



Green Line LRT

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
Green Line in Your Community, March 2017

Engagement Overview

In March 2017 the Green Line LRT project team unveiled a draft, detailed alignment along the north segment of the Green Line. This section runs along Centre St and Harvest Hills Blvd, from the Bow River to North Pointe. There were three public events appropriately titled “Green Line in Your Community.” The team sought public input on how access and circulation will work along the alignment and within the surrounding communities.

Community members were able to see the detailed alignment, road network and station locations within their community, along with any potentially impacted properties. 658 area residents attended the in-person events, and an additional 237 comments were shared online.

Prior to these events the Green Line North team had engaged the public and stakeholders in planning the alignment, station areas and transit oriented development (TOD). The input received has been used to inform the detailed alignment that was presented at these March 2017 events. A final version of the proposed alignment, which may include refinements based on feedback collected at the March 2017 events described in this report, will be presented to Council for approval in June 2017.

This engagement is part of the “functional design” phase of the project which is an early phase in the overall Green Line LRT program. Functional design aims to prepare the following for Council approval:

- Track alignment;
- Station access and locations; and,
- Transit Oriented Development.

What public input were we seeking?

At this point in the functional design, the alignment was mostly determined. Because this engagement was the last in a series of engagements in the northern segment, the Green Line team was looking for input on a limited scope of alignment components. The team was looking for input on “access and circulation” for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians in relation to the detailed alignment that was presented. This included neighbourhood access, intersections and vehicle turn locations, and pedestrian/cycling crossing locations.

Comments outside the scope of “access and circulation” were recorded and reviewed by the project team. However, these comments are less likely to be acted on at this stage in the functional design as the team prepares their final report to present to Council for June 2017. All comments can be found in the “verbatim” section of this report.



Green Line LRT

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
Green Line in Your Community, March 2017

Level of engagement

With this engagement happening in the final stages of functional design phase, the engagement operated at a Listen & Learn level, with the promise made: *We will listen to stakeholders and learn about their plans, views, issues, concerns and expectations and ideas.*

At this level of engagement, the project team does not necessarily commit to act on the feedback received. However, they do commit to reviewing all of the public input with the intent of learning from it. Where they are able, they may make some changes in response.

Potential property impacts

City of Calgary staff were on hand to speak with attendees who had questions and concerns regarding potentially impacted properties. These conversations were held in a separate area to ensure the privacy of those individuals. Those who were not able to speak to someone at the event were contacted by phone or email in the days following the event.

In-person events

Three events were held in March 2017:

- 1. March 14: Beddington Tr N to North Pointe (125 attendees)**
Notre Dame High School, 5:30 – 8:00 p.m.
- 2. March 15: Bow River to McKnight Blvd N (223 attendees)**
Highland Park Community Association, 5:30 – 8:00 p.m.
- 3. March 21: McKnight Blvd N to Beddington Tr N (308 attendees)**
Thornccliffe/ Greenview Community Association, 5:30 – 8:00 p.m.

The event was a drop-in, open house format. Due to the relatively high proportion of Chinese language speakers in North Calgary, tri-lingual Chinese interpretation was offered at these events (English/ Mandarin/ Cantonese). This service was utilized at each event, including during a number of conversations with potentially impacted property owners.

Upon entry, participants were invited to read project information posted on large boards throughout the rooms. Project team members and technical experts were available to answer questions. A representative from Calgary Transit was stationed after the display boards and had a large service map to help answer any Transit service related questions.

After the boards, a video was shown of what the proposed Green Line LRT could look like from North Pointe to Seton in the south. Chairs were positioned around a large screen where people watched and got a feel for the route, station locations, and track alignment.

In the centre of the rooms a large map (roughly 15-20 feet long and five feet wide) was arranged so that people could see the draft, detailed alignment. The map showed a satellite image of the area with the route alignment, station locations, crossing locations, intersections and potential property impacts overlayed on top. Around the map is where most public input was received.



Green Line LRT

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard *Green Line in Your Community, March 2017*

Technical experts were positioned around the map. In addition to answering questions, project team members recorded participant feedback by placing stickers on the map for areas of concern (red stickers) and support (green stickers). Detailed feedback was captured by project team members on comment forms. As much as possible, the comments were associated with specific locations to assist the project team members in reviewing and learning from the input afterwards.

Finally, participants were asked to fill out evaluation forms before leaving the event. This feedback is used to help inform future events. Upon reviewing the evaluations, the team was happy to see that 78% of participants agreed that they *understood how prior public input helped shape the detailed design* they saw at the public events.

Online activities

March 15 to April 2, 2017

<http://engage.calgary.ca/greenline/north>

237 comments received

Online input was designed to replicate the in-person events to the fullest extent possible. All informational boards displayed at the in-person events were available online in PDF format. The video of the proposed alignment was also posted on the web page.

Using a tool called a “social map”, online participants could view a digital replica of the map shown at the in-person events. Three maps were published and open for public comment. Participants could drop a digital pin (i.e. marker) anywhere on the map and leave a comment up to 140 characters in length. The character length was limited to 140 characters to make the transcription and theming of the data more manageable. All online comments are included in the verbatim summary attached to this report.

Public Feedback Summary

This section highlights some of the prominent themes as identified by the public. The intent is to bring attention to some of the most commented on features of the detailed alignment. It's important to note that *all comments received* are reviewed by the project team, not only the most frequently mentioned. The themes do, however, help the project team understand what features are of particular interest to the area residents.

Like the in-person events and online activities, the themes below are presented in three distinct sections, beginning at the Bow River.

Bow River to McKnight Blvd N (an estimated 274 of 460 comments)

The majority of the comments received were in relation to the area from the Bow River to McKnight Blvd. The most frequently mentioned avenues and streets were 2 St NW, 20 Ave N,

24 Ave N, and 28 Ave N. Themes are highlighted below and a full record of comments can be found in the verbatim section.

Traffic flow

The majority of comments highlighted traffic flow concerns based on the presented alignment. Some of the most frequently mentioned area/features were:

- ***Concern regarding single lane traffic between the portal and McKnight Blvd***
This was an area of concern for many participants. Participants expressed that Centre St N in this area is already very congested at times. Questions were asked about the impact of busses stopping or accidents occurring. Many people suggested going underground all the way to McKnight Blvd. There were some concerns about a lack of vehicle access to local businesses. Edmonton Tr, 4 St NE, and 2 St NW were identified as likely diversion routes. 2 St NW was also identified as an important bike route that may suffer as a result.
- ***16 Ave N must remain a priority east/west route***
It was mentioned that the impact of the 20 Ave N portal on 16 Ave N must be considered. 16 Ave must remain an essential east/west route.
- ***2 St NW is an important bike route that will be impacted***
Numerous participants expressed concern over the trickle-down impact of traffic diverting to 2 St NW. It is an important bike route that is currently used. People are concerned traffic will move here due to congestion on Centre St N and 20 Ave N.
- ***20 Ave N, and the proposed portal just south of 20 Ave N***
20 Ave N was identified by many as an already congested and highly used road. There were numerous suggestions to move the portal (where the train emerges from underground) north of 20 Ave N. Participants identified that increased congestion on 20 Ave N would push people to 24 Ave N which would worsen the problem (see below). It was suggested to use 20 Ave N to make bus transit connections to the station. Anticipated future development would also worsen congestion.
- ***Concern regarding the proposed intersection at 24 Ave N***
24 Ave N was highlighted by many as a very important road due to the nearby schools and playground zones. Many people commented that a signalized intersection here would encourage cut-through traffic and speeding from Centre St N to 4 St NW. It was suggested that having the portal south of 20 Ave N would compound this problem at 24 Ave N.
- ***Current uses at 28 Ave N need to be considered***
28 Ave N was highlighted as a very busy road where people often speed. It is a primary connector to/from 4 St NE. Potential issues for the proposed intersection here are the new traffic circle and residential parking implications. Funeral processions also use this road.

- ***40 Ave N is busy and may change with the golf course redevelopment***

Some people suggested the need to consider the traffic circle proposed in the area as part of the golf course redevelopment. 40 Ave N is currently very busy as a connector to/from 4 St NE. The proposed intersection at the bottom of the hill at Highland Valley and Centre Street was identified as problematic when the roads are icy.

Pedestrian safety

- ***Sidewalks are already narrow and poor quality***

Some people feel sidewalks in this area are too small and difficult to use in winter. A reduced boulevard, some felt, would reduce pedestrian accessibility.

- ***Four blocks between crossings will be inconvenient***

Some people wished to see more frequent crossings, suggesting that four block intervals would be inconvenient. 22 Ave N and 23 Ave N were specifically identified as ideal crossing locations. 24 Ave N was identified as a good location for a crossing, and one that is used frequently today.

- ***Consider foot traffic from Edmonton Tr***

Participants highlighted the high volume of foot traffic travelling from Edmonton Tr toward 28 Ave. A “massive blind spot” was identified due to the hill at 32 Ave N.

Station accessibility concerns

- ***Concern regarding the removal of 9 Ave N station***

The majority of comments express concern about the removal of 9 Ave N station. The distance to/from 16 Ave station and downtown was seen as quite far. Sidewalks were described as narrow and poor quality around 10 Ave N making the situation worse. There was also a reasonable amount of support for the removal of 9 Ave N station, describing it as close to downtown and expensive to build.

- ***Location of McKnight Station is too far from McKnight Blvd***

There was some concern that McKnight Station is too far from McKnight. Moving it closer, it was suggested, would make it more accessible to all neighbourhoods in the area.

- ***22 Ave is a community connector***

Not having a crossing here was seen as a barricade between communities.

Add 9 Ave station

- ***Many participants wish to keep 9 Ave N station***

While there were also numerous comments expressing support for the removal of 9 Ave N station, most comments expressed a desire to keep it. Participants felt there were many diverse needs in the area to justify it: low income residents, secondary suites, elderly people, and other people without cars. Some people were also concerned that station removal would discourage future development and retail south of 16 Ave N. The hill is seen

as difficult to walk for some. Bus service is already in high demand in the area. People felt future density would justify the station.

Add traffic control/calming

- **Emergency access gates**

Emergency access gates were suggested at 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 24 Ave N to discourage cut-through traffic. 1 St NW was an important street in relation to these suggestions.

- **There must be traffic control/calming at 24 Ave N**

As described earlier, this is a school area with lots of children. It's perceived that the proposed intersection will encourage cut-through traffic and speeding.

Parking

- **Parking concerns were brought up for each of the station locations.**

At 28 Ave N there was concern about people parking in residential areas to access the station. People currently park on Centre St N in this area but will not be able to in the future. A park and ride was suggested for 16 Ave N station. Some people also expressed desire for a park and ride at McKnight Blvd.

- **20 Ave will remain a high traffic area**

There was some concern that people will try to park here due to the portal location.

- **Consider local businesses**

Parking for local businesses was described as important. Two particularly busy businesses were identified as Lina's Italian market and McKinnis and Holloway Funeral Home.

Growth/development potential

- **28 Ave N has great potential**

Some participants described 28 Ave N as having good development and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) potential. Businesses, landscaping, and public parks were suggested. There was some concern about plans for an addictions clinic in the area.

- **Development potential south of 16 Ave N**

Some people felt development south of 16 Ave N would be encouraged if 9 Ave N station was kept.

