



# **Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study**

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

## Table of Contents

- 1 What We Heard / Did Report overview .....3
- 2 Project overview .....3
- 3 Engagement overview .....3
- 4 Phases 2/3 – What we asked .....4
  - 4.1 Community Association (CA) Executive Meeting .....4
  - 4.2 Commercial Property Owner Meetings .....4
  - 4.3 Public Information Sessions and Engage Portal .....5
- 5 Phases 2/3 – What we heard .....5
- 6 Phases 2/3 – Summary of input .....7
  - 6.1 Public Information Session and Online Engagement – Key Themes .....7
- 7 Phases 1/2/3 – What we heard, what we did .....8
- 8 Next steps .....13
- 9 Phases 2/3 – Verbatim comments .....14
  - 9.1 CA Executive Meeting – May 2, 2017 .....14
    - 9.1.1 Questions and comments during presentation .....14
    - 9.1.2 Parking lot .....15
  - 9.2 Open House Comments .....15
    - 9.2.1 Evaluation Form Comments .....17
  - 9.3 Online Comments .....20
    - 9.3.1 What do you like? .....20
    - 9.3.2 What could be improved? .....21



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

## 1 What We Heard / Did Report overview

The purpose of this report is to provide stakeholders with a summary of the feedback received during Phases 2 and 3 of the Sarcee Trail/Richmond Road Functional Planning Study (the Project), as well as to provide information on how stakeholder feedback, including issues, concerns and suggestions, was incorporated into the final Project design. This will be the final report back to stakeholders for the Project.

- Information regarding feedback received during Phases 2 and 3 of the Project can be found in [Section 5 Phases 2/3 – What we heard](#).
- A summary key themes we heard during Phases 2 and 3 of the Project engagement program can be found in [Section 6 Phases 2/3 – Summary of input](#).
- Information regarding how the project team addressed issues and concerns provided during the Project engagement program can be found in [Section 7 Phases 1/2/3 – What we heard, what we did](#).
- Next steps for the Project can be found in [Section 7 Next Steps](#).
- Verbatim feedback received during Phases 2 and 3 of the Project can be found in [Section 9 – Phases 2/3 Verbatim comments](#).

## 2 Project overview

The City of Calgary is undertaking a functional planning study for the Sarcee Trail/Richmond Road S.W. interchange. Although there is currently no funding allocated to construct an interchange at this location, The City hopes to have these plans approved and the interchange included as a candidate project for funding in 2018. This timing allows us to evaluate the option to design and construct the interchange in coordination with the Southwest Calgary Ring Road (SWCRR), which is currently under construction and scheduled to open in late 2021.

Due to the growth of Calgary's southwest and the opening of the SWCRR in late 2021, The City conducted a Southwest and West Ring Road Downstream Traffic Impact Study in 2015. The results of this study indicated an interchange at Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road would provide significant benefits to the overall road network, as well as the surrounding communities, regardless of whether or not the West Calgary Ring Road (WCRR) was in place.

The objective of this study is to determine an interchange configuration that fits with the SWCRR and the local road network, provides accesses to local businesses and connects appropriately with communities.

## 3 Engagement overview

The engagement program for the Sarcee Trail Richmond Road Functional Planning Study (the Project) includes three main phases:

- Phase 1 – Public and Stakeholder Engagement (February – December, 2016)



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- Phase 2 – Targeted Stakeholder Engagement (January – March, 2017)
- Phase 3 – Draft Recommendation Plan Report Back (April – May, 2017)

Phases 2 and 3 of the engagement program included the following activities:

- Community Association (CA) Executive Meetings
- Commercial Property Owner Meetings
- Public Information Sessions
- Engage Portal Page

## 4 Phases 2/3 – What we asked

### 4.1 Community Association (CA) Executive Meeting

The Project team included the following CAs in its stakeholder engagement program:

- Discovery Ridge;
- Glamorgan;
- Glenbrook;
- Glendale/Glendale Meadows;
- Killarney/Glengarry;
- Rutland Park;
- Signal Hill/West Hills/Richmond Hill; and
- Springbank Hill.

The City met with CA executives on May 2, 2017, to provide an update on engagement and evaluation work since the previous phase of stakeholder engagement, an overview of the proposed interchange design and plans for the upcoming public information sessions. This meeting included representation from the Discovery Ridge, Glamorgan, Glenbrook and Signal Hill CAs. The Project team asked CA executives for input regarding:

- Issues and concerns related to the proposed interchange design; and
- Clarity of information to be presented at public information sessions, as well as whether there was any additional information that should be presented.

### 4.2 Commercial Property Owner Meetings

The City met with following commercial property owners from surrounding business areas during late February and early March, as well as early to mid-May, 2017:

- Boardwalk Properties;
- First Capital Realty;
- RioCan Real Estate Investment Trust; and



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- Triovest Realty Advisors.

The purpose of these meetings was to provide updates regarding the proposed interchange design, particularly regarding access to their respective commercial areas, and obtain their feedback regarding potential impacts to their properties.

Commercial property owners were generally supportive of the proposed interchange design, including attempts with the design to maintain or improve access to shopping centres where possible. Some concerns were raised regarding noise and light pollution in the southeast quadrant of the intersection. The City and commercial property owners committed to following up should the proposed interchange design receive funding in order to discuss access to land and other detailed design considerations.

## 4.3 Public Information Sessions and Engage Portal

The City hosted two public information sessions on May 30 and 31, 2017, at the Glamorgan Community Centre. The purpose of these sessions was to provide members of the public with an overview of the proposed interchange design, provide information regarding how input from the first phase of public engagement impacted the proposed interchange design, have questions answered by Project team members, and allow the Project team to obtain any final issues or concerns regarding the proposed design. Stakeholder feedback at the information sessions was collected through a comment wall where stakeholders were provided with post-it notes, and asked to stick any additional comments, questions or concerns to a poster board, as well as through event evaluation forms.

