



What We Heard Report
Transportation Master Plan
Phase two: public participation

Date: September 30, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| B-1 | CONTEXT | 1 |
| B-2 | ATTENDANCE | 1 |
| B-3 | INFORMATION PRESENTED..... | 2 |
| B-4 | COMMENT SHEETS & ONLINE SURVEYS | 2 |
| B-5 | COMMENTS RECEIVED THROUGH SOCIAL PINPOINT | 7 |
| B-6 | EVALUATION SHEETS | 12 |
| B-7 | ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK | 12 |

TABLES

| | |
|---|------|
| Table B-1: Number of Attendees and Responses | B-1 |
| Table B-2: Roadway Classification Comments | B-2 |
| Table B-3: Active Transportation Prioritization | B-3 |
| Table B-4: Collision Safety Review..... | B-4 |
| Table B-5: Public Transit Considerations | B-5 |
| Table B-6: Infrastructure Improvements Considerations | B-6 |
| Table B-7: Missing Improvements..... | B-7 |
| Table B-8: Other Comments and Concerns | B-6 |
| Table B-9: Social Pinpoint Comments | B-7 |
| Table B-10: Evaluation Survey Summary | B-10 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Appendix “B-1” – Advertisements of Public Participation Session | Appendix B-1 |
| Appendix “B-2” – Handout Information Sheets..... | Appendix B-2 |
| Appendix “B-3” - List of Attendees to the Public Participation Sessions | Appendix B-3 |
| Appendix “B-4” – Comment Sheets | Appendix B-4 |
| Appendix “B-5” – Evaluation Survey | Appendix B-5 |
| Appendix “B-6” – Pictures of the Events | Appendix B-6 |
| Appendix “B-7” – Social Media Comments | Appendix B-7 |

B-1 CONTEXT

The second phase of public participation to address the Leduc County Transportation Master Plan consisted of the following:

- In-person public participation session held at Rolly View Community Hall on Wednesday, September 1st, 2021, between 6:00 pm and 8:00 pm;
- In-person public participation session held at Glen Park Hall on Thursday, September 2nd, 2021, between 6:00 pm and 8:00 pm; and
- Online public participation via Social Pinpoint website, accessible to public between August 26th and September 12th, 2021.

In-person public participation session presented the information contained within the TMP document on poster boards spread out throughout the venue. Attendees were encouraged to leave their responses and feedback on comment sheets. Representatives from CastleGlenn Consultants and Leduc County were on-hand to explain the extent of the project, and to answer any questions or concerns the attendees may have had.

Online public participation website consisted of a public presentation accessible in a PDF format, seven pages with background information related to each element, as well as an interactive map of proposed infrastructure investments. Visitors to the site were encouraged to leave their comments on the interactive map and fill a comment and evaluation survey.

B-2 ATTENDANCE

Attendees to the in-person participation sessions were required to fill in sign-in sheets upon arrival to collect attendance data. While the attendees were encouraged to leave their feedback on the comment sheets, it was not mandatory. In addition to the comment sheets, attendees were given an opportunity to evaluate the event organization and quality of information presented using an evaluation survey.

Social Pinpoint website indicated the number of unique visitors to the platform. Despite the high interest in the online engagement, only a small fraction of unique visitors left comments on the map or provided a survey response

The attendance to the public participation sessions and number of responses received was as follows:

Table B-1: Number of Attendees and Responses

| Session | Attendance | Comment Sheets / Responses Received |
|---|--|--|
| Rolly View Community Hall, September 1 st | 28 people | 5 comment sheets 3 evaluation surveys |
| Glen Park Hall, September 2 nd | 34 people | 6 comment sheets 4 evaluation surveys |
| Online (Social Pinpoint), August 26 – September 12 | 1871 unique visits 5027 total visits | 6 survey responses 73 map comments |

The public was advised of the public participation sessions by way of the following:

- Leduc County website;
- Leduc County social media (Facebook and Twitter);
- Social media advertisements (Facebook);
- Newspaper Advertisements;
- Roadside signs along Glen Park Road (See Appendix B-1); and
- Utility notices.

B-3 INFORMATION PRESENTED

The in-person sessions were conducted in a “drop-in” format without a formal presentation. The attendees could arrive any time between 6:00 pm and 8:00 pm and were invited to read over the information contained within the TMP on poster boards (see Appendix B-8). Poster boards were spread out across the venue and formed stations focusing on each of the seven elements of the TMP (see Appendix B-6 for pictures of the event). Representatives from CastleGlenn Consultants and Leduc County were on-hand to explain the extent of the project, and to answer any questions or concerns the attendees may have had.

B-4 COMMENT SHEETS & ONLINE SURVEYS

The comment sheets were filled out by attendees during each event. Additionally, comment sheets were available online as a survey on Social Pinpoint.

