



## Table of Contents

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND	3
1.2 OBJECTIVES	3
<b>2.0 METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION PROCESS	4
2.2 PROJECT LIST	4
2.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA	5
2.4 CRITERIA WEIGHTING	6
<b>3.0 PROJECT PRIORITIZATION</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 PROJECT SCORING	7
3.2 PROJECT PRIORITIZATION	7
<b>4.0 COMPLETED PROJECTS</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1 FUNDED AND/OR COMPLETED PROJECTS	13
<b>5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1 CONCLUSION	13
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	14
<b>FIGURES (Maps)</b>	
FIGURE 1: PROJECTS READY FOR CONSTRUCTION	AFTER PAGE 8
FIGURE 2: PROJECTS READY FOR DESIGN	AFTER PAGE 10
FIGURE 3: PROJECT FUNCTIONAL PLANNING OR STUDY	AFTER PAGE 12
FIGURE 4: ROADWAY PROJECTS	SEE APPENDIX A
FIGURE 5: TRANSIT PROJECTS	SEE APPENDIX A
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
<b>APPENDIX A: CAPITAL REGION ROADWAY AND TRANSIT PROJECT LIST</b>	



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

The Capital Region Board (CRB) approved the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) in September 2011. The Plan defines key elements of the Capital Region's future transportation system over a thirty five year time frame. The IRTMP builds upon and supports the policy framework established in the Capital Region Growth Plan. The IRTMP also lists the ten-year roadway and transit investment priorities throughout the region.

In order to help implement the IRTMP, the Capital Region Board supported the development of a shorter term prioritization of the ten year roadway and transit project list in 2013. The development of such a regional priority list was to foster coordination of regional transportation initiatives between municipalities, as well as to influence the Provincial Three Year Capital Plan towards better alignment with the Region's needs and priorities. The first transportation priorities report was completed in mid-2014. Based on its success the Board directed that the priorities be updated annually. This 2017 edition is the 4<sup>th</sup> annual transportation priorities report.

### 1.2 Objectives

The objectives of the IRTMP Transportation Priorities Project are:

1. To compile a listing of the Capital Region's transportation priorities that would serve to coordinate the actions of member municipalities and the Province over the short term towards the longer term objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan.
2. To include provincial transportation staff in the development of regional priorities to achieve better alignment of municipal, regional and provincial capital plans.
3. To develop a set of recommendations that will focus municipal and provincial attention and action on priority transportation initiatives by municipalities and the province in its Three Year Capital Plan.
4. To enable timely and rolling updates of regional priorities as conditions evolve over time. This document is intended to be a living document which will be changed and improved in the future to meet and reflect changing conditions.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Overview of Evaluation Process

Representatives from all member municipal administrations and Alberta Transportation were invited to participate in the project prioritization process. In addition to representation from Alberta Transportation the following municipalities participated in the 2017 evaluation process:

- City of Edmonton
- City of Fort Saskatchewan
- City of Leduc
- City of Spruce Grove
- City of St. Albert
- Leduc County
- Parkland County
- Strathcona County
- Sturgeon County
- Town of Beaumont
- Town of Bruderheim
- Town of Morinville

The following is a summary of the various stages of the regional transportation project prioritization process:

1. Reviewed and updated the Roadway and Transit Project List (Appendix A)
  - Project must be part of IRTMP Roadway or Transit Network
  - Roadway projects needed to be “regionally significant”
  - Defined project status
2. Defined Evaluation Criteria
  - Specific criteria that related to the IRTMP and Capital Region Growth Plan
3. Determined weighting of the evaluation criteria (Using pair-wise analysis)
4. Each project was scored against the agreed upon criteria and their weights
5. Determined project urgency: high, medium or low
6. Adjusted project scoring
  - Assigned numerical value to project urgency
  - Applied project urgency rating to project score to arrive at adjusted score
7. Prioritized Regional Projects by project status
  - Sorted project list by adjusted score to arrive at project ranking

### 2.2 Project List

Regional projects that have been included on the Roadway and Transit Project List (Appendix A) reflect transportation infrastructure that is “regionally significant”. The IRTMP defines regionally significant roads as “any arterial or higher order roadway that, regardless of jurisdiction, serves to connect CRB municipalities with each other and with other regions in Alberta and Canada”. In the case of transit projects included on the list, they are projects of regional significance that support intermunicipal transit and a regional shift to transit.

