

# STAGE 2 ION: LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT KITCHENER TO CAMBRIDGE

## PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE NO. 3 SUMMARY REPORT

NOVEMBER 21 and 28, 2017

JANUARY 16, 2018



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Project Overview .....	3
1.2 Transit Project Assessment Process Consultation Requirements .....	3
<b>2 CONSULTATION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Purpose.....	5
2.2 Consultation Method .....	5
2.3 Outreach and Notification .....	6
2.4 Participation.....	10
<b>3 FEEDBACK AND INPUT .....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Positive Feedback .....	11
3.2 Issues and Concerns.....	13
<b>4 NEXT STEPS .....</b>	<b>19</b>

---

## **APPENDICES**

- A NOTIFICATION MATERIAL**
- B COMMENT SHEETS AND EMAIL SUBMISSIONS**
- C ONLINE SURVEY**



## Executive Summary

Public Consultation Centre No. 3 (PCC No. 3) for the Stage 2 ION Transit Project Assessment process was held in November 2017 and January 2018. Hosted by the Region of Waterloo's rapid transit team, these public consultation centres were held on three separate dates in different venues located across the study area, to accommodate local residents to the greatest extent possible:

- » November 21, 2017 – Cambridge City Hall, 2 pm to 8 pm
- » November 28, 2017 – Preston Memorial Auditorium, 4 pm to 8 pm
- » January 16<sup>th</sup> 2018 – Kitchener Lion's Arena, 4 pm to 8 pm

Local residents were notified of the public consultation centres through emails, letters, on-street advertising, social media posts, and newspaper advertising.

The Region hosted PCC No. 3 to provide an overview of comments received at PCC No. 2 and how these have provided input to the route selection process, present refinements and additional route alternatives in the Kitchener, North Cambridge (Preston) and South Cambridge segments, explain how the routes will be evaluated and hear feedback from the public and other interested stakeholders. Participants were invited to review 25 display boards, and Information Packages were distributed with a more detailed overview of the information presented. These are available for download from the project website [www.stage3ION.ca](http://www.stage3ION.ca). Participants were able to provide comments by submitting a comment sheet at the venue, sending an email to the project team, or completing an online engagement survey.

In total, 383 people signed in at the three venues and 269 comments were submitted as of February 16, 2018. Comments covered a very wide range of issues, encompassing both positive feedback and concerns. All comments received have been transcribed and are included in this report in Appendix B (comment sheet and email submissions) and Appendix C (responses to the online survey).

Consistent with the feedback received at PCC No. 2, many residents who provided written feedback were generally supportive of LRT as the Region's rapid transit strategy and the overall alignment and stop locations. Support was also noted for the project team's efforts to review additional alternatives following feedback received at PCC No. 2, with the goal of re-examining the relative benefits and impacts within key segments. Other positive feedback included:

- » Support for the F2b-K3b alternative in the Kitchener segment, as it is more direct and reduces travel time, avoids King Street and thus reduces potential for congestion and traffic impacts, and reduces property requirements.
- » Support for maintaining a stop in Preston, with comments in support of many of the additional alternatives presented, particularly those reducing property impacts and with less impact on traffic operations.



- » Strong support for alternatives along the Mill Creek corridor in South Cambridge as an alternative to a route on Beverly Street given reduced property and traffic impacts, and opportunities to enhance and better integrate the existing multi-use path along Mill Creek.

Most of the comments that identified issues or concerns were area specific, and included:

- » The lack of information about specific property requirements at this stage of the study.
- » Concerns about impacts on the established residential communities in North Cambridge (Preston) and South Cambridge (along Beverly Street), particularly property acquisition and displacement of heritage buildings.
- » Concern that the introduction of LRT on existing roadways, particularly King Street between Fairway Road and Highway 401, Eagle Street and Beverly Street, would reduce access for vehicles, increase congestion, and/or create delays at traffic signals.
- » The engineering challenge related to the steep grade of Shantz Hill Road, and how LRT could be safely introduced.
- » Environmental concerns, including direct impacts to sensitive natural features and floodplains, and potential impacts on walking trails and parks.
- » Concerns about disruption to traffic and business during construction.
- » Preferences for different routing and/or different stop locations, including routes to the Toyota Manufacturing Plant (Maple Grove and Fountain Street), Region of Waterloo International Airport, Homer Watson Boulevard (Conestoga College) and Hespeler Village.

Responses to frequently raised issues are included in Section 3.2 of this report.

The project team will be reviewing and incorporating feedback received at PCC No. 3 and proceeding with evaluation of the additional route alternatives. Public Consultation Centre No. 4 will be held in Spring 2018 to present and seek feedback on the results of the evaluation and the recommended alternatives. Following Public Consultation Centre No. 4, the recommendations will be presented to Regional Council for consideration. Pending Council endorsement of a preferred route, the next steps include completion of preliminary design and impact assessment, development of mitigation strategies, confirmation of property requirements and preparation of the business case for the project. This information will be presented at PCC No. 5 in 2019.



# 1 Introduction

---

## 1.1 Project Overview

The ION light rail transit (LRT) project started as an individual environmental assessment in 2006. Prior to this, technical studies for a rapid transit project were prepared in 2004-2005. These technical studies concluded that rapid transit was a feasible transportation alternative and a strategic financial investment that would support the Region's economy, competitiveness, and growth over the next 30 years, while meeting Provincial and Regional planning goals. The Region subsequently provided a notice of intent to transition from individual environmental assessment to the Transit Project Assessment (TPA) Process (Ontario Regulation 231/08) to the Ministry of the Environment (currently the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change).

In June 2011, after completion of the Stage 1 ION TPA Process, the Region of Waterloo Council approved a staged approach to LRT from Waterloo to Cambridge in Stage 2. Stage 1 ION (currently under construction) includes LRT from Waterloo to Kitchener. Stage 1 ION also includes ION bus rapid transit between Kitchener and Cambridge, a service that was launched in September 2015, as the first step in implementing Stage 2 ION LRT in the corridor.

Stage 2 ION will extend LRT to downtown Cambridge, replacing the bus rapid transit system constructed in Stage 1. This will create a continuous LRT system across the Region's three urban centres: Waterloo, Kitchener and Cambridge. When approving the staged approach to the ION system in 2011, a Stage 2 ION LRT route and stop locations were endorsed by Council.

The Stage 2 endorsed route is currently being re-evaluated by the Stage 2 ION Project Team to prepare for the formal commencement of its own TPA Process. The process involves stakeholder and public consultation that will help define and develop the project and ultimately form part of the Environmental Project Report (EPR).

---

## 1.2 Transit Project Assessment Process Consultation Requirements

The Stage 2 ION project is following the TPA Process (Ontario Regulation 231/08), an environmental assessment process which exempts proponents of certain transit projects from the requirements of Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act if they adhere to the requirements of the TPA Process. The focus of the TPA Process is to identify both the effects predicted to occur as a result of the transit project and the measures to mitigate (i.e., avoid, remove or minimize) those effects. In preparation for the formal TPA Process, information and background studies are being completed and shared with stakeholders and residents. This advance work is examining the entire 'environment' which includes natural, cultural/social, economic, and transportation



environments.

Given the universally recognized benefits of transit projects, the TPA Process does not require proponents to document the planning alternatives to public transit (alternatives to the undertaking), or the rationale and planning alternatives to the particular transit project. Identification of the selected project is completed within the pre planning phase and may include feasibility studies, master planning, preliminary environmental reports (inventories, potential effects), consideration of project alternatives, and pre-consultation activities with the public, regulatory agencies, Indigenous communities and other interested parties.

Public consultation is a major component of the TPA Process. The TPA Process requires proponents to consult with persons that the proponent considers may be interested in the project. Consultation allows the proponent to:

- » Properly identify, inform or notify persons, which include those potentially affected by the transit project.
- » Identify and assess the range of potential environmental impacts of the transit project.
- » Respond to the concerns of interested persons, which include adjacent property owners and others who may be affected by some aspect of the project.

One aspect of the consultation program developed for the Stage 2 ION project is Public Consultation Centres. PCCs are an essential component of the pre-planning stage of the project to ensure interested stakeholders are consulted early and throughout the alternative assessment and selection process for the Stage 2 ION route and stops.



## 2 Consultation Process

---

### 2.1 Purpose

Three rounds of Public Consultation Centres have been held thus far for the Stage 2 ION project.

Public Consultation Centre No. 1 was conducted to introduce residents and other stakeholders to the Stage 2 ION planning and approvals process, share the study area and proposed criteria to be used to evaluate route alternatives, and gather input on the various LRT routes and stop locations.

Input collected at Public Consultation Centre No. 1 was used to screen the potential route alternatives and stop locations to a short list for evaluation, and finalize the evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria were then applied to each shortlisted alternative in order to determine a 'Preliminary Preferred Route'.

Public Consultation Centre No. 2 presented the short-listed route and stop alternatives, explained how the alternatives were compared and evaluated, and presented the Preliminary Preferred Route for comment. The Stage 2 ION Project Team received comments during and following PCC No. 2 on many aspects of the project, including the evaluation and the rationale for the Preliminary Preferred Route. Most notably, considerable feedback was received on the section of the route from Sportsworld to Hespeler Road, primarily regarding the alignment and stop location in the community of Preston.

In response to this feedback, the Region initiated a review of additional alternatives in the Preston area, and examined refinements to route alternatives in the southern Kitchener and Downtown Cambridge areas. The Region hosted PCC No. 3 to provide an overview of comments received at PCC No. 2 and how these have provided input to the route selection process, present refinements and additional route alternatives in the Kitchener, North Cambridge (Preston) and South Cambridge segments, explain how the routes will be evaluated and hear feedback from the public and other interested stakeholders.

### 2.2 Consultation Method

The third round of Public Consultation Centres was held on three separate dates in different venues located across the study area, to accommodate local residents to the greatest extent possible. The dates, times and locations of PCC No. 3 were:

- » November 21, 2017 – Cambridge City Hall, 2pm to 8pm
- » November 28, 2017 – Preston Memorial Auditorium, 4pm to 8pm
- » January 16<sup>th</sup> 2018 – Kitchener Lion's Arena, 4pm to 8pm



Participants were invited to view 25 display boards, arranged to:

- » Summarize the comments received following PCC No. 2 regarding the Preliminary Potential Route (previously known as the Preliminary Preferred Route) and how these have provided input to the route selection process;
- » Describe how additional route alternatives or refinements to the Preliminary Potential Route were developed in the Kitchener, North Cambridge (Preston) and South Cambridge segments;
- » Present the alternatives that will be carried forward for evaluation in the next stage of the study;
- » Explain how the routes will be evaluated; and
- » Encourage discussion and feedback.

Stage 2 ION Project Team members, including the Region's Project Manager, were in attendance and were available to answer any questions or concerns. Many of the attendees engaged in one-on-one or small group discussions with members of the Project Team.

Information Packages containing a more detailed discussion of the information summarized in the display boards were made available for residents to take and read at their convenience, as well as copies of "The ION Story".

PCC No. 3 material, including the display boards and Information Package, were also made available on the project website: [www.stage2ION.ca](http://www.stage2ION.ca).

---

## 2.3 Outreach and Notification

In order to provide access to residents throughout the study area, 3 different dates and venues were selected for the Public Consultation Centres. Residents were notified of opportunities to participate using emails, letters, on-street advertising, Twitter postings, Facebook postings, and newspaper advertisements, as summarized below.

### Project Website

Details about the public consultation opportunities were posted online at [www.stage2ION.ca](http://www.stage2ION.ca).

### Emails

For the November 21 and 28, 2017 sessions, two emails were distributed:

- » To 853 addresses on November 3, 2017
- » To 2,453 addresses on November 15, 2017

For the January 16, 2018 session, two emails were distributed:

- » To 2,458 addresses on December 22, 2017



- » To 874 addresses on January 6, 2018

The emails included details on the date, time and location of each venue, and the opportunity to provide input either in person or online. Sample email blasts are included in Appendix A.

### Letters

For the November 21 and 28, 2017 sessions, 1,362 notices were sent to stakeholders and residents, and 388 notices were hand delivered. The notice was comparable to the email blasts and is included in Appendix A.

For the January 16, 2018 session, notices were mailed to 1,180 addresses.

### On-Street Advertising

For the November 21 and 28, 2017 sessions, six road signs were placed across the study area detailing the place, time, and date of the Public Consultation Centres. Two road signs were placed at each location, one in each direction, to ensure that motorists travelling in both directions were informed of the meeting. The signs were installed on November 16 and remained in place until after the completion of the November 28 session in the following locations:

- » Fairway Road between Wilson Avenue and Wabanaki Drive, adjacent to Fairview Park Mall, in Kitchener
- » King Street on each side of Eagle Street in Cambridge (Preston)
- » Water Street North at Ainslie Street North in Downtown Cambridge

For the January 16, 2018 session, signs were placed at the following locations:

- » Fairway Road between Wilson Avenue and Wabanaki Drive, adjacent to Fairview Park Mall, in Kitchener
- » Courtland Avenue at Block Line Road in Kitchener

### Twitter Postings

The Region of Waterloo has a Twitter account for the LRT ION project, @ridelONrt. Several tweets were posted prior to Public Consultation Centre No. 3 advising followers of the upcoming PCCs. Figure 2 provides examples.



**Figure 1: On-Street Advertising**

**ION** @ridelIONrt · 15 Nov 2017  
 Stage 2 ION Public Consultation Centre information packages and display boards are available online: [bit.ly/2j43zZj](http://bit.ly/2j43zZj).

First PCC is Nov. 21st, 2 - 8 p.m. at #Cambridge City Hall, Bowman Room. See you there!




**ION** @ridelIONrt · 3 Nov 2017  
 Next round of public consultations scheduled for Stage 2 ION, more details on our website: [bit.ly/2xWbASH](http://bit.ly/2xWbASH) @RegionWaterloo



**Figure 2: Tweets Announcing PCC No. 3**

## Facebook Postings

The Region of Waterloo has a Facebook account and posted a number of newsfeeds advertising the public consultation centre including the following:



**Figure 3: Facebook Postings Announcing PCC No. 3**

## Newspaper Advertising and Media Release

For the November 21 and 28, 2017 sessions, advertisements were printed in the following publications:

- » Kitchener-Waterloo Record – November 16, 2017
- » Kitchener Post – November 17, 2017
- » Cambridge Times – November 16, 2017

For the January 16, 2018 session advertisements were printed in the following publications:

- » Kitchener-Waterloo Record – January 11, 2018
- » Kitchener Post – January 18, 2018
- » Cambridge Times – January 11, 2017

A tear sheet of the advertisement from the Cambridge Times on November 16 is included in Appendix A as a representative example of the advertisements listed above.

In addition to the advertisements, a media release was also issued on November 3, 2017. A copy is included in Appendix A.

---

## 2.4 Participation

### Attendance at PCC venues

In total, 383 people signed in at the three venues:

- » Cambridge: Cambridge City Hall (November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017) – 133
- » Preston: Preston Memorial Auditorium (November 28<sup>th</sup> 2017) – 204
- » Kitchener: Lion's Arena (January 16<sup>th</sup> 2018) – 46

### Comments and Online Survey

Residents were provided with an opportunity to offer their written feedback in the following ways:

- » complete and submit a comment sheet
- » prepare a sketch showing additional alternatives they suggested be considered, using a tabloid sized map of the study area
- » submit comments by email: [rtinfo@regionofwaterloo.ca](mailto:rtinfo@regionofwaterloo.ca)
- » submit comments through an online survey on the project website: [www.stage2ION.ca](http://www.stage2ION.ca)

The PCC No. 3 comment sheet is found in Appendix B. The questions posed in the online survey are found in Appendix C. Comments through all of these methods were accepted until February 16, 2018.



## 3 Feedback and Input

In total, 269 written submissions were received as of February 16, 2018 and evaluated for this summary report:

- » Comment sheets submitted in-person at venues – 87
- » Sketches with suggested route alternatives submitted in person at venues – 39
- » Email submissions – 5
- » Responses to the online survey – 138

Comments were received through February 16, 2018. Input will continue to be received and reviewed by the Stage 2 ION Project Team, however comments received after this date may not form part of the public record.

The following sections provide an overview of the comments raised most frequently, and how these issues are being addressed. Comments in support of the project or specific elements of the project are highlighted in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, followed by concerns and potential issues in Sections 3.3 and 3.4. The full details of all written comments received are provided in Appendix B (comment sheets submitted at the venues and emails) and Appendix C (responses to the online survey).

---

### 3.1 Positive Feedback

Consistent with the feedback received at PCC No. 2, many residents who provided written feedback were generally supportive of:

- » Light Rail Transit as the Region's rapid transit strategy
- » the overall alignment and stop locations which link major urban centres and provide good coverage and connectivity throughout the region, and support growth and development
- » the Project Team's efforts to review additional alternatives following feedback received at PCC No. 2, with the goal of re-examining the relative benefits and impacts within key segments

Support was also noted for elements of the project within specific areas. This is summarized in the sections below.

#### **Kitchener Segment**

Some of the comments reflected a preference for the Preliminary Potential Route presented at PCC No. 2 (F2a-K2), expressing that it would provide better service to a larger population of people who would be more likely to use public transit and because it includes the opportunity for an LRT stop closer to the Grand River Hospital – Freeport. There was also support for this alternative based on the ability to move traffic and LRT onto a new bridge crossing the Grand River, converting the existing heritage Freeport



Bridge for active transportation use.

There was a greater stated preference for the new alternative under study in this segment (F2b-K3). Reasons included:

- » Provides a more direct route from Fairway to Sportsworld;
- » Allows for shorter travel time between stops;
- » Has less property impacts than the F2a-K2 route, particularly along King Street;
- » Avoids King Street between Fairway Road and the Highway 8 interchange, and thus reduces potential for congestion and traffic impacts;
- » Has less risk of traffic incidents impacting LRT service, as LRT is on a fully separate right-of-way; and
- » Avoids potential construction impact on existing roadways and traffic

### **North Cambridge (Preston)**

Although concern within the community of Preston remained high with regard to potential impacts, a large proportion of the comments received were in support of an LRT stop in Preston as it provides access to rapid transit for local residents, supports existing businesses and encourages economic growth, and provides opportunities for redevelopment. Many of those expressing support for LRT through Preston noted a preference for the alternative routes they felt best serviced the community or had the least impacts, or supported the Preliminary Potential Route presented at PCC No. 2. In particular:

- » A number of these comments showed support for the M-M1 route running along the Highway 401 corridor and crossing Riverside Park as these routes appeared to have the least impact to the established community and avoided Shantz Hill Road and Eagle Street. Alternately some residents were concerned that the M-M1 alternative would put the Preston stop too far away from the central business area to effectively generate ridership, or expressed concerns about intrusion into Riverside Park.
- » A few comments indicated a preference for the O-P alternative along Fountain and King Streets as this route eliminated property impacts along Moore and Eagle Streets.
- » A large number of comments were in favour of using the former CP rail spur that runs north of Eagle Street. Members of the public commented that these routes provided a solution with less impact to properties and traffic on Eagle Street and shorter travel time as the LRT would be able to travel at a higher speed than on-street.

### **South Cambridge**

Comments were strongly in favour of the S3c/S3d route alternatives running along Mill Creek. Support for these options was mostly focused on the reduced property impacts



when compared with the S3a/S3b alternatives running along Beverly Street. Residents were also in favour of preserving and/or relocating the existing multi-use pathway running along the Mill Creek and the potential introduction of a stop at Main Street and Wellington Street to serve more people and locations.

With regard to the Downtown Cambridge terminal options, the majority of the comments recognized the benefit of looking at other terminal locations and supported redevelopment and revitalization of downtown Cambridge. The comments included support for all three of the terminal locations, including:

- » Preference for maintaining the existing terminal at Ainslie Street, as it is centrally located and already being used for transit purposes
- » Support for the T2 and T3 options, as they provide additional access for areas south and west of Downtown Cambridge, including on the west side of the Grand River, and open up the lands where the existing Ainslie Terminal is located for redevelopment

Some of the key issues that were raised as needing further consideration with any of the terminal options included:

- » How bus routes would integrate with LRT service
- » How growth in ridership and expansion of bus services would be accommodated
- » Future opportunities for park and ride in Downtown Cambridge

---

## 3.2 Issues and Concerns

There was a wide variety of issues and concerns raised, ranging from more general concerns about the introduction LRT in the Region to impacts associated with specific segments. The following list highlights the most frequently raised issues, and summarizes how these have been addressed and/or future action to be taken by the project team.

### Need for LRT

**Concern Raised:** Some comments reflected a perception that there is not sufficient ridership to warrant LRT in the Region of Waterloo, and question whether LRT represents the best value for money.

**Project Team Response:** LRT has been selected by the Region as the best way to manage growth by encouraging development and growth in existing urban areas, limiting urban sprawl and protecting the environment. The idea of a rapid transit corridor in Waterloo Region is deep-rooted and was first presented in 1976, when it was highlighted in the Regional Official Policies Plan. Planning for ION began in 2000, and in 2003, rapid transit was included in the Region's Growth Management Strategy. In 2011, Council's decision to implement LRT in two stages was made following six years of technical studies and an extensive public consultation process.



Moving people more efficiently in and around our community, limiting urban sprawl and saving farmland through the protection and preservation of the environment are three of the fundamental goals of ION. ION will help local businesses attract new talent to the region, assist with job creation and stimulate new business growth. It will also help with traffic congestion and reduce the need for costly road improvements in some areas.

The purpose of this study is to re-examine the LRT alignment and stop locations from Fairway to Downtown Cambridge as endorsed by Regional Council in 2011, taking into account updated information development and intensification initiatives, environmental conditions and engineering challenges.

### **Lack of information about specific property requirements**

**Concern Raised:** A number of comments were received regarding property impacts and when this information will be shared with affected owners. Many questions were raised about why property impacts will not be available until 2019, rather than as part of the route evaluation process. Residents were also interested in knowing how impacted property owners will be compensated for construction impacts and/or property acquisitions.

**Project Team Response:** The project is still in the route planning stage and at a conceptual level of design. Pending Regional Council endorsement of a preferred route, the project team will proceed to the preliminary design stage which will include a more detailed engineering study to identify the specific impacts to individual properties. Potentially affected property owners will be contacted by Region staff in advance of PCC No. 5 in 2019 to discuss the process and timing for property acquisition.

The Region prefers to acquire property on a willing buyer/willing seller basis rather than expropriation.

### **Impacts on traffic operations**

**Concern Raised:** Many comments were received that expressed concern that the introduction of LRT on existing roadways would reduce access for vehicles, increase congestion, and/or create delays at traffic signals. In particular, concerns were raised about the section of King Street between Fairway Road and Highway 401, Eagle Street, and Beverly Street.

**Project Team Response:** In most cases, LRT is added in existing roadway corridors by widening the road and creating new lanes for LRT in the middle of the roadway. The number of traffic lanes in each direction is maintained. The Preliminary Proposed Route (2017) as presented at PCC No. 2 was designed in this way, and did not involve any segments with shared LRT and traffic lanes.

Signalized intersections with dedicated left turn phases provide access to crossing roads and adjacent development. Left turns are restricted between signalized intersections for safety reasons, and therefore U-turns are permitted at signalized intersections. At intersections where LRT travels straight through, LRT goes at the same time as through traffic and therefore no delays are incurred. Separate phases



may be required where LRT turns onto a crossing street, however the time required to accommodate LRT is minimal and thus does not significantly delay general traffic.

With regard to concerns about specific locations:

- » A group of local residents has suggested an alternative route between River Road and Preston that would avoid impact on King Street. A concept design for this alternative will be developed and evaluated by the project team, and the results will be presented at PCC No. 4.
- » The project team is examining additional alternatives in Preston, including alternatives that are not located on Eagle Street. These alternatives were presented at PCC No. 3; additional alternatives will be considered based on feedback received at PCC No. 3. The results will be presented at PCC No. 4.
- » The project team is examining additional alternatives in South Cambridge, including alternatives that are not located on Beverly Street. These alternatives were presented at PCC No. 3; additional alternatives will be considered based on feedback received at PCC No. 3. The results will be presented at PCC No. 4.

### **Providing LRT stop at Grand River Hospital - Freeport**

**Concern Raised:** Several comments noted that an LRT stop near the Grand River Hospital – Freeport was necessary to provide access for patients and visitors, as well as to provide access to LRT for residents in the Chicopee/Morgan Avenue community.

**Project Team Response:** The potential for a stop in this area was reviewed in detail with Grand River Transit and planning officials and it was found to not be warranted. Pedestrian access between an LRT stop and the Hospital and area residences faces significant challenges due to the need to cross the CP Rail tracks and a very long uphill climb along Morrison Road from King Street to the hospital entrance. Grand River Transit concluded that a more suitable approach is to provide more frequent bus service from the Fairway LRT stop into this neighbourhood, which would enable passengers destined to the hospital to access the bus closer to the hospital entrance, and provide more places for residents to access the bus. The travel time by bus from Fairway would be significantly less than the walking time from a LRT stop on King Street.

### **Accommodating LRT on Shantz Hill Road**

**Concern Raised:** Some comments raised the issue of the steep grade of Shantz Hill Road, and questioned how LRT could be safely introduced.

**Project Team Response:** This engineering challenge has been addressed in the concept design. A photographic rendering of the proposed configuration will be presented at PCC No. 4, which the project team hopes will make it easier for interested residents to visualize how Shantz Hill Road, Fountain Street and LRT will look in this area.



### LRT alignment in Preston

**Concern Raised:** Many local residents have raised concerns about impacts on properties in Preston, as well as on the established residential community, with the alignment on Moore Street and Eagle Street. In addition to direct property impacts, concerns were raised about impacts on heritage buildings, and general noise and vibration concerns with the proximity to the residential community.

**Project Team Response:** A number of refinements to the route in this area have been developed, and were presented at PCC No. 3. These routes meet the project objective of bringing LRT to the core of Preston but seek to reduce property impacts. Local residents attending PCC No. 3 were also encouraged to identify other potential routes that meet the project objectives. These will be reviewed by the project team, the list of alternatives will be finalized, and a detailed evaluation will be carried out using the evaluation criteria presented at PCC No. 3, which include natural, social, cultural and engineering factors. The results of the comparative evaluation and the recommended alternative will be presented at PCC No. 4.

### Preference for Maple Grove Road – Speedsville Road for the LRT alignment

**Concern Raised:** Industrial development (including the Toyota manufacturing plant) along Maple Grove Road and planned residential development in the Maple Grove/Speedsville area will provide sufficient ridership to support LRT, and thus an alignment along Maple Grove Road and Speedsville Road is preferred over the alternatives in Preston.

**Project Team Response:** The Public Information Package for PCC No. 2 summarizes the comparative evaluation of the Maple Grove alternative (K2-N2) and the alternative on Shantz Hill Road and Eagle Street (K2-N3). While the Maple Grove Road area has many employees, the distance from the roads and sidewalks to the buildings is too far for transit users and the density of employees is too low. The area is being preserved for large lot industrial as per planning policy and is not planned to contain transit oriented development.