Along with the public information sessions, The City updated its Project Engage Portal page to include similar information and engagement activities to what was available at the public sessions, and complement the information found on the Project webpage. Feedback opportunities on the Project Engage Portal page were open from May 30 to June 14, 2017.

## 5 Phases 2/3 – What we heard

In general, stakeholders were in favour of the proposed interchange design and indicated it would be an improvement over the current intersection. Stakeholders were interested in learning more about movement through the proposed interchange by car, bike and as a pedestrian, as well as how the proposed interchange design related to the SWCRR.

Of all the comments provided by stakeholders, the following key themes stood out.

- Stakeholders were generally in favour of the proposed design, particularly that it would be easy to navigate, and would improve traffic flow in the area.
- Stakeholders had some outstanding concerns regarding traffic flow at key points and intersections, particularly the merge from westbound Glenmore Trail to northbound Sarcee Trail S.W.
- Stakeholders wanted to ensure that the proposed design connected effectively with the SWCRR, and that construction for both projects aligned with one another.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- Stakeholders stressed the importance of clear signage well in advance of entrances and exits.
- Stakeholders wanted pathway connections to be maintained, and to ensure that pedestrian safety was taken into consideration.

Residents of the surrounding communities continued to express concern regarding maintaining access to their communities while reducing cut-through traffic, especially along Sierra Morena Boulevard and through the community of Glamorgan. Residents of Glamorgan were specifically concerned with the pending permanent closure of 45 Street S.W. at Glenmore Trail, which is due to safety issues regarding the proximity of that access point to the SWCRR, and the potential for increased traffic from the SWCRR to cause congestion along alternate access roadways such as 37<sup>th</sup> Street S.W. and Richmond Road S.W.

- For a detailed summary of the input that was provided for Phases 2 and 3, please see the [Section 6 Phases 2/3 – Summary of input](#) section.
- For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided for Phases 2 and 3, please see the [Section 9 Phases 2/3 – Verbatim comments](#) section.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

## 6 Phases 2/3 – Summary of input

### 6.1 Public Information Session and Online Engagement – Key Themes

The following table provides a summary of the key themes we heard during Phases 2 and 3 of the Project engagement program. Please see the [Section 9 Phases 2/3 – Verbatim comments](#) for further details.

Theme	Detailed Descriptions
Support for Proposed Interchange Design	Stakeholders were generally in favour of the proposed design, particularly that it would be easy to navigate, and would improve traffic flow in the area. Stakeholders were also supportive of the reduction in the number of traffic lights in the project area.
Traffic Flow	Stakeholders had some outstanding concerns regarding traffic flow at key points and intersections, particularly that the merging of lanes at the basketweave approach Sarcee Trail S.W. would result in congestion. Concerns and suggestions regarding traffic flow outside of the Project area included improvements to the signalization of surrounding intersections, such as improvements to the intersection of 37 Street and 46 Avenue S.W. to allow for improved access to Glamorgan, as well as improvements to traffic flow from Mount Royal University. Glamorgan residents were particularly concerned about traffic flow due to the pending permanent closure of 45 Street S.W. at Glenmore Trail.
SWCRR Integration	Stakeholders wanted to ensure that the proposed design connected effectively with the SWCRR, and that the timing for construction of both projects aligned with one another, especially given the potential increase in traffic along Sarcee Trail prior to the completion of the WCRR.
Signage	Stakeholders stressed the importance of clear signage well in advance of entrances and exits.
Pathway Connections	Stakeholders were supportive of proposed pathway connections and wanted to ensure these are maintained in the final interchange design, as well as to ensure that pedestrian safety is taken into consideration.
Bow Trail	While out of scope for this study, some stakeholders were concerned that increased traffic from the SWCRR would exacerbate issues at the intersection of Bow Trail and Sarcee Trail S.W., especially if the WCRR does not receive funding in the short-term.
Signal Hill Roundabout	Stakeholders were generally supportive of the roundabout to access Signal Hill shopping centre, but wanted to ensure it was adequately signed reduce confusion in navigating the circle, as well as that it was large enough to not negatively impact traffic flow.
Noise	Stakeholders expressed concern regarding increased noise due to both the proposed interchange and the SWCRR, and asked that noise barriers be expanded and improved to address this issue.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

## 7 Phases 1/2/3 – What we heard, what we did

The following table provides an overview of the key concerns we heard from both phases of public engagement for the project, as well as an explanation of how that feedback was addressed in the proposed final design. Detailed descriptions of key themes from Phases 2 and 3 of Project engagement can be found in the [Section 6 Phases 2/3 – Summary of input](#).

Theme	Phase of Engagement	What we heard	What we did
Traffic Lights	1	Stakeholders preferred proposed concepts that maintained or reduced the number of traffic lights along Richmond Road. Stakeholders also indicated that they would prefer designs that attempted to eliminate traffic lights.	The number of signalized intersections was highlighted as a factor in the interchange evaluation process. The recommended plan will ultimately remove one of the existing traffic signals from Richmond Road.
Traffic Flow	1, 3	In Phase 1, stakeholders were concerned by the potential for certain concepts to exacerbate existing traffic congestion on Sarcee Trail, Richmond Road and within adjacent shopping centres. In Phase 3, stakeholders had some outstanding concerns regarding traffic flow at key points and intersections, particularly that the merge from westbound Glenmore Trail to northbound Sarcee Trail S.W. would work with a single lane. Concerns and suggestions regarding traffic flow outside of the Project area included improvements to the signalization of surrounding intersections, such as improvements to the intersection of 37 Street and 46 Avenue S.W. to allow for improved access to Glamorgan, as well as improvements to traffic flow from Mount Royal University. Glamorgan residents were particularly concerned about traffic flow due to the pending permanent closure of 45 Street S.W. at Glenmore Trail.	<p>Vehicle Accommodation (traffic operations) was included as a High Priority criterion in the interchange evaluation process. The recommended plan rated highest in the area, compared with the alternatives.</p> <p>Comprehensive traffic analysis and modelling was completed for all elements of the design, including the merges from Glenmore Trail. The design also offers a degree of flexibility for the plan to be adapted to accommodate an additional lane if circumstances change in future.</p> <p>Feedback on traffic issues beyond the study area were referred to The City's Ring Road Implementation team for consideration.</p>



