Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments presented here include all feedback, suggestions, comments and messages that were collected online and in-person through the engagement described in this report. All input has been reviewed and provided to Project Teams to be considered in decision making for the project.

Any personal identifying information has been removed from the verbatim comments presented here. Comments or portions of comments that contain profanity, or that are not in compliance with the City's Respectful Workplace Policy or Online Tool Moderation Practice, have also been removed from participant submissions.

Wherever possible the remainder of the submissions remains. No other edits to the feedback have been made, and the verbatim comments are as received. As a result, some of the content in this verbatim record may still be considered offensive or distasteful to some readers.

Study Area 1

Online: Which option would you feel more comfortable travelling on this corridor? Please tell us why...

Raised and completely separated from the motorists is a wonderful safety feature. I think most day cares/schools are on the north side so access to these places is better.
Option 2 offers the best separation between the 3 modes of travel assuming the concrete barrier between cars and cyclists is sufficiently high and wide to provide safe separation. For pedestrians, being far from the driving lane is a better walking experience. Having the cycle lane on-street, but separated from the driving lane should lessen the chance of cars blocking cyclists when pulling onto the road.
This keeps all users the most separated.
Balances the needs of all users and is safer for all users.
Keeping pedestrians and vehicles separate from wheeling traffic is the safest option for all parties. Also allows the best freedom of movement for all involved.
Because then I can keep my observations of trying to watch for all the cyclists that don't follow the rules of the road to one side of the road rather than them coming at me from both directions.
Travel as a pedestrian is usually on the north/east side, so reducing car speeds and parking hazards on that side is important. As a biker (wheeler), both options 1/2 are ideal and make safer options than currently. Since option 1 is technically raised AND separate and option 3 is less practical (see comments below), I think option 1 is safest for users.
None, I do not agree with any of these options.
Less disruption to existing. Keep as many parking spots as possible. Keeps bicycles off the roadway.

You can not put bus lanes on the north side of the street. All of the busses unload there. You are asking 1000 students many with disabilities to cross a bike path to get into their school. This is idiotic.
We need bike lanes in the south and unidirectional rather than shared is safer for pedestrians. I like raised paths because you don't have to worry about buses or cars trying to park cutting you off
I think this option provides the most space for all users in a safe way.
These paths provide separation for cyclists from dangerous drivers as well as improvements to pedestrian walkability. Raised lanes gives better sightlines for drivers turning across any of these lanes so that they don't hit a pedestrian or cyclist who might otherwise be hidden behind parked vehicles. It also is a good middle-ground in terms of allowing continued on-street parking options in certain areas for those who might need or prioritize that. To be clear, any of these three options would be a vast and much-needed improvement, but option three (if money allows) would be the safest and would provide the best possible improvement for the community.
Many more pedestrian users than bicycle users
Due to the amount of traffic at this location a bike path on both sides would be best for flow
None of these options are acceptable. All of these options remove parking on both sides of the road along Section B-1. With the residential buildings there, the rec center and the tennis center, the street parking is necessary to accommodate all of the traffic. Forcing the parking to go elsewhere will create downstream negative consequences.
The road already has issue with traffic jams and parking along it daily and during events at the community center and at tennis center on 90th Ave. Inside the community the parking is needed for the houses and residents and taking parking out for bike lanes that are barely used during the day is ineffective. Do not take parking away. Only option is multi use pathway
I think that option 2 is better, because when people bike in same directions as traffic it's safer, because drivers exiting school parking wouldn't look both ways on a bike path (option 1), but only in directions of traffic and because of that on cyclists like in option 2. Also on the intersection cyclists and pedestrians don't mix and cyclists don't need to jump curbs like in option 1 or 3, and drivers don't expect cyclists coming both ways on a crosswalk like in option 1.
Mixed paths often cause problems for both pedestrians and cyclists. Unfortunately pedestrians don't care about walking 4 people wide and blocking all cyclists, and cyclists ride quite fast so Option 3 provides the best separation of people and bikes, as well as not removing any of the space on the roads for cars.
I live in Acadia, and find that there are too many obstacles to vision on the road, mainly the parked cars on either side of the street. To add in street-level bikes to that scenario would be terrible. Multiuse pathways seems like the best option that will be most used, or the raised bike paths would be a good second option.

These roads are too wide and you have a lot of traffic cutting through this area to avoid Deerfoot congestion during p.m. rush. Need to replace empty roadway with space for young families to feel safe, especially on bikes or walking to school. I support this initiative.
Having experienced the on-street bike lanes downtown I have witnessed too many incidents of vehicles forgetting to check for cars AND bikes when making turns. The cyclists downtown are usually adults and aware they need to be watching out for these things. I am concerned about this type of incident when the cyclists are children who don't always have great situational awareness. Also, I have seen and used many multi-use pathways in various towns in BC and they seem to work quite well.
Option 3 keeps everything neat and tidy - and SAFE!
No bike pathways needed in this area. It has a ton of traffic as is no need to add more hazards like bikes. Improve the area with speed bumps, more traffic lights and clearer crossing signs.
I think Option 3 is a great way to improve connectivity through the area, while promoting safety. The raised multi-use lane option is preferable to on-street bike lanes to improve visibility for drivers when turning across the lanes. While Option 1 is useful, separating pedestrians from the bike lane will likely improve safety and ease congestion on the lanes.
I would be supportive of any of these options as someone who bikes and drives regularly in the area. My biggest concern as a cyclist is that whatever option is chosen must have snowclearing in the winter.
More separation from traffic.
There is a lot of traffic going in this area, and if we want to increase safety in biking and walking, we can't take too much out of the road in terms of lanes and parking.
Acadia to 90ave is a very busy road, with twice a day young drivers.
Separate infrastructure for different speed levels of transportation
Option 1 provides the highest level of traffic calming and a wide paved surface for comfortable passing and allows pedestrians using strollers or wheelchairs a comfortable smooth surface. Option 2 intersections are not ideal
Provides physical division between motorists and cyclists which improves safety. Raised bike paths can improve safety and adds onto the existing bike path connections.

