

**TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR STUDY REVIEW PROJECT**  
**CONVERSATIONS: PLANNING TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS**  
**Workshop summary and verbatim notes**  
**June and November events**

**About the Corridor Study Review Project**

Transportation Planning is conducting a review of the transportation corridor study process to create a new policy that will allow The City to better prioritize and plan transportation corridors in Calgary.

The project team is conducting a multiphase, engagement program to gather stakeholder and citizen feedback to inform the decision-making process in support of the new Corridor Study Terms of Reference Policy.

***Conversations: Planning Transportation Corridors* workshop summary**

The project team held three *Conversations: Planning Transportation Corridors* workshops on June 20, Nov. 20 and Nov. 23, 2013 as part of the engagement program. All three events were designed to gather feedback about past experiences stakeholders and citizens had with previous transportation corridor study projects. The project team wanted to hear about what we did well and where we could improve our engagement and communications process.

NOTE: Engagement events were originally scheduled to take place consecutively in the month of June but were rescheduled due to significant flooding in the Calgary area. The events were rescheduled for November in consideration of flood recovery efforts and the municipal election in October.

Invitations to the events were sent to stakeholders and community associations located within communities that have participated in past transportation studies. Social media and articles in community association newsletters were also used to inform stakeholders and citizens of the events. A total of 61 stakeholders and citizens attended the workshops.

**Workshop format**

The workshops were used to gather input from stakeholders and citizens to understand the experiences and perceptions of past participants in transportation project engagement programs. The workshop attendees worked with the participants sitting at their table of six to 10 people and were asked to provide input centered on specific questions developed by the project team.

After a brief project introduction and update, four, two-part questions were discussed by each table group. Each table was provided a City of Calgary facilitator to help move through the questions, keep time and help take notes of the discussion. NOTE: The June 20, 2013 event was changed to accommodate the request of the attendees to have a larger group discussion rather than split into smaller table groups. The verbatim notes are below but are not organized by questions due to the format change although the same subject matter was discussed.

The following lists the four questions that were discussed and a verbatim list of comments that were captured by workshop facilitators. There was also an opportunity for comments that did not fit with the questions called ‘Other Ideas/Comments’ and those comments are also included below.

The Project Team will use the feedback from this event to help inform the future planning for engagement within this project and to help with the development of the policy.

We encourage all stakeholder and citizens to take part in the Transportation Corridor Review Project and follow the process going forward. Check the web link often: [www.calgary.ca/corridorstudies](http://www.calgary.ca/corridorstudies)

### **Workshop questions**

**Question one:** What aspects did you like about the transportation planning process you participated in? What can The City do to help make the planning process experiences more consistent and valuable?

**Question two:** What aspects did you not like about the planning process you participated in? What could have been done differently by The City to help make your experience better during the planning process?

**Question three:** What types of transportation projects and/or issues do you want to be involved in? How would you prefer to be involved in transportation projects?

**Question four:** What types or groups of stakeholders and citizens do you think should be involved in transportation projects? At what point in the planning process do you want to be involved?

### **CONVERSATIONS: PLANNING TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS VERBATIM NOTES**

**June 20, 2013**

**Metropolitan Centre**

**Attendance: 13**

- What’s the scope? Who defines it?
- Where do we get to come in. Consultative vs. inform.
- Presentation was more information rather than engaging
- Northwest traffic calming project gave opportunity for input & idea development to participants
- Liked convenience of survey. Combination of engage methods
- Dislike – open houses are more informative, want to be involved earlier
- West LRT – very informative. City staff well informed & helpful
- West LRT information process – multiple meetings, city staff helpful at answering questions
- Want more opportunity to choose a hybrid option
- Like – face time & conversations with the city
- Continuous conversations – documents going back and forth – collaborate to provide feedback
- More advance notice of open houses
- Want to provide feedback earlier in the process
- Like options!! Visual element (see the options)
- Liked information we can respond to
- CT – open house – liked options visual aspect

