

Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study

Public Open House #1 – November 6, 2012

Comment Form Summary

Part 1: About the Project

1. What are your thoughts regarding the possible concepts for Shaganappi Trail between Crowchild Trail and Bowness Road?

Overall Support for Concepts:

- I like the concept of arterial Shaganappi south of Crowchild Trail and skeletal Shaganappi north of Crowchild. I do not know how you plan and design for the presumably heavier skeletal traffic heading south and squeezing into the arterial below Crowchild, apparently current traffic patterns show it balancing out between Crowchild going east and Shaganappi going south, but won't the expansion to skeletal north of Crowchild change that?
- The principle of the concept (to enhance n/s traffic flow) is sound.
- Like the downgrade to arterial and freeing up lands.
- Most look feasible.
- I like the general concept of reduced traffic flow.
- Interesting, needs more public input.

Overall Concerns or Non-Support of Concepts:

- This entire proposal is exactly opposite of what NW Calgary requires. We need a higher speed corridor, not a downgraded road. There is not enough room to list the faults with this proposal.
- I'm not a fan of any of the changes. Vision described to me does not make sense. 6 lane road with HOV and low density housing with many commercial points (i.e. Market Mall) does not lend itself to pedestrian and bike friendly. Varsity has that in community.
- I think concepts 1A, 1B, 1C are not an option.
- Ridiculous. I travel Shaganappi every day during rush hour. The only time traffic gets really backed up is due to an accident which would happen on any road.
- Why do we keep building too small just to have to rebuild a few years later?
- Too many hours of thought have resulted in a proposed situation which will function less well than the existing. The bicycle religion will not solve any problems that exist on Shaganappi Trail. HOV lanes though eminently fashionable, are not going to make much difference to anyone who lives around here except to be a nuisance.
- Alderman Hodges was at the community meeting years ago where we gave Market Mall the land for the interchanges at 32 Ave now the City has downgraded Shaganappi to arterial (really has anyone driving the road think it is not at minimum a skeletal road?) and no interchange will be put in at 32 and 40 and Varsity Drive. Please reconsider, look at the success on Crowchild with overpasses from 24 out to 12 Mile Coulee. It works please follow a model that works!
- Interchanges at 32 Ave. and 40 Ave. would seem to be overkill unless future traffic projections would justify them. The most effective type of interchange if needed would be N/S flyovers with ground level roundabouts below to manage turning movements. Pedestrian underpasses would achieve proper grade separation and allow for all pedestrian movement in safety.
- Improvements to Crowchild Trail happening at the same time as improvements to this section of Shaganappi Trail is the only way, in my opinion that Shaganappi to could/should remain an arterial road. Without Crowchild improvements I don't see how any of the options could work. I travel Shaganappi northbound in the evening rush hour because Crowchild is backed up.
- Understand the need to expand the roadway for more traffic. To save space and possibly lessen the impact on the adjacent residents and for businesses consider putting in only one pathway on one side only to be used by cyclists and pedestrians, just ensure there is a marked separation on the pathway to avoid cyclist pedestrian interference.
- No point in developing overpass at hospital (Children's) until coordinated with west campus development.
- Must retain access from 40th Ave onto and off Shaganappi as the access on and off Crowchild is a disaster with 3 sets of lights and a 4-way stop. A single 2-way bike path on the west side of Shaganappi along with expansion of motor traffic lanes on the west side of Shaganappi seems the most logical solution.
- Crowchild Trail to 40th Ave – not in favour of any option that would require the purchase of homes just to widen Shaganappi. Bottleneck is Shaganappi around John Laurier Blvd. Too disruptive to have rush hour land closures that would limit access to Varsity Drive, Valiant, etc. Crowchild to 40th Ave is only 3 blocks.
- First sight of this information – will take some time to determine likely impact of the various proposed options. Hard to tell at this point to give our opinion.
- Why not concentrate on roads that need an immediate fix. Crowchild Trail and Memorial Drive interchange.

- Directional ramps to and from Shaganappi Trail with an overhead roundabout giving access to West Campus and the Children's Hospital would provide easy free flowing traffic off Shaganappi. Pedestrian crossings should be incorporated – there is a considerable amount of casual pedestrian traffic even now across Shaganappi. This might require lowering the hillcrest on ST south of 40 Avenue.
- Given the housing and businesses so close to Shaganappi Trail I think this section should stay as 4 lanes with upgrades for bike and pedestrian traffic. Then at Crowchild go into 6 lanes north to Stony Trail. If this is impossible then go with Option 4 that preserves left turns into Varsity Drive and 40th Avenue.
- I have a good view of Shaganappi Trail from Shaganappi Village to the crest of the hill at the Children's Hospital. Present traffic flow is adequate but congested at the traffic lights at Varsity Drive, 40 Ave. and 32 Ave. especially during rush hours. During off-peak hours traffic is delayed unnecessarily by inflexible traffic light timing. This needs to be changed to be more demand-responsive for a considerable short-term benefit.

Current Road Adequate Comments:

- I find the Shaganappi Trail 16 Ave – Crowchild quite adequate for my purposes. I do not drive much at busy times. Need some attention to 40th Ave Interchange.
- Ok as is. No need to spend multi-millions.

Need to Expand Existing Road Comments:

- Should bite the bullet and don't try to squeeze into the existing road.

Doesn't affect me Comments:

- Does not affect me directly in Dalhousie area.

Widen to the West Comments:

- If Shaganappi is widened, it should be to the west. Prefer widening to east rather than condensed concept.
- If they widen, the best plan seems to be on the west side.

Concept 1 Comments:

- Concept 1. I like the idea of widening the road and adding HOV lanes; I don't really care if property acquisition is required or not. Wide shoulders to accommodate stalled vehicles and emergency vehicles should be a priority.
- We like concept C1.
- Concept 1 or 4.

Concept 3 Comments:

- Concept 3 (widen west side only) – probably the best of a poor lot of choices. I am not sure this needs to be done!
- Of the several concepts presented, #3 seemed to present the best series of solutions for traffic congestion in this area.
- I preferred concept 3 – widening Shaganappi on due west side appears to disrupt fewer residences an empty lot in on the corner by Varsity on the west side no commercial businesses would be affected.
- Concept 3 is the least disruptive to residents and businesses. Leave lanes wide and no confusing lane reversal.
- Of the several concepts presented, #3 seemed to present the best series of solutions for traffic congestion in this area.

Concept 4 Comments:

- Most progressive approach is Concept 4.
- Concept 4 seems the best if the 6 lane expansion is unavoidable.
- Concept 4 & 5. Why not put sidewalk and bikes on other side of sound wall? Like Concept 4 best.
- Concept 4.
- Like smaller than standard road width because impacts less property and is less of an interruption between adjacent residential areas (disconnect, prefer no/limited impact at properties). Concept #4 preferred.
- Concept 4: one way roads do not meet 6.0m minimum fire access requirements.
- Agree with downgrade of Shaganappi Trail from skeletal to arterial road. Concept 4 for Crowchild to 40th Ave. Agree with new intersection across Shaganappi Trail near West Campus. Pedestrian overpass should be added to avoid pedestrian triggering light on Shaganappi Trail.
- Concept #4 would greatly reduce value/desirability of properties losing 4 m of their front yards. Better to expand on east side alone or west side alone and properly compensate home owners.

