
Community Workshop Report

Calgary Southwest Ring Road
Functional Planning Study

29 January 2011

Gale Simpson, Facilitator

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

A functional planning study for the Calgary Southwest Ring Road (CSWRR) began in late 2009. Alberta Transportation is leading the project and they are working in partnership with The City of Calgary in the interests of meeting the required roadway standards while minimizing the amount of land required. (See Attachment 1 for a list of project representatives who attended the Workshop.) The Province and the City are working closely with the Municipal District of Foothills and Rocky View County, keeping them updated on the project as it progresses. The study includes a public engagement program, consisting of several meetings with designated community and key stakeholder representatives, as well as a number of public open houses.

As the first step in the public engagement program, a Community Workshop was held on January 29, 2011. Invitations were sent to 40 Community Associations in Calgary's southwest quadrant asking them to nominate two people from their association to attend the Workshop and continue their representation through the next, approximately 18 months of the study. 40 people attended the Workshop, representing 27 community associations. (See a list of represented communities in Attachment 2)

In the Workshop introduction, the Facilitator explained to participants that at this early point in the study, the technical team has identified five options that could produce the necessary connection between Glenmore Trail and Highway 8 in the west, to Highway 22X in the south.

Each of the five options has been evaluated against some basic evaluation criteria and this has provided a preliminary indication of the pros and cons of each option. All five options have positive and negative aspects – none of the options is perfect. While the preliminary evaluation has provided useful information on each of the options, the technical team wanted input from Workshop participants on additional criteria that would be important to consider from a community perspective.

This report provides an outline of the purpose and objectives of the Workshop, a high level summary of the information shared in the technical presentation, and a summary of the information that was generated at the Workshop.

A review of all of the data received from the Workshop was conducted by the facilitator who has summarized the most frequently noted comments into a number of themes. The themes are not arranged in any particular order, they simply represent the items most frequently mentioned throughout the Workshop discussions. (Detailed information captured on the flipcharts from each table, by the table recorders, and from the Reflection Wall can be found on the project website: www.cswrr.info)



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

This report reflects a summary of the themes developed by the facilitator resulting from the dialogue at the **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP** for the Calgary Southwest Ring Road Project. It is based on what participants contributed, but the interpretation of that input in this summary lies solely with the facilitator.

Abiding by the Code of Ethics of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2), I have tried to reflect participant input from the conversation in a way that captures the essence of what was shared. Any mistakes or errors in this interpretation are based solely on my interpretation of that input.

*Gale Simpson
gWhiz Consulting Ltd.
Workshop Facilitator*

WORKSHOP – PURPOSE & OBJECTIVES

At the start of the Workshop, the Facilitator outlined the overall goal:

To share information about the Functional Planning Study and to gather input from participants on the work completed to date, related to issues, concerns and ideas.

Specifically the intention of the workshop was to meet the following objectives:

- Participants will have an opportunity to learn more about the planning study;
- Participants will have an opportunity to be involved in a discussion on a topic that is important to them and their communities;
- Participants will experience talking with a variety of people and hearing an array of viewpoints and opinions;
- Participants will have an opportunity to express their concerns, ideas and perspectives in a supported way.
- The project team will learn from the participants and will have significant input to consider in the next part of the study

TECHNICAL PRESENTATION (Aziz Merali)

A technical presentation of about 60 minutes provided participants with details on the following:

- What is a functional planning study and why is one being done for the CSWRR?
- Future traffic patterns
- Five options that have been identified, outlining the positive and negative aspects of each one



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

- The evaluation matrix – the criteria used to compare the five options at this preliminary stage in the study
- Different construction options that will be considered when a preferred option is identified – tunnel (cut and cover compared to boring), aerial roadway structures, and surface roads.

Following the presentation, several questions were addressed. (See Attachment 3 for list and questions and their respective answers.)

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT INPUT

Following the technical presentation, participants were engaged in small table discussions. While there were no limits placed on what each of the groups wanted to discuss, they were provided with four questions to consider as part of their discussions, if at all possible.

- What are your thoughts, suggestions and comments on route selection?
- What are your thoughts, suggestions and comments on the proposed evaluation criteria?
- What are your comments and concerns specifically related to your community?
- What other ideas, suggestions or comments do you want the project team to know about?