- Evaluation of assets near a corridor should be done so road designers have parameters other than A to B
- Early communication is critical
- What should the corridor be to communities?
- Crowchild – too much information – self destructed
- Convenience of online information
- Likes options, but more engaged process, more flexibility
- Limitations about Crowchild study – like convenience of study
- Figure out who the stakeholders are: Which departments in the City Administration? Which services? Which business areas? Which communities?
- No evaluation of community assets before process
- No evaluation of community assets
- The City needs to get more people involved in open houses, etc
- Some components are missing in the process with information
- Stadium – the right people/stakeholders involved in the internal
- Scale the consultation to the scale of project
- People who work in transportation that don't know the city
- The City needs to give more advance notice to get the word out
- How do we get more people involved? Use different media
- All stakeholders involved need to be there (project transit – need EMC, transit, roads there)
- Consultation was done too late in the process, high level conversation at beginning (asset mapping)
- Consultation process should be longer. Not 5 month consultation process for a 30 year plan project
- Need to start communications/consultation earlier
- Have the engagement with the public earlier
- Have more frequent & earlier consultation for infrastructure projects
- Frequent & early consultation – 80% consult up front – 20% technical
- Confusion of information before open houses for Crowchild project
- Lots of confusion & misinformation – no money to actually do it – stakeholders are key
- Latest Crowchild project – messages mix from the City
- Conflicting messages from the City on what they want. More bike lanes then say no?
- Temporary signage on/by the corridor to direct engagement
- Going through communities
- Community associations use newsletters – min 6 weeks
- Universities
- Piggy back on other organizations
- Website usability – difficulty to navigate
- Make information about your house & street available online
- Quick & easy input – provide this opportunity beyond community associations
- Communication two-way city <-> CA
- Finding a balance – is everyone's say equal
- Interactive map online – what's going on in your community short vs. long term
- Use the web
- Take pressure off CA – the City has a dedicated resource to communicate with the CA – currently there is a volunteer helping with communication
- Want an evaluation of community assets (parks, schools, other assets)
- Want to be included in continuous transport studies

- 311 – limitations
- Use bold signs to direct people to engagement opportunities
- Use multi-pronged approach to have people involved
- Different types of engagement at different stages
- Have a list of projects by geography that people can see and choose
- New website is hard to navigate
- How does this project tie in with planning?
- West LRT – multiple meetings – knowledgeable staff
- Who defines the scope?
- Opportunity to work with creation of document
- Crowchild – different options were good – visual elements were good
- Mixed messaging about what priorities of the City
- Use community association newsletters
- Large organizations can disseminate information e.g. University
- Is everyone an equal stakeholder? Is there balance?
- Community Associations do not necessarily represent everyone
- Differentiate the City departments as separate stakeholders
- Use the web to keep up to date on what policies/projects will affect a property/community
- Is there any easy way to get input to community members?
- How do we make it easier to have citizens provide feedback to the City, without CA's involved?
- Use as much budget to disseminate information at front end of process
- How is it determined who is involved in projects, work to ensure relevant communities involved
- More accessible information permanently that will affect them 20 years from now
- Scale the consultation with the length of the project
- Is every stakeholder equal in the process? – need to find balance for the project
- Need to have opportunity for The City to give everyone a quick & easy way to give their feedback
- How do we make the people who will see the changes down in the future aware of projects?
- Context & scope of project is important in how The City communicates to stakeholders
- Interactive map to show what is going on in my area short term & long term
- Clear goals – what are the goals of The City?
- It all has to work together
- Major organizations like the university
- Better information from The City e.g. we are going to do this go to this link from The City
- Crowchild Trail Study – the NW people are more important than SW – so need more communications to NW

**Nov. 20, 2013**

**Marlborough Community Centre**

**Attendance: 9**

**Question one:** What aspects did you like about the transportation planning process you participated in? What can The City do to help make the planning process experiences more consistent and valuable?

