Report to Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee

To: **Chair and Members**
Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee

From: **Kelly Scherr, P. Eng., MBA, FEC**
Deputy City Manager, Environment and Infrastructure

Subject: **London Transit Rapid Transit Operational Readiness Review**

Date: **April 21, 2026**

Recommendation

That, on the Recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Environment and Infrastructure, the following actions **BE TAKEN** with respect to the review completed on the London Transit Rapid Transit Operational Readiness:

a) the summary of finding and recommendations by Stantec Consulting on the London Transit Commission Rapid Transit Operational Readiness Review **BE RECEIVED**;

b) the London Transit Commission **BE DIRECTED** to review the following opportunities and report back to Council on implementation, including timing, operational considerations, and resource implications no later than Q4, 2026:

   i. with respect to *Fare Collection and Boarding Practices,* develop an expanded fare retail network and an implementation plan for all-door boarding for the Rapid Transit network;

   ii. with respect to *Rapid Transit Vehicles*, undertake discussions with New Flyer Industries Canada ULC regarding potential vehicle specification enhancements to support Rapid Transit operations, including feasibility, costs, and implementation timelines;

   iii. with respect to *Rapid Transit Identity and Customer Comprehension,* develop a Rapid Transit brand and identity, and associated communications and public awareness programs, to support the launch of the Rapid Transit system; and

   iv. with respect to *Rapid Transit Stations*, review and implement remaining station enhancements to support safe, accessible, and efficient Rapid Transit operations.

Executive Summary

London's Rapid Transit (RT) program represents a significant investment in dedicated transit infrastructure intended to deliver more reliable, and more frequent transit service along key corridors in the city. While the infrastructure provides the physical foundation for this service, the operational practices used to deliver RT service will play an equally important role in determining whether the system achieves its intended performance and customer experience outcomes.

To support implementation of the RT system, the City retained Stantec Consulting to complete an Operational Readiness Review. The review examined operational elements commonly associated with successful Bus Rapid Transit systems and considered how these practices could be applied within the London context.

The review focused on several key areas that influence overall system performance, including:

1. Fare collection and boarding practices;
2. Rapid Transit vehicles;
3. Station design;
4. System identity and customer comprehension; and
5. Operational practices such as transit signal priority and operator training.

The review found that London's RT program already incorporates many elements consistent with higher-order transit systems, including dedicated transit lanes, enhanced stations, and a corridor-wide Transit Signal Priority framework. However, several opportunities were identified to further support system performance, improve passenger experience, and strengthen public recognition of Rapid Transit service as the system is introduced.

Recommendations are provided within this report to support the implementation of RT operations and help ensure that the system fully leverages the significant public investment in dedicated transit infrastructure.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

The London Transit Rapid Transit Operational Readiness Review supports the 2023–2027 City of London Strategic Plan under the Mobility and Transportation Strategic Area of Focus.

The recommendations in this report support the outcomes of equitable access to reliable public transportation, improved ridership and rider satisfaction, and public transit that better meets the needs of London's workforce by helping ensure the Rapid Transit system operates reliably, efficiently, and accessibly as it is introduced into London's transportation network.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee – April 23, 2018 – Bus Rapid Transit Environmental Assessment Initiative
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee – October 28, 2019 – Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program, Public Transit Infrastructure Stream, Approved Projects
- Civic Works Committee – July 18, 2023 – Mobility Master Plan Update: Strategies, Mode Share Target Options and Project Evaluation Frameworks
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee – March 26, 2024 – Request for Proposals for External Auditor of the London Transit Commission
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee – January 14, 2025 – Request London Transit Commission Review Recommended Approach
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee – March 25, 2025 – Request London Transit Commission Assessment Growth Business Case
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee – April 21, 2026 – London Transit Route Planning and Management Review
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee – April 21, 2026 – Review of Subsidized Transit Programs in London

1.2 Background

The London Transit Commission (LTC) operates as a Commission of the City of London under *By-law No. A.-6377-206*, which establishes LTC as the sole operator of public transit in the City of London and defines the composition of the Commission.

At its meeting on July 25, 2023, Council directed Civic Administration to review the current by-law and report back with recommendations to optimize the collaboration between LTC and the City of London in delivering on Council's 2023 to 2027 Strategic Plan.

At its meeting on April 2, 2024, Council further resolved that Civic Administration undertake a Request for Proposals for an external auditor to initiate a comprehensive operations and performance audit of LTC.

At its meeting on January 21, 2025, Council received a report from Civic Administration outlining the recommended approach to address both Council directions which ultimately resulted in direction to undertake four distinct reviews; Governance Review; Rapid Transit Operational Readiness Review; Route Planning and Management Review; and Transit Passes and Subsidized Transit Programs.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to summarize the Rapid Transit Operational Readiness Review completed by Stantec Consulting and outline recommended next steps arising from the assessment. The review examined operational practices commonly associated with higher-order transit systems and considered how these practices could be applied within the context of London's Rapid Transit network.

London's Rapid Transit program represents a significant capital investment in transit infrastructure, with a total approved budget of $454 million for the three corridors, including $176 million in federal and provincial funding. As construction progresses toward service implementation, aligning operational practices with the capabilities of the new infrastructure will help maximize the long-term value of this investment.

The third-party review provided an opportunity to assess industry best practices from comparable rapid transit systems and evaluate their relevance for London's operating environment. The recommendations presented in this report include actions that support the initial launch of RT service, as well as longer-term considerations as the network continues to expand. The review also confirmed several initiatives that the City and the London Transit Commission have already undertaken or are currently advancing as part of RT implementation.

1.4 RT Construction Status

RT construction continues to progress across the three approved corridors, which together represent approximately 15km of major arterial roads. Construction of the Downtown Loop is now complete, with existing transit routes already benefiting from dedicated bus lanes and priority transit signals. Major portions of the East London Link and Wellington Gateway corridors have also been completed, with several multi-year contracts continuing and final construction phases anticipated to begin in 2026. Rapid Transit service is currently planned to commence on the East London Link corridor in Fall of 2027, followed by the Wellington Gateway corridor in Fall of 2028.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

Given the shared aspects of the LTC Rapid Transit Operational Readiness and Route Planning and Management reviews, they were combined into a single RFP to improve cost-effectiveness and reduce overlap, with the intent that the work be conducted in parallel and delivered as one consolidated report, structured as Part A (Route Planning and Management) and Part B (Rapid Transit Operational Readiness). The final document presents Stantec's analysis, findings, and recommended actions, summarized in the main report and Appendix A.

