



Crowchild Trail Study

Public Open House Summary March 12, 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, Mar. 12, 2016 from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. at Queen Elizabeth School – Main Entrance Atrium (512 18 St. 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 75 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
- Lara Tierney, City of Calgary, Engagement Advisor
- Asif Kurji, City of Calgary, Transit Advisor
- Neil MacDonald, City of Calgary, Planning Advisor
- Erin Russell, Russell Public Relations, Consultant Engagement Lead
- 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
- Luke Denton, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Dave Breu, ISL Engineering and Land Services, Consultant Technical Advisor
- Dave Thatcher, Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consultant Technical Advisor
- Ryan Martinson, 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 the idea to ban left turns on Crowchild Tr. during peak hours (Idea 1) met the key principles well because it is a short term solution that could be implemented immediately. However, they also evaluated the idea to not meet the key principles well because the idea would limit access to and from Crowchild Tr.
- In the **North Section**, the ideas to implement 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 well because participants felt they could help to improve traffic flow and have low community/business impacts. The ideas to implement right-turns only at 24 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at 23 Ave. N.W. (Idea 2) and to move Crowchild Tr. west, north of University Dr. (Idea 4) were evaluated as not meeting the key principles well due to limited access to Crowchild Tr. and negative impacts to adjacent properties.
- In the **Central Section**, participants evaluated the ideas to implement an interchange at Kensington Rd. with restricted access at 5 Ave. N.W. (Idea 8), an interchange at 5 Ave. with restricted access at Kensington Rd. (Idea 9), interchanges at both Kensington Rd. and 5 Ave. N.W. (Idea 10), a tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. (Idea 11), and an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow) (Idea 13) as meeting the key principles well or somewhat well because of improved traffic flow, better access to/from and across Crowchild Tr. and low community/business impacts. Participants felt that the idea to implement right-turns only at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. (Idea 7) did not meet the key principles well because it would restrict access to and from Crowchild Tr. Participants also felt that the idea to implement an elevated roadway from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. (Idea 12) did not meet the key principles well because of large noise and visual impacts to bordering communities.
- In the **South Section**, the idea to widen the Bow River bridge for more lanes and/or continuity of lanes (Idea 15) was evaluated by participants to meet the key principles well because the idea would help to improve traffic flow. Participants evaluated the ideas to implement dual left turns (Idea 16) or roundabouts (Idea 17) on 17 Ave. S.W. as meeting the key principles well or somewhat well, but they felt that the idea for dual left turns versus roundabouts on 17 Ave. S.W. would be better for people who walk and bike.

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 to/from Crowchild Tr.:** Participants had mixed feedback about whether banned lefts during peak hours met the key principle. Some participants thought the idea could limit access to and from bordering communities.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- ✓ **Short term solution:** Participants felt that the idea to ban left turns on Crowchild Tr. during peak hours met the key principle somewhat well as it was a good short-term idea to improve traffic flow.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- x **Limits access to/from Crowchild Tr.:** Participants thought that banning left turns during peak hours on Crowchild Tr. could be implemented now to see the impacts it would have. On the other hand, some participants assessed the idea as not meeting the key principle well because it would reduce access to and from bordering communities.

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

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- ✓ **Low community/business impacts (Ideas 5 and 6):** The ideas to implement interchanges at 24 Ave. N.W. and 16 Ave. N.W. or an all-turns interchange at 16 Ave. N.W. were assessed by participants as meeting the key principle well as there would be limited impacts to bordering communities.
- x **Negative impacts to adjacent properties (Ideas 3 and 4):** Participants felt that the ideas to implement an all-turns interchange at 24 Ave. N.W. or to move Crowchild Tr. west, north of University Dr. did not meet the key principle well as there would be large impacts to Foothills Athletic Park and McMahon Stadium.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Ideas 2, 3, 5, and 6):** Implementing 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, or an all-turns interchange at 16 Ave. N.W. were all ideas that participants felt could help to reduce congestion on Crowchild Tr.
- x **Doesn't improve traffic flow (Idea 4):** Moving Crowchild Tr. west, north of University Dr. was assessed to not improve traffic flow as there would still be lights on Crowchild Tr.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- x **Limits access across Crowchild Tr. (Idea 2):** Participants evaluated the idea of implementing right-turns only at 24 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at 23 Ave. N.W. as not meeting the key principle well because east-west traffic flow would be restricted.
- x **Doesn't improve traffic flow (Idea 6):** The idea to implement an all-turns interchange at 16 Ave. N.W. was assessed by participants as not meeting the key principle well because adding lights on 16 Ave. N.W. would not help to improve traffic flow.