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

Theme	Phase of Engagement	What we heard	What we did
Weaving	1	Stakeholders preferred designs that reduced the amount of weaving for on and off ramps from Sarcee Trail.	Vehicle Accommodation (traffic operations) was included as a High Priority criterion in the interchange evaluation process. The recommended plan includes a “basketweave” structure to separate weaving movements on the ramps along northbound Sarcee Trail.
SWCRR Connection	1, 2, 3	Stakeholders wanted to ensure that the proposed design connected effectively with the SWCRR, and that the timing for construction of both projects aligned with one another, especially given the potential increase in traffic along Sarcee Trail prior to the completion of the WCRR.	<p>The City has met regularly with Alberta Transportation and the SWCRR ring road designers during the planning process, to coordinate the design to the best degree possible.</p> <p>As there is currently no funding for the interchange, timing for construction will be subject to review and confirmation by City Council as part of the capital budgeting process in 2018.</p>
Community Access	1	Glamorgan residents expressed concern regarding access to their community, especially given the impending permanent closure of 45 Street S.W. at Glenmore Trail, and preferred concepts that maintained more direct access to their community. Stakeholders expressed concern regarding cut-through traffic, especially along 46th Avenue S.W. and Sierra Morena Boulevard, and asked that proposed concepts address this issue. Stakeholders preferred concepts that improved east-west access along Richmond Road.	Ease of Community Access was included as a High Priority criterion in the interchange evaluation process. The recommended plan provides direct ramps for access to Glamorgan, without having to make unusual movements. Analysis of the Sierra Morena Blvd area was completed to assess if any of the interchange types would affect traffic in the area. The assessment confirmed that none of the interchange types had neither a negative nor a positive effect on existing traffic issues.
Shopping Centre Access	1, 2, 3	Stakeholders were concerned with current congestion within the Westhills and Signal Hill shopping centres, especially when trying to exit these centres, and were not in favor of reducing	Shopping and Business Access was included as a High Priority criterion in the interchange evaluation process. The recommended plan maintains all existing shopping centre access



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

Theme	Phase of Engagement	What we heard	What we did
		the number of exits from the shopping centres. In Phase 3, stakeholders asked whether it would be possible to include an access road to Richmond Square shopping area from the northbound entrance lane onto Sarcee Trail.	with the exception of the western-most driveway to the London West site in Glamorgan, which would have been too steep to maintain. In some instances, such as Signal Hill, opportunities to enhance and improve access have been incorporated in the recommended plan. Providing a new access to Richmond Square from the northbound ramp was not found to be a favorable option as it would create conflicts with vehicles entering Sarcee Trail and require private property acquisition.
Signage	3	Stakeholders stressed the importance of clear signage well in advance of entrances and exits.	The interchange type and budget has allowed for installation of standard advance signing along all approach roads.
Safety	1	Stakeholders' concerns regarding safety focussed primarily on weaving and traffic along Sierra Morena Boulevard. Residents of Sierra Morena were concerned that any increase in traffic along Sierra Morena Boulevard would increase an already unacceptable level of risk to residents. Stakeholders were concerned that too many traffic lights would increase congestion, and cause a safety risk due to traffic lining up on Sarcee Trail and within the shopping centres.	Analysis of the Sierra Morena Blvd area was completed to assess if any of the interchange types would affect traffic in the area. The assessment confirmed that none of the interchange types had neither a negative nor a positive effect on existing traffic issues.
Cycling Accessibility	1, 3	In Phase 1, stakeholders supported increased cycling accessibility, but preferred solutions that did not include bike lanes on roadways. In Phase 3, Stakeholders were supportive of proposed pathway connections and wanted to ensure these are maintained in the final interchange design, as well as to ensure that pedestrian safety is taken into consideration.	The recommended plan includes off-street multi-use pathways for cycling accommodation, rather than on-street bike lanes.  The recommended plan does include all pathways and connections reviewed during the community engagement process.
Walking Accessibility	1, 3	In Phase 1, stakeholders questioned how the proposed concepts accommodated pedestrian	A number of new pathway and sidewalk connections are provided along the west side of



