



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

Project overview

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

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

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

Engagement overview

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

- Phase 1 – Public and Stakeholder Engagement (February – December, 2016)
- Phase 2 – Targeted Stakeholder Engagement (January – March, 2017)
- Phase 3 – Draft Recommendation Plan Report Back (April – May, 2017)

Phase 1 of the engagement program included the following activities.

- Community Association (CA) Executive Meetings
- Commercial Property Owner Meetings
- Public Open Houses
- Engage Portal Page

What we asked

Community Association (CA) Executive Meetings

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

- Discovery Ridge;
- Glamorgan;



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

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

The Project team met with the Glamorgan CA on February 18, 2016, and attended a Ward 6 Presidents' meeting on February 24, 2016. The Project team also hosted a CA executive meeting on November 1, 2016, inviting representatives from all of the above communities. The purpose of these meetings was to introduce the Project and provide CAs with a Project update, obtain feedback on draft designs and identify issues and concerns prior to the public open houses.

At The City's meeting with Glamorgan CA on February 18, 2016, the Project team distributed the conceptual interchange plan from the 2008 Sarcee Trail Corridor Study and provided a Project overview. The Glamorgan CA asked questions regarding the 2008 plan, and expressed concerns regarding access to shopping centres, mobility for seniors and issues with community traffic.

At the February 24, 2016, Ward 6 Presidents' meeting, members of the Project team distributed the conceptual interchange plan from the 2008 Sarcee Trail Corridor Study and provided an overview of the project. CA executives asked whether the intersection of Richmond Road and 50 Street SW was in the Project scope.

The City provided further information regarding the Project, Project timelines, plans for the public open houses and proposed interchange concepts at its meeting with CA executives on November 1, 2016, which included representation from the Glamorgan and Springbank Hill CAs. The Project team asked CA executives for input regarding:

- Issues and concerns related to the proposed concepts;
- Clarity of information to be presented at public open houses, as well as whether there was any additional information that should be presented; and
- Evaluation criteria for the proposed concepts.

Questions included whether the Project scope included intersections at surrounding shopping centres, including Westhills Way, timing of the Project relative to SWCRR, impacts of approved developments in the area including a new apartment tower and daycare, Project funding, traffic impacts to surrounding roadways and intersections, pathway connectivity and community access. From the feedback at this meeting, The City confirmed that analyses of existing traffic conditions at the four-way stops at 51 Street / 39 Avenue S.W. and 50 Street / 40 Avenue S.W. intersections (location on either side of Richmond Road S.W.) would be conducted as part of the study.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

Commercial Property Owner Meetings

The City met with the major commercial property managers from surrounding business areas during the weeks of November 14 and 21, 2016. The purpose of these meetings was to provide these stakeholders with an overview of the Project, and obtain their feedback regarding potential impacts to the properties surrounding the intersection of Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road. The Project team presented information regarding the Project and proposed concepts, and asked commercial property managers for general input and questions. The property managers were also requested to share information about the upcoming engagement opportunities with their tenants and individual businesses within their respective shopping centres. Primary feedback at these meetings related to ease of access and potential property impacts.

Public Open House and Engage Portal

The City hosted two public open houses on November 21 and 26, 2016, at the Glamorgan Community Centre and Glamorgan School, respectively. Roughly 171 stakeholders attended the public open house on November 21, 2016, while roughly 126 stakeholders attended the session on November 26, 2016. The purpose of these sessions was to provide members of the public with an opportunity to learn about the Project, have questions answered by Project team members, and obtain their feedback regarding the Project.

In addition to providing information regarding the Project and proposed interchange concepts at the public open houses, The City provided stakeholders with the following opportunities for input:

- **Evaluation Criteria Prioritization:** The Project team provided stakeholders with an overview of the criteria the Project team would be using to evaluate the proposed interchange concepts and select a recommended design, and informed stakeholders which of those criteria were open for public input. Stakeholders were then asked to select their top three priorities from the criteria open for public input.
- **Comment Wall:** Participants were provided with post-it notes, and asked to stick any additional comments, questions or concerns to a poster board.

Along with the public open houses, The City created a Project page on its Engage Portal. This page included similar information and engagement activities to what was available at the public open houses, and complemented the information found on the Project webpage. The Project Engage Portal page was open from November 21 to December 10, 2016. The City collected 113 responses during this period.

Similar feedback opportunities to those at the public open houses were available on the Project Engage Portal site. Participants were able to rank the full list of evaluation criteria open for public input based on priority, and were able to provide general comments on each of the proposed concepts.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

What we heard

In general, stakeholders were in favour of the need for the Project. Stakeholders were interested in learning more about the proposed concepts, as well as how the proposed concepts related to the various evaluation criteria. Stakeholders were also very interested in learning more about how the Project related to the SWCRR, as well as other projects related to the SWCRR.

The top three themes that emerged from the comments provided by stakeholders provided at both the public open houses and on the Project Engage Portal were:

- vehicle accommodation;
- community access; and
- business access.

In addition, stakeholders expressed the following key concerns:

- Stakeholders wanted to ensure that the final recommended design did not hinder the flow of traffic on Sarcee Trail or Richmond Road.
- Residents of the surrounding communities expressed interest in maintaining access to their communities while reducing demand on community roads, especially along Sierra Morena Boulevard and through Glamorgan.
- Residents of Glamorgan were concerned with access, given the upcoming permanent closure of the 45 Street S.W. exit off of Glenmore Trail, which is due to the future construction of the SWCRR.
- With regard to shopping centre access, stakeholders were most concerned about improving their ability to exit the shopping centre, especially during peak times such as weekends and holidays.