Online: Do you have any additional comments?

I think going with the single pathway is great. Easier, more efficient for snow removal as well.
crossing at ARC is awful`
I'm all for safety. I'm curious though, removing on street parking increases safety, but where do all the cars now go to park? Will other parking options be made available to homes in the area?

I believe that any of the three options is needed and that moving quickly to building a solution is essential. With that in mind, I think options 1 and 2 are most likely to be able to be done swiftly. Option 1 is more likely to get wide use early from a variety of wheeling and pedestrian users.
The option to make NO CHANGES to this are is missing. Ultimately I am against the whole project! This is unnecessary and the funds could be put to better use elsewhere.
What is the point of this bike path. It doesn’t connect to anything. You are asking students to cross a bike path to get to their school. This is the most idiotic plan I have ever seen.
Looking forward to these changes!
As a young person who owns a home in this community, I have a much higher stake in the future of the infrastructure being built here. Improvements to walking and biking infrastructure is so important because it gives us and our children safe options with which to explore our neighbourhoods and access amenities without the need for a car.
Prefer raised cycling facilities; would be ok with either uni-directional or bi-directional, as long as it is consistent across the corridor.
I do agree with the speed being and option but I don't see the point of loosing parking that is short already and the only time there are any bikes in the area isnon the weekend. So I think money can be spent in a better way
The installation of an independent bike lane is ridiculous. There are insufficient year-round cyclists to warrant this. Additionally, from my experience working downtown, most cyclists will not utilize the bike lane - they're on the sidewalks or the road. Instead of removing needed parking, widen the sidewalks.
You should create a survey that actually takes people input. The survey must have the option of do nothing but you already have your mind made about what is "best" for the masses so you include only 3 options. You need to start listening to people. No on road bike ways, no parking reduction, 3 m shared pathway is all that could be accommodated
Study Area 1 is the only part of this entire project that seems worth making any changes. Study area 2 and 3 do not have enough bikes using this corridor to justify the cost to make all of these changes. If the concern is for families that don't want to ride in the street, chances are they will still ride on the sidewalk after these changes.
90th ave intersection needs turning light onto bonaventure
do bonaventure drive next.
Please ensure that more vegetation is added, or at least maintained at current levels. Removing vegetation and replacing with concrete cover is not going to provide the sense of community improvement I hope this project is looking to achieve.
Please add curb extensions at EVERY intersection and driveway. People should not be able to park there blocking the view of people walking and wheeling. Please ensure that all curb cuts point in the direction people should be walking, not diagonally into the intersection. It's 2025, we know this.

I think the plan to add/improve bike and pedestrian lanes across 90th Ave and Acadia Dr is great. It will help to improve the accessibility throughout the neighbourhood.

Pop Up 1: In-person comments received at Acadia Aquatic and Fitness Centre

Want bikes off the road
Need to consider impacts of new design in terms of high volumes of traffic (vehicles and school buses) during drop off and pick up at the schools along the corridor
Potential development of a multi-family building on the SW corner of 90 Ave & Fairmont (impact on design options?)

Pop Up 2: In-person comments received at Alberta Tennis Centre

Sightlines hard to see when exiting from the driveway at Alberta Tennis Centre.
Use mirrors for blind spots for exiting to see WB traffic.
Need lower speed sign. When kids get out (of school) – everywhere and hard to see or know if someone will jaywalk.
Want to know why there are no playground / school zone signs.
WB lanes are always full.
Two lanes at intersection are required here.
Lots of parking from Tennis Centre across the street.
Like the crosswalk.
Need EBL / WBL turn lanes at Bonaventure.
Should be speed controlled in this area for the school.
Don’t really see the big issue in this area.

Pop Up 3: In-person comments received at Acadia Recreation Complex

Very excited about option 1 and 2.
The development of the tennis centre needs to be taken into consideration.
Use 86 Ave SE for this instead.
Wheelchair access at crosswalk is important. Beware of KP at x-walks.
No bike lanes.
Bike lanes sharing space with walkers is not safe.
Not in favour of parking removal in option 2.
Do not see the volume to justify bike lanes.

Connections to Macleod.
Make it as safe as possible.
Please don't do it!
Option 1 and 3 provide better space for cycling.
Bike infrastructure is important for kids and seniors.
Option 1 seems the least offensive. X -ing at the High School is unsafe.
Need wheelchair ramp / sidewalk directly in front of ARC.
If the street parking was removed, it would be an easy solution.
Need dividers between all pedestrians/cyclists and motorists.
90 Ave / Bonaventure tons of speeding, narrow sidewalk, lots of foot traffic = dangerous.
Lighting on 90 Ave northside going out – issues for years.
Beacon Hill and Bonaventure apartment buildings cause the parking issues.
School buses need space to take turns.
Option 1 safer to pass. It is the most attractive option, more popular for everyone.
Intersection 90 Ave and Fairmount – 1 lanes but people treat it as 2 – marked left turn lane?
Maintenance / clearance of snow and ice on 90 Ave a problem.
Option 2 is best because motorists can expect you to be there. It is safer.
Bowness Drive is a good study example of raised lanes. Safer. Visually pleasing.
Raised is a safer option. Better visibility. Japan and Netherlands are good examples.
Great connection to the dog park.
Would like option 1 or option 3 preferred because off-street paths.
See the value in having more transport options / safer crosswalks.
Crossing signals at traffic lights don't give an automatic x-ing option. Prefer a timed crossing for pedestrians.
Person hit by car at Carriage House. Strongly support traffic calming and crossing improvements.
Fairmount Southland 90th Heritage – left turn lanes please. Impatient drivers are scooting around other drivers and cyclists.
Option 1 – most viable, less tree removal, lower cost, more buy-in.

