



Crowchild Trail Study

Public Open House Summary February 27, 2016

Project overview

The City of Calgary is conducting a transportation study to identify short-, medium- and long-term upgrades for Crowchild Tr. between 24 Ave. N.W. and 17 Ave. S.W.

Crowchild Tr. is an important roadway within Calgary's overall transportation network. Its function is critical to both the land use and transportation needs of Calgary as it continues to grow and redevelop in the coming decades.

The study consists of a six-phase process that provides multiple opportunities for Calgarians to provide feedback through each phase of the study.

Ideas and feedback received from stakeholders and the public will help The City make better decisions for the future of Crowchild Tr.

Engagement overview

Phase 3: Concept Identification is about identifying ideas on possible changes to the Crowchild Trail corridor and understanding the benefits, impacts, constraints and trade-offs of those ideas.

At workshops and online discussion in the fall of 2015, over 500+ unique ideas on how to improve the Crowchild Tr. corridor were raised by Calgarians. After consolidation, the results of an initial review of all of the ideas were shared with stakeholders during an open house with community members and the public on Saturday, Feb. 27, 2016 from 2 to 5 p.m. at the Sunalta Elementary School (536 Sonora Ave. N.W.). Participants were asked to review the ideas and provide feedback on how well the ideas met the key principles of the study (i.e. maintain / enhance bordering communities, improve travel along the corridor and improve mobility across the corridor).

Approximately 45 participants attended the session.

The following members of the project team were also in attendance at the session:

- Feisal Lakha, City of Calgary, Project Manager
- Madhuri Seera, City of Calgary, Deputy Project Manager
- Stephen Kay, City of Calgary, Technical Lead
- Andrea Sichewski, City of Calgary, Communications Advisor
- Kirsty Neill, City of Calgary, Engagement Advisor
- Asif Kurji, City of Calgary, Transit Advisor
- Misty Sklar, City of Calgary, Planning Advisor
- Jana Sinclair, Russell Public Relations, Consultant Engagement Lead
- Erin Russell, Russell Public Relations, Consultant Engagement Coordinator
- Chris Delanoy, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Project Manager
- Alana Getty Sommers, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Lead
- Courtney Laurence, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Engagement Coordinator
- Andrea Stevens, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Engagement Coordinator
- Brent Vos, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Ariel McCance, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Andrew Monson, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor



- Dominic Cheng, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Jack Mason, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Mario Prezelj, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Luke Denton, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Dave Breu, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Mark Bagnall, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consultant Technical Advisor
- Brad Tiedemann, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consultant Technical Advisor
- Dave Thatcher, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consultant Technical Advisor
- Andrew Vandertol, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consultant Technical Advisor
- Ryan Martinson, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consultant Technical Advisor
- Arliss Szysky, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consultant Technical Advisor

What we asked

During the open house participants had an opportunity to:

- See how the ideas gathered last fall (October and November 2015) look when applied to the Crowchild Trail corridor. This included what we heard from Calgarians and viewing the project team's initial review of the ideas, including the benefits, impacts, constraints and trade-offs.
- Learn about why some ideas are not continuing after the initial technical review.
- See which ideas were not explored in this phase but will be explored in **Phase 4: Concept Evaluation**.

The purpose of the open house was to evaluate the remaining ideas against the three key principles of the project:

1. Maintain / enhance bordering communities
2. Improve travel along the corridor
3. Improve mobility across the corridor

Post-its were made available to allow participants to review each idea and rate whether it meets the key principles well, somewhat well or does not meet the key principle. The ideas were grouped by geography into four sections of the study area:

Entire Study Area: Includes an idea for the Crowchild Trail corridor that extends beyond one specific section.

01. Banned lefts on Crowchild Tr. during rush hour at Kensington Rd., 5 Ave. N.W., 23 Ave., N.W. and 24 Ave. N.W.

North Section: Between 24 Ave. N.W. and University Dr. (near McMahon Stadium).

