

**North West LRT Extension
NAIT to North West City Limits**

**Public Involvement Process
Profiling Interviews**

Submitted by:



March 2010

1. Introduction and Background

Gray Scott Consulting Group Inc. has been retained to provide public involvement consulting services for the NORTH WEST LRT Extension planning project (Downtown to the North West city limits) for the City of Edmonton.

In February and March 2010 a series of profiling interviews with key stakeholders was undertaken to collect feedback on the three possible corridors identified by the project team and get input on a proposed public involvement plan for the project. This component was undertaken through a series of one-on-one profiling interviews with 9 key stakeholders. A copy of the Profiling Interview Form is included as Appendix A to this report. The results of the process are reported in this summary document.

2. Key Stakeholder Profiling Interviews

Gray Scott Consulting Group Inc. developed a list of key stakeholders in cooperation with the City of Edmonton. The contact record for this phase of the project, included as Appendix B to this report, outlines the list of key stakeholders who were contacted for interviews.

The Project Public Involvement Plan identified a total of 17 stakeholders for, Gray Scott Consulting Group to approach for profiling interviews. Of the sixteen who were approached by phone or e-mail, ten face-to-face interviews were completed as of March 8, 2010. At the time of writing this report, one more interview is scheduled for the week of March 8, 2010. We have been unable to contact one stakeholder group and five stakeholders who were contacted did not respond to repeated requests. (See Appendix B).

The profiling interviews were all prescheduled, and a copy of the profiling interview form and the Public Involvement Plan were sent to the stakeholders prior to the interview.

The interviews were all conducted face to face at the stakeholders' choice of location. At each interview, the interviewer kept notes of the responses to the greatest extent possible. A detailed compilation of the summary notes of the responses is contained in Appendix C.

The compilation is intended to provide a complete summary of all of the responses to questions asked by the interviewer. Some comments were edited or omitted to maintain confidentiality.

Not all interviewees were asked all questions due to time constraints or due to having felt that they were asked the same questions previously.

2.1. Common Themes from the Interviews

While many of the responses to the questions were specific to the individual situation for each interviewee, there were a number of common themes that emerged from the interviews.

The common themes are listed below the question as excerpted from the survey form. Not all questions were asked of all participants directly since, in some cases, responses were given while addressing other questions. Also, some interviewees simply did not wish to respond to a question due to lack of knowledge or because the response would be of a proprietary nature.

Initial Level of Awareness and Knowledge Section

What is your general knowledge of public transportation planning in Edmonton?

The majority of the respondents had limited awareness of the current LRT project. One respondent has followed LRT planning in previous projects and through the Master Transportation document. Three respondents indicated some knowledge about the WEST LRT project and two through the NORTH LRT project.

What is your general knowledge of this project?

Eight respondents indicated they had no previous knowledge of the project other than that information we had shared. Two others had some discussion at the community or area level regarding the project.

What involvements have you and your organization had in previous LRT planning processes?

The majority of the respondents had not been involved in any other LRT study. Two were active in the NORTH LRT study and one in the WEST.

General Route Considerations and Local Issues Section

What are your general thoughts and impressions about the need for LRT expansion into the west?

A common theme from the responses was that something must be done to address congestion on roads feeding into and out of northwest Edmonton 127 Street, St. Albert Trail and 97 Street were pointed out as constantly congested during rush hour traffic. One respondent wanted better bus system all others believed LRT would be very beneficial to the area.

One respondent made it very clear that using the airport lands as an end destination was inappropriate as the decision to close the airport is not final and the clean up costs and requirements are yet to be determined.

One respondent specifically asked if this was just to serve the residents of St. Albert.

Are there proposed expansion/growth opportunities in Downtown or northwest Edmonton that you feel may impact the route alignment decision?

All respondents mentioned growth in Castledowns, Griesbach, Canada Lands, and airport land. In addition a development called Ascot Gardens at 132 Street and 132 Avenue was mentioned two times, the old Charles Camsell Hospital mentioned once.

What do you see as the major traffic generators / origins/ destinations within the described corridor?

Virtually all respondents indicated St. Albert and the neighborhoods and communities north of 137 Avenue were the primary traffic generators.

Issues and Concerns Section

What do you think are the primary concerns or issues that should be considered in the route alignment and design of the LRT expansion from Downtown to Lewis Estates and what do you see as the top three priorities for the WEST LRT route alignment?