For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.

For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.

Next steps

Your feedback has provided the project team with the additional information they needed to begin evaluating the proposed interchange concepts in order to select a final recommendation to bring forward to Council.

Over the coming months, the Project team will continue their evaluation process. Key steps of the engagement program will include:

- Further discussions with adjacent property owners;
- Targeted engagement with directly affected stakeholders as required;
- Follow up meeting with CA executives and commercial property owners to discuss the recommended plan;
- Public information sessions to provide details on the recommended plan; and



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Final reporting on the results of the Project engagement program.

Stakeholders are welcome to reach out to the Project team via 311 or sarceerichmond@calgary.ca at any time with comments or questions.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

Summary of Input

Open House Evaluation Criteria Prioritization

Criteria	November 21, 2016 Open House	November 26, 2016 Open House	TOTAL
Vehicle Accommodation	103	63	166
Ease of Community Access	84	59	143
Shopping / Business Access	82	45	127
Walking Accommodation	38	32	70
Noise Impact	19	33	52
Constructability / Impacts During Construction	36	15	51
Cycling Accommodation	19	14	33
Construction Cost	21	11	32
Transit	14	15	29
Accommodation for Disabled Persons	6	7	13
Visual Impact	4	4	8

Online Evaluation Criteria Prioritization

Stakeholders were asked on the Engage Portal to rate the evaluation criteria in order of first to last. The following table shows the average results of these rankings, with 1 being the highest priority.

Criteria	Priority Ranking
Vehicle Accommodation	1 (tie)
Community Access	1 (tie)
Shopping and Business Access	3



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

Criteria	Priority Ranking
Transit Accommodation	4
Walking Accommodation	5
Cost	6
Accommodation for Disabled Persons	7
Constructability	8
Cycling Accommodation	9
Traffic Noise	10
Visual Impact	11

Open House and Online Engagement – Key Themes

The following table provides a summary of the key themes we heard during Phase 1 of the Project engagement program. Please see the [Verbatim Comments](#) for further details.

Theme	Detailed Description
Traffic Lights	Stakeholders preferred proposed concepts that maintained or reduced the number of traffic lights along Richmond Road. Stakeholders also indicated that they would prefer designs that attempted to eliminate traffic lights.
Traffic Flow	Stakeholders were concerned by the potential for certain concepts to exacerbate existing traffic congestion on Sarcee Trail, Richmond Road and within adjacent shopping centres.
Weaving	Stakeholders preferred designs that reduced the amount of weaving for on and off ramps from Sarcee Trail.
Community Access	Glamorgan residents expressed concern regarding access to their community, especially given the impending permanent closure of 45 Street S.W., and preferred concepts that maintained more direct access to their community. Stakeholders expressed concern regarding cut through traffic, especially along 46 th Avenue S.W. and Sierra Morena Boulevard, and asked that proposed concepts address this issue. Stakeholders preferred concepts that improved east-west access along Richmond Road.
Shopping Centre Access	Stakeholders were concerned with current congestion within the Westhills and Signal Hill shopping centres, especially when trying to exit these centres, and were not in favor of reducing the number of exits from the shopping centres.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

Theme	Detailed Description
Safety	Stakeholders' concerns regarding safety focussed primarily on weaving and traffic along Sierra Morena Boulevard. Stakeholders expressed concern that increased weaving increased risk to safety, especially when combined with traffic exiting onto Sarcee Trail from Glenmore Trail. Residents of Sierra Morena were concerned that any increase in traffic along Sierra Morena Boulevard would increase an already unacceptable level of risk to residents. Stakeholders were concerned that too many traffic lights would increase congestion, and cause a safety risk due to traffic lining up on Sarcee Trail and within the shopping centres.
Cycling Accessibility	Stakeholders supported increased cycling accessibility, but preferred solutions that do not include bike lanes on roadways.
Walking Accessibility	Stakeholders questioned how the proposed concepts accommodated pedestrian access to the shopping centres on the west side of Sarcee Trail. Stakeholders wanted to encourage pedestrian access to adjacent shopping centres, but were concerned with required road crossings and impacts to pedestrian safety.
Construction Considerations	Stakeholders wanted to reduce construction timelines as well as construction impacts to surrounding communities and roadways. Stakeholders suggested completing other planned roadways such as Westhills Way in order to reduce access issues during construction.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

Verbatim Comments

CA Executive Meeting – November 1, 2016

The following notes are CA executive comments recorded by the Project Team during their meeting on November 1, 2016.

Questions during presentation

- Look at 4-way stops at 51st
 - Questions about this possible at open house
 - Consider including in Project boundary
- What about Westhills Way? → SWCRR
- Provide CAs with text to put on website re: open houses
- Municipal noise abatement standards? → Yes
- Greenway misses Optimist Park
- Pathway along berm on east side of Sarcee → Opportunity
- Transit Hub very important to the community → Opportunity
- Constraint: approval of apartment behind Boston Pizza. May affect available space, traffic, possible combined construction traffic. → Check with Planning
- Clarity around info/studies done/planned at various phases of larger process at open houses.

