

WEST LRT (LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT) COMMUNITY SUMMIT

Saturday, June 21, 2008
TELUS Convention Centre

“WHAT WAS SAID” REPORT

PART 1 - WHY THIS SUMMIT? WHAT WE HEARD IN PRE-SUMMIT INTERVIEWS

Gale Simpson, Communications Manager, West LRT Project Office, thanked participants for attending the Summit. She referenced the City’s “Engage” Policy, noting that the intent of the Summit was to work with attendees at the “collaborate level” to develop an engagement plan for the West LRT project.

Specifically the objectives of the event were to:

- Identify critical elements and factors for working together constructively as the project moves forward;
- Identify key ideas, issues and opportunities to be included in the new public engagement plan; and
- Identify people who would like to work in an advisory capacity with the project team to draft the public engagement plan.

Stephani Roy McCallum, Facilitator, introduced herself to participants and welcomed them to the Summit. She provided an overview of the pre-Summit interviews, including the results of what was said. She indicated that a supplemental report would be developed during the summer to account for additional comments that were provided after the initial report was prepared.

Facilitator Note: The Pre-Summit interview report can be found online on the West LRT Website. Please view that report for complete details.

PART 2 - INTRODUCTIONS

Summit attendees were asked to introduce themselves, and speaking for him/herself rather than for an organization or association, offer how they had been affected by the West LRT project and/or process.

Facilitator Note: In order to respect the privacy of participants, we have removed names from the statements below.

- Resident near Sarcee Trail and 17th Avenue - Frustrated and upset and wants to be involved in process.
- Frustrated with trains going through residential area
- Concerned about process and lack of feedback and her concerns have never been identified

- Concerned about 45th intersection. Community designs will be ignored. Hope this process will be more collaborative
- Wants to listen and learn from neighbours and collaborate. Hopes trust can be earned
- Wildwood resident – frustrated and marginalized and had no inkling of change in median alignment and received no information from City. Hopes communications improve. Hoping to discuss how process can fit in.
- Alignment is an issue with wires/climbing of 26th St/traffic at intersection. Affected by safety/traffic flow/surface LRT/traffic disruption after the fact/aesthetics. Why are they doing it?
- Glendale resident – disillusioned with process, council struggling with questions, time requirement, waste of time, feeling marginalized & disregarded.
- Sunalta resident, speaking for one of Calgary's poorest communities – this is a citywide issue and disagrees that alignment is not open for discussion.
- Scarboro resident – perception of how Calgary works and this requires a change to City council because the process is flawed. He thinks the Open House began at wrong time and is too late.
- Concerned about lack of process of listening to community at large – want to come up with concrete plans.
- Shaganappi resident – interested in solutions
- Optimistic that this process is moving in right direction – goal is that the City will not go forward without engaging communities in the future whether the project is large or small.
- Shaganappi resident – Upset with the secrecy of City Hall.
- Concerned about aesthetics/privacy/sound – the whole thing, as well as process
- Shaganappi resident – Spent time in City discussions and is upset at the attitude of City officials. Doesn't agree that the alignment that won't change
- Shaganappi resident – West LRT is critical to further development of Calgary but it needs to incorporate community needs. Frustrated with the City – statements and actions contrary to direction of council. Engage designers to provide direction to engineers.
- Frustrated by process regarding station, communications and how engineers select the route. When in design/build process, we want to be consulted. We need time to get things on table.
- Sunalta resident - Concerned about process in general on a citywide scale.
- Shaganappi Resident – LRT project has included a lack of process and there seems to have been secret information.
- Process has been frustrating with little trust on both sides. Residents have been trashed in media and were set up again today. Need input on station design, traffic access, and transportation network process.
- Resident near Sarcee & 17th Ave – there has been a lack of information, frustration at open houses and a feeling of getting nowhere with the City because of no answers.
- Resident of Westgate – has received poor treatment by the City: was told there was money to put LRT underground but where is the money now? What about traffic access? Where are the previous plans/proposals/input?
- Concerned with issues of transparency. Will this day be any different?
- Angry and upset at how the process has been handled.
- Local business owner – excited about West LRT and the alignment and looking forward to being involved more going forward.

- Don't want the West LRT, but trying to make the best of it and find solutions that work for all neighbours.

