

Chen, Ellen

From: Tom Betty.muir [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 18, 2019 12:37 PM
To: Bajwa, Reena; Sharman, Paul; Meed Ward, Marianne
Subject: Development Charges Background and Technical appendix Reports.

Hi,

As you know I am unable to attend the meeting personally and so cannot verbalize my comments and concerns in the meeting.

However, I have several concerns that are serious to me and so I want to present these top of mind issues in broad outline at this time so they will be raised at the February 19 meeting which is supposed to finish covering these reports.

I would appreciate it if these comments were generally circulated to the meeting and the proceedings.

1. My first concern is that almost everything presented is just numbers. None of the report sections for various services contain explanations of what things are based on in terms of methodology, assumptions, underlying data, rationales, and other variables that tie things together in an internally consistent way. I see no traces of a methods and material section for any service. There may be staff presentations of verbal explanations but these are not in the least sufficient, and there need to be written reports that can be reviewed closely.

I am particularly concerned at this time about the transportation and transit services sections. Both of these services, particularly the transit service include substantial costs that are included in the "benefit to existing" category. The problem is that I see absolutely no rationale for any of this - there is no methodology, assumptions, underlying data, and rationalization for anything, that can be reviewed and scrutinized.

This is not adequate. And moreover, none of these underlying numbers and their explanatory methods and rationales, have been seen before and subject to public review and process, particularly before being explicitly included in the Budget and this DC exercise.

The Regional refusal of the adopted OP was partly based on transportation matters, which also includes transit. There are no publicly vetted plans for either of these services and these are needed to move forward on revising the OP as Council and the Mayor have unanimously decided.

2. My second concern is the question about what planning scenario or big picture - specifically what Official Plan - is the underlying driver and rationale for all of this? This extends to both the Budget exercise now ongoing, and now to the DC exercise here. These are inextricably linked and cannot, in my opinion, be legitimately or accurately articulated before we have a revised OP.

Frankly, I have to wonder whether the adopted OP that was refused by the Region, and then by the new Mayor and Council, are in effect being brought in through the back door?

I am of the view that after all the years working on the adopted OP and making overall assumptions about transportation and transit that were facilitating and enabling of that OP, that staff are I'm afraid infected or self-indoctrinated by that thinking, and I think I see the results of that in the DC material offered with no explanation.

The Budget too will be influenced I'm afraid, although it's not so visibly apparent in such details as in the DC.

I see nothing presently, or moving forward from this, that shows awareness of what the actual problem is with the over building other than attributing it to people not liking it or the change. The change is not the problem. It's the change based on impossible levels of different behaviors people are expected to manifest for no reason.

I see no rationale or explanation for why people should or could use a significant and costly increase in transit and pay the estimated large cost share, as calculated here in of all things a DC estimation exercise. I support some transit increase, but I see absolutely no demonstration and evidence-based reasoning to support what I see here.

This needs a rationale to show how the transit system configuration proposed will work to provide real results. All I have seen so far are assumptions that people will somehow and magically change.

I remember clearly at the previous DC Committee meetings hearing a transportation staff tell us that expansions and widening of roads were not in the cards, and was unaffordable, as in the future people would bike, walk and bus and there would be fewer cars.

Well, as we know now, none of this happened, and what was tried - dedicated bike lanes - did not work, and transit use fell. Am I supposed to believe in a repeat of this assertion from last time?

I would ask on what basis this transit increase is supposed to comprise a large proportion of the transportation needs for service that have accumulated over time and now are mostly said to be needed to service even more growth as a substitute I think for the real transportation needs and modes of travel in the City at present and moving forward in any practical and realistic transportation system.

Without the Council having some type of "what too much is and why", I fear the "reconsulted" public just ends up with an new plan, cost structure, and unworkable nature built in, that is basically the same thing reworked.

Thank you,

Tom Muir

1. The basis for the 2,312 incremental units between Mid-2016 and Early 2019 in Schedule 2 of the D.C. growth forecast appendix.