Priorities (evaluation criteria)

- Free flow/ease of access to community a priority
- Hybrid designs potentially confusing to drivers.
- At open houses, make map big enough to see SWCRR interchange to south.
- Consider having scenarios to show how designs would impact drivers. → Make it real for people.
- Trade-off → Concern: cost of art influencing functionality of intersection.
- Lighting may come up as a concern at open house. Prepare to speak to it.
- Constructability/length of construction a concern.

Parking Lot

- 45th st closure, how will this impact volumes on 46th/Richmond Road
- Conflicts (potential) between 69th st & Westhills Way
- Originally, Richmond/Sarcee lowered for interchange, with berm used as sound wall. Berm to be used as bike path connector.
- Bike connections for SWCRR
- What happens at Bow/Sarcee with other interchanges on Sarcee Complete.
- Ensure construction traffic/detour impacts included in detailed design phase. → especially 46th ave.
- Plans (immediate) to widening Sarcee
- Have appropriate lead time for construction notification



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Have updates to community as study progresses
- Have brief update paragraphs at each phase of process (exec. summ.)

Open House Comments

- B or C, Not A
- B or C to give Glamorgan residents better access to their community via Richmond Road
- B only Petro Canada a good station
- Ensure/encourage accessibility to and from local neighborhoods via foot/bike
- Option B only
- A or C for traffic flow
- Leave South West Ring Road closed until west Ring Road built!
- Would like to see better transit options
- Need for West Ring Road to minimize costs required for interchanges & Sarcee upgrade
- Support Concept A - efficient & cost effective
- Make it easier to escape from Westhills
- Need to have flexible options
- Impact of traffic on Bow Trail & Sarcee Trail!
- B or C not A
- Ability for residents to get out of Signal Hill (Sierra Morena) during Ring Road & Richmond construction
- Ease & safety for cycling commuting
- Re: the removal of the Glenmore/45 St access, residents of Glamorgan can only enter their community from the perimeter - BAD!
- 51 St Northbound access backs up Richmond Rd and access to Glenmore
- None of the 1/4 clovers work well
- B or none
- In favor of concept B, easier to go south
- In favour of concept A
- A or C not B
- S.W. Ring Road / Utilities are tentative
- B4 starting Richm. Rd. Interc. Open additional easy access to Glamorgan from Glenmore Trail
- Ability of Richmond Hill residents to get in/out of our community during Ring Road & Richmond/Sarcee construction
- Design must keep vehicles moving!
- Option C - keep the free flow right turn NB on Sarcee to Rich Rd
- B #1 Bow Trail overpass
- B is the best
- Avoid costly buy-out of Petro-Can station



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Major issue is egress from shopping centres without clogging Richmond Rd flow.
- Access from 69th St SW to Westhills major concern with traffic
- It might cost more, but plan B
- Option C
- Ease of moving into the traffic lanes - not having to worry about 2 difficult lanes converging in a short distance.
- B or C not A
- Serious concerns about shortcutting from Hwy 8 through the Westhills access and Significantly impacting traffic on Sierra Morena Blvd
- B or C not A
- Concept B
- Impact of road/residence East of 37 street? Richmond Rd more congestion more traffic
- Overpass on Sarcee & Bow
- Reduce commuter traffic on Sierra Morena
- Traffic flow in future community north and going down "Bow Trail" will likely be problematic
- C B looks too expensive & busy A don't like it
- Pla C concept, not A or B
- Big C Less traffic lights, Turn going north onto Richmond Road better
- Prefer A
- Needs to be parking at transit nodes. Consider Calgary Works Centre
- Choose an option that minimizes storm water to our Glenmore Reservoir
- Desire good community access but minimize 'cutting thru' opportunities
- Options B or C not A
- Rezoning: Redevelopment of adjacent commercial - more mixed use
- Current approved plan looks best
- Consider traffic impacts to Glenmore and 37th during construction
- Less lights on Richmond Rd
- Move primary cycle path to existing overpass north of intersection
- Accelerate construction, reduce time of construction
- Push hard on bike path to Hwy 22
- Don't wait for province - build Bow Trail overpass @ sametime
- Build Bow Trail overpass quickly
- Concept "C" looks best, concept "B" OK, Concept "A" is NoWay!
- No! to HOV lanes
- Option C. Concerned about congestion East of 51St on Richmond & 17 Ave
- Really? 6 stoplights to cross Sarcee!
- B or C
- Reduce traffic on Sierra Morena



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Plan "A" please as Sarcee seems to be going to 6 lanes HOV please
- B or C
- Build Bow Trail overpass
- Reduce traffic on Sierra Morena
- Too many lights to cross Sarcee Trail
- No short weaves (Basket Weaves)
- A=#1 C=#2 B=least preferred
- Minimize/eliminate stop lights
- Dark sky lighting
- Get Province to build West leg of Ring Road
- Try the KISS method
- Has planning committee evaluated exactly how glamorganites lives (in traffic) will be affected by "A", "B", or "C" option
- Add O'Pass on West side of Sarcee in option C to fix weaving issue
- Concept C
- Least lights on E-W access glenbrook - Signal Hill
- C is a good option
- Have info at future sessions on environmental impacts. What changes impacts to water etc.
- C
- Reduce traffic lights on Richmond Road between S.M. Boulevard & 45 Street
- Concept "B" best FLOW for traffic
- Less traffic lights on Richmond Rd PLEASE!
- Mitigating high speed of travel on Sarcee. -No HOV lanes - Two lanes max. (each way)
- Preventing Sarcee from becoming an alternate "Freeway" and detracting from travel on the new west ring-road.
- Safety, Safety, Safety
- Concept A looks the simplest and cleanest. Less Lights. Thanks
- Absolutely no bikes on roads. Agree baiké path separated by a boulevard a distance away from roadway
- Block access to community areas
- "Short Cuts" on my street. 46 Ave.
- Make Westhills Way functional now by connecting it with Hy 8 immediately - even if only the Westbound lane!
- To many lighthts
- Concern about weaving sections both North & South at Richmond Rd
- Any plan for emergency vehicle center lanes? Police, Fire, Ambulance
- Pedestrian and cyclist safety
- Less trafic lights is the best solution!