PART 3 - PARTICIPATION EXPECTATIONS

Participants were asked to identify their participation expectations for the Summit – for themselves, for others and for the facilitator.

- Get on with the job of getting process back on track.
- Provide good input to the City.
- Have an opportunity to change what's been happening so far.
- Processes are integral – want to facilitate better process and get information out so more people aware of what's going on.
- Get information, be part of a collaborative effort and share information with neighbours.
- Plan to participate until the end
- That crime and safety will be dealt with.
- Willing to participate
- Wants to be involved in process.
- Wants to get going and get involved.
- Wants proper information and to know how to participate in committees, etc.
- To be listened to and heard – to be involved because they have knowledge and experience over the years. Not giving up.
- Wants Respect
- Wants concerns heard
- Need connections on what we do in the future
- Need to know how the process fits with triple bottom line
- Want to be involved
- Hear what others are thinking
- Share with others what you hear
- Don't disregard my voice
- Changing the way Calgary works
- Wants the report to reflect what has been wrong so far
- Develop a concrete, collaborative plan
- Concern about focusing on process so it will be different going forward
- Optimistic that today this process is moving in right direction
- This is the very beginning
- An opportunity to provide input
- Transportation Department to get `marching orders` on process going forward
- We can make a difference
- Give City specific direction
- Want to be consulted – to know choices/opportunities/constraints
- Take step in the right direction
- Create a new process that will work

- Wants ``real`` citizen engagement – accountability, transparency
- Seek the best design
- Respect the cornerstones of engagement
- Energized for change
- Hone leadership
- Want it done right
- Add value to communities
- Citizens who are affected need to be engaged
- Honest, open, collaborative process
- Real information/sharing information
- Define who is a stakeholder, so everyone who has a stake is involved
- Too rushed, more time
- Want the entire process changed for projects like this going forward
- Share information with neighbours
- Opportunity to change process
- More time, less grandstanding
- Gather input and wisdom from group
- Proper information
- Participate
- Be listened to and heard
- Need answers going forward
- Is this going to change anything?
- Establish trust
- Create a process that works for the future
- One participant offered the following quote from R. Buckminster Fuller as a way to sum up his hopes for the Summit and a new collaborative process: *“You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete.”*

PART 4 - WORKING TOGETHER ON WEST LRT – WHAT DO WE FOCUS ON?

Summit participants were asked to identify the issues they wanted to talk about for the day.

The following items were identified for small group discussion:

Group 1:

Consultation, Engagement and Public Process

- Effectiveness and focus for the topics of collaboration process
- Public hearing before decisions/planning
- Collaborative communication and establishing trust between the City and communities
- Community liaison – communication circle
- Principles of collaboration, i.e., mechanics, commitment
- Area Planning Councils for each Station

**Group 2:
Transparency****Group 3:
Safety / Traffic / Parking / Crime**

- Pedestrians, Seniors, Disabled, Skateboards, Transient People, Children
- At grade pedestrian crossings
- Proper lighting
- Accessibility
- Surveillance/onsite security
- Traffic and Accessibility
- Level crossings at intersections, safety, traffic

**Group 4:
System design input into design/build**

- Comprehensive analysis before design decisions are made
- Land Use
- Group Feeding West LRT Stations
 - On the line
 - In the City centre
 - As a precursor to a citywide strategy

**Group 5:
Social, Economic and Environmental Impacts****Group 6:
Noise and Noise abatement**

Two items were not specifically discussed:

- Best Practices
- Minimize Impact on Shaw Millennium Park – Maximize Achieving Park Vision

Facilitator Note: participants grouped themselves into subject areas that were similar for the purposes of discussion, and in the majority of the situations, participants took their own notes, which are reflected here.

PART 5 – WHO, HOW AND WHEN ARE RESIDENTS ENGAGED?

Summit participants broke into small groups depending on their personal interest to discuss the identified topics. Participants in the group took notes to document the discussions, which are recorded below.

