



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## Project overview

In 2016, City Council created the Community Representation Task Force (Task Force). The Task Force was asked to review options, and advise Council on how community organizations can better represent the diverse interests and perspectives within their communities. The Task Force is comprised of members from Council, the development and building sector, community and residents' associations, the University of Calgary and City Administration.

The goals of the Community Representation Framework are to:

1. Enhance the effectiveness of community groups to contribute to the representation of the diverse interests and perspectives within their communities;
2. Promote community representation best practices and help develop a more collaborative working relationship between community groups and The City;
3. Revitalize City processes related to planning and development so they are more open, inclusive and welcoming to a broad range of community groups;
4. Identify the necessary supports and resources required by community groups so they can be effective representatives of their communities in dialogue with The City.

Since December 2016, Administration has worked with the Task Force to develop the foundations of a framework. Through investigation and facilitated discussions, the Task Force has identified three areas of focus for a community representation framework:

1. **Representation structure** – a system by which organized community groups and individuals collaborate with City staff on community-building issues.
2. **Community involvement** – clear roles, responsibilities and expectations of different stakeholders in community building, with significant focus on the processes and practices of The City with respect to community involvement.
3. **Supports and resources** – human resources, funding and programs required to build the capacity of individuals and organized community groups so they can effectively contribute to community-building processes.

The current focus of the Task Force is representation structure. The Task Force has expressed interest in an approach for community representation by which organized community groups and individuals collaborate through a 'forum' on community building issues. This concept came from review of a discussion paper that explored the systems used in a selection of North American cities and facilitated conversations. Administration has completed public engagement to review this possible representation structure and key elements related to all three areas of focus.

## Engagement overview

The project team presented an update report to City Council in February 2018. Based on this report Council approved the recommendation for the Community Representation Framework project team to:



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

1. Gather input from a diverse range of community stakeholders in response to a new approach for community representation envisioned by the Community Representation Framework Task Force;
2. Use the input gathered to inform the Community Representation Framework Task Force recommendations that will be presented to City Council by the end of 2018.

## Phase 1 – understanding the current state

To meet this direction Administration completed engagement in two parts or phases. In May 2018 three surveys were sent to community associations (CAs), business improvement areas (BIAs) and a range of community groups representing different perspectives (such as seniors, religious organizations, homeowners and residents associations, sport organizations, etc.). The three surveys were tailored to the groups. Participants were asked to provide input about their current work on City planning processes, a proposed district forum as a possible new model for representing community stakeholders, and additional resources the Task Force should consider.

The intent of all three surveys was to gain an understanding of current practices and to collect initial thoughts and ideas about the suggested district forum model (from here referred to just a model). The information collected was used to design phase II of the engagement. More than 200 surveys were completed. We heard from 97 community associations, a number of business improvement area groups, resident's associations, and community organizations. The full report of everything we heard can be found on the project website at [www.calgary.ca/CRF](http://www.calgary.ca/CRF)

## Phase 2 – focused conversations on trade-offs

What we heard in phase I was used to structure the questions for the phase II workshops. We asked participants to work through trade-offs, challenges and opportunities on the following three topics that emerged as the most common themes and points of discussion during phase I:

1. Membership, diversity and inclusion
2. Resources, capacity and training
3. The District Model

Everyone who received the survey in phase I was invited to register through Eventbrite for one of the six workshops. Participants were also provided the information brief shared in the first phase of engagement and the two "What we Heard" reports.

Each workshop was divided into tables and participants guided through each topic (approximately 30 minutes on each topic). The facilitator took notes on a flip chart. Participants were also given worksheets and post-it notes where they could write their own comments. Participants had the chance to add to a Task Force terms of reference working copy.

Based on feedback at the sessions we also emailed all registered participants the worksheets so they could have more time to reflect and provide additional thoughts. We received 19 worksheets/comment forms through email and had 95 participants across all six workshops.



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

The table below summarizes the location and participant totals for each workshop.

Date	Location	Number of attendees
Thursday, 14 June 2018 from 6:30 PM to 8:30	North Haven Community Association	14
Wednesday, 13 June 2018 from 4:30 PM to 6:30 PM	Temple Community Association	10
Tuesday, 12 June 2018 from 6:30 PM to 8:30 PM	Silver Springs Community Hall	12
Saturday, 9 June 2018 from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM	Hillhurst United Church	20
Wednesday, 6 June 2018 from 6:30 PM to 8:30 PM	Marda Loop Community Association	11
Tuesday, 5 June 2018 from 1:30 PM to 3:30 PM	Acadia Recreation Complex	28

Participants at all of the sessions were asked to fill out an evaluation form about the session. The table below summarizes these forms from those who filled out the forms. For comments, we received on the forms see [Appendix 2](#) on pages 78-82.

Please check the statement that best describes your opinion	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
This meeting/activity/session/tool was a good use of my time	10	42	12	4	1
I'm satisfied with the opportunity to participate and provide input.	19	34	10	6	1
I received enough information to provide meaningful input.	5	31	14	11	6
I understand how my input will be used.	2	30	16	18	3
This meeting/activity/session/tool was an effective way to collect my input.	8	45	12	4	1



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

We also asked how participants heard about the session. The following table summarizes what we heard.

How did you hear about the meeting / activity / session / tool?	Number or responses
Email	17
Federation of Calgary Communities/ Federation Planner	18
Through my CA / Fellow members of CA	14
Invite / email from City	8
NPC	8
Email invite	5
Twitter/Online	2

## Next steps

This report will be provided to everyone who participated in the workshops and posted on the project website – [Calgary.ca/CRF](http://Calgary.ca/CRF). Administration will share this report with the Task Force on June 5, 2018. Throughout the summer of 2018 Administration will work through the information with the Task Force to come up with recommendations. Those recommendations will be presented to the Standing Policy Committee on Community and Protective Service in late 2018, for subsequent approval by Council. Once a framework is endorsed by City Council, elements of it will be further developed and refined through working groups and pilot projects starting in 2019. This phase of work will provide opportunity for further input from community stakeholders.

## What we heard

The City of Calgary defines public engagement as “input into decision making.” The following sections summarize everything we heard from participants in phase II of the engagement. The sections are organized by questions asked. The summary captures the different ideas, feedback, and key themes shared by participants on each question. For a full list of all of the comments, see the [verbatim](#) sections for each question.

VERBATIM COMMENTS – MEMBERSHIP, INCLUSION & DIVERSITY IN PARTICIPATION .....	20
VERBATIM – RESOURCES, CAPACITY & TRAINING .....	30
VERBATIM – TOPIC 3 THE DISTRICT MODEL .....	41
VERBATIM – ONE FLOW CONVERSATIONS.....	52
APPENDIX 1 – WORKSHEETS .....	76
APPENDIX 2 – FEEDBACK FORM COMMENTS.....	78



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## What we heard - overall sentiment

Regardless of opinion about the model and the project participants, at all six workshops talked about the need for The City to work on trust, relationships and confidence in the planning process. This included both City Administration and City Council. Specifically we heard that planning projects need to:

- *Re-establish trust.* At all of the sessions, we heard that there are struggles with both Administration and City Council ignoring community feedback. Almost every participant said The City needs to establish trust in its processes before going on with any changes. Specifically, they said improvement is needed with internal City processes and giving more time and better information earlier on in the process, and being clear about what information is used when, or when it can't be used providing an answer why it cannot be used.
- *Be clear about when something is open for ideas and changes.* A number of participants explicitly said that they are ok if something is a "done deal" but Administration needs to be clear and treat it like one. Specifically, there was a feeling of frustration at the number of projects that seek community engagement but leave a perception that the engagement was an exercise to "check a box" and share the final design/solution.
- *Be consistent in your approach and presentation of planning projects.* Specifically participants asked for:
  - o Consistency in planning applications, how they are treated and assessed. Participants identified inconsistency in internal planning processes from one project to another.
  - o Consistently in the staff on the project(s), specifically file managers. At every session we heard that they participants, at least once, had different answers from different staff, and had a high staff turnover with different opinions on a project/process.
  - o Consistency in the engagement process. Participants wanted to see more consistency in the engagement in general on planning application. One table specifically talked about the engage policy and the need to apply it consistently to all planning projects.
  - o Use plain language. Almost everyone asked for simpler language that explains what is being done, asked of the group, and of the general public.
- *Give better consideration for the community needs, feel, history, etc. what many called the local context.* Overwhelmingly we heard that local needs must be addressed and preserved in planning processes. All participants talked about the unique character and needs of their communities and that certain issues need to stay local. Most expressed fear that if a new model is implemented it would take away from the local needs of a community/neighbourhood.
- *Give more time to review and organize.* A key need that almost everyone said there is a need for better timelines. Tools like a checklist they could follow, and that aligns with how planners make decisions. This would give groups something to reference, and to guide them in the in time that they did have.
- *Be consistent and clear in your decisions.* At every session we heard frustration about inconsistencies in Council decisions and the lack of clarity on why public feedback was ignored on any given application.
- *Be clear about what was done with the feedback collected.* Every table said, and many shared specific projects, where plans were shared and they either did not hear how their input was used (Administration took the feedback and disappeared) or the feedback was not used and no explanation was given as to why it was not used (by both Council and Administration). "We scrutinize application, City always approves and we have to appeal." Participants did give an example of what they would like to see. At every session participants talked about the engagement



process that was done during the Crowchild Trail study and how effective that process was in sharing information, telling the story of what was heard and what could and could not be used and why. They specifically used the example of the tunnel.

- *Help make the current model better.* Instead of going with a new model, all tables asked for resources and supports to make the current model work. Participants said by giving resources directly to community associations (CAs) they can do the work better, and make it easier for the groups to work with City processes.
- *More information on the district model.* Some of the participants were unclear about why the model is being proposed, what other models were considered, how The City would define the roles and responsibilities of the district form and its mandate. Specifically, participants wanted more background information on “the why” — what isn’t working that this is trying to fix?
- *Give recognition and share what is working.* There was a feeling that there is little acknowledgment of current work by volunteers, specifically by community associations. Some participants felt that the process was disrespectful of the work being done currently by them and their members and that more attention/effort needs to be given to highlighting what is working. There were a number of participants who asked for some way to share successes in the existing CA model.

## What we heard - membership, diversity and inclusion

Participants were asked about what membership might look like under a district model, what diversity and inclusion look like now, what are some of the challenges, how access could be improved, etc. The following is a summary of the ideas, questions and concerns heard during the engagement. For a full list of all of the comments, go to the [verbatim section](#).

1. The City needs to “walk the talk”. Many said this feels like a download onto the CA/community of work The City should be doing.
2. Should be looking at how to better use the existing organizations to achieve this goal instead of recreating the model.
3. Need to work on trust and relationship building. Without these, two participants explicitly said that none of this would work.
4. To make a process more inclusive there needs to be more time given to CAs but also to all citizens to participate. The challenge isn’t always inclusion, but time, the time given to be able to participate and to get people out to participate.
5. Make it easier to participate. Planning engagement in general is inaccessible and hard to understand. The information requires training (in its current state) to be able to process and give feedback. The members would either need to be trained or the information needs to become easier to understand (there was a preference for the latter).



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

The three tables below summarize the challenges and needs, as well as the who participants identified when talking about membership, diversity and inclusion.

<b>Challenge &amp; questions</b>
There is no way of knowing that voices heard represent the whole.
Balancing voices and needs. All groups discussed when it is appropriate to have certain members and voices present, and that it would be a challenge to balance whose voice, ideas matter when (local vs. bigger issues).
Special interests groups taking over, over representing on an issue. As an example, there is fear that the developers will take over the process.
The CA struggles to attract members, skepticism that the forum will be able to do any better.
Diversity at the CA level might not be there so would be hard to have it at the higher level.
Clarity of the role of stakeholders at the forum, what would they do? Would they make decisions? Define the role.
Groups only participate when something directly affects them. Need to identify issue or opportunity for different groups about a process/development and what they can contribution.
Capacity of volunteers, fear that this will be another drain of people.
Seeing low diversity in existing open houses, fear that this would be the same in the district model. That it would not represent the community.
How to motivate people to participate?
If CA influence is lost, what is the incentive to participate?
Is it appropriate to ask about personal demographics when it comes to planning issues?
How do you include the silent voices? Want community to be representative but whose responsibility is it?
There is no way of knowing that voices heard represent the whole.

<b>Needs for participation</b>
Training in planning.
Need to identify the roles, the meetings and the logistics of the forum and the expectations of members.
City to balance the power between the community and the developer. Developers need to engage earlier.
Decisions and feedback needs to be based on facts and reasons not on I like/don't like.
A process that makes it safe to voice different opinions
Group needs to be open and neutral.
Is it one voice or one vote?
Clarity at what scale the membership is representing the community.
Clarity on the point of the developed area guidebook in a district model
Needs to be someone who is who is knowledgeable, and takes the courses offered.
Applying the district model to City Administration.
Training in planning.



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

<b>Who should participate</b>
Churches, mosques and service groups
Only those affected by the development
Not a member of The City but a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party representative. Nonpartisan, non-political
Schools
Seniors
Residents associations
City needs to identify who is not represented where, official and unofficial groups
Should be fluid membership based on need
Should only be through the CA
One voice per community group (a united voice)
Reaching out to the silent voices
One member from group (CA, RA, etc.)
An advocate for the community
Churches, mosques and service groups

## What we heard - resources, capacity and training

The following section summarizes what we heard from participants about resources, capacity and training. For a list of all of the comments and ideas see the [verbatim section](#). Participants were asked to think about this topic both in terms of what would support and meet the needs, and address the challenges in the membership and inclusion conversation as well as what resources etc. would make their work in general better.

An overwhelming theme that emerged from all of the workshops and the feedback forms is the need for better City processes. Participants saw this as one of the biggest obstacles, and asked for it as a need in general but also as a resource and capacity that would support them in participating as well as in their own resourcing. Specifically what we heard was a need for:

- Honouring of the voices and opinions heard/shared through the process.
- Clear and timely information to allow for informed decision making.
- Early outreach so that people can participate and don't come in late, challenging the process.
- Better support of City staff. Specifically, participants asked for neighbourhood partnership coordinators to have fewer communities, and for planners to be more consistent on files.
- Better, and consistent application of existing policies (planning, engagement, etc.).
- Need for clear, easy to understand and consistent information.



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

The first table below outlines the specific resource and training needs identified. The second table gives specific process examples and needs. These were seen as process that support or would eliminate the need of major resources and supports.

<b>RESOURCES / TRAINING NEEDS</b>	Newsletter
	Recruitment support
	Resources for door-to-door
	Newsletters in different languages
	Planning liaison/support (equivalent of an NPC)
	Support (financial) for existing training like partners in planning
	Training of CA members on planning in general, or on specific policies
	Forum for groups to share ideas and best practices, one suggestion was a teleconference line
	Street beat software – a software that shares information directly to a mailing list
	Neutral facilitation/mediation
	A district advocate who reports directly to a councillor
	Easy to customize web pages provided by The City to CAs and training to help some of the older members use the social media that can reach out to youth.
	Financial support of partners in planning
	Broad appeal of communication (different demographics)
	Promoting the benefits of being involved
	Investments in social aspects of networking
	Neighbourhood engagement coordinators
	Independence review of City plans
	Funding for billboards and signs
	Meeting support – staff support
	Mandatory parking studies
	Architecture lessons, information on why we preserve historic neighbourhoods, etc.
	Better access to funding and grants
	Clarity on how all of the planning process and regulations (statutory, non-statutory) fit with one another and are applied
	Succession planning so that when one person leaves that information and knowledge isn't lost
	Electronic meeting methods to reduce burnout
	Training and resources for chairing meetings
	Resources to manage CA facilities
	Incentives for membership, City help to drive people to be members
	Online survey for each application, done by The City, results shared with the CA
	Training based on board member interests
	Education resources to leverage participation
	General communication support
A way to reach renters/condos	
Electronic circulation not just email	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Portal by community</li> <li>○ Portal issue with copyright</li> </ul>	



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Administration within the community</li> <li>○ Cloud based public info</li> </ul>
	<p>Paid positions</p> <p>Translation</p>
<b>PROCESS</b>	<p>Clear, timely information</p> <p>Timelines of the process, needs to be early. 30 day minimum for communication</p> <p>Follow up by The City on what was done with feedback received</p> <p>Support for neighbourhood partnership coordinators (NPCs). Specifically for them to have fewer communities so that they can better do their work</p> <p>Information needs to be in plain, easy to understand language</p> <p>Bylaw checklist</p> <p>City support of people who don't have capacity</p> <p>City processes also need to be inclusive, they need to reduce barriers</p> <p>Simplify the information and process, complexity pushes people away</p> <p>Stability in city staff (turnover)</p> <p>Partnership by City with non-governmental groups like Propellus, Benevity, etc. City to facilitate these relationships, give capacity to NPCs to do it.</p> <p>Consistent message from City</p> <p>Support the grassroots, the people doing the work on the ground so that they build capacity</p>

## What we heard - the district forum model

The following section is a summary of the key themes and ideas we heard from participants about the district forum model. For a list of all of the comments and ideas see the verbatim section.

