

**South East LRT Extension – Downtown to
Mill Woods**

**Public Involvement Process
Profiling Interviews**

Submitted by:



January 2009

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction and Background**
- 2. Key Stakeholder Profiling Interviews**
- 3. Report Recommendations**

Appendix A: Key Stakeholder Profiling Interview Form

Appendix B: Contact Record for Profiling Interviews/Stakeholder Contact

Appendix C: Compilation of Profiling Interviews with Stakeholders

1. Introduction and Background

Gray Scott Consulting Group Inc., as a sub-consultant to the CH2M HILL project team, is providing consulting services in undertaking the public involvement component for the South East LRT Extension planning project (Downtown to Mill Woods) for the City of Edmonton.

In December 2008 a series of profiling interviews with key stakeholders was undertaken to collect feedback on the five possible routes identified by the project team and get input on a proposed public involvement plan for the project. This component was undertaken through a series of one-on-one profiling interviews with 12 key stakeholders. A copy of the Profiling Interview Form is included as Appendix A to this report

The results of the process are reported in this summary document.

2. Key Stakeholder Profiling Interviews

Gray Scott Consulting Group Inc. developed a list of key stakeholders in cooperation with CH2M HILL and the City of Edmonton. The contact record for this phase of the project, included as Appendix B to this report, outlines the list of key stakeholders who were contacted for interviews.

The Project Public Involvement Plan identified sixteen Key Stakeholders for the profiling phase of this project. Of the sixteen who were approached by phone, fax or e-mail, fourteen face-to-face interviews were completed. One stakeholder chose not to do the interview due to a change in property ownership. One other is willing but as yet was unable to commit to the time for the interview. Gray Scott Consulting will continue our attempts to book that interview. (See Appendix B).

The profiling interviews were all prescheduled, and a copy of the profiling interview form was sent to the stakeholders prior to the interview. 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 a record 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. Some comments were edited or omitted to maintain confidentiality.

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

2.1. Common Themes from the Interviews

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

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

Initial Level of Awareness and Knowledge Section

Did you participate in the October 22nd Stakeholder Information Session and if so do you have any comments?

Very few of the interviewees were able to attend the information session. Of those who did attend, the general feeling was the information provided gave general knowledge and a basis for moving forward with the project.

What is your general knowledge of this project and public transit planning for Southeast Edmonton?

Many of the interviewees had been a part of the Southeast High Speed Transit Study. Many interviewees believed that the termination of that project ended discussions for any new transit to the South East. The October 22nd Stakeholder Meeting was the first time many of the interviewees had heard of this project.

Several of the stakeholders are involved in other City transit planning projects so had some knowledge about the project and in several cases there had been discussion regarding the need for LRT into Millwoods within the various organizations.

One interviewee was surprised to learn that a separate route was under consideration, They had assumed that there would be an eastbound extension of the South LRT Route east to Millwoods.

General Route Considerations Section

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

The most common theme from the responses was that something must be done to address congestion on roads and reduce the impact on the environment. There was general consensus that this service is overdue.

There was also discussion regarding where the residents of Mill Woods were going to on transit and therefore what the hub or termination point for the SE line should be. Connectivity, access to more than downtown destinations and the need to force ridership were all issues raised.

What do you see as the top three priorities for the SE LRT route alignment?

Two common themes heard from most interviewees were “respect for neighborhoods” and “ensure you provide service where it is needed”.

Neighborhood organizations and School Boards raised the issue of safety along the route. This included cars accessing stations, areas around stations, pedestrians and transit riders.

Another common theme was the need for scheduling transit to meet the needs of the various institutions along the route.

Cost was not a large factor for most of our interviewees, though cost “effectiveness” was mentioned often. The need to consider future development, growth, and future extension of the line were issues raised by several respondents.

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

Specific stakeholders shared information regarding expansion and growth plans for their organization or institution. Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre and Grey Nuns Hospital are both planning expansion within the next 5 years. Parking shortages will be a large factor for the hospital when that occurs. Planned development of Strathearn Heights and the Hollyrood area will increase population in those areas.

The community groups spoke about the change in demographics in the area. An increase in seniors is occurring now as well as a corresponding increase in condo conversion, senior’s housing and small businesses serving seniors. As the seniors move out of their homes, younger families are moving in. Those young families represent riders of the future and will require access to Colleges and the University.

New areas such as The Meadows, Ellerslie, The Quarters and Strathcona Junction were also mentioned as areas growing or expanding in the near future.

Issues and Concerns Section

What do you think are the primary concerns or issues that should be considered in the route alignment and design of the LRT expansion from downtown to Millwoods?

Many of the interviewees reiterated their response to the question above regarding top priorities. Additionally we heard concern regarding the City's ability to construct in neighborhoods with minimal disruption and concern that they have a lack of concern for the people in the neighborhoods.

Several respondents questioned the need for the route to go into downtown. One suggested initially building to the river and not across. One suggestion was to move residents "around" the south side on LRT and not necessarily into downtown.

Others suggested terminating at the University. This issue was one of access to the University and minimizing the impact on the river valley. Another stated that only 42% of employment is in downtown Edmonton and felt the City is "too focused on downtown".

Are there issues that you anticipate from your organization or the public that should be considered in determining the best route?

Once again interviewees restated their priorities from the previous questions.

School Boards requested information as soon as possible if the route was to utilize their land (current or future) as it affects their planning.

General comments were made regarding the LRT having the ability to bring workers/employees into the work areas (downtown and on the south side) and the need to make use of the system as convenient as possible.

Local Transportation Issues and Perceptions Section

What would you forecast the traffic conditions (volumes, degree of congestion) to be in this area five years from now, what factors will cause this and what are the major traffic generators?

Our interviewees were not able to provide detailed information regarding traffic conditions but most expect that there will be an increase. Those organizations planning expansion were able to speak specifically about the increase in traffic on/or near their properties. One organization believes that if the City develops reliable, efficient, timely, predictable transit, there will be a flat line on growth of cars.

