Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study

Public Advisory Committee Feedback Summary

October 2022

Background

The City of Winnipeg is currently conducting a community traffic study in Lord Roberts. The City recognizes the ongoing traffic issues in the Lord Roberts neighbourhood and is working collaboratively with the community to identify solutions. The purpose of the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study is to identify community traffic concerns, validate those concerns with real data, and develop and implement solutions to improve transportation in Lord Roberts.

The Public Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed to provide a mechanism for working together to identify traffic issues and solutions with those living and working in the community and those responsible for designing and implementing community traffic solutions in Winnipeg. The group met seven times between February 6, 2019 and October 8, 2021.

The terms of Reference outlining the purpose, authority and responsibilities of the PAC is available in Appendix A.

Engagement

In the Fall of 2021, the Lord Robert Community Traffic Study began the implementation of trial traffic solutions. With engagement in the study coming to a close, the project team identified a need to learn more about PAC members' experience with the committee and to get feedback on how the PAC could be improved in the future.

PAC members were asked for feedback on what went well, what didn't, and what could be improved. Feedback was collected via an online survey, online meeting, and email.

Promotion and Participation

PAC feedback opportunities were promoted using the following methods:

- Email to PAC members – sent on August 26, 2021 to 11 PAC members
- Reminder email to PAC members – sent on October 7, 2021 to 11 PAC members
- Notes circulated to PAC members – sent on October 21, 2021 sent to 11 PAC members
- City of Winnipeg website updated with meeting notes – posted October 21, 2021

Feedback was collected through:

- Virtual meeting with five PAC members held on October 8, 2021. Notes are available in Appendix C.
- Online questionnaire completed by four PAC members. Results are in Appendix B.

Key Findings or What We Heard

Question: How did your initial expectation of this project match with the outcomes?

- PAC members who completed the online questionnaire noted their experiences was either positive (3 responses) or very positive (1 response).
- Respondents pointed to feeling respected and the facilitation of balanced discussion as reasons for a positive experience in the PAC.
- Participants were also impressed with transparency in the project process, active listening by the project team and a feeling that participants had the opportunity to work together on making improvements.

> *I was given opportunity to share my own experiences and opinions, and listen to those of others, before being asked to contribute formal input. I appreciated this community building approach.*
> *- PAC member*

- Unmet expectations shared during the online meeting included disappointment that implemented solutions have not had a more dramatic impact on reducing traffic and a desire for increased diversity within the PAC.
- All online respondents indicated they would recommend being a PAC member to a friend or family member.

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

- All respondents agreed community awareness of the PAC itself could be improved. This included a desire to see

To learn more about the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study, please visit winnipeg.ca/lordrobertstraffic

Winnipeg

more people involved who are youth, seniors or those facing financial barriers.
- Online respondents noted a desire for increased involvement of the PAC with other City decisionmakers.
- PAC members liked least the limited scope of influence and discussions that veered from the focus of the meeting.

> *…help facilitate an opportunity for the PAC to present to other community members more formally, rather than relying on us to use a grassroots approach to sharing information back to our own community networks.*
> *- PAC member*

- Over time, several PAC members stopped participating. PAC members suggested replacing open seats as they become available.
- Participants were not asked to provide their connection to the neighbourhood in terms of years in the area. PAC members thought this would provide context to their feedback.

Question: How could we improve community involvement

- Improvements to notification were a top theme, including suggestions for greater in-community presence by the project team targeting school areas, bus stops and door-to-door notification.
- In regards to PAC development, one suggestion was increased outreach of residents facing engagement barriers to participate.
- PAC members continue to encounter area residents who are unaware of the study. One member suggested greater celebration at the end of each phase to highlight the positive work being done.
- To improve community participation, one member suggested the project team provide clear communication about the time commitment required to participate/provide feedback. For example, if a busy resident knows an activity will only take ten minutes of their time, they may be more likely to participate.

Next Steps

In 2022, the project team will report back to Council on the lessons learned from this process so elected officials can consider a recommended process for community traffic studies in other communities.