The table discussions produced a great amount of input – on the route options presented, on the evaluation criteria and concerns from a community perspective. (The detailed notes from the table discussions can be found on the project website at: www.cswrr.info) The review of the input revealed several common themes across all of the table discussions. Each of the themes is summarized below in no order of priority:

Options - 1, 2, 3 & 5

Essentially all of the tables were in agreement that Options 1, 2 and 3 carried with them far too many significant issues to be considered as viable options for the CSWRR. For instance, the amount of property required would translate into very high costs, construction staging would result in huge inconveniences for users of these roadways and the complexity of adding the Ring Road to these already highly used roadways would add significantly to the time required to complete the project and there would be major impacts to the adjacent communities. In one case, Option 5 was singled out as a second choice to Option 4 – otherwise it too was said to be inappropriate for a Ring Road.

Option 4

Many of the tables indicated Option 4, was the best option of those presented, and in some cases, the only viable option of those presented. Some tables indicated they were still in favor of “Option 6” (Tsuu T’ina lands) but Option 4 was the best of the five options presented. That said, many people noted that if Option 4 goes forward as the preferred option, it requires further study and more details must be shared with communities as these details become available.



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

Tsuu T'ina

Several of the tables noted there were participants who suggested the project proponent should re-open discussions with the Tsuu T'ina people. In some cases, the table notes showed that participants named this "Option 6."

Timing

This theme is related to two items - the time impacts of construction staging and the time impacts related to getting the project started. Several times it was noted that the length of time estimated to complete and open the CSWRR (7-8 years) is a concern. The notes from many tables showed participants are interested in getting this project underway as soon as possible and minimizing the estimated time for completion. Others suggested that time must be taken in the early study phases to address community concerns along the way.

Costs

Some participants said costs should be weighed more equally with other factors. A concern was mentioned that in trying to keep costs as low as possible it will affect the quality of the aesthetics of the built project. Some suggestions were put forward to address the potential high cost of building this road, such as – look at options like toll road to reimburse some of the costs and combine solutions – tunnel, plus at grade, plus elevated – to economize where possible.

Environmental Impacts

There were several mentions of the environmental impacts of building the CSWRR, including adding to greenhouse gas emissions, potential impacts to crossing Fish Creek / Glenmore Reservoir and possible impacts to drinking water quality. Some of the discussions showed that participants thought the environmental assessment to this point does not provide sufficient information for evaluating the environmental impacts of the CSWRR.

Transit

One of the focuses of The Calgary Transportation Plan is delivering alternative modes of transportation. Some participants questioned whether or not this study was taking that vision into consideration. There were some participants who wanted more detailed information on how transit is being considered in this study. Some wondered if an LRT can be accommodated in the CSWRR and others wondered why more emphasis is not being placed on enhancing transit to replace the need for additional roads.

Community Impacts

Several times participants said they found the information regarding community impacts to be not specific enough and they indicated they need more information in order to be able to consider the impacts to their community. For example, an exact number of how many homes are impacted in each



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

Option is the kind of information that would be beneficial. Some didn't understand the meaning of "communities impacted" as shown in the presentation – so more definition and additional information is necessary before a meaningful response can be expected from communities. Some participants said visual impacts and noise impacts are important issues for their communities.

Evaluation Matrix

Several times it was mentioned that the evaluation criteria in the matrix are too general. Following are the items that were suggested as additional criteria for the Evaluation Matrix:

- Time to construct/complete each option – implementation time
- Exact number of properties required in each impacted community
- Damage to Weaselhead – length of bridges?
- Specific impacts to public/municipal facilities (schools)
- Noise impacts

At the conclusion of the table discussions, each table facilitator provided the priority items from their discussion to the entire group. (See Attachment 4 for the items shared in the report back.)

CONCLUSION

Overall, participants indicated they were pleased with the information provided and that they were given the opportunity to discuss the information and their related concerns and ideas with participants from other communities. (A summary of Workshop Evaluation can be found in Attachment 5). The project team found it was extremely beneficial to hear directly from community representatives. One of the goals of the functional planning study is to choose a preferred option that will undergo a more detailed evaluation, and the workshop discussions provided an abundance of information that they will review and consider in advance of moving to the next stage of the study.

