



DECISION REQUEST

Governance & Priorities Committee

DATE: June 17, 2010

ENDORSED BY CITY MANAGER:

PREPARED BY: Mike Lai, P. Eng.
Assistant Director of Engineering,
Transportation & Parking Services


GAIL STEPHENS

DECISION(S) REQUESTED:

Council is being requested to consider the recommendations within this report concerning the scope of work for either the rehabilitation or replacement options for the Johnson Street Bridge. This will allow staff to move forward with Phase 2 of the public engagement process.

1.0 CONTEXT

1.1 Relevant Policy / Bylaw:

The following policies and bylaws speak to the importance of the bridge as a multimodal transportation corridor serving both the City of Victoria and the Region.

- a) Relative to Council's Strategic Priorities, the Johnson Street Bridge is the City's number one infrastructure priority;
- b) The City's Official Community Plan [OCP];
- c) City's Bicycle Master Plan;
- d) Harbour Plan;
- e) Greenways Plan;
- f) Victoria West Transportation Plan;
- g) Pedestrian Master Plan;
- h) Harbour Pathway Plan;
- i) Old Town Guidelines
- j) Capital Regional District's [CRD] Regional Growth Strategy;
- k) CRD's TravelChoices Long-Range Transportation Study.

1.2 Strategic Relevance:

The Johnson Street Bridge is a critical part of the City's transportation network that provides for the movement of people, goods and services to support the economic vitality of the Downtown. It is a main Inter-Municipal Corridor in the Capital Regional District's [CRD's] Long-Term Transportation Strategy entitled TravelChoices that links View Royal and Esquimalt with Victoria and Oak Bay. It also connects to the Galloping Goose Regional Trail / Lochside Regional Trail and the future E&N Rail & Trail system for the Region. The bridge

carries approximately 30,000 trips per day, including about 4,000 pedestrians and 3,000 cyclists. It also serves a variety of commercial and recreational marine users and supports the industrial activities in the Upper Harbour.

It should be noted that addressing the Johnson Street Bridge would reduce a portion of the infrastructure deficit within the City that has been identified at approximately \$500 million.

1.3 Description of Decision Requested:

Staff require Council's direction regarding the advancement of the Johnson Street Bridge project to Phase 2 of the public engagement process as outlined in a staff report to the Governance & Priorities Committee [GPC] on June 3, 2010. On June 14, 2010, the City's technical consulting team reported on work completed to date on both the rehabilitation and replacement options. In order to proceed with the project, the City must introduce a borrowing bylaw, which is to culminate in a referendum later this fall.

However, before proceeding Council must give direction to the Administration around the scope of the two options in order to proceed with the public engagement strategy.

A final decision on either the replacement or rehabilitation scope of the Johnson Street Bridge project must be made by August 12, 2010. That decision will determine the amount of borrowing required to fund the option and features chosen. As per provincial requirements, the referendum question must specifically reflect the amount and purpose of the borrowing. In other words, Council is not able to pose an either or question on rehabilitation or replacement.

Council is being requested to consider the seismic design, rail crossing, funding and community input for this project.

1.4 Decision Considerations

Seismic Design

The Johnson Street Bridge is an important transportation and emergency response corridor within the region. The bridge is located in the most seismically active zone in Canada where it is estimated that there is a 30-35% probability of experiencing a major earthquake [in the range of M7.0 – M7.9] in the next 50 years as per Natural Resources Canada. Engineering consultants advise that the "required seismic performance [is] driven by life safety, disaster response, protection of investment, post-disaster recovery."

Both the rehabilitation and replacement options require a significant investment, with the expectation that the infrastructure will have a 100-year service life. There is a potential for loss of the major investment "if seismic performance is reduced below M8.5."

Staff agree with the consultants recommendation that the seismic design should be at the highest level under the current bridge design code, which is for an M 8.5 seismic event [earthquake] which will make this a "lifeline" structure.

Rail Crossing

The CRD's TravelChoices Study – A Long-Term Transportation Strategy for the Capital Region, recognizes the need to protect existing rail corridors for possible high capacity

transit use in the future. The E&N Rail and Trail have been recognized as regional corridors to protect and develop for possible commuter rail use. The City supports the need to protect the corridor for future use for commuter rail as outlined in the City's Official Community Plan.

On May 27, 2010, Council received a presentation from Ipsos Reid on the results of a baseline survey of a representative sample of City residents that was conducted about the bridge project. The survey revealed that when residents were asked about factors that the City should consider in reaching a decision about the project, the presence of a rail crossing [while not unimportant] was the least important consideration in comparison to other features including a dedicated pedestrian walkway, the length of life of the selected bridge option, cost, and dedicated bike lanes. The greatest concern that businesses and residents expressed was the overall cost of the bridge project.

It was noted by the MMM Group that significant savings could be realized in the bridge options if the railway terminated in Victoria West.

For the bridge rehabilitation option without rail, a separate multi-use trail bridge would no longer be required because the existing rail bridge could be converted as a multi-use trail. This would reduce the cost of the rehabilitation option by an estimated \$23 million. However, this will result in full bridge closures of at least 12 months and an estimated economic impact to downtown businesses of \$13 million, in addition to potential liability to the City.

For the bridge replacement option without rail, the project cost would be reduced by an estimated \$12 million and would likely include some partial road closures for short periods of time. This is not expected to result in economic impact to downtown businesses.

Given the regional nature of the rail crossing, staff recommend that the City not borrow funds to finance the rail crossing and that other levels of government be approached for funding these costs. If funding is not received, the City will maintain the right-of-way to facilitate a crossing at a future date. It should be noted that the cost to accommodate a rail bridge in the future will likely be higher than today. A decision by the region is required no later than December 31, 2010 when detailed design for the project will commence.

Funding

The updated technical information presented on June 14, 2010 outlined costing for a rehabilitation and replacement option as follows:

- Rehabilitation: \$103 million with rail; \$80 million without rail
- Replacement: \$89 million with rail; \$77 million without rail.

Appendix 1 outlines the options and funding for both replacement and rehabilitation.

Options 1 & 2 assume that a federal grant is approved and Option 1 also contemplates the potential sale of consolidated green space. The City has received written approval-in-principle for a grant for the replacement option. Minister Baird is amenable to receiving a revised proposal for the rehabilitation option. However, that proposal would require a federal review and approval process, including addressing the issue of seismic standard. Therefore, there is uncertainty about whether the City would receive a grant for the rehabilitation of the bridge.

Option 1 outlines the replacement option with or without rail. The option without rail can be achieved without a tax increase provided potential land sales are factored in as the City has the available budget room for the annual debt principal and interest payments. The option with rail would require either a tax increase of approximately 0.95% or additional capital funding of \$11,600,000 from an alternative source.

Option 2 outlines the rehabilitation option with or without rail and with a federal grant. The option with rail would require either a tax increase of approximately 2.52% or additional capital funding of \$30,600,000 from an alternative source. The option without rail would require either a tax increase of approximately 0.63% or additional capital funding of \$7,600,000 from an alternative source.

Option 3 shows the rehabilitation option if federal funding is not approved. The option with rail would require either a tax increase of approximately 4.25% or additional capital funding of \$51,600,000 from an alternative source. The option without rail would require either a tax increase of approximately 2.36% or additional capital funding of \$28,600,000 from an alternative source.

In addition to the capital cost consideration, based on the information presented by the consultants the present value [in 2010 \$] life cycle costs for the rehabilitation option are approximately \$48 million with rail and \$42 million without rail over a 100-year life. The present value [2010 \$] life cycle cost for the replacement option is approximately \$22 million over a 100-year life with or without rail.

Public Input

The Administration is seeking direction from Council on what input they require from the community prior to choosing a project to borrow money for. A recent representative Ipsos-Reid poll of Victoria residents and businesses baselined the community's understanding and interest in the project based on information from the past year. Upon final direction of Council, phase two of the public engagement process will focus on presenting comparable options for replacement and rehabilitation to the community for consideration and discussion. Building on a robust information and awareness program to commence shortly, public input will be formally solicited through a mail in-survey and an Ipsos-Reid poll in late July. All input received, will be compiled and presented to Council to inform an August decision on which project to proceed with.

The Administration will seek the community's input on what considerations are most important in terms of proposed features, cost and construction impacts.

Appendix 2 outlines the approved Phase 2 public engagement process.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:


1. Approve the seismic design of both the rehabilitation or replacement options at the M 8.5 ["lifeline" level];
2. Considering the size and scope of this project and the regional nature of the corridor, staff should approach other governments and agencies for assistance in funding the Johnson Street Bridge project including road alignments, trail connections and other regional features.
3. Not borrow funding for the rail portion of the project. Instruct staff to pursue funding sources from other levels of government for the provision of the rail crossing. Unless alternate sources of funding have been identified and secured by December 31, 2010, the railway will terminate in Victoria West. The City will maintain the right of way for a potential future railway crossing.
4. Direct staff to commence Phase 2 of the public engagement process approved by Council at the June 3, 2010 GPC meeting.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL: Attached X Available N/A


Respectfully submitted,



Mike Lai, P. Eng.
Assistant Director of Engineering -
Transportation & Parking Services




Dwayne Kalynchuk, P. Eng.
Director of Engineering & Public Works




Brenda Warner
Director of Finance



Katie Josephson
Director of Communications



Peter Sparanese
General Manager of Operations



Mike McCliggott
General Manager of Corporate Services

APPENDIX 1

**Johnson Street Bridge Borrowing Options
20 year Amortization @ 4.81%
Appendix 1**

	Option 1 Replacement With Rail	Option 1 Replacement Without Rail	Option 2 Rehabilitation With Rail	Option 2 Rehabilitation Without Rail	Option 3 Rehabilitation With Rail	Option 3 Rehabilitation Without Rail
Project Costs						
Bridge Construction (net of rail)	77,000,000	77,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000
Bridge Rail Construction	12,000,000	-	23,000,000	-	23,000,000	-
	<u>89,000,000</u>	<u>77,000,000</u>	<u>103,000,000</u>	<u>80,000,000</u>	<u>103,000,000</u>	<u>80,000,000</u>
Funding						
Federal Grant	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-	-
Potential Land Sales	5,000,000	5,000,000	-	-	-	-
	<u>26,000,000</u>	<u>26,000,000</u>	<u>21,000,000</u>	<u>21,000,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Capital Funding Required	<u>63,000,000</u>	<u>51,000,000</u>	<u>82,000,000</u>	<u>59,000,000</u>	<u>103,000,000</u>	<u>80,000,000</u>
Borrow full amount						
Annual Principal and Interest	5,145,950	4,165,769	6,687,804	4,819,223	8,419,220	6,534,540
Debt Room Available	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
Shortfall - Surplus	<u>-845,950</u>	<u>34,231</u>	<u>-2,487,804</u>	<u>-619,223</u>	<u>-4,213,220</u>	<u>-2,334,540</u>
Estimated Property Tax Increase Required	<u>0.95%</u>	<u>0.00%</u>	<u>2.52%</u>	<u>0.65%</u>	<u>4.25%</u>	<u>2.36%</u>
Additional Funding Required to Avoid Tax Increase	<u>11,600,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>30,600,000</u>	<u>7,600,000</u>	<u>51,600,000</u>	<u>28,600,000</u>

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT GOALS:

- Provide meaningful opportunities for community to learn more about bridge options being considered and provide input to inform Council decision-making on borrowing bylaw
- The public engagement process will support the overall project budget and timeline

SCOPE OF THE ENGAGEMENT PROCESS:

- The engagement process is organized into three consecutive components.
- Technical requirements for the engineering project are to provide two comparable options for rehabilitating or replacing the bridge. Technical information to include a Class C engineering estimate on rehabilitating the aging Johnson Street Bridge, updated costs for Class C estimate for replacement option, results of a public engagement process providing more information and seeking citizen input, an independent peer review of technical work done for both the replacement and rehabilitation options, and an Economic Impact Assessment regarding the effect bridge closures will have on downtown businesses.
- The technical requirements will be fulfilled and fully considered by City Council prior to commencing phase two engagement activities.
- Council decision-making in phase two will be informed by the results of the representative polling of citizens and businesses conducted by Ipsos-Reid.
- Phase two of the public engagement process will be designed based on input from the Victoria community about what information they would like to receive and how they would prefer to provide input
- The results of the phase two of the public engagement process will inform Council's decision on the borrowing amount and purpose
- The results of phase two and three of the public engagement process will inform further dialogue with other levels of government on future aspects, including potential funding, for whichever option is chosen.

ENGAGEMENT OBJECTIVES:

The scope of the engagement work began in March of 2010 and is organized in three phases:

Phase One March-May 2010

Information Gathering and Engagement Process Design

- Baseline citizen and business understanding of issue and hear how they would like to be informed and provide input to the decision once the technical information is received
- Measure the community's interest in participating in a referendum and what will motivate them to participate once a decision on refurbishment or replacement has been made

Phase Two June- August 2010
Active Engagement on Options

- Present replacement and rehabilitation options to community through a variety of mediums and opportunities. Design engagement opportunities based on baseline input from community
- Solicit feedback from community through second representative poll to inform Council decision on how to proceed

Phase Three September-November 2010
Referendum Information and Awareness

- Communicate City Council decision on project choice, referendum question and purpose
- Work with community to raise awareness and motivate Victoria electorate to learn more about referendum borrowing question and voting opportunities.
- Communicate results of referendum and next steps as a result

	PHASE ONE Information gathering and engagement process design	PHASE TWO Presenting and considering the options	PHASE THREE Awareness of referendum process and borrowing question Encourage voter participation
Level of Public Participation	Involve	Involve	Inform Empower
Public Participation Goal	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure the public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure the public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions. To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.
Promise to the Public	We will work with you to ensure your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will keep you informed. We will implement what you decide (permission to borrow)
	March-May	June-August	September - November

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS:

Given the importance of meaningful engagement of Victoria stakeholders, the City will build on the public's involvement in the initial information gathering and engagement design phase. In phase two the City will employ a variety of techniques to achieve objectives along spectrum of public participation from inform to involve.

A variety of communications tactics will be used to maximize the reach of project information to those who have an interest in staying informed.

COMMUNICATIONS APPROACH:

It is clear that Victoria citizens, businesses and those affected by the future options for the bridge would like to receive more information about the bridge options being considered and over 80% of citizens feel action need to occur quickly to address the condition of the bridge.

Phase one of the engagement process in March – May identified what the community would like Council to consider when looking at future options for the bridge as well as how the community would like to receive information and provide input. This information will guide future decisions on the options and how information is shared and collected going forward.

The engineering analysis is complex and comprehensive and it is important to recognize that although awareness of the bridge issue is high, only 14% of citizens felt they were very familiar with the bridge condition and options. Of those who are somewhat aware, this was significantly higher among those 35 years and older. It will be imperative information is complete, accurate and in plain language and focussed on the information that citizens and businesses are most interested in receiving: cost, amenities of options and process.

A variety of communications tactics will be used to maximize the reach of project related information to those who have an interest in staying informed.

1. The City's project website www.johnsonstreetbridge.com will be the primary and central point for information related to the project, including outlining opportunities for public information and input. This will ensure a current, accurate platform for information and is attractive to younger demographics.
2. Direct mail and newspaper will be used as broad communications tools for providing information about the options being considered and the process going forward. This will include paid advertising in local newspapers. Project information (and a mail-in survey) will be mailed to every household in Victoria.
3. Administration will work closely with local media to keep the widest range of stakeholders and citizens informed and be responsive to citizens' and businesses noted preference of newspapers medium for staying informed.
4. The project email address at johnsonstreetbridge@victoria.ca will continue to be used as a central correspondence point for questions and input. An RSS (subscribable email service) has recently been established for those who would like regular updates about the bridge project. Email was noted as the preferred method for businesses to receive information.
5. A cross-promotional strategy to raise awareness of the information available and opportunities for public input will be utilized to reach those most affected by the bridge decision and most frequent users including radio advertising during morning and evening commute, local newspaper print advertising and social media tools where appropriate.

6. Although open houses and public meetings ranked lower on the preferred ways to learn more about the bridge options, two open houses will be offered at a variety of times to provide an opportunity to learn more from staff and consultants and provide input on options being considered. Efforts to schedule open houses after the household and business information has been delivered
7. Scheduled bridge tours will also be offered for one day on a pre-registration basis. This will provide an opportunity for Victoria residents to tour the bridge with city engineers to learn more about the current condition and mechanics of the current bridge and what is being considered in the future.
8. Information will also be provided to stakeholder organizations that represent or are associated with those who regularly use the bridge or are closely affected by the bridge decision due to proximity. This includes Victoria residents who use the bridge the most frequently (cyclists), transit, marine users, immediate neighbours, etc.
9. The younger adult demographic has indicated less awareness and understanding of the bridge options and is historically less likely to participate in public process. An effort to reach younger demographics will be undertaken through targeted posterage, web and social media and youth and young family groups.

GATHERING INPUT:

Input from Victoria residents and businesses will be gathered through a variety of methods, compiled and presented to Council in early August.

Residents' preferred method of providing input is through a representative survey followed by an interactive website. Businesses preferred methods of providing input is the converse. However, if Council is seeking input from Victoria residents and businesses, an interactive website as a primary input mechanism could be problematic as there is no way of knowing where the respondent lives or whether they are a Victoria business owner.

1. A mail-in survey will be included in the direct mail-out to each household with detailed project information.
2. A representative Ipsos-Reid survey of both citizens and business will be conducted in late July-early August after detailed information has been supplied through a variety of mediums to Victoria residents and businesses.
3. All input received through email, facebook and letter correspondence will be compiled for Council's review. Similar challenges related to confirming Victoria residents and businesses will apply to these tools as well.
4. All input will be compiled and presented to Council several days before making a decision on the borrowing question.

TIMELINE AND WORKPLAN:

Under the Community Charter, a referendum or by-election must be held on a Saturday. Based on a proposed referendum and by-election date in late November 2010, the proposed timeline outlines milestone dates for decision-making and engagement activities.

Upon approval of the engagement strategy, firm dates will be set for engagement activities.

A Council decision on what question to put to the referendum will be required by August 12, 2010 to meet a proposed referendum and by-election voting date in late November.

MILESTONE DATES	ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES
June 3 (GPC)	Council decision on project timeline and corresponding engagement process
June 14 (Special GPC)	Council receive requested technical and costing information for all options
June 17 (Regular GPC)	Potential decision points on level of seismic upgrade, rail crossing, rehabilitation bridge amenities, and what input Council requires
June 21-27	Options presented to community for consideration through variety of communications tools including central website, facebook, and earned media initially
June 28- July 4	Information delivered to every household through direct mail. Information presented to business community through email and web Information sent to affected users of the bridge through stakeholder organizations (cycling, pedestrian, accessibility, transit etc)
July 5-11 July 12-18	Three open houses at City Hall offered at variety of times. Two to be scheduled after broad distribution of print materials Scheduled tours of bridge
July 19-25	Ipsos-poll of citizens and businesses commences Written surveys to be accepted until August 3 (allow time for compiling)
July 26-August 1	All input from written surveys, emails, etc, compiled for Council consideration
August 2-9	Input from engagement process to be compiled as package for Council to consider prior to deciding borrowing question on August 12
August 12 (Special GPC)	Council decide which project to undertake and prepare borrowing bylaw
August 19 (Special Council)	Borrowing bylaw prepared for approval
August 20	Bylaw submitted for provincial Inspector approval

September 9 (Council)	Referendum and by-election process initiated with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council appointment of Chief Electoral Officer • Council approval of referendum questions and bylaw synopsis
November 20 or 27	General voting date

PROCESS EVALUATION:

The public engagement process will be evaluated on an on-going basis and upon completion of Phase Two.

The following measures of process will be measured:

- Numbers of letters and emails and requests for information, categorized
- Number of people in attendance at public open houses
- Facebook discussions
- Visits to www.johnsonstreetbridge.com
- Media monitoring
- Levels of participation and response rates to input opportunities

BUDGET:

Proposed engagement process remains within budget approved on February 18, 2010. Council approved up to \$150,000 to support public engagement efforts as key component of the Johnson Street Bridge project.

DECISIONS REQUESTED:

1. Endorse project timeline to hold combined by-election and referendum in late November 2010.
2. Endorse public engagement process as outlined.

APPENDIX A - STAKEHOLDERS:

Residents

Victoria property owners
Victoria residents
Citizens who live or work near, and/or travel along Johnson Street Bridge
Young adults (18-34 demographic)

Downtown

Downtown businesses
Downtown Victoria Business Association
Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce
Downtown Residents' Associations
Neighbouring businesses
Mermaid Wharf residents

West of Johnson Street Bridge

Vic West Residents Association
Victoria residents west of JSB

- Those who live in vicinity of construction
- Those who commute using bridge

Ocean Pointe Resort
Songhees neighbourhood
Vic West industry and businesses

Harbour Users

Transportation

Pedestrian users of bridge
Cycling users of bridge

- Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition
- Bike shops

Driving public
Taxi companies
BC Transit (bridge routes and alternate routes)
Tour operators - double deckers, pedi-cabs, horse drawn carriages
Emergency service agencies

Accessibility

CNIB
Disability Resource Centre
Seniors

Heritage

Hallmark Society
Province Heritage Office

First Nations

- Songhees and Esquimalt First Nations

Government

Federal government – Ministry of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

- The Building Canada Fund – Major Infrastructure Component

Capital Regional District
Regional municipalities

City Staff

Citizen Advisory Panel

Media

- Print
- Television
- Radio
- Social/blog

APPENDIX B - CITY OF VICTORIA CORE VALUES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

In June 2009, City Council adopted the International Association Core Values for Public Participation. The following outlines the values and how the proposed engagement process will incorporate those values.

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.

- Victoria residents and businesses, who will pay for the required improvements, those who use the bridge regularly and those who are impacted by bridge construction will be provided a variety of opportunities to learn about what the options being considered, and will be asked to inform engagement and decision-making process through use of representative, independent survey
- Survey information will inform how information is presented to those affected and how input is solicited to inform key decision points
- Based on representative surveys in phase one, those who use the bridge more frequently are more interested in participating in the process and rate the importance of bridge higher than those who use it less frequently

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.

- Citizens and business will inform the engagement and decision-making process through use of representative, independent survey prior to decisions being made.
- Clear process map outlines how input will be gathered and input into decision-making process.
- Public's input will be presented to Council prior to Council making a decision on how to proceed.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.

- Communicate residential and business input broadly to ensure input is heard and recorded.
- Clearly define process that outlines opportunities for public information, providing input and Council decision-points.
- Clearly outline risks and impacts changes to project timeline or engagement process may have to overall project
- Identify what information Council will consider when making decisions on this topic. (eg. community input specific to this matter, long-term municipal and regional transportation plans, community input from other relevant, recent surveys including Official Community Plan engagement process)

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

- Ask representative sample of citizens who use and pay for bridge, as well as businesses who contribute to City of Victoria budget
- Inform and seek input from those whose regular use of the bridge would be affected- daily or regular commute (all modes), marine users, transit, rail stakeholders.
- Seek input from those affected by construction impacts (closures or detours, noise, lights, etc.)
- Seek input from those involved in long-term municipal and regional transportation plans.

5. Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.

- Baseline community's awareness and understanding of topic to determine what information and input Victoria citizens and businesses need and want
- Capture community's values related to bridge to inform future decision-making.

- Measure citizen and business interest in participation, how they would like to receive information and how they would like to provide input.
 - Design engagement process based on input from representative surveys.
- 6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.**
- Clearly articulate engagement process to referendum decision at start of process for how public input will inform decisions and where and when decisions will be made
 - Provide a variety of opportunities to get informed. Incorporate communications methods as community requested and appropriate to support process
 - Provide input through the mechanisms articulated by the community
 - Make information easy to access and easy to understand
 - Seek input from variety of local perspectives to identify potential issues and ensure technical information is easy to understand
- 7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.**
- Use the same communications tools the community requested for receiving information during process, to communicate how input was used, decision made and next steps in process.
 - “Close the loop” with stakeholders involved in process.

Johnson Street Bridge Project Timeline

APPENDIX C

PHASE 2

