Segment A (Governor)
Right-of-Way / Alignment

From Workshop Tables:
- Concern about impact on St. Paul’s church property through Alt #2 or #3
- Which side of the roadway are you taking property from?
- Concern about noise (can we use rubber wheels?)
- Concern about new alternatives being introduced at this stage → new alternatives seem to go against the LRT philosophy proposed last year
- Only way to increase LRT acceptance is to limit traffic lanes
- Hate to see Tasty Tomato go
- Prefer whatever option that is safest for pedestrians
- Consider North alignment but only 2 lanes of traffic
- Many Grosvenor community members believed the 2 lane option was the only consideration. Bait and switch technique
- Have you looked at South side alignment and is their a cost difference?
- Suggest lowering speed limit for cars along the whole route
- Concerned about accidents at 104th and 142nd street
- Traffic capacity question – how many cars on the roads?
- Where would bikes go? Bike lanes one side or another
- Concern for left turns off 104th and 142nd
- Concern for the expropriation of St. Pauls
- One traffic lane each way a concern to one person
- North alignment “might be” safer
- Consider pedestrian overpasses
- The alternative with least expropriation is best
- What is the cost to tax payers for expropriation?
- Fellow developing land currently shown in Red (map), need decisions
- Support more traffic on alternative routes (e.g. 107) and provide one lane each direction on SPR
- What about the width of the trackway?
- Station parking and residential parking concerns
- Visual intrusion of overhead wire
- LRT and passenger vehicles are not mutually exclusive
- Have proper supporting roadways
- Need balanced system
- Park and ride is important
- Compare parking and cost of fares
- Bus turnaround?
- Elevated or buried across 142nd / 149th?
- Closure of SPR from 149 to 124 to vehicles except for bicycles, scooters, segways, pedestrians, etc
- Steep grade on 149th street intersection
- Avoid conflicts with separate train and roadway intersection (like University Ave)
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- Technology? Could it be a monorail?
- People’s homes and churches more important than commuter traffic
- Could add a counterflow lane on 107th?

Alt #1
- Preferred because less impact on neighborhood/community/church
- Concern of WMD traffic still use SPR, therefore west end traffic will be worst
- Consider using one track instead of two tracks to save space through this area
- Not a problem to reduce lane here because people would change route to get to DT or modal shift
- 101 Ave / 142 street EBLT would be required
- Bus service to the neighborhood; how would it be impacted?
- Adjacent neighborhood roads are narrow and may not be able to accommodate busses
- Wider road decreases the incentive for people to take transit and is bad for environment
- Keep it, this is what Council voted on in November 2009

Alt #2
- Never option 2! It won’t force people into LRT, too many traffic lanes
- Concern for noise
- Property loss of church
- Parasitic parking around stations
- Pedestrian safety/ wider road to cross
- Access to Jasper Gates, especially West bound
- Complex intersection at 142nd street, not want repeat of 51 Avenue

Alt #3
- 3 lane option less safe, more confusing for vehicles because it changes at different times
- Limited access for commuters to the North onto SPR (Grovenor)
- Viewed as a negative for Grovenor
- Viewed as a positive for neighborhood south of SPR
- If heavy snowfall comes, how would snow removal be done?
- Need to be fair to existing businesses. They pay taxes too and should be considered
- Impact to accesses between 148th and 149th street North side of SPR in the North running option
- Concern for cul de sacs, people cannot cross tracks
- Business access
- Concern for area in front of church

From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):
- If heavy snowfall happened how would snow removal be done?
Segment A (Governor)

Stations

From Workshop Tables:
- Concern for train operations under severe weather
- Future bus service?
- What is the capacity of the station?
- How about a larger shelter?

Alt #1 (Strong preference for alternative #1)
- Prefer only crossing one lane of traffic
- Bus loop at SPR and 142 on south side could give room for 112th, 150th routes to stop
- Neighbourhood feeder bus
- 142nd street turns, very busy, potential issues with station. Left turns against staggered station might be risky and hazardous
- Highly preferred to have centre loading, non split options

Alt #2
- Not too different from Alt #1
- Not desired because too many lanes
- Stations the same as #1, but prefer split stations due to amount of land needed
- Railings for safety?
- Whether there is shelter and is heated?
- Bike racks?
- Noise level of bells?