While the interviewees had differing views on the order of priority for their issues and concerns there was a great deal of commonality in their top three. The following indicates the issues raised:

- Impact on Neighborhoods 6
- Ridership 4
- Good Access to Stations 3
- Park and Ride at Stations 2
- Serving Major Destinations 2
- Cost Effectiveness 1

Specific Route and Technology

What is your impression of the urban LRT approach described above?

Only three respondents were aware of the differences in the technology proposed for use for LRT in Edmonton. Once the material was reviewed, seven respondents expressed disappointment that low floor would not be used in this project. One respondent was pleased the system would not utilize low floor as they felt this technology would not be appropriate for Edmonton winters.

One respondent hoped that the City was not continuing the use of higher floor into the Northwest out of convenience rather than building the northwest using low floor and changing over the rest of the system over time.

What ideas come to mind as a way (or ways) to enhance integration with the community?

All respondents spoke to the need to have stations fit into and be properly accessible. “Sheltered”, “warm” and “friendly” were all words used to describe an appropriate station. One respondent indicated stations should be designed with the various community cultures or ethnic mix in mind. Two respondents indicated they would like to see communities involved in station design.

One respondent felt that though an urban approach is acceptable, trains should not be given the right-of-way in all cases.

What are the benefits and negatives for each route option?

113A Street

Interviewees provided a total of forty six (46) comments regarding the use of 113A Street as the NW LRT Route. This route was indicated to be the preference by seven (7) of the ten respondents and six (6) of the ten specifically preferred 153 Avenue.

Benefits:

Of the forty six (46) comments collected, twenty seven (27) were supportive of the 113A Street option, eight (8) more than the non-supportive comments received.

Of the twenty-seven (27) supportive comments twelve (12) suggested that the 153 Avenue option brought LRT to the widest ridership. Specifically mentioned were Griesbach, Canada Lands, YMCA, and Grand Trunk Recreation Centre

Seven (7) supportive comments were made regarding the opportunity to service the various businesses along 137 Avenue

Three (3) respondents felt that this route was wide and straight thus making construction easier or less neighborhood disruption.

One (1) respondent indicated this route goes to the “core of the Northwest”

Negatives:

Of the forty-six (46) comments collected, nineteen (19) were not supportive of 113A Street as the NW LRT Route.

Two (2) respondents felt that 113A Street was too narrow to accommodate LRT. Three (3) respondents felt that 153 Avenue was too residential with limited redevelopment opportunity. One comment received was “No one south of Yellowhead will take this route”, another indicated there was no room for Park and Ride so it wouldn’t work, and another indicated it was faulty for not using a major transportation corridor.

127 Street

Interviewees provided a total of thirty-six (36) comments regarding the use of 127 Street as the NW LRT Route.

Two (2) respondents indicated when asked if they were aware of any local or specific community, business or institutional initiatives that would need to be considered in more detail with this option, that this route would serve the development planned for 132 Street and 132 Avenue well. Another when asked the same question, indicated that Westmount Mall is not being served by any of these routes.

Benefits

Of the thirty-six (36) comments collected, fifteen (15) were supportive of the 127 Street route

Three (3) respondents liked the 153 Avenue portion of this route. The south option to 118 Avenue was seen as offering more ridership opportunity and better access to Inglewood businesses.

One (1) respondent felt this route offered more development opportunity, two (2) felt it was beneficial in that it served more apartments. Three (3) indicated it was beneficial for the Sheppard’s Care Senior complex.

Negatives

Of the thirty-six (36) comments collected, twenty-one (21) were not supportive of using 127 Street as the NW LRT Route (six (6) more than supportive comments)

Five (5) respondents felt the roadway was too narrow for LRT. Two (2) felt 127 Street was too busy now and couldn’t be closed down further. Four (4) indicated this route would be far too disruptive to communities.

One (1) respondent indicated this route had a greater potential ridership than the St. Albert Trail route but less than 113A.

St. Albert Trail

Interviewees provided a total of thirty-eight (38) comments regarding the use of the St. Albert Trail or 142 Street as the NW LRT Route.

Benefits

Of the thirty-eight (38) comments collected, fourteen (14) were supportive of this route

Respondents thought, for the most part, that this is the straightest, shortest and least expensive route. The term “path of least resistance” was used by one respondent. Two (2) respondents felt that businesses along St. Albert Trail would benefit.

