



NORTHEAST RIVER CROSSING FUNCTIONAL PLANNING STUDY

Stage 2 - November 2017 Survey and Map Comments (verbatim)

Identifying information removed to meet Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP Act).

Comments are recorded exactly as they were received and are grouped by alignment option. Where reference to a specific location was given, that location is included in *italics*.

S1 specific comments (no reference to a specific North alignment):

- S1 is more direct connection
- S1 seems to suit my concerns better, as TWP 542 makes more sense as a connector than TWP 540
- S1 is my choice as it works into a bypass for Fort Saskatchewan
- Connection to TWP 542 (S1) is preferred
- I like the shorter natural areas impact on west side and the fact that E side has generally fairly undisturbed green space, so less impact on wildlife habitat. But note that W side has a very narrow corridor remaining under the bridge so consider adding generous buffer (*Placed at the S1 N1-N3 junction*)
- The TWP 542 route (S1) makes the most sense because it makes the most efficient use of the land and road accesses. It keeps Fort Saskatchewan expansion to an optimal level.
- TWP Rd 542 good - connection to Highway 830
- S1 best option less highway to construct equals less land disrupted
- Gives Fort Saskatchewan opportunity to annex south to bridge site (*pointing to S1*)
- Isolates train to N of river. Creating safer hauling of materials by rail, with little impact to residential (*pointing to S1*)
- S1 is already a beaten path
- S1 brings more business into Fort Saskatchewan (south side)
- Least disruption of community. Fewer lands/homes destroyed (S1)
- Less developer land disrupted. Who cares who sold land to them? (*Posted on S1 map, west of study area - no indication of specific alignment*)
- I object to this route (S1) because it still cuts through an eco system and farm land which is so exceptional - none like it in the world. This route is too close to proposed reserve as well.
- Move S1 north to avoid an additional creek crossing 1/4 mile
- Concern about wildlife corridor and creek crossing location (*Pointing to S1*)
- Crossing of this intersection of Pointe Aux Pins creek tributaries must be elevated to minimize impact on wildlife. Also, need to establish a generous buffer to minimize impact. (*Placed at S1*)
- No fragmenting lands of landowners, no dividing properties (*pointing to S1*)
- S1 too close to Fort Saskatchewan may impede their growth

S2 specific comments (no reference to a specific North alignment):

- S2 avoids class "A" fish habitat!
- Not S2 as all options go into neighbourhood structure plan which is already in planning/development
- S2 is preferred since it is further away from houses (Pointe Aux Pins Estates)
- S2 makes more sense in terms of farming, wildlife interference
- S2 better: river crossing S2 is designated an amenity. "South Sturgeon Park" on NE river crossing study area with a top-of-bank trail.
- S2 preferred to S1: crosses river over industrial site, industrial site can still be used for active recreation once reclaimed, cuts and embankments can be done with industrial land instead of agriculture land, land already disturbed by industry, incorporate bridge into reclamation process, between S2 and S1 ribbon of green has identified same value of heritage & ecological considerations, so might as well use industrial land for bridge, CoE should be consulting with ribbon of green public engagement process sooner than later
- S2 good alignment - parallel Pointe Aux Pins creek will provide a great scenic route
- S2 In my opinion is the best way to go to avoid the expansion potential of Fort Saskatchewan
- S2 as it only shows a connection at TWP 540, causes me concern, unless the future road development follows the railroad
- S2- is too intrusive overall
- S2/ N1 to N3 goes through ASP requiring re-opening ASPs
- Most impact to river valley (S2)
- Fragments Strathcona land owners (S2)
- This "option" should not even be considered (S2)
- Interchange disrupts Bremner subdivision. Physically & noise. (S2)
- Doesn't eliminate south Fort issues. Bottlenecking in the city. (S2)

N1 specific comments (no reference to a specific South alignment):

- Would wipe out many homes/landowners (*posted near N1*)
- Will wipe out Horse Hill community altogether (*posted near N1*)

N2 specific comments (no reference to a specific South alignment):

- Like N2 because of the directness
- N2 seems to be the most viable
- N2 is preferred as it's the least obtrusive as far as impacting acreages
- N2 protects residents from potential train 'incidents'
- Don't want to be next to the highway. I'd rather be under it. Don't mind N2.
- Avoid N2 as it will impact the tree nursery

N3 specific comments (no reference to a specific South alignment):

- N3 is preferred as it is further away from the river valley
- N3 too far south

- N3 impacts too many residents/homeowners
- Did you know dinosaur bones were found in here? (*posted between the river and railroad tracks along N3*)
- Impacts way too many established homesteads N3

S1/N1 specific comments:

- If I have to choose an option, I go with S1/N1. This route has least impact on river valley, agricultural land, and historical site.
- S1/N1 Homes to be destroyed non-agricultural 18, agricultural homes 1

S1/N2 specific comments:

- Prefer S1/N2 - less cutting up of agricultural land making it easier to get equipment around
- S1/N2 is most direct route - least # of homes affected
- Prefer S1/N2 as it avoids ecologically sensitive areas in Pointe Aux Pins creek
- S1/N2 preference. Why not push S1 to the north 1/2 - 1/4 mile across more of environmentally sensitive area keeping tighter to NE corners boundary
- S1/N2 does not break up the community
- S1/N2 would let farmers keep their land for 35 more years *a guarantee*
- S1/N2 opens corridor to south Fort Saskatchewan needed!
- S1/N2 impacts minimum number of existing homes
- S1/N2 would be my first pick
- S1/N2 best choice less impact on families
- Don't split the Horse Hill community S1/N2 #1
- S1/N2 less affect on homes and doesn't displace so many families
- S1/N2 perfect option for overloads to go through 543 east to secondary highway 830 reducing dangerous goods & oversize from Fort Saskatchewan
- S1/N2 better thoroughfare to north from upgraders in Fort Saskatchewan with bypassing residential/populated areas
- S1/N2 allows easier access into Fort Saskatchewan for sport programs. Did you know Fort Saskatchewan is the 'elite' sports programs for Sturgeon County residents? I.e. Hockey, lacrosse, football, baseball...
- S1/N2 Homes to be destroyed non-agricultural 3, agricultural 2
- S1/N2 reduces traffic flow off 825 and 15/21 intersection without pushing traffic away from residential

S1/N3 specific comments:

- I prefer the S1/N3 route as it appears to be the least disruptive and fits better with the Strathcona land use plan
- S1/N3 Homes to be destroyed non agricultural 23, agricultural 0

S2/N1 specific comments:

- Disrupting residential is acceptable to me; homes can be built anywhere. Natural areas & agricultural lands, however, can't be. From what I see, I like S2/N1 the best (assuming it does actually favor natural space > agriculture > residential)
- S2/N1 less impact on river valley
- S2/N1 Homes to be destroyed non agricultural 16, agricultural 0

S2/N2 specific comments:

- S2/ N2 would be my pick
- S2/N2 Homes to be destroyed non-agricultural 3, agricultural 2

S2/N3 specific comments:

- S2/N3 seems to have the least detrimental impact east of 21. Township Road 542 has too many natural areas to disturb.
- I prefer S2/N3 avoids agriculture lands more
- S2/ N3 seems to be least impact on agricultural land & green spaces
- Looks like S2/N3 uses least farmland
- S2/N3 is best option, least food land affected, avoids class A fish habitat, best lowland protection, least recreation area affected
- S2/N3 impacts me the least
- S2 /N3 because the other plans destroy our homes & business. I have spent many years establishing a successful business that will no longer be able to operate with this road. A road beside/behind the property will devalue the property as well as negatively impact our quality of life. This area today is beautiful & a wonderful place to live & raise a family. This roadway destroys all of this.
- S2/N3 looks good!
- S2/N3 Homes to be destroyed non-agricultural 27, agricultural 0

Other comments (not specific to a particular alignment):

- German property historical? Century homestead? (*pointing to farm on northwest of intersection of Highways 15 and 28A*)
- Is it possible to move this over? (*referring to proposed area for an interchange northeast of the intersection of Highways 15 and 28A*)
- Why is agriculture considered important in the hatch area? There is nothing in the ASP or city policy to preserve the land into the future -- the owners can still make application to rezone. It's only on a promise today, nothing to prevent rezoning.
- TWP Rd. 542 bypass study - Strathcona county - 21 to 830
- How much land will be used for the roadway, plus interchanges, in each option?
- Please give thought to the option that uses the least land, to keep more future options for use
- I'm really pleased to see that some effort was taken to protect prime agricultural land
- I'm pleased to see that some consideration has been given to protecting environmentally sensitive land, particularly in the river valley
- I'm really pleased to see how much work, thought, and care is going into this whole exercise

- Gives closer access to roadways so farmers can transport their fresh produce to distribution center (*Placed northwest of study area - no indication of a specific alignment*)
- Too close to Meridian interchange? (*Points to potential interchange on Hwy 15 near 195 Ave*)
- St. Stephen's cemetery owns agricultural land to the east
- Class 'A' soil can be found all over the Metro region, why not land swap?
- How does the EALT Conservation Easement impact the NERC decision for alignment?
- Future development of route east will not disrupt a national park 'Elk Island' or Oster Lake (*posted southwest of study area*)
- Generally a colossal waste of money - crossing is too close to the Henday crossing. Upgrading the Highway 15 crossing at Fort Saskatchewan would be most adequate and cheapest option in my humble opinion.
- East down 543 allows Bremner development to flourish without noise pollution or a cloverleaf overpass without losing the top of the subdivision
- Some forested land - significant cultural values (trees blessed by First Nations) -Rich agricultural land -Some farmers work is important for charities, donate food to charity A variety of forest types present, evidence of use by ungulates - Encourages community engagement due to practices at some farms.
- For any agricultural land that would be destroyed - should have to remove good soil & relocate to new fields for growing
- 20 years too late
- Sooner would be better (than 25+ years) congestion into Fort Saskatchewan could be reduced if a suitable by-pass existed
- I see the potential for substantial naturalization of these quarry-ponds. Good opportunity to provide wildlife habitat for passive viewing. (*posted near Bremner lagoons and river*)
- Respect the conservation easement
- No roads on great farm land
- It is a great concept for the area. Planning in advance is a progressive way. All options look good
- When line is drawn, owners need to be compensated now
- Upgrades to Hwy 28 interchange would be great. Twinning Hwy 28 would be very helpful, have seen many accidents here.
- How likely to affect the existing residential structure plans, schools etcetera?
- Would like to see this 'gravel pit' natural area preserved for hiking/biking (leave 'as is')
- Lesson of the day: No gravel in the gravel pit!
- Would make a terrific 'Rundle Park' area (*Area across the river from the Bremner lagoons*)
- Maintain access to Alberta Capital Region WWTP plant
- Disrupts many bodies of water on Strathcona side
- Indigenous burial grounds not reported on study but shared during Open House 1