- P3 (public, private partnership)
- P3 designed stations
- Community bases committees
- City sought out meaningful engagement
- Recorded request of the community in a transparent manner
- Want to see documents public
- Transparency in the budget process
- When community was asked about specific requirements of RFP's
- Ombudsmen appointed
- Community newsletter updates – CRC updates
- Project timeline in 5 year increments
- Layouts of streetscapes – visuals & interactive
- Relevant & timely engagement = projects that will happen sooner
- More participation from councillors e.g Druh Farrel or representative
- Updated councillor information, including website
- Open houses
- Dotmocracy
- Round table discussions
- Having a list of available contacts for Q&A's available after the open house
- Getting the conversation started. So you know you are being heard
- Bold signs with web information
- Keep it interactive especially with plans/designs 'street view' 3D rendering
- 16 Ave corridor impact study on Crescent Heights...too many contacts to get the information. We need one contact to get the information
- Navigating the City is a nightmare. The City should be one cohesive voice
- Get down to how the engagement session will impact you & your community
- Newsletters
- Pinpoint specific areas that are/will be affected
- How does planning work with operations? E.g. Lake Fraser Gate
- Interested impacts you
- Ward councillor should market a little more
- Community mailing list
- Plain language e.g. What is a transportation corridor?

**Question two:** What aspects did you not like about the planning process you participated in? What could have been done differently by The City to help make your experience better during the planning process?

- Selection of the ombudsman, bias for the city
- Not much information out to the community
- Not like that “how decisions were made” were not made public
- Should have nights like tonight (information nights)
- Identify needs of community, recorded & documented points, they need to be community approved
- Ombudsman not being active in terms of communication to communities (set time)
- What do you want to hear from ombudsman – update on project – 11 on budget
- Did not have an oversight of the budget
- Process of prioritizing corridors has to be transparent
- More time for public consultation (front end)
- Plans are not reused, how to making this a living document (plan for specific corridor)
- How do we make combo plans living
- Not enough concern on budget X2
- Don’t know the mechanics of municipal government (hall)
- Follow up after engagement
- Ask for solutions and ideas to challenges
- Options for non-involved councillors
- The policy should explain the process. Who is responsible for what? Next steps? Timeline
- Timelines with corridor study to design to build – very long. Revisit study every few years reengage & update accordingly
- Studies need to be updated more often as population changes/increases
- Better relationship with developer & citizens & City create a “fuller picture” study
- Does the City ever come out to CA meetings to just hear what we have to say?
- Citizens don’t know what questions to ask
- Citizens don’t know they can ask questions
- Create a thought starters question sheet to get ideas flowing
- Follow up with community after the study. Regular check ins. What worked? What didnt?
- Dashboard by community in a que with explanation & status & background information

**Question three:** What types of transportation projects and/or issues do you want to be involved in? How would you prefer to be involved in transportation projects?

- More involved with RFP’s
- Ring roads/highway expansions
- Long term growth projectors, sustainability, conservation projects
- LRT’s, bikes lanes -> sustainable modes of transportation
- Bus routes

- Pedestrian traffic/safety
- Community associations
- Online presentations
- In person forums
- Dynamic mentality -> two way street
- Town hall meetings
- Door to door
- Newsletters
- Leaflets
- Online survey
- More frequent engagement
- Community association (ie. Traffic committee)
- Neighbourhood committees
- Chamber of commerce
- BRZ
- Community level involvement
- Everything transportation engages on
- Engagement sessions – more local & smaller face to face
- Start at the beginning of the project for engagement e.g. North Central LRT
- Traffic & transportation is a passionate topic. It's important to be involved from the start
- Does the City talk to each other? Better internal communications departmentally
- Make sure that engagement sessions are cohesive e.g. how each dept. Affects the plans for that community annually
- The City needs to be more tapped into each community
- City-wide engagement sessions. How all depts affect the community & project?

**Question four:** What types or groups of stakeholders and citizens do you think should be involved in transportation projects? At what point in the planning process do you want to be involved?