### LRT alignment in South Cambridge

**Concern Raised:** Many local residents have raised concerns about impacts on properties along Beverly Street, including heritage buildings, and the potential loss of affordable housing.

**Project Team Response:** Alternatives both on Beverly Street and following the former railway corridor along Mill Creek were presented at PCC No. 3. The evaluation will consider property impacts and impacts to cultural heritage resources, and input received at PCC No. 3. The results of the comparative evaluation and the recommended alternative will be presented at PCC No. 4.

### Need for GO Train service to Cambridge

**Concern Raised:** Many comments were received indicating that provision of GO Rail



service to Cambridge should be a higher priority, and that planning for LRT should include a multi-modal hub at the future GO Rail station.

**Project Team Response:** GO Transit service is planned, constructed and operated by Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario. Metrolinx has a comprehensive strategy for expanding rapid transit service (bus and train) through the GO Transit network, as outlined in their Regional Transportation Plan. Expansion of the Milton Line, which would enable rail service extension to Cambridge, is a longer term initiative and will require significant improvements to the railway line in association with CP Rail, who owns much of the line. The Region and the City of Cambridge remain strongly supportive of bringing GO Rail service to Cambridge, and will continue to work with Metrolinx and the Province to see this initiative come to fruition. In the meantime, the route alternatives for LRT in Cambridge have considered potential locations for a GO Rail station to ensure the opportunity for future interface is maintained.

### Environmental concerns

**Concern Raised:** Comments were received about potential impacts on river corridors, Riverside Park in Preston, walking trails, heritage buildings and flood prone areas.

**Project Team Response:** The evaluation presented at PCC No. 2 considered impacts on environmentally sensitive areas, floodplains and heritage resources, in consultation with specialists and regulatory agencies. The evaluation of new route alternatives will follow the same process. More detailed studies will be carried out in preliminary design to reduce impacts and incorporate mitigation measures. Walking trails may need to be relocated where they cross the LRT alignment, but the intention is to maintain or enhance continuity and access. Pending Regional Council endorsement of a preferred route, the project team will proceed to the preliminary design stage which will include a more detailed engineering study. The results will be presented at PCC No. 5 in 2019.

### Impacts during construction

**Concern Raised:** Concerns were expressed regarding local business closure due to lack of access during construction and whether or not there will be alternate traffic routes during construction to ease congestion. Comments also inquired if the Region learned any lessons during the construction of Stage 1 to aid in minimizing construction impacts, cost and/or loss to businesses that can be applied to Stage 2.

**Project Team Response:** A staging plan for construction of the project will be developed during the design phase. Construction will be managed to maintain access to adjacent properties and businesses, however detours may be required. Planning for this work will include consulting with business owners in advance and minimizing disruptions as much as possible. The business support program established during Stage 1 will also be maintained during implementation of Stage 2, including refinements to the program to reflect experiences with construction staging and sequencing during Stage 1 construction, and the effectiveness of specific business support initiatives.



## Alternative routes and stops

**Concern Raised:** A number of suggestions were received that the LRT corridor should follow different routes or service other areas of the Region. Examples included:

- » Toyota Manufacturing Plant (Maple Grove and Fountain Street)
- » Region of Waterloo International Airport
- » Homer Watson Boulevard (Conestoga College)
- » Hespeler Village
- » King Street/Coronation Boulevard
- » CP Rail corridor east of Highway 8 (as an alternative to King Street)
- » Water Street to downtown Cambridge

Recommendations for additional stop locations along the Preliminary Potential Route (2017) were also provided. The most common requests were:

- » Conestoga College
- » River Road/Grand River Hospital (Freeport Campus)/Chicopee neighbourhood
- » Cambridge Memorial Hospital
- » Eagle Street/Speedsville Road
- » Beverly Street/Dundas Street

**Project Team Response:** The Project Team started with the 2011 Council endorsed route and stops. Several challenges were identified with this route after more detailed study. In order to maximize the opportunity for transit-supportive development and create the most cost-effective solution (both in terms of construction and operating costs) a number of alternative routes were added. The Public Information Packages from the three previous rounds of PCCs (PCC No. 1 in November 2015, PCC No. 2 in February and March 2017, and PCC No. 3 in November 2017 and January 2018) provide details on how these alternative routes were developed, evaluated and refined. While the project team is not examining other routes such as to Waterloo Regional Airport, Hespeler Village or Conestoga College, future expansion of LRT is not precluded, and would be the subject of separate studies. Pending Regional Council endorsement of a preferred route, the project team will proceed to the preliminary design stage which will include a more detailed engineering study to identify items such as additional stops.



## 4 Next Steps

The project team will be reviewing and incorporating feedback received at PCC No. 3 and proceeding with evaluation of the additional route alternatives. Public Consultation Centre No. 4 will be held in Spring 2018 to present and seek feedback on the results of the evaluation and the recommended alternatives. Following Public Consultation Centre No. 4, the recommendations will be presented to Regional Council for endorsement. The next steps include completion of preliminary design and impact assessment, development of mitigation strategies, confirmation of property requirements and preparation of the business case for the project. This information will be presented at PCC No. 5 in 2019.

Following the completion of preliminary design and the business case, the project will be presented to Regional Council for endorsement, and the formal Transit Project Assessment process will commence. The Environmental Project Report is anticipated to be available for public review later in 2019.

# APPENDIX

## **A** NOTIFICATION MATERIAL

A large, white, diagonal shape that resembles a stylized letter 'V' or a folded corner of a page, positioned in the lower-left quadrant of the page.


**Notice of Public Consultation Centre No. 3**



**Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge**

In June 2011, Region of Waterloo Council approved a staged approach to light rail transit (LRT). Stage 1 ION (currently in testing phase) includes LRT from Kitchener to Waterloo and bus rapid transit (BRT) between Cambridge and Kitchener (launched in September 2015). Stage 2 ION will see BRT replaced by LRT.

Public Consultation Centre No.2 (PCC No.2) introduced the preliminary preferred route to the public. During, and after, PCC No. 2 we received many comments from the public, including a number of suggested alternative routes. The Region will be further considering localized route alternatives and refinements to the preliminary preferred route within the areas shown below (dashed boxes):



The potential alternative routes will be presented to the public at an upcoming Public Consultation Centre. Please join us at one of the following Public Consultations to provide feedback on the route alternatives under consideration:

Date	Time	Location
November 21, 2017	2-8 p.m.	Cambridge City Hall – Bowman Room 50 Dickson Street, Cambridge
November 28, 2017	4-8 p.m.	Preston Memorial Auditorium, 1458 Hamilton Street, Cambridge

After evaluating the potential route alternatives the results and the preferred routes will be presented to the public at another Public Consultation Centre (PCC No. 4).

The environmental impact of this transit project will be assessed in accordance with the Transit Project Assessment (TPA) Process as outlined in Ontario Regulation 231/08. As part of the TPA, an Environmental Project Report will be prepared and will be available for public review in 2019. All information on Stage 2 ION is available at [www.stage2ION.ca](http://www.stage2ION.ca), and from the Region’s Administrative Headquarters located at 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener.

Under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and the *Environmental Assessment Act*, unless otherwise stated in the submission, any personal information such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in a submission will become part of the public record files for this matter and will be released, if requested, to any person.


**Notice of Public Consultation Centre No. 3**



**Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge**

In June 2011, Region of Waterloo Council approved a staged approach to light rail transit (LRT). Stage 1 ION (currently in testing phase) includes LRT from Kitchener to Waterloo and bus rapid transit (BRT) between Cambridge and Kitchener (launched in September 2015). Stage 2 ION will see BRT replaced by LRT.

Public Consultation Centre No.2 (PCC No.2) introduced the preliminary preferred route to the public. During, and after, PCC No. 2 we received many comments from the public, including a number of suggested alternative routes. The Region will be further considering localized route alternatives and refinements to the preliminary preferred route within the areas shown below (dashed boxes):



The potential alternative routes will be presented to the public at an upcoming Public Consultation Centre. Please join us at one of the following Public Consultation to provide feedback on the route alternatives under consideration:

Date	Time	Location
January 16, 2018	4 - 8 p.m.	Lions Arena 20 Rittenhouse Road, Kitchener, ON

After evaluating the potential route alternatives the results and the preferred routes will be presented to the public at another Public Consultation Centre (PCC No. 4).

The environmental impact of this transit project will be assessed in accordance with the Transit Project Assessment (TPA) Process as outlined in Ontario Regulation 231/08. As part of the TPA, an Environmental Project Report will be prepared and will be available for public review in 2019. All information on Stage 2 ION is available at [www.stage2ION.ca](http://www.stage2ION.ca), and from the Region’s Administrative Headquarters located at 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener.

Under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and the *Environmental Assessment Act*, unless otherwise stated in the submission, any personal information such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in a submission will become part of the public record files for this matter and will be released, if requested, to any person.

# APPENDIX

**B**

COMMENT SHEETS  
AND EMAIL  
SUBMISSIONS

## APPENDIX B – COMMENTS SHEETS AND EMAIL SUBMISSIONS

Those who attended the PCC in person were given the opportunity to submit comments using a comment sheet, either at the venue or by mail. A station was also set up at the PCC venue to encourage anyone who wished to identify other potential routes in the North Cambridge area to sketch these on a map provided and leave these with the project team. Comments were also able to be provided directly to the project team by email.

This tables starting on the following page present the comments submitted using comment sheets (Table B1) or sent by email (Table B2). Information identifying individuals or specific addresses has been redacted as noted in square brackets, e.g. [ ... ]. Best efforts have been made to replicate comments as written, however where comments were only partially legible, some interpretation was required. Besides minor corrections for spelling, no other editing has been done. The original of each submission has been retained by the Project Team on file.

Sketches were also submitted, and these have been retained by the Project Team on file.

# Stage 2 ION: Light Rail Transit from Kitchener to Cambridge

## Public Consultation Centre No. 3

### Comment Sheet

#### Tell us what you think!

The Region of Waterloo is seeking public input on the Preliminary Preferred LRT Route for the Stage 2 ION TPA Process.

Public consultation for this project is a two-way communication process between the Region of Waterloo and affected or interested stakeholders.

This provides opportunities for information exchange and for those consulted to contribute to the decision-making.

Please provide us with your input so that your views can be considered during this phase of the ION Rapid Transit Project.

#### ***Thank you for your participation!***

Completed comment sheets may be placed in the comment box or sent by mail, fax, or email no later than **February 16, 2018** to:

Region of Waterloo, Rapid Transit  
50 Queen Street N, Suite 830  
Kitchener, ON, N2H 6P4

InfoLine: 519-575-4400  
TTY: 519-575-4608, Fax: 519-745-4040  
Email: [ION@regionofwaterloo.ca](mailto:ION@regionofwaterloo.ca)  
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/rideION](http://www.facebook.com/rideION)  
Twitter: @rideIONrt  
Instagram: @rideION

An online comment sheet is also available at:


[www.stage2ion.ca](http://www.stage2ion.ca)



# Are there other routes that should be considered in North Cambridge?

Sketch out your ideas here, for review by the Project Team.

<b>Contact Information (Optional)</b>	
Your Name:	
Mailing Address:	City:
Postal Code:	Phone Number:
Email:	



**TABLE B1 – COMMENT SHEET RESPONSES**

<b>Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	<p>There is a dilapidated hotel at Shantz Hill and King. Tear it down and build a tunnel to the empty field on King Street on the Kitchener side of the 401. This avoids going through the Eagle Street neighborhoods, saving potential long and drawn-out legal challenges from local residence.</p> <p>Go down King Street – there is a six lane boulevard that is *perfect* for the LRT. Stations on the empty lot downtown King Street and across from the hospital.</p> <p>Second line between the Ainslie and Pinebush, with a Delta transfer gives the option for future expansion to the downtown or the other side of 401.</p>
2	<p>Alternate route - Shantz Hill, Kink St, Bishop St., Hespeler Rd. Route V and the green through Riverside Park needs to stop. The impact on this beautiful park and all the wildlife and river will be negative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- [redacted]</li> <li>- The number of wildlife that will be impacted. This is a route for wildlife. I watch deer, racoons, coyotes, foxes, etc. walk through right where the trains will be.</li> <li>- Also the river is quite close and bald eagles fly around the area and feed from the river</li> <li>- The best route to me is if Preston doesn't want it – to go Maple Grove to Hespeler Road (or Fishermills to Queen and back onto Hespeler Road)</li> </ul> <p>*Have a vote to see if Preston citizens even want it in their community*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The route through Riverside Park and Route V will not pick up people – King Street is where the people are and Hespeler Road.</li> </ul>
3	<i>Attachment provided - Community LRT Proposal. Retained on file.</i>
4	I am very upset and do not want the LRT going down Eagle Street. I live [redacted], the bridge over the tracks will put the LRT at the level of my kitchen window. I can imagine how bad it will be having a train going by every 4 minutes. M1 is a better route.
5	Go by way of Sportsworld and leave Eagle Street alone...Whose bright ideas are these?
6	Strongly recommend K3B K2 is too congested and I suspect would end up costing far more
7	Maple Grove Rd Going into Riverside Park rather than into our trail and river with our birds, beavers and otters.
8	I guess my only comments on conditions and restraints would be that the train is meant for ridership (what we've been told) the train in Waterloo and Kitchener service the cores (downtown cores). This is the condition that needs to be met in Cambridge. Not sure why more consideration not given to a King St. run to either, Bishop or Dunbar.
9	Route should go down Maple Grove since there is huge development of houses there. Why Preston? Everyone thinks there are apartments and huge condos going in near the river.
10	It is unfortunate that a stop at Conestoga College is not included. This stop seems more important to me than a Sportsworld stop. As the LRT line is split in downtown Waterloo and Kitchener it could be split with a line on Hespeler Rd. and Concession, split at the Delta and at King and Eagle.
11	I remember the controversy when the region proposed and built the expressway. I am hearing the same arguments and disapproval of the project. London was also considering building a ring road around London to avoid the congestion.

<b>Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Waterloo region went through with their expressway it was also controversial but they went through with it. I don't think there are any people who regret it was built. London did not build their ring road and my friends in London still regret to this day it wasn't built. London has grown and they are still struggling with finding a solution to their congested streets.
12	The Eagle St. bypass is a must lots of homes saved
13	I like Preston being served but would prefer the M-M1-V-W-X route. If possible, down Concession serving the hospital. I fear huge traffic on Eagle while 401 is backed up. Eagle is already packed at rush hour. I think the Riverside dam has impact on this. If it is removed, Speed River will be narrower but the flood plain could change. Why hasn't there been in-depth environmental impacts. Where would people park in Preston? A stop at McGarry's office would be nice with M-M1 route.
14	Your blanket statement of "your comments/opinions are important" is not in the scope of reality. We were in attendance as the first public consultations and we posed our queries and quandaries to no avail. We are being force-fed this harsh reality without the public getting a voice. Again, here are my concerns/ideas: - You say that going down (some) railways is not an option. Any time the city needed to expropriate land from the railway (i.e. Babcock/Wilcox bridge project), the city got their wishes granted. Now with the Region being the officiating face to the LRT (a bigger firm), could they not persuade the railway to share track? Duplicate tracks, use existing rail systems already in place. Dam project – great opportunity to expand for rail. - Hespeler via Maple Grove route is now completely removed from any proposals – would it not make sense to build the infrastructure now before the 4000+ homes that are slated for the area? - Public are supposed to have input, have there been any public polling for ridership? If so, what percentile of people would actually take LRT? - The environmental impact of the expansion/rebuilding of the Fountain St. Bridge will take 2 years to complete. The magnitude of the bridge over the river into known flood plains is a ridiculous eyesore. What impact in a much larger area will be endured? - How much money will the region bring into the area to guarantee return on investment? The GRT buses are mostly empty, why do we need ION transit to service the few that may find it beneficial? - Ridership in question. Phase one is not currently running, but yet we are lead to believe that the ION will bring in the masses. - The increased construction of track will inevitably get out of control and go over budget; during this perceived overage, what can we expect as taxpayers for footing the bill for the project? - Property impact will also be a headache for years...consistent vibration would also impact foundations of 50+ year old homes in which I reside, will ultimately crumble. Who will be held responsible for repairs – the city, the region, the LRT or other? - Looking at revised proposals, and considering we have "no other options", the "M" to "M1/M2" is logical. We would then alleviate traffic from Eagle/King intersection. Where would the "Hub" or "Station" then be situated?
15	- No, I think you have done a thorough job explaining the alternatives. - Can't get over how wonderful it will be to finally have dedicated rail and get some cars off our streets. - Need to be forward thinking – keep up the good work! - I like the original proposed route the best

<b>Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
16	I would prefer the LRT stop not hit Preston at all. We are a small community that would not contribute a lot of ridership. Downtown intensification would be small and not worth the destruction of Eagle St. Listen to the people that live here.
17	I think that you should look at avoiding Crossing River to Moore to Eagle on south side of King St. Preston running from Sportsworld to Speedsville Rd. to Eagle would get my vote.
19	<i>Attachment provided – suggestions for additional route alternatives. Retained on file.</i>
20	“The peoples’ good is the highest law.” – Cicero
21	Knock down Wilfrid Laurier University and run the Cambridge LRT in a loop there. You can expand to include the University of Waterloo in due course. (More sarcasm!)
22	Don’t want it at all. We have buses and taxis. We had a headache this summer. Do we have to go there with this again?
23	I object to the proposed V route – which goes though Riverside Park – what happens to all the wildlife, trees, etc. bald eagled or river. I bought a condo unit on [redacted] and my balcony overlooks the trails, and the old railway tracks. I will not accept a train speeding down the tracks every 4 minutes. What right do you have to disrupt someone’s life? I can’t recall even voting to see if residence of Preston even want the LRT – should we vote?
24	Common sense does not prevail. Come on folks. This is a huge problem for residence on Moore and Eagle. Take the rail off residential roads and put it behind the scenes where it belongs.
25	Honestly I think it is a total waste of tax dollars. If you must come down Shantz Hill and across the river put a walking bridge over the river. Or all the people and high school kids from Preston Heights will be walking on the tracks over the river.
26	Go back and look at Maple Grove – Toyota employees appr. 8000 people. Loblaws are appr. 2000ish. Speedsville new homes – 1000 homes x 2.5 = 5000 approx. Hwy 24 and Maple Grove = another 1000 homes x 2.5 5000 appr. Give or take, 20,000 jobs/people – don’t tell me it’s no high density (160/hex.) because it is so much higher # count than Eagle St. WHY??? – stop discounting to suit your needs
27	No. I would like to note that I have no concerns with the appropriation of existing roads/lanes for LRT tracks, particularly as the LRT would ultimately alleviate some traffic. I am a firm believer that efficient transit routes should always take priority over car traffic. Keep up the great work!
28	Stick with buses unless the "trains" (actually glorified streetcars) are elevated they'll foul up traffic flow for decades to come. What about what happens when the streets the train tracks are on have to be reconstructed to replace aging pipes and wires? Elevate the train like the Disneyland monorail of 1956.
29	I would like you to consider coming across the river diagonally and running the track behind or take out The Beer Store, and City Café - cross King at 180° and continue if possible through surplus store and pickup the spur line "v" and "w" as identified OR at City Cafe turn right on King and left on Eagle. The other consideration is to cross the river diagonally and make sweeping curve onto Eagle in the area of Queenston Chopin King and Eagle - Taking one block and preserving Moore Hamilton Eagle.

**Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?**

Comment No.	Response
30	The Foundation St. bridge construction is taking two years to complete with high regard for the natural environment and endangered species. The same care, if not more, needs to be taken with the various river crossings to and in Preston. The destruction of stable neighbourhoods to attract density is an unfair balance, so this needs to be minimized as much as possible. Emphasis on young families, seniors giving up their vehicles - their independence - means cost and convenience considerations.
31	It is a difficult matter paring down the many route alternatives suggested by the public. There will need to be the greatest emphasis on volume of ridership and frequency of service and that will inevitably require some expropriation. The Challenge is to minimize this. The Eagle St. option is apparently the most sensible, all things considered. Easy for me to say since I'm not directly affected!! More effort is required to explain how buses and the LRT would intersect. One of the most annoying things about the current BRT is infrequency, unpredictability and poor off-peak service.
32	First off, thank you for taking the time to educate the community. 1. Must have the stop in Preston at King & Eagle. 2. Respect property rights of all involved. 3. Suggest Route Q, G, R, V, W, X. Minimal impact on property owners while retaining stop in Preston.
34	I live in Preston and do not like the Preliminary Potential Route in Preston where the LRT comes down Shantz Hill with a fly over across the Speed River/Linear Trail onto Moore St. with a left turn onto Eagle. Eagle Street is too narrow to accommodate vehicular traffic plus the LRT. I'm concerned about the impact on the wild life at the Linear Trail as well as all of the destroyed homes in Preston. My neighbourhood would no longer be "my" neighbourhood as I know it.
35	The only route to Cambridge is using the CPR Railway live from Kitchener. The regional government can pay CPR running rights to use this part of the line. Other railways do this agreement and it works out fine.
36	Servicing the Cambridge Industrial area will create greater ridership (i.e. demand) by present residents and attract new residential development in Preston + Hespeler. Don't service existing residential only. We want growth, not stagnation. S a, b, c, d are fine T 1, 2, 3 are fine Do NOT expand LRT into Cambridge. We need GO Trains! Cambridge and south Kitchener residents commute to Mississauga + GTA (i.e. 401 pile ups)
37	Since no stop will exist between Fairview Mall and Sportsworld Dr., following King St. seems to be an inappropriate route. I strongly support the new alternative for the King St. route to the K3b route along Highway 8 corridor.
38	Kitchener Segment, my house backs onto King St. route. NO to K2 YES to K3B
39	The representative from the region the proposal of the next ION in Cambridge to run near McGarry's office runs through Russ St. and goes to Speedsville Rd. Not to many property will be affected. I think this proposal is much better.
40	I really think you should use the existing railway, and not go down Eagle and destroy

<b>Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
	everything. It makes more sense and less impact on homes, families, etc.
41	I think the alternate routes M, M1, V, W, X are the best routes available that will have the least amount of impact on the town of Preston. Is the fastest route not the one competing with traffic, I understand that the ION will have the right-of-way, but this will then impact vehicle traffic and possibly affect emergency vehicles responding to calls. With the route being away from population, would train be able to travel faster along this route? Possibly being a safer option also with it not being near the public. I would like to see the least impact on the houses in Preston. I understand more apartment type buildings are needed, but I think there is plenty of land currently available for this without a massive expropriation needed.
42	Major Priorities – do we need this LRT through Preston? Can we still preserve the small town feel? Will it industrialise our small subdivision too much? And by that I mean sterilize it and cause even more traffic issues with shared road use?
43	I believe the original route proposed is the most effective and am in complete support of the route the LRT will enhance the lives of the present residents and promote higher population density along the route which will or could allow businesses to flourish while at the same time welcome new people into a stagnant area. This is a forward thinking plan that gives a far greater population an opportunity to live, work and prosper along an affective transit corridor, instead of yelling not in my backyard by selfish persons not willing to look towards a vision of the future.
44	- too many families will be effected with something most people won't use - use the 401 corridor get off Eagle St.
45	My concern is why the heck didn't the LRT get incorporated into the roads? When you drive in Toronto, you can drive on the railway tracks. It makes sense, no road way or lane loss occurs. Giving the LRT its own track is a huge mistake in my opinion. It may not be a problem in the short run, but in the long run, I believe this will cause huge traffic issues. I really like the proposed idea of on map D-3 North Cambridge alternative routes section "V" "W" "Y" "Z" "X". Using that abandoned railway is an excellent choice in my opinion.
46	I was extremely disheartened to see one of the route alternatives, showing the proposed route to come down Fountain St. in front of the Sulfur Springs Hotel. By doing so, the hotel would need to be torn down. Our city should be ashamed to have allowed the current owner of this building to allow it to be run down to the current condition it is now. This is a very large part of our cities history and should be shown the respect it deserves and restored, not torn down! Please do not allow our cities history to be destroyed! Our current dam in the river is to be torn out...what's going to be left to honour our cities past? I would love to see the land used that currently has the spur line trail that is not in use anymore, this would have less impact on the home owners, churches etc. Also, this past while we have suffered through construction and routes closed leaving town. To undergo more construction on heavily used roads would be extremely difficult for all to endure.
47	Continued... North Cambridge alternative routes I really like the proposed "M" and "M1" routes. I think they would be most cost beneficial, environmentally sound and best way to keep Prestonites from war.
48	I have a house full of sand cracks/ pictures have been taken in the beginning twice by your young lady. Are now going to reopen Shantz Hill to add the fly over the river!! Are you going to include a walkway for students and others on this bridge?
49	A route through Riverside Park would have a minimum amount of impact on residential areas

<b>Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
	at the same time providing opportunity for ridership.
50	I think that your original plan is the best. It serves a higher density area of Cambridge and has strong potential to improve business, travel, access to leisure (Riverside Park!), and improve property values in nearby homes. King + Eagle is the best, most obvious station stop. Yes, I understand that some people are unhappy because of the potential of losing their home. But quality of life for the majority will be vastly improved when there is better access to reliable transit on a dedicated rail system. Look to modernizing for the greater good of our community. Keep up the good work and please bring LRT to our neighborhood. Build it and people will come!
51	Please go ahead with the K3B route. Please keep out of my backyard (the K2 route).
52	LRT Phase 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bad idea with route coming down King St. / Shantz Hill</li> <li>- Deeridge Crossing is a bottleneck at the best of times.</li> <li>- Bad idea coming up Moore / Eagle</li> <li>- Need more transparency and Criteria</li> <li>- Friday - Snowstorm, jack-knifed transport, 401 shut down both sides, eagle was a parking lot from 3:00pm-8:45pm, it was sad. Shantz Hill was stopped for over an hour. Shantz Hill - cars could not make it up the hill.</li> <li>- You want to add to the congestion + escape route.</li> </ul>
53	It is vitally important to mitigate the potentially damaging impacts on King Street traffic flow during and after the LRT construction. It would of course be better to avoid running the LRT down King St. in the first place.
54	We are given different answers about whether or not alternative routes are being considered for the route along King St. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The argument that there is no population along Maplegrove is also not really true. That area is going to be built up. So the citizen's route along Maplegrove should still be considered.</li> </ul>
55	The LRT down Eagle is a bad idea. Traffic off the 401 uses Eagle as an alternate route. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expropriating houses on Eagle is not an option</li> <li>- Ridership will not be good. Buses now have minimum ridership.</li> <li>- Problem here is expendable people. They do not value homes, communities, or businesses</li> <li>- Residents are not being heard</li> <li>- Information is not heard at all</li> </ul>
56	They should consider why they are bringing the LRT through Preston, through a well established neighborhood. No one I have ever spoke to that lives in Preston wants this stop. I am not sure why it is notes as a must. Please consider the homes and families by that route. There has to be a better way than the N3 route.
57	Very poor planning. You will be creating chaos during the construction as King St. is the major artery to K-W from the 401. After the LRT is running on King St., it will cause more traffic jams. No one from the subdivisions in the areas will be likely to use the LRT. Businesses along King St. / Kitchener are not geared (sp?) for LRT users. Can you imagine someone shopping at Costco and taking their purchases home by the LRT? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There have been a number of alternative route suggestions to avoid King St. Kitchener.</li> </ul> What are the criteria for the route plans? We have not been given a full feedback to our questions during council meetings.
58	Although I may never fully capitalize on the LRT route, this route looks to be the starting point for a future light rail transit system that will benefit a large amount of people with the

