Project overview

The Baseline Engagement and Communications Project is led by Administration in collaboration with communities, industry and City Council. This project is looking at establishing a predictable outreach approach for Community Planning projects.

The keys areas of focus include:

- Creating a level of predictability, without making things cookie cutter and ensuring we are customizing and tailoring our approach to address the unique needs and local context of communities and stakeholders.
- Pushing for better and more authentic outreach, earlier in the planning process.
- Defining roles and responsibilities connected to community outreach for all stakeholders involved in the process (The City, community and applicants).
- Creating a planning-specific outreach process and toolkit to guide best-practice outreach.
- Improving reporting to stakeholders and to Council – focusing on creating clearer linkages between What We Asked, What We Heard and What We Changed.

Engagement overview

The engagement for this project has included outreach to Council, development industry, community members and City Administration. In phase one engagement that occurred through summer and fall 2018, we met with each stakeholder group individually to gather an understanding of the successes and challenges that exist for community outreach on planning projects. To review the phase one engagement report, please click here.

In phase two engagement, we invited representatives from all stakeholder groups to work together to:

- **Clarify roles and responsibilities.** Discuss who leads what part of engagement, who is involved when, who coordinates what, and who pays for what?
- **Prioritize improvements and identify solutions**. Discuss and prioritize the tools and resources needed to support improvements and help stakeholders be successful in their role.

To achieve this we held a half-day workshop session on March 16, 2019, where stakeholders – community, industry, council and administration came together to discuss roles and responsibilities, and tools and resources required for community members and industry applicants. The goal for the session was to bring everyone together and collaboratively discuss how we can work together and enable everyone involved in the outreach process for planning projects to be successful in their roles for outreach. To view the presentation shared at the session, please click here.

What we asked

To introduce the session, we provided an overview of the project, the engagement that has occurred to date and a draft of the roles for outreach along the planning continuum. To view the presentation, please click here.

Our first activity for the session involved asking participants to think about the success factors and what needs to be in place for this project. What would be the key factors contributing to having a predictable, yet flexible, approach to outreach on community planning projects?

Our second activity for the session involved, reviewing the draft roles and think about what some of the responsibilities would be for each role in regard to outreach for planning. Then participants were asked what tasks this role would need to complete for community outreach to be successful.

The final activity, Tools and Resources, participants were asked these specific questions:

1. What tools/resources might the community need to successfully participate in the development of a local area plan?
2. What tools/resources might a Community Association need to successfully support outreach connected to a development application?
3. What tools/resources might an applicant need to successfully conduct outreach with the community?

What we heard

The multi-stakeholder approach of this workshop encouraged representatives of the development community, City Council, Community Associations and City staff to work together towards developing best-practices for outreach on planning projects.

Participants provided a wide range of input on what success for this project would entail. Success factors identified were delineated into five categories: tools and resources; effective engagement process; role clarification, outcomes and education & information. The two other workshop exercises led to participants providing a wide range of feedback associated with responsibilities the various stakeholders play in the engagement process and what tools and resources could best support this important work.

- For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the Summary of Input section.
- For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the Verbatim Responses section.

Next steps

City Administration has been working on refining the roles and responsibilities for outreach based on feedback received at this session. We have also began drafting tools and building out the online toolkit. The

City will be hosting a review session for each stakeholder group, where we will showcase some of the tools prior to sharing the toolkit with Council at nextCity in mid-June 2019.

The initial public rollout of the online toolkit will occur by the end of June 2019. It is our intent that the toolkit will evolve and be evaluated over the summer months, with the expectation of arriving at a more finalized resource by the end of Q3 2019.

Summary of Input

Success Factors

- Several participants recognized that online and easy access information would be vital to the success of community engagement and referenced creating an online hub or portal where this information can be easily accessed.
- There were many references about creating or having tools and resources available for effective, consistent and transparent engagement and feedback for the community.
- Several participants focused on educating the public on both the engagement process (where and how decisions are made) and community planning and development processes.

Roles and Responsibilities

Leads

- Participants thought the leads for engagement projects should be responsible for defining what decisions are being made, where on the spectrum the engagement event falls and whether the event is looking for feedback or informing the public
- Participants identified leads should project manage the engagement. They are responsible for the coordination of the engagement, indicating who pays for which elements of the engagement, and mapping out a process and timeline for all engagement opportunities and identifying who is responsible for feedback loops and when they are to be completed
- Participants felt that leads should look the same for all stakeholder groups whether the engagement is led by The City, developer, or Community Association

Support

- Participants felt that support roles should play a supportive role in the engagement process and provide leads and facilitators with tools and educational resources to ensure participants are informed
- Participants identified the support role being responsible to help create the resources and materials that engage participants, are shareable and in plain language and provide guidance on accessible engagement regarding location, access, and online tools and ensure that engagement can be accessible for all

- Support roles to provide resources for both council and developers for them to understand the process of engagement
- Support roles were identified as being responsible to share success stories, what has worked well for community and industry, to ease the fears around potential changes in communities

Facilitator

- Participants were looking to have a definition of what a good facilitator would be – ideas participants had included: unbiased, knowledgeable, needs to be able to interpret planning language, neutral and trust worthy in the eyes of the community, council and developers
- Several participants cautioned that CA's are not always the best choice for facilitator – CA's are not paid, usually in volunteer roles, limited to no capacity to facilitate sessions, and should not be expected to resource (find) the facilitators
- Very important to have consistent education tools and to have transparent reporting and share feedback with decision-makers
- Participants felt that professionals and/or paid facilitators were important to consider for these types of projects