Additional comments received by email related to study area 1

The 90 Ave bike lane proposal is unnecessary hardly anyone using this road as a bike route, and this will affect the traffic flow. There are already traffic slow measures and there is a community centre on this road that already does not have enough parking. For example, I had to wait 3 minutes to turn left onto Willow Park from Acadia Drive due to all the cars parked waiting to pick up the children from R.T

Alderman school, the community centre and the mall. No other cars could get past me due to the traffic calming measures and cars parked all along the streets to pick up children. I can't imagine having a bike lane involved as well, I think that proposes a safety concern for children, cars and walkers. Instead, the sidewalks, unmarked crosswalks, and the road needs to be improved properly and with care for the community that uses this infrastructure. It would be beneficial to use this money to work with the community center to create more parking.
I am a father of 2 young daughters. 2.5 years and 4 months old and we actually live right on Acadia drive. I can't think of a better opportunity to improve the communities in these areas than this project. With improved access for families to Notre Dame, RT Alderman, Maple Ridge Elementary, Lord Beaverbrook, Willow Ridge community Centre, the multiple day cares, Montessori's and day homes all within such close proximity to Acadia drive/90th. This project makes a whole world of sense. I think it will give all people in these areas a great opportunity for something that is priceless. A better sense of community. Not to mention other wonderful things this project would bring. ○ Reduced Speed limits ○ Improved bus stops ○ increased and improved pedestrian crossings. Just to make a few. I know as an only a family of 4 we have little voice but we are in FULL support of this project.
I am writing to you as a resident of 90 Ave. SE, plus as a senior and as a person whom delivers to Acadia and area seniors. These ideas of a bike lane does not solve and known problem in the community other than not enough parking for residents of Candlewood, Carriage Park Condominiums, Beacon Heights plus atttendees at the Acadia Rec Centre which includes Hockey Parents, Lacrosse, Seniors, meeting attendees, The ATC Alberta Tennis Centre, The Church, student {both 15 year olds to 18 plus those over22} whom are attending night classes, weekend classes at Lord Beaverbrook High School. In addition proposed developments at 9103-9107 Fairmont Dr and 9316 Fairmont Dr. SE. The parking loss already is at the point I have had to park my van near the church, because all the on street parking was taken at night, from Hockey Lacrosse at ARC {Acadia Rec}, students attending Lord BeaverBrook, now also the ATC events or just tennis users, so if you try to find parking from 3:30 PM, it frees up around 10:30 PM, but the gets cramped again at 6:30 A.M - 10 A.M. early hockey, Tennis plus students parking on the street. Now When Stampede rolls around, for14 - 16 days our street also has the Ranchmans crowd as well. Their supplemental lot has the Ranchmans tent etc. People cannot park in Macleod Plaza too, because, they would need to go to 90th or 94 ave to cross? If the City Cuts off access at 94 Ave SE to make macleod free flowing that becomes another issue. Lord Beaverbook

students at 3:30 to 4:30 is choked in both directions from Macleod to Acadia Dr x Southland. This is both students and Parents. 90 Ave.SE is also used as a feeder to Southland Dr between 7:30 A.M and 9:30 A.M. as well as between 3:30 to 6 PM from non residents wanting to excape Macleod Trail traffic as a reason. A bike lane would only choke it more. The City Planning is looking at allowing a bike lane, which may be used by say 5 bikes an hour? I know this as many of my travels have been though Marda Loop, 12 Ave. SW from 12 Street SW to 1 St. SE and the few bikes I see are bike couriers in the belt line area, in Marda Loops, in last 7 trips in afternoons, etc i have counted under 10 original bikers, ie people whom have seen 1 or more times, {you may have a specific term for this but if I see the same male or female 2+ times I counted as 1. They might be using their bike to go to a favorite coffee bar etc. around say 1:30 PM as example. In Acadia, you may have a few more bikes on weekends, as people whom are travelling through to eg Fish Creek Park Glennfield Entrance, 5 kms, Bannister Road Entrance 7 kms, but to do those long distances which google maps shows via Macleod Trail , requires a higher experience of driving that distance even via a dedicated bike lane. Seniors, will they use these bike lanes daily, I highly doubt it, as many times looking out from my window on 90 Ave.SE, I do not see Seniors using their mobility Scooters , to drive on 90th or on the sidewalk. People in this community usually move over if someone is approaching on the sidewalk with a rollator {Walker} I know this as my wife uses a walker on warmer days and no one would say, use the street? Its called common courtesy.I have lived here since 1992 and in area willowPark and Haysboro since 1978.

Study Area 2

Online: Which option would you feel more comfortable travelling on this corridor? Please tell us why...

Adding concrete barriers to the road is not only ugly but will make the road too narrow.
Options 2 and 3 are similar in providing protection for cyclists. Option 2 with the on-street bike lane might be better in preventing cars from blocking the cycle lane when entering the road. Option 3 is better for cycling safety if the parking areas are implemented where trees and lights are absent.
Safer for all commuters to have cyclists on the same side of the road, less for motorists to worry about and get distracted by.