- **Connect the pathway at Laycock Dr**

It was suggested to connect the City pathway on East Side of Centre St N to the proposed pathway on West Side of Centre via Laycock Dr. Coordination with the developer was encouraged.

McKnight Blvd to Beddington Tr N (an estimated 86 of 460 comments)

The area from McKnight Blvd to Beddington Tr did not have as many concentrated themes as the area described above. Traffic flow, parking, access to amenities, and pedestrian safety were still dominant themes; however, the focus areas within were more diverse. Concern over the loss of 72 Ave N station was also raised. Themes are highlighted below and a full record of comments can be found in the verbatim section.

Traffic Flow

- ***Get rid of the bus trap***

Some people suggested to open up the bus trap. The demolition of homes in the area was perceived to make it more feasible.

- ***Bergen Crescent is mentioned numerous times***

A number of participants mentioned Bergen Crescent and the alley behind it. It was recommended to open access to Bergen Crescent from Centre St N.

- ***Unnecessary intersections/lights***

There were a handful of intersections that some participants felt should be reviewed or did not need signalized intersections. According to these participants:

- There is little cross traffic at 54 Ave N;
- 68 Ave NE (at Huntridge and Huntford Hill) is an important intersection for cars, bikes, and people. People often shortcut and speed through here. A signalized intersection may cause undesirable level of traffic; and,
- 72 Ave N is already a very busy intersection. There was some concern about traffic jams.

Parking

- ***Beddington Station park and ride.***

Some people suggested that the park n ride is too far from the station and/or not big enough.

- ***64 Ave Station***

Some participants suggested having a park and ride at Huntford Cl. Concerns were raised about access to residential parking. 5908 Centre St N was identified as already serving as a park and ride for bus users.

Add 72 Ave Station

- ***72 Ave N is an important commercial area***

There was some concern around the recommended removal of 72 Ave N station. It was suggested that the station would provide important access to the shopping areas and be beneficial to low-income residents in the surrounding area.



Green Line LRT

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
Green Line in Your Community, March 2017

Amenity access concerns

- **Ensure access to Thorncliffe Greenview Community Association**
There was some concern around lost access to the Thorncliffe Greenview Community Association parking lot.
- **Useful alley north of 54 Ave N**
The alley just north of 54 Ave was noted as an amenity that is used by area residents and that needs to be considered.
- **Need better access to Beddington Station park and ride**
It was suggested that access to the Beddington park and ride could be difficult except for eastbound traffic.

Pedestrian safety

- **Ensure student safety around the fitness centre**
Concern was expressed about students going to and from the school and fitness centre. Students from Catherine Nichols Gunn School regularly go to the fitness centre for classes. Safety is critical.

Beddington Tr to North Pointe (an estimated 58 of 460 comments)

The area from Beddington Tr to North Pointe received the fewest number of comments.

Comments were primarily focused on traffic flow, a desire for underground alignment, and pedestrian safety. Themes are highlighted below and a full record of comments can be found in the verbatim section.

Traffic flow

- ***Congested areas that may become more congested with Green Line LRT***

A number of areas were highlighted as currently being congested, or as likely to be congested based on current plans. Participants suggested planning for future congestion at:

- 96 Ave and Country Hills Road;
- Country Village Road;
- Country Hills Drive (traffic is getting worse now); and,
- Country Village Link and Country Village Way.

- ***Mixed opinions on the side-running track alignment***

There were some suggestions to run the alignment down the centre of Harvest Hills Blvd. However, there were also numerous participants who expressed support of the side-running concept.

- ***Additional signalized intersections***

Signalized intersections were suggested at 96 Ave, Country Hills Drive, and Country Village Way. The proposed traffic circle at 96 Ave was flagged by one participant as problematic during high traffic volumes.

Want section underground

- ***96 Ave N station and airport link***

Some people suggested putting the 96 Ave station underground. There were a few comments that suggested would help to incorporate the future airport link.

- ***Semi-underground suggestions***

There were some suggestions to go semi-underground at the following intersections:

- Panamount Blvd and Country Village Road; and,
- Panamount Gate and Country Village Way.

Pedestrian safety

- ***High pedestrian volumes in some areas***

High pedestrian volumes were identified at Country Village Road, Country Village Way, and 96 Ave N. Participants highlighted the student foot traffic in these areas. Over/under-passes were suggested to ensure safety and movement.



Green Line LRT

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
Green Line in Your Community, March 2017

Next steps

This engagement was done as part of the “functional design.” It is a very early stage of planning.

In June 2017 the Green Line project team will go to Calgary City Council to seek approval on the following:

- Track alignment (where, exactly, the track lies along the entire line);
- Station locations; and,
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD) plans.

In April 2017 all public input from these events will be reviewed by the appropriate members of the Green Line project team. The team has committed to listen to stakeholders and learn about their plans, views, issues, concerns and expectations and ideas. While some aspects of the feedback may be acted on at this point, there is no guarantee of significant changes prior to June 2017.

After June 2017, the Green Line project team will begin to gain a better understanding of next steps and timelines. Pending Council approval, there would certainly be future opportunities for public input in the next phases of design. Please visit <http://calgary.ca/greenline> for regular project updates.

The Green Line project team extends a sincere thanks to all area residents who have taken the time to share their invaluable local knowledge with us. We look forward to working with you again!

Verbatim Comments

The following list outlines all comments were recorded online and at the in-person events. Comments have not been altered from their original state or corrected for spelling or grammar. Only personal information such as names or addresses have been edited.

Specific locations have not been associated with each comment in this section. The technical team did, however, review the comments in relation to their specified locations.

Bow River to McKnight Blvd N

Traffic Flow: concerns regarding volume / lane decisions / travel time

- From North Mount DR to the River. Currently two bike lanes have been installed with two auto lanes down and one up. Will the city be putting in rush hour lane reversal to help move traffic that will move over from centre st?
- east/west priority for vehicular traffic needs to be a priority on 16th AV, as traffic being pushed to 20th AV and others.

- traffic flow is already choked here daily. Both north/south and east/west. As long as it's underground will work 20yrs too late tho
- I am concerned that there are no park + rides near 16 Ave N. Could a parkade type lot not be put in on the SE corner of Centre + 16 Ave. My biggest concern is traffic pedestrian flow at centre + 40 avenue.
- I am concerned about traffic flow on centre street between 16th Ave + 20th Ave if the transition between below ground and above ground occurs south of 20th Ave. I think it would serve traffic better on Centre Street and 20th Ave if this transition occurs north of 20th Ave. Also, given that the reduction in lanes along Centre Street on the above ground portion will affect traffic flow, has there been any analysis conducted for the effect on traffic on 4th Street between 24th and 26th Street where traffic is already down to 1-lane (each direction). I expect traffic will find alternate routes from Centre Street which will congest 4th Street.
- Do not reduce car lanes to one in each direction. There will always be cars going to businesses along centre st. How do you turn left to enter a business travelling southbound.
- Reducing car lanes to 1 lane each direction will be making but big trouble, traffic needs to flow smoothly and the stopping + starting people crossing will cause lots of trouble + delays. I think there will be lots for road rage and accidents! NO bicycle lanes on centre st bicycles can use 1st or not w/ major street to travel on so much less traffic.
- Limiting North + south bound vehicle traffic to one lane each direction seems woefully inadequate + will create ridiculous traffic in that area
- Should be underground. Cost only 5-8% more. 2 lanes of traffic is not sufficient. Will create chaos and push people to 4th and edmonton trail.
- There is currently a lane reversal during rush hour between 20th Avenue and downtown, and traffic is still very congested with three lanes.
- Reducing Centre Street to two lanes will cause standstill traffic congestion in a growing city. Let's build for future generations!
- funnel of traffic north of the portal. -it will be impossible to make a right turn from 18 ave - other options would be to use 20 ave or 16 ave. -impossible to turn left on 20 ave from 1 St NE. -16 ave is too congested.
- Centre St is already congested with 4 lanes during rush hour. Reducing to 2 lanes will have a negative impact.
- Concerned that 2nd Street NW will become busy with vehicles trying to avoid Centre Street.
- 2nd Street NW is currently a relatively quiet street with a bike path.
- Concerns with vehicle traffic diverting to 2nd street off of 16th AV, an essential bike lane network. Safety issues for bicyclists
- Worried that commuters will use 2nd Street NW to avoid congestion on Centre Street
- Will 20 Ave NW be impacted? Some talk in 2015 of eliminating curb parking for more cycle route. 20 Ave can not sustain any bus traffic & residents on 20th require the ability to park in front of their homes.
- to 40 ave one lane in either direction ->what happens where there is a car accident?
- Concerned about traffic
- I am concerned with the potential traffic congestion that may occur if the tunnel ends prior to 20th Avenue. This part of centre street is busy and 20th Avenue is a major throughfare for east/west traffic. I would support the train coming above ground after (north) of 20th

Avenue. I believe the original design was for 24th or 25th Ave. I would be interested to Read the outcome of traffic studies and that the planners are looking at current train lines to understand the impact to traffic in those areas.

- Surface LRT N of 20 Ave N. The intersection is already congested. Traffic on 20th Ave. -> Moving the @ grade transition N of 20th also provides opportunities for other Transit feeder & cross town East-West routes closer to residential area. Think about the whole picture. Put transit on 20th Ave. So many opportunities! Transit needed on 20th!
- Please have the portal come up north of 20th Ave, as opposed to south of it. Lots of residential surrounding including a newly built apartment building on the NW corner of 20th Ave + Centre St. Also, it's a very busy intersection especially during rush hour. Please re consider.
- What happened to the original plan to have the tunnel resurface N of 24 ave? The new design failed to consider the E to W traffic on 20 Ave.
- Portal should be north of 20 ave. 20 Ave is already congested. Community of tuxedo park / Mt Pleasant & are the Highland ones who use 20 ave to get to centre street. 3 lanes to 1 during rush hour is going to make conjection worse //
- train should surface north of 20th AV so that lanes not reduced to 1 per direction. unless planned congestion is desired?
- Mt. Pleasant residents enjoy convenient access to Centre ST via 20th AV, decreasing lanes will create bottleneck here.
- Train at grade on 20th will create congestion. Concerns with traffic diverting into residential roads.
- 20 Ave N and Centre St intersection is often busy, train tracks through this area will disrupt traffic.
- The LRT coming out of the tunnel south of 20th ave. I don't thing this will stop traffic on 20th ave. 16th Ave is so busy and backed up that which will still travel to 20 ave. One way to stop some of this is have no left turn heading North and no left turns heading south.
- To whom it may concern: I'm very concerned with the section of the Green Line between 20th Ave North and McKnight Blvd cutting the street down to one lane of traffic each way is a terrible plan. This will just cause congestion & frustration. This is a street that has high volumes of traffic and should not be choked off. Going underground for this section is a way better idea, even is it costs more. In the long run it would be better for the city. Sincerely
[identifying information removed]
- The LRT will surface from the tunnel on 20th Avenue. There will only be 1 lane of traffic going North & going South on Centre Street from 20th Ave up to McKnight Blvd. Why isn't the LRT tunnel'd up to McKnight Blvd. The one lane of traffic on Centre Street will negatively impact the residential areas between McKnight and 20th Ave because drivers will drive thru the residences to get away from the single lane traffic on Centre Street. Is the city thinking about ways to deter traffic in the residential areas?
- I'm calling the avenues with traffic lights "ACCESS POINTS." 24th Avenue and Centre Street is an ACCESS POINT. Due to the limited # ACCESS POINTS, drivers will divert through 24th Avenue to cut across Centre Street. There is a school on 24th Ave & 4th Street. What are your plans to deter drivers/minimize traffic on 24th AVENUE. Why would the city choose 24th Ave as an access point where there's a school. The amount of traffic that goes thru 24th Ave is

already high and it will just go higher if 24th Ave is an Access Point. How is the city going to control the amount of traffic on a “school” zone.

