Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study

Meeting 7 Notes

**Location:** Remote teleconference and Zoom Meeting  
**Date:** Friday, October 8, 2021  
**Attendees:** 5  
**Time:** 10 a.m. – 11:30 p.m.

**Meeting Purpose:**
- Project status update
- Open discussion for PAC feedback on study process
- Next steps
- Thank you to PAC

**Meeting Notes**

1. **Welcome and introductions**

2. **Study timeline recap**

Question: In regards to seeking feedback on changes to parking, would like to know why the City requires more data.

- City understands that there is an on-street parking issue in the northeast part of the neighbourhood. However, public feedback within the latest public survey on proposed solutions was very low – sometimes just one person on entire block. This is too low to understand community support for proceeding with a proposed solution. City will do a targeted outreach to those residents who are directly affected to gain an improved understanding of support/opposition for a proposed solution. Will connect with SORG for notification considerations.

Question: Did neighbourhood participation in the last round of public engagement meet the City’s expectations? Was the number of residents participating in solutions feedback was less than initial feedback request for input on area issues?

- The member from the Office of Public Engagement noted anecdotally participation rates across the City engagement programs can fall in later phases when discussion solutions over issues.
  - Public engagement reports can be found here: [https://winnipeg.ca/publicworks/transportation/projects/lordrobertstraffic.stm#tab-documents](https://winnipeg.ca/publicworks/transportation/projects/lordrobertstraffic.stm#tab-documents)

3. **Open discussion for PAC feedback on study process**

Question #1: How did your initial expectations of this project match with the outcomes?
Comments:

- Overall was impressed with the study process, providing the PAC with a large base of data for decision making. Was impressed to see how information was balanced between technical data and public input/lived experience.

- Asked if there were any city planners involved with the process.
  
  - Project manager indicated staff from the Property, Planning and Development department were involved in the project’s technical advisory committee.

- Noted the PAC could have included more diversity including newer residents.

- Participants found they enjoyed a respectful and considerate process and were continually kept informed.

- Participation in the PAC allowed greater transparency in the process which was reported and shared with members of the area residents association. Participant believes this supported increased City credibility.

- Noted this process supported the rebuilding of trust with area residents which was damaged during development processes in the last several years.

- Expectations have so far not matched the program results. Some members believed that the study would lead to more dramatic reduction of traffic through the neighbourhood. One participant noted the majority of solutions appear to be focused on child safety.
  
  - Project manager noted project focus of four priority areas: pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, school area safety, on-street parking, and other safety improvements.

- Concern that child safety targeting the school area during school hours does not go far enough for protecting children travelling throughout the community.

**Question#2: What do you feel could be improved for future community traffic studies?**

Comments:

- Questioned if the program suffered engagement fatigue with the long timeline.

- Could there be an improved understanding about differences in the feedback based on the number of years a resident has lived in the area? The public engagement program did not measure or make a distinction between newer residents compared to long term residents.

- Member encouraged improved mechanisms for reaching aging residents without access to a computer. Noted for this audience it is most important to meet people at the door and invite to meetings.

- Member encouraged clarity from the City on the time commitment of an engagement technique to encourage greater participation. Example provided was that a new parent may only participate if they know a task requires less than ten minutes.

- Encouraged the project team to go to where residents are. Such as school intersections during drop off/pick up times, or to ride Winnipeg Transit servicing the area.
Question: How could we improve community involvement in future studies?

- There is a desire for greater understanding on how the City’s technical committee are receiving and weighing the input and advisement from the PAC. It was expressed that there is still mistrust and fear some City departments will dismiss the input. Participants indicated separation of technical committees and public contributions are too rigid, indicating a desire for greater transparency on the content of internal discussions and access to additional project staff.
- Would like to have seen more diversity within PAC members, such as low-income households. Suggestions to achieve this include solicitation of certain groups to participate or nomination process to help spread awareness.
- Encouraged greater celebration at the end of each phase to highlight the positive work being done.
- Over time PAC members stopped participating. These open seats should have been replaced as they became available.

4. Next Steps

- The online survey issued by email to all PAC members will remain open for one more week.
- Meeting notes will be distributed with the PAC before the end of the month.
- The Office of Public Engagement will produce a small internal report on the process feedback we’ve heard from our PAC members. In 2022, Public Works be reporting back to Council on the lessons learned from this process so elected officials can consider how we may apply this approach in other communities.
- All members of the community who signed up for project updates will be notified by email when the report is scheduled to appear on the Council agenda.

5. Thank you to PAC

- This was the last formal meeting of the PAC. City would like to acknowledge the time commitment and investment made by all of the resident participants whose contributions resulted in better decision making by the project team.
- Meeting notes will be circulated with an option to share contact information with other members of the PAC should there be a desire by those individuals to connect outside of the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study process.