

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program Public Transit Stream Transportation Project List for Consideration

- Harold Usher – speaking in support of the proposed bus rapid transit projects, as per the attached submission;
- Helen Riordon – urging all Council members to construct all projects of the bus rapid transit, as per the submission on the public agenda;
- Penny Moore – suggesting that better transit for all is needed, and noting that paratransit should be included in the bus rapid transit projects, as per the attached submission;
- Resident – speaking against the evisceration of the bus rapid transit plan; suggesting that the proposed bus rapid transit plan is the best thing that could happen to the city; advising that London can become the best of Canada’s mid-sized cities with the well thought, comprehensive bus rapid transit projects;
- Sammy Roach – speaking in support of the proposed bus rapid transit projects, noting that each provides opportunity to branch out and really make public transit a viable choice for residents, as per the attached submission;
- Rob Hueniken – providing information related to micro transit, as per his submission on the public agenda; suggesting that this is the future of public transit;
- Joe Fontana – noting that there is not any urgency to complete the bus rapid transit projects all at once; suggesting that London has developed differently than other cities; advising that everyone believes there is a need for better transit, particularly at peak times, but there are issues that are not addressed with the bus rapid transit projects such as under-served areas; speaking firmly against the north route, because it will not work; encouraging incremental steps to any development;
- Paul Hubert – speaking in support of the bus rapid transit plan as an economic development for London, and noting historical actions that have been to the detriment of the city, as per the attached submission;
- Jodi Simpson – acknowledging agreement with the comments of the previous speaker, in support of the bus rapid transit projects as economic development; noting that hundreds of thousands of hours (experts and individuals) have gone into the projects already; advising that London does not perform well against other municipalities with respect to public transit; imploring Council to make the right decision for the future of London, and leverage the additional funding that is available;
- Mike McKenzie – noting that he has probably never used any bus service in London, but expressing support for the bus rapid transit projects, with the exception of the north route; suggesting that there is a time constraint and the submission for funding should be done as soon as possible, the money is always on the table; speaking about the Adelaide project, traffic signals, the need for additional buses – hybrid, alternate fuel cells and noting support for the cycling downtown connections;
- Marcus Plowright – imploring Council to understand the impact of the decisions they make related to the funding available for the projects, as per the attached submission;
- James Chan – noting his public transit experience in other cities, and suggesting support, as per the attached submission;

- Dean Sheppard – speaking in support of all parts of the bus rapid transit plan and encouraging Council’s support for the whole project, as per the submission on the public agenda;
- Ed Goodhue – providing information about the Kitchener-Waterloo experience; suggesting that there are new ways for public transit that are more effective such as micro transit; suggesting that the city can experiment with the technologies going forward and there will be employment opportunities for autonomous vehicle building; noting that there are other municipalities facing these same challenges and members need to think about today’s and tomorrow’s technology;
- Joy Cameron – speaking in support of the full bus rapid transit network; advising that transportation as a social justice issue; providing details of her own experience as a cyclist and public transit user; suggesting that not everyone can drive, some people are unable to ride a bike, others cannot afford a taxi or personal car – but everyone can ride the bus; advising that these decisions have impacts for those living with disabilities or in poverty;
- Resident - speaking in favour of all projects, but particularly the north corridor; noting that students are a lot of the ridership; suggesting that there are clear economic impacts to having students be able to get around, better service would result in additional students staying after graduation; suggesting that we have this opportunity now, and should take it now;
- Danny Chang – urging support of the entire project, but in particular the north connection, noting that this is crucial for more efficient and affordable transit, as per the attached submission;
- Aiden Fullarton – noting that as a student he had to buy a car, resulting in less money that he can spend in London in a year; encouraging support for the full bus rapid transit project, with notation that the north connection is essential;
- Resident – advising that his whole family uses the bus, and noting support for the bus rapid transit project, but also concern with the project business case; noting a need for more agile approach to transit; suggesting that most of the current transit ridership is subsidized; noting support for the proposed infrastructure, and encouraging a foundation to make the whole system better;
- Jeff Williams – speaking against the proposed bus rapid transit projects; noting his experience in Melbourne, compared to North America; suggesting that the proposed bus rapid transit will compound existing problems, and that people will not get out of their cars; suggesting that Council should review traffic lights for removal that are no longer useful, and encourage alternate designs in any new development that would encourage traffic to flow;
- Alex Masserant – noting support of the entire transit initiative, noting a need to get to the city from suburbia; suggesting people choose where to live, based on reliable transit; advising that bus rapid transit has flexibility and that there is availability to expand in the future; suggesting that under-used routes be removed; and noting that dedicated lanes equate to future development potential;
- John Hassan – noting support for the bus rapid transit projects as the work benefits all Londoners, as per the attached submission;
- M. Wallace, London Development Institute (LDI) – noting that the LDI recognizes the importance of the bus rapid transit project, as members are concerned about the mobility of the community, as per the attached submission;
- Paul Cocker – noting support for improved public transit, but also noting concerns with some facets of the current plan; noting that a major issue that can’t be ignored is the railroad tracks in the city;