During this conversation participants were asked to think about the trade-offs, pros/cons, opportunities and challenges with a district approach. Two key things were common across all workshops. The benefits seen in the model were in resource sharing and leveraging existing capacities better to participate in projects. The majority of participant were critical of the model. They saw great potential in building on what already exists. Even those who saw this as a potential of the model felt the same way — that building on what exists is key. All participants said that improving internal City processes and using the existing City engagement practices to do it better would be their preferred approach over the addition of another layer. Participants saw too much risk in losing community context and diluting volunteer resources in the additional layer for not much benefit. In all of the sessions, we heard that a process, rather than a structure, would be a better approach. The following two verbatim comments summarize these points and the overall sentiment of the groups:

The first verbatim comment:

There is little in the model that benefits the community associations, it is seen as an offloading of work that should be done by The City and responsibilities that should be those of City Council. The City needs to make its own processes more efficiently, leverage



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

existing groups and patterns in the work. It was also unclear to participants on where the District Model/Forum fits in its scope and mandate on planning issue.

The second verbatim comment:

The District model feels like a solution to a problem that doesn't exist? Larger infrastructure projects or zoning changes already bring in diverse groups from businesses, communities and other stakeholders in an ad hoc way. But codifying the process gives the perception of "doctoring" the input which the City will receive, by choosing exactly who can be involved in the process. As well - burnout of volunteers is a large issue, which needs to be factored. With community associations, residents and homeowners associations, and all the other possible stakeholders constantly scrambling for volunteers, and to "educate" those volunteers and other members, I am fearful that the "District" model will just add another layer of meetings and email, which will potentially overwhelm volunteers and contribute to even quicker burnout for those people.

There was a lot of discussion about at what level a district should operate. People talked about the history, local needs, and that different communities/neighbourhoods are at different stages of development (some have seen a lot already, and others are just starting to see some). This led to discussions about how a district model would address this. Some saw this as a chance to share experiences and past learnings with communities seeing things for the first time that others have already experienced. Those who saw the model as beneficial also saw it as a way to limit some of the resources drains they are seeing. Groups hoped that the district would not take away from volunteers but instead give them more resources so they could focus on the local community needs.

Others were very skeptical of another layer bureaucracy that is not needed. The majority of participants said that instead of putting in another layer, The City should focus on funding existing organizations like the CAs and the Federation of Calgary Communities to let them continue to build on their own networks. Almost all of the tables talked about enhancing the current model by supporting it with resources and by sharing best practices directly with CAs to enhance their effectiveness. The majority also said that internal processes need to be improved. Specifically participants talked about Crowchild trail and that the City should do better engagement on planning projects, like it was done on that project.

At every session we heard that the solution for community representation should be a process. Something that is potentially on a project-by-project basis and only on projects that impact many groups/neighbourhoods. There was a lot of discussion about what this might be, whether it should be based on geography. Many found issues with this as it would be difficult to draw clear boundaries. The discussion groups that saw a district process or model working saw its benefit more so around common issues and projects. There were a number of people who said The City is already doing this on a project-by-project basis. Why not focus on making this better rather than instituting a new model? Participants struggled with the trade-offs around the different types of districts that could exist. The following is a list of district types that were suggested:



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- District by infrastructure: large service centres, transit systems
- District geographic: vertical village high-rise
- District by era: e.g. 1960
- District by ward
- District by need
- District by mega projects: e.g. hospitals
- District by cultural and city similarities

The tables below is a summary of the pros, cons, challenges and needs participants identified of the district forum.

<b>Pros</b>
Sharing of resources
Seeing the “big picture”
Good for large projects
Tempering of special interest group voices
Adjacent communities can engage on issues close to them
Could be a way to discuss new issues, like cannabis stores, that are affecting all communities
Should deal with other big issues like the Olympic bid, new arena, flexibility with densification etc.
Cooperation among CAs and resource sharing
Common vision
Could build capacity, past learnings, and best practices
Could help stagger and coordinate projects
Removing obstacles around diversity
Better access to past information and what files are currently active
Reduces “NIMBY”
A spot for the City to share information in one spot

<b>Cons</b>
Another layer of bureaucracy
Challenge of drawing up boundaries
Overpowering/watering down of CA voice
One size does not fit all
Local voice and expertise would be lost
Loss of historic significance
Cooperation but not a common voice
Voice for special interests groups, developers
Scope creep – how do you keep the issues and conversations from spreading too far and wide?
More meetings, more resource drain
Taking away of volunteers
More volunteer burn-out to have to go back and forth from district back to CA
More logistical demands on local volunteers
“Loud and together” communities could overpower the voices of the smaller less organized ones
Gentrification



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

People getting stuck in past projects  
 Duplication of existing work

## Challenges

Institutional memory  
 How to address competing community interests and needs  
 How do you educate on local issues, planning issues that is already there at the CA  
 Different issues/projects have different impacts and impact different groups, this would be impossible to address in a set geographic model structure  
 Determining who participates – discussions about demographics, groups, and who lives in the district vs. who works/operates in it  
 What about the area resource plans, developed area guidebook, all the other existing models and processes? How do they fit?  
 What happens if a district disagrees with Council direction or vice versa?  
 How do you manage membership? Is it open to the public?

## Needs

High standards for developers on engagement  
 Local issues to stay local  
 Scalable and flexible process. There were two clear polarities in opinions. A minority who wanted rigid structures and the majority who wanted a flexible scalable process rather than a structure  
 Definition of key stakeholder and roles of each (CA, RA, etc.)  
 Terms of reference and roles, scope  
 Standards for developers on engagement  
 Considerations/address of legal implications of the status of a CA if changes are made and impacts of those directly adjacent to a development  
 More voices need professional facilitation  
 It if is to succeed it needs to have a clear mandate, governance, strong chair, process  
 Combining similar CAs and similar demographics  
 Set timeline for meetings  
 Sign-off by each stakeholder  
 Look at where this has been attempted in Calgary to see what lessons have been learned. Example: South Shaganappi Area Development Council  
 No veto, consensus or agreement. Some said only information sharing and discussion. No decision making power. Needs governance to be truly effective.  
 There was disagreement on if it should be standard members or flexible membership  
 Needs to be inclusive of voices, ideas and backgrounds  
 City needs to use the information that it collects. Demonstrate how it used it. “What we Heard” and “What we Did” reports.



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## What we heard - terms of reference

As part of the district forum model discussion, we also asked participants to provide comments on a working terms of references for a district forum. All of the verbatim comments are below and divided into three sections. To see the working document shared with the group see [Appendix 1](#) on page 76 and 77.

### *Vision*

- Simplify: purpose, objectives
- Doesn't require a Vision
- Major projects infrastructure only
- For special projects, i.e. LRT not for individual DP's which would still be dealt with by CA's
- How about actually providing the true purpose of this
- Mission Statement (R1) – how do you incorporate?
- Advocate for the district define district by natural barriers
- Scale of “district” committee investment i.e.) major projects vs local street level
- Needs clear scope
- Too hard to get a community values / vision across multiple CAs. Don't spend time on this
- Collect the common threads within each defined districts: major projects, 40 yr. plan, City initiatives that will impact neighbourhoods
- That you implement district when “this happens” ... the district defines that bubble a model of implementation for when a district issue needs to happen
- District bubble parameters and service bubble parameters
- District by project: Hospital. Greenline, Etc.
- Who is being served by the change?
- The project goals, and the problem defined, seem to be rooted in making administration and Council's jobs more convenient – there is very little here for existing community associations.
- To form a single voice on larger projects that affect multiple communities (infrastructure, services, transport)
- This is not necessary. Each community has their own Vision & Mission they are all unique.
- Standing district representation or ad hoc.
- Unclear for need of university of Calgary
- Unclear what has happened in the past for creating this task force. Let's have an example.
- There were no comments presented to us by participants from: City Council, Development and building, University of Calgary, City Administration
- These items should be determined by the Task Force and the City.
- Eliminate Goals and Vision; this is not an independent organization but is an advisory committee without any authority
- Establish performance standards
- Establish standardized processes for all Districts
- Definition of problem(s)
- Mapping processes, identifying complexity, dependencies, ownership and gaps in order to simplify and make processes efficient and consistent.



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- What is the reason for including a specific person or entity in the task force for a particular LOC or DP?
- The 4 bullets should clearly define the mandate of district forum representation.

## *Responsibilities of District Forum*

- Simplify: 5 things only
- Decision making
- Membership
- Transparent operations
- Minutes and record keeping
- Communication and notifications
- No decision making authority, feedback only
- Yes to all public (open meetings)
- Not supportive of another level of bureaucracy
- Can't comment on this without more info
- Only in some circumstances, larger cross-community projects, etc.
- Facilitated by content knowledgeable 3rd parties. Not all stakeholders would participate, i.e. faith groups
- Level of authority – City and community
- Decision making – input only
- Reporting structure – Councillor, not administration
- Time commitments – minimal
- Membership – anyone who volunteers – not by persons education
- Inclusion – N/A
- Non-discrimination – N/A
- Transparent operations – City
- Open meetings – City
- Minutes and record keeping – City
- Communication and notifications – City
- Financial accountability – City
- Grievances, mediation procedures and corrective action - City
- Level of authority – community provide feedback
- Different levels
- Communities provide feedback on The City
- Time commitments – volunteer burnout
- Yes to Non-discrimination
- Yes to Communication and notifications
- Yes to Grievances, mediation procedures and corrective action
- Do not lose, however this shakes out, the history and collective wisdom that resides in CA's who have participated in the planning process – including those that didn't work well and learnings from it. Plus acknowledge to commitment



- Establish a terms of reference b/w participating groups that everyone agrees to
- Live document
- Could vary from forum to forum
- Transparent operations – very important
- Yes to minutes and record keeping
- Yes to communication and notifications
- The list opposite is an outline of an accountable administrative structure. We didn't think more bureaucratic administrative structure is needed.
- This needs to be a process, not a structure.
- The process needs to be politically accountable. Councillors and community reps are elected, not appointed.
- Perhaps the district representative or group could report to the elected area Councillor, and as such be accountable for political trade-offs, instead of administration. There is danger in having elected and representative community delegates reporting to appointed members of City administration (or district reps).
- Yes to grievances, mediation procedures and correction action
- CA has to be the point of first contact
- District model only for city-wide proposals / plans (i.e. cannabis, art policy, secondary suites) – things that affect all communities equally
- For individual DPs, the affected community should be the primary stakeholder, not a district
- Time commitments – there will be volunteer burnout if we are dealing with issues in a district, rather than just our CA
- Interfacing with CA
- Please help the CA's become more prominent and the single conduit the RA's, HOA's and 3rd party organization feed into. It's important that a single cohesive representative message feeds up to the district representatives
- Who will be part of the district forum (faith group, CA, RA, HOA, etc.)
- Time commitments: How do we fit this into the planning cycles? e.g.: can larger projects w/ multi communities get longer windows for input? Needs to feed into City planning changes to cycle times?
- Yes to minutes and record keeping
- Yes to communication and notifications
- Yes to grievances, mediation procedures and corrective action
- Start more with the history of the task force, steps taken so far and the conception of the District Model
- Communities to have the authority to respond to all Developments and other issues.
- CA must be the final answer.
- Membership only community volunteers to discuss issues. Currently adjoining communities network on issues.
- Ultimately the Planning Department makes the final decision on all issues, unless a Public Hearing is required.



- A District model would not be the decision maker, only Advisory is formed
- The District model would create another level and create addition meetings and time commitment from volunteers
- Would involve another role for City Staff, a time waster. Much easier to discuss community to community and reach consensus.
- Many of these responsibilities exist with CAs and should stay there. The City needs to provide governance to ensure that CAs handle these responsibilities in a consistent and effective manner.
- Assessing potential members by examine their qualifications, experience and attributes
- Provide non-City training for members of the Forum
- Attribute comments to the person making them. Summarising the results without attribution - we see this all the time in LOCs presented at City Council and in DP decisions - doesn't give a clear picture of either the issues or the depth of concerns or support.
- Not level of authority but of influence
- Stakeholder priorities need to be set, some will have more say than others and most will just be consulted to see if they are affected.
- Which stakeholders will have more influence or represent more input than others
- These are all reasonable considerations.
- Needs to be structured so that this doesn't become another level of bureaucracy.
- Participation by volunteers but screened for ability to contribute meaningfully
- Funding for support positions.
- Not level of authority but of influence
- Stakeholder priorities need to be set, some will have more say than others and most will just be consulted to see if they are affected.
- Which stakeholders will have more influence or represent more input than others
- Comments on district forum
- these 13 items create a very complicated system
- make this simple by having a forum of communities affected by some project come together
- Discuss, identify main points
- Report done outlining pros and cons of the project and each CA opinion of the project
- *Responsibilities of City Department(s)*
- Must have excellent disciplined facilitators
- Should re-evaluate current CA's rather than impose District Model
- Geographical basis – advocate for communities
- Facilitator paid by City. This type process will take more time and expense to be successful
- CA should not be dissolved / replaced by district. How can we use a district approach for district issues and a community approach for community issues?
- We are volunteers doing "paid" work for The City. How much should be done by City employees
- Discussed
- Yes to Funding
- Yes to Staff dedication



- Commitment to honesty and transparency and review – how is this going
- Organize by geographic areas / team
- Funding – very important
- Staff dedication – City staff that have education and experience
- Programs and training – not so important
- Oversight – come to the table with the time and skill to assist in the development of the community
- More time to view project proposals in communities
- Low amount of response due to minimal quick turnaround
- Dedicated file / planner manager for a zone
- Have them help out the CA
- You always have someone to contact quickly
- 3rd party non-partisan paid position that is not a City employee. Goes to trust
- District should be flexible based on change who is serviced by change
- District model not a stagnant ever-present group. Only gets formed when a change meets certain threshold of impact
- Fund NPC's
- Provide funding to Federation of Calgary Communities to work on issues.
- Programs & Training are currently offered by the FCC.
- We do not need more bureaucrats telling us what to do.
- If we go this route who would provide oversight? Definitely not a role for bureaucrats.
- Appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Cannot support it. The big concern is the lack of trust with City Departments. When staff changes so do the promises – they become broken promises that communities suffer from. We've had enough feel good statements only to find out later they don't mean anything.
- Partnering with those organizations that can deliver an inclusive, effective approach for all Calgary citizens.
- Remove oversight as a City responsibility; the Forum is an advisory committee to the City
- Impartiality - don't bring the City's current 'policy of the day' to the table.
- And establishing that participating groups all practice similar levels of good governance. If so who decides?
- City departments need to recognize the expertise of those participating in district forums. Open houses that I have attended on the SWBRT and Southland COOP development for example have ignored feedback from participants. There needs to be a close to loop process where feedback that is not considered is responded to as to why.
- Example of funding?
- NPC is great – neighbourhood partnership coordinator
- engage City admin to communicate what questions are to be answered when requesting comments
- identify people affected by the proposed project
- example of loss of some transit line when NE BRT is complete



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## Verbatim comments

The next 63 pages are all of the verbatim comments we received. Comments are un-edited, this includes spelling and grammar. To make it easier to read most of the verbatim section has been organized by topic. During the workshops a few tables had flowing conversations. To keep the integrity of these conversations they are all kept as one topic/conversation.

Under each topic first there are all of the worksheets and emails and second are all of the facilitator notes. Please note that there are some duplications in the facilitator's notes. This is because the same thing was said more than once, or because the facilitator, not taker and participant(s) wrote the same thing. These are all shown in these pages since they capture everything that was heard.

## Verbatim comments – membership, inclusion & diversity in participation

The following section has all of the comments received on membership, inclusion and diversity. The section is divided into the feedback we received from emails and worksheets and what facilitators wrote on flipcharts and participants shared on post-it notes at the workshops.

