

**North LRT Extension – Downtown to NAIT
Preliminary Design Phase**

**Public Involvement Process
Profiling Interviews**

Submitted by:



November 2008

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Background	1
2. Pre-Consultation Profiling Interviews.....	1
3. Report Summary and Recommendations	8
Appendix A: Key Stakeholder Profiling Interview Form.....	11
Appendix B: Contact Record for Profiling Interviews/Stakeholder Contact.....	15
Appendix C: Compilation of Profiling Interviews with Stakeholders	18

1. Introduction and Background

Gray Scott Consulting Group Inc. has been retained by Transit Projects, Transportation Department, City of Edmonton, to provide public involvement consulting services for the North LRT Extension planning project (Downtown to NAIT).

From July through October 2008 a pre-consultation series of profiling interviews with key stakeholders was undertaken to collect feedback on the public involvement undertaken during the Concept Planning phase, and get input on a proposed public involvement plan for the next phase of the project (preliminary design). This component was undertaken through a series of one-on-one profiling interviews with approximately 20 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. Pre-Consultation Profiling Interviews

Gray Scott Consulting Group Inc. developed a list of key stakeholders in cooperation with Transit Projects. 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 original primary list for the profiling phase contained the names and addresses of approximately 18 key stakeholder groups and individuals, but was a flexible list that evolved over the duration of the interview period.

Of the twenty-two who were approached by either phone, fax or e-mail, ten interviews were completed in person, one by phone, and four stakeholders sent in their responses via e-mail or FAX. Five stakeholders who were contacted did not respond to requests and two more chose not to do the interview but will be involved in the next round of consultation. (See Appendix B).

The profiling interviews were all prescheduled, and in most cases, a copy of the profiling interview form was sent to the stakeholders prior to the interview. Also, with a few exceptions, the interviews were conducted at the stakeholders' choice of location.

At each interview, the interviewer provided a copy of the profiling interview form to the interviewee(s) to follow along as the questions were asked. The interviewer kept notes of the responses to the greatest extent possible. A detailed compilation of the summary 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. Numbers in brackets following some comments (x) indicate the number of people that gave the same response. 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 in previous studies.

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. A minimally edited compilation of all responses from each interviewee is included as Appendix C to this report.

The common themes are listed below the question 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.

Personal Involvement Section (questions specific to the individual being interviewed)

Why your interest in this study?

Most respondents indicated they were generally interested in the impacts of the LRT on the neighbourhoods or institutions in terms of traffic flow, increased pedestrian traffic, safety or general quality of life.

A number were also concerned about specific impacts and responded to this question with a list of perceived negative impacts. This list included access to the business, residence or institution due to increased traffic on adjacent streets and alleys.

In most cases, stakeholders also mentioned that they felt responsible in representing the views of the organizations or communities that they were serving.

Initial Level of Awareness and Knowledge Section

What have you heard about the North LRT Planning Study to date?

Most interviewees had extensive knowledge of the overall study but limited detailed knowledge of the exact concept, excepting most members of the Stakeholder Advisory Group that were involved in the study over the last year. In most cases, interviewees were very knowledgeable about the concept plan for the locale closest to their community or institution but not as informed about other sections of the route.

Most were able to generally describe the approved route as follows: *"[I] understand that it is planned to go north of City Hall, under the EPCOR Tower to MacEwan College, then on to either on the Royal Alexandra Hospital, Kingsway Garden Mall or NAIT"*. Interestingly, all three institutions were mentioned as being the terminus of the route concept.

A few responded, some quite vehemently, that the study and its outcomes were not well communicated and that awareness within the impacted communities was quite low.

What do you understand as the outcomes or recommendations to date?

The most common theme from the responses was an accurate description of the route concept and comments about the process and timelines.

A second common theme was that the concept plan was a good one, it is very important to get LRT to NAIT, and this is a good route.

A third common theme was a perception that the concept plan had been revised a number of times in getting to the recommended plan.

A significant (but not predominant theme) was voiced that the concept plan was already a “fait accompli” before the study even started and that it would be approved, regardless of community or stakeholder input.

From your knowledge of the concept-planning phase of the North LRT public involvement process, what do you think has worked well?

Most interviewees, other than members of the Stakeholder Advisory Group from Phase One, did not have comments due to lack of knowledge of the concept planning phase. Those that did were generally complimentary of the public involvement process and complimented the City on its efforts to inform stakeholders. The theme of informing stakeholders and seeking input, but not listening or acting upon input was evident but not prevalent.

Two interviewees who were representing groups located on or very close to the planned route expressed great frustration about not being informed and feeling left out of the process.

Feedback from members of the Stakeholder Advisory Group was predominately positive and complimentary. The following quote represents the common theme:

“Stakeholder Advisory Committee has been an excellent forum to receive and provide input.”

What hasn't worked well?

The most common theme was that businesses and residents in the areas most likely to be directly affected by the route were not as engaged as they should have been. A comment from one interviewee reflects this theme best, *“Not all stakeholders were included – individual property owners not as engaged as they could have been.”*

However, although there was recognition by most that not all stakeholders were as engaged as they could have been, a less common but significant theme is captured in the following quotes, *“All has worked well; the project team has done its best to inform.”*

“Communication is a two-way process and people need to take some responsibility for being and staying informed”.

Three members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee commented that although all members should be given the chance to make comments, the meetings needed to be facilitated better to reduce the time given to some individual members.

A number of interviewees responded that there was very little that did not work well.

Institution Related Questions (For institutions only)

Questions in this section were designed to solicit specific information from individual institutions and for most interviewees this question was not applicable. However, some did make comments in this section that led to a common theme.

Are there other aspects of your long-range master plan that may have changed in the past year that should be considered in this preliminary engineering phase?

All institutions from which we received responses stated that there were no changes in the past year.

However, a few institutions, and two other interviewees raised the issue of the future of the Edmonton City Center Airport and the impact on the North LRT line to NAIT and beyond. One interviewee used the term “elephant in the room” in referring to uncertainty around the possible closure of the airport and subsequent re-use of the land, and the impacts of closure on the LRT line.

One interviewee also spoke of the impact of the possible location for a new downtown arena and that this leg of the North LRT would be impacted dramatically.

Identification of Issues and Perceptions

Please provide your comments about the recommended route.

Most respondents made positive comments about the recommended route generally speaking, but most, if not all, also had specific comments about sections of the route in their area. Many commented on station location and access, access to their communities, businesses, or institutions, noise, increased traffic and congestion.

It is important to note that most of these interviews were completed prior to the special Council Meeting and Public Hearing on September 25, 2008 and some of the respondents were commenting in the context that the route had not yet been finalized.

What kinds of impacts would the LRT have on adjacent properties?

Common themes in this section were:

- Property values would be affected with some concerned that values would decrease but others looking forward to potential increases in property values.
- Impacts of “parasitic parking,” that being use of adjacent private property and streets by people driving to a location close to a station, parking their vehicles and using the LRT for the rest of their trip downtown.
- Concerns about access to and from businesses and within neighbourhoods, created by the perceived impact of reduced access back and forth across the LRT right of way.
- Aesthetics (landscaping, architecture of stations and other LRT structures, look of the trains themselves) of the LRT right of way, if not done properly with artistry and investment, will

negatively impact the potential for redevelopment in the area, especially in the downtown north edge area.

- Security issues resulting from more people being in and drawn to the areas through which the LRT may run.
- Negative noise impacts.

Again, it is important to note that most of these interviews were completed prior to the special Council Meeting and Public Hearing on September 25, 2008 and some of the respondents were commenting in the context that the route had not yet been approved by City Council.

The project team has identified the following consultation points:

Are these of interest to you?

- **Landscaping treatment?**
- **Architectural features?**
- **Look and feel of the station(s)?**
- **Fencing/ retaining wall look?**
- **Vehicle access?**
- **Mitigations for potential loss of on-street parking?**
- **Pedestrian/cyclist circulation/access?**

Most (if not all) interviewees expressed unreserved interest in all of the points. The most frequent comments occurred for the consultation point “**Pedestrian/cyclist circulation/access**”, with the common theme being that the LRT route would negatively impact the access back and forth within neighbourhoods and to the institutions and business around the proposed station locations.