- -concern about the traffic on 24th AVE NW between 4st & Centre Street all ready too much traffic – with the schools on 4st & (illegible) with NW across from Centre Street. Also traffic cutting through the neighborhood with buses, cars, trucks.
- I am very concerned to see that there is proposed traffic light and vehicle crossing point at 24 AVE NW. I am worried that this street will become a major cut-through street with high levels of traffic like 20 Ave NW. There are 2 schools immediately west of the lights on 4th Street NW.
- Very concerned about the increase volume & speed of traffic thru playground zone.
- Commuters will be cutting through the community instead of using 20th street. Concerned about the reduction of my property value.
- concern with cut thru traffic
- high density of uses if station too far north in the middle of nowhere. Can't access parking. South bound traffic has no access. Access & circulation issues businesses loss tenant loss, property value loss.
- Concern with residential street (24 Ave NW) becoming a 'cut through' street for vehicles in community trying to cross Centre or turn north.
- Will buses be using this street to access LRT station? Further increasing traffic.
- What is the impact of train at grade before 24th AV to firestation access on 24th? Fire requires clear route.
- up to 4th street NW is a "school" area. Right now there's already drivers speeding along 24th Ave even though there's a school & playground zone on 24th Ave between 2nd street & 4th street NW. It doesn't make sense to have controlled traffic lights on cetnre street & 24th avenue because that will just encourage irresponsible drivers to speed thru 24th avenue. Why was 24th avenue chosen as an access street where that is a "school" street. Why not 23rd or 27th Avenue.
- Please do not place lights here, this will greatly increase traffic along 24 Ave NW past schools, playground zones and residential areas.
- Tunnel to McKnight. S of McKnight: narrow st, restricts access to businesses, too much local congestion/cut thru -divides community in half
- The location of the station at 28th Avenue is a poor choice which will complicate a very bad and erratic traffic that is there already. The 28th is also used by funeral processions, and there is already a lot of parking & speeding along the 28th in the mornings & evenings. Please move it away!
- The current plan to have a LRT station between 30th + 28th Ave will make the already high + fast traffic on 28th ave between centre street + 4th ave NW even worse as it is currently a “short cut” due to the traffic circle + now you are forcing them down 28th ave.
- concern with cut thru traffic
- Again, two lanes are required before and after the intersection. If it's icy in the winter, only three cars will get through before red ligh
- LRT riders will drive to there streets and use them as a parking lot. This will dramatically increase traffic, noise, and congestion.

- It is a very bad choice for the train station. The 28 avenue is extremely busy already; everybody drives either towards 4th street or towards Centre + funeral traffic + everybody parks & speeds. This will put us living between the 4th & centre, into a much worse situation on top of the existing troubles with the traffic circle, speeding during rush hours and strange people parking along our 28th Ave during day hours & weekends. Please move the station away from 28 Ave N.
- Between 4th St and Centre. Concerned about cars driving through my currently very quiet street to get to the LRT station. Do not want more traffic congestion and/or parking on my street (my property tax is too high for that!!!)
- Why this artificial bottleneck? There should be two northbound lanes.
- Another bottleneck. There should be 2 lanes on either side of the intersection to ensure traffic cleared out quickly and less vehicles idle.
- With any pedestrian traffic and vehicles turning, this will effectively grind any southbound traffic to a halt.
- grid street network is key planning principle and the green line is ruining it.
- Centre Street needs to maintain at minimum 4 lanes to McKnight Blvd; it is congested with 4 lanes. Reducing to 2 will be catastrophic.
- Has traffic study been conducted on impact of 4th street once Centre St. goes to one-lane traffic?
- concerned for peds & traffic. Tim Hortons creates traffic issues. Okay with stations locations.
- Appreciate the opportunity for Feedback & to ask questions. Very concerned about the bottleneck of one lane traffic (S&N) btw 20 Ave N & McKnight Blvd. Also, did not see the traffic circle integrated for the Golf Course Development. This will development add significant traffic onto 40 Ave & Centre St.
- More than one lane is required after the intersection for at least a block while traffic gets up to speed after the traffic lights.
- Consider underground tunnel to 40th Avenue or to McKnight to avoid traffic congestion on Centre Street.
- 40th ave -West of 2nd street at the bottom of the hill proposed access to the Highland Development to the North. There has been talk by The City about putting in a traffic Circle at this location & access to Highland Development but I don't think a traffic Circle @ this location makes sense. Traffic backs up from 4th street to the East up the hill on 40th Ave
- If the 9 ave tunnel is underground I would prefer not to have it. -low ridership increased crime would prefer investment to go toward public realm (centre) instead. If the station is above ground I would prefer not to have it. Increase traffic at turn lane avenues (ie 9ave) and removes the grid system. 9ave W would funnel all of Rosedale Hill & School traffic which is currently going thru multiple avenues!
- underground - centre st "" - accidents
- One lane is NOT enough! There is too much traffic even without all the busses.
- There definitely needs to be more than one straight-through northbound lane.
- One lane traffic will slow things down so much. Not everyone can use transit b/c need to drive kids to school.
- on avenues/streets off centre st. Cut-thru traffic. Circulation thru neighbourhood

- The buses shall have adequate bend in the curb for stopping with no interruption to traffic flow. Often times cars are looking to change lane at the intersection
- Centre street is still 4 lanes of traffic w/ the LRT I don't understand why. The train is removing volume which should result in less cars. Centre Street NEEDS a bike lane and fewer cars. Lane reversal s/b removed. Centre should have reduced lanes for cars.
- From 20 Ave N to 40 Ave N + north. Dramatic negative impact on centre st traffic, incl No provision for bus stops that are out of the traffic flow.
- I do not think one lane of vehicle traffic each direction is adequate for a busy route like Center street.
- Where will buses pull in for the bus stops? Will there be room for cars to pass buses or will all vehicles be backed up?
- Don't turn centre street into the nightmare that is 36th Street NE
- Decrease traffic along Centre street and reroute to alternate streets. Centre street should be a Great Street, not a freeway!
- Single lane for N&S bound traffic will be a nightmare during rush hour in the best of conditions. Poor conditions will triple travel times.
- From 20 Ave N to 40 Ave N + north Not clear what provisions will be for additional traffic on neighbouring streets eg Avenues and edmonton trail
- Residents might as well use existing BRT connections, which will be impeded by traffic once Centre Street is converted into a 2 lane road.
- Concern for bottlenecking traffic between 20 ave to McKnight
- Future access on 40 avenue. Will compound traffic that is already funneled to 40 ave due to fewer intersections on Centre Street.
- Potential future intersection at bottom of Highland Valley + Centre St. I am very concerned about the possibility of having to stop at the light at the bottom of the valley + in the winter having to try to make it up the hill from a full stop. Also concerned about cars slamming into one another N bound on Centre, to stop at the light. How is traffic going to flow at all when there is a the eventual car accidents?
- Extending tunnel to McKnight and placing 16 ave stn and McKnight Stn under roads. Connections to bus or other modes on. Very Constrained.
- There needs to be lane reversal for north/southbound Centre St traffic so that commuter traffic is not stuck idling so long.

Pedestrian Safety: concerns around pedestrian safety at intersections / pedestrian ways / pathway connections

- Need a pedestrian crossing at 11 Ave. No train here, so give peds priority over vehicles!
- Big development happening east of Edmonton Trail. Infills. I have tried to walk across Edm. Tr and it's not good. Foot traffic will get worse going to/from 28 station. Blind spot at 33 and Edm Trail people cross all the time (between 32 and? At Cedars Deli)
- I am concerned that there are no park + rides near 16 Ave N. Could a parkade type lot not be put in on the SE corner of Centre + 16 Ave. My biggest concern is traffic pedestrian flow at centre + 40 avenue.
- Need a pedestrian crossing here.
- Need Pedestrian crossing

- There needs to be a pedestrian crossing at every intersection. Businesses on Centre Street will be negatively impacted without them.
- 20 ave to McKnight. Taking away boulevard space between vehicles & pedestrians. Peds won't want to walk down centre st being this close to the vehicles
- We need to have more pedestrian crossings, we shouldn't have to walk 2 blocks to cross the road then 2 blocks to get where you want to be.
- Where are the pedestrian crossings?
- Need a pedestrian crossing here.
- Yes, pedestrian crossing should already be there.
- no pedestrian crossing shown
- Where are the pedestrian crossings?
- Please have a pedestrian crossing at this intersection. There is one there currently, why is it being removed?
- No pedestrian crossing between 20 Av N and 24 Av N creates too large of a gap. 4 blocks between crossings creates a wall for pedestrians.
- Intersection needs a pedestrian crossing
- Need a pedestrian crosswalk here.
- Pedestrian crossing required for access to local businesses. 4 blocks between ped crossings is insufficient.
- need pedestrian crossing
- Where are the pedestrian crossings?
- Please retain the current pedestrian crossing here. Why is it being removed? Local residents need to cross the street!
- Need a pedestrian crosswalk here.
- Place barrier here to prevent cut through traffic. Pedestrian access across Center.
- maintain E/W connections for pedestrians and bikes. sidewalks should be wide enough for pedestrians.
- Keep the pedestrian crossing, lose the traffic lights
- up to 4th street NW is a "school" area. Right now there's already drivers speeding along 24th Ave even though there's a school & playground zone on 24th Ave between 2nd street & 4th street NW. It doesn't make sense to have controlled traffic lights on centre street & 24th avenue because that will just encourage irresponsible drivers to speed thru 24th avenue. Why was 24th avenue chosen as an access street where that is a "school" street. Why not 23rd or 27th Avenue.
- Need a pedestrian crossing here.
- Local residents need to cross the street at every intersection to access local businesses. Where are the pedestrian crosswalks?
- with extra traffic moving from centre street to 4th st NW. Will the curb extension be removed?
- concerned for peds & traffic. Tim Hortons creates traffic issues. Okay with stations locations.
- pedestrian and cyclist connection E/W here crucial.
- Train should be underground. Infrastructure cost of relocating utilities etc vs cost of tunnel to McKnight or 64 Ave. More room further north. Ped crossing every 4 blocks is creating a

disconnect in the community. Train will be loud. New developments on Centre St will be impacted

- Centre street not walkable to access stations (especially to 10th). Wider sidewalks needed. Cut through area along 24th & all signalized intersections
- Pedestrian crossings must be maintained every 2 blocks! Otherwise the vehicle wins again..
- Foot Traffic to cross Edmonton Trail to get to 28th and Centre LRT Station
- Significant foot traffic trying to cross Edmonton Trail. Massive blind spot due to the hill at 32nd.
- Foot Traffic crossing Edmonton Trail to get to 28th and Centre LRT Station
- Sidewalk is really narrow and hard to use during the winter with snow piled up.
- The amount of crosswalks for Pedestrian + cyclist traffic after 19th Ave Tunnel (one every four blocks) is going to cut up communities. Option: Overpasses for pedestrians? Tunnels for pedestrians? Use tenion ie dips in land to create underpass for cyclists.