To strengthen the project team's expertise, the City engaged Dr. Casello, a University of Waterloo professor, recognized for his leadership in sustainable urban transportation. His background in planning, engineering, and the design and operation of multimodal transportation systems provided specialized insight for this assignment.

3.0 Summary of Review Findings and Recommendations

London's Rapid Transit (RT) program represents a significant investment in dedicated transit infrastructure intended to support faster, more reliable, and more frequent transit service along key corridors in the city.

While the infrastructure currently under construction will provide the physical foundation for this service, the operational practices used to deliver RT service will play an equally important role in determining whether the system achieves its intended performance and customer experience outcomes. In many cities, Bus Rapid Transit systems incorporate operational approaches that differ from conventional bus service in order to support higher passenger volumes, shorter dwell times, and more consistent travel times.

As London prepares for the introduction of RT service, this review examined several operational elements that commonly support high-performing rapid transit systems and considered how these practices could be applied within the local context.

The following sections summarize key considerations and opportunities related to:

- Fare collection and boarding practices
- Rapid Transit vehicles
- Rapid Transit stations
- Identity and Customer Comprehension
- Service design and operational practices

Together, these elements will help ensure that London's Rapid Transit system fully leverages the significant public investment in dedicated transit infrastructure and delivers the level of service and reliability expected from rapid transit.

3.1 Fare Collection and Boarding Practices

Why This Matters
Fare collection practices are a key factor in determining whether Rapid Transit (RT) systems can achieve the speed, reliability, and passenger throughput expected of higher-order transit. While conventional bus services can accommodate longer boarding times, RT corridors are designed to move large passenger volumes at frequent intervals. As a result, the time vehicles spend stopped at stations (dwell time) becomes a critical determinant of corridor performance.

Modern RT and Bus Rapid Transit systems increasingly use fare collection approaches that reduce or eliminate onboard fare transactions, such as off-board payment, all-door boarding, and electronic fare validation. These approaches allow multiple passengers to board and exit simultaneously, significantly reducing dwell times and improving schedule reliability, particularly during peak periods.

For systems operating in dedicated transit lanes with frequent service, efficient boarding processes are essential to maintaining consistent headways and maximizing the travel time advantages created by dedicated infrastructure.

Current Approach in London
The London Transit Commission (LTC) currently accepts a range of fare media including cash, paper tickets, smart cards, monthly passes, student passes, and other specialized fare products. Cash continues to be widely used within the system despite higher processing costs and lower convenience for riders.

Smart cards or monthly passes are currently only available through two LTC retail locations, while paper tickets can be purchased at various stores across the city. This limited distribution reduces accessibility for riders who depend on in-person purchasing or cash-based transactions.

For the launch of the Rapid Transit system, LTC intends to maintain the existing front-door boarding and onboard fare validation model. Under this approach, passengers board at the front door and pay their fare using the onboard farebox or smart card validator.

RT station infrastructure has been designed with conduit provisions that would allow the installation of future fare collection equipment if required. However, ticket vending machines or off-board validation equipment are not currently planned for initial deployment. In addition, the current vehicle specifications do not include interior validators that would support all-door boarding at launch.

Stantec Review Findings
The operational readiness review completed by Stantec identified the current fare collection approach as one of the key operational factors affecting the long-term performance of London's RT system.

Operational Performance
Front-door boarding concentrates all fare transactions and passenger movement through a single entry point, which can significantly increase dwell times at busy stations. As passenger volumes increase, longer dwell times can make it more difficult to maintain consistent headways and may limit the travel time benefits expected from the dedicated RT infrastructure.

This issue is particularly relevant for corridors operating at higher frequencies. The planned East London Link service is expected to operate with peak headways of approximately five minutes. Under these conditions, efficient passenger boarding and alighting becomes essential to maintaining reliable operations.

Fare Technology Limitations
LTC's existing fareboxes are approaching end of life and do not support newer fare technologies such as open payments using debit or credit cards and smart phone based transit passes. These technologies are becoming standard in many modern transit systems and allow for faster, more flexible fare payment and encouraging use of the system by occasional riders who may find cash, tickets or physical transit passes available at limited locations inconvenient.

Fare Enforcement Considerations
Systems that implement all-door boarding typically rely on a proof-of-payment model where passengers validate fares before boarding or upon entering the vehicle. Enforcement is conducted through periodic inspections rather than operator verification at the front door. LTC has identified potential concerns related to staffing requirements and operating costs associated with implementing a fare inspection program.

Equity and Access
Any transition away from onboard cash payments would require a broader network of retail locations where riders can purchase or reload fare media. Without this expansion, riders who rely on cash could face barriers accessing the system.

Global Best Practices
Rapid transit systems increasingly rely on all-door boarding and proof-of-payment models to improve speed, reliability, and customer experience. Examples provided from Prague demonstrate the benefits of full multimodal integration and seamless payment with small validators in the transit vehicle. While examples from San Francisco highlights how all-door boarding reduces dwell times while maintaining fare integrity through effective enforcement; and examples from Indianapolis show how account-based payment and fare capping improve equity and simplify the customer journey. There are many Canadian examples that have adopted similar practices to support high-capacity operations such as Viva in York Region, the Pie-IX in Montreal, and Rapid Bus in Vancouver.

Local Context and Considerations
Some Bus Rapid Transit systems in Canada continue to operate using front-door boarding and onboard fare payment, particularly during initial system launch. However, these systems often operate at lower service frequencies or with lower passenger volumes than those anticipated for London's Rapid Transit corridors.

London’s RT program represents a significant capital investment, with approximately 15 kilometres of dedicated transit corridors designed to support frequent, high-capacity service. Operational practices will play a critical role in ensuring the system delivers the intended improvements in travel time, reliability, and passenger experience.

While it may be operationally feasible to begin RT service using the current front-door boarding model, maintaining this approach over the long term may limit the ability of the system to fully realize the performance benefits associated with dedicated RT infrastructure, particularly as ridership grows.

The RT station infrastructure has been designed to maintain flexibility for future upgrades, and the upcoming replacement cycle for fare collection equipment provides an opportunity to evaluate modernization options that could better support RT operations.