Change in population demographics and the new development in Ellerslie, The Meadows, Strathearn Heights, Hollyrood and Strathcona Junction were all seen as causes for increase in traffic. Schools however are experiencing a decline in population that they anticipate will continue in all but the outlying areas of the city.

The planned recreation centres are also thought to be traffic generators and the hope is that LRT would bring people from all areas of the city to complexes of this type.

Specific Route and Criteria

Do you have any comments on the guiding principles used in determining the 5 possible corridors?

Overall the interviewees felt the guiding principles were well thought out and all very important.

One common theme expressed by our interviewees was the importance of respect for neighborhoods and river valleys. The second most common theme expressed was the importance of developing compact urban form. Cost effectiveness, proper long term planning and effective use of transit were also listed as important principles in choosing the route.

Do you have any comments on these criteria?

Overall our interviewees were in full agreement with the criteria used to choose the route. Comments ranged from “all very reasonable” to “all very important in any planning”. Social Issues were thought to be of most importance by several respondents with one commenting that social issues should be decided “with” the people instead of “for” the people.

In your opinion what critical components must be incorporated into the route alignment selection process?

The majority of the respondents pointed to the guiding principles and criteria in response to this question. Those making additional comments indicated the following:

- *Use existing structure in the river valley – respect the land*
- *Be careful about the environmental impact*
- *Where the people are and where they need to go*
- *Have to have some consistency with the Transportation Master Plan*
- *Make sure you consider future growth*
- *More compact urban form will be critical*
- *Need to define the word “respect” in relation to parklands and river valley*

Are there any other impacts or factors that should be considered?

Several interviewees indicated they were satisfied with the guiding principles and criteria and had no further comment. We did receive the following suggestions:

- *Make sure the LRT plans take future development into consideration*
- *Vimy Ridge High School now offers a Continuing Education program used in the evenings by adult students.*
- *Consider going to the University not downtown. Without making a convenient connection to University and Century Line [the term used to describe the South LRT line] you are not doing your job.*
- *Added expense of a bridge seems needless*
- *Consider the amount of time it takes start to finish*
- *If only interested in servicing Millwoods, go out Whitemud and connect to South LRT*

- *If you have a vision for the city in place, the rest should fall into place.* [This refers to having a long term vision for development of the City, including Transit]
- *Will need to have a large “hub” somewhere – for all the lines across the city. Could go straight out 87th to the west into the University and take this SE line into there too.*

In reviewing the alternatives, which would you feel is the best choice?

Of the fourteen interviewees, five chose Option A (High Level down CPR right of way).

Two of these suggested using 23rd Avenue instead of 34th. One suggested taking 34th to 91 street then south to 23rd Avenue. One suggested going to the university at the north end of the route and not crossing the river.

Three respondents chose Option B (High Level and 82 Avenue). Two of those respondents suggested taking 83 street south rather than 75th Street. The third suggested taking the route to the University and not to downtown.

Three interviewees suggested Option C (Low Level) as the optimal route. One felt 75th street was the best option, the other two preferred using 83 street.

No respondents chose Option D (James MacDonald).

Three chose Option E (Dawson Bridge). Of the three, one wanted the route to stay on 83 street and not 75th Street.

What is it about this choice that you feel makes it the best alternative?

Reasons given for choosing Option A were cost effectiveness, least intrusive, most fitting the guiding principles and criteria. 23rd Avenue was chosen for access to South Edmonton Common.

Those choosing Option B felt it was the best option due to access to Old Strathcona and Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre, senior housing and a variety of other businesses. With this option, as most others, 83rd Street was preferred over 75th street due to traffic already on 75th and access to more schools and residents on 83rd.

Option C was preferred due to its approach, on the street rather than 82nd Avenue, to Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre. Additionally the proximity to the Strathern Heights and Hollywood developments was appreciated.

One respondent preferred Option E due to its access into the east end of downtown and therefore its service to the Quarters. The others felt it services the most High Schools and a significant number of communities.

We also gathered Information on why some options were not thought to be good.

Generally respondents expressed concerns regarding the feasibility of Options C and D and the impact they might have on the river valley.

Concern for the river valley was also a factor in not choosing Option E.

Options B was thought to likely add to an already congested 82 Avenue and not to service enough of the residential neighborhoods.

Option A, though likely most cost effective, doesn't address enough of the areas wherein ridership will be found.

Communications – The Public Involvement Plan Section

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

After reviewing the communication plan, most respondents felt the plan was good and addresses most concerns. One interviewee felt the plan did not consider the needs and wants of the community sufficiently.

The majority of the respondents felt we should take 1 – 3 preferred options out to the public and explain, in detail, why other options had been eliminated.

We asked for suggestions on ways to improve the plan and received the following:

:

- *Explain what was thrown out and why*
- *Should communicate more often and sooner; Don't waste time; BRT process was insane*
- *Just present one preferred option and ask for comments*
- *Take time to consult. Must build trust in the City and the engineering firms by providing information on cost, impact and benefits*
- *Used a matrix in presentations on the South LRT to show answers to issues the public believed were key*
- *Don't feel the need to "justify" your preferred route. Provide sound reasons for it and for those eliminated*
- *Bring the community people on board to defend the route choice*
- *Fortify your decision with sound decision making process*
- *Must convince people that once the route is in place it is easy to get on at A and move/go to B and then to where they really want to go their final destination*
- *Give the public involvement earlier*
- *Should allow healthy debate*
- *Should show all the options (22) and show why they were eliminated*
- *Your "Option A" will cause less issue for the general public*
- *Include the Councillors from Ward 5 if your are using west side of 103 street*
- *Make sure they know you spoke to other groups*
- *Be prepared to answer why other routes were eliminated*
- *Stakeholder meetings are a good chance to hear the opinions of others to help understand the affect the route has on them*
- *Just present one option and ask for comments*
- *Give the public more involvement*
- *Suggest taking out one option only – there will be a storm but will blow over quickly.*
- *Make sure that the spokespersons at the open houses have big name tags. I've found that anyone with an opinion will take up a spot at a storyboard and*

rail on about their opinion. I've sometimes thought those people were there "officially".