Station Accessibility: concerns regarding station access / locations / connections to existing transit

- wants 9 ave station. 10 ave NW is clogged with buses to accommodate school at 10 ave NW. Train would relieve some of the buses. Might get people getting off at 9ave to use parks on the river.
- Long walk to downtown for those people living there
- want multiple access for ped into station
- South Entrances. -> move station south 1 block (15 ave)
- Concerned with transit connections to get here; otherwise, this station and green line is useless to me.
- station placement -> move north to connect better w/ new residential
- Do Not put a gate. We need more access not less. Fewer walls and gates, less segregation of uses.
- Shift portal north of 20 ave at least
- No pedestrian crossing between 20 Av N and 24 Av N creates too large of a gap. 4 blocks between crossings creates a wall for pedestrians.
- Would like to maintain access onto centre st. Do not want vehicle barricades installed, or restrict to exit only barricades from community.
- There should be no barricades for any community streets as it impedes access unnecessarily.
- Abandoning this station questions whether there is a benefit to the Green Line to nearby residents
- No 9 ave stn = long distance between stations (16N - 2Ave S)
- we want the station on 9 ave, more accessible than 16th Ave station
- Would like to see the station back in design. Connection/revitalizing communities. Decision to get underground \$\$\$\$. High density neighbourhood. Low income houses -> people do not have cars. Elderly people. No3 won't run every 5-10min once GL comes in. Would not have advocated for GL if they knew 9ave station was going to be eliminated. Long standing community. Lower density communities are getting stations. Businesses above the turner are going to suffer -> people aren't going to walk south from 16ave

- Live near 9 ave station, work downtown, high density neighbourhood, density is only going to get higher, ridership will not be low. This is a community-.taking away access. Long way to go to get north. Expensive station but it would be the best. May not be a good decision now but will be in 2027...& beyond
- loss of connectivity. Long walk to Green line stn @ 10th. Closer to go to Ridership. High density in Bridgeland *they would use station* higher land use along Edmonton trail.
- Station is required. Should be included, goals of Community Intergration and community access to the LRT system fail as communities south of ~14 ave N have limited access to system
- station removal cannot be served by 10th str stn. Isolation community. Not serving potential ridership in area
- Is it possible to do a station on 13th Ave or 12th Ave instead of 16th Ave? In 40-50 years might it be needed? So prepare ground now....
- 9 Avenue N Station should be reconsidered, as it would improve convenient access from inner city residents
- keep the station - do it right the first time! You can't go back. Crescent Heights has the potential to become an amazing community with the Green Line -don't overlook us please!
- want 9 ave station. High density. Lots of people in secondary suites. Lots of people without cars who rely on transit. Secondary suites are illegal so numbers are not recorded.
- Not having a 9 Ave station will greatly reduce the value of the Green Line to many communities. Please consider people with mobility issues.
- Keep a 9 AVE station. Development potential for the centre st commercial region; access for residents, particularly with mobility issues.
- Please build the 9th Ave station. The train will already be going underground so I would be interested in knowing how much more the station would be (cost vs. benefit) I feel there wasn't enough info on why (quantified) it won't be recommended. Also please include several access points to 16th Ave Station! Great job on underground for inner city!
- Will there be a road going through our park?
- Train should be underground. Infrastructue cost of relocating utilities etc vs cost of tunnel to McKnight or 64 Ave. More room further north. Ped crossing every 4 blocks is creating a disconnect in the community. Train will be loud. New developments on Centre St will be impacted
- Centre street not walkable to access stations (especially to 10th). Wider sidewalks needed. Cut through area along 24th & all signalized intersections
- From 20 Ave N to 40 Ave N + north Not clear what provisions will be for additional traffic on neighbouring streets eg Avenues and edmonton trail
- Residents might as well use existing BRT connections, which will be impeded by traffic once Centre Street is converted into a 2 lane road.
- Why so far away from McKnight? This is even worse than taking the 3.
- Put the station closer to Mknight BLVD, its more accessible to all neighborhoods
- "Thornccliffe Station" should be the name given this station's proposed location. (Northmount is closer, if you /must/ use a street name.)
- Stop should be closer to McKnight blvd

- want/need access to Green Line (w/o 9ave how are we servicing the growing community)

Traffic Control and/or calming: requests for additional traffic control and/or calming in an area

- consider gate like south side of 16th ave for cut through traffic
- How will traffic calming be implemented on the crossing streets
- First street ne needs to be upgraded to a bicycle route with slower speeds and reduced stops and crossing @20 av
- key east/west connection. please don't split crescent heights up! Intersections should be maintained.
- 12th ave busy with rush hour & cut through traffic, worse with construction. More stop signs on 12th ave & 4th St to slow traffic
- gate to prevent cut through traffic
- emergency gate on west side of alley way to prevent cut through traffic
- exit only similar to 13th avenue nw
- Implement traffic calming / gates to prevent cut through traffic
- gate to prevent cut through traffic
- 2 ST already sees many "short-cutters" during rush hour-is a bike route-slow vehicles down-add barriers like on south side of 16th Ave NW
- emergency gate on west side of alley way to prevent cut through traffic
- exit only similar to 13th avenue nw intersection
- funnel of traffic north of the portal. -it will be impossible to make a right turn from 18 ave - other options would be to use 20 ave or 16 ave. -impossible to turn left on 20 ave from 1 St NE. -16 ave is too congested.
- gate to prevent cut through traffic
- emergency access only gate on west side of alley to prevent cut through traffic
- exit only intersection similar to 13th ave nw
- install emergency access only gate to allow for bicycle traffic only - prevent cut through traffic
- parking on 20th removed? Busy traffic detour route. Parking restrictions on cross streets that are signalized.
- emergency access gate to prevent cut through traffic
- Need traffic gates to prevent 21st from becoming a short cut throughway to avoid 16th ave. cross section congestion.
- Place barrier here to prevent cut through traffic. Pedestrian access across Center.
- Would like to see 30 km zone and speed bumps to control speed and volume.
- Does 24 Ave E need to be this wide? Will encourage higher speeds.
- Turn residential areas into 30km zones (like in in Rosedale) to alleviate cut-through traffic and try to preserve our peaceful community
- Place traffic calming measures along 24 Ave NW to slow down or deter extra vehicles
- Place barrier here to prevent cut through traffic
- traffic calming
- No traffic signal showing on map??
- traffic calming

- There is no NBL on 30 ave for adjacent Vacuum Store. Their store used to be at 16 ave and moved due to widening. Fell NBL access is important for business.
- Centre street not walkable to access stations (especially to 10th). Wider sidewalks needed. Cut through area along 24th & all signalized intersections

Requests to add a station to a specific location

- Seems like more stops would reduce the number of transfers a customer needs to make. i.e.: stops closer to destinations.
- please keep 9 Ave station. crucial to livening the area
- Abandoning this station questions whether there is a benefit to the Green Line to nearby residents
- There are concerns around the 9 Ave station in Crescent Heights and there is a need for greater education and clarity around the decision for possible exclusion of this stop.
- Please don't cut the 9th Avenue station. SO MANY people depend on the frequent bus service there, including, seniors, people with disabilities. This winter, I was pregnant and it was too icy to walk/bike downtown. I depended on that service. Bringing in the train w/o that station means service will get worse. Need to stop ignoring inner-city communities! Transit it not just about shuffling people from the suburbs to downtown.
- A station is needed south of 16th Avenue, especially in light of the potential density that has already started to develop in that area. Not having a station would be a missed opportunity to support inner city densification outside of downtown and the commercial environment is already suffering because of a lack of pedestrian traffic.
- 9th Ave N station should go ahead! Think of density & # of people serve. Other stations close to dtwn like Sunnyside serve many passengers! If 9th Ave is too deep consider moving it N, like near 12 Ave. Yes it will be very close to 16th but the population is there to support it. Why are we subsidizing stations in the suburbs?
- Crescent Heights has high density and will get higher. It is a mistake to remove the 9AV station. It will make the LRT inaccessible for many residents in Crescent Heights – 16 AV station is too far. It is worth the investment for future growth to put a station at 9AV. It will also ensure local business traffic does not disappear.
- I understand the 9th Ave N station is under technical review for reasons of ridership in the catchment area. Has future development of condos on Edmonton Trail/4 Street NW been considered in these projected ridership numbers?
- *Keep 9th Ave Station! LRT isn't about moving suburbs to downtown. CH has a high low-income demographic that needs that station to get around the city not just to downtown. LRT has virtually no benefit to CH if 9th Ave Station is eliminated.
- We need, want, deserve a station at 9 Ave N. Crescent Heights would not have supported the underground alignment if it meant the station would not go ahead. The purpose of moving the alignment to centre st was to connect communities instead of the LRT being about moving people from the suburbs into downtown. Crescent Heights has excellent N/S transit service now. The removal of the station means Crescent Heights gets nothing out of this project.
- The folks around the 9th ave station (proposed) will pay property taxes on the green line "benefits" but should also get an underground station as a result!!

- Very concerned about loss of 9th Ave N. Station. 16th Ave is awkward + a long ways away from River population.
- no station A stn here would be so far underground that by the time we get to platform we could have walked/biked to 16Av Stn or bus/walk DT
- Would like to see the station back in design. Connection/revitalizing communities. Decision to get underground \$\$\$\$. High density neighbourhood. Low income houses -> people do not have cars. Elderly people. No3 won't run every 5-10min once GL comes in. Would not have advocated for GL if they knew 9ave station was going to be eliminated. Long standing community. Lower density communities are getting stations. Businesses above the tunner are going to suffer -> people aren't going to walk south from 16ave
- Live near 9 ave station, work downtown, high density neighbourhood, density is only going to get higher, ridership will not be low. This is a community-taking away access. Long way to go to get north. Expensive station but it would be the best. May not be a good decision now but will be in 2027...& beyond
- loss of connectivity. Long walk to Green line stn @ 10th. Closer to go to Ridership. High density in Bridgeland *they would use station* higher land use along Edmonton trail.
- We need a 9th ave station!! This was proposed on the initial buyin now its gone.....!!
- Station is required. Should be included, goals of Community Intergration and community access to the LRT system fail as communities south of ~14 ave N have limited access to system
- I am concerned with the potential elimination of the 9 Ave station. Keep 9 Ave station.
- station removal cannot be served by 10th str stn. Isolation community. Not serving potential ridership in area
- 9 Avenue N Station should be reconsidered, as it would improve convenient access from inner city residents
- want 9 ave station. High density. Lots of people in secondary suites. Lots of people without cars who rely on transit. Secondary suites are illegal so numbers are not recorded.
- I fully understand the rationale for eliminating this station, but make sure you're taking the long-term view. Crescent Heights density is increasing quickly and it will continue to do so. Centre Street is also logical for TOD and for a commercial extension of downtown. The 9 ave station would help the vitality of Centre St.
- Not having a 9 Ave station will greatly reduce the value of the Green Line to many communities. Please consider people with mobility issues.
- Keep a 9 AVE station. Development potential for the centre st commercial region; access for residents, particularly with mobility issues.
- Keep the station, turn this area into a 'destination', like the Broadway area in Vancouver. So much potential to this part of town
- Please build the 9th Ave station. The train will already be going underground so I would be interested in knowing how much more the station would be (cost vs. benefit) I feel there wasn't enough info on why (quantified) it won't be recommended. Also please include several access points to 16th Ave Station! Great job on underground for inner city!
- Please put in the 9th Ave Station. We want to get it right the First time. My wife recently got pregnant & was no longer able to walk down the hill. Strollers in winter will be a challenge. The inner city should not be penalized. Crescent Heights is focused on increasing density &

the station is key to making that a community hub. We bought recently in the neighbourhood under the idea we would have a station.