Participant

- Should be responsible for being informed, to seek out information and be open to different ideas
- Should feel empowered to say more than just 'no', provide sincere feedback and understand and respect timelines

Decision Maker

- There was some confusion by participants on this role, who it is and how they get the info they require – is it council, is it developers, is it both? Council is the ultimate decision maker and should hold everyone accountable
- Participants felt the decision makers should be the roles who provide feedback on why decisions were made a certain way

Tools and Resources

Lead

- Participants thought it was important to have a feedback tool or template to show how certain decisions were made and why
- Participants could use a common language tool for outreach, translation and plain language examples
- Participants suggested creating a list or database for IAP2 consultants, so developers can use the experts

Support

- Participants referenced toolkits and outlines for different aspects of engagement (including roles and responsibilities and evaluation toolkits), development permits and land use information
- Several participants suggested having resources hosted online or creating online platforms to assist with sharing information with those who require it

Facilitator

- Participants identified tools and resources for engagement planning, execution, conflict resolution, guidelines and outreach options (community events, online, public spaces) as items needed for success
- Participants suggested creating the opportunity for networking and sharing between CAs to share their experiences, and an opportunity for sharing between CAs and developers

Participant

- Participants suggested online tools to engage with participants
- Participants also thought a way to identify different stakeholders would be valuable, different stakeholders have different needs

Decision Maker

- Participants identified information sharing and collaboration between business units within The City and for Council in general is required for success

Verbatim Comments

Following is a record of the feedback captured, as submitted, during the half-day session. Please note: blank spaces are highlighted where the transcribed feedback was illegible.

Success Factors

Tools and Resources:

- Its less tactful, less of an exercise in process and more of a sense of community input
- Suite of tools for applicants
- Online toolkit that is easily accessible
- Toolkit available for applicants and communities
- Plain language handouts as soon with The City of Edmonton
- Accessible and consistent online hub
- Better tools and systems for community associations and other stakeholder groups to communicate broadly and in an inclusive way – get out of the bubble of just a few voices
- Need engagement guide as a resource that is easy to access
- Buy in by **ALL** stakeholders
- Clear articulation of trade-offs
- Project portal to illustrate timelines and next steps
- A level of development that triggers the required WWH – for the community not the project (resources to use for future developments)
- We have expectations that are identified and adhered to
- Identify the processes that are transparent and inclusive

Education and Information:

- Community associations are a good place to mine information:
  - How the community wants to be engaged
  - What resources the CA had to help share information
  - Ask up
- Agreement between all stakeholders on what a "baseline" is
- Clearly defined policies to ensure consistency in application types and process
- Community would have a clearer understanding of land economics as it relates to housing type and redevelopment

- The level of understanding connected to what can be accomplished at each stage of the process; process is clear and has increased
- Certainty for all participants about roles and responsibilities
- Clear urban design guidelines to define evaluation criteria for D.P.'s
- Public that is informed about planning continuum
- There is very little opportunity for intentional misinformation to flourish during a process (example: easy to access website)
- How to get information out to the community?
- Continue the conversation and education about life cycling and community change
- I can see others POV's and learn the other perspectives (information is posted and easy to access)
- The city capital project should have a higher level of engagement
- Strategic framework for communities to grow
- Contact information to speak with key people
- Stakeholders have the information they need to make decisions
- ASP's – Stop reviewing them when there is an issue and perhaps, we should be doing community 10-year reviews to make sure they are relevant
- Multiple communication channels, more than online (example: community newsletters, posters at key community hubs)
- Community association that each have planning expertise, to some extent, to help inform about what/how development happens
- Communication and support with Federation to ensure PIP and Federal workshops/resources are consistent
- Community associations would have a greater understanding of the neighbourhood timeline, and triple bottom line necessity for intensification
- Meet people where they **ARE AT** in terms of knowledge base and time/location

Effective Engagement Process

- Engaged residents would be demographically diverse – measurement?
- Guidelines on how you know enough engagement has been done\
- Communities actually see results from their input
- Supporting governance/system structure at a City
- Transparency regarding how and why particular decisions were made
- The community knows and feels like their input has been heard
- Ideas on successful engagement with the community
- Everyone feels they were heard
- Less policy, more clarity; measured benefits

- There is less demand on community volunteers
- People should understand the decision and why it was made, whether they agree or not
- Monitoring – how do we define success?
- Tracking and metrics of how policies and developments have affected communities/community association in years after (example: 1 year? 5 years? 10 years?)
- Proper listing by all parties; communities are very protective and developers want profit; the City wants revenue; everyone has their own agenda and their needs to be more common ground
- System understands the milieu of change; we drive toward end state (this means before policy)
- There is a clear line of sight for all stakeholders regarding how outreach engagement was conducted and what resulted from the process
- People care at the early stages and participate
- The City hears from/get acknowledgement from people not opposed to an application but who don't want/have much time to spend providing that information.

