

Transportation Corridor Study Review Project

ENGAGEMENT: Part A Summary and Verbatim Notes

April 2014

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.

ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY: PART A “Understanding the As Is”

The engagement program in support of the Transportation Corridor Study Review Project has been divided into three phases. The first phase of engagement: Part A “Understanding the As Is” was 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. The feedback gathered during Part A of the engagement program will be used to inform the development of the second phase of engagement: Part B “Shared Learning” and will inform the creation of the new Corridor Study Terms of Reference Policy.

In support of Part A of the engagement program, the project team held three *Conversations: Planning Transportation Corridors* workshops, an internal stakeholder workshop and an online survey with a total of a 139 participants.

Each of the engagement events, in person or online, asked participants to answer a set of four questions about past experiences with transportation corridor study projects and to provide information about improving the current planning process.

The four questions asked during engagement Part A are the following:

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?

Included in this report is the summary of the general themes we heard from the feedback gathered through engagement Part A, the verbatim notes from each of the events and the online survey report.

General Themes: here's what we heard:

- **Timely engagement**

Stakeholders commented that engagement needed to be conducted at the right time and before decisions were made. The questions need to be more open and not concentrating on just what stakeholders' preferences were. Overall, stakeholders requested that they be brought in early in the project (some as early as conception) and throughout the life of the project. They also asked for the final results and execution. In short, they want to be kept informed. There was a lot of discussion around being asked for input when the perception was that decisions had already been made and that this was now 'lip service'.

There was also interest in keeping engagement sessions smaller and more plentiful, as well as providing as much notice as possible.

- **Communications**

Several stakeholders mentioned communications and awareness of engagement sessions as something that needs to be improved. There was asks for information sharing, being transparent, being repetitive in the messaging as well as a need to provide more information visually – pictures and maps were suggested. There was an expression of interest to have more web and online content, in addition to the in-person sessions and other alternative methods such as phone calls. It should be noted that in-person sessions (open house, workshops, town halls) are still the preferred method, but there is considerable interest in alternative methods to participate (phone and online surveys, online forums, 311, focus groups, etc.). Emphasis was placed on having clear, timely communications and updates on the project – including scope changes.

- **Preparation and manpower**

A number of stakeholders mentioned the need to simplify the information being presented into common categories such as costs, impacts, affects, efficiencies, pros and cons. There was an interest in having the appropriate people at sessions to answer questions that were specific to their area of expertise, and to expand this beyond the 'technical' aspects of transportation. There were several comments asking for land planners to be at these sessions as well, and to look at Calgary in its entirety rather than as a sum of its parts; in short, to consider the larger context of the project and its scope.

There were also requests for less ‘loaded’ questions and to provide neutral facilitation as there was some discussion around leading questions, preference questions rather than decision option questions.

- **Interests**

Many stakeholders stated that they would like to be involved in projects that will affect their community. The areas of interest were largely around linkability – so roads, bike/pathways, transit; but expressed interest in awareness in what is being done or considered across the city.

Of particular note, there was an interest in learning more about the plans for Crowchild Trail as well as the North LRT project. There was also mention to consider mobility and access issues and to be more accommodating of those suffering from mobility issues. Although this was not echoed by several stakeholders, there is a significant risk attached if administration does not consider these issues when planning future events.

- **Involvement**

Stakeholders reiterated the need to be inclusive of groups and to not let special interest groups or more vocal groups be the only ‘voice’ that is heard in engagement sessions. There were considerable comments about trying to ensure a more representative sample of Calgarians, but also some reflection that anyone who wants to participate should, but concentration should be on the more affected or impacted stakeholder groups such as communities.

Recommendations

- Keep in-person sessions but keep them smaller and on-point
- Provide alternative methods to gather input such as websites, phone surveys, 311
- Exhaust communications efforts so that stakeholders are very aware of sessions and how to participate
- Be inclusive in providing subject matter experts – include other business units outside of Transportation, and outside of The City
- Work on being more neutral in facilitating and attending sessions so that stakeholders feel they have the freedom to voice their input and that decisions have not been pre-determined

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY/VERBATUM NOTES

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.

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.

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 queue 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 projects, 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 33rd Ave SW to 24th 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 actives 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 engage 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

INTERNAL ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY/VERBATUM NOTES

The internal engagement workshop was used to gather input from other City of Calgary business units and departments to understand the experiences and perceptions of their past participation in transportation project engagement programs.

After a brief project introduction and update, attendees were asked to discuss the four questions with each other in a group setting. The workshop was attended by a total of 10 City of Calgary staff from Land Use Planning and Policy, Calgary Transit, Transportation Planning, Transportation Infrastructure and Parks.

The following lists the four questions that were discussed and a verbatim list of comments that were captured by workshop facilitators.

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?

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

- Input at early stages – Shaganappi a good example
- The goal is now if Trans is doing a project we try to make sure we coordinate with water, etc. We had to walk it around to other BU's
- How do we set the goal posts? How do we keep scope creep from happening?
- Short term planning is long term planning & we have to educate the public about this idea
- Are we still going to be using open houses? Why don't we coordinate project open houses? We go as one as the City.
- Partnerships with BU's, we have one City, we need one voice
- Why doing it? When implemented, define upfront
- What is long term? In 30 years or last 30 years
- No predetermined solutions
- Leverage existing structures or groups to engage
- Prep of project plan & running by other BU's prior to developing the plan

- How do we establish a framework/charter of work with the public? Last time we engaged a lot but this time we don't have scope
- Internally – what does corridor study mean LUPP vs. TP
- Define stakeholders
- Manage public expectations about what we can do
- Who owns the project? 17 Ave SW – does NP own engagement or is it TI? – Defining ownership
- Suggestions: create stock boards/materials to explain MDP/CTP that we bring to every event
- Good example is 17th Ave SW with TI
- What is your thought about piggy backing engagement with LUPP projects or other projects
- Good framework for understanding these projects – short term/long term