### From emails and worksheets

- Difficult to engage diverse opinions
- CA membership may not be diverse therefore district membership may not be diverse
- Membership must be from balanced, informed members
- Members should live within the district, or own a local business, run a non-profit or other agency
- How is this meaningful and not box checking?
- How do you weight experience?
- I would like to see more focus on helping CA's through the planning process and in the case of large projects affected CA's brought together than the vision of District Models being presented

### BNA:

- We have an engaged membership
- We feel included in the processes around CA / Planning
- We have a young board (demographic and board's age) that is in its second term. We've tried to increase our diversity
- What is community? What value does the association bring to provide data to associations on diversity
- Community Associations compete for resources with resident associations
- Remove obstacles to participation as opposed to specifically trying to "drag" special interest groups into the process
- Stakeholder input in low density residential is predominantly homeowners; their voices need to be heard the loudest for planning matters that directly affect them
- Diverse stakeholders may not want to be specifically pointed out to be included in a process; City has better access to these groups to include in wider scale projects
- Communities need a voice



- What City wants shouldn't outweigh their input
- If you want to increase participation, groups need to feel that there is an obligation to listen to their opinion's and honour them. However, due to the inconsistencies in the operations of community groups and level of knowledge and participation of volunteers, such as obligation is irresponsible. There is no way to know that the opinions received represent the community as a whole
- Very few groups would have planning knowledge. They should be required to attend planning education sessions
- We have issues in volunteer burnout.
- We have challenges getting renters engaged in community issues
- Timelines too short. Not enough accurate information and City does not follow their own rules.
- City hit and miss – some awesome folks but poor process
- What is the purpose of this exercise – lots of dancing around the topic
- Trust – what is The City trying to do?
- Discussed
- Are there business groups that should be included
- There is a hierarchy to topics / issues that can effect who participated
- Want to have input on projects adjacent to community
- Timeline to review is too short
- Business voices need to be heard
- People without high stakes in an issue are giving a disproportionate voice
- How relevant is diversity to voice in planning
- Community voice gets lost in forum
- Define what a stakeholder is and what interests are
- Remove obstacles to participation – build community through @ CA:
  - Events
  - Social media
  - Board members from specific groups
  - Needs assessment: ask who is not represented today
- Ensure membership requirements @ CA forum do not self-select to representation that lacks inclusion
- Better inclusion
- Resourcing
- Model
- Existing concern on stepping on each other's toes
- Major barriers to information
  - Information and time
  - Both need to increase participation
- Broaden circulation of issues
  - Communities on both sides of road / shared corridors
- Transparency
- We need more time (notice length) to respond appropriately
- This feels like a way to circumvent



- Clarity is needed on how the district group would be determined. Would planning directors be automatically in the group or would each CA nominate their representatives to be included in the group
- I know we're not doing well enough. Will this help?
- Some faith groups may help but I'm not sure how or when to include them
- Offended that CRF task force did not engage the CA's to start
- Need another way to engage across CA's and do so on an assurance base rather than perpetual basis
- Timing – not in work hours
- Education – with cultural inclusion
- CA directors – not on the same page – hidden agenda / education
- Newsletter cost – consider costs
- Community presidents diverse
- Community cleanup
- Mural project / facade transparent
- Stakeholders need to be defined – key question should be whether they appropriately have an interest in the planning issue discussed
- Our group saw limited applicability for a district model in simple land use / development permit issues – the type of projects suitable for a district construct may be more broadly based, like Main Streets, larger transportation projects etc.
- We were very concerned about the possible imposition of special advocacy groups into the process (as outlined in the project goals, unfortunately). We thought in some circumstances the imposition stakeholders not accountable to, or elected by, communities comprising the district might be problematic.
- Do not support the District model. Currently community associations create their own networks with adjoining communities on issues that affect them. A district model would dilute this approach. With issues inside community boundaries that impact them only, it is dealt with internally. A formal approach to communities working together on Planning/Development is not necessary. Only serves to create another level of Civic bureaucracy that is costly and not required. Provide the funds and resources to the Federation of Calgary Communities to assist communities with Planning. Diversity is a loaded question, residents live in a particular community for a variety of reasons. By asking an individual their ethnic background or gender when they become involved in a community is insulting. Why should it make any difference where a person is from or who is their partner? Not relevant to Planning issues. Unfortunately the District approach is ripe for Political interference and developers controlling the future of communities – this is not wanted. The District model is not the way to proceed. Leave the system as it is, in my opinion it is working well at the community level. The BIG issue is lack of trust volunteers/communities have with the City. Far too many broken promises and feel good statements made by City staff.
- The CRF seems to have assumed there is a problem but it is not clearly defined there is a problem. There likely are problems with CAs not fulfilling their roles effectively to promote inclusivity but I don't believe these problems can be considered broadly. We need to identify clearly the problems, where they reside and address them that way. Let's not develop solutions to 'perceived' or 'spotty' problems. The Task Forces has not identified where CAs are effective and leveraged that information for solutions. The City seems to imply problems reside in CAs and I would contend they reside with the City in terms of inclusivity and diversity.



- There were great suggestions from different CA members about getting diverse and inclusive voices in their CAs. These included outreach to churches, mosques and service groups. Based on the extremely small sample in our discussions this worked really well for specific things but have not attracted members of those groups to join the CAs. That makes me wonder why the City seems to think that the new District Forums will be able to attract any more of these voices to make the leap.
- Our Community Association Board and the Community Development Committee is representative of our community with respect to gender, demographics and ethnicity but important stakeholder groups, including business and faith group representation, have not been included. When we practice succession planning, we focus on skill sets and applicable experiences rather than targeting specific groups so that our Association is both effective and efficient. It is difficult to recruit certain socio-demographic groups because we do not have data to identify these groups nor do we believe it is our place to be intrusive in targeting these groups. We must also ensure that we do not inadvertently incorporate special interest or single issue groups into our Board. Those groups are often not representative of the community and we expect that our Directors will work in the best interest of all residents.
- This is impossible to comment on - as I was only involved in one session, aside from online engagement. It did seem that staff tried to direct discussion's in each smaller group, by putting together people from similar experiences/BG (in terms of their engagement with the planning and development process).
- Membership should include those affected by the development, as now happens in our community, and no one else. Unaffected persons / entities will dilute and muddle the decisions of those affected. Those affected should have fact-based comments using planning rationale, not just 'it's nice' or 'I don't like it'. Ultimately the community in which the project is located should gather the input, analyse and consider all of it, and be the primary commentator. Since individual resident input is provided both to the Development Authority and the community association's planning committee, and available to its Board, no one is unheard.
- All proposed members of the District Forum (which should be called the District Engagement Forum) need to be reached out to and asked if they would like to be involved.
- It should be determined which groups need and should be involved, and which can be just consulted based on issues, small or larger based
- Many groups' individuals miss the opportunity to be involved and get engaged, come later in the process they voice that they never received the communication. Better effort needs to be made to make sure all groups are reached.
- Community Associations ("CAs") need to be a key part of any District Model going forward, because they are the entities that citizens within communities approach regarding development issues. Other community groups need to be encouraged to engage as well, however, in the experience of many local CAs, groups that are focused on issues that do not specifically involve city development do not necessarily engage unless there is a proposed development that is of significance to that group specifically. One way to address this issue is to clearly identify when a proposed development may create an issue or opportunity with regard to community groups, and ensure that those groups are notified and brought into discussions regarding that development. There are concerns about what representation will look like at the District level. Will there be designated representatives from



multiple groups? Will there be regular meetings of such groups? It needs to be understood that many community organizations, including CAs, are staffed by volunteers, and there isn't necessarily capacity to add many additional hours of volunteer time to make a District Model work. Overworked volunteers can lead to high turnover, which in turn leads to a loss of knowledge regarding city processes, and the need for further ongoing training of new volunteers. There is concern that the District Model is designed to ensure that local communities do not have a voice in the developments that directly affect them, and that this is a mechanism to ensure that the city bureaucracy and local councillors with their own views on what communities should look like take control in the guise of making things more "representative". There are more comments on this below, however it is important to note that local communities which are most impacted by developments must continue to have a voice on developments that directly affect them. The issues noted above are not specific to Community planning engagement processes. Our CA policy is to be open and inclusive to all residents without exception. While we do not seek specific age groups, genders or cultural backgrounds for participation, the CA **does** seek to provide opportunities for individuals at risk of being excluded from the general population. We work directly with WINS and the Brenda Stafford Foundation to offer participatory programmes that provide access to day care, food and community garden programmes. Some programmes seek to help individuals who feel isolated to make neighbourhood connections whether they are seniors or disadvantaged in some way. There is no area in which **everyone** is not welcome. I conclude from the kind of questions included in both the background documents and the Phase 2 Worksheet that the City is responding to some specific complaints or concerns regarding exclusion of particular groups. While that may be relevant in the context of city government and society in general, I do not believe that focusing attention on particular cultural or interest groups with respect to planning issues is a good thing. In my estimation democracy means treating everyone equally all the time, not giving someone or some grievance additional input. There are serious impediments to diversity and inclusion in a democratic process: indifference at jurisdictional levels, ineffective communications within communities, lack of funding and staff to reach all residents, tendencies of interest groups to overtake organizations, relying on special interests (e.g. BIAs, cultural groups, etc.) to provide unfiltered information to members, and sometimes deliberate dissemination of misinformation. Membership, and therefore participation, whether at community association, BIA or church groups, is optional. So it is difficult for organizations with limited resources to reach everyone, to solicit every opinion, serve every need. If I understand the purpose of the Community Representation Framework Task Force correctly, we are discussing better representation and input to decision-making regarding planning issues **ONLY**. If that is the case should we not be working on how to use established groups and associations to better serve the purpose instead of seeking an entirely new forum to achieve the purpose

- Given that seniors are the group participating the most in providing feedback there is not enough diversity of opinion. Observation of attendance from open houses in our community and those adjacent bear this out.
- Membership in our (BCA) association is very low and does not reflect the community demographic. A concern with a district model is that diversity won't be achieved.



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- All proposed members of the District Forum (which should be called the District Engagement Forum) need to be reached out to and asked if they would like to be involved.
- It should be determined which groups need and should be involved, and which can be just consulted based on issues, small or larger based
- Many groups' individuals miss the opportunity to be involved and get engaged, come later in the process they voice that they never received the communication. Better effort needs to be made to make sure all groups are reached.
- representatives from business owners
- representatives from schools
- representatives seniors
- representatives residents associations

## From workshop flipcharts and post-it notes

The following are notes from the flipchart papers and post-it notes. The group numbers are there just to show that the comments came from the same table.

### Group 1

- Needs structure
  - A. very local
  - B. community issue
  - C. communities affected
- Should start with CAs
- Perhaps with some community membership don't know about CAs
- Have planners with City write into newsletter
- Different tiers of engagement of community
- Recruit
- Newsletter
- Inform people
- Agree need diversity on planning decisions
- Identify which groups are underrepresented (women, renters, rich, poor, geography)
- District model makes things more diverse
- People are busy
- People are reactive and localized in community
- How to inform people of 'impactful' projects
- 'I don't speak planning' make less intimidating
- City needs to frame issue – give lots of time
- No resources for door to door
- How to motivate people?
- Signs are a good idea but not necessary
- City to identify official and unofficial groups at communities
- Need more resources- city support



- Revitalize process – bring back bylaw checklist
- Tension between different groups within a community – CAs don't know what their role should be (pressure to side with one group). Larger groups would mitigate this?
- Key: making people aware of what's planned
- The city needs to do more to recognize the power in balancing between developers and community to:
  - 1. economically strengthen
  - 2. Politically connections and acumen
  - 3. Knowledge of development process
- Developers: how to make sure they engage the community properly
- Improve (even more) development notices
- Helpful to have city help people find who their CAs are – “open door” open door can be difficult to find
- The communities need(s) some help from the city to make it easier to identify and solicit feedback from under represented group. Forward feedback from city website?

## Group 2

- How can we bridge the cultural divide
- How can we find out the demographics
  - Who should we contact?
  - Diverse
  - How can we get baseline info?
- Who is representing us?
- Members (directors) are not on this page
- What are the barriers in the groups
- Voices are a type of diversity
- First timelines from process x5
- It is senior heavy
- How hard are council listening?
- Newsletters from different languages
- How do people view community?
- Get over the fear that your voice might be different
- Bring a different voice

## Group 3

- Concern about the loss of influence of CAs gives rise to a lack of interest in being included
- If the city wants to walk the talk of inclusion, put some teeth into community engagement for developers
- Trust
- Uncertainty and mistrust in the process
- Concern that the genesis of the entire exercise is flawed
- <http://calgaryherald.com/new/local-news/does-calgary-still-need-its-community-associations/amp>



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- U of C school of public policy document on CAs
- Trust in the process and groups
- Important that groups remain open and neutral
- Challenge in different processes, in different communities (and FCC)
- Current system can be improved but doesn't need to be completely built from scratch
- Acknowledge value of volunteers and participants
- Lack of trust due to late engagement

## Group 4

- Topic 3 should predicate topic 1
- Is one voice one vote? It shouldn't be
- Should be a fluid membership, i.e. CBE vs catholic vs charter school
- Is a main street a community?
- Neighbourhood not community
- Bring the mainstreet into the district
- Neighbourhood should include all people/groups
- Not special interests groups, sports religion, etc.
- CAs should be the only voice
- Special interests should be through CA
- Special interests don't have planning knowledge
- CAs can give balanced perspective for whole neighbourhood
- Some members are for info only
- Developers are special interests
- 1 voice per community group (united voice), 1 member from each CA, 1 member from BIA, 1 member from planning, 1 member from groups
- CA bylaws need to support membership and decision making takes 6+ months
- Voice through associate membership not voting
- Inglewood use, Ramsey, East Village, Bridgeland, Dover all get a say move sought Millrise but not a vote
- Every community on the boundary of each effected community
- More support from the city, money, etc. for CAs
- Include spheres of influence when a project affects nearby neighbourhoods
- CA model is outdated, can't do on volunteering
- More liaison positions with other groups
- Is 17 Ave mainstreet a neighbourhood? A district?

## Group 5

- Don't want to limit this just to planning
- Planning is not a driving force
  - Clarification – everything is on the table
- How would I find out all the businesses, NGOs in my community? Does the City have a list?
- What are the boundaries?



- To be included in the district forum what is your locality? Etc.
- Check boxes? Type of organizations? Business?
- Resource centres
  - Support, but CAs are driving force
- I want to understand the relevance to this topic to participate
- CA relies on resource centres to bring softer groups when asked (i.e. single mom working 3 jobs)
- Build relationships before there is a need (i.e. Tuscany monthly meetings)
- Each CA is different because of different demographics
- This is my neighbourhood communities are so well connected
- Are NPCs being engaged in CRF process
  - NPCs feel are having difficulty reaching engage resource unit
  - Expand on NPC program
  - They can link to answers
- Connection approach to established communities could result in 200+people
- Reach out to silenced voices
  - We shouldn't assume by group name
- We can take steps, create awareness that silenced voices are considered but cannot mandate this
  - Mandating at a volunteer capacity is a challenge
- I want my community to be representative but who does it? Who's role is it? Volunteers?
- Say what you envision it would like
- Use billboards to notify residents
  - Unsure how to connect with different demographics
- How are special interest groups defined and how do we consider their opinions equal to others?
  - Not drown out other voices
- Organized groups are well engaged. It is those who are not organized that participation less
- It's not just inclusivity. Sometimes its time
- City gives notice to whom they want
  - Expand who is notified about planning
  - Determine who are the affected parties
  - Notice from the City is too narrow
- This session
  - Of all responses are CAs representative?
    - Has the City reached out to exemplify what this looks like?
    - Feels a little downloaded
    - Walk the talk!

## Group 6

- Were any other models considered – issues based model?
- Are there examples of project that went awry that were the impetus for CRF (Highland Park?)
- What drove this – is it transforming planning?
- What will be the measures of success for the CRF? – less ppl mad at The City?
- On board w/ the goals – initial thoughts – district good for bigger projects but not the granular stuff



- Focus on senior demo – concern they don't reflect larger demo
- Villages – council focus district too big compared to "village"
- Concerned this won't address bigger issues – LRT, new arena, Olympics
- How will voices be heard in a bigger model – loss of smaller voices
- Calgary unique C.A. model – worried it will water down high functioning CA's
- These things often fail in the implementation
- Everyone is welcome. People show up when there's an interest
- CA's are stretched
- Open mind – benefits but concerns
- Fundamental issues exist at The City of Calgary. These need to be addressed
- Only reaching SR's because our tactics are geared towards this demographic, and not for every day Calgarians (i.e. time of public hearings, SDAB) timing difficult to participate
- Amount of knowledge you need to know about planning is a barrier to participation
- Recognize they don't talk to adjacent communities – but there's territory issues but some good examples of collaboration
- Questionnaire made them start to think of inclusivity – started to think how could they do better and make CA more representative
- Worried about opening up to special interest group – Nimbys
- Hard for small CAs to resource
- Years ago it was only 35-45 year olds and never seniors
- CA's often centered around sports / groups
- CA's are good w/ planning if its specific to a community
- City wide issues – look holistically
- Need to get citizens interested in planning – do something interesting to get their attention and get them thinking about it
- Planning engagement is inaccessible
- They may not show up unless there's a threat but they are generally aware
- Ex: Councillors open houses – all one demographic hosts one / month
- Pique interest – then they will get engaged
- CA has interactive platform for dialogue on planning conversations – there was too much push communications
- CAs have different issues – diff level of planning issues – some lots of development / some none
- Some communities are very homogenous – single family – but interested in larger issues (Crow child)
- Model will work well but missing a model to address
  - City wide issues – where should next LRT go?
- Some CAs only have 2% member participation from community
  - Not representative
- Look to broaden diversity of boards
- Lots of opportunities for CAs to connect w/ other groups – they exist – but ppl not aware they exist / connection isn't happening



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## Verbatim – resources, capacity & training

The following section has all of the comments received on resources, capacity and training. The section is divided into the feedback we received from emails and worksheets and what facilitators wrote on flipcharts and participants shared on post-it notes at the workshops.