Role Clarification

- Don't ask too much of people
- All stakeholders (CA's, development industry, neighbours, and council) understands the spectrum of responsibility in engagement
- Clear points of contact to discuss topics/issues during engagement process
- Everyone understands their role and the specific responsibilities associated
- Acknowledgement through council of roles and responsibilities for stakeholders
- Council is clear about who should lead and who should pay when sending back things for engagement
- People understand how they can be involved in the process
- Clear understanding of what is open for input when and opportunity to influence
- Equitable opportunity for all shareholders to access "pertinent" information
- Clear articulations of who is a legitimate stakeholder
- What decisions need to be made and by who?
- Shared understanding of areas for input on all project applications
- Acknowledgement through process of legislated authority for each app type
- City properly informs stakeholders of all details of process and support
- Clarity on roles and expectations
- Clear understanding of decisions to be made
- Ensure there is outreach to CA's **VERY** early in the process so residents can be involved before its too late
- City must "market" the long-term visions of a LAP to the public before major developments or re-developments occur

- Most of the "push back" is from communities because they don't feel like they understood what/why development was being proposed

Outcomes

- People are contacted where they are at – are we reaching out to the community members through the appropriate channels?
- Process workshops
- Stakeholders have had full opportunity to participate
- Shared confidence by applicant and City in a best practice process translated into confidence and support from council
- Ensure all stakeholders are involved, heard, have a seat at the table early on – who did we miss and how can they be included?
- Success looks like a logical flow/chain of opportunities to provide input and receive/see the input
- Success looks like people telling councillors that they appreciated the process, even if they disagree with the recommendation
- Community and counsellors have an opportunity to provide input in advance of applications being brought forward to council
- People care when they can make change, not when its too late
- Consistent and predictable engagement on planning applications
- Open and transparent process
- Timely decision/process
- Establishing trust between all stakeholders
- There were less surprises for level of engagement expected to be undertaken
- Culture shift to see and value input and communization from ALL parties to ALL parties as necessary, meaningful and not antagonistic
- Agree or agree to disagree
- An applicant will come to the community for a vision of the desire to create, not out of an exercise in process and expectation
- Engagement represents a broader spectrum of residents, not only the agendas of those with the time/resources to participate
- Consistency but not uniformity
- Engagement approach is clearly defined and used on all projects
- Applicant-lead engagement early enough to influence project design
- Consistency in application of processes across City
- Probing efficiencies to better help flush out resident concerns of use and utility
- Better access to Council, especially councillors other than the councillor for the community ward
- Consistent touch points for each stakeholder in processes

- There would be a shared understanding on engagement aims (example: not consensus. But transparent conversations) between community
- There is a complete feedback loop
- Word "conduit" is confusing; planner not always in that role
- Feedback is meaningful and useful and can be used to inform change
- Clear understanding of purpose of engagement – what can/can't we change?
- `Feedback is relevant to the application
- Council agreement/endorsement of the "baseline"

Roles and Responsibilities for Outreach
Lead

- Responsibility to define what is open for input and what is just informing
- Lead should leverage community specific stakeholders to determine who outreach should target
- Be clear about roles/expectations (inform vs. outreach)
- Delivering notices should be the responsibility of the Lead and/or Support, not the CA
- Embedded City-community team
- Shifting how we used to build; any lead has to be involved in creating the policy creating the policy environment that dictates how we get to build
- Need a lead who is fund involved in the history, culture, state of given area
- Lead should be responsible for ensuring a deeply embedded interdisciplinary group involved in planning the future of their communities
- Problem – too often the facilitator ends up taking on the applicants (lead) role
- Resources - $$$
- End-state vs. pulling pad proponents along
- How they capture diversity – is it their role to ensure? Can they help to ensure it's not the same people always?
- Clearly define expectations of roles and clearly communicate them
- Decide and keep to decision; "don't need full scale engagement on a row-house"
- Need more clear distinction of when we do and don't engage
- Define what are driven by tech/financial requirements and where public input can be used
- Define what is, not what is not open for engagement; this will help to define the roles at onset
- Need to include significant education component first thing
- Similar guidelines expectations whether its City or applicant
- Guiding the discussion – the City developer should lead

- When the decision maker is sending something back, specify about what? Who is responsible? Who will pay?
- Could and couldn't do and why? What did we report?
- Meaningful comments back – clear and sufficient, themed and understandable, connections are clear
- Carrying the what we did report to what we did – need training on how to do it
- Notify of changes to ALL of the parties – council, CA, etc.
- Who is responsible for the feedback? Loop – they are to share information back and be transparent
- Why are you developing in our community? Tell a story
- Engagement overload – help space it out
- Open focus from project scope to more geography/scope of projects/coco
- Ability to pull in a 3rd party facilitator when requires
- Have a plan for conflict resolution
- COORDINATION
- Things don't "die" at the conversations; clear expectations of expectations and roles
- Feedback loops – 1. Ownership of WWN, 2. Training for WWN
- Clarity on what you are doing in the project background
- Clarity on parameters
- Build trust, be accountable
- Ownership of the role in the WWN
- Define the problem
- Printing cost of applications and plans and sharing it
- Sharing of market needs/restrictions, sharing key information
- Be responsible to all stakeholders and answer questions, say you don't know when you don't know
- Outward focus – what else is happening? Holistic look at the City
- Reflective of community/area context
- Identify decisions open for input and why
- City should lead and facilitate the conversations before the applicant and community
- Applicant – education about the scope and about what is open for input
- Provide framework on education information – plain English, infographics, parameters vs. what's proposed
- Have images and pictures of your ideas/development
- Better educate community on planning principals
- Signage to be more engaging to citizens, easier to understand the what's and how's, are the tools using appropriate terminology? Are there pictures? Does it encourage people to stop, read, and ultimately engage?