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

- Need to be more clear about what happens with feedback from public
- How do you deal with emotions?
- Upfront work by project team using data
- Simplify messaging
- It's not about avoiding the questions it is about answering the questions
- Use data available
- Anticipate issues
- Make complicated transportation planning language to explain/communicate
- More discussion about problem definition
- A lot of the discussions on projects like this is not fact based
- Use data available to tell the story
- Public always wonders why we are engaging because they think it's already a done deal
- What's a given & what isn't?
- Problem – not just stating the framework and assumptions for a project, but being clear about how comments can fit within them. Very difficult to do with an emotional subject
- Be less text heavy
- We need to have a list of given at early meeting – clear up front of what they don't have input on
- We need to be better at building trust
- We tell public too often “this is out of scope” we should move away from that. We worry too much about timelines & budget. IF we do this we can build trust
- Problem definition upfront
- What's on the table, what is off the table
- Be clear on what we do with feedback
- Not text heavy or technical heavy

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

- How do we figure out what's needed in budget for engagement?
- Should work with LUPP corridor study & corridor program
- Have a pre-planning stage with other City BU's to develop scope
- Are there regular meetings between different groups?
- Liaison between transportation & LUPP at the manager level – not just circulation & not just GM's
- By the time we get reviewing plans it's almost too late
- Involve people (internal) at project planning stage

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?

- More focus on non-local, get less site specific
- Timing of engagement – evenings? Is it the best time to engage?
- We went to shopping malls & people thanked us – place based engagement
- Very noticeable difference from CA & public – we should be broader
- Frustrating that website has no comment – set up a project email address
- Translink in Vancouver has an ongoing transit/transportation panel that aren't project specific – maybe we could do that

ONLINE ENGAGEMENT REPORT

Research Objective



Transportation Planning conducted engagement for the Transportation Corridor Study Review Project, holding in-person workshops in mid to late 2013. Transportation Planning needed an online channel by which stakeholders could provide input if they were unable to participate in one of the workshops.

Research Methodology

The online engagement opportunity was conducted using the FluidSurveys online surveying tool and was made available to stakeholders on June 18, 2013. The results presented in this report include those collected between June 18, 2013 and February 6, 2014. As a result of the methodology used (opt-in), results are not representative of any particular population or group of people.

Results

1. a) Have you ever been involved as a participant in a City of Calgary Transportation project? This can include, but is not limited to, attending an open house, visiting a project webpage for information, participating in a workshop or survey, etc.

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Yes		54%	37
No		46%	31
Total Responses			68

1. b) What project(s) were you involved in?

Response
JOhn Laurie Blvd and 14th Street NW study survey for the interchange
Crowhchild Trail North Central LRT
I was involved in bus route mapping as part of Dalhousie Station project and was involved in all aspects of Crowfoot Station project from design through execution of the plan. I was part of the CCC representing Scenic Acres. I was also involved with the Province on Stoney Trail north expansion. I worked with the City of Calgary on transportation matters from 2002-2009 before moving to Fort McMurray and I am now back in the Scenic Acres community.
Crowchild Trail Shaganappi Trail
the Conversations: Planning Transportation Corridors workshop in June. TOD: Banff Trail and Brentwood stations Banff Trail station redevelopment planning
It's Your Hub survey
Crowchild trail study

I followed the construction of the west LRT line, checking information on the City of Calgary website.
Stoney Trail
NW Hub web survey
Crowchild Trail introduction at McMahon Stadium
Crowchild Trail
attended a number of Open Houses
survey
crowchild
Visited web page for bike path consultation.
same one. i think there was a survey before
The Crowchild study A study regarding center street
Visited website for Crowchild Trail redesign proposal.
Transportation Corridor Study Review Project
attend an open house
Crowchild Transportation project; Plan It Calgary
Crowchild Trail.
crowchild trail
Dont recall
Crowchild Transportation study
Crowchild Trail Open Houses
Crowchild Trail; Banff Trail Community Traffic Study
Via 16 Urban Corridor Crescent Heights Y2K traffic study
West LRT
Chrowchild
North Central LRT
West LRT
20th Ave NW Safety/Traffic Calming
6&7 St bike lanes, 7 St cycle track, Crowchild Tr corridor study, Shaganappi Tr Overpass, Cycling Strategy
Shaganappi Tr Corridor Study Brentwood Mobility Assessment Project (TOD) University Bike and Ped system review

2. What aspects did you like about the transportation planning process you participated in?

Response
<p>The Alderman took a realistic, practical view of the situation, and when presented with the project, requested the planning present three options which were proposed to the public and particularly those most interested in the neighbouring districts</p>
<p>Some good information. North Central LRT was good for what it was worth. Intention was very general and intended to gain interest in moving route from Nose Creek Alignment to an alternate alignment along Centre St or Edmonton Trail. The info session at Cardel Place provided the necessary information for this type of a broad question. Detailed questions on how any future choice would impact affected communities and what can be done to mitigate negatives and improve positives would, by necessity have to be undertaken at a later stage. Crowchild Trail Red and White presentation was an unmitigated disaster. The Survey Monkey that purportedly led to the various option schematics was non-sensical. IT simply asked what the problems were for Crowchild - which is not difficult to ascertain. It did not ask what some of the solutions might be, how to mitigate problems and how to avoid unintended negative consequences. To do so would have required focused discussions with the communities impacted. As well, its scope would have had to be defined by outcomes and not design options. As Stantec engineers indicated, the sole option was for their firm to implement the 1978 master plan of 3 free flowing lanes from north of 24 Av N to 17 Ave S. Outcome based would have defined the solution to be 20,000 vehicles per hour (or some similar outcome) that would have allowed for all design options to be on the table, and not just an innercity freeway. In neither case was planning involved to any great degree. A real loss in providing informed input to the process. It would have been very interesting to know how community planning may be impacted by the choices for the LRT realignment. Likewise, if planning was involved with Crowchild, several issues could have been addressed at the same time as the redesign of Crowchild, reducing concerns amongst residents and possibly gaining avid supporters for change.</p>
<p>Bus route design, facility design and layout of the Crowfoot station footprint, road and access points, parking, security, sound attenuation, land management, open house planning and other forms of communication. I facilitated community-based information sessions apart from City and narrated a monthly article in the community newspaper.</p>
<p>Public open houses</p>
<p>Having all pertinent subject-matter experts from City departments engaged in the conversations at the same time. Being able to work with City departments on changes to plans and achieve goals of the community, business, and the City. Having City representatives that take community input back to their departments and work to support the goals of the community</p>
<p>The survey seemed to ask relevant questions that would gather useful information.</p>
<p>participative</p>
<p>I appreciated the visuals of the future (now existing) line.</p>
<p>public meeting</p>
<p>Quick, easy to provide feedback.</p>