Recommended Next Steps
The Operational Readiness Review identified several opportunities related to fare collection and boarding practices that may influence the long-term performance of the Rapid Transit network. Staff recommend that the London Transit Commission review the following considerations and report back on potential implementation approaches.

1. Develop an Expanded Fare Retail Network
LTC should review expanding network of retail locations where riders can purchase and reload fare media. Improving access and addressing the uneven distribution of fare options would enhance equity for riders who rely on cash or paper tickets, while reducing reliance on onboard fare transactions.

2. Develop an Implementation Plan for All-Door Boarding
LTC should develop an implementation plan for transitioning the Rapid Transit network to an all-door boarding model supported by modern fare validation technology.

The plan should identify:

- appropriate timing and operational triggers for implementation;
- capital and operating cost considerations, including vehicle validators, fare system upgrades, and fare compliance approaches; and
- public communication and transition planning to support rider understanding of new fare payment and boarding procedures.

Developing this implementation framework in advance of system launch will help ensure the RT system can support higher passenger volumes and frequent service as ridership grows.

3.2 Rapid Transit Vehicles

Why This Matters
Vehicle design is an important component of successful Rapid Transit (RT) operations. Vehicles used in higher-order transit services are typically configured to support faster passenger boarding and alighting, efficient passenger circulation, and improved accessibility for riders with mobility devices, strollers, or other mobility needs.

Features such as wider or additional doors, open interior layouts, multi-purpose spaces, and integrated passenger information systems help reduce station dwell times and improve the passenger experience. These elements are commonly incorporated into rapid transit vehicles to support higher passenger volumes and frequent service.

Current Approach in London
The London Transit Commission (LTC) plans to operate the RT network using 60-foot articulated buses. A total of 14 articulated buses are anticipated for the initial RT fleet serving the East London Link and Wellington Gateway corridors.

LTC maintains a multi-year bus supply agreement with New Flyer Industries Canada ULC for the procurement of both 40-foot and 60-foot buses. In April 2024, LTC completed a procurement process establishing this contract for bus purchases between 2024 and 2027. Under this arrangement, vehicles are procured using a standardized LTC vehicle specification that supports fleet consistency, maintenance efficiency, and operational flexibility.

The first order of articulated buses intended for RT service was initiated prior to completion of this review in order to meet vehicle manufacturing lead times and support the anticipated launch of the East London Link corridor in Fall 2027.

Stantec Review Findings
The Stantec review identified several vehicle features that could further support the operational goals of London's RT system.

These include:

- door designs that support faster passenger boarding and alighting;
- interior layouts that improve passenger circulation and standing capacity;
- accessible or automated wheelchair restraint systems that reduce operator involvement and improve rider independence;
- dedicated flexible spaces for passengers with mobility devices, strollers, or larger items; and
- pre-wiring or equipment to support future interior validators that would enable all-door boarding.
- Enhanced on-board passenger information screens with audible announcements

These features are commonly incorporated into vehicles used in rapid transit services to support efficient passenger flow and reduce dwell times at stations.

Global Best Practices
Agencies worldwide use common vehicle design principles that support fast, reliable, and accessible rapid transit. Examples provided from Luzerne, Switzerland articulated buses feature all-door boarding and flexible interiors to improve passenger flow and reduce dwell times; while the Indianapolis's IndyGo RT fleet adds wide doors with bridge plates, level boarding, roll-on bike racks, automated wheelchair securement, and adaptable seating. Similarly, Montreal's Pie IX RT have similar vehicle features inclusive of multidoor boarding with onboard validators to manage heavy passenger volumes. Together, these examples reflect a clear trend toward vehicles designed for accessibility, rapid boarding, and interior flexibility.

Local Context and Considerations
The features identified in the review reflect common design elements found in purpose-built rapid transit vehicles. However, implementing a completely unique vehicle specification for London's RT system would present cost, procurement, and operational challenges.

LTC has a multi-year procurement contract for new buses with New Flyer Industries Canada ULC, and maintaining a consistent vehicle platform supports fleet management, maintenance practices, and operational flexibility across the transit system.

For these reasons, the RT fleet will largely follow the base articulated bus specification established under the existing procurement agreement. However, there may still be opportunities to incorporate targeted enhancements within the existing vehicle platform that could better support RT operations. Identifying any feasible specification adjustments early in the procurement process will be important to avoid costly retrofits in the future.

Recommended Next Steps
Based on the findings of the operational readiness review and the context of London's existing bus procurement contract, staff recommend that the London Transit Commission undertake the following action to support the long-term performance of the

Rapid Transit network.

1. Review Targeted Vehicle Enhancements
As part of the Operational Readiness Review, several potential vehicle enhancements were identified that could support passenger flow, accessibility, and future operational flexibility for Rapid Transit service. In the context of London Transit's existing bus procurement contract, staff recommend that the London Transit Commission review the following opportunity and report back on feasibility and implementation considerations.

The review should consider:

- Pre-wiring for interior validators to enable future all-door boarding;
- Interior layouts and flexible spaces to improve passenger flow and accommodate mobility devices or strollers;
- Accessibility enhancements, including automated wheelchair restraint systems;
- Enhanced on-board passenger information screens with audible announcements; and
- Cost, timeline, and feasibility for implementation in the initial rollout of nine buses for the East London Link corridor.

Completing this review early will help ensure the RT fleet supports higher passenger volumes, frequent service, and reliable operations.

3.3 Rapid Transit Stations

Why This Matters
Station design directly affects the speed, reliability, accessibility, and overall passenger experience of a Rapid Transit (RT) system. Efficient stations reduce dwell times, support predictable service, and improve safety, while poorly designed stations can create delays, safety risks, and rider frustration.

Current Approach in London
London's RT stations along the Downtown Loop, East London Link, and Wellington Gateway corridors feature:

- Enhanced lighting, tactile plates, and accessible boarding areas;
- Real-time visual and audible passenger information;
- CCTV infrastructure and conduit for future upgrades;
- Leaning rails, benches, and adequate space for mobility devices;
- Distinct shelter architecture, public art, and pylons.

These station elements ensure the network is functional, safe, and easy to navigate for all riders.

Stantec Review Findings
The operational readiness review by Stantec highlighted best practices such as level boarding, advanced platform alignment, and boarding aids to improve efficiency and accessibility. While some recommendations are not feasible for London's RT network, other enhancements—such as tactile wayfinding, clear signage, and boarding zone markings have already been incorporated.