### From emails and worksheets

- Some CAs do not have professional planning / policy expertise
- Training for CA members, or guidance or specific policies?
- FCC Partners in Planning is great
- Facilitation is key
- Volunteers have limited capacity
- Members of districts must be knowledgeable
- If the CA's are being asked to give up or reduce their voice, then communities should receive extra planning in return
- We already have enough training opportunities through FCC – but no time as volunteers.
- Capacity and sustainability are issues – how can you balance this?
- Hire the equivalent of an NPC to help CA's through the planning process
- We cannot ask for more time, not all CA's are spending the same amount of volunteer time. More meetings may work for some, and not others
- The attendees of any "district" model should be educated on planning issues ... perhaps the Director of Planning?
- Provide community specific forum on resources coordinated with associations
- Resources reallocated to planning pulls from other association activities
- Centralized planning to ease resources may lose community voice
- Clarify the relationship between city and associations
- Need a planning advocate
- Need a consistent NPC
- Need more development files
- City should look into providing Street Beat site license type program so CA's can connect with geographical stakeholders in a timely fashion
- Imposing another layer of bureaucracy on the planning process will make matters worse in low density residential areas; more appropriate for Main Streets, connected pathways, large scale redevelopment, etc. - forum
- Sufficient resources and training are available through FCC. However, there is no obligation to be a member of FCC and it is not reasonable to expect volunteers to gain all of the knowledge required to make effective planning decisions
- Concerns over duplication of volunteer hours – district issues and micro issues: Will the neighbouring community be concerned about protecting the heritage home on my street?
- Time and burnout
- Timing – too short for thoughtful input and responses
- Failure of City to follow up and follow through
- Share info from other communities



- Discussed
- Put on workshops for specific communities including planning and development
- Forum for communities to share knowledge and best practices
- To extent that it enhances CA ability to engage with residents versus
- Turnover in NPC role at City
- Tools / systems for CA
- Actually listen to people
  - Shaganappi
  - Membership / map driven / topic of interest
  - Emails go to the right people
- “Street beat” software – Phil Ivers
- Tools / protocols to assist in social media outreach
- Facilitation tools
  - Strong voices
  - Dissenting opinions
- City Staffer Planning Advocate (process v. structure)
- More transparency and completeness in circulations from City
- Consistent
- Would this organization increase the demands of the CA or would it reduce these demands? Would a participant be required to have specific experience as credentials?
- Online surveys to get feedback to the CA w/o attending meetings
- A City Planner for each district would help, as would a facilitator / not taker would benefit
- Training on what feedback is most useful
- Community Halls – multicultural commercial kitchens with banquet facility
- Report criminal 311
- Call to police non crime 911
- CEMA – very dangerous
- To deal with the possible imposition of bureaucratic processes on limited volunteer capacity, we suggested district model take the form of a process, instead of a structure
- The idea of a district advocate was also discussed, and we explored the idea of having this individual or group report to the area Councillor instead of administration
- Provide resources and dollars to the Federation of Calgary Communities Currently the FCC in conjunction with the City provides training and the Partners in Planning Course for volunteers and others. It is working well, many volunteers have the skills to deal with developments.
- Often resources are within the community and volunteers are ready to help; they just have to be asked. Even with hard-to-reach parties, there is usually a few ‘champions’ who are willing to help CAs to engage with them. FCC provides a broad range of training opportunities and should be encouraged to continue and grow their offerings. The City provides advocacy and training through Neighbourhood Partner Coordinators and this service should be continued. CA resources are stretched in large part to manage the City’s complexity not to manage our communities.
- Suggestions included easy to customize web-pages provided by the City to CAs and training to help some of the older members use the social media that can reach out to youth.



- Our Community Association is fortunate to have a significant pool of qualified candidates for our Board, Committees and volunteer positions. Our community is getting older and we find that recently retired residents are willing to offer their time to serve the Community. Of course, this will change when residents become even older and are unable or unwilling to serve. While our Association is not rich, we are in good financial shape and we have a plan to stay that way. We are not concerned about financial resources. The Federation of Calgary Communities offers an outstanding curriculum of courses, training and workshops to help us in our work. We are encouraged to take training in our portfolio areas as well as overall governance training.
- Overall experience was pleasant - although it did feel rushed.
- If the district model is implemented, embed a Development Authority planner into the mix. Currently the Authority approves anything and everything, and it's up to the affected parties to appeal the decision in order to obtain fairness. Even then the Authority doesn't take the lesson.
- We need to make sure that the resources and training are made available to all to make sure informed decisions are made
- Training in development should continue to be provided for those who want to engage regarding the District Model. The idea that each District would have access to its own City Planner is an idea that is welcome and encouraged. Training should be provided to volunteers at the outset, and ongoing training needs to be made available, because new individuals will be participating.
- The City should use this opportunity to improve the access to information of all types. While the City has a great deal of information online, the key information regarding proposed developments is often not available.
- Resources: serious City commitment to providing resources would key to success. CA's are already struggling with work overload to respond to unrelenting development application pressures, especially within the inner-city communities. Support should come in the form of technical as well as organizational staff time; financial support will be required for specific public engagement and result analyses; physical support for office and meeting space. My question is why does the City not provide this kind of support to planning volunteer functions at Community level? Capability: there is a legitimate concern that the district model would drain volunteers away from CA's, thereby crippling the normal functions at a community association. The unintended consequence will surely be a dilution of the ability of the CA to function at various levels, not just in planning engagement. The process then becomes complicit in undermining the delicate balance built over decades to use community volunteers as a way of stretching City budgets and it will change the fundamental agreement between the City and CA's. Training: we already ask Community Association planning volunteers in our community to self-educate by attending the Partners in planning program offered to the FCC; and by participating in City of Calgary hosted engagement functions that might be unrelated to specific development applications being contested within our own community (e.g. LRT routes, new rules for the development guidelines). However, participating at a District forum WILL require even greater levels of knowledge, experience and dedication. Technical jargon alone takes months of study to comprehend; understanding provincial and municipal planning rules and codes is ongoing; the amount of time required to be a good planning committee volunteer is legion. Representatives at a District forum may find themselves acting almost as full time/part time employees of the city.
- Training for participation in a planning role is required. There is a lot of background policy and regulation at a provincial and municipal level to be grounded in. This takes time to absorb. Capacity will come from those who are community association members. Members I think fall in to 2 camps.



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

Those who are interested in leisure based (sports, arts, girl guides etc.) and those that are development issue based. Getting involvement from younger community members is a big challenge.

- We need to make sure that the resources and training are made available to all to make sure informed decisions are made
- First is to expand membership
- Next is to organize members into groups that members want to work
- Training can be available from F.C.C. for example

## From flipcharts

### Group 1

- City and CA both have feedback mechanism – its not consistent
- NPCs leverage them!!!! X3
- The City communication needs to be clear, concise and tailored to address diverse interests. In plain language.
- The city must include the by-law checklist. Planning committees are made up of volunteers who are not experts on the planning bylaws.
- FCC good resource
- Make it simpler “plain language”
- City should respect the ARP/ASP rather than the community
- Make more use of FCC training and workshops
- Neighbourhood partnership coordinators should represent adjacent communities – i.e. promote cooperation
- Partnerships in planning – offer in community
- Training for community association members
- Clear understanding of planning policies
- Don't like planning, City of Calgary jargon
- Need to learn to speak and listen to people
- City communications needs to come out in sufficient time for CA to receive, review, meet as a board, consult, etc. before responding

### Group 2

- There are competing issues and resources
- Relationship are 1<sup>st</sup> priority
- What are the expectations of the CAs from the City? Provide a framework
- We (CA) bolder the City position – support this more
- CA can find a gap in the services
- Shift of resources would lose the community perspective
- How do you manage issues before they happen? Key:
  - Newsletter
  - Condo dinner (reception)



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- Mural
  - Key resource – knowledge of community
  - How could we provide citizens/city forum
  - Constraints: specific timelines and process
  - City to provide consistent tools somewhere, i.e. website
  - There are finite hours
  - The focus of planning has drawn the resources from community resources
  - City support people who do not have capacity
  - What could the city provide that FCC already gives
  - Issue does the City have the relationship
    - Resource and capacity to handle this item
  - We need consistent TODs and resources that are common

## Group 3

- Volunteer requirements can be quite large to ensure diver understanding of development issues. Not all communities have this
- Greater simplicity in language
- Resourcing and recognition helps build diverse volunteer corporation
- Appeal to millennials and under 40 year olds
- Use of bread communication techniques
- Need to distribute plans more broadly and early
- Inclusive approach needs to be both ways. City processed need to be inclusive. Feeling that city is not inclusive in their approaches.
- FCC is not viewed or treated as an equal partner.
- Complexity pushes people away
- Financial support of volunteer pressures
- Recognition of value of CAs – built on seeing the impacts of CA work in City decision making
- Increase in network and a best practice between CAs and also acknowledgment on the city side of the value of these best practices
- NPCs should be empowered and resourced to provide support to CAs
- More basic support for community needs
- “Direct contact” – NPC or planner. The importance of the personal touch
- Standard documents for things like financials
- Promote personal benefits of being involved
- Training- lots already available through NPC and FCC. Better funding these entities, rather than something new.
- Invest in face-to-face relationships between City and CA
- Invest in social aspects of networking

## Group 4

- We scrutinize application, city always approves and we have to appeal
- Want city to listen better and more



- Would district model better engage and collaborate with the City of Calgary
- Create neighbourhood engagement coordinator
  - Could be a city role, NPC?
- City process not too detailed. They miss things. Need contractor, independent to review plans. Not city workers or community.
- Want billboards, signage, city funded.
- Need (geo-boards, alerts, signs) to make protect relevant to people
- Department of planners, no involvement within community. Should they be part of the community? Stationed?
- Arrogance and condescending of city planners
- Include special interest groups only when developments affect them and through CA
- Meetings critical, face to face is necessary
- Make it a policy to engage neighbourhoods
- Technology and resources and support personnel, gather info/communication
- Need more context to planning policy
- Training and education on planning etc. FCC
- City planners to work in community or quadrants
- Project managers see projects through. Stability through projects.
- Force parking studies, shade studies. Take work away from CAs to guess if there are issues
- Go to Gemba for planners, embedded in community
- Architecture lessons – learn about why we preserve historic neighbourhood aspects. What is historic?
- City needs to provide billboards so we can engage
- Allow for better infrastructure planning, schools, transit, rec centres. Can give CBE a voice in designating lands.

## Group 5

- City should model inclusivity
- Will city offer resources and training if asking CAs to implement?
- Leadership on the City's part
- Engagement is more than postcards in the mail. It needs to be more
- Go to the public (special groups) directly
- Meet people where they are
- CPS did a great job engaging diverse populations (great example of leading by example)
- District model is inclusive
- Watershed?
- Leverage the FCC courses to share info, competencies, best practices and CA experiences
- FCC would know some of the CA competencies but could support this and leverage the inventory of best practices
- CA audits should include competencies assessment of boards
  - Help to identify gaps
  - Go beyond financials



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- Train the trainer works well on paper but in reality you are downloading
- Come outside the community and facilitate conversations
- Suitable model
- Don't fly in and then leave
- In partnership WITH the City of Calgary outside groups that can support (i.e. propellus, benevity, etc.)
  - City to facilitate these relationships
  - NPC or other key roles
    - Give them additional resources to bring these groups in
- NPCs – less communities that can be more involved. That they do less well.
- Identify gaps between current and future state
- City sends mixed messages – adds complexity
  - City is asking CAs to do more
  - Sifting work off City
- City isn't happy with how ARPs are done and now coming out with model that steps around it
- Use the good that is happening in the city and exemplify this (i.e. good applications, etc.)
- CAs do have relationships with other CAs and we share best practices
- I don't want to consult more with FCC and City. Already at capacity.
- Engagement is process to give political coverage
  - Placating the masses
  - Need to ensure input is used
  - Feel that sometimes the path is already set
- Is training resources?
  - As designed by city. Created so those trained meet city objectives or inspire independent thought.
- Honesty about planning objectives
- Fortifying the status quo
- All of this has to do with trust and building relationships. This could be solved if NPCs had less communities. CAs feel hung out to dry.
- The best way to build resiliency and community capacity is to give it to the people so that it can be done by the people at the grass roots level.
- Start with the CASs, build capacity, so they can work on their own issues and they can work with other CAs to collaborate.
- Who are you putting us up with when we are struggling at engaging at the bottom level
- Need to recognize the uniqueness of the CAs and the power that they have within them
- Need to put resources on the ground to make communities more resilient

## Group 6

- Too much transition with NPC's
- We're looking at organization change without fixing the process
- Common complaint from CA's is City process
- City transferred program to CA's without process (i.e. landscape and maintenance)



- This feels like end of the line and the process needs to be looked at
- Volunteer burnout – spending near 40% of time doing volunteer work. We're volunteers!
- NPC was able to walk through process and could support through lengthy process
- How could we make volunteer life easier?
  - This process isn't helping to get com involved
- Volunteer efforts being used for things mandated in MDP
- Competing for scarce \$
  - Better access to resources, funding, grants
- Hodgepodge currently at the community level of resources. Why doesn't The City make sure that they are at the front line of making good process, good cohesive funding
- Professional managers are being hired in some instances to manage large amounts of funding the CAs have
- Who is talking to who with the new guidebook (DAG/MOP)
  - How does it relate to a district forum
- What is the point of the DAG if there is a district forum and vice versa
- Who will staff / resource the district forum?
  - How will you mitigate?
- Not sure it will do anything different that CAs do
- Opportunity
  - Watershed work and impacts – issue
- Issue (fluid district) vs “existing” district structure
  - Fluid district: The City more active and going out
  - Static district: static individuals who are reporting to council
  - Static district: challenge – an extra layer of government
- How do you assess who contributes?
- Not sure that the governance is there
  - How would they come to decisions?
- Issue opportunity with district forum (i.e. watershed)
- With DAG out now, what is the point of engaging on the district model?
- Stakeholder mapping vs static stakeholders group
- Fluid district
- District model is a case by case basis
- City / district / CAS
  - Are we creating a new layer
  - How would you make it work and who would be part of it
- Benefit in looking at urban planning more holistically
- @ the planning model
  - Statutory
  - Non-statutory
    - Applying ARP's that broadly could create potentially more cohesion with The City
- Cohesion and plain language on all of the plans, DAG, etc. how they all fit
- Lack of understanding of DAG



- ARP or no?
- What would make my process authentic enough that The City doesn't question my voice on behalf of my community?
- Maybe identifying a high-functioning and effective CA – opens the door to larger
- DM – muddies the ideal community association
- Higher level – professionalism – benefits from the DM
- What is professional? Define what that looks like?
- Challenge membership fatigue
- I don't like the term District Model
- The CA will be more effective w/ training tools supplied by The City
- Maybe that same NPC can represent the three communities / member on the DM
- (Pro) Collaboration between the communities is a good thing
  - Benefit – break down the silos
  - Larger perspective
- Similar to what the FCC's partners in planning
  - We have this already available
  - (Con) Challenge – time / capacity / desire to participate
- (Con) Loss of community voice
- (Pro) Opportunity relationship / partner building capacity
- Need to go back to the CAs again
  - Clearer understanding of the issue The City is trying to address
  - Look at the current model of the CA
- The current WWH vs the verbatim = softer language vs the actual tone emulated in the verbatim
- These workshops should have occurred in Phase 1 – not brought in at this stage of the project – would have benefited workshop we're at today
- Target inner city CAs – engage w/ them and their models / challenges / identify opportunities to collaborate / coordinate w/ adjacent CAs

## Group 7

- CA has the resources / capacity – this CAs planning issues are smaller
- FCC is a great resource (PiP)
- Model adds another layer / training required
- Could always use more resources at CA level
- Depends if ppl on model are diff then those that sit on planning CA committees
- Need a level of screening
- Not all communities have strong planning process
- Good CAs seek out opinions of their members (surveys, etc.)
  - Some don't – it becomes individual issues being represented
- Can't just rely on FB to reach members
- More time demands on district – higher load for some vs other
- Grants? More competition for the grants



- Helpful for bigger developments – benefit could be to share resources / relieve capacity issues on bigger issues / devel where hard to reach everyone
- Large screen msg board for all committees
- Benefit to bring new ideas to the table
- Hard to understand everything planning
  - Benefit of model could lessen this burden
- Ensure Reps don't get bogged down in internal workings – how are these facilitated?
- Best interests of district / or communities
  - How do you balance the needs
- Speed of change happening w/ development but not looking at bigger picture
- Density not being looked at thoughtfully – just approving everything “all density is good”
- Burn out from ARP process – and amendments that keep happening. Process is broken. Very frustrating
- If someone leaves – institutional knowledge lost. Succession planning needed