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

Theme	Phase of Engagement	What we heard	What we did
		access to the shopping centres on the west side of Sarcee Trail. Stakeholders wanted to encourage pedestrian access to adjacent shopping centres, but were concerned with required road crossings and impacts to pedestrian safety. In Phase 3, Stakeholders were supportive of proposed pathway connections and wanted to ensure these are maintained in the final interchange design, as well as to ensure that pedestrian safety is taken into consideration.	the interchange, providing new direct access for people walking to the shopping centres. The recommended plan does include all pathways and connections reviewed during the community engagement process.
Construction Considerations	1	Stakeholders wanted to reduce construction timelines as well as construction impacts to surrounding communities and roadways. Stakeholders suggested completing other planned roadways such as Westhills Way prior to construction of the proposed interchange in order to reduce access issues during construction.	A general construction plan was developed to ensure constructability of the interchange. At most times, all existing movements will remain open at the Sarcee Trail / Richmond Road intersection; however, during selected periods some movements may need to be closed. Detailed review of detours will be completed at the detailed design stage, and will include consideration of alternate routing such as Westhills Way.
Bow Trail	1, 3	While out of scope for this study, some stakeholders were concerned that increased traffic from the SWCRR would exacerbate issues at the intersection of Bow Trail and Sarcee Trail S.W., especially if the WCRR does not receive funding.	This concern is acknowledged by The City. Other options, such as a Lane Reversal on Bow Trail, remain under consideration as part of The City's broader response to the SWCRR implementation.
Signal Hill Roundabout	2, 3	Stakeholders were generally supportive of the roundabout to access Signal Hill shopping centre, but wanted to ensure it was adequately signed to reduce confusion in navigating the circle, as well as that it was large enough to not negatively impact traffic flow.	This concern is noted. Proper signing would be provided for the roundabout as part of the detailed design process. Traffic analysis determined that a roundabout at this location is the best solution to maintain traffic flow.
Noise	1, 2, 3	Stakeholders expressed concern regarding increased noise due to both the proposed	A noise study has been completed as part of the study and recommended upgrading noise walls in



## Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

Theme	Phase of Engagement	What we heard	What we did
		interchange and the SWCRR, and asked that noise barriers be expanded and improved to address this issue.	various areas along Signal Ridge and Glenbrook, as well as maintaining the existing berm along Glamorgan. Additional consultation with affected homeowners will be completed as part of the detailed design process.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

## 8 Next steps

Your feedback has provided the project team with additional information they needed to begin finalizing their recommended interchange design to bring forward to Council.

Next steps for the project include:

- Late 2017 – Completion of Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study
- Early 2018 – Presentation of recommended plan to Council for approval
- Through 2018 – Consideration as part of Council capital budget planning process

Stakeholders are welcome to reach out to the Project team via 311 or [sarceerichmond@calgary.ca](mailto:sarceerichmond@calgary.ca) at any time with comments or questions.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

## 9 Phases 2/3 – Verbatim comments

### 9.1 CA Executive Meeting – May 2, 2017

The following notes are CA executive comments recorded by the Project Team during their meeting on May 2, 2017.

#### 9.1.1 Questions and comments during presentation

- When 45 Street S.W. closes, the interchange doesn't deal with impact to backup on 37 Street S.W. around corner to Glenmore.
  - A: Are not expecting backup around that corner due to removal of existing traffic lights. Traffic will be free flow around right corner, with some traffic waiting at the traffic lights to turn left onto Richmond Road.
- Look at surplus areas for planting of new trees.
- Will wide pathways increase use?
  - A: Working to meet 4 m width as this is the new standard.
- Percentage of capital cost invested in landscaping?
  - A: Not a percentage, but policy to fund planting & landscaping
- Will this [project] widen Sarcee to 3 lanes to 17 Avenue S.W.?
  - A: 17 Avenue overpass was built to accommodate additional lanes. Pinch point is Sarcee/Bow Trail.
- What happens to people exiting off of southbound Sarcee who need to get back onto Sarcee?
  - A: All exits will have highway-style signage to help prevent wrong traffic movements.
- Construction impacts and noise will already be far worse due to SWCRR. Because of this, construction noise for this project is not a key criteria.
- Consider raising height of berms to deal with noise from Sarcee/Richmond.
- Have explanation of what is meant by "significant increase/decrease in traffic." Use percentage change.
- What are current traffic counts? How will these change over time? Stakeholders would like to see. Could give context.
- 37 Street S.W. also impacted by SWCRR. Government of Alberta paying for upgrades at 37 Street & 46 Avenue S.W., but 37 Street & Richmond will also be pinched. Also, work on 37 Street S.W. from 17 Avenue to 26 Avenue will impact traffic.
  - A: 37 Street S.W./Richmond won't be full overhaul, but will look at signal optimization and other improvements.
- Look at repaving ruts around 4-way stops at 51<sup>st</sup> St. & 39<sup>th</sup> Ave, and 50<sup>th</sup> St. & Glamis.
- Consider pathway south of Glamorgan parallel to Glenmore, follow Sarcee north to Richmond.
- Conversation with Boardwalk to have path on berm for seniors with motorized scooters?
  - A: Difficult due to existing berm being located within private property.
- City of Calgary Transportation Plan is Policy. Why not take internal road over to Westhills Way?



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- A: Utilities constraints, mainly.
- Where would westbound Richmond Road become three lanes?
  - A: Westbound at Co-op.
- If you do right the first time, you don't have to pay more down the road. Lower construction costs.
- How many lanes on Richmond?
  - A: There will be three core lanes westbound and two core lanes eastbound within the project limits.
- Estimate on east/west traffic on Richmond Road at Sarcee Trail [when the SWCRR is built]?
  - Removing traffic lights at this location would mean that traffic along Richmond Road would not conflict with through traffic on Sarcee Trail.

## 9.1.2 Parking lot

- Issues finding project info on Calgary.ca because of search engine.
- 3 way stop in front of Montana's. Options didn't deal with that.