Alt #3
- At 149th, prefer centre platform therefore less land required
- Prefer station platform closer to 149th street
- How can we access by bus?
- Concern about traffic all filtering to 145th street signal
- Makes sense if centre loading non split

- Neighbourhood feeder bus
- Impacts on seniors and persons with disabilities to walk to the stations
- Does ridership justify having so many stations?
- Split platform at major intersections to provide LRT makes sense
- One center platform vs split, one makes more sense and is more economical as well as better use of space
- North running allow for better accommodation of heavy turns in AM + PM PK at 142nd and 149th
- Concern about access to businesses in NE corner of 149/SPR
- Where the pedway crossings are throughout neighbourhood, long stretch between 142nd and 149th
Concern about noise impact if we were to use gates and bells for LRT crossing. However, signals are OK

Concern for crime at stations

**From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**
None

**Segment A (Governor)**

**Neighbourhood/Business Access**

**From Workshop Table:**
- Circulation for emergency vehicles, crossing the traffic
- Traffic signals, coordination problems (example 51 avenue)
- Why along SPR?
- Access to Jasper Gates?
- Alternative #1 is best overall for access for both pedestrians and vehicles
- Alternative #3 is worst, causes barriers
- Parking should blend with surrounding environment
- Why not elevated? This would permit access under the guideway
- High potential for cars cutting through neighborhood, but not high volumes
- 142nd and 149th too far apart for signals; should provide interim signal (at 145th street) to facilitate jug handle movements in and all movements out of neighborhoods (understand no left hand turns required on SPR)
- Coordinate signals at 142nd, 145th, and 149th
- Alt #3 cul-de-sacs are an access barrier, but could calm neighborhood traffic at the same time
- Alley north of SPR west of 145th is heavily used
- Access issues and concerns during construction
- Length (time) of impact for construction
- Impact on SPR during construction may help to change travel patterns for vehicles come from WMD / 149th street or convince them to shift mode to LRT
- Concern that jug-handle would direct more traffic through NBHD – affected pavement conditions/property value/parking on local street
- Snow removal for the local roads being used for jug-handle
- Center alignment gives better access for businesses west of 149th street
- Shortcutting concerns in the Grosvenor NBHD once the lane is reduced on SPR
- Alt #2 has less shortcutting but more property impacts
- Concern for Alt #3 for existing businesses on the north side of SPR, east of 149th street (NE corner)
- Alt #3 with 4 lanes not good – not feasible and too expensive
- North running with 2 lanes of traffic preferred because it allows for pk turn movements and have less property impact
- North running not good for N NBHD, impacts access and funnels traffic to a couple of local roads, more impact for those residents
- North running better for NBHD south of SPR and better for Crestwood (less shortcutting)
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- NBHD south of SPR would likely need signal at 142nd St/ 101 Ave to help in access out of NBHD, but need to be careful of signal coordination between 101 Ave and SPR on 142nd street
- 101 Ave + 142nd street left turn to go North, may need lights at that intersection
- Alt #3 – lights at 144 or 145 is better for traffic flow. Could happen if NnR Alignment used with only 2 lands of traffic not 3 or 4
- Development on S.W corner of 142nd street and SPR is very difficult to access on centre alignment
- North alignment preferred but only 2 lands of traffic
- 144th or 145th intersection must have all direction turns in all alignments
- South right turns off SPR at 142nd and 149th are rare
- Concern about access to stores N.W corner of SPR and 149th street, currently 3 access but need those to remain
- Cutting through neighborhoods an issue
- Narrow streets in Grosvenor south of Stony Plain Road
- Emergency vehicle access and cul de sac?

From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):
- Council got approval based on Alt #1
  - For North option, should limit to two lanes
  - Oppose Alt #2 and #3