<b>Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
	initial impact of not pleasing a few. Choosing your pathway into the future for the greater good of many should always be the right choice, carry on and good luck.
59	The rep from the region explained the proposal to go past K. McGarry's office up Eagle and down Russ and carry on through the park to Speedsville. This proposal appears reasonable and will not affect as many properties in the process.
60	It makes no sense to put the LRT along Beverly Street. As a resident / home owner for the past 30 years on Beverly Street I find it disturbing that it is under consideration when the old railway line along Mill Creek is an option. The residential impact and cost alone is prohibitive. Please put the S3c / S3d alternative into effect and leave Beverly Street as is. Please!
61	A stop at Eagle and Concession / Speedsville would be very good to revitalize the area as well as connect more riders to the service. Perhaps CN or CP would be wooed to the project with naming or other decision making rights. Example, Dan Gilbert and the Q-line LRT in Detroit. Other investors could be wooed this way as well.
62	I think there should have been a consultation in Kitchener, since 1/3 of the route goes through Kitchener. We are still concerned that other options are not being considered along King St. and were disappointed that our route was not included. Consider going along off-set to King St. rather than in the middle of it. Also it is imperative that King St. is widened BEFORE the LRT is built so that 2 lanes in both directions are maintained.
63	I feel that highlighting the elevated section in Kitchener but omitting it for Shantz Hill is deceptive. Along with that, you comment that Riverside Park would be closed. This is disingenuous. A) You could route car traffic into Riverside via Fountain by the 401 B) You have renderings of the cross sections elsewhere C) EDR routes from the 401 run on Eagle. That road is packed during rush hour and accidents. I dislike the elevated span. I dislike affecting heritage and established homes on Eagle St S. I don't see how you can get around Cambridge surplus. I am concerned that floor planes are not respected or notes. I would like to see the 'M1' or 'M2' through Riverside. I would call my MP to push this option. I am concerned about Hespeler lane closures.
64	- Has anyone contacted the School of Architecture to propose a collaboration? If not, this is a massive missed opportunity. - Why is there a potential stop at Pinebush near Eagle? It is too close to the highway to take full advantage of the radius of densifications that will occur and the proposed GO stations are down in Galt. Plus, the already dense and walkable core of Preston is barely services at the moment and will die without transit/support. there is an opportunity to come down or alongside King Street and also service the Concession / Langs area, then cut across Bishop to get to the GRT hub at Cambridge Centre Mall.
65	I definitely think the old tracks should be used, not to come through a small residential area. V, W, Z perhaps as you still may pick up pedestrians on that side of Eagle. Not sure if pedestrians will be out at X as it does not look like it has been built up yet. Unless there are future plans of developing that area with high reses and such.
66	The best option is to take suggested route "V" to "W" then down "Z" to Eagle. This will have less impact on the residence along Eagle as the preferred route shows. Benefits include a scenic route for commuters. This will also allow for a stop position before Eagle splits to "V"

<b>Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
	path. It allows for an intermediate pick up/stop position midway of Eagle at "Z" and another, last stop at where "Z" & Eagle meet. Include Shantz Hill --> to "O", then to "L" then to "H" & up tracks to Eagle then to "V" (or "H" to "R" then to "V") stop positions can be worked out. (Best for the park & Preston residents & commuters.
67	See below. Move immediately to study which options through Preston is/are the best to avoid impact to a quiet residential neighbourhood.
68	Please look at alternatives to running the LRT along King St near the 401 and Highway 8. King St serves as the only access point to Deer Ridge, Grand Hill Village and also serves as one of only two access points from west of Kitchener from the 401. This already extremely congested area would act as a choke point.
69	Preston - Routes V, W, X provide a good option for part of Eagle Street - These routes (V, W, X) do not bypass any of the preliminary potential stops - M and M1 make the Preston stop too far from King Street South Cambridge - preferred terminus is T3 - high visibility area along Concession St. - would free up T1 area for parking - Parking at T1 would be convenient for both T3 and the Main St. stop. - T2 is not a good site as there is very little space for parking and optics of that location is not great (will be seen as pandering to the new Gas Light District development) - T3 is also less disruptive to traffic in Galt core than T2 - Prefer route along Mill Creek NOT Beverly Street (too disruptive)
70	Greater consideration in parking (current and with future growth) at stations / stops. Little info on predicted parking requirements which should be a consideration in placement / location choices of terminus (south end). T2 option would seem to have very little options for parking furthermore it would create a barrier to the river greenspace - If not a barrier, an interruption. The other options are reasonable close to the foot bridge while not being "in the way". Strongly in favour of T1 or T3 option.
71	The charts are misleading or at the very least, unclear. There were colour keys and letters (I.e. M2, G, etc.) that were not on the legends to provide explanation. For many people, especially re: the up to 110 homes that could be expropriated. That is roughly 400 people who will be displaced. South Preston has no room for growth and if you take 110 homes out of inventory we will not be able to live in our own community ever again. The direction to "serve Preston" resulted in ELEVEN pretty coloured lines on a map, very few of which make logical sense.
72	I hope that residents of the Eagle St. S neighbourhood are generously compensated if their homes are expropriated or an ION train track is constructed in front of their homes. Longtime residents will be affected. Families will be affected.
73	Map D-4 As a commuter from Cambridge to Waterloo, I would be open to walking approx. 500 m to a Preston stop if the Eagle St. South neighbourhood was preserved. The word "far" is a subjective one. Preston residents have dealt with traffic impact. Routes along Fountain St. and King St. would be acceptable if the Eagle St. South neighbourhood was preserved. There are multiple entrances to Riverside Park. Closure of the Rogers Dr. entrance is not a strong argument for the destruction of the Eagle. St. S neighbourhood.

**Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?**

Comment No.	Response
74	<p>*You have space and safety in Mill Creek. No need to disrupt Beverly St. and make it even smaller.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Beverly St. is too narrow, many children and young families are moving in and establishing roots.</li> <li>- LRT makes Beverly St. too narrow and dangerous for children</li> <li>- Traffic is already heavy on Beverly St. too narrow for added strain of rail system.</li> <li>- Homes will be too close to road.</li> </ul>
75	<p>I believe that you should further consider the damage that the current preferred route N3 will have on the community of Preston. I am glad there have been new routes offered that will minimize the damage. I think P+P2 is great to avoid homes and avoid the problems running along the road will pose.</p>
76	<p>* N3A mixed use is a good solution!                      *T2 is critical - supports waterfront &amp; HIP development</p>
77	<p>My Preferences:                      * K3b (not K2) - keep it following King, it is already a main corridor                      * S3c/S3d (Mill Creek) - keep it away from Beverly Street                      * T1 (use existing bus terminal) - already a hub for buses, easy to transfer from one to another                      * Preston - going through Preston seems to make sense. No matter where you go, the people who live there are going to have a "not in my backyard" mentality. It nicely links Preston to downtown Galt and Kitchener; a lot of people would appreciate that, compared to the few it is going to inconvenience.</p>
78	<p>I think you should stay away from the river and the trail. There are a lot of birds and wildlife that will negatively be affected by a train and the construction in that area.                      The LRT is an ugly (visual) project. You will take away the beauty and the quietness of the area.                      You should consider running the rail on the other side of the CN tracks and Riverside Park; away from the Grand River and Trail system.</p>
79	<p>Your hand out (P5) talks about minimizing natural environment impacts. What about minimizing the stress on the people likely to lose their home or church? Early 2019 is too late to identify property requirements.                      If you have the preliminary preferred route by Spring of 2018 (flow chart P. 13) then the property requirements will also be known. Property owners should be notified as early as possible.                      A map with a list of properties required by the LRT should be displayed in SPRING 2018.</p>
80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A dedicated route that does not run on King St. or Eagle / Hespeler Rd. will allow for future growth in speed and shorten travel times</li> <li>- Keep the train out of flood plains</li> <li>- The least invasive route is the best route</li> <li>- Consider the 401 plan to the Smart Centre</li> </ul>
81	<p>Run track on Cherry Blossom Rd. instead of Eagle St. Pick up Toyota employees and Arrisscraft. Leave Preston / Eagle Street alone! This is not needed here or wanted.</p>
83	<p>Riverside Park route M disrupts less people (houses).                      Use the existing rail lines.</p>
84	<p>Reference to Map D-3.                      I think the best route alternative would be from the Preston stop up Eagle, then take Route V,</p>

**Question 1: Are there any study area conditions, constraints or route alternatives in the refinement areas that the Project Team have not identified or should further consider?**

Comment No.	Response
	W and X. This would stop any expropriation of land (homes) down Eagle Street.
85	Stick with the buses or elevate the trains. Or go really big and combine all transportation together: a canal big enough for the Queen Mary 2, train and glorified streetcar tracks, asphalt lanes for both motor vehicles and airplanes, sidewalks for all pedestrians and bike lanes to be ignored with bicycles all over everywhere. (I hope my sarcasm is evident) This perpetual construction (and disruption) project could also (as in Montreal) be a magnet for political corruption.
86	What happens concerning car parking at the King / Eagle stop? What's the impact of winter weather on the elevated part crossing the Speed River?
87	The proposed route uses the railway shunt track that borders [redacted business name]. This shunt line is used multiple times per day to deliver [redacted] to [redacted business name] as we have a RR siding that comes off this shunt line. Concerns: (1) Will we maintain railway delivery service to our RR siding? (2) Our warehouse is less than 20' away from the shunt line - would our warehouse be in the way of the LRT tracks? <i>Commenter included diagram, retained on file</i>

<b>Question 2: Do you have any comments or questions about the study and/or the work completed to date?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
4	What are they going to do for [residents] living right beside the train. I am very much against the bridge going over the CN rail tracks. It will greatly impact [residents] that live at the top of the hill.
5	Looks terrible in downtown W'loo (Waterloo) & KW area...back to soviet style systems of the 1950's East Europe! Ouch!
6	I do not like the curbs guarding the tracks they blend in visually with the rest of the concrete and are only traps for vehicles I will have to find alternate routes
7	I feel like no one is listening to our concerns.
8	I am a business owner in Preston. We been in business 32 years downtown. It is very important that the core area of Preston is represented along the route. When I visit other cities trains service core areas. It will be very important to the vitality of our city that the cores be first. So that said, in my opinion bring the train down Shantz Hill, cross the river, up eagle.
9	Everyone I spoke to thinks the region has already decided and does not care about what Preston thinks.
10	I strongly support a stop at Eagle and King. The downtown Preston area must be on the LRT to promote and even development throughout the region. Any change will upset some people but out politicians must consider more than the angry, loud voices, and show leadership. Our children will live and work differently than we do today so we must look to the future. For Preston to be left out, it will be relegated to a backwater of the region.
12	The stop at King and Eagle has to happen, hopefully a route with the least impact on the properties in the area.
13	I am wondering why more property impact info won't be made available until after the 2018 election. I feel there hasn't been a ton of info provided and it seems cluttered and busy. I appreciate the staff levels servicing the meeting Nov 28. I wish staff had more info to share or knew about the topic. Ie. Spoke to GRT bus planner, did not know many details.
15	You are doing a great job. I could not be more pleased that LRT is coming to Preston. I have a couple of requests: - Please keep the stop at King and Eagle. It makes more sense that moving it further along Eagle if you have to reroute. - To minimize the outrage of a number of residence, I would suggest N3-P-P2-G-R segments - Since the recent construction Shantz Hill is much more suitable for additional transit, so second choice is N3-O-L-H-R
17	I don't know how you can cross Speed River at Shantz Hill on GRCA flood plain when a Pedestrian bridge was not allowed 20+ years ago.
18	As a property owner along the Eagle St. S route I am concerned about the impact on not just my property, but my neighbourhood. The interruption that the addition of the tracks and trains would cause is immeasurable. Not to mention the effects on the trail along the river – nothing ruins a stroll in nature like a giant concrete structure and train passing overhead. The effect of the track further down on Eagle St. is also huge – while a Preston stop is desirable is it worth the impact on the residents and neighbourhood?

<b>Question 2: Do you have any comments or questions about the study and/or the work completed to date?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
24	Where are all the alternatives? I see the same old route what a couple of tweaks. Where are the people's choices?
26	Yes – why are you not doing what you say you would? Common sense should prevail. Take the rail off Eagle /Moore. Stop selling out your Preston residents.
27	Pleased to see consideration of a new terminal in S Cambridge w/ a mere central location (T2). My main interest in the LRT is that it effectively serve the existing urban cores and connect Cambridge to KW. I am strongly in favour of any of the proposed options for S Cambridge. While I don't have a personal stake in the N Cambridge route, I sincerely hope the vocal objections of some residents will not "derail" (ha?) the ability of the LRT to be an efficient and effective driver of urban intensification.
28	[expletive deleted] to the Ken Seiling legacy project If businesses close because of disruption during and after construction, one bureaucrat should be fired for each lost private sector job. If anyone dies because emergency response vehicles can't respond properly, the project managers, chief bureaucrats who oversaw the project and the politicians who voted for it should be jailed for the maximum period for criminal negligence. Put some of your own skin in the game.
29	I like the spur line V and W.
30	Have you learned any valuable lessons in KW to minimize the construction upheaval and enormous cost / loss to business? Can you apply these lessons to this next phase?
31	The LRT has to be coordinated with <u>housing</u> demands - particularly the need for more rent-geared-to-income and family accommodation.
33	I really like the proposed route for Kitchener segment using Hwy 8 over the Grand River. I think this route limits (the most) impacts to figuring out how to get over the river @ Freeport and the narrowness of King St. through that area (K3b). I also like the proposal to move the proposed rail line off Beverley St. in Cambridge and follow the existing rail corridor beside it (S3C / S3d)
34	My preferred route would be on Map D-3: North Cambridge "M" to "M1". However, if it is important to keep the Preliminary Potential Stop in Preston at King and Eagle Street, then my second option would be "M" to "M2" to "H" to "R" onto Eagle Street.
35	This is the same old preferred route the regional government is using to tell Cambridge that is the way should be.
36	Nothing seems to have changed... just like Phase 1. Not impressed.
37	Thank you for listening to previous comments and developing a new possible route... this is a work in progress... continues!
39	We the people of Cambridge should have a chance to have a vote regarding whatever proposal.
40	I don't understand why you can't use a route that makes more sense and does not ruin the Preston area and destroy and take people's homes away,
41	I don't not think that this process has been transparent. When we challenge the region, the typical answer is, we don't know the answer because the assessments have not been completed. When I walk around this room, there is some eye candy with the above M, M1, V, W, X routes, but again it is noted that this route is not a

<b>Question 2: Do you have any comments or questions about the study and/or the work completed to date?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
	direct enough connection to Sportsworld.
42	Yes – updates on speculated completion dates! If we want to sell our home we need to know when we can do so knowing when the decision will be made to take our house or not. As of now, how can we sell being on Eagle St. S.?
43	Push forward and do not let a vocal minority derail the progress. In every city I have been in with mass transit be it LRT or subway or any combination of these along with connecting Regional rail these are efficient people movers, and they enhance lives. I will support this plan and voice my support to all who will listen!
44	Do not use Eagle St. way too much car traffic
45	Sorry for the sloppy writing lol.
50	No, looks good. Thank you for the many opportunities to provide feedback.
54	Firstly, why was this meeting held so far from the people affected? Sportsworld Arena would be a much better location. Coming out to Lions Area is a real disincentive. - The criteria need to be re-evaluated as the same criteria are applied and result in the same conclusion. We were also told that the application of the criteria are neutral and in a louder breath that it is a 'subjective judgement'. How can a subjective judgement be neutral? This is disingenuous.
56	Please be more open and honest about what is happening and decisions that are being made.
57	What are the criteria for the route plans?
58	Keep up the good work
59	We the people of Cambridge should have a chance to have a vote regarding whatever proposed.
60	It seems to be a discussion that is open and ongoing.
63	I feel there was not enough staff who could answer questions around 6pm. I would have liked to see rendering of your proposals so others could see. I feel that after massive reconstruction of Shantz/Fountain/King, you are proposing huge changes with no details. I don't see anything to reflect changes to heritage and established homes.
64	- Routes S3c/d will have the least impacts on existing housing and will provide the opportunity to get started on revitalizing Mill Creek. This is a great opportunity to have a really positive interaction between the city and the creek and also revitalize the walking path (and connect the path directly to the arena) - Having the terminal at T2 will allow service to a greater area of Galt, including direct access across the river via the new pedestrian bridge
65	I think it was a crazy idea to run it through Eagle such a small street to begin with. Schools, homes, busy street, add a Light Rail train every 7 minutes...CRAZY! Best to put a system in with less disruption to the city, and to the parks. The city is congested enough!
66	The current preferred route doesn't have positive options for pedestrians, current Eagle traffic, schools along this path, homes that will be affected. This route will also look invasive in this small area. Too busy as it is.

<b>Question 2: Do you have any comments or questions about the study and/or the work completed to date?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
	"Closet is already full (Eagle) why try to shove more clothes (people/train) in it!!" If you lived here, you would see what your suggested route will affect.
67	I am very surprised and disappointed to find M3A as an option to connect Shantz Hill to King and Eagle. Instead of being discarded as I expected it not only remains but has a proposal to try to see it as an option. Under no circumstances is Moore and Eagle an acceptable route for LRT tracks. It would be like putting in a highway. I will campaign vigorously to fight that option! See my The Community Edition column for greater detail than allowed in the rather limited space for feedback allowed here.
68	We would appreciate if a public meeting could be scheduled in Kitchener to look at the Kitchener impacts.
70	Why would Beverly Street option ever be considered when the old rail base running parallel is an option. Making Beverly one way is a terrible idea. It is a major thoroughfare in the area.
71	This was presented earlier this year as the "preferred route". The Region was tasked with servicing Preston, and coming up with alternative routes. Eleven options were "presented" in approximately a 4K area near the original "preferred route". These options are very difficult to understand and make no sense at all. With all due respect to the planners, it seems that 11 options were slapped on a map as a placeholder for the true preferred route. Take a look at Map D.3 North Cambridge to see what I mean.
73	It would be worthwhile to consider routes along Highway 401 when MTO reconstructs the interchange although there may be a delay if the Eagle St. S neighbourhood is preserved. Routes along the Speed River might disrupt existing walking path, but there are plenty of other walking paths. The preservation of the Eagle St. S neighbourhood and its residents should be paramount in comparison to a walking path.
74	- Soper park (Mill Creek) bike track is better suited for this!! - New school on Beverly St *should not have rail in front of school*
75	I would like more information provided to the public on a more constant basis. There has been a lot of miss-information provided and it would ease a lot of people's minds to have more content?
77	Information well said out and explained very well.
78	It's ugly - cement city - Keep it away from the beauty of the trail and river.
79	1. The proposed closing of the Riverside Park entrance will be a disaster. There are many events in the park that attract hundreds of people and cars. At present, there are two ways in and out of the park. Imagine the chaos that will ensue when hundreds of cars enter and exit one narrow, winding exit! 2. The junction of Eagle and King is very busy now from 8:00-9:00am and at noon and from 3-4:30pm because of students from Preston H.S.
80	Listen to the people!!
82	This has been a fairly open process and the region has been open to feedback. I am strongly against the idea of the LRT running through mixed traffic. This would be at the cost of reliability and poor reliability is a major reason that people avoid transit. The alternate terminus points in South Cambridge all seem reasonable. Water

<b>Question 2: Do you have any comments or questions about the study and/or the work completed to date?</b>	
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Street would be my preference as it provides access to West Galt, but all locations would be good. Preston should be included in the route. This has the potential to drive the much needed development in the area. Changing the route to minimize impact is positive, but not at the expense of failing to serve Preston.
83	No one can give to a time frame. People living in limbo.
85	PBS recently ran Ken Burns' documentary on the Vietnam War. I'd forgotten about one protest song, "The Big Muddy" ostensibly about the 1940 Louisiana maneuvers but actually about Vietnam: "Knee deep in the Big Muddy and the Big Fool said to push on... waist deep... chest deep." You're big fools saying to "push on".
86	Has a survey been done on potential ridership? As a resident of the Preston area the current proposed route does not meet my needs as far as areas / patronize i.e. Food Basics + Zehrs in the Hespeler area. Downtown Galt has few stores all the time and Cambridge Centre is dying so why the push to get there. By the time the LRT comes into being Bombardier will be bankrupt.

**TABLE B2 – EMAILED COMMENTS**

Comment No.	Response
88	<p>I hope that the concerns of the residents and businesses in Preston and Cambridge as a whole eventually prevail with the Waterloo Regional Council.</p> <p>It would seem a miscarriage of democracy for them to be swept aside by any majority of public servants, whether they are elected or hired, who neither live or work in the areas directly impacted by their decisions.</p>
89	<p>I'm a social worker in Cambridge working in the fields of medical and mental health. Transit access to our community hospital is extremely important for our residents! Please, Please, Please ensure that our Light Rail system has a stop at the Delta (Coronation and Hespeler). When the 200 iExpress added this stop, it helped many patients, family members, visitors and hospital staff with hospital access. With the bus system, it was possible to miss this the first time and add the stop later. With the rail system, a later correction would be extremely costly. Let's get it right the first time!</p> <p>It is not enough to have bus connection between the rail system and the hospital. Too many people are needing a direct link from Kitchener-Waterloo and/or require multiple transfers to get to the hospital.</p>
90	<p>My name is [redacted], I spoke to you on November 21 at Cambridge City Hall about LRT to Cambridge.</p> <p>Our conversation was about numerous aspects; this email is about 2. Maple Grove Rd, and how/why the Ontario Housing Corporation lands that were previously in Waterloo Township were put in Cambridge in 1973, and putting LRT on Hespeler Rd underground as Edmonton....Jasper Ave.</p> <p>1) The Stewart Fyfe report on which Waterloo Region was set up. This is the document I refer to:          Waterloo area local government review : report of findings and recommendations.          Author: Stewart Fyfe; Ontario. Department of Municipal Affairs.          Publisher:[Toronto] : [publisher not identified], 1970.          I was an employee the Department of Municipal Affairs at the time and did have some sideways contact with those OHC lands.          Memory serves me that the Province did make some changes to the recommendations of Dr Fyfe when actually setting up Waterloo Region for Jan 1 1973m there must be some archival information at The Region indicating why areas of the former Waterloo County and it's Townships were put in the various cities. My comment that Maple Grove Rd be re-added for consideration as the LRT route stands. This was added to Cambridge as the area that Cambridge was designed to grow into when Cambridge was designed Waterloo Region should add the modern transportation infrastructure to allow it to do what it was designed to do.</p> <p>2) Hespeler Rd LRT:          I checked with my various sources as to how Edmonton LRT was put underground from Churchill Station to University just south of the river except over the river where it is in an enclosed bridge. The phases of LRT under Jasper Ave including the very first Phase of Edmonton LRT were done by tunneling; at no time on any LRT construction under Jasper Ave was the street closed for excavation purposes. The geology of the soil and any bedrock encountered did not require anything but tunneling operations. The distance from Churchill Station to University is about 3.5 Km          What I did find of course was that the tunneling was controversial as to cost per Km compared to surface building. More surface LRT could have been built had the money not gone to tunneling. What cannot be disputed is that LRT operations in the tunnel cannot be affected by surface car/truck traffic and vice versa. The picture in your PCC #3 handout on Page 9 in which 2 18 wheelers are obvious indicates why tunneling and/or excavating Hespeler Rd for LRT should be considered. If Edmonton could do it; and Edmonton has long been held up as a comparable to Waterloo Region, then surely we can do it.</p>

Appendix B: Comment Sheets and Email Submissions

Comment No.	Response
	<p>I will supply comments on the other aspects of PCC #3 that we discussed before the December 31 deadline.            I ask that this email be added to the record as being submitted as comments from PCC #3.            Thank you.....I certainly enjoyed our conversation.</p>
91	<p>I went to the meeting about the LRT at the Preston Arena tonight and I was very disappointed in how I was treated and the lack of the Region showing any change to their plans. I voiced my concern about the lack of their ability to address the concerns of the people that will be left living next to the LRT train. I live at [redacted] which is at the very end of [redacted]. I live at the top of the hill overlooking the current CN Rail tracks. I have a lovely view of the Speed River and Riverside Park that will be destroyed by the LRT. They said that they will build a bridge over the current CN Rail tracks that cross Eagle Street. That will put the LRT at about the level of my kitchen bay window and give me a view of a train going by every 4 minutes. They could not give me any answers as to how they would address this issue and what noise levels and barriers I may expect.</p> <p>I feel that the concerns of the people of Preston (Cambridge) do not matter to them. They can not tell us what impact this will have on our property values when those of us with houses on the hill will be living with the LRT running beside our backyards.</p> <p>I hope that you are our Regional Representatives will continue to fight for us and not allow the Region to run the LRT down Eagle Street. There are many other ways they could run this track but I did not see any willingness to change the route.</p> <p>I appreciate your assistance in this matter and please help give a voice to us who will end up living with the LRT running beside our properties.</p>
92	<p>We own a few properties, by the corner of Beverly Street and Dundas Street.            [Redacted property details].            We are very happy that the LRT will be coming to Cambridge. However we do have a few comments and concerns.</p> <p>Cambridge Memorial Hospital:            First we would like to see the LRT go past the Cambridge Memorial Hospital, this would have been ideal for a number of reasons; LRT would have made it easier to get to the hospital, this would have cut costs (no parking fee) for people visiting the hospital, there is already a grass boulevard down the middle of Coronation which would have been perfect for the rail track lines, it would have better served the people living in Preston.</p> <p>Have you considered not doing the Eagle Street line, but instead going through Preston on King Street, past the Cambridge Hospital and having a line go from the Delta up Hespeler Road and back again (this could be a straight line back and forth). This would probably be the same length of train track line required.</p> <p>GCI:            It would also have been beneficial for the LRT to go past GCI High School with a stop this is the French Immersion and ESL High School, students from all over Cambridge go to this school.</p> <p>Beverly Street (S3):            The bike/walking path, located behind the house on the south side of Beverly Street, on the old railway line, is really lovely and used by many people. It would be a shame to locate the LRT on this path and have to put up a barrier between the new tracks and the relocated bike path. This would wreck the park and path area. It would remove the park views from all the houses that now back onto the park. It would increase the noise levels; all the houses would continue to have traffic noise in front and LRT noise behind their houses. All the houses would have decreased privacy, because the LRT users would see directly into the back yards of these houses. This would in turn decrease all the property values, which would lower the assessed values, and then lower the taxes collected by the city.</p> <p>The most economic (not requiring to buy a lot of pieces of land), would be to have the LRT located on one side of Beverly Street and the other side of Beverly Street would be one-way street. Looking at Google Earth, there appears to be enough land in front of the houses to</p>

## Appendix B: Comment Sheets and Email Submissions

---

Comment No.	Response
	<p>satisfy the land requirement for the LRT tracks. It appears that no houses would have to be bought and removed, maybe only some land would need to be purchased in front of some houses. Wellington Street could be converted to a one-way to serve the traffic going the other direction. This would require a traffic signal light at Dundas and Wellington, this is a very problematic area, where there are often accidents, this would help alleviate the number of crashes in this area.</p> <p>We have been landscaping our property, which now backs onto the bike/walking trail, for the past 20 years, with the plan for our son to one day build a house on this property, we really do not want to have any of this land expropriated away. It is such a small lot, we do not want to lose any of it.</p>

# APPENDIX

## C ONLINE SURVEY



## APPENDIX C – ONLINE SURVEY

The Engage Waterloo online survey was available to members of the public through the project website [www.stage2ION.ca](http://www.stage2ION.ca), to provide comments on the project. The survey was available from November 16, 2017 to February 16, 2018. The landing page for the survey is shown below:

**582 We want your input on the Light Rail Transit (LRT) route from Kitchener to Cambridge!**

Introduction Feedback Your Response Outcome

**Introduction**

At the last round of Public Consultation Centres (PCCs), a preliminary preferred route was presented for public feedback. During and after the last PCC the Region received many comments from the public, including a number of suggested alternative routes.