- City needs to educate applicant as they prepare to lead the engagement
- City should have certified public participation consultants that an applicant should be required to engage
- To what extent are changes to ARP on the table – can change conversations
- Transparent reporting – keeper of the documents
- Be approachable, have contact information present on site, promote discussions
- Clearly identify what is open for input
- City should be lead for engagement on LVA's, consult level spectrum, integrated feedback based on tech specs
- Planners present stakeholders input or summarize
- Lead can be community sometimes
- The lead should be defined for every process
- Map out a process and timeline for opportunities for input, but also be flexible emerging issues
- Need to impartially present feedback to council
- Clarify how scope related to policy
- Provide details

Support

- Champion the success stories of what has worked well – community and industry examples of change
- Leverage NPC's
- Support needs to provide lead and facilitator with tools and educational resources so people can understand and engage
- Embedded City – Community Team
- Genuine engagement helps get rid of the anger outreach
- NCP's – do more with them
- Communities learn from each other; championing success stories
- Communicate success stories of development to ease fears of development and change
- Engagement = Education
- Targeting the online engagement – can this be done?
- Ensure continuity for all parties through the process, where possible
- Community – Profile – Cultural needs
- Defining timelines is helpful to work with
- Engagement central accessible for all
- Ensure some level of community should lead change
- Guidance on accessible engagement tools
- Make general results of earlier project concerns open to leads

- Summer engagement is a good/missed opportunity for outreach
- Helpful to have examples of projects they like; CA's to reference on hand
- Feedback loops are clear
- Questions are answered
- Right of way coordination for once a project is done for concerns/issue management
- Tool restrictions to be appropriate
- Right person at the right time
- Be prepared for questions for all stakeholders at all levels by all leads including the industry
- Creating resource materials that make it easier for the participants to be informed
- Having subject mater expertise available so that people can participate
- Make it so people care about it, make it a reason so that people want to come
- Creating the materials for access/sharing with different participants
- Conversations are documented and shared
- Clarity of scope – what you can and can't do
- Clarify the scope of each role
- City advisor plays a support role – provide information, "hold" applicant accountable for engagement
- City to support the education efforts
- Education about the process and about the roles
- Provide an overview of engagement at public hearing to assist council who must have an open mind going in
- Provide plain language support
- Educate council about the process (City admins)
- City needs to educate applicant as they prepare to lead the engagement
- City should have certified public participation consultants that an applicant should be required to engage
- Developers need to follow perspective rules around engagement
- Need for an interpreter of "planning" language
- WWH needs to be transparent and unbiased of comments
- City inform and support community
- Neighbourhood planning coordinator would be a valued resource for CA's to level the field
- Be clear about the outcomes of the decision (what is actually at stake)
- Help support CA's better with turnover and volunteer concerns

Facilitator

- CA – share local context information to help leads and support to succeed
- Share success stories

- Embedded City – Community Team
- Questioning CA's as facilitators – "we are all volunteers"; community can provide local knowledge, but not be responsible to do it all
- Agendas – there has to be trust in the facilitator; the facilitator should be neutral enough to accurately stakeholder map
- Need to be cautious about being gatekeepers; CA membership is not necessarily representative
- Wasn't this the intent of the CRF? To have accurate community representation?
- Get CA's out of task running communities and into the leadership roles
- Need to define the qualities of a good facilitator to ensure they are good representatives
- Professional and Paid – dealing with really hard stuff is very hard on the volunteers
- CA should play more of a role in clarifying what engagement is
- Not just community associations: BIA/businesses, institutions/organizations, member-based groups, faith-based culture organizations
- How do you call out bad gateway/keeper CA's?
- CA has no capacity
- CA's are not representative – 2-5% average population representative
- Challenge – for both CA's developers define application level of outreach
- Challenge – encouraging a diverse group/perspective to participate
- CA – how to we do more with less? Level of input can be overwhelming
- CA – guidelines for how much input is enough
- What about engaging children, seniors?
- Make engagement accessible, more targeted; online engagement
- Make engagement accessible
- CA – more clarity on timelines; we are volunteers
- Guide participants to a place where input is useful and heard
- Do more with less – what is enough? What is a good job from the view of the CA? challenge with low numbers, guidelines needed
- Defined timelines at the onset, where we can slot these in (don't want to miss deadlines)
- How much do you require for engagement?
- What are the guidelines that we need to adhere to? Working with neighbourhood partnership is helpful
- Challenge – changing the roles within the City (hard to control) loosely relates, builds continuity and trust
- Optics to CA – the City fights on behalf of an applicant; we don't have defined criteria in our engagement process
- Challenge – working to share the baseline, broadly understood guidelines
- Its about trade-offs: community challenge for developers' level of outreach
- Communication and facilitation distinction