Group 1 - Consultation, Engagement and Public Process**What has happened so far?**

- See things already decided where there was no impact of community input
- Connection between City and communities not clear
- No opportunity to get real feedback from residents
- Glamorgan excluded from transportation studies
- Studied to death in isolation
- Defined by community – others impacted are excluded
- No one from Transit or planning at open houses
- Need information from City to communication/residents
- Alignment still being talked about
- Alignment not a dead issue until built
- Community missing a big piece
- Zone 2 excluded because not considered part of the process
- Stakeholders that have input must get closer to the designers and the planners so that they have input at the beginning.
- Communities have huge issues.
- Project should never have got this far without real feedback.
- Design must be made with input from community first.
- I suggest this City is run by administration – people who have been in their job for 30 years – and who are presently not willing to address the communities in a real manner.
- When an alderman can say that "Council knows best" - we know we have to change!

How to Plan/Decide/Build a Major Public Work in Calgary – Going Forward

- LPT Committee – What do they need to hear from us?
- Actively involved in design/build process closer to design/build consortium.
- Give feedback directly to decision makers – not to PR people.
- Community Association members are volunteers – this is a huge commitment of time
- Employees need structure to hear feedback
- How to deal with varying feedback?
- How would area planning council work now?
- How to codify issues?
- Example – bringing two neighbourhoods together, people losing houses, had area planning council – funded by City council
- Suggestion - four groups funded by City for Area Planning Council
- Have to go before Area Planning Council and get consensus before moving ahead
- Areas get dollars to hire consultants and ask questions of staff. Staff reports back to A.P. Council
- Issue of design/build – Hatch (?) hired to deal with huge bridge structures – with median bridges cheaper so other options can go forward.

- Bring specifications to Area Planning Council to ensure options
- What we can do today?
- City go to all areas for consensus vote.
- NW leg – after route decided, offer 1% of cost to each community for design of stations, interface, noise wall.
- Authority to decide what station would look like and dollars to spend.
- Do not have area from transportation councils to decide on stations in their neighbourhoods?
- Disagree with the idea for the Area Planning Council – just another committee/lawyer
- Will it even be recognized by the recognized by City?
- Volunteer time – struggle to get people - can't place such a big onus on community
- Planning department more involved in facilitating
- Paid/have broader view
- Alternative to Area Planning Council
- Needs to be vetted through community
- Use new technologies, e.g., web like Best West easier to disseminate information more effectively.
- Decision makers always at table.
- Area Planning Council gets to question senior administration and council
- Citywide issue
- City needs to get representatives from each area to be on Area Planning Council
- Terms of Reference – need to be established
- What can we decide now?
- Who decides?
- Who in Calgary has say on design/build?
- Geographic issues
- Authority - people have to influence outcome of LRT?
- A geographic box with things people can decide?
- Communities along line/west leg of line
- What is authority?
- If you have alignment, break it down, but if not, back at square one.
- Alignment – need to engage everyone if still talking about it.
- No alignment – then break into three sections (west end/middle/Sunalta 10th)
- Energy issues
- Taxpayers - Will not be misled
- Choose five or six things: what wanted out of collaboration
- Multiple City Business Units should be involved – not just Transit
- Design/build – alignment – Shaw Mill Park and Sunalta....location/move/level crossing
- Design/build consortium: Who will it be?
- Bidder – major contractor – price for what City proposing...specifications must include flexibility
- Different zones
- Some flexibility inside proposal
- Citizens need to know what specifications are before accepted

- Citizens need to know design options
- Traffic/residential areas: Traffic and Planning need to be at table between now and September 15th.
- Impact of ring road
- 45th and Westbrook as feeders
- Issues must be part of process
- What does the train do?
- Planning review committees
- Lines of communication
- How does the City engage its stakeholders?
- How does the City plan design or build a public work?
- What does the City need to hear from the stakeholders?
- How is it that they get us involved in the LPT report?
- What does council do now?
- Build the LRT
- Lots of voices, many different views
- How do I make recommendations to City based on all the varied feedback from communities?
- How do we code issues and get the issues in a coherent manner?

Facilitator Note: There is some repeat in the points made above and the recommendations reported by the group. This repetition reflects my attempt to group the information into related areas, while respecting the information that was recorded by the group.

Recommendations for Consultation/Engagement and Public Process Going Forward

1. Engagement on zone basis (7 zones)

Idea of 7 stations on West leg of LRT, suggest in all 7 areas that there be area transportation planning councils that have a mandate to engage the City through West LRT office for all aspects of design and physical design. Need to build Terms of Reference for planning committees – including mandate and who on it. Every department of City needs to be able to be part of that process, couldn't leave out transit, planning, police, fire – all had to be at the table at time plans were being made. Planners cannot go ahead without participation of all parties. Looking for people within City who are not just accountable to report to supervisors, but are accountable to customers. Consensus of neighbourhood planning council is essential.