Segment B (Glenora)
Right-of-Way / Alignment

From Workshop Table:
- Have just LRT tracks and bike baths – no roadway
- Consider one way road on SPR, blocked at one end – exit only
- Property values and compensation need to be considered
- Safety for people getting on/off LRT – North versus Centre – which is safer?
- North alignment has better access for property south of SPR
- Centre may be better – left turns with North running options may result in shortcutting from 102 Ave through neighborhood
- Will there still be buses traveling the road where the LRT is? Want busses to be less on SPR (buses only on cross streets or stations)
- Left turns at 142nd street (WB to SBL) may back up
- Turn 102 Ave into 2 lanes (1 lane each direction) from 142nd street to 124th street to stop 102 Ave from becoming main through route
- Emergency vehicles – where will they go?
- Residential parking only near stations to avoid parasitic parking
- Property acquisition – further define please
- North alignment restricts residents access to south due to no left turns
- Green space/ park land along LRT route and East of Groat Bridge – no vehicle use
- 102 Ave and SPR are already congested
- Emergency vehicles need good access
“does not go anywhere I need to go”
Has the City bought property already?
Have they only considered LRT only on SPR and 102nd for traffic?
Options for school crossings?
Preference for North alignment (Alt #2)
More businesses impacted on North side at 142nd
Is 107th viable?
Which is cheaper, C or S?
Concern about impact alignment may have on vehicle access – need to optimize access (e.g. concern with Alt #2 North running)
Pedestrian crossing and pedestrian circulation
North and South of SPR – students need to be able to cross (East of school crossing out?) What safety mechanisms are at each crossing?
Time LRT to school zone hours?
Alt #2, closing off access on North communities will divert into only 134th / 136th street will be too heavy from traffic that would divert here
Combined number of kids to two schools on both sides of SPR is greater than a 800 block radius
Concern about crossing protection – arms and gates
Don’t want bells but kids must be safe
Slow speeds preferred
Least amount of property requirements preferred
Preference for Alt #1 (strong support table wide)
Alt #2 is unacceptable
Concern about loss of access to Vi’s for Pies area
Cross streets for 134th / 136th, why?
Median islands on these?
Don’t want walls to separate houses (no barriers)
How do cars turn eastbound turn North at 136th and 139th street without backing up traffic? Consider a turning lane in both options
Has a traffic impact study been done on 102nd Ave?
Concerned about 136th North traffic at 107th Ave and how this intersection will function safer
Consider South alignment of LRT line to allow residents access/egress from neighborhood especially morning traffic access to 102nd Ave
Should have bike lane East and West of LRT (104th and 102nd Ave)
Should have a bus down 102nd Ave in both alternatives
Stations should be every 3-400 meters not every 1000-1200 meters to be more convenient and accessible
Consider land-locked implications south of Stony Plain at Glenora Point
Integrate bus to feed/provide transfer points and to increase efficiency

From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):
• None
Segment B (Glenora)

Stations

From Workshop Tables:
- Center platform more efficient
- How wide is total width of road + LRT + Station?
- Stations should be at schools
- Better at 136th rather than 134th
- Prefer North side station at 142nd
- Snow removal and EMS?
- Have videos of LRT in operation and sound
- Consider volumes of people using buses at 136th street versus 134th street
- No protection – people may cross and get hit – consider protection or prevention
- 136th street option impacts school (if this option consider pedestrian over/underpass for children crossing tracks)
- Pedestrian activated light at 138th street for school children – how does this interact with LRT?
- 136th street station better option for junior high student North
- 134th street station will be used less than 136th street station
- 134th street station is more central
- People using 134th street station will be community people
- What is the noise due to stop/start at stations?
- Are station platforms long enough to hold all train cars?
- If no bus traveling or stopping along SPR, we will need another station along this corridor or buses on cross streets to pick up riders and feed the station
- Side or centre loading platform west of 136th street
- 134th street requires parkland – leave parks!
- Need more stops – this is a winter city
- Need better ability to turn left or right onto road
- Too many cul de sacs in Alt #2
- Concern regarding circulation through neighborhoods
- Why not BRT?
- Alt #1 needs another signalized intersection
- Access better on Alt #1
- Need turn lanes at intersections
- Left turn out of neighborhood needed
- How will school access across SPR be handled?
- How will "vision for the corner" be handled?
- How will major disruptions be handled and will information be provided
- What are laws regarding rights of businesses and residents?
- Not sure if access NW of bridge is needed or redundant
- Need to make it aesthetically pleasing
- Should have artist competition for stations
- Don't want increased lighting levels
Concern about crime at stations
Something to improve stigma of public transit
No Glenora station needed
Majority of people in the community will NOT use bus or LRT (some disagreement on this)
Communities north of SPR use bus, as well as seniors
If construction of LRT is a disruption to community, would be disappointed if we couldn’t use it
If it is going to happen, do it with the smallest footprint possible
Stations should be closer to schools
Alt #2 has too many cul de sacs
Bikelanes?
If you need to have one, put it closer to Groat
Straddle Glenora crescent, there’s an empty lot on North and vacant lot for sale right now on South – less footprint but just as convenient and less impact on 134th street businesses
What happens with businesses on 134th street – parking for businesses will be taken away and therefore people will park in neighborhood
Did not know corridor was decided and that we were at that stage
Station by school is a safety risk! Move it away
Don’t want spread out stations
Look at congestion at intersections (136th/134th) and impact on pedestrian movements
Concern about pedestrian exiting LRT station onto road (especially for seniors and mobility challenged)
Parasitic parking concerns
Provide room for bikes on train or lockers at stations
No park and ride please
Feeder bus lines are not shown, how would they connect to the station?
How do buses circulate?
Stations would be underutilized without bus feeder
Traffic on 102nd and SPR will not help walkability
At 142nd street, station should not be staggered – dangerous intersection and busy
Impeding mobility of existing neighborhood with little benefit
Make walkability a priority both on 102nd Ave and SPR
Concerns about legal issues and challenges under Public Works
Concerned both options are dividing the neighborhood and walkability
Stations must respond to winter climate and be designed as such
Should be located at 136th street Intersection to serve schools
Neither options preferred