- Enough time to discuss, respond
- Increase time to digest information
- Proper information at the right time
- Ongoing feedback on projects whenever possible More global meeting. Break it up by transportation corridor
- At minimum – community association, if no CA should be councillor
- Explain budget & bidding process. Be transparent why are we over budget
- Explain RFP & tendering process
- Bundle all issues up and present to community



**Nov. 23, 2013**

**Hillhurst Sunnyside Community Centre**

**Attendance: 39**

**Question one:** What aspects did you like about the transportation planning process you participated in? What can The City do to help make the planning process experiences more consistent and valuable?

- Venue – accessible – parking – time slot
- Online access to view details
- Sharing the goal for each location – allowing the group to agree or disagree
- Prep for collaboration e.g. photos of intersection, sizes of each element
- Sign Board Promo on Crowchild – short/succinct adequate time period, but responses not collated to theme & report back clearly
- Initial project leader (woman's name?) was great on her feet with both high level content & process smarts to satisfy inquiries real time
- Meeting posters were great. These need to be online at project web page. The day after public meeting.
- Having multiple sessions that build on each other
- Online information same as presentation. Ability to get answers to questions related to presented information
- Crowchild study – Likes – options presented for various sections/interchanges
- Open house sessions were well advertised including along Crowchild Tr.
- Open house sessions were well located (e.g. The Red & White Club along Crowchild Tr)
- Dealt with the entire section of Crowchild Tr. From 33<sup>rd</sup> Ave SW to 24<sup>th</sup> Ave NW
- Study looked at both the big picture and each problem area/interchange individually (e.g. Crowchild & Shaganappi Studies)
- Ability to view open house boards online during and after open house, and to submit comments online for a reasonable period of time after the open house is very important. Gives time for more reflection.
- Shag Trail: brought to meeting big picture flow & then subset of individual segments & problems specific to that segment. It was good & efficient to see pieces & how all fit together.
- Back alley improvements – excellent communication through 311 – quick response to getting proper forms to do a petition
- LRT study: felt like we were involved early enough that we had impact- not all the decisions had been made already
- Place speak: great engagement not persistent
- Multi – year project engagement good, but smaller/follow up elements fall through the cracks when project completed
- Engagement brings all stakeholders in the room – inclusive process
- Invite to participate – invite to collect feedback & develop process



- 311 Like
- West LRT – big board, short notice – open to change
- Direct engagement with City rep. City rep able to be communicator between community & City departments
- Clear description of problem – clear description of criteria, weighting, benchmarks, condition analysis
- Start with function not form
- Share information that forms basis of discussion
- Context of decision (constraints elsewhere?)
- Involve planning up front with transportation
- Define what to be solved – condition analysis – criteria – weighting – benchmarks – measure outcomes
- Community selected, community advocate (needed throughout project) West LRT office
- Previous corridor studies did not fully consider the interaction between corridors
- Embed community volunteer in City planning sessions meetings
- I haven't been involved in any
- Provide guidelines (funding/timing) for alternative project proposals
- Listen – made changes – halt and review – bring money problems to us – early communications & engagement with community – joint sessions with other communities – councillor heavy involvement (Hodges)
- Crowchild corridor study – where is the report – not on the City website many spent on the Crowchild corridor study but not published.
- Shaganappi Trail Corridor – good working session – well represented by City personnel – well advertised – open house are increasingly well attended
- Narrowing the corridor plan to the most problematic zones
- Improve communication, regular, through all phases ( I filled gap with LRT & Dalhousie & Crowfoot) – Senior planning personnel – lack of awareness – understand community dynamics, safety, social development in area, etc
- Hire fewer “communications” staff and more 30 year engineers with communication skills
- Council must demonstrate some back bone and resolve in ‘staying the course’ on studies and plans already complete and in process! (i.e. no repeat of what happened on Crowchild Trail Corridor Study in early 2013)
- Excellent engagement of bike community – including advocates, users – Go to the user community early, go to the user community often
- Good identification of stakeholders
- Involved citizen advocacy groups & CA's early to help educate others

**Question two:** What aspects did you not like about the planning process you participated in? What could have been done differently by The City to help make your experience better during the planning process?