That it was held.
Bringing in planning people
Good maps on display.
on line convenience open house peopel available to answer questions
presentation of options, even though they appeared somewhat unrealistic
Helped me see a larger picture. Encouraged me to look for future opportunities for input. It's valuable that the City (or any government) understands the specific priorities of citizens before proceeding with significant projects.
don't remember
Was able to see what the issues were and some clear solutions
Information was easy to access.
We were kept informed of the progress of the project by my alderman's staff.
Not sure if I liked anything particularly - really it just said it had been postponed
City of Calgary's website information along with it's use of the media has provided adequate information to help understand the issues and plans for the transportation planning project.
None. This was not a consultation but a fait accompli of \$1 million then presented to the citizens. Perhaps you should rephrase your biased question above. It is not statistically valid.
I was happy to be able to give feedback as to what I think is important. From the open house I attended it sounded like a lot of people thought that a number of changes were needed to the plan presented.
Good info
Public Open House
The venues were good, although the entire approach was flawed
The ability to ask the actual technical experts who will be designing the changes questions about how the proposed changes will affect existing traffic patterns, including which traffic patterns will worsen (such as delays at traffic lights).
Holistic approach in trying to anticpate collateral issues and minimize unanticipated issues
The fact that it was open for input from the public.
All of it
A booth for each section of Crowchild trail with knowledgeable external staff from the engineering firm was helpful. Great to hear the reason for the design considering resources limitations.
Ability to ask staff questions, see maps and concept images.
the group from the city at least tried to engage the community
Being able to offer feedback on personal experiences where safety my was concerned crossing

20th Ave NW and 2nd ST NW.

openness, feedback considered, availability of information & ability to ask questions

3. What can The City do to help make the planning process experiences more consistent and valuable?

Response

The City has to stop trying to institute an agenda that is European in its planning approach and respect Calgary's history and its character (a car city with suburbs). To ignore this is to send the City down the Detroit road, where first residents start to leave, followed by businesses, and the pattern has been repeated throughout North America. One cannot "uninvent" something that is challenging to plan for - the car (it's here to stay until we have Star Trek transporter beams or "flying" cars). Given this, adjust policies to accommodate that mode of transportation (not all will ride public transit), and not everyone commutes to the downtown for work. The City should always present options, with the pros and cons (including costs, impact, efficiency for the City AS A WHOLE)

Introduce planning (not just transportation) into the equation from the outset. Consider the transportation ideas in the context of larger solutions for the immediate areas. Get rid of design based ideas at the outset and replace them with outcome requirements to help guide fulsome discussions. Stop hoarding information. Learn from over 35 years worth of experience across North America about the ineffectiveness and negative consequences of inner city freeways and consider alternatives.

My experience was the City was good at early communications but did not carry them through the life cycle of the project. I had to strong encourage the City to facilitate more sessions and then had to carry the effort by myself once project execution began. The City needs to gather input and advise how they have used it, need to communicate same messages repeatedly realizing the public understands through repetition and comes in and out of a project at various points along the timeline. In most situations, the public doesn't realize what is going on until they actually see work and therefore the need for further repetitive messaging and communication through completion. The City should also identify those in each community who are 'game changers'. These are people who are willing to work with the City and promote their communities but also willing to advocate for the community on decisions made. I provided this advocacy for Scenic Acres during the LRT projects.

Neutral facilitation

Representation from pertinent City departments at meetings. These people need to be subject-matter experts at a minimum. Decision-making level staff is even better.

More online options are preferred since in-person meetings can be intimidating.

Make the process predictable

I don't know.

no comment

Acknowledge feedback received bring comments as what type of action or consideration will be made to each point.

Involve world class traffic planners; those who have actually designed, developed and won awards for their designs.
More web content. Perhaps being able to email the planning people
I found the "man from Toronto" who was running things to be condescending. I asked a question about the number of vehicles a particular project would generate and he informed me that "people won't drive cars - they'll use the ctrain." Good way to shut down discussion!
open communication not push "personal" flagship agendas
hold more, smaller sessions
Continue to invite input through various means (online surveys, public workshops). Send updates to interested & involved parties when major changes to the plan are incorporated. Make clear what values and needs (short and long-term) the plan addresses.
continued invitations to surveys and open houses
Be more consistent in how the process is handled, allow more on-line review, it is not always possible for folks to get out to review sessions.
Keep providing info on website but use all methods, conventional media, electronic media, etc to advise that info is available.
Announce meetings and information sessions well in advance (at least 4 weeks). Hold these meetings at night on weekdays so that working people may attend.
A few different options and the reasons behind decisions
Provide earlier city wide announcements of upcoming Internet and community information sessions.
The city has to really consult with a community. For instance, we've had one week to respond to online survey about Crowchild Trail and asked for more time to reach our seniors who were not online and were told no that was that. It seems the city has an idea and the consultation is just window dressing. Really problematic and the city lacks credibility in our community for its method of consulting which is not consulting at all.
The City can make all plans, even proposed ones, available online with surveys for residents to give feedback as soon as possible in the planning cycle. Perhaps even have residents complete a survey BEFORE planning changes are made to determine what residents think is important before spending money on planning that will ultimately be rejected. I think all surveys should request the residents postal code and primary mode of transportation. I think there should be more open houses which should be scheduled and advertised well in advance.
Gain public ideas first then present options
info posted online, open houses etc
Involve potentially affected communities/homeowners very early in the planning/study process
Hold sessions in the evening or on weekends at locations easily accessible by transit, especially the CTrain. Provide technical details of how the proposed changes will work, not just simple key messages provided by spokespeople. Engage the community before the decision has been