## Group 8

- Reduce meeting burnout by using electronic meeting methods
- In person discussions can't be duplicated via electronic methods
- Having staff take meeting minutes, run meetings and keep things on course
- Training / resources for chairs of CAs / CA committee's
  - City could provide training / workshops for CAs
  - CA board members tend to have multiple hats / rules
- City could provide contact to various departments
  - Dedicated planner for district
- What does CA provide for the residents
- CA boards use a lot of resources to maintain CA (City) facilities
- CA needs City to provide more resources to help CA's manage facilities
  - Provide resources so CAs can participate more in other district activities
- RAs can run buildings w/ fixed (regular) incomes
- Can some form of online survey when planning issues come in
  - Residents can submit info
  - Make results available to CA
- Duplication isn't necessarily a bad thing
  - Repetition can be helpful
  - Sometimes duplication can have a different slant
- Sometimes The City makes decisions that go against opinion of residents
  - Processes / decision making could be more clear
- RAs work because we have guaranteed income and staff
- Lifecycle plans are super time / resource intensive, and it's a City resource! Need help!
- Need more incentive for people to be members
- City can provide contacts for people / groups who understand specific issues
- Need more clarity f/ The City in what feedback they're looking for



- Support local discounts for every member
- The City should help drive people to participate in CAs. We are low membership and it's hard to recruit
- Need clear mandate / direction on how / what we should contribute to a planning document
- Need people on the ground getting info out there. Door knocking, translating, etc.
- We work in the day, volunteer at night. We need more legs
- We want our members to lead the CA, but need many more others to help with work
  - Step 1: Lots of members
  - Step 2: Give them work based on strengths and interests
- Use local partners to help recruit members
- Training based on issue or board member interests
- We need more time for planning documents
- Limited resources to reach out extensively in the community
- Need help w/ legs on the ground in the community
- Need help to increase members to learn who can do what in the community to assist with tasks at hand
- Organize groups based on what they're interested in
- List of people
  - What are their strengths
  - Where can they get training
- What partnerships are available in the community to work with to assist each other
- Larger retail institutions could help create partnerships
- Better utilization of partners to reach people
- CA's are unprepared when planning issued come to them
  - Guidebook on CA's involvement in planning process
- Some CA's may have low participation rates
  - How can The City help encourage residents to participate in their CA
- Promotion of CA membership benefits
- How can we have better conversations?
  - Can The City be more clear with what they want input on
- Training how to chair meetings
- Have a staff person to chair meetings, take minutes, mediate, etc.
- Discussion in-person can't be matched in other methods
- Video conferencing capabilities
- It's hard when other councillors vote against the communities' interests (duplication of comms)
- Challenge with duplicating comms is that different groups can skew it for their own purpose
- Duplication is not always a bad thing. Repetition can be helpful
- Online survey for each application, done by The City, results shared with the CA
- Specific skill sets for specific roles



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## Verbatim – Topic 3 the district model

The following section has all of the comments received on the district model. The section is divided into the feedback we received from emails and worksheets and what facilitators wrote on flipcharts and participants shared on post-it notes at the workshops.

### From emails and worksheets

- Potential to share resources and seeing “big picture”
- But risk of overshadowing
- Another layer of bureaucracy to go through?
- It doesn't matter who the model is, it matters that the execution is excellent
- It is fine – but, so is the CA model
- Must be only for large projects
- How do you logically draw up the boundaries of a district? Good luck!
- I think the root of issue is how the current model works / doesn't – I would start there before jumping to District Model
- My understanding of the District Model will water down the CA's position and their voice will be overpowered by a more professional group
- The District Model should hold off, instead the engagement should start looking at how to support the planning groups that are already in place. “How can we help the system in place rather than add a new system on top?”
- One size does not fit all
- Should it align with councillor representation?
- Key stakeholders in low density communities are the homeowners. They need the most say on what directly affects them
- District forum for Main Streets, cross City projects, new TOD's and revitalization zones: higher standards of engagement for developers at this level, but still need a high commitment from developers to engage at the community level – best practice
- MDP allows for maintaining comm. Character; one size does not fit all; should be a scalable process
- No to a forum approach where groups outside of a low density residential community would have the ability to override the community vision or detract from char of the community
- The District Model may be effective for larger development decisions but should not be relied on for smaller, local decisions
  - Only used for special large projects, i.e. LRT
- The district model poses challenges in terms of trying to impose a geography on issues – based items which each have their own geographies / scales. It is good for communities to come together over issues like regional pathways but not for every day issues like reviewing resignations or development permits
- What are the “key stakeholders”? Until this is defined the purpose is moot. Community and residents retain the voice. Cannot be political and tied to administration



- Create terms of reference
- Business – particularly small business tent to be shut-out
- Has to be community driven not City
- District model for City as well
- Would still like to have more information on what this district model look
- Pro: Community Associations are a special interest group. Combining them into a district tempers their special interest
- In a district model do all communities get equal say when the issue effect one community is impacted more?
- Scope is critical
- Does it apply to planning – MGA & Professional planers are affected parties' voices drowned out
- What are topics that would be good at district level?
  - Which issues
  - Main streets
- Thinking about it as a process v. a structure (gathering input to decisions)
- (The above) should be reflected in goals of projects
- Localized issues in low-density residential areas should not be part of this
- The City rarely follow existing protocols around engagement so hard to have faith in establishing a new progress
- Hierarchy of topics
  - Something b/w CA & District Forum
- Communities need to feel engaged
- Turn it around
  - Could City also have some geographic forum teams
  - Institutional memory
- Why?
- Scope of district forum
- Overall:
  - Demeaning to us as CA's
  - Just trying to quash our voice
- Process v. a structure
  - Scalable
  - What issues need feedback
  - Process adapts based on issue
  - Not necessarily a standing group
  - Make it politically accountable so that it is less cumbersome and bogged down by bureaucracy
- City more proactive issue by issue on reaching out to stakeholders
- No to a forum approach if it leads to override of community interest / character



- Developers have to be provided with standards on how to engage (Representative Community Engagement Standards so know how to engage)
- Not clear to me what is the model. Not sure how districts are created; what is their mandate and what is their focus. How would the district interact with the CA
- Will it mean local plans are developed / adapted more often?
- What process will CAs use to decide what hits the district? Who will determine that?
- Already have 2 support groups in FCC and NPC's. Don't need a 3<sup>rd</sup> group in District Model to cover support
- District Model dilutes the influence of CA's
- Downtown and surrounding area district – could be as multifamily buildings
- Recycling in high-rises poor, left to their own resource
- Media educates, single home
  - The project goals as set by council appear to be based on a perceived capacity problem not experienced by many of the communities present.
  - However, most of the communities represented at our table felt a need for more district representation for broader city initiatives. Some (e.g. South Shaganappi, West LRT, Crowchild) have be left to organize multi-community models on their own.
  - The underlying objective seems to be to make the district model a “go-to” source of information concerning communities in each Councillor's Ward.
  - For some Councillors we see it as a matter of convenience for them to not to know their member communities, and the model would increase their ability to mandate strategic changes and over-ride opposition to pet initiatives.
  - The project goals, and the problem defined, seem to be rooted in making administration and Council's jobs more convenient – there is very little here for existing community associations.
- As above NO to the District Model.
- The City seems to want to re-organize to this district model and expect it to resolve perceived problems. This approach is a paradigm that large corporations have fallen into many times and I have been involved in process redesign through my career. The best approach is to review processes to identify issues and complexity in order to simplify and make efficient; then re-organize to fit tasks to the subject matter experts and most appropriate owners. At this point in time, the best solution would be to let CA's do their job to engaged affected parties. The City needs to clear the way for CAs to handle this role through simplifying their own processes, encouraging affected party engagement through CA membership, equipping and training. This training should be done by leveraging the existing partnership with FCC and creating forums to share best practices as many CA volunteers are qualified and willing to share in forums brokered by FCC. The City requires CAs to report financials, have a business plan and more recently complete a risk assessment profile. These are good measures. However, a dimension missing is to assess competency and capacity of board directors and CA organization to meet the needs of their respective communities. I require the directors on my board to take courses and improve their skills to serve our community. This



competency and capacity measurement approach would provide a more complete CA profile to identify and measure gaps and establish remedial action plans to close them. For awareness with respect to Planning & Development, Community Associations have legal 'affected status' with respect to ALL developments in their respective communities today. There are legal aspects to a district mode that would have to be considered if this change made. As a Calgary resident, I am not looking for more layers of engagement and increased costs of City organization infrastructure! I don't believe the Task Force has looked objectively at options other than this district model which as stated is just another re-organization.

- My personal feeling was that this is a done deal and the entire meeting was a sales job. I felt that comments were being cherry-picked (at least at our table) to support a system the City obviously thinks will be an improvement. Hard questions (such as which other options the City rejected before backing DFs and which jurisdictions have been successful with this model) were ignored. This is a very important issue for the Eau Claire Community Association. We've already encountered an attitude among some City councillors that they tend to regard the inner city communities (e.g., Beltline, East Village and us) as more or less one and so pay less heed to our concerns about promoting growth in EC ("There's development going on in Beltline so what's your issue?"). Keep in mind that there are a finite number of volunteers. If you slide District Forums into the hierarchy between Community Associations and the City that will siphon off dedicated volunteers and weaken Community Associations to the point where they probably won't exist in the future. Then if the District model fails because of competing interests among the neighbourhoods there will be nothing left.
- The CFR Task Force has landed on the District Model with minimal research. We heard that only five cities (only three could be identified by the City representative) were studied. Surely a larger sample size should have been examined. The Task Force should have done much more work before arriving at this conclusion. The four overarching goals set out by the Task Force focused on helping Community Associations (CA) becoming more representative of their community, creating a better relationship between CAs and the City, improving City processes and providing support and resources for CAs to include community groups. However, the City has admitted that the purpose of District Forums is to improve effectiveness and efficiency in the planning process. It has more to do with process improvement than inclusivity. The City needs to be forthcoming as to its real agenda. The District Model is an intermediate step between local issues best left to the CA and City-wide issues which are too large and complex for a District Model. Small land use re-designations, development permits and traffic and parking issues should be handled by the CA. They are closest to local issues that affect residents. Large issues, policies and initiatives that affect all citizens equally across the City need to be handled by the Planning Commission, professional staff and Council. The District Model is intermediate between these two end members. It might be considered a regional advisory group. It is important that the District Model does not engage in scope creep by getting involved in local community issues or by encroaching on higher level City work. The District Model will be increasing diversity adding more community groups as members. Member dynamics will be changed by diversity of knowledge and opinions requiring enhanced facilitation. Representatives from CAs who will serve on the District will need to act in the best interest of the



District and not necessarily the best interest of their CA. The District Model can either be an issues focused body which disbands after a decision has been made or it can be a standing body that is on stand-by waiting for a new issue to be presented to it. The District Model must have a clear mandate, rigorous processes and procedures, strong governance principles and enforcement from a strong chair.

- The District model feels like a solution to a problem that doesn't exist? Larger infrastructure projects or zoning changes already bring in diverse groups from businesses, communities and other stakeholders in an ad hoc way. But codifying the process gives the perception of "doctoring" the input which the City will receive, by choosing exactly who can be involved in the process. As well - burnout of volunteers is a large issue, which needs to be factored. With community associations, residents and homeowners associations, and all the other possible stakeholders constantly scrambling for volunteers, and to "educate" those volunteers and other members, I am fearful that the "District" model will just add another layer of meetings and email, which will potentially overwhelm volunteers and contribute to even quicker burnout for those people.
- In my opinion, the excessive number of participants that is proposed, most without planning experience and knowledge of the local context, will dilute the experience of those that actually know what they're doing with respect to reviewing land use amendments and development permits. At the session, one of the facilitators asked what it would take for communities to give up their right to comment on land use amendments and development permits, and delegate it to the CRF. We would never agree to that. Our lengthy and multi-year experience with the Authority totally ignoring or paying only lip-service to our community's review and comments on LOCs and DPs tells us that things wouldn't improve if we no longer had the right to comment on and appeal their decisions. If the culture in the Authority wanted to be collaborative and transparent they would already recognise the fact-based defects in most DPs, when they are pointed out, and either compel the developer to fix them or deny the application. I've had planners tell me in social situations that the City's policy is to be developer-friendly and let the appeal board give the bad news to the developer. That is absolute nonsense. It puts the burden on communities and affected neighbors to do the job the Authority and planners should be doing, and are supposedly trained/ educated to do. More specific guidance from Council and senior management is definitely needed. It's also apparent to me that the Authority relies on 'no comment' submissions from CAs, and the lack of knowledge wrt planning matters by most affected parties to allow developments with multi-relaxations and disregard for statutory policies to be built without anyone invoking an appeal.
- The district forum should be renamed the District Engagement Forum. This is a forum and a process of engagement for all stakeholders.
- There should be set parameters and boundaries set for each forum. Combination of CA's with similar demographics, etc.
- Set times per year for each forum to meet.
- It should also be determined how much weight and influence should be given to each stakeholder. No veto ever, but agreements on consensus.



- Every stakeholder should have to “sign off” on projects or indicate no issue. Deadlines for sign off to make sure that one group does not hold up the rest. A city position should be given and if stakeholders do not respond in a given time, they are found to be in agreement with the city position.
- HHBH shares the concerns of many other CA representatives who are concerned that the proposed District Model may lead to local communities no longer having a voice in the developments that may profoundly affect them. We recognize that there are possible positive uses for the District Model. It would give adjacent communities the opportunity to engage on matters that have an impact beyond one community. By way of example, the re-development of North Hill Mall will have a direct impact on the communities of Hounsfeld Heights / Briar Hill and Capitol Hill, as well as the SAIT community. There are also communities that will be indirectly affected because of their proximity and use of North Hill Mall and local library, including Banff Trail, West Hillhurst, St. Andrews Heights, and Parkdale. It would be good to have a mechanism where different voices from these communities come to the table to provide input on that development. It would also be useful to have a District Model to enable discussion of how to manage issues that affect all communities in the City, including cannabis stores and secondary suites. We have concerns about how Districts will be decided. A District Model may run against the reality that the interest of local communities is often driven by the issue. For example, for the Crowchild Trail expansion, the logical community partners with HHBH might be Banff Trail, St. Andrews, Parkdale and West Hillhurst because we are all close together and bound the existing road. On the other hand, if we are engaged in something happening at SAIT it might make more sense to collaborate with Capitol Hill, West Hillhurst, Hillhurst and Rosedale. Collaborative groupings like this may be more flexible and issue specific than districts. The District Model should be set up so that it is advisory only. It is very difficult for people in volunteer positions, even within local CAs, to ensure that they are speaking for the local community. This would even be more the case where a District Group is attempting to gather input from an area that covers up to five existing communities. The District Model should not lose sight of the fact that those in closest proximity will be most affected by any development that takes place. Under no circumstances should members of one local community dictate what the long-term development of another local community should look like. Those who live in those communities need to have their voices heard in the ongoing developments that affect them. As a final note, the District Model should be respectful of the legal framework in the Municipal Government Act, as well as case law which has interpreted who is affected by development. Those who live in close proximity are generally the most affected by proposed developments, and that is clearly reflected in the law. Any new model needs to ensure that those who are located in close proximity and are therefore affected by a proposed development do not lose their ability to provide meaningful input into that development.
- District boundaries should group contiguous and physically similar communities as these would most likely be willing to cooperate on planning issues that cross community boundaries. Adjacent CAs don't always work closely together for various reasons. representation should be drawn from existing geographically delineated organizations (CAs, RAs, BIAs, churches etc.), leaving those organizations to respond to organization specific issues (infills, local rezoning) that do not cross the geographic boundaries Representatives to the district forums should focus on the wider issues



(public transportation, regional parks, large area developments like shopping malls, hospitals etc.) and then report back community associations, resident associations, BIAs, churches through their individual planning committees or governing boards. This would have the effect of reducing volunteer commitments required from every group and the forums could seek representatives who are more interested in bigger, cross-boundary issues. Selection of representatives should avoid including single issue interest groups. Skewed input generally comes from groups who have self interests, particular agendas and controversial reasons to exist in the first place. At district forum discussions, we should avoid having to revisit the ‘we are excluded...we are not heard...’ issues. Our CA’s planning group experimented with a “multi-stakeholder task force” to attempt to bring diverse stakeholders into the community’s planning responses – representation started with residents, a United Church, several developers, several representatives from key City of Calgary departments including Planning and Transportation. Review of this experience could provide additional insights.

