

NEW FACILITY PRIORITIZATION ASSESSMENT MODEL: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Wednesday, April 23, 2015

A. Who Will Be Engaged?

Group	What issues interest this group?	Engagement level	Notification Radius	Proposed engagement tools
Facility operators (both internal and external)	Decisions may affect the daily operations, future planning, interaction with current and future visitors, ability to maintain policy directed service levels, budgeting requirements, staffing plans, etc.	Consult	All facility operators will be consulted	Personal meeting
Major/regular users of a service or program (St. Albert Minor Hockey, schools, etc.)	Decisions may affect overall satisfaction, planning, scheduling, registrations, business model of the organization, etc.	Consult	All major / regular facility users will be sought after to consult	Personal meetings and/or focus groups
Casual service users (drop in museum visitors, recreational swimming, etc.)	Decisions may affect personal choices regarding frequency of participation, satisfaction with services and programs, etc.	Consult	Current visitors	intercept surveys and on-line/in-facility surveys
Community at large	Decisions may affect personal choices regarding frequency of participation, satisfaction with a specific service or program, overall satisfaction with the provision of the bundle of services the City provides, etc.	Consult	St. Albert residents	Statistically significant telephone survey

B. Outcomes of Engagement

The intent of this engagement plan is twofold:

- 1] to validate and ensure accuracy and thoroughness of the information gathered and utilized to inform the New Facility Prioritization Model, and
- 2] To gather significant depth and breadth of feedback and perceived impacts from all levels of operators, users, and the community at large to inform Council, as the decisions are made regarding new facility priorities.

C. Key Messages to the Public

- 1] The intent of the New Facility Model is to utilize analytics and significant community and user feedback to inform final decisions for future new facilities.
- 2] this engagement process is critical to the Model, as the information gathered will be considered in the final recommendations.

D. Tools and Events

Timeline	Tool/Event	Objective	Details
May	Personal meetings with operators	To confirm and ensure completeness of information contained in the Model	All internal, arms length organizations, and partner organizations will be requested to support the engagement process
May-July	Major Regular/Users - Personal meetings and/or focus groups	To gather information regarding utilization, availability, time requirements, impacts of recommendations, etc.	This approach is intended to reach out to the regular and major users of community services.
July - September	intercept surveys and on-line/in-facility surveys	To gather information regarding perception of Model impacts, planned visitation patterns, overall views of Model, etc.	This approach is intended to reach out to the casual users of community services.
August - September	Telephone survey	To gather feedback from citizens at large, regarding model impacts and resulting budget impacts,	This engagement method is intended to gather feedback from the community regarding impacts of the Model, and overall sentiments about new capital projects

E. Coordination with Other Departments and Initiatives?

Implementation of this engagement plan will be coordinated with other city initiatives to maximize reach, minimize intrusion into resident's life and time, and control costs.

F. How will input be used? How will input inform recommendations?

All input will be recorded and reported to Council. If information is presented that was not known that impacts the model outputs, the changes will be incorporated into the model. All impacts will be reported to Council in the final analysis.

G. Budget

Estimated: \$40,000 _____

Actual: _____

St. Albert Expo: Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4

Review and Approval

Communications Advisor

Date

Project Sponsor/Manager
Comments:

Date

Themes to Explore:

Facility Operators

- Overall views of the New Facility Prioritization Assessment Model
- Accuracy/completeness of Information
- Industry specific metrics
- Scope and Impacts of a new facility (operating, utilization, etc)
- External/additional funding sources available to contribute (operating and/or capital)
- Their perspective on the future needs of the service they provide and the lifecycle of the service
- Impact/Value to the community of the service they provide
- View service as core or discretionary – probe rationale

Major Users

- Overall views of the New Facility Prioritization Assessment Model
- Accuracy/completeness of Information
- Industry specific metrics
- Scope of New Infrastructure required for continued participation
- Do they bring and additional and/or on-going funding (operating and/or capital)
- Their perspective on the future needs of the sport/service they participate in
- How would more infrastructure impact their participation
- Impact/Value to the stakeholder group they represent
- View service as core or discretionary – probe rationale

Casual Users

- Overall views of the New Facility Prioritization Assessment Model
- Their perspective on the future needs of the sport/service
- Would more infrastructure impact their participation?
- View service as core or discretionary – probe rationale

Community at Large

- Overall views of the New Facility Prioritization Assessment Model
- Their perspective on the future needs of the sport/service
- Impact/Value to themselves and the community
- Would more infrastructure impact their participation?
- View point on paying for additional service through tax increases (both capital and/or operating)
- View service as core or discretionary – probe rationale