

# Report on the Mobility Master Plan (MMP)

Submitted by the Environmental Stewardship and Action Community Advisory Committee on February 5, 2025

## 1 Recommendations for City Council

**1.1 Recommendation A.** ESACAC is satisfied with progress on the Mobility Master Plan to date and recommends that the process continues on schedule. However, we note that the City is dangerously off track from meeting its community greenhouse gas emission reductions targets. To promote transparency and public understanding when the next MMP report is received by SPPC, we recommend staff clarify the following details using layperson language:

1. how carbon budgeting and the Climate Emergency Screening Tool could be incorporated into future mobility projects (e.g., at which stages of the planning process, to account for which variables);
2. when and how the adopted MMP can be reviewed and updated to add, modify or cancel projects, such as to coincide with future development charge studies;
3. how the MMP projects are being designed and prioritized using the City's [equity tool](#);
4. how the City intends to communicate with the public about mobility moving forward to encourage behavioural shifts at the scale required to reach the mode share and potentially other targets, and to promote wider awareness of processes to address current gaps in the mobility system;
5. a breakdown of what was heard from key stakeholders including the LTC and major employers, and how their feedback is being addressed in the MMP;
6. answers to frequently asked questions heard from the public during consultations.

**1.2 Recommendation B.** We recommend that the City reviews its standards for collecting data from human participants (e.g., information shared during MMP public consultations) as well as data management, data analysis and data reporting to support future master planning exercises, and considers the feasibility of incorporating third-party peer review in master planning exercises. In terms of the MMP, we trust the City staff's work to date.

**1.3 Recommendation C.** We advocate for all members of Council to focus on supporting the planning process and avoid politicizing details of future transportation project decisions, which must be based on evidence and expert consensus reflecting principles underpinning the MMP, including rapidly phasing out fossil fuels and anticipating induced demand across modes rather than incidental transportation concerns that are beyond the scope of a master plan.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Who we are

The Environmental Stewardship and Action Community Advisory Committee (ESACAC) appreciates the opportunity to share invited feedback on the Mobility Master Plan (MMP) and thanks the MMP team for their work completed to date. We are community volunteers appointed by London City Council with subject matter expertise and lived experiences relevant to climate change planning. Our membership includes people of diverse demographics and mobility habits: we are pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, drivers, carpoolers, commuters and remote workers.

As Londoners, we are all exposed to microplastics emitted from vehicle tires (estimated [3-7% of particulate matter in the air](#)) and pollution from combustion vehicle exhaust ([including respiratory irritants](#)). We pay significant fiscal costs associated with historic and ongoing prioritization of personal vehicles in our mobility system, which has struggled to keep pace with urban expansion. We are aware that cars provide the least efficient way to move our growing population. We are concerned with vehicle collisions occurring often and suddenly throughout our community. Our comments pertain to [our committee's mandate](#) and focus on greenhouse gas emissions reduction, climate change adaptation, environmental stewardship, and specific feedback requested from the City of London.

### 2.2 What feedback were we asked to provide?

A member of the MMP staff team, Sarah, attended our January meeting and asked: what should their team consider that they may not be not aware of? Which specific projects should the City of London prioritize? Jay Stanford

recommended that we focus our feedback around the mandate of the committee, particularly on greenhouse gas emission reductions and environmental impacts.

Councillor Sam Trosow also attended our January meeting. The visiting councillor asked us: what is our perception of the overall MMP? Is there a creative vision here? What would we like to see that was not presented today? Are there other ways to improve the cycling network? Other ways of improving traffic safety by cutting down drive-through in neighbourhoods? Other ways we can implement safer streets? Writ large: what is the overall perception? Does this excite us? Does it excite the population? Do we think raising the mode share as Council did is going to be adequate, given the growth of the city? What would we like to see? What is our vision for 2050? Councillor Trosow encouraged us to think outside the box.

### 3 Rationale and detailed feedback

ESACAC began preparing this report by considering the MMP vision statement: *“In 2050, Londoners of all identities, abilities and means will have viable mobility options to allow them to move throughout the city safely and efficiently. The movement of people and goods will be environmentally sustainable, affordable, and supportive of economic growth and development.”* We also considered the five MMP guiding principles:

- **“Environmentally sustainable:** *Take bold action to address climate change and design and move in ways that protect and enhance the natural environment.”*
- **“Financially sustainable:** *Ensure mobility and its infrastructure is affordable for current and future generations.”*
- **“Equitable:** *Recognize diverse mobility needs and embed equity into decision making to enable everyone to move through the city.”*
- **“Healthy and safe:** *Promote and protect the physical, mental and social wellbeing of all and encourage active living.”*
- **“Integrated, connected and efficient:** *Strengthen community and the economy with better access to people, places, goods and services as London grows.”*

We reviewed all documents available at [london.ca/mobility](https://london.ca/mobility) including the [Needs and Opportunities report](#).