- The comment sheet was designed to provide feedback on several of the key elements of the TMP (See Appendix B-4).

- In addition to the comment sheets, individuals were encouraged to provide input through other modes of communication including on-line (Social Pinpoint™), telephone, fax, email and letters.
- In total, CastleGlenn received 11 paper comment sheets from in-person events, 73 comments on the Social Pinpoint interactive map, and 5 online survey responses

The following summarizes the comments from survey sheets received. Some of the feedback received was related to specific roadway corridor improvements, which is indicated as being outside of the TMP's scope.

1. The TMP proposes a new roadway classification system that addresses both land use and roadway function. When reviewing the map, do you feel that the assigned classifications are appropriate? Are there any roadways that you feel should be "re-classified"?

Table B-2: Roadway Classification Comments

| <i>Comment</i> |
|--|
| 1. Road use is better reflected |
| 2. No need for extra collector from Chubolka highway |
| 3. Classification is appropriate |
| 4. Everything looks good, TR500 collector is good |

2. The TMP proposes the long-term development of a County Trail network. Upon reviewing the map, identify the 3 most important recreation trails that are important to you.

Table B-3: Active Transportation Prioritization

| <i>Trail</i> | <i>Count of Votes</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Weskahegan – South | 3 |
| 2. Saunders Lake Trail | 3 |
| 3. North Saskatchewan River Trail | 2 |
| 4. Telford Lake- Saunders Lake Trail | 2 |
| 5. Alternative Great Trail | 1 |
| 6. Blackmud Creek | 1 |
| 7. Old Railway Corridor | 1 |
| 8. Trunk Sewer Pipeline ROW | 0 |
| 9. Twp Rd 505 | 0 |
| 10. Twp Rd 510 | 0 |
| 11. Pipeline ROW | 0 |
| 12. Kiskayo Corridor | 0 |

| <i>Additional comments or additional trails to be considered:</i> |
|---|
| 1. Don't use trails |
| 2. None are important |
| 3. Not important |
| 4. Additional connection between North Saskatchewan River trail and the Old Railway Trail, somewhere to the west of Calmar (perhaps Buford or Thorsby) |
| 5. Bike path on TWP 490 east of 2A . Leduc Beaumont |
| 6. I am curious about access to these trails, right now it is difficult to have continuous access along the trails without going around/over or through fences. |
| 7. Somewhere east of Beaumont as there seems to be a lot of bike riders on the roads |

3. Below are 5 intersections where others have identified safety concerns. Identify the top 3 intersections you'd like Leduc County to evaluate further:

Table B-4: Collision Safety Review

| <i>Intersection</i> | <i>Count of Votes</i> |
|---|------------------------------|
| 1. TR490 (Glen Park Road) / Highway 2A | 9 |
| 2. TR490 (Glen Park Road) / RR263 | 8 |
| 3. TR490 (Glen Park Road) / Highway 795 | 7 |
| 4. TR510 / Highway 21 | 4 |
| 5. TR510 / Looma Road | 2 |
| <i>Are there any other important intersections where safety is a concern?</i> | |
| 1. RR262 South of Glen Park Road | |
| 2. Glen Park / Highway 60 | |
| 3. Twin lanes for highway 21 (note – provincial jurisdiction) | |
| 4. Highway 625 / Highway 21 (note – provincial jurisdiction) | |
| 5. 50 th Street . 41 st Ave North of Beaumont | |
| 6. Highway 814 / Highway 625 (note – provincial jurisdiction) | |
| 7. Twp 243/44 / RR510 difficult to turn left with increasing traffic flows | |
| <i>Do you have other ideas or suggestions to help further improve safety on our roads? Please describe:</i> | |
| 1. Improve Speed Enforcement | |
| 2. Speed zones on Glen Park Road being different in each direction (90 / 100) km/h make no sense | |
| 3. Reduced speed and dedicated left turn lanes at Glen Park Road/ Highway 2A | |
| 4. Addition of scales for large trucks – Glen Park and Highway 60 | |
| 5. Larger signage | |
| 6. Roads with shoulders | |
| 7. Greater enforcement of speed limits on collector roads. | |
| 8. More rumble strips at paved intersections on collector roads. Rumble strips could also be used AFTER an intersection to discourage drivers from accelerating too quickly as they continue on a collector road. | |
| 9. More traffic circles, better than lights. | |
| 10. Widening busy intersections for left turns similar to Hwy 625 @ RR245. it works very well. | |