Parking: concerns around parking loss / permitting / location

- I recommend there should be some parking space provide for 16 Ave station. There are limited parking space now, and LRT will create a even more limited parking in the future.
- Make sure there is adequate parking for 16th Ave station
- I am concerned that there are no park + rides near 16 Ave N. Could a parkade type lot not be put in on the SE corner of Centre + 16 Ave. My biggest concern is traffic pedestrian flow at centre + 40 avenue.
- Will 20 Ave NW be impacted? Some talk in 2015 of eliminating curb parking for more cycle route. 20 Ave can not sustain any bus traffic & residents on 20th require the ability to park in front of their homes.
- Looks good. No parking lots @ 20 AV -> good!
Looking forward to detailed design @ stations.
Need to get accompanying land use right (upzone)
- parking on 20th removed? Busy traffic detour route. Parking restrictions on cross streets that are signalized.
- keep no cycle lanes
- people park on the street & take the bus downtown. This might happen more often with the GL in place.
- high density of uses if station too far north in the middle of nowhere. Can't access parking. South bound traffic has no access. Access & circulation issues businesses loss tenant loss, property value loss.
- Will residential streets in Tuxedo Park close to Centre be turned into Residents Parking only?
- People currently park on Centre Street for residential units on Centre Street. Where will they park with only one lane available?
- LRT riders will drive to there streets and use them as a parking lot. This will dramatically increase traffic, noise, and congestion.
- It is a very bad choise for the train station. The 28 avenue is extremely busy already; everybody drives either towards 4th street or towards Centre + funeral traffic + everybody parks & speeds. This will put us living between the 4th & centre, into a much worse situation on top of the existing troubles with the traffic circle, speeding during rush hours and strange people parking along our 28th Ave during day hours & weekends. Please move the station away from 28 Ave N.
- Between 4th St and Centre. Concerned about cars driving through my currently very quiet street to get to the LRT station. Do not want more traffic congestion and/or parking on my street (my property tax is too high for that!!!)
- Residential Streets around stations will need to become permit only parking to avoid residential parking issues.
- people using 28 ave station are going to try to park on the street on 30 ave. Parking is already a problem for residents
- Currently, people park on Centre for residential units on Centre Street. Where will they park with only one lane available?

- People currently park on Centre for the residential units on Centre Street. Where will they park with only one lane available?
- Renters currently park on Centre Street for these rental units. Where will they park with only one lane available?
- Difficulty to give clients enough parking w/ transit users using all parking
- parking on weekends overflows to street parking along Centre St - need avoid parking congestion for residents on neighbouring streets
- Difficult for attendees to access parking for funeral. What impact for processions to cemetery-was Centre to 28 ave to 4 st nw
- Build a parkade here... there isn't enough parking in the area
- Where will all the people park? There are already issues with the amount of use of side streets for parking.
- concerned about potential parking loss and property impact to strip mall
- Use as a parking lot for train station at Mcknight BLVD

Growth / Development Potential: acknowledgement of / suggestions for development or growth of an area

- for sale -> 3 lots want to bundle and sell
- BUS 404, How about improving this line to its actual useful and more frequent than once/hr. per stop? Connect to here?
- Need wireless service at stations and underground.
- having a station at 16th Ave that is underground is great and should be built. Underground -> Great idea. Will also contribute to redevelopment of the 16th Ave corridor all the way to SAIT.
- Currently zoned for an addictions clinic? Could this land be used for something else now that a station may be going there?
- The center street church at 40 av + center st N is currently entertaining offers for their West Campus -the old church property. At least talk to them to see what they might want and assess whether an elevated [illegible] or small park + ride might be accommodated with a transit bus of some sort. Don't delay. Developers have been making unsolicited offers
- Excellent opportunity to develop this parcel into a 'destination'. Bar, restaurant, coffee shop, anything...
- underutilized space could be supported through land use policy to enable redevelopment, addition of local commercial amenities and greenspac
- This space needs a transit oriented development that will enliven the street.
- Tuxedo park has great potential as a landscaped park.
- Can some of this additional space not be used to keep Centre St at 4 lanes of traffic?
- Lie the station where it is proposed, south of 40 Ave N. Want to encourage the City to do retail development proposal/land use change proposals within the 600m TOD zone of that station to encourage re-development of this area or Centre St, with MIXED USE!
- keep the station - do it right the first time! You can't go back. Crescent Heights has the potential to become an amazing community with the Green Line -don't overlook us please!

- want 9 ave station. High density. Lots of people in secondary suites. Lots of people without cars who rely on transit. Secondary suites are illegal so numbers are not recorded.
- I fully understand the rationale for eliminating this station, but make sure you're taking the long-term view. Crescent Heights density is increasing quickly and it will continue to do so. Centre Street is also logical for TOD and for a commercial extension of downtown. The 9 ave station would help the vitality of Centre St.
- Keep the station, turn this area into a 'destination', like the Broadway area in Vancouver. So much potential to this part of town
- I would like to see the TOD for the entire Centre St corridor from Centre St bridge to 16 Ave as part of the plan even without 9 Ave Stn.
- Integrate underground with at and above grade commercial development, expands overall developable space).
- The City has a mandate under the MDP to "connect the city". The opportunity existst to connect the City pathway on the East side of Centre on City land to the proposed pathway on the West Side of Centre on the proposed new development. -Should coordinate plans better with the new development
- Build a parkade here... there isn't enough parking in the area
- Plant large trees to mitigate noise and light pollution. Will also block unsightly overhead power poles.
- N-S vehicular traffic should tunnel under with the train to allow free flow E-W along McKnight. Let's get this busy intersection right!
- McKnight widening here should happen with the train tunnel. Tear up the road once, not twice! All levels of gov't need to work together.
- Use as a parking lot for train station at Mcknight BLVD

Property Impact Concerns

- There is currently a Condo complex being built on THIS SPOT. Does this mean that it will be torn down not long after being finished?
- There needs to be a pedestrian crossing at every intersection. Businesses on Centre Street will be negatively impacted without them.
- Can the tunnel be placed further north, as originally planned so that it can be much less disruptive on our community?
- Pedestrian crossing required for access to local businesses. 4 blocks between ped crossings is insufficient.
- Many businesses on Centre St N would benefit having underground sections of the tracks extended further north.
- Commuters will be cutting through the community instead of using 20th street.

Concerned about the reduction of my property value.

- Tunnel to McKnight. S of McKnight: narrow st, restricts access to businesses, too much local congestion/cut thru -divides community in half
- People currently park on Centre Street for residential units on Centre Street. Where will they park with only one lane available?

- Currently, people park on Centre for residential units on Centre Street. Where will they park with only one lane available?
- People currently park on Centre for the residential units on Centre Street. Where will they park with only one lane available?
- Renters currently park on Centre Street for these rental units. Where will they park with only one lane available?
- Will there be a road going through our park?
- We didn't go down on Mcleod Trail so why use all of Centre Street? It negatively impacts local business and residents too much.
- Noooo my house! I'm pro green line but anti taking-away of my land! How much beyond the boulevard is going to be taken?
- Will Lina's lose it's patio?
- Difficult for attendees to access parking for funeral. What impact for processions to cemetery-was Centre to 28 ave to 4 st nw
- Will all of these houses be demolished? There will be a lot of impact on families in our neighbourhood.

Supportive: comments in support of a decision or Green Line generally

- I do like the underground alignment through downtown to 16 Ave.
- having a station at 16th Ave that is underground is great and should be built. Underground -> Great idea. Will also contribute to redevelopment of the 16th Ave corridor all the way to SAIT.
- There is already a tunnel under 8 Ave. Would this join up to it? Be a waste not to.
- Looks good. No parking lots @ 20 AV -> good!
Looking forward to detailed design @ stations.
Need to get accompanying land use right (upzone)
- Yes, pedestrian crossing should already be there.
- Great design - decreasing vehicular traffic and improving transport for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. Residents must drive less!
- I really like we are going to underground stations & line. Better value for our \$\$\$\$. I also like the idea of removing 9 ave. N station. The area is not dense enough to necessitate two station to provide quality transit options
- underground -> to expensive. Not needed so close to 16th ave station
- Great spot
- Too many stations that are too close together.
compared to NW line, which has very few stations. This one or one of the others needs to go.
- As long as the #2 bus is still operating as a "frequent" bus route than I'm ok with no station here.
- keep the work up
- Noooo my house! I'm pro green line but anti taking-away of my land! How much beyond the boulevard is going to be taken?

Transit Connections: comments concerning Green Lines connection to existing Transit options

- increase frequency
- BUS 404, How about improving this line to its actual useful and more frequent than once/hr. per stop? Connect to here?
- PLEASE do not decrease efficiency of bus 2 route, as it circumvents traffic here and benefits Mt. Pleasant residents.
- keep no cycle lanes
- prefer buses over train at 40 ave -lots of options
- Concerned about lack of revitalization and on going bus service
- Would like to see the station back in design. Connection/revitalizing communities. Decision to get underground \$\$\$\$. High density neighbourhood. Low income houses ->people do not have cars. Elderly people. No3 won't run every 5-10min once GL comes in. Would not have advocated for GL if they knew 9ave station was going to be eliminated. Long standing community. Lower density communities are getting stations. Businesses above the turner are going to suffer -> people aren't going to walk south from 16ave
- loss of connectivity. Long walk to Green line stn @ 10th. Closer to go to Ridership. High density in Bridgeland *they would use station* higher land use along Edmonton trail.
- want 9 ave station. High density. Lots of people in secondary suites. Lots of people without cars who rely on transit. Secondary suites are illegal so numbers are not recorded.
- As long as the #2 bus is still operating as a "frequent" bus route than I'm ok with no station here.
- From 20 Ave N to 40 Ave N + north. Dramatic negative impact on centre st traffic, incl No provision for bus stops that are out of the traffic flow.
- The City has a mandate under the MDP to "connect the city". The opportunity existst to connect the City pathway on the East side of Centre on City land to the proposed pathway on the West Side of Centre on the proposed new development. -Should coordinate plans better with the new development
- The amount of crosswalks for Pedestrian + cyclist traffic after 19th Ave Tunnel (one every four blocks) is going to cut up communities. Option: Overpasses for pedestrians? Tunnels for pedestrians? Use tenion ie dips in land to create underpass for cyclists.

Underground: requests for portions to be underground

- anything above ground is going to grind traffic flow to a halt and increase the possibility of injury or death. raise it above ground.
- If paying for LRT to go below grade, can Centre Street not be pushed down too? Allow 16ave free-flow here.
- Consider extending underground tunnel to McKnight Blvd. It will cost more, but let's get it right the first time around.
- Reconsider placing the tunnel as far north as possible (to McKnight?). The train on the surface is cutting Tuxedo Park in 2
- tunnel has to be N or 20th as its a collector. vehicles not turning at 16th to go to 4th or edm tr will bottle neck at 17, 18, 19.