Negatives

Of the thirty-eight (38) comments collected, twenty-four (24) were not supportive, (ten (10) more than supportive comments)

Twelve (12) comments indicated that this route would have poor ridership and was too far west to service neighborhoods specifically growing populations such as Griesbach.

Two (2) indicated LRT riders would have to drive long distances to get to their connection, would likely cut through communities to do so and would need park and ride at the stations.

Of the 118 Avenue option, one respondent indicated that Groat Road was “too pretty” for LRT and that 118 would affect too many neighborhoods negatively.

Communications – The Public Involvement Plan Section

What do you think of the proposed public involvement process for this phase?

After reviewing the communication plan, most respondents felt the plan was good and addresses most concerns. Several commented that it is the vocal majority who often dominate these conversations and that the “apathetic masses” don’t always participate.

One respondent expressed skepticism that the process would be meaningful and that any stakeholder input would be taken into account.

The majority of the respondents agreed with the process as outlined and agreed that the primary objective would be to communicate as much information as possible to the public. All respondents indicated a willingness to participate further

Several suggestions were made regarding the Public Involvement Process as listed below.

- *At open houses, make sure all departments are there so questions can be addressed*
- *Approach developments, big buildings, senior centres and engage their people directly*
- *Put posters, information, displays, survey terminals in public meeting places*
- *Lots of notice - 6 weeks*
- *Go through CRC's to reach community*
- *Involve high school students - go to them and ask their opinion*
- *Post card door to door*
- *Meet with the full board of each community*
- *I did the survey but has some technical challenges*
- *Advertise in the Sun and the Journal*
- *More lead time for communities*
- *Posters would be good*

How do you see yourself or your group participating in the process (going forward)?

All respondents advised they wish to continue to participate as key stakeholders in the project. The majority had newsletters that they would utilize. All intended to speak to this issue at their Board meetings. Gray Scott Consulting provided wording for newsletters along with a .pdf of the route and technology fact sheets to all those who asked.

Are there other stakeholders that should be involved?

It was suggested that as they meet as an area council, it might be easier to do it through that group rather than individual communities. Kensington, Roslyn, Calder, Athlone, Wellington and Lauderdale are all in Area 1

It was suggested that Woodcroft, Westmount, Inglewood all be involved. One respondent suggested we utilize the CRC's for dissemination of information.

How do you suggest we best distribute copies of the project fact sheets? Would you be willing to distribute on behalf of your organization? How could the project team help in "getting the word out"?

In all cases respondents were willing to put information into their newsletters and provide a link to the City of Edmonton website.

A copy of the fact sheet package was left with every interviewee.

Conclusions Section

What did you think of this interview? Was it worthwhile?

All interviewees expressed satisfaction with the profiling interview advising that it provided clarity or a “heads up” that was beneficial. One indicated that while the face-to-face format was good it was “likely expensive”

Did we ask the right questions? Did you anticipate any questions that were not asked?

All respondents indicated satisfaction with the questions asked

3. Report Summary and Recommendations

Recommendations Resulting from the Interviews

- Future public consultation processes should address the need for longer lead time needed by community leagues
- While not captured as part of a question, interviewees for the interviews done after the closure of the on-line survey expressed some frustration at not being able to complete the surveys or to be able to inform other community members of the opportunity. Future plans should better coordinate these two steps.
- Consideration should be given to involving CRC's more directly.

Appendix A:

Stakeholder Profiling Interview Questions

Name:

Representing:

Date & Time of Scheduled Interview:

Type of Interview:

Duration: _____

Background Explanation

1. The City of Edmonton has initiated a planning study to identify an LRT corridor from the NAIT STATION to North West City Limits. The study will be completed in June 2010, and it will be presented to City Council as an amendment to the City of Edmonton Transportation System Bylaw. Upon City Council approval of the route corridor, a detailed concept planning study will begin.
2. There is currently no funding to build the North West LRT Extension. This study is being completed to identify and protect the LRT corridor for long-term planning.
3. In December 2008, City Council approved the LRT Route Planning and Evaluation Criteria. These criteria provide a consistent approach to LRT corridor selection, reflecting overarching strategic planning direction in the City Vision, Transportation Master Plan, and Municipal Development Plan. Key criteria include:
 - Land-use/Promoting Compact Urban Form
 - Moving People/Goods
 - Feasibility/Construction
 - Parks/River Valley/Ravine System
 - Social Environment
 - Natural Environment
4. Public Involvement will be conducted in accordance with the City of Edmonton Public Involvement policy. Information on the policy is available on the City's web site at www.edmonton.ca/publicinvolvement.
5. The key aspects of the public involvement process for this project are:
 - To identify and engage representatives of the key stakeholder groups in the area that will be impacted by LRT in the study area.
 - To identify key issues stakeholders wish to see addressed in the study.
 - To educate and inform the public generally about LRT
 - To communicate the results of the project.