- A good example of a local District Forum is the South Shaganappi Area Development Council (SSADC) where members meet cooperatively to deal with regional planning matters and include neighbouring CAs, the University, and industry – so the model does exist in Calgary but as an overlay to the traditional CA managed engagement process.
- Success of the district forum approach will depend on the details. Additional stakeholder input on the details should be considered by the Community Representation Framework Task Force.
- It is only one of several planning forums that are needed. It can work when the planning issue is one that affects several communities within a geographic are. It possibly needs to have flexible boundaries. It needs to have very clear terms of reference for what it will participate in and what it won’t.
- There need to be forums for much bigger picture planning issues (e.g Olympic bid, new arena, flexibility with densification etc.).
- The district forum should be renamed the District Engagement Forum. This is a forum and a process of engagement for all stakeholders.
- There should be set parameters and boundaries set for each forum. Combination of CA’s with similar demographics, etc.
- Set times per year for each forum to meet.
- It should also be determined how much weight and influence should be given to each stakeholder. No veto ever, but agreements on consensus.
- Every stakeholder should have to “sign off” on projects or indicate no issue. Deadlines for sign off to make sure that one group does not hold up the rest. A city position should be given and if stakeholders do not respond in a given time, they are found to be in agreement with the city position.
- Should be following a fluid model by identifying individual projects that affect interested communities. A model set by geographic boundaries only could leave out communities affected by a project proposed only to the geographic model



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## From workshop flipcharts and post-it notes

The following are notes from the flipchart papers and post-it notes. The group numbers are there just to show that the comments came from the same table.

### Group 1

- Without preserving a significant role for a CA (in district model) community concerns may be swamped in a broad discussion
- Consult with communities who should be involved
  - 1. street
  - 2. Community
  - 3. District
- Prefer evolving district depending on the project
- No one size fits all
- Lose historical significance that is confined to inner city communities
- Don't want to lose historical uniqueness of those communities
- CAs need to provide rep to district forum
- City must better engage CAs
- On an issue by issue basis the City should ask for community input/consent before recognizing a district for a particular issue
- District model needs the local but need big picture too, **MUST BALANCE**
- Need standard fixed district
- Need well defined membership and goals, core defined goals
- Top down approach, bad when it comes to addressing issues a specific community issue
- A district model must acknowledge the role/view of a CA in consultation on a process
- City planning has to check its biases
- Each issue should be approached by the city first consulting with the CAs affected and get affected CA input on the district, strategy, etc. the CAs should have input on the size of the "district" and its governance structure.

### Group 2

- 1at what is the purpose of a district?
- One size does not fit all
- District model mirror the existing model
- Con: cooperation but not a common voice
- Pro: cooperation
- Pro: district model common vision
- Pro: common agenda
- district by infrastructure
- district geographic – vertical village high-rise
- district by era X2
  - 1960s
- District by ward



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- District by physical structure
- District by need
- What are the resource framework
- What was discarded before the district model idea
- City planning must include by-law checklist volunteers do not know bylaws

## Group 3

- Process instead of structure
  - Issue based – process adapts to the structure
  - Keep it a process, make council accountable (using community advocate)
  - Problem: once it is handed over to administration it becomes a structure
- District risk: becomes a voice for developers
- No to an approach if a larger voice can override it. If BRTs are in the area, more engagement, more resources, from the developer
- Representative community engagement standards for all the member communities
- Con: standards are needed
- The community needs to come together to define a terms of reference (we are the important elements)
  - Cannot be limited by peoples formal education, because we are volunteers
  - To impose these limitations would be a loss of knowledge
  - But some CAs do need the expertise
- Need for equal representation from the area (important)
- If communities are driving – success, if not it won't succeed
- Biggest issue: people, not enough people at the right time
- Advantage for community, working together across, coverage, best practice, leaning on each other
- District model: maybe the City should look at reorganizing themselves as a forum/district
  - Look at the CA structure, create a consistent team/ reps that the communities are working with

## Group 4

- This timeline isn't appropriate for this work
- Desire for better access to planners who have a firsthand understand of the community
- Don't commit to the District model if the FCC and NPCs can/should do it better if properly resourced
- Double standards and barriers for simple tasks or questions
- Some assurance within this process that community concerns have been heard
- No city sponsorship for communities to collaborate on issues
- "A lot of effort for not much return"
- District help build capacity and leverage past learnings and best practices
- Feeling that City decision makers don't have an understanding of actual community context
- Invest in social aspects of networking
- Does this structure already exist within the FCC?
- Concern that this layer of bureaucracy takes power away from community



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- Properly fund and resource FCC and NPCs to support CAs. No need to create a district model to do same again
- Fluidity of borders may lead to being drawn to many conversations

## Group 5

- District defined by project/issue
  - City defines voices
- Could be the end of CAs
- Limited player involvement
- Still want neighbourhoods respected
- District could work based on scope/scale
- City should support building at way cheaper RO & CAs
- District has to be flexible – change or project dependent
- Impact assessment to determine district stakeholders
- Defined list of vices to engage with each project
- Fluid districts
- City financial support (buildings, billboards,) to let CAs focus on advocacy and programs
- Help to stagger projects and coordinate projects that rely on each other's outputs
- Don't want to lose unique community architecture
- Need to do impact assessment to determine district members
- The district model may dedicate more resources to advertising City projects and plans
- Need fluid districts depending on scopes

## Group 6

- Clear mandate, process, governance
- Well defined
- Access to professional resources
- Will work for some things – clearly define what those are
- Avenues for accessibility in engagement
- Other stakeholder groups involved
  - Ex. Consider those who work in area, not just residents (Quarry Park example)
- Large infrastructure should be considered
- Greenfield communities should be looked at by district model
- Does the model come together on issues basis or is it standing / always? Does it disband when no issues to address?
- When there's no issue for one district they could resource other districts
- Don't get into the minutiae at district level
- Will be successful if you lower expectations and pilot it a few times
- Model could look at things 5 years ahead be proactive group
- Pilot a few versions – run for a year or two
  - Pilot a few very diverse communities to get a better understanding
  - So you can work out kinks, and make best model



- Consider a Stipend / grant for reps on model
- Interview reps on model to see fit
- Need to define scope
  - Is it about planning issues only?
    - Opportunities for it to be more
  - Have to be willing to cross boundaries
- Vision? – no one interprets that correctly
  - Tough to write
  - Should be unique to each district
  - Inclusion / transparency
  - Fluid boundaries
  - How many communities per?
  - Beneficial to bring diverse communities together for diverse views – not just “like” communities together
  - Boundaries of district model should be flexible over time
- Needs a specific focus
- Not for city-wide – geographic bundles not an answer to city wide issues
- What about sector wide (i.e. Crowchild)
- Is this the same as wards – does it duplicate the Councillors role?
- Hope it doesn’t become bureaucratic
  - Simple not a bureaucracy
- Base membership on demographics (i.e. seniors, youth, etc.)
- Meeting times that work for wider demo
- Could limit participation

## Group 7

- If districts are there, what do we need CA's for?
- Is this a push to get rid of CA's?
  - CA's are the identity of the community
  - CA's don't want to be lost in district format
- CA's provide value as identity of residents
  - Don't necessarily need fixed districts
  - CA's / communities maintain voice. Keep issues local
- Fixed district for regular meetings / education / collaboration
- Ad hoc district for big issues
  - Different groupings
- If CA's disappear, who will do the work in the community?
- If districts are to work:
- District membership
  - Core members
  - Network of core members
- Information given to City needs to be used by The City and not just do their own thing



- City doesn't listen and has their own agenda
- Who has common interests on a particular issue - need to be at the table
- When The City makes visionary decisions, it's not clearly explained (e.g. BRT) that projects are 10, 20, 30 years in the future
- Fluidity w/ The City in how they deal w/ communities. Respect realities of communities, e.g. RA shouldn't set up a community clean up
- More involvement of district reps in major community planning. Not just every 40 years! Stronger voice, based on our experience
- City offer resources to community-led visioning and other exercises
- Concern it will result in new / more / too many meetings
- City staff to support / organize meetings could make it work
- Keep the CAs but shift the district (ad hoc) based on the issue
- If the CAs go, who will take on all the work? Not the single staff member
- Core members, but use them to reach other relevant groups
- Info collected by The City, through the district, has to actually be used
- Those involved have to have real interest in the issue. Must be a fluid model
- Need more support f/ The City to help explain long-term planning
- When the district tells The City / developer "we need more info" we need then to support that
- Fear this district model is being set up to support more density
- Training to understand city growth issues so the area representatives can be better advocates
- Districts are being set up to promote particular agendas (density)?
- Rumors that an increase in density in a community could result in an increase in funding to community amenities
- If issues are explained a residents / CA's educated then more beneficial conversations and better conduit of information between residents and The City / developers, etc.
- If you aren't in "the box" then you may not access certain programs
- Can CA's have more say / review ARP's more often
  - Add value / balance within district
- Visioning exercise to look at more targeted approach to ARP / density development
  - City can help
- (Con): One person has to bring info from district to CA's / communities
  - Can lead to burnout of those volunteers
- (Con): Adding too many logistical issues for volunteers
  - Could City provide staff to assist issues

### Verbatim – One flow conversations

There were a number of groups that had single flowing conversations. To keep them as they were they are captured separately in the verbatim. The themes, ideas, etc. shared in these conversations have been rolled up into the summary.



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## Group 1

- What does the district form look like in terms of scope?
- Why has council directed the CRF – what are you trying to fix?
- What is already working/established it is working well
- Consider it insulting that we are not inclusive
- District- people who don't have high stages have large influence (special interest groups)
- If it comes down to what I prioritize – my community takes my priority
- The city is looking out for the city – not the stakeholders
- Opportunities for diversity – should be written as inclusive
- Be clear about collective good – people in the community
- Community voice is lost within the district model
- CAs- we are not allowed to discriminate – we are the voice to the City, the Province, on behalf of the community
- There are opportunities to collaborate in some areas, but not all. E.g. main streets
- District forum structure: hard to understand as a structure vs. looking at it like a process – issue dependent
- Is the forum jumping to a structure? Should be more of a process
- City could improve its own communication tools, i.e. notice boards
- Inclusion: how to create this?
  - We put our residents in front of the City of Calgary
  - With more inclusion will this benefit you in anyway? By being inclusive?
- Define what a stakeholder is – you need to define this
- Is this only about planning processes?
  - When it comes to land use etc. it becomes very confusing
  - Social housing/resignation – different
- Confusion around scope
  - Improving communication tools, e.g. signage, mechanical things that can be done
  - Please provide a definition
- If you marry the engagement process and consulting that's what would work well?
- Risk: Membership – qualifications to be a member within district model = less inclusive
- Inclusive – appropriate for certain things
- Removing obstacles around diversity – identifying faith, gender, etc.
  - Opportunity to build the community i.e. neighbor day, rep from low income housing
- Who is not represented today, needs assessment on our end (e.g. social housing)
- City needs to re-establish trust
  - Lack of consistency in City staff, administration, large turnover, NPCs
- To put restrictions on participation would be difficult for us
- Collaboration with CAs – does that work for you?
  - Demographics are a factor for us
  - Barriers to participation: getting information out, and time. Need to improve the process, either provide more time or provide more information.



- Barriers: info – wrong channels, confusion. Time – not enough time. Need more/better for more inclusion.
- Part of the weakness identified is in the city process
- If we both got the circulations/communication would be better
- Shared major concerns around circulation process:
  - Shared with 4 communities
  - Corridor tow communities
  - Current state, now only one community gets the info
  - Timelines – not adequate once community get the info
- You are making it easier for the city – convenience
- Council needs to get to know their community! Not one or two people within the community
- I get the sense the Council does not want to deal/work with CAs
- We feel that the information is being manipulated
- This isn't representation
- Lack of communication in engagement, what we heard and what you did?
- CAs use a software system (street beat) that you can target circulation and send email blast, a more effective communication tool
- Resources
  - Education resources to leverage participation
  - Removing obstacles to participation – at the city level
  - Needs assessment to know what is missing
  - Street beat software – effective communication tool
- Transparency not always there is a gap, not as much information received now as previously
- City of Calgary website is bad, staff are overstretched, lack of communication
- You don't get responses, lack of time to respond
- Tell us what impacts us! No communication!
- 30 day communication minimum! (had when planning application)
  - 30 days to 6 weeks for communication
- Help communities scope these kinds of things
  - Challenge: communities have different demographics/zoning
- City needs to recognize community
- CAs should help one another (opportunity)
  - Share that information, avoid burnout, build capacity
- When CAs/residents/communities participate in engagement the City of Calgary needs to report back, not radio silence
- Something like street beat could help CAs communicate
  - But this is the City's responsibility- their initiative- they are responsible for communication
- Face to face: harder to work but ultimate engagement
- Clear, concise communication required so that everyone understands
- Crowchild trail engagement fantastic – closing the loop. E.g. the tunnel. Supporting pieces why/why not things can happen
- Consistency of city support (want to see the same faces)



- Could use someone from planning/or file advocate on behalf of the CAs, accountability needs to be political
- Developer engagement standards (helpful for CAs)
- Engaging the applicant (planning)
- Dissemination of information via traditional channels an online
- Opportunity for CAs to communicate, share best practices
  - Challenge when the FCC doesn't seem to support working with CAs

## Group 2

- There needs to be a clear definition of the CA and how it rolls up into the district
- Standardization of roles: CA, HOA, etc.
- The large number of folks who will build out each community brings large areas together
- Capacity: taking people out of the volunteer pool, each CA determining each capacity
- CAs bring that local feel and many are experiencing frustrating that time is being wasted with the community context
- How do you get the value of the voice?
  - And the group didn't agree?
- Who is making the appointments?
- There need to be clear parameters and clear decision. Honesty on where we are at. The City being honest at the events on what level of engagement we are at.
  - What will happen?
  - What you can change, and what you can't change
- You need to build trust first.
  - If you want inclusion it needs to be built in trust
  - You need to own what you will hear
  - Be clear and tell us what you need
- More engagement at the start
- The electronic dissemination has been useful but having it easily accessible would also be useful
- Knowledge needed
  - How do you get competing interests and non-relevant interests to work?
  - Support and info planning training is needed
  - There needs to be a dedicated person who supports this because there needs to be a level of understating of the process and what is involved in the process
- Fix the issues that happen at the ground level
  - Volunteer burnout
  - Fatigue
  - Disconnect
  - Few people and places to connect
- Look at how these resources are allocated by district? As a way to fix it?
- Loud and together existing communities that currently have networks are overpowering smaller community voices
- How do you have the smaller segments, the less organized community?



- Having the groups like faith agencies, service agencies be a part of issues is a challenge
- Scope when is appropriate:
  - Certain number of people
  - Service hubs
  - Main street
  - Transportation – areas defined by major infrastructure
  - Anything that deals with local issues keep it local
  - Using the natural barriers as divisions. Need to define these and using them as a way to define the districts:
    - Hospitals
    - Large service centers
    - Transit systems
    - Cultural and city similarities
- When does it get used? Being well defined in where the district is used
- Mega projects it makes sense
- Huge work to have a common vision
  - One specific area – challenge of having it built out over a long period of time
  - Challenge of having it built out over a long period of time
  - Need the resources
    - City does it when that crucial mass is happening, need to define what is a community issue what is a district issue
  - Having it (community vision) be a leverage of the critical mass that natural forms
- The city needs to define:
  - What
  - When
  - How
- Need to have an education forum as well
- Membership
  - Not volunteer
  - Representative of the local
  - Not city staff – 3<sup>rd</sup> party
    - A non-partisan person
    - Non political
    - Someone who will be an advocate for the community, paid by the city at arm's length
    - This needs to be them member because of the burn out of the volunteers
    - They need to have a record of the community on a holistic way that remembers what happens in years past
    - Person who knows, has the context, is a hired advocate, this cuts out a lot of the noise
    - Question of who pays for it?
  - One way to find them is identifying community champions, through an independent interview process and they work together to represent the district and community as a whole
  - Having it linked to the volunteer and the CAs (the position)



- Important: don't lose the knowledge, capacity, continuity at the CA level
- Challenge is how do you provide a cohesive voice?
- Discussion over archivist and convener vs. the advocate
  - The advocate being objective not subjective, share of information, like an NPC or local dedicated planner
- Having someone who is knowledgeable, and takes the courses
- We have a fractured community, how can we have a common voice?
  - Let's create a strong representation within a neighbourhood
  - Early communication
  - Parameters of what the district looks like
  - Then forming a district from that, having the City and the groups have them connect and they pilot
- Education
  - District – role and capacity
  - CA –role and capacity
- Have all of the district forum stakeholders been engaged and are in consensus?
- Having the things that pull the communities together
- Change the cycles in the planning process
  - At the district model you will need more time
  - CA resourcing is also very quick for 2 weeks (need more time)

### Group 3

- Financial resources – need budget
- Communications support
- Volunteers
- Burn out
- Need more supports
- Trying to fit into geographic boundaries doesn't make sense
  - Need two levels
- Fear – makes people inclusive – more people come
- How do we define geographic groups?
- Need greater understanding of City of Calgary planning hierarchy
- CA role is daily operations
- Different groups of people come out for different issues/topics
- Can't force people if no interest
- People self-select
- Planning overload in some communities
- No way to reach apartments/condo residents
  - City access to residents?
- Cultural, language barriers
- Renters vs. owners = interests
- Time