Keeping pedestrian and vehicles separate from wheeling traffic is the safest option for all parties. Also allows the best freedom of movement of all options.
Acadia Drive from Fairmont to Southland is a speed demons heaven
Travel as a pedestrian is usually on the north/east side, so reducing car speeds and parking hazards on that side is important. As a biker (wheeler), both options 1/2 are ideal and make safer options than currently. Since option 1 is technically raised AND separate and option 3 is less practical (see comments below), I think option 1 is safest for users.
I have a concern about the intersection of Acadia Drive and Ancourt Road as there's already calming Island and flashing pedestrian lights. Students cross there from the south and buses are trying to turn north at that intersection with changes on options one or two where with the people living on Acadia Dr., Park? This isn't intersection could cause a lot of congestion as there's a lot of traffic going along Acadia Drive. Also trying to turn off of Vancourt back onto Acadia to avoid the lights so my option would be option three.
None, I do not agree with any of these options.
This is also idiotic.
Option 1 maintains on-street parking and I think that is important.
The separate raised bicycle infrastructure described here offers the safest option for bicyclists and pedestrians while maintaining parking infrastructure in certain areas for those who might require it. It improves sight-lines so that cars will be less-likely to turn into pedestrians and cyclists, and it offers the best visible improvements for the neighbourhood as a whole who will be living with these changes in their day-to-day. If the budget allows for it, this is my top choice. That being said, any of the three options is vastly preferred to nothing.
The sideway and bike path is segregated and accessible from both sides of the street depending on direction. Also looks asthetically pleasing, and has clearly separated from the roadways.
Inclusive to all needs parking, walking, biking
Please live Acadia Dr 90ave alone the way it is now. All winter by lord Beaverbrook at 3:30 pm is the same time 80 curlers leave the ARC curling. What a total disaster and near accidents with all the congestion!! Kids driving fast and wanting to get home safely from school. Several curling seniors trying to deal with getting home in a traffic and bus jam!! Unacceptable so those improvements will not help but make it far worst !!
None of the above. The neighborhood requires the street parking, and there are insufficient year round cyclists to warrant creating bi-directional bike lanes. Additionally, most cyclists will either stay on the sidewalk or the road despite the bike lane. A better option is to widen the side walk and provide a barrier between pedestrians and cyclists if something must be added, as opposed to removing needed street parking.
1 is the best, 2 is also very nice, but 3 is bad, because it could create confusion between pedestrians and cyclists on intersections

Keeps wheeling users off the road and the sidewalks while allowing for less congested traffic by only using up one side of the street.
These are all terrible options because although you say that the multi use pathway will be in the boulevard, your design actually shows it taking up the entire parking area on the north side - which is not at all acceptable in a residential community where lots of people park in front of their house.
Removes the cars that park on the road. I find all the parked cars cause limited visibility at intersections.
You can't take away both side parking
Option 2 appears to meet the criteria of the project with the least disruption to existing landscape.
Having raised paths on both sides will improve the general look of the community and greatly slow down traffic in the area. Option 3 makes it much easier for motorists to see cyclists as they are raised up. Therefore option 3 is best. Option 1 is okay, but would be much better if the multi-use pathway was on the west side of the road. Why? Because people heading south bound always rush to beat the light on Southland. Narrow that side of the road and they will have to go slower. Option 2 looks like a nightmare when snow covers the cement barriers and will be full of rocks (from the snow melting trucks) in the bike lanes. Option 2 also makes turning onto Acadia harder as you need to move into the path of the bike lane to see oncoming traffic.
Option 3 keeps everything neat and tidy - and SAFE!
No bikes, please! The streets are as busy as they get. No need to create more hazard with bikes.
As above, any of the options are good. I support making biking safer and more accessible. Please make sure you choose an option that can be cleared of snow in winter
You take away parking from residents on one side, but there is still some available, while giving a safe lane for other traffic via walking etc.
Separate infrastructure for different speed levels of transportation

Online: Do you have any additional comments?

Better opportunity for snow removal and safety. Moving bus stops further away (100m) from intersections would also be a safety improvement for visibility and yielding/merging.
intersections in this section are particularly risky
We lived at the corner of Acadia at Athlone Rd from 1998-2019. We lost count the number of times we called the police re. cars peeling out heading AcadiaEast at extremely high speeds. Rarely would the police appear with radar guns. There were 1 or 2 pedestrian deaths from drivers while we lived there. It's unreal there weren't many more. Slow Down.
I believe that any of the three options is needed and that moving quickly to building a solution is essential. With that in mind, I think options 1 and 2 are most likely to be able to be done swiftly. Option 1 is more likely to get wide use early from a variety of wheeling and pedestrian users.