Appendices

Appendix A – Public Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

Appendix B – Online survey results

Appendix C – Meeting notes

To learn more about the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study, please visit winnipeg.ca/lordrobertstraffic

Winnipeg

Appendix A –
PAC Terms of Reference

Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study
Public Advisory Committee
Updated Terms of Reference (revised on February 6, 2019 with PAC)

Note: Terms of reference will be finalized by the Public Advisory Committee once the committee is formed

1. **Purpose**
   The Public Advisory Committee (advisory committee) is intended to provide a mechanism for working together to identify traffic issues and solutions with those living and working in the community and those responsible for designing and implementing community traffic solutions in Winnipeg.

2. **Authority**
   The advisory committee will be established by the City of Winnipeg (City) for the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study and will collaborate and discuss traffic issues and solutions. Traffic solutions decisions will depend on community input, budgetary constraints, engineering assessment, and may require Council approval, depending on the solutions identified.

3. **Responsibilities**
   Advisory committee members will be responsible to:
   - Advise the City on traffic issues in the area, and connect the project to the community through spreading information within their networks;
   - Maintain a respectful and constructive dialogue with all members of the group, allowing all members an opportunity to voice their opinions;
   - Provide feedback on the advisory committee process;
   - Work directly with project team members to provide feedback to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are understood and considered; and,
   - Work effectively within a diverse group to collaboratively discuss and propose solutions to issues as they arise.
   - Revisit timelines throughout the study to ensure objectives are being met.
   - Rely on evidence provided through lived experience and data as the basis for discussion.

   The City is responsible to:
   - Provide background information to ensure all advisory committee members start discussions from the same knowledge base;
   - Act as an information sharing link between community and members of Council, sharing pertinent information, input and recommendations;
   - Bring forward substantial and appropriate topics for review by the advisory committee;
   - Facilitate the advisory committee meetings;
   - Provide logistical and accessibility support including coordination of meeting schedules and venues, including the development of meeting agenda and notes;
   - Keep the advisory committee informed with regular updates, listen to and acknowledge concerns and input, and give appropriate and timely consideration of public input and show how it was reflected in recommendations;
   - Provide advisory committee agendas and applicable reference material in advance of meetings to allow for adequate time to review; and,
   - Record and distribute advisory committee meeting notes to all members electronically or in alternate formats upon request following each meeting, to be approved at the following committee meeting to ensure suggestions and concerns were recorded accurately.
   - Revisit timelines throughout the study to ensure objectives are being met.

- Rely on evidence provided through lived experience and data as the basis for discussion.

4. Membership

Applications will be received by the City's Office of Public Engagement for review.

Advisory committee membership will endeavor to include the following representation (in no particular order):

- Up to five [5] residents of Lord Roberts (selected at random)
- One [1] representative of the South Osborne Residents Group (SORG)
- Up to two [2] representatives of local Lord Roberts businesses
- One [1] representative from a school in Lord Roberts
- One [1] representative from a community centre in Lord Roberts
- Up to two [2] community stakeholders from other active groups in the nieghbourhood
- Up to two [2] City employees
- One [1] facilitator, likely a representative from the City's Office of Public Engagement

Committee members are not required to represent an entire sector or organization, but are expected to have some knowledge and experience with issues that might impact those interests. City staff plan to invite experts to present on specific meeting topics to ensure advisory committee dialogue is based on information from the most knowledgeable sources.

Membership Changes

- Members may resign at any time by giving notice to the facilitator;
- Missing two meetings in a year without notice to the facilitator is deemed equivalent to a resignation;
- Members who feel they may have a conflict of interest with their involvement in the PAC should declare it as soon as possible to a City of Winnipeg representative;
- Membership may be terminated by the project or public engagement lead or designate for violating the terms of reference – written notification and a reason for termination from the advisory committee will be provided; and,
- City employees may fill vacancies for the remaining portion of the committee activities by appointment, using applications on file from the original call for applicants.

5. Operations

Meetings

Advisory Committee meetings will not be open to the public, but if a community member is interested in attending or making a presentation, this may be arranged with the approval of the committee. Five meetings are anticipated from early 2019 to early 2021.