- The 2,312 incremental residential dwelling units are based on building permits issued from 2016 to 2018. Permits issued in 2016 and 2017 are based on Statistics Canada building permit data, as contained in Schedule 5 of the D.C. growth forecast appendix. At the time of putting the forecast together, 2018 permits were not available. 2018 permits are estimated by Watson & Associates Economists.
- A 6-month lag is assumed between the time the permit is issued and when it is ready for occupancy.
 - For instance, a full year of building permits ending from January to December 2018 would take you to a mid-2019 period.
 - The base year for the Burlington forecast is early-2019, therefore half the permits issued in 2018 were taken to achieve an early-2019 period.
 - Year issued: $2016 + 2017 + (2018 / 2)$
 - Year built: $2017 + 2018 + (2019/2)$
 - $797 + 1,109 + (812 / 2) = 2,312$

2. A comparison of the D.C. growth forecast projections with the Region's Best Planning Estimate (BPE) forecast is provided in the following table.

		Population		Housholds				
		Including Undercount ¹	Excluding Undercount	Singles & Semi-Detached	Multiple Dwellings ²	Apartments ³	Other ⁴	Total
2016	Watson Forecast	189,900	183,300	39,860	14,090	17,270	170	71,380
	B.P.E.	181,900	175,400	38,940	13,820	18,860	-	71,620
	Difference	8,000	7,900	920	270	-1,590	-	-240
2031	Watson Forecast	200,400	193,400	40,360	15,430	24,620	170	80,570
	B.P.E.	193,000	186,200	39,540	14,840	26,190	-	80,570
	Difference	7,400	7,200	820	590	-1,570	-	0
2016-2031	Watson Forecast	10,500	10,100	500	1,340	7,350	0	9,190
	B.P.E.	11,100	10,800	600	1,020	7,330	-	8,950
	Difference	-600	-700	-100	320	20	-	240

¹ Census Undercount estimated at approximately 4%.

² Includes townhomes and apartments in duplexes.

³ Includes bachelor, 1 bedroom and 2 bedroom+ apartments.

⁴ Other households defined by Statistics Canada as a single dwelling that is attached to another building and that does not fall into any of the other categories, such as a single dwelling attached to a non-residential structure (e.g., a store or a church) or occasionally to another residential structure (e.g., an apartment building). Other households also includes mobile homes and other movable dwellings.

		Employment						Total
		Primary	Industrial	Commercial	Institutional	Work at Home	No Fixed Place of Work	
2016	Watson Forecast	440	24,850	37,100	16,270	8,170	8,670	95,490
	B.P.E.	-	33,850	45,170	4,170	7,780	7,730	98,710
	Difference	-	-9,000	-8,070	12,100	390	940	-3,220
2031	Watson Forecast	440	27,400	44,000	18,570	9,740	9,500	109,640
	B.P.E.	-	34,670	49,400	4,550	8,410	8,320	105,350
	Difference	-	-7,270	-5,400	14,020	1,330	1,180	4,290
2016-2031	Watson Forecast	0	2,550	6,900	2,300	1,570	830	14,150
	B.P.E.	-	820	4,230	380	630	590	6,640
	Difference	-	1,730	2,670	1,920	940	240	7,510

Note: Figures have been rounded. Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: B.P.E. adapted from the Halton Region Best Planning Estimates, June 2011, and Watson Forecast by Watson & Associates Economists Ltd., 2019.