- Include each component of LRT, for all seven stations on the west leg
- With design/build office
- Delegate dollars for each seven "territorial" areas to engage in design for their area station
- Design/build – engage process must include station and alignment issues
 - Community MUST be included along with Planners, Designers, Architects
 - Ensure design process is not driven by backroom "political" director
 - Includes all Ward 6 communities
 - Inclusionary

- Engage has to include City project decision-makers
- Use a Consensus Process Model
- Community Liaison ↔ City to communities – skilled groups.
- Fan out to community and build community capacity to participate
- Give feedback directly to decision makers – not to PR people.
- Terms of Reference – need to be established
- Who in Calgary has say on design/build?
- Geographic issues
- Authority - people have to influence outcome of LRT?
- A geographic box with things people can decide?
- Communities along line/west leg of line

Residents

↓

Gather feedback in organized fashion (email, surveys, meetings)

↑

Liaison returns data

↑↓

Impact – engineering – planning

↑↓

Impact on residents

↑↓

Feedback from residents

2. Create Area Planning Councils

Community members as decision makers in their own communities

"Area Planning Liaison" charged:

- With meeting with City planners
- Agreeing on what will be relayed to community residents
- Using internet to communicate with City to majority of residents – making businesses and associations aware, etc.
- Collecting feedback from residents and returning feedback to City
- All communication filed (legal responsibility)
- City Administration – employees are accountable to guarantee that feedback is included. Failure to address information holds a consequence.
- How to deal with varying feedback?
- How would area planning council work now?
- How to codify issues?
- Have to go before Area Planning Council and get consensus before moving ahead
- Areas get dollars to hire consultants and ask questions of staff. Staff reports back to Area Planning Council
- Disagree with the idea for the Area Planning Council – just another committee/lawyer
- Will it even be recognized by the recognized by City?
- Volunteer time – struggle to get people - can't have onus on community
- Need alternative to Area Planning Council

- Needs to be vetted through community

Facilitator Note: Subsequent to the June 21, 2008 Community Summit, detailed information on a proposal for Area Planning Councils was provided by a participant. That information does not form part of the Summit record, as participants did not discuss the specific proposal.

3. Use technology to communicate

- "Website" - each community has its own website and information liaison
- Technical Person – website
- Liaison person – writer – communicator
- Volunteers to arrange meetings
- Community Association – membership key to information gathering
- Using internet to communicate with City to majority of residents – business aware, etc.
- Use new technologies, e.g., web like Best West easier to disseminate information more effectively.

4. City to fund communities to engage on their own terms

- Design/build – 1% of cost of project to be given to community – then build the station based on the guidelines developed by the community.
- If the people of Calgary are involved at the very beginning of all projects, by initiating it or by a planning future change (LRT, for example), I believe the City will recognize that projects go more smoothly – may even get done more quickly – without fighting (as we always seem to be doing now).
- Cost less and buy in from the people is far greater.
- Authority to decide what station would like and dollars to spend.

Group 2 – Transparency

The concerns around transparency in relation to the West LRT project are:

- There have been substantial efforts in providing input to the public consultations on the West LRT but there has not been any output showing how or if the input was used in the decision making process.
- The unwillingness or inability of the City of Calgary or the West LRT Project to provide detailed information on the project that would allow for meaningful public involvement and participation prior to decision making.
- A concern that to date the process is listening to the "loudest" voices and not necessarily those who need to be listened to.
- This is the first step in up zoning property along the West LRT line
- The timelines for the construction of the whole process are unrealistic and do not allow for meaningful public engagement.
- This is not just a West LRT issue; it has applicability to future large scale transportation projects.

Who, How and When Should People be Engaged?