- The hills get steep after 20 Ave, why not put the whole line underground, like a PROPER CITY? Riding in the cars will be hard farther North.
- Tunnel exit should be extended as far north as possible, at least past 24 Ave N as it is designated as an emergency evacuation route.
- Many businesses on Centre St N would benefit having underground sections of the tracks extended further north.
- Tunnel to McKnight. S of McKnight: narrow st, restricts access to businesses, too much local congestion/cut thru -divides community in half
- Consider underground tunnel to 40th Avenue or to McKnight to avoid traffic congestion on Centre Street.
- Having the train run through centre street destroys accessibility for residents of surrounding communities. Run the train underground.
- It should stay underground until after 20th Ave
- underground past 16 Ave. Anything else will ruin Crescent Heights.

Cycling Infrastructure : comments regarding cycling infrastructure

- First street ne needs to be upgraded to a bicycle route with slower speeds and reduced stops and crossing @20 av
- From North Mount DR to the River. Currently two bike lanes hear been installed with two auto lanes down and one up. Will the city be putting in rush hour lane reversal to help wove traffic that will more over from centre st?
- 2nd Street NW is currently a relatively quiet street with a bike path.
- Concerns with vehicle traffic diverting to 2nd street off of 16th AV, an essential bike lane network. Safety issues for bicyclists
- 2 ST already sees many "short-cutters" during rush hour-is a bike route-slow vehicles down-add barriers like on south side of 16th Ave NW
- install emergcey access only gate to allow for bicycle traffic only - prevent cut through traffic
- consider bike access only roadway
- bicyclcel access only north south to prevent cut through traffic
- maintain E/W connections for pedestrians and bikes. sidewalks should be wide enough for pedestrians.
- pedestrian and cyclist connection E/W here crucial.
- no station A stn here would be so far underground that by the time we get to platform we could have walked/biked to 16Av Stn or bus/walk DT
- From 20 Ave N to 40 Ave N + north: not clear what provisions for cyclists
- Centre street is still 4 lanes of traffic w/ the LRT I don't understand why. The train is removing volume which should result in less cars. Centre Street NEEDS a bike lane and fewer cars. Lane reversal s/b removed. Centre should have reduced lanes for cars.

Positive Feedback on Green Line Accessibility

- good ped location crossing at 24th (well used today)
- Great design - decreasing vehicular traffic and improving transport for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. Residents must drive less!
- concerned for peds & traffic. Tim Hortons creates traffic issues. Okay with stations locations.

- Lie the station where it is proposed, south of 40 Ave N. Want to encourage the City to do retail development proposal/land use change proposals within the 600m TOD zone of that station to encourage re-development of this area or Centre St, with MIXED USE!
- Happy to see it gone!!! :) saves \$ -people in crescent Heights can walk downtown in 20-30 mins -walk, bike, bus, uber; lots of other modes to get downtown. -happy to see LRT underground through community ->won't create a divide
- Happy about McKnight intersection

Amenity Access: concerns around access to existing amenities

- There needs to be a pedestrian crossing at every intersection. Businesses on Centre Street will be negatively impacted without them.
- high density of uses if station too far north in the middle of nowhere. Can't access parking. South bound traffic has no access. Access & circulation issues businesses loss tenant loss, property value loss.
- Local residents need to cross the street at every intersection to access local businesses. Where are the pedestrian crosswalks?
- Vacuum specialist: there will be no access to [the] business from centre st. parking lot will be blocked. We should have access to our business from centre street
- Would like to see the station back in design. Connection/revitalizing communities. Decision to get underground \$\$\$\$. High density neighbourhood. Low income houses ->people do not have cars. Elderly people. No3 won't run every 5-10min once GL comes in. Would not have advocated for GL if they knew 9ave station was going to be eliminated. Long standing community. Lower density communities are getting stations. Businesses above the turner are going to suffer -> people aren't going to walk south from 16ave
- Having the train run through centre street destroys accessibility for residents of surrounding communities. Run the train underground.

Car Safety

- anything above ground is going to grind traffic flow to a halt and increase the possibility of injury or death. raise it above ground.
- to 40 ave one lane in either direction ->what happens where there is a car accident?
- bells and gates. New condos on 20th
- Again, two lanes are required before and after the intersection. If it's icy in the winter, only three cars will get through before red light
- The buses shall have adequate bend in the curb for stopping with no interruption to traffic flow. Often times cars are looking to change lane at the intersection
- Potential future intersection at bottom of Highland Valley + Centre St. I am very concerned about the possibility of having to stop at the light at the bottom of the valley + in the winter having to try to make it up the hill from a full stop. Also concerned about cars slamming into one another N bound on Centre, to stop at the light. How is traffic going to flow at all when there is a the eventual car accidents?

Impact on the Environment

- If the train doesn't go under the river I am concerned about the loss of trees & greenspace on the hill
- Need plan to show open space to justify proposed TOD INCREASED DENSITY
- Need Concept Drawings/Sections to Respect Creek & Valley. Natural Functionality & Park Potential Should Not Be Lost. Invest Here Now. Other Cities Would Envy Opportunity.
- Plant large trees to mitigate noise and light pollution. Will also block unsightly overhead power poles.
- Move tunnel entrance at Laycock Dr further north more in alignment with the natural slope of the valley. Daylight the creeks on either side of Centre St

Visual Impact

- Concerned about lack of revitalization and on going bus service
- What will streetscaping look like north of 20th if we lose the boulevards and sidewalk is only 2 metres wide?
- concerned with crime. High brake & enter frequency. Homes might be a target. Adding volume of people in the community. Make lots of garbage / disposable areas at stations with regular maintenance
- Plant large trees to mitigate noise and light pollution. Will also block unsightly overhead power poles.

Noise Concerns

- Train should be underground. Infrastructure cost of relocating utilities etc vs cost of tunnel to McKnight or 64 Ave. More room further north. Ped crossing every 4 blocks is creating a disconnect in the community. Train will be loud. New developments on Centre St will be impacted
- Plant large trees to mitigate noise and light pollution. Will also block unsightly overhead power poles.
- I am interested in what is going to happen along the lane, will there be a noise barrier wall or a chain link fence?
Thank you

Children's Safety

- Very concerned about the increase volume & speed of traffic thru playground zone.
- Please do not place lights here, this will greatly increase traffic along 24 Ave NW past schools, playground zones and residential areas.

Crime Concerns

- If the 9 ave tunnel is underground I would prefer not to have it. -low ridership increased crime would prefer investment to go toward public realm (centre) instead. If the station is above ground I would prefer not to have it. Increase traffic at turn lane avenues (ie 9ave) and removes the grid system. 9ave W would funnel all of Rosedale Hill & School traffic which is currently going thru multiple avenues!

- concerned with crime. High brake & enter frequency. Homes might be a target. Adding volume of people in the community. Make lots of garbage / disposable areas at stations with regular maintenance

Cost Concerns

- Exit is too soon. Costs to property + community + walkability of community's VS the costs of going underground until McKnight or 64th Ave.
- Train should be underground. Infrastructure cost of relocating utilities etc vs cost of tunnel to McKnight or 64 Ave. More room further north. Ped crossing every 4 blocks is creating a disconnect in the community. Train will be loud. New developments on Centre St will be impacted

Construction Impacts

McKnight widening here should happen with the train tunnel. Tear up the road once, not twice! All levels of gov't need to work together.

McKnight Blvd to Beddington Tr N

Traffic Flow: concerns regarding volume / lane decisions / travel time

- increased traffic flow. Due to changes in traffic patterns
- need to make sure Bus only is enforced effectively
- Bus trap should stay. Reduces traffic on centre street between beddington trail & Bergen
- a couple of concerns for the neighborhood :
 - possibility of very heavy traffic volume
 - noise level
- does not allow all movements
- All access to shopping to the North. Puts *[illegable]* on beddington blvd Beddington Trail
- As a resident How do I turn left on to Centre St from Thorncrest Rd NE (to then turn left on to McKnight EB)
- These traffic lights seem unnecessary. Can they only be activated by sensors? There is very little cross traffic here.
- It might ease a lot of the traffic concerns on McKnight if this bus trap was removed. I don't know why they were installed.
- Elevate the tracks here & make access via +15 from the library/sports complex. Keep this extremely busy intersection clear of trains.
- At Huntridge Hill. Placing a light at the intersection may cause an undesirable level of traffic at the intersection with people are short cutting.
- Traffic will increase, but maybe drug deals will go down. People not think they can go down Huntford Hill (first left) to go around the block. Concern is congestion on 68th and traffic on Huntford Hill. Currently on huntford Hill concerns of speed in playground zone + of DRUG

DEALS. Safety - for speed + drug deals. Conjestion -busier street traffic people drving off 68th to Huntford Hill - to get around on gothru the area. concern will make my streets busier

- I am concerned about traffic jams at an already extremely busy intersection.
- Perfer to open the Beddington Trail bus trap to facilitate movement of residence from the community to Beddington Trail and to go north and south. Right now some moevement to 64 to go south on Deerfoot rather than to loop north to Beddington Trail
- Taking all these houses you may as well let cars through the bus loop. Now is your chance to improve this poor design. Make Centre St whole!
- should be opened for traffic
- line ups turning left onto centre in morning and onto bedd Blvd in evening. How will you ensure the cars get through?
- Go down center! Then no disturbance to businesses here and no need for signalled traffic further increasing congestion.
- How will traffic move between coop and Safeway mall? Very busy area now
- Lane across. Upgrades to laneway to increase quality of access along back of homes
- Make alley off Bergen Rd the access to Bergen Cres. Block south access to cresc. and leave north entrance so cars leave cresc. to go south
- Access to this intersection from Centre Street North bound will be awkward unless expanding the car lane from single to dual lane
- Would be great to open this up to traffic and remove the bus trap
- constrained south of transit only access
- centre st is already congested. -4 st nw is worse -taking out lanes on centre st is going to make traffic worse. -concerned that demographis is older & might not transition to taking transit easily. (Concerned with traffic conjestion x5. Heard this comment a lot!)

Parking: concerns around parking loss / permitting / location

- Parking on residential streets. No park & ride until Beddington. 2 hr parking solution?
- People already use this area for park&ride for the 3, 300, 301. It will get way busier with more commuters. Is this going to get worse?
- There needs to be improved access to the park and ride at this entrance. Needs to be safer for pedestrians and drivers.
- parking at McKnight station experiencing problem now. Park zone
- Concerns with the lack of parking / taking away parking at the Thornhill Fitness Centre with the proposed Bus Terminal. Will need parking somewhere else.
- Concerns about kids walking from school to the east towards the Centre. Students (CN Gunn) walk regularly to the Centre as the physical program. Need safe access across Centre Street + Parking concerns with the loss of parking sure the facility is being used constantly.
- 8347 Centre Street -> Back alley is in bad condition. Only use front entrance. Disabled spot out front. Park on street (directed to [identifying information removed])
- Access into here would be very difficult except for eastbound Beddington Blvd.
- Parking needed between Bergen and Beddington
- Parking
- Too far from the station. Also need

- Park & Ride is far from station. Co-op & Safeway will need to monitor parking lots
- Additional station with huge parking area to entice riders to park and ride
- Noise assessment for Harvest Hills blvd needed. Overdue. Fencing between rail & homes along Harvest Hills -what type? Parking? Already congested @ Notre Dame
- This street is a great area for park and ride for LRT passengers. Allow passengers to park for free to increase usage of LRT.
- Parking on residential streets. No park & ride until Beddington
- Will there no longer be an entrance to this parking lot?
- parking permit in Thorncliffe
- Parents pick up their kids from school here but if there are a lot of park & riders, there won't be enough room!