Concept 5 Comments:

- Option 5 good re: no intrusion on housing but then would go from 6 lanes to 5 lanes that are narrower! Safety!
- Concept 5: with no left hand turn to Varsity and 40th will only lead to frustrations and people trying to bypass. Too many rules and restrictions at certain times leads to accidents from confusion.
- Not concept 5. Plans must consider residents who have to cross Shaganappi Trail and increased time six lanes will take.
- Crowchild Trail to 40th Ave. Concept 5 (reversible lane) – absolutely NO!
- Concept #5 with reversible lanes and no left turns would be a disaster!

- I prefer option 5. Traffic is not very heavy 24/7. Don't like not being able to turn left off Shaganappi in rush hour. Hard for pedestrians to cross Shaganappi at Varsity Drive right now!
- Concept 5 with reversible lanes provides capacity and ability to incorporate sufficient pedestrian and cycling routes separated from traffic. Appears to have lower maintenance costs.
- Concept 5 means increased traffic through residential areas (no left turns/traffic to mall and other directions in awkward).
- Concept 5: no left turns at rush hour not acceptable.
- No to option 5, the shortcutting through the neighbourhood would be horrendous.

Varsity Drive Comments:

- Turn restrictions onto Varsity Drive would have serious effects on Varsity Acres Presbyterian Church congregation life with folks drawn from all over SW Calgary and many coming from west of Shaganappi Drive. Any suggestion of increased traffic on 53rd Street south of Crowchild would be a disaster. Crowchild square high rise developments are too much in themselves. Any weather condition makes traffic through the parkway/golf course valley most difficult now and just can't handle increased flows.

Lane Reversal Comments:

- I think lane reversal is a no go! We are all getting too old in this area to cope with lane reversal.
- Not fan of reversible lane.
- I think I like Concept 5 reversible centre lane as it saves houses and doesn't affect businesses. Reservation is if it's a long-term solution. I do not want to increase traffic especially bus traffic on 32 Avenue as it will affect the flow of traffic and there is nowhere to build pullouts for buses.
- Reversible lane is the best – cheapest, least impact on residents, traffic only backs up in one direction at any given time, still allows for bike lane, doesn't decrease property values.
- Ok with 6 lanes south of 32 Ave would prefer reversing lane option between 40th and Crowchild. Don't see a need for a flyover that serves only HOV.

Roundabout Comments:

- No roundabouts.
- Very complicated – let's not have roundabouts; HOV lane – not sure how many people will carpool; 2 lanes. Do not like 3 lanes. Feel that bike and walking pathways good and needed. Merges at Bowness Road can be smoother than present. People will not go to 10th Ave – too many traffic lights. Keep as is!

Bowness Road Comments:

- Improving the Bowness Road interchange should help mitigate known short-cutting issues in Montgomery (Home Road and 48th Street). The Gibbard report, prepared at the time of Market Mall expansion invoked this. Traffic calming with Montgomery should be considered as part of a 'regional' solution.
- Road itself is fine. Certain spots are problems (i.e. Bowness Road, 16 Ave).
- Will Bowness Road be able to handle increased traffic flow? Ensure pedestrian, bicycle access down through 16 ave interchange to Edworthy.
- Need to review options for 16 Ave/Bowness Road/Shaganappi interchange. None of presented ones resolve the problems. Already have sidewalks and pathways to get from 40th Ave to Nose Hill Park and Dalhousie or Northland Mall. Remove redundancy and provide more space for vehicle movement and commercial access.

Multi-mode Transportation Comments:

- Current work needs to solve multi-mode Varsity Drive intersection problems. These proposals for Crowchild to 40th section are interesting but major expropriation not justified cost. Unused poor quality PED overpass at Valient needs to be discussed. Enhanced bus connectivity to Market Mall deserves better than additional bus stops on R.O.W of Shaganappi Trail.
- HOV flyover where Shaganappi Trail crosses Crowchild is a great idea.
- A bike path can be tremendous for many people to go to work downtown. This requires a proper bike lane where only bikers are allowed (no pedestrians). Commuter bikers need efficient and safe bike lanes. There bike path/lane that are shared with pedestrians are not efficient as bikers cannot ride as fast as they would like. If because of space only one lane is possible, please make it the downhill one.
- Specific area for my concern is accessing the Foothills campus of the U of C from Varsity Village: I'm in agreement to have a pathway on the east side of Shaganappi from 32 Ave to Bowness Road, but due to the high number of health care providers and students commuting via bike it should be separated from the walkway and allows for efficient bike travel to the two hospitals, U of C Campus at FMC. It should easily connect to West Campus Drive in order to access Foothills Medical Centre.
- Not a fan of reversing lanes or flyover at Crowchild. There are a large number of children crossing at Varsity Drive in both directions. Plans need to incorporate pedestrian crossing times. Do not see a need to speed-up traffic but recognize the need to have a long-term strategy.
- Frankly the concept of having bicycles and pedestrians on Shaganappi seems absurd. My thoughts are to get them away from the traffic. What's next Deerfoot? The HOV lane has some merit.

- I like that pedestrians/bikes are considered. In favour of HOV lanes. Absolutely need pedestrian access across Shaganappi between 32 Ave and 16th Ave! The path shows its use, albeit unsafe.
- Bike trail: great! Increased busing: great!
- Bicycle traffic in this area should be entirely separated from pedestrian and vehicular traffic – I anticipate considerably increased volumes as the university grows.
- The idea of accommodating all modes of transportation is fine, but it would appear that most downtown bound traffic goes from Shaganappi to Crowchild. Should not more effort be put on HOV lines from Shaganappi south. Does the down grade of Shaganappi make sense in light of the congestion that is then transferred to the east to Crowchild. This creates eastward traffic volumes on 16th and memorial.
- Please ensure that pedestrians and bicycle traffic is well separated from vehicles.
- Can't wait 30 years to accommodate pedestrians, need action now.
- Pedestrian overpass over Shaganappi at Children's Hospital – incorporated into West Campus Way intersection. Not in favour of concepts that eliminate left turns onto Varsity Drive at 40 Ave during peak hours.
- I think the moneys paid to include bike lanes so many roads are misplaced. Season for are too short in Calgary and there's relatively few cyclists and it's an aging world so fewer cyclists going forward.
- There should be no HOV lanes and no bicycle lanes, the motoring public paid for these roads and should have exclusive access to them. This part of the road should be widened and classified as a freeway. Speed limits should be increased to 100km/hr.
- Not so interested in the pathways providing pedestrians access along what will still be a busy street.
- I am concerned about local access across Shaganappi Trail to Market Mall, not just vehicle but especially pedestrian and cycle traffic. The present pathway system is unfriendly and inadequate (post and wire barriers, chain link fences at inappropriate places). A new system should be visible for safety, have clear crossing points and because of the width of Shaganappi Trail and the volumes of traffic I recommend pedestrian bridges at Varsity Drive (especially because of school children crossing Shaganappi Trail) and 40 Ave. as well as the existing bridge at Valiant Drive. These would not only improve pedestrian safety but substantially increase traffic flow and efficiency on Shaganappi Trail by removing pedestrian crossings from the mixture.
- There is a bus stop on southbound Shaganappi Trail at Varsity Drive. This is a perfect example of how NOT to install a bus stop. No bus bay, so traffic would be impeded (if there were ever a bus to stop there); two benches on the grass/snow; no access pathway; the regional pathway nearby (50 feet away?) is separated from the bus stop by a chain link fence. There is no sidewalk even to the pedestrian crosswalk on Varsity Drive/Shaganappi Trail. If you are serious about accommodating transit users and ensuring there is good traffic flow, you MUST do better than this at all bus stops, not just on Shaganappi Trail.
- Interchanges at 32 Ave. and 40 Ave. would seem to be overkill unless future traffic projections would justify them. The most effective type of interchange if needed would be N/S flyovers with ground level roundabouts below to manage turning movements. Pedestrian underpasses would achieve proper grade separation and allow for all pedestrian movement in safety.
- Directional ramps to and from Shaganappi Trail with an overhead roundabout giving access to West Campus and the Children's Hospital would provide easy free flowing traffic off Shaganappi. Pedestrian crossings should be incorporated – there is a considerable amount of casual pedestrian traffic even now across Shaganappi. This might require lowering the hillcrest on Shaganappi Trail south of 40 Avenue.
- Bicycle traffic in this area should be entirely separated from pedestrian and vehicular traffic – I anticipate considerably increased volumes as the university grows.
- Concept renderings are provided for Crowchild Trail and 40th Avenue (five concepts) and 40th Avenue to 16th Avenue (one concept). In all concepts, cyclists are accommodated within the pedestrian realm on 2.5 to 3.0m wide multi-use pathway ("MUP") facilities located within the boulevard ("Boulevard MUP") on each side of the roadway. While traffic speed and volume likely favor accommodation of cyclists in off-street facilities within the Shaganappi Trail corridor, we point out the following limitations, based on present experience, with accommodating cyclists in a Boulevard MUP environment:
 - *Intersections* - All pathway travelers are treated as pedestrians, compromising bicycle travel efficiency by requiring cyclists to dismount to cross intersections. Likewise formal means for cyclists to diverge from the pathway onto intersecting roadways are lacking.
 - *Speed Restrictions* - Boulevard MUPs restrict travel speeds to 10 to 20km/h, significantly below typical cyclist travel speeds of 20 to 30km/h, and up to 50km/h on downhill's, described in the 2008 Bicycle Policy and Needs Report.
 - *Cyclist Pedestrian Interaction* - Cyclists often desire efficient origin to destination travel over long distances, an expectation that may differ substantially from a pedestrian's, who may desire a leisurely experience, free from faster moving vehicles, in a local area.