- The more paid staff can do this, the better the resources are filled
- Planning liaison role to show information, educate, support, inform people at the right time
- Common role back for what is/isn't open
- Need more that 1 facilitator in different areas – CA, industry, City, political
- BILD and other groups also facilitate with industry and between other groups
- After presentations, provide recommendations (by CA) on best way to connect
- Support for those who cannot go online
- Who are we leaving out if by moving digital? Responsibility is that everyone has access to what they need
- Unbiased knowledge (ISP2)
- Reporting developer – run open houses and don't share feedback with decision makers; have to send separate letters to File Manager
- Educate and inform the community that the applicant can put forward a non-compliant application
- Each role should be clarified
- Need for an interpreter of "planning" language
- It is very important to have consistent education tools
- Transparent reporting – complete, same documents no matter who's showing/sharing it
- Information sharing
- CA's should not be expected to resource engagement
- Access to rich resources
- Transparent reporting, unidentified information sharing
- Define the role more

Participant

- Responsible for being informed
- Support engaging earlier on so engagement can be sincere (example: CRF looked rigged, but it could have come across more sincere with more time/early involvement)
- Sometimes development starts here, but now you have to find a lead; its not that easy
- Need to know more about "what is engagement" but need information tools to make it easier
- Education is the silver bullet
- Expectations need to be set and defines for participants to be informed; understand just one piece of the puzzle to find the wins; it is okay to ask for change, don't just block it
- Fear and trust
- Empower participants to say more that "no"
- What does engagement mean?
- Bridging understanding between lead and participant on scope of opportunities for input

- Working groups to work on different things – limit their scope to maximize resources
- Having people of different ideas, clashes happen in person
- Responsible for being open to other ideas and cross-pollination with other groups
- Having a complete picture of the issues so that informal decisions can be had
- To seek out information, and have it accessible
- Understanding of market value can/can't be built on site
- Respect the local knowledge the community brings
- Can also provide positive input – what did you like?
- Define exactly what the participation event is – come and go? Lecture? Open house?
- Culture and value shift to valuing the conversations and engagement of the bigger picture and why we are in this
- Community, developer, stakeholders, council members
- Identify common parameters tailored for the community – can co-design the process across roles
- Make sure we have plain language information for all participants
- Be informed
- Understand and respect timelines

Decision Maker

- Embedded City – Community Team
- Making/leading decisions based on biases (example: supporting voter base) or on recommendations of best processes
- Decision makers often apply different principals to engagement and decision making; need consistency
- Make decisions and don't do engagements when it can't be used
- Understand what was done and who was involved
- Demonstrate ROI on engagement – good outcomes
- Define a "good engagement" process
- Is it up to the decision maker to go back and direct to re-engage pending outcomes?
- ROI – what does it look like?
- Why are we doing the engagement?
- On bigger projects a better back on why we made this decision
- Clarity on who decides what and when
- TOR for each body and each process
- No overlap on decision making and decision-making power
- Clarity on when a decision is made
- Take engagement report/process information account (balanced with public hearing)
- Give admins the permission to push back for better engagement

- How is information funneled to the decision-maker? Which role?
- Is this council or applicant?
- Council hold every accountable
- Council should be provided with a summary of engagement and participants and outcomes from community input
- A mechanism to trigger outreach/engagement outside of the process (example: where a DP accompanies or is associated with a land use change, the applicant is required to engage neighbours in a certain radius of DP)

Tools and Resources for Outreach

Lead

- Common language used for all planning outreach (example: open house means engagement)
- Development map comments process makes it difficult to share verbatim comments with stakeholders
- Too many windows for input, makes it hard to consider all comments
- Feedback loop tool
- Empower planners and teach engagement skills
- Consistent reporting tool for all input and includes what we did
- Tools enable transparency – development economics; why did you make a certain decision?
- Consistency and coherent system in which to act
- Clarify and communicate where we are on engage spectrum
- Language – translation, plain language, multiple communication channels
- City planners must all be engagers
- Digital connection is still a privilege ($) – how do we communicate with equity?
- Planning-urban design evidence-based persons
- Why changes were made and why changes were not made
- Multi-community planning approach
- Use pop-ups for projects on the go
- Network of cultural/religious/business/councillors for out reach
- Public/lead accessible data base of community feedback
- Targeted community profile
- Defines timeline – is this a template/tool?
- Digital, printed plans
- 5-10 year reviews of major policies/plans

- Monitoring – what has been built, evaluation of what happened? What are the benefits? How much money was spent?
- Pre-application fees just increases, this could impact the little guys
- For applicants – make it easy to find, tools and information, FAQ's
- Need life from the City on hoe to engage about the community
- Developer's basics – did you know? Things that are location specific contracts for CA
- Understand the structure
- Create a safe space where conversations can be had and ideas can be shared
- Know the process – who reports to who?
- Internal resources to coordinate and understand each other
- City website – breakout for small and big applicants, for community, and for CA
- Signs – plain language, infographics, make them exciting to grab attention
- Engagement tool – decisions, how will input be used?
- Inclusive and transparent, decision making tool
- Outreach calendar in the community
- Acknowledge and provide community specific background information; shows that the City and applicant did their research
- Engage policy and training
- Online engagement
- Educate council on the steps taken
- List of IAP2 consultants to be given to vendors
- Stronger design guidelines and policies for DP process evaluation; gives certainty and consistency
- 3D massing rendering (basic box) on notice posting
- Consistent 3D massing's/visualizations for land use (City resource)
- Guidelines/matrix that outlines what is and is not up for discussion
- Visualization of what is allowed by land use
- Sample of City involvement in land use engagement session (resource)
- City to bring poster to workshop that outlines they are 3rd party at events to give non-bias

Support

- Toolkit/outline for what's on the table for discussion at development permit and land use; what is open for input and when?
- Sticky notes are the start of a conversation from there it needs to continue; need real feedback loops
- Online platform can be used by developers, community, City; includes lots of tools
- Question – is it the government that is responsible for providing digital environment for citizens to participate?