#### 3.1 Overall perception

ESACAC is not confident that the Draft Mobility Network Maps showing “sustainable” transportation building out to 2050 will be adequate for fulfilling the stated vision. We do not understand how to interpret the vision statement. What makes a mobility option “viable” in terms of a minimum level of service? We are unsure how the City will improve its policies to ensure mobility is “environmentally sustainable” while also “supportive of economic growth and development”. The language being used as the foundation of this master plan is aspirational and does not appear to commit the City to specific metrics besides the overall mode share target.

On the one hand, this plan does not seem ambitious compared to what we believe the City and the community are capable of achieving in terms of transforming the mobility system by 2050. The mode share target adopted by Council seemed like it also fell short of matching our full potential or the scale of change required to prevent catastrophic global warming and widespread dysfunction of our already-strained transportation network. On the other hand, amid unprecedented population growth and without a major cultural shift, we predict the City will struggle to meet even these relatively modest targets. The mode share will require large investments in transit operations which could depend on external funding [that may no longer exist](#) a year from now. What else is the City prepared to do to make transit more efficient and convenient? (e.g., queue jumping when lights change, dedicated lanes, closing LTC service gaps...) We would suggest promoting massive growth in transit ridership must be front of mind during future budget cycles.

The [Climate Emergency Action Plan](#) notes *“there is a large (1 million tonnes per year) “action gap” between what a “gradual” increase in action would achieve and where London needs to be by 2030 to do our fair share to keep global warming at or below 1.5°C.”* For London as a whole (community-wide) the CEAP sets targets for greenhouse gas emissions to drop by 55 per cent below 2005 levels by 2030; 65 per cent below 2005 levels by 2035; 75 per cent below 2005 levels by 2040, and “net-zero” emissions by 2050. Transportation represents London’s largest category of emissions. The 2024 CEAP progress report notes an overall community reduction of 20% over the past 20 years.

Is the City expecting to reduce emissions by a further 35% in just the next 5 years to meet our 55% target? This report did not give a clear breakdown and conflated total and per capita reductions. It looks like transportation emissions have actually increased since 2005 and may increase further under the mode share being followed by the MMP, given London's growth trajectory. In 2019, [a report on the Cycling Master Plan](#) was submitted to Council by the former Cycling Advisory Committee. Section 4.4 of the report discusses preliminary modelling of emissions reductions associated with the mode share, and may provide a useful starting point to analyze assumptions and shortfalls of the MMP and linkages to meeting CEAP targets.

In section 7.2 of the CEAP, titled "*Are These Emission Reduction Milestone Targets Realistic?*" Table 2 (page 23) provides actions between 2022 and 2030 to close the "Action Gap" including 40% fewer in-town vehicle trips by car and 25% fewer out-of-town trips by car, representing reductions of 100,000 and 60,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year, respectively. In other words, the CEAP recommendation for reducing in-town trips using vehicles by 2030 is roughly 5 times more ambitious than London's mode share target for 2050.

We question whether the metrics being used are sufficient. For example, does it make more sense to aim for a reduction of 8.5% in overall trips using personal vehicles (61% down to 52.5%, as in the adopted mode share target) or should a target represent a change in the extent of those trips, such as a reduction in [Vehicle Kilometres Travelled](#)? VKT is a performance indicator the City uses for its fleet (see [Connected and Automated Vehicle Plan](#) pages 42 and 121). Perhaps the City should aim to track future successes and failures across modes more specifically. Do we have targets for increasing transit ridership? For selling bikes? For how many employers promote non-vehicular transportation? How does the City measure the success of mixed-use zoning in enabling walkability and particularly to promote household access to food resources? (e.g., grocery, hospitality and urban agriculture).