6. This interview is referred to as a profiling interview to get a sense from you, as a key stakeholder or as a representative of a key stakeholder group, of your understanding of the project at this point, what you see as the issues, your comments and suggestions about a number of route options that are being studied and your thoughts on the planned public involvement process. We hope that you will share this information and your responses to the questions with the groups and or businesses/institutions that you represent.
7. Following this interview, we will supply you with an information package with the information we will be discussing today. We ask you to share this information with your contacts, and encourage them to be involved in the LRT planning process.
8. Stakeholders have been selected to participate in this interview because of their unique interest, ability to express their opinions, and ability to represent the broader interests of their constituents and the community. We ask that you keep these perspectives in mind as you answer the questions we have prepared.

1. **Awareness**

- What is your general knowledge of public transit planning in Edmonton?
- What is your general knowledge of this project?
- What involvement have you and your organization had in previous LRT planning processes?

2. General Route Considerations

- What are your general thoughts and impressions about the need for LRT Expansion into the North West?
- Are there proposed expansion/growth opportunities in downtown or Northwest Edmonton that you feel should be considered in the route alignment decision?
- What do you see as the major transportation generators/origins/destinations within the study area?
- What do you think are the three primary issues or priorities that should be considered in setting the route alignment of the LRT expansion from NAIT STATION to North West City Limits?

3. LRT System Style

In June 2009, City Council approved the LRT Network Plan, which defines the ultimate long-term future size, scale, and operation of the LRT system. The ultimate LRT network would have six lines extending to the Northwest, Northeast, East, Southeast, South, and the West.

An important part of the LRT Network Plan is a change in approach to the overall system style. While the current LRT system can best be described as a “suburban” system, the LRT Network Plan calls for a change in approach to an urban LRT system. LRT would continue to operate on dedicated right-of-way, with priority, so the trains do not mix with traffic or stop at intersections. However, the urban approach brings other changes that improve connections between the LRT and city life.

An Urban LRT system means:

- Building smaller scale stations that are spaced closer together than you see on the existing LRT system.
- Integrating the LRT within the surrounding area by providing better links to a greater number of destinations, and providing more direct transit, pedestrian and cyclist connections.
- Integrating visual elements that minimize intrusion and maximize openness of space to create a safe environment.
- Respecting communities. The LRT would operate with reduced speeds in congested areas, allowing LRT to fit and operate safely in pedestrian-oriented communities with reduced right-of-way and fewer barriers.
- Investing in aesthetics to fit within an urban environment. This includes features such as landscaping, streetscaping, and architectural features like street furniture. Opportunities to use embedded track instead of traditional rock ballast and railway ties will be explored to improve visual appeal.

The City intends to use a new type of LRT vehicle technology (low-floor) on new lines that do not connect to the existing system (such as the West and Southeast LRT lines). However, because the Northwest LRT will integrate with the existing LRT system, the existing High-floor LRT vehicles would be used. This would mean that stations would still need ramps and higher LRT platforms, but other urban-style operating characteristics would still be pursued to ensure better integration with the surrounding area.

- What is your impression of the urban LRT approach described above?
- What ideas come to mind as a way (or ways) to enhance integration with the community?

4. Route Options

(Show each route and ask the following questions)

- What do you see as benefits to the LRT/transit system that would be offered by this option?
- What do you see as potential issues that would need to be explored with this option should it continue to be explored as the LRT route?
- Are you aware of any local or specific community, business or institutional initiatives that would need to be considered in more detail with this option?

5. The Public Involvement Plan

(Please refer to the draft public involvement plan document)

- What do you think of the proposed public involvement process for this phase?
- Any suggestions?
- How do you see yourself or your group participating in the process (going forward)? (i.e. – information, meetings, etc.)
- Are there stakeholders or groups that should be involved? How should they be involved?
- How do you suggest we best distribute copies of the project fact sheets? Would you be willing to distribute on behalf of your organization? How could the project team help in “getting the word out”
- If not, can you suggest another contact or another way for us to collect this important input from stakeholders?
- Other Comments?