- *Make sure we don't just hear the loudest or shrillest voices but everyone.*

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

All of our interviewees expressed an interest in being kept informed as to the progress of this project. Several indicated they would like more information and sooner and asked about sharing the specific route information with their constituents as soon as possible. One organization pointed out that businesses and developers represent a large percentage of those affected by these plans. That same organization made the following comment:

- *Everyone needs to have a bigger and longer- term view of this. This will affect the City of Edmonton for years to come – we need the City's interest top of mind not our own individual needs. It won't likely happen in your time, to your home – think about the future.*

No other stakeholders were identified as missing from the process in the view of our respondents.

Conclusions Section

Do you feel there are any other critical components to the success of this project which should be considered?

Only one of our respondents had an additional comment in response to this question. They reiterated the need for a "stronger public involvement".

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

All interviewees expressed satisfaction with the profiling interview. Comments received included:

- *Good to get this information first hand*
- *Thanks for doing this quickly – it is a busy time of year!*
- *Appreciate keeping us in the loop*
- *Good questions*
- *Thanks for this*
- *Very valuable discussion today*
- *Very good – (followed up with an email)*
- *Thank you for taking the time one on one*
- *Good questions and feel we've been listened to*
- *It was very good, I appreciate the time*
- *Really good. We like to participate in the stakeholder meetings but these are far more effective. Quiet – one on one*

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

Eleven of the fourteen interviewees believed we asked the right questions and no others to add.

One interviewee felt there were *“not enough questions about the people and neighborhoods specifically and not early enough in the process”*

3. Report Summary and Recommendations

Recommendations Resulting from the Interviews

- River Valley intrusion must be clearly explained and mitigation commitments clearly stated
- Public sessions should present one route and why that route was chosen, as well as an explanation of the process and routes eliminated
- There is a need to address the perception that a separate route is not required but rather a connection to the existing South LRT at 23rd Avenue or at the existing University station.
- Present the entire LRT system plan in order to put the SE line into context.
- Given the comments from some of the stakeholders who wish to consult the groups that they represent, the time line for the public involvement process and the project should be extended through the summer and concluded in September or October.
- Consistent with the public involvement plan for the West LRT project, we recommend a series of two identical workshops between the profiling interview stage and the public open house events to broaden public engagement and to provide an opportunity for more people to become knowledgeable and understanding of the route selection process and the preferred route analysis. These workshops will support and inform the technical evaluation process.
- We recommend that the Mayor and councillors in Wards 4 and 6 (Henderson, Batty, Thiele and Sohi) be re-engaged prior to the holding of the workshops and prior to the public open houses, as per the comments of some of the interviewees that felt that Council involvement is important.

Appendix A: Key Stakeholder Profiling Interview

Southeast LRT Preferred Alignment

Public Information and Community Consultation Process

Internal Stakeholder Profiling Interview

Name:

Representing:

Date & Time of Scheduled Interview:

Type of Interview:

Duration:

External Stakeholder Profiling

Background Explanation

1. The City of Edmonton has initiated a detailed concept planning study for a southeast LRT extension from Downtown to Mill Woods.
2. The Southeast LRT study builds on recommendations from a high speed Transit (Downtown to Millwoods) planning study, which was finalized a short time ago with a series of recommendations to enhance existing bus service to Mill Woods.
3. The Southeast LRT (Downtown to Mill Woods) concept planning study is to be completed by mid-2009, with the key deliverable of a concept plan report and an amendment to the City of Edmonton Transportation System Bylaw. Upon City Council approval of the concept plan and bylaw amendment, Phase 2, Preliminary Design, will commence.
4. There is currently no funding for the Southeast LRT Extension. This study is being completed so an informed decision can be made if and when funding becomes available.
5. The purpose of the Southeast LRT Project is to establish an LRT connection between the downtown and Mill Woods.
6. The guiding principles supporting this purpose include:
 - Maximize cost effectiveness
 - Maximizing use of existing transportation corridors

- Connecting existing and future activity centers
 - Consistent with the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), Municipal Development Plan (MDP), and the City’s strategic direction
 - Provide opportunities for future system expansion
 - Increase transit system effectiveness
 - Shape land use to promote a more compact urban form
 - Respect neighborhoods
 - Respect parklands, river valley and ravine system
 - Promote economic development/redevelopment
7. Public Involvement will be conducted in accordance with the City of Edmonton Public Involvement policy. This can be viewed [on](#) the City’s web site at www.edmonton.ca/publicinvolvement.
8. The key aspects of the public involvement process for this project are:
- To identify and engage representatives of the key stakeholder groups in the area that will be impacted by LRT in the study area.
 - To identify key issues stakeholders wish to see addressed in the study.
 - To educate and inform the public generally about LRT
 - To communicate the results of the project.
9. This interview is referred to as a profiling interview to get a sense from you, as a key stakeholder, of your understanding of the project at this point, what you see as the issues and your thoughts on the planned public involvement process
10. Stakeholders have been selected because of their unique interest and their ability to express their opinions, and to represent the broader interests of their constituents and the community. We ask that you keep these perspectives in mind as you answer the questions we have prepared.

1. Awareness

- Did you participate in the information session October 22nd?
- If so, any comments or thoughts about the session?
- What is your general knowledge of this project and public transit planning for Southeast Edmonton?

2. General Route Considerations

- What are your general thoughts and impressions about the need for

LRT Expansion into the Southeast?

- What do you see as the top three priorities for the SE LRT route alignment?
- Are there proposed expansion/growth opportunities in downtown or southeast Edmonton that you feel may impact the route alignment decision?

3. Issues and Concerns

- What do you think are the primary concerns or issues that should be considered in the route alignment and design of the LRT expansion from downtown to Millwoods?
- Are there issues that you anticipate from your organization or the public that should be considered in determining the best route?

4. Local Transportation Issues and Perceptions

- What would you forecast the traffic conditions (volumes, degree of congestion) to be in this area five years from now?
- What factors will cause these changes?
- What do you see as the major traffic generators / origins / destinations within the described corridor?