- Interest
- Ability to attend
- Relevance
- Look to the MDP and groups engaged
- Minimize the amount of engagement – coordination – review of past work
- Large scale building work and the projects move forward
  - Criteria for community engagement
- Community's 1<sup>st</sup> point of contact
- Type of communications dependent on age group – seniors don't do well online
- Difficult to get flyers delivered
- Designated area depending on size of project
- Discretionary timelines
- Ability to communicate with file manager
  - Circulation protocol
  - Ability to see status of a file online
- Need to connect with developer early
- District model allows for area wide review – looking for duplication etc.
- Strength would be (of district model) more communication with CA, access to see what files are active and supporting documents
- CAs are not treated as a partner
- Dialogue with planner would make it easier
- Training
  - FCC partners in planning
  - City training – how to be discrete and apply it to communities, not just a check box
- Diversity
  - Members may be diverse, but not specifically identified or purposely selected
- Don't have an issue vs. too much in district map – lose the feel of a particular neighbourhood
  - Question: is the goal homogeneous?
- Criteria for what is reviewed:
  - Regional planner
  - Data base of contacts
- Good: if it keeps the planner up to date and planners/ developers follow it
- District model should follow main streets
- Loss of character of community, how does district model address this?
- Principles are in the MDP- targets
- Isn't this what the DAG was for?
- Are we trying to get rid of ARPs?
- 20-30 CAs and communities of interest
- Similar to the south 'Shaganappi group
  - Connections
  - Transportation



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## Group 4

- Community voice cannot be lost
  - Don't lose the voice and needs of the community over the needs of the City of Calgary
- Looks like the voice of the CA is being taken away
- There are things that need to be kept to CA and others that could work for a bigger area
  - Main streets
  - Crowchild
  - Question: are we not doing this already?
- We are jumping to a structure vs. a process
  - E.g. issues
- Depending on the issue is where this should be applied
  - Should be based on topic and the scale
- Afraid that this will move to the structure without thinking about the process
- Can't impose more demands on our existing resources
- Keep the low density and residential things at the community level
- Being inclusive of too many special interests could drive it in the wrong direction
- Does this just stay at planning or does it go beyond that?
- This looks like a process reinventing of an existing process that already exists. the engagement process that the city already has
- The city needs to use its process on engagement
- The relevant building documents, policies (MGA), must be applied if this is just for planning
- Definition around what "planning" goes and is defined by the district
  - Is it just zoning? Is it parks? Etc.
  - There needs to be a clear definition of a matrix of what this scope is
- Concern that having just an expert voice at the district model would be inherently exclusive. Need to have resources that support those who are not experts in an area.
- Removing obstacles to participation by being welcomed regardless of who you are and to what group you belong to
  - This is something the city needs to do
- Doing a needs assessment to know who you are missing from your membership
- The city needs to re-establish trust. They have done of things to ignore community feedback.
- The burden has been put on CAs to do a lot of work that the city should be doing
- There is a lot of change over on the city side that process wise is making this difficult. There is a lot of change over and inconsistency at the city level, and experience at the table in terms of who they get to interact with and work with.
- Having a hierarchy of topics
  - Right now it is at the CA and the district
- Have to accept that when you reach out that there will also be reach in
- Timelines – 2 weeks to review DPs
- Quality information and time are huge participation
- You need to either provide more information or time or broaden knowledgeable people in the community



- Part of the problem the city has identified in the goals is an issue within its own process
- If both got the circulation then they would get to talk about it and leverage each other's capacity (adjacent communities)
- Get better at circulation and to who especially along corridors and the areas that are adjacent
  - To who
  - Timelines are way too fast
  - Clarity on who the file manager is and for the info to be sent out with enough time to be sent out to the community
- This is looking like the city is looking at one process to do everything by one group. A lot of this is coming from council to get one voice, this is looking like council is not wanting to deal with community.
- Our backs are up because they just want to rubber stamp and they don't want to deal with us, they don't want to listen to the diversity of voices.
- An acknowledgment of what went well and what didn't after the fact (of a city project) is needed
- Resources
  - Trustful information – city talks a lot about transparency but that's not what you get on an application.
  - The applications don't have all of the background information you used to (e.g. bylaws)
  - Website is hard to navigate
  - More diligence throughout the process and recognition of how communities meet so you can meet the circulation timelines. 30 days to 6 weeks would be better so that we have more time to respond.
- Capacity building:
  - Helping CAs scope these issues and applications
  - Being appropriate to the CAs capacity and zoning and what the existing state of the community is like. The community context and experience within the planning process.
  - Building capacity to manage change in communities.
  - The district forum would be an opportunity to share info and experience, help others so they don't burn each other out.
- City needs to put money behind it and on what (the people) they already have
- Follow through!
- Provide feedback on what the next steps are: what are you doing with the information you collected? Finish it! Close the loop.
- Communities could benefit from something like a site license or the city could have a site that share the information to people directly
- Being more direct in reaching people directly
- Face to face with the people within the communities
  - The hard work but the thing that pays off the most
  - Having tools that enable and get people into the building and participating
- Clear and concise of why are there. Follow up on what was discussed. Having the follow up and reporting it back. What is the idea, what is the next step, what is the outcome.
- Resources: support from the City of Calgary



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- Consistent staff by the City of Calgary
- Good and clear information
- Planning advocate for the CA
  - E.g. At the council office so that there is a line of site
  - Represent each community by the community
  - Like an ombudsman – the accountability has to be political but also the community
- Developer standards of what is expected of them
- Still need to be face to face for the older communities and those who are not connected online
- Spend the time ahead of time
- A forum where these things are shared. A conference call?
  - Someone to sponsor it: a phone line where people share ideas and best practices
- District model
  - Process instead of a structure would work
  - Process adapts based on the issue
  - Process for broadening or narrowing
  - The way you make it an accountable process e.g. Via community advocate, to council
  - Structure isn't always warranted
  - Fear is that this will become a voice for developers
  - Should stay at the level projects like main streets
  - A bunch of people can't override the vision of a community
- There needs to be more engagement by developers, by the people doing the development
- Engagement standards – so that then it is responsive to the community
- Membership can't be limited by formal education it needs to be inclusive regardless of education and be inclusive of lived experience
- Although having a balance is important with education because you need some level of expertise
- There needs to be representation for the business who are part of the local area
- A success will be if the communities are driving it. If they are not it won't be successful. Nothing having enough people makes everything challenging by having a district you could have some of that leveraged and reduced.
- A district model would be useful if it was applied to the city administration. If they applied it would at least get a consistent team that doesn't lose institutional memory.

## Group 5

- Con: horrible move
  - Gentrification
- New development: sign board
  - Member contact info
  - Anyone who has interest/concerns
  - Should be part of the process
- District- can have very different needs. Another are for developers to overlook the community needs
- Task Force – vested interest in development (banking, developers, etc.)
  - Stand to gain at loss of community
  - Area development plans and CA marginalized



- Not balanced approach
- Limited view/clout as volunteers
- Developers/developments have benefit but really need to focus by community
  - Case by case basis (large/small)
  - Don't want to prohibit development but needs to be lanaced
  - Community needs to shepherd development
- Communities have different ideas of development and different priorities
- No need for district forum, too different of views
- Lack of city engagement – afterthought for the community
- City processes need to improve not the CA
- Lack of understanding around city processes, law? (MGA, etc.)
- Improvement: planning departments need to educate CA on process and rights
- City develops in spite of CA requirements
- Goal/transparency of Task Force?
- What resources are available and how can CAs leverage City resources
- Who can advocate on behalf of CAs
- How to navigate City processes/practices
  - Not consistent between different CAs
- Lack of tools to manage projects for CAs
- Need to better understand the purpose of the district forum
- District model presented as the only option
  - Very opaque process
  - No transparency (i.e. Minutes)
- Task Force
  - Inefficient
  - Inconsistent messaging
  - How did District model get to be only option? Not inclusive
- Trust?
- End results are already decided prior to CA engagement
- Charette
  - Difficult to participate
  - Need time off work
  - Not accessible to all
  - Not inclusive
- Transparency is not just providing a decision document. Needs to have method to encourage two way communication.
- What project for a district approach?
- i.e. faith based organizations have different priorities, do we need special groups to be part of the meeting in order to be 'inclusive'/representative
- District – some CA voices would be overlooked
- same priorities as other communities, has some benefit
- Why isn't City reaching out to divers group they feel are being excluded?



- Some CAs already model the district approach for big projects, reach out to communities that may be impacted
- Need to still keep in mind the individual CA needs even in district model
- Need better formal communication within and including different CAs
- Training
  - City process/practice knowledge
  - Rights as a CA/individual
  - Potential to ID community individuals that could become trained as ‘resident experts’
  - Time commitment can be difficult to achieve
  - Social media – Facebook, twitter, website, newsletter,
    - Money, and effort
    - Doesn’t necessarily equal engagement, just because people are informed
  - Adding value
    - Uphill battle/defeated
  - Engagement: priorities, value/benefit of development
    - Subcommittee to address specific organizations need
- Burnout because can’t move forward/facilitate change
- district cannot solve engagement – CA’s need to work
- One on one with project management of development organizations very effective
- Access to who is who
- Electronic circulation not just email
  - Portal by community
  - Portal issue with copyright
  - Administration within the community
  - Cloud based public info
- Having one person managing one application can get overwhelming by portal access/feedback
- Single place/resource/technology to access information
  - Better transparency
  - Intuitive technology
- More informal opportunities to meet other CAs
  - Like today’s session
- Opportunities for NPC to facilitate/offer channels for open communication
- What are the channels to communicate with different city officials?
- Partners in planning is a great resource
- Cloud based access to data
  - DP
  - Portal access
- What is district approach?
  - Who
  - When
- Pros: if city commits resources (legal, administrative, etc.) would have potential to be successful
- Mediator/3<sup>rd</sup> party to run meetings would be beneficial



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- Reduces NIMBY effect
- When do we apply district model?
- How do we ensure fairness?
  - Need to be objective
- Feel that it is too early to determine benefit
  - Feel that the district model is a done deal
  - Not transparent
- Project approach – membership based on size/priority
- Will the district model bog down/increase timelines of current process?
- When does the district committee get involved and impact of involvement?
- More paperwork?
- Would planning department need to realign their mandate?
  - Better quality development?

## Group 6

- FOIP implications, can't ask diversity question
- Make a point to be welcoming and inclusive
- Found the survey offensive
- Groups self-select based on interest not on diversity
- They come as themselves, not as representatives of specific diversity group
- Use social media, different channels to reach wide variety
- Only requirement is you live in community
- Ex. Youth are interested in other things (not planning) can't force them to come out
- Broad communications to reach everyone
- Who about when there is no consensus?
- How would representatives be chosen?
- Some CAs are more sophisticated in development review than others
- Planning a difficult subject matter to understand and get involved in
- Huge resource drain on volunteers (part time job)
- Some CAs have paid staff
- Another meeting to attend (capacity issue)
- Many people join for one specific thing/interest area
- Fear that group wouldn't understand local community needs
- How do you know other groups are representative (i.e. has a church polled their members)
- If it hits home they want to engage
  - RCG (lots of interests) vs. main streets (no interest) example
- Some take efforts to go door to door
- Community – little town within Calgary
- CAs care about every application, worried that gets lost at the district level
- Issues will get watered down
- Worried about potential district make up
  - Some communities aren't compatible, R1 communities vs. high rise, etc.



- Broken promises from the City of Calgary
  - E.g. feeder bus removed after West LRT
- Lack of trust exists based on past experience
- CAs are responsive to be the point of contact for circulation
- Bring more people in, more work for these people but is anything going to change? Are you going to listen to the input on applications, because planning currently doesn't so it would just waste more time.
- Can't we make a better use of resources and capacity at the local level
- Concerned about notice posting process
- For localized issues- worry about loss of say at the district
- Worried developers will be on district and pay for process to go their way
- Starting from scratch to get everyone up to speed
- Development committee members are passionate
- Taking partners in planning is a big investment
- Fear of radicals against everything on district
- Putting groups against each other
- Who is relevant? You become one voice.
- Whose voice overrides
- Are they going to be handpicked by council
- Membership will be critical (CAs)
- Can see opportunity for collaboration
- Everything we do has an impact somewhere else
- Might be opportunity for reverse advocacy
- Individual CAs can share overarching issues
- Planning liaison – dedicated resource to CAs
- More defined engagement process for applicants and city on applications
- Need better engagement process
- Large model could get better information
- Can't we just do broader engagement
- Power in numbers, on common issues in the district model
- Each community is distinct. Vision needs to respect individuality of each. Would be hard to create a vision for 5.
- Purpose to look at large redevelopments (i.e. north hill mall, mail streets)
- Guiding principles – consistent
- Does it just provide advice? To individual CAs or to City?
- Will it be engagement that effects change?
- Staffing function to gather info and share
- Need to understand the why
- City wide polices/wider issues for the district i.e. cannabis
- Good settlement – leaves everyone a little grumpy
- levels of issues to address



- Screening antenna for what goes to the district?
- Discussion of trade-offs, but experience with being bulldozed instead.
- Resident association, mixed opinions on inclusion, some are “private clubs”.
- Shouldn’t be decision makers/advisory role
- Worry this replaces the CA
- How is it relevant? For a DP it doesn’t matter what age, sex, orientation, religion or other that you are!
- Inclusion/membership
  - Don’t assume that we don’t have diversity whole at the same time limiting us through FOIP and privacy. We may have LGBT, various religions, renters/owners, married/single, etc. but we don’t even know. We certainly can’t ask and there is no reason to.
- Discrepancy in training, to make decisions on things
- Only hear opposition on things, don’t hear from people who support (NIMBY)
- Use resources we already have

## Group 7

- Scalability within planning process
- What is the city trying to fix
- Trust that we will be heard
- District model: beyond just geography, could be church, etc.
  - District evolving out of local area plans
  - Who runs the district? People who are part of the community
  - District who governs a district and the area of communities?
  - District implies geography? Why can’t you have likeminded or different communities?
  - Grouping like communities with like infrastructure, like challenges, like transportation
  - Challenge now is getting enough people out to our existing issues
  - There would be a large vote?
  - Invite based on what is discussed?
  - What power does a district have?
    - Don’t like having different CA, operating like small cities
  - Would this make it easier for the City of Calgary about area?
  - Talking about area, by topic, by project?
    - Big impact things
    - E.g. south ‘Shaganappi study
  - Being ad hoc – a district comes together based on projects
  - Doesn’t need to be permanent, comes together when it is needed
  - Cohesive impact of small, and many projects on an area could be useful, e.g. southland drive development
  - Would want to be there representing my area to respect my community because that is where the information is
  - What about a planning or presidents district? All the amenities, the people, the economics, etc. all the areas and issues that affect a community
  - When it is needed it comes together, when it is not it goes away



- A district is something there for the city to go to
- As a way for the city to share the same information in one space, as a way for the city to share the same consistent answer, highlighting what people agree and what they disagree on.
- Raising awareness and sharing information about issues like the highland park development impact on the water shed, instead of it just being a local issue
- You can define district in many ways
  - Would the city be conducive to a district not in line with local area plans?
    - E.g. flooding, the river, age of community
- Southwood is defining the local context, vision for the community to share with the city and developers
- Does it have teeth? It would need to be something that has ground to it
- How do the different plans fit together? Local plans are assumed to be ARPs/ASPs.
- Population based, design based, newer communities, older communities. Different rings of development
- Communities that can stand alone vs. communities that interdependent on one another
  - Can't figure out how this would work
  - There are so many barriers that prevent this from working
- Benefit of scale to having an ARP
- If you make it bigger would it make it more likely to have an ARP/ASP?
  - As you move out there are some economies of scale
- What is needed is a life cycle plan in communities, every community at some point needs planning help
- Gave each district an assigned planner, a single planner for each area
- Can't see ad hoc working because it is already a thing and already a challenge
- The people right by it have something invested in the local, direct issues that affect them
- A CA is about the right size for community issues
- If we did it by ward size?
- Planner at the city level
  - Whose client is the community
  - They are consistent for the community
  - They are there to translate, they translate issues in to plain language
  - Thing outside of the box and bring in greater planning context, a holistic approach
    - Transit
    - Pedestrian interface
  - Someone who is thinking about current plans and how they impact all aspects of a community and its quality of life
  - Not just limited to one planning application
- Better planning for things that already exist like the FCC
- If this takes away from CA it would diminish the power of the CA
- It is important that CA funding still happens, that the local context and those who know they are leveraged, that it is not lost
- The city providing direction to developers on local needs



- If the district comes forward will council listen more?
  - Needs to have teeth
  - If the district supports it then what happens if city council disagrees?
- How do you decide what is significant and goes to the district?
  - If it is ad-hoc then the special interest groups could take over?
  - Size, scale, impact:
    - CA: it should all stay at the CA level when it is the most important, felt
    - District: transportation plans, green line, water, roads, transit, ring road
- Planner and plan with extra resources could work, otherwise it is aggregation of the voices into one group so there is less to deal with.
  - Recourses where CAs would be willing to give up some of their say.
- So anything that is hyper local and has a large impact then it stays with the CA
- Anything that crosses areas that could be district based
  - Road corridors, water corridors
- Could be nice to have a say on bigger issues
- When we need to board a voice and an idea to carry more weight than a district could be useful, e.g. Letters of support from other communities
- Membership:
  - Keep it specific to planning them keep it specific to those groups
  - Essential that members have expertise in the planning process and planning decisions
  - If there are other topics happening then other experts need to be part of it too
  - Members should live in the district. There was disagreement on if working in the district or having a business was appropriate.
  - Members from each CA
- Defining the roles:
  - Who pays?
  - Needs to operate like a paid position
  - How are these districts funded besides CA funding?
  - Planners working with the communities because planning impacts people