Global Best Practices
Global best practices in RT station design prioritize durable, legible, modular and cost-efficient infrastructure, with investment scaled to context. Examples provided from systems like in Indianapolis, IndyGo and San Francisco, Van Ness show how standardized elements with clear wayfinding, protective features, platform-level amenities, prefabricated shelters, real-time information, and proof-of-payment improve usability and reduce dwell times. In contrast the example from CTfastrak, Connecticut illustrates a higher-investment model that delivers rail-like comfort and strong identity, with correspondingly higher maintenance needs.

Local Context and Considerations
Level boarding was evaluated but is not being pursued in London due to the mix of curbside and median platforms, operational safety considerations, and accessibility challenges. Even under ideal conditions, gaps between buses and platforms remain that require ramp deployment, reducing the benefit of level boarding.

Many of Stantec's other recommended improvements have been incorporated, including high-capacity shelters with tactile guidance and audible passenger information at all RT stations. These enhancements support safe, efficient boarding and a consistent passenger experience while respecting London's unique corridor design and operational realities.

Recommended Next Steps
Based on the findings of the operational readiness review and London's existing RT infrastructure, staff recommend that the London Transit Commission and City undertake the following action:

1. Complete Remaining Station Enhancements
The Operational Readiness Review also considered station design and functionality. While many recommended elements have already been incorporated into London's RT infrastructure, several additional enhancements were identified for further review.

- Mirror dots or other low-cost docking aids to support consistent operator alignment;
- Corridor-wide wayfinding enhancements, including static signage, ground markings, and transfer information;
- Painted passenger markings and clearly defined boarding zones.

Completing these actions will ensure stations continue to support safe, accessible, and reliable operations across the RT network.

3.4 Identity and Customer Comprehension

Why This Matters
A clear and consistent Rapid Transit (RT) identity is essential for public recognition, understanding, and adoption. Distinguishing RT from conventional bus services signals its higher-order function, highlights frequent and reliable service, and reinforces the benefits of dedicated corridors and stations.

RT is part of London's integrated transit network, including local, express, RT, and paratransit services under a single fare structure. Establishing a defined RT identity ensures riders immediately understand the system hierarchy and the advantages of using RT. Launching with a complete identity maximizes the value of the city's investment in corridors, stations, and vehicles.

Current Approach in London
Early branding exercises explored RT identity during the Environmental Assessment phase but did not result in formal recommendations. To date, London's RT system is contained largely within the existing transit brand, without a formal RT name, visual identity, or coordinated launch campaign. While project communications have been shared with the public, no structured branding program has been implemented.

Stantec Review Findings
The review identified several key actions to strengthen system understanding and public recognition of RT:

- Establish Formal RT Name and Brand – Define a short, intuitive name for RT (e.g., "London Link" or locally inspired alternatives) aligned with LTC's network.
- Develop Visual Identity – Apply consistent branding to vehicles, headsigns, maps, and digital channels to create immediate recognition.
- Introduce On-Street and Station Assets – Coordinate signage, pylons, and streetscape elements to reinforce RT's distinct identity.

- Develop Communications Plan – Maintain ongoing communications via web updates, social media, signage, and other channels to inform the public about RT features, milestones, and service benefits.
- Prepare for Public Awareness Campaign – Plan a coordinated launch initiative with citywide events, video content, and other programs to build awareness, excitement, and civic pride, positioning RT as a premium service within the LTC family.

Global Best Practices
Global best practices show that effective rapid transit branding is functional, intuitive, and rooted in local context. Strong branding creates a clear, memorable identity that helps riders recognize services quickly, understand the network quickly, and feel confident using the system. Examples provided from Indianapolis's RT system demonstrates how simple symbols, colour coding, and motion-friendly graphics support instant recognition, while Richmond's GRTC Pulse integrates branding into real-time features, including colour-coded countdown pylon that reinforce reliability. Example from Colorado's VelociRFTA applies a locally inspired identity to build community pride and position rapid transit as a preferred mobility option.

Local Context and Considerations
The RT fleet, stations, and corridor infrastructure provide opportunities to introduce a clearly recognizable identity without requiring new vehicle types or major infrastructure changes. Coordinating visual identity elements, communications, and public awareness prior to launch ensures riders immediately understand RT, its higher-order role, and its benefits, supporting system adoption from day one.

Recommended Next Steps
The Operational Readiness Review highlighted the importance of a clear and recognizable identity for Rapid Transit as part of London's integrated transit network. Staff recommend that the London Transit Commission consider the following opportunities related to branding and communications to support public understanding and the successful introduction of RT service.

1. Develop a Rapid Transit Visual Identity
LTC should establish a coordinated branding program that:
- Defines a formal RT name and visual identity aligned with the broader transit network;
- Applies consistent visual branding across vehicles, digital channels, and on-street/station assets;

2. Develop Communications and Public Awareness Programs
Once the brand is confirmed, LTC should implement a coordinated communications program, including:
- Develop a communications plan; and
- Prepare a coordinated public awareness campaign to introduce the service and support system launch.

Implementing this identity prior to launch will ensure RT is immediately recognizable, supports rider understanding, and maximizes the impact of London's investment in higher-order transit.

3.5 Service Design and Operational Practices

Why This Matters
Efficient Rapid Transit (RT) service depends on coordinated operations, effective use of dedicated transit infrastructure, consistent operator training, and a well-functioning Transit Signal Priority (TSP) system. Together, these elements influence travel time reliability, the ability to maintain consistent headways, and safe integration with general traffic.

Even with dedicated lanes and stations, operational performance ultimately depends on how vehicles interact with signals, traffic conditions, and passenger activity. Effective training and traffic management practices help ensure that the RT system operates as intended and delivers the travel time and reliability benefits associated with higher-order transit.

Global Best Practices
Global best practices show that effective Transit Signal Priority (TSP) is built on conditional priority policies, real-time data, and strong coordination between transit and traffic agencies. Examples from Cleveland's HealthLine demonstrates this through a centrally managed, ITS integrated system that grants priority only when buses fall behind schedule, minimizing impacts on general traffic while improving reliability. Similarly, the Minnesota Twin Cities' Metro Transit example applies conditional priority triggered when buses are late or full paired with supportive corridor design such as far-side stops and queue-jump lanes, resulting in measurable travel time improvements and more consistent operations.