5. Specific Route and Criteria

- The guiding principles that were used in determining the 5 possible corridors are:
 - Maximize cost effectiveness
 - Maximizing use of existing transportation corridors
 - Connecting existing and future activity centers
 - Consistent with the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), Municipal Development Plan (MDP), and the City's strategic direction
 - Provide opportunities for future system expansion
 - Increase transit system effectiveness
 - Shape land use to promote a more compact urban form

- Respect neighborhoods
 - Respect parklands, river valley and ravine system
 - Promote economic development/redevelopment
- . Do you have any comments on these principles?
- The criteria used for selecting the most responsive routes are:
 - Feasibility/Constructability
 - Land Use/Promoting Compact Urban Form
 - Movement of People and Goods
 - Natural Environment
 - Parks, River Valley and Ravine System
 - Social Environment
- Do you have any comments on these principles?
- In your opinion what critical components must be incorporated into the route alignment selection process?
 - Are there any other impacts or factors that should be considered?
 - In reviewing the alternatives, which would you feel is the best choice
 - What is it about this route that you feel makes it the best alternative?

6. The Public Involvement Plan

(Please refer to the draft public involvement plan document)

- What do you think of the proposed public involvement process for this phase?
- Any suggestions?
- How do you see yourself or your group participating in the process (going forward)? (i.e. – information, meetings, etc.)
- Are there other stakeholders or groups that should be involved? How should they be involved?
- Other Comments?

7. Conclusion

- Do you feel that there are any other critical components to the success of this project that should be considered?
- What did you think of this interview?
- Worthwhile?
- Did we ask the right questions?
- Did you anticipate any questions that were not asked?
- Any other questions or comments?

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

Appendix B: Contact Record for Profiling Interviews/Stakeholder Contact

Southeast LRT Planning Study Key Stakeholder Contact Record
for October 22 Introductory Meeting and for Profiling Interviews

Organization	Name	Contact Information	Comments/ Status
MacEwan College	Stuart MacLean	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private info redacted
Grey Nuns Hospital	Bruce Andrusiak	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed
Central Area Council	Sandy Guilbert	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed
Mill Woods Town Center Shopping Center	Kimberley Wingerak, Acting General Manager	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private info redacted
Southeast Transportation Planning Council	Phillip Walker	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed
Bonnie Doon Shopping Center	Charles Swanwick, Center Manager, Morguard	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed

Organization	Name	Contact Information	Comments/ Status
	Investments		
Southeast Edmonton Community League Council (SECLA)	Brian Kapitza	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed
Southeast Business Association (SEBA)	Lesley Lambert and Arnold	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed
CP now to be contacted by City and Project Team NOT Gray Scott			
Millwoods Presidents Council	Greg Campbell and Harman Grewal	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed
Alberta Home Builders Association	Guy St. Germain	redacted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed

Urban Development Institute	David P. Kent	redacted	• Completed
Old Strathcona Business Association	Shirley Lowe	redacted	• Completed
Edmonton Catholic Schools	Ron Chomyc, Asst Superintendent – Facilities NEW CONTACT Rob Tarulli – Land Use Planner	redacted	• Completed
Edmonton Public Schools	Roland Labbe	redacted	• Completed
Downtown Business Association	Jim Taylor	redacted	• Completed
Jasper East	Duncan Fraser	redacted	• Completed

Appendix C: Compilation of Profiling Interviews with Stakeholders

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

Key Stakeholder Profiling

a. Awareness

- i. Did you participate in the information session on October 22, 2008?
 - No (9)
 - Yes (5)

- ii. Is so, any comments or thoughts about the session?
 - a. n/a (9)
 - b. *It was good - good information*
 - c. *Before that we just had rumors*
 - d. *Good base information*
 - e. *Good information*
 - f. *Was good – not much information but clarity on the switch from BRT to LRT*

- iii. What is your general knowledge of this project and public transit planning for Southeast Edmonton?
 - *Really had no awareness at all.*
 - *Involved with the BRT and HST*
 - *None!*
 - *General awareness – didn't feel it affected us*
 - *General awareness – we work very closely with Transit in all their planning*
 - *We were involved with the BRT and HST but thought this was now a dead issue. Surprised to get the email.*
 - *Involved as a stakeholder through out the process*
 - *General awareness – we've heard rumblings and rumors. No conversation as yet at Council.*
 - *General knowledge – keep aware of all the City projects which might affect us. Discussed in relationship to the Strathcona Junction project*
 - *General information, we've discussed it as a group. I can provide a feel for what the sentiment is in the community*
 - *Following along in the news*

- *Surprised a separate route considered, assumed they'd come across from the South LRT Line*
- *General knowledge – not considered route options as yet*
- *General awareness – of the transit need but thought it was dead when BRT project ended.*

b. General Route Considerations

- i. What are your general thoughts and impressions about the need for LRT expansion into the southeast?
 - *Parking is already a problem for us at the hospital – LRT or any other alternative would help*
 - *We subsidize employees now for transit passes. Good take up rate now, LRT would make it even better*
 - *Lots of growth – change in demographic age*
 - *We pull from Southside, East and Sherwood Park*
 - *Hope you are looking at putting this overhead – above ground – above roads*
 - *Assume it is needed – cannot speak to the needs of the communities in the South East or Millwoods specifically*
 - *It is important to understand who is coming downtown and why. There are stats available*
 - *I would think that the SE is a catchment area for those using transit*
 - *Should consider the Denver model where within the downtown core, a small free bus moves people around – block to block*
 - *Student mobility is a key*
 - *Using Millwoods Towne Centre a hub seems logical*
 - *Maximum ride time shouldn't exceed 20 minutes*
 - *High School students would be potential riders not Junior High or Elementary students*
 - *We don't have much experience – will watch the McKernan Station traffic when it opens and see how it affects the Junior High across the street*
 - *From our perspective we are looking to connect Quarters residents and employees to the overall LRT route not specifically the South East*
 - *Traffic on 50th and 75th streets is much higher now. LRT seems needed*
 - *Some people take the same route every day and we need to provide better options particularly into the downtown core.*
 - *Going into downtown will only deal with a fraction of the overall picture and doesn't address the outskirts*
 - *Downtown doesn't have to be the hub*