6. Conclusion

- What did you think of this interview?
- Was it worthwhile?
- Did we ask the right questions?
- Did you anticipate any questions that were not asked?
- Any other questions or comments?

***Thank you for your time today and for your interest
and participation in this project***

Appendix B: Contact Record for Profiling Interviews/Stakeholder Contact

WEST LRT Planning Study Key Stakeholder Contact Record

For Profiling Interviews

Association or Community League	Contact log
Prince Charles	Unable to contact
Lauderdale	Messages left
Calder	To get back to us
Athlone	COMPLETED
Rossllyn	COMPLETED
Kensington	COMPLETED
Wellington Park	COMPLETED
Sherbrooke	Booked for March 8, 2010
Dovercourt	COMPLETED
Carlisle	Messages left
Caernarvon	COMPLETED
Cumberland-Oxford	Sent email Feb 11
Prince Rupert	COMPLETED
Kingsway Business Association	COMPLETED
Inglewood Business Association	COMPLETED
North West Industrial Business Association	COMPLETED
Mature Neighborhood Advisory Group	Messages left

Appendix C: Compilation of Profiling Interviews with Stakeholders

This compilation provides a complete summary of all responses to questions as asked by the interviewer. Numbers in brackets (x) following some comments indicate the number of people that gave the same response. Some comments were edited or omitted to maintain confidentiality.

Awareness

- What is your general knowledge of public transit planning in Edmonton?
 - Newspapers and news only
 - Limited;
 - Aware of NAIT line; not too knowledgeable about NW. Assumed it would come this way eventually.
 - Very knowledgeable about WEST not so much the NW
 - Active in the N LRT route planning
 - City employee; works in SW lives in NW
 - Knows about and has read the TMP
 - Monitors the website
 - Aware of WEST, involved in NORTH
 - Got an email from the CRC no involvement previously
 - Some awareness – news
 - Some knowledge of the WEST

- What is your general knowledge of this project?
 - ◆ Limited
 - ◆ With the 124 St BRZ re WLRT
 - ◆ WEST
 - ◆ Just what I received from you
 - ◆ Aware, contacted community President and okayed to speak to this interview but not a representative of the community directly
 - ◆ Got email from city making us aware this was underway
 - ◆ Just the email from CRC and your call
 - ◆ Nothing really though we did the survey
 - ◆ Some discussion at community level and Area 1 Discussions

- What involvement have you and your organization had in previous LRT planning processes?
 - WEST - we were also consulted
 - None - aware of South due to business there
 - NLRT active (2)
 - None (3)

General Route Considerations

- What are your general thoughts and impressions about the need for LRT Expansion into the North West?
 - ◆ Good idea, necessity, a perfect form of transportation for the area
 - ◆ NW primarily industrial; are we just serving St. Albert?
 - ◆ Needed - so few access routes from NW to downtown, Huge traffic congestion
 - ◆ Lots of ridership out here
 - ◆ Great to get vehicular traffic off the roads
 - ◆ LRT is great - less cars the better
 - ◆ My neighborhood is directly affected by St. Albert traffic.
 - ◆ Lots of people live in NW and work elsewhere
 - ◆ Fewer cars on the road important
 - ◆ No large employers up there and LRT is important to provide access to employees of businesses, not as important up there.
 - ◆ The business district is further west than this route is considering
 - ◆ Great thing for the NW
 - ◆ Great for hockey access; family uses LRT by going to NE - this will be great
 - ◆ Should have been done sooner
 - ◆ LRT to the NW is important - I currently take the bus
 - ◆ Children in the community are future users to U of A etc
 - ◆ Can see taking LRT to Century Place and then cab to airport
 - ◆ Hate the current bus system
 - ◆ Needed for sure
 - ◆ Have to take traffic away
 - ◆ 127 Street is a joke now, wasn't designed for this much traffic

- Are there proposed expansion/growth opportunities in downtown or Northwest Edmonton that you feel should be considered in the route alignment decision?
 - ◆ NW primarily industrial; are we just serving St. Albert?
 - ◆ Not a whole lot of ridership in industrial area, this will reduce traffic congestion from St. Albert and their growth. Some potential for development on 118 Avenue, airport
 - ◆ Expansion and growth within Castledowns
 - ◆ No growth - we are out of land
 - ◆ The Airport of course - Huge! Also the Charles Camshell Hospital
 - ◆ Griesbach
 - ◆ Airport lands
 - ◆ YMCA up in Castledowns
 - ◆ Calder needs revitalization
 - ◆ Griesbach and the Canada Lands
 - ◆ Castlebrook, St. Albert, Morinville, Skyview, Oxford
 - ◆ Ascot Gardens -132 Avenue and 132 Street