Our review was limited by the lack of reported evidence to support interpretation of the trajectory of the MMP at this stage. While it appears that a lot of good work is being put into developing the plan, we are unclear about the methodologies, inputs and analyses being applied. As a community advisory committee composed of volunteers, we are unable to provide expert technical analysis and labour required to evaluate all critical details. [The response to the Integrated Transportation Community Advisory Committee report on the MMP](#) suggests Council might prefer to receive independent feedback on master plans from a trusted source other than advisory committees (see section 3.9).

### **3.2 The City of London should fund adoption of carbon accounting as standard planning practice**

Due to our limited access to information about the data and methodology used to develop the MMP, we are unable to assess whether the proposed projects are consistent with the scale of change required to meet the City's greenhouse gas emission reduction targets (especially Scope 3 transportation emissions in the community). Although it is stated that climate change is being considered and the general direction of mobility planning aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with transportation, we cannot determine if MMP projects will reduce personal vehicle trips by enough to meet targets. We suspect not, and feel it is untenable for the City to continue to rely on speculation about carbon emissions associated with its infrastructure planning.

Against previous recommendations from ESACAC, Council did not invest part of the last budget to develop technical capacity required to account for the amount of carbon associated with infrastructure projects and to model how planning decisions align with an overall carbon budget. A carbon budget is a calculation of the maximum amount of carbon dioxide that can be emitted while keeping in line with London's science-based targets. **We believe the lack of carbon budgeting represents a critical gap in the City's response to climate change** that threatens progress on emissions reduction. London should follow the example of other municipalities like [Edmonton](#) and [Toronto](#) that are taking steps to adopting carbon budgeting. If the City doesn't measure the carbon associated with project proposals, how can it track whether decisions are aligned with meeting emission reduction targets?

As referenced in the CEAP, London's greenhouse gas emission reduction targets adopted by Council are based on the minimum changes required to limit warming to 1.5°C, keeping the planet habitable and capable of sustaining the global human population. London is one of 444 municipalities in Ontario and 5,162 in Canada. London City Council cannot influence the trajectory of global warming, but it can and it should lead according to our community's values by aligning planning decisions to be consistent with London's and [Canada's Fair Share under the Paris Agreement](#).

The 2015 Paris Agreement commits countries to “*holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels*”. Canada is the tenth largest contributor to climate change in the world and its per capita emissions are among the highest of any country. Coupled with a long history of fossil fuel extraction, consumption, and export, Canada is responsible for relatively more warming to-date than most other countries. Governments within Canada, like that of the City of London, are relatively capable of climate action thanks to economic prosperity derived from those same factors. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change organizes effort-sharing across countries including Canada along three equity principles: *Responsibility* (cumulative accounting for historical emissions); *Capability* (relating reductions to GDP or Human Development Index); and *Equality* (per capita considerations which can be either immediate or such that effort equality converges at a future year). Of course, London cannot meet its fair share target alone; advocacy to higher levels of government will be crucial. We urge Council and the Mayor to make this clear.

Meeting London’s science-based targets requires us to rapidly curb greenhouse gas emissions. Climate change could cause [unprecedented economic devastation](#) at the expense of millions of peoples’ livelihoods, including those of future generations of Londoners. Yet, emissions reduction still does not seem like an urgent priority in London’s current municipal politics. It remains controversial to challenge emissions-intensive norms, like unnecessary overreliance on combustion engines in equipment and vehicles, and relying on fossil fuels for heating buildings. We are not on track to meeting our CEAP targets. If London fails to make an urgent transition, we expect deteriorating conditions locally and globally could force a shift in priorities over the span of the MMP’s planning horizon to 2050.

### **3.3 Feasibility, risks, costs and opportunities of the MMP**

We would like to better understand the specific assumptions that the MMP’s vision is based on, and for the City to forecast what would happen if those assumptions are not met. We sense there are significant knowledge gaps and uncertainties (many of which are beyond the City’s control) that make predicting future mobility needs challenging (see the [Mobility Master Plan Needs and Opportunities Report](#), section 2). For instance, is London’s ability to meet its City-wide emissions reductions targets (nearly half of which come from transportation) contingent on [universal adoption of electric vehicles by 2035](#)? How might Londoners’ mobility needs change if the cost of gas increases sharply or electric vehicle production stalls? The City has historically underestimated and planned insufficiently for ongoing population growth. Council recently voted to exceed the Ontario Ministry of Finance population growth projection and staff’s recommendation for the Land Needs Assessment, suggesting a lack of confidence in available estimates. Has the MMP process modelled future mobility needs under different population growth scenarios?

