

## Attachment 2 – Waterfront Transit Network Plan

### Consultation Summary

A summary of the feedback received through consultation activities from this phase of the study is presented below.

#### *General*

Several participants expressed general support for an integrated approach to transit along the waterfront, and commended the project team for the breadth of work and options that were considered in this phase of the study. Participant feedback also revealed a range of perspectives, opinions and concerns about the draft directions and concepts presented for the study area.

This feedback according to the four study area segments is summarized to follow.

#### *Segment 01 - South Etobicoke*

##### Long Branch to Legion Road

Relatively few comments were received regarding the draft direction for this segment of the study area. While some of these comments expressed support for the direction to enhance streetcar operations, others conveyed concern that enhancing transit signal priority (a component of the direction) is not sufficient to support convenient and timely service for locals and tourists to destinations in the downtown core (e.g., Union Station, Ferry Terminal, Harbourfront, Billy Bishop Toronto Island Airport, etc.) via Lake Shore Boulevard. Participants indicated that they would like to see faster solutions for the commuters from South Etobicoke into the downtown core with more options, including express buses.

Participant feedback also conveyed an interest in enhancing connectivity on north/south routes other than Kipling Avenue to facilitate connections to a broader range of destinations (e.g., Pearson International Airport, stations on the Bloor-Danforth subway, etc.), and to Go Transit/Regional Express Rail (RER) stations.

##### Legion Road to Humber Loop

The direction to introduce a dedicated transit right-of-way (ROW) on Lake Shore Boulevard from Legion Road to the Humber Loop elicited a range of comments. Although several participants expressed support for the direction, they also raised concerns about the impact on traffic and congestion in the area, particularly at Legion Road which is already considered a “pinch point”, if an existing lane is repurposed as a transit ROW. This concern was also echoed by participants who did not support the direction.

## *Segment 02 - Humber Loop to Strachan Avenue*

### Humber Bay Link

The preliminary preferred option for the Humber Bay Link (Concept 2E via Colborne Lodge and Lake Shore Boulevard) was viewed favourably in the feedback from several participants, particularly the inclusion of pedestrian and cyclist options away from vehicular traffic. Concerns raised about this direction ranged from whether emergency vehicles would be able to use the ROW, the timeline for implementation (i.e., 2030 is too far off) and that the preferred option does not provide direct access/serve St. Joseph's Health Centre or the Parkdale neighbourhood.

### Humber Loop to Strachan

Participant feedback expressed concern that the direction presented for Humber Loop to Strachan offers limited improvements for residents in Liberty Village; they highlighted a need for better service and more north/south and east/west connections for residents and businesses in this neighbourhood.

Feedback also indicated that solutions such as fare integration between TTC and GO Transit, options to transfer between the proposed waterfront LRT and GO Transit/RER lines at Exhibition Station and a potential new GO Transit station Park Lawn Road/Humber Bay Shores could improve travel for waterfront neighbourhoods including Etobicoke-Lake Shore, South Parkdale and Liberty Village.

## *Segment 03 – Strachan Avenue to Parliament Street*

### Lake Shore Boulevard/ Fleet Street/ Bathurst Street/ Queens Quay Intersection

Feedback from many participants recognized the safety concerns with this intersection and expressed support for the preliminary preferred option (Concept 3B – Re-configured at-grade intersection) to address safety issues and improve traffic for pedestrians, transit users and drivers. There was a call to ensure that adequate signage/paint treatments are installed in combination with the reconfiguration to eliminate confusion.

### Front Street and/or Bremner Boulevard Transit

Relatively few comments focused on this direction; those that did acknowledged the complexity of providing streetcar or LRT service on Bremner Boulevard, and noted these options are likely unfeasible and should be discontinued.

### Union Station – Queens Quay Connection

The options proposed to improve the connection between Union Station and Queens elicited a broad range of comments. Several key themes emerged in this feedback

regardless of the option pertaining to user experience in terms of safety, accessibility, convenience, timeliness, and reliability. The key points raised by participants for each option are summarized below.

#### Option A: Expand LRT Infrastructure

Several respondents opposed the removal of the loop at Union Station and felt that a Major Union Station loop expansion was the best solution for commuters in terms of accessibility, convenience (i.e., transferring from one service to another), reliability, system flexibility (i.e., rerouting during emergencies and blockages) and to accommodate growth projected for the study area, particularly in the East Bayfront and Port Lands. A few participants explicitly expressed a preference to expand the existing LRT infrastructure over Options B and C. Many participants however also raised concerns about the cost associated with this option.

#### Option B: Repurpose Tunnel to Walkway/Moving Sidewalk

The proposal to repurpose the streetcar tunnel with a moving sidewalk was welcomed by a few participants and opposed by most of the participants who submitted comments about it. In addition to concerns about removing a direct connection to Union Station, those who opposed this option cited the sidewalk length, movement in only one direction, accessibility (particularly for seniors, those carrying luggage or other belongings), difficulty transferring to other services and overall (un)reliability of the technology as reasons.

#### Option C: Repurpose Tunnel to Alternative Transit Technology

While several participants expressed support and enthusiasm for using an alternative technology such as a funicular to connect Union Station and Queens Quay, other participants raised several concerns. These participants felt that introducing a new option/technology would create more complexity than solutions in terms of: slowing down transfers from one service to another, fare integration between service providers, capacity, accessibility and cost.

#### *Segment 04 – Parliament Street to Woodbine*

Feedback from some participants questioned whether the growth projected for East Bayfront and the Port Lands could be supported by enhanced bus-based solutions instead of an LRT. Comments from other participants expressed concern that the projected demand for this segment appears low given interest in popular seasonal destinations such as Ashbridge's Bay and maintained that service in a dedicated ROW should be prioritized east of Union Station from the outset to promote transit-oriented development.

### *Additional Comments*

Participants provided many other comments, several of which are outside the scope of the Waterfront Transit Reset Phase 2 Study. The list below highlights the top recurring additional comments provided by participants:

- The transit demand forecasting estimates do not accurately reflect growth in South Etobicoke.
- Costs, travel time and implementation estimates should be provided with each proposed option.
- True transit signal prioritization is required across the network to improve service.