- What do you see as the major transportation generators/origins/destinations within the study area?
 - St. Albert - all the residential north of here. E and W on 137 and N and S on 127 St.
 - St. Albert (3)
 - Students, hospital, mall traffic, RCMP. AMA, Hotels,
 - St. Albert, communities north Skyview, Oxford etc

- What do you think are the three primary issues or priorities that should be considered in setting the route alignment of the LRT expansion from NAIT STATION to North West City Limits?
 - Affect on Neighborhoods (6)
 - Need good access (5)
 - Ridership (4)
 - Integration with other bus service (2)
 - Park and ride is critical (2)
 - Traffic congestion
 - Land availability
 - Wise spending
 - Least affect on the beauty of Edmonton, - where it fits in best
 - Time and Distance
 - Accessibility - Proximity and Availability
 - TOD Opportunity
 - This is not just a commuter route; don't just meet needs of St. Albert
 - Look to serve destinations - rec. centres, culture, libraries
 - Use existing corridors
 - Don't harm the heritage of Edmonton
 - Station location
 - Take prominent destinations (schools, colleges, recreation, downtown, shopping)
 - Noise

LRT System Style.

- What is your impression of the urban LRT approach described above?
 - No issues or complaints with technology
 - Worried that we are using high floor because it already exists instead of building for the future by using low floor. Understand the infrastructure exists in the downtown and would be costly to change out
 - South line is sure more appealing than the NE.
 - Preference is low floor but I understand the connectivity with downtown using the other
 - Low floor is a great concept, better than high floor
 - Like Low Floor Technology - more desirable and less intimidating

- Low floor is a real concern - the engineers haven't looked at this enough in our climate
 - Like the low floor - too bad not coming out this way
 - Low floor would fit in better
 - Don't want people standing LRT platform and looking in my windows
 - Would prefer low floor - disappointed in that decision
 - Lots of concern that we won't be able to park at stations
 - Community safety a concern
- What ideas come to mind as a way (or ways) to enhance integration with the community?
 - Rode on Vancouver LRT and really liked it
 - Station location key
 - Berm and fencing is attractive and should be. NE line isn't appropriate for residential
 - Integration of stops into the community - not huge concrete structures; Less fancy
 - I don't think they should have total right of way - they need to integrate better with traffic - might have to stop once in a while for traffic
 - Build the stations as neighborhood friendly as possible
 - Work with the communities in designing (2)
 - Utilize culture or ethnic groups in each particular area
 - Consider history
 - Access to bike paths
 - Have ability to sit and visit – comfortable
 - Access for handicap people
 - Concerns re safety crossing streets
 - Sheltered
 - Access for seniors
 - Make sure they are warm

7. Route Options

113A Street

- What do you see as benefits to the LRT/transit system that would be offered by this option?
 - Hits the biggest population particularly if you go up to 153 Avenue
 - Seems like good access though 153 Avenue reaches more riders
 - Ridership is good on this route
 - More ridership
 - Like 153 Avenue as it serves more people for more times in the day
 - Serves Griesbach, Grand Trunk, YMCA (2)
 - 153 Avenue serves more people, YMCA
 - 153 Avenue serves residents
 - Serves Grand Trunk (2)
 - Great densification opportunity - Griesbach
 - 153 Avenue picks up more people and more neighborhoods
 - 137 Avenue would help get employees to work
 - 137 Avenue makes sense re businesses rather than residential.
 - 137 Avenue has lots of businesses up to St. Albert Trail and that center
 - If the focus is to go to business 137 Avenue would be best but the retail is already built
 - 137 Avenue has lots of businesses
 - 137 Avenue serves businesses and - two very different purposes
 - 137 Avenue would be nice if low floor and would be good for business
 - St. Albert Trail has light industry and it would be good for employee access
 - Close enough to Kensington (137 Avenue) to give access without affecting directly
 - 113A Street has some open fields and side streets so wouldn't affect too many residents
 - Wide avenue and straight route
 - Fairly wide open
 - Employees in the NW Industrial areas come from Millwoods and Clareview so that's where I am looking for help
 - Very convenient
 - Good access to business
 - Goes to the core of the NW