Why not fix the congestion of Macleod trail and people would t be using Acadia and fairmont as back ups.
I think there is a miss here if you are completely eliminating on-street parking on the north side of the street. Please consider keeping on-street parking on both sides, as this will reduce the number of people needing to cross the street at any given time. You can break up the parking and maybe have it alternate between North and south.
We have the option to build a beautiful, functioning piece of infrastructure to help give ourselves and our kids a more vibrant community. Let's build something with the foresight of what the future might bring. I want a neighbourhood where we don't need to be chained to car ownership, but can explore and connect with each-other in other ways.
Yes stop wasting the money to make matter worse than they already are already!! Stop doing this project NOW
Why are the corner radii so wide? Please consider tightening up the entry and exit from side streets, so that these movements across sidewalk and pathway happen at lower speed. Also consider keeping the sidewalk and pathway raised across the minor streets, to create vertical deflection. This is standard practice in other countries.
Just expand the current side walk. Why go through the trouble of taking up road space and risk more collisions when and existing sidewalk just needs to be expanded?
We live on Acadia Drive between 90th and Southland. We are concerned over the potential loss of parking (especially with daycare and high school on the corner). Widening the existing sidewalks on both sides of the street onto the boulevard seems more affordable and less invasive. Why is this not being considered?
None of these options are satisfactory. Removing any street parking will be detrimental to the houses on both sides of the street that need the street parking for themselves and their guests. The only option would be to put a path on one or both sides of the street that does not encroach into the road and eliminate the parking spaces.
As a home owner on Acadia drive, street parking is extremely important
Terrible idea and misleading description
As nice as option 3 would be you can’t take away parking on bot sides
I live on Acadia Drive and I fully this project.
I like option 3 the best, but option 1 is good if the multi-use path is placed on the west side.
Please add curb extensions at EVERY intersection and driveway. People should not be able to park there blocking the view of people walking and wheeling.
I think a turning light/lane at 90 & Acadia is the only thing that is truly needed. The rest is a complete waste of money. Money to install for the 5 bikes who use it, money to plow it, etc. all a waste.

Pop Up 1: In-person comments received at Acadia Aquatic and Fitness Centre

Okay with removal of parking, not sure about removing it all
Love that we're keeping existing sidewalks
Prefer Option 1 o Keeping some parking o Extra access for peds
Don't like buses stopping in the driving lanes
Option 1 o Okay with removing parking on one side
Buses take longer for pick up, drop off when wheelchair ramp is needed o Impatient people driving into oncoming lane
Long queues at Southland/Acadia southbound before left turn lane was introduced

Pop Up 2: In-person comments received at Alberta Tennis Centre

Concern with the potential conflict with peds sharing pathway with cyclists.
Prefer option 2 to ride straight through intersections.
Option 1 because I don't like how the pathway logs up at intersection.
If cost isn't an issue, prefer option 3. Then option 2. Last option is option 1 due to pedestrians.
Agree with lower posted speed. There is too much speeding SB.
Challenges with sightlines on curves in study area 2.
Need better visibility at crossing.

Pop Up 3: In-person comments received at Acadia Recreation Complex

Grade 4 student: Prefers separate separated pathways.
Supportive as long as sight lines are kept.
Option 2 is more dangerous. Option 3 preferred.
Love 1+2 bike lanes options. Faster for cyclists separates cyclists from pedestrians.
Option 3 please – safer for cyclists and pedestrians.
Multi use pathways maybe feels more dangerous with fast bikes encountering kids and others walking.

Study Area 3

Online: Which option would you feel more comfortable travelling on this corridor? Please tell us why...

If you must add bike lanes then they should not be at the cost of road space.
Both options 2 and 3 provide good separation between cars and cyclists, but option 2 being on-street might be safer for cyclists as cars entering the road shouldn't block the bike path.
This is a great safe option for all commuters. The east side of the road has more space for something like this.
My comments for this section are the same for all sections: the multi-use pathway will add the best value for all users (pedestrians and wheeling) while bike lanes will only been seen as used for bikes. Installing the same option along the full length of the project area would be easiest to travel for it's continuity (ie, I could be convinced that switching to a uni-directional bike paths partway through this stretch but it would be less convenient as a user, even with the planned crosswalk upgrades). I also like that the multi-use path is raised from the rest of the road, and on the north/east side that sees more daylight (also on the closer side to other connections and most amenities in these communities).
I prefer you do nothing because the project you are proposing is not needed for Acadia south of Southland. But that isn't possible in the opinion of Annie, your PM. So Option 1 because it seems to be the least intrusive to the existing infrastructure.
Keeping pedestrian and vehicles separate from wheeling traffic is the safest option for all parties. Also allows the best freedom of movement of all options.
Travel as a pedestrian is usually on the north/east side, so reducing car speeds and parking hazards on that side is important. As a biker (wheeler), both options 1/2 are ideal and make safer options than currently. Since option 1 is technically raised AND separate and option 3 is less practical (see comments below), I think option 1 is safest for users.
None, I do not agree with any of these options.
Concrete Barrier’s are not the answer to adding bike lanes to Acadia Dr. Keep it simple and stop over thinking spend our tax dollars. Pave, plow, sand, and fix our water main for the future. Easy!!
Bike lane not needed on this wide road.
Again all horrible ideas. Why not widen the sidewalks.
Uni-directional paths mean that cyclists coming from the west (Willow Park) and wanting to go southbound on Acadia don't need to cross Acadia to reach the multi-use and bi-directional pathway. As a cyclist I would prefer to be on a raised path.
The separate raised bicycle infrastructure described here offers the safest option for bicyclists and pedestrians while maintaining parking infrastructure in certain areas for those who might require it. It improves sight-lines so that cars will be less-likely to turn into pedestrians and cyclists, and it offers the best visible improvements for the neighbourhood as a whole who will be living with these changes in

