

Transportation Corridor Study Review Project

Citizen Working Group

Meeting 2: verbatim notes

April 24, 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 24, the project team met with the Citizen Working Group to present the draft policy that was created using feedback from the first Citizen Working Group meeting. Together, the project team and working group members discussed and edited content in the draft 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 finalize a draft of the policy to be presented to the general public at two information sessions on May 6, 2014.

Citizen Working Group verbatim notes: meeting #2

- Scope – policy will become effective once a corridor study has been decided. This policy will not determine which corridor studies will be undertaken & how they are decided.
- Definitions – City of Calgary as a named stakeholder. Disagree, the originator of a policy usually not a stakeholder of their own initiative
- (1) Avoid the use of external/internal stakeholders
 - We need to stay away from creating a “We against them” scenario
 - Use stakeholder as a general rule!
- Purpose: look at breaking down definition of public to public communities and citizens
 - Consider education (add)
- Define: (1) Stakeholder – “Engage Policy” take away internal/external
 - (2) City of Calgary (need definition)
- Policy: Add to statement no sequence to outlined aspects/no order to elements of policy
- Timelines & “Triggers” change: show to “communicate”
- (2d.) Definitions is capitalized? Consistency throughout document?
 - Throughout the document ie is used but probably e.g. is intended
- (2c.) Minimization, prioritizing & optimization
- (3) first sentence recognizes
- Somewhere needs to guide the “City” to be able to reevaluate/evolve in process
- (14) City will be opened to feedback from stakeholders, options for dealing with impact of change. Example: parking options for business with other parking is taken away

- (14) “multi faceted? Is it 2 words?
- (12) Definitions – “adjacent” – can we make this a generous term so that more than those very close to the corridor are considered external stakeholders?
- Policy – How can we make clear that engagement informs the options for a transportation corridor in the policy? Engagement should not just be “conducted” – it should be used to shape the process & outcomes. Clarify that all components can happen in any order
- (h) How will outcomes be “shown” to stakeholders & the public?
- (12) “adjacent to” could be “impacted by” or “affected by” or stronger
- (11) eliminate list and state all impacted units are to be included
- (12) adjacent – define to ensure scope of who is considered stakeholder will vary based on scope of project
- (12) External stakeholders....business owners, community associations (members), and community residents and stakeholders
- (11) Community heritage & neighbourhood services – local context specialists support striking “external”, “internal” and “public”
- (14g.) Preserve and improve the integrity of adjacent communities
- (14h.) timelines for each potential option
- (14e.) add “and potential” after the word “existing”
- (14h.) add “and what events or conditions will trigger such improvements”
- (17a.) add “meaningful” before process or add “two-way” before process
- (14c.) conduct engagement to establish local character, context and need – engagement intent
- (14c&d.) How do these inform each other? Perhaps, identify issues and shared desired outcomes together – guide & align
- (14d.) Provide clear context of what is possible
- (14) How can we communicate that some components will be revisited (feedback loop)?
- (15) The City of Calgary will not open up engineering/structural processes to City input
- (14d.) How can we encourage questioning the impetus to make the change in the first place? Can we encourage “open box” innovative solutions in this policy? Can we move beyond what we have always done?
- (16) The City of Calgary may
 - Develop a set of “guiding principles” for each study to facilitate decision making & engagement approaches (with or without community engagement on the guiding principles)
 - Create a defined list of alternatives within each study and provide justification on the desired recommendations (each alternative can have a list of pro’s & con’s)
- (15) Will not needlessly limit options able to be discussed using “engineering limitations” for same such thing, et al. (or maybe “beef up D”)
- (16) The City of Calgary may vary in advance implementation of the guide, while publicly stating how, why & to what end the variance is intended to satisfy the purpose of this policy.
- (17) External Stakeholders – provide focused feedback on the study at hand
- (19) Speak to risk identification & mitigation

- Add in definitions – City of Calgary suggest it should be Council and Administration
- (19) Issues identification...it's best efforts to inform stakeholders of the initiation of TCS
- Add – Stakeholder identification & analysis for scope inclusion in process bases on scope of project
- In trying to keep all portions of this policy sealable, do you risk inconsistent application because this policy will be applied in different ways at different times? How can you then better manage expectations?
- (17) External: State at the start of the project every opportunity to participate: public hearing, ask questions to project manager