4. Do you have any specific direction or other considerations for Leduc County as they explore public transit options?

Table B-5: Public Transit Considerations

| <i>Public Transit Comments</i> |
|--|
| 1. Transit is useful but needs to be cost effective |
| 2. On-demand public transit is a good approach |
| 3. The county should look very closely at the cost-benefit of public transit and carbon footprint |
| 4. Improve public transit in Nisku + 10 km radius |
| 5. Public transit / on-demand is a waste of money |
| 6. On Demand access for towns (such as Calmar) in the County of Leduc to support travel between communities. |
| 7. If pursued it is important to have a collector stop that can take people quickly to 1-3 key collectors to Edmonton/Leduc rather than the county provide that service. |
| 8. Don't use public transit |

5. The TMP illustrated infrastructure improvements to County Roads. Which ones are most important to you?

Table B-6: Infrastructure Improvements Considerations

| <i>Infrastructure Improvements Comments</i> |
|--|
| 1. Glen Park Road at Michigan Centre is too narrow for wide loads |
| 2. Pavement conditions (pothole) on Glen Park Road east of 795 |
| 3. Maintenance of potholes and cracks, washboard on gravel |
| 4. Culverts need to be upgraded and maintained – water flowing over roads in spring takes years to recover |
| 5. RR263 (south of Glen Park Road) should be upgraded before classifying it as collector |
| 6. Lights on TR490 (Glen Park Road) |
| 7. Highway 21 and TR 510 |

6. Are there any improvements that you feel that the TMP may have missed?

Table B-7: Missing Improvements

| <i>Missing Improvements</i> |
|---|
| 1. Glen Park Road needs turn out lanes north and south |
| 2. Widening of RR263 south of Glen Park Road – truck traffic concerns. Currently dirt is pushing up from the middle of the non-upgraded portion |
| 3. Improvements of drainage systems on gravel roads |
| 4. Decommissioning redundant / not travelled often roads |
| 5. Interconnecting subdivisions with trail networks |

7. Do you have any other concerns or comments about improving transportation in Leduc County?

Table B-8: *Other Comments and Concerns*

| <i>Other Comments and Concerns</i> |
|--|
| 1. Pothole on EB lane on Glen Park Road, east of Hwy 795 and west of RR265 |
| 2. Significant truck traffic on Glen Park Road between Hwy 39 and RR263 onto Highway 2 |
| 3. Significant truck traffic on the EIA ring road, province should be providing funding |
| 4. "tend to look downstream when problems are upstream" |
| 5. Incorporate dust control learning into roads |
| 6. Graders make more passes on gravel roads, don't wait until washboard is out of control. Make gravel road intersections clearer for safety of drivers |
| 7. Intersection lights at Highway 625 / Highway 21 (note – provincial jurisdiction) |
| 8. Signage for wide loads – placed on both sides of the road at exact same position. Place defined barrier guard rails at dangerous road segments |
| 9. Pavement on the bridge over highway 2 on TR482 needs to be re-done |

B-5 COMMENTS RECEIVED THROUGH SOCIAL PINPOINT

Social Pinpoint allows stakeholders to leave comments relating to infrastructure improvements on an interactive map. The “upvote” feature allows visitors to the website to upvote other people’s comments that they agree with rather than leaving a new one. In turn, this helps highlight the most important issues for Leduc County residents. Below table summarizes comments received via the social pinpoint website starting with the most upvoted:

Note – Rows that are highlighted “red” represent issues related to links and intersections in either the province of Alberta jurisdiction, City of Leduc jurisdiction or City of Edmonton jurisdiction, thus being outside of the Leduc County’s TMP scope.

Table B-9: Social Pinpoint Comments

| Location | Comment | Upvotes |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| TR490/RR255 | Remove 90 km/h speed zone/re-up it to 100 km/h. no need for the reduction. It is a major connector road operated by the county not the province. If for whatever reason 100 km/h is not 'safe' as deemed by whoever upgrades to the road/intersections should be done | 32 |
| TR510/Goudreau Crescent | 510 needs repaired and widened. It is in terrible shape and is dangerous to drive in the winter. | 19 |
| Highway 2A/Highway 2 | The turn-on to Highway 2 is very dangerous. Not enough distance to get up to speed of the flow of traffic on the highway. | 19 |
| Highway 39 Between Leduc and Calmar | Highway 39 needs to be twinned from Leduc to Calmar. At minimum up to the Devon Turnoff. Large trucks reduce the entire stretch of road to 80 km/h | 18 |
| TR490/Highway 795 | Bring speed back to 100kmph. No one goes 90km | 15 |
| TR510/29 th Street | Widening township road 510 long overdue as it is such a high traffic road. Needs to be done ASAP. | 10 |
| TR490/Highway 2A | Something needs to be done with the intersection at Glen Park Road and highway 2A. There is an accident there at least weekly if not more from people trying to turn left onto Glen Park Road and oncoming traffic not stopping behind the turning vehicle. The right lanes are turning lanes to turn right, not to continue through. Need a turning lane or a light or something. | 10 |
| 50 th Ave/Highway 2 | From 50ave and to access the highway toward Edmonton. There are a lot of holes and the road is really rough, especially the middle section until a point where the highway closer to Edmonton it has been repaved. I would like to add one more comment. How come this province don't know how to pave two side by side section? There is always a big crack that build up like a trench. We don't see that in other provinces. I think we should ask those compagnie to get their personal for update training. | 10 |
| 50 th St/Highway 2A, Leduc | Bottle neck. Two lanes down to one back to two. Slows down those getting and from to highway 2a at 50st. Deep ditches there too seen roll overs due to ice or speeding. | 9 |