## 9.2 Open House Comments

- Please do some research on clear, advanced signage (we shouldn't have to guess which exits to take)
- Need ramp from north bound sarcee at Richmond Rd. to Canadian Tire & other business's
- Can the city sponsor classes at the AMA to help seniors confidence on 10 & 5 lane highways?
- Make sure ppl know in advance where to turn
- Lights on the overpass is a great idea, one fewer lights is great
- Closing 45th will add more traffic to Richmond Road from Sarcee Trail Glamorgan residents have a longer ride
- Richmond Road square can/should be accessed via Sarcee at Honda dealership or Canadian Tire (make exit from Sarcee there)
- Teach people to drive period (or at least pay attention to driving first)!
- Teach drivers how to drive traffic circles
- Looks pretty good
- Good signage on roundabouts needed. Be clear about which lanes "go where"
- Active mode on Richmond. --> Plan for both multi-use pathway where there are separate uses & exclusive space for pedestrians and bikes
- Wasting your time unless you remove traffic lights at Bow Trail!
- Agree on the above comment.
- Will there be road closures, how long (over the weekend)??? Or move. Don't want big traffic construction
- Access to ring road via the road next to RONA (Westhills Way) is a great idea (fast & accessible)
- EB Richmond to NB 51st left turn length should be longer - Not enough time to cross lanes
- Need noise barrier 35th ave --> Richmond Square shopping center & by dog park by Sarcee (it currently breaks there)



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- WB Glenmore to WB Rich to signal Hill + concern with Stewart Green + Signal Hill Centre --> More lanes need.
- STOP - building horrible shopping plazas like Westhills: 1) Waste of land; Poor pedestrian + cyclist access; 3) Traffic problems; 4) They are the opposite of "Traffic calming"; 5) They are eyesores and blots on the land.
- Many people avoid roundabouts how do we get them on a 10 lane highway
- Glenmore --> Sarcee N. Should be at least 2 lanes merging on to Sarcee North.
- Glenmore --> Richmond Road should be at least 2 lanes merging on to Richmond Rd. when Stoney Trail is buildt there will be a problem getting on to Richmond Rd. going east from your present plans.
- Do the infrastructure now before Stoney Trail comes into existence.
- 37th (Richard) to 29th is one lane it will get more busy with cut-through traffic
- How will I be impacted by noise? There will be more noise on Sarcee than there is now.
- Elevated Richmond Road is a great idea.
- Boston Pizza entrance needs to be closed. It's a full stop after the Sarcee Trail.
- :) Glad you picked "C".
- WB Glenmore to NB Sarcee 21 Ave entrance? Why 2 SB but only 1 NB?
- I live on Sidon Crescent will I hear the cars on Sarcee? My concern is the noise.
- General Timeline questions. Phasing of ring road & the reccomended plan
- General comments on how clear the plan/intersection is.
- Nice long ramps keep traffic going along = great design
- that intersection need to be over & under (Richmond/Sarcee)
- Richmond road traffic can be heard in Glenbrook area
- Concern: spending money on sarcee before we spend \$ on ring road.
- Traffic from ring road will create traffic on Sarcee trail
- New overpass at 37th is temporary, new one will be built
- If we do not build ring road traffic will be on Sarcee, need to push the gov't
- Road Markings on roundabouts are no substitute for eye level signs and useless in snowy conditions - signage important.
- What about the overpass at Bow Trail? Is that in the picture of possibility? There will be so much more traffic on Sarcee when the ring road happens.
- Please make sure the design avoids the "spaghetti" interchanges which are showing up in the city.
- Ensure signage is clearly understood. Consider focus groups.
- NB weave on ramp b/w basketweave + Richmond - is there enough space to change lanes? To go both EB + WB Rich?(weaving)
- What is main str. Program boundary + coordination
- Build Richmond / Sarcee interchange to tie in iwht SW ringroad before greenline
- WB Glenmore to NB sarcee Basketweave should be 2 lanes under bridge all the way to enter sarcee.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- What does the 37 St/ 46 Ave "intersection improvement" mean? Ped safety concerns. WB exit out of MRU @ PM peak.
- NEED ENOUGH TIME TO MERGE LANES!
- GOOD SIGNAGE NEEDED WELL IN ADVANCE!
- Opportunity for turn-off into Richmond Square from Northbound exit onto Sarcee?
- Now that 45th Str access off Glenmore is being closed, more north bound traffic on 37th St. Need an advance green light at 37 St. & 46 ave so people can go either north or turn west.
- NB 50 St. peak PM turning left @ Richmond Rd. Back up to 46 ave today
- Intersection of 51 St SW and 39 Ave SW should be changed from a 4 way stop to lights
- Hopefully a sound wall is incorporated for Glamorgan noise control... Thanks
- Ensure adequate signage distance
- Thanx for the info session :)
- Looks really well planned!
- Like the walking paths
- Well designed for a very challenging area. Thank you.
- Glenmore West to Sarcee North with merge into one lane could cause congestion. Extend merge.
- Glad they are blocking off 45 St from Glenmore Hopefully will improve all the traffic on 45 St
- Address safety and speed issues