- There are a wide range of people and organizations that need to be engaged. This includes individuals, businesses, communities and organizations with an interest in transportation. This also includes all the departments within the City of Calgary and not just the Transportation Department and West LRT Project team.
- There is also a range of how people and organizations will be affected by the construction and operation of the West LRT. These interests need to be determined and engagement strategies developed that relate to what the impacts will be.
- Individuals and organizations affected through road closures, construction and the noise and visual impacts of the West LRT need to be directly engaged and have the opportunity to provide input on how the impacts will be addressed.
- Do not rely on consulting with and engaging organizations who are seen the “represent’ stakeholders. There is no substitute to dealing with individuals.
- Those with an interest in the West LRT need to be involved in the process prior to decisions being made that will affect them. They need time and relevant information and they need to know how their information will be used.
- There are both short term and long term needs for consultation and engagement. The short term needs to focus on identifying potential options for the balance of the West LRT project. Options need to be identified and assessed as part of the work to develop the plan requested by City Council.
- Starting this process in the middle of the summer and the short time frame to complete the work to have the engagement plan prepared means have implications for the potential involvement and input of the people participating in the workshop.
- Transparency - People don’t know where comments are going. Lack of willingness to provide information. Concern: need to look at all people with concerns – have to get out of mode of relying on organizations that represent stakeholders. Unrealistic timeframes. Dealing with trust issues. Committee and council have a big say in the outcome in the long run. Long-term: Learn from this process and start fixing now. Short-term: Need a group to oversee what happens in the next few months. Who is making the decisions? Who’s on the LRT Advisory Committee? Disconcerting that people are making decisions with residents and committee associations don’t know what’s going on. Where are results that have gone through the system?

Group 3 – Safety/ Traffic / Parking / CrimeTraffic

- LRT should be trenched under – 45th Street SW, Sirocco, Christie Park Gate
- The Sarcee/17th Avenue SW interchange and LRT MUST be done in conjunction. They are not two issues, BUT ONE.
- Ensure Bow Trail construction west of 33rd Avenue is completed before LRT construction is started.
- IF underground trenching is not done – major issues will occur including accidents and safety. Please do not repeat 36th Street NE.

- Is there a long term plan for West of 69th Street SW?
- Need bus access to all LRT stations.
- Better traffic signals and lighting (advanced greens) at 45th Street and 26th Avenue and Sirocco.
- Access for EMS/Fire/Police – How??

Crime/Safety

- Please leave EMS/Fire/Police at 45th Street/17th Avenue SW
- Location of stations regarding lighting: How can stations be safety buffered when located in an isolated location, e.g. Southwood and Franklin? This will result in crime. Costello Station will be the ideal location to do drugs – it will be the hideout for users and dealers and squatters. Station must be open.
- Lighting
- Surveillance cameras
- Buffer from open park space, squatters, drug users and dealers. Also social impact on neighbourhoods.
- BIGGIE! Key process is engaging community and residents in identifying existing issues and to collaborate on solutions specific to individual stations and surrounds. Include CPS/EMS/Fire.
- Onsite security, tracks to be fenced to stop access and crossing of tracks.
- Focus on “weakest” person – make plans for their safety then all will be safe.
- Focus safety on the most vulnerable (many unable to protect themselves), e.g., Seniors, Disabled, Challenged, Homeless, Low Income, Immigrants
- As a note, we have along West LRT, Homeless Shelter, Seniors Housing, Calgary Housing – low income/immigrants/chronic medical conditions/physically and mentally challenged.

Parking

- No parking during the day in front of residences by LRT users.
- Residents require parking passes to alleviate not having access to our homes.
- Limited time parking for communities.
- 26th Street Station
 - should be a plan for drop-off
 - again limited term and residential parking required.
 - parking permit (for residents) needed.
- Businesses along 10th Avenue SW stand to lose not only parking but potentially income – existing cars will be driven into the next neighbourhood.
- No provisions appear to be on the table for Park ‘n Ride and drop-off at 45th Street/17th Avenue. Need drop-off zone for LRT, but no park & ride.
- 26th Street east to Sovereign/Sandhurst/ etc. - two hour zones within 1-2 km radius of stations.

Group 4 - System design input into design/build

Pre-tendering system design. Community input needed before any tendering. No contract signed before Request for Proposal issued. Bring in independent transportation consultants. All tenders have to be acceptable to community. Communities would interchange with stakeholders. Communities should be involved in “soft” issues such as traffic, movement of seniors, etc. Oversimplifying? Need shared decision-making. Process has to be plugged in at significantly high level. Collaboration with police force as well as EMS. Crime detection through environmental design.

Who needs to be engaged?

- Independent Transit designer with planning and engineering resources
- Liaison between communities/stakeholders and City

How are people engaged?