| Location | Comment | Upvotes |
|--|--|----------------|
| | Widen it to two would be helpful. Lights by coop hardware store. Not on sensors. Waiting long red light with no one around. Please put sensors there. | |
| Highway 819/41 st Ave SW | It's criminal that this road isn't twinned - I appreciate its Edmonton, but EMRB must have some sway to influence or force response to a road that has left so many victims to unnecessary collisions because of deferred investment. | 9 |
| Highway 616/Highway 814 | Hwy 616 East needs to be re-paved. The pot holes and long, deep cracks are dangerous especially for motorcycles and vehicles with smaller tires. A turn lane at the top of the Coal Lake would also increase safety as traffic must slow down dramatically when drivers ahead are turning south on the range road heading to Wetaskiwin | 9 |
| TR505A/RR232 | Chronic washboard and poor rail crossing | 8 |
| TR490/RR254 | Why did it ever drop to 90 km/h. Bring it back to 100. It's not like anyone actually goes 90km since it was changed. | 7 |
| TR504/RR230 | Rail crossing is awful. | 6 |
| TR492/RR263 | Making this a "safety corridor" sure wrecked this road for daily users. | 6 |
| TR500/RR223A | Rail crossing pavement is very unsafe with the 80 km/h speed limit causing drivers in both directions to slam on their brakes to safely navigate the crossing. Pavement needs to be leveled as there our big dips/bumps. | 6 |
| TR490/RR261 | For a short time, electronic signs that showed your speed on Glen Park Road by RR 261 till a guy in a Chev truck ran them down and stole them (which for some reason the Police and the county seemed to have no interest in knowing) Those signs actually helped a lot with the speeders. | 5 |
| TR490/RR255 | The 90 km/h speed reduction on GPR between Hwy 2 and RR 263 is pointless. Raise it back to the original 100 km/h as the Hwy runs to Sunnybrook. If the concern is that "ditches are too steep" in that section for 100 km/h zone, why don't I point out other roads in the county with narrow shoulders and steep ditches that remain at 100 km/h. This is a major route for county residents and the appropriate action should be to invest in upgrades for the road, rather than lowering the limit as a quick fix | 5 |
| 50 th Ave/Highway 2, Leduc | The ramp from Leduc to Highway 2 - speed limit of 80 km/h until you hit the highway needs to change. There is no way all the traffic can safely merge onto Hwy 2 when the Hwy speed is 110 and off ramp is 80. See so many potential accidents and near misses. The police sitting there watching speed does not help. | 5 |
| Highway 616/Highway 778 | This highway has taken out numerous hubs on my SUV | 4 |
| Highway 2/ Highway 2A | Need a bypass lane linked up to the exit to highway 2A. | 3 |
| RR14, just north of TR474 | We would like to have our road paved and do not understand why paving was not part of the requirements for the subdivision when it was approved. All the other roads are paved around us. | 3 |
| TR490/Highway 2A | People going straight through in the turn lanes. I have witnessed 4 accidents. Enforcement or light | 3 |
| 59 Ave/32 nd St (new collector) | Paving this or even making it a dirt road would create an alternate exit/access for Royal Oaks/ Diamond Estates residents. This would make it feasible to bike out to the range road and even to Beaumont more safely as biking on township road 510 is dangerous. As Royal Oaks residents for 4 years we have been waiting for this to open up and would love to have a way to bike to Beaumont amenities | 3 |

