

**Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street Interchange Planning Study
Public and Stakeholder Involvement Final Report
December 2013**



**Submitted by
Jacqueline Schimpf Communications**

Table Of Contents

A. Project Overview..... 3

B. Public Involvement Process 3

 B.1 What We Heard: Key Themes 4

C. Public Consultation Details

 C.1 Stakeholder Interviews 5

 C.2 Public Meeting #1..... 6

 C.3 Stakeholder Input Group Workshops..... 7

 C.4 Project Bulletin..... 13

 C.5 Public Meeting #2..... 13

D. Next Steps..... 15

E. Public Engagement Evaluation..... 15

APPENDIX

- A. Public Involvement Plan
- B. Interview Questionnaire
- C. Public Meeting #1 – Communication Materials
- D. Public Meeting #1 – Summary Report
- E. Purpose Statement and Principles
- F. Workshop Presentations
- G. Final Weighting and Criteria
- H. Interchange Options – Workshop 3
- I. Evaluation Data Summarized
- J. Options – Workshop 4
- K. Project Bulletin
- L. Public Meeting #2 – Communication Materials
- M. Public Meeting #2 – Comment Form Verbatim

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The City of Edmonton’s Yellowhead Trail Strategic Plan, as accepted by City Council in November 2011, recommends that Yellowhead Trail become a freeway. An interchange at 149 Street and Yellowhead Trail is part of that vision.

In the spring of 2012, the City initiated a planning study to develop a concept plan for an interchange at Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street that would balance the needs of area businesses and residents with the long-term transportation needs of the city. Planning considered accesses to businesses and properties, the crossing of CN Rail’s mainline and the overall performance of Edmonton’s transportation network to support the City’s vision of a Yellowhead Trail Freeway.

The City sought input from impacted and interested stakeholders and the public to inform the concept plan. This report includes an overview of the public involvement process, an overview of the input received, as well as how the input informed the development and refinement of the preferred options for the intersection of Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street.

B. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

As stakeholders and the public play a key role in providing local/community level input, a public involvement process was developed that created multiple opportunities for the City to inform and educate about the project, and for stakeholders and the public to provide input to inform the project team in their development of a concept plan for the intersection of Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street. The public involvement process followed the City of Edmonton’s Public Involvement Policy and framework. (Appendix A: Public Involvement Plan).

The public involvement process was designed to:

- gather input and feedback from public and key stakeholders including immediately impacted businesses and residents
- identify stakeholder interests, issues and opportunities to inform decision making in the development of preferred options
- build awareness, knowledge and understanding of the scope and expected project outcomes

The public involvement process took place between June 2012 and September 2013. It included two public meetings (one to introduce the project and one to present the final two options); interviews with immediately impacted businesses, interested community groups and associations; discussions with internal and external stakeholders; an information bulletin to area residents and businesses; and the establishment of a project-specific volunteer Stakeholder Input Group that participated in five workshops, providing feedback to the Yellowhead Trail/149 Street configuration.

Profiling Interviews (11)	June – August 2012
Public Meeting #1 – Project Introduction	June 13, 2012
Stakeholder Input Group Workshops (5)	September 2012 – February 2013
Project Bulletin	September 2012
Public Meeting #2 – Two Options	September 17, 2013

The project team developed and investigated approximately 35 freeway configurations for Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street, each with numerous access sub-options. Each option underwent comprehensive technical analysis by both the City of Edmonton and Al-Terra Engineering contracted as a technical advisor for this project. Options were also presented to the Stakeholder Input Group for review and discussion. Through the process, options were eliminated due to fatal flaws and engineering or technical issues.

Following the elimination process, two preferred options (Strategy A – ¾ Diamond Interchange and Strategy B – No Interchange, One Way Service Roads) were considered to be the most viable and were presented to the Transportation Committee of City Council in May 2013 and at a public open house on September 17, 2013 at Dovercourt Community League Hall. Strategy B was presented as the preferred option.

B.1 WHAT WE HEARD: KEY THEMES

Need for an interchange

Participants, especially those involved in the Stakeholder Input Group, agree there is a significant need for a configuration at 149 Street and Yellowhead Trail that would increase traffic flow, minimize congestion and improve safety.