- Bring together community and City technical skills
Share TTE process
Congruent with area planning advisory councils (APAC)
- IMPORTANT: Community input before Request for Proposal or tendering.

When are people engaged?

- NOW
- No contracts should be signed before collaborative design process complete.

Group 5 – Social, Economic & Environmental Impacts

Ensure ‘Triple Bottom Line’ factors – social, environmental and economic – are included throughout the RFP/RFQ and ‘Design / Build’ processes in order to allow vendors sufficient latitude to optimize “fine tuning” of all aspects of the West Leg, though what is documented below applies mainly to the Bow Trail Corridor. This was chosen due to the minimal 8 day period between May 15 ‘unveiling’ and the May 21 end of public input as relates to the Bow Trail Median alignment. That is, virtually no time was permitted for input *before* the decision.

Who should be engaged?

While all impacted areas deserve representation, this concentrates on Bow Trail users left out of the earlier stages of the process by virtue of the fact that the November approved alignment was not contentious to Bow Trail users, however the 11th hour change that moved the tracks to the Median caused significant new issues to these users. These are residents from Bow Trail and 24th St. heading west to the City Boundary, including Shaganappi, West Sunalta, Wildwood, Coach Hill / Patterson / Prominence Point, West Springs / Cougar Ridge, Valley Ridge and more.

How should people be engaged?

By processes such as these public engagement sessions and the proposed collaborative input over the summer as mentioned at the ‘Summit’.

When should people be engaged?

'Now' is the time; though this should have occurred long ago and the last minute change should have caused a later date for the approval process to allow fair input from the several tens of thousands of newly impacted homes using Bow Trail.

Triple Bottom Line:

Social:

There are several potential issues which can be addressed to 'tweak' the Bow Trail Median route to allow significant improvements in the 'social' realm, some of which can also be quantified by dollar amounts. All these can easily be positively changed in a cost effective manner. The overall thrust is that the Median need not be used for 100% of the length along Bow Trail.

- Lost productivity due to maximum traffic disruption caused by 100% use of the Median route.
- Loss of or disruption to south turning traffic access caused by 100% use of the Median route.
- Increased difficulty and associated safety issues of pedestrian and bike access across Bow Trail, including access to Bow River pathways by 100%.use of the Median.
- Increased noise and visual considerations are caused by 100% use of the Median route.
- All the above impacts housing along the length of Bow Trail and is easily avoided by partial use only; specifically using the Median from 10th Avenue to 24th St, only and thereafter going under Bow Trail and along the North side up to 33rd St.

Environmental:

While the entire West Leg implies huge environmental savings, there is at least one case where a slight change can yield significant additional savings. Specifically, if at grade on the Median, each pass of a ~180 Tonne train raises it roughly 16 – 20 Ft above what is necessary and therefore to remove this hump by placing the tracks lower down on the golf course yields savings due to avoidable energy costs.

Economic:

Many of the above have economic implications though they may be difficult to quantify. While it seems clear that proximity to an LRT would be a 'plus' for say, home values, if tracks and train could be hidden or obscured, it would be much better still. This can happen along Bow Trail in an economical manner, especially when social- and environmental-dollar figures are brought into play. However, all costs – including straight construction costs - should be re-examined to ensure that 'fine-tuning' can be optimized to produce the best West Leg possible.

Group 6 – Noise and Noise Abatement (Along Bow Trail and 17th Avenue)

How should people be engaged?

- What design options are available? Noise walls? Berms?
- What options are available for noise attenuation and privacy? These will differ in various areas.

- How will noise abatement be handled where there are roads that will stay (i.e. 24th Street at Bow Trail on north side)? Need to reduce noise, but keep roads.
- Berms can be used to decrease noise and visual impact in a more attractive manner in some areas.
- How high will the berms or walls be? What will they look like? Where will they be? Provide technical detail.
- Empower communities.
- Provide detail about options, include impact – cost should not be the only factor.
- Add greenery – trees, etc., where possible. Landscaping and beautification, where possible. This needs to integrate into the community. Pay special attention to existing communities – how can it be advantageous to the communities it runs through? Don't just slam in sound walls – quality of life issues.
- Early consultation with planners and urban designers.
- How else can we reduce noise? Can the train be trenched where it makes sense to bring the train lower, reduce noise and decrease the cost of noise walls/berms, have a positive impact of safety.
- Build noise walls with care not to create areas where safety becomes a concern, i.e., dark area that can attract criminal activity, blocks drivers view of traffic.
- Noise and visual impact go hand in hand. Use website to show visual renderings – “a picture is worth a thousand words”.
- Include social, environmental and economic analysis for all design options.