- Not all levels of representation. Yes – alderman, No – community leaders or community groups
- Citizens & affected parties not involved in preliminary process
- No opportunity to decide vision for the community by the community
- Exploring all possible solutions, not just the one favourite or obvious
- Lack of honest, accurate capture/characterization of comments/feedback received – to improve honesty/accuracy and minimize attempts to put “spin” on feedback, always make verbatim comments themselves available as back up
- Lack of consultation up front with all relevant stakeholders to – better identify the issues/problems/objectives/opportunities – get better buy in
- Decisions were already made & solutions already provided
- Not enough notice time wise
- The CTP published a hierarchy that recognized active modes/transit then service vehicles, lastly P.O.V. Transportation department not showing this priority from initial scope nor through study work
- Provide context to the corridor discussions(constraints, problems, issues...) Don’t just present 3 possible solutions
- Feedback was not captured & communicated accurately
- Problem to be solved was not explained in detail. Why are these changes necessary?
- Smart citizens understand they are not traffic engineers/planner experts nor that they “carry the can” for technical or political. But admin project leaders need to be transparent so the smart citizens can engage, develop ownership or even give ideas
- Long range planning is primary goal – agreed. But working the issues undoubtedly brings forth current problems of very small through to larger scope concerns. City process needs to show (with vigour) capturing these & have room to consider, discuss all, solve some soon.
- Decision was already made, before consultation or involvement
- The City needs to do better job at onset of all projects with role & process clarification – sure subject to change as process evolves e.g. communities don’t have decision power. When/if council involved. City needs to continuously assure roads are put in context similar to SEWAR, it is a utility but City building is scope
- Who decides what the issue/problem is in the first place?
- Does the City look at how other larger cities solved similar problems?
- What is ultimate purpose? Building a great city isn’t just transportation. Look at the big picture plan.
- Consider more than just cars & road widening – maybe the solution is bike lanes, transit, pedestrian
- Need more follow through after project implementation – what was the impact? Have we honoured our commitments?

- Would like to have a website where past, current and future consultation activities are listed on each corridor study
- Feeling that decision has already been made and engagement process won't change anything
- Reinvent process for communities every project – there is no consistency across the board
- Designated transportation corridor website – community headings
- Community improvements survey – promise from City to effected communities
- 2 year notification to residents community association of proposed city projects specific to area
- City has to be willing to support the impacts of change rather than leaving the community to solve the issues i.e. cut through traffic, extra parking issues, etc
- 311 website trending – currently not done
- Stop catering to cars
- Don't like the 'expert' driven approach – i.e. the 'experts' make a 'solution' and then ask for consultation. Public consultation should be from the beginning.
- Please make sure to include renters
- Prioritization of stakeholder concerns needs foot on the ground face – to-face engagement with users
- Understand how destructive the 'TBD' designation is to community – maintain it or remove it to make linear green park.
- No information provided on basis of discussion
- Initial engagement not solution based
- Community engagement agenda driven push poll/survey
- No question on do different at planning stage – no information common at beginning of project, planning & design input
- Don't treat forum input as "scientific sample"
- Anonymous input needs to be defined to vested interest for weighting
- Connect/reflect early session ideas/ input directly to subsequent session goals/direction
- E-surveys are not engagement
- Engagement process for process sake & not real input
- Don't set false expectations around degree of influence – inform vs. consult – define non negotiable
- European model is adopted piece meal out of context, big picture needed – of human scale is missed e.g. big busses adjacent to bike lanes
- Little advance notice of the public consult sessions
- No prioritization of the sub elements – yet it was obvious some parts could be done near term, others obviously would take 10+ years
- Most disliked was that the study was abandoned for reasons that I never understood, supposedly for some 'loss' of residential properties that I was never shown would occur
- Nobody listened at the Stadium transportation study, residents have concluded that the decision for high density is a foregone conclusion
- Design build – use of engineering consultants instead of accountable senior staff