- *Need fast connectivity*
- *Transit is a huge part of our long term planning*
- *Our goal is to increase pedestrian and bike traffic and fewer vehicles*
- *Needed – now – soon. Faster the better and above ground*
- *Long overdue*
- *Essential to Millwoods and was part of the original planning*
- *Hope they increase parking fees downtown to convince people to use LRT*
- *Certainly there is sufficient ridership*
- *Not sure what areas are most important*
- *Employees come from everywhere but mostly North East, Leduc and Beaumont*
- *Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre, Grey Nuns Hospital and Old Strathcona are important areas to keep in mind*
- *Opportunity to dovetail with the City's plans for densification*
- *Some routes might be easier and cheaper but that won't address densification*
- *Need to establish a corridor of dense population to reach ridership in order to make the line cost effective*
- *Single family neighborhoods are not viable – they become an encumbrance to tax payers*
- *Should be aware of the LEED Neighborhood identification requirements*
- *Would be good to marry industrial areas and other employment areas with sources of employees*

ii. What do you see as the top three priorities for the SE LRT route alignment?

- *Must have ease of access – wheelchairs*
- *Scheduled based on our shifts*
- *Millwoods Towne Centre is a perfect hub*

- *Cost*
- *Timing*
- *Environment*

- *Don't go through school property – existing or potential*
- *Like the Millwood's Towne Centre terminator as it is close to our High School, recreation centre etc.*
- *Don't really see any route affecting schools – maybe High School students but not Elementary or Junior High*

- *Cannot speak specifically to South East.*
- *LRT in general, respect the neighborhoods as they are an essential partner. Consider the “people” in those neighborhoods*
- *Cost should not be a big consideration*
- *#1 is careful use of the existing transportation corridor*
- *Respect for the neighborhood – don’t get into the situation they had with Belgravia and McKernan.*
- *What is missing is the concept of winter cities. We ARE a winter city. Make it okay for me to use LRT in the dead of winter. Make it easy/comfortable to get on and off at both ends in the dead of winter*
- *Feasibility is a given*
- *Access to stations from schools. Not just access but safety for students and cars. Safe crossings across the corridor. Make sure there is a simple traffic route*
- *Security within/at the stations*
- *Scheduling to meet school needs*
- *Comfortable with the guiding principles and the criteria as I was a part of their development*
- *Maximize movement of people and goods*
- *Minimize the amount of traffic on major arteries*
- *Provide access to the University – kids in Millwoods go to NAIT, Grant MacEwan AND the University*
- *Maximize use of space and facilities in Millwoods - terminating at Millwoods Towne Centre is very important as it is a hub*
- *Make sure it is extendable past Millwoods*
- *Go to places that have people and are developable*
- *Go through and to areas where there is parking and/or a business hub*
- *In and through Old Strathcona will limited negative impact*
- *Service Seniors and Youth*
- *Stations as close as possible to High Schools, MacEwan, Millwoods Towne Centre, Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre and Senior Complexes i.e. put stops in where they are needed not based on distance*
- *Careful choosing how to cross the river*
- *Consider present and future ridership*

- *Look into redevelopment opportunity*
 - *Service more than just the 100,000 residents of Millwoods*
 - *Put into place a mechanism to not just encourage but insist upon ridership*

 - *Future growth*
 - *Respect for existing neighborhoods*

 - *Cost recovery and operation recovery*
 - *Urban densification and development*
 - *No more than 2 – 3 block walk – stations and parking critical*
- iii. Are there proposed expansion/growth opportunities in downtown or southeast Edmonton that you feel may impact the route alignment decision?
- *There are expansion and growth plans for the hospital which will eat up more land and therefore reduce parking. Cost to build a parkade is outrageous*
 - *Big transition happening now with neighborhood shifting from older families in houses to new younger families. Older population moving into condos and Senior residences. Both groups need convenient transportation*
 - *Bonnie Doon Mall has expansion plans, not sure what how or when as yet*
 - *Lots of condo conversion happening in the area*
 - *Some growth in catholic schools – maybe Meadows and Ellerslie in the future*
 - *Sherwood Park is a big audience/ridership and is still growing*
 - *Cannot speak specifically to South East*
 - *City is growing like crazy*

 - *The Meadows may have a new Elementary and Junior High in 2010*
 - *Summerside will have the same in 2012*
 - *There is land available around 23 Avenue and 34 Street for a new High School and another space in Summerset. There is no decision as yet nor a potential date*
 - *That land might also house a recreation centre*
 - *Annexation of the areas to the South East are up in the air. We could build a High School there instead of the two locations above. Those annexation plans are in the City's hands not ours*

- *We expect 18,000 to 20,000 people in the Quarters within the next 20 years. There are 2400 now.*
- *Established the 5 corners area at 95th street and Jasper which would easily accommodate an LRT station*
- *Ellerslie and The Meadows are growing and working cooperatively with Millwoods in planning*

- *Strathcona Junction study underway now (area south of 82 Avenue between 103 and 104 streets*
- *Have some concern about the discussion of high speed train to Calgary*
- *Senior population is high now and getting higher. Disproportionately higher senior population compared to other communities. Apartments and condos being built for seniors and small business growth for services for those seniors*
- *SECLA is in favour of smaller recreation centres scattered throughout the community not larger centralized centres*
- *Most people don't work downtown. Need to look at travel to areas east of 103 street, north of Whitemud for work*
- *There will be natural growth over the years*
- *Redevelopment will happen eventually*
- *Professional and retail business is likely to grow. If they are on the LRT line, they could draw from all over the City*
- *Too downtown centric – only 42% of employment is downtown*
- *Nearctic is developing in Strathern Heights and in Hollyrood – significant growth*
- *Park and ride is not the long term solution – need to be living, working and playing on the route*

c. Issues and Concerns

- i. What do you think are the primary concerns or issues that should be considered in the route alignment and design of the LRT expansion from downtown to Millwoods?
 - *Makes most sense for us if the line comes down 23rd Avenue*
 - *Patients come from Tofield, Sherwood Park, Beaumont etc so they have to be considered too*
 - *Scheduling and station location to meet our staff needs*
 - *Same as response to question 2b i and ii (7 responded with this answer)*
 - *City of Edmonton doesn't know how to build through communities. They concern themselves with safety on the construction site and not the area around the site – the path the people take.*