- *Snow and Ice Control (“SNIC”)* - SNIC varies depending on whether it is a municipal, residential or commercial responsibility. Unreliable SNIC means cyclists may not accept the Boulevard MUP as functional infrastructure on a year-round basis.
- *Obstacles and Encroachments* - Obstacles (i.e. utility boxes, power poles, light standards and even bus stops) and encroachments (sound walls, vegetation, etc.) compromise safe travel and limit visibility, thus raising the potential for collisions.

Consistent with feedback we provided for the 2011 Interim Complete Streets Guide, we are concerned that Boulevard MUPs, using current standards, detract from the priority of cycling as a transportation choice and will limit the attractiveness of this corridor to a large part of Calgary’s cycling community. We are particularly concerned that four of five concept renderings, for Crowchild Trail to 40th Avenue, make no explicit mention of cyclists being accommodated whatsoever in the description of the concept design, leading us to worry that minimal serious consideration is being given to accommodating bicycle travel at a high level within the Shaganappi Trail corridor.

We would like to see our concern about the level accommodation for bicycle travel addressed and, as such, recommend that the City consider incorporating robust cycling-specific facilities as an integral component of the Shaganappi Trail corridor. In this regard, we make the following suggestions:

- Cycling facilities are developed in accordance with the basic needs of cyclists set out in the 2008 Bicycle Policy and Needs Report as well as with consideration to other policy reports and accepted best practices. Specifically, that cyclist travel speed requirements, as well as the necessity for safe and efficient movement, are considered.
- Cycling facilities and degree of separation are tailored to conditions, i.e. available right-of-way, traffic volume and travel speed. Some ideas for discussion include:
 - Cycle Tracks - on-street accommodations with physical separation, where corridor space is severely constrained.
 - Segregated Paths - off-street accommodation within dedicated space in a shared facility (e.g. Riverwalk), where corridor space is moderately constrained.
 - Dedicated Paths - off-street accommodations within a physically separate bicycle-specific pathway, where corridor space is not constrained.
- Cycling facilities accommodate bicycle travel at all points along the corridor, including intersections, specifically:
 - Non-signalized minor crossings, i.e. alleys and such, clearly indicate cross-traffic yields to cyclists (appropriate signage, pavement markings, conflict paint, etc.).
 - Signalized major crossings have direct (as possible) cycle facility routing with formalized cycle crossings (i.e. crossbikes) and bike-specific signalization.
- Cycling facilities provide easy and logical connections between communities along the corridor and adjacent amenities and services.
- Formal means to travel between cycling facilities and intersecting roadways, via curb cuts, pavement markings, signage, etc., are investigated.
- Snow and Ice Control becomes a municipal responsibility, at a level befitting the status of the corridor as Primary Cycling Route within the Primary Cycling Network.

Adjacent Homeowners/Residents Comments:

- Within Crowchild to 40 ave, I am a homeowner on and we are definitely not interested in ever being forced into selling to the City, so concept 3 would be the worst candidate. Concept 5 would be my first choice, followed by concept 2, followed by concept 4.
- None of the options work for us. Either way our house continues to be devalued and we cannot get a fair market value even now because of these plans, so when you take the house we still will not get a fair market value.
- I don’t really want a new lane on Shaganappi closer to me. I suffer from asthma, COPD and am allergic to dust so not looking forward to construction out my front door.
- My thoughts are focused on my own well-being. I have lived on adjacent to Shaganappi Trail since 1985, it is my home, my whole life. I think I cannot support any part of the Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study.
- They all have adverse effects on current residents.
- Personally concepts 4 and 5 would significantly impact our access to our residence.
- As to the entire study, I can appreciate that options by the city must be considered due to increased traffic flow due to the expansion of NW residential areas but I found the whole process so far to be lacking in detail and poorly publicized for such a major undertaking. And that a study completion is to be made by May 2013 with only 2 open houses is beyond my comprehension. Information I picked up at the open house showed the first part of the process involved “stakeholders” (July 24, October 16) could you please clarify who the “stakeholders” are?

Market Mall Comments:

- Entry and exit to Market Mall from Shaganappi Trail needs to be improved so as to reduce stacking for north-bound left turns from eastbound 40 Ave. Demand responsive traffic light phasing would help.
- I am concerned about local access across Shaganappi Trail to Market Mall, not just vehicle but especially pedestrian and cycle traffic. The present pathway system is unfriendly and inadequate (post and wire barriers, chain link fences at inappropriate places). A new system should be visible for safety, have clear crossing points and because of the width of Shaganappi Trail and the volumes of traffic I recommend pedestrian bridges at Varsity Drive (especially because of school children crossing Shaganappi Trail) and 40 Ave. as well as the existing bridge at Valiant Drive. These would not only improve pedestrian safety but substantially increase traffic flow and efficiency on Shaganappi Trail by removing pedestrian crossings from the mixture.

Shaganappi/Crowchild Trail Interchange and Flyover Comments:

- One of the most important factors to consider is the Crowchild Trail, Shaganappi Drive interchange. None of the new improvements will work without redesigning this very poorly designed intersection.
- I like the idea of a flyover not requiring a stop at traffic lights on NB and SB Shaganappi at Crowchild and future overpasses. Don't limit flyovers to HOV only.
- The interchange at Crowchild and 14th needs to be totally bulldozed and a 4-leaf clover style freeway type interchange. There is enough space to do this and it works well (think Glenmore and Blackfoot SE). The existing proposal of a flyover falls short of the main issue with this POS intersection; anyone who wants to make a left turn off either Crowchild or Shaganappi must make it through three sets of lights. It is absolutely ludicrous.