The original Ten Year project list from the IRTMP has been updated and expanded to include all regionally significant projects that are not only emerging but also those that are identified as important in achieving the long terms goals and objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan. The Roadway and Transit Project List has grown from 36 projects in the 2014 Report to over 90 projects to date. New projects are added as they are identified (ie. Fowler Way, St. Albert ITS, Highway 642, etc.) and others have been broken into segments to recognize phasing (ie. Nisku Spine Rd., 41<sup>st</sup> Ave., Etc.). The updated list and maps of Roadway and Transit projects is presented in Appendix A.

## 2.3 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria were originally developed in 2013/14 to help identify project priorities and select a list of projects that would be deemed to be of highest priority for the Region.

The criteria defined in Table 2.1 were carried over from 2014 and correlate directly with the Policies and Principles of the IRTMP and are in alignment with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

Table 2.1: Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria Category	Scoring	Scoring Rationalization
<b>1. Integration with the Capital Region's Growth Plan (First Guiding Policy Theme of the IRTMP)</b>		
<i>How well does the project support the CRB Growth Plan with imminent growth and development in Priority Growth Areas (PGAs)?</i>		
<b>i) Supports Growth in Priority Growth Areas (PGA's) (Supports Principle 1)</b> * Provides Access to a PGA (as shown in IRTMP)  * The Project is a New Link or Adds Redundancy to the Regional Network * The Project Supports Intensification  * Number of PGAs Served (One point per PGA, as shown in IRTMP)	0 or 1  0 or 1 0 or 1  Scores 1 per PGA	If located within or alongside a PGA as shown in IRTMP Figure 1, score 1.  Score 1 if project is a new link or improves redundancy in the network. If supports access to known major infill area (i.e. City Centre Airport Redevelopment), score 1. Score 1 for each PGA the project is in or PGA boundary it approaches.
<b>ii) Maximize Use of Existing Infrastructure (Supports Principle 2)</b> * The Project Improves an Existing Link * The Project Increases Efficiencies in Person Carrying Capacity (i.e. HOV Lane/Transit Priority, etc)	0 or 1  0 or 1	Score 1 if link exists currently. Score 1 if HOV/Transit Priority lane, LRT or Park & Ride.
<b>iii) Supports the Regions Economy (Supports Principle 3)</b> * Improves a Major Goods Movement Route  * Connects or Provides Direct Access to a Major Employment Area (as depicted in IRTMP)  * Improves a Major Commuter Route  * Project Improves a High Load Corridor (as depicted in IRTMP)  * Connects to Major External Economic Corridors (i.e. to Fort McMurray, Hwy 2 south, etc)	0 or 1 or 1  0 or 1  0 or 1  0 or 1	Scores 1 if project improves a major goods movement route. HOV/Transit Priority, Park & Ride and LRT is rated 0 even if on corridor. Score 1 if road provides necessary connection or direct access to major employment area(s), as shown on IRTMP Figure 4.  Scores 1 if on major commuter route. If existing or potential future HLC/LCV as shown on IRTMP Figure 4, the project scores 1. Scores 1 if project along Hwy 2 south to Calgary/US or Hwy 28/28A/830/15 to the north. Hwy 21 also connection to north. HOV/Transit Priority, Park & Ride and LRT is rated 0 even if on corridor.
<b>2. Increased Transportation Choices (Second Guiding Policy Theme of the IRTMP)</b>		
<i>How well does the project improve transportation choices for travellers by strengthening the transit and active transportation system? How well does the project improve connections to multi-modal facilities for goods movement?</i>		
<b>i) Provide Viable Alternatives to the Private Automobile (Supports Principle 1)</b> * Project Provides a Viable Alternative to the Private Automobile * Project Improves a Transit Priority Corridor or is a Park and Ride on a Transit Priority Corridor (as depicted in IRTMP)	0 or 1  0 or 1	Scores 1 if HOV/Transit lane, Park & Ride or LRT. Scores 1 if along a transit priority (including LRT) corridor shown on IRTMP Figure 5.
<b>ii) Supports Active Transportation (Supports Principle 2)</b> * Project Supports Active Transportation	0 or 1	Score 1 if active transportation will clearly be incorporated in project (i.e. in planning study or design, or along TransCanada Trail).
<b>iii) Supports Multi-Modal Transportation Facilities (Supports Principle 3)</b> * Project Improves Connections Between Modes (Road/Rail/Air/Transit/Active)	0 or 1	Score 1 if project is a MAJOR connection to multi-modal areas (i.e. EIA, Rail to Road yards, Park & Ride, etc)
<b>3. Reduction of Environmental Degredation (Third Guiding Policy Theme of the IRTMP)</b>		
<i>Does the project reduce environmental degradation associated with the Region's transportation system?</i>		
<b>i) Project Reduces Environmental Degredation</b>	0 or 1	All projects to meet environmental regulations and guidelines. Score 1 if will unequivocally reduce environmental degradation (i.e. HOV/Transit Lane, Park & Ride, LRT, or some other design concept, LEED, etc.)
<b>4. Effective Coordination of Infrastructure Between All Jurisdictions (Fourth Guiding Policy Theme of the IRTMP)</b>		
<i>Is the project supported by multiple jurisdictions?</i>		
<b>i) A definitive agreement is in place between jurisdictions to complete the project</b>	0 or 1	Score 1 if an agreement has been defined between two or more jurisdictions to complete the project (i.e. between municipalities and/or Alberta Transportation).