- Communication – town halls, community newsletter, community board meetings, events e.g. Stampede Breakfast
- Changed project manager midstream – should not do – coordination with City & province on projects that intersect (stoney trail & Crowchild)
- Line up policy of province & City
- With respect to Race City Motorsport park, decisions were made with 0% input from the community, and thousands were negatively impacted
- Share more technical input data with communities
- Communications staff with no clout with accountable staff & consultants – better information available from contractors – lack of honesty by staff – staff paranoia
- Need to engage the community leaders to engage the community
- Engage with the community at project onset, not once designs have already been created or when studies are in progress
- When missed – have to bring people in once engagement has already started – do engagement with key people and ask them to do word of mouth and then reconvene – do not come with designs at the onset
- Be able to select how you are communicated on specific like Calgary events
- Scenario planning is preferred what are the options, what are the outcomes
- Use multiple tools to communicate – via CA's, FCC, road signs, word of mouth via key community members, web, mail outs, etc
- Allow citizens to sign up for getting information about certain projects based on interest (area of the city, transportation, etc)
- A city online resource to find out what engagement opportunities are happening, what plans/policies are changing (and a tool to filter that info)
- Balancing how we plan for today. 30 years out and also policies already in place – and communicating how decisions have been made & will be made
- Engage in both long term & short term planning
- Communicate clearly in plain language about project scope, background process
- Regular reminders are helpful (event brite) – more advance advertising – multiple engagement dates – timelines for newsletters in communities – high level discussions on priorities prior to regulatory talks – perception around the decision has already been made
- Community visioning could help – have values identified prior to asking for feedback on specific questions
- Landing page – goes to all works currently going on, in all matters, planning/roads/environment
- Perhaps a map with all business unit's activities for public – transportation, planning, engagement
- Skyscraper forum is helpful
- Big picture implications explained, what else is going on – e.g. west campus explained at the Crowchild study talks – connect the dots

**Question three:** What types of transportation projects and/or issues do you want to be involved in?  
How would you prefer to be involved in transportation projects?

- I would like to be kept informed of all transport issues to decide which level I choose to participate in from the start
- The City should not decide how & when I participate in any transportation study, I should decide. Methods – the more the better – in person, online, etc
- Could the alderman's office please send out notice as far in advance as possible
- Have an opportunity to vote on whether citizen involvement is required for each initiative
- Types of transportation projects to be involved in, projects that: are in my community, are in neighbouring communities, will affect my community or neighbouring communities, even if only indirectly, will affect my commute, ability to get around the city, ability to get in and out of the city
- Road projects, transit projects, cycle projects, pedestrian projects
- Transportation project design needs to start with acknowledgement that transportation is not the end project but is a utility like sewer with city building. So why aren't LUPP planners front & centre in all these e projects?
- When to be involved – at the start before any decisions are made.
- Cycling corridors, transit/roads, plans such as ARP's. Working sessions that are broad enough to not be controlled by Fiefdoms
- Engagement on small projects that impact people directly
- Day-to-day ongoing project engagement on smaller issues
- Face-to-Face involvement is valuable too
- Engagement on a longer term planning basis (urban planning & design)
- Better understanding of ripple-effect
- Online involvement
- Engagement for ongoing, non-project specific neighbourhood transport improvements
- Opportunity to vote/concrete paperwork
- Trending & prioritized list of items being addressed
- Be more proactive, less reactive. For example. 11 st SW now has lots of pedestrian activity after west Kirby LRT went in but sidewalks are not wide enough & 9 Ave SW traffic light is too long
- Want to be involved in long term plans (30 year, etc) through online surveys, in person workshops, etc. Also want to be involved in short term project through the same kinds of activities
- Policy & process development
- Early & often – policy level – Op costs driven by construction deficiencies that belong as project costs – identify as final inspection deficiency
- Schedule shifting to allow volunteers (community) & City departments reps work together
- Define/describe fixed non negotiable parts of project upfront
- Project scope changes need reflect change in project name – to trigger awareness in community