NEXT STEPS

The information presented at this workshop will be available to the general public in an Open House to be held in February or March. Highlights of the information gathered at this workshop will be provided at the Open House.

More meetings will be organized with Community Association representatives and other key stakeholders, at some time following the Open House and after the technical team has had sufficient time to review the input received to this stage of the study.



ATTACHMENT 1

PROJECT TEAM REPRESENTATIVES

ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION

Jarret Berezanski
Alex Broda
Garry Lamb
Trent Bancarz – Communications

CITY OF CALGARY

Deric Herek – Communications

FOCUS CORPORATION

Aziz Merali – Senior Transportation Engineer
Feizal Lakha
Ed Tahmazian
Herman Theilen

AMEC ENVIRONMENTAL

Ian Campbell
Oliver Laser

WORKSHOP COORDINATORS

Katherine Zilm
Cheryl McArthur

WORKSHOP FACILITATOR

Gale Simpson

OBSERVERS

Paul Hinman – MLA Calgary Glenmore
Neil Brown – MLA Calgary Nose Hill



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011
SUMMARY REPORT

ATTACHMENT 2

COMMUNITIES INVITED, REGISTERED & ATTENDED

Community Association	Registered	Attended
Acadia Community Association	0	0
Auburn Bay Community Association	1	0
Bonavista Downs Community Association	0	0
Braeside Community Association	1	1
Calgary Evergreen Community Association	2	2
Canyon Meadows Community Association	0	0
Cedarbrae Community League Association	0	0
Chaparral Community Association	2	1
Chinook Park/Kelvin Grove/Eagle Ridge Community Association	0	0
Discovery Ridge Community Association	1	1
Douglasdale Glen Community Association	0	0
Elbow Valley Community Association	2	2
Glamorgan Community Association of Calgary	2	2
Haysboro Community Association	1	1
Kingsland Community Association	1	1
Lake Bonavista Community Association	0	0
Lakeview Community Association	2	2
Marquis de Lorne Community Association	2	1
Mayfair Bel-Aire Community Association	2	2
McKenzie Lake Community Association	0	0
McKenzie Town Community Association	0	0
Meadowlark Park Community Association	0	0
Mid-Sun Community Association	2	2
Millrise Community Association	2	2
New Brighton Community Association	1	0
North Glenmore Park Community Association	1	1
Oakridge Community Association	1	1
Palliser/Bayview/Pumphill Community Association	2	2
Pinebrook Homeowners' Association	2	1
Queensland Community Association	1	1



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011
SUMMARY REPORT

Community Association	Registered	Attended
Rutland Park Community Association	2	2
Shawnee/Evergreen Community Association	2	2
Shawnessy Community Association	1	1
Signal Hill Community Association	2	1
Silverado Community Association	0	0
Somerset/Bridlewood Community Association	1	1
Southwood Community Association	2	2
Springbank Hill Community Association	2	2
Willow Ridge Community Association of Calgary	1	1
Woodcreek Community Association	1	1
TOTAL ATTENDEES	45	40