Guidelines for Respectful Participation

All advisory committee members shall adhere to the following guidelines for respectful and productive discussion:

- Meetings will be conducted in an organized but informal manner;
- Strive to meet the stated committee purpose and achieve intended meeting outcomes;
- Listen actively to others. Avoid interrupting and one-on-one side conversations while other people are speaking;
- Manage your own participation by sharing speaking time, debate ideas not individuals, and actively provide focused input, comments and questions;
- In meetings, ensure phones are on silent, responding only to urgent calls outside the meeting room; and,

- Adhere to the City of Winnipeg Respectful Workplace Statement of Commitment.

Appendix B –
Online survey results

Q1 Overall, how would you describe your experience as a Public Advisory Committee member for the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study?

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Very negative	0.00%	0
Negative	0.00%	0
Neutral	0.00%	0
Positive	75.00%	3
Very positive	25.00%	1
TOTAL		4

Q2 Please explain:

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Everyone was respectful and thoughtful. City staff facilitating were very responsive. I'd say "very positive" except I did feel a measure of frustration with the limitations in scope.	10/21/2021 8:14 PM
2	City treated us with respect. Meetings started with innovative questions that prevented people from personal grandstanding. Very clever to focus on positives first.	9/6/2021 8:49 AM
3	I was given opportunity to share my own experiences and opinions, and listen to those of others, before being asked to contribute formal input. I appreciated this community building approach.	9/2/2021 9:18 AM
4	In today's world we don't have if any opportunty to come together as a community, nevermind coming together to better and make our community safer. It was interesting to hear the different issues that effect different pockets of our neighbourhood. As a proud Winnipegger, it was very humbling to be part of improving our city, as citizens we rarely get an opportunity to have such a direct impact. It was also interesting to get a sense of how these issues and decisions are handled by the city. I am grateful to be part of this process.	8/26/2021 12:36 PM

Q3 Please select your response to each of the statements below

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0



Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study PAC Member Feedback on Process



	HIGHLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	AGREE	HIGHLY AGREE	NOT SURE/DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
The PAC's role in the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study was clear	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	4
I feel the PAC had the appropriate role in the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study	0.00% 0	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	4
I felt engaged throughout the study	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	50.00% 2	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	4
I felt informed throughout the study	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	50.00% 2	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	4

Q4 If you feel the PAC’s role should have been different, please explain:

Answered: 2 Skipped: 2

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	It should have been the primary decision-maker to prevent Transit and developers from taking over for their self-interests.	9/6/2021 8:56 AM
2	Opportunity for the PAC and the City’s project team to interact was limited. It felt like we weren’t given an opportunity to face those who overruled us and ask why or get an honest response.	9/2/2021 9:23 AM

Q5 Would you recommend being a PAC member to a friend or family member?

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes, definitely	50.00%	2
Yes, depending on the circumstances	50.00%	2
Neutral	0.00%	0
No, I would not likely recommend	0.00%	0
No, I definitely would not recommend	0.00%	0
TOTAL		4

Q6 What part did you like most about being a PAC member?

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I liked the conversation about options amongst the committee members - differing points of view and ideas were respectfully discussed. I felt like we did have some agency to suggest improvements that could be implemented.	10/21/2021 8:19 PM
2	Being treated with respect. Our lived experience was data that mattered.	9/6/2021 8:56 AM
3	Contributing lived experience and actual user opinion/expertise.	9/2/2021 9:23 AM
4	I thought the team from the city did a great job making the PAC feel genuinely part of the process. Personally I felt heard and respected.	8/26/2021 12:39 PM

Q7 What part did you like least about being a PAC member?

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I was disappointed in the somewhat spotty attendance of some of the members. At some meetings, there wasn't really good representation. I also felt some frustration that the scope was limited. I like some of the things that have been implemented, but I really feel overall safety in the neighbourhood could still be very much improved.	10/21/2021 8:19 PM
2	People going off-topic. Hard to focus those speakers on evidence rather than opinions, but we should have done that. We went off track often. To chair those people requires disrupting their social disruption...tricky but needed.	9/6/2021 8:56 AM
3	Project team overruling PAC recommendations.	9/2/2021 9:23 AM
4	As with every group, tangents occur and at times the discussions felt a bit micro focused on individual wants or needs.	8/26/2021 12:39 PM

Q8 Was there anything you think the PAC could have been more involved in that they were not? Please explain.