made, so that there is a reasonable chance that the input will help inform the final decision.
Balance competing and often conflicting priorities
Take public input into account, but not use it as a determining factor in decision making. Some small groups of affected citizens will try to have their opinions prevail by being more vocal, but the city's decisions should aim at maximizing the welfare of the entire city's population, not just a few people.
Actually listening to the committee members and what they actually know what they are talking about. They ignored what community members said with the West LRT about feeder routes, parking, access, etc. and now they are reaping what they sowed. Dangerous intersections, no parking removal of critical bus routes, elevators and handicap elevator/escalator access that never works, that were NEVER properly addressed. Quit making the studies so narrow. Things need to be planned - who are the main users - not who you would expect - what about detours and alternate routes during construction? Timely notices to residents? If you want input from volunteers then value the input. Don't simply dismiss the input because it doesn't agree with the City's agenda. In then end we are all losers when that happens.
State the issues so the solution to address those issues is understood by all and not those just close to the issue. A formal voting process on options at the meeting, so we were "heard" The survey form did not give a comfort feels that we have been heard.
Provide more clear information to participants.
It is critical that the "sample" include more than those who will benefit/ be ccustomer from the use of the "new" route/road. Quality of life of those living with the impacts of the "new" seem to have no waiting in the evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria is the first stage that community input needs to be sought, otherwise every step that follows is seen to be pushing an agenda.
Provide illustrations of what the end states once work is constructed. Conceptual Renderings of the end states of what the vision could be would be helpful to understand what the corridors might look like in the future. Or alternatively, conceptual renderings of what is not desired for the end state of a corridor that will be in existence from the next 50 years.
put designs online earlier

4. What aspects did you not like about the planning process you participated in?

Response

No donuts, but coffee was available. It was a very good experience, and the Alderman was there as well as the planners.

Whether intended or not, the design options for Crowchild were presented as a "which do you prefer" instead of a way to kick start the conversation on how to move forward. They did not take neighborhoods in to consideration beyond how to dampen noise along the corridor. Impacts on local nieghborhoods (traffic patterns) were completely ignored.

Infrequent communications and communication that essentially stopped after the plan was approved and didn't proceed through the execution phase. There was disjointed

communications between City and Province where projects intersected. I am aware that the Province has a representative to perform this task but it was not well handled and the community had to still deal with both governing bodies. Early on an inexperienced engineer from Stantec was given responsibility for the Crowfoot Station project. He needed significant coaching how to handle the people/community dimensions of the project and it took awhile for the community to achieve success in this area although we did. The City needs to consider all dimensions - not just technical ones!
internal knowledge experts trying to manage consultation
Failing to have integral or influential City departments represented at working meetings causes uncertainty and delay. Community and business representatives not being at the same meetings.
There weren't any aspect I didn't like.
participants felt that no matter what input they provided they outcome was driven by other factors and their input was negated
I was not always able to find the information I was looking for. This was mainly concerning the transit information once the line was going to start running.
public comment did not seem to affect plans
Uncertain what outcome came of feedback
That the designers were all Calgary City employees and had never designed something "...this big.". A partial quote from the head planner.
More internet based engagement would be preferable. The majority of attendees tended to be the naysayers.
As above.
none
too many people per session makes it hard to talk to the staff on an issue - make the staff responsible more visible
Most people are busy. I wouldn't like to miss an opportunity for input if questions raised in phone townhalls or in meetings were not also accessible for feedback online.
not sure
Once I attended all seemed to go quiet, no real feedback or indication anything changed as a result of the "new" information gained.
That the whole thing was shelved. There appeared to have been a lot of good work done and it was a shame that more community consultation didn't take place before it was released, if that really was the reason for it being shelved.
Need more detail about the decision making process for the project.
Nothing
Public awareness and involvement prior to the release of the various transportation proposals may have made the development plans more acceptable to the public upon the initial release of

the project's proposals.
I liked the location of the red and white club with free parking and the size of the room and displays. However the point was mute. The decisions were taken. The staff seemed unable to respond to questions or criticism. The money that was spent on Stantec could have been better spent on a true consultation with communities. I was pleased to see our area councillors at the consultation.
Resident's priorities should be solicited sooner in the process to save the taxpayers money.
Poor ideas
mmmmm, can't comment
There was absolutely no dialogue with the affected communities prior to rolling out various project/construction options, some of which verged on ridiculous in terms of catastrophic consequences to communities and potential cost to the City, showing houses and portions of various communities destroyed.
Information was vague, staff did not seem well-informed, and staff were not willing to talk about potential technical problems with the designs.
Incomplete outcomes and reversion to back-of-the-queue status once project completed; no opportunity for follow-up to address inutended consequences of main initiatives.
Controversy generated by differing opinions from the public - and their representatives - significantly delayed decision making on pressing issues that should otherwise have been dealt with in a timely manner.
The squandering of taxpayer money on items that needed to be properly addressed and totally ignored. There is never money to do it right the first time. But there is always money to re-do it again and again. What was so disappointing was the lack of knowledge by the City side and the unwillingness to actually listen to people who lived and worked in the directly affected areas. They only wanted to look at the actual train line and not deal with anything beyond the first 20 feet. So what happened - business went broke, 2 schools were demolished and have left a huge eyesore, no parking and very dangerous intersections. The loss of really good transit access in exchange for poor to mediocre service despite commitments to the contrary. There is no such thing a dealing in good faith with the City.
No timelines given. The plan was grand in nature for Crowchild. Need a realistic plan for the short term and a longer term vision.
Concepts and information presented were vague and non-committal.
we were told at the initial stages of the WestLRT, at a form; that there would be no impact on our community and "we could go home". This proved to be far from true. The label of the WestLRT project remained over years, but the scope changed substantially, to become a Primary Bike route, and Large buses servicing through traffic to communities downstream. Neither of the last components are really WestLRT and hid the need for "non" customers in our walking/cycling community to again try and submit perspective on a project that has resulted in unnecessary yet substantive negative impact on the liveability of the neighbourhood. There are solutions that would fix many of the negative outcomes, but we are told the project is "closed". To this day feedback is sought from "customers" with no equal / balancing input from

the community.
The time lag in developing a plan as the plans take a long time to develop
sometimes unclear if earlier public engagement would have led to better options on the table