- Cathy Melo, Lambeth Community Association – noting that the plan focuses on the privileged north and northwest and there's not anything for the south of the City; noting the money that has been spent on the Bostwick Community Centre and there is not transit to the area; suggesting that transit improvements need to come before we talk about fancy systems;
- Ben Lansink – noting opposition to the proposed bus rapid transit plan, as per the submission on the public agenda;
- Sean O'Connell – noting some of his experiences, as he uses transit exclusively, and advising of his concern with the approach being taken for parts of the bus rapid transit project; suggesting a need for political will to see this entire project through, noting that dedicated lanes are key to rapid transit; suggesting it's time for Council to be innovative in supporting the whole project;
- Resident – noting concern for the timing of the meeting, meaning input may be limited; advising her support for the bus rapid transit project, and encouraging action now; noting the need to curb climate change is critical and bold action is needed; suggesting Council allow for the benefit of moving away from cars;
- Jen Sadler – noting support for the bus rapid transit projects, especially the north connection, per the attached submission;
- Sarah Gastle – noting that current transit in London is a problem, and that she uses active transit and transit; noting the need for dedicated lanes for the proposed bus rapid transit projects, as per the attached submission;
- Vicky Van Linden – noting a need for public transit and desire that future social projects not have funds diverted from them; noting concern with the proposed north connection (Richmond), but support for the remainder of the bus rapid transit projects; also noting concern for the areas that are excluded from the current plan;
- Paul Michael Anderson – noting that the current proposed projects are perfect, but they offer improved road equity; the bus rapid transit projects are a good first step, and should be approved entirely; suggesting that this is a moral choice, it's affordable and it will make London a more livable city;
- Gil Warren – noting support for the full bus rapid transit proposal; suggesting that sprawl doesn't support mass transit, it is designed for car use, and that micro-transit is not appropriate for density;
- Robin Pitman – suggesting that more cut-outs for buses are needed; noting support for the Adelaide underpass project; noting concerns with the proposed bus rapid transit plan;
- Dave Wayman – noting a need to fix London Transit, that is the root of more issues and should be a priority; questioning where the land to facilitate projects will come from; requesting the impact to property taxes be made known, and suggesting that residents be allowed to vote on the issue; advising that the project will exceed the proposed \$500 million;
- Walter Lonc – suggesting that the October 2018 election was a referendum on the bus rapid transit, and the majority of Londoners don't want it; advising that voters will remember actions in 2022;
- David Winner – comparing the consideration of the bus rapid transit projects to Brexit, where viable alternatives were not offered or suggested; noting his past experience on municipal council and London Transit Commission related to this matter; suggesting support for the bus rapid transit projects;
- Sandy Weir – noting displeasure in notification for this meeting, and suggesting that the projects amount to bus rapid transit presented in a different way, as per the attached submission;
- Josephine Pepe – expressing disappointment with the provided project list; citing current issues with Richmond Street traffic and suggesting that