- Training for file managers – how to engage
- Database of toolkit of cultural groups
- PD Map – information is power; put out as much data
- Story telling – positive success stories
- A coherent and consistent system in which to act
- Checklist for council, CP's; support makes it for participants
- A tool for how input is coordinated and documents – verbatim
- MUST be clear up front in process design to avoid perception of voting/weighed evaluation, etc.
- Engage unit push information to stakeholder groups (example: planning sends DP)
- Identify stakeholders – where can stakeholders sign up to be invited?
- Multi-community planning approach
- Greater awareness of PD Maps, my property tools
- One central window into all City projects – better user interface for all City projects, one-window approach
- Push out information without looking for it, information on the community
- Ward information
- Development permits
- Coordination at the start – who is and who wants to be apart of this?
- Key contacts – planner, escalation structure
- Integration and flexibility in the smaller stuff to focus on the problem and the outcome
- Topography maps so that you know
- Geo-based map that shows everything, not just planning
- Informing the directly impacted – contractor, planner, CA
- How do we connect and understand each other?
- Know how to better access information and for it to be easy to find
- Focus on the larger piece not the small stuff; focus on the possibility to focus on the bigger problem
- As bylaws try too become more flexible, less prescriptive, then why a project is beneficial is more important
- "Certified Consultant" would have platform for outline engagement and host capabilities
- Roles and responsibilities document
- Develop open interactive web-based engagement; place-based discussion forum
- Plain language, infographics, multi-language
- City supports the creation of reports to council
- The City to push information
- Evaluation tool for engagement

- Broader engagement (example: main streets, side streets); residents didn't pay attention until their street got re-zoned
- Create 1-page key topics/concerns/summary of each involved party
- At time of application, give applicant best practices/toolkit to set expectations
- Take in application and give applicant toolkit/expectations
- Construction management/on-site policies and best practices
- Planning liaison – resource, conduit from the City CA, City planner
- Aligning census and other data to ARP areas
- Community website on calgary.ca to educate and help with volunteer turnover knowledge
- Define terms – consistent and transparent
- Best practice guidelines – co-defined, City resource, context specific, can't be prescriptive

Facilitator

- Conflict resolution tool – needs to be good because nobody thinks they are the problem ☺
- Conflict resolution tool is helpful but needs to have clear definition of roles
- A consistent and coherent system in which to act
- Facts/evidence shared with participants
- Identify what is missing – voice, perspective, density
- Meetings every 2 weeks, invite stakeholders
- Door hangers for directly effected residents in plain language, with graphics
- Engagement should build trust – clearly defined can's and cant's (managing expectation)
- Meet people where they're at – libraries, re centres, festivals, community events
- Defined guidelines for CA's to help streamline
- Advice on how to run your CA
- Create network of CA's for shared advice (maybe FCC)
- Engagement planning support
- Case studies to reference for developers and CA's
- Neighbouring communities and CA's sharing their experiences
- Formalized CA connection
- Be productive
- Common language – glossary of terms
- Heritage component to the toolkit, understanding history
- Involve early, allow evolution, create evolution
- Telling WHY something is happening, tell a story
- Understanding how to run planning meetings

- Clarify on structure, organization process, language
- People and processes that foster open communication, trust and safe places to share thoughts and ideas
- Reduce complexity in system – more clarity, sometimes less is more in defining goals and objectives
- Don't "policy and process" everything to death, accept more risk
- Be mindful of your audiences – common language, definitions, meaning and how/when they do things
- Sometimes City can take an approach that is "easy to administer" for them, but not others
- Facilitator to tell City this is how much I know, this is who you can/should talk to
- Make it special/make it count by getting al COC departments included and allowing creativity by the community and developers
- Community consultant to provide/choose to lead a few - LRT stations, dog parks, AGM's
- Cheat sheet for outreach location options – outline, community events, dedicated open houses, public spaces
- Be clear about WHO can provide feedback – owners, renters, long-term, short-term
- Someone to work with CA to create educational tools that are easy to read
- Community leader or advisor liaison (could be councillor, CA board, BR2 director)
- Can City work with CA's to develop communication tools?
- Online tools to supplement in person
- Push notifications for new proposals on PD Map; option to select City-side or certain districts in the City
- Online map to add comments on the website that can be location specific (policy planning)
- Contacting marginalized populations – phone, email, letters, events, in person
- City administration should be part of facilitator role based on description provided (currently not listed)
- Planning 101 resources for CA's to help understand planning process
- Advisory groups for policy planning
- Toolkit for communication
- Implement within City/developer business practice an "outreach time" off hours that are dedicated to allow for communication (example: Thursday evening a CA can sign up to talk about any project, they will need to specify, and the City would have plan, person available to discuss. Make these time part of business practice. If no one signs up, the City doesn't have anyone available, same goes for developer)

Participant

- IAP2 for dummies – toolkit to allow participants to understand their roles
- How to present to council tip-sheet
- Technological tool to engage parties immediately
- Plain language resource about the "big picture" (example: MDP, why we are intensifying for participants)

- Trade-offs and benefits understanding
- Tough conversation resource – we need to update plans from the 70's; things are going to change
- Links to City resources – PD map is your best friend
- Clear distinction on who's who, which group and why?
- A coherent and consistent system in which to act
- Who is the stakeholder? Can't be anonymous, what is your stake? What is your conflict?
- Different "stakeholders" have different resources, time, money, etc.
- One comment, equal value – one person = 20 sticky notes
- Development permits
- Reference the "my property" website – PD Maps enhancement
- Engage
- Status of all projects in the area
- Selectable filters, defined parameters, frequency
- Central engagement hub – close to transit, central space used by multiple CA's and developers, build the awareness, engagement storefront
- My property tool to set a radius around your house, get notified on new developments in that area
- Support for these with occasional issues and ability issues
- Let the CA know what is happening if you are developing
- Communicate regularly so that the whole story is understood
- Accessible issues – address these for those, especially those who can't leave communities
- They need they constraints and where you came from
- Be clear about technical constraints, share knowledge
- List ward offices to share their contacts of who to call
- Use councillors
- A tool that allows conversation and sharing under FIOP/CA's
- Liaison role
- Developers to add and talk too
- Use City staff, use community assistants
- Information and legacy transfer
- List of communities
- Standardize on what was done (road map)
- Needs to receive all information relevant in order to take on informed decision
- How will the input be used – tool, infographic
- Ask how people want to be engaged (example: Crowchild Trail and citizen group to advice the engagement process)

Decision Maker

- Collaboration between business units to ensure that roads, parks, etc. are on the same page
- A coherent and consistent system in which to
- Need to radically decrease the amount of land use amendments and develop permit applications
- MGA needs to allow planning projects to consider economics of a project
- Minimum share of information from council that is shared with facilitators so all councillors share the same basic information
- Council should mandate/encourage a baseline of engagement, regard less of law/MGA
- Time to be at council – public hearing by appointment
- Council NEEDS to share a minimum amount of information
- What is happening in my area? Real time
- First community connectors available to developers
- Fee for pre-application
- Share milestones so that they get information along the way
- Connect expectations to process and outcome
- Updated list of CA's, facilitators with those who don't know great resources
- Connecting CA's with other CA's who were/are successful
- Standardize on what was done (road map)
- Standardize slide to support verbal feedback at a public hearing
- Clear – what we heard, what we did
- Verbal report of engagement at council
- What we heard about ad what we did
- DP to land use

General Project Questions and Comments

- Questioning the accuracy of the level/continuum of influence depending on the stage
- Baseline – are we designing a system to bring the laggards along, or about the end-state?
- Challenge – mixed commitment of involvement; great file manager but low community involvement or vice versa
- People generally don't know where to go to get involved and it is usually always the engagement website where engage scopes are defined

Comment Form

Following is a record of the feedback captured from the comment form, as submitted, during the half-day session.

Is there anything else that you would like to share with The City about this project?

- This is a good event. Conversation between developers/stakeholders/administration must happen before we get to Council. Let's bring these people together again, they are wanting/need to develop a way forward.
- We need to have an honest conversation about the genuine representativeness of CA's (average of 2-5 % members of any local population
- Online resource centre for all system players
- Excellent session with right people in the room (which has been a challenge in the past).
- More forums to debate & discuss issues with multi-stakeholder/diverse perspectives
- I enjoyed having all parties in the same room/pert table – CA's, Council, City, Developer. Is there a way we can have more networking events like this? Promotes relationship building.
- Also, it's interesting to see how once we see where someone is from/what 'team' they are on, we judge their opinions differently. Does it matter where they are coming from or can their comments stand on their own?
- Well done. Had fun.
- More focused feedback by stakeholders, then common sharing/informing would be useful.
- I am so happy to see this project. Engagement (from my perspective) was broken and needed improvement.
- Great to see CA's Councillors, Developers and City administration together and talking.
- The City's own internal departments must learn to communicate better if this project is going to be meaningful. A lot of the problems stem from this. The City and Developers need to realize that the people live in these communities and their opinions are relevant. It can't always be about money. My community (Bowness) has changed from a "no" society to a more open and understanding community. A "why this decision was made" letter at the end of the process would be appreciated.
- Communities want to be a part of the process. Thanks for the opportunity. CA would like to work with city and developer on how to engage best with residents/stakeholders. We can help you!
- Reaching out to more people – be clear that homeowners, renters, etc. can all provide feedback on applications.
- Acknowledge and appreciate complexity. Show you did your research before coming out to stakeholders' meetings/open houses. Group of stakeholder reps can help inform the initial research and smooth over any bad feelings down the road.
- I emailed a sample of items to Emma 😊
- To meet the goals of the MDP the City must improve the engagement process. Therefore, sessions like this are critical.

- In determining best-practice tool-kit of recommendations for engagement based on scale, community context, and level of change, avoid labelling "major, minor, etc." Alternatively, provide scenarios and recommended baseline engagement approaches. Labels are too powerful and subjective. Also, do not be too prescriptive – allow for some flexibility and/or innovation.

- I'm glad to see the City be willing to improve a process which has been the cause of many contentious issues. A continued evaluation and monitoring of the engagement process should be done, with periodic feedback on successes and improvables from all stakeholders. This is generally lacking in the Calgary community planning process.

- Consider voices involved in community development/planning/engagement and involve them in your process. (Beyond and including CA's). I'm from Sustainable Calgary and we work closely in communities in planning and design. Bike Calgary, Green Calgary, Seniors Associations, etc. would be important voices to include in a process such as this. 😊 (Broader scope/outreach)

- Appreciate you've shared this process. Would be good to share these opportunities more widely with communities using multiple communication modes. My CA Board had no idea this was happening until someone from another CA (missing perhaps 'let us know').

- Looking forward to seeing the publishing of tools in Q2!

- This work has to be placed in the context of where it is in a shift towards a different/better end state.

- We need to collectively understand the end state we're trying to achieve.

- The adjustments we're making have to serve getting to that end state as opposed to locking in our over-investing in the current transitional state.

- Who wasn't here today? What other city building groups are making active changes and weren't invited to participate. Were we diverse? E.g. no visible indigenous voices, 1/3 of Calgarians are immigrants).

- We focused a lot on built form/land use of housing stock. What about roads, pathways, sidewalks, bike lanes, transit, parks and playgrounds, and utilities like water and power?

- A lot of what's being proposed/asked of community associations is potentially time and resource heavy. What platforms/funding/support should the city be aiding with?

- How to level the playing field. CA's – full-time jobs + volunteer responsibilities. Developers and planners are professionals.

- I hope that now that the city has seen golf course sized infills, the city develops policy to protect current residents as a multi-year project rolls out. For example, 175 acres top soil for a 10-year rollout means current homeowners cannot sell and get value out of home.

- More resident-friendly resources. Use infographics with links to deeper info.

- Authentic engagement please!

Session Evaluation

Please circle the option that best matches your experience.

	19 Agree	**4** Somewhat Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
The session was a good use of my time					

Comments

- I like the small group work/any engagement I've done this way feels rewarding.
- Awesome dialogue.
- Yes, but I hate giving up my weekends with my family when I'm a volunteer.
- Honestly enjoyed the different perspectives.
- Good amount of time. Appreciate the workshop and thanks to participants. Appreciate being able to network with different people.
- See my big comment "this work has to be place of where it is in a shift towards a different/better end state".
- This is also a personal interest area.

	18 Agree	**4** Somewhat Agree	**1** Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
I am satisfied with the opportunity to participate and provide input.					

Comments

- Facilitator did a good job of going around the table to hear voices.
- Strong facilitation.
- Great conversation. What now?
- Feel awkward sharing with group although I have a lot of experience developing engagement. I have lots to share 😊. Very difficult in group setting for workshops for quiet people; would suggest targeted interviews or stakeholder group meeting.
- I have struggled with city engagement. I am happy to help improve this important process.

	18 Agree	**5** Somewhat Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
I received enough information to provide meaningful input.					

Comments

- I think continuing to dig deep into roles and responsibilities and setting expectations will drive us towards positive experiences.
- But not sure if non-experts would agree.
- Even on this project, what problem(s) is the city trying to solve?
- I wish I was involved in earlier sessions.
- Questions were confusing initially.
- I'm not clear how path dependant this process is. We're at the turning point here.

I understand how my input will be used.	**9** Agree	**10** Somewhat Agree	**3** Neither agree or disagree	**1** Somewhat Disagree	Disagree

Comments

- I think this has yet to be defined, but I appreciate the opportunity to be here.
- Where will this go? Hard to predict.
- Let's hope so. 😊
- Look forward to seeing the WWH/WWD reports.
- How far is the project along to be able to use our feedback?
- Feedback and how info will be used is a problem to be solved. This is a wait and see thing.
- Big picture or small picture? See my comments: "This work <u>has</u> to be placed in the context of where it is in a shift towards a different/better end state. We need to collectively understand the end state we're trying to achieve. The adjustments we're making have to serve getting to that end state as opposed to locking in our over-investing in the current transitional state".

The format was an effective way for The City to collect input.	**17** Agree	**5** Somewhat Agree	**1** Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat Disagree	**1** Disagree

Comments

- As said above, small group work forces both listening to different perspectives and having an opportunity to voice your own (with a good facilitator).
- Great job. √
- Our facilitator Dejana was outstanding.
- Good way to engage, but not sure if this was best way to <u>collect</u> input. There was a lot of sharing/" defending"/explaining that was likely lost in this process.
- I would say that there are voices who could be involved who were potentially not reached out to engage – Bike Calgary, Green Calgary, etc.
- Appreciated the mix of perspectives at each table (Council, Planning, Engage, Industry, Community).
- Great conversation. Feedback loop needed.
- Not enough opportunity to dig deeper. Interested in exploring IAP2 techniques of engagement further.
- Great discussions.

This gave me an opportunity to provide input on something important to me	**23** Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree

Comments

- Overall, I understand how the city must remain neutral. However, CA's are really at a disadvantage with volunteers trying to find capacity to work with professional planners and developers.
- I think the city is driving towards meaningful and effective engagement. Continuing to push boundaries with metrics of inclusion will be key to a strong, united and diverse set of voices building our city.
- Felt well heard.
- Hopefully this will lead to better communications between the City/Developer/CA's/BIA's.
- Great conversation with a great group. Very well facilitated. What now?
- Great knowing other feedback. Love the assigned seating.
- Yes! Thank you.