

MMP Mode Share Target

Feedback and comments on October 24, 2023 Master Mobility Plan 2050 Mode Share Target Report to Civic Works Committee
Prepared by the Integrated Transportation Community Advisory Committee (ITCAC)

October 2023

Summary

- Proposed mode share target is not supported by ITCAC or public survey
 - Target is not ambitious enough
- ITCAC input and recommendations not adequately considered
- Insufficient analysis
 - Limited analysis of current and future travel patterns
 - No analysis of feasibility of mode substitution, e.g. cycling instead of driving for short trips
 - No analysis of London as a 15 minute city
 - Insufficient references to best practices and research studies
- Weak justification for targets
 - Similar to existing mode shares at other cities (e.g. Ottawa 2011)
 - Unsupported claim that achieving target will require increased densification
 - Unsupported assumption that current mode share cannot be easily changed
- No evidence that Option 3 will meet London's Climate Emergency Action Plan objectives

ITCAC Recommendations

- Council should refer this report back to the MMP Project Team for further study.
- Council should direct the MMP Project Team to establish a range of MMP Mode Share Targets, at least one of which will actually support the achievement of London's Climate Emergency Objectives
- Council should direct the MMP Project Team to consult with the ITCAC MMP Sub Committee prior to tabling any future MMP reports to the Civic Works Committee

Introduction and Background

- ITCAC mandate is to provide input and advice to CWC regarding MMP
- ITCAC had no input in establishing mode share targets in the first MMP report
- ITCAC provided detailed comments and feedback in response to the first report. In particular, ITCAC argued that the mode share targets were not sufficiently ambitious, and that much more ambitious targets are feasible. Detailed rationale and recommendations were provided.
- MMP staff prepared a final report with mode share targets for approval by CWC. This report was not presented to ITCAC. There is no evidence that ITCAC input was considered.

Mode share target is not ambitious

- Option 3 mode share is very close to the mode share for Ottawa in 2011
- Option 3 is justified as being comparable to the mode share in Ottawa's master plan
 - So Ottawa is planning status quo?
- Option 3 mode share targets are similar to existing mode share in several comparator cities now
- The report implies that Option 3 is very ambitious, and will be difficult to achieve
- However, it is only an incremental change to current mode share
- No evidence that Option 3 will meet London's Climate Emergency Action Plan objectives

There is support for more ambitious targets

- ITCAC recommends much more ambitious targets
- 81% of survey participants preferred Option 3 as the most ambitious option offered
- 69% of survey participants felt that Option 3 is not ambitious enough
- Top priorities identified by public survey were
 - Improving transit performance (65%)
 - Encouraging active transportation (57%)

Inadequate research

- No references to existing best practices, e.g. Amsterdam, 15-minute cities, etc.
- No references to relevant research studies
- Limited discussion of emerging trends and technologies and their potential impact on urban mobility

Missing analysis

- No evident analysis of current trip distances, trip types (purpose)
 - The 2016 travel survey provides a wealth of information that is not discussed
 - In particular, the majority of trips are within cycling distance but only a small number are made by bike
 - This suggests that cycling mode share could be increased significantly
- No evident analysis of whether most Londoners already live in a 15-min city.
 - It is already clear from the trip survey, and from analysing the London map, that many if not most Londoners live within a 15 min walk or bike of many if not most amenities including shopping, services, health care, recreation, and employment
- In fact, the report claims that the Option 3 mode share targets can only be reached by further urban densification!

Forecasting future travel patterns

- A model has been developed but it has not been used to estimate future scenarios incorporating various “disruptors”
- The model should be used to estimate a range of scenarios to establish
 - Worst case (business as usual, current situation)
 - Best case
 - Most likely
- The model should estimate overall future travel patterns including
 - Frequency of trips
 - Distribution of trip distances and travel times
 - Total annual travel distance
 - Distribution of trip type/purpose, e.g. commuting, shopping, socializing, etc.
 - Feasibility of different modes for different trip types, distance, purpose