

## Waterfront Design Review Panel March 20, 2019

### Transit Reset: Union Station – Queens Quay Link Study For Information March 20, 2019



## Study Context: The Link



## Transit Reset: Union Station – Queens Quay Link Study Proponent: City of Toronto Design Team: ARUP Review Stage: For Information

Source: Google Earth

## Study Context: Waterfront Transit



## Policy Context

- Crucial to realizing the Waterfront Secondary Plan and Precinct Plans' visions
- Sustainable mobility and sustainable development ullet
- Unlocking potential ٠
- Leveraging investment ٠

## Goals for Today

- For the Panel to become informed on the latest design, study findings and conclusions 1.
- For the Panel to provide comments for consideration as the design evolves 2.

## Agenda

- Study Background: Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto (5 minutes) 1.
- Study Findings: Marc-Paul Gauthier, ARUP (20 minutes) 2.
- Questions/Comments/Discussion (45 minutes) 3.

# Transit Reset: **Union Station – Queens** Quay Link Study

**Design Review Panel** March 20, 2019







# Why it's important...

- The existing streetcar loop is inadequate to serve current ridership needs (to and from the west)
- The loop would not function effectively or safely considering future growth and if additional service from the east was added.





## **Need for improvement**



- Approximately 40% of AM peak hour trips are destined to QQ/Bay and the remaining 60% of trips are destined to the wider waterfront
- Not including special events and tourism, which is significant n **Toronto**

# **Council approved network plan**







# Project background

- 1990 Union Station streetcar loop opens
- 2010 East Bayfront Transit EA: The need for the Union-Queens Quay Link and Queens Quay East LRT
- 2018 Waterfront Transit Reset Network Plan
- 2018 to 2019 Union Queens Quay Link Study





## **Transit Reset Timeline**





# Union to Queens Quay Link Alternatives





# The technologies

1. Streetcar













lexity)	
	30m
rd load)	130
	Traction power

ole Mover			
	36m		
rd load)	200		
	Cable-pulled		

# Screening

- 3 Alternatives initially considered:
  - Streetcar loop expansion
  - APM with underground streetcar at Queens Quay and Bay
  - APM with surface streetcar connection at Queens Quay and Bay







### Screened Out: APM with surface streetcar along Queens Quay

 $(\mathbf{C})$ Scale 1:500







# **Guiding design parameters**

- No level crossings of streetcar tracks underground
- Underground connection to Jack Layton Ferry Terminal
- Ontario Building Code (OBC)
- Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 130
- City of Toronto PATH guidelines









### ARUP

### 38



UNION - QUEENS QUAY LINK
STATION PLAN CONCEPT APM OPTION
UNION STATION G-1 (PLATFORM) LEVEL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
STATION ENVELOPE WALLS (DEMOLISHED) WALLS (EXISTING, RETAINED) WALLS, G-1 LEVEL (NEW) WALLS, G-2 LEVEL (NEW) PLATFORMS STATION AREA
ARUP





UNION - QUEENS QUAY LINK
STATION PLAN CONCEPT STREETCAR OPTION
QUEENS QUAY STATION G-1 (PLATFORM) LEVEL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
STATION ENVELOPE WALLS (DEMOLISHED) WALLS (EXISTING, RETAINED) WALLS, G-1 LEVEL (NEW) WALLS, G-2 LEVEL (NEW) PLATFORMS STATION AREA
ARUP



UNION - QUEENS QUAY LINK
STATION PLAN CONCEPT STREETCAR OPTION
QUEENS QUAY STATION G-2 (PEDESTRIAN UNDERPASS) LEVEL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
STATION ENVELOPE WALLS (DEMOLISHED) WALLS (EXISTING, RETAINED) WALLS, G-1 LEVEL (NEW) WALLS, G-2 LEVEL (NEW) PLATFORMS STATION AREA
ARUP



1	UNION - OUFENS OUAY LINK
	STATION PLAN CONCEPT APM OPTION
2	QUEENS QUAY STATION G-1 (PLATFORM) LEVEL
	NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
10. 10.	STATION ENVELOPE WALLS (DEMOLISHED) WALLS (EXISTING, RETAINED) WALLS, G-1 LEVEL (NEW) WALLS, G-2 LEVEL (NEW) PLATFORMS STATION AREA
	ARUP













# **Evaluate Alternatives**

## Key criteria

- User experience
- Transportation

- Costs
- Constructability





## **User Experience Assessment**

Criterion	Streetcar	
Travel time assessment	Medium/longer trips (QQ) faster	Short
Service reliability	Union Loop subject to potential on-street delays	Higher h B
Comfort/convenience/ accessibility	Single ride to/from Union	Additional
Conclusion	Preliminary preferred	



### APM

### t trips (Bay) faster

### eadway reliability for ay Street trips

### transfer to/from Union

## **Travel time to Sherbourne and Queens Quay**







## **Travel time to Spadina and Queens Quay**





## **Travel time to Bay and Queens Quay**





# **User experience: comfort/crowding**





# **Transportation Ridership**

- Within Bay Street corridor, APM is preferred
- East and West of Bay Street, streetcar is preferred
- Negligible difference beyond Central Waterfront and East Bayfront

		UNION STATION		
NO TECHNOLOGY	STREETCAR	APM	STREETCAR	NO TECH
PREFERENCE	PREFERRED	PREFERRED	PREFERRED	PREFE
BEYOND CENTRAL	CENTRAL	BAY STREET	EAST BAYFRONT	BEY
WATERFRONT	WATERFRONT	CORRIDOR		EAST BA



## d nd East Bayfront

INOLOGY RENCE

OND YFRONT

# **Construction impacts**

Criterion	Streetcar	
Risk profile	Rail viaduct risks	No
Pedestrian teamways	Teamways closed and pedestrians rerouted due to construction	Teamv
Property impacts	141 Bay basement impacts and teamways	No si
Bay Street lane impacts	South of rail viaduct impacts	No s
Duration estimation	4-5 years	
Overall	-	Preli



### APM

### rail viaduct risks

ways not closed for construction

ignificant impacts

### ignificant impacts

3-4 years

### minary preferred

## **Construction management**

- Streetcar service along Bay will be suspended during tunnel work for both options
- Streetcar service along Queens Quay may be suspended for some duration of construction for both options
- Replacement bus service required
- Phasing to mitigate impacts to transit to be evaluated in next phases, including options to minimize downtime for streetcar service along Queens Quay



# **Construction management**

- Pedestrian access in the corridor will be maintained and may require significant temporary improvements to accommodate anticipated flows
- One lane of traffic in each direction will also be maintained
- Significant concurrent projects to be coordinated
  - Numerous Metrolinx projects
  - Future developments under construction and planned/proposed
    - E.g. CIBC Square: 141 and 81/45 Bay Street
  - Gardiner ramp changes (e.g. removal of Bay Street on-ramp)





# **Class 4 capital cost estimates**

• Designs brought to current code (NFPA 130)

Criterion	Streetcar	
Capital costs (to Small St.)	\$650 - \$700 million*	\$65
Overall	No prelimina	ary preferre
*subject to refinement		

Operating costs forthcoming



### APM

### 0 - \$700 million\*

### ed

# **Overall evaluation summary**

Criterion	Streetcar	
User experience	Preliminary preferred	
Transportation	Preliminary preferred	
Construction impact	-	Prelir
Capital costs	No prelimina	ary preferred
Overall	Preliminary preferred	





# **Streetcar preferred**





## **Benefits to overall network**

- Both options are viable
- Both options offer significant improvements to moving people
- Construction of both options is feasible
- Streetcar preferred for the overall TTC network



# **Completing this study**

- Finalize technical analysis and consider public feedback
- Executive Committee April 9th
- City Council April 16<sup>th</sup>



# **Next Steps**

- Evaluate potential for new eastern portal location west of Yonge Street
- Seeking optimization in preferred solution
- Advance preliminary design



## Portal Location EA: Freeland Street





Portal Location EA: Freeland **Street** 



Street-level render of EA-approved portal location east of Yonge Street

Artist's depiction subject to change and future design refinement



## Portal Location Alternative: West of Yonge Street



YONGE STREET INTERSECTION AND HEAD OF SLIP



El Fuel Paul Facelo, Ocario Info 50 1 e 2 año face e 1 e 2 año face



Portal Location **Alternative:** West of Yonge **Street** 



Street-level render of alternate portal location west of Yonge Street

Artist's depiction subject to change and future design refinement