## Group 8

- Confusing around some of the options the city has presented
- Some base level understanding of the MDP
- Level of detail – is this necessary?
- Challenges within so many communities
- Clarifying what is working and what is not within the current CA model?
- District model: I need to understand if this is an addition to current model, how would this work?
- What will it be resourcing?
- How will this work?
- Everyone has different knowledge, involvement
- Identify support based on best practices
- Risk- silos, people focus on their past projects



- As far as development permits coming there: immediate community issue, the CA can deal with it
- Vs. larger issues: would the voice of the community be strong?
- When you consult, listen to the CA residents.
- Diversity, acknowledge and made efforts to change
- Challenge if the model casts a wide net I would worry that issues and questions of a community would be lost (both communities and new CAs)
- Concern – how do you manage this? Is it open to the public
- Who is involved/required to attend?
- Big scope you'll have to manage
- Concern with planning – coaching that you currently
- Challenge not enough context to contribute for the idea of the district model
- Risk – you need someone who knows not random conversation
  - I.e. knowledge within planning (details, city, processes)
- Capacity demand on the community
- District model – micro meetings – capacity – challenge = stakeholder fatigue (dissolve from there)
- If you don't have credible voices at the table with the developer and the city = won't listen
- Should be a set of rules for CAs
- District – maybe wrong term, is this more than just planning?
- Risk: nature of each community
- What exactly are we talking about, functionality?
- This appears to be more ad-hoc
- This needs to be clarified, who's collecting feedback?
  - The district to represent the community or does the district write the letters on behalf of the ca? Challenge if there are all CAs. Differing opinions. (further away from the affected area = different opinion that could affect the outcome)
- People will go back to individual bias and community bias
- Challenge without consistency, training, knowledge. Baseline is needed.
- Am I asking on behalf of my community (training, knowledge, can see the big picture)
- Gotta love community – want to be there!
- When it comes to providing this level of information the city needs to listen and demonstrate that they are listening. If they can't do something with it tell why/why not?
- Value with that knowledge
- The city fails without providing required information
- Key from the city is to have a facilitator that can set the table with the DM
  - Honoring time of attendees = support the capacity issue
- I cannot represent my community fairly on a particular topic if I haven't engaged with them previously!
- If The city did proper engagement (re. notice drop to adjacent communities) then I wouldn't have to do it – building capacity
- Challenge: when you have a large development – how does the CA support (i.e. Mail drop)
  - Will this create an additional layer to the process?
  - Risk: duplication of work from the city and the CA



- Risk: diluting the message/ignoring the message
- How do different CAs/RAs/BAs collaborate effectively about a specific issue?
  - Reporting their issues accurately
- The City has to remember CAs has their timelines/turnaround
  - How will this be supported/communicated?
- How will this support/change/enhance our current model (communicating, engaging)
- Model challenge: including/encouraging participation
- Whatever is decided it needs to be executed well
- Review current CA model and enhance it with best practices!
- Clarify: idea state of a CA!
- Current state: is it clear to Calgarians the role/assistance CAs provide?
- Ways to support this:
  - Terms of reference
  - Best practices
  - Framework for CAs
  - Want a structure to encourage involvement, supports with tools and resources. Consistency and sustainability are a must.
- Current state of CAs – highly functional model – could be enhanced with tools and resourcing
- Could the role like NPC also provide a planning coordinator?
  - Support planning issues/challenges consistent connect to the City of Calgary
  - Desire to have a community member not city employee
- Terms of reference
  - I find this abstract, I want a better CA
  - Looking at this I am going to want to know this: define the purpose!
- Is this engagement at the forma level the responsibility of the CA to invite its members? Or will the city support this?
- What is the question, issue, concern that the CRF is trying to achieve? Where did this come from? What was the driver of this?
- What's not working? What can we do to fix it?
  - We are starting at the wrong place
  - Optics: that we aren't doing a good job!
  - What, why, how?

## Group 9

- What is the alternative to "District"?
- Development constantly is opposed
- Will this process be justification to do what they want
- City should have reached out initially
- City must work in a productive way
- CA will be one stepped removed
- Solution in search of a problem
- Go to where people live



- A lot of electronic reaching out
- Need more volunteers – ask for more volunteers
- Need paid positions
- Email list social media
- Questions in person / survey meet demographics
- Feedback from outsiders of community
- Large survey – in person encourages participation
- Constant need for volunteers – challenge
- How would you define participation in the DM? – challenge
- Challenges w/ DM – another bureaucratic level
- Diversity of inclusion / bad words – it's issue and interest based
- Policy based approached to planning
- Challenge: participation
  - Issue / interest based = involveme
- Policy based approach to planning
  - The City isn't a positive participant in the process
  - Broken trust
  - Override decisions
- Does it affect me?
- How do you define membership in district model?
- The City isn't a positive participant in process
- Policies can be in conflict w/ ARP / community
- Community coordinator is helpful
- Bold signs
- Participation – homeowners more than volunteers
- People who have an investment in the community
- Community Coordinator
- Events Coordinators
- How to involve renters more
- Message board / bold signs
- What is City's direction
- District could add another level
- Who would coordinate the district
- Potential with special interest groups
- Traffic committee
- How will administration of district work?
- How will it be organized? Administration and how will it work?
- Greenline enjoyed by everybody
- Lack of communication from The City challenge
- Challenge leveraging the knowledge base within the community
- DM connectivity opportunity



- Pd map is good
- Identity committee SMB on a particular topic
- District is good w/ connectivity proc – travel
- U of Studies was great resource
- CA is keepers of local experience. They have knowledge over time
- Coordinate w/ groups along larger topics
- Issue-based planning. Good example – Green Line
- The City needs to engage early not come to the table late
- Value in community – Legacy. The CA owns this should be valued / utilized
- Pd map and sandwich boards are good
- How much councillor cares
- City must plain language letters
- Lack of communication w/ e.g. secondary suites
- More stability and consistency with City person or planning point
- District approach must be w/ City
- Planners should be more engaged w/ community – site visits
- Planners have regional offices like NPCs
- City must look at district model like policies
  - Bowness more proactive
- All different file managers
- Concurrent applications are good – save \$
- If paid it would be very beneficial
- Regions are flexible
- Communities are different – unique – district different
- Will there be multiple systems? District and CA?
- Planning policy from 20 to 50 is a huge shift
- Does district make it more homogenous?
- Community characteristics. DM challenge inner city – suburbs common interests
- Huge change DM
- Define the value in the DM
- The City needs to engage more often and earlier
- Paid people = build capacity
- Planning process – concurrent process helpful
- Opposed to DM due to lack of info, change
- Maintain community voice
- Do ppl self-select to participate in the DM?
- Timeline challenges / coordination
- Communicating / direct line to PD = beneficial
- Challenge / portfolio breakdown?
- DM / district offices not the google earth
- The City needs to look at their service through DM lens!



- Issues based approach
- City should focus on planning – outreach, regardless of scale – CA / district
- The MOP is already used as a blunt instrument to override ARPs
- City is only placating / not real feedback
- Would the district have more clout – bargaining power
- It all starts w/ the City
- CA need more resources
- District could be good w/ smaller communities
- Communities have geographic size? Hillhurst vs Panorama? What are district size
- Is the local better than land based model
- District should be issue based
- Hard to comment w/ no information
- City should engage earlier w/ projects / communicate earlier
- Larger impact, more complex beneficial / district
- Decision makers should face the people
- Hold The City accountable
- “District Model” has bad connotation
- Volunteer incentives / honorariums
- Would the district model hold The City accountable legislative
- Loss of community voice
- Influence from external groups
- Challenge w/ DM is the diverse voices / the decision makers need to hear it!
- District approach would need to allow a larger voice!
- Communication – better from The City
- PD needs to follow-up with a workshop and talk to us about making the process better
- What other models were considered? Issue based vs geographic based
- Inclusive could be:
  - Store owners, renters, homeowners, multi-family
  - What does the legal definition of inclusion
  - e.g. BRT
    - focused conversations
    - Would district model diffuse?
    - Seniors felt neglected and pushed their way into issue to get voice heard
    - Sometimes designated representatives either don’t get info in time, restricted timelines and limited communication to multiple groups but info doesn’t always get out to masses
- What could be done better to identify stakeholder groups? By the plan proposers
- How do we “The City” get info to the appropriate groups
- Language diversity is a challenge to ensure more people know / understand what’s going on?
- Some families aren’t comfortable to come out
- Don’t put people into a reactionary state
- Better stakeholder group / category identification



- Needs to be done early in process
- Get feedback
- Get to more people in the community and use multiple channels to get to more residents
  - Learn who we reach
  - Learn who we may have missed
- Is the district membership “fluid” or “fixed”?
- Are districts being carved out ahead of time?
- District membership should be fluid and issue based
- Districts could be based on scale of project
- CA’s / RA’s can help pull different stakeholder groups to the table
- Not everyone in a district would be needed to provide feedback as they may not be affected / impacted directly
- People close to issue may lose voice in district model
- CA’s / RA’s represent residents politically and socially
- Will CA’s lose their say?
- Assume CA’s will continue to exist in new process
- Helps / trains new volunteers / CA members if they are part of the district, creates new connections and learning
- Can districts decide who is impacted?
- What does CA membership look like?
- How to resource CA’s to reach more people within their communities?
- Sometimes changeovers in CA Boards can create new ideas and new connections within the community
  - How can The City support
- Cultural Associations in the area
- Need translators as a resource
- BRT as example
  - Bring opposing groups to educate each other on issues
- Local retail owners (e.g. strip malls)
  - Management companies
- Schools
- School liaison
- Property owners / managers of strip malls / developments
- Non-profit groups, but can vary based on the issue
- Could benefit by getting diverse interests to talk to each other
- Cultural Associations. Some are very strong and political and can translate
- We need The City to lend some people to us to help reach our neighbourhoods
- In a community of 6000 we have 200 members. We are trying, but we’re not really representing the diversity of our area
- One benefit is that we could learn from other groups
- Concern over loss of voice for those most impacted
- Concerned that certain councillors are driving this based on their opinion of CAs



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

- The purpose of a CA is the political voice of the community
- Not every group in a district would need to have a say on all issues
- We don't need to have core membership. I can call my neighbouring CA if there's an issue
- Core membership should include CAs and RAs
- Better stakeholder analysis early on by The City
- Don't put people in a situation where they have to react
- Diversity of language required as our communities are more diverse
- More info and sharing consequences / impacts earlier on
- We need more time to comment (earlier info from The City)



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## Appendix 1 – worksheets

The following are the two worksheets participants had during the session. The second page is the working terms of reference.

**Use this space to write down anything you think is missed during the group conversation or you rather not share with the group but want the team to know about the topic area.**

Topic 1: membership, inclusion & diversity in participation

Topic 2 resources, capacity & training

Topic 3 the district model



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

The key elements of a terms of reference would include	
Task Force brainstorming suggestions	Your suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose</li> <li>• Goals</li> <li>• Objectives</li> <li>• Vision</li> </ul>	
<b>Responsibilities of District Forum</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of authority</li> <li>• Decision making</li> <li>• Reporting structure</li> <li>• Time commitments</li> <li>• Membership</li> <li>• Inclusion</li> <li>• Non-discrimination</li> <li>• Transparent operations</li> <li>• Open meetings</li> <li>• Minutes and record keeping</li> <li>• Communication and notifications</li> <li>• Financial accountability</li> <li>• Grievances, mediation procedures and corrective action</li> </ul>	
<b>Responsibilities of City Department(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Staff dedication</li> <li>• Programs and training</li> <li>• Grievances and appeals</li> <li>• Oversight</li> </ul>	



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

## Appendix 2 – Feedback form comments

The following is all of the comments we received on the evaluation forms. They are exactly as written. Only time anything is changed is when there is personally identifying information and that is shown by [personally identifying information removed].

Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Depends on whether Task Force listens to our comments			1		
This should have happened a year ago before the "District Model" was conceived			1		
There was no new information presented on which to base discussions					1
It is unclear whether this input will actually influence the outcome				1	
Confused on the outcome				1	
Would like to see percentages attached to "types" of comments so it is apparent what the views of all participants are		1			
See comment below vis-à-vis why we are doing this. Feels like this is a "done deal" and I am skeptical how our feedback will be used			1		
Feels like this is a "done deal" and I am skeptical how our feedback will be used			1		
Facilitator was great; effective at managing the table	1				
Useful to meet with other CA reps		1			
Skeptical that any of the comments will be listened to				1	
District model is still not clear				1	
Unsure if Council would react positively to conclusions of this study			1		
Would have been to have more context up front		1			
The Facilitator did an excellent job	1				
There are a lot of things I don't understand about the District Model			1		



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The questions should have been provided in hard copy. Difficult to hear facilitator			1		
I thought this meeting should have been in phase 1			1		
How will the task force make decisions / recommendations?			1		
Good facilitation at our table		1			
Not certain			1		
Some people dominated the conversation and topics				1	
Seems like the District Model is further along than our conversation		1			
I thought this was a good discussion		1			
I think the facilitators did a great job but I question whether The City will pay attention			1		
I have been involved and informed previously but have heard that there was not a proper "inform" period					
This process seems like a surprise, has been rolled out too quickly			1		
Almost not quite				1	
With reservations - I'm hopeful we're truly being listened to		1			
Unsure we're really going to be listened to				1	
It all depends on the results - if this is a smoke screen then no. If this info is being listened to and really will be addressed then yes.			1		
Our CA is not nearly aware enough of what is going on	1				
Why are we only involved beginning May / June 2018 when it started in 2016					1
No. The 3 topics were framed poorly for what I thought this was about				1	
It is not clear to me whether there are other options The City will consider					



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
That remains to be seen when you come back to us with what you heard	1	1			
Should have been provided original feedback, my communities response		1			
Group size was good, maybe slightly large	1				
I don't know what weight our voice has vs already collected data			1		
Meetings work - create educated opinions					
Purpose of this entire exercise is not defined and no clarity provided			1		
Time too short - no clear purpose				1	
Very vague				1	
No idea what will happen and no opportunity for review once this is put together				1	
Useful to connect with other communities			1		
Opportunity to gain others perspective		1			
Good format with small group discussions		1			
On-line background and stakeholder report back		1			
Opportunity for discussions beneficial		1			
We were able to voice our opinions		1			
Good format with small groups and facilitation. Would have preferred if City reps came out to CAs to provide face to face contact / Q&A	1				
Yes, but not sure if it will impact decisions. The CRF seems to evolve		1			
Small, respectful group discussion	1				
Yes					



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Pleased to have an opportunity. Should have taken place months ago					
No. The original School of Public Policy should have been available					
Understand that my comments were being heard but will Council hear?					
I appreciated the sharing of ideas, but uncertain if effective					
Lots of talk, lots of ideas but will it have any impact?			1		
We had a good table that shared and listened (thanks _____!)		1			
Not clear who will champion the ideas				1	
Collection is good but not sure how it will be interpreted or used		1			
It was good to meet other CA's and P&R committee members					
Too late to actually be a constructive part of this discussion				1	
The process to date did nothing to support this engagement					1
I have no trust as there has been no transparency					1
I have no idea what will actually be done or if I have effected change			1		
ok' but still uncertain IF city will consider input					

Please tell us any other thoughts or ideas
The failure to articulate and validate the problem / opportunity with Community Associations at the start of the process is a major shortfall and has the potential to invalidate the entire process. Working behind closed doors for 2 years before engaging directly affected stakeholders with the deadline for the City Council deadline for the project report is less than 6 months away
It would be useful to understand why The City is undertaking to make this change. It is hard to be in the right context without that
Still don't understand what the district model is, what the problem is that it's trying to solve, how it will be implemented
Stephanie and Brad are awesome
I have real concerns about the City Council standing on the board. I feel that they have made their decisions already



# Community Representation Framework

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

July 13, 2018

<b>Please tell us any other thoughts or ideas</b>
Poor acoustics
Once the CA's role is defined then work can begin on the district forum
What would be the kill switch on this project
Our facilitator [personally identifying information removed] rubs and picks his face a lot
Too little information has been shared concerning the District Model
Let us know about parking ahead of time
Could use screening of former city planning attendees. Rest of group could have produced more effective input. Could use longer session time. Thx
People do not know how we got to this point, e.g. the UofC Public Policy Report in 2016?
Our group believes issues-based groups would be more effective than geographically-based. Do not want community association model to change. Would like more resources - building maintenance, staff or City liaisons, NPC's are a good asset. Can we have dedicated planners for our area? CA's are a repository of knowledge - long term. We are also the interim dialog between residents and council and city departments