The Region is further considering three localized route alternatives and refinements to the preliminary preferred route.

Your input will be used to identify issues that may need further consideration before a preliminary preferred route is selected.

Following this PCC, the Project Team will review all feedback received and any new information will be considered. Using input from the technical team, stakeholders and the public, the Project Team will evaluate the additional route alternatives and a preferred route will then be identified. The Project Team anticipates presenting the findings of this evaluation at the next round of public consultations in spring 2018.

For a complete list of the criteria used to determine the route alternatives and refinements to the preferred preliminary route, please see the [Public Information Package](#). To review all documents related to Stage 2 ION please visit [www.Stage2ION.ca](http://www.Stage2ION.ca)

**In-person feedback**

You can also provide input at one of the following public consultation centres:

- [... read more](#)

The questions posed the survey were organized into the three areas under study as follows:

For the Kitchener area:

- What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?
- What challenges do you see with the additional route option?
- What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?

For the North Cambridge area:

- What do you like about the additional route options?
- What challenges do you see with the additional route options?
- What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?

For the South Cambridge area:

- What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
- What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
- What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?

Responses were entered directly into the online tool. The survey manager then extracted the data and provided it to the project team for review. In total, 138 submissions were received.

This tables starting on the following page present the output from the Engage Waterloo online survey. Information identifying individuals or specific addresses has been redacted as noted in square brackets, e.g. [ ... ]. Besides minor corrections for spelling, no other editing has been done. The feedback has been organized into three tables: Kitchener Alternatives (Table C1), North Cambridge Alternatives (Table C2) and South Cambridge alternatives (Table C3).

**FEEDBACK FROM THE ONLINE SURVEY**

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E1	Shorter route. Less street running means less conflict and higher speed.	The large bridge span could pose technical or budget challenges.	
E3	Seems like this route would be more beneficial as the purpose of this train is to have a more convenient and speedier mode of public transport. Following the F2a-K2 route would only slow down the train.	Engineering challenges to build a bridge over the river, additional traffic to merging traffic coming off Hwy 8 to King St (Sportsworld bound)	Distance traveled along the new route is less than the preliminary potential route.
E4	I like that Grand River Hospital will be serviced.		
E5	Nothing. The project has a great and significant negative impact to environmental features.	1. Closure of local businesses due to lack of access during construction. 2. Increase of non-porous surfaces 3. Negative environmental impact 4. Multitude of wires and tracks throughout the city which will not help with the current and future congestion issues, regardless of the bypasses being built to remove transport trucks from going through Hespeler Road. 5. Significant cost that will not meet the need of commuters in the area. 6. Cambridge is made up of 3 core areas and the Village of Blair, there is no central point to make it convenient or easily accessible to the full community. 7. Rapid buses are a more readily available and economically lower in cost to be the better option. 8. If a GO train may come to Cambridge, we do not also require the LRT. 9. The GO train is the better option, while rapid buses are inter-city.	Being able to Provide "NO" as the outcome rather than the only option being a preferred route. With the development of more efficient and emission lowered vehicles as well as electric vehicles, there is more of a negative impact along with higher costs in the development of the LRT than the need. Replace with Rapid Bus system and GO Train as we have more residents commuting to and from Toronto than when the plans were first considered.

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E6	I prefer the route along the west side of Highway 8 (K3b)	Not clear where (or how many) stops will be	
E7	ride times look like they would be much improved. The idea of using the existing highway minimizes expropriation of properties along King st.	I guess the bridge across the river might be difficult or expensive to expand? But we need a river crossing somewhere.	Fixing up alternative routes for traffic during construction. This will be a big mess for commuters using the highway.
E8	-more direct route, fewer turns/intersections -hopefully can reduce congestion that would be created by LRT having to navigate king street in this section	-cost of dedicated right-of-way bridge for LRT	-traffic congestion/travel times for both cars and LRT trams for both proposed routes
E9		I don't see the need to send the train along the Highway 8. It makes sense to keep it in a built up area.	
E10		King St and Deer Ridge currently has significant traffic congestion prior to the LRT. Adding LRT construction and potentially resulting in permanent lane reductions would cause severe bottlenecks for drivers exiting the HWY on King, drivers heading into Cambridge from King, and for all the residential occupants driving in and out of their neighbourhood.	
E12	It's more direct and will probably be a little faster.		
E13	less impact on home owners/traffic	construction	migratory patterns of both ground and flight animals
E14	Less disruptive to the community	it would under service the area along old king st.	Cost, Road Closure information, environmental impacts.
E15	I have no problem with this route until it reaches King Street East where it starts to interact with the existing traffic. This is a	Way too much traffic congestion on the stretch as it reaches King Street East...difficult access for automobiles into	King Street East is also the main thoroughfare that connects this part of Kitchener to Cambridge and to the 401

**TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?	What challenges do you see with the additional route option?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?
	very busy highway at all times. I feel that the route should go to the east of King Street behind the Mandarin etc. where it can connect with the Go Bus Station for easy connection access to Toronto Etc. Better yet if it went to the east of Hwy. 8.	the existing businesses along this stretch and very difficult access for residents living in DeerRidge and areas to the east of King St. Adding a train into this mix is totally unacceptable. It would cause more congestion	West. This is the time to get this right and not to add more congestion and difficulties in getting around these areas. You are really trying to make life worse.
E16	Good. Since the train will not be stopping at Freeport Hospital (Grand River), you might as well take the shortest route possible. The ride time will be shortened.	None. All positives.	Engineering design over the Grand River.
E17	Avoids congestion on King St., particularly over the Grand River. There's no need to clog King St along this corridor when there is no stop until Sportsworld.	Path from Hwy 8 to 401 along King Street is going to be higher congestion. Alternative route fails to address this. Are we still going to have a 4-lane road here? Deer Ridge/King intersection is already dangerous with cars flying off the Hwy 8 ramp and frequent red light runners through this intersection (in both directions). This route for the ION makes it worse.	Traffic study along King between Hwy 8 and Sportsworld Drive including King/Deer Ridge intersection. Short distance between the King W off ramp and Deer Ridge corner. Potential to route the train tracks away from this stretch of road, impact of moving track in behind SportsWorld Crossing instead. Routing vehicle traffic heading to/from London via 401W away from King Street via a bypass to offset congestion created by ION. Widen King St including the Grand River Bridge to 4 lanes.
E18	Do not care for this route as it effects traffic on King Street and effects access into my neighborhood.	Traffic issues and there is no need of a King Street route	The people who pay taxes should have some sort of say it this train which most of us do not want.
E19	Most direct route. If on West side, no multiple crossings of highway. Bridge impact less severe than previous River to King proposal which sandwiches it between King and CP.	Cost of single span Grand River Bridge, but it has to be done somewhere	Proximity to Hidden Valley and Grand Hill personal properties

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E20		Skipping major public infrastructure like the hospital is a bad idea.	What major public institutions (including parks and trails) are best served. What route comes closest to the greatest population concentrations? What routes work the best with existing and new active transport infrastructure.
E21		Too expensive. Take down the highway then the people sitting in traffic will see the train go by.	
E22	It's the most direct route and there is already a highway that has impacted the area.		Same criteria as the other routes?
E23	Looks like a more straightforward route	Short term plan. What happens when highway needs to expand?	We only seem to think short term when we do any planning in region. Take long term (20 years) as a base of what to do. How will high speed rail (if,we,get) factor in.....
E24	I like that it's more direct and avoids the already crowded space along King St.	Making sure as little environmental impact as possible. Future maintenance/repairs to the track might be more challenging since it's a larger span and more remote. Bridge would have to have emergency walkway in case it is stuck on the bridge.	May be more wildlife on the tracks unless there's a fence there.
E26	Your map showing the route isn't showing it in Cambridge so I can't answer this question.	See above, and please fix the site to make it easier to navigate.	Putting an LRT train through the Delta in Cambridge is the worst possible idea. This is the most heavily congested intersection in Cambridge, and there is no room to add a lane for a train which means taking an already existing traffic lane. This would send us back to the constant high level of congestion we had before the overpass was built except this time it would be constant instead of only when a train was passing or

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
			shunting. Another route that doesn't use the Delta is essential.
E27	Why isn't a route to Conestoga College being proposed? All of this could be skipped if the LRT went to Conestoga first then continued on to Cambridge.	Bridge over the Grand, But no matter always will need to be one.	
E28	The whole reason this is being constructed is to increase transit ridership. If it's not what's the point? Trains are held at some higher regard than buses for some reason. (I suppose it's because they have a dedicated line).	Using connecting buses, people won't buy into it.	Why is there no connection to the Airport? Would it not be a good idea to create a transit hub there? Do we not anticipate any increased usage of the airport by 2025-2028? With all of the money sunk into the Airport over the last 15 years, does council not believe this could help attract flights and airlines? If we're spending all of this magical money anyway, why would we not try to connect as many systems as possible? Why are we trying to pull the trigger on this route now, when GO Transit hasn't been determined for Cambridge? That should be a higher focus anyway. Regardless, I really cannot fathom the province not providing Go transit to Cambridge for another decade. That being said, why would this line not have flexibility to incorporate a proposed GO stop? This would most definitely be a wasted opportunity.
E29	Don't like either option	No ridership - train to nowhere	Please consider routing from Fairview along Wilson to pioneer and then to Conestoga college - then along fountain to Preston - follow through Preston on King past the Hospital then Ainslie terminal

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
			<p>More ridership - servicing areas where people actually live - how many live and/or work on the sportsworld corridor - this would service students - many more residents and commuters - Preston core (Hespeler and the mall are cars and express bus) many medical offices along my route (seniors would benefit)</p> <p>This route bypasses trouble with shantz hill and eagle street</p> <p>Build along proposed routes it's a waste of money - will not have the ridership build past college and through Preston core to Galt core</p>
E31	It looks more direct	None	
E32	this is a more direct route to Sportsworld than following the existing rail alignment (F2a-K2)	I expect this will be a more expensive option to construct, given the F2a-K2 alignment goes over an already existing rail bridge on the Grand River	will there be a stop between Fairview Mall and Sportsworld? It seems the Chicopee neighbourhood / Freeport hospital are unserved by an LRT alignment following this route, unless there is a stop near River Road / Hidden Valley?
E34	Keeps constructions disruptions to a minimum because it will be taking place off the regular roadways. Unless a stop was being created at the hospital (which I would support), why bother taking it along the roadway up there anyway?	The environmental impact from crossing the river and other natural areas. Additionally, because there isn't much infrastructure there, it would likely cost more to put this in place than converting roadway space.	Cost difference between road v solo-line across river. Possible addition of Hospital stop.
E35	It will avoid environmentally sensitive areas.	None.	Already a high traffic area, so it won't affect the atmosphere much.
E36	I like how direct the new route is - this feels like it will speed up journey times, I also like that drivers arriving in KW will have a great	The view from the expressway looking west is a nice one, so I would want careful	The LRT Bridge design should be inspiring as it will be so prominent.

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
	view of the LRT in action running alongside the expressway. Hopefully this can be a full speed section so that commuters are maybe inspired to take the train next time?	consideration of the bridge design so that it doesn't look too utilitarian.	
E37	It might be a bit quicker, but I'd rather see F2A-K2	K3b may have challenges in the winter months, as it goes directly over the river. Frozen tracks could be of concern.	Weather, and if the stops are located near where people need to be, ie: the hospital
E38	I like the west side idea. Keep it running along the major highway where the noise is and the cars are. Old highway 8 is a nice drive into kitchener, don't put a train down the middle of the road. It makes sense to put it beside highway 8		
E39	This route is most direct and will result in reducing transit time. The construction of this route would have the least impact on traffic and other impediments that would result if the King St route is chosen. The King St E corridor is a constraint today with 3 lanes of traffic and would be even more congested if a bidirectional rail system is added.	The only large challenge would be the river crossing but less challenging than building a new bridge alongside 2 existing bridges on the King St route. The engineering and construction costs for the alternate route are quite clear and defined. The K2 route could create unknown costs. (pay me now or pay me later)	The alternate route option is clear and decisive. This path has the least amount of community and traffic impact, both pre and post construction.
E40	it looks fine and much more straightforward. Seemed weird that it was going to be over or under hwy 8 to get to king street to cross the river there instead. The hospital does not need a stop as some people seem to think. It doesn't draw that much traffic and is 5 minutes from either sportsworld or fairway.	nil, seems like best option	nil, seems like best option
E41	route would be faster	Less populous area?	Speed at which the train can go, and the density of the route. Needs to go through developed areas with growing populations.

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E42	it's probably quicker	probably involves more disruption to existing uses and expense	
E43	Is it a shorter river crossing? That would be good Fewer environmental and financial impacts More direct - save travelling time	Convincing drivers it's a better choice Convincing hidden valley people it won't impact their community	Is wind on that bridge more forceful than further up river?
E44	I like that it has fewer engineering challenges, which could potentially save time and money.	I would prefer to see an LRT stop at River and King to service Chicopee Ski Hill, Chicopee Tube Park, the Hospital and surrounding area to maximize accessibility.	What are the implications if the River Road proposed extension does not come to pass? I have concerns that this may add delays and complications to completing this phase of the LRT project.
E45	Hospital access.		
E46	- direct - minimal environmental impact on new	- appears to serve a new area of town but no station is included	The objective of LRT is to create a direct and quick link. Adding unnecessary bends and detours detract from any travel time savings incurred by ION.
E47	River Road extension provides another alternative. Scenic route and environmental impacts are minimal.	The addition of more stops on any Kitchener leg will only make things more difficult for Cambridge clients who commute to Kitchener or Waterloo.	An LRT stop should not be considered at Freeport Hospital, that could increase travel time due to loading or unloading of patients. GRT bus and accessible services are sufficient for this long term care facility.
E48	Seems more direct. looks like it saves on crossing the highway twice	Crossing the grand but you have to anyways	I like the k3b option
E49	I strongly prefer option F2b-K3b over option F2a-K2. Option F2b-K3b is a much more direct route between Fairway and Sportsworld and will presumably result in a shorter travel time. This option will have no impact on the existing road network during construction (no impact on King St. E) - a minor consideration.	Potential impact on the natural environment.	Minimizing the impact on the natural environment.

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
	This option also eliminates the chance of incidents on the road network impacting the LRT network (ie: a vehicle crash that is blocking the tracks).		
E50	avoids Hidden Drive connects to intercity buses at Sportsworld k3b serves more people and businesses	none	none
E51	considers existing infrastructure and environmental impact	Doesn't serve many important destinations. Could go to Freeport, Conestoga College, some of the employers along Maple Grove Rd., or maybe even collaborate with GO/ Via to connect to intercity train service (the rail is right there). Another opportunity might be to stop at a carpool parking lot near the 401.	
E52	I like that it follows the CP line down to Sportsworld and makes a fast trip between Fairway Station and Sportsworld Station	N.A.	N.A.
E53	Although it is more direct, I believe that a stop along K2 would provide LRT access to a high density of potential riders. This is a lower income area and therefore the surrounding residents are more likely to opt towards using public transit.	I think it would be ideal if the LRT stop was with the Greyhound/GRT station on Maple Grove - would make everything connected.	The potential for the LRT in the future - if you do not build where there are people, additional stops can not be added in the future.
E54	I like the directness of F2b-K3b. The route is shorter, and less time will be spent on slow turning movements. If it runs parallel to the highway, it won't be subject to traffic speeds and can travel more quickly as well. I did like the idea of from the previous staff recommendation for a new King Street	I'm a little surprised by how far back the proposed stop is from the Sportsworld Dr/Pioneer Tower intersection. It seems far less central to the commercial area, and further away from the bus terminal. Does this have to do with traffic operations at Maple Grove?	Figure out how GRT and intercity bus operations will integrate with the Sportsworld stop, since the existing bus station will not be directly on the route.

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
	bridge with active transportation on the old one.		
E55	with the EA already complete (i believe) for the River road extension, the red tape for this section should be minimal. if construction of the river road extension and phase 2 were to be conducted simultaneous, impact to traffic could be minimized. If unable or unwilling to delay the river road extension to coincide with phase 2 construction, River road could be constructed with phase 2 in mind in order to reduce the time needed to rebuild the road with ION.	the construction of a new independent river crossing for ION will increase costs and time to build. It does not service the residential area to the NE of hwy 8, behind Freeport hospital	consider combining F2b and K2. it uses the River road extension to reduce the need for an EA and can be fit into existing construction plans to minimize traffic impact. a stop can be placed at or near Freeport allowing easy public transit access to the hospital and access to ION for the residential area behind Freeport. this would also allow the use of the existing (CP/CN) rail lines from river road to east of the grand river. this would save cost and time and would save the visuals of the iconic grand river bridge.
E56	I like how it is more direct and is impacted less by traffic and intersections.	The lack of a stop at river/king or at Freeport hospital. Stops are necessary for the lrt to be widely used, and for intensification. Also, the greater cost of a new structure over the grand river.	Please remember that part of the whole point of lrt is to bring transit to neighbourhoods. Without a stop somewhere around river road, residents and workers won't have access to lrt despite the fact that it runs right through their neighbourhood.
E57	I think F2b-K3b looks more direct - it's much less meandering than F2a-K2. If there won't be any additional stops, then there's not much benefit to going the more indirect route.	I don't think there are any opportunities to build a new stop in the future with this new route option. With the K2 route, you could eventually build an additional stop in Chicopee area. Routing the LRT along highway 8 makes it very hard to attract development or ever build a new stop there.	
E58	Looks direct and efficient. Good choice.		
E59	this route would serve more commercial areas than staying on the rail corridor entirely	severe gradient going down Shantz hill- would land acquisition not be more costly this way?	

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E60	I like that it is a shorter route, and will not impact the heritage bridge or the heritage homes or the river bank drive community in the same way	Being off the rail corridor in the King street area between the highway 8 and the 401 west on ramp (to london) is troublesome. Traffic is already a nightmare and with waste water trunk sewers from the East Side, and regional road improvements planned in the coming decade for the same stretch means the Deer Ridge Community with only 2 ACSESSES will all but be held ransom for MANY years! This sucks as a resident, and would really appreciate if the Region could do some imaginative traffic routing for residents to make sure my 12km commute to and from work doesn't take 50 minutes as it sometimes has in the past year during 401 accidents/construction delays!	Despite my HUGE issues with current traffic on King near sportworld, I do believe this is a great route and suggest that MTO be lobbied to speed up their capital funding to construct the flyover to westbound 401 from highway 8. If this 401 bound traffic can be taken off King street then perhaps construction of LRT could be palatable. I SO WISH that some angel would fly down from heaven and fix the relationship between the Region and the rail line so that the rail corridor could be an option through Kitchener and into the Preston area. I am going to ask baby jesus to grant this wish this Christmas....it would make all the Stage 2 heartaches disappear.
E61	More direct and will be quicker when thinking that this is a connector to Cambridge. It's more likely to be used to travel between cities if it takes a more direct path.	Perhaps does not service as many stops. There are no east-west options for GRT to fill in the gaps. Overshoots a hospital that charges for parking and so is primed to be a destination for transit.	
E62	It's direct. The views will be lovely.	I would like a stop at River Road and Highway 8 for bus connectivity from the Morgan Ave / Chicopee area. There's no reason we have to funnel those people all the way up to Fairview or all the way down to Sportsworld to access the rest of the network.	Please place a stop at River Road and Highway 8.
E63	Straighter and avoids narrow king st.	Need to connect to the hospital	
E64	It appears to be quite a bit more efficient in terms of both construction costs and time travelled.	I think it would be important to have a stop at Freeport; otherwise why make that detour?	Would people take advantage of getting on at Freeport?

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E65	The new potential route is much more direct and would provide much faster LRT service instead of weaving through the Freeport area. This option also provides the potential for a unique and distinct bridge over the Grand River to serve as a gateway feature for the area, perhaps a cable-stayed bridge?	Having an elevated section of the LRT alongside Highway 8 due to the significant grade variations that doesn't look awful will be challenging. During the design process care should be taken to blend in the structure alongside the highway with the surrounding landscape if possible.	I believe consideration need to be given to an additional station at Highway 401. I am supportive of the already-proposed station for Sportsworld Crossing (which would also service the adjacent Deer Ridge Centre) but there are limited opportunities for a transit facility including a Park and Ride and Bus Terminal at this location. A additional station serving as a dedicated Park N Ride Station at Highway 401 could be built on land already owned by MTO. There will still be a significantly large parcel of empty land bound by Highway 8, Highway 401, King Street and the businesses along Gateway Park Drive even after the proposed Highway 8/401 interchange is reconfigured that could accommodate a large Park and Ride and Intercity (Go/Greyhound) and GRT Bus Terminal.
E66	More direct, faster route	Less visibility, far less access to local neighbourhoods, environmental challenges with Hidden Valley	Need to consider a stop at Freeport Hospital and for the Chicopee Community. Sure one might be able to take a bus from Sportsworld but these could be busy destinations where accessibility is important - particularly if one considers that this might not just be an LRT from mall to mall but also from hospital to hospital...
E67	Direct, fast connection from Fairview Mall to Sportsworld. Take advantage of River Road extension road allowances; minimizing property impacts	Widening of Hwy 8 bridge over Grand River, but this is better than building a brand new bridge in route K2	Impacts on Natural Environment, which should be less than widening roads and highways

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E68	I like that the new route is more direct and also has fewer places to interact with other modes of transportation, giving likely higher speed through the lowest jobs/residents area.		
E69	I like that it utilizes the new River Rd extension so the two can be built at the same time to maximize efficiency and reduce cost. I also like that using the highway section of the corridor will reduce the overall impact on surrounding communities and environment.	The cost of the bridge over the Grand River might be high as well as ensuring the construction of the light rail does not negatively impact the sensitive environment along what is not Hidden Valley Rd. Additionally, the section of King St through the Sportsworld area is very busy, so managing traffic needs in that area must be carefully considered.	I would strongly suggest considering a mini transit hub in the Sportsworld area. Being right off the 401 make this areas ideal for a park and ride for out of town guests and commuters. Additionally, it is a good hub for intercity buses (GO, Greyhound, etc) and intracity buses coming from areas not serviced by the LRT (Hespeler Village, Conestoga College, new route in the Pioneer Tower neighbourhood, etc). I mention this because station location for the LRT will be heavily influenced by these other factors. My suggestion would be place the station next to a piece of land that could, in future, service as this transit hub (like the one currently in the Sportsworld Dr/Sportsworld Crossing area, or the empty lot at King and Sportsworld Crossing).
E71	Do NOT like it! Not a favorable route, it destroys hidden valley road and the environmentally sensitive area adjacent to it	LRT 2 route should NOT be encroaching on green space	Forget it its a non starter, opposition is strong
E73	I don't like very much about it. If the stated goal of the LRT is to spur development and to get people out of cars, why would you divert away from a major section of the population in Stanley Park/Chicopee (especially low income Chicopee) and divert it onto the highway were it will not spur	NO PEOPLE to serve. There are large amounts of people who live east and south of Fairview mall that are being completely ignored by this ridiculous diversion onto the highway.	There are significant opportunities for redevelopment along old King and down to Sportsworld that are being ignored by this route change. If the stated intention was to intensify and drive development this route does not do that. It seems to be mainly driven by the need to get to Cambridge the

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
	development or get people out of cars. Seems to only meet the needs of engineers. This route isn't about people or development.		fastest rather than actually achieving the stated objectives.
E74	This is a more direct route which will improve travel time, and has the benefit of being in an area already affected by highway 8 as opposed to having impact on an area that has not had significant work		
E75	-it looks quicker -it looks to have less impact on environment (less water crossing and less land use)	-none	-none that I can think of
E76	I don't like anything about it. One way or another the route needs to go out near Toyota plant where there are many many thousands of people working. It should also be an option for people using the airport.	The whole concept for Cambridge is different than Kitchener because it can't go through the centre of town. Sections like Hespeler, West Galt most of Preston, and almost all for Galt lose out.	The route needs to focus on where people need to go such as Power Centre, Cambridge Centre, CAMBRIDGE HOSPITAL, South Cambridge Centre, and may down around City Hall
E77	This optional route from Fairview to Sportsworld does not appear to have anything likeable about it.	The first main challenge would be the expense and potential for delays to constructing a new bridge spanning the Grand River. The lack of potential for future development along the K3b portion of the line.	Instead of either K2 or K3b, there is potential for reduced expense, traffic and enviro impact through the co-use of the existing rail corridor and bridge through to Maple Grove. Is there not undeveloped land at the Maple Grove/Sportsworld and Hwy 8 interchange which could be used for a terminal with commuter parking (people could leave their cars there instead of bringing them into downtown core areas), and connecting to the Go Transit system?
E78	it will help people get to kitchener faster than the 200 IXPRESS to conestoga mall		the section along Hespeler road by the cambridge center mall should be two lanes

TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES			
Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?	What challenges do you see with the additional route option?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?
			instead of three lanes of traffic because there might be a lot of traffic problems.
E79	K3b offers additional options for stops along King if the area further develops.		None of the routes shown on here include the option that was at the meeting at Cambridge City Hall of taking it down Homer Watson and along George Street into Galt. I believe that is the best route. I am opposed to anything that goes down Eagle Street in Preston.
E80	i appreciate the simplification of following hwy 8 - but you are using old King street which is unacceptable! The congestion for the entry to our city is a very bad idea. I recommend building a LRT lane across the Hwy at cost similar to expanding the current plan for River Road Extension. Then use the EAST side of HWY 8 to run into the Sportsworld area. King Street east is a heavy artery to the city from the western part of SWO/Cambridge. truck traffic and car volume is at capacity .There is very little ridership in Deer Ridge and Grand Hill/Settlers Grove/Pinegrove. Development opportunities are on other side of Hwy 8 so the route K1 is a better solution. follow the railway under the 401 and connect to the abandoned rail line behind cambridge surplus? Better Yet do not incur the cost of tunnel and hop across at Speedsville. Use a Bus to service Preston and build a nice terminal at Concession and Eagle....	You have not addressed the use of shantz hill. you have not addressed the hwy 8 westbound traffic. your plan steals traffic capacity from old king St through deer ridge/Sportsworld. You have not addressed the need for multi mode terminal. You failed to demonstrate any safety provisions for pedestrians transferring from bus to LRT. if business development is the objective then the LRT needs to be closer to the industry on east side of Hwy 8 where a current plan is forming for new Industrial complex.	#1 - huge need the hwy 8 bypass to the west(401 to London) this will remove ~50% of traffic. > need to get MTO involved! #2 - space for parkade/multimode transfer will mandate bus lane for transfer lanes. this is not possible as King Street has been built up to capacity and is not a proper plan for traffic flow into Waterloo region from the southwest part of the province. Bus Lay-by spots are best placed in multi mode terminal. #3 - You have not understood that Old King Street is a 50km/hr HIGHWAY... and should not be used to have pedestrians trying to hop a train in middle of the road. trains stopping and starting every 15 minutes will impede the flow of car and truck traffic on King Street. SAFETY??? #4 - negotiate with CP to parallel the rail as set out in K1! then opt for either a route across the top of the 401 from ATS to Speedsville, else you have to contend with the mess at bottom of Shantz Hill with hundreds of expropriations. (Political suicide for regional council)

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E81	F2b-K3b is a more direct connection to Sportsworld and will likely be faster as it avoids the King Fairway Road intersection.	The crossing over the Grand River is likely to be very expensive, particularly given the differences in elevation of the two banks.	Since the LRT initiative is just as much about encouraging intensification and development as it is about moving people it would be useful to know how this option compares to the Fairway-King option in terms of development potential.
E82	Direct connection from Fairview to sportsworld	Just construction, in my opinion we should have 24/7 construction with concrete pouring and etc at night, etc etc, our problem is usually we only have one more shift, we should at least 2	I don't see any
E83			cost if the proposed route minimizes costs and environmental impact then good but if the cost is greater and the environmental impact is minimal then no changes should be made
E84	Significantly shortens the route. Eliminates two grade separations of Highway 8.	Providing effective bus connections to ION for those living in Chicopee/Centreville. Congestion on Fairway between King and Wilson will still be a reality, although the River Road extension will open up access. I understand that the grade South of Highway 8 is a concern, but will elevating the LRT ROW along Highway 8 really be less expensive than ballasted track and a retaining wall? The existing location of the Sportsworld station is not the best location for a park and ride. There is an abundance of MTO land closer to the 401 that can help fulfill the function of a Park and Ride without	If ION is to run on the South side of Highway 8, I see no real reason to bring it into the King St median at Sportsworld. There are not a whole lot of driveway accesses on the South side, and keeping the route on the South side has better potential to eliminate conflict with the MTO regarding the ramps at Highway 401. The King Street interchange can be easily retrofit to allow for access from the North (East) side of King/Shantz Hill only using the existing ramps.

**TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
		sacrificing development potential around Sportsworld.	
E85	I like it running along the west side of the highway K3b	The existing hwy 8 desperately needs a ramp to the wb 401 to get traffic off King now and then close the ramp to eb 401 from Shantz Hill	I don't think it will make a difference not going by Freeport Hospital with k3b being the easiest to work with
E86	The reduced environmental impact of using the Hwy 8 corridor is useful and could help reduce the expense.	It seems like there's less possibility for development along the Hwy 8 corridor than there would be along Old King and the future River Road extension	Whatever route is chosen through south Kitchener, it must be placed so that a stop in Preston is possible on the next leg.
E87	Seems to be less expensive and faster. I'm not sure what purpose going down old king will serve(?)	None	possible push back from deer ridge home owners
E88	More direct. It sounded like Freeport would not be usefully served because of a large hill.	None	The region could consider a stepwise approach to Phase 2 by extending gradually to Sportworld and then onward.
E89	Other than the loss of the beneficial stop at the hospital, I think it's great. Over that river would make taking the LRT a beautiful trip. I lived in Ottawa for a time and the best part of everyone's morning commute was traveling along green areas or near water. The F2b-K3b route would also allow for a much faster trip!	Running along the highway is a GREAT idea, it should run along the 401 as well. However, I worry about highway traffic slowing the LRT down somehow.	Really consider timing. Even 5 minutes faster seriously counts towards people taking the LRT to work over their cars. If the LRT runs right along the highway and seems faster in times of traffic- that is amazing advertising for the LRT and traffic-raged people may start to take it.
E91	More straightforward.	I think there would be fewer challenges	
E92	Following the Highway across the river makes complete sense.		
E93	Lower environmental impact. Seems to be a more direct route and avoid populated	Potential cost increases with development of separate structure.	Quickest trip times, maybe higher speed availability. And future expansion purposes for the new structure.

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
	areas; therefore a potential to for a quicker route time?		
E94	Seems to have less of an impact and is more of a direct line	seems like there would have to be a lot of excavation along the first half and there are homes perched right at the top of the hill	
E95	Much better alternative	Easier than previous	
E96	it keeps it off an already very crowded traffic corridor (king street) that already has too much traffic going onto 401 west and east due to volume on highway 8	I would like to see F2a to k3b staying away from most residential and king street is the way to go, Sportsworld is also a very busy place but there is at least a transport hub there.	there is too much happening in this end of town, we are too built up already, there is no width, highway 8 is already backed up everyday onto 401 east, king street is also backed up onto 401 east and Shantz hill. 401 west is always busy at the king street on ramp. There needs to be better escape routes from Waterloo and Kitchener onto 401 and not through highway 8 or king
E97	-potential for high train speeds -less interaction with Vehicular Traffic	-lack of development opportunities	Potential future widening of highway
E98		Cost	Better to go to Freeport for seniors
E99	King St already a large mover of traffic. Would not disturb nearby quieter subdivisions.		
E100	This route provides an independent structure for the LRT opposed to already clogging up dense traffic areas in the region (king street, sportsworld)	I see less challenges with the additional route option as there are with the preliminary route option	
E101	It seems it would be a quicker option with a more direct route	No stop at freeport.	Cost of both routes
E102	Fiscally responsible. Environmentally responsible. Likely will be faster to get	Potential disruption the hwy 8 during construction, as if we need any more issues	N/A

**TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
	through that section of LRT. No risk of land expropriation. Likely better option.	with that highway. Doesn't service Freeport directly.	
E103	I don't like anything about it	It will cause traffic delays for motorists	Find out if the taxpayers in this area even want or need LRT. I have yet to talk to anyone who thinks it's a good idea.
E104	It extends to sportsworld - smart move	very congested traffic wise as it is at King and River road.	
E105	I like that it is straight forward and that it will be visible from the highway, hopefully allowing for more people to see it in use.	There is no stop at the hospital. I feel that the change from having a stop at the hospital is a bad choose.	how much faster is the route going to be now that there is one less stop.
E107	Shorter route with less impact from road traffic signals	Potential delays from further environmental studies, like what was required for river road extension	Environmental studies
E108	I like that it is a more direct route. Runs next to existing highway, so no manor neighbourhood disruptions.		Cost, construction time length, and future transit expansions.
E109	Its more straight and direct. The only benefit for the route going to the Freeport site is if there was a stop		
E111	Nothing. Will cost money for a service not needed		
E113	Unless you are putting a stop on the K2 route to service the neighborhoods around the grand river hospital, F2b and K3b route is more direct and less obtrusive to the neighborhoods in the area.	None,	None this is better.
E114	It looks like this route could work with limited impact on housing		
E115	F2b-K3b		

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E116	Seems more direct (and hopefully faster?). As well, the idea of reducing environmental impacts is important.	No comment.	What is the effect on travel times between stops? The new option seems more direct - I hope whichever segment route option is chosen results in faster travel. If there's no difference in travel time, which one offers the more scenic trip over the beautiful Grand River?
E117		-environmental study may cause delays -potential environmental harm is not worth the re-routing, stay with the original K2	-which route has the greatest potential ridership for people not only residing but working on or near the K2 or proposed options?
E119	More direct route saves time, faster service will bring more passengers, more use.	Costs to build bridge over the river clearly need to be weighed	A Sportsworld stop is a must - this is a large shopping area, to not include it in on ION would just promote more sprawl, more car use and everything the ION aims not to be.
E120	In favor of route alternative		Speed of total transit from KW to Cambridge
E122	It goes to sportsworld	Will it tunnel or bridge over river?	
E123	It seems more direct	There is potentially more infrastructure cost if another bridge must be built over the Grand River.	
E124	Nothing ...I feel that the LRT should be kept off the main roads and run along side the roadway..there is enough congestion with traffic in these areas that the LRT will never alleviate. The K3B looks fine until just when it reaches King St. East, then it should cross the highway and go in behind Sportsworld to match up with GO Bus Station to make access to transit to Toronto a little easier and to touch the employees that work on the		

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
	Maple Grove Route. It should stay off of King Street East where the traffic is		
E125	Makes sense.	nothing in particular.	
E126	I don't. They avoid public services like long term care at the Freeport Hospital and runs it along a highway which defeats the purpose of transit options. Unless of course you don't plan to have a stop along king st. Anyway (a wasted opportunity).	There won't be an option to put a stop along the highway. You might have time to correct the fact that you don't have a stop between fairway and sportsworld now.	
E127			Missing a huge opportunity to run down Maple Grove. This would run it by Toyota and a large industrial park allowing many commenters easy access to work
E128	The K3b route makes sense, allowing greater speeds over a shorter distance, with fewer turns, and avoiding the narrower section of King Street.		
E130	Keeps LRT traffic away from narrow King Street corridor. No significant environmental impact.	Difficult to put into place between highway and Hidden Valley Road.	--
E131	Not intrusive and follows highway Since the route has less engineering challenges, it will likely be cheaper as well	Grand River crossing and environmental area below may be impacted during construction Trail will be unavailable for a period	This route is better since it does not go down an already busy corridor (King Street)
E132	Good plan, as King street is very busy its good to avoid King street	none	none
E133	More direct.	More costly due to much larger structure required. River crossing and elevation change is much larger at that point.	Potential ridership that would benefit from a stop at Grand River hospital. Time savings with K3b route vs. K2 route

<b>TABLE C1: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE KITCHENER ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route option (F2b-K3b)?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route option?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route option?</b>
E134	"Directness" will work in your favour to avoid public pressure for stop at hospital. I see an opportunity to carry out F2b-K3b as the "phase one" of phase two to Cambridge. Build the infrastructure with River Road extension, implement bridge, monitor results/usage. Sportsworld provides an effective park/ride facility and connection to out-of-town buses. Implementing this segment as a first phase would allow you to monitor how many people drive/connect to ION from the Preston area, and would help rationalize the Preston corridor.		Unless a stop can be considered for Grand River Hospital (ridership potential), this route seems more direct and "competitive" to the highway users that will see it every day.
E135	Shorter overall route, minimizes traffic impact.	No possibility to add stop on King St in the future. Possibly higher construction cost from the longer bridge span required.	Potential impact to transit time.
E136	Quicker connection through to Sportsworld and beyond. Less traffic disruptions.	Bridge over the Grand, though I appreciate that it'll fully span the river - great news!	Potential loss of customers and reduced access from people living in the Chicopee neighbourhoods
E137	Connection to King Street. Additional infrastructure to what the city has invested in already is always good.	Keeping up with speed, compared to an iexpress bus.	Consider adding stop at Freeport campus?

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
E1	Nothing.	They're less direct, slower, have more turns, and some of them by-pass areas that are exactly where a stop would be most useful and allow for the most new density.	If this area has a stop of any kind, then there will be large incentive and pressure to intensify the surroundings. The area will change substantially regardless, so trying to preserve a few houses or a neighbourhood feel isn't going to work. Don't let that stop you from making the best long-term choice.
E2	Possible route over Fairway road or Sportsworld intersection to Hespeler road and all sidelines r in the future going to Preston from Hespeler road. As time, money and need proves itself. A direct link to Guelph in the future over HWY 24. to downtown. Lots of land to be developed. Under No condition going down Shantz Hill and the existing neighbourhood in Preston. There are good bus services available.	The changing weather climate, Hydro interruptions, snowclearing and accidents are likely to bring traffic to a stop as it is with the present traffic on the 400's highways.	Again time, financing and future results. Good luck.
E3	M-M1 are the ones I would love to see as it seems like has the least impact on residents and goes through a park and over the River. Also seems like it would be least impacted by traffic to get to Eagle St	Some go through residential areas that are quiet. I imagine the residents in that area would not be too happy.	Traffic, time of travel, impact on local residents, environmental impact to park and river
E4	Q, G, R avoid Eagle St. V, W, X could go faster as they are not near cars or pedestrians.	Don't like the options that go through Riverside park. What environmental impact would there be for routes going through or near Riverside Park?	Using the rail right of way under the 401, as opposed to coming down Shantz Hill.
E5	Nothing	1. Closure of local businesses due to lack of access during construction. 2. Increase of non-porous surfaces 3. Negative environmental impact 4. Multitude of wires and tracks throughout the city which will not help with the current and future congestion	We need to be able to say "NO" as an option. With the development of more efficient and emission lowered vehicles as well as electric vehicles, there is more of a negative impact along with higher costs in the development of the LRT than the need.

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
		<p>issues, regardless of the bypasses being built to remove transport trucks from going through Hespeler Road. 5. Significant cost that will not meet the need of commuters in the area. 6. Cambridge is made up of 3 core areas and the Village of Blair, there is no central point to make it convenient or easily accessible to the full community. 7. Rapid buses are a more readily available and economically lower in cost to be the better option. 8. If a GO train may come to Cambridge, we do not also require the LRT. 9. The GO train is the better option, while rapid buses are inter-city.</p>	<p>Replace with Rapid Bus system and GO Train as we have more residents commuting to and from Toronto than when the plans were first considered.</p>
E6	<p>M, M1, V Y seem to make the most sense and avoid a "scorched earth" through the neighbourhoods at the southern end of Eagle Street</p>		<p>Would like to know where stops are and how many? For instance, is there a stop at Concession and Eagle?</p>
E7	<p>shantz hill and eagle look the best in terms of ridership and expense. I don't like the idea of building through a park. Existing rail lines look like a good use ( VWX sections)</p>	<p>Rail line becoming too meandering and long; too few riders because stops are away from major streets.</p>	<p>whether there is potential for the city to grow into the area along rail routes. If not, we should take the pain now and do the work directly along Eagle.</p>
E8	<p>-less trackage directly on Eagle Street -using existing but defunct trackland for options V-W-X</p>	<p>-all additional options still utilize Eagle Street which is narrow, hilly, busy at peak hours and has many residences close to the road</p>	<p>-traffic congestion at choke points and intersections -land around Eagle Street is extremely hilly, what kind of land needs to be excavated to facilitate tram lines? -How will any excavation effect nearby residences health and safety? -Is taking the LR <i>[comment not completed]</i></p>
E9		<p>Keep the route in a built up area. Taking part of it off Eagle is OK with me.</p>	

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
E11	Any of VWYZ seem like a reasonable way to bypass the area (assuming the travel times aren't significantly longer and costs aren't exorbitant).	All of G to R are problematic. M1 bypasses the Preston core entirely. Transit isn't worth building if it doesn't serve the areas its users need to go. If we are going to be more concerned with the convenience of drivers than responsible transit planning we probably shouldn't build anything. Additionally, M1 appears straight through the heart of Riverside Park which would irreparably harm one of the city's best public spaces and could present significant safety issues for park users. All the other options from G to R seem as though they would have a significant impact on LRT travel times due to the turn at King and Eagle, the additional turn at King and Fountain in O > L > H > R, and the additional turn at Shantz Hill Road and the 401 on ramp and the significantly longer route of M > M2 > H > R. P, P2 and Q all appear as though they may also have significant environmental impacts.	
E12	They may avoid people's homes thus not causing noise issues.	They are out of the way, passing through fewer populated areas, but then the tram line should be going through populated areas so people can walk to the nearest station. We don't want the stations to be far away from populated areas. Some of the combination of extra routes are too convoluted; the tram line should be as direct as possible. Don't make it as convoluted as many of the bus routes zig-zagging through neighbourhoods so they can cover more people, but then it also takes the bus forever to get anywhere. The tram line should be as direct as possible	

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
		so speed of getting from one side of the Region to the other gives it an advantage over buses. Certainly don't increase the number of tram stations because that is also a problem with buses as they stop at every corner and become inefficient at getting to places in a reasonable amount of time.	
E13		congestion/traffic, impact on home owners	
E14	M and M1 seem to utilize the already built train corridor and would cause less impact on eagle st/main st	the train heading through riverside park could be an environmental impact.	environmental impact
E15	The main thing that I like about M1, M2, is that it gives the people in Preston another option other than using the already congested Shantz Hill area, Moore Street and Eagle Street South. However the M route seems awkward and I don't like the use of King Street East to get to M. I also like V, W and X because it takes the train off of Eagle Street, YES YES YES and saves a lot of residences from being destructed. Again if King Street East In Kitchener is not used and if you put a route on the other side of Hwy. 8 you connect that route direct to M1 or M2.	Again, remove the route from King St. East to ease the congestion along here between Kitchener and Preston and put the route on the other side of Hwy. 8 in the green space it would connect either direct with M1 or M2. The other big stumbling block is taking it through Riverside Park in Preston which is very much loved and very well used. You would have to be delicate in how you take this route through the Park. Possibly running this along the 401 corridor to connect with Speedsville Rd. in Preston is an option.	As I have stated before, forget the highway congestion on King Street East, Shantz Hill, Eagle Street areas. The people that live there know this is next to a nightmare. Put the route in space that is not now being used on a daily basis. Keep it behind the businesses at sportsworld and possibly put it along the 401 to make it visible and something to see. Possibly you can create a stop at Speedsville Road near the Knights of Columbus Hall and have buses transport the people to other areas and possibly a new Go Bus Station. Also taking the route into the Walmart in Cambridge which is the smart centre and using this as main hub for other transportation would be great, and then taking the route along Conestoga Blvd., which would connect to the Cambridge Centre. This route would allow Hespeler people to get the train at the Smart Centre. It would connect the two malls, being Smart Centre and Cambridge

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			Centre, therefore alleviating the congestion that you will cause on Hespeler Road, which is another nightmare. Come on guys, put on your real thinking caps and make some smart moves and get this right not make the whole route the mess that you are planning on making.
E16	Minimizes the impact on the old Town of Preston. It will cost less to build since less homes and businesses will not have to be destroyed.	Minimizing the impact on Riverside Park.	As with the current primary route selection, you need to consider compensation packages or payments to residents who will now be living with a train running past their homes which will impact the market value of their homes. Your organization needs to be honest on the issue of environmental impact to existing residents and be prepared to address the issue of compensation. Otherwise you might find yourself as a target of a civil action because it will be relatively easy for effected residents to prove damages. I would suggest a 20 year property tax holiday.
E17	Keeps the train off Shantz Hill and Eagle Street where it is most narrow and already congested.	Looks very circuitous. Possibly slower transit time for the train.	
E18	Avoid Preston as this has a big effect on the residents of this part of the Region.		The people who pay the taxes not the ones who take our taxes.
E19	First, I'm strongly in favour of V, W, X. It removes congestion and neighbourhood concerns on Eagle. The means of crossing the Speed River all have impacts, so no	Added distance of V, W, X, but higher running speed due to dedicated ROW should mitigate it.	Not considered here is an at-grade crossing with CP just East of the current Speed River bridge. This would extend route G across King Street and use the vacant land on the North side of King as the station stop (Ex-

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
	real guidance here except good luck. Not really in favour of M routes though.		Daisy-Hedon/Preston Furniture building lot). A specially controlled at-grade crossing with CP (with height allowances/moving overhead wires for auto racks) would place ION strategically to the North of CP. The CP river siding would be removed and CP moved closer to Cambridge Surplus. This would minimize land extension/shore fortification with the Speed River. The biggest gain is not having to build a mixed road (Eagle) and LRT bridge over CP. This also removes an eyesore from Riverside Park as well as the congestion point at King and Eagle.
E20			What major public institutions (including parks and trails) are best served. What route comes closest to the greatest population concentrations? What routes work the best with existing and new active transport infrastructure.
E21	I do not like the addition routes. Keep the original please.	Too close to the River.	Too expensive.
E22	I do not like the new additional routes. I don't believe that any routes/segments should go through Riverside Park. While I understand the politics behind adding the additional route options I believe the original N3 was and still is the best route.	I don't think the new routes are best environmentally or where there would be the most number of passengers to take the LRT.	Environmental issues need to trump and concerns from people who reside on or near the original and best route (N3).
E23	Ability to avoid green space in Preston. Should help reduce traffic in Preston area. Go with m, m1 , v, w, x. Uses existing rail.		Traffic. Impact on green space ( which we need more of)

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
E24	I would probably go N3 to V W X, that way it still gets the stop but avoids eagle street as much as possible. Plus, then the train can go straight through that intersection. Better than M and M1 since it just avoids downtown and goes through the park.	Having to go through the neighbourhood south of King St.	As long as it was kept on the North side going East on the N3 path, then my suggestion above would work out great.
E25	The route should run across maple grove and down speedsville to concession then make a left up eagle st to 24 hwy		The savings of not expropriating houses along eagle st and displacing long term residents of the Preston area. This will not be creating a place for homeless people to set up camp under the new bridge in urban center speedsville is also a lesser grade for the rail to travel up and down. This route will allow for better transportation of workers in the industrial section as well as the new subdivisions being built at the top of maple grove rd. There is also a lot less displacement of people and houses as this route I propose appears to be in the middle of developing and will better serve that expansion.
E26	I am still having difficulty understanding your maps. They need to be made much simpler when asking the public to comment.	There is not room to add a train rail to Shantz Hill. This area was just improved because of the high volume of traffic through it, and the traffic congestion it caused multiple times a day. Taking away a lane would set it right back again, and make all the money spent on improving this area wasted. Sending a train over the bridge on King street will also cause huge traffic problems. In addition, this bridge is almost 100 years old and may not be able to sustain a track and trains.	

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
E27	<p>Nothing, I don't want to see the LRT on Eagle street. For me M to M1 to V, W, X Seems Perfect!!</p> <p>Although, Going down through Preston Downtown should also be an option. Skipping Eagle completely and going Straight down through downtown to Bishop should be considered?</p>	<p>Lack of places to stop. Traffic Congestion in the Shantz Hill, King street, Fountain street areas.</p>	<p>The new routes seem to have less impact on Property, people's homes as they are more of a less developed area.</p>
E28	<p>Options V W X Y will undoubtedly have the lowest rate of ridership transfers on the entire line (if stops are even proposed in this area). I imagine this is by design to piggyback existing rail, and nothing more than cost savings.</p> <p>I do like the idea of coming in from Speedsville, (via a route from the airport). And that would bypass the entire mess at the foot of Shantz Hill / King / Eagle Sts.</p>	<p>M &amp; M1 would be the only alternative option I would even start to consider using in this proposal.</p> <p>The problem is, it runs through the middle of Riverside Park.</p> <p>Maybe Waterloo was fine with losing half of their park for this project, I'm not ok with it happening here.</p> <p>The area is prone to flooding. Too much park land would have to be sacrificed for this option.</p>	<p>I think before anyone who is qualified to vote on this, votes on this. They should spend a month at rush hour (both morning &amp; afternoon) sitting in this area. I say sitting for a reason.</p> <p>I believe this area has been under some form of construction since about October 2016. I'll be shocked if all the construction work is finished by October 2018.</p> <p>Here we are proposing to more than likely affect this section of town for potentially at least 2 more years in the next decade? It's too narrow and congested now as it is. How, without massive amounts of land expropriation, does anyone propose to fit a rail line into the mix?</p> <p>There's not enough space for a train in this area. I would again recommend going to the airport, then you could route it down Speedsville to Eagle. Speedsville Should have been changed to 4 lanes long before the new development at Maple Grove even started, perhaps we can incorporate rail into a new widening design, and lobby the province to help pay for that project.</p>

TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES			
Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
			Not to mention the grade is much more gradual (and can be modified easier) in that section of town. Eagle St just does not have the room to support this project between King & Concession, without causing major disruptions. I mean both during, and after construction.
E30			This is still useless as it does nothing to deal with the traffic coming and going from around Toyota and the new business park back into the rest of Cambridge. There should be a light rail stop there to help reduce the volume of traffic in that area prompting more people to use the system to get to and from work.
E31	- less disruption via M, O, P to the trail by the river since initial route crossed over the river and joined Chopin/Eagle - most options still have convenient stops in downtown Preston - this infrastructure is important and as a citizen of Waterloo Regi <i>[comment not completed]</i>	- some, like M and M1, essentially bypass downtown Preston which would impede usability. If I can't walk or bike to a stop from south Preston it will be inconvenient to use. - route Q still seems disruptive to the green space and walking trails	- the short term controversy will be outweighed by importance of having this valuable infrastructure - I for one am strongly in favour of having the LRT in Preston
E32	the additional route options do a better job of minimizing impact to residential homes in Preston	don't like the idea of it running on Fountain St - there is already limited room there and traffic issues these seem like good options Q>G>R P>P2>G>R M>M2>H>R	impacts to residences and traffic through the area

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
E34	The attempt to balance preservation of natural areas and maintaining neighbourhood quality.	Not everyone is going to be happy. That's just the way it goes.	Costs involved. Are there any infrastructure repairs in these areas that were planned in the near future that could be done simultaneously? Will any routes force the tram to drive in a live-traffic lane? (Should instantly disqualify that route option, that's the whole point, getting out of car-traffic travel ways)
E35	Nothing!	It will destroy the integrity of North Cambridge. It will run through a quiet neighbourhood next to our river trails and natural areas, completely ruining the serene and quiet nature of our town. It will demolish homes, and destroy Preston's economy for years of construction. It will cause families who have lived in this town for generations to relocate immediately. Keep it out of Preston.	Destruction of natural areas Noise pollution Demolishing of homes, streets, businesses Altering the peaceful and laid back atmosphere if our town forever Failing economy Population loss due to imminent relocation
E36	I prefer the more direct route - N3	I don't prefer any of the options	N/A
E37	There are more pick up options.	P, P1, P2, Q, G, R, O, L - all looks very congested!	How will the creation of this route impact people living in the area? And will there be noise issues to home owners?
E38		It goes right through Eagle street. People's houses are going to either be taken down or their land expropriated in order to make room. Preston is a nice quiet community, don't put a train down there in front of people's windows. The other thing is that Shantz Hill was just redone. So now if the LRT comes down Shantz Hill all the work that went into changing it and all the money is down the drain. The city and region should have waited until the LRT was finalized so	Use routes M, M1 to get to Eagle street then use V, W and X. As of now where V starts there is an old abandoned railway there which could be recovered for the use of the LRT. It goes through a nice treed area behind houses, away from the street which benefits home owners and is a nicer view for passengers.