- *They don't consider the noise involved*
 - *Doesn't matter where it terminates in downtown. Either east or west side, transfers will be needed to get to work places.*
 - *If you come into a station on the existing pedway it would be beneficial*
 - *Respecting Neighborhoods*
 - *As above, stations should be where the people are (seniors and students)*
 - *Careful going over the river. Build it "to" the river now – fast and cheaper – worry about how to get over the river later. Move us around the south east on LRT*
 - *Smaller technology mentioned at Oct 22 meeting would be good*
 - *Shape land use*
 - *Respect the integrity of the parks and river valleys. Use them well – people need to use them for a multitude of uses*
 - *Economic development and redevelopment*
 - *Consistent with the MDP and TMP*
 - *Reasonable cost effectiveness*
- ii. Are there issues that you anticipate from your organization or the public that should be considered in determining the best route?
- *Same as response to question 2b i and ii and 2ci (4 responses)*
 - *You've captured everything well*
 - *Don't "over use" roads like 75th street*
 - *If the route chose goes through our communities we will want involvement*
 - *Involve the public early*
 - *Grandin is not attached to the pedway*
 - *Land requirements – don't "nip away" at school land. If you need to use some, we'd want to know sooner than later.*
 - *Give consideration to how parents might utilize the LRT. Do they drop off the kids at school then get back on and go on to work?*
 - *We would like to plot our schools out on your route maps to better anticipate concerns or issues*
 - *Would like to present this information confidentially to the trustees as soon as possible*
 - *There are 6 – 7,000 people working within their boundaries who should be considered as potential riders*
 - *There should be some connectivity to the University Station perhaps instead of or more important than downtown*
 - *Don't anticipate problems is streets need to be closed as it would make for quieter neighborhoods*
 - *Need clarity about 75th street – is it an inner ring road?*
 - *Public will suffer from NIMBY no matter what route you choose*

- *The proximity to Millwoods Towne Centre is good and to Grant MacEwan*
- *Make sure it is convenient*
- *Should be able to draw the public into some of the recreation areas.*
- *System needs to be a 10 minute walk maximum and/or parking provided*

d. Local Transportation Issues and Perceptions

- i. What would you forecast the traffic conditions (volumes, degree of congestion) to be in this area five years from now?
 - *We expect to be bigger so more traffic*
 - *Significant growth expected in the south east outlying areas*
 - *66th street and 50th street are already super busy*
 - *Schools are emptying not filling. Some growth in the far South East*
 - *Assume higher but can't speak to SE specifically*
 - *We know there will be increased traffic and population*
 - *We expect our school numbers to flatten or decline in schools south of the river and east of 104 street*
 - *School numbers in Millwoods declining*
 - *Meadows and Ellerslie growing*
 - *Bigger!*
 - *Senior population will grow and businesses associated with services to them*
 - *n/a*
 - *See 2c iii (3 responses)*
 - *Believe that if you develop reliable, efficient, timely, predictable transit, you will see a flat line on growth of cars*

- ii. What factors will cause these changes?
 - *Growth – transition*
 - *See above 2 d1 and 2cii (2 responses)*
 - *n/a (6)*
 - *Aging population*
 - *More awareness of our carbon footprint*
 - *More High School aged kids*
 - *Recreation centre proposed for the Meadows*
 - *Natural Growth – transition*
 - *Aging population*
 - *New generation more conscious of the environment*
 - *We will stop having 2 cars per household*

- iii. What do you see as the major traffic generators/origins/destination with the described corridor?
- n/a (10)
 - See 2di (2)
 - *Development - redevelopment*

e. Specific Route and Criteria (show principles, criteria and specific routes)

- i. Do you have any comments on the guiding principles used in determining the 5 possible corridors?
- *Most important respect for neighborhoods, river valleys and parks; maximizing use of existing corridors.*
 - *All seem logical and equally important*
 - *Most important are*
 - *Promoting compact urban form*
 - *Maximizing cost effectiveness*
 - *Respecting neighborhoods and river valley*
 - *Increase transit effectiveness*
 - *Make sure all departments are on board in the planning*
 - *We created principles for the South LRT Extension (copy provided). Why would you reinvent the wheel?*
 - *Respect the people in the communities not just the communities*
 - *All very important*
 - *Think consistency with the Master Transportation Plan is critical.*
 - *Other important ones are*
 - *Compact urban form*
 - *Transit Effectiveness*
 - *Maximizing and Connecting with existing transportation routes*
 - *Cost effectiveness*
 - *Comfortable as I was part of their development*
 - *most important cost effectiveness, respect for neighborhoods – try not to disturb existing*
 - *most important considerations are neighborhoods and parkland*
 - *Reasonable list – careful crossing the river – this will rile people up!*
 - *Think you should be open minded when “using existing transportation corridors” – let’s think outside the box*
 - *All important aren’t they*
 - *Most important are opportunity for future development and respect for neighborhoods and river valley*
 - *I agree for the most part – see my list above*

- ii. Do you have any comments on these criteria?
- *All important (7 responses)*
 - *Social issues should be decided with the people instead of for the people*
 - *Movement of people and goods is very important*
 - *Land use – EPSB are seeing decline not renewal of schools. Could close 4 / 1*
 - *Social environment is most important – keep communities whole*
 - *All reasonable*
 - *All very important in any planning*
 - *All very important - agree in principle with them all*
- iii. In your opinion what critical components must be incorporated into the route alignment selection process?
- *Use existing structure in the river valley – respect the land*
 - *Be careful about the environmental impact*
 - *See above - 2b ii, 2ei, 2ci (6 responses)*
 - *I believe in “compact urban form”*
 - *Where the people are and where they need to go*
 - *Have to have some consistency with the Transportation Master Plan*
 - *Make sure you consider future growth*
 - *More compact urban form will be critical*
 - *Need to define “respect” parklands and river valley*
- iv. Are there any other impacts or factors that should be considered?
- *Make sure the LRT plans take into consideration future development*
 - *n/a – (3)*
 - *See above - 2b ii, 2ei, 2ci (3 responses)*
 - *Vimy Ridge High School now offers a Continuing Education program used in the evenings by adult students*
 - *Consider going to the University not downtown. Without making a convenient connection to University and Century Line you are not doing your job.*
 - *Added expense of a bridge seems needless*
 - *Consider the amount of time it takes start to finish*
 - *If only interested in feeding Millwoods, go out Whitemud and connect to South LRT*
 - *None (2 responses)*
 - *If you have an vision for the city in place, the rest should fall into place*
 - *Will need to have a large “hub” somewhere – for all the lines across the city. Could go straight out 87th to the west into the University and take this SE line into their too.*