5. What could have been done differently by The City to help make your experience better during the planning process?

Response
Not on the prior one, but on this one, have presentations well advertised for all districts along Crowchild Trail (the road's widening will affect Parkland and Kensington the most, but all districts are affected when nothing is done and the congestion increases) The City tends to be a bit obtuse (sorry), but please keep in mind that traffic includes business and commercial vehicles, and if they are unnecessarily congested, then business and commerce suffers in this city, and if it continues to do so, it jeopardizes this City's reputation as a very good place to do business. (Long term is Detroit, Edmonton's loss of the oil industry headquarters, etc.)
Actually engage the communities up front in the design process. Include planning to address all issues that may be relevant to the impacted neighborhoods and not look at transportation as the sole focus. Focus on outcomes - and examine all impacts before making even preliminary recommendations.
Communication through planning to execution of the project. Communication in various formats not just open houses - community newspapers and community events. We did an community session at our Stampede breakfast that was effective for example. Identify game changers who can advocate for the City within their respective communities.
See previous
Longer lead-time prior to meetings, list of attendees or groups being represented, general scope of meeting and agenda.
I'm not sure how broadly the information was disseminated because I'm on a mailing list, but it would be a good idea to make sure that notifications to participate and broadly distributed through multiple channels.
Make participation by more public members as easy as possible. Feedback can be difficult to obtain because the public doesn't feel their voice is heard or acted upon.
I don't know.
do public forums before planning and approving developments and roads
Inform of projects. Seek input provide feedback, address concerns
Introduce multiple design options from multiple designers including pictures/ videos of prior designs.
nil
City reps need to be more "open" to questions and suggestions. Many come across as, "This is how it is going to be." I end up wondering why the City bothered to hold the Open House and

why I bothered to attend. Same with this survey. Is anyone LISTENING??? Or are you simply generating statistics?
additional open house
smaller sessions, perhaps by community definition, that are located along a route
No suggestions.
not sure
More on-line information. Maybe even phone informaion.
Can't think of anything.
.
More options and reasons for the current ideas
The City and the community associations should have released information on how the ncommunities would be impacted made the residents of the prior to the release of the whole Transportation plan
It's not about the experience. It's about integrity of planning. Basically, the city continues to sprawl despite Nenshi's promises, and the inner city is bearing the brunt. There's real disdain for citizens who want to preserve inner city communities and facilities. I think there's a serious integrity issue and lack of respect for citizens.
Have more planning people at the open houses.
Get more public ideas first
can't comment
Involve communities directly in a meaningful dialogue prior to unveiling potential or proposed significant projects to the public at large
Be better able to talk about how changes in the transportation system will likely impact the quality of life for the residents in the communities that the transportation system runs through. Changes in one roadway may result in drivers using alternate routes, which will create more noise and exhaust fumes. Similarly, changes in signal timing may result in longer lines of traffic waiting for the light and impacting nearby homes. These impacts need to be identified when presenting the analysis of options, their benefits and their drawbacks.
Opportunities to address collateral issues once the main project was wrapped up
Give more weight to the independent, technical, non-political opinion of hired experts whose competence is beyond question while giving consideration to (but limiting the weight of) opinions from different interested constituents.
As I have previously stated - LISTEN!!!!!! and learn from residents. STOP assuming that they have already figured it out and this exercise is only lip-service and volunteers are simply to be tolerated. We know our areas, our communities, the existing issues and bottlenecks and how business will be impacted. We willingly do the City's job for free. Our expectation in exchange is that the City actually listen and incorporate these things.

Really ensure that the citizens understand the issues and why the proposal. The session needs to articulate the greater good, as many had their own agenda to protect. Crowchild is a really issue, as the City has grown considerably and cannot support the traffic volumes.
Present more concrete ideas that we can respond to.
Be honest upfront about the scope of the project, label and change labels of projects if the scope changes. Seek input on the evaluation criteria and the weighting of the components of that evaluation. Define clearly the decisions that are fixed/unchangeable going into the "consultation" to avoid wasted time, energy and hope of effecting a change to those parts of the plan. Grasp that potential new users might have a very different perspective than the current customer base, and to "grow the business" they are critical. Surveys of what is needed to retain existing customers, are very different questions that what would make you become one. Destroying/ eroding the liveability of the innercity with through traffic / buses will not result in the needed increase in the inner city overall population density/ customer base.
Shorter time frame however this is difficult to achieve
engage earlier, provide engagement materials (displays) online before and not just at open houses

6. What types of transportation projects and/or issues do you want to be involved in?












Response
specific to my community
Overall strategy for the City, as well as local transportation projects and integration of all types of transportation
North Central LRT Planning
Major Corridor, LRT, transit
Within the community - safety and security issues such as traffic calming and protection around sensitive areas such as school and park zones. Issues related to traffic flow within a community. Projects related to public transportation.
local area studies and awareness of city wide network studies
Crowchild Trail corridor, 16th avenue NW, NW near inner city communities
Bicycle infrastructure, TOD, Pedestrian management
Those where my community is directly affected or they have major traffic impact for the overall city
I would like to continue to be made aware of changes where I live.
n/a
Crowchild trail
Crowchild expansion and alternative options for travel