ATTACHMENT 3

PRESENTATION QUESTIONS

Q	Is there a need for a road of this size? To what extent will there be transit improvements? I don't see anyone here today from the City's transportation group. This concerns me. If the City is involved would have been good to have someone here from the City's transportation group. This issues is a city one as much as a provincial one.
A	<i>When the City plans its growth, we look at multiple modes for transit. The plans consider the City's plans for transit. We look at all modes of transportation and are now designing a facility for those that don't use transit. The growth of the city, and the subsequent planning around that growth, certainly takes into consideration all issues (transit and otherwise) that are related to city growth.</i>
Q	It appears that in your discussion with respect to Route 4, it has the Ring Road being overlaid on top of all the other roads but in Routes 1, 2, 3 and 5 your discussion indicated that there was no attempt to incorporate the Ring Road into already existing roads? Did I hear you correctly?
A	<i>With respect to Route 4, in some parts of 37th Street, there are no existing roads so we don't need to have both the existing road and the Ring Road. For all routes, we reviewed and evaluated all existing criteria to come up with the route options that we have presented today.</i>
Q	With respect to Route 4 and crossing Fish Creek – Will you need to widen the bridge already in place, and is there a right-of-way for this already?
A	<i>Yes, there is adequate right-of-way if needed.</i>
Q	You speak of 14 lanes - how many kms in Calgary are presently at 14 lanes? Is this "14-lane" plan part of a staging process? Will you be developing a certain number of lanes and then, dependent on city growth, increase the number of lanes?
A	<i>Upgrades to existing lanes get triggered by congestion. We generally start with a certain number of lanes, and increase depending on congestion. If growth demands show a need, we will build taking into consideration construction details and, of course, funding availability.</i>
Q	When is Highway 8 to Highway 16 being built?
A	<i>It's in the future plans.</i>
Q	Your options speak to future traffic plans and new proposed routes, but what % of the traffic currently crossing the Glenmore causeway is going downtown?
A	<i>Don't have that answer here, but we will get it to you.</i>



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011
SUMMARY REPORT

Q	If you build a 'Deerfoot-type' roadway, does your (financial) planning take into consideration the incorporation of sounds barriers (i.e. is sound attenuation accounted for in the overall cost of the project?)
A	Yes.
Comment	Good study with lots of detail.
Q	It all boils down to timing - which of the routes presented today would get us to a Ring Road faster? Most of us living in the deep south want to see a Ring Road fast.
Q	What kind of time factor are we looking at in terms of a construction detour for each route? For how long? Anyone familiar with the construction for the west LRT knows what I'm talking about. Having to contend with construction for an extended period of time is very challenging.
Q	My community lies west of the city. Is it the vision of this Planning Group to address bottlenecks that are already occurring on Highway 8 west of the city? Presently, there are major problems in terms of safety and congestion.
Q	Area west of 37 th Street – why isn't there a better route in this area with less impact to the communities?
Q	With respect to route options and the cost of getting the lands for the right-of-way, have you considered doing more of a right angle at the Glenmore and Highway 8 intersection?



ATTACHMENT 4

TABLE REPORT BACK

- Not enough information to evaluate routes cost/timelines, etc.
- Must live with "evil" - Route 4 - minimize impacts to community and environment
- STOP TALKING AND DO IT!
- Timing: Start ASAP
- Proper environmental assessment – (reservoir) more information needed
- Route 4 - Build it now
- Route 4 - don't want an all or nothing (different techniques – aerial / tunnel)
- Consider the communities!
- Route 4
- Re-open negotiations with Tsuu T'ina
- Route 6 - original Tsuu T'ina
- Route 4 is best of the 4 "bad options"
- Get on with it!
- Work with communities up front & throughout, share information with all stakeholders
- Can't veto the project if no consensus
- Not an all or nothing approach
- Fix Macleod Trail / 22X intersection first
- How much time do the options take?
- Need more criteria - time, level of disruption, detours, delays
- Signage on 37th Street area (in appropriate areas that will be seen)



ATTACHMENT 5

WORKSHOP EVALUATION RESULTS

WORKSHOP PROCESS

1. Were the location and time of the Workshop good for you?

YES 34	SOMEWHAT 2	NO 0	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 0
--------	------------	------	-------------------------

2. Were you given the opportunity to speak and provide your comments?

YES 35	SOMEWHAT 1	NO 0	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 0
--------	------------	------	-------------------------

3. Were you given the opportunity to hear the opinion of other participants?

YES 35	SOMEWHAT 1	NO 0	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 0
--------	------------	------	-------------------------

4. Were your questions addressed satisfactorily?

YES 18	SOMEWHAT 13	NO 6	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 0
--------	-------------	------	-------------------------

5. Was the facilitator effective in coordinating the Workshop and keeping discussion on track?

YES 30	SOMEWHAT 6	NO 0	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 0
--------	------------	------	-------------------------

6. Was the presentation clear and helpful?

YES 24	SOMEWHAT 10	NO 1	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 1
--------	-------------	------	-------------------------

7. Was the presentation an appropriate length?

YES 29	SOMEWHAT 6	NO 0	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 1
--------	------------	------	-------------------------