Ideas 07-14 for the Central Section

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- × **Increases traffic in neighbourhoods (Ideas 7 and 8):** Participants felt the ideas to implement right-turns only at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. or an interchange at Kensington Rd. with restricted access at 5 Ave. N.W. would increase shortcutting through bordering communities.
- ✓ **Low community/business impacts (Idea 11):** The idea to implement a tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. was evaluated as meeting the key principle well because it is a solution that would enhance bordering communities with few impacts.
- × **Not cost effective (Idea 11 and 13):** Participants raised concerns about the significant cost to tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. and to implement an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (free flow).
- × **Increase noise/visual impacts (Idea 12):** Participants assessed an elevated roadway from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. as not meeting the key principle well due to increase noise and the roadway would not be aesthetically pleasing.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Idea 7):** Participants evaluated the idea to implement right-turns only at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. as meeting the key principle well. They felt that the idea would help to improve traffic flow, especially if roundabouts are implemented on Memorial Dr. to maintain access to/from West Hillhurst.
- × **Not cost effective (Idea 11):** The idea to tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. was assessed by participants as not meeting the key principle well as it would be expensive to implement.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- ✓ **Improves access across Crowchild Tr. (Idea 11):** The idea to implement a tunnel from Memorial Dr. to University Dr. was assessed to meet the key principle well as it would help to improve east-west connectivity across Crowchild Tr.
- × **Reduces pedestrian/cyclist connectivity (Ideas 7 to 9):** Participants assessed 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. and an interchange at 5 Ave. N.W. with restricted access at Kensington Rd. as meeting the key principle somewhat well. They felt that restrictions in access across Crowchild Tr. could reduce connectivity for people who walk and bike.
- × **Doesn't improve traffic flow (Idea 14):** Participants felt that the idea to implement an all-turns interchange at Memorial Dr. (with roundabouts) did not meet the key principle well because roundabouts would not help to improve traffic.

Ideas 15-17 for the South Section

Key Principle 1: Maintain / enhance bordering communities

- ✓ **Enhances pedestrian/cyclist connectivity (Ideas 15 and 16):** Participants evaluated the ideas to widen the Bow River bridge for more lanes and dual left turns at 17 Ave. S.W. as meeting the key principle because the ideas provided opportunities for pedestrian and cyclist connections.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- ✓ **Improves traffic flow (Idea 15):** The idea to widen the Bow River bridge was assessed by participants as meeting the key principle well because it would help to decrease weaving and reduce the bottleneck on the bridge.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- ✓ **Enhances pedestrian/cyclist connectivity (Ideas 16 and 17):** The ideas to implement either roundabouts or dual left turns on 17 Ave. S.W. were evaluated as meeting the key principle well because of improved pedestrian and cyclist connectivity.