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
		there wouldn't be shovels digging up the brand new roadway that was just laid.	
E40	M to M2 to H to R looks like the best option, it avoids the tight mess at fountain and king. Otherwise O to L to H to R works. I don't like M1, its a bit far from King st to connect to stuff there. V W X is interesting. I can see the benefit of using Y and Z to be able to connect to the housing nearby. Y seems like a better option if the predetermined route in black isn't used in this segment.	Going down Shantz hill to cross at a bridge at the bottom of the hill seems like a more expensive option that impacts the nearby trail and river life.	
E41	I don't. The route needs to be near and accessible to businesses and residences. The route needs to be close to central Preston for shoppers and commuters.	The options take the train out of the populated areas.	Consider the silent majority who prefer the original route.
E42	Generally I like the N3 route	My concern is with the area between Fountain Street and King/Eagle. This is an extremely sensitive area both because of the heritage value of the area, site of John Erb's mill, and the river itself.	
E43	O-L-H-R Least impactful to residences, closest to businesses	Traffic in and out of P&H Milling could block the LRT Would bridge at H need reinforcing?	
E44	I would prefer route options that maximize accessibility.	I would prefer route options that maximize accessibility. There is little sense in having an LRT route that doesn't meet these goals. Change is difficult, but communicating the positives about this change through personal stories of people who will benefit and how this will improve their access to other parts of Waterloo Region is key.	

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
E45	In order for this to be genuinely accessible - Eagle street makes the most sense. Please don't bend to pressure to stick this out into an industrial park because of NIMBY-ism.	Push back from those affected. Please consider a campaign which directly counters the opposition to this. Right now, those opposed seem to be valuing a Cambridge that doesn't change. A good news campaign about how this will allow Cambridge to grow and attract young people to maintain and build our vibrant community needs to counter this. Right now - all you're saying is nuts and bolts of how this will work - not why it should. Get some testimonials. Work with civic leaders.	These maps are particularly difficult to read. I literally live in the middle of this and can't figure out this stop. I can see that it's on or near Eagle ...but where? Eagle and King?
E46			Trains must go through Preston. If trains bypass Preston, you won't see the benefits from ION. Recognizing the issues with the preferred route option, the QGR route would be my second choice - if it minimizes expropriations and direct impacts on private property. However, the preferred route is my preferred route.
E47	There are additional options to help address concerns from Preston residents. Maintains a stop in Preston Town Centre which should be mandatory.	Routing through Riverside Park could be problematic due to the floodplain. There will still be traffic and property expropriation concerns.	There should be consideration for a route option that goes down Hwy 8 and connects with Cambridge Memorial Hospital similar to the old Galt Preston Hespeler LRT.
E48	Keeping the train off shantz hill is a good idea. Also moving the train off of eagle street is a good idea	You need that stop there. if it's where I think it is it is an ideal spot for a stop and the area deserves it	
E49	n/a	Out of options N3, V, W, X, Y, and Z, a route pairing that produces the shortest travel time should be selected.	

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
		I do not like options M and M1 because they are indirect.	
E50	n3 is the best route through this area. Although a few homes will be lost on eagle, etc, the route serves Preston - a key requirement critical to avoid Riverside park	no, other than convincing people without a long range view	non
E51	Lots of options	Looks really complicated to use- people really need to understand the system or risk getting on the wrong route. Even a perception that this might happen would discourage usership	Simplify!
E52	I do like the LRT routing making the Left towards Fountain and River Side Park.	I would recommend that sending the LRT through Shantz Hill Road would be a traffic nightmare not just for people travelling in cars, but buses and bicycles as well, preferably sending the LRT along Maple Grove to Speedsville Road to Fountain would be a more traffic effective and travel effective for the LRT.	Shantz Hill traffic at Rush-Hour and any time of the day can be bad, adding the LRT to Shantz Hill would be a commuter nightmare.
E53	THANK YOU for taking out the Maple Grove option. It is so necessary to have a stop in Preston to service the high density, walkable neighbourhood that exists rather than hope that the residents of the new Boxwood development will want to ride.	The right combination of routes needs to be used to avoid too many sharp turns. O, L, H & R will interfere too much with the already congested traffic along this route. M & M1 do not allow the King & Eagle intersection to be serviced. The shared lanes on Eagle St S may cause some headaches - can be backed up at peak travel times. And even though it's not allowed, there are usually cars parked along Eagle St S which would block the trains completely. Lots of pedestrians in the area -	V,W,X,Y & Z - these would prevent the demolition of some houses, but in the end are a less direct route and likely would have larger environmental impacts.

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
		would need to ensure proper sidewalks and buffers are in place.	
E54	I like that V, W, and X stretches have the potential for faster operations, thanks to a more dedicated corridor. Options O and P offer some relief to concerns for the handful of residents along Eagle or Chopin. I am thrilled that the Speedsville 401 crossing is out of the running - this option would have completely prevented a useful Preston stop - which is essential for ridership. Very happy that most of the options shown here allow for a Preston stop on/near King.	I can't say I'm in favour of any route using M1, as this would make a useful location for the Preston stop impossible. I am a bit concerned about the possibility of mixed-traffic operations on Eagle St South, as this could have implications for reliability across the entire corridor.	Ensure that any mixed-traffic options are minimized, and the operational impacts mitigated by signals that keep traffic clear in front of trains.
E55	M-M2-H-R is my personal preferred alternate. this area is already highly congested and adding ION to it would not help. there are not a lot of businesses or residential areas to be serviced here, so a bypass of some sort seems logical. using "H" results in a lower cost due to not building a dedicated crossing for ION	the current route and M1 would require a new dedicated crossing to be constructed. this would result in higher costs. the V,W,X,Y,Z options do nothing but remove the line from the residential area it is designed to service.	the stop on King St near Sportsworld should be combined with the current GO and Greyhound stop at Sportsworld crossing. If the current route is to be taken, considerations should be given to building the crossing as a multi modal crossing to allow both cars and trains to cross. this would help to alleviate some of the congestion issues in this area. if the proposed route is to be taken through Preston, consideration should be given to adding a stop in the area of Eagle and Speedsville in order to allow greater access to the route from the residential area it will be cutting though. this would help to increase ridership on ION. should a bypass route be taken, using the existing rail bridge over the Grand River and no additional

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			stops are planned between Sportsworld and Preston, consideration should be given to turning the route North on Maple Grove Rd to meet up with existing rail lines to be taken until the other side of the Grand.
E56	That a stop in Preston is preserved and not bypassed altogether.	Some environmentally sensitive areas around here. Also future traffic concerns.	Some of these routes are going to be pretty out of the way to be useful as good transit (ie. M, M1).
E57	I'm not sure any of these extra options make sense. The initial route proposal seems more direct and sensible.	Don't want to make the train line too meandering and zig zaggy. It will slow down travel and may make the LRT less attractive of a transportation option. Bypassing Preston in any way reduces the usefulness of the LRT. I like the current proposal down Shantz Hill and Eagle st.	
E58	Not sure I like any of them. It's better for business to have trains go right through the main street, and riders seeing all the potential commercial opportunities when they get off at the station.	Could add time to route making longer routes or taking minor streets.	Going through Preston is critical for success. The core has so much potential and needs an LRT station to draw investment and density.
E59		route should not deviate from Eagle st. Any route that veers away from residential and commercial areas makes no sense.	Can you not parallel the existing CPR line under the 401 coming out at Riverside park? Is the Shantz Hill/Fountain St. intersection very problematic?
E60	Nothing, they all should be discounted as they are all as troublesome as taking the train off the rail corridor and onto shantz hill. (Shantz Hell). My children are bussed in to Preston for school and it is unfair to them sitting in traffic for an hour each way (oh by the way the busses are not air conditioned,	if you must abandon the dream of having the LRT on the rail corridor into preston, I do prefer the Shantz hill to Eagle approach	There must be a stop in Preston. I find it troublesome with all the additional route "options" that King to Coronation Blvd was not considered. Hespeler Road is already well serviced by conventional transit, and there would be opportunity to service Cambridge Memorial Hospital. THE

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
	and the kindie kids have had accidents on the bus because they can not hold their bladder in the sometimes unexpected traffic night mares on Shantz Hill)		HOSPITAL AND HEALTH CENTRES FOLKS why was this scenario not ever explored?!!!
E61	M-M1 would likely make this a faster route for through riders. The smaller options could potentially provide access to more destinations and/or provide more fluid vehicular traffic options.	They are convoluted for infrequent users and will slow train speed.	I believe the straightest line is always the best option when it comes to transit. More riders will be interested in riding a straight route considering they are on LRT for a more rapid ride.
E62	That you've evaluated them at all.	They're all some variant of twisty (slowdowns, track noise) or too far from the Preston core.	Please stick to your guns on this one; the original alternative was the best one. Everything else is politics. Please develop a street cross-section and detailed drawing of the Eagle Street neighbourhood that shows how edge-running LRT (or both directions on one side of the street) wouldn't cause the demolition of 150 homes, just the partial takings.
E63	I'm with the Preston residents, lrt can't fit through the heart of Preston. M2/H/R is the closest you'll get. D My money is on the LRT being pushed off to M1. V is an awesome bypass of another very narrow area. Since there isn't a stop planned I figure stay back there with W and X.		
E64	Don't really understand why they are being considered.	Due to the extra turns, could take longer.	Why do the additional routes?
E65	I see that a lot of effort has been made to come up with good alternatives. I generally favor Option Q-G-R between Shantz Hill	Regardless of what route option is ultimately chosen I don't believe everyone in the area can be appeased. There are obviously	Great care needs to be taken to blend the LRT into the Preston area to reduce the visual impact. For example, the anchor

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
	<p>and King/Eagle. The route could be constructed as a viaduct starting at-grade at the top of Shantz Hill and then after crossing Fountain Street, curve towards King near the intersection with Chopin. I think consideration should also be given to placing the actual Preston LRT Station on King Street itself on segment R, possibly as curb-side platforms (one on each side of King). For the section between King Street and Hespeler Road I generally favor Option V-W-X. The off-road alignment would avoid the biggest disruptions to the residential areas along Eagle Street and would allow the LRT to travel at higher speeds, especially if the curve along the X segment is kept quite broad. In addition, I believe an additional station at Speedsville Road should be considered to serve the existing residential area just south of the station as well as serve as a connection point for GRT buses serving the Cambridge Business Park and the Langs Farm neighbourhood.</p>	<p>some very significant constraints to running the LRT through this area of Preston and some of the more constrained areas around Moore and Eagle should be avoided altogether since there are other options available (as shown).</p>	<p>walls for the Preston station could be made to resemble the historic stone buildings in the area and the design of any needed bridge structures needs to have the same care taken to incorporate aesthetic elements that are not out-of-character for the area. As for the LRT operations, I believe any mixed traffic use of the LRT right-of-way should be avoided at all costs since it could delay trains along the entire LRT line.</p>
E66	<p>All of them take you to Preston! Great to see the awful LRT route past Toyota and to the middle of nowhere no longer on the table!!!</p>	<p>Each of them will have pro's and con's. I'm not from that neighbourhood but it will be important to work with the local community to determine the optimal route. Be sure to plan for success - which route is going to do the most to truly build ridership and be a world class solution? What option would be chosen if money was no object or we were actually constructing several LRT routes through the area as one day our community</p>	<p>I know many seniors and others in the Preston area though who are very excited about LRT coming in the future and are counting on it for mobility as they age and driving becomes more challenging.</p>

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
		might have multiple LRT lines like most European cities our size.	
E67		Adding length to route resulting in longer travel times	environmental impacts on natural areas.
E68	M+M1 allows us to ask the fundamental question: does Preston want to atrophy and reject "outsiders" or does Preston want to grow and thrive with our community? The reason for creating LRT is to encourage sites of intensification and urban renewal. The Preston routes all bend over backwards to taking so much as a blade of grass of expropriation from anyone's front lawns, and fear of this is indicative that in no way is Preston ready to accept or accommodate any level of intensification befitting an LRT stop. If Cambridge and Preston cannot accept that LRT requires and is intended for intensification, then LRT may not be appropriate for Preston.	Many of the alternatives drastically change the impact on the river, an area Preston residents have already said very loudly (as relating to preserving a dam which damages the environmental quality of the area) that they do not want to see changed. Costs would also be high for routes along areas of sensitive environmental natures. Some of the alternatives seem to introduce 1 or 2 more grade crossings to the route. If we are to take the Weber St. grade separation as an example, we are talking about over \$100 million in expense just to avoid changing Preston in any way, an egregious waste of money for a project, LRT, which is supposed to help guide the change an area sees.	Cambridge needs to answer the fundamental question: is it willing to accept change? If it is not willing to accept the changes LRT would bring in coming in along its original N3 path, then it is certainly not willing to accept the far more drastic changes which LRT would bring in the form of new development, and so the region would benefit most from making a complete bypass of Preston as cheap as possible, save the costs of a station, save commuters travel time, and skip over Preston as cheaply as humanly possible. LRT is not a shiny bauble to put on a mantle and ignore, it lives and breathes, and that takes the form of change, which Cambridge must accept or reject, and with it the presence of an LRT stop in Preston. Both or neither, there is no other reasonable option.
E69	I like that the new route options take into consideration the concerns of the residents of Preston and the very narrow roads along Moore and Eagle streets. I also like the consideration of using on street mixed traffic for the LRT in this section. Well not ideal, it does help reduce property impacts in this older neighbourhood.	Getting from Sportsworld to Preston, regardless of the route, will be difficult and expensive. Given this reality, I feel it is important the region is upfront with those difficulties and costs, and select the option that is best for the system and communities (challenges aside). I also, question the real benefit of the Preston station and route through Preston to the surrounding community. The route does	I would seriously recommend reconsidering the Pinebush station requirement laid out by the city. Routing the LRT down King St through Preston would do well increase the flow of people through the downtown, provide much needed access to the core, and not so severely impact the houses and communities along Eagle St. Pinebush Station does not service anything people are going to want to walk to from the LRT.

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
		not realistically bring riders into downtown Preston as the walk to shops and restaurants is not convenient. It appears that the station only really serves Riverside Park and a few near by towers. Further, there is not a lot of room in the area for development as established neighbourhoods and limitations caused by the river and landscape reduce opportunities to build.	The route to Pinebush effectively bypasses an entire residential neighbourhood to put a station into a hotel and big box store area. While I understand the idea is to encourage development along Hespeler Road, surely there can be a way to more effectively service to downtown Preston (an establish community in need of development), and have LRT stops on part of Hespeler Rd to encourage said development.
E70			I don't have any opinions about the specific routes options, but I think it's important to have the LRT to have a dedicated right of way wherever possible to have efficient travel times and that Preston should have a stop.
E71	You have disregarded the population of Preston's opposition to N3. This is just ramming your route down our throats. You are not offering any of the public's selections just more of your own		Don't cross the river at the bottom of Shantz hill Don't cross over Riverside park
E72	Overall, my preferred options are N3 to V, W, X.		Like many people who live in Cambridge, I've been giving the route of the ION through the city, particularly through the Preston neighbourhoods, a great deal of thought. First off, I have a conflict of interest. I do not live in the immediate vicinity of the intersection of King and Eagle Streets but I do live in Preston. Any decision that the Region makes which involves ION "touching" the north end of Cambridge in Preston will increase the value of my home.

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			<p>So I say - "yes", bring it on!                      As a long time (27 years), but not lifetime, resident of Preston, I estimate that the value of my home has more than tripled in value during the past three decades. I can't imagine what the impact of ION will be on house prices in Preston, but they will only go up.</p> <p>At some time in the next ten to 20 years, I believe that the seven area municipalities and the Region of Waterloo will be amalgamated into one mega-city. I know that most people don't want to talk about the "A" word, but it's going to happen. Interestingly, the completion of the proposed ION project in Cambridge is about ten to 15 years away, i.e. amalgamation and a completed north-south ION will happen at about the same time.</p> <p>As a result, I'm pleading with the Region and the City to sit down and plan for the future. Think about what an amalgamated region will look like, what will change, and what will stay the same. Think big picture. If I look at the ION project from the amalgamated municipal future that I envision, I would like three things to happen in the Preston section of Cambridge ... I would like the ION to touch Preston; I would like the inevitable urban development in Preston to be planned and controlled; and I would like the wonderful commercial blocks along King Street, built in the late 1800s and early 1900s, to be preserved. How can all three things happen? Let me</p>

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			<p>propose one.</p> <p>Along the Kitchener-Waterloo length of the ION, in addition to driving development and housing, there seems to be a grand vision - the creation of a new urban "core" at the intersection of King and Victoria Streets in Kitchener. Whether it was intentional or not, it is happening. This new core area will be increased in size and density when the transit hub is developed, and the Zehr Group and other developments are completed.</p> <p>What I haven't seen or heard regarding the ION through Cambridge is a similar grand vision.</p> <p>So rather than trying to squeeze ION through the north end of Preston, on streets and through neighbourhoods that truly cannot accommodate the required width of train tracks and related infrastructure, I propose that the Region proactively plan for and create another new urban core in Cambridge in the area bounded by the Speed River, King Street, Eagle Street and Moore Street. The Region should buy ALL the properties in this area (i.e. not just the land required for ION), approximately 61 by my estimation, although it represents more residences because of existing multi-family residences.</p> <p>Then the Region should call for private sector development of the entire area, just like the Region has done at the new transit hub in Kitchener. The development would include ... a through-way for the ION</p>

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			<p>including a Preston "station" (perhaps it could be inside a new building); multi-residential highrise buildings; commercial development; a new street pattern/layout; and parkland including naturalized areas along the Speed River. There are a handful of buildings in this zone that should be protected by heritage designation and incorporated into the new development. There are other properties on Eagle Street, from King Street to Russ Street, that will also lend themselves to new development, including multi-residential, particularly those properties fronting the Speed River. In exchange for the complete redevelopment of the existing residential area, and the creation of a new urban core in Cambridge, the City/Region should put strict development guidelines in place that will protect the 19th and early 20th century commercial buildings that front King Street, from approximately Waterloo Street to Dolph Street.</p> <p>As a side note, I hear some residents decrying the loss of heritage buildings in the area bounded by King Street, Eagle Street, Moore Street and the Speed River, but I haven't heard anyone express concern about the loss of the commercial blocks on King Street. I'm certain that without heritage and zoning protection, these buildings will be lost to developments that will be built if the ION touches the north end of Preston. I would argue that the protection of the existing urban core along</p>

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
			<p>King Street is more critical to saving the character of Preston, than protecting the existing homes and businesses bounded by King/Eagle/Moore and the River. How should the ION get to/from the new development ... from Kitchener it should come down Shantz Hill and cross the Speed River as envisioned in Option N3. Heading to Highway 24, the route should be V-W-X, i.e. along the flats of the Speed River.</p> <p>Before the Region selects a preferred route for the ION through Cambridge, I would like to hear about a grand vision - more than just "there will be intensification along the ION route". The Region, the City and the community need to work together to plan that grander vision, rather than just select a preferred route.</p>
E73	Glad that this route is taking into account population centres and intensification opportunities		Think it should go through Preston and drive more intensification there.
E74	Route VWX could help alleviate some concerns about property impacts on eagle st.	<p>Routes that bypass Preston have the significant downside of failing to aid development in the area. Additionally, it eliminates the chance of reducing traffic along eagle because it doesn't allow travel from Preston to Hespeler along the LRT route. Any route that does not bypass Preston is not preferable.</p> <p>While VWX may help with property impacts, it may have greater environmental impacts.</p>	I'm of the opinion that property impacts are preferable to significant environmental impacts.

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
E75	-minimal infringement on residential properties...this is a must -I like P to P2 to G to R (it looks like a smaller bridge needed too)	-If M and M1 are used, then it seems that Preston is not getting a stop...I feel they need a stop -could going up Fountain street be an issue for traffic and mobility of the train in the winter	-what are residential implications with route O and L? -I feel that Preston needs to have a stop on this route, otherwise you are excluding part of the city and not providing equal accessibility
E76	Nothing	Don't complicate it	
E77	None of the plethora of suggested routes which traverse Shantz Hill to King St & Eagle St are especially favourable.	They are complicated and that usually means expensive. There is no obvious meeting of the goals of the overall project which would justify the additional expense. They block a major intersection for additional untold number of months during construction. Could cause irreparable ongoing traffic disruption.	1. King St through downtown Preston is already scheduled for reconstruction, sewers, watermains and streetscaping around the same time as the LRT Phase 2 is getting underway. <a href="http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/gettingAround/resources/5384-KingStreetImprovementsInfoSheetAUG302017.pdf">http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/gettingAround/resources/5384-KingStreetImprovementsInfoSheetAUG302017.pdf</a> 2. The future of the Riverside Dam which runs alongside the Speed River railway bridge is under its final phases of assessment. <a href="https://www.cambridge.ca/en/learn-about/resources/PIC4-Notice---Riverside-Dam-Class-EA.pdf">https://www.cambridge.ca/en/learn-about/resources/PIC4-Notice---Riverside-Dam-Class-EA.pdf</a> If a terminal was added at the Hwy 8 and Maple Grove/Sportsworld interchange, then the LRT could continue down the existing rail corridor and across the Speed River alongside King St on the existing rail bridge. From there, instead of turning down Eagle St., it could continue straight up King St through to Bishop and down Bishop to Hespeler Rd. OR from King and Bishop it could continue down King to Coronation Blvd with a stop at the CAMBRIDGE

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			<p>MEMORIAL HOSPITAL and then on down to Hespeler Road and the stop at the Delta.</p> <p><b>BENEFITS:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Combining of infrastructure projects to reduce time, money, traffic disruption.</li> <li>2. Not disturbing existing residential areas through the entire expanse of Eagle St. Less expropriation expense.</li> <li>3. Eagle St remains open as a main artery to connect Preston to Hespeler Rd/Pinebush, 401.</li> <li>4. Perhaps the CP rail bridge needs to be rebuilt too? Could it be integrated with the Riverside Dam project and thus incorporate private, Federal &amp; Provincial investment which combined would result in something of lasting architectural and urban value across the Speed River?</li> <li>5. Downtown Preston would be elevated to the same priority with the same potential for investment as the Downtowns of Kitchener, Waterloo and last but not least Galt.</li> <li>6. Restores a historical feature to Downtown Preston. The street is wide enough for LRT and railway tracks ran down it from 1894 to 1939. <a href="https://www.therecord.com/living-story/5607666-flash-from-the-past-traiblazer-s-nostalgia-behind-preston-s-name/">https://www.therecord.com/living-story/5607666-flash-from-the-past-traiblazer-s-nostalgia-behind-preston-s-name/</a></li> <li>7. Coronation Blvd is also wide enough to accommodate the rail down the middle without expropriating additional lands.</li> <li>8. Less environmental impact to the wetlands adjoining the Speed River and its</li> </ol>

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			nearby connection to the Grand River because the existing preferred route requires a new bridge be built over the Speed River at the bottom of Shantz Hill. 9. If the first phase of the route through Preston went all the way down King St to Coronation to Hespeler Rd., additional phases of rail preceded by iExpress could move passengers from a Bishop & King stop or King/Coronation/Concession stop to Pinebush/Eagle and Bishop/Hespeler.
E78	this part of tracks is okay i see no problems		
E79	I don't like any of these routes and think it is going to be a disaster coming down Shantz Hill.		
E80	i do not like the majority of these suggestions. W-X, Z can make sense if the train crosses at Speedsville. If N1 is used with K1 the rail can follow the Railway under the 401 and hook onto the abandoned CP rail behind Cambridge surplus. This was the original preferred plan! still makes the most sense.	Y has problems with yet more expropriations and loss of access for those home owners. Fear is that downtown Preston area is in flood plain and therefore will mandate elevated rail line and stairs to access the train... I am not a fan of elevated structures in this climate (refer to the fiasco the Gardiner expressway has turned into in Toronto with all the crumbling concrete). Shantz hill is TOO STEEP and ultimately winds up taking the train into/across a swamp. region expropriating 110 homes in Preston is simply awful! and i believe unnecessary.	Negotiate with CP for right to parallel their rail under the 401? Visibility of the train along the north side of 401 from ATS to Speedsville may provide visual cue to passersby. Redevelop Preston with focus on new downtown on Concession and Eagle???
E81	I dislike most of the additional route options (with the exception of the combination of	I believe that the challenge already exists and that is local resistance to N3. It's natural	

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
	<p>segments that follow the existing road infrastructure... ie Segments that follow Shantz Hill to Fountain and then onto King and Left on Eagle). With that said the Potential Route (N3) is preferable. N3 avoids the congestion between Eagle and Shantz Hill and it provides for future development opportunities. This may change the character of this neighborhood but it will not be the first nor the last neighbourhood in the Region (and beyond) to undergo changes.</p>	<p>but shouldn't be overstated and shouldn't be misinterpreted as a Cambridge-wide rejection of the option.</p>	
E83			cost
E84	<p>I still prefer the original option for crossing the Speed River. Q-G-R has the best potential to maintain a dedicated right of way for the route, but has a higher environmental cost, and would present challenges in getting a straight section of track for station placement near King due to required turning radii. It is unfortunate that the CP right of way along the Speed River between King and Eagle St N is too constricted to be considered here. Although it will cause short-term pain, the Eagle St route is still the best option to connect Preston to Pinebush. Although going off-road via V-W-X East if the CP grade separation has the potential to reduce impact to residential properties, it does lengthen the route and has little development potential due to the floodplain. The addition of a station at Speedsville and Eagle would help make the most of an</p>	<p>Running the route through mixed traffic along Moore and Eagle St S is not the most ideal option. Operationally, it is better to keep the route separated from traffic. Property impacts and potential interactions with vehicle traffic could be lessened if Eagle St S were instead converted to one-way operation. Politically, it is probably most important for the Region to stick to the preferred route option along Shantz Hill and Eagle if it is certain that Hespeler Rd must be served by Light Rail. Those opposed to the project will decide to move somewhere else if the existing route is too onerous. The Eagle Street grade separation is still a very costly proposal and would not be eliminated or significantly mitigated in any of the presented route options. Eagle St is the most contentious part of the route for various reasons and could ultimately serve to sink</p>	<p>If options M and M1 are being seriously considered as viable, perhaps it wouldn't be infeasible to relocate the CP line through Riverside Park, over the Speed River and South to Eagle Street. It could either be run directly through the park on an elevated structure, or further East at-grade to meet up with existing CP spur (Section V). Re-routing the CP track would then open up the section of former CP line along the Speed River to run the LRT right of way on from sections Q and G. Eagle Street would also cross the CP ROW at closer to 90 degrees, potentially reducing the cost and local impact of a grade separation. Perhaps something like the following should be considered? <a href="https://imgur.com/a/mTfwL">https://imgur.com/a/mTfwL</a> If it would help reduce congestion at King and Eagle, an extension of Hamilton St across the Speed River to Shantz Hill may be worthwhile as a measure to divert traffic</p>

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
	Eagle Street route, and also potentially provide a transfer point to future GO service via Guelph.	Phase 2 ION politically. I am still of the opinion that serving Hespeler Road is not critical to the success of Phase 2 ION and that running the route more-directly through Preston Towne Centre and via Coronation Blvd serves Preston better with multiple stations, serves Galt better with a faster, more direct connection, would be less expensive, and has more potential to revitalize Preston as an existing community with an existing grid.	away from that intersection and make routing ION through Preston more feasible. Historically, residents have seen road expansion as an inevitably and are not as vehemently opposed to expanding a road through a built-up area as much as putting in light rail.
E85	I prefer M M1 V W X as it put access in reach of the condos along King and Eagle and bypasses Eagle St for the most part using undeveloped land across the old rail corridor and put it closer to Toyota Etc. There isn't a lot in this area that will drive any ridership and after 2 years of redoing Shantz Hill Fountain and King Sts why tear it all up again	I at the moment don't see any	I don't see any
E86	Shantz Hill-Fountain-King is the best route, absent other concerns. Going through Preston is a big must.	King & Fountain are already congested and a whole additional bridge would need to be built across the speed, but at least that one side of King is empty land which could be used to widen it so 4 lanes to Eagle is still possible. So maybe Shantz Hill-Fountain-King, in spite of the traffic disruption, is still the better way to go instead of Moore. The option of sharing lanes along Moore & Eagle as mention in the PCC docs, that just seems like a recipe for constant delays and would undermine the separated right of way of the rest of ION and the entire system's efficacy.	Perhaps rebuilding the old dam in Preston could be done to hold the LRT bridge and kill two birds with one stone?