| Location | Comment | Upvotes |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Windrose Dr., Leduc | Lower speed limit from 60 km/hour to 50 km/hour. A lot of speeders. Unsafe conditions | 3 |
| 50 th St/ Highway 2A | Please add a left turning lane here, it's a major bottleneck for people coming off 2A | 3 |
| Highway 625/ RR240 | It would be great to have some sort of safe bike path from Hwy 21 to Beaumont (either airport road or Hwy 625) as these roads are too narrow and busy to safely be able to ride into town. It would be great to have alternate (safe) modes of transportation. | 3 |
| RR234/ Yellowbrick Rd. | Range Road 234 is currently a gravel road. In the past 25 years it has been gravel, oiled surface, dust free surface and now back to gravel. It has a lot of traffic, dust, gravel and pot holes are a major issue. It was slated for some sort of permanent dust control years ago then put on hold due to a culvert needing to be replaced. That time has passed and nothing has happened. This road is very much in need of better maintenance as well as dust suppression for this 2-mile stretch. | 2 |
| RR260/ TR505 | The road to rabbit hill needs to be repaved the whole way from the highway and the shoulders made wider. Lots of potholes and washboard gravel road closer to the resort. Not safe for travelers and school busses that go there daily. Also needs better clearing and sanding in the winter. | 2 |
| RR15, north of Highway 622 | bridge was to be widen to accommodate 2 vehicles at the same time and road straighten to allow for safer flow of traffic | 2 |
| Highway 2/ Airport Road | Hwy 2 southbound has large cracks and large potholes that are unsafe as they grab the tires of motorists and pull them. I have already contacted the department of transportation over a year ago and was assured this would be fixed. It's a hazard and so far, only a short section has been repaired. | 2 |
| TR490/ Highway 2A | I usually turn right and go east then pull a U-turn and cross 2A at right angles as it's not safe at busy times to turn Left both going North or South. | 1 |
| TR490/RR255 | Since the speed got lowered, I have been doing the speed limit and countless people have nearly crashed into me or have tried forcing me off the road, when it was 100 km/h this was a lot less common. Glen Park and Michigan Centre communities are the places that a lower speed limit would actually help the residents. | 1 |
| RR240A/ TR494 | Sections of this road already have packed crushed asphalt. The rest of 240A should also get that or should be paved. There is excessive wash board and the grader operator is not maintaining proper road management. | 1 |
| RR10/ Highway 39 | I have noticed on numerous occasions that the sight lines from the east are short due to the weed creek valley. During the winter there is minimal amount of time to gain traction to avoid a possible accident with highway traffic. | 1 |
| TR490 / RR261 | Fix the bump just west Hwy 2A on Glen Park road. Right where the culvert is for the slews the cross the road. | 1 |
| TR505A/ RR232 | The Looma road should be paved. The washboard is terrible. | 1 |
| TR510/ Nisku Spine Rd | Motion detection camera needs to pick up cyclists so they don't run the red light. Currently two or three light cycles happen before a green light if no vehicles. Also, the barricade prevents visibility of oncoming traffic which makes this intersection very dangerous. | 1 |
| TR480/ Highway 778 | In cooperation with Wetaskiwin County, this road should be paved from 778 to 795 to provide another connector for lake traffic. | 1 |

| Location | Comment | Upvotes |
|--|--|----------------|
| RR275/ TR484 | The traffic on Range Road 275 is increasing because of the oil tankers and businesses in the area and the boat launch on Wizard Lake it should be dust controlled by the county because of the heavy traffic. | 1 |
| TR504/ RR21 | if TR504 is considered "bypass road" it needs paid dust control all the way to RR15 | 1 |
| TR473A/ RR13 | Not stop sign or yield sign at this "T" intersection. There used to be a yield sign but has been gone for a few years. | 1 |
| RR13/ Highway 622 | Range Road 13 and 12A north of Hwy 622 should be paved in the very near future due to multiple acreage subdivisions and as a result a lot more traffic. Road is busy already and not all acreages are occupied with residential yet. Maybe survey the land owners on the range road and see if this a concern for everyone. Some increased tax for being on a paved road would be expected. | 1 |
| TR490/ RR21 | Replace grader operator with someone who knows how to take care of roads. | 1 |
| Highway 21/ TR510 | Not sure if this is provincial, Strathcona County, or Leduc County but this intersection could really use some safety improvements like adding highway entering/exiting lanes. It was noted in the survey but I didn't see anything marked on this map. | 1 |
| RR275/ Highway 39 | Why does the County not extend the pavement south to Glen Park Road, it would only make sense to tie it in with the Road to nowhere or whatever you call the road to the north of highway 39 | 1 |
| Grant MacEwan Blvd, Leduc | Continue the soon to be new 4 lane road up to the 711. It's a busy road. Having to go back to one lane road each direction will cause accidents and congestion | 1 |
| 50 th St/ Highway 2A, Leduc | I don't disagree with you about it being a bottle neck, but it is a city of Leduc problem, not a county of Leduc problem. | 0 |
| TR502/ RR223 | Pave township road 502 from Hwy 21/Airport Road east and then south on range road 223 where it meets New Sarepta on township road 500. | 0 |
| TR504/ RR23 | Genesse Bypass Road was supposed to be paved when the power plant went in. Somehow the plant was able to change the plan. I would request a rethink. Traffic increases are evident especially gravel trucks. | 0 |
| House Crescent | I don't know what local road improvements that have been/or will be made to this Crescent? And what improvements are planned for this road | 0 |
| Highway 2A/ Highway 616 | This intersection is becoming more dangerous and drivers do not follow traffic rules (not passing on the right of someone making left turn), accidents are increasing at this intersection. New signage, widening or lights? | 0 |
| RR233 south of TR502 | RR233 has become very busy with cars doing over 100 in 80. Find it impossible to go for a bike or walk without traffic speeding past. Especially where there are subdivision turn offs. Would be nice to see a slow down around these subdivisions. Speed bumps even? | 0 |
| TR510/ 29 St E | The widening needs to include proper shoulders to provide a safe distance for traffic to allow with the cyclists on the road. | 0 |
| TR504/ RR22 | people use RR22 as a short cut from Highway 622 to Highway 770 it needs to be better maintained | 0 |
| RR15/ TR482 | Range Road 15 pavement should be pushed through to either Glen Park Road or Highway 39 to provide better lake access. | 0 |
| RR245/ Beau Vista | to ensure the safety of people who walk and/or walk their pets on the road well as well as to maintain heavy transportation restrictions are maintained, the county should consider reducing the speed limit on this residential collector roadway back down to 60 km/h from 80 km/h. The 80 km/h speed limit seems to be in opposition to the great signage put up at the ends of the road way "this is your neighborhood, slow down" | 0 |