- v. In reviewing the alternatives, which would you feel is the best choice?
- *Option A (High Level and CPR right of way) but go to 23rd Avenue and go to University not downtown.*
 - *Option A (High Level down CPR) but take 91 Street down to 23rd Avenue instead of straight out 34th Avenue*
 - *Option A (High Level down CPR) (2 chose this option)*
 - *Option A (High Level down CPR) but take 23rd Avenue instead of straight out 34th*
 - *Option B (High Level down 82 Ave) and down 83rd Street not 75th Street*
 - *Option B (High Level and 82 Avenue) but go to the University not downtown and take 83rd street not 75th*
 - *Option B – High Level down 82 Avenue (2 chose this option)*
 - *Option C (Low Level)*
 - *Option C (Low Level and Connors Road) but take 83rd street not 75th.*
 - *Option E (Dawson Bridge) but take 83rd Street instead of 75th*
 - *Option E (Dawson Bridge) (2 chose this option)*
- vi. What is it about this choice that you feel makes it the best alternative?

Comments Pro Option A (High Level CPR ROA)

- *Less impacting to neighborhoods*
- *Suggests using 23rd Avenue to pick up South Edmonton Common*
- *Suggests University as a destination there is much commonality and interaction*
- *Based on your guiding principles Option A is best.*
- *Option A (High Level down CPR) is least impacting to communities*
- *Coming into Grandin is fine (though not on the pedway). Addresses the government office workers. Millwoods Towne Centre is the hub of Millwoods and draws the workers the downtown businesses need.*
- *Like the use of the High Level and the CPR right of way*
- *Likes coming into Grandin*
- *Lots of options re tunneling on south side of river*
- *Option A if chosen should come down to 23rd Avenue not 34th to pick up South Edmonton Common*
- *The other options disrupt the river valley too much*

Comments against Option A

- *Option A doesn't pick up many schools – Old Scona only. If you went out 28th Avenue you'd pick up J Percy Page and Grant MacEwan*
- *Option A (CPR right of way) has no population, likely the cheapest but not right for community*
- *It doesn't address a vital connection to the University*
- *Option A – I implored the City to use that route 20 years ago. Certainly some duplication in the parallel route of the south line. Not sure if it is a good idea to cross Whitemud at both 104 and 111 streets*

Comments Pro Option B (High Level – 82 Avenue)

- *Option B (High Level and 82 Ave) is okay, like the idea of picking up the commercial properties along 75th street. Good that it picks up Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre. Still think it should have gone to University*
- *Don't mind Option B (High Level and 82 Avenue) as it could easily be extended down Sherwood Park Freeway. We have a significant number of customers who live in Sherwood Park.*
- *Option B (High Level down 82 Avenue) would be our second choice but if chosen would have to be smaller technology to support existing businesses and traffic.*
- *Coming into Grandin is fine (though not on the pedway). Addresses the government office workers. Millwoods Towne Centre is the hub of Millwoods and draws the workers the downtown businesses need.*
- *Like connecting to both Bonnie Doon and Old Strathcona*
- *Option B does pick up businesses on 82 avenue which is good*
- *Like the use of the High Level and the CPR right of way*
- *Likes coming into Grandin*
- *Lots of options re tunneling on south side of river*
- *Though it is a longer trip than Option A, I like including Old Strathcona and Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre*
- *The other options disrupt the river valley too much*
- *Option B is good for students and Old Strathcona. Picks up more area than Option A.*

Comments against Option B

- *Option B picks up a few more schools. 83rd is worrisome from a safety perspective – prefer 75th street*
- *Option B will just add to the already congested streets of 82 avenue*
- *Option B – stations might be a problem and I don't see the density coming on that route. I don't seem the opportunities or logic*
- *It doesn't address a vital connection to the University*
- *B doesn't address the areas north of 82 in the way C, D or E do.*

Comments Pro Option C (Low Level)

- *Option C (Low Level) picks up more residential and Bonnie Doon*
- *Like the way it comes to the Shopping Centre better than straight down 82 avenue*
- *Option C is okay – comes into the pedway system. Prefer 83/85 street rather than 75th. Think there is a higher density of employment in the 108 and 107 street areas*
- *Option C is okay, picks up Vimy Ridge*
- *Option C (Low Level) “could” come into Quarters station instead of Churchill*
- *Picks up our development in Hollyrood and Strathern Heights and that high density*
- *Resembles the suggested BRT route*

Comments against Option C

- *Options C, D and E are not of assistance to Old Strathcona*
- *Option C (Low Level) big hurdle down and up again*
- *Option C – I question if this one would work! I don't like 75th street compared to CPR right of way.*
- *It doesn't address a vital connection to the University*
- *Not sure if there is an opportunity for densification up Connors*

Comments Pro Option D (James MacDonald)

- *Option D (James MacDonald) 98th Ave residents would like it and it does give good access to the river valley*
- *Option D picks up Cloverdale and has great potential to go out to Sherwood Park*

Comments against Option D

- *Option D and E (James MacDonald and Dawson respectively) are not as effective as the other routes*
- *Option D doesn't serve any high density*
- *Options C, D and E are not of assistance to Old Strathcona*

- *Option D and E – don't like the grade issues and not fond of using 75th*
- *It doesn't address a vital connection to the University*

Comments Pro Option E (Dawson)

