

# Transportation Corridor Study Review Project

## Consultant workshop

### Verbatim notes

April 8, 2014

During Part B of the engagement program in support of the Transportation Corridor Study Review Project, the project team invited third-party consultants that had worked with the City of Calgary Transportation Planning on previous transportation corridor study projects to a workshop on April 8, 2014.

The consultant workshop was part of the “shared learning” phase of engagement in support of the project. The workshop was held to understand the perspective of consultants about the way in which the City of Calgary has undertaken transportation corridor studies in the past with a focus on what processes should be included in the the new Transportation Corridor Study Terms of Reference Policy.

In total, 20 consultants attended the workshop. Attendees were asked to work together with the five to eight people sitting at their table to answer six questions developed by the project team. Once each question was answered, the group was encouraged to write down their answers and discuss with the larger group. The verbatim notes of the workshop are below.

### Verbatim notes

#### Question one: What top three or four objectives should the policy include?

- Define overarching phases of study and level of engagement for each phase
- How do you define “public” and when is it defined – Council defined? (initial)
- Allow flexibility
- Policy needs to be scalable by project type
- Policy must be defensible
- Define “Public Support” – so you know when you’ve achieved it. How do you quantify it?
- Seek to maximize public acceptance early on
- Action: marketing the policy – “friendlier” “picture the process”
- Overarching and confirmation of CTP principles
- Why we follow CTP – rationale?
- Identify who, what level, and when engagement will be undertaken
- Provide framework for citizens to understand expectations “road map”
- Timing of first opportunity for engagement (i.e. pre-RFP)
- Build support through the process
- Provide adequate opportunity for engagement
- Align with City vision and communicate this
- Work with stakeholders and public to define scope (pre-RFP)
- Gain public support for engagement process
- Flexibility to accommodate various studies
- Define a process for stakeholder identification

**Question two: What action items should be included in the policy?**

- Early engagement – determine how to engage different stakeholders
- Develop stakeholder-specific communications plans
- Multiple mediums & frequent
- Check-in points to revisit plan
- Flexibility – engagement & solutions
- NO promises
- Specify/guide when to apply policy
- Validate project status & location on timeline
- Establish initial stakeholder process prior to project initiation
- Policy – commitment to report back on “what we heard” and “how we used it”
- Policy state: all new projects and project being re-initiated must follow this policy
- Guidelines: define City vs. consultant responsibility for leading PE
- Engagement checklist in guidelines
- Documentation requirements outlined
- PE must provide public with understanding of context and background
- Bubble diagram common phases – example:
  - Public
    - Define problem
      - Public buy-in
    - Constraints
    - Develop options
      - Public review
    - Evaluate options
      - Public buy-in
    - Recommend
      - Public live with

Engagement level matrix – iterative flexible

	High Corridor	Mod	Small	Traffic Study	Interchange	Intersection	Community Calming
Issue ident/define problem							
Constraints/design criteria							
Develop options							
Evaluate Process							
Recommendation							

**Question three: What should not be included in the policy?**

- Policy should not include/dictate specific timelines, format, etc
- Policy should not restrict/dictate the means for achieving engagement goals
- Not require consensus
- Not dictate specific strategies/timelines
- No revisiting CTP corridor definitions
- Do not prescribe process of engagement
- Cannot be entirely open-ended – must include some framework
- Timeline commitment
- Project objectives
- Project goals
- Project selection process/budgeting
- Not consensus, no definitive number of people participating

**Question four: What aspects ‘worked’ in a transportation planning (engagement) process you participated in?**

- Grassroots tactics
- Grassroots can verify or disqualify what other groups (BRZ, CA’s, etc) have said
- Take issues to the individuals
- Reshaping/flexibility – iterative
- Working with small groups – they feel involved
- Online surveys
- Locations with high traffic (malls, leisure centres, etc)
- Developing a scope early on – pre-RFP
- Doing public engagement at earlier stage (pre-concept)
- Starting the engagement early (not getting ahead of ourselves)
- Comprehensive public engagement and communication plan
- Define process – where can we and can’t we change things

**Question five: What aspects didn’t ‘work’ in a transportation planning (engagement) process you participated in?**

- Inability to change in response to input
- Not just about solution; need to understand the need first
- People are more engaged if they know how their input will be/not be used
- Rigidity in process
- Text/technical boards
- Lack of “report back”
- Impose scope on them
- Assuming transportation solutions that work in one area/project will translate well to another
- Scoping discussions with citizens should come before RFP process
- Boards – overuse of technical terms, mapping, concepts
- What we need to say vs. what they need to know
- Formal presentation on own – set context prior rather than present and react
- Lack of adaptability

- Formal presentations at open houses
- Too much technical jargon

**Question six: What does the term “collaborative engagement” mean to you?**

- Educational tool
- Balance technical and non-technical
- Dialogue (two-way)
- Work together to develop solutions
- Creating a balance between technical and varying inputs
- Collaboration
- Dialogue “two-way”