02. Right-turns only at 24 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at 23 Ave. N.W.
03. All-turns interchange at 24 Ave. N.W.
04. Move Crowchild Tr. to the west, north of University Dr.
05. Interchanges at 24 Ave. N.W. and 16 Ave. N.W. with frontage roads
06. All-turns interchange at 16 Ave. N.W.

Central Section: Between University Dr. and Memorial Dr. (the 5 Ave. N.W. / Kensington Rd. area).

07. Right-turns only at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd.
08. Interchange at Kensington Rd. with restricted access at 5 Ave. N.W.
09. Interchange at 5 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at Kensington Rd.
10. Interchanges at BOTH Kensington Rd. and 5 Ave. N.W.
11. Tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr.
12. Elevated roadway from Memorial Dr. to University Dr.
13. All-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow)
14. All-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (roundabouts)



South Section: Between Memorial Dr. and 17 Ave. S.W. (including the Bow River bridge).

15. Widen Bow River bridge for more lanes and/or continuity of lanes
16. 17 Ave. S.W. dual left turns
17. 17 Ave. S.W. roundabouts

What we heard

The following is a high level overview of what we heard at the open house:

- Across the **Entire Study Area**, participants felt that banning lefts on Crowchild Tr. during rush hour (Idea 1) would only result in minor benefits for improved traffic flow, but would have larger impacts on access to/from and across Crowchild Tr., especially for residents in bordering communities.
- In the **North Section**, the ideas to implement an all-turns interchange at 24 Ave. N.W. (Idea 3), interchanges at 24 Ave. N.W. and 16 Ave. N.W. with frontage roads (Idea 5) or an all-turns interchange at 16 Ave. N.W. (Idea 6) were evaluated to meet the key principles of the study because participants felt the ideas had few community and/or business impacts, could improve traffic flow and could improve access to/from Crowchild Tr. Right-turns only at 24 Ave. with restricted access at 23 Ave. N.W. (Idea 2) and moving Crowchild Tr. to the west, north of University Dr. (Idea 4) were evaluated as not meeting the key principles well because they limited access across Crowchild Tr. and impacted bordering communities.
- In the **Central Section**, participants thought that the ideas to implement right-turns only at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. (Idea 7), an interchange at Kensington Rd. with restricted access at 5 Ave., N.W. (Idea 8), a tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. (Idea 11), and an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow) (Idea 13) met the key principles well because they would help to improve traffic flow and have low community/business impacts. An elevated roadway from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. (Idea 12) was evaluated as having large visual and noise impacts to bordering communities and participants felt an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (with roundabouts) (Idea 14) would not improve traffic flow. Participants felt that both ideas did not meet the key principles well.
- In the **South Section**, participants evaluated the ideas to widen Bow River bridge for more lanes and/or continuity of lanes (Idea 15) and implement dual left turns at 17 Ave. S.W. (Idea 16) as meeting the key principles well because they would help to improve traffic flow. However, participants had mixed feedback on whether implementing roundabouts at 17 Ave. S.W. (Idea 17) would help to improve traffic flow. Participant feedback was also mixed on whether the ideas at 17 Ave. S.W. (Idea 16 and 17) would enhance or reduce pedestrian and cyclist connectivity.

For a more detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the Open House Summary of Input section. For a verbatim listing of all the input received at the open house, please see the Verbatim Responses section.

Next steps

Feedback received during in-person and online engagement sessions in February and March, 2016 will help the project team identify concepts for further development. As part of **Phase 4: Concept Evaluation**, these preliminary concepts will then be presented in June 2016 and Calgarians will be asked to help evaluate the concepts against the project goals established in **Phase 2: Confirm Project Goals** of the study.



Open House Summary of Input

Themes related to the three key principles of the study

- '✓' indicates that participants felt the idea met or somewhat met the key principles of the study
- 'x' means that participants felt the idea did not meet the key principle

Idea 01 for the **Entire Study Area**

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- x **Limits access across Crowchild Tr. (Idea 1):** Participants felt that while banning lefts on Crowchild Tr. during rush hour at Kensington Rd., 5 Ave. N.W., 23 Ave. N.W. and 24 Ave. N.W. would improve traffic flow, this idea would completely limit access across Crowchild Tr. in the West Hillhurst area.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- ✓ **Short term solution (Idea 1):** The idea to ban lefts during rush hour was considered a good short term solution while other long term ideas are being explored to improve travel along the corridor.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- x **Limits access to/from Crowchild Tr. (Idea 1):** Participants identified that banning lefts during rush hour did not meet the key principle of improving mobility across the corridor as it would limit access of Crowchild Tr. for bordering communities.