Current Approach in London
London's RT corridors incorporate a mix of centre-running, curbside, and counterflow bus-only lanes designed to improve transit travel time reliability. The City has installed TSP hardware along the RT corridors and has begun initial testing of the system.

The TSP framework includes:

- A centralized Transportation Management Centre (TMC);
- Vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communications through onboard and cabinet-mounted devices; and
- Cloud-based signal request and response management.

Traffic management measures have also been implemented to support RT operations. These include red pavement markings for bus-only lanes, standard provincial and national transit signage, and enhanced treatments in areas such as the King Street counterflow lane. Public information and education initiatives have been undertaken to support awareness of these new traffic conditions.

LTC plans to operate RT service using its existing operator workforce, supported by targeted training related to dedicated transit lanes, transit-specific signals, boarding procedures, and headway management.

Stantec Review Findings
The review identified several current operational practices at the LTC and the City of London that support the reliable performance of RT systems:

- Comprehensive Operator Training – Ensuring operators receive targeted training and scenario-based experience related to RT operations, including transit lanes, station operations, and signal priority interactions.
- Transit Signal Priority Implementation – Deploying a corridor-wide TSP system supported by centralized management, operational policies, and integration with traffic management systems.
- Operational Modelling and Testing – Using microsimulation or other modelling tools to assess corridor performance and identify potential operational improvements prior to service launch.

Local Context and Considerations
Many of the operational practices identified in the review are already being implemented or are standard elements of London's RT program. Operator training is a core component of LTC's onboarding and professional development program and will include RT-specific procedures. TSP hardware has been installed and testing is underway, with centralized management through the TMC and integration with the City's traffic management systems under development. Additional training will also be provided to staff in the TMC as the new RT system is brought on line as well.

Previous corridor modelling was completed during the planning and design phases of the RT program. While additional microsimulation studies are not considered critical at this stage, staff will review the potential value of updating modelling prior to launch to support operational optimization.

Recommended Next Steps
Based on the review findings, staff recommend that the London Transit Commission and City Staff continue advancing work-in progress RT operational readiness by delivering targeted operator and TMC staff training, completing corridor-wide Transit Signal Priority implementation, assessing the value of updated operational modelling, and further developing coordinated RT corridor policies and procedures including TSP and KPI frameworks to strengthen integration between Traffic Engineering and LTC systems.

These actions will help ensure that the RT network operates reliably and safely while maximizing the travel time and reliability benefits associated with dedicated transit infrastructure.

4.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

The financial implications of the recommended program elements will vary by section; however, the existing Rapid Transit program already includes budget provisions for items such as platform ticket vending machines (TVMs) and recommended station enhancements. Additional components particularly those involving any vehicle modifications, fare system and compliance approaches, and any capital investments arising from the identity and customer comprehension review are not currently allocated within the program's budget. These items should be evaluated against the overall Rapid Transit project budget once their financial impacts have been fully assessed and reported by LTC as part of the broader review.

Conclusion

London's Rapid Transit program represents a significant investment in dedicated transit infrastructure intended to improve transit travel times, reliability, and service capacity along key corridors in the city. As construction moves toward the introduction of service, aligning operational practices with the new infrastructure will help ensure the system delivers these intended benefits.

The Operational Readiness Review completed by Stantec Consulting provided an opportunity to assess operational practices commonly used in comparable rapid transit systems and consider their application within the context of London's transit network. The review confirmed that many elements required to support RT operations – including dedicated lanes, enhanced stations, and corridor-wide transit signal priority – are already incorporated into the current program.

The review also identified several opportunities that may further support system performance, passenger experience, and public understanding of Rapid Transit service as the network is introduced. The recommendations outlined in this report are intended to inform ongoing collaboration between the City and the London Transit Commission and support implementation planning as the system moves toward service launch.

Collectively, these actions will help ensure that London's Rapid Transit system is well positioned to deliver the level of reliability, efficiency, and customer experience expected from higher-order transit, while maximizing the value of the City's investment in dedicated transit infrastructure.

Prepared by:	**Ardian Spahiu, P.Eng., Transportation Design Engineer, Major Projects**
Submitted by:	**Jennie Dann, P.Eng., Director, Construction Infrastructure Services**
Recommended by:	**Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC, Deputy City Manager, Environment and Infrastructure**

Cc: Kelly Paleczny, Doug MacRae, Daniel Hall

Appendix A – Stantec London Rapid Transit Readiness & Route Planning Report

Executive Summary

The City of London, together with the London Transit Commission (LTC), is on the cusp of a transformative moment as it prepares to introduce Bus Rapid Transit (RT) service for the first time. This report evaluates London's readiness to deliver this new Rapid Transit service and assesses how existing policies, infrastructure, service planning practices, and operational approaches align with the requirements of a high-quality RT system. While the immediate objective is to support the successful launch of RT, the broader opportunity is to use this investment as a catalyst to reshape how people move through the city, establishing transit as a faster, more reliable, and more attractive choice for everyday travel.

The assessment is structured in two complementary parts. **Part A** focuses on how London's existing non-RT modes including local bus services, regional transit, active transportation, on-demand services, and other mobility options can be better integrated and re-oriented in a network anchored by rapid transit. **Part B** evaluates London's readiness to deliver RT itself as a high-quality, rapid, and reliable service. Together, these perspectives ensure that RT is not treated as a standalone project, but as a system-shaping investment.

Part B: Rapid Transit Readiness

Part B evaluates London's operational readiness to deliver RT as a high-quality rapid transit service, focusing on the customer experience, infrastructure, vehicles, fare systems, operations, and performance monitoring. This portion of the report assesses whether the physical and operational components of the system are aligned with the expectations associated with RT in leading North American and international contexts.

The assessment finds that substantial progress has already been made in areas such as dedicated bus lanes, station design, transit signal priority infrastructure, and vehicle procurement. These investments provide a strong baseline for reliable and competitive travel times. At the same time, Part B identifies some operational decisions that will significantly influence the success of the system at launch and over the long term.

Key among these is the approach to **boarding, fare collection, and fare enforcement**. The report highlights that front-door boarding and on-board cash transactions present a risk to maintaining rapid, reliable service on high-demand corridors. While recognizing local constraints and policy considerations, the assessment emphasizes that reducing dwell times through strategies such as all-door boarding, simplified fare payment, and clear customer communication is central to protecting the "rapid" nature of RT.