- What do you see as potential issues that would need to be explored with this option should it continue to be explored as the LRT route?
 - Hitting lots of traffic on 137 Avenue
 - 153 Avenue is new development, what would the potential be for redevelopment? Doesn't help Inglewood at all.
 - School (Jr. High) on the route - might be a negative
 - Grade separation at the tracks - that will be the case for all routes

- No great advantage to 137 Avenue
 - Not enough density; no schools or shopping centres on 153 Avenue
 - No impact good or bad on our community
 - No one south of Yellowhead will take this route
 - Nothing unless too many houses need to be taken out
 - Fundamental issue with starting on airport land, this issue is not resolved; you are doing this study yet the land decision is not done. Kingsway is NOT being served by this project
 - No room for park and ride anywhere
 - Not using major corridors
 - Potential for people to park at businesses and then ride LRT
 - Residential
 - Might be noisy for residents
 - 113A Street too narrow (2)
 - Doesn't help us at all
- Are you aware of any local or specific community, business or institutional initiatives that would need to be considered in more detail with this option?
 - No (9)
 - Businesses on 137 Avenue well served by this route;

127 Street

- What do you see as benefits to the LRT/transit system that would be offered by this option?
 - Serves denser population than St. Albert and serves 137 Avenue businesses
 - South route to 118 Avenue has great benefit for Inglewood businesses. Great exposure to new customers. Great chance to redevelop.
 - South route picks up a bit more ridership on 118 Avenue (2)
 - Good densification opportunity
 - Same thoughts re 137 Avenue vs. 153 Avenue as in other route
 - Some ridership but not as good as 113A Street
 - Like 153 Avenue better than 137 Avenue
 - Serves Westmount, Woodcroft better
 - Serves Sheppard's Care Senior Centre (3)
 - Nothing pro about this line
 - Service roads on 127 Street south of Yellowhead
 - Would ease traffic congestion on 127 Street
 - More apartments and businesses than 113A Street
 - Serves us better - like the 153 Avenue piece

- What do you see as potential issues that would need to be explored with this option should it continue to be explored as the LRT route?
 - Narrower (5)
 - Too much traffic now on 137 Avenue; too many issues
 - See no advantage to hitting 118 Avenue Too far west to serve the ridership
 - South route affects neighborhoods and isolates or splits those cornered in by 118 Avenue and 127 Street.
 - Same issues regarding use of airport land
 - Huge impact on communities
 - 118 Avenue is a concern
 - 118 Avenue doesn't seem practical
 - 127 Street is too busy now
 - Lots of houses affected
 - Not convenient for our neighborhood
 - Serves fewer communities, less ridership
 - Unless you are buying land, this is not feasible, you can't build it
 - 127 Avenue will always be a major thoroughfare which you can't choke off
 - Would cause people to cut through our neighborhood
 - 118 Avenue isn't good, too much disruption

- Are you aware of any local or specific community, business or institutional initiatives that would need to be considered in more detail with this option?
 - Development on 132 Avenue and 132 Street best served by this (2)
 - Businesses on 137 Avenue well served by this route;
 - Must have a station within the business area to benefit
 - None of these hit the Space Science Center or Seniors complexes in Woodcroft, Westmount

St. Albert Trail

- What do you see as benefits to the LRT/transit system that would be offered by this option?
 - Fast and good for St. Albert (2)
 - Wide corridors, use of railway space; like 118 Avenue option
 - Great redevelopment opportunity along north side of the railway. Potential to redevelop all along 118 Avenue to St. Albert Trail
 - 127 Avenue section is in a lower income area and likely good ridership there
 - Lots of businesses on the south portion of the St. Albert Trail portion
 - Direct
 - Gives some access to Westmount
 - Path of least resistance, likely lower cost
 - More room for park n ride
 - Follows rail line

- Least impacting and likely cheapest
- Nothing good
- 142 Street uses CN land - limited affect on surface traffic