Answered: 2 Skipped: 2

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Disputing the City's own committee's logic. Analysing Planning & Transit's opinion-based evidence.	9/6/2021 8:56 AM
2	I think it would have been helpful for the OPE to help facilitate an opportunity for the PAC to present to other community members more formally, rather than relying on us to use a grassroots approach to sharing information back to our own community networks.	9/2/2021 9:23 AM

Q9 How would you describe the Lord Roberts Community Traffic Study (keeping in mind the project is not yet complete and solutions are still to be implemented)

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
A huge failure	0.00%	0
A failure	0.00%	0
Neither successful nor a failure	25.00%	1
Successful	25.00%	1
Very successful	25.00%	1
Not sure	25.00%	1
TOTAL		4

Q10 The public engagement objectives of the study were to:a. Ensure the community is aware of the traffic study and feels they will be heard throughout the process.b. Determine traffic issues in the Lord Roberts area, as defined by community members.c. Ensure the community understands the data collected and the measures that are meant to address input and data.d. Gather community input on trial traffic calming measures and permanent measures on an ongoing basis.Do you feel the study achieved these public engagement objectives?

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes, definitely	25.00%	1
Yes, somewhat	75.00%	3
Neutral	0.00%	0
No, not really	0.00%	0
No, definitely not	0.00%	0
Not sure	0.00%	0
TOTAL		4

Q11 Please explain why you chose that answer:

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I'm still encountering people who have no idea that the study was going on! Even though I felt we had good outreach and a lot of networking, the lack of awareness is surprising to me. For example, there's all kinds of speculation going on regarding the changes on Cockburn Street.	10/21/2021 8:28 PM
2	While Rebecca and Morgan worked diligently to provide data to residents, people don't trust the City. Much more could have been done to build that trust by politicians and senior bureaucrats. Esp after one of the first remedies was to build sidewalks to the developer-oriented Transit condos. This increased drop-off and drive-through traffic.	9/6/2021 9:05 AM
3	With respect to a. A group of well connected community members still doesn’t represent the whole community. And for those outside our networks, formal information sharing is required in lieu of implied trust. When covid happened some networks were challenged to stay connected. The OPE adapted to engage the PAC but there was no offer of assistance to the PAC to help ensure ongoing connectedness with the rest of the community. With respect to d. I believe it is too earlier to measure the achievement of this goal, as solutions are not yet implemented.	9/2/2021 9:32 AM
4	Morgan and her team did an amazing job keeping us informed and on track with every stage of the study. If there were any questions or uncertainty they were answered to the best of their ability. At no point was I unsure or confused of where we were at with the study.	8/26/2021 12:44 PM

Q12 Do you have any suggestions for improving the overall process?

Answered: 3 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	If there's any way to get more awareness out there, that would be good. I suspect Covid protocols and the fact that community events were not happening contributed to the overall lack of awareness because if events were going on, people would be talking more to each other.	10/21/2021 8:28 PM
2	Perhaps add more staff. Host more public meetings to determine further research.	9/6/2021 9:05 AM
3	Facilitate methods for the PAC to engage their community network and reach out to the community not presently part of those networks. Don’t let the project team overrule the PAC without their invitation to the meeting where the ideas are being discussed - even as an observer. There is no guarantee of trust between the PAC and the project team. Engage youth and children. Their opinions and experiences are invaluable. And they are the ones whose safety is the most in question in this project.	9/2/2021 9:32 AM

Q13 Is there anything else you would like to add?

Answered: 4 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Just that I felt that for a City-led consultation process, this was actually very good, and a refreshing change from some other processes that I've been involved with!	10/21/2021 8:28 PM
2	Please work hard to solve Transit's use of north Lord Roberts as a parking lot right away.	9/6/2021 9:05 AM
3	Too many different types of solutions across the city. There should be a stronger push for more standardization, so that drivers feel conditions are consistent and predictable, and might be less upset or ignorant to them.	9/2/2021 9:32 AM
4	I think Morgan and her team did an incredible job respecting and encouraging all the PAC members. Handing different levels or concern or frustration can be tricky at the best of times, ad in neighbourhood pride and safety concerns and things could get heated very quickly. I applaud them for being able to manage all the personalities involved. Their patience and understanding didn't go unnoticed.	8/26/2021 12:44 PM

Appendix C – Meeting notes

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

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 manger 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.