

From: bill brock
Date: February 12, 2017 at 11:01:20 AM EST
To: Cathy Saunders <csaunders@london.ca>
Cc: Kelly Scherr <kscherr@london.ca>
Subject: Fw: Brief on Rapid Transit Implementation #4 meeting

Communication To London City Council

Re: 4th Meeting of Rapid Transit Implementation Working Group.

Recommend this communication be discussed with the 4th report when received.

The content of this brief reflects my notes from the meeting which was presented in about two hours mainly by E. Soldo, Director of Roads & Transportation and Brian Hollingsworth of IBI.

Business Case Update: B. Hollingsworth note metrolinx guidelines developed in 2015 were being updated.

Value for money options was being examined. Electric buses could cost \$1M. Value in time savings, capital costs are estimates, some costs still unknown such as expropriation etc.. Although this could be confusing there is real dollar value today of \$556M or nominal dollars in 2026 of \$660M. Government has generally accepted business case and positive response is evident today. Delivery model funding from other levels of gov't. is 77 1/2% so city share is 22 1/2 %. City staff indicated that city of London would be responsible for all operating costs and other costs possibly such as expropriation which are outside the BRT. Councillor Usher raised issue of nominal costs which creates confusion so just going with real today dollars. B. Hollingsworth (IBI) indicated Province needs to see life cycle costs. Councillor Hopkins question about operating costs are part of plan and will be part of updated business. Councillor Van Holst asked about travel times and response indicated an individual in many cases will save about 50 Seconds; however IBI indicated the largest savings come from economic analysis of overall network not individuals. Councillor Helmer raised issue about electric stations etc. and IBI indicated there has been no discussions with Province or maintenance impact. LTC indicated there is more than costs at issue as dwell time may require more buses to maintain schedules etc.. Councillor Squire about government approval MTO generally comfortable but issue of separation of parallel grids is crucial.

There was an overhead presentation made which would be made available to members of committee after meeting. Note that without written comments as stated at meeting the overheads would be difficult to follow. This creates a concern as to what public gets to ensure a level playing field on details of project. There is several assumptions that have not been reassessed or updated. The indication is after public input Council will make a decision and approval must be in sequence of actions required by TPAC.

The corridor concepts for public meeting. General discussion noting target is full dedication of separate lanes (2) for rapid transit. There will be some challenges for locations that don't meet needs which will cause some restrictions to existing traffic patterns. Example is to allow U-turns at traffic lights. All sites to discussed in all four corridors. Locations raised were UWO, Richmond St. Tunnel between St. James and Central Ave., Central transit hub at Clarence and King, Dundas Place impact, King and York, CN 5 trains a day, King. St. serves majority downtown, Kensington buses and bikes only, Queens Ave. at bridge 2 lanes both ways, service every 10 minutes, Wellington 40,000 vehicles per day 2 lanes BRT, Adelaide & Wharncliffe diverse project.

Issues of distances to walk to nodes; using York St., Richmond north, King's College buses, what happens with local service such as LTC if aren't using BRT lanes, confused answer as to local buses on BRT (4) routes, loss of parking by private companies on local streets, loss of local on road parking for the better good of BRT..

Approval of plan by April 17, 2017; TPAC process regulated Jan. / Feb. approved by Ministry; Utilities have already had a briefing, Councillor Hubert raised issue of local buses meeting 10 minute service at various nodes. Question not answered at meeting but issues raised if contracting out of BRT fixed routes full costs of same to build could be covered by province or feds.. Other cities are currently having major issues of operating costs and lost revenue to local transit.

This brief was not solicited but with everything going on 5 minutes won't do it; just as meeting which was a prelude to going to the public lacks clarity and level playing field. Councillor Hubert statement shouldn't be lost full impact will show he is not the only one.

Prepared to discuss further if requested to at this point in process.