

Birnam to Ballinluig A9 Community Group Meeting 26th January 2017

Report on A9 CG Core Group meeting with Transport Scotland/Jacobs 16th Dec 2016.

Key points on which agreement was reached:

1. We need a facilitator now for the further development of a detailed community engagement process plan. TS are proposing PAS. (TS preference as stated at the meeting is for a facilitator to be appointed for the entire process rather than just for the development of the process plan.)
2. The A9 CG will provide TS with the names of some facilitators as soon as possible (*post meeting note: interest/availability being ascertained*)
3. We need a short-term time based project plan to get through the facilitated process development. Once a facilitator is appointed this should be an immediate output.
4. There will be three outputs from the current draft process plan document: (TS: the main discussion related to the simple leaflet rather than the other leaflets.)
 - 4.1 A simple “Leaflet” for wide dissemination to all and to launch the new community engagement process, jointly from TS, the CG, and the Community Council
 - 4.2 A “Process Brochure” (based on the current document) to outline the main stages in the process , to be available to all
 - 4.3 A detailed “Process Delivery Plan” for those more closely involved.
5. We will still try to get the Leaflet out in January.

In addition the CG suggested that we will need some external expert support (separate from the need for facilitation) e.g. to develop the metrics for assessment criteria for ranking in the appraisal processes.

The CG also offered the following suggestions on practical solutions to some issues still under discussion:

- a) To get around the issues of timescales we could design the process to break around the end of June – summer recess during which TS / Jacobs do much of the detailed option modelling work for later community consideration. Re-convene in say September once schools have gone back and quickly finish the process.
- b) To get over the concern expressed by TS about processes that are not deemed part of the facilitated community engagement (we argue for fewer of these to ensure we don't exhaust the community), we suggest looking at the interim CG/CC/TS/Jacobs working processes as the normal processes necessary to get from one key community engagement stage to the next.

Where the CG and CC are part of that process we ensure those interim processes are fair and transparent and honouring the agreed process. We could have alternative engagement methods in place for those who do not wish to participate in a community based process, such as:

- Have a simple form for the relevant parts of the process for them to use instead
- Let them know how to speak to a member of the CG or CC privately
- Let them know how to speak to either TS or Jacobs privately
- Have a post box for private comments / observations
- Use a slogan- 'No-one Excluded from the Process'.
- Communicate all this widely (e.g. household drop), possibly as part of the Leaflet, certainly as part of the Process Brochure

c) In addition and on the basis of b) above we suggest that stages 3 and 4 could be merged to create only three fully facilitated community engagement stages.

d) On the issue of facilitation (of the process), we suggest that one option is to use PAS to “master facilitate” with other facilitators we may wish to suggest working with them. One overall organisation of the various stages needing facilitation would be best.