## 9.2.1 Evaluation Form Comments

- Double lanes for weaves from Glenmore to Sarcee No. Take into account merging from Stoney Trail to Richmond Road east before Stoney opens. Would like to see 2 lanes from Glenmore Trail to Richmond Road W.
- Plans look okay. Good choice on Concept C (versus A or B). Good signage is important... signage @ Glenmore Trail & 37th Street (double ring-road) is TERRIBLE! Good idea to NOT have bike lanes on Richmond Road.
- 1) Get on with it. 2) Start planning for adjacent impacts ie Crowchile Trail south end. 3) Plan to give direction for future expected traffic flow.
- Please try hard to make new Richmond Road interchange happen within reasonable time to other construction.
- I support Plan c.
- Non. Exellent plan! Thank you! I hope City Council approves it! :)
- Free bus ride during construction if pedestrian traffic is seriously disrupted. Ie, if it's a significantly longer walk, free transit passes from nearby residents to mall.
- Concerned about the viability of this plan given that the construction alignment of Sarcee/Glenmore/Highway 8 intersection has not been finalized (according to prov. Gov't)
- With the closing of the 45 St exit off of Glenmore Trail, there will be more northbound traffic onto 37 St North. At present there is an advance green light for south bound 37 St but we need one for the north bound for the left turn onto 46 avenue. The green light for the south bound 37 St traffic does not stop to allow the north bound traffic to turn left.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- Noise pollution from the roadways is always a concern. Trust all will be done for neighbour areas to keep it at a minimum.
- The McDonald's drive thru back out on to West Hills way and can be a problem during peak times. Extending the median may help.
- Pathway connection from Stoney Tr (Hwy 8) to Westhills Way to Richmond Rd & East
- 1) How about some practice sessions showing residents how intersection will work? Prior to opening of road & overpass? 2) Traffic circle on Flanders Ave is very confusing. Please install an understandable traffic circle.
- Noise barriers should go entire length of new road. Hwy 8 to 17 Ave S.W.
- The N-bound exit from Sarcee Trail to E. bound Richmond Rd. is to have a limited-speed design, but travelers will have to be warned, perhaps by speed bumps similar to those at sign-controlled intersections in rural areas.
- I talked to [personal information removed] about: 1) Ped safety at 46 & 37 St - 2 people killed in last 5 years and LOTS of vehicles going through red lights; needs better lighting as well 2) huge backup of traffic from MRU - west along 46 ave - and sits on 50 street waiting to turn left onto Richmond Rd.
- Sounds great - but no money to fund & seniors can't afford the tax increase. Has anyone actually considered tollroads? User pay. If Calgary want to be the big city on the world stage (play with the big boys), we are going to have to give up something. Need to look at 2 tiered roads - even we don't have enough land to keep widening roads. Need to consider the "concrete jungle" like after big cities. And people are going to have to learn to drive!!
- Access to & from Glamorgan will be negatively impacted with the close of 45 St. I hope the 37 St./Glenmore interchange will be significantly upgraded to compensate. I also hope Highway 8 will be upgraded to accommodate the changes.
- Left on note pad board
- In order for this to work, interchange has to be built at Bow Trail & Sarcee
- It wasn't clear that there was an overpass over Sarcee Trail at first. Any changes will be a big improvement!
- Please consider more noise barriers & very good signage
- Perhaps have video of project, and a drive thru? Give people an idea of how they might experience the road change.
- Need to improve Bow Trail/Sarcee immediately. Address traffic on Sierra Morena Blvd. too many cutting through
- 1) Be sure to build Richmond/Sarcee in time for opening of Ring Road ie 2021 2) Build major free-flow interchange @ Sarcee & Bow Trail; if west section of ring road is not built, Sarcee will become the defacto ring road with massive northbound delays backing Sarcee up from the existing Bow Trail traffic light.
- Traffic circles/loop have potential to create confusion, but likely can't be avoided. Traffic on Richmond Road will still be heavy & slow (as it is today). Please keep the multi-use pathways as are planned.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- It doesn't look as if it changes anything for those of us going from Sierra Vista Circle to shop @ Westhills and/or Signall Hill into? Will it be easier to get onto Glenmore Trail south? Will this be more traffic on Sierra Morena Blvd?
- What a big job! Did I really hear that it isn't funded? Hoping to see in done in my lifetime.
- Glad that you chose C plan. Makes the most sense
- Looks good! It is important to fund this project AND the transition eastward to coincide w/ opening of Ring Road by 2021. Otherwise, chaos will ensue.
- The recommended plan seem to be very easy to navigate through.
- Very good.
- As a resident of Richmond Hill, I'm concerned about the potential timing of both the Ring Road and this project being done at the same time!
- Excellent session - staff very knowledgable
- Place signage for lanes well back so we have time to adjust
- Good work. Don't let the shopping centre owners force changes to your well thought out recommended plan
- Do not consider narrowing/restricting 37th St. It is busy and will become busier with no access to 45 St. N. Richmond Rd east from 37 St. is very congested. Do not plan to reduce traffic to make Richmond Rd more pedestrian friendly. It is a critical access to Crowchild Tr.
- No bike lanes/narrowing of 37th street - traffic is too heavy - with no axis to 45th street from Glenmore not a good idea!!
- I would like the exit on 46th to remain Richmond Road is untenable at present. What will it be like with increased traffic 37th is a heavy use road & on any change in lane reduction would be a mistake. The exit "ramp" to the Grey Eagle will be problematic on "event" nights
- Please respect pedestrians and cyclists (as you do now with bike paths, lights in city centre). We enjoy walking/biking along 50 St. to Coop, Canadian Tire and Westhills. We will miss 45 St. turn off!
- I'm a bit concerned about the traffic impacts at Bow Trail, as the last controlled intersection in the area. I'd also like a bit more information about the pedestrian experience within the project area.
- My husband & I live on Sierra Morena Crt on a corner lot. We both like the plans for the interchanges at Sarcee & Richmond & ring road. Our concern is the amt of traffic that cuts through our neighborhood to get to Westhills. \*Please look at traffic calming methods (temporarily closing off 34th ave to local traffic only when interchange is completed. People will need to be retrained not to cut through our neighborhood. Even with roundabouts on Sierra Morena Blvd, people are driving too fast, there are close calls every day. Roundabout on Westhills Way, not lights!!
- Westhills Way and Stoney Trail should have 2 single land roundabouts! New interchange at Richard Rd and Glenmore would allow MRU students access rather than using 37th St.
- I like the project concept. Another intersection at Richards Rd. & Glenmore for Mount Royal University to alleviate traffic @ 37th & 46th. Single lane roundabouts at Westhills Way.
- Please look at the intersection of 37 St & 46 Ave. Concerned about the difficulty & traffic volume i.e. MRU & Glamorgan residents