We are uncertain about future budgetary impacts of the MMP projects. The costs (including overruns) and future availability of funding from all three levels of government will be critical to the feasibility of implementing transit expansion and network improvements. Active transportation and transit investments tend to yield significantly higher returns than infrastructure for cars in terms of the number of people serviced relative to the cost. We are unsure how MMP projects could impact the forecasted infrastructure gap reported in the [Corporate Asset Management Plan](#) (pages 167-168). Is capital funding being spent that could otherwise cover necessary repairs? It seems the City plans to continue falling short of minimum funding needed to maintain existing mobility infrastructure in a state of good repair.

We note that other active transportation methods such as [quadricycles](#) and [pedicabs](#) are popular in other Canadian jurisdictions but don’t quite fit into London’s existing cyclist or road infrastructure or bylaws. We encourage the City to revisit its decisions not to support [bike](#) and [e-scooter](#) share programs and to further study alternative funding models.

### **3.4 Plan for mobility during extreme weather and floods**

How exactly has the MMP anticipated more extreme weather due to climate change? If City staff have not already done so, we encourage them to compare the existing transportation network and plans with a map of urban heat islands to inform the design of transportation infrastructure providing supplemental heating, cooling and ventilation where needed (e.g., fully-enclosed transit shelters). We would also recommend that designs for these projects prioritize shading from trees along active transportation right of ways wherever possible.

According to the Climate Emergency Action Plan, London is predicted to receive 37% more wet days, more severe rainfall and flooding events, and a higher frequency of severe storms. Does the City have data it can use to identify locations of persistent service gaps in terms of snow removal (i.e., failure to meet accessibility standards) and anticipate changes to service delivery as a result of MMP projects?

Where active transportation routes are becoming more susceptible to flooding (pending revised floodplain mapping) it would be helpful to map out emergency detour routes. For instance, the Thames Valley Parkway is already crowded. Parts of the TVP are highly susceptible to flooding and prohibitive to maintain in the winter. How should commuters using the TVP alter their routes during extreme weather.

### **3.5 Consider wildlife mobility to mitigate ecological impacts**

Roads identified on the MMP road network map are already prone to wildlife-vehicle collisions caused by human mobility infrastructure impeding connectivity between habitat patches (i.e., wildlife mobility). Proposed new roads, such as the bend near Oxford and Wonderland, will bisect areas where animals live and move. We encourage the City to incorporate wildlife-permeable designs and collision mitigation into road projects wherever appropriate, such as by using ecopassages, fencing and signage. Designs of vegetation to accompany transportation projects (e.g., boulevard gardens, tree plantings, stormwater green infrastructure) should aim to improve habitat connectivity by establishing corridors to allow for safe wildlife passage adjacent to and through the built environment.

### **3.6 Prioritize projects based on equity and stakeholder feedback**

In response to the staff's request for feedback on prioritization, we do not feel it is within the scope of our committee's role to advocate for any specific mobility projects. However, we recommend the City publishes an analysis comparing planned investments to data representing the current geographic distribution of low-income households, disadvantaged communities, age, and relevant crime statistics (e.g., rates of vehicle collisions, reported sexual and gender-based violence). We look forward to learning more about what the MMP team took away from public consultations and engagement with key stakeholders including the LTC, the active transportation community and employers in the region. How have these entities' concerns and recommendations been specifically addressed?

### **3.7 Shift London's mobility culture by investing in outreach programs and communications**

Following the adoption of the MMP, we encourage the City to invest in a comprehensive, evidence-based communication strategy for mobility that helps all Londoners to see themselves in this planning vision. The City's ability to achieve its mode share target and reduce transportation greenhouse gas emissions depends fundamentally on behavioural changes by individual Londoners. We do not believe this is clear enough for the public who ought to be reminded of this fact regularly in the day-to-day, especially when interacting with the mobility system.

Shifting voluntary driving habits and norms is difficult and can only be achieved through sustained effort. Desired changes can be communicated in terms of individual audience profiles, including but not limited to higher and lower-income households, people with disabilities, newcomers, families with young kids, students and seniors. What exactly does the City want Londoners to do differently? How will the City connect with them and communicate in terms of their values? The separation of modes between the Draft Mobility Network Maps implies cyclists, pedestrians and drivers are separate categories of people with disparate needs. They're not.