8. Were the Project team members knowledgeable and thorough in responding to your questions?

YES 20	SOMEWHAT 12	NO 5	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 0
--------	-------------	------	-------------------------



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011
SUMMARY REPORT

9. Did this workshop help you to have a better understanding of the Southwest Ring Road Project?

YES 25	SOMEWHAT 10	NO 1	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 0
--------	-------------	------	-------------------------

10. Was this workshop a good use of your time?

YES 29	SOMEWHAT 7	NO 0	DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION 0
--------	------------	------	-------------------------

11. Do you have any suggestions that would improve another workshop for this project?

- To me the selection of Route 4 was very obvious. Focus more on that route and less on other 4.
- The Environmental issues should be better detailed. 2) The implementation time and impact level should be clarified for each option.
- We need to move this forward. I have been involved in exactly the same conversation for approximately 7 years +.
- More focus on design features, etc. now that the actual route has been more or less decided on (4). I am looking forward to future workshops and getting more information.
- Narrow the scope. Direct conversation to issue.
- Need more time for discussion and more background information before a sound choice can be made. Why isn't transit / LRT considered as part of the solution?
- More information.
- Human Element Impact Assessment.
- Sending out a meeting agenda / package before the meeting would have been appreciated.
- Good job ! Maybe broaden next meeting(s) to include other stakeholders in addition to community association.
- No need to go over the reminisce of a ring road. This is why we are all here. A bit of a waste of time. Overall a good discussion.
- Send material in advance.
- Make a decision and get with it!
- There is a common request for more details. Is there a sign up to get some more low level documents that may not be discussed as much in the workshop but allow us to be better prepared.
- 4. No specific designs to comment on.
8. No specific designs to comment on.
- Well organized.
- Options 1-2-3 were ridiculous and a waste of time. Not enough time spent on alternatives like Tsuu Tina and costs of construction (bridges / tunnels etc.).
- More involvement from City Council members, the land has been in place for decades - the purpose of the Focus Group is redundant.



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

- Please have city or provincial employees attend that can answer specific questions such as: who do we speak with and how do we keep 24 Street and 22 X open? When will 22 X over Macleod Trail be widened as part of the ring road.
- More information on specific costs and impacts on communities should be discussed and presented and options in specific areas of concern should be presented.
- More detail.
- Well organized and directed but somewhat lacking in details. Spending time on three "non-ring roads" seemed counter productive.
- Less engineering, more information on the pros and cons of what will happen when the Municipal Development Plan is implemented.

PROJECT COMMENTS

12. What general comments and/or suggestions do you have regarding the Calgary Southwest Ring Road Project?

- Get a head start and alleviate congestion on Sarcee Trail and Highway 8 by starting the segment on Highway 8 and the 101 Street T.U.C. to the TransCanada (16th Avenue NW) ASAP. Congestion is extreme at this point in time and the NW component of the SW ring road will fix it.
- Do not stop at Highway 8 and 101 Street. Keep going north to Highway 1. Quit talking and begin these segments.
- I think the Route Evaluation Matrix is missing 2 important criteria: the most important one is the implementation time as it would help to evaluate all options bringing lights to the timeline. The second point would be the impact level, traffic delays, route, diversion etc
- There is only one logical route (assuming Tsuu T'ina reserve is off the table).
- Routes 1,2,3 and 5 were an absolute waste of time. Not enough study emphasis given to the Highway 22/Bragg Creek route.
- Needs to be done but... the Tsuu T'ina route is still the preferable option and needs to be pursued.
- Consider a smaller temporary road on Route 4 to help southwest people NOW and not have them wait 8 plus years.
- We are trying to answer the wrong question - where to put an expressway. The right question is how do we want to move people in and around Calgary? The answer might be a combination of solutions.
- The matrix and route options seemed skewed to Route 4. The RR ran over top of 37th Street and was 8 lanes but every other option was existing road + RR for a total of 14 lanes. The impacts of 8 lanes versus 14 lanes is not a fair comparison.
- Do it now.
- I felt presentation geared to point us to Route 4 in a biased fashion.