- the north route should be on Wharncliffe; expressing support for intelligent traffic signals;
- Cam Lee – expressing support for the bus rapid transit projects as a step in the right direction and it serves the majority of the city, as per the attached submission;
 - Megan Carlson – noting that she commutes daily on the bus and suggesting that personal vehicles need to be made less convenient in order to battle climate change; encouraging support for the bus rapid transit projects;
 - Matthew Hendry – referring to the original bus rapid transit plan, and noting his support of various proposed projects, as per the attached submission;
 - Bob (Old South) – noting support for intelligent traffic signals and improving traffic flow; agreeing with the comments of J. Fontana that the current bus rapid transit is not workable, and that transit needs different enhancements especially in the north; indicating that getting people out of their cars is unlikely and unrealistic;
 - Conrad Odegaard – noting that use of diesel fuel is a significant issue, and this needs to be considered in decision making, as per the attached submission;
 - Susan Smith – noting she has been a long-time user of London transit and speaking in support of several projects: bus stop amenities, expansion buses, west connection, Adelaide underpass; noting that she can't ride her bike anymore, due to traffic;
 - Tanya Whiteside – noting that it can take her two hours to get home on the bus and urging support of bus rapid transit and the dedicated lanes;
 - Resident – noting there will never be unanimous agreement on project, and that it would be ideal to have the complete bus rapid transit plan approved;
 - Steve Struthers – suggesting that if this opportunity doesn't proceed due to "political pain" it will be a permanently lost opportunity; noting the need for bus rapid transit, not piecemeal; noting that the bus rapid transit will also have potential impact for high speed rail;
 - Stan Goss – noting opposition to the proposed bus rapid transit plan, particularly related to the trees that will be lost; noting a need for an improved system that goes to the south side of the city; advising the majority of voters were against bus rapid transit;
 - Kirk Holman – noting that the city missed an opportunity when they didn't build a ring road; suggesting he would choose "none of the above" for the proposed projects;
 - Joan Martin – providing her past experience with London Transit; suggesting completion of the west connection and that Council not proceed with the north connection, noting that the money saved could provide something for car drivers;
 - Frank Fellice – noting support bus rapid transit for London, particularly the east London link; suggesting that staff have done a good job with engaging and listening; Adelaide underpass – positive experience; suggesting that a lot of good reasons have been noted to proceed with bus rapid transit, but the most important is the issue of climate change and is a main reason to support bus rapid transit;
 - Gayle Harrison – noting the options (and associated timing) for transportation in the city, and advising that she is fortunate to have all of these options; suggesting that the system needs to focus on the people who do not have options and imploring that decisions be made for those people who have to use it, it will work for those who choose to use it;
 - Matthew Pereira – requesting support of full bus rapid transit for London, not piecemeal; noting that London is a very car-centered city and that adequate transit is needed for getting to work; noting support for the north

route - while it takes a lane of traffic, it also gives dedicated turn lanes; advising that a dedicated plan is needed to grow the city and the full plan supports this;

- Jason Jordan – advising he takes the bus and can relax, listen to music, etc.; noting he also uses his bike a lot; suggesting people have to allow the most time when taking the bus, but that this is known; advising of his support all the parts of the bus rapid transit project and his support all 19 projects, because so much work needs to be done;
- Cedrick Richards – requesting support funding and implementation of bus rapid transit, as per the submission on the public agenda;
- Resident – noting his agreement with previous speakers, and suggesting that people will move to the city because of bus rapid transit; noting that to make London a great small city, people need to be able to get to work on time; suggesting that it is ok for politicians who ran anti-bus rapid transit platforms to change their mind, and support the projects;
- Anne Lausch – suggesting it's time for London to have a proper transit system, and encouraged implementation of bus rapid transit, as per the attached submission;
- Resident – noting concern for the proposed cost, particularly the 25% overage that is considered acceptable; question why after ten years of work, there's no Plan B;
- Theresa de Jeu – noting she does not have a car, and the overall transit system is just getting worse and suggesting that bus rapid transit is an expensive way to make the system even worse, as per the attached submission;
- Jasmine Ball – noting she uses active transportation, and transit; encouraging support for the bus rapid transit, and other amenities proposed; noting that when they considered moving to London from Ottawa, they looked at the London Plan; describing her transit experience in Ottawa (positive) and Windsor (negative); suggesting that Council needs to look long term, take leadership and consider the needs of the city as a whole;
- written submissions provided at the public participation meeting, and by email, at the request of the Chair.