Who should be engaged?

- Affects only a limited number of people, so need to be focused on “residents on the front line” (within one block of the LRT line)
- Each area/community will have different needs – each needs to be represented and have input.
- “Primary stakeholders” vs. other stakeholders. Priority should be given to residents within one block of the LRT line (“primary stakeholders”) as they will live with the noise attenuation solutions in their backyard daily. Privacy/noise/visual impact – directly impacted.
- Residents/homes next to Bow Trail and Westwood Drive and 17th Avenue.
- “Primary stakeholders” are within one block of LRT tracks – most impacted by noise, visuals.

When should people be engaged?

- Regular (monthly at minimum) meetings and communication.
- Engage residents in the early stage of design before any decisions are made.
- Residents need to know what all (sound walls, berms and landscaping) the options are, not just one option.
- Residents need to know/understand the impacts of each option (social, environment, economic).

Additional Topics Not Covered

Rezoning and TOD

PART 6 – THINGS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Facilitator's Note: this entire report includes important information and considerations for inclusion in the development of a new Engagement Plan for West LRT. This section reflects summary and final reflections from participants, emphasizing additional and key points to be considered.

- Going out to people who haven't been involved so far (shelters, seniors, housing, police, emergency and medical services, street and outreach workers).
- Be more sophisticated in communicating and ensure clear communication
- Post the results of this meeting
- Integrated email/regular communication system to get information
- Consolidate the information/input received so far over the course of the project
 - Develop a Terms of Reference, stakeholders identified so far
- Bring together a small core group over summer
- Create a Google group mailing list to post information, look for replies, enter into discussions
- Include area aldermen in process
- Allocate a budget and resources to support the collaborative engagement plan
- Allocate Time
- What is the role of volunteers?
- Consider the size and range of people
- Have Gale [Gale Simpson, West LRT Communications Manager] to tell people what she needs, who, how people involved
- Have 10 to 12 members on the advisory team to develop the engagement plan. Meetings would be weekends and/or evenings. Communities should be aware of volunteers, etc. Need an independent consulting firm to act as a neutral voice to record comments, etc. Would like a summary from the City with all background information. Would like it to be packaged up and distributed throughout the City to community associations so that in future they have something to work with.

Gale Simpson, West LRT Communications Manager and Stephani Roy McCallum, Facilitator, indicated the following next steps:

- Gale to send a notice out to participants asking for volunteers to participate in the development of the Engagement Plan to be presented to LPT Committee in September
- Stephani to prepare report of Summit proceedings to be sent to participants for review and comment before posting to the website and further distribution

PART 7 - WHAT DETAILS DO YOU NEED

Over the course of the meeting, participants identified information they require. These requests for information are noted below. The West LRT office committed to providing the requested information, wherever possible.

- What design options are available to mitigate visual and noise impact for residents of Westwood Drive (parallel to 17th Avenue)?
- Noise Attenuation – Where are sound walls/berms proposed to be built? How high will they be? Do they take into consideration the topography of the area? What do they look like? Are there alternative design options? What are they?
- Present communication lines at City of Calgary Area Planning Committee design in other communities → What does good communications look like in other cities?
- Real information regarding construction cost and how much has been allocated for “cost overruns”
- A comprehensive Transit overview of existing reports rolled into a summary format for communities west of Crowchild east of Sarcee and north of Glenmore – including traffic counts, accidents and proposed bus access. They are out there.
- Station design access – seniors – access – loads per train projections.
- How can noise be buffered? A wall near stations? Also to keep out squatting.
- Who are the key decision makers at the City and how do we access them?
- What are the parameters/policies that affect design?

As a Certified Professional Facilitator with the International Association of Facilitators and a member in good standing with the International Association of Public Participation, I am bound by the values and code of ethics of these organizations. I verify that the information contained in this report is true to the best of my knowledge and reflects the nature of discussion and agreement that was present on this day with these participants.



Stephani Roy McCallum, CPF
Principal
Dialogue Partners Inc.
www.dialoguepartners.ca