Major road expansion. Transit and bike transit planningk
Ones that enhance the liveability of Calgary while enhancing and building a world class reputation.
Crowchild Trail
It depends what the word "involved in" means. If it means to be on a committee, sorry but I'm not willing to commit to that. However, if it is attendance at one or two gatherings, I could do that. I am very concerned about the amount of traffic which is going to be created on Brentwood Rd once the hundreds (thousands?) of condos start opening there this autumn. That street is already jam packed between about 3:30 and 5:00. I can't imagine what it is going to be like once the condos are open. Though I live in Brentwood and have always shopped at the Brentwood mall, I may have to quit going there. That makes me sad - and angry!
Traffic issues relating to the Stadium Shopping Centre redevelopment, in consideration of plans for the Foothills Medical Centre
local neighborhood transit
crowchild expansion mainly as that will isolate my district from most of the necessary services that make it convenient
Speeding in my neighbourhood and shortcut ting
Any that are close to my community or the routes that I use (inner-city).
any that affects Calgary. I advocate for more transit
Ones that may affect me.
Stopping Bike Lanes that close city streets to cars
Public transit
Major corridor, transit and my specific community issues. Also cycle and pathway issues.
Preventing construction of new roads and bridges in West Hillhurst. Increasing ease of use for public transit. Increasing infrastructure for bicycle commuting.
Big question - I would like to know about most of them
Crowchild Trail at Kensington Road
Community planning and development.
Everything that affects the health and safety of my family and property values.
Crowchild Trail LRT
I would like to be involved in planning for roads, transit and "green" issues such as garbage/recycling/composting, building codes and pathways. I would also like to be involved in handicapped or limited mobility planning for all the above as well as accommodations for limited mobility people to attend various events, festivals and fairs in the city. I find that as a new disable person it can be very had to get to events like the Lilac Festival or Salsa festival. It's fine if you have a motorized scooter or wheelchair but if you use a cane it can be extremely hard if not impossible to park close enough to be able to participate in these events. There should be

a standard that is imposed on festivals that is a required part of obtaining a permit. All festivals that block city streets should make accommodation for sufficient handicapped parking right at the entrance to the event.
All
cycling, transit
Those that affect my community and ultimately my property values
Changes in collector roads, traffic signals, laneways, bike lanes, suicide lanes (road diets), traffic bulbs and traffic humps in Banff Trail and Capitol Hill. Also, any changes to 19th Street N.W., Morley Trail and any changes to Crowchild Trail.
I have yet to see any mention in the press of two areas that are of serious concern to me - as a resident of Garrison Green and frequent visitor to the North Glenmore Park area. My concerns are related to the complex intersections involving Crowchild Trail South and Glenmore Trail.
crowchild
Any that have to do with Crowchild and Bow Trail
Road diversions, road expansions and development
Nortyh Central LRT and Centre Street revitalization.
Would like to have input on the increased traffic volume through the Banff Trail community especially along 19th St NW & 24th Ave NW due to vehicles moving between 16th & Crowchild
North-south corridors, especially on the west side of the city.
large scale planning of infrastructure development and LRT extension possibilities
Crowchild Trail is very important to Ward 6. However according to the City, we are too far away and not impacted. I beg to differ - Ward 6 has 3 access to Crowchild and only 2 accesses into the downtown core - Crowchild and Bow Trail both of which converge into 1 which is 9th Avenue. To simply dismiss an entire Ward is unbelievable. Crowchild is a main corridor for Ward 6 and Ward 8 if you wish to travel north and south from our communities.
North LRT
Infrastructure project to support the growth of the City, as this has an impact to the growth and sustainability, a quality of life for the citizens.
Transit studies, corridor planning studies.
Planning of Transit routes, future LRT decisions, bike lanes, alternative transit solutions
South Shaganappi - University - Foothills AHS - Brentwood TOD - Banff Trail - Stadium area
anything that affects the streets and quality of life of our community, and the activity zone around it.
crowchild trail study
crowchild trail
I am interested in the road cross section discussion for the North LRT potentially running up

Center St or Edmonton Trail
cycling, pedestrian, major road projects (ensure all modes accommodated)
Crowchild trail and 24 Ave

7. How would you prefer to be involved in transportation projects? Please select all that apply.

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Town hall meeting – a meeting where The City makes a formal presentation on a policy, project or issue, followed by a question and answer/comment period for the public		44%	29
Open house – an opportunity to learn about a policy, project or issue by looking at information presented on boards and asking questions of City staff		64%	42
Workshop – an interactive session in which the public and representatives from The City work through key issues		55%	36
Online forum – a conversation via messages posted online		24%	16
Phone survey		18%	12
Online survey		80%	53
Call 311		8%	5
Focus groups		38%	25
Social media (e.g., The City’s Facebook page, The City’s Twitter account)		11%	7
Other (please specify):		9%	6
None of the above		2%	1
Total Responses			66

**7. (Other) How would you prefer to be involved in transportation projects? Please select all that apply.
(Other (please specify):)**

Response
Committee
mail out to provide information
interactive website where documents, plans etc can be reviewed and comments on them submitted. This allows input at my convenience.
Focus groups/workshops must involve the respective community associations/representatives from the potentially affected communities
Community Associations for hosting public forums as well as community feedback. Phone surveys are ineffective and on-line is painful as there is never sufficient information or explanation.
Opportunity to have genuine input, not be dictated to by lobbied interests

8. What types or groups of stakeholders and citizens do you think should be involved in transportation projects?

Response
community members
Representative of all interests, including community residents, commuters (both (private and public), pedestrians, cyclists, commercial drivers, and even public transportation drivers.
Any/all members of the affected communities.
Both those that are expected to benefit, regardless of where they live along the project, with an emphasis on citizens in communities directly impacted by the projects through their neighborhoods.
I have already mentioned game changer type folks need to be involved. Those who are open-minded, committed and advocate for their community as well as the City plans. Those willing to be around from planning to execution. Background in project management and stakeholder engagement would be beneficial. Some technical knowledge is an asset.
anyone who is interested
Connected or adjacent communities, businesses in the areas, City departments like Transit, Emergency Services, Roads, Bylaw services
Residents affected primarily, followed by commuters impacted.
All informed citizens but mostly those who have actively participated and have a background and knowledge of sound planning principals (I admit I don't know how you find these people, but they exist)
All types. I don't know specifically.