From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):
Side running with cantilevers looks better than wires across cross-section
Put station on East side of 136th street on North side
136th street station is logical given volume of use by school kids
Bus stops on SPR (North side) West of 136th street is highly used
Segment B (Glenora)
Neighbourhood/Business Access

From Workshop Tables:
- Increased traffic on streets with lights (busier roads due to vehicles crossing LRT)
- Increased traffic within neighbourhoods – less child friendly
- 102nd Ave traffic will increase
- Access to key destinations will improve using LRT (West Ed, Hospital, DT, MacEwan)
- Build it fast!
- Reduce 102nd Ave to two lanes to prevent impacts to residents along 102 Ave (do not widen 102 Ave)
- LRT will split community and increased traffic on LRT will split community
- Connections across SPR for pedestrians/cyclists at locations other than signalized intersections should be allowed
- No problem with cul de sacs versus RI/RO access
- If we succeed in having SPR as a transit (LRT) and parkland corridor only, would 139th street be a thru route N/S (for the North running alignment)
- Center running option provides better access in only one direction – still needs to re-route to signal to go the other direction
- Would pedestrian activation at signals still occur?
- How would snow removal or storage occur
- People will still cut across tracks to make a left turn at locations where there are no signals – enforcement? Education?
- To allow jug-handle movement will back alleys get snow removal?
- How will 134th/136th street connect through 107th avenue? Signals may be needed
- Take out traffic circle at 142nd / 107th to accommodate traffic
- LRT does not service desired destinations – we can’t use it
- Downtown does not need to be the hub, it slows down connection to University and elsewhere
- Upgrading/maintaining alleyways to have jug handle access is not wanted
- We do not want alleyways used for circulation
- Do not want to pay for maintaining alleyways
- Both option negatively impacts Glenora
- Additional traffic on 102 Ave is NOT the answer
- Will Cul de Sacs get proper snow clearing?
- 105th will become shortcut route
- Should have some speed bumps or four way stops (look at what they did in Sunnydale neighbourhood in Calgary to address shortcutting)
- 136th is currently bad and congested in peak hours, but consider impact on 134th as well
- Need left-turn lanes at these intersections for North bound or South bound (for communities onto SPR)
- Consider pull in/drop off zone for parents at school (Glenora Elementary) to address drop-off congestion on 136th
- Look at rush hour West bound on 102nd Ave and consider improvements to encourage car traffic to use that route
Consider shutting SPR down to vehicle traffic
Consider using 107th Ave for LRT
Consider limiting left turns only at peak from SPR to communities during non-peak (so they can be made during non-peak hours as SPR is quiet at this time and so if you could without a left turn bay) for 134th/ 136th
Will their be a tax reduction for loss in property value?
Glenora is a community; planning and design must improve it not dissect it with roads and LRT
Design should improve community liveability
136th street and 107th ave is going to be an even bigger problem/difficulty getting out of the community
Concern about public using Glenora, which is a quiet community
Neighbourhood parking program will not work
Traffic calming at four way stops need to prevent/stop speeding and shortcutting LRT will create internal to neighbourhood
Prefer alignment #1 for right in right out as a compromise to community on North and South

Alt # 1
-Where is traffic going to go from SPR?
-Is there ridership for Glenora station?
-Concern about shortcutting
-Access to stations for pedestrians – long wait to cross street

Alt #2
-Concern about increased traffic in neighbourhood
-School pedestrian concerns
-105th Avenue will be busier
-Don’t like increased property impacts
-"slightly worse"
-How are people accessing their garages?
-Not desired as it further complicates access

From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):
We all agree that 107th avenue makes much more sense, far fewer issues all around