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Pedestrian Safety
- need to divert more traffic merge south to the new road west of shopping center
- Traffic Flow + Safety #1 Priority!!
- Consider ramping up priority on HOV lanes
- Concept C looks best! Thanks :)
- Connect Westhills way to Highway 8 early to alleviate traffic at Interchanges during construction
- Concept C is less confusing to drivers unfamiliar with area
- Concerned that Signal Hill Shopping access would be reduced from 3 roads now to 2 roads under option A+C. Would it cause too much congestion there?
- Minimal impact to traffic due to construction
- No Bike Lanes off road paths ONLY!!
- South exit at Safeway on to Sarcee Trail - Westhills side
- Multi-user sidewalks only please! Leave existing roads for vehicles. No more bike lanes.
- It is very important that there be actual planning. It is the history here to build up everything at once and then do building as if it is possible. Could leave wait to shut down roads until the building is going to happen?
- Walking path next to Sarcee (behind Glamis Drive) could be repaired & incorporated to join the Mattamy/Greenway path system - highly used now & need to keep it!
- "B" Easy Access to shopping centre - from all directions. Good pedestrian access.
- Concept B is better.
- Concept C - Ease of Access - Vehicle accommodation
- Concept C - Vehicle Accommodation
- Separating traffic flow for community residents (traffic light reduction) vs shopping traffic
- Community Access - Glamorgan too limited
- Transit priority through the intersection
- Reduce vehicle access to Glamorgan / Richmond Rd. Flow traffic along Sarcee
- Deter vehicles from Sierra Morena Blvd as a shortcut to 69th St
- 50 km sign on Richmond Rd around 49 St Speeding - vs a cash cow
- Deterrents to community regional areas
- Access to mall important. Noise? Transit (bus)
- Be more innovative
- Concept A preferred - less weaving. Better flow, seems safer for traffic. Please consider increasing the weaving space.
- Concept "A" simple with less lights
- Widen Sarcee 3 lanes minimum each side
- The fewer traffic lights the better!
- Get rid of lights Bow & Sarcee



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- As a pedestrian heading west along Richmond Rd to access the services in the shopping centre, I prefer Concept A because the pathway on the south side of Richmond Rd seems to have fewest land crossings. My main concern is making sure local residents (Glenbrook, Glamorgan) still have easy walking/cycling access to services. Time to shift the city's focus away from cars and towards sustainable modes of transportation!
- I am very concerned about the impact on Richmond Road westbound @ Sierra Morena Blvd. All of this points to more traffic on the circuitous route on Sierra Morena Blvd to 69 Street and ignores the common sense option of using the road allowance which would provide a straight line, higher capacity access to 69 Street. You are creating a dangerous and untenable situation for everyone on Sierra Morena Blvd.
- Less traffic lights
- K.I.S.S. too many chiefs, not enough braves. Fluidity
- Redo Crowchild Glenmore interchange
- Going through Signal Hill & Stewart Green - To Conjested

Evaluation Form Comments

- I believe the assumptions on overall model do not reflect the actual traffic patterns. The storied flow of traffic from the communities west is to move south and north on 69th and to take the least difficult road over or to Sarcee Trail and believe you will find the work calm the traffic and reduce traffic will be overwhelmed interchanges. This is based on 20 years of observations of local traffic under different conditions
- Cyclists and pedestrians routes should not handicap vehicle flow. Existing both Signal Hill and Stewart Green shopping centres is already difficult due to their poor parking and internal roads. Christmas travel inside the shopping centres is hell! Don't make it worse.
- Ensure/encourage local communities to have ease of access via walking/biking, etc. Ensure safety of pedestrian/cycling traffic.
- I love it. Just wish it would be done sooner :)
- I have concerns about being able to travel to and from my community (Richmond Hill - Sierra Morena Blvd.) during construction of the Richmond Rd/Sarcee Trail interchange alone, and if it's to be done at the same time as the Ring Road, my concerns sky rocket! Fewer lights on Richmond Road please. Choose a plan that has less weaving (safer traffic flow)
- Yes, I'm very concerned about limited access to/from my community. Already, with the 45 St/Glenmore access I always feel restricted (check out 45 St light at Richmond Road North or South). Glamorgan was never intended to be cut off by it's own residents. Whichever option is chosen - give us some flow (not more lights) to get home, or to get out of the neighbourhood. THX
- I would prefer that Sarcee remain 4 lanes and I lived behind the "wall" near 17th Ave overpass. The noise is a huge factor. An HOV is somewhat acceptable if it can be accomodated with the same sized lanes as now, without taking land away from the lineal (?) park, etc.
- I believe a roundabout design with fewer lights could salve the same problems with fewer drawbacks than the options presented.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Look beyond Sarcee and Richmond Rd. Consider impact of traffic east of 37 St. on Richmond. It is already a High Use road. Don't see this being addressed. It could become more congested with the ring road and this plan.
- The west ring road connector from HWY 8 to Stoney has a paramount affect on ALL plans!!
- The west ring road connector from Hwy 8 to Stoney must be done first before you do anything else.
- "B" or "C" NOT "A"
- Option B NOT A. Keep S. Ring Rd closed until W. Ring Rd complete will choke Sarcee.
- liked all the options presented. Would have liked someone to address the sound issues in Glamorgan specifically
- I certainly hope our Alderman fights hard for this interchange to be paid for. We have watched interchanges being build everywhere else in the City. The West side has waited long enough. We deserve good roads and traffic flow too.
- Egress from Shopping Centers an issue with all plans/proposals. Closing 45 st NB will only make congestion at Richmond Rd/Sarcee worse. Access to communtiy from SB Sarcee now further limited.
- Get province to accelerate west leg of Ring Road
- I would like to see this intersection look similar to Glenmore/Elbow. As few lights as possible with none on Sarcee. I think this was Plan B.
- Get on with it ASAP!
- The fewest number of traffic lights!
- Support concept 'A'. Concerned about protected cycle tracks enroaching onto narrow residential streets. Although I recognize the desire to have the tracks I witness in the residential areas infringe on the already narrow roadways.
- Plan B or C not A.
- Disturbing comment by Presenter: Encourage downtown traffic to use Bow Trail instead of Richmond Road to 17 Ave. Bow Trail is a parking lot now. What will be done to improve bad traffic flow - how much will it cost. West ring road should be built. Pressure the province to build it now, now in 15-20 years. Woudl save the City \$200,000,000?
- We need to know the west ring road constrction dates before committing to major expense on Richmond Road.
- Push for west ring road completion to reduce traffic for interchanges, Sarcee Road and Bow Trail. Sarcee and Bow Trail are already a parking lot with rush hour traffic and the only place for this ring road traffic to go is already congested. The west ring road needs to be built at the same time!!! Leave southwest ring road closed until west ring road built!
- Concerned about the triming with the Ring Road construction and the impact of traffic & noise in Glamorgan
- Eliminate short weaves! (basket weaves only). Focus on flow through traffic -- no stop lights.
- Nice to see in advance, although the cynic in me wonders if it's all a done-deal anyway. Good to have Councillor Pootman here, he speaks with authority and is knowledgable at a high level.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Issues with safety
- Preference is Concept A. Lack of budget/cost sharing was very disappointing.
- For all plans look at reducing lights. All plans are under estimating traffic volume from shopping mall on both sides of intersection (east & west sides). Plan A & C are preferred.
- Would like Richmond Road/Sarcee completed at the same time as ring road. Do not want bicycle lanes, prefer wider sidewalks etc for pedestrians.
- Option C is most preferable. Please get rid of bike routes that take away vehicle lanes.
- Option "C" is preferred because it restricts traffic flow the least. Too many traffic lights leads to traffic backups and then the problem is only solved for Sarcee Trail and not Richmond Road.
- I'm glad the pedestrians and cyclists are taken into account in the plans. I'm glad to see HOV lanes are considered and public transit network is presented.
- Anything more that could be done to eliminate more traffic lights and allow free-flow traffic will anymore.
- Make easy for pedestrians to walk to the commercial area. I would like to mention: access to C.O.P. is very limited. Now people has to take the City train - then another one in downtown - then a bus in Ogden (CT) to get to C.O.P. It should be one bus going to C.O.P. and other communities in the area.
- The additional density in Currie Barracks should factor in to the planning especially Sarcee Road & 33rd Ave
- Less traffic lights on Richmond Rd. Connect Westhills Way to Hwy 8 to alleviate traffic at 2 interchanges (Richmond/Sarcee and Glenmore/Sarcee) during construction.
- (1) Reduce the traffic lights on Richmond Road between Sierra Morena Blvd & 45th SW. (2) Implement/complete the connection of Westhills Way and Highway 8. Could be a full intersection with traffic lights or a partial intersection with only the West bound of highway 8.
- Leave 45 exit -> last Thursday 22 Nov it would have been the only way out due to accidents Restricted community access. Hours of operation of construction limited to 7am to 7pm NOT 24/7
- I like the options presented. My only concern is that right now we have 3 road connectors between Richmond road and the Signal Hill shopping area, but under options A and C, that would be reduced to 2 roads. I just hope that this kind of reduction will still accommodate shopping traffic
- Concept B is better.
- Make existing sidewalks wider and multiuser. Like in Denmark. Leave the roads alone for vehicle traffic. Reduce lights and increase speed limits. Idling and slow moving traffic pollutes the air. I like the Concept C plan.
- I do not think cost should be a factor - it is more important to get it right the first time.
- Westhills Shop Centre needs more access and exits. Too much traffic going on Sierra Morena.
- Concept A is better for traffic flow. Please consider widening weaving space. Also consider flow of traffic on Richmond - already congested.
- Prefer option A because it has less lights and the smallest footprint on the area. Bike lanes should be removed off the road. Have separate bike lanes.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- I liked concept C, I feel that it would provide access to communities and allow traffic to flow from the ring road
- I liked concept C, very good. I hope it is done soon.
- main concern is flow of traffic. Less lights the better.
- Essential to get this interchange done in time to SW Ring Road opening. Needs to deter drivers from doing what they do today using Sierra Morena Blvd as a shortcut. Needs to ensure Westhills businesses thrive DURING and AFTER construction.
- Concept A sounds like my pick
- Concept "A" - partial cloverleaf makes most sense. Questions: has any consideration been given to the downstream impact of East bound Richmond Road from Sarcee to Crowchild Trail?
- Concerned for continued pedestrian access to MRU from north Lakeview. Traffic flow from south will congest Bow Trail (which is at capacity). Need to keep traffic away from communities (eg. Glamorgan along Richmond Road). May need to improve Glenmore to Crowchild north access.
- Concerned about increased volume onto Sarcee and hence Bow Tr and Sarcee interchange
- I have concern about the increase of traffic along Sarcee trail. As Sarcee is expanded, it becomes more appealing to use it instead of the ring road. It's important to make sure that main roads can handle the proposed increase in traffic, or else there will be a huge increase in traffic long sub-streets leading downtown. Ideally any plan would mitigate traffic on these sub-streets. This intersection will shape movement patterns in the area for decades. So it's really important to ensure that justice is done for sustainable modes of transportation

Online Comments

Concept A

- Can't seem to gain access from Sarcee to 50th St without having to take Richmond Rd to the shopping centre then turning around to go east bound on Richmond to get to 50th. Not effective to residents that live in that area.
- Concerned that large turning radii on slip lanes encourage motorists to take the corner at too high a speed, causing safety hazards for pedestrians and cyclists. What is the access plan for the gas station shown in the west loop?
- This appears to be the best design of all three options. Will be the quickest for drivers to understand and the quickest to be built.
- A is best - less impact on the east berm, trees, etc. Yes, coming N on Sarcee and then trying to go east on Richmond will be more of a pain, and people will probably start to cut through on 45th, but the other two will really impact those who live directly east of the corridor. I'd vote A - less fuss.
- Weaving sections look too short which may back up traffic on the major roadways during rush hour traffic.
- Definitely my favorite concept hands down.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Concept A is my choice it is the best design for our Castleglen area. Design B and C the access roads to Sarcee/Richmond will abut to closely to the condo property line 23 Glamis Dr SW as there are several new roads on diagram B & C.
- Appears to be the most free flowing of the 3 concepts presented as well as being the most cost efficient. This would be my choice of all those presented.
- I like the idea of reducing the number of extra roads built outside of the construction already planned.
- Of the three options, I prefer Concept A because it should be the lowest-cost option and will improve the direct link from Richmond Road east of the interchange to Richmond Road west of the interchange, which will be preferable for people who live in the communities to the immediate west of the mall. One further improvement would be the elimination of the traffic light/signal on the east end of the interchange. Having traffic signals every 200 metres along this stretch is an absurd proposition. As we all know, the City of Calgary is inept at coordinating traffic signals to keep traffic flowing, so the proposition to have 5 signals within 1 km will just bog down straight-line traffic on Richmond Road hopelessly.
- I believe Concept "A" this is the cleanest concept and possibly the most cost effective. Wonder if somehow a traffic circle could be implemented to cut down on the number of traffic lights?
- Possible solution- more strengths than weaknesses How is pedestrian traffic to and from Westhills Shopping Mall accommodated-bridge?
- Of the 3 offered I prefer concept A
- This is the best design. It minimizes weave zones between interchanges.
- Access to and from both Signal Hill Centre and Westhills Centre are currently very poorly designed. Any time there is an increase in traffic (weekend or holiday shopping, accident in the area) traffic is almost at a standstill. Concern is that removing one exit from Signal Hill Centre will make this even worse.
- The number of traffic lights exiting Richmond Hill community is excessive. Please find a way to reduce the number.
- Good concept. Elimination of basket weave a good idea.
- You didn't say why you are wanting to correct your earlier error. I will assume that you have projected data which shows a substantial increase in north/south traffic in this area. It appears you are only removing the traffic lights. to reduce a traffic flow hindrance. Perhaps you assume east west traffic will remain relatively unchanged. I don't see provision for future traffic increases. your north entry from Glenmore creates a weave area which mixes traffic at 2 different speeds. its like deerfoot and 64th - except there will be more traffic here. Probably more dangerous here
- do not like the access to east bound richmond road from north bound sarcee, seems convoluted.
- Doesn't improve access.
- Terrible - the line ups along Sarcee to head east/west will be worse than at 37 St & Glenmore - puts drivers at risk.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Of the three concepts presented this one seems to be the best one so far. One suggestion would be to keep the access in/out in the NE corner of the Signal Hill Shopping Centre. That way there is an additional access out of the shopping area onto Sarcee Trail, thereby reducing traffic congestion in that area. Also it wouldn't be a major adjustment to this plan, as most of the infrastructure is already there, and therefore may even reduce the time/costs of implementation for that segment.
- This is my 2nd choice. The requirement to stop at a traffic light when exiting Sarcee Road North to Richmond Road as well as Richmond Road West to Sarcee Road I believe will cause unnecessary congestion. While this does provide less access in or out of Signal Hill, a driver would only have to travel one additional light to gain access and still has two places to exit onto Richmond Road from the community. Currently when I go to Signal Hill I typically travel the second light (as compared to exiting at the Petro Canada Station) due to congestion and short travel span to get into the right hand lane. If this concept was accepted there may have to be given some thought as to how to deal with the additional traffic going into and out of Signal Hill at the other two lights.
- All your options are half measures at best. You should be looking at a hybrid solution. For north/south through lanes (2 lanes each direction) elevate (bridge) over east/west lanes. For east/west through lanes as well as left turning lanes these go into a roundabout underneath elevated north/south roadway. Right turning lanes remain exactly like they are now or can be modified to use roundabout. This hybrid solution removes *all* signals, has free flow traffic on Sarcee, doesn't take up any additional land, provides excellent traffic movement east/west, cost would be similar to your option but gives much better traffic flow. There are numerous option for pedestrian and cycle traffic as well. Just don't let whomever designed the existing interchange design the new one.
- I like this the best of the three. Good community and pedestrian access and fewest lights for traffic. Also appears to be lowest cost which is also a huge consideration.
- Seems less 'messy'.
- The partial cloverleaf seems the simplest. This design appears to allow through traffic on Sarcee to continue North and South without major interruptions such as weaves or short lanes at lights which could back traffic up onto Sarcee during heavy volume. I would imagine that this design would be the most cost effective since the roadways appear the most similar to how they are today.
- The best alternative, BUT find a concept without traffic lights. The idiots who designed the interchange at 17th avenue and Sarcee Trail made the roadway MUCH, MUCH worse: more traffic lights, more congestion, more accidents.... Lots of money wasted! A simple underpass where Sarcee Trail runs under Richmond Road with simple on and off ramps with merge lanes is best.
- As a resident in the Signal Hill community, I have had no issue with the weaving areas when driving and consider access to the Westhills Shopping Centre as adequate in its current traffic form. On the other hand, this proposal will reduce access out of the busy Signal Hill Shopping Centre that may create traffic jam in the area during peak hours and on weekends. This would be my first choice.

Concept B

- Looks unsafe. Too many lights without adequate spacing



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Least favourite option. The weaving area on Richmond west of Sarcee needs to be addressed with any changes in the area. Also the complexity of the road network south of Richmond both NB and SB is, well complex. A more streamlined flow of traffic would be appreciated.
- This one is ridiculous. Too much construction required which will add to the time to build and the amount of concrete required.
- This Concept B is overly complicated and will likely be the highest cost alternative. As with many complex routes and interchanges in Calgary, signage will be poor and will result in distress for drivers and will unnecessarily bog down the flow of traffic. The wintertime clearing of the roads in this option will add excessive maintenance costs.
- Too complicated and too many lanes on Richmond Road. How is pedestrian traffic accommodated to and from Westhills?
- While I don't like the additional 12 stop lights on the overpass, I do think it is important to retain or improve access to and from the shopping centres, which is currently poor during heavy traffic periods. This is my preferred concept of the 3 provided.
- Shopping Centre Access is and should be a high priority - as well as direct / typical routing from Sarcee to area communities. Best choice.
- Please consider connecting Westhills Way to Highway 8 immediately. Could be a full intersection or even a connection to West bound lanes of Highway 8 - the current volume of traffic on Richmond Road is unacceptable.
- Questionable improvement over split diamond that exists now. Basket weaves add to driver confusion at what will be a system level interchange to the south. Not a great concept.
- Well I told my wife that you guys have the 4 years of university specialization, far too much data and projections to analyze so it seems silly for me to even comment. You guys are the experts. You don't tell us why you are even looking at the potential project; you just ask how would we action it. How can I choose an alternative if I have no idea of how it fits into something? Then my wife wisely observed that you bright guys designed the existing intersection. Based on that, this alternative is a no go. Too complicated. All you do is remove a traffic light and maybe anticipate more shopping traffic. Is this shopping centre a people draw?
- Don't like the extra traffic light/intersection added. all the off ramps look confusing to use missing a ramp could send you on a long detour especially in heavy traffic.
- Option B to my liking has too many traffic lights and road/ramps to cross. I understand all transportation modes have to wait at the light, but for pedestrians it impacts the mode choice the most. It already takes longer to walk over to where ever one needs to go, add 4 traffic lights plus additional lanes to cross, and I fear in every day life when one has to decide what mode of transportation to use trips are more often going to be by car as time is limited for all of us. Make cars wait a little longer, and they will come anyway. As a resident of Glenbrook I'm not that concerned about the flow of traffic on Sarcee.
- 4 sets of lights replacing one set of lights, does not improve access or flow into and out of the Westhill shopping area.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Good access and minimal risk to vehicle drivers. However, it does not allow for easy east/west flow, There are too many lights on the bridge deck. This is the issue with Elbow & Glenmore - no synchronization of lights and minimal cars can travel through particularly at peak times. Should have built the cloverleaf years ago and this would be a non-issue. Good community access
- avoids weaving but too many lights close to each other
- The big issue in that area is not access into the shopping area, but rather access out. This concept doesn't relieve the existing congestion issues in that area by either reducing the number of lights getting from the shopping area onto Sarcee Trail north, or the distance between lights. I'm not in favour of this concept.
- This is my least favourite concept. Currently entering and leaving this area is very congested. Of the three concepts this one has an extra set of lights which I believe will only increase congestion as there will be the addition of RR traffic in the area.
- This looks congested and will likely slow traffic even more
- The weaves at Glenmore Trail over the causeway have been difficult for many drivers as the slowest driver sets the pace. This option deletes this issue. It keeps the traffic patterns the same as current. None of the options will greatly assist the flow on Richmond Road - not enough land to get rid of the traffic lights on Richmond Rd. Overall good plan.
- I think that the diamond concept is the best interchange option for this area. Especially for entry into and exit from the shopping area, this design will minimize the speed of traffic entering a very congested area.
- Oops. Concept A would not be my first choice as I incorrectly put in my submission. This Concept B is my preferred choice as it retains the current traffic pattern which residents are already familiar with. including parents who have to drive their kids to the Battalion Elementary School. More lanes on Richmond Roads are a good thing and there is road space available to do that.
- I like this based on the strength of eliminating the weaving on Sarcee south of Richmond. This is a big issue at Southland through Anderson on Deerfoot and I think this option best deals with that and result in the best traffic flow on the higher speed of the two main routes (Sarcee).

Concept C

- Of the 3 options this is my top choice as I hope it takes traffic noise further away from Glamis Drive area.
- I like that this concept uses up less space and possibly has a lower cost.
- Concept C is the best choice I think. I live in Glendale and use Sarcee and Richmond on a regular basis. I like the access to the communities this way and the normal/direct exits. I like that there is one less light!!! This concept is the most logical and common sense one even if it may cost more.
- It looks like more drive lanes are created allowing for more vehicles to pass through Sarcee, possibly at higher speeds, at the same time. This leads me to believe this would increase the traffic noise so this is the least desirable option in my opinion. I live in the area and traffic noise is already an issue.



Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

- Concern is the NB traffic coming together to access Richmond road. Looks like a tight weaving section for motorists to change lanes. Would there be a way to move the bridge deck that's south of Richmond road even further south to increase this weaving lane. Otherwise, this is my favourite design.
- I like this one. Easy access to the surrounding communities from Sarcee.
- This Concept C creates a situation in which the northbound traffic from Sarcee Trail turning west onto Richmond Road during heavy traffic times each day will potentially create long lines of traffic waiting for the signal to change. Like Concept A, this one will require the elimination of the PetroCanada gas station on the NW corner of the existing interchange. Traffic exiting the mall on Richmond Road eastbound to Sarcee Trail southbound will have to tolerate that tight loop that recent Calgary interchanges have become infamous for.
- Possible solution- few weaknesses Again, how is pedestrian traffic accommodated to and from Westhills?
- Access in and out of shopping centres is currently poor during high traffic times. This is not my preferred concept because of the reduced access out of Signal Hill centre.
- Not as good as parclo option.
- As an outsider to your discipline I favour this alternative of the 3. not seeing your weave southbound between Richmond road (and what?) seems to separate traffic flowing at different speeds. Seems safe and simple. Simple is good. No provision for future traffic growth or transit. Seems to focus on anticipated now consequences of the ring road. why are you even thinking of changing the intersection? Nobody seems to know.
- best concept of the 3, has less on/off/weave ramps, than concept b less confusing. less traffic lights. does away with loop from concept a to access richmond road form north bound sarcee.
- Thanks. I'll just drive through Signal Hill residential areas to avoid 5 sets of lights, and this traffic mess to get out of the shopping area.
- Better than A&B - less lights on the bridge deck, far safer for drivers and ease of access to adjacent communities. Minimal impact for access and traffic flow. With the loss of 45 St - this intersection become a key road way. No reason that we can't have a similar design to 17 Ave - less confusing for drivers and much safer for everyone. DO NOT CHEAP OUT ON CONSTRUCTION!!!!!!! Do it once and do it right!!!!!!!
- avoids short weaving distances going northbound. Good community access. Only 2 lights
- This is a good plan in that it reduces the number of lights coming out of the shopping area, but it could get a bit congested from the shopping area onto northbound Sarcee Trail, as it does already. I'd also suggest keeping the existing access in/out in the NE corner of the Signal Hill Shopping Centre as it provides an additional access out to help relieve congestion in that area. Also it wouldn't require additional road construction as most of it is already there, so just an additional hookup to southbound Sarcee would be required.
- Of the three concepts, this is my preferred one. I like the limited traffic lights as well as the ability to exit off of Sarcee North onto Richmond East without having to stop at a traffic light and when

Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road Interchange Functional Planning Study

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
January 2017

traveling from Richmond Road westbound to Sarcee Road South, only having one light. While this does provide less access in or out of Signal Hill, a driver would only have to travel one additional light to gain access and still has two places to exit onto Richmond Road from the community. Currently when I go to Signal Hill I typically travel the second light (as compared to exiting at the Petro Canada Station) due to congestion and short travel span to get into the right hand lane. If this concept was accepted there may have to be given some thought as to how to deal with the additional traffic going into and out of Signal Hill at the other two lights.

- Prefer concept A to this one.
- This proposal is just a half-baked partial cloverleaf.
- This would be my second choice of the three proposals (Concept A being the least preferred option) as it has less impact on the existing traffic pattern.
- i think the hybrid is the best concept of the three, however it appears that there will only be one lane brining traffic from west bound Glenmore to south bond Sarcee. That is very unrealistic, there needs to be 2 lanes if not three.
- seems like the best option. Could the greenway not go above the road rather than direct street-level crossings?