- *Picks up 4 of our High Schools more than any other route option*
- *Vimy Ridge School currently has a high percentage of students coming via the Millgate Transit Centre*
- *Comes into the Quarters directly and it would be great below grade*
- *Build it to McNally School and bus to downtown from there. Above ground – worry about going over the river later.*
- *Go down 85th or 75th*
- *Option E has lots of merit and I like the tie into the Quarters*
- *Affects the most SECLA neighborhoods*

Comments against Option E

- *Option D and E (James MacDonald and Dawson respectively) are not as effective as the other routes*
- *Least favourable is E as it brings workers into the far east end of the employment area. Quarters is not the ridership.*
- *Options C, D and E are not of assistance to Old Strathcona*
- *Option D and E – don't like the grade issues and not fond of using 75th*
- *It doesn't address a vital connection to the University*

f. Communications – The Public Involvement Plan

- i. What do you think of the proposed public involvement process for this phase?
 - *Looks good – I think the public should let the professionals do their job*
 - *It's a good plan*
 - *Looks okay*
 - *Does not consider the needs and opinions of the people sufficiently*
 - *Just offer 1 option to the public. It polarizes people to offer more than one*
 - *Think you should narrow down to three options and present those to the public*
 - *Would prefer to do out with choices – at least 2 options to consider*
 - *On the right track*
 - *Involving us is very good*
 - *You folks are being paid to decide*
 - *Give 2 options or say this is the options and why*
 - *It's okay*
 - *Think the public will want input on more than one option*
 - *Looks good. You will always get the "I didn't participate in the decision" whiners*

- ii. Any suggestions?
 - *Explain what was thrown out and why*
 - *Should communicate more often and sooner; Don't waste time; BRT process was insane*
 - *Just present one preferred option and ask for comments*
 - *Take time to consult. Must build trust in the City and the Engineering firms providing information on cost, impact and benefits*
 - *Used a matrix in presentations on the South LRT showing answers to issues the public believed were key*
 - *Don't justify your preferred route. Provide sound reasons for it and for those eliminated*
 - *Bring the community people on board to defend the route choice*
 - *Fortify your decision with sound decision making process*

- *Must convince people that once the route is in place it is easy to get on at A and move/go to B and then to where they really want to go their final destination*
 - *Give the public involvement earlier*
 - *Should allow healthy debate*
 - *Should show all the options (22) and show why they were eliminated*
 - *n/a*
 - *Your option A will cause less issue for the general public*
 - *Include the Councillors from Ward 5 if your are using west side of 103 street*
 - *Make sure they know you spoke to other groups*
 - *Be prepared to answer why other routes were eliminated*
 - *Stakeholder meetings are a good chance to hear the opinions of others to help understand the affect the route has on them*
 - *Just present one option and ask for comments*
 - *Give the public more involvement*
 - *Suggest taking out one option only – there will be a storm but will blow over quickly.*
 - *Make sure that the spokespersons at the open houses have big name tags. I've found that anyone with an opinion will take up a spot at a story board and rail on about their opinion. I've sometimes thought those people were their "officially".*
 - *Make sure we don't just hear the loudest or shrillest voices but everyone*
- iii. How do you see yourself or your group participating in the process (going forward)?
- *Would like to continue to be included as a key stakeholder*
 - *Keep us informed*
 - *Keep us in the loop through Rob*
 - *Really doesn't affect us too much*
 - *If the route chosen comes through our community we will want to be involved*
 - *We will want to stay involved*
 - *Want to be involved throughout the process*
 - *For us it is like holding a tiger by the tail. There are so many City projects on the go that involve us*
 - *The earlier the better for us*
 - *Need time to speak with schools affected*
 - *We will remain an active participant*

- *Would like to continue to be included as a key stakeholder and would appreciate a presentation to our Council in early January*
 - *Would like to continue to be included as a key stakeholder*
 - *Want to stay involved*
 - *Process is great but it could move faster*
 - *Want to be involved throughout the process*
 - *Would like to share route options with this Board for further discussion*
 - *Would appreciate a copy of these notes*
 - *Would like to continue to be included as a key stakeholder – want to be kept informed.*
 - *Businesses and developers represent a huge part of those affected by this plan*
- iv. Are there other stakeholders or groups that should be involved? How should they be involved?
- *n/a (5)*
 - *None that we can think of (5responses)*
 - *No (4 responses)*
- v. Other comments?
- *none.(12 responses)*
 - *Use the 80/20 principle. Put in the above ground south side route. Measure the traffic on that and then build the bridge to downtown*
 - *Everyone needs to have a bigger longer term view of this. This will affect the City of Edmonton for years to come – we need the City’s interest top of mind not our own individual needs. It won’t likely happen in your time, to your home – think about the future*

g. Conclusions

- i. Do you feel there are any other critical components to the success of this project which should be considered?
- *No or None (11 responses)*
 - *Nothing that we haven’t already discussed*
 - *Stronger involvement of the public*
 - *n/a (3 responses)*
- ii. What did you think of this interview?
- *Good to get this information first hand*
 - *Thank you for doing this quickly – it’s a busy time of year!*
 - *Appreciate keeping us in the loop*

- *Good questions*
 - *Thanks for this*
 - *Very valuable discussion today*
 - *n/a (2)*
 - *very good – email follow up sent*
 - *Thank you for taking the time one on one*
 - *Good questions and feel we've been listened to*
 - *It was very good, I appreciate the time*
 - *Really good. We like to participate in the stakeholder meetings but these are far more effective. Quiet – one on one*
- iii. *Worthwhile?*
- *Yes (9 responses)*
 - *Still not sure if we need to be involved*
 - *n/a (2)*
 - *Thank you for taking the time one on one*
 - *Absolutely*
- iv. *Did we ask the right questions?*
- *n/a (4)*
 - *yes (11)*
 - *Not enough questions about the people and neighborhoods specifically and not early enough in the process*
- v. *Did you anticipate any questions that were not asked?*
- *No (11 responses)*
 - *n/a (5)*
- vi. *Any other questions or comments?*
- *No (14)*

Thank you for your time and your comments