



# West and Southeast LRT

## Public Involvement Themes

[www.edmonton.ca/LRTProjects](http://www.edmonton.ca/LRTProjects)

June 2009

### Listening and Learning

- In March and April 2009, an online questionnaire and a series of face-to-face interviews were conducted as part of the Listening and Learning public involvement stage on West and Southeast LRT studies. The purpose of this stage of public involvement was to gain a greater understanding of benefits, issues, and impacts of LRT within the study area. This information has been used to help refine the discussion points for further public involvement.
- A total of 947 online questionnaires were completed, including 502 responses to the West LRT questionnaire, and 442 responses to the Southeast LRT questionnaire. Twenty-one face-to-face interviews were held with West LRT stakeholders and interviews with 12 Southeast LRT stakeholders held in December 2008 have been captured in this summary where appropriate.

### Summary of public feedback

#### West LRT

##### *Overall*

- **Knowledge of the LRT project is strong.** Nearly eight in 10 respondents to the online questionnaire indicate they have a medium or high knowledge of the West LRT project. The majority of the interviewees also had significant awareness of the planning studies, and many had been involved in previous studies and planning efforts in the area.
- **Key growth areas for transit** – Stony Plain Road and West Edmonton Mall were most frequently identified as key growth areas with the potential to encourage sustained transit use in the west corridor. The Misericordia Hospital and the potential for significant student population growth at the South Campus area were also identified as areas with high potential.
- **Minimize disruption while maximizing ridership** – In the online questionnaire, minimizing neighbourhood disruption was the most frequently mentioned issue/concern to be addressed through the route planning study. Maximizing potential ridership and offering quick travel times were the next most frequently mentioned themes.

##### *Route 107*

- **Key benefit – City coverage.** The most common benefit indicated for this route was that it provided service to high-density areas, major activity centres, and accessibility to additional neighbourhoods. It was also noted that areas along the existing roadway were wider and would therefore provide less disruption to existing communities.
- **Weakness – Indirect route.** There is a concern the length of the line would cause a significant delay in travel times and a belief that the proposal would disrupt local communities.

### **Route 102**

- **Key benefit – Direct connection to downtown.** The direct connection from West Edmonton Mall to Downtown was most frequently mentioned as a benefit to this option. Supporting Stony Plain Road Revitalization and the potential to be a high-ridership route were also frequently mentioned. Providing access to the provincial museum was also identified.
- **Key Weakness – Impact on established neighbourhoods.** A concern that this route would have a significant detrimental impact on established neighbourhoods and communities. Concerns about impact on vehicle traffic and the cost of property acquisition are also prominent.

### **Route 87**

- **Key benefit – Quick and direct option.** The direct connection to Downtown and the potential for connection to the University of Alberta were seen as significant benefits. The design option to the South Campus site was identified as an opportunity to reduce impact on communities.
- **Key Weakness – River crossing.** The need to cross the North Saskatchewan River was the most commonly cited weakness. The design option to Whitemud Drive would alleviate some of this concern, but leads to concern that ridership would be limited because much of the line is removed from transit supportive development.

## **Southeast LRT**

### **Overall**

- **Knowledge of the LRT project is average.** Overall, six in ten respondents indicated they have either a medium or high level of knowledge of the Southeast LRT project. Many of the interviewees had some knowledge due to previous work on associated projects, but have not had direct involvement on SE LRT.
- **Key Growth areas for transit –** Providing access to Mill Woods and high density neighbourhoods were noted as key drivers to supporting and encouraging transit use. Providing LRT service for students, the Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre, and the Grey Nuns Hospital were also cited as key factors.
- **Minimize disruption while maximizing ridership -** In the online questionnaire, minimizing neighbourhood disruption was the most frequently mentioned issue/concern to be addressed through the route planning study. Maximizing potential ridership and offering quick travel times were the next most frequently mentioned themes.

### **High Level (CPR) Route**

- **Key benefit – Existing infrastructure.** Using existing infrastructure is the most frequently cited benefit of this option, which is seen to provide cost savings and be less intrusive because infrastructure is already in place.
- **Weakness – Ridership Potential.** Many of the participants believe the route, as planned, excludes high density areas and would be a low ridership line. Also, there is concern this line is too close to the existing LRT service.

### **High Level (Whyte Avenue) Route**

- **Key benefit – Good access to Whyte Avenue.** Providing access to Whyte Avenue, Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre and other business areas, and proximity to high-density residential neighbourhoods were seen as benefits to this proposal.
- **Key weakness – traffic disruptions.** Opinions clearly indicate traffic disruption on Whyte Avenue during construction is a key concern of the proposal. The cost to build the route and the disruption to an already congested traffic corridor were other prominent concerns.

### **Connors Road Route**

- **Key benefit – Direct Link to Downtown.** Respondents believe this proposal provides a direct link to downtown from Southeast Edmonton, and that it will serve high-density residential areas.
- **Key weakness – Neighbourhood disruption.** Potential to disrupt existing neighbourhoods was the most commonly cited concern, followed by cost concerns relating to building a new river crossing and not using existing CPR infrastructure.

### **Dawson Bridge Route**

- **Key benefit – Direct link to Downtown.** The most frequently mentioned response was that there were no benefits to this route. However, serving the east side of the City and east side of Downtown were mentioned as key benefits by another segment of the population.
- **Key weakness. Neighbourhood opposition.** Organized opposition from neighbourhoods was the most frequently cited concern, followed by concern about construction costs and the need to cross the North Saskatchewan River.

## **Next Steps**

<b>Evaluating Benefits and Impacts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Workshops and online consultation will be held to get input from stakeholders and the public on strategies to address community/institution/business impacts of the route options</li></ul>	June 2009
<b>Sharing Information on the Recommended Route</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Open houses and communications materials will be used to share information on the recommended route that will be presented to City Council.</li></ul>	September 2009
<b>Presentation to City Council and Decision</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A public hearing will be held in November 2009 where residents, stakeholders and the general public can share their input directly to City Council</li></ul>	November 2009
<b>Report Back</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Information on City Council's decision will be reported back to participants.</li></ul>	December 2009