Vehicle design and interior layout are also examined, with attention to passenger flow, accessibility, and flexibility for a wide range of users. The report notes that thoughtful vehicle configurations, along with clear passenger information systems and consistent operational practices, can materially improve dwell times, comfort, and overall service reliability. Similarly, station design elements such as wayfinding, platform layout, and maintenance provisions are identified as important contributors to both operational efficiency and customer perception.

Part B further evaluates operations, training, and transit signal priority, concluding that London's technical infrastructure is well positioned to support RT, provided that policies, procedures, and monitoring frameworks continue to evolve alongside the system. Finally, the report underscores the importance of robust performance monitoring and key performance indicators to track outcomes, inform decision-making, and support continuous improvement as the system matures.

2.3.2 Fares & Fare Compliance Summary of Recommendations

Table 11: Minimum, medium, and maximum levels of recommended courses of action for fare and fare compliance.

Option	Characteristics
Do Current Plans Only	
Front-door fare payment/validation, designated LTC retail locations, pre-loaded smart cards.	**Benefits** • No additional capital cost. **Risks** • Significant delays to bus rapid transit, • Inconsistent headways, • Higher long-term operational costs due to long dwell times/may require additional buses, • Operator must take on fare enforcement.
	Cost: $
	Recommended: NO
Do Minimum (Current Plans +)	
Off-Board Fare Validation – On Platform	**Benefits** • Only readers on station platforms would be required; lower costs with this minimal infrastructure, • Small footprint. **Risks** • Higher propensity for fare evasion, • Open platforms.
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: None
	Recommended: NO
Do Medium (Minimum+)	
Retail Network	**Benefits** • Could enable a reduction in cash fare due to handling of cash moving away from LTC, • Vastly expanded availability of reloadable fare media, • Vastly expands opportunities to reload fare media with cash, • Opportunity to integrate fare media with other municipal services. **Risks** • Retail network provider will require a cut, • Some retailers may choose to not carry the card, • Card design can be challenging due to placements of bar codes, • Integration into retail networks can be challenging.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: YES
Single source planning, fare	**Benefits** • Comprehensive mobility options • Ease of use • Encourages greater usage from variety of users including those who only occasionally use transit. **Risks** • Potential high expense and effort required • 3rd party dependence unless done in-house
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: NO
Do Maximum (Medium+)	
	Benefits

All-Door Boarding – Interior Validators with NFC Readers	• Speedy boarding and alighting, • Enables NFC payments through cards and devices, • Can dispense low-cost, paper fare media, • Expands catchment area for ridership, • Provides opportunity for “open payment” and integrated debit/credit cards, • Opens potentiality for a future integration of varying modes and operators. **Risks** • Requires public service announcement campaign and ongoing communication on how to pay, • RT Vehicles must be pre-wired to avoid after-market costs, • Fare Enforcement Policy and Staffing. • Articulated vehicle fleet for RT could not operate outside of RT network, but this is not an uncommon practice
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC and City of London
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: YES
Off-Board Fare Collection with Platform TVMs	**Benefits** • Expanded ticketing network, • Widest variety of payment options. **Risks** • Large footprint on open platform, • High capital cost, • High ongoing maintenance/servicing costs, • Fare Enforcement Policy and Staffing.
	Cost: $$$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: NO

3.4.1 Rapid Transit Vehicles Summary of Recommendations

Table 13: Minimum, medium, and maximum levels of recommended courses of action for rapid transit vehicles.

Option	Characteristics
Do Current Plans Only	
Front Door Boarding Only	**Benefits** • No additional capital cost. **Risks** • Delays to bus rapid transit due to slower loading or offloading speed, • Higher long-term operational costs due to long dwell times/may require additional buses, • Operator must take on fare enforcement.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: NO
Perimeter Seating Configuration from Front to Back Door	**Benefits** • No additional capital cost, • More flexibility; ability to be flipped up for more space when needed. **Risks** • Less optimal spacing and capacity limits.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: NO
	Benefits

Automated Wheelchair Restraints	• Relatively simple system that most people are familiar with. **Risks** • Manual restraint takes a lot of time, • For many passengers, the process of manual restraint is unpleasant and undignified.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES (one manual, one automated)
	Critical: YES
Bicycle Racks Outside of Vehicle	**Benefits** • Preserves interior space, • Enables transport of bicycles on vehicles without taking up interior space. **Risks** • Passengers must step down from platform to load the bike, • Depending on how many bikes need to be loaded or taken off, dwell times may occasionally be longer than desired.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES (*Note: This is an action already being taken by LTC. This recommendation is to reaffirm LTCs actions)*
	Critical?: YES
Implementation of Multi-Purpose Bay	**Benefits** • Pleasant experience and greater degree of accessibility for those with items such as strollers, small carts, and bags, • Improves overall passenger flow by reducing crowding near rear door. **Risks** • Reduced seated capacity.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: NO
On-Board Passenger Information Screens and Audible Announcements	**Benefits** • Clear and concise information disseminated to passengers, • Reduces the need for the operator to personally make announcements. **Risks** • May require additional costs of screens and ongoing servicing costs.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES – currently in place
	Critical?: YES
Do Minimum (Current Plans +)	
2+1 Seating Configuration	**Benefits** • Improved passenger flow, • Increased standing capacity (passengers are unlikely to be riding end to end), • Reduced costs/fewer seats. **Risks** • Reduced seating capacity for those who are taking longer trips.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES

	Critical?: NO
Do Medium (Minimum+)	
Pop-Out Doors for Vehicles	**Benefits** • Improved accessibility, • Improved passenger flow for rapid boarding/alighting. • **Risks** • Slightly higher cost.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: NO
Use of Vinyl Seating Materials	**Benefits** • Material does not absorb water; acts as a repellent, • Material provides extra padding for passenger comfort. **Risks** • Material may not allow for the logo of the transit agency to be embroidered into the seat, • Material may be slightly more expensive compared to typical fabric. • Material would require a dedicated fleet, thereby increasing overall costs.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: NO
Do Maximum (Medium+)	
Pre-Wired RT Vehicles	**Benefits** • Provides flexibility for the implementation of on-board fare validation and open payment systems. **Risks** • Some additional capital cost incurred, but significantly less so compared to if these features were added after-market.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: YES
Bicycle Parking Network	**Benefits** • Secure locations for passengers to lock bicycles, • Reduced need to load bicycles onto bicycles. **Risks** • If passengers do not properly secure their bicycles, they may be stolen or damaged, • City may occasionally need to remove abandoned bikes from racks.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: City of London
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: NO

4.4.1 Rapid Transit Stations Summary of Recommendations

Table 15: Minimum, medium, and maximum levels of recommended courses of action for rapid transit stations.