- What do you see as potential issues that would need to be explored with this option should it continue to be explored as the LRT route?
 - Difficult to cross 137 Avenue missing population density
 - Station location on map is too far away from Inglewood businesses
 - Groat Road is too pretty for LRT
 - It is on the backsides of the neighborhoods- poor ridership
 - 118 Avenue section would affect too many neighborhoods
 - 3rd option up 142 Street not as effective for ridership
 - Low density
 - Traffic circle problematic on Groat Road
 - Suggest extending to Westmount and 114 Avenue and going up 142 Street from there
 - Far too far west to serve the people
 - No opportunity to rejuvenate neighborhoods
 - Cuts off even bigger part of Inglewood and Sherbrooke than the 127 Street route does
 - People on 97 Street or 113 Street will NOT go west and then south, they will stay in their cars
 - Same issues regarding use of airport land
 - Narrower
 - We are the west, we need park and ride
 - Too far west to serve communities
 - More travel to reach LRT
 - Least access to ridership
 - Doesn't serve us or very many communities - just serves St. Albert
 - We might as well drive
 - Too far from population (Griesbach and Castledowns)
 - Traffic would still be heavy
 - People would cut through to get to stations

- Are you aware of any local or specific community, business or institutional initiatives that would need to be considered in more detail with this option?
 - None (10)

8. The Public Involvement Plan

- What do you think of the proposed public involvement process for this phase?
 - Seems good (4)

- Good - If people care, they will be aware
 - Always good - so much better than the original work on the WEST.
 - Small vocal groups dominate conversation and overpower others
 - The large apathetic masses don't attend
 - Need more than 1 week's notice
 - Good - could still improve; need to engage youth
 - This has all been decided, this is just window candy, we get lied to told one thing and something different happens
 - Public forums will be good
- Any suggestions?
 - At open houses, make sure all departments are there so questions can be addressed
 - Approach developments, big buildings, senior centres and get to their people directly
 - Put posters, information, displays, survey terminals in public meeting places
 - Lots of notice - 6 weeks
 - Go through CRC's to reach community
 - Involve High school students - go to them and ask their opinion
 - Post card door to door
 - Meet with the full board of each community
 - I did the survey but has some technical challenges
 - Advertise in the Sun and the Journal
 - More lead time for communities
 - Posters would be good
- How do you see yourself or your group participating in the process (going forward)? (i.e. – information, meetings, etc.)
 - Have newsletter for Business Association and planning an open house in spring
 - Newsletter - suggest to residents to attend open houses etc.
 - I'll present this to my Board this week. They will want to be kept informed but won't be active
 - Want to be involved
 - Too late for our March newsletter but send something to us
 - We have newsletter
 - If you want our hall can be used
 - We have an AGM on March 9, we can hand out info and speak to it
 - We will do something in our newsletter (2)
 - We'd like to do an open house
 - We have an Exec meeting on the 8th, we will speak to this

- Are there stakeholders or groups that should be involved? How should they be involved?
 - No
 - We are part of Area 1 and commonly meet or coordinate together. Might be easier to do it through that group rather than individual communities. Kensington, Roslyn, Calder, Athlone, Wellington and Lauderdale
 - Inglewood - Paul Adams and Woodcroft Patricia Grell
 - Involve CRC's
 - Lynnette Thompson - Castledowns Recreations Society
 - Westmount and Woodcroft

- How do you suggest we best distribute copies of the project fact sheets? Would you be willing to distribute on behalf of your organization? How could the project team help in "getting the word out"
 - ◆ Have newsletter for Business Association and planning an open house in spring
 - ◆ Would be good to have copy provided by the City to include in the Newsletter
 - ◆ We can put something in our newsletter - can you provide content?
 - ◆ Make posters available and give us more notice
 - ◆ Newsletter awareness and maybe a meeting with our members later
 - ◆ Newsletter

- If not, can you suggest another contact or another way for us to collect this important input from stakeholders?
 - ◆ None (10)

- Other Comments?
 - None (10)

9. Conclusion

- What did you think of this interview?
 - ◆ Excellent
 - ◆ Good - certainly more aware now
 - ◆ Fine as always
 - ◆ Good (2)
 - ◆ One on one is good - likely expensive though
 - ◆ Know more now for sure

- ◆ Great heads up for us

- Was it worthwhile?
 - ◆ Yes – good understanding now
 - ◆ Yes (2)
 - ◆ Gives clarity I didn't have
 - ◆ For sure - much more aware now
 - ◆ Yes absolutely

- Did we ask the right questions?
 - ◆ Yes (3)
 - ◆ Good Questions

- Did you anticipate any questions that were not asked?
 - ◆ No (2)

- Any other questions or comments?
 - ◆ Thank You (2)
 - ◆ More notice and online survey in advance would make this more productive