- In my quadrant of the city – and all corridors, LRT, surface transit and traffic calming studies
- All project planning in my district – all aspects of the project in my district
- Types of projects – corridor studies – policy studies – city wide studies
- Steering committee – communication formulation – community advocacy
- I would prefer to be involved from concept – solutions – evaluation
- All forms of transportation in Ward 1
- I want enough information to determine my degree of involvement
- Local plans in NW, or close to the core (Crowchild, memorial, close to the city centre)
- Raise the profile of the issue through my existing leadership positions
- I need to see a plan up front to determine first if I want to or need to be involved. Then I would need to know that my involvement could have an impact, so I'm not wasting my time
- Involve me as resident 'volunteer' and tell me if all the volunteer slots were filled earlier, or with others
- Visioning vs. problem solving
- Pedestrian realm must not be removed from transportation equations
- High level transportation planning & priorities & modes – big picture – long term
- Open houses at various times & locations – well advertised
- Online surveys
- Mail outs, newsletters, webpage, social media
- Citizen/volunteer committees, advisory committees
- Citizen advocacy groups – citizen elected – attend and be engaged on behalf of a specific group
- Road shows at community events – onsite feedback opportunities
- Decisions: send all information & opportunities to get engaged out – allow groups/citizens to select what they attend

**Question four:** What types or groups of stakeholders and citizens do you think should be involved in transportation projects? At what point in the planning process do you want to be involved?

- Suburban commuters are always a stakeholder in inner city discussions
- Do not limit participation, leave it open for all to view & discuss. Involve people early – before decisions are made
- Don't limit stakeholders to "select" community representatives who may be self appointed – early involvement
- Inner city is always a stakeholder in suburban decisions and planning
- Decisions should not be based on population – volume of stakeholders pits suburban against inner city
- Groups/Stakeholders – users (i.e. walkers, cyclists, transit users, drivers, etc) – different categories of users e.g. commuters, transport employees, etc. – adjacent communities including residents, businesses, service organizations, community/resident associations – BRZs – health professionals – environmental groups
- Business & commercial representation is usually lacking in discussions

- Level of involvement should be defined for each stakeholder. RACI matrix effects their ability to influence
- Stakeholder involvement should take place as early as possible, before issues and proposed solutions become entrenched
- Any citizen who wants to should be allowed to be involved. As long as they follow rules of decorum & process descriptions. But formally, Federation of Calgary Communities & all CA's anywhere nearby should be continuously communicated with.
- Seniors – schools – special interest groups (bike Calgary)
- Grass roots – smaller community issues. Advantages: immediate stakeholder engagement & results with immediate benefits.
- Stakeholders – project scope – city depts. and why – citizens that represent or disseminate to larger number of citizens
- Weighted interest input – community stability of ownership vs. renters
- City stakeholders who involved broader scope – west LRT only transit represented at forms
- When to involve others – is project highly effect by cycles (e.g. Rush hour, seasonal) – plan to engage to be ready for beginning of the cycle
- Interactive map layer for long term planning
- Community leagues, chamber of commerce, trucking orgs, Alberta motor association, insurance companies, railways, the public
- From conception to completion
- Will City council follow the recommendations of your studies?
- Transparency – display project plan and continue to update graphically – communication – also tell people what you have done – explain where you are leveraging best practices – new York transit
- Citizens in immediate area targeted – truckers – chamber of commerce – communication focals in community – city operations together with the community – communications should include project background always then updates
- Future planning needs to be shared with the public on the calgary.ca website
- Community associations, schools, businesses, institutions, residents
- Businesses, BRZ reps – emergency needs – CA's, local institutions (schools, health)
- Developers, landowners
- CA – not just asking CA's to do engagement which have limited capacity & resources – although important and a sharing voice full & regular communications are still required
- Right at project onset, pre-design
- Different types of stakeholders will be interested in various stages of the planning process
- Contact the CA first
- Communities want to be engaged at the high level so that they can understand to full extent of policy development and implementation