Option	Characteristics
Do Current Plans Only	
Higher-capacity shelters with tactile plates, improved lighting, real-time bus arrival information in visual and audible formats, leaning and standard benches	**Benefits** • No change orders • Provides comfortable passenger experience **Risks** • Some stations are at sidewalk-level and serve as pedestrian pass-throughs, which may result in minor conflicts between pedestrians and passengers.
	Cost: $
	Recommended: YES – and already incorporated as part of station design
Audible Passenger Information	**Benefits** AODA compliance and increases accessibility. **Risks** Risks associated with audible passenger information being provided center around additional operating and maintenance costs. However, without them, there may be limited ability for those with accessibility needs to fully benefit from RT.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES (*Note: This is an action already being taken by LTC and the City of London. This recommendation is to reaffirm such actions)*
	Critical?: YES
Do Minimum (Current Plans +)	
Mirror Dots	**Benefits** • Mirror dots provide low-cost operator alignment to improve stopping accuracy. **Risks** • Mirror dots will require re-painting, can be limited visibility in snow/glare.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: City of London
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: NO
Passenger Wayfinding	**Benefits** • Assist passengers with where to stand and wait, • Assist with onwards connections to other modes and destinations. **Risks** • Without doing so will hinder the passenger experience and potential reduce ridership.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES *(Note: This is an action already being taken by LTC and the City of London. This recommendation is to reaffirm such actions)*
	Critical?: YES
Signed Passenger Information (Static)	**Benefits** • Improves wayfinding and accessibility. **Risks** • Require ongoing updates to ensure accuracy, • If not done, brand presence is weakened and increase in passenger confusion, leading to missed trips and poor experience.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC and City of London
	Recommended: YES

Painted Symbology for Both Drivers and Riders	**Benefits** • Clear space assignment for bus boarding (boarding zones), supports efficient boarding and limits dwell, • Assist operators for stopping alignment. **Risks** • Wear and maintenance in winter and refreshing costs.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: City of London
	Recommended: YES
Water Hookups	**Benefits** • Supports cleaning, and incident response. Improves long term asset condition and customer perception of services. **Risks** • Additional maintenance requirements, • If stations are not well maintained, negative perception of system grows, and brand can erode. • It is too late to add this feature to current stations but should be considered for future network expansions.
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: City of London
	Recommended: YES (Future Stations)
Do Maximum (Medium+)	
Network-wide Signed Passenger Information (real-time)	**Benefits** • Premium rider experience and strong brand identity with the RT system. **Risks** • High install costs and O&M, • Without doing it riders lack real time info which can impact ridership, missed connections and poor experience.
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES *(Note: This is an action already being taken by LTC and the City of London. This recommendation is to reaffirm these actions)*
	Critical?: YES
22cm Platform Height (as many as possible)	**Benefits** • Near-level boarding in as many places as possible for accessible and faster boarding, • Better perception of RT to attract new riders. **Risks** • Major civil works and utility works, • If not done, misses operational efficiency opportunities, riders do not have a premium boarding experience; • It is too late to add these to the existing station designs but should be considered for future network expansions.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: City of London
	Recommended: YES (Future Stations) It is noted that for the current program of RT in London, it was reviewed and deemed not operationally feasible for the existing program. However future corridors may open up an opportunity to review again.
	Critical?: NO
Automated Snow and Ice Melt Systems	**Benefits** • Reduces winter slip hazards, • Improves reliability of services; • Reduces need for staff to manually clear stations. **Risks** • High capital expenditures, • Less premium experience for riders and a worse winter experience.
	Cost: $$$

	Responsible Parties: City of London
	Recommended: NO
Precision Docking	**Benefits** • Provides fast and more consistent boarding, reduced dwell time and schedule variability, • Improved accessibility (reduced horizontal and vertical gaps), • Supportive of future near level-boarding, **Risks** • Higher capital cost, • Additional complexity (curb geometry, guidance and training), • It is too late to add these to existing stations but should be considered for future network expansions.
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: City of London
	Recommended: YES (Future Stations)
	Critical?: If platforms are 22cm or higher.

5.4.1 Identity, Branding & Marketing Summary of Recommendations

Table 17: Minimum, medium, and maximum levels of recommended courses of action for branding.

Option	Characteristics
Do Current Plans Only	
Do not develop a specific RT identity, brand, or marketing strategy.	**Benefits** • Lower initial cost. **Risks** • Lack of awareness of new system and its differences resulting in less ridership, • Poor rider perception/understanding of integrated network, • Limited opportunities to capitalize on the opportunity to launch new services and spark excitement about RT.
	Cost: $
	Recommended: NO
Basic communication plan web updates, fact sheets, social media posts) to inform riders about RT purpose and progress	**Benefits** • Builds basic awareness, • Ensures consistent messaging, • Reduces speculation or misinformation. **Risks** Have to manage negative narratives forming if engagement seen as lack luster.
	Cost: $
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES (*Note: LTC and the City of London are already planning to do this. This recommendation is to reaffirm this planned action)*
	Critical?: YES
Public awareness campaign, whereby digital ads, community events are held)	**Benefits** • Builds informed support, • Encourages mode shift, • Manage and alleviate concerns. **Risks** • Needs continuous updates on progress and delays costing resources, High coordination effort.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC, City of London (Comms and Planning, Engineering, Procurement), and Key Stakeholders (public, businesses, Indigenous communities).

