

# Transportation Corridor Study Review Project

## Citizen Working Group

### Meeting 1: verbatim notes

April 12, 2014

During Part B of the engagement program in support of the Transportation Corridor Study Review Project, the project team asked external stakeholders and citizens to volunteer to be part of the Citizen Working Group to work together with the project team to write the new Transportation Corridor Study Terms of Reference Policy. In total, 17 members of the public signed-on to take part in the Citizen Working Group and together members and the project scheduled two meetings in the month of April.

On April 12, the project team met with the Citizen Working Group to present the outline and format for a City of Calgary policy document. Together, the project team and working group members discussed content that could be included in each section of the policy. Below are the Citizen Working Group verbatim notes and comments from the meeting.

The verbatim notes, comments and discussion at the meeting will be used to create a draft of the policy to be reviewed by the Citizen Working Group and the project team at the next meeting.

### Citizen Working Group verbatim notes: meeting #1

Policy:

- Leverage thought leaders
- Engagement by stakeholders and demographics
- 3 phased engagement
  - Pre
  - During
  - Post and lessons learned
- Defined guiding principles for each study undertaken
- Defined groups to be engaged and purpose of each group
- Identify need
- Identify reason for need
- Identify rationale for action
- Identify foreseeable consequences of no action
- Identify supports needed by stakeholders
- Should definitely include definitions/terms, etc
- Official plan/course – where does budget fit?
- Role of council in raising awareness of issues/choices
- Official plan/course of action
  - Identify affected areas/groups/individuals

- Advertise opportunities for engagement proactively with multiple dates/times, and through various forms of communication
- Provide for a variety of “forms” of engagement – online surveys, citizen groups, road shows, and open houses
- Utilize feedback from engagement sessions in designing solutions for transportation corridor
- Engage the public again with proposed solutions (again with multiple venues/modes/dates)
- Is there a way to support those who want to share engagement with others?
- Positive potentials can be highlighted or feedback from community to encourage ideas about adding value to improvements, so the community can benefit even with potentially “damaging” impacts
- New park? Better paths? What can be added to the project to “soften the blow”?
- A website dedicated to the project should be created (and maintained for a long time) that updates to show open house times, surveys, proposed solutions, etc. It would serve as an ultimate reference for that project. It would include a full breakdown of engagement so people later can review (and not claim that consultation didn’t occur)
- Make process to follow a progression:
  - Wide open feedback
  - 1<sup>st</sup> plans created – feedback just on those plans
  - Final solution arrived at
  - Communication of impacts
- Introduce the identified issues to a community early:
  - Show (open house?) the problems you are hearing (311 comments) and seeing (photos of traffic congestion)
  - Explain what a “do nothing” approach would result in
  - Show other examples of where this problem has arisen – other corridors or other cities. Show solutions that have worked or not
  - Show previously approved plans?
  - Seek feedback early
  - Ask how the problem affects stakeholders
  - Ask how stakeholders use the corridor and surrounding areas
  - Ask why people like the area where they live, work, and play (to identify what impacts are most important to stakeholders)
- Would it be appropriate to include in the policy a statement to the effect that in the long run increased road capacity is not a possibility and that most future transportation into the city core will focus on public transit in one form or another
- A commitment to engage “futurist” type consultation to help the thinking “outside of the box” at the very beginning of the planning process
- The above may include a commitment to survey how other jurisdictions solve the problem the plan is addressing. And other jurisdictions mean not only Canada and North America, but Europe

as well. That is people who already have lots of experience in dealing with congestion and related problems

- Could we have a statement of principle of “do no harm” to the environment to the absolute best possible technical solution
- Following the above a commitment of showing the different alternatives with their respective environmental/budget impacts so citizens can “vote” or “choose”
- A commitment to use technology (information technology) to disseminate information and collect feedback
- How the feedback is analysed and how decisions are made
- A statement to be included in what “insufficient involvement” or “apathy” looks like and what happens if this situation arises
- A statement of how special interest groups positions are dealt with – how are they accepted/rejected, this fact is published with reasons for acceptance/rejection
- A commitment for the planning process to propose alternatives, including the “do nothing” option, showing the social, environmental and budget impacts of each.
- Define what social impact means:
  - Impact on communities
  - Access to schools, shopping, rec facilities
  - Service to densification
  - Response to flooding
- Flexibility – commit to flexibility in light of change in societal values and change/evolution in technical and technology
- Early engagement
- Ongoing engagement