Are there other issues that should be discussed through this process?

There were no common themes for this question. For the most part, interviewees built upon their comments made earlier and restated them in the context of this question. The reader is encouraged to refer to the compilation of all comments in Appendix C for specific answers.

Would you want to be involved in a process to address these?

All interviewees responded that they wanted to be involved. Although only one person responded with this specific comment, “*Want to be in a proactive position – not reacting to proposed designs as in the past,*” this was a common expectation from most. This underlying theme was articulated differently in comments elsewhere that there was a perception that the City had already decided on the route and station locations.

Public Involvement

How do you see yourself or your group participating in the process going forward (i.e. information, meetings, etc.)?

All interviewees wanted to continue in the public involvement process. All members of the original Stakeholder Advisory Group wished to continue in the next phase. Those that were not

members all expressed interest in participating in one or both of the smaller stakeholder advisory groups suggested and explained by the interviewer.

The common theme alluded to earlier in this report about creating or developing ideas as opposed to reacting to proposals was raised again by a number of interviewees.

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

Most of the comments are reflected in the following quote from one of the interviewees:

“Must attempt to be comprehensive, with adequate notice and a variety of opportunities for people to voice concerns, glean information and participate in mitigations of negative impacts.”

Most interviewees also responded positively to the process as described, and supported the approach.

(For previous SAG members) Do you still want to be involved on the Stakeholder Advisory Group?

Yes (9)

Are there other stakeholders or groups that should be involved? How should they be involved?

Those that felt knowledgeable enough to provide a response to this question focused on the individual businesses and property owners along 105 Street north of 105 Avenue. Other responses indicated specific groups or businesses that would be impacted directly such as the Alberta Motor Association, EPCOR, Qualico, schools, the 107th Avenue BRZ, Neighborhood Enhancement Council, Avenue of Nations, and proposed condominium developments along the north edge.

Communications

Would you use a pre-prepared column in your community newsletter/employee bulletin? If so, who would be the best contact person to work with to arrange this?

All interviewees for whom this question was applicable stated that this was an excellent idea and that if they had a newsletter they would either incorporate the column into the newsletter or include it as a standalone insert to the newsletter. A detailed summary of the responses and the contact persons is contained in Appendix C.

A newsletter would be sent to residents and businesses surrounding the future LRT line to update them on project progress (quarterly, through direct mail).

Would this be a useful way to share information with the broader community?

The majority of interviewees commented that this was the best form of communication suggested. However, many did comment on two factors that would lessen the impact and effectiveness of a newsletter:

- Though literacy is a problem in a low-income neighborhood, consider TV, radio and Internet spots to disseminate information as well. People are busy so they need to receive information in a number of ways – not just a newsletter mailed to them.
- “...Few will read it (perceived as “junk mail”) or readers will not understand it.”

Are there other people that should receive it (the newsletter)?

The common theme amongst responses to this question was to ensure that property owners received the newsletter since there are many tenants in the area, both business and residential.

Do you have any suggestions about any specific local papers that should be used? (i.e. – ethnic community papers?)

Specific responses to this question are listed below:

- Metro (the most frequent suggestion)
- Panorama (Polish community newspaper)
- Rat Creek Press (a joint publication of the community leagues in the area)
- Edmonton Examiner
- See
- Vue
- The Vietnam Times
- Edmonton Chinese News

Do you have other suggestions for ways we can share information in this area?

Interviewees were quite forthcoming in suggesting other additional ways to share information and a long list was generated.

- Contact condo management groups for owners information (who do not live on site)
- TV, radio and Internet spots
- Blogs
- You Tube, etc.
- On mall displays
- Websites
- Good media coverage
- Posters on specific poster pedestals and on store community boards
- Info as inserts in grocery bags
- Access cafés, ethnic restaurants and malls
- Tough to access young, urban males
- Next Gen information resources
- Through community leagues - Central McDougall Community League

- Transit advertising – ads aimed at transit ridership driving them to the website
- At critical points, hand delivered bulletins by (stakeholder).
- Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues website

Interviewees also commented that the project team is doing a good job in trying to communicate with traditional forms of mass communication. It is important to note that non-traditional or “new” communication tools such as blogs, You Tube, Internet spots, websites are on the list.

Conclusions

Any other comments or questions at this time?

Eight of the interviewees had no further comments or questions, thanked the interviewer for the opportunity to provide input, and felt that the interview was comprehensive.

Of those that did comment, the common theme was that the project team needed to be more proactive in involving stakeholders in the process and that they had not done enough to encourage participation and involvement.

A number of interviewees also commented that they were looking forward to LRT coming to their neighbourhoods and that even though there would be challenges to address, when the project was completed, the benefits would outweigh the drawbacks.

A commitment from the City in 1998 to undertake a study and to develop a traffic plan for the area was to done

Will advocate for a parking study (in Central McDougall to address shortcutting and parasitic parking)

3. Report Summary and Recommendations

3.1. Summary Comments

The profiling interview component of Phase Two of the project was intended to seek the perceptions of key stakeholders on the outcomes of Phase One, the concept planning phase, comments on the proposed public involvement plan for Phase Two, and to collect stakeholder input on ideas for a communication strategy for informing the public on the progress of the project through Phase Two.

Many of those interviewed had been involved in at least one other transportation planning study or land use planning study undertaken within the North LRT study area previous to this undertaking. The majority of those interviewed were also interviewed during Phase One and as such, were very knowledgeable about the area and the results of the previous studies

Of the 22 potential interviewees that were contacted for this phase of the project, 12 participated in the Phase One interviews and 9 had not participated. Of the nine newly engaged

stakeholders, most were familiar with the outcomes of the concept planning stage and had contacted the project team, or had been suggested by the City of Edmonton. .

The most important outcome was to measure understanding and support amongst the stakeholders of the outcomes of the concept-planning phase, and to seek comment on the proposed public involvement process for the preliminary engineering phase.

As summarized above, most interviewees were looking forward to LRT service coming to their area. However, most also had issues about the impact of LRT within the local area that they lived or worked. The most common issues, as expected, are access impacts, noise, safety and security issues, and increased traffic. A significant number of interviewees also indicated that there would be benefits of having LRT close by, primarily increased access to the rest of the city and property values.

Most felt that the public involvement process worked well and did not offer any suggestions for improvement. The primary theme from those that felt that the process worked well was that the project team worked hard to engage as many of the public as possible.

Those that commented that the process did not work well felt that the City should have done a better job of engaging those that would be most directly impacted by the concept plan.

The two overriding themes regarding public involvement for the next phase were

- Need to do more to share information with and engage the immediate community and property owners.
- There is a desire for more collaboration to be built into the public involvement process (versus seeking feedback on specific proposals).

There is a strong expectation of all of those interviewed that input should be provided in the next phase of the project regarding the specific consultation points listed in the interview (landscaping treatment, architectural features, look and feel of the station(s), fencing/ retaining wall look, vehicle access, mitigations for potential loss of on-street parking and pedestrian/cyclist circulation/access). This aspect of the project will have to be carefully designed to manage the expectations of these stakeholders.

Regarding the proposed public involvement process for Phase Two, all those that were interviewed expressed interest in being involved in the next phase. All key stakeholders included as proposed members of the geographically specific stakeholder advisory groups showed great interest in participating.

All members of the Stakeholder Advisory Group from Phase One that were interviewed also wished to remain engaged in Phase Two in the role suggested in the interviews. There were a few comments from Stakeholder Advisory Group members that the meetings could be improved with tighter facilitation and better control of those that spoke most frequently.

Regarding the series of questions dealing with broad communication of progress with the next phase of the project, the idea of providing pre-written insertions for stakeholders' own communication tools was well received. Distribution of newsletters by the communities and institutions themselves and in mass mailings was also well received as an effective means.

However, there were a number of comments suggesting that project newsletters would have to be well designed to allow differentiation from other “junk mail.”