## 2.4 Criteria Weighting

Since the project selection criteria have differing levels of importance, a criteria weighting exercise was undertaken. To determine the weight of each criterion, a pairwise comparison of the criteria was carried out with the participation of the Technical Review Committee members charged with developing the regional priorities in 2014. The result was a set of weighted criteria that reflect regional, municipal and provincial interests. For 2015, the evaluation criteria weighting was modified slightly to incorporate feedback from the Land Use & Planning Committee in 2014 to increase the importance of the criterion related to supporting the region's economy. The weighting of the evaluation criteria is reviewed each year as part of the update. No changes to the criteria weighting were proposed for 2017. Table 2.2 below identifies the weighting of each criterion.

Table 2.2: Evaluation Criteria Weighting

Criterion	% Weight*	Rank
Supports the Region's Economy	25.5	1
Maximize Use of Existing Infrastructure	23.6	2
Provides Viable Alternatives to the Private Automobile	16.4	3
Supports Growth in Priority Growth Areas (PGA's)	14.5	4
Supports Multi-Modal Transportation Facilities	10.9	5
Coordination Between Jurisdictions-Agreement in Place	5.5	6
Project Reduces Environmental Degradation	3.6	7
	100%	

\*Note that previous versions rounded the weight to the nearest full percent. For 2017 the actual percentage to the first decimal point, used in the actual calculation of weight, have been provided.

## 3.0 PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

### 3.1 Project Scoring

The initial phase of project prioritization involved the scoring of each project against the evaluation criteria outlined in Table 2.1, together with the criteria weights in Table 2.2.

### 3.2 Project Prioritization

Following completion of project scoring, the list of projects was subjected to an additional round of scoring to reflect the urgency of each project; high, medium or low. The project urgency rating was assigned a numerical value: high = 3; medium = 2; low = 1. Each project's weighted score was then multiplied by the project urgency rating to arrive at an adjusted score for each project.

The project list was then refined to reflect three main project status categories; Functional Planning or Study, Preliminary Engineering/Design, and Projects Ready for Construction. Projects that are at the Functional Planning or Study stage have typically been defined in a longer range strategic plan such as a transportation master plan; they have typically not undergone any type of engineering to confirm feasibility, alignment or specific configuration. These projects require significant planning and engineering work before they can be implemented.

Projects that are at the Preliminary Engineering/Design stage have undergone the initial stage of planning and engineering, which establishes basic feasibility, alignment, configuration, property requirements and planning level construction cost estimate. This stage of planning and engineering entails considerable investigation and detail including geotechnical, hydro-technical, structural and the preparation of construction contract packages that include drawings and specifications.

After the Preliminary Engineering/Design stage is complete projects are Ready for Construction and are typically waiting for funding in order to commence.

The list was then organized into tables corresponding to project status, project category – Roadway or Transit, and sorted by the adjusted score from highest to lowest. The resulting lists by project status are depicted in tables below.