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- I have concerns about the widened roads when they suddenly return to the original size - (ie: 3 lanes, down to 2 lanes on 1)
- Will be interesting to watch it all come together.
- Lack of traffic flow at 37th and 46th, needs upgrade or an option like 45th for residents only.
- No
- In the cross-section of Richmond Road, I think there should be a dedicated, buffered cycling lane. Why is this "not recommended?"
- I think it will be less congested for Westhills area.
- Looking good moving forward
- Traffic across Sarcee is already bad from the west; I am concerned that the SW Ring Road will put too much traffic into Glenmore/Sarcee. Overpasses at Richmond/Sarcee and Bow Trail/Sarcee are critical. I remain concerned about excess traffic through Richmond Hill via Sierra Morena Blvd. Unfortunately, this overpass will encourage even more traffic that way. I ask that the city look for other mitigation measures to restrict traffic via Sierra morena Blvd. Thanks.
- The chosen plans seem to address our concerns; disappointed to hear 45th St. is closing for sure... it limits EMS access to the S.W. corner of Glamorgan.
- It appears that the intersection at sarcee & Richmond Road should be reversed so that the east/west road would be at ground level or a little below and the north/south road would be raised. This design would allow traffic to an easier entrance and exits to the shopping centers. The north south flow would mean raising the overpass higher but would still flow well. Also, if trucks are hauling products that are high they wouldn't have a problem with any obstructions.
- Thanks for the update. The mail out was very effective. This was the first public session we were aware of for this project. The mailout should have specified "5-8 drop-in" for those unfamiliar with those type of events.

## 9.3 Online Comments

### 9.3.1 What do you like?

- The Sarcee Trail freeflow looks good. Also the access to S/B Sarcee looks well planned for the interchange and the traffic volume.
- I generally like it
- With the ring road coming in to Sarcee and Glenmore without the extension to 16th Avenue NW, this overpass is critical to be timed with the ring road completion.
- I like that it removes the lights and makes it mostly free flow
- No private land required. Traffic circle as long as it's a single lane one and not multi-lane.
- Westhills Way is a nice alternate access into the mall. Roundabout on East side of Signal Hill a nice traffic flow resolution to an already difficult exit from mall parking lot (but needs to be a larger roundabout). Basket weave bridge is excellent to keep traffic flowing smoothly!
- Good traffic flow into shopping areas. Not too many lights on richmond road.
- Transit priority.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

- This looks great but what about bow train, it will turn into a traffic jam...
- Design strikes the right balance between providing access to communities and shopping while minimizing the footprint as much as possible. Looking forward to having Sarcee integrated with the SW Ring Road.
- Looks Good!
- It looks great! I hope this project be approved soon !
- Looks great with the exception noted below.
- Closing off the London drugs entrance off of Richmond is good Less lights is good The weave bridge is nice as well More lanes is great
- There are a lot of good changes here. This intersection is often confusing even for regular drivers. Addition of bike paths is good. Addition of basket weave overpass from the N. Sarcee exit is very good.
- This draft is perfect. A free-flowing Sarcee is exactly what this intersection needs. I live in the area and absolutely would welcome this.
- Looks good. The number of stop lights looks acceptable. Less impact to existing businesses than some of the other designs that were considered. Makes the most sense of all the options that were presented.
- The design is intuitive and seems like it will alleviate traffic flow.
- Much better approach to the terrible sight lines that exist at the intersection currently. Reduces the number of things people need to see at once in order to drive safely.

## 9.3.2 What could be improved?

- Please, please consider a lane -- even one would be enough -- that flows directly EB from the Westhills complex into the NB lanes of Sarcee. That left turn will be a bane to everyone. It's bad as it is. There's enough room to fly over the planned Sarcee SB, and curve under the bridge. More expensive, yes, but it will greatly improve traffic flow EB out of Westhills.
- The staff at the open house was clueless on how this project, in particular the widening of Richmond from 37 st to Stewart Green (and greatly increased traffic flow). Would impact the planned BRT route that is to dump busses from what is a parking lot currently onto the right side of a roadway where they would then have to force their way over into traffic that is today backed up past the intersection. Remembering that according to the Alberta Highway Traffic Act busses do not have the right of way.
- Access for E/B Richmond Rd to N/B Sarcee Trail. Usually a huge volume turning left at the present time, appears that this has been left as is. Also, the tie-in to the anticipated future Glenmore Tr upgrades and Sarcee/Glenmore/Highway 8 interchange seems to be missing.
- Two merging southbound traffic lanes potentially interfering with southbound Sarcee traffic wanting to head west on SWRR/Hwy8? Not sure what you could do better but its the only real conflict I see
- Eastbound Richmond Road is already congested, particularly on weekends and during holiday times. I hope this design does not make that situation worse. As a resident of Richmond Hill I am



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

concerned that the overpass will encourage more traffic onto Sierra Morena Blvd. Can the city look at ways to limit access from the west?