3.2. Recommendations Resulting from the Interviews

- In order to manage expectations of stakeholders regarding their level of involvement and influence in decisions, the public involvement team must be clear and concise from the outset as to what is open for comment and input and what is not.
- Proceed with the proposed public involvement plan to create two geographically specific stakeholder advisory groups to work on the specific consultation points discussed during the interviews.
- Proceed with the proposed continued involvement of the members of the Phase One Stakeholder Advisory Group by way of electronic updates on a timely basis.
- Continue to communicate and build relationships with the representatives of the organizations (i.e. Holy Rosary Church, Sisem Daycare Society) and community groups (i.e. Central McDougall/Queen Mary Park Business Coalition) that were not as engaged in Phase One as they are now.
- Work more closely with the leaders of the stakeholder groups in the area to seek assistance in engaging their members. Do not assume that the representatives are communicating back to their stakeholder groups.
- Seek out and engage leaders and media resources amongst the ethnic communities within the study area to improve engagement with these communities.
- Ensure that the ward councillors for the project area are informed of the public involvement process and results to date on an ongoing basis.
- Continue to make efforts to engage residents, workers and property owners in the project area to the greatest extent possible but do not overlook the personal responsibility that those same people must take for being aware and informed of developments in their neighbourhoods.

Appendix A: Key Stakeholder Profiling Interview Form

North LRT Extension – Downtown to NAIT Preliminary Design Phase

Date / Time / Duration:	
Name:	
Title / Representing:	
Contact Information:	Email address - Mailing Address - Phone Number during the day -
Type of Interview:	

Section A – Background Explanation

1. As you may be aware, the City of Edmonton is planning an LRT extension from Downtown to NAIT. On July 8, 2008, a public hearing was held at City Council to consider a proposed concept plan (including the route and station locations). At this meeting, Council referred the plan back to Administration to amend it by placing the LRT alignment on 105 Street from 105 Avenue to 108 Avenue (proposal was to place it on the west side of 105 Street in this area). A Special City Council meeting (including a public hearing) is scheduled for September 25, 2008, at 1:30 p.m., to deliberate this amendment.
2. While this work is ongoing, the City is also planning to move forward on the next phase of the project –preliminary engineering. The project is currently funded to the end of preliminary engineering, which should be completed in summer 2009.
3. This interview is referred to as a profiling interview to get a sense from you, as a key stakeholder, of the impacts on the issues that will be studied during the preliminary engineering stage.
 - We want to identify your issues, keeping in mind that much of the content of this phase is very detailed and very specific.
 - We also want to collect your thoughts on which stakeholders you think should be involved, and how you and they should be involved as we work through the issues.

Section B – Key Stakeholder Profiling

Personal Involvement (not needed if involved in Phase 1)

Please give a quick overview of the group or institution that you represent as it might relate to a transportation/ public transit-planning project? (Current size, number of members, customers, their usage of public transit etc.)

What is your position with the group or institution that you represent?

Why your interest in this study?

Initial Level of Awareness and Knowledge

What have you heard about the North LRT Planning Study to date?

What do you understand as the outcomes or recommendations to date?

From your knowledge of the concept-planning phase of the North LRT public involvement process, what do you think has worked well?

What hasn't worked well?

Institution Related Questions (For Institutions Only)

Are there other aspects of your long-range master plan that may have changed in the past year that should be considered in this preliminary engineering phase?

Identification of Issues and Perceptions

Please provide your comments about the recommended route.

What kinds of impacts would the LRT have on adjacent properties?

The project team has identified the following consultation points:

Are these of interest to you?

- Landscaping treatment -
- Architectural features -
- Look and feel of the station(s) -
- Fencing/ retaining wall look -
- Vehicle access
- Mitigations for potential loss of on-street parking -
- Pedestrian/cyclist circulation/access

Are there other issues that should be discussed through this process?

Would you want to be involved in a process to address these?

Public Involvement

How do you see yourself or your group participating in the process (going forward)? (i.e. – information, meetings, etc.) (Show plan)

The project team is proposing a public involvement process that includes:

- A series of one-on-one interviews with major stakeholders (such as this one today)
- Working with institutions to resolve site-specific issues on a one-on-one basis.
- Creating two advisory groups consisting of representatives from community and other interest groups to review more detailed plans (one for issues from 105 Avenue to Kingsway, one focusing on plans from Kingsway to Princess Elizabeth Avenue).
- Ongoing communication to share updates with the Stakeholder Advisory Group that was formed during Phase 1.

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

(For SAG members). Do you still want to be involved on the Stakeholder Advisory Group?

Are there other stakeholders or groups that should be involved? How should they be involved?

Communications

Sharing information about the project to the broader community is important. The project team is considering a number of ways to reach these people, and we would like your thoughts on some of ideas under consideration:

Would you use a pre-prepared column in your community newsletter/employee bulletin? If so, who would be the best contact person to work with to arrange this?

A newsletter would be sent to residents and businesses surrounding the future LRT line to update them on project progress (quarterly, through direct mail).

Would this be a useful way to share information with the broader community? Are there other people that should receive it?

We would like to advertise updates in local papers such as those targeting ethnic communities, student associations, etc.

Do you have any suggestions about any specific local papers that should be used? (i.e. – ethnic community papers?)

Do you have other suggestions for ways we can share information in this area?

Conclusions

Any other comments or questions at this time?

Thank you for your time and your comments

Appendix B: Contact Record for Profiling Interviews/Stakeholder Contact

(As at September 30, 2008)

Need to confirm updates here

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Comments/Status
1. Jack Menduk Director of Capital Projects and Facilities Operations	Northern Alberta Institute of Technology	11762 – 106 Street Edmonton, AB T5G 2R1 471-7712	Not Completed Contact attempted but not completed; stakeholder's needs will be met in the next component of the consultation process
2. Stuart MacLean Director of Facilities	Grant MacEwan College	10700 – 104 Avenue Edmonton, AB T5J 4S2 497-5512	Not Completed Contact attempted but not completed; stakeholder's needs will be met in the next component of the consultation process
3. Brent Skinner	Capital Health		Contact attempted but not completed. Capital Health's needs will be met in the next component of the consultation process Pending feedback.
4. Brad Merchant General Manager Oxford Properties Group Kingsway Garden Mall	Kingsway Garden Mall	479-5955 378-6301 (direct)	Completed by telephone
5. Brian Marcotte	Edmonton Transit Advisory Board	481-0661 (?) 1405-9020 Jasper Ave (?)	Completed
6. Graeme Smith	Downtown Edmonton Community Association (DECA)	grysmith@telus.net 425-5748	Completed

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Comments/Status
7. Warren Champion President Deborah Peaker, Chair, Transportation Committee,	Central McDougall Community League	Warren 438-5802 (work) 426-7217 (home) 435-5823 (fax) Deborah 424-3545, Extension 253 (work) 425-8117 (home) FAX – 425-6627	Completed
8. Verna Stainthorp	Spruce Avenue Community League	11219 105 Street Edmonton, AB 479-8019	Completed
9. Jim Taylor	Downtown Business Association	424-4085	Completed
10. Karon Kosof	Kingsway BRZ	454-9716	Completed
11. Roland Labbe	Edmonton Public Schools	429-8428	Not Completed. Key contact will be Roland Labbe and will be pursued for the next round of consultation
12. Jason Rumer	Carma Developers (representing Downtown North Edge Developers)	Suite 200, 10404 – 103 Avenue Edmonton, AB 423-1910 990-2699 (Direct) jrumer@carma.ca	Completed
13. Al Wilson V.P. Alberta Gateway Casinos GP Ltd.	Baccarat/Palace Casinos	444-2112 499-9300	Completed
14. Barbara Filopowski Chair Parish Council Sister Teresa Dada	Holy Rosary Church/Sisem Day Care Society	780- 458-6713 (Chair, Parish Council) 780- 479-1090 (Sisem Day Care Society)	Completed
15. Fiona Administrator,	City of Edmonton Advisory Board for Persons with Disabilities		Not completed. Advisory Board wishes to participate in the next phase of the stakeholder advisory groups
16. Stan Wilk Administrator	Polish Hall	10960-104Street 780-426-1856	Completed
17. Bob Wilkins President	McDougall Landing Condominium Association	bobalou@telusplanet.net 780-428-4234	Completed

Name	Organization	Contact Information	Comments/Status
18. Sarah French President, Condominium Board		10740 – 105 Street salty_pearl@shaw.ca	Completed
19. Lewis Rodney Spokesperson	Central McDougall and Queen Mary Park Business Coalition	c/o #205, 11125 107 Avenue, Edmonton, T5H 0X9 780-428-1379	Completed
20. Laura Stirling Coordinator	Avenue of Nations Enhancement Council	780-496-8669	Repeated contacts attempted. No response
21. Greg Lewis	Community Liaison Officer, Edmonton Police Service	780-421-2602	Repeated contacts attempted. No response
22. Doris Berg	Morguard Residential	780-429-6787	Completed

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.