Respondents feel that the most important transportation issues related to the study area are traffic congestion and access to businesses, while the major benefit of an interchange would be improved traffic flow.

Impact on business visibility and viability

Input received highlights concerns about the impacts of an interchange on business viability. Key issues are potential loss of business due to negative impacts to accesses, loss of business visibility, constrained or loss of business access during construction, property impacts and physical space constraints.

Commuters are also concerned about access, specifically the potential decrease of access points onto and off of Yellowhead Trail. Comments were also received regarding the current lack of directional/way finding signs along Yellowhead Trail and suggested that this be improved in any new scenario.

Impact on community and other roadways

Respondents, specifically the Dovercourt Community, expressed concern about impacts on the community such as noise, increased diverted traffic through the neighbourhood and increased pressure on other roadways including the Yellowhead interchanges at 156 Street and St. Albert Trail, as well as on nearby roads including 111, 123, 124 and 128 Avenues, 156 and 127 Streets and St. Albert Trail.

Other

Respondents also expressed the need to include the crossing of the CN Rail mainline (located just north of Yellowhead Trail at approximately 127 Street) in the solution and consider the needs of large transport trucks, specifically their wide turning requirements. Respondents also want to ensure that the cost is not the main consideration in choosing strategy B over A.

Comments received at the final open house in September 2013 showed both support and criticism of the options presented with 48% of survey respondents stating they were satisfied with the preferred Option B.

C. PUBLIC CONSULTATION DETAILS

This section provides summary reports of each of the public and stakeholder engagement activities, timelines and input received.

C.1 STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Early in the process, interviews were conducted with stakeholders—impacted businesses and industry associations—to identify issues, opportunities and risks, and confirm the public involvement process outlined in the project’s Public Involvement Plan. A series of questions was developed to provide consistency to the interview process and ensure efficiency. (Appendix B – Interview Questionnaire)

Interviews were conducted with the following stakeholders:

Date	Stakeholder
June 11, 2012	· The Grocery People
June 12, 2012	· Kal Tire
July 19, 2012	· Yellowhead Highway Association
July 19, 2012	· Ambae
July 26, 2012	· Alberta Motor Transport Association
July 27, 2012	· Carpet Superstore
July, 2012	· Barcol Doors
August 2, 2012	· Safeway
August 2, 2012	· Platers Investments
August 20, 2012	· Yellowhead Inn
August 2012	· Costco (phone call)

A presentation was also made to the Dovercourt Community League executive on Tuesday, July 12, 2012.

Key Themes: What We Heard

There was general consensus among the interviewed stakeholders that there is a significant need for a configuration at 149 Street that would increase traffic flow/minimize congestion and improve safety. Priorities were identified as business access and visibility, and safety. Issues were identified as potential loss of business due to negative impacts to accesses, loss of business visibility, constrained or loss of business access during construction, as well as property impacts and physical space limitations.

The majority of respondents feel that providing service roads to ensure direct access to businesses would best accommodate their needs.

Opportunities to be considered during the project included obtaining the input of impacted businesses and considering solutions that increase visibility and access for businesses.

The primary risks identified were the direct impacts on businesses during construction and creating an interchange solution that severely impacts future business accesses/visibility.

C.2 PUBLIC MEETING #1

Attendance: 53

8 comment forms submitted

Public Meeting #1 was held on the evening of June 13, 2012 from 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. at Dovercourt School (13910 – 122 Avenue). This event provided an opportunity for the City to share information on the Yellowhead Strategic Plan and to gather input on issues, risks and opportunities relative to the proposed interchange at Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street. Input received from the public is considered together with technical studies and policy direction to inform the design team in the development of an interchange option.

The event was advertised in the Edmonton Journal and Examiner, on roadside signs in the study area, in a public service announcement to media, on Facebook, on Twitter, on the City of Edmonton website and on an advertising postcard that was distributed to the residents of the Dovercourt Community and area businesses. (Appendix C – Public Meeting #1 - Communication Materials).