Ideas 02-06 for the **North Section**

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- ✓ **Low community/business impacts (Idea 5):** Participants felt that the idea to implement interchanges at 24 Ave. N.W. and 16 Ave. N.W. with frontage roads would require little land.
- x **Impacts communities (Idea 4):** The idea to move Crowchild Tr. to the west, north of University Dr. was evaluated by participants to impact bordering communities because it would spread the roadway out and therefore, have a larger impact to the community.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Ideas 2, 3, 5 and 6):** Participants felt that the ideas to introduce right-turns only at 24 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at 23 Ave. N.W., an all-turns interchange at 24 Ave. N.W., interchanges at 24 Ave. N.W. and 16 Ave. N.W. with frontage roads, and an all-turns interchange at 16 Ave. N.W. would help to improve traffic flow along Crowchild Tr.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- x **Limits access across Crowchild Tr. (Idea 2):** The idea to implement right-turns only at 24 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at 23 Ave. N.W. was identified as not meeting the key principle well.
- x **Reduces cyclist/pedestrian connectivity (Ideas 2 and 5):** Participants thought that the ideas to introduce an all-turns interchange at 24 Ave. N.W. and interchanges at 24 Ave. N.W. and 16 Ave. N.W. with frontage roads might reduce mobility across Crowchild Tr. because of the larger roadways and ramps cyclists and pedestrians would have to use.



Ideas 07-14 for the Central Section

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- ✓ **Low community/business impacts (Ideas 11 and 13):** The ideas to implement a tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. and an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow) were evaluated by participants to meet the key principle well because there were minimal impacts to bordering communities.
- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Idea 13):** Participants felt that an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow) could help to improve traffic flow and function more efficiently.
- × **Negative impacts to adjacent properties (Ideas 9 and 12):** Participants thought that the ideas to implement an interchange at 5 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at Kensington Rd. and an elevated roadway from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. would have negative impacts to adjacent properties and did not meet the key principle well.
- × **Negative visual/noise impacts (Idea 12):** The elevated roadway from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. was evaluated by participants to have both negative visual and noise impacts to residents in bordering communities and did not meet the key principle well.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Ideas 7, 8, 11, and 13):** The ideas to implement right-turns only at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd., an interchange at Kensington Rd. with restricted access at 5 Ave. N.W., a tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr., and an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow) were evaluated by participants as meeting the key principle well because these ideas could help to improve traffic flow along Crowchild Tr.
- ✓ **Enhances pedestrian/cyclist connectivity (Ideas 11):** Participants felt that the idea to tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. met the key principle well as it would improve travel for people who walk and bike along Crowchild Tr.
- × **Doesn't improve traffic flow (Idea 14):** Participants felt that the idea to implement an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (with roundabouts) would not improve traffic flow because the roundabouts would cause congestion on Memorial Dr.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- ✓ **Improves access to Crowchild Tr. (Ideas 12 and 13):** Participants thought that the ideas to implement an elevated roadway from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. and an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow) would work well to improve access to and from Crowchild Tr.
- × **Doesn't improve traffic flow (Idea 7 and 14):** Participants felt that the ideas to implement right-turns only at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. and an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (with roundabouts) would not improve traffic flow along Crowchild Tr.

Ideas 15-17 for the South Section

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- × **Increased noise (Idea 15):** Participants felt that the idea to widen the Bow River bridge for more lanes and/or continuity of lanes met the key principle well, but raised concerns about the need to address noise impacts at the same time.
- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Idea 17):** Participants thought the idea to implement roundabouts at 17 Ave. S.W. would help to improve traffic flow.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Ideas 15 to 17):** Participants felt that the ideas to widen Bow River bridge for more lanes and/or continuity of lanes, to implement dual left turns at 17 Ave. S.W. or to implement roundabouts at 17 Ave. S.W. would help to reduce major bottlenecks along Crowchild Tr. and 17 Ave. S.W.



Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Ideas 15 to 17):** The ideas to widen Bow River bridge for more lanes and/or continuity of lanes, to implement dual left turns at 17 Ave. S.W. or to implement roundabouts at 17 Ave. S.W. were evaluated by participants as meeting the key principle well because the ideas help to improve traffic flow.
- ✓ **Doesn't improve traffic flow (Idea 17):** The idea to implement roundabouts at 17 Ave. S.W. was also rated by participants as not meeting the key principle well because roundabouts may not help to reduce bottlenecks.



Verbatim Responses

A number at the end of a comment (e.g. "x2"), indicates the number of times that comment was heard.

Entire Section (includes ideas for the corridor that extend beyond one specific section)

Idea we heard #01: Banned lefts on Crowchild Tr. During rush hour at Kensington Rd., 5 Ave. N.W., 23 Ave. N.W. and 24 Ave. N.W.

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Although it might improve flow on Crowchild Tr. a little, I don't know that the complete lack of access to Kensington area is worth it. Drawback outweighs benefit, I think.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Faster moving traffic on Crowchild Tr. with higher vehicle volumes does not meet principle 1 because it doesn't enhance green space and does not reduce traffic noise.
 - Will make it hard to get into Kensington from the north during the hours of which it is in force – people will reroute to 19 St. N.W. and by Foothills, thus worsening traffic there.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - This might work but only use as a short term solution while implementing the medium and long term solutions.
 - Likely some improvement in wait times at intersections.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Probably no significant improvement.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.

- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Reduces permeability of Crowchild Tr. One less way for people to move from neighbouring communities.





North Section (north of University Dr. to 24 Ave. N.W.)

Idea we heard #02: **Right-turns only at 24 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at 23 Ave. N.W.**

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- No comments received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - It is time to restrict some access; needs to include improvements at 16 Ave. N.W.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Limits car access across Crowchild Tr. and doesn't really improve bike or pedestrian access even with bridge.
 - I'm not really sure I fully understand, but if this means you can't cross Crowchild Tr. at 24 Ave. N.W. it will be a real disaster for access to the University, funnelling traffic through 30km/hr ring road on campus to get back to the main parkade, the Arts parkade.
 - It restricts mobility across Crowchild Tr.
 - This prevents access to the University from 24 Ave. N.W. east of Crowchild Tr. Also, there are no means of going north on Crowchild Tr. from the University.
 - Unless you provide a pair of traffic circles on 24 Ave. N.W. or other means of pulling a U-Turn, you are just shifting the traffic problem to another area. Don't restrict access to major corridors/offshoots. Think overpass.
 - Agree (that idea restricts access across).



Idea we heard #03: **All-turns interchange at 24 Ave. N.W.**

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Increases mobility with fewer disruptions, although this will work better if the stadium ends up moving. Improves area around Transit Oriented Development (TOD) (all 3 principles).
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - I would like access to 24 Ave. N.W. from Crowchild Tr.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - There is not enough traffic making left turns or going straight across Crowchild Tr. to justify this expense.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Increases mobility with fewer disruptions, although this will work better if the stadium ends up moving. Improves area around Transit Oriented Development (TOD) (all 3 principles).
 - Scenario #2 – make Crowchild Tr. free flow through to 24 Ave. N.W.; make it easier for pedestrians to cross; could add a higher speed ramp from southbound Crowchild Tr. onto westbound 24 Ave. N.W.
 - Improves travel, make it happen faster!
 - Seems good for access to 24 Ave. N.W. and University. Stadiums would be affected.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - This scenario would restrict access for Motel Village to 16 Ave. N.W. only, which might cause traffic issues on 16 Ave N.W.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Interchange will greatly improve crossing for people.
 - Increases mobility with fewer disruptions, although this will work better if the stadium ends up moving. Improves area around Transit Oriented Development (TOD) (all 3 principles).
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - If 24 Ave. N.W. goes under Crowchild Tr., this would be an unpleasant crossing for pedestrian and cyclists.



Idea we heard #04: Move Crowchild Tr. to the west, north of University Dr.

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - The 'trade-off' is a no-no!
 - Keep Crowchild Tr. north and southbound together and not spread out over rest of community.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Why have lights if the area is redeveloped this much? Add bridges.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - It causes too much construction and cost. Keep Crowchild Tr. where it is.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- No comments received.

Idea we heard #05: Interchanges at 24 Ave. N.W. and 16 Ave. N.W. with frontage roads

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - I don't think frontage road would be necessary unless there were to be more retail development on both sides of Crowchild Tr.
 - It does affect the surrounding communities but requires comparatively little land/existing buildings.



- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Improves travel by fixing interchanges and removing lights.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - This seems pretty good. Needs bike connection north to south.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Larger roadway/off ramps to cross especially for pedestrians.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Idea we heard #06: All-turns interchange at 16 Ave. N.W.

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- No comments received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Diamond intersection makes sense; Crowchild Tr. flows independently (scenario #2).
 - Less confusing for drivers trying to get on/off 16 Ave. N.W.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Like the improved flow but would like to avoid lights on 16 Ave. N.W., use the space north of the 16 Ave. N.W. (park space and parking lot) to accomplish this.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.



Central Section (north of Memorial Dr. to University Dr. N.W.)

Idea we heard #07: **Right-turns only at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd.**

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Shifts traffic; will be negative to communities east of Crowchild Tr.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Great quick fix which will show that there is not that much traffic/need for these intersections.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Don't really like impact to Memorial Dr. with this solution. It might work short term; maybe try roundabouts before lights to see if they work better.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Moving traffic to 19 St. N.W. seems like a bad idea. No bridge at the south end and no good exit from the north either – would route it to 24 Ave. N.W. and back to Crowchild Tr.



Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Not a significant improvement. No improvement of traffic going northbound on Crowchild Tr.



Idea we heard #08: Interchange at Kensington Rd. with restricted access at 5 Ave. N.W.

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Like, fair to residents and improves Crowchild Tr. flow.
 - No property impacts north of 5 Ave. N.W.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - The public realm at Kensington Rd. would make the neighbourhood ugly. This would be scorched earth for pedestrians and cyclists.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - This addresses the major congestion at Kensington Rd. both on and off Crowchild Tr.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Prefer to overpass solution in Idea 10, scenario #1 rather than this. Fixing both 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. in same way will be better than two different solutions.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - This addresses the major congestions at Kensington Rd. both on and off Crowchild Tr.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.



Idea we heard #09: Interchange at 5 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at Kensington Rd.

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - More impact on my neighbourhood than interchange at Kensington Rd.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Prefer Idea 8. Kensington Rd. is more of a business road.
 - Prefer 2 overpass solution in Idea 10, scenario #1 rather than this. You have to fix both 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. – if similar solution at both, it will be better.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Increased flow on side streets would be very bad given the amount of traffic wanting to go south on Crowchild Tr. from Kensington Rd. westbound.



Idea we heard #10: **Interchanges at BOTH Kensington Rd. and 5 Ave. N.W.**

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Like! Maintains all the principles but want assurances of improved noise barrier.
 - Overpass allows community connection while allowing traffic to flow on Crowchild Tr. (scenario #1).
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Access to and from my neighbourhood is affected but no acquisition of my home. Scenario #1 – more impact to properties bordering Crowchild Tr. Scenario #2 – less property acquisition but increased traffic on 25 St. and 23 St. N.W.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - It creates an unpleasant environment on Kensington Rd. and 5 Ave. N.W. This is similar to the previous plan that was not well received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Prefer scenario #1 over scenario #2. Side roads along freeways work well and don't send you off to drive in the neighbourhood roads like scenario #2.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Not enough local traffic to justify this type of excessive build and expense.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- No comments received.

Idea we heard #11: **Tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr.**

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - This is excellent for the bordering communities. The above ground street with bike lanes shows that neighbourhoods are more important than cars.
 - This is the best idea in terms of promoting inner city living.
 - The benefits that are listed on this board are significant. This option is worth the cost. We already paid for the freeway, now let's take care of our inner city as well.
 - Minimal negative impact to nearby area. It will actually probably reduce noise 😊



- Keeps community together and creates a new main street for the community which would benefit businesses. And the tunnel would allow for mass traffic movement. Calgary needs to plan for the next 30 years.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Horrible idea! Way too expensive, difficult and timely. Only benefits immediate neighbourhood.
 - Very expensive.
 - It would most likely involve the loss of my home (I live on 24 St. N.W.).

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - This is the only way we can travel along Crowchild Tr. as a cyclist or pedestrian.
 - The urban boulevard looks nice. Let's prioritize people over cars. The urban boulevard is great for active transportation and for bordering communities.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Diminishes the "bottleneck" that we have experienced for all these years!
 - Good idea, but overkill.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Not the best use of tunnelling. Would rather just widen here and put the tunnel under the river. This isn't a good use of money.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Access across Crowchild Tr. will be easier and more pleasant.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Idea we heard #12: Elevated Roadway from Memorial Dr. to University Dr.

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.



- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Not sure this is the right idea.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Loss of light/casts larger shadow on 1 block east and west of elevated road. Visually not appealing, property devalued and noisy.
 - Increased noise, construction. Visually unappealing, huge visual impact. I live on 24 St. N.W., possible expropriation.
 - Expensive and ugly. Might as well build a tunnel if spending enough for elevated roadway.
 - Terribly ugly and loud. Huge impact on property values. Let's not reproduce Montreal... yuk!
 - Don't like elevated roads, create dark area underneath and slum like feeling below.
 - Somewhat expensive and aesthetically undesirable.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Yes, elevated roadway.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Winter issues!
 - Icing of road can be a problem in winter. Plus it is ugly.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Access looks easy but is truly unpleasant. Looks like Gardiner Expressway in Toronto. Gross.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Idea we heard #13: All-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow)

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - It means no new property acquisition.
 - Provides an all movements interchange without affecting communities.
 - Much more efficient.



- I suspect that if people could get to Memorial Dr. from northbound Crowchild Tr. a lot of pressure on Kensington Rd. would be eliminated. Could eliminate left turns at Kensington Rd. perhaps. Needs bike paths too.
 - I agree with other feedback. Good flow, low impact.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Would like to see Kensington Rd. closed to facilitate this and Idea 14.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Good flow!
 - Good flow.
 - Like this idea over Idea 14.
 - Yes, great plan, long term solution.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Better solution than traffic circles.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - This proposal seems to work well in terms of improving flow of traffic off and onto Crowchild Tr.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - This idea seems better than Idea 14 for Memorial Dr.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Idea we heard #14: All-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (with roundabouts)

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - My house won't get torn down or be overshadowed by a giant elevated roadway.



- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Using traffic circles for all eastbound Memorial Dr. traffic seems too optimistic.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Too complicated and likely expensive to boot. If on Memorial Dr., you just want to flow through and not get tied up with traffic circles.
 - Slow flow!
 - Roundabouts will cause backups.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Too much volume for roundabouts to be effective.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Can't see how this will help Crowchild Tr. Looks very confusing and taking far more space than should be necessary.
 - This will likely not improve things much due to time taken to slow down for traffic circles and having to go through 2 of them in some cases. And somewhat confusing (i.e. 37 St. S.W. at Glenmore Tr., only some improvement).





South Section (17 Ave S.W. to Memorial Dr. N.W.)

Idea we heard #15: **Widen Bow River bridge for more lanes and/or continuity of lanes**

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - I like this.
 - Good thinking! Need to deal with noise too at the same time.
 - Like idea of widening bridge over bow.
 - Land bridge between Sunalta School and Oliver Quarry park to extend green space (example in Vancouver at Fairview Slopes over BC rail tracks).
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Would like to address the “sound stress” to surrounding communities.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - This proposal seems to address northbound traffic very well across the river.
 - 3 north lanes over the river is a big improvement.
 - This is straightforward and gets rid of lanes dropping off. Two thumbs up!
 - It saves a major bottleneck without major disruptions or affecting existing property.
 - Seems obvious to work the rehabilitation with the lane improvement, especially since this seems like such a good idea, independent of all the decisions on the other sections of Crowchild Tr.
 - Get started on this right away!
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Yes, 3 lanes across Crowchild Tr.! No criss-crossing of traffic where people used to cut 3 lanes across northbound Crowchild Tr. to get off at Memorial Dr. – that is a problem today.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Moving ramps to south side Crowchild Tr. much safer than crossing in winter icy conditions.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.



- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Would make sense to access southbound Crowchild Tr. from 10 Ave. or 11 Ave. S.W. If/when West Village is developed, how will they access southbound Crowchild Tr. without cutting through communities like Scarboro or backing up 14 St. S.W.

Idea we heard #16: 17 Ave. S.W. dual left turns

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - This is much better than roundabouts suggested in Idea 17.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Seems like the space from old helicopter pad is not being utilized and is otherwise not useful (i.e. wouldn't put park there!)
 - This idea looks simpler than roundabout solutions. What's the downside? I like this solution better than roundabouts, I think it's cheaper too.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Seems like the roundabouts would be safer than this option for pedestrians. Already the 17 Ave. S.W. and Richmond Rd. lights are a bit scary for pedestrians. Cars turning left on 17 Ave. S.W. from Richmond Rd. are so eager to get through the light that they ignore the walk sign and pedestrians crossing on the west side of the intersection.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Inexpensive and east to implement. Not confusing.
 - Looks good to me.
 - Would improve clogged intersections with little change.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Why cross out turn ramp onto Crowchild Tr.? See the 2 lights causing more mobility issues as proposed.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Reduces pedestrian access to Crowchild Tr. Waste of useable helipad space. Simple and common obstructions would cause congestion.
 - Need to ensure the right turn at Richmond Rd. and 17 Ave. S.W. is retained if a dual left gets implemented. Currently not addressed.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Easy to implement. Improves traffic, very minor impacts.



- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Would need to ensure a dual lane left from Richmond Rd. to 17 Ave. S.W. doesn't make the people who simply want to turn right on 17 Ave. S.W. have to wait. Would also need a right turning lane for quick access to northbound Crowchild Tr. from Richmond Rd.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

Idea we heard #17: **17 Ave. S.W. roundabouts**

Based on what this idea could look like, how well does it meet each key principle?

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Utilizes the helicopter pad (wasted space) and moves traffic away from communities. Seems safer for pedestrians.
 - Great idea to improve traffic flow. Helicopter area currently not being used constructively.
 - Traffic flow would be simplified. What's the impact to pedestrians?
 - Great idea, 2 roundabouts.
 - I like the 1 roundabout better, thank you.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Expensive and potentially confusing (relative to idea 16). Doesn't address southbound Crowchild Tr. to 17 Ave. S.W.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Westbound 17 Ave S.W. to northbound 22 St. S.W. is a very tight turn if current turning lane is taken over by pedestrians/bikes. Turn from 17 Ave. S.W. needs to make sure that it does not inhibit westbound 17 Ave. S.W. through lane.
 - Traffic circles seems to have a better visual impact versus traffic lights with dual lanes.
 - Keeps 17 Ave. S.W. flowing in both directions, but 2 roundabouts seem excessive. 1 roundabout seems better.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - I would never find my way home!!
 - No more small roundabouts without traffic lights. They create backups at heavy use times.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Currently 17 Ave. S.W. does not have decent access over bridge for pedestrians/bikes (especially eastbound). Both scenarios alleviate this issue.
 - I really like this idea to improve flow much better than Idea 16 which just makes for more dangerous intersections. This is safer.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Good idea. Not sure Calgary drivers will use the circle properly, may not improve flow.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Prefer roundabouts to slow traffic over Idea 16.
 - I cannot see anything but backups resulting from the use of roundabouts during rush hours at these locations (Idea 16 better).

General Comments

- I love all of these benefits (of no-build scenario)! ☺ Let's seriously consider a no build scenario.





Comment Form Summary

Concept identification

Do you have any additional feedback relating to the ideas for possible changes for each of the following sections of the study area?

1. **Entire Study Area**
 - Good ideas presented. Hopefully implemented in a timely manner.
 - Idea 6 with scenario #1, then tunnel from University Dr. to Memorial Dr., then upgrade interchange with idea 13 and widen Bow River Bridge with idea 15.
 - Do we have an interim plan to accommodate traffic in communities?
2. **North Section** (24 Ave. N.W. to University Dr.)
 - Blocking travel across Crowchild Tr. at 24 Ave. N.W. is not reasonable, especially for University students.
 - Traffic needs to flow better east/west at the University.
 - 24 Ave. N.W. overpass with no large loops, just lights.
 - Interchange ideas here could work, especially if McMahon Stadium is relocated.
3. **Central Section** (University Dr. to Memorial Dr.)
 - Flow needs to be better – tunnel idea is good.
 - I really feel this section should be tunnelled, that way traffic bottlenecks are resolved while maintaining community interaction.
 - This is the area where the most property owners risk to see Crowchild Tr. move to their backyard, or worse, at elevated heights. Can the city be upfront with citizens and make a plan for financial compensation for the \$100/200K property value loss?
 - I understand the need to improve infrastructure and traffic flow but it would be awesome not to lose my home (I live along 24 St. N.W.) or have it severely impacted by more noise and visual obstruction.
 - No easy way to build interchanges without affecting property. The 72/73 bus routes operate here, real improvements should include transit improvements.
4. **South Section** (Memorial Dr. to 17 Ave. S.W.)
 - Bridge over Bow River needs more lanes and better flow.
 - Bus route 20 crosses here. Fixing the lack of through lanes is important, do that first!



About the session

1. How satisfied are you with today's session?

	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
Clarity of information provided	x5	x1	x0	x0	x0
Project team's response to my questions	x5	x0	x0	x0	x1
Opportunity to provide my input	x4	x2	x0	x0	x0
Opportunity to hear other' input	x4	x0	x1	x0	x1
Session location	x2	x4	x0	x0	x0
Session time	x4	x2	x0	x0	x0

2. What worked for you about the session format and activities today? Is there anything we could do differently to make it better?

- Good flow, easy to understand. Lots of people to answer questions.
- I liked that there were multiple plans for dealing with Crowchild Tr. in separate sections, but there was no 'package plan' to really see the big picture. Would have also enjoyed plans that included transit in some way (i.e. LRT route involved or transit route).
- Self-guided format works well.
- No problem, but Sunalta School is a pain to get to!

3. Which community do you live in?

- Arbour Lake – x1
- Airdrie – x2
- West Hillhurst – x2
- Hounsfeld Heights – x1

4. What are the main reasons you use Crowchild Trail?

- To commute to and from work or school – x4
- To visit recreation facilities, shopping centres, or to visit friends and family – x5
- I don't use Crowchild Tr. – x0
- Other – x0

5. How have you participated in the Crowchild Trail Study to date?

- Online survey – x2
- Online discussion – x1
- In person session – x1
- Idea board – x1
- Walking tour – x1
- Bus tour – x0
- I have not participated in the study prior to this session – x2
- Other – x0



6. **How did you hear about this session?**

- Letter / Notice in the mail – x2
- Community association – x0
- Community newsletter – x0
- Community road signs – x2
- Project email – x1
- Social media (Facebook / Twitter) – x1
- On TV – Report to Calgarians – x0
- Word of mouth – x2
- Signs along Crowchild Tr. (e.g. message boards, pedestrian banners) – x3
- Other
 - Ward 2 News / Google search – x1
 - University of Calgary has posters everywhere and because my major is urban studies, my professors talked about it – x1
 - Calgary.ca – x1