London is often described as a city where people need to own a car, and other forms of transportation are considered "alternative". This framing is fatalistic and reinforces a self-fulfilling prophecy: if Londoners believe they need to drive everywhere, they will structure their lives to do just that. The City should try harder to combat this narrative and create excitement about making a shift. Meeting a mode share target is not just a challenge for planners and engineers: it's about bringing people along emotionally.

Reading the MMP, how should Londoners interpret what it means for them specifically? How can they change their commute or their mobility purchasing decisions? What is their ethical responsibility to reduce pollution and harm to the environment and people? The City can do a better job of telling these stories, modelling good behaviour and



helping people to understand the true costs of overreliance on cars to Londoners individually and to our communities. Language like “mode share” and “alternative transportation” obfuscates what is materially relevant to most target audiences: *what’s in it for them?*

Wherever possible, we urge the City to be more direct and explicit about what Londoners are encouraged to do differently, celebrate the positive benefits of non-vehicular transportation, and remind drivers about the costs of overreliance on personal vehicles. Invest in strong, visible marketing. There is no single approach to communication that will reach everyone; multiple approaches are needed and should be developed based on behavioural science, change management theory and adjusted over time using a continual improvement model. Council should be unafraid to lead Londoners to doing the right thing.

Many individual choices and options related to switching modes are not being communicated widely and are therefore poorly understood. For example, many Londoners are unaware of the feasibility of using eBikes for their short trips (e.g., financing options, winter safety) and don’t know about local car share and carpooling programs. It is unnecessarily difficult for Londoners to access current maps of transit routes and information about sustainable mobility options for attending events. People may not realize how much owning a car actually costs them in the long run (payment systems are automated). Simply persuading Londoners to try a different mode once can represent a huge step towards removing personal barriers to a greater shift.

### **3.8 Situate the MMP in the bigger picture**

The City’s planning processes involving external partners like the LTC and land use planning provide the backdrop for the MMP and are difficult for us to understand. From a citizen/outsider’s perspective, it seems like London’s development cycle follows a “build fast now, figure out how to move people later” approach. People living in new builds may have fewer options for accessing non-vehicular transportation (i.e., not viable). Households may become unintentionally locked into relying on a personal vehicle, at least until transit can be expanded, and may be cast into a form of mobility poverty.

We would like to understand better how approvals of housing development and land conversion on the periphery of the city take into account future infrastructure and service expansions required for mobility, particularly transit. To what extent is the existing transit service area used to inform where housing development is planned? Where densification happens quickly or is likely to happen in the future, how will the mobility network adapt?

ESACAC is unclear on how the MMP will interface with a regional approach to transit planning that is under development. The [MMP Needs and Opportunities report](#) from June 2024 includes the following:

*Provincial Planning Initiatives in Southwestern Ontario*

- [Connecting the southwest: A draft transportation plan for southwestern Ontario \(2020\)](#)
- [Southwestern Ontario transportation task force final report \(2023\)](#)
- [Southwestern Ontario Transportation Planning Study](#) currently underway.

*These initiatives are focused on improving regional connectivity and better integration of transportation services across the region, including for inter-municipal passenger transit services. Notably, they recognize the unique opportunity to leverage the City of London as a transportation hub, due to its centralized location and proximity to communities across the region.*

ESACAC is also unclear about how the MMP is accounting for anticipated growth in industry and employment across the City and effects on mobility in the near and long-term. The MMP Needs and Opportunities report provides a map showing Population and Employment Growth Density (2021-2050) but it does not indicate how this data was collected. The greatest reduction in greenhouse gas emissions since the CEAP was adopted was due to the pandemic, when people were working from home. Can the City encourage local employers to accommodate hybrid/remote work to help alleviate congestion, such as during temporary construction impacting traffic?

### **3.9 Foster trust in the master planning process through ethics oversight, audits and peer review**

The MMP is an example of a highly complex, long term City-led planning exercise involving the collection, analysis, interpretation and management of large datasets including information gathered from the public. The City collects other data on mobility using tools like the Service London portal and through the LTC. Who at the City is centrally responsible for evaluating how the City designs research using potentially sensitive information from human participants? (e.g., online surveys, focus groups). How are the interests of vulnerable Londoners protected throughout the research process? Collected information may need to be conveyed to separate divisions of the city or agencies and organized into processes that are siloed from each other (e.g., public feedback on service gaps shared during the MMP consultation may warrant separate followup).

