

# APPENDIX J

## Comment Tracking Sheet



No.	Plan No.	Review Comment	Initial	McElhanney's Response
G.1	General	Can the alignment swing east a bit to minimize the impacts on the wetland? There appears to be additional ROW width on the east side adjacent to Maple Ridge. Suggest realigning to provide a space between the existing ROW and sidewalk adjacent to turn bays as per the standard section.	NC	Yes – this will be updated
G.2	General	Switch the sidewalk and the SUP so the sidewalk is on the east and the SUP is on the west side of 17 Street. Maintain the existing trail alignment on the east and use sidewalks north and south of the existing trail.	NC	Yes - this will be updated
G.3	General	The CL and stationing should be behind all other elements	--	Yes – we will revise line weight to blend the stationing – variance from City standards
G.4	General	Check and correct all text overlap	--	Yes
G.5	General	Show existing property lines in all cross-sections	--	This will be added
G.6	General	Label all access widths, collector width & ROW	JW	Where applicable – many of the future development accesses will not be known at this time.
G.7	General	For Strathcona County sheets, update the title block, City will not sign off on county plans	JW	Strathcona will provide a title block for their requirements
G.8	General	Construct all two directional curb ramps as one 3.0m wide curb ramp.	JW	Curb ramps and crosswalks have been relocated and/or adjusted
G.9	General	Construct all one direction curb ramps as 1.5m walk connectors.	JW	Curb ramps and crosswalks have been relocated and/or adjusted
G.10	General	Remove notes regarding bus pad locations.	NL	These should be left on as they were provided by ETS and are not the same distance from each intersection through the corridor
G.11	General	Round off VC lengths. VC's need to satisfy sight lines.	JW	There are no sightline issues as the profile is flat through the City section, L values will be rounded to the nearest metre
G.12	General	Design all RT islands to City standards.	JW	Which standards???
G.13	General	Some of the existing accesses line work not shown, but they are proposed to be closed. Show line work.	NL	Where the baseplan shows accesses (paved) they are shown. Gravel accesses will be drawn onto the plans

No.	Plan No.	Review Comment	Initial	McElhanney's Response
G.14	General	Confirm all ROW corners cuts are 6mx6m.	JW	All corner cuts will be updated to 6m x 6m
G.15	General	Show Atco crossings.	--	These will be added for crossing locations only – and have been included in the utility drawings
G.16	General	Show existing PL's on all sections.	--	Refer to 6.5
G.17	General	Review is medians require landscaping.	--	This is a design level detail, all medians are shown as medians.
G.18	General	Design all RT's to City standard.	JW	Refer to G.12
G.19	General	Plans do not match TIA assessment of the intersection of 17 street and Roper Road.	TIA	This has been discussed in the body of the report, the recommended plan has additional capacity as compared with the TIA
G.20	General	Ensure 3.0m pans on curb ramps linking to SUP's.	ST	Curb ramps and crosswalks have been relocated and/or adjusted
G.21	General	Ensure all existing accesses that are proposed to be closed are labeled accordingly		
1.1	S017-1201	Did the WMD/17 St i/c provide space for a sidewalk and SUP?	NL	No – only a SUP was shown on the design plans
1.2	S017-1201	Can we show how the 3.0m SUP ties into to existing at WMD	NL	Yes
1.3a	S017-1201	Revise note regarding development accesses to include that they are subject to review with future development applications	NL	Yes
1.3b	S017-1201	Suggested rewording of note in 1.3a: "Access subject to approval with future development applications per latest City of Edmonton" access management guidelines." Copy note onto all pages	RG	Refer to 1.3a
1.4	S017-1201	Shift cross section line A-A or show the bus pad in the section view	NL	This has been updated
1.5	S017-1201	24m ROW is required at the Future 51 Avenue.	NL	51 Avenue will be updated to a 24m row
1.6	S017-1201	Why the odd property lines at Future 51 Avenue	NL	51 Avenue is former row, and is now privately titled, row take will be shown as 24m
1.7	S017-1201	Does the City need to acquire land from CN? Update property line across rail.	NL	No CN land cannot be acquired, rather the crossing permit will determine the row at design