Section A – Background Explanation

(As reviewed with interviewees to ensure that everyone was starting with the same basic information)

1. As you may be aware, the City of Edmonton is planning an LRT extension from Downtown to NAIT. On July 8, 2008, a public hearing was held at City Council to consider a proposed concept plan (including the route and station locations). At this meeting, Council referred the plan back to Administration to amend it by placing the LRT alignment on 105 Street from 105 Avenue to 108 Avenue (proposal was to place it on the west side of 105 Street in this area). A Special City Council meeting (including a public hearing) is scheduled for September 25, 2008, at 1:30 p.m., to deliberate this amendment.
2. While this work is ongoing, the City is also planning to move forward on the next phase of the project –preliminary engineering. The project is currently funded to the end of preliminary engineering, which should be completed in summer 2009.
3. This interview is referred to as a profiling interview to get a sense from you, as a key stakeholder, of the impacts on the issues that will be studied during the preliminary engineering stage.
 - We want to identify your issues, keeping in mind that much of the content of this phase is very detailed and very specific.
 - We also want to collect your thoughts on which stakeholders you think should be involved, and how you and they should be involved as we work through the issues.

Section B – Key Stakeholders Interviewed to Date

(or who provided responses to the interview form by other means)

Institution/Group Interviewed	Name/Position of Person interviewed	Related Information
1. Carma/North Edge Developers	Jason Rumer, Project Manager	Representing Carma and other north edge developers rather than the Urban Development Institute which he was previously representing on the SAG
2. Central McDougall and Queen Mary Park Business Coalition - will become the 107 Avenue BRZ – going to Council September 23, 2008	Lew Rodney, Member	320 businesses in the area, Bounded on the west by 116 Street, on the east by 102 Street, on the south by 104 Avenue and on the north by 108 Avenue
3. Downtown Business Association	Jim Taylor, Executive Director	2000 members Includes educational institutions, arts & culture
4. Downtown Edmonton Community League	Graeme Smith, Treasurer	
5. Edmonton Transit Service Advisory Board (ETSAB)	Brian Marcotte, Board Member	ETSAB advises City Council, the Transportation Department, and ETS on ways to improve public transit and issues affecting the provision of public transit in Edmonton. ETSAB reports to City Council through the Transportation and Public Works Committee (TPW)
6. Holy Rosary Parish/Sisem Daycare Society	Barbara Filipowski, Chair, Parish Council An unnamed member of the Parish Council Reverend Roman Majek Sister Teresa Dada, Sisem Daycare Society	Church has 1500 families City-wide parish; come from all parts of the region Usually ~200 vehicles for church events, especially on Sundays 40 funerals and 30 weddings annually & active everyday from 7 PM to 9 PM. <u>Daycare:</u> Facility cares for 50 children Open from 6:45 AM to 5:30 PM with peak hours for traffic in and out from 6:45 AM to 8:00 AM and from 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM
7. Kingsway Business Association	Karon Kosof, Executive Director	350 members 12 board members Boundaries – 121 St., 106 Ave., Kingsway Ave., Yellowhead Trail
8. Kingsway Garden Mall	Brad Merchant, General Manager Oxford Retail Group	10 million visits/year 3000 employees 8 to 11% of visitors don't use private vehicles Has data on transit users (exit surveys)

Institution/Group Interviewed	Name/Position of Person interviewed	Related Information
9. McDougall Landing Condo Association	Bob Wilkins, President	
10. Polish Hall	Stan Wilk, Manager	Facility opened in 1960 Banquet/hall rental business A very competitive business that needs to provide safe, secure surroundings Owned by three not-for-profit organizations 500-1000 capacity depending upon event Unable to estimate a yearly figure for number of patrons/guests
11. Spruce Avenue Community League	Verna Stainthorp, Secretary/Treasurer	60 to 70 households Very active community league
12. Victoria Manor Condo Association	Sarah French, President	Victoria Manor is at the south west corner of 105 Street and 108 Avenue Includes 22 suites with a mixture of owners and renters residing there Approximately 1/3 to 1/2 use public transit regularly
13. Central McDougall Community League	Warren Champion and Deborah Peaker	150 to 190 community league members 15 board members 5000 residents in Central McDougall Boundaries - 105 Ave., 101 St., 109 St., 111 Ave.
14. Square 104 – Morguard Residential	Pat Gardener District Manager / Broker for Morguard Residential	Square 104 has 277 residential units which are owned and managed by Morguard Residential
15. Gateway Casinos and Entertainment	Al Wilson President of Operations	Gateway Casinos & Entertainment own and operate the Baccarat Casino located at 10128 – 104 Avenue. The property is 11.5 acres and stems from 101 Street to west of 103 Street, and from 104 Avenue to 105 Avenue. The casino employs 300 people some of who rely on public transportation to get to and from work. Some customers also use public transit to get to and from the property.

a. Personal Involvement

Please give a quick overview of the group or institution that you represent as it might relate to a transportation/public transit-planning project (current size, number of members, customers, their usage of public transit etc.).

(See “Related Information” in table above)

What is your position with the group or institution that you represent?

(See table above)

Why your interest in this study?

- I both own and live adjacent to the projected LRT track.
- Supportive of LRT because it will enhance business once the access impacts have been mitigated.
- LRT will dramatically affect access to our property.
- Entry to the property and the building will change and renovation plans will have to be reworked; planned renovations currently on hold.
- Renovation plans have been supplied to Brad Smid for their review and recommendations for alternate access.
- Proposed routing will materially affect the units on the southeast corner (2 and possibly 3 units).
- Traffic noise and volume increases will impact owners living on the perimeters of the land.
- Property values will be impacted – both negatively and positively depending on location of the unit.
- New seniors' residence would have to have access off 105 Street impacting owners in McDougall Landing.
- For my job.
- Since becoming aware of the planned routing for the LRT we feel there are no benefits to us, only problems.
- Local impacts (9) - Affects traffic and businesses in the area, will have a great deal of impact on businesses and on the community.
- Would be positive in that it provides easier access to our establishment but we also see it as a potential detriment as LRT users will use our parking lot to park in.
- Effect of LRT on tenants and owners in the long run.
- 100% support of the study but not accepting of the ridiculously expensive above ground line.
- No answer.

b. Initial Level of Awareness and Knowledge

What have you heard about the North LRT Planning Study to date?

- Very knowledgeable - was a SAG member – Phase 1 (6) - involved on stakeholder advisory committee for the project over the past year and have been kept fully informed.
- LRT is running up 105 Street across 107 Avenue turning east at 108 Avenue to pass between the Prince of Wales Armory and Victoria School of Performing Arts.
- Time line for study and subsequent construction has been “bumped up” (advanced) due to construction of the EPCOR Tower.

- There has been a lot of public involvement especially with the Central McDougall Community League.
- Attended the open house at the Polish Hall.
- Well informed as a result of a meeting with the project team; very upset about the impacts.
- Have heard and seen what President, Central McDougall C.L. has said at Community League general meetings and has distributed over time.
- Not much awareness of the North LRT study amongst board members.
- Projected start 2-3 years.
- Approval of funding is in place to complete past the EPCOR Tower.
- Not exactly sure of the rest of the route from a funding point of view or about the recommendations except for the location of the temporary NAIT station.
- Not enough; the perception is that City Council gave direction to Administration and the Administration is driving that direction forward.
- The LRT line will be built.
- The City wants better public transit access to Royal Alexandra Hospital, NAIT and MacEwan College.
- Understand that the LRT will go underground and then would go above ground at or close to the northeast corner of our property and that the first station would be in the northwest corner of our property. The route would then go north along 105th Street to NAIT.
- We understand that some residents and lobbying groups are suggesting it would be less of a detrimental impact on businesses and residents in this community if the route was moved to 104 Street.
- Had a meeting with the project manager and voiced concerns about noise, garbage, etc. An all directional access traffic signal is critical since one of the accesses to (our building) will be closed.
- Very involved and knowledgeable

What do you understand as the outcomes or recommendations to date?