Table 1
City of Burlington
2031 Transit Corridor Projections to 2031

Route	Corridors	(A)			(B)			(C = A/B*60)			(D = C*.10)			(E)			(F = C+D/E, rounded up)		
		Length (KM)			Scheduled Average Speed (km/h)			Travel Time (mins)			Minimum Layover (mins)			Peak Headway (mins)			Peak Vehicle Requirement		
		2018	2031	Difference	2018	2031	Difference	2018	2031	Difference	2018	2031	Difference	2018	2031	Difference	2018	2031	Difference
101	Plains	31.13	30.08	- 1.05	28.6	30.0	1.4	65.31	60.16	- 5.15	6.53	6.02	- 0.51	15	6	- 9	5	12	7
21	Fairview	13.68	13.68	-	27.5	25.0	- 2.5	29.85	32.83	2.98	2.98	3.28	0.30	30	6	- 24	2	7	5
2	Brant	19.34	24.24	4.90	24.4	25.0	0.6	47.56	58.18	10.62	4.76	5.82	1.06	30	10	- 20	2	7	5
3	Guelph	32.78	25.80	- 6.98	21.1	25.0	3.9	93.21	61.92	- 31.29	9.32	6.19	- 3.13	30	10	- 20	4	7	3
10	New	24.75	24.75	-	25.0	25.0	-	59.40	59.40	-	5.94	5.94	-	20	8	- 12	4	9	5
11	Appleby	24.47	23.30	- 1.17	29.4	25.0	- 4.4	49.94	55.92	5.98	4.99	5.59	0.60	30	12	- 18	2	6	4
20	Burloak-Lakeshore	10.58	10.58	-	33.7	25.0	- 8.7	18.84	25.39	6.56	1.88	2.54	0.66	30	12	- 18	1	3	2
12	Upper Middle	23.77	23.77	-	30.5	25.0	- 5.5	46.76	57.05	10.29	4.68	5.70	1.03	30	8	- 22	2	8	6
25	Walkers	21.34	21.34	-	29.0	25.0	- 4.0	44.15	51.22	7.06	4.42	5.12	0.71	30	10	- 20	2	6	4
	Dundas		14.73	14.73		25.0	25.0			35.35	35.35			15	15			3	3
80	Harvester	14.82	14.82	-	25.5	20.0	- 5.5	34.87	44.46	9.59	3.49	4.45	0.96	30	10	- 20	2	5	3
1	Plains	25.60	30.08	4.48	25.6	25.0	- 0.6	60.00	72.19	12.19	6.00	7.22	1.22	30	20	- 10	3	4	1
5	North Shore	15.73	15.73	-	24.8	25.0	0.2	38.06	37.75	- 0.30	3.81	3.78	- 0.03	30	30	-	2	2	-
6	Mainway-Headon	21.52	21.52	-	26.5	25.0	- 1.5	48.72	51.65	2.92	4.87	5.16	0.29	30	20	- 10	2	3	1
48	Millcroft	6.96	6.96	-	22.6	25.0	2.4	18.48	16.70	- 1.77	1.85	1.67	- 0.18	30	30	-	1	1	-
81	North Service	33.51	33.51	-	29.5	30.0	0.5	68.16	67.02	- 1.14	6.82	6.70	- 0.11	30	20	- 10	3	4	1
87	Tyandaga Park	18.47	18.47	-	25.0	25.0	-	44.33	44.33	-	4.43	4.43	-	60	60	-	1	1	-
	Total/Average	338.45	353.36	14.91	26.8	25.3	- 1.5	47.98	48.91	0.94	4.80	4.89	0.09	30.31	16.88	- 11.65	38	88	50

Route	Corridors	(G)		
		Ridership		
		2018	2031	Difference
	Total	1,950,000	10,763,637	8,813,637

Table 2
City of Burlington
2019-2029 Ridership Forecast

	City 2016 PM Peak Period	Interpolated 2019 PM Peak Period	Interpolated 2029 PM Peak Period	City 2031 PM Peak Period
<u>Mode Share</u>				
Auto	93%	90%	80%	78%
Transit	2%	3%	10%	12%
Pedestrian/Cycling	5%	6%	9%	10%
Total Trips (all modes) - PM Peak Period	54,992	57,252	64,416	66,229
<u>Transit</u>				
Transit Trips	1,169	1,720	6,137	7,947
Existing Trips	1,169	1,720	5,454	6,870
New Development Trips	-	-	682	1,077
Total Growth in Trips			4,417	6,227
New Development Share of Incremental Trips			15%	17%
Total Ridership	1,900,094	2,696,224	8,516,223	10,763,637