residents of area affected
Local Businesses, residents and council.
Land owners and commercial business. City planners
Those directly affected.
Those that pay City taxes, corporate citizens and the provincial government.
People who actually use the corridor. Open houses tend to be stacked by people who live in the neighbourhoods and as a general rule are naysayers.
Tax payers
Everyone - homeowners, renters, Community Association, small store owners, schools.
Residents of communities that are now considered "inner-city" (at least by realtors), and that are being or will be impacted by future redevelopments in established communities. Are these not the true "stakeholders" as they are the most impacted?
end users of projects area business developers
adjacent communities - ems personnel
Community members and community board members
Any who accept the invitation: residents, elected officials, business people, developers, commuters... and top-notch urban planners.
bicyclists, community residents. give lower weight to those who only ride cars and house developers
The stakeholders who are most involved or have the most to gain or lose.
Taxpayers only
Plebiscite
I think a wide group. To often I think the groups that are closest and the loudest get heard and others that are greatly impacted (such as by greatly increased travel times due to "traffic calming" do not have a say. However, I do believe that those impacted the greatest should be heard but in any large city there will always be trade offs and something that benefits some will hurt others.
Home owners.
Anyone who wants to be involved
Members of impacted community
All residents and business who consider themselves impacted by the project.
All residents who own property. Business owners.
Tax paying ones only
All the people use cars or trucks daily and those whose houses are affected by the traffic.

<p>- Local Residents - Affected Community Associations - Users that may not be local (i.e. commuters, business transport) - Some sort of Green council or representatives of groups that foster sustainability for the future (I'm not certain what groups or individuals this would include but if there is a City "green" department they should participate as well as outside community representation.) - City of Calgary bus drivers (specially if the project is transit related and they should NOT be senior or middle management but actual long term service drivers) and representatives from the taxi community as they are on the roads all day and often have great insights to the challenges and possible solutions to transportation issues. - In addition to the City's planning specialists, perhaps each major transportation project should have intern(s) made up of recent graduates of planning or related fields in order to get fresh ideas. Younger people may have viewpoints that would be different that a seasoned professional. Their ideas may be better or if not, at least we would be actively training future planning professionals.</p>
Local residents
community associations, groups like Bike Calgary or Tour de Nuit society
As stated above, representatives from the respective community associations of the potentially affected communities
Any resident who feels that they may be impacted by a transportation project. Do not exclude residents from neighbouring community associations if changes in one community could impact residents in another.
Anyone with an interest who is a resident of Calgary
a wide variety - those who live in the communities near corridor, drivers who have to use the corridor to get to work, etc, those who walk or bike and could be affected by changes to corridor, city planning projections of population changes
communities affected by road expansions or newly build roads
Citizens affected (living by) by the proposed changes to road transportation corridors. Individuals that are not living by affected communities should NOT be allowed to participate as it only affects their commute not their property or living standards.
Community Associations, individuals
Community residents & business owners working closely with the City planners
Transportation experts with a track record of successful, state-of-the-art planning in Canada or abroad.
business owners local residents in effected areas calgary transit focus groups calgary parks and recreation
General Public, Transit Users, Local Businesses, Community Associations and most importantly Directly Affected Residents along ALL portions of the project - not just what the City wants to pick and choose.
Community associations, citizens using the roads, citizens' homes/neighborhoods impacted by the project
Residents, Businesses, Developers.

Transit users, cyclists, Universities, Hospitals, Airports.
Residents and people that goes through the area
Urban / Community planners, Community associations,all directly impacted by the project, industry
drivers
businesses, community members, residents close to corridor
Whoever wants to be and however might complain about the end result. Community Associations and offer update through Community Association monthly publications has been effective for myself.
users (ie citizens), groups representing user groups (bike calgary, transitcamp), residents
Daily commuters from NW quadrant and residents along 24 Ave NW

9. At what point in the planning process do you want to be involved?

Response
at the beginning
early and throughout all phases
Planning
Inception - to ensure the right process is undertaken and the questions properly framed.
I have been involved in all phases of City projects. My preference is design and communications.
terms of reference through to recommendations
Policy creation and implementation
At all levels.
As early as possible to allow the broadest range of outcomes
i would like to be able to be updated via website on the entire process.
before final decision
Early
Research possible solutions
Grand scheme. What is the final idea and how will it look. The day to day logistics are not as important
Before City Planners get any funding for a design proposal.
any
Before final decisions are made.

Surveys, workshops. Sadly, I feel it is already too late to have any impact on the development which will affect me the most.
Depends on the project, and what influence I might have (probably less influence than developers). If this is just "window-dressing" then I don't want to waste my time.
early on- ideas
every 2 - 4 months
At the point where my opinion will actually matter
In most cases, throughout. In particular, early consult, to ensure that overall direction considers (even if the project cannot ultimately serve) a wide range of interests.
not sure
Before too many decisions have been made or frozen.
Start
Early stages
When initial options are proposed and before preferences are developed. Also should get input on options that City staff may not have considered.
As early as possible, in order to protect the neighbourhood from the construction of roads and bridges.
before it gets so far along it can't be changed - but have you should have some ideas to present - and pros and cons of a few different ideas.
All
Ongoing.
The very beginning of an idea germinating by someone in the city--not after \$1 million given to a consulting company.
no idea
I would like you to solicit what I consider priorities. I would enjoy participating in workshops and focus groups as well as attending open houses.
First step even before someone decides there is a problem
when appropriate
Very early on, and certainly prior to any public announcement or open houses or townhall meetings being conducted
At all stages - at the conceptual stage when the broad options are being planned, when the options are being more fully designed and when the designs are nearing completion.
Early on - I missed the meetings related to the Bow River area of Crowchild in which I also have an interest.
now

Initial planning stages
At the outset.
As early as possible and through to completion
Throughout the planning process if possible
Both before a transportation study begins (to give input on my mobility habits) and after one or more plans are proposed to solve the issue in question (to give opinion on the project).
schematic or conceptual
At the very beginning. Once the actual project rolls out in any detail it's too late.
Planning
During concept formation
At the beginning so I can know that finally, at last, something is being done.
All points
when the evaluation criteria is being established, when the impact studies are available, when the analysis of the options have been completed and recommendations are being made... before decisions are taken.
all
the beginning
I'd say earlier when thinking about the North LRT to be apart of discussing the vision for the corridor to get buy-in and potentially discuss a different cross section than the Calgary Transit has implement throughout Calgary previously.
early
Planning and study inputs to determine options.