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...
 - Remove left turns at 5 Ave. N.W.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Remove left turns at Kensington Rd., must use Memorial Dr. to City Centre.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Eliminating the left turn at Kensington Rd. forces the need to take the flyover from Crowchild Tr. to Memorial Dr. in order to get to 24 St. N.W. area.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - There are alternatives for drivers, simple solution with quick benefits.
 - Cheap, easy and simple. I like.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Might be a good idea for now but not in the long term.
 - Short term solution only, don't like drop down gates.
 - A reasonable compromise.
 - Limited improvement on Crowchild Tr.
 - May help somewhat during rush hour but go further, NO LEFT TURNS ANYTIME.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - What alternative are you suggesting for left turn traffic from 5 Ave. N.W. to southbound Crowchild Tr.? What time is rush hour?
 - In the AM no access to Crowchild Tr. from westbound 24 Ave. N.W., 5 Ave. N.W. or Kensington Rd. so have to access Crowchild Tr. from Charleswood Dr. or go down 14 St. N.W. to 17 Ave. S.W – very awkward!
 - Not in favour.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Sure, give it a try to see how well it works and much impact it has.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Forces West Hillhurst access to go to 19 St. N.W. Eastbound Memorial Dr. has no left turn at 19 St. N.W., adding lights would slow Memorial Dr. especially at evening rush hour.





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...
 - Will improve traffic flow.
- 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...
 - Scenario #2 is preferable.
 - Yes, reasonable. There are or will be other routes to make these left turns unneeded.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - How will University traffic access Crowchild Tr. going north?
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Cross traffic access is eliminated forcing alternate routes and increasing hospital access distances.
 - 24 Ave. N.W. is no longer a University/Hospital access from north central Calgary.
 - Helps north/south flow but at cost of impeding access to 24 Ave. N.W., an important artery.
 - 24 Ave. N.W. is a major entry point to the University from the east. Must maintain bike and pedestrian access on both north and south sides of 24 Ave. N.W.

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...
 - NO diamond interchange. Deerfoot Tr. experiment was enough of that bad plan.
 - Scenario #2 is preferable to scenario #1 as it maintains public spaces.



- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Impact to University of Calgary recreational space in scenario #1 = bad. Scenario #2 =okay.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Foothills Athletic Park.
 - Really restricts access to McMahon Stadium parking lot for LRT parking and football games. Will load up Banff Tr.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Eliminates two sets of lights.
 - Cloverleaf is the best option everywhere, 100%.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No need to have all turns at 24 Ave. N.W. if 16 Ave. N.W. interchange is improved.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Differentiated flow across Crowchild Tr.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Don't like additional hill to climb crossing Crowchild Tr. but pedestrian and bike access very good (in scenario #2 only – must have sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides of 24 Ave. N.W.).
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

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...
 - No comments received.



- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Sterilizes huge amount of public space.
 - Splits community in two.
 - Forces construction of west end stadium and justifies use of more public dollars for new stadium.
 - NO!!!
 - Idea 5 is far better.
 - McMahon Stadium isn't going anywhere!
 - Lose too many facilities, looks expensive and wastes land.
 - Ties up valuable land unnecessarily.

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...
 - Don't need lights on Crowchild Tr., don't need to plan for McMahon Stadium development yet.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - NO!!!
 - Doesn't eliminate lights.
 - Idea 5 is far better.
 - Does not support the free flow of traffic on Crowchild Tr. due to lights at 24 Ave. N.W. and 16 Ave. N.W.
 - Makes traffic worse at a huge cost. Visual footprint of Crowchild Tr. becomes enormous.
 - The left hand curves from northbound Crowchild Tr. to southbound and vice versa are deadly. Left hand turn offs to left lane turn ons – just asking for accidents.

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...
 - NO!!!
 - Idea 5 is far better.
 - No pedestrian and bike access to University of Calgary on the north side of 24 Ave. N.W.



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...
 - Maintains University sports facilities over Idea 4.
 - Maintains accessibility and area for public spaces over Idea 4.
 - Better than Idea 4 by far. Maintains Foothills Athletic Park and wastes less land.
 - Good option to maintain traffic flow and it retains business access.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Take out the exit to University Dr. northbound and take apartment building (Suncourt Place) south of McMahon Stadium to expand and you have three lanes north and south.
- 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...
 - Consistent with Crowchild Tr. design over rest of corridor.
 - This improves the free flow of traffic all the way from 12 Mile Coulee Rd. to the Bow River.
 - Flow north/south should work. Try scenario #1 first before the cost of scenario #2.
 - Good flow on Crowchild Tr. with access basically on service roads.