their day-to-day. If the budget allows for it, this is my top choice. That being said, any of the three options is vastly preferred to nothing.
The options I selected are the least disruptive to the existing system. All the others seem over engineered. I've lived in Mapleridge since 1979 and am very familiar with walking, cycling, driving in the community. Our kids all walked to school. Generally, when cycling I have used the sidewalks, option 1 addresses that. Although I have to say I do not see what the issue is, rarely as a cyclist doing this have I encountered any conflict at all with pedestrians; the boulevards are so wide that it is simple to just move aside for a moment. What problem are you trying to solve? Is there really a problem with pedestrian-cyclist interactions or safety? Just widen the existing sidewalk! (actually that is not even needed).
Seems a less expensive alternative
Due to the amount of traffic, pedestrians, and bikes this would be the best and inclusive option as it also allows parking
Do not take away parking and road access especially due to new zoning rules that should also not be changing
Seriously, you people lack imagination and problem solving skills if this is the best you can come up with. Such flagrant disregard for the majority of residents who want their street parking and street access, where there are insufficient numbers of cyclists year round to warrant this kind of disruption to neighborhoods.
Separating pedestrians and cyclists is very important especially with the number of pedestrians with dogs that are frequently walking in this area. Option 3 also doesn't need to remove any of the street parking. The shoulders in this section are huge and could accommodate the paths without reducing the width of the road. The one downside to all of this is that cyclists will now be crossing every side street in a dedicated lane, but the concern will be that any car trying to exist the side street onto Acadia drive will need to block the cycling path in order to safely merge into the main road. Cyclists may also be travelling quickly on the dedicated path lanes and may startle drivers that are approaching Acadia drive. This is no worse than cyclists that ride on the sidewalk now, but when they have their own bike lane, they will use it like a priority lane and I envision many collisions or close calls between bikes and cars.
A concrete barrier is good enough to stop traffic from entering the bike lanes.
None of these options are good. Why aren't you looking at utilizing the sidewalks and existing green space rather than cutting into the road and making traffic and pollution worse? Why can't cyclists share with pedestrians? It's less dangerous than a car sharing with a cyclist.
Least impactful to what there. Narrows driving lanes which accomplishes one objective, most street parking is on the North side so leave it alone as much as possible and rework the intersections and bus

stops for accessibility concerns. Could rework or refurbish as much as possible the existing sidewalks. The tree roots have them in rough shape.
Snow removal, parking and access to homes on Acadia would still be possible in option three.
Option 3 keeps everything neat and tidy - and SAFE!
As above, any of the options are good. I support making biking safer and more accessible. Please make sure you choose an option that will be cleared of snow properly in winter.
Honestly, I live at the corner of Maplecroft and Acadia. Been here for over 30 years. Drivers, bike riders are simply idiotic and selfish..no cares for anyone else but themselves. People love the trees on the boulevard but fail to understand it's homeowners who water and pickup the leaves each year as well as shovel those darn sidewalks that are so uneven you risk damaging your wrists while shovelling. Do the plan with the least disruptions to the homeowners who live along these routes. We deserve at least that much in return for the cost of water and labor maintaining the city boulevards.
Separate infrastructure for different speed levels of transportation

Online: Do you have any additional comments?

I challenge the assumption that there is enough bike traffic to warrant any bike lanes. I live along here and I can tell you the number of daily bike riders is very low. The cost to implement this project does not meet the actual need. Fix the existing sidewalks and definitely improve the crossing at Maplecroft Rd. But bike lanes are not justified.
Increased pedestrian crossing would be handy with the pathway only on the east side. Bus stops moved further away from intersections would be beneficial and keep intersections from clogging up during rish hours and improve sight line visibilities for all drivers as well.
I am excited for these changes to 90th/Acadia and have been hoping for this upgrade for a long time. Pathways/bike lanes are community energizers and whatever installation is determined to be best, will be well used by both local community members and those living in communities north/south. Thank you so much for all your work so far!
I attended Mar 22. Per Annie: Do Nothing isn't an option; traffic safety justifies the project; the cost is $10 million. I am a 40 yrs. resident. Acadia Dr has cars parked on the east side or concrete jut outs at key intersections that already reduce traffic to 1 lane N and S. Bike lanes are not critical. More visible cross walks is good.
The problem with the traffic along this route is that it is heavy during rush hour. It is used as a feeder road. As traffic is congested on Deerfoot & Blackfoot, people use this route to get to work/school. Conjestion is specially heavy around the junior high. The rest of the time, traffic is fairly light as it is reduced to mostly local use.

I believe that any of the three options is needed and that moving quickly to building a solution is essential. With that in mind, I think options 1 and 2 are most likely to be able to be done swiftly. Option 1 is more likely to get wide use early from a variety of wheeling and pedestrian users.
How come there are no playground zones in front of either school between Anderson and Southland?? This would slow traffic down. Another easy solution. Stop over thinking and spending on such projects that only few will utilize in the end.
How will the bus stops work with concrete barriers for bike lanes? Not a big concern as the busses are typically almost empty anyway.
Fix Macleod and people won't use fairmont.
The location of the stop line for side streets coming onto Acadia Road has always been problematic and this work doesn't do anything to address that. The stop lines are set too far back so almost no drivers actually stop at those lines, they instead roll through the pedestrian crossing at the intersection.
As someone who was hit by a car while in a cross walk in this neighbourhood, these improvements are not just fluff, but critically necessary for maintaining our safety and the safety of our children.
The last thing we should do is overcomplicate the existing roads/sidewalks/boulevards with uneeded changes. I really see no issue - at all - with pedestrian or cyclist traffic. After living here since 1979 and raising kids, pedestrian safety or cyclist safety has never ever been the least issue. Do not "clutter" up OUR neighborhood.
Not enough bike traffic to warrant taking lanes
Please soften the angles on the pathway as it curves on intersection approaches. Please also narrow up the minor sidestreet entries/exits so that movements across the sidewalk and pathway happen at slower speed. Keeping the sidewalk and pathway raised across the minor street would also align with global best practice.
The proposal to add cycling lanes that go from nowhere useful to nowhere useful is a waste of taxpayers money, that could be better invested in improving road conditions. People who cycle either want to go to the river valley or downtown - Anderson to Macleod is a stupid route since it connects nowhere. Do better.
None of these options are good. Why aren't you looking at utilizing the sidewalks and existing green space rather than cutting into the road and making traffic and pollution worse? Why can't cyclists share with pedestrians? It's less dangerous than a car sharing with a cyclist.
I do not see a lot of bike traffic so multi-use is the way to go.
Daily life should for homeowners should not be disrupted for through traffic.
Please add curb extensions at EVERY intersection and driveway. People should not be able to park there blocking the view of people walking and wheeling.
No bikes, please! The streets are as busy as they get. No need to create more hazard with bikes.

Traffic is now getting very heavy on Acadia to Anderson and gets very backed up because the road narrows towards Anderson. Make the Anderson left hand turn lane of Acadia dr southbound longer and less congested so people can get past and keep traffics flowing down Acadia dr
Why not include a dual turning lane onto Deerfoot from southbound Acadia. Traffic gets so backed up I can't turn south onto Acadia

Pop Up 1: In-person comments received at Acadia Aquatic and Fitness Centre

Ppl would use bike paths to walk on instead of sidewalks
W/ Option 3, would like sidewalks done too
Option 1 only addresses half the issue (no improvements on south side)
Want a playground zone in front of community centre
A lot of cut-through traffic using residential streets
Support for crossing north of Maplecroft Rd + sidewalk connecting to crosswalk
Sidewalks are old + uneven + patchwork
Existing snow removal from residents @ bus stops
Bus stops not cleared by city in a good amount of time
Snow removal concerns b/w path + parking for Option 1
Were told if Deerfoot was closed, this would be an alternative truck route
Lots of visitors to ODR in winter (from all over the city + they park on the street)
Weird sidewalk near Willow Park (narrow) across blvd
Hair salon & halfway house near (south) of Maplecroft Road needs parking in front
Mailbox access is important (most walk)
Like pavement markings for crosswalks
Consider mailboxes - Walking to/from houses to mailboxes - Tactile throughout corridor? On the sidewalk

Pop Up 2: In-person comments received at Alberta Tennis Centre

Prefer option 2. Safer for cyclists at driveways and intersections.
Prefer wider pathways.
Option 3 creates less traffic and space for everyone.
I like option 3.

Pop Up 2: In-person comments received at Acadia Recreation Complex

Prefer option 3. Allow for bus stops.
Likely that MUPs will mostly be used by bikes.
Option 1 preferred – off street pathway.

All Study Areas Spot Improvements

Online: As a pedestrian, how comfortable do you feel travelling on this corridor with these spot improvements?

More comfortable, I am not sure how much this will change the behaviour of drivers but these additional tools will help me feel seen as a pedestrian
Decent improvements but could do more around busy intersections like 90th & Fairmont.
These cross walks are very dangerous. Multiple observations of vehicles locked up and skidding towards pedestrians on cross walks. Acadia Drive is a main arterial route. Add over head flashers and save lives. Multiple 311 complaints submitted and city cllr asked. But no improvements. What more needs to happen? Another senior citizen killed?
Because No one stops for you and painting won't change anything. We need lights to fix these issues!!!
Crossing Southland is hard. It would be nice if there were triangles so cars turning right would yield and there was a spot for pedestrians to stand while crossing. Everywhere else is safe.
I think you have highlighted a variety of options where improvements should be made, but I was unclear in some areas as to what those improvements would be exactly. I was hit by a car and almost hit by another at the Macleod crossing and Bonaventure crossing, those need vast improvements.
These would improve things. Why not try a raised sidewalk (and pathway depending on the option chosen) across the sidestreet? Could create much nicer 'entrances' into the residential sidestreets this way, while also slowing traffic more than a sign would.
I feel the corridor as is has sufficient safety measures to ensure pedestrian safety. Adding more will not improve poor drivers.
I feel unsafe. Vehicles turning on red, to the right, off Southland Drive to Acadia Drive are looking only for vehicles, not pedestrians. Vehicles turning on red, to the right, off Acadia onto Southland are only looking for vehicles to their left and do not see pedestrians. It is a race for vehicles to get in front of oncoming traffic.
the sidewalks are safe. Flashing lights at the crossings would add to pedestrian safety.
Plenty of work to make pedestrians more visible, but what about slowing down cars with traffic-calming measures

Crossing Acadia drive is problematic at crossing without lights/crosswalk lights. Drivers look the other way rather than stopping to allow pedestrians to cross.
I still worry for my kids walking or biking to school as the centre street to fairmont to Acadia drive speedway has fast traffic.

Online: As a wheeling user, how comfortable do you feel travelling on this corridor with these spot improvements?

Signals to drivers that there is a strong pedestrian presence on these roads so that they may drive more mindfully, this supports cyclists as well.
Most spot improvements are for pedestrians and do not enhance wheeling travel.
As a used of the roadways, speeds are too high, people try and pass within the same lane (extremely wide lanes), no calming measures. Narrow the road, add cycle lanes.
If "wheeling user" also pertains to cyclists, none of these spot improvements really pertain to improved cycling. The other study area improvements would certainly help, however.
If the spot improvements are Option 2 or Option 3, I will feel safer riding my bicycle along this route. What I do not see with any of these spots is how the bicycle route will be improved.
If wheeling includes a bike, I see no implements that would improve the safety of a person travelling on the road. Could traffic-calming measures be used to keep the speed of vehicle down.
I still worry for my kids walking or biking to school as the centre street to fairmont to Acadia drive speedway has fast traffic. Also the traffic calming structures make bikes enter traffic frequently

Online: As a motorist, how comfortable do you feel travelling on this corridor with these spot improvements?

Better visual notification of pedestrians supports my desire to be a safer driver.
Changes do not materially impact vehicle travel
See above
It doesn’t matter as the kids will be kids and they will cross wherever
Turning left onto willowpark from Acadia is difficult during school let out. A 4 way light would be nice.
As a driver, someone driving a car should never feel entirely comfortable. When you provide a road which "comforts" drivers, it allows for them to disengage from the incredibly dangerous task at hands which fosters the ever increasing number of pedestrian and cyclist deaths we are experiencing all over the city. Roads should create conditions which force drivers to pay attention to their surroundings and maintain the highest possible safety for others. Our comfort should be the last priority.

Also, why does the motorist feedback box have no limits, but the pedestrian and wheeling user boxes are limited to 350 characters?
I frequently drive along this route and the part that merges two lanes to one in Willowpark is dangerous for cyclists as they are squeezed in close to the cars. This is dangerous for both motorist and cyclists.
There is basically a free speeding spot from willowpark drive through to Anderson…no discouragements for autos to respect the speed limit thus making the crosswalk at Maplecroft road across Acadia a killing zone. Seriously, lighted crosswalk to get across Acadia needs to be considered.
Cars are the safest way to travel this corridor. :(

Online: How well do you think these spot improvements meet the project objectives of safety, connectivity, and accessibility improvements?

I hope that this will support crossing pedestrians of all ages and stages.
Some accessibility and safety improvements. Could do more for traffic calming, lighting, and safety around busy intersections.
They are insufficient. They need to be more robust to calm traffic and make the community more peaceful for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists alike.
It sucks!!!!
I think they will cause massive increase in congestion especially during school let out times.
We desperately need these improvements, please make them happen!
We need better lighting at Acadia crossings (crossing acadia). At night, except where there are already pedestrian lights, I feel at risk in the cross walks. That does not seem to be addressed in any option. It is a more important issue than traffic calming (people drive fast despite measures, people drive around curb extensions). Focus on improving sight lines and lighting at intersections over bike lanes or road narrowing. During rush hour, incidents on Deerfoot cause traffic to divert through the neighborhood - traffic still needs to flow and narrowing of the roadways might cause real congestion and disruption; the roadway works well enough as it is. How about some traffic law enforcement? Where are the police?
Please consider ensuring that left turns at Acadia Southland and Acadia Fairmount do not conflict with pedestrian (and bike) movements.
I want to know more about how the bicycle path will be improved and which of the stated three options will be chosen.
The only section that deserves this much attention is from Macleod Trail to Fairmount Drive. Everything east of Fairmount Drive is currently wide enough is for cyclists to ride with relative safety all the way to Fish Creek Park along Acadia Drive. This area depends on the street parking, and removing any of it will cause more congestion and a

greater chance for pedestrian injuries as people cross Acadia drive to get to their vehicles on the other side of the road, or on a side street.
Doesn't matter how much you want to repaint those crosswalks, if there are no crossing lights, the pedestrians waiting to cross are ignored by drivers
I tea not enough.

Pop Up 1: In-person spot improvements comments received at Acadia Aquatic and Fitness Centre Pop-Up

Mapleton Dr + Willowpark Dr – Major issues with compliance at crossings
Willowfern Dr – one of the worst for people not stopping (major injury in the 90s)
Curb extensions installed
Speed – alternate to Deerfoot Tr (study area 3)
20 – 30 km/hr over speed limit
Slow down!
School zone near RT Alderman
Park south of Maplecroft Rd with a playground or
RRFB + signal maybe @ Willowfern Dr.
Potential RRFB @ 97 Ave
Do not relocate bus stops 4386 and 4399
Not enough space for bus stop/buses at new crossing @ Ancourt
Foundations for the future à sidewalks on 86 Ave in poor conditions not due to trees

Pop Up 2: In-person spot improvements comments received at Alberta Tennis Centre Pop-Up

Connect to river via Southland. Better pathway. Less grade than Anderson. Bike up Ancourt
Road to 86 Ave. Connects across to LRT station and over. Quieter/More Direct.

Pop Up 3: In-person spot improvements comments received at Acadia Recreation Complex Pop-Up

Scattered crosswalk at 90th and Fairmount.
Lots of cut through on 6 street to Heritage.
Great idea to replace yield sign.
Traffic calming Fairmount Dr. (entire corridor). Safer xing at 92 ave and Fairmount at 93 or 94 and Fairmount (by Frances Klein Centre).
Add a turn light at signal at Fairmount and 90 Ave.

Route on Macleod makes more sense.
Start with spot improvements first, rather than spend 10million project.
Abercresent / Fairmount – new daycare 150 students.
94 Ave – David Thompson school bus problem can spill on to Acadia Drive.
General concern for school traffic / buses.
People like these communities because there is space.
Snow maintenance issues. Seniors home on 92nd have mobility challenges. Need bus.
5 street crossing is important.
Want a bike facility on Bonaventure.
86 Ave traffic signs / calming.
I am not in favour of any of your three options. I want you to leave us alone, keep it as it is.
Very excited about new bike infrastructure.

Additional comments received by email related to engagement

Could you please explain the process of incorporating feedback from people who choose none of the three options when the only method to express this is via long text? What is the process to properly consolidate free text responses and ensure those are properly accounted for? As an example, if 50% of responses only indicate preference via the free text option (i.e. "none of the above"), would that clearly indicate to infrastructure services that they should go back to the drawing board, or will the process be to proceed with the highest chosen option even though it is clearly not the majority?
I would like to hear from the City Administration why the survey in Phase 2 for the study areas does not include a "none of the above"?