10. If you have any other comments about transportation projects or planning processes, please provide them here:

Response

While "walkability and cycling" are very noble causes, please keep in mind that our city lies on 52 degrees north latitude, and most do not walk or cycle in winter. Automobiles represent the highest standard of living in the world, and surely engineers can come up with solutions other than artificial traffic jamming. All forms of transportation must be welcomed, not "pitted" against each other, which only causes tension and bitterness in the long run.

I find the City has generally listened to concerns and has either incorporated into their plans and/or has provided sound rationale why not to pursue suggestions. I found the City staff to be genuinely interested in a 'win-win' outcome.

I would like the process to be more science and less politics. It feels that some communities politic to sway traffic policy while less vocal communities suffer by being less vocal - this feel

<p>unjust and there ought to be more level policy for the good of the overall city.</p>
<p>I would just like to add one thought on how roads in Calgary are changed and planned: Closing roads and feeding people into neighbourhoods with only one or two entries does not increase efficiency of the roads (examples being the Tuscany and Rocky Ridge area where roads were CLOSED rather than increasing entries and exits). I would beg that older areas not be turned into these kinds of closed neighbourhoods.</p>
<p>The Peace Bridge involved an acknowledged world class bridge designer: going forward, so should all significant infrastructure planning. Minimize the use of staff designers for most design work.</p>
<p>Not sure what is meant by "planning processes," given what has happened with the Stadium Shopping Centre "ARP".</p>
<p>I realize that everyone has the NIMBY mindset must inner city neighbourhoods need to be protected from the suburb traffic</p>
<p>Thanks for inviting comments.</p>
<p>i thought this survey was about the crowfoot transportation corridor study... not a 'survey about surveys'!!! Hence why a lot of 'not sure' answers!!!!</p>
<p>This is a tricky issue as you will have people for each solution and people against it. It is most important to have people see priorities. How does this solution effect people and what are the the costs or gains per solution.</p>
<p>MY GAS TAX PAYS FOR ROADS AND REPAIRS, quit closing them for your special interests like bike lanes.</p>
<p>We must protect the neighbourhood from the construction of roads and bridges.</p>
<p>Once again, the cellphone tower consultation is just totally in favour of industry, there seems to be no end of cash for roads and road consultation. We need more protection of inner city communities from cut through traffic, traffic volumes, more cycling infrastructure. Oh, trying to figure out why the city was monitoring school zones in the summer months! You see stuff like this and really wonder why. The feeling in my community is that the city sees residents as an inconvenience to summer master plan that continues to promote city sprawl. For instance, the West LRT. There are 43 identified communities at risk. There is only one on the West LRT. It's tough to see the city working at cross purposes. As well, Roads has decided it will NOT respond to 311 requests from citizens. How can there be any respect from mere citizens. Lots of issues with the city. At the core is integrity.</p>
<p>holding people hostage in the south west because the Indian nation has got to ,sixty years og negotiations pure stupid and a city of Calgary size should have safe and good routes out of thier communities,The City took no time to build a tunnel that goes nowhere in a hurray and at abig price.Lets build the road through the the enviroment aera up not in a tunnel because of flooding.</p>
<p>na</p>
<p>Traffic calming on richmond road is terrible and dangerous when simple speed humps would be much more effective. That was a bad idea now we have to live with it.</p>

nil
Calgary has a number of road signs which I consider to be inadequate with respect to offering direction to exits that appear in unlikely places. I've driven in all of Canada's major cities and I don't recall any of them having main arterial roads on which there are no proper shoulders, as we find in Calgary. Many of the white lines painted on our roads seem to be continually in a state of disrepair - I understand that the durability of the paint used for that purpose was seriously compromised when Calgary opted for lead free paint - many years ago. I remain unconvinced that that was a prudent move - clear lines save lives. I've yet to hear of anyone who died from being subjected to road based lead paint.
Currently they are not transparent
The attractiveness of Calgary as a home for new businesses, migrants and immigrants will be greatly compromised if its citizens continue to be stuck in traffic for hours on a daily basis in their commute. The city must be able to fund the large transportation investments necessary to protect the quality of life of its people by preserving slack in the transportation system, as it has done for decades, despite fast population growth. Small fixes will only hide growing problems.
When the city actually involves stakeholders at the very beginning and listens to what they have to say, the projects are generally on time, under budget and have minimal fuss and fix-it's after they are completed. Where the City allows political interference to trump this process they end up over budget, way over on time delays, and general leaving everyone with a bad taste not only for the process but the outcome. The City has some good policy and process in place. However they need to follow it more often. Yes - the planning portion take longer but once the execution phase begins the roll out is so much easier.
see above
The transit system in the Southeast is woefully inadequate. Buses drive convoluted routes taking transit users into neighbourhoods they don't live in or want to drive through (ie: McKenzie Lake/Towne goes through Douglasdale/Glen). The Bus Rapid Transit can take up to two hours to get transit users downtown or back home at the end of the day, there is nothing rapid about the service, in fact routes operated far more smoothly and quickly before the introduction of the BRT. Bike lanes are virtually non-existent and the reconstruction of the pathway system has not been prioritized. As you can see there are very few options for someone without the income for a car. Train service has frequently been promised to this area but now again the concern is with transit ways in the NE and NW, I am very disappointed in this city government and extremely sad to have supported a city council that doesn't care.
If citizens are going to be impacted and the city knows this at the beginning of a project. Those directly affected need to be told what solution the city is going to offer them so that they can retain some degree of personal "going forward" choice.
Comments covered above
I did not fill in balance of survey because I didn't want to double up on comments already provided at a workshop except to add: I have a problem with Transportation studies that use terms of reference worded as "preserve the integrity of adjacent communities". Need to assure using words that do not create argument of 'no development', or imply 'no impacts'. There will be impacts and in the eye of the beholder, some winners and losers at micro-level. Need to keep

focus on summative for benefit of the city within what is big picture agreed reasonable criteria.

Planning should involve a 20 year look ahead forecast of traffic and population density.