Table 3.1: Projects Ready for Construction - Roadway

Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	#
1	Nisku Spine Road (Twp Rd 510 to 25 Ave) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	New Link	158	S5A
2	Highway 19 (QE2 Highway to Highway 60) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Twinning	143	S1
3	Highway 15/37/825 Intersection - Interim improvements	Intersection Improvements	115	NE1
4	Highway 28 (Highway 28A to Highway 63)	Upgrade existing road	111	NE2
5	Highway 643 (Highway 28A to Agrium)	Signals & Intersection Upgrades	97	NE9
6	Highway 60 (Highway 16A to Highway 16) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Twinning & Rail-Grade Separation	96	W1
6	75 Street (Argyll Road to Whitemud Dr)	Widening	96	C3
8	Highway 628 (Anthony Henday Dr. to Highway 21)	Twinning	81	E6
9	Highway 2 at Cardiff Rd	Interchange	27	NW1
10	Hwy 779 (Highway 16A to Highway 628)	Upgrade existing road	17	W2

Table 3.2: Projects Ready for Construction - Transit

Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	#
1	Heritage Valley Regional Park n Ride	New Park n Ride	166	T10

See Figure 1: Projects Ready for Construction Map

Table 3.3: Projects Ready for Design - Roadway

Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	#
1	QE2/65 Avenue (Leduc) Interchange & Arterial	Interchange	176	S4
2	Nisku Spine Road (25 Ave to Highway 625) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Twinning	158	S5B
3	50 Street (Ellerslie Road to 41 Avenue SW)	Widening	124	S6
4	Yellowhead Trail (156 Street to St Albert Trail)	Upgrade to Free Flow	120	C4
4	Yellowhead Trail (50 Street to 97 Street)	Upgrade to Free Flow	120	C5
4	Yellowhead Trail (Victoria Trail to 50 Street)	Widening	120	C6
7	Ray Gibbon Drive (AHD to 300m north of LeClair Way)	Twinning	107	C9
7	Ray Gibbon Drive (300m north of LeClair Way to 300 m north of McKenney Ave)	Twinning	107	C9
7	Ray Gibbon Drive (300m north of McKenney Ave to Villeneuve Rd.)	Twinning	107	C9
10	Anthony Henday Drive (SW River Xing to QE2)	Widening	99	C20
11	Highway 28A (Highway 15 to Highway 28)	Twinning	96	NE3
11	St. Albert Trail - Boudreau Rd and Hebert Intersections	Intersection upgrades	96	NW7
13	Terwillegar Drive (Whitemud Drive to Anthony Henday Drive)	Upgrade to Free Flow	91	C17
14	Highway 625 (Nisku to Range Road 241 Beaumont) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Twinning	84	S7
15	Fort Road (Yellowhead Trail to 66 St)	Widening/Intersection Upgrades	81	C16
16	QE2 Highway Widening on Southbound Dir to Highway 19	Widening; Add Southbound Lane	76	S16
17	Highway 15 (Manning Dr.) near Meridian Street	Interchange	74	NE10
17	170 Street (Ambleside Dr to 41 Avenue SW)	Widening	74	C14
17	Highway 628 (Highway 60 to Highway 779)	Reconstruct and Surface	74	W3
20	41 Ave (127 St to 170 St)	Upgrade existing road	73	S20
20	41 Ave (91 St to 50 St)	Upgrade existing road	73	S21
22	Nisku Spine Road (Allard Ave to 65 Ave)	Upgrade existing road	72	S3B
23	Anthony Henday Drive (50 St. Northeast Overpass)	Interchange	66	C18
23	Anthony Henday Drive (135 St Overpass SW)	Interchange	66	C19
23	Whitemud Drive / Highway 628 (231 Street to Highway 60)	Twinning	66	W4
23	Highway 16 (Interchange at 830)	Interchange	66	E1
27	QE2 Highway/Ellerslie Rd. Interchange Upgrading	Upgrade Existing Interchange	64	S8



Table 3.3: Projects Ready for Design – Roadway Continued...

Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	#
27	Highway 16 (Highway 824 to Elk Island Park)	Access management	64	E2
27	170 Street CN Grade Separation	Grade Separation	64	C15
27	Nisku Spine Road (Highway 625 to Airport Road)	Upgrade existing road	64	S9
27	Highway 625 (Range Road 241 to Highway 21) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Twinning	64	S12
27	Whitemud Drive / Highway 628 (Anthony Henday Dr. to 231 Street)	Upgrade existing road	64	W5
33	Twp Rd 510 (QE2 to 50 Street)	Upgrade existing road	51	S19
34	Nisku Spine Road (65 Ave to Highway 623 (Rollyview Rd.))	New Link	48	S10
35	Highway 627 (Anthony Henday Dr. to 199 St)	New Link	44	W6
35	91 Street (Ellerslie Road to 41 Avenue SW)	Widening	44	C25
37	Manning Drive (137 Avenue - Anthony Henday Drive)	Widening	37	C8
37	QE2 Highway/Highway 2A Interchange	New Interchange; replaces existing when bridge reaches end of life	37	S11
39	Ray Gibbon Drive (Highway 37 to Highway 2)	Extend-first 2 lanes	33	NW2
39	Ray Gibbon Drive (Villeneuve Rd. to Highway 37)	Extend-first 2 lanes	33	NW3
41	Anthony Henday Drive (109/111 Ave Overpass)	Interchange	32	C21
41	Anthony Henday Drive (Add 137 Ave Ramps)	Interchange	32	C22
43	Highway 642 (Highway 2 to East Boundary Road)	Intersection Improvements	31	NW10
44	127 Street (Edmonton City Limit to St. Albert Trail/Highway 2)	New Link	27	NW4

Table 3.4: Projects Ready for Design - Transit

Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	#
1	Campbell Regional Park n Ride (on Edmonton lands)	New Park n Ride	129	T9
2	West LRT (Downtown to Lewis Estates)	LRT Extension	108	T5
2	South LRT (Century Park to Ellerslie)	LRT Extension	108	T6
2	NW LRT (NAIT to Campbell Rd Transit Centre)	LRT Extension	108	T7
2	NE LRT (Clareview to Gorman)	LRT Extension	108	T8
6	Spruce Grove Regional Park n Ride	New Park n Ride	105	T13
7	NW LRT (Campbell Rd TC to North St. Albert Park n Ride)	LRT Extension	61	T14

See Figure 2: Projects Ready for Design Map

Table 3.5: Project Functional Planning or Study - Roadway

Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	#
1	New Northeast River Crossing (Highway 21/Twp Rd 540 to Highway 28A) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	New Link	126	NE4
2	Yellowhead Trail (97 Street to St Albert Trail)	Upgrade to Free Flow	120	C7
3	Twp Rd 534/Aurum Rd (Anthony Henday Dr. to Highway 21)	Realignment of Road + New Interchange on Hwy 21	110	E7
4	Highway 831/Heavy Haul Road (Highway 15 to Highway 28)	Widening and Intersection Improvements	97	NE6
5	170 St Corridor Study (Terwillgar to QE2 south of Leduc)	Corridor Study	96	S22
5	Highway 21 (Highway 14 to Highway 628) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Twinning	96	E3
7	St Albert Trail Intelligent Transportation Systems (North City Limit to AHD)	ITS	95	NW9
8	170 Street Extension (Highway 19 to Highway 39)	New link	92	S13
8	170 Street (41 Avenue SW to Highway 19) Extension	New Link	92	S14
10	Highway 21 (Highway 16 to Ft Sask) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Upgrade to Freeway; build interchanges	89	E4
11	97 Street (167 Avenue to Anthony Henday Dr.)	Widening	80	C23
11	Highway 15 North Saskatchewan Bridge Crossing at Fort Saskatchewan	Bridge Upgrade	80	NE11
13	Highway 16 (Sherwood Drive to Highway 824)	Widen to 6 lanes and build interchanges	76	E5
13	Highway 15/37/825 Intersection - Interchange	Interchange	76	NE1A
13	Highway 16 (Anthony Henday Dr. to Highway 779)	Widening	76	W8
16	Highway 21 (Highway 625 to Highway 14) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Twinning	74	E9
17	Highway 15 (East of Fort Saskatchewan to Lamont) including Intersection Improvements at Highways 830, 45 and 29– High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Twinning and Intersection Upgrades	72	NE7
18	Highway 834/Heavy Haul Road (Highway 16 to Highway 15)	Widening and Intersection Improvements	66	E8
18	Highway 16 at Highways 43 & 770	Interchange	66	W10
20	St. Albert Trail (North City Limit to Boudreau Rd)	Widening/Intersection Upgrades	64	NW6
21	Hwy 2A extension (QE2 to 170 St /Highway 39)	New Link	56	S15
22	Highway 830 (Highway 16 to Highway 15)	Widening	54	E10
23	Nisku Spine Road (Highway 623 to Highway 2A/QE2)	New Link	48	S18
24	Highway 21 (Highway 628 to Highway 16) – High Load/Heavy Haul Route	Upgrade to Freeway; build interchanges	42	E11
25	Fowler Way (Ray Gibbon Dr to St. Albert Tr)	New Link	37	NW8
25	Highway 28 (195 Avenue to Highway 28A)	Twinning	37	NE8
27	127 Street (Anthony Henday Dr. to Edmonton City Limit)	New Link	27	C24



Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	#
28	Highway 627 (199 St to Highway 60)	Twinning	17	W9
28	41 Ave/Twp Rd 512 (50 St to Hwy 21)	Upgrade existing road	17	E12

Table 3.6: Project Functional Planning or Study - Transit

Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	#
1	Regional HOV Transit Priority Study (Hwy 16, Baseline Rd./98 Ave, Wye Rd./ Sherwood Pk Fwy./ QE2 Hwy to Leduc)	HOV Lane/ Transit Priority	209	T1
2	Acheson Industrial Area Transit plus Park & Ride	New Service & Park n Ride Study	149	T4
3	Strathcona County High-Speed Transit (LRT)	LRT Extension Study	115	T2
4	Fort Saskatchewan Regional Park n Ride	New Park n Ride	105	T11
5	EIA/City of Leduc/Leduc County Transit Study	Transit Service Study	47	T3
6	North St. Albert Regional Park n Ride at the north end of St. Albert Trail	New Park n Ride	44	T12

See Figure 3: Project Functional Planning or Study Map

## 4.0 COMPLETED PROJECTS

### 4.1 Funded and/or Completed Projects

The 2017 Transportation Priorities Report represents the fourth year that priorities have been established. It is important to recognize and celebrate the success of the collaborative effort in attaining funding and completing projects. It has been demonstrated that the Priority Lists are being used by the members and the Province in planning and building future regional transportation infrastructure. Accordingly, some of the regional successes are listed below:

- Commencement of construction of the SE-LRT (City Centre - Mill Woods)
- Nisku Spine Road (41 Avenue SW to Twp Rd 510) - Municipal funding in place for constructing 4 lanes
- Highway 37/825/15 Intersection Improvement on Provincial 3-year program
- CRB funded Regional HOV/Transit Priority Study – Completed Fall 2016
- Provincial/municipal funding of functional plan for new Northeast River Crossing
- 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue overpass over QE2 completed
- Twinning of east and west ends Highway 19 on Provincial 3 year construction program
- Highway 15 bridge twinning over North Saskatchewan River added to Provincial Budget

## 5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Conclusion

The Roadway and Transit project lists have been updated and successfully prioritized in a manner that reflects both the policy goals of the Capital Region Growth Plan, as well as on-the-ground challenges and imperatives.

Implementing any long term strategies such as the IRTMP and The Growth Plan, requires an ongoing commitment to planning, design and construction that is reasonably true to the underlying policy objectives. As such, the process for arriving at regional transportation priorities identified priorities in three categories: construction, design and functional planning.

The regional project priorities listed in Tables 3.1-3.6 include a mixture of project types that respond to urgencies throughout the Capital Region. More importantly, the priorities were arrived at collaboratively between a mix of municipal and provincial representatives.

It is recognized that while completion of planning and design activities are crucial elements of project implementation, other activities such as land acquisition and funding harmonization that may also need to be completed to effect project construction. Nevertheless, the prioritized lists should serve to inform municipal and provincial priorities over the next three years and help the region coordinate and align its infrastructure investments with a better understanding and respect for differing interests.



## 5.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to advance the implementation of regionally important transportation projects:

1. That the recommended regional transportation priorities reflected in Tables 3.1-3.6 be approved by the CRB.
2. That the CRB forward the regional priorities expressed in this report to the Government of Alberta for active consideration in the preparation of its 2018 Three Year Capital Plan.
3. That the CRB continue to support the annual update of the regional transportation priorities to reflect changing and emerging priorities.
4. That the CRB plan for the review and update of the Integrated Regional Transportation System Study and the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan based on the new Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan.