To gather and analyze engineering, financial and community information about the Southwest Transitway Stage 2 alignment options identified in the Winnipeg Master Transportation Plan in order to establish the best alignment option.
What is the Scope of the Study?

This study *is*:

✔ a comprehensive evaluation of the Letellier versus the Hydro Corridor alignment options and will serve as the technical, financial and community due diligence required to confirm the future alignment.

This study *is not*:

✗ a preliminary engineering report for any one or both alignments.
✗ a budgetary commitment to proceed with Stage 2 of the Southwest Transitway.
Alignment Options
(Fort Rouge Yards to Sugar Beet Lands)

The study details the primary alignment options for the extension of the Southwest Transitway from the south end of the Fort Rouge Yards:

- The **Hydro Corridor** alignment runs west from Pembina through the Parker Lands then south through the Manitoba Hydro Corridor that divides the Fort Garry Industrial area from the Beaumont and Maybank residential neighbourhoods. There are two variations of this alignment, one through the north part of Parker Lands and one through the south part of Parker Lands.

- The **Letellier** alignment runs south along the west side of Pembina on the east side of the Letellier CN Rail right-of-way, behind the Pembina Highway businesses from the Pembina Underpass to McGillivray and then through the middle of the Maybank neighbourhood.
Both concepts are the same where the Hydro corridor joins the CN Rail right-of-way in the vicinity of the Sugar Beet Lands.

South of the Sugar Beet Lands, both concepts proceed south to Bison Drive along the CN Rail right-of-way.

Either alignment opens several options to access the future station at Investors Group Field (the new Stadium at the University of Manitoba).
Common Alignment
(Sugar Beet Lands to Bison Drive)
Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro Corridor (Concept 1A)

Characteristics:

- More opportunities for transit-oriented development;
- Will require Parker Land private properties;
- Less neighbourhood impact;
- Easy to accommodate active transportation;
- Faster operating speeds (80km/hr);
- Significant positive tax implications due to future new transit-oriented development opportunities;
- Longer distance on a dedicated corridor;
- Major negotiations with Manitoba Hydro required; and,
- Potential impact on users of Parker land dog park, wetland, and Hydro corridor parking lots and gardens.
Concept 1A travels through the Parker/Hydro Lands alongside CN’s main line, then shifts and is located within the Manitoba Hydro right-of-way until it again meets with the existing CN track, north of Bishop Grandin with no CN track relocation required. From here the alignment continues south along the east side of the CN rail line to Bison Drive. Concept 1A and 1B have the same alignment from Parker Avenue to Bison Drive.
Characteristics:

- More opportunities for transit-oriented development;
- Fewer private properties required therefore lower land costs;
- Less neighbourhood impact;
- Easy to accommodate active transportation;
- Faster operating speeds (80km/hr);
- Significant positive tax implications due to future new transit-oriented development opportunities;
- Longer distance on a dedicated corridor;
- Major negotiations with Manitoba Hydro required; and,
- Potential impact on users of vacant Parker land and Hydro corridor.
Concept 1B travels through the Parker/Hydro Lands paralleling Parker Avenue and then shifts and is located within the Hydro right-of-way until it again meets with the existing CN track, north of Bishop Grandin with no CN track relocation required. From here the alignment continues south along the east side of the CN rail line to Bison Drive. Concept 1A and 1B have the same alignments from Parker Avenue to Bison Drive.
Characteristics:

- Shorter, more direct distance;
- More service along Pembina Highway;
- More transit access for residences in the Maybank neighbourhood;
- More at-grade intersections to cross, significantly impacting traffic on crossing streets;
- No room for co-located active transportation;
- Negotiations and relocation of CN tracks required;
- Lower running speeds (~60km/hr);
- No opportunity for future full operational build-out;
- Immediate commercial and residential property impacts with significant property costs;
- Reduced incremental tax benefits to the City due to fewer new opportunities for transit-oriented development; and,
- Higher overall cost (construction and property).
Concept 2 departs from Stage 1 of the Southwest Transitway at Jubilee Avenue and follows the CN Rail Line from the end of Stage 1 to Bison Drive. This option requires the relocation of the CN Rail Line 9.0 m in a westerly direction.
# Operational Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Criteria</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1A)</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1B)</th>
<th>CN Letellier Subdivision (Concept 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance on Dedicated Corridor</td>
<td>7500m</td>
<td>7040m</td>
<td>6020m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Length of Structures (m)</td>
<td>612 m – Base</td>
<td>612m – Base</td>
<td>172 m – Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>753m – With Build-out</td>
<td>774m – With Build-out</td>
<td>172 m – No opportunities for Build-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Grade Gate Controlled Intersections within Corridor</td>
<td>7 – Base</td>
<td>7 – Base</td>
<td>12 – Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – With Build-out</td>
<td>5 – With Build-out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>• Poor drainage</td>
<td>• Poor drainage</td>
<td>• Difficult drainage with limited property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lots of land available to accommodate ditches or ponds.</td>
<td>• Lots of land available to accommodate ditches or ponds.</td>
<td>• Requires piped storm sewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation of Multiple Modes (Active Transportation, Park n’ Ride)</td>
<td>• AT can be accommodated</td>
<td>• AT can be accommodated</td>
<td>• AT cannot be accommodated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential Park n’ Rides near Fort Garry Industrial Park and Bishop Grandin</td>
<td>• Potential Park n’ Rides near Fort Garry Industrial Park and Bishop Grandin</td>
<td>• Potential Park n’ Ride at Bishop Grandin only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Running Speed</td>
<td>• North of Bishop Grandin 80 km/hr</td>
<td>• North of Bishop Grandin 80 km/hr</td>
<td>• North of Bishop Grandin 60 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• South of Bishop Grandin 80 km/hr</td>
<td>• South of Bishop Grandin 80 km/hr</td>
<td>• South of Bishop Grandin 80 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Future Ridership</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimal riders</td>
<td>• Minimal riders</td>
<td>• Limited connectivity to north portion of Linden Woods and Seasons of Tuxedo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good connectivity to Linden Woods, Seasons of Tuxedo and Whyte Ridge.</td>
<td>• Good connectivity to Linden Woods, Seasons of Tuxedo, and Whyte Ridge.</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Limited opportunities for growth along corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased riders through Parker lands development.</td>
<td>• Increased riders through Parker lands development.</td>
<td>• Potential for high density commercial along Pembina.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Construction Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Criteria</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1A)</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1B)</th>
<th>CN Letellier Subdivision (Concept 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Phasing</td>
<td>• Land available for efficient phasing.</td>
<td>• Land available for efficiency of phasing.</td>
<td>• CN track relocation necessary prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aqueduct and Feedermain evaluation and protection necessary.</td>
<td>• Aqueduct and Feedermain protection may be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manitoba Hydro clearances required.</td>
<td>• Manitoba Hydro clearances required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptions to Traffic and Property Owners (i.e. closure and noise)</td>
<td>• Limited noise and traffic impact.</td>
<td>• Limited noise and traffic impact.</td>
<td>• Increased noise and traffic impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity/Feasibility of Land Assembly</td>
<td>• Complex land negotiations.</td>
<td>• Complex land negotiations.</td>
<td>• Complex land negotiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Major aqueduct and feedermain exist within Manitoba Hydro right-of-way.</td>
<td>• Major aqueduct and feedermain exist within Manitoba Hydro right-of-way.</td>
<td>• CN track relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential expropriation of residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT/BRT Compatible</td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>• Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Environmental Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Criteria</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1A)</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1B)</th>
<th>CN Letellier Subdivision (Concept 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ecologically Significant Natural Lands** | • Runs through A Quality Aspen.  
• May isolate and protect A Quality Wetland.  
• Limited impact on natural areas at south end of plan. | • Runs through A Quality Aspen.  
• Limited impact on natural areas at south end of plan. | • Natural areas not present along railway. |
| **Environmentally Impacted Lands** | • Potential for impact near CN lines.  
• Impacted sites exist outside of alignment. | • Potential impact near CN lines.  
• Impacted sites exist outside of alignment. | • Potential impact at CN line.  
• Close proximity to industrial property. |
| **Greenspace**                    | • Existing greenspace provides amenity and connectivity to Corridor:  
• Parker / Summerville buffer  
• Farwell Bay Greenspace and Marshall Crescent Park  
• Chancellor / CN buffer  
• Couple of active Community Gardens south of McGillvray could be relocated. | • Parker Tot Lot could be impacted.  
• 10 – 15 Community Gardeners may be impacted but alignment could accommodate if adjusted slightly.  
• Couple of active Community Gardens south of McGillvray could be relocated. | • Waller Park west side of Letellier could be impact |
| **Ecologically Significant Natural Lands** | • Runs through A Quality Aspen.  
• May isolate and protect A Quality Wetland.  
• Limited impact. | }
## Community Impact Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Criteria</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1A)</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1B)</th>
<th>CN Letellier Subdivision (Concept 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Disruption to Community** | • Potential loss of service for both residential and commercial (transit diverted away from Pembina).  
• Good connectivity (Maybank)  
• Poor connectivity (Beaumont).  
• Increased noise (Beaumont and Maybank)  
• Potential relocated dog park. | • Potential loss of service for both residential and commercial (transit diverted away from Pembina).  
• Good connectivity (Maybank)  
• Poor connectivity (Beaumont)  
• Increased noise from corridor (Beaumont and Maybank).  
• Potential relocated dog park. | • Potential loss of Pembina service south of McGillivary (transit diverted away from Pembina).  
• Increased noise to residential along corridor.  
• Increased distance for Crescent Park access.  
• Increased traffic through Maybank and Beaumont. |
| **Community Amenity and Opportunity** | • Service to 5 of the City’s Major Redevelopment Sites.  
• Consumes significant land in Parker neighbourhood.  
• Room to create Park n’ Rides and mixed use development. | • Service to 5 of the City’s Major Redevelopment Sites.  
• Room to create Park n’ Rides and mixed use development. | • Service to 4 of the City’s Major Redevelopment Sites.  
• Limited service to Parker Lands.  
• Encourages redevelopment along Pembina.  
• Better connectivity to residential, commercial, institutional.  
• Limited opportunity for mixed used development. |
| **Connectivity to Nearby Communities** | • Increased service for north of Beaumont.  
• Direct access to Fort Garry Industrial Park and employment area.  
• Good connectivity to Linden Woods, Whyte Ridge, Kenaston Common via Bishop Grandin. | • Increased service north of Beaumont.  
• Direct access to Fort Garry Industrial Park and employment area.  
• Good connectivity to Linden Woods and Seasons | • Improved transit for Maybank, but limited to other residential.  
• Excellent connectivity to Pembina.  
• Limited opportunities for new development. |
# Financial Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Criteria</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1A)</th>
<th>Parker Lands and Manitoba Hydro (Concept 1B)</th>
<th>CN Letellier Subdivision (Concept 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative Preliminary Construction Costs</td>
<td>Base – Highest (Build-out* - Highest)</td>
<td>Base – Higher (Build-out* - Higher)</td>
<td>Base – High (Build-out* – not possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Estimated Costs Associated with Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$$$$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Incremental Tax Revenue from Transit Oriented Development (TOD)</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Estimated Overall Cost</td>
<td>Base - Higher (Build-out* – Highest)</td>
<td>Base - High (Build-out* – Higher)</td>
<td>Base – Highest (Build-out* – not possible)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Build out is the potential for grade separated intersections.*
Next Steps

1. Confirm alignment
2. Prepare for and design future stages
   - Functional design
   - Detailed design
   - Land acquisition
   - Construction
Thank you for your time.

For more information, please visit winnipegtransit.com