| Location | Comment | Upvotes |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------|
| TR490/RR255 | I totally agree. 90 km/h is pointless for such a straight flat highway. British Columbians are laughing at us! | 0 |
| TR474 | Push Mission Beach 7th street through to the north-west (to TS474B) to provide quicker access to the main artery. It would cut the summer traffic in half and allow Mission Beach to have their own access that is not Sundance Beach Controlled. There was an existing trail through the trees 50 years ago. I do not know if it is a county road allowance. The 20 km/h speed limit (Lakeshore Drive) is too slow to access main road. | 0 |
| TR504/ RR230 | Seems fine to me. Smooth and rarely a delay... | 0 |
| TR504/ RR15 | if road was upgraded to become the "new by pass road" it needs to be better maintained and either repaved all the way to Twp Rd 504 or the bad /rough/potholed pavement ripped out | 0 |
| Highway 616/ Highway 778 | Totally agree, the first 3 miles of this road going west is terrible. | 0 |
| Mission Beach | The paving on Mission Beach barely lasted 3 years. The potholes are horrible. | 0 |
| RR260/ Highway 19 | The Leduc section of this road should be widened and shouldered. | 0 |
| Highway 616 | Hwy616 need to be replaced lol the way to Millet, need to be cleared better in the snow and cut better in the summer. Lots of blind spots due to poor care (grass too high to see from some side streets, or snow drills in the winter. Lots a of patches pot holes, could use to be paved). The main road company girded to do the care are awful, not as well taken care of as it was before main road go the contract. Main road needs to go, get back the other people much better workmanship and better people | 0 |
| Highway 39/ RR10 | There needs to be a better drainage there on the south side of this bridge. The current orientation causes significant deep-water pooling. Many instances of severe hydroplaning. | 0 |
| TR505A/ RR232 | I don't know why they keep coming back every couple of months to fix this small section of road. The way board is terrible and it's a tiny stretch that should just be placed | 0 |
| Meadowview Blvd, Leduc | Better snow removal is needed. This crescent is crammed. When the snow flies, we have nowhere to put it the snow. | 0 |
| RR233/ TR502 | Traffic of turning vehicles is getting heavy at RR233 and Rd 502. Need turn lanes in both directions. | 0 |
| RR260/ TR484 | 260 should get paved, it's a high traffic road supporting a gravel trucking company, dairy farm, and a kennel. It's always covered with washboards. | 0 |

B-6 EVALUATION SHEETS

Attendees to the two in-person public participation sessions, as well as the online engagement platform were given an opportunity to provide their feedback and evaluation about the events and the information presented using event evaluation sheets (See Appendix B-5). Below table summarizes the feedback received from the public.

Table B-10: Evaluation Survey Summary

| <i>Summary of Evaluation Surveys</i> | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Question</i> | | <i>Count of Responses</i> | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
| I believe that sufficient information was provided. | | 2 | 7 | 2 | | 1 | 1 |
| I learned something new about transportation in Leduc County and future | | 5 | 5 | 2 | | 1 | |
| I believe this was a meaningful process. | | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| I believe that Leduc County is listening and understands my perspectives | | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| I believe that Leduc County will consider my input | | 4 | 8 | 1 | | | |
| How did you hear about this engagement opportunity? (Select all that apply) | Leduc County Website | Roadside Signage | Utility Notice | Newspaper | Facebook | Twitter | Word of Mouth |
| | 1 | 9 | | 2 | 1 | | |

B-7 ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK

Leduc County received additional feedback on the Public Participation Sessions and the contents of the TMP via Facebook comments on the Leduc County Facebook page. Appendix B-7 provides a summary of social media comments received during the public participation phase.