- Council has instructed the design team to proceed down 105 Street crossing 107 Avenue regardless of community concerns or impacts.
- Under EPCOR building – approval of funding is in place to complete past the EPCOR Tower (2).
- Businesses just west of EPCOR tower are concerned – are only now beginning to understand the implications.
- Not sure whether route has been finalized.
- Get the LRT to NAIT.
- Current with what was presented at the Open House at the Polish Hall.
- The route has changed a number of times and has been changed again, resulting in the September 25 Special Council Meeting.

- Recommendation to use 105 Street from 105 Avenue to 108 Avenue to go to council on September 25 – just tying that piece of the plan up.
- Council has considered all the information provided by administrations who have considered all the input provided by the stakeholder advisory committee and the public, and will be making a final decision on the alignment and station locations at the Public Hearing on September 25th.
- City Council asked Administration to study it until the September 25th Council meeting which is just a formality – 105 Street will be approved.
- Final route to be determined but as of now, Council still needs to make a final decision at the special meeting on September 25, 2008.
- Described the route and the four stations and locations (2).
- NAIT hasn't made plans and LRT in that area is unconfirmed.
- Until NAIT finalizes plans.
- Concept plan has been approved as a go.
- Surface line all the way – other options are too expensive but this will isolate communities and may “ghetto-ize” the neighborhoods.
- Surface not the best in his opinion.
- City Council amended to use 105 Street as right-of-way.
- Very little; was not sure of the recommended route other than it will pass through the Central McDougall and Queen Mary Park neighborhoods on 105 Street.
- It will be built.
- Not exactly sure of the route from a funding point of view or about the recommendations except for the location of the temporary NAIT station.
- (Question interpreted as “outcome – in their opinion – if the LRT line is built on the proposed alignment) - Major loss of vehicle access to our facility, invasion of privacy by LRT users, loss of land, noise impacts, increased vandalism, parasitic parking, littering, loss of business through loss of customers
- The recommendations of this study are contrary to the Downtown North Edge Study.
- City Council didn't have complete or accurate information to make this decision.
- We want Mr. Boutiller and the Transportation Department to be as flexible and open with the Downtown to NAIT route as they were with the South LRT project expansion issues (i.e. Suggest one approach one week (postponing operation for one year and then change their position one week later).
- It is understandable that the City wishes to save money but the costs of the at-grade route will probably result in just as much expense as below-grade routing because of the very expensive mitigation that would have to take place with the at-grade route as with the underground route.
- At-grade routing does not necessarily have to be precluded if the at-grade routing is located in the proper location (cost efficient).

- Emergency vehicle access on 105 Street will be adversely affected.
- Short cutting through the adjacent neighborhoods will increase.
- This routing will key off a key corner of Central McDougall where new Canadians are settling and living.
- Mass increases in illegal activities will result.
- We have no intention to allow the at-grade, surface level routing to proceed.
- Project Manager is going to find us an alternate place for our garbage bins that won't affect our visitor parking or above ground parking lot.
- An all-directional traffic signal would be very beneficial to the tenants especially during rush hour.
- The proposed green vision on the roadway that is being closed with a walking trail and landscaped plaza area would enhance (our) image.
- Understand that the LRT will go underground and then would go above ground (near us) and that the first station will be near us. The route would then go north along 105th Street to NAIT.
- We understand that some residents and lobbying groups are suggesting it would be less of a detrimental impact on businesses and residents in this community if the route were moved to 104 Street.

From your knowledge of the concept-planning phase of the North LRT public involvement process, what do you think has worked well?

- Stakeholders are well informed but the City is maybe not listening (we will do it our way anyway) despite input by stakeholders.
- Communication to the SAG was excellent, except for when Kingsway Garden Mall (KGM) was caught unaware of the proposed location of the LRT station on Oxford property.
- (We) have been somewhat on the sidelines (by choice).
- Stakeholder Advisory Committee has been an excellent forum to receive and provide input.
- Knew nothing about the project until a meeting that the City initiated after the Open House at the Polish Hall.
- Public advertising was there but the City still needs to contact key stakeholders on an individual basis.
- I don't have any suggestions for changes to the public input process.
- Do not know the extent of the involvement so cannot comment.
- There was lots of opportunity for feedback, comprehensive, inclusive of all stakeholders.
- SAG worked well; first hand information.
- Impacted people have participated and, as a result, changes have been made. The public involvement has worked.
- Has spoken with Brad Smid; engagement started with a phone call to Brad followed by a preliminary meeting.

- Was aware of the project open house in June since it was held at the Polish Hall.
- Graphic material and verbal presentation at the Open House were very good and very understandable.
- Availability of project team to meet with community league members and town hall meetings was good.
- Timing of SAG meetings was excellent for our community relative to the timeline of the study.
- Gave “common interest” groups an opportunity to gang together to support a “given” route.
- Nothing has worked well.
- As already stated in the above question
- No comment right now
- No response

What hasn't worked well?

- No suggestions for changes (2).
- No comment at this point.
- Must provide opportunities for people to express their views but the line needs to be drawn sooner.
- Need to do a better job of facilitating the ones who talk too much and waste the time of other SAG members.
- Sample size for public involvement was not large enough (only a couple hundred people were truly involved and informed). Too few people being involved and providing input.
- Do not say that recommendations were based upon public feedback since the samples were too small – suggestion of a telephone survey.
- Sense that the City was showing us the plan and it was a fait accompli, “our way or else”; no time or sense that what we have to say will be listened to.
- It is challenging to give feedback in a large group (SAG).
- Not enough attention to community impacts (i.e. – gave 105 Street alley option that could win thereby hopefully diffusing the cut and cover issue).
- Public meetings are poorly advertised and somewhat dysfunctional.
- The process has not engaged those not directly impacted (those affected by secondary [downstream] impacts) were not as informed as could be until it was too late.
- Poor engagement of ethnic communities but these are difficult to reach since many ethnic people are afraid to speak or be engaged by government officials – a cultural impact.
- Suggestion was made that in the longer term, create a system and not a one-time project related occurrence, that includes neighborhood empowerment teams.
- All has worked well; the project team has done it's best to inform.

- Communication is a two way process and people need to take some responsibility for being and staying informed.
- Notice for meetings is on a very short timeline so that people haven't had the chance to rearrange plans to attend.
- Generally the neighborhood has been kept ignorant of this process.
- Some hidden agendas.
- Not all stakeholders were included – individual property owners not as engaged as they could have been.
- City was intimidated by Kingsway Garden Mall and their lawyers.
- Since there was a mindset and preconceived notions of the route and the methodology, the entire process seemed predetermined. The Transit Projects Office (T.P.O.) could have offered options for consideration and discussion.
- The P.I. plan was not well planned; the 107 Avenue businesses, when they became engaged, generated a reactive response.
- There was not a Question and Answer period at the June, 2008 Open House at the Polish Hall, which stifled exchange of information in a public forum.
- Survey questions from the Participant Survey Form handed out at the June open house were tainted and there was no opportunity to comment on the questions being asked of participants.
- The concept-planning phase includes a complicated set of issues that has not allowed for the education and learning that the public and key stakeholders need in order to provide knowledgeable input. Only cursory and superficial input was allowed. Try using more pictures and illustrations at the open houses. Put the material on kiosks at City Hall and in neighborhood grocery stores.
- Not enough advertising to the community

c. Institution Related Questions (For Institutions Only)

Are there other aspects of your long-range master plan that may have changed in the past year that should be considered in this preliminary engineering phase?

- N/A (8)
- No
- Impact of future City Center Airport is being discussed more openly and widely now than when this study first began, and the resolution of that debate will certainly affect (our) long-range plans and the entire study for the matter.
- Starting from the core, the new proposed arena will be the key; if it proceeds at the perceived location in the downtown, the North LRT line will be key (almost certain that the arena and associated development (this is not just about an arena) will be downtown. A new ice surface for the Oilers must be in place by 2012.
- Possible plans for expansion but nothing imminent.

- Very interested in a downtown connection to NAIT.
- Planned renovations are currently on hold due to this LRT project; building access will change. Loss of on-street parking on 104 Avenue (currently on both sides of the road) will impact access to the new entrances. More access points to the Polish Hall property along 105 Street will have to be accommodated.
- Potential closing of City Centre Airport will also have long range development impacts on downtown (current height restrictions will be eliminated).
- As you leave the D.B.A. jurisdiction to the north, D.B.A sees impacts on access and traffic flows to downtown from the north edge that need to be considered.
- No plans other than resolving the drainage issues at the north and east sides of the property.
- No, but we will table our landscaping plans for now to be sure that they complement the proposed “green vision”.

d. Identification of Issues and Perceptions

Please provide your comments about the recommended route.

- Why is this leg all twisting and turning through the middle of the neighborhood?
- Excited about LRT coming this way
- Community will face challenges from developers being attracted to the area that will change the community (higher density).
- Building under EPCOR tower was a good move.
- People will want to know exactly where the permanent LRT station will go on 106 Street.
- Royal Alex Station and Transit Centre are well located.
- Condo owners on the southeast corner will be impacted by noise and decreased property values; especially on the 4 most southerly units facing east on the east side of the property and the 3 or 4 units facing south along the south side of the property.
- The current route has the potential to “ghetto-ize” the area east of 105 Street, south of 107 Avenue west of 102 Street and north of 104 Avenue. The area is “bad” now and will get worse since the LRT will isolate it more due to reduction of traffic flow through the area.
- East/west traffic on 107 Avenue will decrease because drivers will start to avoid the route since they will have to stop every five minutes for the trains to go by. This will result in a loss of business along 107 Avenue.
- The sacrifices and negative impacts of the LRT route will not be balanced out by any positives or improvements to the area.
- No stations between City Hall and the Royal Alexandra Hospital and if there was one at 105 Street and 107 Avenue (or at 106 Avenue or even at 105 Avenue) that would be a benefit. *(Explained that a station is planned for 105 Avenue and 105 Street).*
- Running the LRT at the surface may seem cheaper in the short term but the long term social and economic impacts of surface routing will end up costing much more. Underground LRT may be less expensive in the long run.

- Is a good compromise
- A spectrum from all-underground to above grade – this route is balanced.
- Concerns about delays due to land acquisition have been lessened.
- Huge amount of land north of NAIT that could be used for the station; why not locate the station there or at Kingsway Garden Mall?
- Now the City also wants a piece of our land.
- The LRT will bring lots of new traffic into the area.
- Why not build the LRT above grade (overhead) or underground?
- It is unclear if alternate routes have been adequately explored/considered.
- I'm concerned about the effect of the tracks in front of my building with noise, property value, construction, access and crime.
- Concerned with the 105 Avenue onto 105 Street curve – too tight – can't compromise the speed of the train because of stakeholders.
- Way too many turns but understandable.
- All proposed routes have their difficulties so it comes down to a City Council decision based on all the input received.
- Fine with route to KGM – no issues.
- OK with location of NAIT station, but do not want it too far away from entrances to KGM.
- Have concerns with pedestrian access across Kingsway from proposed new location of the Transit Centre and across 106 Street from the LRT station.
- We're happy as long as it is compliant.
- We are in support of further LRT expansion. The fact that the first platform station would be located near our property could be a positive impact on our business as long as we could be satisfied that the city planners have done their due diligence and considered the entire scope of work and the impact on the community.

(The following comments were also made in a previous question.)

- At-grade routing does not necessarily have to be precluded if the at-grade routing is located in the proper location (cost efficient).
- Emergency vehicle access on 105 Street will be adversely affected.
- Short cutting through the adjacent neighborhoods will increase.
- This routing will key off a key corner of Central McDougall where new Canadians are settling and living.
- Mass increases in illegal activities will also result.
- (We) have no intention to allow the at-grade, surface level routing to proceed.
- No comments (2).

What kinds of impacts would the LRT have on adjacent properties?

- There is an equal chance of the LRT line decreasing or increasing my property value. It does however really depress my ability to sell until a decision has been made.
- Impacts have been documented by administration.
- Critical impact is noise.
- Impacts, for the most part, will be positive. Property values will increase and there will be increased connectivity to downtown, since this development is the closest one of its size this close to an LRT station and to downtown.
- Private property damage around curves if derailment occurs.
- Divides communities.
- Might propagate a right-side/wrong-side of the tracks issue.
- Parasitic parking by visitors and staff from the RAH is now a problem and will get worse with the LRT coming.
- Fencing along the west side of the building will be a good thing from an access control point of view.
- Do not know what the security impacts will be with LRT in close proximity, but access control will be more difficult when security issues occur on the west side of the building and the security station is at the east side of the building. The Polish Hall has a significant investment in its existing video security system.
- Will lead to increased security needs, housekeeping needs (to deal with littering) that will result from LRT being so close.
- “Parasitic parking” will be an issue (2).
- LRT will likely have a positive impact on NAIT.
- More garbage and trash, more graffiti, unsightly activity (prostitution and drug dealing) and general deterioration.
- Increased traffic in the alleys east and south of the building; they are very narrow and the electrical poles make them even narrower at some points; almost impossible to navigate in winter with the snow piles.
- Access to business and residences close by will be affected due to parasitic parking from LRT users.
- Not enough thinking and research has been done by the planners regarding the impact of surface LRT. Surface LRT simply does not work in high-density downtown areas. Why do other large cities have their LRT’s underground?
- Carma has invested a lot of time and money in their project and want the City to respect this when designing the LRT (especially the stations and the portal).
- Noise will have a big impact as will access to/from the North Edge to downtown.
- Aesthetics – must look good. Developers spend millions of dollars to make things attractive so the City should too.
- City needs to understand and implement this vision (and its own, in fitting in to the community).
- None for downtown except Stationlands development.

- I am also concerned about access to the property. How can I walk to work with a set of LRT tracks directly in front of my building? What damage could the construction inflict on my building which already has issues with settling and shifting?
- LRT on 105 Street without a stop will not be beneficial (access issues).
- City needs to be fair in land acquisition on both sides.
- Concerns with traffic flows as a result of the 111 Avenue crossing.
- People living on 106 Street will want to know about noise, look of the trains, and visual impacts.
- There is a huge opportunity around stations for businesses but may not have as much impact because of development restrictions such as building height due to the flight path to the City Centre Airport.
- Station at the hospital will create change but may not impact as much because of the flight path.
- The routing at 105 Street north of 107 Avenue is far too close to the residence at that corner (28 feet or less).
- CPTED issues need to be addressed since there will be an increase in safety and security issues.
- Mitigation for noise pollution and other impacts (visual impacts) for the multiple family units along 105 Street will be difficult
- Hopefully this will stop the flow of the homeless from the soup kitchen.
- Disruption to traffic flow and alternate routes to travel during construction.
- Major concerns for parking that is available to the general public at the station adjacent to our property.
- Safety and security of our customers and staff that would use the proposed LRT station is an issue we would like the city to address.
- We would also encourage that the station was designed in such a manner as to provide a well lit and safe environment.

The project team has identified the following consultation points. Are these of interest to you?

- All are very important (10)

Landscaping treatment:

- Yes – of interest
- People need to feel comfortable, safe and welcome so plan accordingly.
- Need more greening of downtown generally.
- No comment
- Not really important

Architectural features:

- Yes – of interest
- Not too striking; must fit in; may contrast.
- Visual impacts, look of trains.
- Interested in the LRT blending in with its surroundings with nice landscaping and fencing etc.
- People need to feel comfortable, safe and welcome so plan accordingly.
- Not really important

Look and feel of the station(s):

- No comment.
- Don't want MacEwan Station to be a trouble spot (i.e. Gangs).
- Incorporate SPTED principles.
- Important.
- Not of interest.