Segment C (Westmount)
Right of Way/Alignment

From Workshop Table:
- Concern about East West connection south of SPR
- Carry further North to 124th Street in Alt #2
- Prefer Alt #2 for North running
- Concerns about properties South of SPR (land locked)
- Do not like Alt #1
• Concern on one way street converted to two way at 127th street
• North running LRT please!
• Why choose Stony Plain road instead of 107 ave?
• Pedestrians should have right of way, not trains
• Provide left turn at 127th street to get rid of new road
• Keep to the North up to 124th street
• Either option, however access concerns during construction (Alt #1 and #2), or what happens during a vehicle collision/breakdown
• Proposed new roadways may create shortcuts through the neighborhood South of SPR
• Concerns about people shortcutting through 126th to 129th street between SPR and 107 avenue (Alt #1 and #2)
• SW of 127th street – want access North along 127th + 128th. Need more North South access and therefore more signals
• Left hand turn 127th street both EBL +WBL Stony Plain Road
• 127th Street preferred
• Better access for South pocket at 128th street

From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):
• Alt #1 scenario will require more traffic lights on 107 Ave
• 128th facing South can a left turn be made?
• Alt #2 I like this scenario at 128th

Segment C (Westmount)

Stations

From Workshop Table:
• How do you access stations if not able to drive?
• Purpose of LRT? To move people downtown primarily or for local people?
• Concern for safety as schools on each side
• North running LRT please!
• Need more bus service and alternative bus stops to service communities
• Why not BRT?
• Reduce impact at 124th street and provide station config with least impact
• Station at 121st street
• Station at 116th street with major North South traffic
• Concern for safety, 124th street will become a zoo
• Traffic calming on new road
• East bound left turn bay is deficient
• Safety at station require some serious thought please
• Why do the cars have priority over the pedestrians when accessing the stations?
• Unsafe for children at crossings
• Seniors complex at 127th street is a long way to walk to 124th street proposed station
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- Walking light at either end of each platform
- Pedestrian crossings at 3 points on each platform
- No noisy bells please
- Platforms architecturally designed to be specific to the historic character of the neighbourhood

From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):
- Why not widen crosswalk at center to make it convenient for passengers unloading/loading
- Time lights after train arrives to ensure pedestrian comes first
Centre running LRT with side loading platform is unnecessary and duplicates infrastructure

Segment C (Westmount)
Neighbourhood/Business Access

From Workshop Tables:
- At street crossings where there is no signalizing, don’t want barriers to pedestrian crossings cyclists (a curb may make it difficult to cross)
- Pedestrian safety at route crossings is important, MUST consider this
- 125th street 104th road is a bad, potential shortcutting through neighbourhood
- Consider truck ban on 107th ave
- Consider locked in cul de sacs, access left
- Concerns at 124th street NBL onto SPR
- N/S access using Connaught Drive
- No one will use Stony Plain Road anymore?
- Suggestion – Purchase land at 129th, push train further North, which will give extra room for turning lanes south

Alt # 1
- Multi use trail along LRT Route
- Concern about parking in community
- Allow straight through from cross streets
- Provide bike lanes parallel to LRT
- Resident permits for parking near station location
- Keep green spaces intact – provide good landscape
- Provide u-turns at intersection
- Short cut on 127th street to the neighbourhood
- Seniors housing at 126th street
- New road will encourage traffic in neighbourhood
- New streets are important to access
- New road is on ravine, may have environmental impacts
- Eliminate new roadway, this will bring traffic to the neighbourhood
- Keep 127th street one way
Alt #2
-preferred because of cul-de-sacs
-Make 127th street as two way (currently one way)
-Stony Plain WB – no left turn, makes the route too long
-WBL left turn arrow shown on figure may be incorrect? How is access going to pocket SW of 128th Street
-Cul de sacs need to have pedestrian access to Stony Plain
-Landscaping please, no concrete blocks
-Multi use trail on LRT route
-Preference with this alternative based on access for South neighborhoods – no south access a concern
-Concern about increased traffic on 127th street with Alt #2
-More access to properties near bridge
-LRT will restrict pedestrian crossings to lights, please provide pedestrian crossings at un-signalized
-Keep 127th street one way – bike lane
-Provide left turn bays at 127th street intersection (we prefer this over new road)
-Like the option – close off 129th street – less traffic
-107th ave is good alternative to take in this option
-Streets will be calm/less traffic
-Bike access
-Provide pedestrian crossing from new cul de sacs

From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):
None