Annex “B-7”

Social Media Comments

Public participation input tracking sheet

For more information refer to page 21 of the Public Participation Guide and/or page 23 of the Public Participation Workbook

All input received through public participation efforts must be tracked. This is often a shared responsibility and various individuals may need to track different aspects of public participation efforts. This includes tracking emails, phone calls, online comment form submissions, social media comments, input shared at public participation activities and more. This information is required to accurately present findings to the decision maker and/or make recommendations, as well as to report back to the public. Multiple tracking sheets may be needed, and each individual responsible for tracking input can work off their own sheet.

This input tracking sheet details the input we received throughout the public participation for the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) project between Aug. 20 to Sept. 3.

| Date | Name (if applicable) | Platform | Comment (verbatim unless otherwise noted) |
|---------|----------------------|----------|---|
| Aug. 21 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | Is there a map to see what we would be giving feedback on? |
| Aug. 21 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED]es, the map will launch on August 26 and will be accessible from www.leduc-county.com/transportation-planning |
| Aug. 21 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | I guarantee sustainable development will dictate every move in this development. Don't expect any ideas to be heard. Regular people have no say. Don't be fooled. |
| Aug. 21 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | I lived in a small community and they had volunteer drivers. I paid \$10 for the trip and a \$1 for each store I needed to go to...wish they had something here like that for the elderly |
| Aug. 23 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] we would love for you to participate and provide feedback at one of our open houses or through our website. Online participation begins on Aug. 26, where you will be able to fill out a survey and comment on an interactive map. If you would like to speak |

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|--|
| | | | to a member of the project team, please call 780-979-6185. |
| Sept. 1 | | Facebook | Maybe try chipping in with costs to bring the LRT from Edmonton. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Public participation input tracking sheet

For more information refer to page 21 of the Public Participation Guide and/or page 23 of the Public Participation Workbook

All input received through public participation efforts must be tracked. This is often a shared responsibility and various individuals may need to track different aspects of public participation efforts. This includes tracking emails, phone calls, online comment form submissions, social media comments, input shared at public participation activities and more. This information is required to accurately present findings to the decision maker and/or make recommendations, as well as to report back to the public. Multiple tracking sheets may be needed, and each individual responsible for tracking input can work off their own sheet.

This input tracking sheet details the input we received throughout the public participation for the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) project between Aug. 27 and Sept. 9.

| Date | Name (if applicable) | Platform | Comment (verbatim unless otherwise noted) |
|---------|----------------------|----------|---|
| Aug. 27 | | Facebook | Why does American infrastructure BS come up on this site? |
| Aug. 27 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] because it's pertinent to Leduc County? Does the link go to an American site? Can't seem to load it. |
| Aug. 27 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] goes to an American site talking about nothing but the American infrastructure plan. There was a prompt to take a survey I clicked on it and this crap came up! Which is not pertinent to Leduc County! |
| Aug. 28 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] Hi [REDACTED] the site is set to a map of Leduc County. It can also be accessed from our website here: https://www.leduc-county.com/.../transportation-master... |
| Sept. 1 | | Facebook | [REDACTED] |
| Sept. 1 | | Facebook | All main road lights should be on sensors. It's annoying stopping at almost all lights with no one around |
| Sept. 1 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] thanks for your feedback, [REDACTED] If there is a specific location you'd like to highlight on our interactive map, we would appreciate the input! Here is a direct link to |

| | | | |
|---------|--------------|----------|---|
| | | | the map: https://castleglenn.mysocialpinpoint.ca/leduc.../map... |
| Sept. 2 | | Facebook | It seems all the pertinent and safe logical ways to improve traffic flow is rejected by the canned answers from the county. The county will not listen to the people who drive the roads every day. Some overpaid fat cat in an office 50 miles from the area of concern will decide for us. After all, what do we know. We just live and drive here all day |
| Sept. 2 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] Hi [REDACTED] we appreciate all feedback, and would love to hear from you. We are hosting an open house tonight at Glen Park Hall. You can drop in anytime from 6 to 8 p.m. If you're unable to attend, we also have online options available for you to share your feedback. Further, you are welcome to contact the project manager directly. His name is Khushnud Yousafzai and he can be reached at 780-955-4590 or khushnud@leduc-county.com. |
| Sept. 2 | | Facebook | Something needs to be done with the intersection at Glen Park Road and highway 2A. There is an accident there at least weekly if not more from people trying to turn left onto Glen Park Road and oncoming traffic not stopping behind the turning vehicle. The right lanes are turning lanes to turn right.. not to continue through . Need a turning lane or a light or something. Tried to add to map but it won't let me. |
| Sept. 2 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] thank you for the feedback. I've submitted it to our project team and it will get added to the map. |
| Sept. 1 | | Facebook | I cant seem to add it on the map but there was for a short time electronic signs that showed your speed on Glen Park Road by RR 261 till a guy in a Chev truck ran them down and stole them (which for some reason the Police and the county seemed to have no interest in knowing) Those signs actually helped a lot with the speeders. |
| Sept. 1 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] Hi [REDACTED] I'm sorry you're having difficulty with the map. I've shared your comments with the project team - thank you for the input! |
| Sept. 1 | | Facebook | REPLY TO LEDUC COUNTY |