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
E87	in a single word. confusing and unclear if the routes meet the project goals for development and infill.	slow with many turns and intersections	How do they meet the project goals
E88	It serves Preston. It is hard to consider a Cambridge LRT connection worth it if it missed Preston.	Destroying existing neighbourhoods to bring LRT through does not look like something Cambridge residents would ever accept. Much better to insist on a resolution with the rail company for their corridor.	Any shared traffic segment on Eagle would have negative consequences not just for Cambridge but for Kitchener and Waterloo too. Traffic congestion here would delay schedules everywhere. Please keep the LRT on a dedicated right of way exclusively.
E89	I like that the options are not the preliminary one. I would propose following highway 401 to the SmartCentre. Even as someone living in Waterloo (used to live in Cambridge), I would definitely take the LRT right to the Smart Centre. As of now, it takes over an hour to get there from where I live so I never travel to Cambridge. Think of how many students from Waterloo would want to visit all the awesome store options at the Smart Centre. For the routes V, W, & X, I seriously appreciate that they follow existing rail.	It would still disrupt many people's home life.	The preliminary route is horrible. It will ruin many people's lives, similar to the construction that recently happened, it frustrated so many. Go along the highway!!! Firstly, trips will be far faster. Putting the LRT in such a tight area around Shantz Hill is dangerous and disasters could happen weekly. Second, dropping a load of people off on Hespeler to walk 10-20min to the Smart Centre, is seriously asking for many commuters to get injured. As well, it would hold up more traffic from the 401 if there is a steady stream of people crossing Pinebush/Hespeler. You see this daily in any major city, a large amount of pedestrians will stop traffic for whole lights.
E90	I already answered this survey. This is just an addition. I live in South Preston. The initial preferred route is the BEST option for LRT through Preston. It provides the best access for ridership in my opinion. Properties will be lost regardless of the route. The attitude of		

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
	many seems to be "not in my backyard". But they don't care if it's in someone else's. Just PLEASE keep it away from our beautiful Riverside Park and don't screw up the rivers!		
E91	Nothing.	They are taking the LRT away from the ridership. They're all over the place and frankly, they make no sense.	
E92	I prefer the recommended route. I grew up in Preston and while I understand and appreciate the NIMBY syndrome - Cambridge needs to look further into the future than what they currently deal with. Eagle St with dedicated lanes for the LRT will make life easier for people to move around the city and get into KW from the train as well.		
E93	None - you need the potential stop in Preston or you may as well not take the train down there.	slower trips, avoid populated and commercial areas.	keep the route through dense populations and not where there will be no future population growth.
E94	I still like the N3 route but the M->M2->H->R isn't bad either especially if the vacant lot beside the bridge could be used for the station	more environmental impacts or longer and more costly route options.	you need to consider if it is worth the extra money and who is this service for.. I know there are so many stop the lrt through preston signs but if my house wouldn't get targeted i would have GO THROUGH PRESTON sign on my front lawn. this is for the future and growing pains sometimes hurt
E95	M-M1-V-W-X		

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
E96	M would reduce compression point at bottom of Shantz hill but once again it a very congested area to be sending more transport through Go further east between add another bridge across the 401	This area is again too condensed, it seems we have looked for the areas with the least space and then decided to put a lite rail line through it.	we may need to cut through green space, the train is electric so pollution free and fairly quiet
E97	M-m2-h-r. Eagle Street West of King Street is incredibly narrow and would have few options to accommodate tracks beyond sharing the tracks with vehicles (slowing down the entire network) or demolishing buildings, which would impact a very old neighbourhoods and destroy heritage structures, which sets a bad precedent and is unfair to private developers who are not afforded the same freedom. Problems with the m-m2-h-r route were only described (as I could find) as "engineering difficulties" and "impacting the speed river in a manner harmful to First Nations". I don't personally find either of these a detailed enough explanation for me to make informed input on that route. More discussion of the route would be appreciated.	See above	Eagle Street is too narrow west of King. If you're harmfully impacting the residents of the neighbourhood with the lrt, why even build it?
E99	M to M1 would be an ideal second choice as long as M section is next to the 401 behind the sound dampening walls. The neighbourhood in there would constantly hear the trains otherwise.	Fountain st carries high volume of Toyota traffic at start and end of workday. Already a pain to get stuck at these times of day. Having train cross fountain would be awful.	

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
E100	Nothing. You are already taking a very heavy dense area and clogging it up more with LRT. Preston area (Shantz hill/fountain) is the absolute worst entry point into Cambridge. The industrial traffic that is already driving through there has slowed remarkably and now adding decreased lanes and putting an LRT through Preston will make traffic even slower and more clogged. Entering through hespler via maple grove, or speedsville to Eagle is a better option for coming into Cambridge.	As stated above, the current route options and proposed route options provide no relief in current heavy traffic. Preston is high traffic area with minimal lanes that it will become much worse by adding in the LRT	Lack of land to make sufficient lanes with LRT. Stop making one lane traffics with concrete medians.
E101	They eliminate the need of taking down as many homes, while keeping a stop in preston.	O,P,P1,P2 would have a negative impact on car traffic going done king-fountain-shantz hill. Q,G might interfere with existing trail system.	Living in preston, but not close to the stop, i hope the preferred stop doesn't move. Driving to work in the fountain maple grove area, I'm worried about having the lrt crossing king-fountain and creating a choke point.
E102	This map is terrible... but, if I am reading it right, the best route through the Preston area should be M-M2-H-R-N3-V-W-Z-N3. I think all efforts should be made to put the tracks in existing rail corridors because the space has already been cleared (whether or not there are still tracks in place), so fewer/no houses will have to be expropriated and of those people who will have the tracks practically in their backyard, they purchased their houses knowing there were tracks behind them (too bad for them). This route keeps the tracks close to the main arteries and businesses that users will	Perhaps the existing rail corridors are too narrow?	N/A

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
	be accessing yet balancing the needs of existing homeowners.		
E103	I don't like any of the options. I don't want LRT anywhere near my neighbourhood.	Traffic disruption. More cost to taxpayers. More small businesses will go bankrupt	Ask the taxpayers who live in the area if they even want or need LRT..if they will use it.
E104	Like the idea of using existing rail line. M, M1 (or M2) very good idea. Can rail line on the other side of speed river be used?	Shantz hill is already very tight - not a good idea to go down there.	
E105	I do not like any of the additional route options.	Would the stop change? Would the route cause other issues for the residents.	Will there be just as much negative talk for new routes. What would the impacts for people who have already invested in property on the route get compensated? What are the number of people who are going to be negatively affected by the route change.
E106	I like that you can come down into the Preston downtown without any additional transportation or a significant amount of walking. For someone visiting from out of town this is great especially for events such as Canada's day.	Residents may be unhappy.	
E107	Nothing, I prefer the original N3 route.		
E108	I like that there are options that don't run through small residential streets. M-M1 or O-H-L-R	Many go through small residential streets	
E109	The use of railway corridors vs displacing residential properties	Nothing serves Hespeler core or all of the new planned residential development in the Maplegrove/Hespeler road area as well as queen st in Hespeler	Agree that the industrial area of Maplegrove won't generate riders, the new Mattamy Rivermill sub division and the other 2-3 subdivisions in the area ( Hespeler Road and Maple Grove) need to be addressed.

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			Additionally, Hespeler village area is not serviced at all
E110	I like the M and M1 options - to avoid the Shantz Hill congestion and keeping it away from as much residential in Preston		
E112	I think the usage of a V,W,X line would make a better route then having it run down eagle street. The traffic is bad enough already. Plus those rail lines served passengers years and years ago as it was. It could also make a future route into downtown hespler more feasible. I really hope this becomes the option. It would be nice to see trains use that abandon spur once again.		
E113	There is no space for any of these additional routes. Have you actually walked down there? Traffic congestion in this area is already a challenge .... fix the vehicular traffic before you try to shoehorn a LRT into the area. N3 is good because it services both neighborhoods on either side of the river.	The additional routes will make the existing traffic congestion worse.	Vehicular traffic congestion and space.
E114	I feel that if we go with the v option and end it at x it will work better	If you follow through with the v option that would be best as eagle street is way too small of a street to handle a lrt vehicle	
E115	Keep the n3		
E116	P-L-H-R: potential to reduce impacts of multiple river crossings. N3 may well make the most sense, but it would be good to find	I oppose M1 if it means cutting through Riverside Park. Riverside Park is an iconic place in Preston with a lot of history -- the LRT should give the whole region access to	The route coming into Preston from Sportsworld passes through an old and interesting part of town with beautiful river landscapes and remnants of Preston's

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
	<p>a route that doesn't cut through the lovely landscape near the entrance to Linear Park.</p>	<p>the park's scenic river views, great bike trails, Canada Day festivities, etc. with a nearby stop at King and Eagle, but the route should not cut through the park itself.</p>	<p>history as a sulphur spring resort town! Do what you can to protect Riverside Park, Linear Park, and the old (still abandoned--but maybe one day revived!) hotel at the intersection of King and Fountain street. Care for the context and character is really important here. Preston has great bones -- think about how the LRT can help in building up a unique place, in bringing new life to what is already there without clearing too much away. Maintaining a stop at King and Eagle is important. You can walk to the shops along King, the library, Riverside Park, there's a mix of high and low density homes, probably room for more development. Preston needs more people to support local businesses and bring more life to the community--I think good transit will help with this.</p>
<p>E117</p>		<p>-too costly and slow to construct as I suspect that the original K2 would be faster, easier and cheaper to build and maintain as it is already along a major established route with substructure, drainage, electrical services etc.</p>	<p>-potential ridership for those working or living along each proposed route</p>
<p>E118</p>	<p>Not being totally familiar with the area, I can't comment.</p>	<p>Railway crossings, and the need to grade separate them. I've always wondered why a straight through route to Dundas/Hespeler Road was not considered. The existing Eagle/Hespeler Road routing is very indirect, increasing track mileage and travel time, and</p>	<p>Potential patronage, convenience to passengers</p>

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
		serving an area of minimal potential patronage. Why not follow King St. and Coronation Blvd. and Dundas St. from downtown Preston, to the old right-of-way near Beverly Road, and on to the Ainslie Street terminal. This would serve an established residential area, and the hospital.	
E119	I see the Riverside Park additional routes as unnecessary compromises. It's more important that the system is efficient and reaches the areas that need to be reached than caving in to NIMBY types. 20 years later these will be a catastrophic mistake. The decision should be based on what's best for the system and the community as a whole. A Preston stop that is central and usable is critical - moving it a km down the road compromises the entire system, not just one neighbourhood. The future is coming like it or not, let's not compromise it with the attitudes of the past (or present) where the car is King of Cambridge. Also the idea of running the ION inline with traffic like a street car down Eagle is a terrible idea. Don't bottleneck the whole system, it compromises all the other stops and the system of a whole.	They add complexity and time, they move the Preston stop further from the actual neighbourhood - which could greatly decrease use, accessibility (800m is a long way for those with mobility issues!).	It would be preferred to not take out all the old homes, but for the system to be useful and effective it needs to be fast and serve communities as directly as possible. Change isn't always fun but its sometimes necessary. Please don't compromise stage 2 for a few NIMBYs.
E120		Disagree if the route is slower	Negative impact on speed of fill trip, KW to Cambridge
E121		Just seems crazy to tear up another downtown, when you can go around it.	

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
E123	if the LRT must continue on this routing I prefer using the existing rail corridor, M1,V,W,X. I think it is more economical, less effect on residential properties, has the potential to redevelop low use industrial in the V,W,X section, and be a faster ride for customers using the rapid transit service.		<p>I am unconvinced that Preston needs a station at King &amp; Eagle. it's too far away from the core of Preston to be effective, or spur much more development potential. Much of the surrounding walking area is parkland and River, hardly an area of concentrated population. It would be better to have the LRT run through the core of Preston, before using an alignment on or near Bishop or Dunbar to reach Hespeler Rd.</p> <p>I think a much better alternative at a far cheaper price, is to build supporting infrastructure for GRT's planned 206 limited stop express that is already planned to run from the LRT terminus in Galt to Sportsworld and Fairview Mall. I believe with a truly dedicated transit lane, or at least ways for transit to clear traffic bottlenecks, "enhanced stops" at CMH, Bishop, Westminster and Eagle, and Preston Parkway that featured large sheltered areas integrated into the surrounding streetscape, displaying transit information, infotainment , and Wi-fi , would serve the Preston Community better than a one stop LRT station. The planned 206 route will serve the Sportsworld station, and other local transit routes could be beefed up to serve the Cambridge Centre station to provide reasonable alternatives to Preston community. I would also like to point out that the Sportsworld station is less than 4 km from the proposed King and Eagle station, easily covered by a limited stop bus</p>

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
			<p>in under 10 minutes.</p> <p>Studies in other municipalities have now proven that Bus Rapid Transit with proper planning can be as effective as LRT in spurring development, at much less cost than flashy LRT lines. While it might take more time I think an enhanced 206 line (not well described in the Ion literature) will be a better benefit to the Preston community, implemented earlier and at less cost than a one Preston stop LRT.</p>
E124	<p>First of all, your route showing is very confusing...do you do this on purpose...Secondly, you definitely need to take this off of King Street East, in Kitchener and Shantz Hill...was there a person with a mind problem that suggested this route? It would be much easier and more direct if you go in behind the GO Bus Station and cross over the Flyover, along the 401 and connect to Speedsville Rd. , then backtrack on the spur line to Kathryn McGarrys office , for a stop at her office , then backtrack on the line to V, W , X. or even continue across 24 to Walmart Shopping Centre, across to Conestoga Blvd., going into the back of the Cambridge Mall, accessing the Medical Offices on Conestoga, down the CanAmera Parkway to 24 and then you decide.</p>		<p>You need to take a good look at what you are designing and keep this LRT away from already congested areas and from the Shantz Hill, Moore, King &lt;Eagle which is a total nightmare at the best of times as it is the ONLY entrance into Preston from Kitchener, the 401 and all points north. Even when the Fountain Street Bridge is reopened, it adds more traffic and congestion to this area and when the 401 is disabled , these routes are virtual parking lots....Please use COMMON SENSE. none of this will be alleviated by the LRT, the only rail system that will alleviate any of the traffic in these areas , it a GO Train to and from Toronto.</p>
E126	<p>The original proposed route is fine. Preston needs a stop.</p>	<p>It doesn't serve a large swath of Cambridge. A few nay sayers shouldn't be able to undue a service for an entire community. They can complain about property and property value</p>	

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
		but the fact is people want to live near LRT lines and will pay for the locale.	
E127	Maple Grove Rd has great advantages for commuters to Toyota and other businesses currently located there as well as new developments in this area. Street is wide and easily workable to add the LRT The currently proposed route through Preston is extremely evasive to current residents. Nobody I know is happy about this losing houses and property. This will also cause more traffic issue in an already congested area. I see no be idiots to this. It doesn't touch downtown Preston. As long as it runs down Hespler road it will be easily accessible to anyone in Preston		
E128	I'm in favour of mixed traffic on Eagle Street. Car traffic is very light west of King Street, to the point that a reserved lane would be an unnecessary impact. The use of the railway spur to avoid the junction of Eagle Street and Hespeler Road is also sensible. I'm glad the route has remained urban, rather than being shifted to rural roads as the red-sign campaign demanded	If a new bridge is built at Shantz Hill Road, it should have a footbridge attached. Otherwise, high school students from the Preston Parkway will be tempted to risk crossing on the railway itself. They already have a history of trying to cut across the river when it freezes.	
E129	I very much like the idea of having the trams stop nearby Riverside Park.		
E130	Keep traffic away from quiet and compact Eagle Street South neighbourhood west of King, minimizing disruption of neighbourhood and heritage buildings.	One of the proposed routes disrupts Riverside Park, which I think will have a negative effect on the park. Fitting the light rail line between the former Geo. Pattison	What effect would M1 have on Riverside Park wildlife? Will M eventually be rerouted to eliminate awkward turn at 401 in time? Will stations between Sportsworld and

**TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?
	Provides an alternative to Shantz Hill Road and disruption of Linear Park and repurposes a disused railway line.	building and the Eagle Street North hill may require a single-track bottleneck. Segment Y may disrupt the St Clement's Cemetery land. Segments O and L will be difficult to fit into the space available along Fountain and King. Moving station away from King will limit potential adaptive reuse of land around King-Eagle intersection. Will Q, which appears to parallel Chopin Street, be on secure ground when it's so close to the Speed River?	Preston and Preston and Pinebush be considered, especially if the route stays close to arterial roads and existing residential areas?
E132	M1 M@ is better as King street is narrow and busy road, to avoid king street is BEST option	none	none
E133	M1to M1 makes the most sense. Going through Preston will be a construction and political nightmare.	Shantz Hill should be avoided due to traffic. King St. in Preston already congested.	Need to consider if ridership from downtown Preston warrants even going thru that area. Consider a direct route to Cambridge Mall with few stops completely missing that area.
E134	Excluding M, M1, M2(?), I'm assuming all other alternatives still serve Preston. These are relatively still direct. I support the preliminary potential route.	Challenge justifying who we are serving with the Cambridge extension if we bypass Preston.	Comparative property impacts of new routes.
E135	Nothing.	Using multiple streets will impact traffic more heavily by slowing traffic on all the streets.	None.
E136	Nice to see some consideration of avoiding Eagle Street South residential streets, but I don't see this as a huge issue for the N3 route... Ottawa St and Borden in Kitchener appear to work fine.	Cost alternate bridges, congestion with traffic especially at intersections that are already busy such as King/Fountain. Routes M and M1 should be avoided as they completely remove service to Preston, even if M2, H & R were used which would add a significant unnecessary length to the route. Routes V, W, X, Y, Z unnecessarily avoid important populations. The route should be	Impacts to the Speed River should be considered paramount. Homes come and go, people move on, but a river has no voice.

<b>TABLE C2: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE NORTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options?</b>
		built near people, high-density employment areas, or areas where redevelopment potential is high. The proposed N3 route makes sense. However, I don't like the proposal for 'streetcar' style integration of LRT with vehicles. The route should be separated from traffic as much as possible.	
E138		They do not go to Hespeler.	Add a route to Hespeler.

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E1	I think extending to T2 or T3 provides better Galt coverage, and T2 is potentially visually more appealing.		
E2			Just listen to and incorporate the Cambridge citizens input to improve the plans. No further comments.
E3	I like that T2 has been extended to reach residents of the other side of the river. T1 options offers many connections to the City	Residents along the route down the residential road may not like the LRT going down their road.	Impact on residents in the area
E4	I like that S3C and S3D use former railway alignment. Multi-use pathway will be maintained.	Why are alternative Terminal locations T2 and T3 needed? What is the problem with using T1?	
E5	Nothing	1. Closure of local businesses due to lack of access during construction. 2. Increase of non-porous surfaces 3. Negative environmental impact 4. Multitude of wires and tracks throughout the city which will not help with the current and future congestion issues, regardless of the bypasses being built to remove transport trucks from going through Hespeler Road. 5. Significant cost that will not meet the need of commuters in the area. 6. Cambridge is made up of 3 core areas and the Village of Blair, there is no central point to make it convenient or easily accessible to the full community. 7. Rapid buses are a more readily available and economically lower in cost to be the better option. 8. If a GO train may come to Cambridge, we do not also require the LRT. 9. The GO train is the better option, while rapid buses are inter-city.	The ability to say "NO" to the LRT. Do not bring to the downtown core. Sell Ainslie Street Terminal and use the area to develop low income housing in the downtown core as more needed than the LRT. The LRT does not meet the needs of commuters who are moving to the downtown core areas and therefore it will not eliminate congestion. With the development of more efficient and emission lowered vehicles as well as electric vehicles, there is more of a negative impact along with higher costs in the development of the LRT than the need. Replace with Rapid Bus system and GO Train as we have more residents commuting to and from Toronto than when the plans were first considered.

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E6	T1 seems to be the most useful for downtown (Galt) and avoids necessity of building new terminals, either T3 or T2.		
E7	no comment		
E8	-S3c/S3d is most direct and removes LRT from small residential roads  -T1 connects with the Ainsley terminal, better integration with Existing transit and relatively centralized for Galt, possibility for future connection south along Ainsley	-what intersection will need to be completely redesigned to support LRT? (ex: main/wellington)	-proximity to residences along Beverly -environmental impact on Mill Creek and surrounding greenland -T2 and T3 are blocks from the Ainsley terminal, not well situated to serve the downtown or commuters with connecting buses
E9		I don't live in Cambridge and so I am not familiar with any of the routing. It makes sense to take it through the business district and beyond. Taking it over the Grand River to service west Galt makes sense.	
E11	I like the minimal impact and separation of transportation modes of Route S3d. T1 seems to be minimally disruptive to the Galt core while also being closest to the heart of the area.		
E12	The tram terminal should be integrated at the existing Ainslie terminal. Having grown up in Europe, I love to travel on public transit whenever in Europe because there are multiple options all integrated together. One of the massive failings in Canada is that the modes of transport here are non-existent for one thing, but when they do exist, they are not integrated together. Example: I flew to Edmonton and wanted to		

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
	<p>get to the train station, but no public transit went there and no sidewalk was available so I had to take a taxi. Pathetic, with all due respect. All modes of transit in Europe, trams, metros, trains, buses, trolleybuses, airports are all integrated together so a person can easily hop from one mode to another at the same transit hubs. This is missing in Canada. Therefore, the GRT buses must be integrated with the tram, otherwise we will lose the purpose of the tram line. Please make this tram work as they do in Europe. I love transit in Europe because it's modern, clean, fast, convenient, efficient, integrated and so much more. Canada is behind the times in public transit. The only city in Canada that I would say has an integrated transit system on par with Europe is Vancouver. I have lived there in the past. The only city though, as I have visited all other major Canadian cities and have not been impressed, including Toronto.</p>		
E13	do not like this alternative	homeowners impacted/traffic congestion, not appealing scenery when riding	access to businesses-this has least amount of practical access for businesses
E14	S3a has the most access for the public. i would leave ainslie st terminal as the downtown cambridge terminal for LRT	however it will interrupt traffic on beverly st	road closure information.
E15	Again, keep the route where it involves the least destruction to people's homes and causes the least congestion on already busy streets. so S3c/S3d sounds the best.		

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
	The terminal is not something I can comment on		
E16	Using the now defunct railway right of way parallel to Beverley Street makes the most sense since it will impact street traffic on Beverley the least. Your use of the street name "Concession Road" causes me to NOT have a high level confidence in your organization since "Concession Road" is in Preston and the street I believe that you are referring to is "Concession Street". Someone obviously did not vet this survey prior to release.	Only advantages for the additional route options. Use the existing terminal to control project cost.	Financial compensation to residents whose homes' market value will be negatively impacted by the trains operating next to their property. DAMAGES!
E20			What major public institutions are best served. What route comes closest to the greatest population concentrations? What routes work the best with existing and new active transport infrastructure.
E22	I prefer the S3c/d route and I think it is critical to have a stop near Main St which is apparently only available with T2 or T3.	While I think T2 is the best option especially with the new Gaslight development on the west side if the pedestrian bridge I am worried about the impact on the river and the walking trail, etc.	The cost of building another terminal vs using the existing bus terminal. Environmental impact of T2.
E23	Using existing trail. Doesn't impact vehicle traffic. Again think long term not just how to get LRT. Go with s3c/s3d. Don't need another terminal. Interconnected transit using existing bus station should be used	Relocating green space. Traffic if using existing roads	See above
E24	I like options S3c/S3d and T1. That way it doesn't impact the street, uses the existing	Keeping people off the tracks along the path for sure.	

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
	corridor (less engineering), and uses the existing terminal.		
E25	I don't like them		The LRT should go to the old rail station in Galt where in the future possible go train activity will be possible and maybe just have a shuttle bus to the Ainslie Street terminal saving millions in development costs, there is enough congestion in downtown Galt area all ready
E26	Since these routes are in a downtown area, I think using any one of them would work. I always prefer using what is already there, so would choose using the multi-use path, however downtown areas should be set up to favour pedestrians, and cyclists so any of the routes would work.	None.	
E28	I think S3c/S3d has great potential and will affect the least amount properties.  If the proposed Stop is at the vacant lot of Kerr / Shade it would be great to finally see that vacant lot put to use.	S3a/S3b wrecks of gentrification. Public outcry/backlash will be inevitable if said route is used.  I don't think the Ainslie St. terminal has the space to be configured for rail. The T3 site is probably best, but I don't know if it needs to extend that far. I don't know what is occupying the former Dickson Bowl property, but I would imagine that lot alone is large enough. That could be expanded into the adjacent Ainslie terminal.	Parking, Parking Parking. We can't expect everyone to either bus or walk to this station if it is to be used, and if that is the plan, this project will never reach its full potential. Parking needs to be made available. This is a massive challenge with the Galt core already. The other big factor to this that needs to be evaluated is the human side to it. There are a lot of businesses and families that need to be consulted with first. For every home that gets purchased to make way for this project, a family needs to find a new residence. Some may not have the means to maintain the existing quality of life they have.

