

# EX30.1.6

January 23, 2018

To Whom It May Concern:

On Jan. 24, 2018, Executive Committee will be reviewing the Waterfront Transit Network Plan recommendations ([agenda item here](#)). For Segment 2 (Humber to Strachan) the recommendation is to prepare the background studies needed for a subsequent Transit Project Assessment Process based on the 2E Colborne Lodge Dr. Crossing alignment<sup>1</sup>. This will effectively eliminate the other alignment options from further consideration.

We believe that 2E-Colborne Lodge Dr. is being recommended without a thorough evaluation of option 2A-Sunnyside Crossing.

The 2A Sunnyside Crossing option is important for several reasons that were clearly noted in the Phase 1 Preliminary Evaluations<sup>2</sup>:

- It provides the best access to St. Joseph's Health Centre – a community hub for both healthcare and employment;
- It retains strong connections to the 501 and 504 in the Roncesvalles area, thereby enhancing the transit network to a greater degree than the 2E alignment; and
- It eliminates construction, maintenance, and provision of TTC service to overlapping track between Colborne Lodge Dr. and Sunnyside.

Despite these important benefits of the 2A-Sunnyside alignment it has not received the same Preliminary Functional Plan that was conducted for 2E-Colborne Lodge<sup>3</sup>. This vital transit link is the only new higher order transit that can be expected to directly benefit Torontonians living near the western waterfront to 2041 and beyond. It is crucially important that 2A receive equal consideration, technical evaluation, cost comparison (both construction and operating costs) and preliminary functional plan before any recommendation for Segment 2 of the Waterfront Transit “Reset” Study is endorsed by Executive Committee or City Council.

We are asking that Executive Committee amend the recommendations to ensure that Segment 2 receives the attention it requires, and that alignment 2A (Sunnyside Crossing) receive a preliminary functional design, as 2E has received, as Waterfront transit planning moves forward into the next stage.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Report For Action: Waterfront Transit Network Plan*. EX30.1. Jan. 10, 2018. See page 4.

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2018/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-110749.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> *Preliminary Evaluation Results: Waterfront Transit “Reset” Phase 1 Study Public Forum: Station 2 – Humber River to Strachan Avenue*. See page 2.

[http://waterfrontoronto.ca/nbe/wcm/connect/waterfront/0acfba82-f799-40f6-a15b-8ce5890f8d3f/preliminary\\_evaluation\\_results\\_waterfront\\_transit\\_reset\\_study\\_may\\_25\\_2016\\_1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=0acfba82-f799-40f6-a15b-8ce5890f8d3f](http://waterfrontoronto.ca/nbe/wcm/connect/waterfront/0acfba82-f799-40f6-a15b-8ce5890f8d3f/preliminary_evaluation_results_waterfront_transit_reset_study_may_25_2016_1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=0acfba82-f799-40f6-a15b-8ce5890f8d3f)

<sup>3</sup> *Waterfront Transit Network Plan: Planning and Technical Background*. EX30.1. See page 10.

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2018/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-110750.pdf>

Over and above the reasons outlined above, there are significant inconsistencies in how Segment 2 has been evaluated during Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Waterfront Transit “Reset” Study. These inconsistencies suggest that Segment 2 has not been studied with the same care and attention as other route segments. For example, while 2B North Rail Embankment was marked for elimination in Phase 1<sup>4</sup>, in Phase 2 it was combined with 2A-Sunnyside<sup>5</sup>. The failure to eliminate 2B as directed in Phase 1 (and by the study’s own procedural protocols) harms the evaluation of the only alignment option that directly serves St. Joseph’s Health Centre. Moreover, even though the same “Feeling Congested” evaluation framework was employed in Phase 1 and Phase 2, there are unexplained changes in how those exact criteria grow to favour 2E and disfavour 2A in moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2.<sup>6</sup>

Sincerely,

SETAC (South Etobicoke Transit Action Committee)  
[info@setac.ca](mailto:info@setac.ca)

---

<sup>4</sup> *Waterfront Transit “Reset:” Phase 1 Study* (Coordinated Transit Consultation Program Public Information & Consultation Meeting May25 & 26 2016). P. 36.

[http://waterfronttoronto.ca/nbe/wcm/connect/waterfront/d77e68d9-c258-4273-8d1b-c98f5cece62b/waterfront\\_transit\\_reset\\_study\\_final\\_presentation\\_may\\_25\\_2016\\_1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=d77e68d9-c258-4273-8d1b-c98f5cece62b](http://waterfronttoronto.ca/nbe/wcm/connect/waterfront/d77e68d9-c258-4273-8d1b-c98f5cece62b/waterfront_transit_reset_study_final_presentation_may_25_2016_1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=d77e68d9-c258-4273-8d1b-c98f5cece62b)

<sup>5</sup> *Waterfront Transit “Reset:” Phase 2 Study*: Public Information & Consultation Meetings September 18 & 26, 2017. See “Humber Bay Link Options” display board which a) depicts 2A as crossing near Dufferin and b) describes 2A as presenting “environmental impact and loss of parkland (i.e. mature tree loss, community disruption) **along the entire rail embankment**” (emphasis added). In fact, the display boards and presentation slides do not even show the same evaluations of this segment.

[http://waterfronttoronto.ca/nbe/wcm/connect/waterfront/c29caf9c-ed8e-4a98-a22a-037120b66f14/waterfront\\_transit\\_reset\\_phase\\_2\\_study\\_final\\_presentation\\_AODA\\_sept\\_18\\_2017.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=c29caf9c-ed8e-4a98-a22a-037120b66f14](http://waterfronttoronto.ca/nbe/wcm/connect/waterfront/c29caf9c-ed8e-4a98-a22a-037120b66f14/waterfront_transit_reset_phase_2_study_final_presentation_AODA_sept_18_2017.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=c29caf9c-ed8e-4a98-a22a-037120b66f14)

<sup>6</sup> For example, under the “social equity” category, Phase 1 scores the 2A alignment as 6/8 and 2E alignment as 0/8, but Phase 2 scores 2A as 4/4 and 2E as 2/4 with no explanation for the changed scores. Other evaluation criteria exhibit similar unexplained changes.