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

- Tsuu T'ina option is still the best option (not presently available) but can it be recovered?
- The answer is clear Option 4. Spend the money and get it done. We can't please everyone.
- Build it Now!
- This is the biggest project since I was a kid and Deerfoot Trail upgraded. Planning is key as discussion made on Deerfoot Trail greatly affect me now.
- More attention paid to those directly affected for the preferred Route 4. Specifically the Lakeview residents as well as Glamorgan. Also people affected are Calgarians who are North Glenmore Park and the Weasel Head.
- I think it is still being framed as a ring road issue when I believe it is really a commuter issue.
- The outcome of the Functional Study is pretty obvious today, start over with the next planning level asap and work by the end of 2011. Save time (money!).
- Aziz did a great job presenting options that he saw.
- Ensure that pre construction of roads that will be used for detour routes are done prior to construction of the ring road (ie Macleod Trail and 167th Avenue SW).
- Very discrete solution - no creativity.
- Route 4 is the only logical choice - must still minimize impact on environment and communities as much as possible. Do it sooner than later. Use a variety of construction methods if need be to reduce impact.
- Go back to the Tsuu Tina and do it right.
- Continue with Option 4 as planned before Oakridge, Cedarbrae, Woodlands, Woodbine, Evergreen etc. Please start on Route 4 asap, no further negotiations are needed. Mayfair and Belaire have already had enough - expropriation for progress - Lakeview / Oakridge / Cedarbrae all know this is the plan
- Expedite the work at least on portion that does not have multiple options and / or ROW issues such as portion between 101 street and Sarcee Trail and Stoney Trail between Highway 8 and Highway 1.
- Our communities south of Anderson and west of Macleod Trail feel very left out and not acknowledged for our traffic troubles and concerns to travel to downtown, the west or north end of the city. We have a major concern to PREVENT the closure of 24 Street at 22 X which will negatively impact the traffic flow THROUGH our community.
- Route 4 is the logical option, has the least impact of all the options and the least cost on the surface.
- Get on with it.
- Environmental impact on Weasel Head / Glenmore Park and reservoir and Fish Creek - sound pollution and impact.
- Make it a real ring road that actually goes around the city as it is.



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011
SUMMARY REPORT

13. A detailed environmental assessment is being carried out as part of the Functional Planning Study for this project. Please provide any information on environmental concerns you think should be addressed.

Minimize construction impact across the reservoir / Weasel Head (Route #4).

- That's going as a simply comment. It was a negative point not to have a previous environmental assessment at this time. Please speed up it.
- Protection of water and parks.
- When considering water quality in the Elbow River/Glenmore Reservoir, look upstream, particularly where Loff Creek enters the Elbow River.
- Drinking water quality; airborne pollutants from traffic; noise impacts; wildlife impacts re Weasel Head.
- Detailed environmental assessment for which route? The environmental impacts of both bridge crossings would be valuable to evaluating the routes.
- Impact on Weasel Head / Animal corridor.
Comparison of concerns with completed project impact ie bridge over Fish Creek and Bow River for ring road.
- Route 6.
- Sound; environmental - air quality from increased road traffic; road run off issues
- Environmental impact of doing nothing! Increased travel times, congestions, accidents on overcrowded roads.
- There are so many concerns in this area so it would be best to see what is already available and then comment on what is provided and what is missing.
- If Option 4 is implemented, the Weasel head is clearly of huge environmental significance.
- Impact on Glenmore Reservoir at Weasel Head reserve. Drinking water - Wildlife - Nature - Social Impact / Recreation.
- I think that the study should also include the noise impact and other considerations on communities.
Design must include the impact on communities.
- Disaster Recovery Plan in place for all scenarios that could happen on the construction and the future travelling on the ring road (ie) Glenmore Reservoir!
- Obvious Glenmore Park and Weasel Head.
- Look at possibility of a covered / sound proofed bridge over the reservoir.
Minimize impact on natural areas and communities.
Consider the whole picture - will need to examine the Glenmore / Crowchild interchange as well.
- Not too many people have mentioned enviro impact on the Bow River Weir, Fish Creek Park etc. - suddenly a delta that was created because of a dam we built becomes paramount. 37th



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

was always to go north from Anderson - 1 50th - not Glenmore - was to be east/west. 14th Street was to go all the way - stay the course.

- Underground tunnel below Glenmore Reservoir may be expensive but should be weighed against environmental concerns and potential for 500 + houses needed for ROW.
- That's going as a simply comment. It was a negative point not to have a previous environmental assessment at this time. Please speed up it.
- How wildlife will be affected and what will be done to cause the least amount of disruption to wild life. IE wild life crossings below the road way and fences on either side of the highway. Noise pollution to homes - how will this be managed.
- Additional options of construction should be looked at and considered for affluent portions of the RW - tunnel under Weasel Head - - dedicated lanes for through traffic - elevated bridge costs of tunneling or elevated bridge that are very expensive could be portioned as Toll sections but the toll should be removed as soon as that portion is paid. Toll is dedicated and is accounted for separately.
- Not to the detriment of the overall project.
- How far must SW ring road discussion go before west Ring Road is approved / commenced / built?
- Drinking water quality.
Increase in pollution and greenhouse gases.
Efficient use of land.
Impact of ring road on urban and rural sprawl vs. creating a more compact city.

14. Do you have any other comments or concerns you'd like to share?

- The longer we wait the more it will cost.
- We as community association and I personally would like to receive (1) electronic copy of the presentations and (2) a report of the workshop.
- The intersection at Glenmore/37 Street needs to be designed correctly the first time and able to handle traffic anticipated 30-50 years from now. We don't want an intersection upgraded continuously over the next 50 years.
- That the road has to be seen as special and may not be able to be all things to all parties - AT may need to reduce expectations. Commuters may need to accept less convenience or only partial solutions, communities need to share the impacts.
- We were asked to choose between five bad options - they are not the only options!
- Building a road of this size without incorporating public transportation is not forward thinking. Showing the routes on satellite maps with communities and homes would be much more valuable.
- Provide support funding for affected communities for them to participate fully in impact studies as propose solutions relevant to their specific communities



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – January 29, 2011 SUMMARY REPORT

- I would like to receive more detailed maps on the various options. The format does not matter but would prefer vector based files.
- The impact to Lakeview residents is HUGE - Don't forget that.
- I think that there needs to be a great deal more transparency in terms of the analysis of the project. The presentation clearly favoured one option and glossed over some pros and cons of the options.
- Some technical aspects were grossly misrepresented (tunnel) get out and get some expert advice not just local expertise!
The study appears to be a waste of money since options 1, 2 and 3 do not even meet project specs and should not have been explained to this level of detail!
- Please review to last SWRR functional study and the ring road functions study for Hwy #1 to Hwy #8 for Pinebrook house owners' concerns.
- I agree this needs to be done now sooner not later and I hope that all avenue have been addressed prior to construction so no hold ups politically, environmentally, stop this from happening.
- Concerns that traffic will continue down 37 Street to 33 Avenue SW or Sarcee Road (29 Street SW) to 33 Avenue SW to avoid backtracking to the Glenmore Crowchild connection which is currently inadequate and must be upgraded (including widening Glenmore between 37 Street and Crowchild).
Look at adjusting lights to keep traffic flowing (and even closing intersection at Kensington and Crowchild - regulate lights to keep up flow).
- *Alberta Transport and Focus Consulting tried to direct the tone and selection of alternatives. Looks like this backfired based on the responses from the tables!
*Overall a good 1st effort which was effectively managed. Well done.
- As noted above. MacLeod @ Bannister, Canyon Meadows, Shaw/Midpark 162nd, 22X, are in need of improvement.
- Access to SW Ring Road. Signal Hill community would like to see access / exit from SWRR to West Hills mall to reduce the excessive cut-through traffic from Signal Hill.
- It was very beneficial to speak with other communities to understand how we will all be affected by the ring road AND how we will need to work together for the better of the city. Our community would like to have input on how we MUST prevent the closure of 24 Street @ 22 X. Route 4 - SOON ! Please don't make us wait another 50 years !!!
- It is time to stop talking - we need this road - do it ! It is time to stop being held up by agenda driven groups.
- We have told you which route is best, don't delay.
- You need a project leader who is willing to take risks to expand the scope to include Tsuu Tina options and impact of more efficient use of lands.