- 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...
 - Like scenario #2 for bike and pedestrian access at 23 Ave. N.W.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Like the idea of frontage roads, don't think we need full movements at 24 Ave. N.W. Like the flyover at 23 Ave. N.W.
 - Prefer scenario #2 to scenario #1. Creating unidirectional turns results in extra travel for people trying to get places.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Light on 16 Ave. N.W. NO!!!
 - Must maintain bike and pedestrian access on north side of 24 Ave. N.W. for University of Calgary access.

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

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Scenario #2 is a far more elegant solution for traffic and bordering space and had the least community impact.
- 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...
 - Seems doable and should improve north/south flow and east/west okay.
 - Improves flow of traffic, will solve lots of problems.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Would like to see University Dr., Crowchild Tr., and 16 Ave. N.W. all worked into one free flowing interchange with no lights.



- 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...
 - Like the move of the access to University Dr. to the right side of northbound Crowchild Tr.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Scenario #2 has yet another traffic light.
 - Adding more traffic lights to 16 Ave. N.W. is not a good idea. Especially if there is no synchronization of the lights for smoother 16 Ave. N.W. flow.



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...
 - Modest change to existing infrastructure.
 - Scenario #4 – Memorial Dr. is not a high speed route anyway.
 - Scenario #4 would greatly benefit 19 St. N.W. southbound to Memorial Dr. eastbound.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Don't like the idea of roundabouts on Memorial Dr.
 - Will need some traffic management on Kensington Rd.
 - Would require improvements east/west pedestrian connectivity.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Will increase short cutting and speeding (already occurring) through communities.
 - Reliance on 19 St. N.W. increase community traffic. 19 St. N.W. sub-standard grade – slippery/accident prone in the winter.
 - Requires large detours for community residents needing to travel south.
 - 19 St. N.W. already has speeding and safety issues. Should be kept "local."
 - Would limit bus service (commuter, east/west).

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Roundabouts can work very well to allow access to free flowing traffic.
 - Excellent option for quick and less expensive fix. Like roundabouts and like no right turn on 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. No light on Crowchild Tr. at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd.
 - Roundabouts are a good idea.
 - Increase flow with limited investment and impact to local communities.
 - Like scenario #4, roundabout at Memorial Dr. and 19 St. N.W.
 - Prefer scenario #2 and scenario #4 (roundabouts).
- 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...
 - There are other ways to get into these areas, 16 Ave. N.W./Memorial Dr. Don't need left turns.



- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Must maintain at grade crossing possibilities for pedestrian and bikes at 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd.
 - Roundabout on Memorial Dr., NO!
 - Having to use an overpass acts as a barrier to some pedestrians/cyclists. If Crowchild Tr. was lowered, this would not be a problem.
 - No traffic signals, roundabouts please.
 - Need all turns access at Kensington Rd. – bus route.
 - Would limit commuter and east/west bus access.

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...
 - Best option for cross connectivity and community with scenario #3.
 - Like that it does not require a big rework at Memorial Dr.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Would require traffic calming, speed enforcement and upgrades to pedestrian environment.
 - Good plan, saves homes. There is three lanes there already on Crowchild Tr. (scenario #2).
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Kensington Rd. becomes an arterial, cause bisection of community north and south.
 - Two schools fronting Kensington Rd. – safety decreases. Kensington Rd. is already a hostile pedestrian environment.
 - Conflict with intent and objectives of Main Street program for Kensington Rd.
 - Scenario #3 – what impacts are made to the park along 5 Ave. N.W. and the existing businesses?
 - Traffic in West Hillhurst needs a connection to Crowchild Tr. at 5 Ave N.W. If not there is too much traffic on Kensington Rd.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Like scenario #2, no need for left turns at 5 Ave. N.W., prefer over Idea 9 or Idea 10.
 - Scenario #3 looks best.
- 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...
 - Combines with scenario #3, transit continuity, community access and traffic is generally improved.
 - Bridge on Kensington Rd. and 5 Ave. N.W.
 - Best option of the Kensington Rd./5 Ave. N.W. solutions presented.
 - It does push more traffic to Kensington Rd. but interchange will improve access with no lights on Crowchild Tr., improved traffic flow.
 - Bridge on Kensington Rd., thumbs up.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Pedestrian and bike access must be maintained at 5 Ave. N.W. Overpass is a bad option so scenario #3, if any.
- 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...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - There are already three lanes here. Keep the lights and save homes.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - I don't think we need Kensington Rd. intersection, I came this way today but 5 Ave. N.W. would have been the same. And with a bike bridge I could still use this route.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - If interchanges are the best option, consider Crowchild Tr. dropping below 5 Ave. N.W and Kensington Rd. to reduce noise impact when compared with elevated interchange.
- 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...
 - Bridge on 5 Ave. N.W., thumbs up.
 - 5 Ave. N.W. flyover works only if there is an interchange at Kensington Rd.
 - Prefer scenario #3.
 - Best option of the Kensington Rd./5 Ave. N.W. area solutions.
 - This works! Scenario #2.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Must maintain pedestrian and bike access across Crowchild Tr. Overpasses suboptimal – scenario #3 > scenario #1 > scenario #2.
 - Kensington Rd. a better roadway for handling traffic than 5 Ave. N.W.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No comments received.

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 interchanges at both intersections. Scenario #2 is better.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Idea 8 is preferable.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - No need for two interchanges.
 - Two interchanges needed? Destroys neighbourhood park space used all day for traffic that is an issue periodically.

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Scenario #1 allows for growth, scenario #2 is too limiting.
 - Maintains interchanges and has best flow through for Crowchild Tr.
 - I like scenario #1 rather than limiting turns off 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. which is just an irritation.
 - Maintains traffic flow in the long term.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - What happens to traffic westbound from Memorial Dr.?



- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Is there a true need for two interchanges?

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Maintains traffic flow for the long term in the area.
 - East/west connectivity is crucial.
 - See #8 and #9; both bridges, yes!
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Car traffic/mobility required? What about just a pedestrian/cyclist overpass at 5 Ave. N.W.?
 - Scenario #1 is better because it maintains access on current streets. A lot of communities (Parkdale, Bowness, Montgomery) will be forced onto 25 St. and 23 St. N.W.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - More money than Idea 8 and Idea 9. 5 Ave. N.W. and Kensington Rd. are not both needed if it's done right.

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...
 - I support the tunnel idea because it integrates community and traffic flow.
 - Although we'll have working space impacts, it will result in a really elegant solution.
 - Best option for enhancing the community of all options but is it worth the cost?
 - Maintenance of east/west connectivity and reduced road noise would be a positive.
 - Please get rid of the ugly freeway through some of our best neighbourhoods altogether! This would be so wonderful!
 - Improved cross flow, reduced noise and improved surface area.
 - Building this tunnel would provide a long term solution, enhance the walkability and cycle ability of the communities. LOVE IT!
 - Great way to improve access for pedestrians/cyclists in the area. Buries much of the noise.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Seems to be an expensive way to appease the local residents.
 - Huge impact during construction, huge cost.



Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Would remove a lot of properties in one area. Cost is high but perhaps necessary.
 - Great idea to decrease impact on local traffic demand on Crowchild Tr., if it serves a large percentage of Crowchild Tr. traffic (in combination with interchanges).
 - Excellent – reduce traffic on bridge over river.
 - Improves flow for outlying communities, while not impacting local communities. Great!
 - Big Dig Boston – yeah it works.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Looks good but what cost? Too much?
 - Make sure tunnels and/or elevated roadways have plenty of room for three lanes both ways plus emergency situations (i.e. two more lanes each way).
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Hugely expensive.
 - While elegant, it will be hugely expensive and very disruptive during construction.
 - Majorly expensive and concerns regarding flooding!

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Would be great from a community perspective but the cost?
 - Will maintain cross connectivity.
 - Great idea for reducing community impacts and increasing east/west connectivity.
- 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...
 - No comments received.



- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - This would truly be an atrocious intrusion in the communities. Crowchild Tr. is a barrier now – it would be a genuine wall with this option. This is truly a bad idea.
 - Significant barrier for those crossing Crowchild Tr. Eyesore for community members in adjacent communities. Destroys quality of life for nearby homes.
 - No – Seattle has elevated roadway as well. Noisy. Not appealing.
 - Gardiner Expressway in Toronto = disaster.
 - Concern over the noise impacts with the road being so high above the ground.
 - Visual and noise impact.
 - An eyesore!
 - Noise concerns and would not be aesthetically appealing.
 - Other cities are removing their elevated freeways.
 - This would be a blight on the city.
 - Maintenance of elevated roadways is expensive and causes division with far greater impact than currently. Toronto is dismantling the Gardiner Expressway due to impacts.
 - Would eliminate property values for blocks on either side.
 - God this idea is gross. What is this, 1970?

Key Principle 2: Improve travel along the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - More cost effective and quicker to implement.
 - Custom ear plugs for everybody.
 - This improves travel along Crowchild Tr., separating bypass traffic.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - We should look at moving people, not cars. First priority, improve public transportation and sustainability.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Like additional pathway along north side of Memorial Dr. and north on Crowchild Tr.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Bow River pathway on southwest side is very constrained.
 - Elevated roads – too ugly and hard to maintain.
- 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...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Traffic volume and destination needs may not demand such an elaborate approach. What about future volume demand? Maybe not very much increase demand from today.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Maintain existing community, Idea 13 is not better, still confusing. The building of this has increased costs and increased time.

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...
 - Requires the closure of Kensington Rd. at Crowchild Tr. which is not necessarily a bad thing.
- 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...
 - Yes, free flow is better if possible, both are busy skeletal/parkway.
 - Better than Idea 14. Roundabouts are a problem on very busy roads.
 - Preferred over Idea 14.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Good. Perhaps scaled back to save costs.
- 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

- 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...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Seems unlikely that roundabouts would improve things. Idea 13 seems better than this although intuitively both seem like overkill to me.

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...
 - Too much traffic, might not flow and dangerous.
 - Roundabouts, NO!
 - Rush hour will be a cartoon.
 - Loss of park space and this is a high use park area which should remain as is. Confusing roadway – “looks like a big mess.”



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...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Be sure to look at pedestrian/cyclist path under the bridge. Can structure accommodate wide or additional pedestrian infrastructure? And look at pedestrian connections on either side of the river. Talk to Calgary River Valleys for options and workshop.
- 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...
 - Allows traffic flow.
 - Stay in chosen lane over the river and up to 16 Ave. N.W. and beyond.
 - Speed limit 60 with advisory signs would help.
 - Helps with bridge bottleneck.
 - Yes, good idea to widen bridge and add lanes.
 - The current design has almost everyone changing lanes currently. Think access from 10 Ave. S.W. should come up from the right side (heading northbound) as opposed to the left side. Allows people driving through on Crowchild Tr. from the south to have continuous flow without merging cars from both sides.
 - Prevents having to cross many lanes of traffic.
 - Essential to provide lane continuity and three lanes over bridge northbound with additional turning lane to Memorial Dr., but eliminating left lane access onto bridge.
 - Definitely need to eliminate lane reductions that create bottlenecks. Adding and/or widening will be great for flow.
 - Yes. Something is needed to improve Bow Tr. and Crowchild Tr. over the bridge.
- 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

- No comments received.



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...
 - Better cycling accommodation possibilities along Richmond Rd. and across 17 Ave. S.W.
 - Should help neighbourhood with better access, less idling and smooth flow.
- 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...
 - Yes, good idea. Likely more cost effective than traffic circles.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Like this plan but please lengthen the on ramp from 17 Ave. S.W. to northbound Crowchild Tr.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Prefer roundabouts over traffic lights. Too many lights in Calgary.

Key Principle 3: Improve mobility across the corridor

- This idea meets the key principle WELL, because...
 - Better pedestrian and bike facilities on bridge is important.
 - Like improved cycling access.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Needs something to help pedestrians crossing Richmond Rd. from overflow parking to the centre.
 - This is better than Idea 17.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Not using existing ramp from eastbound 17 Ave. S.W. onto Crowchild Tr. north would be foolish. This would back up traffic significantly on eastbound 17 Ave. S.W.



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...
 - No comments received.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - Roundabouts will make it difficult for bikes to get on and off of Richmond Rd. to the neighbourhood street just north (Summit 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...
 - Both scenarios seems to work. Do scenario #1, its cost is not much more than scenario #2.
 - My experience with roundabouts is they can work well to keep traffic free flowing (what about winter?).
 - One roundabout is preferred over two and definitely better than lights. Like minimized impact with one roundabout. Pedestrian/cycle is great.
- 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...
 - Improved pedestrian and bike facilities on bridge are great.
- This idea meets the key principle SOMEWHAT, because...
 - No comments received.
- This idea DOES NOT meet the key principle, because...
 - Roundabouts in Calgary in the winter! No!





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**
 - Better pedestrian and bike crossings, ramps not stairs.
 - I have a comment about the 3 principles: it seems to me that something important is missing. Shouldn't there be an overriding principle of increasing the sustainability of Calgary's urban development system, including transportation? If so, then public health goals, getting people out of their cars (both served by [unintelligible] and better transit) should have priority. It doesn't seem that they have been given priority in the Crowchild Tr. study. Do we know how enhanced transit would reduce congestion in the Crowchild corridor? I saw no evidence that this kind of data had informed the study. Thanks for the opportunity to give input.
2. **North Section** (24 Ave. N.W. to University Dr.)
 - Right turns only at 24 Ave. N.W., northbound traffic to the University of Calgary can use University Dr.
3. **Central Section** (University Dr. to Memorial Dr.)
 - Of all the options, I think the tunnel is best for the long term. Short term impacts would unfortunately be big.
4. **South Section** (Memorial Dr. to 17 Ave. S.W.)
 - No comments received.

About the session

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

	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
Clarity of information provided	x3	x0	x1	x0	x0
Project team's response to my questions	x4	x0	x0	x0	x0
Opportunity to provide my input	x4	x0	x0	x0	x0
Opportunity to hear other' input	x2	x1	x0	x0	x1
Session location	x4	x0	x0	x0	x0
Session time	x4	x0	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?

- Arguably there was too much detail (clarity). I can read the post-its but don't get much chance to discuss with others (others input). Be a little more aggressive in eliminating options at this stage; some of the options are very likely going to be eliminated by transportation engineers (i.e. roundabouts).
- It all works very well – well done!
- This was an excellent session with knowledgeable, friendly staff and very clear information. Kudos.



3. Which community do you live in?

- Point McKay – x1
- West Hillhurst – x1
- Sunalta – x1
- Altadore – x1

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

- To commute to and from work or school – x1
- To visit recreation facilities, shopping centres, or to visit friends and family – x3
- I don't use Crowchild Tr. – x0
- Other
 - Cross it on my bike. – x1
 - I try not to use Crowchild Tr. and can usually manage to avoid it. – x1

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

- Online survey – x1
- Online discussion – x0
- In person session – x2
- Idea board – x0
- Walking tour – x0
- 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 – x0
- Community association – x0
- Community newsletter – x0
- Community road signs – x1
- Project email – x2
- Social media (Facebook / Twitter) – x1
- On TV – Report to Calgarians – x0
- Word of mouth – x1
- Signs along Crowchild Tr. (e.g. message boards, pedestrian banners) – x1
- Other – x0