Scope:

- Clarify that this is engagement process
- Purpose to improve community and citizen engagement for corridors
- Triple bottom line
- Limitations and Scope:
  - Limitation on the time (dollars?) spent on engagement (perhaps in proportion to scale of the project) Before an RFP
  - Scope – more than just immediately adjacent residents should be engaged. How do we ensure that motorists are engaged too?
- Responsibility for enforcement:
  - How do we ensure the engagement is meaningful?
  - How do we communicate the engagement process already done?
  - How do we ensure engagement is honoured by council? (and not overtaken by last-minute NIMBY’s?)
  - Websites for each project that show all historic engagement

## Background:

- “Apology” statement – policy
- Developed after public recognition that engagement can be improved
- 2.a – road/rail/path
- 2.d – impacts to property, community planning, community impact , et al...
- 2.d – identify issues along the corridor (such as impacts to property, public amenities, park space, etc)
- 2.d – “Do nothing” impacts also identified, to contextualize why changes might be needed
- Concerned that 1.a) mean that the outcome of a corridor study might be pre-determined
- What if the corridor study points to a good result or solution that does not conform to an older Calgary Transportation Plan?
- Does the policy need to be flexible enough to allow for some disagreement or modification to the CTP?
- Terminology to be generic and inclusive – eg: avoid words like “road”, except in a list. Use instead “corridor” or “facility”
- The background might want to describe why this document is desired – some history of what happened in the past and what prompted the development of this document
- 2.d should be careful to include all aspects of society, environment, budget
- 1. Clarify link, facility, pathway/road
- 2.a – road – link
- 2.d – property should be broader eg: community, city, etc

## Purpose:

- Constructive engagement from local groups
- Raise questions to groups wherever possible
- Ensure engagement groups understand options, pros and cons of options, and have opportunity to choose
- Flexible to future change
- How does corridor detail sync with transportation planning – e.g.: bike routes downtown or elsewhere, CTS (bus routes, pedestrian crossings, snow removal)
- Detail stage, e.g.: Crowchild Tr. (merge from Bow Tr., Memorial Drive, North Crowchild)
- When do details, suggestions, proposals get fed into process?
- Weighting of input (individuals, communities)
- How to reach compromise/consensus
- “Not intended to replace engineering practice...” – Need to ensure this phrase does not become unnecessarily all encompassing so as to inhibit new ways of thinking/new learning and experimentation to uncover new solutions
- “Levels of involvement from citizens may be different for Transportation Corridor Studies conducted in different areas of Calgary” How do we make sure this is not so vague so that the

errors of Crowchild engagement are not repeated? “Different” could mean not as extensive or meaningful engagement?

- 3. “Identify and involve stakeholders in a meaningful way”. What is considered meaningful? How is this measured/determined?
- 4. A & b are repeated essentially in the closing paragraph
- External stakeholder – should also include the larger community (users of parks and public amenities, etc)
- Include a commitment to review, in the planning process, social values that are changing, technical evolution (or evolution of technologies for transportation)
- Include a commitment to take public input and a description of how the input will be dealt with, how the response will be published
- Include a description of how the City proposes to “NIMBY”. For example, how to deal with the traffic from outer communities flows through inner city communities
- Engineering practices – clarify or reword
- Readability

#### Procedure:

- Specific steps checklist? (could be large piece of work with a number of groups considerations)
- Consultation must be iterative: A. Ensuring input is both understood and properly incorporated (i.e.: avoid “fly-by” in communications) B. Allows for more progressively focused discussions that are defensible to participants who enter into the process late (if properly shared)
- Pre-engagement/education
- Ensures context of engagement is understood on the various plans adopted by City
- Have Land Use Planning at the table for more holistic solutions
- Must include opportunity to include new learning between original inception of plan and implementation as much can change over 10-30 years
- Holistic review of total corridor – a: ensure scope of work is relevant to larger corridor ability/capacity existing and planned b: manage expectations of what can be achieved

#### Definitions:

- 6a: road/rail/path
- 6b: need to clarify “all higher level planning studies of network routes”
- External Stakeholders: Include all potential or targeted users of corridor and include impacted communities
- External Stakeholders: needs to include non-resident users of an area (parks, parents of students)