There seems to be an appetite among members of Council and the public for greater transparency around the data being collected and analysed for the MMP. For data collected from human participants to be made public, it would be important for the City to demonstrate how privacy is maintained to a rigorous ethical standard. As far as we know, the City lacks an ethics review body responsible for authorizing staff-led and consultant-led research to support long-term planning projects. We suggest that establishing an ethics review framework inclusive of experts and community could be a worthwhile investment for the City moving forward, especially to anticipate changes in how the City engages with the public and to prepare to responsibly adopt artificial intelligence technologies and citizen science tools. For example, university researchers will standardly submit plans in the form of protocols to an ethics board for review and approval.

When the City initiates master planning processes of comparable scope to the MMP involving consultants, it could standardize a preliminary audit of the terms of reference before data collection begins. This exercise could be handled by City staff, or perhaps more appropriately by an impartial Council-selected third party who can provide expert analysis and validate that the planned methodology is feasible, complete and aligns with current best practices. This would be the appropriate point for methodological gaps to be identified and remedied. The [MMP Phase 1 Engagement Summary Report](#) provides some of this information (e.g., section 2.4 Open-Text Response Processing and related appendices); however, this report was prepared *post hoc*, it does not discuss other types of data being analyzed and it does not identify gaps.

Final reports could similarly be subject to expert external peer review of the data, analysis, interpretation and completeness prior to being received by Council. The ability to publish results of such audits or peer reviews may be contingent on the City having adopted a research ethics framework that can provide assurance when it is safe and responsible to share data openly (see [Open Data terms of use](#)). For instance, the MMP Engagement Summary Report section 2.4 says “*For transparency as to how the open-text comments were interpreted and sorted, and to provide a means of reading the fullness of detail and insights provided in the responses, Appendices A, B and C provide a full listing of the sorted comments together with the respondents’ age cohort, gender and location*” yet these appendices have been redacted from the public document (“*for internal use only*”). Regardless of the competency of City staff and consultants (which we believe to be generally excellent) confidence in the rigour of a planning process and as well as awareness of gaps and limitations are necessary to build public trust in a long-term plan and institutions responsible for it.

Transportation planning is sensitive, detailed work that carries significant economic implications. It is incumbent on City staff to ensure the planning process is carefully designed to screen for potential gaps, flaws or conflicts. By recommending an audit and peer review, we do not mean to imply anything negative about the integrity or competence of the MMP team or consultant; we are simply pointing out that master plan materials could generally be made easier for the community to trust and understand if we could refer to comprehensive analysis by an independent third party in addition to our own personal analysis.

### **3.10 Leave transportation project planning to the experts**

We expect elected councillors to trust in the City’s transportation planners and give them the space and resources they need to sustain their work. When it comes to long-term master planning exercises like the MMP, it is essential that Council, civic administration and the public strive for mutual understanding, so that the staff and consultants (experts) can be trusted to move individual transportation projects forward in a good way. We also expect the City to consult deeply and meaningfully with the community, and Councillors’ voices to be heard, when it is time to make *major* transportation planning decisions. We commend the MMP team for their consultation efforts to date.

For the next stage of the MMP process and the MMP's implementation to be smooth and predictable, we urge politicians to exercise discretion when weighing in on *specific* mobility network decisions. For example, Londoners may advocate through their representative for the City to adopt a particular change to the mobility system where there is disagreement within the community (e.g., where bike lanes should and should not be) or contradictions with scientific evidence (e.g., adding more car lanes [generally will not improve congestion](#) as more traffic is induced). Councillors should be prepared to confront unrealistic expectations of constituents that do not align with the MMP vision or principles. Even though Council gets to make the final decisions, it should have confidence in the opinions of professional engineers and planners who understand the feasibility, merits, and risks of changing complex networks.

When politicians micromanage designs of projects such as those outlined in the MMP, changes can result in unknown impacts to the cost of implementation, introducing risks of further delays, cost overruns, and higher likelihood of not staying true to the MMP guiding principles. London's history of deferring investments in transit network expansion includes many instances where politicization of decisions contradicted recommendations of City staff, leading to worse long-term outcomes. If we want transportation planning to be done well, it must not be based on short-term popularity contests. Transforming mobility over the next 25 years will require balance between immediate and anticipated future needs.

To meet the mode share target, Council will need to make difficult, expensive decisions, beware of pressure to capitulate to car-centric convenience, false economies and NIMBYism, and plan boldly for a mobility system capable of benefiting Londoners in the decades to come.