- The Westhills Way Interchange with Stoney Trail should be a roundabout and not a signalized intersection at the ramp terminal on your project site plan.
- Bike path access south is not included. Currently, there is no safe way to bike to west hills without going through all the parking lots. Even walking through this area is dangerous because of a lack of safe paths.
- The WB Glenmore to NB Sarcee merge seems short. Does this make sense for the anticipated traffic volumes? Same question for Richmond to NB Sarcee. Does Stoney to NB Sarcee really need 3 lanes, or could it be dropped to 2 lanes so that the Glenmore traffic would have a dedicated lane to NB Sarcee, similar to what is shown on the Alberta Transportation drawings for the SWCRR?  
<http://www.transportation.alberta.ca/Content/docType490/Production/SW-CRR%20-%20Sarcee%20Tr-Strathcona%20St.pdf>
- -separate the notation on the maps sidewalk/pathway could just be a sidewalk and not accommodate cyclists at all. Poor communication. Poor clarity of what actual plan is (i.e. is it really the previous cross-sections from last fall, or just a 1m wide sidewalk... What is extent of actual MUP? This is the same issue as other City of Calgary documents. Communicate more clearly by using a different line type or color for MUPs versus sidewalks) -separate cyclists and pedestrians either with a set of two parallel paths or by stamping/texturing (e.g. brick pattern) the walking side. - what is the pedestrian/cycling accommodation for Glenbrook across Richmond Rd/Sarcee? Could be very poor for cyclists. -looks like a great bike counter location on/beside overpass bridge on both north and south pathways. -concern about geometry/vehicle design speed of channelized right turn lanes to/from Richmond Rd to/from Sarcee. These need to be designed for cyclists, not just pedestrians (geometry of pathway turns, include elephant feet pavement markings). Current pathway crossing at Stewart Green Way SW sucks; it is really a sidewalk, not a multi-use pathway! The channelized turning radius are too large; designed for too high a vehicle speed. -in extra space east and west sides of Sarcee south of Richmond Rd include pathways at edge of Sarcee right-of-way to facilitate access to south half of West Hills Shopping Centre and properties west of Glamis Drive. West of Glamis there is already a disconnected sidewalk, improve it, connect it! -reverse the grade changes with Sarcee down 6m and Richmond Rd up 3m instead-better for pedestrians and cyclists. -the northbound Sarcee Tr basketweave is a missing movement from the province's Glenmore Trail/SWCRR interchange. The cost is being offloaded the City of Calgary. -disappointed not to see bus only/HOV lanes through the 3 Richmond Rd intersections and across bridge. Richmond Rd to downtown or a West LRT station connection would make a logical BRT. Either via transit-only passage over Crowchild by 26 Ave SW or via 33 Ave SW to 14 St SW. There's enough room for a park and ride or a parking structure south of West Hills Shopping Centre. This would capture south and west transportation demand.
- Roundabout on East side of Signal Hill mall needs to be wider in diameter so multitude of vehicles exiting Southbound off Sarcee do not monopolize the circle (example of issue with a small roundabout is the one on the North side of Glenmore Trail at 37th Street SW needs to be wider in



## Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

diameter as the traffic exiting Glenmore can't flow into the roundabout efficiently enough because of the volume of vehicles already in the roundabout from Southbound 37th Street SW heading over the bridge, which negatively results in Westbound vehicles backing up onto Glenmore Trail since they can't exit into 37th Street roundabout... let's not make that same mistake - simply add diameter to the roundabout so space exists for more vehicles. Also want to recommend that off ramps are sufficiently long enough that traffic waiting at lights like vehicles waiting at Northbound lights off of Sarcee Trail don't prevent vehicles attempting to turn right / Eastbound into Richmond Road, are not held up until the traffic light changes.

- Glenmore trail goes to 1 lane in basket weave where it connects to Sarcee Trail which will cause backups.
- Very concerned about the Westbound Glenmore to Northbound Sarcee - it looks like two lanes converse into a single lane as it goes under the basket weave - although the basket weave idea is good - trying to merge the Westbound Glenmore traffic into a single lane is a recipe for disaster and massive traffic tie-ups - tie-ups that the interchange is supposed to remove. Thanks.
- Will on lane merging from WB Glenmore to NB Sarcee sufficiently handle volumes?
- Demolishing Petro Canada isn't the best I don't see an eastbound Richmond onto northbound Sarcee option unless I am not understanding the light, but it looks elevated for cars to go under rather and therefore we cannot turn left there. The additional traffic through the center of westhills might be huge and fast, might need to slow people down
- Basket weave on south Sarcee from Richmond onramp towards the ring road needs improvement. This will cause large traffic backups. I calculate the distance from this onramp to the next offramp (Glenmore & Ring Road) as 600m. My suggestion: 1) Eliminate the two offramps into the signal hill center (one that turns into Signal Hill Centre SW and one that arrives at Richmond Road) and consolidate them into one arrival along Signal Hill Centre SW. 2) Eliminate the proposed onramp to S. Sarcee from Richmond Rd. 3) Use the space from #1 and #2 to extend the onramp from Richmond to S. Sarcee further to the north (to where Signal Hill Centre SW currently turns into an onramp to S. Sarcee). Make this onramp the main onramp from Richmond Rd. to S. Sarcee. 4) Upgrade: - current Stewart Green SW - Signal Hill Centre SW from Stewart Green SW to the current S. Sarcee onramp to be able to handle higher volumes of traffic. I estimate that this could increase the distance along S. Sarcee from Richmond Rd. onramp to the Ring Road offramp to by 200-400m, and greatly reduce traffic backups from the proposed basket weave along southbound Sarcee between Richmond and the Ring Road. It would feel like a longer trip from Richmond Rd. to S. Sarcee, however reduction in traffic backups would even out the distance (and save S. Sarcee travellers from the basket weave slowdown).
- Northbound Sarcee needs a speed/red light camera asap. I usually am never one to advocate for more traffic enforcement cameras, but last week I witnessed the aftermath of a major accident at this very intersection where me and the others who stopped noticed aside from the speed camera on southbound Sarcee, there are no other cameras at this major intersection.
- New interchanges should never be built including traffic lights. It is akin to building an outdated structure.



# Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard / Did  
November 2017

The Signal Hill roundabout probably is too small of a radius for the load I suspect it will see, especially considering it is probably choked by a line of pedestrian crosswalks in the shopping centre itself. If it causes backups onto the westbound funnel road that loads it, it will become really difficult to get into or out of the shopping centre despite the other roads being properly sized for the