	Recommended: YES (*Note: LTC and the City of London are already planning to do this. This recommendation is to reaffirm this planned action)*
	Critical?: YES
Do Minimum (Current Plans +)	
Establish RT Name and Brand	**Benefits** • Awareness of brand distinction, • Visibility on new services and options to build on/develop in the future; • Communicates to the public that the service is distinct from other services provided by LTC; **Risks** • Name or logo agreement requires extensive stakeholder engagement. • Not doing so results in minimal brand differentiation • Requires dedicated fleet and brand development/marketing
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC and City of London and citizens of London
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: YES
Do Medium (Minimum+)	
Develop visual brand, in terms of motion legible head signs and basic visual kit for buses Mapping and iconography for route maps	**Benefits** • Creates a unified, modern image, • Enables professional application across multiple platforms, • Enhances rider navigation and identity consistency. **Risks** • To implement requires branding specialists, • Coordination between marketing, engineering, vehicle procurement, • Difficult to integrate branding later once infrastructure is built. • If not done, service may appear piecemeal or unfinished.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC, City of London (Comms and Planning, Engineering, Procurement), and Key Stakeholders (public, businesses, Indigenous communities).
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: YES
Do Maximum (Medium+)	
Full brand experience and launch campaign. Large scale launch initiative with video storytelling, media partnerships, citywide events, and local ambassadors to celebrate the RT launch	**Benefits** • Creates excitement and civic pride, • Boosts early ridership and positive perception, • Reinforces LTC's leadership role. **Risks** • Needs continuous updates on progress and delays costing resources, • High coordination effort, • Requires complex logistics and timing.
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC, City of London (Comms and Planning, Engineering, Procurement), and Key Stakeholders (public, businesses, Indigenous communities).
	Recommended: YES
	Critical?: NO
On-street/station assets such as totems/posters	**Benefits** • Reinforces distinct nature of RT, • Improves wayfinding and user perception. **Risks** • Requires continual maintenance to avoid fade and wear, • Requires extensive coordination with streetscape designers, procurement, permitting and approvals. Without doing so, there is an increased risk of 'invisible investment'.
	Cost: $$$

	Responsible Parties: City of London (Comms and Planning, Engineering, Procurement), and Key Stakeholders (public, businesses, Indigenous communities).
	Recommended: YES *(Note: Distinctive design elements, such as tall and well-lit pylons, are already included in the station design. This recommendation is to reaffirm this action)*
	Critical?: YES
Marketing materials for customers' "how to ride" guides, with pop-ups and previews of onboard and stations	**Benefits** • Builds rider confidence and creates rider buzz, • Reduces confusion at launch, • Attract more new riders, broadening market, • Strengthens perception of RT as modern, new and customer focussed. **Risks** • Materials require updating, • Additional staffing and coordination for events. Without doing so, riders may be more confused, and adoption may be limited.
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC, City of London (Comms and Planning, Engineering, Procurement), and Key Stakeholders (public, businesses, Indigenous communities).
	Recommended: NO

6.4.2 Operations & Training, Transit Signal Priority, and Traffic Management Summary of Recommendations

Table *19: Minimum, medium, and maximum levels of recommended courses of action for operations and TSP.*

Option	Characteristics
Do Current Plans Only	
Continue operating the signal system as-is, without activating TSP or developing supportive policies.	**Benefits** • No immediate capital or staffing costs, • Maintains current operations. **Risks** • Missed opportunity to improve bus travel time reliability and customer satisfaction, • Potential loss of funding opportunities tied to transit priority improvements.
	Cost: $
	Recommended: NO (*Note: While this is a "NO" recommendation, the City of London and LTC have already implemented TSP and will continue to optimize the system has it matures. This recommendation is to reaffirm the actions of the City of London and LTC)*
Comprehensive training program (covering vehicle operations, safety, customer service and accessibility procedures). Including scenario training and ride-along programs.	**Benefits** • Operators more effective in more scenarios, • Improved reliability and consistency in service delivery and quality, • Builds strong operator confidence. **Risks** • More expensive and time intensive to undertake.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC
	Recommended: YES *(Note: This is an action that is already standard within LTC practices. This recommendation is to reaffirm this action)*
	Critical?: YES
Do Minimum (Current Plans +)	
Activate basic TSP functions on select	**Benefits** • Quick to implement using current infrastructure and controller capabilities,

intersections using existing signal hardware. TSP would operate on an intersection-by-intersection basis, using green extensions only.	• Demonstrates visible progress toward bus priority and improved schedule reliability, • Limited disruption to existing signal coordination or pedestrian operations. **Risks** • Lack of consistent system logic across corridors (patchwork implementation), • Lack of ability to scale or manage system performance city-wide, • TSP effectiveness constrained by absence of policy, central coordination, and adaptive features.
	Cost: $$
	Responsible Parties: LTC and City of London
	Recommended: NO
Do Medium (Minimum+)	
Implement TSP across the RT system through the TMC, using centralized communication, green extensions and early greens, and an updated signal timing policy. Integrate TSP operations into the forthcoming Transportation Intelligent Intelligent Mobility Management System (TIMMS).	**Benefits** • Consistent, centrally managed priority logic across corridors, • Balanced coordination between buses, emergency vehicles, and pedestrians, • Enables real-time monitoring and performance analytics through TIMMS, • Enhances readiness for future RT or bus priority lanes. **Risks** • Moderate capital investment and staff resourcing required, • Requires detailed coordination between City ITS and LTC planning/operations teams, • Minor public learning curve if signal timing changes are noticeable to drivers.
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC and City of London
	Recommended: YES *(Note: This is an action that has already been taken by the City of London and LTC. This recommendation is to reaffirm these actions)*
	Critical?: YES
Consider engaging in a microsimulation study of the RT network or select corridors.	**Benefits** • Understand vehicle or modal interactions at key areas and develop context-specific mitigation strategies. • Test mitigation scenarios to quantify operational impacts. **Risks** • Misallocation of efforts, creating or shifting operational impacts. • Lack of data or insights is insufficient to apply responsible measures,
	Cost: $$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC and City of London
	Recommended: YES – LTC have already undertaken this modelling for the current corridors. For future corridors a similar study should be undertaken.
	Critical?: NO
Do Maximum (Medium+)	
Adopt a fully adaptive, data-driven TSP system with integrated RT corridor signal priority, conditional TSP logic (based on lateness or occupancy), and pedestrian-friendly adaptive phasing. Implement comprehensive policy, street design, and technology integration	**Benefits** • Maximizes transit reliability and person-throughput efficiency on key corridors, • Fully supports future RT operations, bus lanes, and active mode integration, • Continuous performance optimization via adaptive algorithms and real-time analytics, • Strong alignment with net-zero, Complete Streets, and Vision Zero goals, • Travel time improvements **Risks** • High capital and operational cost,

	• Complex integration across multiple software platforms and data systems, • Requires sustained inter-agency coordination and high technical maturity, • Short-term complexity and dependency on technology partners; greater exposure to initial system bugs or calibration issues.
	Cost: $$$$
	Responsible Parties: LTC, City of London, and ITS Vendors
	Recommended: NO