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
			For every business that closes because of road closures, someone has to find a new means of making a living. Then we have the challenge of finding a new business to take that space after. This really needs to be looked at with a fine tooth comb. This project is for the betterment of the city, and the region as a whole, that's understandable. However, this will directly affect people's lives negatively, and that damage needs to be minimized.
E29			Route from Fairview to Wilson to the college to Preston core along King and then coronation to Galt core
E30	I like the T2 extension which will bring a stop very close to the new gaslight district soon to have a large number of people commuting to for work and events. This will help reduce the number of cars requiring parking and rush hour traffic in this area which is already bad enough.		
E32	S3C/S3D is the best, as long as multi-use pathway is maintained. It keeps the train off Beverly St as much as possible. Like the idea of an additional stop on Main St. Also like the idea of stopping it a new transit terminal using T3 option, or the T2 option to meet the pedestrian bridge. This way it connects the LRT to the other side of Galt better.	Don't like the impacts to Beverly St on S3a/S3b option.	impact to traffic if run on city streets
E33	I like the T1, as it is a gold existing terminal, and that it would not require the building of	There needs to be a stop on Beverly or near as if you don't it will cut off a major amount of	

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
	<p>a new terminal. Also I like the idea of using the S3d option and turning the path into the light rail. That path is super scary and sketchy anyways. There is 0 chance I would ever walk down it again after the last time, with barking dogs charging the fence, and run down backyards. We own a dog and live 2 min away, its the closest path to our home, we would be the ones using it, but we dont and wouldn't. Its just not a nice trail. A new trail on the other side of the river may be a lot nicer and more utilized. The houses on Beverly street have a better chance being gentrified if there isnt a LRT whizzing out front, but rather out back. The houses have massive back yards so it wouldn't be like the LRT is that close.</p>	<p>the population from the service. Nobody is going to walk over that massive rail overpass bridge on dundas, I did it once and wouldn't redo.</p>	
E34	<p>Maintaining the existing Ainslie terminal makes the most sense, though a loop down to the water front to service the Gaslight District would make sense. Beverly could do with some improvement anyway, and this would be a great reason to do it.</p>	<p>Beverley and the parallel street are narrow and can't see where the additional space is coming from. Same goes for most of the decisions in Galt, narrow streets with not a lot of spare space.</p>	<p>Detailed drawings of what the street-scape is to look like in these compressed areas.</p>
E35	<p>Runs along bus route                      Busy traffic area already so it will not disrupt environment                      Many in Galt would benefit from more access to public transportation (government buildings, courthouses, shelters are all in Galt)</p>	<p>None.</p>	

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E36	Using the former rail corridor would appear to be a better use of land. T2 would provide a better connection for the gaslight district,	N/A	T2 should connect to bus services.
E37	The Pedestrian Bridge is a terrific idea! Maybe a few more along the way could be built! Lots of pick up options is good.	I don't see any real issue.	None.
E38	T2 Terminal seems like a good idea. That would give people more access to use the new pedestrian bridge if the train went straight to it. That way people can just get off and cross rather than using the closest bridge which would end up being the Main Street bridge. Also, S3c/S3d are the best option. Use the old alignment rather than tear up another road way.		Do not make Beverly street a one way. That street is used frequently and can not afford to become a one way.
E40	I like S3c and S3d more, less impact to north/south traffic and has better economic spinoff to redevelop buildings on beverly streets so they have less 'issues'. Station at T2 or T3 is interesting. T1 is more centred around potential development, the other end points have less opportunities in all directions	T2/T3 is further away from the current galt core and there are less options south of there for development. T2 has less development options since it is also bordered by the river and the opposite side has the school of architecture and theatre which doesn't have space for further development.	
E41	Probably S3d would allow the most space and not dislocate too many residents.	Too many options. Probably more efficient to be at the Ainslie terminal.	How many residents will it displace? Cost? Need optimum ridership. Easy access.
E42	I like Sc3/Scd, following the rail corridor; and terminal T3, near Concession		
E43	Either S3c or S3d to keep rail away from crowded street & residences T1 because why wouldn't the rail connect to the rest of the transit system?	people concerned with safety along the path	

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
E45	I'm not familiar enough with needs and vagaries of Galt to comment.	I'm not familiar enough with needs and vagaries of Galt to comment.	
E46	- I like U1 Terminal Option (better opportunities to connect with bus routes at a lower cost)	- traffic issues with routes S3a/b - I like S3c/d since it creates a safer place for LRVs and trail users, potentially less traffic impacts	
E47	I like how there is a Main Street Stop. S3C/S3D is the only rational and acceptable route that should be considered for Galt City Centre out of the current listed options. This Galt area is one of the more historically significant and oldest neighbourhoods in the region. Beverly Street is essentially a regional road and it has a diverse range of housing options and several heritage properties and buildings of significance. Property owners and residents want to see their street capacity and homes maintained. Utilising the old rail lines for LRT is best as this a priority. The trail that currently exists can be shifted over beside the LRT right of way or relocated to the otherside. Bike lanes and other sustainable transportation nodes can be added to Beverly and/or Shade Street. This will help address illegal activities that has been occurring on the trail in recent times, increase safety and vigilance in the area and give residents proper access to LRT. Also LRT passengers get a nice water feature view of Mill Creek as they head in and out of the Galt Core. The Galt Multi-Modal Station should be a priority and	S3A & S3B are both completely unacceptable options. These old route options in another form were presented and debated back in 2011 and were axed based on local residents feedback which had put the original Galt alignment on Ainslie St & Water St. These two route options (S3A/S3B) are the worst yet they were resurrected? These two route options have the most negative impact to property owners and residents of Beverly Street. Beverly Street was last widened in the 1980's by expropriating sections of front lawns of the odd numbered homes/properties. The end of 2017 a new watermain was installed and resurfacing of the street occurred. Traffic on this street is not light. There is no more room to widen the street let alone run a train down it without major disruption to property owners/residents of Beverly Street which can lead to the expropriation of our homes/properties if S3A/S3B is selected. Downtown Cambridge traffic will get worse if S3A/S3B is selected, Dickson/Wellington and Wellington/Beverly are intersections right by each other and chokepoints. Cambridge City Hall staff all use this street	I cannot comment on which T123 section I prefer because it will all be dependent on where the multi-modal station is going to go. It makes sense to have the line terminate at the tip of Hwy 24 or Hwy 97 to connect with bus routes and be more accessible to West and South Galt. There needs to be a stop added along Beverly Street and Hwy 8 or near there depending on where the LRT end point terminates. The GO Train Service should consider reusing the Galt Train Station before all other options. If not it should be near the station on the Galt sub. There is no question that all transit should be combined at a central point station in Galt as historically this was the central hub between Toronto and London and that should have been maintained. Connections to Hamilton, Halton and Niagara need to be increased and connections to Brantford, Guelph, Woodstock and London need to be restored. This can be fulfilled by the new Multi-Modal Cambridge Station. The Multi-Modal Station / GO Train Station could work at these two other locations: -Hwy 8 and Beverly Street, right near the

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
	Ainslie Street terminal should be declared surplus and redeveloped if no longer needed.	daily to access their parking lot. Bad idea to run a train between two single family homes through the entryway of the Beverly Street/City Hall Parking lot for obvious reasons. Safe entry of our properties, driveways and pedestrian access must be maintained. ION LRT must respect the current built form and character of this historic street/neighbourhood of Downtown Galt while increasing quality of life, economic growth and improving the transportation options for residents and that can only be achieved by S3C/S3D and infill projects on vacant land when it comes to station planning and development of LRT and GO train service in this area. There are plenty of opportunities to achieve this given the best areas for redevelopment are along the Beverly/Dundas/Samuelson triangle, around Soper Park and the area of Shade and Kerr Streets. These all are by the rail right of way and have lots of vacant space prime for intensification.	Galt Sub/Railyard -Kerr and Shade Street, there is so much land here that needs to be redeveloped and its behind the Mall (ROW 150 Main). That would be a good spot for the LRT/GO/GRT station and an office tower above the station that could be used by the region/provincial ministries.
E48	Nothing	That it looks like you are thinking about putting it near the water.	Don't put it near the water
E49	I prefer route options S3c/S3d and T3.		
E50	Mill creek routes are best, they allow busy Beverly st to handle cards I like T2 or T3 (with a stop where ever buses meet) to more readily serve west Galt. Choice of T2 VS T3 depends on	none	it is essential that the LRT have a stop at the hospital and then go to Hespeler road using Dunbar or Bishop - this is the biggest shortcoming of any version of the routes

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
	which area best allows parking and kiss and ride		
E51	Connects to bus terminal		
E52	I do like the S3a-Beverly to Ainslie would be the best way to get to Ainslie via the Train corridor.	N.A.	N.A.
E53	I think Ainslie is central to both the shops on Main Street and the new pedestrian bridge		
E54	I like how T3 has the potential to integrate well with cross-corridor routes along Cedar/Concession. T1 will allow Ainslie terminal to continue to remain, and is fairly central to the Galt core T2 allows greater access for origins/destinations on the far side of the Grand.	I'm a bit wary of the S3c/d options - will they remove the existing Mill Creek Trail? We should try to use the excess road space on Beverly as much as possible.	
E55	nothing. the beverly rail bridge underpass is already too small for cars, the dedicated rail line takes the trains away from the businesses its supposed to be invigorating and bringing people to. i do like the inclusion of a stop at T2. i like this as a stop and not a terminal.	it is pulling the line away from the downtown core.	i feel like the best option would be to re-convert (i know) water and ainslie back to one way roads and putting southbound trains on water down to the T2 stop, then turn around and head up ainslie, through the current terminal with considerations given to adding stops at or around park hill road (north and south bound) and main st (south bound only as ainslie terminal would serve for north bound). The T2 stop would service the south end of the downtown core.
E56	That they go right downtown, where a transit stop is most useful.	Heritage preservation downtown.	

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E59			the rail corridor is going to be used by GO/Metrolinx for the Cambridge GO service, if my info is correct.
E60	These are all equally bad. The route should wind down Water Street and not be routed in the back end of downtown to facilitate a dream of GO transit that will never happen. GO would never put a stop here with no ability to park and ride. Most of the current commuters in Cambridge would not take the 18-22 minute bus ride from their current homes to then wait for a 1.45 hour train ride in to Toronto. Can Mr. Craig abandon this dream already!? Commuters will not use a downtown station that is so inaccessible and does not have the ability to accommodate large scale park and ride. GO knows this, everyone knows this but Mr. Craig.		The routes should be looped across the bridges to accommodate development on the west side of the river and facilitate cross-city bus spines.
E62	I don't like that this route has been removed from Water Street in the first place, but T3 shows promise for at least being extensible to Myers or the South Boundary Road in future.	I feel as if Galt could have had more stations along Water that would have provided more access to people from the other side of the river.	Please consider the possibility that in the future, this may be extended south to accommodate park-and-ride customers. Please don't choose terminal locations that would make that difficult or impossible.
E63	I don't have much of an opinion on the route choices. The stop needs to be very close/convenient to existing GRT services and as close as possible to the core.		
E64	Traveling along Beverly could give more people access if a stop is made there, otherwise I don't know what difference it would make.	Not enough info...	Much more info.

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E65	<p>For the segment from Dundas Street to the Downtown Galt area I favor using the former railway corridor. The off-road alignment would limit disruption to the residents along Beverly Street, has a more consistent grade and would allow LRT trains to operate at faster speeds. I also believe an additional station between the intersection of Beverly/Dundas and the main CP rail corridor should be considered as there is significant brownfield redevelopment potential in the area and potential GO Train connection in the future. I like that the additional options with the LRT terminals at T2 and T3 provide for a station at Main Street, which would allow cross-town GRT buses to connect along this corridor. I favor decommissioning of the Ainslie Street Transit Terminal and decentralizing the bus network into more of a grid layout, this would provide improved cross-town mobility with fewer transfers and would also decrease the bus congestion in the Galt area around the existing terminal site. The Ainslie Terminal site is a prime site for redeveloped. For the LRT terminal, I generally favor option T2 as this would provide the best access to the new pedestrian bridge over the Grand River that links to the new Gaslight District, Dunfield Theatre and the U of W School of Architecture. However, I think the actual station for option T2 should be alongside/parallel to Water Street ending at</p>	<p>I think the biggest challenges are along the Beverly Street or former railway corridor alignment from Dundas/Beverly to Downtown Galt since these are both narrow corridors. Additionally, there is the challenge of planning for a future GO Train connection including an integrated LRT Station and surrounding development opportunities when Metrolinx has not yet committed to extending the Milton GO Line to Cambridge.</p>	<p>Although it is beyond the scope of this study I believe that consideration should be given to extending the LRT further south as far as Churchill Park/Myers Road in the future. An additional extension to this location would provide an opportunity to build a Park and Ride Lot at the south end of Cambridge for travelers using Highway 24, could provide an intercity bus connection linking to Brantford, would provide service to Churchill Park (which hosts many large events during the year) and would provide easier GRT bus connections to areas in the south end of Cambridge using the Myers Road corridor.</p>

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
	Water and Concession, this could be accomplished by turning the LRT south along the west side of Water Street after Bruce Street.		
E66	I think it is very important to push the LRT as far into Galt as possible and ensure two stations rather than just one - it gives double the amount of station areas to work with. Also the visibility from the River and even opening up the other side of the river (Architecture School, new retail developments, etc.) could be very important for building ridership and future use.	Alignment with optimal GO Train station.	Building ridership, convenience, creating a world-class system built for success not lowest cost.
E67			route should be selected to serve the highest density of residential, employment, retail, and business clients
E68	I like that it asks the question about what is the most effective location for a transit terminal, from the perspective of giving transit users the best access to walkable destinations and to effective transit connections. We are already seeing the terrible transit network effects of giving in to the University of Waterloo's demands for a mid-block terminal, and should not make the same mistake here. The terminal location should be sited so that bus connections are as easy and seamless as possible from a routing standpoint, avoiding adding multiple turns and travel on lower-order streets. Secondly, the terminal location, as with	Fear of LRT's changes has made it challenging to properly route the line. As we see in Downtown Kitchener, we have an incredible pedestrian street (King), and we split the LRT line along both Charles and Duke. For drivers, this means that three streets operate far less effectively and synchronously, when routing down King Street with the elimination of all vehicular traffic would have kept two far better car functioning streets available for drivers, while also allowing for a better pedestrian and dedicated cycling experience on King. Sometimes in trying to preserve everything, we wind up preserving nothing, or far less than had we made the hard choice in one	How do the different terminal locations impact the ability to avoid bus network issues seen clearly at the University of Waterloo? How do the different routing options for the line impact the ability to preserve both effective active and car transport, unlike the nobody-wins scenario seen in Kitchener of splitting the route and winding up with Charles, King, and Duke all working substandard for both drivers and active transportation users? How do the different terminal locations impact the ability to have good pedestrian connections and adjacent density boosts, avoiding geography, heritage, and zoning

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
	Preston, should be located in an area ripe for higher density redevelopment. The sites under consideration must be weighed to determine which ones offer the best redevelopment and intensification potential, and which ones have the least ability to be redeveloped, due to natural features like the river, recent redevelopment at lower density, as well as any heritage or other zoning impediments which would preclude taking advantage of the density LRT is meant to foster.	location, giving much better overall success in the neighbouring areas.	which would preclude the intensification LRT is intended to foster?
E69	I really think the station should continue right into downtown Galt as T1-3 option do. Short ending at the potential GO station area would be a poor choice. Of the three option, I like the T3 option as it provides good access to rides to both sides of the river. This is particularly useful with the development of the Southworks property and that area of downtown on the station side of the river could really use some development. I also like using the former rail right away and relocating the multi-use path to the opposite side of the creek. It keeps Beverly St open to traffic and avoids the significant impacts to the houses along that street.	Ensuring the continued availability of a multi-use trail in the area is important but might be a challenge if the trail needs to be moved to the other side of the creek. Also, the roads in downtown Galt are narrow, so having a route which has only limited impacts on traffic flow and properties in the area will also be a challenge.	While not new, I would remind the planning people and the region of the need to consider the potential future GO train stop in downtown Galt and plan the routing accordingly. Both access to the station and placement of the LRT corridor need to be considered with how it will synergize with a possible GO station.
E70		Whichever location is selected for the terminal, it should be multi-modal and allow for easy transfers	

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E74	All alternatives seem reasonable. T2 has the benefit of tying into the pedestrian bridge and providing access to west cambridge. T1 has the benefit of not requiring a new terminal, the Ainslie terminal is a good central location.	T3 isn't bad but is distanced from the core, and less preferable.	
E75	-S3c/S3d is a great option in my opinion...no impact on housing -You can't make Beverly one way or even put a system through there...absolutely not, so S3a/S3b is out Terminal must be at the Ainslie terminal!	-L672 and L674 routes are ridiculous...no need for them...unnecessary and will cause congestion on Concession and Ainslie which is already an issue	-make sure no environmental issues result from running system along the Mill Creek
E77	Within Galt, the proposed T1 termination at the existing Ainslie Terminal utilizes existing infrastructure and would save time and again save on downtown traffic congestion and expense.	Disturbing existing residential areas, and main thoroughfares which would force traffic onto already congested core routes like Water St, Ainslie St and even Grand St.	Why is there not a T4 option which would create a terminal for the LRT at the current Galt Railway Station on Malcolm St or within the Samuelson St rail corridor? If the plan to connect Cambridge with the GTA is to move ahead sooner than later, wouldn't this be a priority terminal?
E78	it all looks great i see no problems		
E80	You will kill any existing business on Beverly but it is a prime area for redevelopment ...	i recommend keeping the end of track away from the river. T3 provides better option for parkade/ multi mode point of entry to the LRT system.	
E81	Being on the edge of the core of the city, Beverly Street is a strong candidate for urban renewal and re-development. Perhaps this future state should be encouraged with the choice (in terms of route) that is made. I would avoid eliminating (or re-locating) the trail along	The challenge with this alignment (i.e. avoiding the more direct Hespeler Road-Water Street route) is that it diverts the route through old industrial lands and, as stated above, through Beverley Street. These areas would benefit from re-development and urban renewal and the future route should	The main issue (beyond the ability to fund this needed LRT extension) may be the political resolve to make this investment in Cambridge. This extends to both City of Cambridge and Region of Waterloo political leaders. Local impacts need to be managed but local interests must not be allowed to

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
	Mill Creek. In terms of the location of the transit terminal... unless there is a compelling reason to change the existing Ainslie Street location its difficult to provide feedback.	both encourage and accommodate the future state. This may be politically challenging as it will likely be met with resistance.	drive this important investment. Region of Waterloo politicians should not interpret these local interests as a rejection of the LRT project nor should City of Cambridge political leaders be unnecessarily swayed by local interests. This is an issue that could delay and/or defer this indefinitely and if so will leave a lasting negative impact on the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo.
E82	Great, I'm from Cambridge and use the bus, having direct LRT would be amazing, just need better construction and like I said more than just one day shift of construction. And less businesses closing due to impact.	Someone from the city needs to monitor construction make sure it's done ON time and each that no one is standing around in construction sessions.	
E83	nothing, S3a and T1 are the best route options	oh where to start..	besides costs? effect on traffic effect on pedestrians and on bicycles? These alternative options mean cars will go else where endangering pedestrians an bicycles on those routes especially during dawn and dusk times
E84	Option T3 is most preferred as a terminal location. I prefer the addition of a station at Main St being more central to Downtown Galt than the existing terminal location. It would help simplify the downtown Galt route network by aligning stations with bridges over the Grand River and presents the best options for any possible extension of the route.	All of these route options work well, but which one is chosen will depend on where GO commits to locating a station in Galt. S3c probably has the lowest property impact of all options, however, GO may require this right-of-way for a station. Furthermore, while I'd like to see the addition of a station near Samuelson, I don't think it is worthwhile until the location of a GO station is known.	

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
E85	S3c/S3d looks like the best route with the least impact on existing infrastructure to T1	I see major traffic issues with T2 or T3 as a high percentage of traffic running through this city are going elsewhere outside of the region	Do a comprehensive traffic study to determine vehicle movements through this city, Brantford/Paris etc to Guelph Etc
E86	The T2 option is nice because it positions ION for future expansion across the river for Cambridge's "East of the Grand" plans, as well as the extra space which would allow a Main St. station.	Less of an ability to closely hook up with busses than possible if the current Ainslie Terminal is the station because there's not much space around Bruce.	
E87	T1 aligns to existing terminal for fast and convenient interconnections with bus	T2/T3 serve no real purpose I can see and T3 will cause more traffic congestion by crossing Ainslie St. And more expensive	Traffic congestion in downtown areas need to be avoid at all cost. Cambridge is no like Kitchener Waterloo and has no ring road. Most traffic traversing the city goes via cores so impacting traffic with additional crossing would not be a good idea.
E88	T2 is a really interesting option for bringing an LRT stop closest to the other side of the river and therefore more riders. The idea of a stop closer to the centre of Galt is also very good.		Being able to serve downtown Galt with two stops would be a big plus.
E89	I LOVE the idea of building S3c/S3d. It is a great way to use areas that have seen limited and at times, troubled use. They were designed for rail and they have heritage as routes for carrying people. To save on costs, the Ainslie terminal should be used. They continued with all three of the same terminals (Conestoga, Charles, Fairview) in the rest of the region- do the same in Cambridge.	S3a&S3b just seem silly. Do not disrupt traffic and people's home more than necessary.	Cambridge is facing a drug crisis, that is widely known. The old rail route is a known area for "trouble" to occur. By putting the LRT in that area, it may help to eliminate some of that.

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E91	I think any of the routes are a viable option. I think T2 would be the best terminal option.	Nothing overwhelming	
E92	T1 location makes the most sense.		
E93	SC3 with T2 - uses current corridor, direct path and the T2 gets the terminal a little closer to the new walking bridge.	T2 will need to be for buses too	
E96	no comment don't know area well enough to comment	no comment don't know area well enough to comment	no comment don't know area well enough to comment
E97	I would appreciate two stops in downtown Galt. It would also spur the most development.	Two include two stops would mean to bypass the terminal - making connections inefficient. This would to be considered in the bus route design. Perhaps the bus terminal to be moved to t2 or t3.	
E98		Do not take out the trail. Terminals should be close.	
E101	I like s3c or s3d. And terminal T1 or T3.	If there is an option not reduce auto traffic, such as s3c,scd, I prefer those. As for terminal location the only reason I'm not a fan of t2 is it will make future stops more difficult to implement	
E102	As I said before, utilizing existing rail corridors is preferable, so S3c makes the most sense. S3A has some virtues in that it remains along the traffic areas without disrupting existing roadways. T1 is the most cost effective option and most dental to businesses downtown, but T2 will connect better with the new gaslight district (could be a selling feature to potential buyers?) and would create more traffic in an area	Alternate terminals would cost a heck of a lot more and would necessitate another stop with associated costs.	

**TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES**

Comment ID	What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?	What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?
	(near the river) where unsavoury activities go in because of a lack of traffic. T3 would connect best with a high traffic road. T2 and 3 both enable more than 1 stop in downtown Galt, which can only help get more traffic to businesses there.		
E104	I don't know much about this part of Cambridge to provide comment		
E105	I do not know	I do not know	What ever is the cheapest
E108	I like the idea of connecting to the existing terminal. T1		Future transit connections.
E109	Uses unused rail corridor so no impact on streets		
E110	I'd rather not see an existing hiking/biking trail be changed back into a railbed but if the trail can be relocated it's the better option I feel.		I get very perturbed when incorrect information is given. It's Concession STREET not Concession Road. Big difference in location.
E113	I like the T2 and T3 terminus as it will be closer to my home. I have no preference to the Beverly Street options. I think there is value is S3a and S3b over S3c/d in keeping noisy vehicles (cars and trains) together and quitter pedestrian places (trail and former railway) in a different area.	None	None
E114	Sounds like a good choice to me	I feel that if you choose to use an alternative terminal location that people will not use Irt as much as they would have to walk to the other terminal	

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E116	No preference.	Unknown.	Heritage impacts should be weighted heavily when thinking about routes in Galt.
E117			-I'm not very familiar with that area so I would suggest using my earlier comments above to help evaluate criteria for the decision
E119	The railway corridor may offer speed advantages to make the system more efficient. It seems to make sense to integrate with the Ainslie St terminal, though for my personal use Water St would be an advantage as that's the area of Cambridge more used. Also would Water St offer more advantages being closer to the Southworks development etc.	Important that stops are as central and usable as possible.	What is best for the system
E120			Speed of full trip KW to Cambridge
E123	stick with Ainslie terminal as the terminus.		
E124	I do not have any comments on the Galt area...		
E126	I don't know enough about this area to weigh in other than to consider filming sight lines so that Galt can continue to attract movie/tv opportunities		
E128	While it would probably be possible to fit tracks onto Beverley Street, the Mill Creek railway corridor seems a much more promising option, given that it's available. The existing trail is unattractive and lightly used, so it would be no great loss.		

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
	The T2 option, with stops both next to the river and at Main Street, seems the best option, provided there's sufficient room for bus connections.		
E130	Gives opportunity for easier LRT access to those living/working in West Galt. Puts less emphasis on Ainslie terminal, which may lose significance as density and demand grows on Hespeler corridor and bus lines are rerouted with light rail. Nothing of particular architectural significance in Ainslie/Bruce St intersection.	S3a/b will likely require considerable property expropriation and face community opposition. Keeping trail open will prove challenging for construction.	Will S3c/d be vulnerable to Mill Creek flooding? What options remain open for future GO train service connectivity?
E132	no idea	none	none
E133	Nothing - Stop the line at the Mall. It is only a 5 minute bus ride from Galt terminal to mall. Way too costly for a small increase in ridership and not worth the construction nightmare.	Any route to downtown Galt will not be easy. Construction will be extremely disruptive due to limited routes for traffic.	Does the ridership from the Galt terminal to the Cambridge Mall justify the expense? Doubt it.
E134	Dedicated centre corridor is the most valuable and avoids conflict points. I don't see value in an alternative terminal location considering the existing Ainslie terminal appears to have a sufficient footprint and redevelopment potential to accommodate LRT and be a secondary transit hub in the Region.	Unnecessary "wastage" of current Regional assets, and acquisition of new land, when current terminal footprint should be sufficient for redevelopment.	What does GRT support?
E135	T2 in the existing terminal appears best as it makes all transit options accessible from a single location.	Possible cost of expropriations required.	

<b>TABLE C3: FEEDBACK ABOUT THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGE ALTERNATIVES</b>			
<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>What do you like about the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What challenges do you see with the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>	<b>What new issues or information do we need to consider when evaluating the additional route options and alternative terminal locations?</b>
E136	S3c/S3d make sense by avoiding a street without extending the route unnecessarily. This would also support a stop at Main St which is a great connection to the neighborhoods west of Downtown. I support either T2 or T3. They're close to Ainslie Terminal while extending the routes slightly closer to Cedar St Bridge for access to populations West of the river. There is significant land available for redevelopment here so now is the time to extend it while we can.	Potential flooding along Mill Creek?	
E138		They do not go to Hespeler	Choose an option that goes to Hespeler