Speed Limit Comments:

- I do not support changes that would reduce the speed limit on Shaganappi Trail. It is important to note that cyclists do not use Shaganappi Trail for NB and SB travel in the area, nor are they likely to do so without substantial incentives. I do not support changes that would limit my ability to turn off Shaganappi into Varsity.

Voyageur Road/Drive Comments:

- When widening the road I hope they take more consideration of Voyager Road and the houses that are there.
- I hope that when widening the road between Crowchild Trail and Varsity that they go with making the lanes narrower and having one-way traffic on Voyager.
- Very concerned about residences on Voyageur Drive. This whole study will reduce their perceived property values and ability to sell. Please note I do not live on Voyageur but do emphasize with what is happening.

Edworthy Park Comments:

- Don't kill road access to Edworthy Park and Drive. Don't go below standards for MUPs (3.0m) safety. Keep the road as arterial to connect communities. Make main feed off Crowchild and possibly 16 Ave (not aware of current loading here). Discourage add use of Bowness Road, at least not to serve north of Crowchild.
- Could intelligent lights account for flow and change to keep flow smooth solve some of these issues without major work?
- Changes are definitely needed. Most intersections have lots of room for clover leaves. If they are not to be constructed then some of the proposed ones are good.

2. What are your thoughts regarding the possible concepts for the interchange at Shaganappi Trail and 16 Avenue?**Option 1 Comments:**

- Concept 1C bike paths overlapping so much road does not make the situation friendly for bikes or cars. Not much housing around area proposing paths. However for roads I like it. Traffic circles are best to move people. New intersection for West Campus should be traffic circle.
- 1 A is ok. Don't like use of parkland by river in IB and IC. 2A and 2B concept – too complicated.
- Concept 1C looks like it would provide the most cost effective solution.
- Any change would be an improvement. Concept 1C in my view would afford best option for traffic movement.
- Don't like Concept 1A, 1B or 1C. I want to be able to exit onto Bowness Road from 16th Ave going west.
- I think concepts 1A, 1B, 1C are not a feasible plan.
- Do not think the intersection nodes (blue dots) are a good idea for Concepts 1A and 1B.
- Concept 1C appears to be the best option (why is there no exit northbound on Shaganappi onto 16Ave, as it exists today?).
- Merging ramps onto 16th need to be longer, the way they have been makes it very unsafe during rush-hour to merge. Concept 1C is good for vehicle traffic, but none of the concepts are well designed for bike paths. I suggest making the bike path along West Campus Drive and then connect it from the Foothills Medical Centre via Parkdale to Memorial.
- Concept 1C gets my vote though there are surely ways to increase permeability to pedestrian and cycling traffic (i.e. tunnels under ramps and roads; like 14st NW/SW on Bow River path, very effective).
- Concept 1C seems to provide best access Shaganappi to Edworthy Park. I absolutely hate the concepts that forces a right in/right out of Edworthy Park.

- Concept 1A seems the safest way to go although I realize it doesn't solve all the problems. As it uses existing roads it will be the most economical as well. Roundabouts and circles are confusing and lead to high accident rates.
- Concept 1C but utilize existing roads for south side of 16th Ave (access roads like 1B). Concept 1A ok but concerned about two lights/traffic circles in short distance on Shaganappi trail.

Option 2 Comments:

- Only two options provide for WB 16 Ave to EB Bowness Road at the interchange. This will increase traffic on 29st (by hospital) or around the block in Montgomery. Options 2A and 2B seem like overkill for an arterial road.
- 2A – Loud sup Parkdale Blvd with Root from park. 2B – probably too complex for Calgary Drivers. 1C looks best option and allows residential development good for Shaganappi onto 16th east and 16th west onto Shaganappi.
- 2A and 2B would be much more expensive and would not result in reduced travel time in any direction.
- Concepts 2A, 2B, 2C are basically better if the roundabouts work for heavy traffic.
- Concepts 2A and 2B look too complicated and probably cost a lot of money.
- Concept 2A.
- Favourite concepts is #2A because: maintains flow (no lights), efficiently uses land, maintains direct/convenient access/routes for pedestrians and cyclists and transit from multiple directions. Enables potential redevelopment to pay for improvements and fill in the spatial void and disconnect between communities.
- The problem with #2A is the right turn only in/out at Edworthy Park. A lot of traffic exits the park to go north on Shaganappi or west on Bowness Road. This movement is not accommodated by #2A and will result in U-turns at the traffic lights immediately east of this intersection. These movements could be accommodated by demand-actuated traffic lights or another roundabout at this tee intersection (not recommended). A modification to the design is essential at this location to accommodate all turning movements.
- The ideas on panel B are the best; the one I vote for is 2B.
- Of the concepts offered #2A is the optimum and probably has the cleanest traffic flows due to the intelligent use of the double roundabouts. However MUCH MORE CAREFUL DESIGN IS REQUIRED than has so far been applied to the roundabouts in use in Calgary and on Highway 8/22 so far. Simple solution: hire an experienced, skilled British traffic engineer where roundabouts have been in use since the 1930s at least.
- The problem with #2A is the right turn only in/out at Edworthy Park. A lot of traffic exits the park to go north on Shaganappi or west on Bowness Road. This movement is not accommodated by #2A and will result in U-turns at the traffic lights immediately east of this intersection. These movements could be accommodated by demand-actuated traffic lights or another roundabout at this tee intersection (not recommended). A modification to the design is essential at this location to accommodate all turning movements.
- 2C below, discussing concept #2A relative to Edworthy Park access road and parking – on further thought, my concerns can be overcome by extending the southern roundabout southwards into an oval shape, and by adding access roads to/from the park at the NW end of the parking lot into the SW 'side' of the roundabout (which doesn't have to be circular – extend the sides so as to provide proper weaving distances).

Comments About any Improvement Being Good:

- This area definitely needs some upgrading – merging to Shaganappi onto eastbound 16th is dangerous so any improvement will be welcome.
- Any improvement would be better than existing
- Something needs to be done at that interchange, I agree. Concepts look ok.
- I think anything would probably help this area!
- Good.

Don't Like/Confused/Don't Know Comments:

- A is better than B, but still confusing.
- No opinion.
- Difficult interchange to work with. Several options all viable but can be confusing.
- Difficult intersection to work with.
- Boards showing concepts aren't clear (confusing people around us) who believe lanes are being added only to one side of the existing corridor per concept. Unnecessary/large waste of land here that disconnects adjacent communities. Like idea of improving multi-modal connections. Not sure, sounds complicated.
- Go back and revise plans. Nothing presented are optimal. Consider all routes. Note many arriving off of Hwy 1 through 16 Ave will not be familiar with setup so need clear signs and room to manoeuvre.
- They all look like spaghetti junctions. I truly wonder if any of them make much of an improvement over current situation. Possibly Concept 1C with its 2 loops at 16th Ave could help. The traffic circle at Bowness Road (foot of Shaganappi) creates a very awkward entrance to Edworthy Park and Point Mackay when proceeding westbound on Bowness.
- Need more information. No one really answered my questions.
- I am angry about this proposal, it has taken me one week to respond.

- Again let's not spend or plan to spend multi-millions. Typically and notoriously these things develop cost over-runs.
- Aside from travel to Northhills Hospital, don't use it around interchange, only as a flow-thru N/S.
- Criteria should be – 1. Provide justifiable functionality, 2. Cost, 3. Use reduced speed for vehicles if optimizes #1&2, 4. Minimize land aerial use our major roadway interchanges take up too much acreage! Options provided on poster board don't seem exhaustive. Are we thinking out of the box? None of these feel like best design.
- Interchange at Shaganappi Trail and 16 Avenue. I agree this is a traffic restriction point at times of heavy use and something should be considered in this area. Land is available for changes with no disruption to the community. I cannot comment on the proposals given. There are 5 different concepts, all with pros and cons given. Without more detail I find it difficult to believe anyone could make an educated evaluation of this. One open house and brief details on the web do not provide enough information.

Roundabout Comments:

- I would prefer no roundabouts.
- No roundabouts.
- Not sure about the roundabouts either.
- I like the option of roundabouts.
- Traffic circles work well, we need more.
- It would be appropriate. Two traffic circles close together will confuse many drivers especially at first, signing these will be a challenge.
- All these concepts seem complicated but 2A seems to be the easiest to negotiate. I hate roundabouts 1 and there are 2 there.
- Use 1A – don't want roundabouts.
- Do not like the idea of a 6 lane roadway having roundabouts. Lots of options are too complex for drivers. Keep it as simple as possible for drivers! HOV lanes are another complication and need serious consideration. Again HOV north of Crowchild is ok but not south!
- Like 2A but need better access to Park not just one way in and one way out. Roundabouts rock!
- People in Calgary do not know how to drive roundabouts or traffic circles. Edmonton has taken them all out. I wonder if there is not something else that can be done.
- Please do not install a traffic circle.
- Like the idea of traffic circles as they keep traffic moving effectively. Concept 2A all the way.
- Long overdue. Circles (roundabouts) don't move traffic well. Would like better access back to Shaganappi North from Edworthy Park
- Like Concept 2A because of the roundabouts and pedestrian access and (hopefully) less cost. But must fix access from park to Shaganappi north.
- The roundabout or traffic circle (Concepts 1C, 2A and 2b) will make the engineers feel good and give a couple of people promotions but they will produce an operational disaster.
- Roundabouts in high traffic areas can be dangerous. Concept 1A would be our preferred designed change.
- Of the concepts offered #2A is the optimum and probably has the cleanest traffic flows due to the intelligent use of the double roundabouts. However much more careful design is required than has so far been applied to the roundabouts in use in Calgary and on Highway 8/22 so far. Simple solution: hire an experienced, skilled British traffic engineer where roundabouts have been in use since the 1930s at least.
- Access and egress from Edworthy Park must be in both directions. 16 ave interchange concept 2A with connection to traffic circle from Edworthy Parking seems efficient, but difficult connection from southbound Shaganappi to east bound 16th. So greater traffic Bowness Road. Please include proposed pathway at white pedestrian path from Shaganappi to West Campus (well-traveled).
- Confusing - Concept A is better than Concept B. Too many roundabouts on Concept B.
- Roundabouts are great!
- See above. Access needs to be easy, no roundabouts. Access to Edworthy Park – very cumbersome. If I go west, how do I turn around?
- Traffic volume currently would make roundabouts a poor solution. If there are additional residential developments in the future roundabouts are not feasible. If they are put in now, then in another few years they will likely be pulled out and huge waste of tax payer money.
- I personally like the free flow of traffic circle options.

Cyclist Comments:

- Please make it efficient and safe for bikers. Looks like there would be enough space for a dedicated bike lane that would avoid the intersection all together, connecting to the river pathway and memorial.
- I.e. don't send cyclists that want to go downtown west towards Cochrane. A cycle pathway on only one side of road may make interchange simpler.

- There is a very high bicycle traffic volume at Edworthy and cyclists must be properly accommodated and separated from pedestrians in this area (and up Shaganappi Trail too). I anticipate a demand to go up to West Campus from the riverfront as well as to the Varsity area. Dedicated separated bicycle paths are essential in this area. Informal footpaths on west campus land and at ST under 16 Avenue show there is a need for proper footpaths as well.
- Two concepts, with five variations, are provided for the 16th Avenue interchange. In regard to the variations, we identify the following concerns and mitigative options:
 - All variations show cyclist accommodation on Boulevard MUPs.
 - Ensure maximum bicycle route options.
 - Incorporate robust cycling-specific facilities, as discussed earlier.
 Significant encroachment on the regional pathway and greenway is shown.
 - Care must be taken to ensure pathway and park users are not marginalized.
 Cycling facilities west along Bowness Road merge onto the roadway.

Traffic Flow/Access/Interchange Comments:

- Better access to the Children's Hospital from both westbound Parkdale Blvd and southbound Shaganappi should be positive for Montgomery. Does the revised Shaganappi need to relocate so close to the school to the west?
- Whatever makes merging from Shaganappi onto 16th safer would be good.
- Ensure the final design has no traffic lights. Keep free flow for times of light traffic can move through easily.
- Clover Leaf!
- The south end of Shaganappi is a mess. First south bound Shaganappi doesn't go anywhere. The present 16ave intersection is terrible. It looks like it was conceived by a 2 year old. I'm not certain improving the south Shaganappi area is of any value unless you upgrade the TCH particularly from Shaganappi to Home Road.
- Need flow between Bowness Road, Shaganappi Trail, and 16 Ave NW to allow reasonable NS, EW options for car, transit routing. I.e. all direction options included.
- Many challenges with 16ave no longer having access to Bowness Road. The current bridge construction illustrates the challenge and the importance of this access. Do the flow volumes justify cutting access off from Bowness Road. It would not appear to be the case. The other concern is the Point Drive lights. Any circles/intersections that do not account for making those lights flow with traffic could create snarls. With bridge construction we are seeing people cut through residential streets to access Bowness Road, the streets are not designed for that type of constant flow.
- Must consider impact to Montgomery residential traffic. Access from 16th Ave to Bowness Road is important and shouldn't be left out, otherwise people will cut through the streets between 16th Ave and Bowness Road. 17th Ave is a residential street. Please improve Bowness Road to 16th Ave W so people do not short cut through Bowness Road to past Home Road to get back on Highway. It is very, very busy on Bowness Road in rush hour.
- This interchange/intersection cannot be considered in isolation and without also considering Bowness Road.
- Need to make this simple while maintaining all traffic flows. Concept C looks the closest.
- It seems to me that the emphasis should be to cross the river at the bottom of Shaganappi and not move more traffic along 16 Ave to Crowchild. We will end up with spaghetti north of river on Crowchild as we have on the south side of the river. I like the idea of limiting the roads freeways and putting more transportation demand management strategies. We need to put these strategies in place on this ground before we add more roads and density.
- Full interchange all directions with no lights and bridges for pedestrians and bicycles.
- My thoughts are if the possible concepts improve the flow of traffic in all directions, it will be a positive change.
- This interchange/intersection cannot be considered in isolation and without also considering Bowness Road.

3. Please share any other comments you may have about the Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study.

Preferred Concepts Comments:

- Concept 5 – it is imperative that 40Ave and Varsity Drive can exist both ways at all times. Appreciate the work and planning that has been done.
- I like the idea of an access onto Shaganappi from the Children's Hospital.
- Prefer concept 5 – reversible centre line – no left turn access to Varsity and 40th. Crowchild to 40th Ave. Also 40th ave to 16th ave like ideas of keeping non-community commuters out of 40th ave as thoroughfare.
- Only 2A on the 16th ave exchange accounts for the importance of 16th to Bowness Road without having to cut through residential streets. Continued access from Bowness Road to and from 16th ave should be a permanent importance for this project

West Campus Comments:

- Comment about west campus intersection, parking and new parking controls have been added to north Montgomery since ACH was built. While a safe connection over is probably good for our community residents should be provided strong support to alleviate non-resident parking issues when an intersection goes in.
- Need to have a better idea of the West Campus development and potential public transit needs. More bus service, trans, etc.

Roundabout Comments:

- No roundabouts.
- I have great concerns over all the traffic circles being proposed.

Pedestrians/Cyclists/Transit/HOV Comments:

- Please add pedestrian pathway to complete section between Foothill Hospital and Children's Hospital. It's marked on the maps but does not exist. For about 200m south of 24th Ave on West Campus Boulevard.
- Pedestrian and bike regional maps very good! Don't lose this info in all future presentations. Helps keep focus on transportation priority triangle!! Traffic volume progression between Crowchild and River seem in error 16k vs. 23k etc. so need side road numbers to convince it makes sense.
- I have noticed the high number of commuters jay-walk Shaganappi from Montgomery to the Children's Hospital – the majority of who are either healthcare providers or U of C students. I really hope that the building of a safe bike path starts in the next year and not in 10-30 years, in order to prevent injuries and fatalities. The building of the Alberta Children's Hospital and major expansion of the Foothills Medical Centre should really have been also considered into building safe and reasonable bike transportation routes for Calgarians, so I would really like to advocate for this to be a priority. Thank you very much!
- Ensure pedestrian access is kept from Dalhousie into Nosehill Park across the Shaganappi and John Laurie Interchange.
- Bicycle routes should be more fully examined. Bow River path provides a great cycling link to the downtown core, how can we increase cyclist access to this great transport feature?
- Any plan should maintain a balance of transportation needs and community access by non-motorized needs. Varsity is well-served by transit no increase in transit services in necessary.
- Please consider crossovers for pedestrians. The possible West Campus intersection would help.
- I think bike lanes taking up driving lanes is very unfair to auto traffic. If they want to ride bikes in winter let them go to California to ride.
- Don't like bike lanes taking away driving lane. Do most bike riders pay taxes? Some bike lanes are absolutely dangerous – wonder who designed them.
- Please use some common sense. Fix the TCH. Fix the Shaganappi 16ave intersection. Get the bikes and pedestrians off of Shaganappi.
- Pedestrian bridge to Northland Mall.
- Ensure pedestrian bicycle access.
- Stop putting in HOV and bicycle lanes everywhere and immediately eliminate the existing ones. Fire everyone involved in this effort. Raise speed limits on Shaganappi Trail to 100km/hr.
- Bike lanes need to be totally away from traffic and HOV lanes.
- Intersection of Shaganappi and Varsity Drive. This intersection is so dangerous. I drive it just about every day. Pedestrians run for their lives. Drivers turn without regard to right of way. I have seen a lot of near accidents and there have been accidents. If this becomes a 6 lanes high speed zone, the number of accidents would increase. Possible solution would be a pedestrian bridge or arrow on traffic lights on Varsity turning to Shaganappi.
- Bicycle lanes are a more current problem and danger. The 40th Ave/37th Street terrible example when westbound on 40th from Crowchild. New further example is the lane changes and restrictions along the length of Northland Village on Northland Drive. A nightmare from Crowchild to Shaganappi and vice versa.
- Crowchild Trail is by far more of priority that is difficult to access changes proposed here against things that need fixing there. HOV seems like overkill and does not encourage a more pedestrian and bike friendly topography also not very conducive to concept.
- There needs to be coordination between transportation initiatives on Shaganappi and Crowchild. I am not in favour of turning Crowchild into the freeway. If we keep accommodating the car- people will never get out of them and explore using other modes.
- Accommodating increased HOV traffic on Shaganappi implies increased feeder traffic. I would prefer to see more buses routed through West Campus and off 32nd Avenue to reduce noise levels in Varsity.
- No direct bus connects N/S along Shaganappi/should be direct transit connections including to Children's Hospital and along Shaganappi. No direct pathways along Shaganappi; limited along John Laurie; difference between recreational pathways and transportation/community/etc. paths. Missing future pedestrian bridge on existing pathway network map (Shaganappi. Bell N. to Northland). Disconnected walk along Shaganappi (SB Shaganappi. South of Crowchild through NW). Like pedestrian and bike facilities along the entire Shaganappi Trail. Dislike large roads which specifically disconnect communities. Roundabouts are great. We need more! Please don't wait 30 years to provide pedestrian/bike/transit connections along Shaganappi!
- Provide a cycling route up Shaganappi to Nosehill Park. Separate from traffic and wind up the hill. Cycling on Shaganappi north of John Laurie is frightening!

- Review transit routes to take advantage of them. Shaganappi should not be part of primary cycling network. Home road should be since it already has bike lanes.
- We recognize that the City of Calgary divides the Shaganappi Trail Corridor and HOV Study into two parts, consistent with the 2009 Calgary Transportation Plan (“2009 CTP”):
 - 1 Bowness Road to Crowchild Trail - Classified as an Arterial Street. Cycling is accommodated from a “variable” to a “high” standard.
 - 2 Crowchild Trail to Stoney Trail - Classified as a Skeletal Road. Cycling accommodations are either not required or “poor performance” is acceptable.

We also note that the corridor is a Primary Cycling Route within the Primary Cycling Network, “a network of on-street cycling facilities, pathways and cycle tracks that connects major destinations such as activity centres mixed-use corridors and major institutions” (2009 CTP).

Opportunity: Communities adjacent to the Shaganappi Trail corridor show a high propensity for cycling (2000 Commuter Cyclist Survey, Exhibit 2; 2006 Calgary Downtown Commuter Cyclist Survey, Figure 2; 2011 Civic Census, pg 123-132) with an existing high demand for direct and efficient cycling access between these communities and the Bow River pathway (2000 Commuter Cyclists Survey, Exhibit 6).

Accommodation of cyclists to a high standard along the Shaganappi Trail corridor offers the potential to capitalize on the existing cycling demand as well grow cycling mode-share by:

- Improving bicycle access between northwest communities and the Bow River pathway
- Facilitating inter-community bicycle travel along the corridor
- Improving bicycle access to amenities and services within and near the corridor
- Providing bicycle access between communities and Nose Hill Park

Potential also exists to tie cycling facilities along the Shaganappi Trail corridor in with the future Calgary Perimeter Greenway.

We believe that designation of the corridor as a Primary Cycling Route warrants the inclusion of cycling facilities within the HOV Implementation Study, as the roadway configuration will have a direct impact on future cycling facilities within the corridor. This position is in alignment with CTP 2009 policy stating that “cycling facilities should also be enhanced as redevelopment of corridors along the Primary Cycling Network occurs”. In addition to the benefits of connecting communities to one another, to amenities and services and to Nose Hill Park, considering cycling facilities at this stage allows for:

- Innovative designs that provide direct and efficient cycle travel, over or under interchange motor-vehicle ramps, through the use of bridges or subways, thus minimizing the requirement for cyclists to detour around the footprint of the interchange.
- Tailoring the type of cycling facility and its degree of physical separation from the roadway directly to traffic speed and volume so that cyclist exposure to traffic noise and pollutants is minimized.

While we recognize the potential to incorporate innovative cycling facilities into an upgraded Skeletal Road between Crowchild Trail and Stoney Trail, we are concerned that cyclist and pedestrian access to Nose Hill Park may be compromised, as well as that motor vehicle facilities will encroach upon Nose Hill Park itself under the current concept rendering.

The Shaganappi Trail Corridor and HOV Study presents the City with a unique opportunity to incorporate innovative and robust cycling-specific facilities as an integral component of the transportation network in an area with numerous amenities and services, as well as an existing high cycling demand. With this in mind we summarize our comments as follows:

- Consider the limitations with the current standard for Boulevard MUPs in meeting the needs of cyclists compared to cycle tracks, bicycle-specific pathways or even painted bike lanes, where cyclists are accommodated to a high level at all points along the corridor, including intersections.
- Ensure cross-corridor cycling access to key amenities is facilitated at a high level, specifically in areas where formal crossings do not exist and a nascent demand for such travel is already evident, i.e. between Montgomery and the Alberta Children’s Hospital near Montalban Drive/Montalban Crescent.
- Ensure implementation of a high level (i.e. timely and high quality) of snow and ice control, befitting the designation of the corridor as a Primary Cycling Route.
- Include cycling facility design at the earliest stages in the Stoney Trail to Crowchild Trail HOV Implementation Study area, so that innovative concepts to facilitate cyclist mobility as a primary mode of transport can be incorporated.

We thank the City of Calgary for allowing this opportunity to provide input on the Shaganappi Trail Corridor and HOV Study. We recognize that this study is planning for many years into the future however we feel it is important that cycling facilities be given due consideration as a viable transportation mode along this Primary Cycling Route.

- We look forward to being part of the ongoing discussion and invite you to contact us in the event that you require any clarification of the information provided.
- Need bus routes all along Shaganappi! This should be the main priority.

Residential Impact Comments:

- Feel upset it has to involve tearing down houses. I think this should not be an option. The most important issues is better public transit – would alleviate a lot of congestion.
- I have many comments and would be pleased to share in a one-on-one personal interview with a representative of the project. Included in the comments would be real concerns about my quality of life if any of the options are implemented.
- Minimize existing homeowner business impact.
- I have lived here for 30 years, please do not impact existing community housing. Interchanges and redesignate Shaganappi as a skeletal road is way to go. The lane reversal is also a reasonable compromise to increase traffic flow as long as it includes interchanges at 32, 40, Varsity, Dalhousie and John Laurier.
- Varsity is not just a drive through area. Real people live here and their concerns must be addressed. Anything that focuses more on traffic onto 53rd street is a bad idea. The Crowchild Square corner with its apartment development is already destined to be a trouble spot.

Open House Comments:

- This open house is a good part of the planning process. City staff were forthright and helpful. Thank you.
- The maps could be better displayed so that a person who was looking at it could see exactly what was happening and know what he or she was going to expect.
- Would be nice to see approx. costs of the options and the probable lane frame to construct especially where builders are to be demolished.
- Without more discussions and clarification we didn't see any concept that we thought would solve the traffic concerns in Varsity area.
- How much input do the people affected have?
- Nice maps!
- Would have been much more informative if traffic numbers for reasonably anticipated densification and new developments were added. How much traffic can be accommodated for options without assuming major changes in cycling? Roundabouts with significantly more people? Not feasible.
- Thank you for holding the open houses and inviting our input. Please keep working with the Varsity Community Association. I am not convinced that Shaganappi can remain an arterial with all of the traffic on it avoiding Crowchild. Why did council decide that Shaganappi should only be an arterial?
- Boards are very difficult to understand.
- As to the entire study, I can appreciate that options by the city must be considered due to increased traffic flow due to the expansion of NW residential areas but I found the whole process so far to be lacking in detail and poorly publicized for such a major undertaking. And that a study completion is to be made by May 2013 with only 2 open houses is beyond my comprehension. Information I picked up at the open house showed the first part of the process involved "stakeholders" (July 24, October 16) could you please clarify who the "stakeholders" are?

Concerns:

- The idea of adding another "at grade" intersection at West Campus means another light and is only really compatible with the existing 4 lane roadway! Again south of Crowchild is a completely different road than north of Crowchild. The transition from 4 lanes to 6 lanes should occur at Crowchild not at 4 lane Memorial Drive/Bowness Road. A final comment would be that the high density of housing between 32nd and Crowchild on both sides (but especially on East side) of Shaganappi Tr. should be respected and a six lane roadway is quite intrusive. It is very important that many more residents are aware of what is planned. More effort to get people to participate will prevent a lot of last minute angst.
- Fire the lot and start all over. Price tag is in excess of \$100 million. Why such a design for a road that will carry fewer vehicles, put cyclists and pedestrians close to traffic and accommodate bus requirements when Calgary Transit has not needed nor used southern Shaganappi in over 25 years.
- Save money to fix Crowchild Trail from Bridge to 34 Ave, reduce need for Shaganappi. Do cyclists want to use Shaganappi as it is quite steep? Perhaps they could use McKay Road if the connectivity were improved.
- More concepts without barriers needs to be made available.
- Intersection at Children's Hospital has potential to be very dangerous due to steep grades and slight curve. Needs to be evaluated very carefully perhaps just a right-in right-out only. Need further consultation in the future.
- I don't see the need for Shaganappi being such a big deal. Use it a few times a week – late in rush hour – 9:00-9:15.
- No to reversible lane. Excuse for more short cuts through varsity.
- The new possible intersections near Children's Hospital is not in a good spot being near the top of the hill. It will impede traffic during snowy and icy weather (exp. Coming up Shaganappi going north).

- Seeing as how it will not even be started for at least 25 years I doubt very much if I would see it. An idea I have which is not proposed is a bridge connecting to Bow Trail. I know this was turned down years ago, but council has disregarded citizens wishes before so why not on this idea?
- I do not support the creation of a new interchange at West Campus Boulevard and Shaganappi Trail – there is already plenty of access from 16th Ave and 32 Ave. A new interchange would add problems, not solve them. Fewer lights are better! Just do a pedestrian overpass. No lane reversals! I'm sure they look good on papers, but they don't work in the real world. Memorial Drive is a good example of how it doesn't work. A pedestrian overpass is needed from Canadian Tire to Northland Mall. An overpass is needed at Shaganappi and John Laurie or an underpass. The green light on Shaganappi northbound at John Laurie only lasts ten seconds, so only about six cars can get through on each light. A longer green on the northbound lanes would solve the northbound traffic problems.
- Proposed interchange on John Laurie and Shaganappi shows off ramp lanes coming significantly closer to community. No specifics on whether sound barrier or how close it will come. Area is natural reserve so question on environmental impact.
- I was interested to know if the green space on the West side of Shaganappi Trail would be affected, due to the installation of a sitting garden at Valient Drive (completed) and an Entry way sign to be installed (DP pending) at Varsity Drive and Shaganappi Trail. I've been assured the latter will be possible.
- Need to eliminate (or at least minimize) the traffic exiting the west side from Market Mall through Horne Road. For the volume of traffic moving through this area is a totally ridiculous system. A well designed exit, west out of the City, via Shaganappi Trail is long overdue.
- Why are we fixing something that isn't broke? Because that's what Calgary does i.e. Northland Drive NW.
- Any new or expanded road impacts into Montgomery community?
- 3437 42 Street NW Landmark Estates III. The concept encroaches a high volume road to close to some of the end units in this existing development and provides pedestrians access in an area where no pedestrians currently walk increasing traffic behind the condo unit back decks and changing fundamentally the character of the existing development. Do not like this idea! There are currently gates in the existing fence. We have security and privacy concerns where home currently exists!
- Should include future traffic flow from West Campus and 32 ave problems of access and volume.
- The time I spend writing this is without a doubt a waste of time and effort. It may make me feel better to do it. The planners are determined to advance their careers by making it more difficult for the citizen to move in their city and we cannot change that.
- Traffic should flow more freely. Please remove the Shaganappi/Crowchild intersection lights or time (synchronize them) so you don't have to go through three red lights when making a turn or two when going straight through!
- Need to consider impact of mid Nov-Jan mall traffic at Northland and Market Mall in all simulations. Volumes are much more then. Promote existing pathways for pedestrians and bikes. Don't need as much duplication. HOV is a good concepts, how to enforce?
- I am shocked and appalled at the lack of cost control on the draft stage of this project. It is obvious whoever carried this out was not acting on behalf of the taxpayers. Calgary is a city of over a million people and growing. We need roads capable of handling traffic not downgraded roads that will cost our future generations on account of poor planning.

Part 2: About the Session

To help us prepare for future project events please take a few moments to respond to the questions below.

4. Place a checkmark (☑) in the appropriate box to indicate your level of satisfaction with your meeting experience.

	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied, but	Dissatisfied
The clarity of information provided about the study	34	22	15
The project team's response to my questions	41	24	6
My opportunity to provide my ideas/input	37	25	6
The location of the session	70	3	2
The time of the session	64	9	2

Comments:

- A lot of information for those who do not have much time!
- But: see Q1 – Q3 on other side. 16th Ave interchange options not exhaustive or explained full enough. Bus connection quality at Market Mall poor. Solution at Varsity Drive (multi-mode).
- Poster maps and detailed notes a bit overwhelming.
- Need to have more input with the community.

- My questions around how expansion of the U of C West Campus was being communicated to the community was vaguely answered. It's not clear how the City and U of C are collaborating on ensuring the most reasonable and safe bike path route. There was no clear communication on how our feedback here would be incorporated.
- All team members were diplomatic, but some did not seem receptive to comments or alternative ideas. Some people seemed to need a more detailed legend on the Shaganappi and 16th Ave maps.
- Shaganappi is a road that is key for me to access the City. It currently functions very well and I'm very concerned about changes as little consideration seems to be given to access points for residents of community into Calgary. Other points including SW, SE, Downtown, etc. and access to go to other areas are also important on weekends, etc. not just community during rush hour. Access to hospital for Foothills from Varsity may be hampered.
- Needed a lot of verbal explanation.
- Too much info. Definitions not clear. Engineer's lingo?
- Need more clarity. Pro and Con.
- Please include updates like this in the Varsity View with Alderman Hodges input.
- Studies are always value intentionally.
- No more bike lanes!
- Time frame a little short.
- Hard to picture especially 16 Ave Interchange options.
- Good help from City people.
- Earliest time frame that any road impact will happen. Would like more detailed info on expected extent of right of way on L,R of Shaganappi that will be used (/ of motors, whether residential communities will be impacted.)
- Surprised by the widening. Do not like to be surprised in this way. Would like to see more of the integration between the pan and the west University Campus plan when available.
- Very difficult to grasp in one visit/session. Wow!
- Location not well advertised. It was difficult to find where it was. Signs should have more information. Even on City page there was no map.
- Boards with concepts were unclear at times; such as, missing parts of legend or concept of where roads were confused other people.
- Nice of you to hold this meeting and tell us your ideas.
- Have information on web prior to session, allows more time to review. Many boards difficult to understand without careful review. Community signs removed before session. Team answered some questions, unsure on some.
- Without a team member to explain the drawing were not clear. Great explanation by team.
- Great time of day.
- I cannot read maps at the best of times! (my bad). However, I would have found it helpful to have someone (or audio) walk me through (i.e. explain) each of the boards. Just my learning style. Thank you for the open house.
- At 16 Ave EB at 19 Street there are 3 straight through lanes. The RH lane should be right turn only.
- Disappointed that some non-viable options were presented (even city presenters agreed that option #5 was not going to be recommended). Don't waste time.
- That was a very small window of opportunity and I had to make arrangements for another event to be moved to allow me to participate in the one short time you offered.
- The various options are relatively complex to absorb in a quiet walkthrough. Spending time on the City website was much better – same info boards but more time to analyze. Need a comment form on website so can send in feedback!
- The time was okay for me but what if you worked or had a prior commitment. Perhaps 2 times would have been better or all day.
- No cost estimate, I don't think any of those present had even walked or driven Shaganappi prior to this work. City will; like all other projects I have attended not pursue any ideas from those that replied.
- Unfortunately I was unable to attend; however, would be pleased to meet with a representative from the project.
- Hard to believe my opinion will make any difference.
- Questions could not be answered as "this was just a study". Please note general questions were answered but team could not answer detailed questions as they did not have it. With just a short session and such major proposals, I fail to see how anyone could make or suggest anything meaningful without more time to study the situation/proposals.

5. How did you hear about today's open house? (Please check all that apply)

0 Ward Aldermen or office

68 Bold signs or orange message boards

16 Community Association - newsletter

1 Letter to businesses

2 City blog, Facebook or Twitter

7 Other:

- Newsletter
- word of mouth X 3 (wife, neighbor)

- VAPC in my church, so I knew about this open house
 - Internet
 - church newsletter
- This question is very concerning to me. I heard about it from a concerned neighbor while the open house was going on. I find this shocking as I am a potentially directly affected homeowner. I asked about this at the open house and was told there were signs posted. Please note signs were not posted in all routes of access to affected areas. At no time did I receive any kind of phone call, mail notification, or direct communication when I am one of the few that could be directly affected. Does that not make me a stakeholder and warrant direct communication?

Part 3: About you

6. What interests are you representing when completing this comment form? (Please check all that apply)

18 - Property owner adjacent to Shaganappi Trail (please specify community)

- Varsity x 3
- Varsity Village x2
- Shaganappi x2
- Edgemont Estates
- Silver Springs (Varsity Village)
- Montgomery
- Varsity Acres
- Brentwood
- Property owner adjacent to both Crowchild Trail and Shaganappi Trail.

71 - Resident of the community (please specify community)

- Varsity x 36
- Montgomery x 7
- Varsity Acres x 7
- Dalhousie x 5
- Varsity Village East x 5
- Varsity Village x 3
- Varsity Estates x 3
- Brentwood
- University Heights
- Parkdale
- Edgemont Estates
- Point McKay

5 - Business owner in the community (please specify)

- Varsity
- Self-employed
- Varsity Village
- Home business license

59 - Regular driver on Shaganappi Trail

14 - Transit user

14 - Other: please specify:

- Cyclist x 4
- Cyclist wanting to go downtown
- Cyclist and pedestrian
- Commuter cyclist
- Biker
- We use both pedestrian bridges
- Pedestrian walking across Shaganappi Trail regularly.
- Community association planning director- have sat on many committees regarding this corridor in the past 10 years.
- University of Calgary – Medicine Faculty (Foothills Campus) student, and biker
- Member of Varsity Acres Presbyterian Church
- Resident and traveller in and about the Varsity/Dalhousie/Brentwood community. That is, a local, not through traveller.