Fencing/retaining wall look:

- Graffiti proof.
- Unobtrusive, see-through.
- Community will be divided by walls.
- Not just straight.
- Put murals on walls at portal and stations to discourage graffiti.
- Don't want noise walls in our community.
- Yes – of interest.

Vehicle access:

- Vitally important because it will create traffic to us/this area.
- Very important.
- Alluded to 105 Street condo issues with Central McDougall Community League President – DECA thinks it is okay.
- No comment.
- Yes – of interest.
- Concern about vehicle access to the Polish Hall and the new seniors residence; specifically, a concern about vehicles from the west side of these two places coming out into the 105 Street cul-de-sac then on to the McDougall Landing private road to proceed southbound out to 108 Avenue. Solution to eliminate or minimize this traffic pattern would be to: (1) Use “knockdown posts” (bollards) with keys in the roadway that could be removed for emergency vehicle traffic or in emergencies or (2) eliminate parking in the 105 Street cul-de-sac.

- Concerned with changes in traffic patterns.

Mitigations for potential loss of on-street parking:

- Always an issue but may not be critical since fewer residents are car owners.
- Very important.
- Mostly in Central McDougall, not much mitigation of 105 Avenue.
- Some have already been suggested but it will still be of additional concern.
- Not of interest (2)

Pedestrian/cyclist circulation/access:

- Vitally important because it will create traffic to us/this area.
- Very important.
- Wants to see it hooked up to available corridors/trails (2).
- Want downtown side access to MacEwan Station.
- Would like to see a M.U.T. along entire North LRT route to provide direct access to downtown and for all north/south pedestrian/ non-motorized vehicle traffic.
- Do not want to make pedestrian and cyclist access and circulation by LRT patrons to be easy (around our facility).
- Concerned with access to and from LRT and neighboring buildings.
- Many cyclists pass through our property and they will be impacted.
- Yes – of interest.

Comments relating to all of the above points:

- These are all site-specific details that are best left to the city administration to resolve with adjacent property owners.
- The planners must try to prevent “local residents” (homeless people and those under the influence of drugs) from wandering onto the tracks – the City has not thought about this.
- Regarding aesthetics, if done properly, architecture and landscaping can be a success, but it will not be since it will be done cheaply; the most inexpensive way.
- Really only interested at Stationlands.
- All of the above are important, especially at the NAIT LRT Station location and the Kingsway Transit Centre and LRT Station.
- No mention of land use and integration with transit as a consultation point. This is the result of fiefdoms with the City (Transportation and Planning and Development departments do not work collaboratively).
- Planning and Development was invited to join the meeting called by (us) in July as an effort to re-engage the Planning and Development department in the study.

Are there other issues that should be discussed through this process?

- How are property owners to voice complaints as issues arise?

- What timelines are being explored?
- How will emergency access be affected?
- What are the opportunities for redevelopment in the area?
- Need to engage locals – for awareness and so they understand the impacts.
- Location of walking (multi-use) trails will require lots of discussion with the community.
- One-on-one meetings with property owners.
- The decision on the City Centre Airport may have a bearing on the NAIT Station location so this issue should be watched closely.
- “Parasitic parking” concerns (2).
- Downtown shuttle bus service connecting LRT Stations with transit centres and downtown destinations.
- Concerns about where parkers from Capital Health (Royal Alex) will go if parking at the hospital is decreased when the transit centre goes there.
- Capital Health parking cannot go on our land.
- Would like to see security (i.e. cameras) at stations.
- Concern about vehicle access to the Polish Hall and the new Seniors Residence.
- Specifically, a concern about vehicles from the west side of these two places coming out into the 105 Street cul-de-sac then on to the McDougall Landing private road to proceed southbound out to 108 Avenue.
- Solution to eliminate or minimize this traffic pattern would be to (1) Use “knockdown posts” (bollards) with keys in the roadway that could be removed for emergency vehicle traffic or in emergencies or (2) eliminate parking in the 105 Street cul-de-sac.
- LRT must match the theme/look/ feel of the proposed North Edge development (look ahead to what it will be – outside the box thinking).
- Dividing of communities.
- 105 Street traffic impacts.

(In order of priority)

- Planning and Development department must be involved for the land use issues. The current ARP and the Downtown North Edge Study results are being trounced upon.
- A CPTED study must be undertaken.
- Need to determine if the LRT will increase or detract from revenue streams that may result from redevelopment of the area (including taxes) once it is built.
- Will there be fewer social costs compared to a healthy community?
- Consideration of commercial utilization of areas around the stations.
- Too early to give an honest answer
- Will the planned LRT route and platform station encroach on any part of our property /land?
- Need to thoroughly investigate and discuss parking in the area surrounding the station adjacent to our property.

- No comment (2).

Would you want to be involved in a process to address these?

- Yes (14).
- Especially issues of pedestrian/vehicle circulation and aesthetics around our property.
- Want to be in a proactive position – not reacting to proposed designs as in the past.
- Maybe a design charette approach.
- We consider ourselves involved in that we receive the information from the SAG meetings. If the project team needs input, come and talk!
- Particularly if there is a direct impact on our property.
- Wish to be paid for our time

e. Public Involvement

How do you see yourself or your group participating in the process going forward? (i.e. information, meetings, etc.)

- As much as possible.
- As a key stakeholder.
- One of the two advisory groups as a SAG member (8).
- Helping to organize “town hall” meetings.
- Want to receive any and all information that the project team sends out directly rather than through the community league.
- Want to have the opportunity to respond to the material being sent out.
- Through the current process as a “silent” member of the SAG.
- Collecting signatures on a petition from users.
- Writing letters to the councilors.
- Would like to suggest ideas rather than reacting to given ideas.
- Carma could share their vision for Aurora with the project team to start the process. Stakeholder/City engagement is also Carma’s responsibility and not always the other way around.
- One of the two advisory groups as a member (9)
- Meetings with our tenants throughout the process
- Would like to be informed of any and all decisions directly related to the development of the LRT impacting our property. We would continue to be supportive of this initiative and provide access to our property to surveyors and planners related to this project.

The project team is proposing a public involvement process that includes:

- **A series of one-on-one interviews with major stakeholders (such as this one today)**

- **Working with institutions to resolve site-specific issues on a one-on-one basis.**
- **Creating two advisory groups consisting of representatives from community and other interest groups to review more detailed plans (one for issues from 105 Avenue to Kingsway, one focusing on plans from Kingsway to Princess Elizabeth Avenue).**
- **Ongoing communication to share updates with the Stakeholder Advisory Group that was formed during Phase 1.**

**What do you think of this proposed public involvement process for this phase?
Any suggestions?**

- Must attempt to be comprehensive, with adequate notice and a variety of opportunities for people to voice concerns, glean information and participate in mitigations of negative impacts.
- Town hall meetings should take place.
- Looks good (4) – nothing to add.
- Would like to be involved with both advisory groups, primarily as an observer.
- Add Kingsway Garden Mall as key stakeholder on the list for one-on-one meetings.
- Once we get to architectural drawings and SAG support of the MacEwan Station and the portal, have an Open House to show local residents.
- Good and comprehensive; an enjoyable process to date, since I have not been involved in one of these before.
- More opportunities for stakeholders to be proactive not reactive.
- Due to the impact on the community I don't think the City has any alternative but to include the public.
- Posted meetings to keep everyone informed – lots of advance notice for water shutdowns etc (if necessary).
- Want to see cross-pollination of the two C.A.C.'s (Community Advisory Committees)
- Do not make advisory committee meetings invitation only – allow the general public to attend

(For previous SAG members). Do you still want to be involved on the Stakeholder Advisory Group?

- N/A (7)
- Yes (8) – as a silent member

Are there other stakeholders or groups that should be involved? How should they be involved?