Requests to add a station to a specific location

- Shame to lose it. More stations make it more appealing to riders.
- 72 is where the shopping centre is. Should keep it
- Additional station with huge parking area to entice riders to park and ride
- Make it go by Huntington Hills Community Center (that's all the matters)
- Need a station at 72 ave NE
Almost useless to most residents of Beddington and Huntington
- Consider a simple station that stops outside rush hours.
- The removal of this station leaves the largest gap in service for the north LRT south of Beddington.
- would be very convenient for the NW communities to have a station on harvest hills or on beddington trail.

Property Impact Concerns

- I feel this will negatively impact my property value. No thank you.
- Can't this be ran down the center of the road???? Or underground??
This is going to dramatically effect my property.
- Make this part underground, so it will have less noise impact on the shopping centre and the golf course.
- Go down center! Then no disturbance to businesses here and no need for signalled traffic further increasing congestion.
- i don't support loss of housing.
- Minimize impact on private property: keep only 1 lane each for north-south vehicular traffic instead of the currently proposed 2 lanes each.
- Do not increase the density of housing units here. Preserve the neighbourhood flavour. We don't want trains nor the condos to support them.

Amenity Access: concerns around losing access to existing amenities

- People already use this area for park&ride for the 3, 300, 301. It will get way busier with more commuters. Is this going to get worse?
- Access into here would be very difficult except for eastbound Beddington Blvd.

- There is no gentle access to this multi-purpose pathway. It's a gravel laneway into a 90 degree turn to a super steep slope.
- Is this alley no longer accessible to residents? There are garage pads, and the garbage trucks pick up along this road.
- Access across two lanes of traffic is problematic.
- Will there no longer be an entrance to this parking lot?
- Access to this intersection from Centre Street North bound will be awkward unless expanding the car lane from single to dual lane

Station Accessibility: concerns regarding station access / locations / connections to existing transit

- Transit Service what will that look like. What happens to the feeder service if its stage?
- It might ease a lot of the traffic concerns on McKnight if this bus trap was removed. I don't know why they were installed.
- Station should be closer to McKnight
- wondering why train station isn't located on this crescent to allow for easier access to MacKnight Blvd. Ensure there is proper shelter provided for winter weather
- There needs to be improved access to the park and ride at this entrance. Needs to be safer for pedestrians and drivers.
- Previously the plans showed a station @ 78 avenue haven't in the current plan there is a large gap between Beddington and 64 station. I access Centre st via 78 ave (and 72) and this would cause inconvenience for me to access transit via the Green Line LRT
- 8347 Centre Street -> Back alley is in bad condition. Only use front entrance. Disabled spot out front. Park on street (directed to [identifying information removed])
- Too far from the station. Also need
- Why does the track seem to end here? I thought the plan was to go into panorama hills

Transit Connections: comments concerning Green Lines connection to existing Transit options

- need to make sure Bus only is enforced effectively
- Transit Service what will that look like. What happens to the feeder service if its stage?
- There is concern about accessibility of the existing cycle path running East - west along Beddington Boulevard to Centre Street N. Please provide a safe access path/facilities to get to the Beddington Station via bicycle
- Greenview east west on McKnight improve transit (bus service)
- Taking all these houses you may as well let cars through the bus loop. Now is your chance to improve this poor design. Make Centre St whole!
- what's happening to it
- Better access from bike path to protected bike lane heading to train station. Creative solution needed.

Noise Concerns

- a couple of concerns for the neighborhood :
 - possibility of very heavy traffic volume
 - noise level
- From bergan Road North to Beddington Trail acquire all house on the first row on each side of the Road. Then put up a sound Fence on near side of the alley to give second row houses 40 plus feet of space between LRT and there house
- Make this part underground, so it will have less noise impact on the shopping centre and the golf course.
- Noise assessment for Harvest Hills blvd needed. Overdue. Fencing between rail & homes along Harvest Hills -what type? Parking? Already congested @ Notre Dame
- LRT running through the bus trap along steep slope Beddington Drive x Centre Street will be noisy; noise reduction measures be addressed.
- I am concerned about noise from the bells and parking on residential streets.

Supportive: comments in support of a decision or Green Line generally

- Great location by Superstore
- Good location. In the middle of station
- good
- Good concept - running along side of road. No property impacts, and the suburbanites here are aware of this LRT right of way.
- Is this where the train is expected to pop up?
- I don't see the need for this intermediary station. It's a bad location due to traffic congestion.

Cycling Infrastructure : comments regarding cycling infrastructure

- There is concern about accessibility of the existing cycle path running East - west along Beddington Boulevard to Centre Street N. Please provide a safe access path/facilities to get to the Beddington Station via bicycle
- Better access from bike path to protected bike lane heading to train station. Creative solution needed.
- Dutch style protected bike crossing should be installed

Similar to proposed long term plan @Northmount & Northland Dr intersection

- 54th Ave is currently a popular route for bicycles to this train stop location. Consider this when planning for the area.
- This is an important intersection for walking/cycling and access to Superstore. Need pedestrian signals to be maintained.

Growth / Development Potential: acknowledgement of / suggestions for development or growth of an area

- Elevate the tracks here & make access via +15 from the library/sports complex. Keep this extremely busy intersection clear of trains.
- At 24,000 vehicles per day, the LRT crossing this intersection needs to be grade separated.

- This street is a great area for park and ride for LRT passengers. Allow passengers to park for free to increase usage of LRT.
- Removing a section of meridian on Beddington Blvd so it's possible to turn (East) out of parking lot would reduce traffic crossing tracks.
- Would be great to open this up to traffic and remove the bus trap

Underground: requests for portions to be underground

- Can't this be ran down the center of the road???? Or underground??
This is going to dramatically effect my property.
- Make this part underground, so it will have less noise impact on the shopping centre and the golf course.
- Why not have tunnel extend a little further to have line come up between Harvest Hills Blvd (where space for the line was already planned)
- Vehicular traffic going below grade here?

Positive Feedback on Green Line Accessibility

- Way more pop density at 72 Ave. Makes more sense to have. Lots of low-income people around 72. There are no jobs at 64
- 72 is where the shopping centre is. Should keep it
- Much better idea than having it at 64 ave. Will increase the number of areas accessible at this point

Car Safety

- proposed xsection McKnight & Beddington Blvd why 3.5m lanes instead of 3.3m lanes SLOW TRAFFIC DOWN
- There needs to be improved access to the park and ride at this entrance. Needs to be safer for pedestrians and drivers.
- congested, dangerous + blind corner

Pedestrian Safety: concerns around pedestrian safety at intersections / pedestrian ways / pathway connections

- There needs to be improved access to the park and ride at this entrance. Needs to be safer for pedestrians and drivers.
- Concerns about kids walking from school to the east towards the Centre. Students (CN Gunn) walk regularly to the Centre as the physical program. Need safe access across Centre Street + Parking concerns with the loss of parking sure the facility is being used constantly.
- This is an important intersection for walking/cycling and access to Superstore. Need pedestrian signals to be maintained.

Visual Impact

- The plan is to run the tracks 30 FT from my livingroom window?? Can this not be ran down the center of the road/extend the tunnel further?
- Do not increase the density of housing units here. Preserve the neighbourhood flavour. We don't want trains nor the condos to support them.

Traffic Control and/or calming: requests for additional traffic control and/or calming in an area

- Need left turning lane or lights here. Access to library swimming pool and arena can be very busy

Children's Safety

- Concerns about kids walking from school to the east towards the Centre. Students (CN Gunn) walk regularly to the Centre as the physical program. Need safe access across Centre Street + Parking concerns with the loss of parking sure the facility is being used constantly.

Vibration Concerns

- worried about structural cracks being exacerbated by train vibration. 30 years old house - settling problems

Crime Concerns

- Traffic will increase, but maybe drug deals will go down. People not think they can go down Huntford Hill (first left) to go around the block. Concern is congestion on 68th and traffic on Huntford Hill. Currently on huntford Hill concerns of speed in playground zone + of DRUG DEALS. Safety - for speed + drug deals. Conjestion -busier street traffic people drving off 68th to Huntford Hill - to get around on gothru the area. concern will make my streets busier

Cost Concerns

- Why pay more to move road when the space between has already been planned? Just put line down center.

Beddington Tr to North Pointe

Traffic Flow: concerns regarding volume / lane decisions / travel time

- Need to ensure turning onto 96 Ave is uninterrupted; many airport employees take this route to work 24 hrs a day.
- Concerned about traffic back-up @ rush hour. Signals would be required @ T-intersection + CH DR CH Rd (currently no signals).
- Should be removed. Circuitous routing. Could buy both sides of street to allow for through traffic.
- need to make sure Bus only is enforced effectively
- does not allow all movements
- May need intersection signalization. -Will get more congested
- This area is better for the train so it can get the other side of panaroma/harvest hills, otherwise it will be a longer walk for the kids
- traffic here has increased drastically; the city should do something to deter people cutting through this section

- Busy, sometimes congested intersection. Need to make sure LRT doesn't add to congestion.
- Country Village Way unsignalized intersection currently not safe - suggest signalizing
- Congested area
- Go down center! Then no disturbance to businesses here and no need for signalled traffic further increasing congestion.
- Can't line run down center of road here? Zero impact to Harvest Oak Dr. and no need for signals. Otherwise, go below grade earlier.
- Why can't the tunnel go under Country Hills to the center of Harvest Hills Blvd (South of Country Hills) where there is space?
- Station location seem difficulty to access. Would overpass improve connections? Can Stn shift mid block? Seems like missed opportunity for TOD -redevelop the parking lot!
- Focus Bus terminal footprint into tri-services parking lot. Alleviates congestion on Country Village Link.
- There're some VERY bust intersections and bus routes (ex 301, 3) that will be VERY disturbed b the construction of centre street. Especially by the T&T near North Pointe. -> Also, will there be plans to extend the green line into the keystone hills area? As livingston is starting up and will be well developed by the time the train is up and running. You should seriously consider extending the boundaries of the train.
- Necessary to have 4 lane bus traffic here? This lot is always busy already. Only need 2 lane bus traffic, no?
- This area's already congested. Is it possible to make the line semi-submerged? For example the zoo and barlow stations are semi-submerged
- "Semi submerge this section of rail or put this underground. Also, run the tracks through the centre of the road, not on the side."
- When LRT expanded here, concerned about potential congestion- busy area to begin with.

Underground: requests for portions to be underground

- "Can't this be ran down the center of the road???? Or underground?? This is going to dramatically effect my property. "
- Make this part underground, so it will have less noise impact on the shopping centre and the golf course.
- Why not put the station underground? This way it will have minimal property impact.
- Make this station underground, so you can build another platform underneath it for the interchange for the airport spur line.
- I echo a couple other comments here about making the station potentially below ground and being ready for the airport connector line
- This area's already congested. Is it possible to make the line semi-submerged? For example the zoo and barlow stations are semi-submerged
- "Semi submerge this section of rail or put this underground. Also, run the tracks through the centre of the road, not on the side."

- Why not have tunnel extend a little further to have line come up between Harvest Hills Blvd (where space for the line was already planned)
- Vehicular traffic going below grade here?

Pedestrian Safety: concerns around pedestrian safety at intersections / pedestrian ways / pathway connections

- Suggest ped underpass from park n ride / bus terminal to station
- Concerns with at grade ped crossing at 96 ave consider overpass
- Like underpass at country hills blvd
- Replace at-grade crossing at Country Village Road with below grade crossing.
- high pedestrian volumes - may need bridge. Lots of students crossing country Village Link from notre Dame & Vivo
- There needs to be improved access to the park and ride at this entrance. Needs to be safer for pedestrians and drivers.
- East side [probably] too noisy go with [up arrow] bells/traffic - need barrier.
- ped crossing @ North point over Counrty Hills is needed. Desire lines are there already. Jay-walking will happen. DRIVE NOT TRAK

Supportive: comments in support of a decision or Green Line generally

- To airport. Great idea. Much better to connect Green Line from YYC to downtown instead of Blue Line.
- We were pleased with the layout of the North section alignment, and pleased with station locations. Also, we are glad our concerns above crossing 96th ave + Country Hills Blvd were addressed with tunnels.
- Great idea to run on one side versus the middle; look at the disaster that is 36 Street N.E. and learn from those mistakes.
- Fantastic idea to run along one side of the road and not the center; traffic will flow much more nicely.
- Good concept - running along side of road. No property impacts, and the suburbanites here are aware of this LRT right of way.
- Great idea to have side running station. Peds and transit users can have direct access to commercial businesses, and community amenities.
- Glad to hear of tunnel- overnight construction would be good plan to reduce access impact during construction.

Property Impact Concerns

- I feel this will negatively impact my property value. No thank you.
- Track between 96 ave and Country Hills should run down the center of the road, not down East side. to minimize property impact.
- "Can't this be ran down the center of the road???? Or underground?? This is going to dramatically effect my property. "

- Make this part underground, so it will have less noise impact on the shopping centre and the golf course.
- Why not put the station underground? This way it will have minimal property impact.
- Go down center! Then no disturbance to businesses here and no need for signalled traffic further increasing congestion.
- Can't line run down center of road here? Zero impact to Harvest Oak Dr. and no need for signals. Otherwise, go below grade earlier.

Parking: concerns around parking loss / permitting / location

- Not enough parking spots - may be used by students @ Notre Dame right now. May be dealt w/ with reserve system
- There needs to be improved access to the park and ride at this entrance. Needs to be safer for pedestrians and drivers.
- orth Pointe parking lot, base on plan, stalls will be significantly decreased, will cause issues, especially many new developing communities pass panorama.
- Additional station with huge parking area to entice riders to park and ride
- Close study of traffic + pedestrian congestion + lack of parking in area across from vivo/Notre Dame school
- Noise assessment for Harvest Hills blvd needed. Overdue. Fencing between rail & homes along Harvest Hills -what type? Parking? Already congested @ Notre Dame

Station Accessibility: concerns regarding station access / locations / connections to existing transit

- Too far to walk for people living between stations
- This area is better for the train so it can get the other side of panorama/harvest hills, otherwise it will be a longer walk for the kids
- There needs to be improved access to the park and ride at this entrance. Needs to be safer for pedestrians and drivers.
- Station location seem difficulty to access. Would overpass improve connections? Can Stn shift mid block? Seems like missed opportunity for TOD -redevelop the parking lot!
- Buses stopped here make it hard to see & hazardous to exit. Need to move entrance away from bus stops.

Transit Connections: comments concerning Green Lines connection to existing Transit options

- Need to ensure turning onto 96 Ave is uninterrupted; many airport employees take this route to work 24 hrs a day.
- need to make sure Bus only is enforced effectively
- build the SOUTH leg first. People in Cranston and Auburn Bay do not have access to BRT lines like the people who live along Centre St N currently. You are replicating a transit line up here that currently (for the time being) is working very well, while the people in south will continue

to suffer for decades. Their portion of the LRT will be much cheaper/cost effective w/o the North line when the city has more money!

- needs better transit. LRT connection -need it!
- What's the planned interchange for future airport train?

Traffic Control and/or calming: requests for additional traffic control and/or calming in an area

- Concerned about traffic back-up @ rush hour. Signals would be required @ T-intersection + CH DR CH Rd (currently no signals).
- May need intersection signalization. -Will get more congested
- Country Village Way unsignalized intersection currently not safe - suggest signalizing

Noise Concerns

- East side [probably] too noisy go with [up arrow] bells/traffic - need barrier.
- Make this part underground, so it will have less noise impact on the shopping centre and the golf course.
- Noise assessment for Harvest Hills blvd needed. Overdue. Fencing between rail & homes along Harvest Hills -what type? Parking? Already congested @ Notre Dame

Growth / Development Potential: acknowledgement of / suggestions for development or growth of an area

- build the SOUTH leg first. People in Cranston and Auburn Bay do not have access to BRT lines like the people who live along Centre St N currently. You are replicating a transit line up here that currently (for the time being) is working very well, while the people in south will continue to suffer for decades. Their portion of the LRT will be much cheaper/cost effective w/o the North line when the city has more money!
- Make this station underground, so you can build another platform underneath it for the interchange for the airport spur line.
- I echo a couple other comments here about making the station potentially below ground and being ready for the airport connector line

Requests to add a station to a specific location

- Additional station with huge parking area to entice riders to park and ride
- There're some VERY bust intersections and bus routes (ex 301, 3) that will be VERY disturbed b the construction of centre street. Especially by the T&T near North Pointe. -> Also, will there be plans to extend the green line into the keystone hills area? As livingston is starting up and will be well developed by the time the train is up and running. You should seriously consider extending the boundaries of the train.
- I want a kincora train
- would be very convenient for the NW communities to have a station on harvest hills or on beddington trail.



Green Line LRT

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
Green Line in Your Community, March 2017

Car Safety

- There needs to be improved access to the park and ride at this entrance. Needs to be safer for pedestrians and drivers.
- Country Village Way unsignalized intersection currently not safe - suggest signaling

Positive Feedback on Green Line Accessibility

- To airport. Great idea. Much better to connect Green Line from YYC to downtown instead of Blue Line.
- Great idea to have side running station. Peds and transit users can have direct access to commercial businesses, and community amenities.

Construction Concerns

- There're some VERY bust intersections and bus routes (ex 301, 3) that will be VERY disturbed b the construction of centre street. Especially by the T&T near North Pointe. -> Also, will there be plans to extend the green line into the keystone hills area? As livingston is starting up and will be well developed by the time the train is up and running. You should seriously consider extending the boundaries of the train.
- Glad to hear of tunnel- overnight construction would be good plan to reduce access impact during construction.

Visual Impact

- The plan is to run the tracks 30 FT from my livingroom window?? Can this not be ran down the center of the road/extend the tunnel further?

Cost Concerns

- Why pay more to move road when the space between has already been planned? Just put line down center.

Cycling Infrastructure : comments regarding cycling infrastructure

- cycling crossing here?

Other/Unspecified Locations

Traffic Flow: concerns regarding volume / lane decisions / travel time

- Playground zone opposite CH Gate concern re: playground zone non-compliance. It's already an issue, more traffic will cause more issues. Can we get police surveillance here?
- in-fill properties mean garages are tight or restricted -> increase parking & traffic on surrounding neighbour
- Constrained w/ lanes north of
- express routes traffic -no cars to go
- single lane - Route 3

- Whole thing should go underground. Save houses. Worried about traffic impacted
- Disruption to traffic should be minimized / coordinated
- Backups / congestion. Usually route onto 4th street / Edmonton Trail / Centre street and will be exacerbated by reduction in lanes on centre street
- suggestion to open bus traps to ease traffic. Would like regular access for passenger vehicles - alleviate round about routing.

Transit Connections

- How to minimize impacts. + possibly improve on existing environmental impacts/intrusions. WIDTH(S), HEIGHT(S), UNDERPASS, SHADOW (appears about 8 lanes? Carriageay + LRT). STORMWATER management + impacts in valley + on creek. NOISE maes/conts of. AVIAN (Bird Flyway) obstructions, losses. FISHERY elements and AQUATIC / riparian wildlife habitat/corridors under, near, + downstream of crossings. Opportunities while modifications/construction taking place -to improve habitat issues _ to provide enlightened (best access, least impact) pedestrian + cycling pathways, viewing etc - not as a nice to have or a possible or as an afterthought but as a primary goal with PRIORITY. Also need to have LRT + Road + Utility maintenance infrastructure designed into the creek + valley crossing to ensure that the all too regular maintenance access/work and repair access and even accident management are not at teh expense of the creek, valley, riparian zones + wildlife corridors.
- Transit service to MRU.
- What's happening to the service
- will there be bus bays?
- people will drive on the tracks if route 3 stops! Will it remain? -lots of people working

Environmental Impact

- How to minimize impacts. + possibly improve on existing environmental impacts/intrusions. WIDTH(S), HEIGHT(S), UNDERPASS, SHADOW (appears about 8 lanes? Carriageay + LRT). STORMWATER management + impacts in valley + on creek. NOISE maes/conts of. AVIAN (Bird Flyway) obstructions, losses. FISHERY elements and AQUATIC / riparian wildlife habitat/corridors under, near, + downstream of crossings. Opportunities while modifications/construction taking place -to improve habitat issues _ to provide enlightened (best access, least impact) pedestrian + cycling pathways, viewing etc - not as a nice to have or a possible or as an afterthought but as a primary goal with PRIORITY. Also need to have LRT + Road + Utility maintenance infrastructure designed into the creek + valley crossing to ensure that the all too regular maintenance access/work and repair access and even accident management are not at teh expense of the creek, valley, riparian zones + wildlife corridors.

Noise Concerns

- How to minimize impacts. + possibly improve on existing environmental impacts/intrusions. WIDTH(S), HEIGHT(S), UNDERPASS, SHADOW (appears about 8 lanes? Carriageay + LRT). STORMWATER management + impacts in valley + on creek. NOISE maes/conts of. AVIAN (Bird Flyway) obstructions, losses. FISHERY elements and AQUATIC / riparian wildlife habitat/corridors under, near, + downstream of crossings. Opportunities while

modifications/construction taking place -to improve habitat issues _ to provide enlightened (best access, least impact) pedestrian + cycling pathways, viewing etc - not as a nice to have or a possible or as an afterthought but as a primary goal with PRIORITY. Also need to have LRT + Road + Utility maintenance infrastructure designed into the creek + valley crossing to ensure that the all too regular maintenance access/work and repair access and even accident management are not at the expense of the creek, valley, riparian zones + wildlife corridors.

Growth and Development Potential

- air tight structures. More shelters McKnight Westwinds stations -heater
- plan early to enable telecomms companies to get utilities in to ensure people have reception underground
- cycling facilities

Parking: concerns around parking loss / permitting / location

- Where is it. Not enough
- Parking migrated into residential neighbourhoods
- in-fill properties mean garages are tight or restricted -> increase parking & traffic on surrounding neighbour
- increased crime rate due to easy access on the LRT. Need more park & rides

Amenity Access: concerns around losing access to existing amenities

- losing this access point - will it for? What Alt access is there away? How does this work w/ Hurcra dev
- What happens here?

Visual Impact

- want to make landscaped for aesthetics/community fit
- Should not be as opulent as west lrt

Concerns Regarding Cost

- Outside users ie: acreages / airdrie do not pay taxes and will use system
- staging / funding

Cycling Infrastructure

- cycling facilities
- No Cycle Lanes on centre st (North/South)