Street – Apartment Building, St. Paul
Central and St. Albans – Bus Stop, St. Paul
Minnehaha and Victoria, St. Paul
Snelling and University – Bus Stop, St. Paul
University Avenue and 29th – Bus Stop, St. Paul
University Avenue and Dale – Bus Stop, St. Paul
University Avenue and St. Albans, St. Paul
Community Events

Citywide Cleanup Day – Dale and University, St. Paul
Frogtown Focus, St. Paul
ISAIAH – State Capitol Event
Comments/Concerns Shared Frequently by Participants

- Customer service issues – Several comments that bus drivers were rude, unapproachable or impatient
- Lack of adequate lighting at bus stops
- Perception that the bus is not a safe mode of transit at night – particularly for girls and women
- Issues with other passengers' behavior – loud, scary or aggressive and use of profanity make the ride feel unsafe. Bus drivers do not intervene.
- Lack of web access or time to access web makes it difficult to retrieve information about bus re-routing and movement of bus stops due to construction
- Difficulty navigating routes and bus stops from schedules due to language barriers
- It takes too long to get from origin to destination – indirect routes lengthen travel times
- Difficulty bringing more than one child on a bus
- More shelters and/or benches are needed at bus stops
- Low frequency or limited service on weekends deters ridership

Positive Comments/Praise

- Taking the bus is less expensive than driving
- Bus is more convenient than facing traffic and having to find parking
- Students often mentioned that bus rides gave an opportunity to read or study
- Widespread excitement about the arrival of LRT

Comments on Specific Routes

- One participant called Route 21 – “I'll be there when I get there”
- Desire for more frequency on Route 65
- Routes 16 and 50 come up frequently in conversations with either concerns about reliability, travel time, and/or the routes future.
- Route 21 should drive on shoulder during rush hours (from Snelling Avenue to Otis Avenue)
Suggestions from Participants and Advocates

- Visual maps along with timetables at bus stops – similar to light rail (Easier for those for whom English is not their first language.)
- Need for more bilingual drivers or customer service representatives
- Updating information at bus stops more regularly
- Heated shelters at major intersections
- More seats or more frequent buses during rush hours, buses are often filled to capacity or over capacity
- Bus drivers should announce bus stops
- More green space near bus stops

Other Comments or Questions

- Lack of seat belts on bus makes people feel unsafe
- Bus fares are too high or confusing – one flat rate
- Perception that buses are unsanitary or dirty
- Senior citizen or accessibility seats being occupied when they are needed
- Some non-transit users are deterred by transferring – fear of getting lost on bus
- Drivers leave when people are running for the bus

Frequently Identified Origins or Destinations

Mosque Dawah
Hennepin County Human Services
Rosedale Mall

Construction-Related Issues

- Concerns about how light rail construction affects driving in the corridor
- Construction has affected the timeliness and overall experience of riding the bus on University Avenue
  - Re-routing and the closure or movement of bus stops came up several times
Lessons Learned in Phase 1

This pilot project is the first time that the trusted advocate model has been used in this region and it may be the first it has been applied to transit service planning. Therefore, there is much to share. We have tried to capture what we feel are the most significant observations and lessons learned so far. As with the rest of the report, Metro Transit has been invited to review and contribute to development of this section.

Project Development

The DCC and Metro Transit had established relationship through the Central Corridor Light Rail Project planning process. Because of this relationship, the DCC and Metro Transit were able to determine quickly the mutual benefit of partnering on a community engagement initiative that would include a diversity of constituents in the transit service study. We were able to deepen this relationship and build trust through clear and open communications and by taking time to understand individual and shared goals for the project.

Metro Transit’s early expression of interest in greater community involvement in transit service planning for the Central Corridor area and their commitment of staff time to work with the DCC to identify and adapt an engagement approach was critical. It enabled the DCC to prepare and submit a substantive funding proposal. Also, their commitment gave funders the confidence that the project would move ahead if they supported it.

The DCC was not able to secure funding until a few months prior to the start of the planning process. Organizations and community leaders of constituencies the DCC sought to engage were understandably reluctant to invest too much time advising on the development of the project without certainty that it would move ahead. As a consequence constituent input into project development was not as robust as the DCC had hoped.
There was a very narrow window of time between the necessary start date to keep the Metro Transit’s study on track and when resources were made available for the pilot project. This shortened the time that the DCC had to develop and circulated the request for applications to be a Trusted Advocate with the project.

**Application Process**

The trusted advocates are independent contractors with the DCC. This relationship would have been clearer had interested persons been asked to complete a work plan as part of their application. While requiring the work plan in the initial application may have required the DCC to provide more detail about the project, technical assistance and possibly work sessions to provide interested individuals opportunities for questions, this approach would have provided more clarity for both the applicants and our organization about what would be required of advocates and what they could bring to the project.

**Material and Resources**

Many of the most important items necessary for the first phase of the project, such as the Metro Transit’s surveys, brochures and large maps were produced after the advocates had already begun to go out into the community. This created some difficulty in the advocates’ abilities to explain the project and understand what information Metro Transit needed the most. Both the DCC and Metro Transit have acknowledged the necessity of having printed outreach materials and other resources available before trusted advocates begin their work. It is also important that agencies and organizations be flexible and provide materials as needed to serve individual communities. For example, many advocates stressed the need for maps that were accessible and easily understood by all community members.
**Engagement**

All of the trusted advocates employed varying methods of engagements during the first phase of the project. Some methods were used more successfully than others depending on the advocate and the community they were working with. While each advocate’s experience was different, some common themes arose within conversations with advocates and in their engagement report documents.

Universally, it seemed that the advocates were able to gain clearer more detailed information in smaller groups or one-on-ones. Due to the nature of the survey information being collected and the lack of knowledge amongst many community members in reading and understanding maps, individual conversations lent the advocates the opportunity to explain the survey tools. Trusted advocates often conducted these one-on-one sessions by seeking out locations where community members were gathered such as, bus stops, libraries, markets, and places of worship.

Large community meetings were valuable in collecting large quantities of survey information, but created limitations in building meaningful relationship and creating continuity in outreach to groups or individual. There was also a difficulty in collecting more detailed information from these interactions.

One significant lesson shared by several advocates was that making direct connections to community members, as opposed to going through large institutions, businesses and the like, was more conducive to effective outreach related to the transit study. It is very evident in reviewing the documentation that the advocates were most successful when they used the existing relationship and networks they had in their communities and built on those. These existing relationships and networks included connections through family, friends, and community and faith organizations. Advocates were much less successful when they tried to connect to institutions and organizations with which they had no previous relationship.
While the trusted advocates reached a wide range of people from different cultural, racial, socio-economic, and age groups and genders, some interesting patterns of success in outreach to different demographics emerged. Several advocates indicated that it was much easier to collect and engage with female participants than male, particularly older adult males. Additionally, many advocates reported more success with the engagement with young people.
Next Phase

Metro Transit has completed their data collection process and senior have begun developing the concept plan. The trusted advocates are shifting gears wrapping up their work gathering raw data. The advocates will participate in an informational training session about the concept plan to prepare to bring the plan back to the communities they made contact with in the first phase of work. Their role will be to present the concept plan to community members, gather feedback, explain Metro Transit’s public hearing process. In the final phase, trusted advocates will assist DCC staff in documenting the project process and success and provide their personal perspectives on lessons learned and best practices.