- Affected property owners should be given the opportunity to be involved as much as they want to be.
- Alberta Motor Association on advisory committee
- 107 Avenue BRZ
- Avenue of Nations
- Schools
- Grocery stores in the area as potential sites for bulletin board announcements and updates.
- Neighborhood Enhancement Council (ANEC was the acronym used but the interviewee was unsure of the name of the organization)
- Westwood Community League – transient area, smaller community league – to let them know what is happening.
- Businesses along Princess Elizabeth Avenue.
- Businesses along 118 Avenue.
- Debra Peaker and her reference group.
- 105 Avenue zone is the main interest; 105 Street condos/business owners on 105 Avenue – especially from the portal to 105 Street.
- When plans are available for viewing a direct letter campaign/Open House should be done.
- University of Alberta; contact Michael Phair and other educational institution. A study was done in 2006 that identified there were 30 educational institutions and more than 37,000 students/staff in the downtown not including the opening of the Robbins Centre and Enterprise Square. The estimate is now 42,000 students/staff in the downtown.
- Must talk to John Szumlas about the development to the south of the Polish Hall (current empty lot).
- Qualico?
- EPCOR Community Relations – Adrienne Stewart.
- BCM – after Aurora gets going.
- Regency/Q condos.
- “Guys” just north of 105 Avenue at 101 – 102 Street (4-storey apartment).
- No answer.
- Not knowledgeable enough to comment.
- No answer / no suggestions (3)

f. Communications

Sharing information about the project to the broader community is important. The project team is considering a number of ways to reach these people, and we would like your thoughts on some of ideas under consideration:

Would you use a pre-prepared column in your community newsletter/employee bulletin? If so, who would be the best contact person to work with to arrange this?

Institution/Group Interviewed	Newsletter/Website, etc.	Name of Contact Person
Baccarat Casino	Employee newsletter	Elizabeth Ryman – Marketing Coordinator
Carma/North Edge Developers	No newsletter, but Carma has an internal employee website Maybe in 2 – 3 years when the Aurora will have residents	Jason Rumer, Project Manager
Central McDougall Community League	No newsletter	
Central McDougall and Queen Mary Park Business Coalition - will become the 107 Avenue BRZ – going to Council September 23, 2008	Could probably put info in Community League Newsletter (Queen Mary Park)	Lew Rodney, Member
Downtown Business Association	Not sure updates on the LRT planning are appropriate for the DBA newsletter that goes out 6 times a year to 5000+ members	Jim Taylor, Executive Director
Downtown Edmonton Community Association	Newsletter and website	Thomas Rose Communications Chair
Edmonton Transit Service Advisory Board (ETSAB)	No newsletter – but could relay info to the board	Brian Marcotte, Board Member
Holy Rosary Church/Sisem Daycare	Newsletter	Barbara Filipowski - Church Sister Teresa - Daycare
Kingsway Business Association	Would use it with revisions as necessary	Karon Kosof, Executive Director
Kingsway Garden Mall	Monthly newsletter to all lessees – renovation updates	Brad Merchant, General Manager Oxford Retail Group
McDougall Landing Condo Association	Would deliver our column as an insert to their monthly newsletter since it is for condo association business only	Bob Wilkins, President
Morguard Residential (Square 104)	Tenant Newsletter	Doris Berg, Site Manager 780.429.6787

Institution/Group Interviewed	Newsletter/Website, etc.	Name of Contact Person
Polish Hall	The three co-owning not-for-profit groups communicate with their members so could possibly pass on info	Stan Wilk, Manager
Spruce Avenue Community League	Rat Creek Press	Jessica Kimmerly, editor@ratcreek.org
Victoria Manor Condo Association	No newsletter but can pass around information to owners/renters	Sarah French, President

A newsletter would be sent to residents and businesses surrounding the future LRT line to update them on project progress (quarterly, through direct mail).

Would this be a useful way to share information with the broader community?

- Yes (8).
- Though literacy is a problem in a low-income neighborhood, consider TV, radio and Internet spots to disseminate information as well.
- People are busy so they need to receive information in a number of ways – not just a newsletter mailed to them.
- Use the mailing lists that (we) supply; however (we are) now more than just businesses.
- This would complement Rat Creek Press.
- The difficulty of using a newsletter is that few will read it (perceived as “junk mail”, or readers will not understand it).
- Not necessary.
- No comment.
- N/A (2).

Are there other people that should receive it?

- Property owners do not all live in the area. Contact management groups (i.e. York West) to contact owners.
- To 109 Street on the west and to 102 Avenue on the south.
- None specifically, but suggested that Laura Stirling (Community Liaison Coordinator for the City of Edmonton) could provide contact information, but she does not want to become involved in the process.
- Yes, the 20 or so off-site owners and they can be reached through the property manager who has the mailing lists.
- Parents of the children at the daycare.
- The T5J postal code (downtown area).
- Debra Peaker should also receive it.
- Westwood community.
- This is a great idea but the key will be to consult the community to determine where will be the best places to distribute it to so that residents can pick it up easily and conveniently.

- All tenants of (our building).
- Also make it available to current LRT users to keep them informed of future development and expansion plans.
- No suggestions (3).

We would like to advertise updates in local papers such as those targeting ethnic communities, student associations, etc.

Do you have any suggestions about any specific local papers that should be used? (i.e. – ethnic community papers?)

- Publications:
 - Examiner
 - Major newspapers
 - Metro (3)
 - 24 Hours
 - SEE
 - Panorama (Polish Newsletter) (780) 434-2665, Suite 1240, 5328 Calgary Trail
 - Vue
 - NAIT Student Handbook
 - Rat Creek Press (2)
 - The Vietnamese Times
 - Edmonton Chinese News
- MacEwan students
- Chinese community
- Ethnic Restaurants as drop off points
- People get their news from other sources at home and away from work.
- A large Polish community (50,000 people plus or minus) – church, school, nuns' residence.
- Two Polish churches you should communicate with.
- Communication with businesses.
- No (4) - not really involved with us.

Do you have other suggestions for ways we can share information in this area?

- Contact condo management groups for owners information (who do not live on site)
- TV, radio and internet spots
- Blogs
- You Tube, etc.
- On mall displays

- Websites
- Good media coverage
- Doing a good job already (2)
- Posters on specific poster pedestals and on store community boards
- Info as inserts in grocery bags
- Access Cafés/Malls
- Tough to access young, urban males
- Next Gen information resources
- Through community leagues - Central McDougall Community League
- Transit advertising – ads aimed at transit ridership driving them to the website
- At critical points, hand delivered bulletins by (stakeholder).
- Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues website
- None (3)

g. Conclusions

Any other comments or questions at this time?

- LRT is very important; it is fantastic that the City is focusing on this.
- Realize that this takes time but believes “Build it and they will come.”
- Again I must reiterate that the City must do a better job of letting those affected know what is happening and how it will affect them. To date this has not been done on any sort of effective level. Property owners are left misinformed or misdirected by poor reporting and little to no information (useful information) is on the city website. Until some solid evidence or research is presented, properties along this extension of the LRT will be concerned about vehicle access, emergency access, pedestrian access, property value (increase or decrease), redevelopment, noise (I haven’t seen this report and I’m not sure how convincing it is), noise during construction as well as access etc. during the multi year project as well as how crime rates will be affected by such a large project in a neighborhood already plagued by disorder/crimes.
- These concerns need to be addressed in each public forum so that as many people can be reached as possible. Some areas have been touched upon but there must be a more developed effort to address public concern.
- We are cynical about the process; we are not confident that our concerns will be listened to.
- Just get it built!
- Wanted to reiterate that (they) strongly support a LRT route below grade and on 104 Street.
- Enjoyed being part of the process and liked the one-on-one interview process.
- Community as a whole remains excited.
- Anticipating much more discussion.

- Will advocate for a parking study for Central McDougall to address shortcutting and parasitic parking
- The claim was made that there was a commitment from the City in 1998 to undertake a study and to develop a traffic plan for the area that was never done.
- Project Manger was very helpful
- None (7)

Comments regarding other projects/other issues:

- Not in the scope of this project but raised the issue of the 105 Street pedestrian crossing at 99 Avenue and increasing flows that may occur resulting from the South Approaches project.
- Although not within the scope of this project, the City should open a recycling depot in the area to help some of the local residents and provide a means of making some money.