No.	Plan No.	Review Comment	Initial	McElhanney's Response
1.8	S017-1201	Provide more clarity as to where the stationing begins. Is it the CL of the existing road or at the CL of the tracks.	RG	Centreline is stationed from the crossing of the existing road.
1.9	S017-1201	VC is not required south of the rail crossing.	JW	Not updated – Rail sets the profile through the crossing area.
1.10	S017-1201	Label track limits. VC should not be within track limits.	JW	??
1.11	S017-1201	Round off VC length north of tracks to 74m.	JW	Refer to G.11
1.12	S017-1201	Section B-B – missing crossing arm in section on west side of road; it is shown in plan.	NL	There is no crossing arm for the sidewalk – crossing arm is for SUP, which will have cyclists
1.13	S017-1201	The horizontal distance between the R/W limit and the edge of the sidewalk should be consistently 1.95m (similar to Section A-A). Currently the distance in Section B-B is 2.15m.	NL	Updated, distance on the sidewalk side is 2.35m, not 1.95m
1.14	S017-1201	Adjust the island nose in between the NB & SB lanes on the north side of the 51 Avenue intersection.	--	Updated
1.15	S017-1201	CNR crossing approval is required. Is a second track required at the crossing?	--	No, CN operates this as a subdivision and did not indicate any requirements for multiple tracks
1.16	S017-1201	Is the Slope before the CN rail crossing 0.03%?	--	Slope must be 0.03% to match existing rail crossing.
2.1	S017-1202	Delete notes north of the CN crossing to retain existing accesses. Others that will be closed are labeled already.	NL	Comment will be removed
2.2	S017-1202	Curb ramps are needed for the two (2) accesses north of the CN crossing and the one (1) just north of Fulton Creek.	NL	Updated for all accesses
2.3	S017-1202	Radii for access just north of Fulton Creek are too large. Consider reducing radii and increasing access width.	JW	Access radii reduced to R10
2.4	S017-1202	Note regarding the location of the future Roper Road should be subject to "Concept" rather than "Functional" Planning Study.	RG	Updated
2.5	S017-1202	Paint line leading north to the Roper Road turn bay should be orange rather than blue.	NL/JW	Updated
2.6	S017-1202	Should a bus stop be located on Roper Road EB, east of 17 Street?	JW	Information not provided, is beyond project limits, which has been updated
2.7	S017-1202	Change the lane widths from 4.20m to 4.45m at the intersection (highlighted in green).	JW	Updated
2.8	S017-1202	Note regarding future access off Roper Road can be deleted in the note in No. 1.3b is inserted.	RG	Updated

No.	Plan No.	Review Comment	Initial	McElhanney's Response
2.9	S017-1202	What size culvert is required for the Fulton Creek crossing?		2.0m is recommended is feasible
3.1	S017-1203	Reword the note regarding access to parcel from south to "Proposed cross-lot access thru parcel to the south.	NL	Updated
3.3	S017-1203	That does "Localized Access" mean? "Localized Access" to what?	NL	Comment removed
3.4	S017-1203	Curb ramps are needed at the "Localized Access".	NL	Updated as per G.8
3.5	S017-1203	1.0m wedges are required where mono-walk transitions to separate walk (2 locations) on the west side of 17 Street.	JW	Updated – but is a design detail, not planning as it could be larger
3.6	S017-1203	Is the bend in the 3.0m SUP (just south of the S017-1204 Matchline at 17m radius min.?)	JW	Will label radii for this transition
3.7	S017-1203	Section A-A - The horizontal distance between the SUP and the ROW line is more than 0.85m where the section is cut.	NC	Cross Sections have been updated
3.8	S017-1203	Section A-A – What is the 18.5m dimensioning too? Remove of flip to other side.	NC	Cross Sections have been updated
3.9	S017-1203	Section A-A – Show a noise fence in this section on the east side of the ROW.	NL	Cross Sections have been updated
3.10	S017-1203	Section A-A - 3.6m wide SUP is desirable	NC	Revised as per G.2
3.11	S017-1203	Adjust nose of the median in between the NB & SB lanes on the south side of the Maple Ridge Drive intersection.	--	Updated
4.1	S017-1204	Add pipeline line work to the legend.	NL	Updated
4.3	S017-1204	Curb ramps at 68 Avenue should be straight north/south, not multi-directional.	NL	Curb ramps and crosswalks have been relocated and/or adjusted
4.4	S017-1204	No painted crosswalk for un-signalized intersections at 68 Avenue.	RG	Curb ramps and crosswalks have been relocated and/or adjusted
4.5	S017-1204	Remove "Right In / Right Out access" note	RG	Updated
4.6	S017-1204	Confirm that sight distance is met at 68 Avenue	RG	There is 170m between intersections, SSD for trucks at 70km/h design speed is 140m
4.7	S017-1204	Change pipeline colour. Yellow will not show up if scanned.	NL	Black line is for crossings, yellow is from City baseplan (as is the black pipe labeling)
4.8	S017-1204	West 70 Avenue lane widths should be 5.75m rather than the shown 5.50m	JW	Intersection has been redesigned based on traffic analysis

No.	Plan No.	Review Comment	Initial	McElhanney's Response
4.9	S017-1204	Suggest maintaining 73 Avenue west as a RI/RO.	NL	In short term, this may be the case, long term traffic should shift to 70 Avenue
4.11	S017-1204	VC is not required north of 70 Avenue.	JW	Curve is required to match existing – may be revised in detail design
4.12	S017-1204	Section A-A - 2.35m horizontal distance between west ROW edge and sidewalk is larger than 2.35 at the section location. Note that it varies.	NL/RG	Cross Sections are not typical, rather specific to the actual location
4.13	S017-1204	Section B-B – Why are the concrete medians not both labeled as “varies” or both labeled with a dimension?	NL	Refer to 4.13
4.14	S017-1204	Section B-B - 2.35m horizontal distance between west ROW edge and sidewalk is larger than 2.35 at the section location.	NL	Refer to 4.13
4.15	S017-1204	4x9 Bus Pad note just north of Oak Ridge Drive: Intersection is spelt incorrectly.	NL	Updated
4.16	S017-1204	Paint line is required in middle of road east of 17 Street on 70 Avenue.	RG	Refer to 4.8
5.1	S017-1205	Note labeled “MAJOR UTILITY CROSSING”: Required is incorrectly spelled.	NL	Updated – apparently the Microstation spell check was not properly utilized!
5.2	S017-1205	VC over pipeline crossing (south of section A-A) is note required	JW	No – not at this level of detail
5.3	S017-1205	Label taper and bay on the south side of 76 Avenue, west of 17 Street and on the north side of 76 Avenue, east of 17 Street.	JW	Updated
5.4	S017-1205	Bus pad on the NE corner of 76 Avenue and 17 Street (NB 17 Street) requires a connector walk and curb ramp.	NL	Updated
5.5	S017-1205	Curb ramps are needed for the access on the west side of 17 Street, just south of the S017-1206 Matchline.	NL	Curb ramps and crosswalks have been relocated and/or adjusted
5.6	S017-1205	Remove note regarding reconstruction of 76 Avenue intersection to accommodate full directional	RG	Updated
5.7	S017-1205	For the section of 17 Street north of 76 Avenue, can we just show the tie-in to interchange? Perhaps put a box around the area with the transition shown separately.	NL	Prefer not to as this is the ultimate plan
5.8	S017-1205	What happens to the profile north of STA 12+735.397?	RG	DEM info not available
5.9	S017-1205	Review lane configuration for 76 Avenue. Number of lanes is inconsistent.	RDC	??

No.	Plan No.	Review Comment	Initial	McElhanney's Response
6.1	S017-1206	Show the existing profile of 17 Street as it enters the interchange.	RG	DEM not available
7.1	S017-1207	Label the existing access as proposed to be closed		Updated
7.2	S017-1207	There are two labels that say "50 BAY" on NB lanes of 17 <sup>th</sup> Street on the south side of 90 Avenue. Only one should be needed?		Updated
7.3	S017-1207	Show existing pavement lines and lane widths further west on 90 Avenue, west of 17 <sup>th</sup> Street.		Updated
7.4	S017-1207	There is an extra thick line on the SB turning lane taper from 17 <sup>th</sup> Street SB to 90 Avenue WB		Updated
8.1	S017-1208	Walks and ramps are not needed. Accommodation for SE corner to receive pedestrians is not required.		Curb ramps and crosswalks have been removed
9.1	S017-1209	Label the existing access as proposed to be closed		Updated
9.2	S017-1209	Additional sidewalk may be needed around the NE and SE corners to the existing property line.		Not required based on no pedestrian connections to commercial site.
9.3	S017-1209	Where is the future cross lot easement required for access to power substation... from Railway Street?		Note updated to clarify that the easement is required from Railway Avenue
10.1	S017-1210	Cross walks are not required at the intersection of 17 <sup>th</sup> Street and the Baseline Road jug handle.		Curb ramps and crosswalks have been removed
10.2	S017-1210	Cross walks are not needed on the north of south side of 17 <sup>th</sup> Street going east/west.		Curb ramps and crosswalks have been removed
10.3	S017-1210	There may be a potential for drivers to assume there is a "new" turn lane heading SB on 17 <sup>th</sup> Street as it approaches Baseline Road.		Additional lane is developed north of baseline to provide additional turning capacity at the jug handle intersection and would be properly signed. Also required for lane balancing through the baseline Road intersection.
10.4	S017-1210	Crosswalk is not needed on the south side of 17 <sup>th</sup> Street and the access to the rail siding road (north of Baseline Road).		Curb ramps and crosswalks have been removed
10.5	S017-1210	Pedestrian crossing without a signal on the north side of the intersection noted in 10.4 may be unsafe.		Based on pedestrian movements, a pedestrian flasher may be considered.
11.1	S017-1211	Extend the limit of the study		Updated
11.2	S017-1211	Where does the median at the end of the study extend too?		Updated

No.	Plan No.	Review Comment	Initial	McElhanney's Response
11.3	S017-1211	There is a bus stop just north of the study limit, this should be included and a sidewalk connecting it to the cross walk on the north side of Knightsbridge Avenue.		The bus stop has been included in the study limit and connected with a sidewalk.
11.4	S017-1211	Should the access north of Knightsbridge be consolidated with Knightsbridge Avenue?		It cannot be consolidated with Knightsbridge because there are two power line towers located east of the intersection of 17 <sup>th</sup> Street and Knightsbridge Avenue.