How Information Was Shared - Information was provided through large maps of the study area and display boards with key project information. Project team members including City of Edmonton staff and consultants answered questions and provided information about the project and process. A project fact sheet was also distributed.

How Input Was Received - Formal input was gathered via a comment form which respondents could fill out either at the event or online at the City of Edmonton's project webpage. Participants could also record comments on "sticky notes" and place them directly on the maps and display boards at the event. A summary of input, as well as verbatim responses received on the comment form and on the sticky notes is included in the June 13, 2012 Public Event Summary Report. (Appendix D – Public Meeting #1 - Summary Report).

What We Heard

Key themes include the impact on access to and visibility of businesses both during and after construction, as well as access and egress to the community, and impacts on other roadways.

Respondents identified priorities to be considered during planning as traffic flow, impact on businesses, and inclusion of the CN Rail mainline in the solution.

The most important transportation issues were identified as traffic congestion and access to businesses, while the major benefit was noted as improved traffic flow.

Respondents feel that the risks to be considered include the impact on the community such as noise, increased neighbourhood traffic and increased pressure on other roadways, as well as decreased visibility of and potential financial loss to businesses.

C.3 STAKEHOLDER INPUT GROUP WORKSHOPS

A Stakeholder Input Group was created to provide guidance to the City's technical design team for the Yellowhead Trail/149 Street interchange planning study. Impacted and interested stakeholders were invited to volunteer to be a member of the Stakeholder Input Group at the public open house and during stakeholder interviews. The membership was assembled to represent impacted businesses, property owners, community leagues, industry associations, residents residing in the interchange study area and the community at large.

The group was made up of the following representatives:

- Alberta Motor Transport Association
- Ambae International
- Barcol Doors
- Casino Yellowhead
- Costco
- Dovercourt Community Resident
- Dovercourt Community League Executive
- Edge Equipment
- Kal Tire
- Lamba Financial
- Platers Investments
- Safeway
- The Grocery People
- Yellowhead Inn

Specifically, the role of the Stakeholder Input Group was to provide guidance to the City's technical team to aid in:

- Decision-making throughout the project
- The refinement of interchange and access configuration options
- The ultimate concept option recommendation

See Appendix E: Purpose Statement and Principles which outlines the roles and responsibilities of the Stakeholder Input Group.

Five workshops were conducted to discuss project topics such as existing conditions (traffic volumes, pedestrian usage, access, etc.) and to identify constraints, challenges and opportunities. During the process, the group was presented with different configuration options for Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street to discuss and evaluate—reviewing pros and cons of each, ultimately creating a short list of preferred concept options.

This group of stakeholders worked with City planners to develop ideas for converting Yellowhead Trail at 149 Street to a freeway operation, while retaining reasonable access to the adjacent businesses and the Dovercourt community. The stakeholder group helped to identify and develop:

- Issues and constraints
- Criteria for evaluating options and their relative weighting
- Interchange and preferred access arrangements

After significant development and evaluation of options, a recommended configuration for the area was selected based on input received from internal and external stakeholders, as well as Transportation Committee. The following details the process and outcomes of the Stakeholder Input Group workshops.

Workshop Summaries

(Appendix F – Workshop Presentations)

Workshop #1 (September 18, 2012)

Workshop #1 introduced the Stakeholder Input Group to the background on the City's vision for Yellowhead Trail and details of the 149 Street interchange project. The members provided input to develop the group's purpose statement and guiding principles, as well as to the criteria and weighting that would be used to evaluate future configuration options.

Workshop #2 (October 10, 2012)

During Workshop #2, the evaluation criteria and weighting were finalized and accepted by the group. (Appendix G - Final Weighting and Criteria). The group was introduced to general interchange concepts and some typical interchange options, and the pros and cons of each. The City technical team presented three general options for the intersection of 149 Street and Yellowhead Trail that would be the basis of the development of many more detailed interchange and freeway designs. All options assume Yellowhead Trail access is closed at 142 Street.

1. Close 149 Street, no access to Yellowhead Trail
2. 149 Street flyover with no connection to Yellowhead Trail
3. Interchange at 149, with full or partial connection to Yellowhead Trail

What We Heard

The following reflects the comments received about each of the three overarching concepts:

Concept 1 - Close 149 Street, no access to YHT

- If 142 Street access is closed, diverted traffic will short cut through the Dovercourt community heading to St. Albert Trail.
- Is a right in/right out option possible at 149 Street as there is merit in carrying forward alternatives showing how right in/right out would mitigate the impact of businesses? *The City noted that a right in/right out scenario does not provide enough distance between 156 Street and 149 Street to allow for safe acceleration and deceleration before the right turn.*
- If 149 Street is closed, significant improvements would need to take place to the transportation network (roads both north and south of Yellowhead Trail and to 156 Street and St. Albert Trail interchanges).
- Could the existing Yellowhead Trail be reconfigured to remove the left-turn lanes in the median to allow for full service roads paralleling the north and south sides of Yellowhead Trail to better utilize the existing Yellowhead Trail right-of-way?
- Several members expressed that they did not like this option.

Concept 2 - 149 Street flyover, no connection to Yellowhead Trail: Discussion

- This option provides more alternatives
- It would also make sense to grade separate the crossing of the rail mainline
- There are pros and cons for both a fly “over” and a fly “under” scenario—land impact versus drainage.
- Do properties north of the tracks need access to Yellowhead Trail via 149 Street?

Concept 3 - Interchange at Yellowhead Trail, connects to Yellowhead Trail: Discussion

- If the left turn lanes are gone, there may be space for a service road from Barcol to Kal Tire.
- Option 1 and 2 would be off the table for Yellowhead Inn as 90% of its traffic is from truckers—it is not a destination hotel. 156 Street could not accommodate truck turn around.

General Comments

- Need access at 149 Street to Yellowhead Trail—there are no benefits for closing access from 149 Street to Yellowhead Trail other than to impact access to surrounding businesses.
- Option #1 is most cost effective, but impact price could equal building an interchange. Interchange may look good as an option, but there would be major impacts to businesses.
- There are varied business types in the Yellowhead Trail area, of which some are destination-type businesses where patrons will find a way to get to them despite access, while others are opportunity-type businesses where patrons may just move on to the next most convenient location if access is too difficult. Impacts of the interchange decision will affect individual businesses differently.
- If 149 Street is going to be a thoroughfare then the CN Rail mainline crossing needs to be grade separated.

The City team also presented various interchange types as part of the interchange education process.

Workshop #3 (November 6, 2012)

During Workshop #3, group members reviewed and discussed 15 interchange/access options (Appendix H – Interchange Options - Workshop 3) as presented by the City’s technical team, with a goal to identify a short list for further study and evaluation. Breakout sessions allowed small group discussions followed by a large group discussion of the options discussing the pros, cons, benefits and risks of each, as well as the possible modifications that could be made.

The group’s evaluation resulted in the following six options preferred to move forward for further evaluation:

Option 1 - Partial Clover Leaf AB interchange

Option 2 - Single Point Urban Interchange with collector/distributor roads and grade separated railway crossing

Option 4 - Diamond with southeast loop interchange

Option 10 - Single Point Urban Interchange with collector/distributor roads and no railway crossing

Option 12 - Fly-over at Yellowhead Trail with at-grade rail crossing

Option 14 - Full closure at 149 Street

Comments received are summarized below:

Option 1

- Provides all movements for Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street with 100% access. Although the footprint of this option is large, it provides good road network access and opportunity to redevelop the area (at the expense of present businesses).
- Makes the most sense for best access, traffic flow. It has deep impacts to business but gets the transport network options desired.

Option 2

- Has the least property impact—good accessibility and is workable for most businesses with minimal impact. One modification: slip lane one-way service road westbound; one way east on north side.
- Better for truck accommodation; smaller footprint.
- Do not like this option because it impacts the same businesses as Option 1 but with greater impact to other businesses on the west side.

Option 3

- Don't carry forward

Option 4

- Keep this option as it minimizes southwest impact; good for trucks

Options 5-7

- Dismiss all three options (5, 6 and 7) noting that Option 5 has significant land impacts, no access to businesses north of the CN mainline and doesn't provide for good traffic flow
- Options 6 and 7 also don't provide access to businesses north of the tracks and therefore aren't considered viable options

Options 8-10

- Dismiss all three options (8, 9, and 10) as the orientation of businesses is to the south. Options benefit businesses between CN mainline and Yellowhead Trail but isolate those to the north
- Dismiss all options with a minor consideration of Option 9 only because it minimized business impacts
- Keep Option 10 as it has multiple point access, could be accommodated to have north side access road, keeping visibility

Option 11

- No access to Yellowhead Trail; really is not viable; great land impacts without gaining access point
- Don't carry forward; only benefit is uninterrupted flow that is true to all options

Option 12 and 13

- No access to Yellowhead Trail; really is not viable; great land impacts without gaining access point
- Don't carry forward; only benefit is uninterrupted flow that is true to all options
- Carry forward as it provides access to the business area on the north side of Yellowhead Trail between Yellowhead Trail and the CN mainline

Option 14

- Do not like this option; it helps Yellowhead Trail but kills 149 street—lots of impact on business viability; traffic congestion
- This options may be possible with modification for trucks, but not preferred
- Do not choose this option—truck access at St. Albert Trail is complicated although property impacts are minimized

Option 15

- Don't carry forward

Workshop #4 (November 22, 2012)

Workshop #4 was the final group exercise to evaluate the reduced number of options using the agreed upon evaluation and weighting criteria.

Following further analysis and input from internal stakeholders, the City technical team brought seven options forward for evaluation. The City considered the six options the Stakeholder Input Group suggested in Workshop #3 and determined that Options 1, 2, 4 and 14 were most viable to take to the next level of evaluation in Workshop #4. The City also determined that other options were also viable and deserved further analysis and evaluation.

These included options #9, #15 and #3.

Option #9 was determined to be preferable over #10 as it worked better operationally, has no collector/distributor roads on the south side of Yellowhead Trail and has similar land impacts on the south east corner as other options while reducing impacts on the south west corner.

Option #15 was given further consideration as it has reduced land impact and because it accommodates one of the peak traffic movements.

Options #3 was given further consideration as the City determined it had better traffic operations potential than some of the other options.

The City chose not to further consider Options #12 deeming it impractical due to the expensive grade separation of Yellowhead Trail, no direct access to Yellowhead Trail and the at-grade nature of the CN mainline crossing.

The group scored the seven different options using the eleven approved evaluation criteria. The results were tabulated and the options are listed below in order of preference based on those evaluations:

1. Option 3 – Full Diamond interchange with collector/distributor roads
2. Option 1 – Partial Clover Leaf AB interchange
3. Option 14 – Full Closure of 149 Street
4. Option 15 – Half Diamond interchange to the east
5. Option 2 – Single Point Urban Interchange with collector/distributor roads
6. Option 4 – Diamond with southeast loop interchange
7. Option 9 – Southeast loop interchange with business access

(Appendix I - Evaluation Data Summarized)

(Appendix J - Options – Workshop 4)

Workshop #5 (February 27, 2013)

Following Workshop #4, the City technical conducted further analysis, which resulted in the further narrowing of options.

The City revised the remaining options into three modified alternatives for discussion and comment by members of the Stakeholder Input Group.

Alternative 1 - Diamond interchange with ramps on the northwest, northeast and southeast quadrants

Alternative 2 - Full Closure of 149 Street at Yellowhead Trail

Alternative 3 - One-way Frontage Roads (requires full closure of 149 Street across Yellowhead Trail)

Discussions indicated that attendees felt that Alternative 1 had substantial land impacts but resulted in a full interchange with reasonable access for the remaining lands. There was general dislike for Alternative 2. The group generally agreed that Alternative 3 was the best alternative, offering reduced land impacts and better overall access.

Key Themes: What We Heard**General Comments**

- Need to upgrade the eastbound ramp intersection at 156 Street—will need to look at traffic volumes to determine what upgrades are necessary to avoid traffic backing up onto Yellowhead Trail
- North of Yellowhead Trail, the pocket of land served by an interchange at 149 Street is quite small as 156 Street and the St. Albert Trail eventually meet up. The cost/benefit of an interchange may not be there considering the relatively small amount of land being served. Currently most drivers use 149 Street out of convenience when a train is not blocking the crossing, not out of a capacity need
- No options are good for Safeway

Alternative 1

- Appears to be an expensive option (land acquisition and two structures)
- Negative impact on many properties
- Access to businesses north of Yellowhead Trail is circuitous—no direct eastbound access
- Consider shifting the collect road alignment on the north side of Yellowhead Trail from the south side of properties to the north
- Best option in terms of connectivity and circulation—retains road grid and spreads traffic between several parallel routes
- Evaluate the merit of a pass over structure for the businesses to the south of Yellowhead Trail
- Minimal benefit of a structure at 149 Street

Alternative 2

- Rail underpass is perceived as expensive
- Concerns about vehicle shortcutting down 124 Avenue to get to and from St. Albert Trail and Yellowhead Trail
- Access to businesses appears circuitous—poor access back to Yellowhead Trail from businesses
- Minimizes property impacts

Alternative 3

- Appears to be least expensive of three alternatives
- Provides south side access back onto Yellowhead Trail
- Eastbound access to north of Yellowhead Trail not ideal
- Concerns about vehicle shortcutting down 124 Avenue to get to and from St. Albert Trail and Yellowhead Trail
- Consider a connection between 149 Street and 153 Street
- Consider tightening up space between the north service road and Yellowhead Trail
- Inadequate weave distance between 156 and 149 Streets (eastbound) causing safety concern

Following this workshop, further technical analysis, geometry refinement and cost estimates were conducted and discussions took place with CN about the crossing of its main and spur lines.

Ultimately, two preferred options for the intersection of Yellowhead Trail and 149 Street were presented to Transportation Committee in support of the Yellowhead Trail Strategic Plan. Strategy A: $\frac{3}{4}$ Diamond Interchange and Strategy B: No Interchange with One Way Service Roads. These two options were the result of a lengthy process of engineering, analysis, input and evaluation.

C.4 PROJECT BULLETIN

In September 2012, a project bulletin was distributed to businesses in the study area as well as the Dovercourt Community League, which provided an update on the project and process. (Appendix K – Project Bulletin)

C.5 PUBLIC MEETING #2 – TWO FINAL OPTIONS

Attendance: 92
50 comment forms submitted

Public Meeting #2 was held on the evening of September 17, 2013 from 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Dovercourt Community League Hall (13510 Dovercourt Avenue). This event provided an opportunity for the City to show the public the two final options for Yellowhead Trail—Strategy A: $\frac{3}{4}$ Diamond Interchange and Strategy B: No Interchange with One Way Service Roads. Strategy B was presented as the preferred option. Attendees were able to learn about the planning study, the options considered, the evaluation process, have questions answered and provide feedback.

The event was advertised in the Edmonton Journal and Examiner, on roadside signs in the study area, in a public service announcement to media, on Facebook, on Twitter, on the City website and on an advertising postcard that was distributed to the residents of the Dovercourt Community League and area businesses. (Appendix L - Public Meeting #2 - Communication Materials).

How information was shared - Information was provided through large maps of the study area and display boards with key project information. Project team members including City of Edmonton staff

and consultants answered questions and provided information about the project and process. A project fact sheet was also distributed.

How input was received - Formal input was gathered via a comment form which respondents could fill out either at the event or online at the City of Edmonton's project webpage. Participants could also record comments on "sticky notes" and place them directly on the maps and display boards at the event. A summary of input can be found below and verbatim responses received on the comment form and on the sticky notes are included as an appendix in this report. (Appendix J - Public Meeting #2 -Comment Form Verbatim.)

Survey Summary/What We Heard

50% of respondents responded as being from the T5L postal code.

The respondents indicated they were*:

Interested Citizen – 41.3%

Commuter - 39.1%

Area Resident - 37%

Business owners/operator - 17.4%

Area property owner - 21.7%

**Respondents could choose more than one.*

Option B was presented as the preferred option and respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with this option. 19 out of 40 respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the plan presented. 11 were not satisfied or not at all satisfied and 10 remained neutral.

Business owners in the area expressed concerned about the negative impact that the access shown could have on their business viability, value and property usage.

Commuters also expressed concern about access, specifically about the decrease in accesses and exits onto and off of Yellowhead Trail.

There continues to be concern about the potential traffic impacts on nearby streets, intersections and neighbourhoods. Specific concerns involve the impact of increased traffic to the Yellowhead/156 Street and Yellowhead/St. Albert Trail intersections, as well as increased volume on 111, 123, 124 and 128 Avenues, and St. Albert Trail, as well as 127 Street. Increased traffic in the Dovercourt community was also noted as a potential issue.

Participants wanted to ensure that cost is not the main consideration in choosing strategy B over A and that careful consideration is given to the needs of transport trucks and their turning requirements.

D. NEXT STEPS

Following public input after the September Open House and further technical refinements to the preferred option the project team will present the final concept plan to the City Council's Transportation Committee (TC) in early 2014.

E. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT EVALUATION

Evaluation forms were provided to the participants of the public meetings and the Stakeholder Input Group workshops to provide feedback on the public consultation process.

The following is a summary of their responses.

E.1 Public Meeting #1

When asked for their input to help with the future planning of meetings:

- 5 out of 5 agreed or strongly agreed the information presented at the event was useful and informative.
- 4 out of 5 agreed or strongly agreed the information was easy to understand.
- 5 out of 5 agreed or strongly agreed the project representatives were helpful, friendly and available to talk to them.
- 5 out of 5 agreed or strongly agreed that they were able to find satisfactory answers to their questions.
- 5 out of 5 agreed or strongly agreed that they have a better understanding of the project because of their attendance.
- 5 out of 5 agreed or strongly agreed that participating in this session was a good use of their time.
- 5 out of 6 agreed or strongly agreed the venue location was appropriate.

When asked how they heard about the public meeting:

6 respondents answered with the following responses:

- Website **1**
- Email **1**
- Roadside Signs **1**
- Newspaper Ads **3**
- Other **3**
 - Post card in mail
 - Did not know until 7:45 p.m.
 - Radio/TV

E.2 Stakeholder Input Group Process

Nine members of the Stakeholder Input Group responded to the workshop evaluation.

When asked for to rate their level of agreement:

- Nine out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed that the objectives of the process were communicated clearly
- Seven out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed the background information (Interchange 101) allowed them to provide educated input to the project.
- Eight out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed the support materials were adequate for them to provide input to the project.
- Eight out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed there was a clear process for collecting individual or collective input.
- Eight out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed there was adequate opportunity for group discussion among stakeholders.
- Nine out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed the discussions were well-managed.
- Nine out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed the process provided an opportunity for them to contribute to the project in a meaningful way.
- Nine out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed their understanding of the proposed interchange project improved after attending the workshops.
- Nine out of 9 members agreed or strongly agreed the process was a valuable use of their time.

**When asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the Stakeholder Input Group process:
9 out of 9 were satisfied or very satisfied.****When asked what improvements they would suggest be made to future Stakeholder Input Groups, respondents said:**

- Criteria evaluation is good tool but takes some discipline to be effective.
- Can't think of any area I would improve. Staff was helpful and accessible. Materials were easily understood and well distributed. Refreshments were plentiful and enjoyable. Workshops well run and kept on track.
- Traffic stats should have been provided. Stakeholder input should have been used when developing new alternatives, all three new alternatives.
- Support materials should have included traffic study data (none provided) for both roadways and rail.

When asked to provide further comments or recommendations on the stakeholder engagement process for this project respondents said:

- Very much appreciated the levels of technical detail because it illustrates that there are no easy solutions.
- It was important earlier in the process that it be made clear that there would only be one opinion considered per stakeholder. I had the impression at times that more presence meant more input.
- Important to know that casinos are not able to relocate. Therefore, impacting access would require management to adjust resources to meet business levels.
- Appreciate the City giving our organization opportunity to contribute and supply business needs feedback. Good collaboration, City should consider this method for other major projects.
- Some participant recommendations were not added to maps (i.e., west bound exit ramp between St. Albert Trail and 142 Street on to north businesses.)