| | | | |
|---------|--------------|----------|--|
| | | | Leduc County if the location of the east sign was moved 100 feet west my yard cameras will see it and capture anyone messing with it. |
| Sept. 1 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] Thank you! We'll add it to the map! |
| Sept. 1 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Always find my self trying to break my last record going through those speed tellers. A lot of people do that. |
| Sept. 1 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] like using them to make sure my speedometer is accurate... or see how fast I can run! LOL |
| Sept. 1 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] that's what I do too. Haha everytime a little faster |
| Sept. 1 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | Why would you need to cut a new road through the farmers field on the east of Telford lake when there's already a dirt road there that you could pave? |
| Sept. 1 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] Hi [REDACTED] our project team would be happy to answer any questions you may have. You can contact Khushnud Yousafzai at 780-955-4590 or Khushnud@leduc-county.com. |
| Sept. 1 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | Fix the pavement on highway 2 and it's on ramps, unless the province s responsible and not you |
| Sept. 1 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] Hi [REDACTED] yes, the Government of Alberta is responsible for maintenance, construction and snow removal on all numbered highways. |
| Sept. 3 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | Highway 39 is riddled with potholes and cheap patch jobs. The thorsby speed curve has 2 big bumps that are really sketchy in the winter |
| Sept. 3 | Leduc County | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] he Government of Alberta is responsible for maintenance, construction and snow removal on all numbered highways, including Highway 39. If you have a road concern for a provincial (or numbered) highway, please contact EMCON at 1-800-390-2242 |
| Sept. 5 | [REDACTED] | Facebook | Dropping the speed limit on Glen park road west of highway 2 is joke |

| | | | |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| Sept. 4 | | Facebook | When is the sound barrier on Hwy 2 going to get done . The MP for our area said it was starting this spring.I also- have a text to that affect from him. |
| Sept. 5 | | Facebook | Range Road 240A is horrible. Washboard most of the year cause vehicle damage. Pavement or maintenance is needed as it is a busy road with the new subdivision. |
| Sept. 6 | | Facebook | Most of the roads are in dire need of repair, doesn't matter where you drive , in or out of Leduc County. |
| Sept. 5 | | Facebook | Leduc country needs new people running it..they should not make new plans and waste time..new mayor please..please..please |
| Sept. 10 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] that the country for you |
| Sept. 10 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] yes I agree |
| Sept. 9 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] Leduc County you full well know how dangerous Hwy 21 is. Finances and authority dictate the lack of direction 20 years ago we were told it would be twinned,NOT done yet. Talking gets ratepayers no where!!! |
| Sept. 9 | | Facebook | REPLY TO LEDUC COUNTY FROM A REPLY TO [REDACTED] Leduc County why cant you answer it here so we all can know ?? |
| Sept. 7 | | Facebook | [REDACTED] |
| Sept. 9 | | Facebook | The merge ramp from 2A going onto QE2 south of Leduc definitely needs a sound barrier. Every morning have to listen to loud vehicles racing full throttle getting on QE2 north. Ridiculous behavior by a residential community. |
| Sept. 9 | | Facebook | Good to see as I had told this was dead. Thank you. |
| Sept. 8 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] What sound barrier is that [REDACTED] I know that living by the Highway south side of Leduc definitely needs a sound barrier. Driver's merging onto QE2 from 2A going north is absolutely ridiculous. Loud vehicles racing full throttle while going by Corinthia Park subdivision. |
| Sept. 9 | | Facebook | REPLY TO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] We in the willow calla sac have sound guns the the people ho do the testing get readings of 90+ db. At work I need double hearing protection at 55 db .. only place with this much traffic without a barrier, and it's bullsh |

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|--|
| | | | |
| Sept. 9 | | Facebook | Just stop playing games with the residents of twp 503 and wild land meadows, and just pave the road already The handling of this situation by Leduc county is absolutely pathetic |
| Sept. 8 | | Facebook | Can you please tell the Alberta government to re do QE2 going north to Edmonton? It's been 21years since they last paved it. It's absolutely horrible and embarrassing. And brutal. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |