

## APPENDIX D: CONSULTATION REPORT

### APPENDIX D-5: PUBLIC CONSULTATION RECORD

PART 1/1



**Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Office**  
**PIC #1 & PIC #2 Notice Distribution**

Count	Date	# of Recipients	Description	Delivery Method
<b>PIC #1 NOTICE</b>				
	1 August 30, 2016	1124	PIC #1 Notice to registered owners, frontage properties.	Registered Mail
	2 August 30, 2016	43	PIC #1 Notice to property owners regarding property.	Registered Mail
	3 August 30, 2016	7073	PIC #1 Notice to properties within 30m' of the B-Line and A-Line corridor.	Canada Post
	4 September 14, 2016	117	PIC #1 Notice to Technical Stakeholders.	Canada Post
	5 September 13, 2016	28	PIC #1 Notice to First Nations.	Email/Phone
<b>PIC #2 NOTICE</b>				
	6 December 19, 2016	25	PIC #2 Notice to First Nations.	Email/Phone
	7 December 19, 2016	92	PIC #2 Notice to Community Groups.	Email
	8 December 19, 2016	60	PIC #2 Notice to City of Hamilton working groups.	Email
	9 December 19, 2016	132	PIC #2 Notice to Technical Stakeholders.	Canada Post
	10 January 9, 2017	43	PIC #2 Notice to property owners regarding property.	Registered Mail
			PIC #2 Notice to properties 45m' of the B-Line (McMaster to QTC); A-Line (on James Street, King Street to Guise Street); run-in track (on Longwood, between Main and Frid Street); OMSF (east of Longwood, between Chatham/Aberdeen); and pedestrian connection (on Hughson, between Gore Park and Hunter Street).	Canada Post
	11 December 19, 2016	8443		Canada Post
	12 December 19, 2016	9	PIC #2 Notice to MPs and MPPs.	Canada Post

**Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Office  
Consultation Events & Meetings**

Name	Host	Type (Meeting/Event)	Date	Time	# of Attendees	Street Number	Street Name	Street Suffix	Street Direction	City
LRT Planning Working Group (1st Round)	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	15-Jan-16	8:30 AM	20	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
LRT Subsurface Working Group (1st Round)	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	15-Jan-16	1:00 PM	20	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
LRT Transportation Working Group (1st Round)	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	18-Jan-16	8:30 AM	20	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
LRT Operations Working Group (1st Round)	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	18-Jan-16	1:00 PM	20	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Hamilton Chamber of Commerce LRT Task Force	Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	Meeting	27-Jan-16	4:30 PM	-	120	King	Street	West	Hamilton
LRT Transportation Working Group (2nd Round)	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	30-Mar-16	8:30 AM	20	77	James	Street	North	Hamilton
LRT Planning Working Group (2nd Round)	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	30-Mar-16	1:00 PM	20	77	James	Street	North	Hamilton
Hamilton Chamber of Commerce LRT Task Force	Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	Meeting	30-Mar-16	4:30 PM	-	1	James	Street	North	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Jackson	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	11-Apr-16	10:00 AM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Farr	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	11-Apr-16	1:00 PM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Ferguson	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	12-Apr-16	11:30 AM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Whitehead	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	12-Apr-16	1:00 PM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Mayor Eisenberger	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	13-Apr-16	11:00 AM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Pearson	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	13-Apr-16	1:00 PM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Collins	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	14-Apr-16	10:00 AM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Merulla	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	18-Apr-16	9:00 AM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Partridge	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	18-Apr-16	12:00 PM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Pasuta	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	21-Apr-16	9:00 AM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Conley	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	21-Apr-16	11:00 AM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Johnson	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	21-Apr-16	1:00 PM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Skelly	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	21-Apr-16	2:30 PM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. Green	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	25-Apr-16	10:00 AM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
LRT Briefing w/Minister Ted McMeekin	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	25-Apr-16	3:30 PM	8	299	Dundas	Street	East	Hamilton
Project Update w/Cr. VanderBeek	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	27-Apr-16	2:30 PM	5	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Team Hamilton MP and MPP Briefing	Team Hamilton MP and MPP Briefing	Meeting	29-Apr-16	12:30 PM	15	36	Hunter	Street	East	Hamilton
Hamilton Cycling Committee	Hamilton Cycling Committee	Meeting	04-May-16	5:30 PM	16	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
International Village BIA Board Meeting	International Village BIA	Meeting	11-May-16	8:15 AM	10	12	Ferguson	Avenue	North	Hamilton
Ancaster Chamber of Commerce Meeting	Ancaster Chamber of Commerce	Meeting	13-May-16	12:00 PM	15	548	Old Dundas	Road	North	Ancaster
Ward 1 Community Meeting	Ward 1	Meeting	17-May-16	7:00 PM	60	125	Cline	Avenue	South	Hamilton
Downtown Hamilton BIA Board Meeting	Downtown Hamilton BIA	Meeting	19-May-16	9:00 AM	12	20	Hughson	Street	South	Hamilton
Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee	Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee	Meeting	19-May-16	12:00 PM	30	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Hamilton I.T. Services Department	I.T. Services Department	Meeting	25-May-16	8:30 AM	100	55	York	Boulevard		Hamilton
Flamborough Chamber of Commerce Business Roundtable	Flamborough Chamber of Commerce	Meeting	25-May-16	12:00 PM	15	27	Hwy 5	Waterdown		Hamilton
City of Hamilton Young Professionals	City of Hamilton Young Professionals	Meeting	02-Jun-16	9:00 AM	20	64	Melrose	Avenue	North	Hamilton
Yale Properties (Jackson Square)	Yale Properties (Jackson Square)	Meeting	06-Jun-16	9:00 AM	6	100	King	Street	West	Hamilton
McMaster Geography Course (1st Year)	McMaster University	Meeting	06-Jun-16	6:00 PM	40	1280	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Ancaster Community Council	Ancaster Community Council	Meeting	06-Jun-16	7:30 PM	15	300	Wilson	Street	East	Ancaster
Hamilton Chamber of Commerce - James St N Businesses	Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	Meeting	08-Jun-16	4:00 PM	40	294	James	Street	North	Hamilton
Ottawa Street BIA Board Meeting	Ottawa Street BIA	Meeting	09-Jun-16	9:00 AM	15	204	Ottawa	Street	North	Hamilton
International Village BIA Open House	International Village BIA	Event	15-Jun-16	8:00 AM	35	1	Jarvis	Street		Hamilton
Downtown BIA Board Meeting	Downtown BIA	Meeting	16-Jun-16	9:00 AM	15	20	Hughson	Street	South	Hamilton
Westdale Village BIA Open House	Westdale Village BIA	Event	16-Jun-16	6:00 PM	30	955	King	Street	West	Hamilton
Dundas Community Council	Dundas Community Council	Meeting	20-Jun-16	7:30 PM	25	60	Main	Street		Dundas
Downtown BIA Open House	Downtown BIA	Event	21-Jun-16	4:00 PM	50		Right House	Building		Hamilton
LRT King Businesses	Cr. Jason Farr	Meeting	22-Jun-16	11:00 AM	10	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
LRT Streetscaping & GO Pedestrian Connection Workshop	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	27-Jun-16	9:00 AM	28	64	Melrose	Avenue	North	Hamilton
LRT Streetscaping & GO Pedestrian Connection Workshop	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	27-Jun-16	1:00 PM	10	64	Melrose	Avenue	North	Hamilton
Hamilton Chamber of Commerce LRT Task Force	Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	Meeting	27-Jun-16	4:30 PM	-	120	King	Street	West	Hamilton
Ward 4 Meeting	Ward 4	Meeting	28-Jun-16	7:00 PM	60	1353	Barton	Street	East	Hamilton
LRT Presentation w/MP Filomena Tassi	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	11-Jul-16	9:30 AM	5	36	Hunter	Street	East	Hamilton
Advisory Committee For Persons With Disabilities	Advisory Committee For Persons With Disabilities	Meeting	12-Jul-16	4:00 PM	25	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Hamilton HIVE Young Professionals Group	Hamilton HIVE Young Professionals Group	Meeting	13-Jul-16	8:30 AM	20	115	King	Street	East	Hamilton
International Village BIA	International Village BIA	Meeting	14-Jul-16	12:00 PM	8	12	Ferguson	Avenue	North	Hamilton
Columbia International College	Columbia International College	Meeting	20-Jul-16	8:30 AM	10	1003	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Hamilton Health Sciences Executive Committee	Hamilton Health Sciences	Meeting	20-Jul-16	10:30 AM	22	1200	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Park 'n' Party	North Hamilton Community Health Centre	Event	20-Jul-16	3:30 PM	500	438	Hughson	Street	North	Hamilton
Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association	Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association	Meeting	26-Jul-16	7:00 PM	10					
City of Hamilton Lunch n Learn	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	28-Jul-16	12:00 PM	100	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Advisory Committee For Persons With Disabilities	Advisory Committee For Persons With Disabilities	Meeting	09-Aug-16	4:00 PM	25	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
International Village BIA	International Village BIA	Meeting	10-Aug-16	9:15 AM	8	12	Ferguson	Avenue	North	Hamilton
Gore Park Summer Promenade	Downtown Hamilton BIA	Event	12-Aug-16	11:00 AM	250		Gore Park	Area		Hamilton
Concession Street Fest 2016	Concession Street BIA	Event	13-Aug-16	11:00 AM	250		Concession	Street		Hamilton
Sidewalk Sale 2016	McMaster University	Event	08-Sep-16	10:00 AM	100	1280	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Supercrawl	Supercrawl	Event	09-Sep-16	9:00 AM	47					
PIC #1 - MIP	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	12-Sep-16	5:00 PM	140	175	Longwood	Road	South	Hamilton

**Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Office  
Consultation Events & Meetings**


Name	Host	Type (Meeting/Event)	Date	Time	# of Attendees	Street Number	Street Name	Street Suffix	Street Direction	City
PIC #1 - City Hall	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	13-Sep-16	3:00 PM	172	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
PIC #1 - LIUNA Station	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	14-Sep-16	5:00 PM	116	360	James	Street	North	Hamilton
PIC #1 - Dr. Perkins Centre	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	15-Sep-16	5:00 PM	83	1429	Main	Street	East	Hamilton
PIC #1 - Battlefield House Museum	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	20-Sep-16	5:00 PM	94	77	King	Street	West	Hamilton
PIC #1 - Sackville Centre	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	21-Sep-16	5:00 PM	115	780	Upper	Wentworth	Street	Hamilton
PIC #1 - Dundas Town Hall	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	22-Sep-16	5:00 PM	141	60	Main	Street		Dundas
AWWCA AGM	AWWCA	Meeting	26-Sep-16	6:30 PM	30	125	Cline	Avenue	South	Hamilton
PED Staff Lunch 'n' Learn	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	29-Sep-16	12:00 PM	40	100	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
LRT OMSF Discussion	Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association (Sub-Committee)	Meeting	12-Oct-16	7:00 PM	10	115	Stanley	Avenue		Hamilton
Engineering Week Luncheon	Engineers	Meeting	17-Oct-16	12:00 PM	500	1520	Stonechurch	Road	East	Hamilton
RAHB Meeting	Realtors Association of Hamilton-Burlington	Meeting	20-Oct-16	10:30 AM	30	505	York	Boulevard		Hamilton
CITE Hamilton Section Luncheon	CITE Hamilton Section	Event	25-Oct-16	11:30 AM	52	660	Barton	Street		Stoney Creek
HHCA Board Meeting	Hamilton-Halton Construction Association	Meeting	27-Oct-16	3:30 PM	10	370	York	Boulevard		Hamilton
Ward 4 Meeting	Ward 4 - Cr. Merulla	Meeting	27-Oct-16	7:00 PM	40	785	Britannia	Avenue		Hamilton
Downtown Hamilton BIA AGM	Downtown Hamilton BIA	Meeting	01-Nov-16	5:30 PM	25	48	Hughson	Street	North	Hamilton
McMaster Student Session	McMaster University	Event	03-Nov-16	9:00 AM	50	1280	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Hamilton CCAS	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	03-Nov-16	10:30 AM	4	735	King	Street	East	Hamilton
International Village BIA Open House	International Village BIA	Event	10-Nov-16	8:30 AM	15	1	Jarvis	Street		Hamilton
JBRE Properties	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	10-Nov-16	2:00 PM	4	36	Hunter	Street	East	Hamilton
LRT Information Session - First Place	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	11-Nov-16	1:30 PM	20	350	King	Street	East	Hamilton
Hamilton Chamber of Commerce LRT Task Force	Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	Meeting	17-Nov-16	4:30 PM	-	120	King	Street	West	Hamilton
Probus Club of Ancaster	Probus Club of Ancaster	Event	23-Nov-16	10:00 AM	110	20	Gilbert	Avenue		Ancaster
LRT Information Session - St. Johns Place	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	25-Nov-16	12:30 PM	15					
LRT Information Session - Good Shepherd	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	28-Nov-16	10:00 AM	5					
LRT Information Session - Indwell	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	01-Dec-16	12:00 PM	20	1429	Main	Street	East	Hamilton
Streetscaping Workshop (Internal)	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	12-Dec-16	1:00 PM	28	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
Streetscaping Workshop (External)	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	12-Dec-16	5:00 PM	13	71	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
LRT Information Session - Mountain	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	11-Jan-17	7:00 PM	30	780	Upper	Wentworth	Street	Hamilton
PIC #2 - Dr. Perkins Centre	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	16-Jan-17	4:00 PM	120	1429	Main	Street	East	Hamilton
PIC #2 - David Braley Health Sciences Centre	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	17-Jan-17	4:00 PM	106	100	Main	Street	West	Hamilton
PIC #2 - MIP	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	18-Jan-17	4:00 PM	193	175	Longwood	Road	South	Hamilton
LRT Information Session - Dundas	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	24-Jan-17	7:00 PM	90	60	Main	Street		Dundas
LRT Information Session - Stoney Creek	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	26-Jan-17	7:00 PM	70	127	Grays	Road		Stoney Creek
Central Cycle Hamilton	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	31-Jan-17	9:30 AM	5	36	Hunter	Street	East	Hamilton
Art Gallery of Hamilton	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Meeting	31-Jan-17	11:00 AM	6	36	Hunter	Street	East	Hamilton
International Village BIA - Streetscape	International Village BIA	Meeting	08-Feb-17	8:15 AM	10	12	Ferguson	Avenue	North	Hamilton
LRT Information Session - Terraces On King	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	18-Feb-17	10:00 AM	35	260	King	Street	East	Hamilton
LRT Cycling Community Consultation	City of Hamilton (LRT)	Event	23-Feb-17	7:00 PM	30	175	Longwood	Road	South	Hamilton



**Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Office**  
**Hamilton LRT Project e-Blast**

Issue	Date	Time	# of Recipients	Description
1	Friday, September 2, 2016	1:06 PM	30	Initial welcome email informing recipients of PICs, online FAQ videos and SUE investigations.
2	Friday, September 9, 2016	4:42 PM	205	Reminder of PICs and LRV at Supercrawl.
3	Wednesday, October 3, 2016	3:23 PM	408	Reminder of PIC comment period deadline of October 6, 2016,
4	Wednesday, December 21, 2016	3:30 PM	1225	PIC #2 notice, FAQs, SUE investigations.
5	Wednesday, January 11, 2017	3:22 PM	1180	PIC # and community update meeting notice, invitation to follow on Twitter.
6	Tuesday, January 24, 2017	4:10 PM	1394	PIC #2 recap, notice of upcoming community update meetings, invitation to follow on Twitter.
7	Thursday, February 2, 2017	3:57 PM	1424	A-Line announcement, RFQ, PIC #2 comment period reminder.

Date of Inquiry	Agency	Problem/Issue	Response
21-Jun-16	Resident	Alternative suggestions	Noted and Welcome
undated	Resident	Traffic; economic impact; alternatives	issues addressed in EPR; concerns noted
08-Nov-16	BBM Business Systems	Loading, garbage, traffic; emergency services; business impacts; mosque parking; 2-way conversions; extension to Eastgate; CP grade separation	Provided in attached letter
undated	Strathcona Community Council	Various comments of support and concern	Noted and Welcome
undated	Sherwood Secondary School - Civics Class	Various questions	Provided in attached letter
25-Oct-16	AMERC Foster Wheeler	A-Line concerns and proposals	A-Line removed from project
05-Dec-16	Sonic Unyon re: Supercrawl	Construction program strategy proposals and requests; festival planning strategies	A-Line removed from project; suggestions noted and participation welcome
15-Dec-16	Downtown Hamilton BIA	Communication; Accessibility/Wayfinding/Welcoming businesses; proposals for construction program strategy	Suggestions noted and participation welcome
23-Dec-16	Art Gallery of Hamilton	Loading dock access; emergency vehicle access; visitor experience during construction	Traffic and loading to be dealt with in detailed design; construction management plan to be developed and participation welcome
16-Jan-17	AMEC Foster Wheeler	West end access suggestion	Noted
23-Jan-17	Zelinka Priamo Ltd, for LCBO	Traffic and pedestrian impacts, construction impacts; visual impacts	Detailed traffic and parking studies will be completed during detailed design; along with construction management plan
24-Jan-17	Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association	Request for involvement, future studies and monitoring	Referred to staff for follow-up; Studies to be addressed in detailed design
18-Jan-17	Resident	Traffic concerns, bus alternatives, CP crossing concerns; commuter parking; O & M contract; Bombardier record	Traffic and crossing issues addressed in EPR; no commuter parking planned at this time; O & M contract to be negotiated; vehicle choice not restricted
01-Feb-17	Cycle Hamilton Board of Directors	Cycling - input and Ideas	Noted and Welcome
PIC 1	Resident	Alternative transportation system	Noted
PIC 1	Resident	Comment on value of project	Noted
PIC 1	Resident	General concerns for project, CP Crossing traffic	Issues addressed in EPR; concerns noted
PIC 1	Resident	Numerous traffic questions; concerns	Issues addressed in EPR; concerns noted
PIC 1	Resident	Eastgate Extension, A-line concerns	A-Line removed from project
04-Oct-16	Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	Bay Street stop	Referred to LRT Sub-Committee, GIC and Council
PIC 1	Resident	Suggestions for commuter rail or tunnel alternatives	Suggestions noted
PIC 1	Resident	Internal train environment	Suggestions noted



Hamilton

Chris Murray, City Manager

71 Main St. W., Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Phone: 905.540.5420 Fax: 905.540.5141

E-mail: Chris.Murray@hamilton.ca

July 15, 2016

Dear :

Thank you for taking the time to write to me, preparing the sketches and for your comments.

I have forwarded the material onto Paul Johnson, Director of LRT Projection Co-ordination for his review.

Sincerely,

Chris Murray  
City Manager

cc: Paul Johnson, Director, LRT Project Co-ordination, City of Hamilton

JUN 22 2016

JUNE 21 / 2016

DEAR CHRIS MURRAY

ENCLOSED IS VARIOUS DIAGRAMS THAT SHOW WHY I AM AGAINST THE LRT TROLLEY CAR. TROLLEY CARS WERE GOTTEN RID OF ALL OVER NORTH AMERICA AND REPLACED BY <sup>LAP 4 R9</sup> BUSSES. TROLLEY CARS REQUIRE ① TRAIN TRACKS IN THE STREET ② UGLY OVERHEAD WIRES ③ ELECTRICAL POWER SUBSTATIONS ④ EXPENSIVE TROLLEY CAR REPAIR SHOPS, ⑤ TOTAL COST IN HAMILTON 800 MILLION DOLLARS FOR TROLLEY CARS ⑥ A SINGLE TROLLEY CAR COSTS 3 TO 6 MILLION PEOPLE AND SEATS 50 PEOPLE

BUSSES CAN SEAT 60 TO 100 PEOPLE OR MORE. AND COST LESS THAN 1 MILLION EACH, AND CAN GO ANYWHERE IN THE CITY

ROUGH

I HAVE ROUGH SKETCHES FOR ANOTHER ROUTE. THAT I THINK WOULD BE MUCH BETTER, THESE SKETCHES WOULD HAVE TO PROPERLY DESIGNED BY ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS & OTHER EXPERTS I AM NOT. AN ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER JUST A CONCERNED CITIZEN. I DID WORK FOR MY FATHER'S ENGINEERING BUSINESS O G MORPAT ENGINEERS 1950 - 1988 AND SAW MY BROTHER'S ARCHITECTURAL FIRM GET GOING 1966 TO 2006. MORPAT KINOSHITA WAS SOLD TO CANNON DESIGN IN 2004

THE THIB GO STATION WAS IN 1982 / BUILDINGS ON TOP OF BUILDING MAYOR. MORROW 1985, IF THIS OTHER ROUTE IS OF INTEREST TO YOU I CAN BE REACHED AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS


Yours Sincerely

Acceleration Rate	1.1 m/s <sup>2</sup>
Deceleration	1.2 m/s <sup>2</sup>
- service brake	Min. 2.2
- emergency braking rate	
Maximum gradient	6% (maximum gradient will be 5% at maximum speed of 25 km/h for an unlimited distance and 6% sustained for 250m)
Seated passengers	50
Standing passengers (4 pass./m <sup>2</sup> )	128
Bicycle, pram and wheelchair locations	Included

SEATS 50 PEOPLE

Below is an example of a similar vehicle, with similar characteristics as defined in Table 2.2 proposed by Metrolinx for similar types of projects, such as the Metrolinx Eglinton - Scarborough Crosstown project.

Figure 2.4: Similar Metrolinx Vehicle Example



#### LRT Guideway

The guideway will accommodate two LRT vehicles. The design criteria were developed by considering the operational parameters (static and dynamic vehicle envelope), the placement of the catenary poles, and the required spacing between LRT vehicles, adjacent traffic lanes and sidewalks.

Depending on the required traffic movements adjacent to the LRT guideway, several segregation options are being considered. Either the guideway will have a raised curb (typically, 150 mm high) or the guideway will be flush with the road where traffic is permitted to cross the tracks, a visual segregation will be considered. The exact detail and locations of the segregation options will be defined in the detailed design phase.

#### Power Supply and Distribution

For this system, the external power supply will be provided by Horizon Utilities from the existing 115 kV/13.8 kV or 27.6 kV transformer stations. The traction power substations (TPSS) will be prefabricated and placed in locations close to the alignment. Exact locations of the substations will be determined in the detailed design phase.

A simulation program was used to verify the capacity and spacing of the traction power substations was suitable for the operation of the vehicle fleet. This program simulates the vehicle movements and calculates the electrical current through equipment and cables in the power system as well as calculates the voltage at the vehicles. To ensure the power system can deliver sufficient power to the vehicles for normal and anomalies in operations, the criteria for the RMS current was limited to 80% of the equipment and cable ratings. As well the criteria for the voltage to the vehicles should not go below 525V and with less than 10% of the time the voltage is below 600V.

If all above conditions are met, the electrical network meets adequate operation requirements. If any condition shown above cannot be met, the electrical network is deemed to have failed to meet the operation requirements.

The power will be supplied to the vehicles through an overhead catenary pantograph feed system. The placement of the catenary poles will be a maximum of 50 metres apart, but shorter spacing is expected at curves. The exact locations of the catenary support will be developed in the detailed design phase. The catenary configurations will vary, and include:

- Centre
- Symmetrical
- Side-double cantilever
- Both sides suspended OCS
- Side-single cantilever

Table 2.3 presents additional detail on the power supply design specifications.

Table 2.3: Power Supply Characteristics

Feed Cables Main Transformer Stations (Traction Power Stations)	Underground conductors installed by Horizon Utilities Corporation	
<b>Traction Power Substations Basic Specifications</b>		
- Type	Prefabricated	
- Size		
- Length	17 m	
- Width	5.0 m	
- Height	7.0 m	
- Access	Adjacent to road	
- Optimum Distance between TPSS and OCS feed point	Not more than 25 m	To minimize section gap arching during vehicle acceleration
<b>Overhead Catenary System</b>		
- Supports		
- Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Centre</li> <li>Symmetrical</li> <li>Side-double Cantilever</li> <li>Both Sides suspended OCS</li> <li>Side-single Cantilever</li> </ul>	Contact wire to be designed to uniformly sweep width of pantograph to minimize localized pantograph wear
- Distance between Poles		
- On Tangent	50 m (max)	
- On Curves	Variable	Depending on radius and length of curve



2A

**BUS: SINGLE  
ARTICULATED  
BUS**

**COST**  
822,634.<sup>00</sup>  
LESS THAN 1  
MILLION DOLLARS

**SEATS**  
60 PEOPLE

**THE CITY OF HAMILTON  
HAS 200 BUSES FOR  
236 ROUTES**

**DOUBLE ARTICULATED  
BUSES EXIST**


articulated joint  
Part connecting the rigid sections  
by a waterproof bellows and a  
turning platform shared by the two  
sections.

**BUSES UP TO  
300 PEOPLE ARE  
AVAILABLE**

articulated bus  
Bus with two aligned  
compartments, connected by an  
articulated joint.

**BUS GOES  
ANYWHERE  
ON ANY ROUTE**

**NO TRAIN  
TRACKS /  
OVERHEAD  
WIRES**



**RUBBER BAND / SINGLE ARTICULATED BUS**

New Flyer offered its 40-foot diesels at \$385,840 each, CNGs at \$418,273 and hybrids at \$553,285. The price of a 60-foot articulated bus was \$646,107 with a diesel engine and \$822,634 with a hybrid.

**SPECTATOR  
FEBRUARY 6  
2007**



2B

**BUS - DOUBLE  
DECK GO  
BUS**

**COST**  
2800,000.<sup>00</sup>  
(LESS THAN 1 MILLION  
DOLLARS)

**SEATS**  
80 PEOPLE

**BUS COMES TO  
MAC MASTER UNIVERSITY  
EBARTON / WASH ROAD**


**2B-1 EXTRA HEIGHT DOUBLE  
DECK GO BUS**

**1A MAY NOT GO UNDER  
THE B TRAIN  
TRACKS**

**1B PARK IN FRONT  
OF STATION**

**1C RE-ROUTE UP  
HUNTER ST  
OVER TUNNEL  
BEHIND CITY  
HALL**

**1D REBUILD BRIDGE /  
LOWER STREET ROAD  
SEE CIVIL / STRUCTURAL  
ENGINEERS**



double-decker bus  
Bus equipped with two levels  
connected by stairs.

route sign  
Screen usually on the front, rear and  
right side of the vehicle, displaying  
the route number and destination.

**GO TRANSIT  
HAVE THESE  
BUS & CITY  
OF OTTAWA  
HAVE THESE  
DOUBLE DECK  
BUSES**


**3 NICE LOOKING BUS**

**4 MAYBE CITY / NSR  
COULD USE THEM  
FOR BUSIER ROUTES**

**5 THE CITY OF HAMILTON IN JUNE 2014  
HAS APPROXIMATELY 200 BUSES FOR  
36 ROUTES MAXIMUM TOTAL COST  
ABOUT 200 MILLION DOLLARS.**


THIS IS A CORRECTLY DRAWN DRAWING OF AN ACTUAL LRT ON KING ST.

FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 2016 A13



CITY OF HAMILTON

The city's detailed LRT design blueprint is coming next week.



JUNE 2016

KING ST HAS 4 CAR LANES @ 10 FEET EACH

WIDTH TOTAL = 40 FEET.

(A) 1 LANE IS SHOWN FOR A PARKED CARS

(B) 2 LANE'S FOR TROLLEY CARS, EACH TROLLEY CAR LANE IS 15'-0" / TOTAL WIDTH FOR

(C) SIDEWALK, TROLLEY CARS 30'-0"

30 FEET - 0 INCHES

MAY 13, 1990

READER

YOU MAY BE INTERESTED TO KNOW THAT THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES ARE CONSIDERED TO BE CRIMES??

41 ??  
MY FIRST CRIME ON OCT. 12, 1982 WAS TO WRITE TO MRS ANNE JONES, REGIONAL CHAIRMAN OF HAMILTON WENTWORTH SUGGESTING THAT THE REGION BUILD A NEW INTEGRATED BUS & TRAIN STATION AT THE T.H. & B STATION ON HUNTER ST. HAMILTON. A FEW YEARS LATER THE HAMILTON CITY COUNCIL APPROVED THIS PROJECT. ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (1990): 110 MILLION

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY  
OF HAMILTON - WENTWORTH

Office of the Chairman

October 21, 1982

Mr. Ian Moffat  
71 Amelia Street  
Hamilton, Ontario  
L8P 2V3

Dear Mr. Moffat:

I do appreciate your suggestions - and the suggestions for the Claremont Access have been referred to our Engineering Committee along with your letter.



I also appreciate your suggestions with regard to the use of the T.H. & B in relation to integrated transit. I referred this to Mr. Schweinbenz, who is our Public Transit Manager and we will certainly give this every consideration in the forthcoming discussions with regard to G) extensions.

If at any time, Mr. Moffat, you want to come and talk to us personally, do not hesitate to do so.

Regionally yours,


(Mrs.) Anne H. Jones

TO HUCHSON ST.





# THE SHADOW OF GIANTS

THE STORY OF  
TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY/2





Handwritten: Handwritten: HAMPTON



On March 9, 2007 Harry Stinson, the developer and operator of this project, filed for bankruptcy protection using the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act at the Ontario Superior Court of Justice as a result of an \$11.8 million dispute with David Mirvish, the financier of 1 King West.

Then Owen Brown designed the Victoria Memorial Museum Building (V.M.B.) (1899) in London. It combined the Neo-Gothic language of Brown's original Palladian building with Frank Austen Jones and his grandson from the spirit of the new style of the day, including London's Victoria Albert Museum. Unfortunately, Brown's original building was constructed on a suitable ground, and the foundations were laid directly from the street. As a result, the building's columns were as close to the ground as the columns, beams and girders from the street and rose up to the top of the roof, including London's Victoria Albert

## Light Rail Transit or is it “Little Real Transparency”

I dropped into the information session today Sept. 12<sup>th</sup> Unable to stay for the Q&A I did ask many of the questions listed below. I must admit I was very disappointed in all the “we are still working on this problem” replies. I see all of these questions as questions whose answers should be known by this time in this project and especially before you start your information sessions. Telling us that you have a plan or will have a plan (within thirty days of being sworn in) is very Trumpish! It may be that there is no answer to some of them and once that is realized the LRT project becomes a no go.

Please attempt to answer my questions ASAP as I hope to attend at least one or two more information sessions and expect all these questions should be resolved by the last session.

What history has been reviewed regarding Hamilton’s experience with Streetcars or Electric Trolley cars?

1. Have the councillors or staff review why these methods of bussing were ended?
2. Have the councillors or staff looked at the operation cost of the two above mentioned methods as compared to conventional buses?

What effects will LRT have on traffic flow if a street closure occurs?

But first some recent history: Recently, a motor cycle and a truck collided at the corner of James and Main Street. That intersection was closed for nine hours. I believe this happened on a weekend. Had it happened during a rush hour and was on an LRT route:

- I. How would the LRT get through the intersection?
- II. Has a study been conducted to determine how many times per year or month an intersection that the LRT will pass through has been closed for a police or fire investigations for:
  - a. One half hour or less
  - b. One half hour or more
  - c. More than one hour
- III. What plans will be implemented for any of a, b or c. above?
- IV. Will other traditional busses have to be purchased to take up the slack as traditional buses will be able to bypass the affected intersection?
  - a. If so, how many buses will be purchased
  - b. Who will purchase these buses and their replacements as they wear out?
- V. I understand that a traditional bus can cost between 600 and 900 thousands dollars.
  - a. Am I correct
    - i. If not, then what does a traditional bus the might be used to resolve this problem cost?
    - ii. What will it cost to have staff available for such an occasion?

What will the cost of upkeep be after the LRT is up and running?



1. Have the councillors or staff looked at other municipalities toward finding out what the cost of upkeep is for them?
2. We are in an area that get dumped heavily by snow; has the cost and possibility of maintenance been taken into account for our heavy winters?

How fast will a LRT bus be permitted to travel while carrying passengers?

I understand that a special lane will be created for LRT and LRT will use separate stop signals than the traffic on the same street.

1. Is this information correct?
2. If not, than how will LRT move through the city any faster than a traditional bus?

I understand that most secondary streets that cross the east west route of LRT will be closed to crossing that route. I further understand that the only (in most cases) streets that pass from north to south and visa versa are the main streets such as Bay, John, and Wentworth and so on.

- I. Am I correct?
- II. If not, please explain!

How many passengers can a LRT carry at capacity?

How many passengers can a traditional bus carry at capacity?

I understand that by 2031, King Street in the downtown will be a capacity and the city will need to find alternate routes for east and west traffic.

- I. Is this correct?
- II. If so, who will pay for the upgrade or building of a new east/west passage?
  - a. Will it be the City?
  - b. Or, Metrolinx?

I understand that the city is selling LRT using some interesting scenarios.

1. One scenario that was suggested at the form on September 12<sup>th</sup> was that people would see store and businesses from the LRT and desire to return.
  - a. If this is so, please tell me:
    - i. Why this same person would not see the desirability to return when seeing this store while riding on a traditional bus?
    - ii. How this person would return to make a purchase?
    - iii. Would the City expect them to take another LRT or just get off at the next stop?
    - iv. Please explain?

### Other methods of non-traditional transit – What has been studied?

Early after the Province announced its intention to support LRT in Hamilton, there was considerable discussion (some on the radio) about monorail, suggesting it was much cheaper to build, maintain and would create much construction hassles.

Not only were the above items discussed, it was also mentioned that a monorail system could go up the mountain as LRT cannot. Not without a major cut being made to the mountain!

1. Have the councillors or staff looked at the cost and viability of using overhead transportation instead of LRT or were they simply pushed into something by the Province?

### Sometime nothing is better than something.

2. Is the Province or for that matter the current councillors going to be available to take the heat twenty years from now when this poorly thought-out transit system finally reveals all its failings?

November 8, 2016

**EMAILED to**

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ :

We have reviewed your letter which was received by Light Rail Transit staff on September 28, 2016 at your business. We appreciate the opportunity we had to discuss your concerns with you and provide the following comments for your consideration:

**1. Issue**

- **Unloading equipment from freight trucks - with one lane, traffic will be backed up for 15 to 20 minutes**
- **Courier trucks, such as Purolator, UPS, etc will have issues delivering to businesses - we receive Purolator deliveries every single day**
- **In addition, if they can't deliver efficiently, they will no longer provide 9am service for our street - this service is IMPERATIVE to BBM's ability to take care of our customers**

**Response**

The B-Line LRT Corridor will operate in the centre of this section of King Street with generally one traffic lane in each direction. As a result parking and loading activity will not be available on this section of King Street. As noted, we recognize the importance of loading activity for your business as well as other businesses on the LRT Corridor. We are exploring the options available, the type of pavement/curb cross sections and will do our best to incorporate as much loading as possible back into the cross section on our engineering drawings. In doing so we must be cognizant of the minimum municipal sidewalk width requirements for pedestrians and other utilities and/or amenities in the municipal sidewalk area.

In our discussions, we also noted that there is possible access to the rear of your property from the rear alley which extends easterly to the rear of your property from Sanford Ave. The alley appears to have been closed to vehicular traffic due to security concerns from the adjacent owners. As noted, there was discussion with the lands owners on each side of your property to provide vehicular access to the rear parking spaces from adjacent lands since your building covers the entire frontage on King Street. We recognize that these are arrangements between private property owners but it may be an option instead of using the public highway for the private loading and unloading of product for your business.

We are committed to working together with the business community and property owners to minimize disruption during construction and to provide the best possible loading and parking solutions while at the same time providing the required public and municipal services on the public right of way.

## **2. Issue**

- **Garbage and recycling pick up - how will this work?**

### **Response**

We are currently developing a Road Maintenance Strategy which will include all activities with respect to snow clearing, winter maintenance activities, street sweeping, maintenance of municipal infrastructure both above and below ground, waste and recycling pick up, etc. If possible, we will schedule most activities to off-peak traffic periods or to night time period when the LRT is not in service. In the case of snow removal, this will be completed as per the established municipal service standards for this activity.

## **3. Issue**

- **Traffic- where will it go?**
  - **With one lane gone from Cannon, it is already very busy**
  - **How will it handle the transfer of AT LEAST 50% of the traffic from King Street**
  - **Our business relies on being able to get to our customers quickly and provide service - if it takes 40 minutes just to get to the west end of Hamilton, this will be impossible**

### **Response**

Our Consultants are currently working on the traffic engineering study which models traffic to the Year 2031 with the current network and the Year 2031 with the B Line LRT in place. It is understood from the approved Land Use data that there will significant increases in population and employment in Hamilton between the base year 2011 and the forecast year 2031. The previous report to Council already identified that with these growth numbers, traffic volumes and delays would increase within the traffic network with or without the introduction of LRT to the King Street and Main Street Corridors. There are a number of intersections that have decreased levels of service between 2011 and 2031. These intersections are primarily along Main, King, Barton, Cannon, James, Burlington and Ottawa.

With the introduction of the LRT, there is a change of traffic patterns in the network. Due to the traffic capacity reduction on King Street, some westbound traffic has diverted onto parallel routes such as Aberdeen Ave, Wilson St, Cannon St and Barton St. In terms of north/ south traffic, the number of traffic movements onto and across the LRT alignment is limited.

Significant work has been undertaken to improve the network operation and mitigate the impacts on traffic operation while still maintaining an appropriate level of priority for the LRT. The following mitigations have been applied to intersections within the network: traffic signal operations, signal timing allocation, staging changes, dedicated turn phases, signal cycle times, intersection layout, turning lane reallocation, addition of turning lanes, addition of a dedicated slip lane and turn movement bans.

With all the mitigation measures in place there will still be a reduced Level of Service within the network and delays to motorist and general traffic will increase. It is expected that as traffic volumes and delays increase that motorists may use “peak hour spreading” to adjust their travel trips and times to spread the peak traffic hour into more of a peak traffic period.

Although the Consultants Traffic Study is progressing, the traffic engineering work is not complete and a number of traffic signal timing and roadway improvement options are still under review. It is clear that the travel desire path for current westbound traffic on King Street is to access the 403 to the west. These desire lines of travel were also shown on the PIC boards. As a result, diverted traffic from King Street will likely use Cannon, Hunter, York Boulevard and the Queen/Dundurn north-south routes to gain access to the Hwy 403 ramps on King Street.

#### 4. Issue

- **The narrowing of Barton Street resulted in the closing of more than 2/3 of the businesses there - this will cause the closing of a large number of businesses on King Street who won't be able to operate - their business is based on people driving there - people taking the LRT will not be frequenting their businesses - example: Gilbert's Big & Tall, and Bill Newman's.**

#### Response

We cannot comment on the closure of businesses on Barton Street as we not aware of the reasons and circumstances of the closure. Although we recognize that traffic patterns will change and that way finding will change, it is still expected that traffic with destinations to properties on the Corridor will still be able to make the trip. As part of this project, the City with Metrolinx, will develop a robust and fluid communication strategy using all the practical means available to inform the public, the businesses, the property owners and the community of construction road closures, detours, alternative way finding, possible signing strategies, alternate transit routes, etc. before, during and post construction. As noted, we are committed to work with the business owners to ensure minimum disruption as possible during construction.

#### 5. Issue

- **Emergency Services: how will they be able to get to emergency calls? Traffic will be backed up on every street, making it impassable - how does a car move over to let them pass, when there's nowhere to move over to?**

#### Response

We have met with the Hamilton Fire Department, Hamilton Police and Emergency Medical Services and have presented them with the preliminary functional design plans of the entire Corridor. We understand their concerns about accessibility, response times and will continue to work them to ensure the best possible plans and communications strategy. As noted, the general travelling public and pedestrians will only be permitted to cross the LRT transit way at locations where traffic signal control will be installed. The First Responders will be given the opportunity to use the LRT transit way for access should they choose to do so.



## 6. Issue

- **With vehicles being unable to cross King at so many streets, they will be driving much further than they were before, and they will likely be crawling due to traffic jams - this will cause more emissions than ever - not environmentally friendly at all**

## Response

You are correct in stating that vehicles will have fewer opportunities to cross King Street and that left turn movements and U-turn movements will be provided at signalized intersections only. It is also expected that traffic will divert away from the Corridor and that through traffic trips will be reduced. Although westbound traffic can only cross the LRT transit-way at traffic signal controlled intersections, residents and business owners/customers will now have the option of travelling eastbound on King Street. With proper guidance, signing and way finding, we expect this new “traffic move/direction” will mitigate some of these concerns.

## 7. Issue

- **When people can't drive through an area efficiently, they just avoid it - thus reducing the number of eyeballs on businesses in the area - and thus reducing the business - you will cause people to bankrupt, and therefore job losses.**

## Response

We cannot comment on the correlation between “the number eyeballs on businesses in the area” and the bankruptcies and job losses. We assume it would depend on the type of business and employee requirement, the type of clientele, etc. We also cannot comment on whether people will avoid a business if they cannot drive through the area efficiently. However we do expect that with construction of a “high order transit facility” that transit ridership will increase and the exposure to “people” may not decrease. However it again depends on the intent of the transit rider and the purpose for the trip as it correlates to the adjacent land use.

## 8. Issue

- **What about the mosque? Where will they park on a weekly basis when normally the entire street is filled with parked cars of service attendees.**

## Response

As noted previously, loading and parking will no longer be permitted on this section of King Street. From our cursory review, it appears that the mosque has off street parking on its own property. During and after construction, the overflow of parking from the mosque would have to occur on the adjacent side streets within walking proximity of the mosque. This will be considered as we continue through our parking and loading mitigation strategies throughout the Corridor. It is also hoped that the construction of the LRT will reduce the reliance on street parking within the corridor.

## 9. Issue

- **We will have to change many streets to 2 ways - not just Wentworth. Sanford has businesses between King and Wilson -unless it's 2 ways nobody will be able to reach them (Danny's Transmission} - what is the cost of this and who's paying for it?**

## Response

Prior to the initiation of this project there were no Council approved plans in the Capital Budget to convert Sanford Avenue from one way to two way traffic. However with the conversion of Wentworth Street to two way traffic and the introduction of the LRT transit way on King Street, the conversion of Sanford Avenue to two way traffic will be reviewed. If the two conversion is deemed warranted and approved by Council, the limits of the conversion and associated costs will be identified and considered in the City negotiations with Metrolinx.

## 10. Issue

- **The current plan to stop at Queenston Circle is inadequate - the same way the Red Hill and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway were already inadequate while they were being built - it needs to go to Jones Road**

## Response

Although not explicitly stated, we understand your question to mean that upon completion of the B Line LRT construction from McMaster University to the Queenston Traffic Circle the LRT line will already be inadequate and should be extended to Jones Road in the first phase. As we discussed, the completion of the B-Line LRT to the Queenston Traffic Circle is the first phase of the LRT construction with the second phase will be the extension of the B-Line easterly to Eastgate Square.

We expect that any upgrades to the transit system east of Eastgate Square on Queenston Road will consist of an increase in bus service frequency and eventually Bus Rapid Transit should conditions and funding warrant such an improvement.

## 11. Issue

- **The current plan to dig a tunnel to go under the tracks at King and Gage is already not adequate, according to engineers**

We cannot comment on the source of this information and basis of this statement. However we can advise that all Bridge Construction must conform to all applicable design and construction standards as specified in Provincial and Canadian regulations.

To receive ongoing project updates, please visit our website at [www.hamilton.ca/lrt](http://www.hamilton.ca/lrt).

Sincerely,

Hamilton LRT Office

Please consider an SCC statement in support of Hamilton LRT. The transformation of our busy corridors will almost certainly address many neighbourhood concerns; excess vehicle lane capacity will be reallocated, Main Street will become 2 way, transit will gain priority as a travel mode, through trucks could be re-routed, speeding and noise will be reduced, underused properties will be redeveloped, to name a few. The inconvenience and disturbance of construction is easily tolerable when considering the outcome will be street repurposed with rapid transit, supporting increased density, improved land use, more efficient and environmentally sound travel options, greater neighbourhood vitality, and a renewed public realm. LRT will help Strathcona overcome its most negative elements, the overbuilt urban through highways denying us a truly livable community. We must not pass up this rare opportunity of a billion dollar investment from the province.

Thank you,

We are both proponents of the LRT and accept that the city chose King St. over alternate routes. As to the LRT, it's true that some businesses will be affected during construction, but that isn't unique to the LRT. Even sewer or road repair is going to affect nearby businesses. Loyal customers will keep visiting their favourite stores and perhaps the SCC can encourage people across the area to buy from these businesses, as well as Strathcona residents, to share the burden placed on them. As to people walking, using buses etc., there are alternate routes and buses will have detours presumably. I seldom walk far on King St. as it isn't a pleasant route, noisy and lacking in shade in summer or protection from wind in winter. As the LRT will eventually reduce the volume of cars on King St., that will increase its walkability.

I can understand that the SCC might want to stay neutral on this issue, or at least advocate compromise and options to minimize disruption. If/when the LRT process starts, it could be helpful to have a community liaison committee to provide information in both directions. Such a community liaison committee was set up by Councillor McHattie for the Good Shepherd development and worked reasonably well.

Sorry to be slow responding. You're in a tricky position. Hope this helps a bit.

Best regards,

As for the LRT I am in favor, 100% in favour. Of course there will be a period of inconvenience. Such is progress. It is an absolute embarrassment that certain members of council are back pedaling on this. This could have serious implications regarding the receipt of provincial funding in the future. We look like a joke. Buses are not adequate for the growing transportation needs of our city. We need to do everything we can to give people an option to using the car. People without cars should have fast and efficient commuting choices. It's the future and will serve a growing population in a much more effective way.

We could have had a full scale subway but the city turned it down. What a mistake.

I don't care at all if people in the upper city will use it. That is not the point.

Main and King Streets are inner city freeways. The car is wrongly King. I'd like to see more bikes, bike paths, more pedestrians and the LRT. Good public transit is also a must for an aging population.

Beyond the LRT, bringing back the incline railroads would also be a great future transportation goal.

Regards,

Hamilton LRT -- I am in full support of the LRT proposal for Hamilton.

I believe that careful consideration is being given to making the streets more pedestrian-, cycle-, and transit-friendly than at present. Currently, I try to avoid King and Main Streets as much as possible, because the vehicle traffic acts as if these are major highways, not city streets!

During the few months that a transit lane was set up on King Street, I noticed a definite improvement in the feeling of safety, as a pedestrian, when I walked from downtown to Dundurn. Since then, I have reverted to walking on the side streets between King and York.

I wonder if the transit lane also acted as a buffer, reducing the amount of pollutants and dust that pedestrians were exposed to?

I will be retired before the project even starts, so I will not benefit directly from the improved transit system to McMaster.

I can appreciate the upheaval construction will have on businesses on King Street, having talked with small business owners on King William, when their street was renovated a few years ago.

However, in the long run, Hamilton LRT will be beneficial to the City!

I don't imagine my LRT position will be any surprise.

100% in favour. Perhaps the only thing we've not enjoyed about living in this neighbourhood the last 15 years is King and Main Streets. They're awful. I've reached a point in life where I have little patience for anyone who thinks they function well as urban streets in a city.

K-W has already seen massive investment along its LRT route and it's not even open yet. Hamilton's lower city has met the definition of urban donut-hole for decades and despite recent improvements here and in other west end communities, there is still a ton of underperforming urban properties between Dundurn and Kenilworth Ave. Those underperforming properties cost all of us tens of millions in potential tax revenue each and every year.

On top of the world-wide evidence that is easy for anyone to find on this topic, we now have virtually every local organization and business group imaginable sending letters to council urging them to stay the course.

When in Hamilton's history has everyone from home builders to environmental groups to poverty advocacy groups all agreed so strongly on one topic or project??

A few contrarian councillors with zero education on such matters should be ashamed of themselves for playing politics with our future.

The most recent letter of support for LRT comes from literally every geographical region of Metro Hamilton.

<https://www.raisethehammer.org/article/3007/letter: past mayors regional chairs support light rail>

Here in Strathcona, facing the daily dangers of the King/Main expressway combo, we'd be crazy not to support LRT and what it will do for the business climate along those long-underdeveloped routes.

Cheers!

I am old enough to fondly remember streetcars and the trolley buses that replaced them before being phased out; my opinion of one-way streets is not so positive. So I believe we have to go back to the future, but I am sensitive to the problem it will pose for small businesses along the route during the transition and I can't see any easy (or cheap) solutions to that one.

Am totally in favour of LRT, regardless of the upset it will cause for the years of construction.

The SCC should foster discussion between our residents and the design/construction teams to encourage and enhance communication but should NOT take a position as such a position could not represent all the residents.

I am fully in support of the LRT and we can additionally request that measures be taken to facilitate the support of business directly affected by the construction (access to their site or parking).

Sincerely,

I think there are many good things that will come out of it but there are other things the \$ could be spent on- I guess that I would be AGAINST if I had to choose

Thank you

I do not think we should be commenting or supporting or be adverse to the LRT as I do not think it is appropriate and not enough information has been release to make an informed decision either way.

I feel the long term benefits of the LRT will far outweigh the relatively short term negative impacts of construction. Also, the city's own internal staff report, third party consultants, and the provincial government all have recommended implementing LRT. Finally, the provincial government has committed to fully funding implement LRT. Therefore, I feel the SCC should issue a statement of support for LRT.

Sincerely,

I support a billion dollar investment in Hamilton. Yes construction will suck but if we can learn from Waterloo and Calgary impact can be minimized. If you consult any urban planning professional you will hear that investment in transit improves a city

in the long run. Let's keep long term goals in mind and not be so short sighted. What will Hamilton look like in 10 yrs without LRT?

As for LRT, although it might be nice for SCC to have a position on LRT, if there isn't agreement on the issue, that is definitely tricky. I have already expressed my wholehearted support for LRT in an email to each member of council. I think it would be tragic for concerns over the interim construction to derail (pun intended?) the final product and its benefits. I wish council would stop just thinking about car/truck drivers and think about transit - for our residents and for tourism. When I visit other cities I exclusively use their transit and it is a major factor in what I think of the city. Anyway, perhaps the best role for SCC in this is to

- encourage residents to communicate with council directly (tell ppl the best way to do that)
- make sure everyone is getting correct information (and championing the project to some degree)
- support and compile legitimate concerns for council and planning groups

Hope that answers your questions.

Thanks a bunch,

As a member of the SCC, a long time resident of Strathcona, I would like to request that the SCC offer its support to the LRT project formally. Numerous other neighbourhood associations have similarly done so and the benefits to the Strathcona neighbourhood directly and to the city broadly warrant the the SCC do so as well.

I would like to offer also that concerns expressed by residents in Strathcona in the past about the pedestrian environment, traffic, cycling, etc, and as represented in the Strathcona Secondary plan, all could be addressed in the opportunity presented by the LRT. I would suggest that articulating that in the letter would very effectively continue to represent the interests and concerns of the residents of Strathcona.

Respectfully,

What is the SCC's position on LRT? The KNA wrote a letter to council in support of LRT and I hope you're considering doing the same.

<https://raisethehammer.org/article/2962>

Regards,

I honestly believe the council should take a stand against it. Once king is reduced to one lane, interrupted at Wellington, people will travel York( as it's the only road which leads to dundurn) to get on the highway. Most decent paying jobs are in Milton, Burlington and Oakville. That means they're driving to and from work everyday and need to to get on the highway. That means the neighbourhood immediately west of dundurn will be flooded with cars hoping for a short cut as well as cars idling constantly along dundurn. This would create a major air quality issue for the immediate residents. I am considering asking the moe to test air quality before and after lrt and publishing the results for city staffers so they can see how they destroyed a neighbourhood. Remember hamilton is very narrow from escarpment to water in this area meaning we cannot add roads to compensate. People speak of lrt in Kitchener and Calgary but they're flat. I personally have never had a real issue with our current bus system and I have found most people saying we need this do not use the bus. There is also the messed



up logic of taking a bus to lrt then off lrt to a bus to get to eastgate. How is a train and two buses better than the one bus I take now. Just in transfer time( boarding and off loading) it will take approx 15 extra minutes to get where I'm going. I will end this with an observation most people don't seem to get, no amount of deterrents will stop drivers, they will bitch but still drive! Hope this helps.

Dear SCC,

I heard that you are currently asking for feedback regarding the proposed LRT. I currently live in the Strathcona neighbourhood on Peter St and I am in 100% agreement that LRT needs to be a priority in our area. There are countless studies that I have read that show how LRT has made a significant positive impact on neighbouring communities. I want those positive impacts along the king st. corridor and in my neighbourhood (increases seen in home evaluations, new businesses start ups, strengthening current businesses)

I believe that the SCC should definitely make a public statement about LRT in favour of it as it will only benefit the community long term. Yes there may be inconveniences as construction takes place, but think about the long term gain that we will see when this plan moves forward.

Sincerely

Am in support of LRT and in support of our association taking political stands for neighbourhood action  
Thank you

Neutral, I think the SCC should not take a position.

Hi,  
I am in support of LRT. Thanks,

Both and I support the LRT even though I know it will be HELL for a couple of years at least. I've seen what has been going on in Kitchener, so I know what it could be like here. Thus, our household at supports it 100%.

The SCC should support the LRT project.

The SCC should support the LRT B line. The SCC should also support the zoning changes along the B Line to optimize it's success. The SCC should support the rationalization of bus lines to that the B Line LRT is properly fed. The SCC should support the inclusion of complete streets that are safe for children, pedestrians, cyclists, cars and trucks. This is all part of supporting the LRT B Line.

I have 3 businesses in the Strathcona neighbourhood. The Staircase, an Artist Residence, and The Elaine May Theatre. All three will face challenges during the LRT build at King and Dundurn, however the long term benefits for the community, and our children outweigh the risks.

Thanks for your time.

Hi there,  
Thanks for forwarding this to me. I'm glad that Strathcona has ensured a fair, open and transparent methodology to this important question. Here are my answers:

Yes

&

Via a letter outlying the methodology and results to the city's LRT committee.

Hello.

I would like to add my comments before going ahead with with crafting a SCC position statement.

1) I am personally in support of the implementation of LRT in Hamilton.

2) I believe that the city and province need to give some sort of consideration and support to businesses which which will be impacted by the construction, whether that takes the form of relocation assistance for those that no longer want to be on the construction line, tax relief and/or other assistance to businesses that stay and strong consideration to maintain access to businesses for pedestrians and ideally, access for those using various mobility aids.

3) The statement should include the fact that the option is the majority (not unanimous) view of the SCC and something of the nature of the SCC as a member group that does not necessary reflect the majority opinion of the neighborhood at large.

Best regards,

As along time volunteer and participant in many businesses and community actions across Hamilton I fully support the LRT project and wish to make a statement on behalf of this support.

Re

Dear Students,

Thank you for taking the time to write to us. Being informed about the changes that affect your community is very important, as it provides you with the knowledge you need to understand the changes to your community, to make informed decisions about.


Below are our replies to each of your questions.

**Will the prices be different than the HSR? Will rates be different for Students, Children, Seniors?**

Fares are subject to an operations agreement that will be negotiated between Metrolinx and the City of Hamilton. However, it is a general goal that LRT and HSR integrate as seamlessly as possible.

**Will it be safer than riding the bus?**

Figure ES-2 - Youth and Total Traffic Fatality Rates



*Youths (15-25 years old) tend to have about twice the traffic fatality rates as the total population average. Both total and youth fatality rates tend to decline with increased transit ridership. Transit-oriented cities have about half the average youth and total traffic fatality rates as more automobile-oriented cities.*

Source: <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA-Hidden-Traffic-Safety-Solution-Public-Transportation.pdf>

Buses and trains are both among the safest ways to get around. A recent study (link provided above) found that you are 10 times less likely to be involved in an accident causing injury or death if you take public transit than if you are in a private vehicle.

**How fast will it go?**

Light Rail Vehicles (LRVs) can travel at the posted speed limit (50-60km/h) however due to operational considerations, such as accelerating from and decelerating to stops, LRVs will travel at an average speed of about 30km/h.

**Will there be speed limits?**

Yes. Speed limits for LRT will be the same as posted speed limits for vehicular traffic.

**Will the bus pass work on the LRT?**

As stated previously, the fare structure is subject to an operations agreement between Metrolinx and the City of Hamilton. It can be noted that the Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Hamilton and Metrolinx

([https://d3fplf1m7bbt3.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/media/browser/2016-08-19/lrt\\_moa\\_2016.pdf](https://d3fplf1m7bbt3.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/media/browser/2016-08-19/lrt_moa_2016.pdf)) states that PRESTO cards will be an acceptable form of payment on the LRT; they are already accepted on HSR buses.

**How many people can each train hold?**

We estimate that a single car train will comfortably carry 130+ people, which is based on the various manufacturers and models available (the manufacturer of the vehicle has not been selected at this point.) However, depending on the model, a vehicle at crush capacity (people standing shoulder to shoulder) is capable of carrying up to 200 to 250 people per car.

On opening day of the system we will operate one car train, but as ridership increases two cars can be coupled together which doubles capacity. Current ridership estimates project that two-car trains would be needed within 8-10 years of beginning service.

**How many trains will be in service at one time?**

We are still refining operational inputs such as run-time and frequency, however preliminary planning suggests that approximately 20-25 single car trains will be needed for opening day service.

**Will downtown lose its character?**

We are undergoing many processes to ensure the downtown maintains as much of its character as possible. This includes creating Design Excellence requirements, streetscaping designs, minimizing property impacts, and conducting a heritage impact assessment.

For more details on Design Excellence and streetscaping design, please refer to slides 12 to 18 of our public information centre boards, located at this link:

<https://d3fplf1m7bbt3.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/media/browser/2016-09-12/lrt-pic1-presentation-boards-r1.pdf>

**What will happen to Supercrawl?**

There are ongoing discussions with Supercrawl organizers regarding this event; no decisions have been made to date.

**Will bus drivers lose their jobs?**

The City of Hamilton has a 10-year transit strategy (link: <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-initiatives/priority-projects/ten-year-local-transit-strategy>) that will be adding and improving service to many other routes. This will require more buses and more bus drivers, some of which we expect will be taken from the existing B-Line bus service when the LRT begins running.

**Will bus drivers be able to drive the new trains? Or is new training a requirement?**

Who operates the LRT system is dependent on the selection of a procurement model which is subject to the previously mentioned operations agreement. It could be that the project is delivered via a Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain procurement model, which means a group of companies would be responsible for all components of the project including operations. It could also be that HSR would operate the system. Whoever operates the system would be responsible for employing the drivers. Driving the light rail vehicles would require additional training.

**Will the stops be different than the HSR? Will it replace the King 1 Route? What will happen to the other buses?**

Stop locations are similar to the current HSR B-Line express route, which will be replaced by LRT. The map of the stops can be found here: <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-initiatives/priority-projects/light-rail-transit-lrt>. Local transit service will continue to operate on parallel routes.

**What will the wait times be at each stop?**

Trains will run at a frequency of every 4-6 minutes. The exact frequency is still to be determined. At 4-6 minutes the average wait time for a train would be 2-3 minutes.

**How will the LRT affect other parts of the GTA?**

Metrolinx's Regional Transportation Plan, called *The Big Move* ([http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/bigmove/big\\_move.aspx](http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/bigmove/big_move.aspx)), is a key plan for transportation in the GTHA. The Big Move is a provincial response to, among other things, growing traffic congestion on regional roads and highways. In a 2006 study ([http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/costsofcongestion/costs\\_congestion.aspx](http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/costsofcongestion/costs_congestion.aspx)), the cost of this congestion to people and businesses was estimated at \$3.3 Billion per year. It's likely increased since then. The Big Move recognizes that part of the solution to moving a growing population more efficiently throughout the region is a well-integrated and interconnected, rapid, reliable and easily accessible regional transit system that offers commuters an alternative to driving.

Hamilton's first LRT line was identified as a key component of this envisioned regional transit system for its ability to help in connecting Hamiltonians to the region. Connections between local and regional transit services will be available throughout the LRT system to enable seamless transfers between these services. This includes transfers to and from HSR buses throughout the line, Burlington Transit in the downtown, and GO buses at a planned transit hub at McMaster University.

A connection to the Hunter Street GO Centre Terminal will be provided via a pedestrian connection on Hughson Street from the King/James LRT stop to the terminal, and there will also be an LRT stop in front of the new West Harbour GO Station.

### **Why is construction scheduled to take so long?**

The estimated construction time is a result of extensive construction work that will be done. Implementation of LRT on the King-Main corridor involves essentially rebuilding the entire public right of way from bottom to top. This includes:

- digging up, replacing and/or relocating public utilities such as watermains and sewers, as well as private utilities such as hydro/telephone/coaxial cables and gas mains
- reconstructing the entire surface, including the road way, the tracks, and the sidewalks
- building train stops/stations, the overhead catenary system, the CP rail underpass and 403 overpass
- implementing streetscaping, which will likely include plantings, street furniture, wayfinding and other signage
- extensive testing of the entire system that includes running the trains for thousands of hours to ensure everything is operating correctly before it is opened for public use

Another consideration that has gone into the schedule is the possibility of staggering construction so that the entire corridor isn't under construction at the same time. Staggering construction makes the construction process easier on businesses and residents by limiting the length of construction in their particular area, but increases the overall time needed for the construction of the entire project.

### **You said "Quality of Life" will improve. How so?**

Quality of life improvements will come in a number of areas, including:

*Environmental -* The LRT trains are clean and "green" with no emissions from the vehicle. Environmental benefits include reducing air pollution from vehicle emissions and greenhouse gases which can contribute to cleaner air and reduce noise pollution. By increasing transit ridership, LRT can contribute to reducing the amount of vehicle kilometres travelled and associated emissions.

*Economic -* Hamilton's LRT will stimulate economic growth and contribute to the ongoing revitalization of Hamilton. The LRT will be part of a multi-modal network of transportation options throughout the city. This will attract new investors, grow our economy, broaden the tax base and bring more jobs to Hamilton.

## *Health -*

Studies have shown that the residents of communities with excellent public transit, and transit-oriented community design to complement it, are healthier than those without. People who live in communities with excellent transit tend to walk more, which results in lower rates of obesity, heart disease, diabetes and high blood pressure. Other research has shown that people who use transit are 10 times less likely to be involved in an accident resulting in injury or death than those who drive.

The links below are two of many resources that provide more information on improvements to quality of life:

[http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA\\_Health\\_Benefits\\_Litman.pdf](http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA_Health_Benefits_Litman.pdf)

<http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA-Hidden-Traffic-Safety-Solution-Public-Transportation.pdf>

## **When will the other phases of BLAST take place? When will the mountain receive a line?**

The A-Line, which includes a portion of the route along Upper James on the Mountain, is expected to be the next rapid transit phase of BLAST to be implemented. The timing and implementation of any of the other rapid transit lines in the BLAST network are dependent on funding commitments.

## **Where will the LRT be built? Will that result in new factories and more jobs?**

The location where the LRVs are fabricated will be dependent on the supplier that is chosen to supply them, and which of their factories they assign this work to. In total, construction is estimated to create between 990 and 3,729 person-years of employment and between 847 and 2,064 person-years of employment indirectly as a result of increased economic activity for suppliers.

(A “person-year of employment” is the amount of work one person can do in one year. This work can typically be spread out among more people to get it done faster. It may be possible, for instance, for 2 people to do “1 person-year” of work in 6 months.)

We hope that your interest in this project will continue, and invite you to join us at the second set of Public Information Centres scheduled for January 2017.

Sincerely,

Hamilton LRT Office



---

**From:**

**Sent:** October-25-16 1:15 PM

**To:** LRT Office

**Subject:** James Street Spur line, comment and suggestion

Dear Paul Johnson and staff,

I had recent opportunity to drive James Street along the section of the proposed LRT spur, and came to the conclusion that it is not suitable to support the LRT spur as proposed. There is simply too much traffic and too high a requirement for deliveries to make LRT workable on this street. Furthermore, one of the main appeals of the James Street spur is to connect to the West Harbour Go Train Station, but this requires rapid, reliable movement of transit cars along James Street to appeal to commuters, something not possible on a non-segregated LRT route.

I can, however, propose a solution. Build the James Street spur as planned, but also add a single segregated line along a parallel street from King to the station, where upon it would join the James Street spur. This parallel, segregated line could operate with cars moving north in the morning to take commuters to the Go Train Stations, and south in the afternoon, taking them home. Return journeys to/from King Street could be made along the James Street spur.

This approach has several advantages: 1) journeys by commuters to and from the James Street Station could be made rapidly, along a segregated right of way to guarantee on-time arrival at the station in the morning, and rapid connection to the King Street LRT in the afternoon, 2) by operating in one direction along the segregated right of way, only one of the James Street lines need be operated at a time, leaving more space for deliveries and car traffic, appeasing merchants, and 3) by providing an alternative route to James Street, complete closure of the LRT during events will not be required.

The choice of parallel segregated route is open, but Bay Street or John Street seem like natural choices, as there would be space adjacent to Strachan Street to move between the streets. Wellington Street North or Ferguson Avenue, with their proximity to the Hamilton General Hospital might also be attractive, but would require a new bridge.

Good luck with the project, sincerely



This message is the property of Amec Foster Wheeler plc and/or its subsidiaries and/or affiliates and is intended only for the named recipient(s). Its contents (including any attachments) may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure by law. Unauthorised use, copying, distribution or disclosure of any of it may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited. We assume no

responsibility to persons other than the intended named recipient(s) and do not accept liability for any errors or omissions which are a result of email transmission. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply email to the sender and confirm that the original message and any attachments and copies have been destroyed and deleted from your system. This disclaimer applies to any and all messages originating from us and set out above. If you do not wish to receive future unsolicited commercial electronic messages from us, **please forward this email to:** **and include “Unsubscribe” in the subject line.** If applicable, you will continue to receive invoices, project communications and similar factual, non-commercial electronic communications.

Please click <http://amecfw.com/email-disclaimer> for notices and company information in relation to emails originating in the UK, Italy or France.



December 5 .2016

Dear Paul Johnson,

I hope this letter finds you well. I'm writing to you today with several comments regarding LRT in Hamilton.

First and foremost, my team and I would like to offer our full support for the construction and implementation of Light Rail Transit in Hamilton. We see this as an important and forward thinking project that will be a vital driver of economic development in our city. We own and operate properties and businesses on King St, James St. N., Wilson St., Mary St. and Cannon St. We feel the long-term benefits far outweigh the short-term business inconvenience for ourselves and tenants operating out of these properties.

With this support in mind, we have a number of requests / proposals in which we will need to work with the City, both during and post-construction of LRT, in order to be able to operate the annual Supercrawl festival. As you are aware, Supercrawl is an open street (pedestrian-only) festival that takes place on the second weekend of September each year, currently operating on 18 blocks of James St. North and surrounding side streets. We would respectfully request that the City of Hamilton assist the festival with any financial hardships that may be imposed during both the construction and implementation phases of both LRT lines ( Main B line and A Spur line). We also would request that the City of Hamilton make accommodations to eliminate additional City Departmental Fees as a result of LRT implementation that may be levied against the festival during the and after the LRT implementation.

During the construction phase of LRT, we have two initial requests:

1. King St.: As one festival terminal is located at James/King St. intersection, we will need the City to work with our team in order to develop a traffic plan which can accommodate audience transport to and from the festival. We have worked with such accommodations with HSR over the last several years, and will need to do so during LRT construction as well.

2. James St. N. – We would like to propose that construction of the James Street spur line take place in two phases, and suggest:

Year 1 - King St. to Cannon St.; and

Year 2 - Cannon St. to Murray St.

This would allow us to continue to operate the festival during the construction years, which we feel is vital to maintaining its momentum.

Post-LRT construction, we also have a few initial requests/accommodations needed in order to operate Supercrawl:

1. We will need to develop traffic and transit plans to accommodate street closures during the festival.
2. We will need to work with the City with regard to overhead catenary cables. Supercrawl needs to be able to set up infrastructure (staging, etc.) on James St. N. for the duration of the festival. Supercrawl's staging spans much of the width of James St. N. and rises to a height of 31-40 feet. Catenary cables are suspended well below that height. Cables will need to be removed / reorganized in our stage and general infrastructure areas, and we request that there be no charges levied to Supercrawl for this service.
3. We would like to participate in and have input into discussions regarding the Transformer locations along James Street North. We further ask to have the ability to have access to said power lines during Supercrawl.

I look forward to discussing these points with you in the near future. I'd also like to thank you and your team for the great efforts you have put forth towards realizing LRT in Hamilton.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tim Potocic', with a stylized, flowing script.

Tim Potocic

Co-Owner

Sonic Unyon Records | 22 Wilson St | Hamilton, ON | 905-777-1223 |  
| [www.sonicunyon.com](http://www.sonicunyon.com)

December 15, 2016



Paul Johnson  
City of Hamilton, LRT Office  
36 Hunter Street East  
Hamilton, Ontario L8N 3W8

RE: LRT Priority Items, Downtown Hamilton BIA

Dear Paul,

After much discussion and consideration of opportunities that would best suit the needs of our members during LRT constructions, our Board of Management would like to suggest the following priority items.

**Communication**

Meetings to be organized with BIA every four weeks in a local business or restaurant (breakfast with city reps, Metrolinx, BIA members). Additionally, the contractor will make themselves available to BIA staff once a week onsite. Weekly and monthly meetings will include detours and an updated map available in pdf form for input to BIA website .

**Accessibility/Wayfinding**

Sidewalks and pedestrian crossings to be kept open and accessible with concrete or asphalt for the duration of construction. Pedestrian accesses and cross construction zones will be at a certain, consistent distance apart (i.e. one in middle of block per block). Where cross construction zones are necessary, business wayfinding signage will be included.

**Welcoming businesses**

Regular window washing to be provided to ensure businesses maintain a welcoming exterior. Compensate for displacement of traffic by offering free parking (2hrs free at city lots, 1 hr free at meters – enforced)

These priorities will be of most importance while construction is between Wellington and Bay streets.

Please let me know if I can offer any further information in regards to our priorities. We appreciate the consistent cooperation offered by your office.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kerry Jarvi", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Kerry Jarvi  
Executive Director

**DOWNTOWN HAMILTON BIA**

info@downtownhamilton.org tel 905 523 1646 fax 905 523 5433  
202-20 Hughson St South Hamilton ON, L8N 2A1 downtownhamilton.org

December 23, 2016

Mr. David Derbyshire  
Corridor Engagement Coordinator  
Light Rail Transit, City of Hamilton  
36 Hunter Street East, 5<sup>th</sup> floor,  
Hamilton ON  
L8N 3W8

Dear David,

As a follow-up to our last meeting we are bringing our concerns forward to you in order that they can be addressed in a timely and effective manner.

As we discussed, the construction and operation of the LRT along King Street West has significant operational impacts for the Art Gallery of Hamilton. The following sets out our concerns as plans stand at the present time.

#### **AGH Loading Dock Access**

The Art Gallery of Hamilton (AGH) has a loading dock that requires access off of King Street. While the loading dock is used by numerous delivery and service vehicles, its prime purpose is to allow the safe and secure delivery or shipment of artwork via couriers. In some cases, there are large trucks up to the size of a tractor trailer that require access to the loading dock.

We are very concerned that these delivery vehicles may not be able to access the loading dock and we require your assistance to ensure this vital part of our operational infrastructure is not affected.

More specifically:

- 1) As the east bound King Street lane will be directly in front of the Gallery, how will any delivery vehicle be allowed to stop in front of the Gallery for a delivery let alone back into the loading dock without interfering with the traffic flow?
- 2) How will the elevated LRT track and the power lines affect vehicles which need to pull out over the tracks in order to back into the loading dock or require a wider turning area to drive into the loading bay?

#### **Emergency Vehicle Access**

As a public institution, the AGH needs every assurance that first responders will have unfettered access to the property in order to deliver emergency services.

**Visitor Experience**

In addition, we have serious concerns on how construction will affect access for our visitors and clients. Not only do our visitors come from around the world but we are also dependent on the revenues generated by our Wedding + Event Services team. We have many events in our facility, including weddings and corporate events in addition to the AGH fundraising, program and community events (over 200 per year). Some clients are already booking for 2019. We need to be working now with you to develop a strategy that enables us to keep our future visitors and clients informed of anything that may affect their visit or event.

Please let me know what the next steps are to help us find the best solutions to these concerns and others as this project moves ahead. We look forward to working with you.

Best regards on behalf of the AGH LRT team,

Bob Marentette  
Director of Operations  
Art Gallery of Hamilton

c.c. Jamie Robertson, Director, Community Relations & Communication, Metrolinx



---

**From:**

**Sent:** January-16-17 3:26 PM

**To:** LRT Office

**Subject:** West End traffic woes

I was not surprised to read in this weekend's newspaper that the LRT would create traffic issues in the west end of the City, but I was pleased to see that the City is looking into potential engineering solutions to solve the problem.

I have one potential engineering solution that might eliminate all the traffic concerns in the west end, and that is extend the existing Hunter Street tunnel to Dundurn and build the LRT beside or above the existing rail line.

From there, the LRT could either cross the 403 on: a) its own bridge without interfering with any major intersection, b) on the south side of the existing Main Street bridge, or c) be diverted to Frid Street and cross the 403 further west at an existing bridge (either Longwood or the rail yard bridge).

Such a change would require a 1.0 km section of the LRT to be built either into the embankment of the existing rail line or as a bridge, but perhaps the funds for this work could be taken from the planned dedicated 403 bridge, which might no longer be required.

In addition to removing most west-end traffic obstacles, such a diversion could have the added advantages of:

- 1) Moving the LRT Locke Street stop into the Locke Street community proper, instead of being 500 m away.
- 2) Integrating the McMaster Innovation Park directly into the LRT route
- 3) Allow unused space behind the Innovation Park to become parking for a transit hub
- 4) Shortening the distance from the route to the proposed maintenance shed, and
- 5) Should the LRT cross the 403 even further west, reduce traffic congestion near the university.



This message is the property of Amec Foster Wheeler plc and/or its subsidiaries and/or affiliates and is intended only for the named recipient(s). Its contents (including any attachments) may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure by law. Unauthorised use, copying, distribution or disclosure of any of it may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited. We assume no responsibility to persons other than the intended named recipient(s) and do not accept liability for any errors or omissions which are a result of email transmission. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply email to the sender and confirm that the original message and any attachments and copies have been destroyed and deleted from your system. This disclaimer applies to any and all messages originating from us and set out above. If you do not wish to receive future unsolicited commercial electronic messages from us, **please forward this email to: \_\_\_\_\_ and include "Unsubscribe" in the subject line.** If applicable, you will continue to receive invoices, project communications and similar factual, non-commercial electronic communications.

Please click <http://amecfw.com/email-disclaimer> for notices and company information in relation to emails originating in the UK, Italy or France.



**ZELINKA PRIAMO LTD**

*A Professional Planning Practice*

January 23, 2017

City of Hamilton  
36 Hunter Street East, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, ON  
L8N 3W8

Attention: Mr. Trevor Horzelenberg, Manager, Hamilton LRT Project

Dear Trevor:

**Re: Hamilton Light Rail Transit**  
**Preliminary Comments on behalf of the LCBO**  
**Our File: LCB/HAM/16-01-GC**

We are the planning consultants for the Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO) for the Hamilton LRT Project. The LCBO has a number of existing stores on leased sites within the City of Hamilton, including the following which are in proximity to the proposed LRT:

- Store # 571, located in the Jackson Square Mall, at 2 King Street West;
- Store # 190 at 1601 Main Street East; and
- Store # 545 at the Eastgate Mall.

On behalf of the LCBO, we have the following preliminary comments pertaining to the Hamilton LRT Project. We will continue to review the Hamilton LRT Project in more detail as it develops, and may provide further comments as required.

At this time, our review has determined potential issues for the above LCBO stores, including:

- There is concern over the anticipated reduced level of vehicle and pedestrian access to the sites during the extensive construction phase and following the implementation of the LRT. Other concerns include disturbance to service vehicles and customer patterns resulting from traffic restrictions and construction traffic movements; increased levels of noise, dust and vibration; and a general reduction in the aesthetic quality of the sites and surroundings.

Should you have any questions, or require further information, please do not hesitate to call. A meeting to discuss our comments and the site specific issues is considered appropriate.

Lastly, would you please kindly add the undersigned for notification of any public open houses/meetings with respect to the Hamilton LRT Project.

Yours very truly,

**ZELINKA PRIAMO LTD.**

Dave Hannam, BRP, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Planner

cc. Jennifer Guzzi, Manager, Real Estate Leasing, LCBO (Via Email)

January 24, 2017

To: Hamilton Light Rail Transit Project Office

From: Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association, on behalf of the residents of Kirkendall

Re: Comments regarding the LRT OMSF development and Environmental Assessment process

In two recent meetings with residents of the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association (KNA) and the Metrolinx project team, our residents listed a number of questions that they would like reviewed during the LRT Operations Maintenance Storage Facility (OMSF) Environmental Assessment (EA) process.

The following is a list of the questions or concerns that we ask to be addressed.

- 1) The KNA would like to be formally involved during both the design and construction phases of the OMSF project to have the concerns and ideas of residents included where possible. We wish to have a KNA representative at time of tender review to offer opinions and observations
- 2) Upon successful bid, we request that a Community Liaison Committee (CLC) be established to discuss concerns and suggest ideas and requests to the final designs and then construction phases of the project. The CLC will act as the representatives of the neighbourhood during construction to help ensure a clean, dust free site with low vibrations etc. The CLC approach has proven beneficial to both residents and owners.
- 3) We request that, where possible, the existing buildings be adaptively re-used for the various needs of the OMSF site and that the new site is designed with a presumption against demolition wherever possible. Where full buildings simply cannot be adapted for the OMSF purpose, we propose they be severed from the project with new builds occurring on vacant areas of the property. We propose that existing structures be included into the project as much as possible, for practical use (existing, stable, industrial buildings) and for aesthetic purposes (for example, incorporation of the large old brick chimney facing Frid St.)
- 4) We request that urban design studies be completed to ensure that the site is designed in such a way as to sympathetically integrate with a walk-able and human-scaled neighbourhood.
- 5) We request that streetscaping be completed to ensure the new OMSF fits into the innovation environment.
- 6) We request that the grade change issues be reviewed to ensure that the new OMSF ground floor is not higher than the surrounding, existing residential homes ground floors in the area.
- 7) We request pedestrian and cycling modifications to the Longwood Rd. bridge, ensuring that sidewalks and cycling paths / lanes from Main Street, Longwood Rd. and Frid St. are consistent with pedestrian and cycling friendly designs and, where applicable, are in compliance with the Cycling Master Plan. Cycling infrastructure should include separated lanes similar to those on the Main Street bridge over the 403.
- 8) With the completion of the Frid St. extension, we request that Aberdeen St. be monitored for truck usage and enforcement be provided to ensure it is no-longer used.
- 9) We request that Metrolinx develop a noise mitigation plan that reduces the overall noise from the LRT trains, operation of the OMSF and current CP rail line. Ideas suggested by residences included a wall or berm on the residential side of the CP Rail line (not between the rail line and the OMSF).



KIRKENDALL  
NEIGHBOURHOOD  
ASSOCIATION

- 10) We request a vibration monitoring program to ensure that during the construction of and operation of the OMSF, increased vibrations are measured and mitigated should there be any concerns regarding damage caused (including the potential rail spur for the project and operations).
- 11) We would like to be informed as to any hazardous materials found on the site and the plan for remediation and control of any hazardous materials.
- 12) We would like to know what Metrolinx or the City will do to ensure that the OMSF operation does not decrease the water pressure in the area.
- 13) Is there the ability to complete a pedestrian bridge over the tracks to make it easier for residents to get to MIP from the Dundurn street area?
- 14) We request that a full lighting study be completed with a "dark sky" lighting design. This is to ensure no increased light levels into the rear of the existing residential area.
- 15) We request a power study be completed to ensure there is sufficient power in the area to operate the OMSF as well as the plans for MIP and the rest of the West Hamilton Innovation District (WHID) and surrounding neighbourhood growth.
- 16) We request that the lighting signal at the corner of Frid and Chatham be completed along with all cycling and pedestrian changes planned and needed in the area to connect the neighbourhood to Frid St..
- 17) Can the underground creek that currently runs under the Sammy Metals building be re-naturalized as part of the design and OMSF project?

Please include the above questions and requests into the EA for review and comment.

Yours truly,

Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association

Mark Stewart

Development Committee Chair

To: Mr. Aidan Johnson, Ward 1 Councilor  
From:  
Re: Light Rail Transit (LRT) discussion

Jan. 18/17

I am concerned about recent news reports in the *Hamilton Spectator* that

- 1) indicate the problematic traffic issues in west Hamilton related to LRT.
- 2) indicate the James St. line will be replaced by a bus service.
- 3) indicate interest in raising the BLAST transit plan again.
- 4) sketchily address the Gage Park connection to the LRT.

Not mentioned yet are

- 5) detailed proposal solutions for the Gage Ave Trench.
- 6) any ideas that address the Operating and Maintaining Contract.
- 7) Toronto's track record for Bombardier transit vehicles.

- 1) Last September, at the first 'Information Sessions' the absence of data on west-end traffic projections was pointed out. Every one of the 'specialists' in attendance that I asked, gave vague hand waves that it was coming. Maybe Metrolinx really knew and wasn't saying. Anyway, it is obvious why and now there is evidence to prove what many pointed out intuitively. You can't take two lanes out of the middle of King Street East or West (or Main Street East or West either for that matter) without a traffic gridlock.

Well yes you can if, at the stroke of a pen, most of the cars trucks and emergency vehicles stop using the roads. It won't happen. One booster of LRT told me that the emergency vehicles will be able to run down the LRT trackways - if there are no Trains in the way, I guess. So that will make the road completely closed with emergency vehicle(s) on the tracks, and personnel or hoses crossing the vehicle lane. I saw no LRT crossovers on the plans - at 1/4 or 1/3 points, maybe, not sure yet, I was told. Were they in your briefing?

Another way to make more lanes out of the existing roadway is with smaller cars. Do you see that happening any time soon? No?

Battery-powered buses, that charge up at off peak electrical rates, and arrive at EVERY BUS STOP THROUGHOUT HAMILTON AT FIVE-MINUTE INTERVALS would get people out of cars and onto transit. Even if it took a while, transit would serve everyone. The LRT price tag would buy 500 such battery buses and **SERVE ALL HAMILTON**. They are available now and need no road destruction to join other modes of movement.

Did recent traffic studies report on traffic on residential streets nearby? If you want grief, ask. Terrified residents can seek fines and speed bumps for anyone who gets out of line on the gridlocked thoroughfare. Do you really intend to treat Hamiltonians this way?

- 2) Do you find it strange that Metrolinx itself has modified the plan again to replace a James Street LRT with buses? A clue to why might be in the financing of every other LRT in North America so far. All others are either over budget to complete or shortened to meet budget restraints. LRT already won't make it to Eastgate and what did I hear was planned for the Queenston Circle? A **BUS** terminal? Why not skip the terminal, and run more electric buses up King St.- and everywhere else. No poles, no track, no dead businesses.

The reason given for cancelling the James St. LRT was that the roadway wasn't wide enough. Isn't that the problem at Dundurn and King? Why is the discussion continuing?

- 3) The BLAST Plan mentions the idea of express bus service across the mountain linking Stoney Creek to Meadowlands. Was that **BUS** service? Not an LRT? Why? Is it that buses are flexible, move more people per pound of metal involved? SHARE the roadway?
- 4) "**LRT planners looking at Gage Park, parking**" said the headline on Jan.4/17. It's penciled in for the Delta? Does that not turn the whole park geometry around? I guess it's doable but I don't want to be the parent hauling the picnic stuff and stroller the distance needed to reach the splash pad and play space. Would you?

Oh yes, there is the Gage Ave Trench needed to get across the tracks. It gets no press attention. It is interesting that a bus system could provide closer access to the park at existing stops with no extra construction at all.

- 5) The Trench at Gage Avenue will unearth other problems like water and sewage lines that will need either expensive re-routing or pumping stations to address. Have they come up in your discussions? From the small print at the bottom of the current documentation, the city will be on the hook for an expensive something it needs because the LRT is there.
- 6) The matter of the Operating and Maintenance Contract seems conspicuously absent from the public discussion. Maybe you have access to better information. I only know that the profits from the Main-King HSR service currently supports the transit routes elsewhere in the city. If those finances disappear from the ledger, what holds up the rest of the system?

One proponent advocating the skyrocketing assessments possible once LRT is in place said that could finance transit for those not living on Millionaire's Row. Contempt like that for ordinary people makes me wonder why they seek to serve in PUBLIC office.

The assessment forecast resting on real estate sales, is already headed upward at rates unsustainable if I believe the local Real Estate Board banner advertising (Jan 18/17). That curve seems to be proceeding over whole GHA without an LRT. Such forecasts look like misleading information in this age of such stuff. Re information sources: Are you getting any information except from Metrolinx sources, about Hamilton Mass Transit?

- 7) Bombardier's 'track' record needs scrutiny. Hamilton will be somewhere behind Toronto in the queue for cars. How's Toronto making out on the cars it was promised? And a couple days ago I heard a report from the people running them. Did I hear they are logging a reportable failure every few hundred Kilometres of operation instead of the expected tens of thousands of Kilometres between such events? Hmmm. Other suppliers can bid, I was told. Does anyone at City Hall hear from other sources?

These dots connect up pretty well don't they? The more information comes up, the worse LRT looks. A web of lines can't conceal that mass transit by LRT will not serve Hamiltonians well. It discourages me further when I read the quotes attributed to Mr. Johnson (Jan 17/17, Jan 18/17). It is obvious he has to represent a tough stand on this topic but can you see the hole he is digging for Council? There was a glimmer of light in the comment of Wednesday (Jan 18/17). "If council rejects the agreement, (presumably the Operation and Maintenance deal that hasn't been announced yet) both sides will head back to the negotiating table." But why get that far when **LRT IS THE PROBLEM**? Who is eliminating your alternatives?



---

**From:** Dave Heidebrecht  
**Sent:** February-01-17 7:36 AM  
**To:** LRT Office  
**Subject:** Statement on LRT Impacts to Cycling Infrastructure

Dear Hamilton LRT team,

On behalf of our membership and the thousands of cyclists represented collectively by our organizations, we are writing to express our concerns regarding the proposed changes to existing and planned cycling lanes along the LRT route. After highlighting our overall concerns with the impacts of this shift away from the broader premise of active transportation that LRT is built upon, this submission outlines our concerns along specific areas of the route. It concludes with some suggested opportunities for the City of Hamilton and Metrolinx to consider as you move forward towards community and neighbourhood consultations.

## Shifting away from active transportation

As Hamilton LRT's Public Information Centre 2 report notes, "Rapid Transit is more than just moving people from place to place. It is about providing a catalyst for the development of high quality, safe, sustainable and affordable transportation options" (p4). This same report also notes that the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan "articulates a vision for *all modes of transportation* in the region" (our emphasis added) and reinforces the need to integrate LRT with pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. Unfortunately, the changes proposed along the LRT route—those aimed at accommodating the status quo traffic flow of single-use occupancy vehicles—don't add up to the ambitious goals of creating a more sustainable and active transportation network that LRT has been built upon. We understand that the LRT project is moving forward in an unsettling political climate exerting pressures to cater to the status quo, but we are deeply concerned that by removing cycling lanes to improve motor vehicle traffic flow, we will waste the opportunity for transformative change that Metrolinx and the City of Hamilton propose to be striving towards. As our community, our province, our country, and the world continue to face the unnerving realities of climate change, it is especially disappointing to see that single-occupancy automobiles are being catered to over more sustainable and healthy transportation options. If the LRT project is truly about "improving the quality of life for our community and the surrounding environment", this shift in strategy falls well short of our aspirations.

We also question the unspoken assumptions regarding the demand for automobile capacity on our roads after LRT has been built. The purpose of LRT is not just to improve the efficiency, quality, and reliability of public transit for people who currently use it. Rather, LRT promises to create a modal shift that will reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicles on our streets. Part of this shift will include single-occupancy vehicles and delivery vehicles adjusting their routes to avoid areas of high congestion—such as the areas identified for removal of planned and existing bike lanes. For these reasons, we don't agree that the expected problem of missing lane capacity is a proper reason to talk about removing existing or planned cycling infrastructure on a project meant to improve active transportation on the whole.

## Specific Concerns

While we are concerned with the overall shift away from active transportation network integration proposed by the LRT project, we have some very specific concerns regarding the current proposed plans. These include:

- **Removal of Main St. W. Cycling Lanes:** Part of the original LRT proposal, these lanes have been removed completely from plans between McMaster University and Highway 403. While the map provided in the Public Information Centre 2 slides notes that there is willingness to explore alternative routes, both of the routes noted (through Westdale and Ainslie Wood) are already cycling routes. This change results in a net loss of proposed infrastructure.
- **Status Quo on Highway 403 Overpass:** While we are very happy that the City's cycling infrastructure currently includes protected two-way cycling tracks on both Main St. W. and King St. W., it must be noted that both of these routes require cyclists to cross either an onramp or an offramp from a 400-series highway. We would hope that given the resources being allocated to this project, and the vision of improving transportation options for all, this safety concern would be top of mind in plans to adapt and change the overall traffic flow in this corridor.
- **Dundurn St. N. & York Blvd. Bike Lane Removal:** These lanes comprise the major cycling route between Westdale and Downtown Hamilton. Removing these lanes in favour of improved automobile traffic flow goes directly against the LRT vision of "safe, sustainable and affordable transportation options" and speaks to the ongoing challenges that cyclists have in our city to be seen as a valued and respected form of transportation. One only needs to look at Hamilton's Cycling Master Plan and the fact that it is incredibly underfunded and decades behind schedule to understand how often cyclists' safety and value as citizens is neglected. Finally, as LRT is meant to be integrated with active transportation options at each hub, the removal of bike lanes would mean that cyclists arriving to the LRT by bike would have to dismount and then walk an additional distance to reach the hub—not ideal for a system that is aiming for seamless integration of transportation modes.
- **Centre-East Lower City:** The centre-east lower city boasts two safe east-west cycling routes along Cannon and Lawrence/Cumberland. However, there are no designated or improved north-south routes linking these to the proposed LRT system. Moreover, the SoBi bikeshare system has been implemented much more sparsely between Wentworth and Ottawa Streets and does not serve the area from Ottawa St. to the Queenston Traffic Circle.
- **Larger Systems Implications of Proposed Changes:** Hamilton's cycling network is vastly underfunded and many of the existing pieces of infrastructure along the LRT corridor have come to fruition only after a great deal of effort from citizens and neighbourhood groups. One such piece of infrastructure is the Cannon St. Cycle Track. As plans develop, we are concerned that proposed removal of cycling infrastructure along the Dundurn/York corridor may also extend to Cannon St. The Cannon St. cycle track is the only safe east-west cycling route through the north central lower city; its removal would be catastrophic for cyclists and would send an unwanted message that cyclists' needs do not matter in Hamilton.

## Opportunities

Aligned with the concerns listed above, we would like to propose some possible opportunities to better integrate cycling into planning as the LRT project moves forward. These include:

- **Main St. W. Cycling Lanes:** Reflecting the overall vision of the LRT project, we encourage Metrolinx and the City of Hamilton to consider the need to balance the use of the roadway for *all transportation options* as per the vision of this project. Please consider the number of schools along this route (n=4)



and the number of children and young people who cannot drive but may be much more likely to be active and healthy given the option. As the LRT office consults on cycling plans, we encourage you to consult with these stakeholders. Of special interest would be feedback from McMaster University students who may be more likely to travel downtown and integrate further with the City were there safe options to do so via bicycle.

- **Highway 403 Overpass:** Consider building a protected 2-way cycle track onto the new LRT bridge that could link to infrastructure along the Dundurn corridor (see below). Given the resources being put towards the bridge already, additional space for a protected (and maintained) cycle track would address safety concerns of existing routes. Alternatively, construct overpasses or underpasses along existing routes to provide safe crossing for cyclists and pedestrians.
- **Dundurn Corridor:** Fund and develop a protected cycle track and greenway that travels through Cathedral Park and connects to Frid St. to the south and Breadalbane St. and Woodbine Crescent to the north. Ensure a safe and direct cycling route that arrives at the Dundurn LRT stop.
- **York & Dundurn Intersection:** Create a two-way cycle track along York Blvd. that connects the existing Cannon Cycle Track with a greenway route on Woodbine Crescent. Expanding the intersection at York and Dundurn could allow for a cycling-specific signal crossing to allow cyclists to cross safely from Woodbine Crescent to a York Blvd. cycle track.
- **Centre-East Lower City:** Improve north-south cycling routes to LRT stops, including safer crossings of Main St. Connect Scott Park station directly to Cannon St. bicycle lanes via multi-use path across proposed HWDSB high school property at the Scott Park site. Expand SoBi service area beyond Queenston Traffic Circle with equivalent station density to west and central Hamilton.
- **Larger Systems Implications:** Be open and transparent about additional changes being considered (if at all) along and near other areas of the route. For example, if changes to Main St. W. are being considered, ensure that neighbourhoods and the community are aware of this possibility, as this option could include a two-way cycle track or protected bike lanes along any conversion of Main St. W. to two-way.

## Let's Be Bold

We are incredibly supportive of the overall vision of LRT to be an incredibly positive game-changer for the City of Hamilton. The vision of developing a truly integrated and sustainable transportation network is one that we as a community need to hold high and strive towards. By removing existing active transportation options we would be falling short of this goal and catering to short-sighted ideals of single-use vehicles as the status quo. LRT is meant to change this, let's be bold in sticking to this vision.

While we have outlined our concerns above, we are very encouraged to see that there are plans for further consultations and discussion with residents, neighbourhoods, and Hamilton's cycling community (we should note that we also hope drivers, transit users, and pedestrians will be part of this conversation). We offer these ideas as suggestions to initiate dialogue, and realize that others will be bringing forward alternative ideas that may also be possible solutions to consider. We very much look forward to hearing more about these consultations, and hope that they can serve as a catalyst for creative thinking, respectful dialogue, and the development of visionary approaches to the complex challenges outlined in the most recent LRT update.

We would be happy to not only participate in this session, but to work with the LRT team to facilitate and follow-up on ideas raised as they relate to Hamilton's cycling network. We would also be open to hosting the LRT planning team and city planners on a ride along the impacted routes to provide a first-person perspective on existing infrastructure and the importance of providing safe, healthy, and sustainable transportation options for all. Perhaps this could be included as part of the consultations in the coming months.

Thank you for considering the ideas within and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Dave Heidebrecht

Chair, Cycle Hamilton

On behalf of the Cycle Hamilton Board of Directors

Mark Chamberlain, Ned Nolan, Kate Whalen, Johanna Bleecker, Chelsea Cox, Lynda Lukasik, and John Neary

## THE SKY CAR

### URBAN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Hamilton has an excellent opportunity to be "PUT ON THE MAP". It would be a transportation system so bold and so exotic that it would make headlines in TEXAS. Instead of traveling on the street level it should be elevated - above the power poles - unobstructed by cars, trucks, buses, pedestrians and even weather, such as wind storms, rain storms, snow storms or sleet. The stations would be air conditioned and strategically placed and accessed by elevators so that walking distance would be a minimum. The tram cars have no operators and travel from start to stop with the push of a button and go north, south, east and west - up and down the mountain - even to malls and train stations. There is no waiting at stations - up to four cars are waiting at the station all the time and if not used - all is quiet - no energy is wasted. The cost of this system is minimal because everything is made in a factory and put in place without diverting traffic. People would come from miles around to to ride the sky car and see the sights from above for only two dollars - cheaper than going to WONDERLAND!

# THE SKY CAR

## URBAN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

### THE PROCESS:

If you want to go to a destination in the city you first go to a strategic street corner where an elevator takes you up to a station above the street. In this enclosed area there are up to four tram cars at each end of the room going in opposite directions. You go to the lead car going in your direction, you open the door, step in, close the door, sit down and press a button to go. The tram car immediately moves out of the station onto the main tram way where it speeds up to set speed. On the wall is a line map of the system showing the location of your car with a moving light. When you see your destination coming up you press a stop button. The tram car leaves the tram way and goes into the station and stops. You open the door, step out into that station, walk to the elevator and go down to the street.

# THE SKY CAR

## URBAN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

### HOW IT WORKS:

The elevator is a free standing structure with an in door and an out door - both locked. To open the in door a two dollar coin is inserted in a slot. A double door can then be opened to enter the elevator car. The outer door and the car doors close together. A button is pushed allowing the elevator car to go up and stop at the station floor.

The station room, which is lighted, insulated and air conditioned spans the street with the tram way running above the sidewalk and above the power poles. The tram cars are all aluminum, light weight, insulated, have no wheels or propulsion but are self contained with battery, lights, cooling and electronics.

The elevator car holds two adults or one adult and two children.

The tram car holds four adults or two adults and four children.

The tram cars have a flat bottom and are supported and propelled by rubber tired motor wheels in the floor of the tramway which are controlled by computers and sensors.

# THE SKY CAR

## URBAN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

### THE STRUCTURE

The supports for the tramway and station are large pipe poles from the edge of the sidewalk up to the deep truss frames that form the structure. All trusses are made from light weight steel shapes and are made in a factory. All pieces are galvanized. The tramway is double decked with the lower section used for maintenance. The upper section has a roof of steel sloped and coated with teflon to assist the adherence of rain, sleet and snow. The whole structure has open sides and steel grating floors.

# THE SKY CAR

## URBAN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

### COMMENTS

This system is not intended to replace busses. Busses are needed to go to the outer edges of the city and beyond.

The tramway can go anywhere in the city - north, south, east, west and up and down the mountain on a four to six percent grade in all weather.

Accidents on the streets can be bypassed as well as fires.



# White elephant

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

A **white elephant** is a possession which its owner cannot dispose of and whose cost, particularly that of maintenance, is out of proportion to its usefulness. The term derives from the story that the kings of Siam, now [Thailand](#), were accustomed to make a present of one of these animals to [courtiers](#) who had rendered themselves obnoxious, in order to ruin the recipient by the cost of its maintenance. In modern usage, it is an object, scheme, business venture, facility, etc., considered without use or value.<sup>[1]</sup>

## Background<sup>[edit]</sup>

A white elephant at the [Amarapura Palace](#) in 1855.

The term derives from the sacred [white elephants](#) kept by Southeast Asian monarchs in [Burma](#), [Thailand](#), [Laos](#) and [Cambodia](#).<sup>[2]</sup> To possess a white elephant was regarded (and is still regarded in Thailand and Burma) as a sign that the monarch reigned with justice and power, and that the kingdom was blessed with peace and prosperity. The opulence expected of anyone that owned a beast of such stature was great. Monarchs often exemplified their possession of white elephants in their formal titles (e.g., [Hsinbyushin](#), lit. "Lord of the White Elephant" and the third monarch of the [Konbaung dynasty](#)).<sup>[3]</sup>

White elephants are linked to [Hindu cosmology](#) as the mount of [Indra](#), king of the [Vedic deities](#), is [Airavata](#), a white elephant. White elephants are also intricately linked to [Buddhist cosmology](#): the mount of [Sakka's](#) (a Buddhist deity and ruler of the [Tavatimsa](#) heaven) is a three-headed white elephant named [Airavata](#).<sup>[3]</sup> [Albino elephant](#)s exist in nature, usually being reddish-brown or pink.<sup>[4]</sup>

The tradition derives from tales that associate a white elephant with the birth of the [Buddha](#), as his mother was reputed to have dreamed of a white elephant presenting her with a [lotus flower](#), a common symbol of wisdom and purity, on the eve of giving birth.<sup>[5]</sup> Because the animals were considered sacred and laws protected them from labor, receiving a gift of a white elephant from a monarch was simultaneously a blessing and a curse. It was a blessing because the animal was sacred and a sign of the monarch's favour, and a curse because the recipient now had an expensive-to-maintain animal he could not give away and could not put to much practical use.

The [Order of the White Elephant](#) consists of eight grades of [medals](#) issued by the government of Thailand. There are also white elephants in Nepal.

In the West, the term "white elephant" relating to an expensive burden that fails to meet expectations, was first used in the 1600s and became widespread in the 1800s.<sup>[6]</sup> According to

one source it was popularized following P. T. Barnum's experience with an elephant named *Toung Taloung* that he billed as the "Sacred White Elephant of Burma". After much effort and great expense, Barnum finally acquired the animal from the King of Siam only to discover that his "white elephant" was actually dirty grey in color with a few pink spots.<sup>[7]</sup>

The expressions "white elephant" and "gift of a white elephant" came into common use in the middle of the nineteenth century.<sup>[8]</sup> The phrase was attached to "white elephant swaps" and "white elephant sales" in the early twentieth century.<sup>[9]</sup> Many church bazaars held "white elephant sales" where donors could unload unwanted bric-a-brac, generating profit from the phenomenon that one man's trash is another man's treasure. Many organizational and church fairs still use the term today. In general use a "white elephant" usually refers to an item that's not useful (decorative) but may be expensive and odd.

To: LRT Project  
From:  
Re: Your questionnaire

Sept 13/16

There is still time to reverse the calamity about to descend on Hamilton in the form of a Light Rail Transit (LRT) system.

I understand it is the duty of the employees I spoke to, to promote the project. They have orders issued by Council to plan and promote the project. I'm sure that adverse opinions from any of them would be viewed as cause for dismissal. That threat alone is reason to suspect the process. But at some point, the duty of public servants is to stand and tell those leaders the minutiae of their mistakes. Such is the case here.

**1) Gift of 1 billion dollars**

It is probably not the duty of the project staff to tell the Council that assigned them the task, to say that the money offered by the Province was not a gift. It was payment for the right of way to use, and control the major arteries of Hamilton on which the LRT is proposed to run. Metrolinx, a crown corporation, is tasked with providing a contractor group, with access to the space to build the system. This is what they want to set about. The city is not getting a billion dollar gift. It is giving an out-of-town monopoly group that is 'buying' city space for the price billion dollars.

It does become an important issue to the servants who are charged with promoting the Council's wishes because the distinction between gift and purchase tarnishes the ability of the staff to adequately answer the legitimate questions of the taxpayers. It suggests that these diligent staff are somehow complicit in dealings which are not quite as they seem. That is compromising to the staff credibility in the eyes of the citizens and demoralizing to the staff that has to defend a position that becomes less credible by the day. Let me elaborate on that point.

**2) Sending employees to supply information that has not been decided or is misleading.**

- a. **Models.** The young lady who was equipped to talk at length about the traffic models being used to project current and future transportation needs can only talk about what planners think will happen if the LRT is implemented. She identified an area of concern west of Bay and along the Cannon/Barton corridor. Traffic will be gridlocked in that space she suggested and needs planning to reduce that. It happens that this is one of more disadvantaged areas of the city. So the poor will have yet another cross to bear?

The blanks in the display of this information intimated that there were no other areas of potential traffic problems. In fact, questioning of the lady on that point revealed that the data for the modeling of other areas was not in hand - was being collected at this time. So the apparent lack of problems was a lack of information about the blank areas. How bad does that look?

The lady has lots of experience modeling but does not live in the area and has scant knowledge of particular streetscapes involved. She was unfamiliar with the fact that at this moment, a single parked car on Cannon Street, that causes a bus to turn tightly around it to reach a bus stop, could project the bus's back end into the only other remaining traffic lane and thus paralyze traffic on the street. As you might know the bike lanes take up the remaining space in that roadway. This is one of the major alternates planned I was told, for traffic displaced from King Street by LRT. I'm suggesting that if such details are not part of a knowledgeable modeling process, how can one have any confidence that the model represents anything like reality? The same lady was not familiar with the Skyway Bridge incident in which a dump truck struck the bridge and closed it in 2014 and diverted paralyzing traffic upon the lower city. She admitted that such single episodes would not factor significantly into models she was working with. But the traffic congestion that doesn't appear in her models sure impacts the life of those upon whom you would lay the simplistic models that miss these moments.

There are endless numbers of legitimate reasons why a single car might be parked along Cannon Street and cause constriction if not obstruction of the street under today's condition let alone under the increased traffic loading brought on by LRT construction.

- b. **Tunnel slope.** In recent weeks, the railway crossing between Gage Ave and the Delta has proved problematic to planners of the LRT. The railway won't play ball and that has led to projections of a tunnel underpass. I spoke to a knowledgeable representative of this problem at your information session. At a ballpark estimation of the depth of such a tunnel of about 30'± and a slope of about 3% The tunnel will be about 1000' on the down slope and another 1000' on the up slope. Well there is only about half that distance between the track and Gage Ave. So is Gage Ave to be closed as an afterthought once construction begins or will the LRT cars become a funicular railway to climb the steeper slope?

The expert went further to say it would not actually be a tunnel. The first choice would be a box construction. Has anyone run this architectural idea (scar some might call it) through the neighbourhood? Would the box have a lid upon which gardens were planted? I missed the panel that showed it.

I asked where the dirt from such a tunnel would go. "No idea!" was the reply. "It depends on what's in it." I think there was a hint there that soil excavated from a street setting might have contaminants that limit its disposal. I was thinking at that moment of the excavation of the 'tunnel' but the same question and answer applies to the excavation of the rest of the track route as well. I find it strange that an amount of dirt of this magnitude is to be removed from an urban setting and nobody knows where it's going. Don't you? I can't think of a flattering way to explain this response. Is this behind the recent application to increase the Taro Disposal site?

- c. **Traffic data.** Among the conspicuously missing data about the LRT project is any empirical data about traffic flows along the route, alternate roadways during construction and the assumptions upon which the models are based. The inability for anyone to obtain that data, obtained at taxpayer expense, is yet one more reason to cast doubt upon the purpose of these sessions.

But to find that data needed to make the needed projections is not even collected yet, is indeed discouraging evidence of the state of the process. Here is a project of epic proportions plunging ahead no matter what the evidence. Well that is what you've been asked to defend and it seems unconscionable that you should be asked to do so, or that those who have ordered the process could be demanding your compliance without having the evidence to think the project through in the first place. Who can ask for a 'Reset' here? Well you'd hope that the publicly hired staff could step up and say 'You should look at alternates.' Who has that kind of courage?

- 3) **Questionnaire.** The questionnaire is designed to conceal the very information that would help Council prevent the calamity that a previous Council initiated. There are a few subtleties that will probably be dismissed as paranoia by all but the planners of the Information Event. Hopefully they will be red-faced enough to admit that their efforts were noticed by one at least, if they aren't delighted that it was only one.

- a. **Appearances.** Did you notice that all the staff wore golf shirts (casual), in White (pure and honest), embroidered (high value), in black (certainty)? The costume reflects status without pressure, an invitation to engage, yet in an exchange in which there is no doubt. Tell me that was not the intent, and I'll believe that two moons will rise to-night.

Sad to say the organizer of the image was not on site the first night to see those efforts derailed by the way the completed questionnaires were treated. Everything was dumped in a couple of cardboard boxes – the kind you rescue from the bin box at the grocery store just before they meet the crusher. The same boxes are used for stuff headed for the shredder and how does the contributor know the difference. Don't be so picky! Isn't someone just being utilitarian here? They are not concerned about the optics. Nobody told them.

Might I suggest that if you want to avoid this image of carelessness or casual disregard, you take each response personally and immediately, number it and register it in a database, by laptop, while the contributor watches. You said you were going to log each response. Well why not right then and there? The issuing of a receipt would be a tasteful touch, don't you think? There is enough going on to erode confidence in the exercise; such attention to detail might be a step towards credibility. That a citizen could actually refer a Councilor to a particular document for discussion would be a step towards dialogue – if anyone wants to.

- b. **Quality.** The paper on which the questionnaire was printed was high quality, meant to convey that the answers offered, were valued. It is a gesture to those

who probably don't get their tax bills on such vellum. Well I mean you don't convey interest with newsprint do you?

- c. Questions are all phrased to imply agreement of the overall process luring respondents to tweak the project. Anyone who has a suggestion about where to put another stop or pedestrian crossing is presumed to be in favour of the project, except for this tiny detail. I expect that is the spin that will be put on those answers.

I was careful to note that you said all responses would be logged. I missed what followed. I expect that that log will never be placed in the hands of a City Councillor. At best, I'd uses they get a tally of some sort – twenty for a stop here fifty for a stop there. It conveys the impression of a democratic process where all opinions are equal. Well that's good isn't it?

Nobody gets to see the single letter from a knowledgeable planner that criticizes some particular element or the process itself and has spent a lifetime earning the right to do so. That analysis is considered as good as anyone else who has no background upon which to base an opinion but what their spouse wanted.

Well the ethics of such a disparity would be addressed by responsible reporting of results. But that is where your ship runs aground. The answer has already been decided. You are tasked with delivering data that supports it and a one-page summary would be best. Am I right?

I would be remiss if I didn't say I noticed the few lines, at the end, tacked on like an afterthought, for dissenting – sorry, 'Other' views. Would critics call this tokenism? Is there a handicap assigned to such statements?

- d. **Opposition display.** It would require a remarkable leader to imagine that LRT has unanimous support but that is what you are told to assume. You and everyone else knows it's not so and that there should be a place in the show for opposition. That is what responsible civil servants were designed to do. I'm surprised that, because of the experience you have, that you did not advocate for such an option.

- 4) **Handout.** I didn't know whether to put this comment under the heading of misleading information or about the handout. This one won out because of what follows.

- a. The colour renderings show a car in a eutopian streetscape. Everyone knows such drawings are not real. So is the rail car any more real than the space it shows? Where are the other elements in the transportation package like the line of cars stretching over the horizon? I suppose if this process continues, the renderings may be more prophetic than anyone realizes. There may be no cars at all, and the number of people on the real street, will only be decorative.

I also call attention to the minimalist representation of the curb that will separate traffic from the rail bed. Don't draw attention to the paralyzing factor.

- b. I was interested to follow up the information under 'How the LRT will run in the snow.' "The guideway is maintained to permit safe ...." I think that thought deserves amplification. How does that space get plowed? Where does the snow get stacked? In the traffic lanes beside it? Do the trains have plows or throwers attached?
- c. I then followed the names of other cities that were cited as being examples of successful LRT installations with a Google search. The following articles came up

- i. Global News **Metro line LRT misses another deadline for running at full speed** by Paul Heidenreich Aug 30, 2016 9:17 pm WATCH ABOVE: It's been saddled with delays since it started running and on Tuesday, the City of Edmonton said the Metro Line LRT failed to meet yet another deadline. As Shallima Maharaj reports, there are still several more speed bumps left to deal with before commuters get what was originally advertised.

- ii. **Snow and LRT outage hit Edmonton commuters with double whammy - A skiff of snow here, an LRT power outage there, next thing you know ...**  
CBC News Posted: Nov 19, 2015 10:49 AM MT Last Updated: Nov 19, 2015 10:50 AM MT. Tristin Hopper: The \$600 million Edmonton train that snarls traffic, slows down transit times and increases emissions. "It's slower than a bus. It has slowed down the buses that existed. And it is almost certainly increasing Edmonton's net amount of carbon emissions. In short, it fails on every single possible justification for why cities should build light rail."

I'm not sure if it was the video linked to this article or another one that complained about the pedestrians who were impeding LRT schedules by not following signs and crossing lights. It seems the burden of behaviour demanded of citizens by this form of transportation is unwelcome. Might it be an expression of opposition to the LRT in the first place? Need Hamilton expect such civil disobedience in the face of the project's unpopularity?

- iii. **(Edmonton)Metro LRT to cause major traffic delays. Drivers can expect to wait up to 16 minutes at an intersection when the trains start running, city says.** By Laura Osman, CBC News Posted: Sep 02, 2015 1:40 PM MT Last Updated: Sep 03, 2015 12:03 PM MT

- iv. **Edmonton LRT Disruption At Central Station** (Is The Winter Over Yet Special Editon Video)Published on Feb 19, 2014  
February 15-23 the Northbound LRT Track Between central and Churchill Stations Closed due to Problems with its rails requiring repairs and maintenance on them. These rails are the ones that were replaced nearly a year ago. Here is a video of the LRT line during this LRT Disruption.

- v. **The price tag for the future light-rail line between Minneapolis and the southwest suburbs will rise sharply — as much as 33 percent —**

under new estimates for the cost of dealing with conflicting freight train traffic. The Southwest Corridor LRT, which was already expected to cost \$1.25 billion, could reach nearly \$1.7 billion if planners choose one of the options under consideration in the hotly contested area between Minneapolis and St. Louis Park.

Estimates released Wednesday put the lowest-cost option at \$1.37 billion if the freight trains run alongside light-rail trains in the Kenilworth neighborhood of Minneapolis and bike and walking trails there were relocated. Similar options have been opposed by the city and could produce a lawsuit from homeowners. Burying the LRT in a deep tunnel under the freight lines, and bike and walking paths in Kenilworth would satisfy many homeowners but could bring the highest cost: \$1.67 billion.

The takeaway from two of the three reference cities, is that LRT can be stopped by a squirrel if not a leak and should be expected to go over budget.

I am impressed by the comment from Edmonton **“It’s slower than a bus. It has slowed down the buses that existed. And it is almost certainly increasing Edmonton’s net amount of carbon emissions. In short, it fails on every single possible justification for why cities should build light rail.”** Which statement deserves the most credence - the one from Edmonton or the pronouncements of the LRT boosters here, that have no experience or are willfully blind?

#### 5) General Comments on particular details.

- a. I asked **how deep the foundation** had to be for the track bed of the LRT. The best I could do was get a guestimate. I was told there was a panel that showed that detail but I could not find it at City Hall, nor could the expert who was looking for it also.
- b. I sought, from the City Water and Sewage Department, the **location of trunk sewers and water mains** that might cross the LRT route. I did this by phone on Sept 13 at about 10:30 am so I could more knowledgably interact with the experts on site at the Information Session. The phone call was recorded, your answering service says. Christine said she could not give me that information because I was not a contractor. Her supervisor was not available. If I could send her a letter making my request, she might be able to find someone who could answer it.

Meanwhile back at the Information session, nobody I could find had any idea which trunk lines would be involved just that redirecting them would be a BIG problem, and frankly the experts I talked to were mystified about why there location could not be revealed.

My personal suspicion is that **redirected Water and Sewage lines** incur either more bends or a lot of digging to realign slopes. The first requires assessment and possible upgrading of pumps, the latter a lot of collateral streets that might have initially been counted on to handle displaced traffic, being dug up. Could failure to address these by-product issues increase sewage backups, water supply



issues or traffic issues? Again, here is another question whose ambiguous response adds evidence to make one wonder what the purpose of the exercise is.

I'm sure it will come as no surprise to find I did not pursue other information of electrical, communication, or gas lines that might lead to unforeseen problems. I guess it is above the pay grade of a citizen to know, and it is immaterial to set policy anyway.

- c. I was surprised that none of the experts pointed to the present Charlton-Herkimer lane alignment as a model of the way it will be on the LRT line. A single accident, stalled car, blown over garbage can, or darting animal now stops the whole street. Standing waves in traffic patterns ensure that the smallest delay on a busy street extends 'upstream' and lasts far longer than the original incident takes to clear. Where there was once optional space in a bike lane adjacent to the driving lane, to ease past an accident, now there is none. When nobody points out things like this it both tarnishes the process credibility and purpose.
- d. Since the second day event was held at City Hall, it was no surprise to see the presence of members of City Council – supporters only. Was it Mr. Farr swaggering through the hall smiling like a cop with a gun belt? I know it was the mayor I spoke to. He was not seeking information, just gloating, adding his weight of office to the event. In fact he claimed he didn't even remember the event was taking place that day. Right! After thanking me for my difference of opinion, I was dismissed. I never saw him after that without a half dozen irate others talking at him. I doubt he saw his presence as chopping the ground from beneath City staff's credibility. It is no wonder the process fails in the court of community confidence.
- e. Mr. Johnson, The City's point man, asked in exasperation at my opposition, what I would do instead. It was thoughtful of him to ask. Only if he and others force an adoption of an alternate, will my thoughts be of use but here is the essence of what I said to him.

Hamilton's transit **needs** rest mostly in the suburbs. To service them, buses need to run at a five-minute schedule. To do that buses should be 10-12 passenger vans till ridership requires otherwise. These buses need to be self-driving and battery powered. Transit should be free to any Hamiltonian – part of your tax bill. If that idea were adopted, who would need a car? With the streets now emptied of all but buses and service vehicles and a few cars, boulevards and urban orchards are possible.

Buses have a flexibility that LRT can never match. They actually acknowledge other forms of transport have a right to road space. LRT only hands out left-overs.

Buses respond to people in emergency. They shelter victims of fires, move crowds to safer places, change routes to accommodate street festivals. Buses respond to rider needs. Riders must respond to LRT demands.

C3

107

# Questions regarding Hamilton LRT

08.25.2016

## Traffic Congestion / Flow

### To:

Kelly Anderson – APR & Manager of Communications & Engagement Light Rail Transit (LRT) | (City of Hamilton)  
Trevor Horzelenberg – Manager of LRT (City of Hamilton)

David Ellis – LRT operational expert with CH2M  
Michael Hodge – Policy Manager with Metrolinx  
Kelsey Ewart – Communications Manager from Metrolinx  
Hamilton Council  
Friends  
Family  
Neighbours

**Dear LRT Staff and City of Hamilton Council,**

Additional questions have been added to this document that I presented at the meeting with the LRT staff on August 19<sup>th</sup> that I had not yet at that time considered. I have not removed any questions as they are still to be answered with specifics that were not available at the meeting.

I respectfully thank you for allowing this coming together to receive my serious concerns regarding the proposed LRT project in Hamilton. I have made this list of questions that I have come up with on my own as well as from listening to friends, family, neighbour's and strangers over approximately the past 4 years. I would like them to be answered by the appropriate expert staff in a timely manner that is by the end of September 15th in time for the first public meetings on the proposed LRT route. I believe strongly that these answers will act to inform the people of Hamilton so that they will have a much more robust understanding of the traffic will flow around the LRT system as well as its payment responsibilities; allowing for at least a decent visualization which is not now available. I imagine that all of these questions have already been dealt with by the LRT staff in order for them to have come this far in the project. I fundamentally believe that the citizens of Hamilton including Hamilton Council need to have the answers to these questions and then decide which path forward is best.

These questions will be regarding the proposed Main / King route as well as the Only Main Street route. I believe that what I will present here will cause you to seriously consider that the proposed route has fatal flaws that are

08.25.2016

Pg.02

too serious to ignore and then entertain again other alternatives which provide immediate Return on Investment rather than hoped for future ROI. I strongly believe this route has to be the A Line from the John C. Munro International Airport - Upper James Street – The Claremont Access – Cannon or Barton (single line north and west) – Hughson (single line south) – Main Street East (single line east) – The Claremont Access.

I visited Kitchener Waterloo, Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup> to compare their system / route and our proposed system / route. I trust that all Council has examined the Kitchener Waterloo LRT system firsthand. Remarks regarding this comparison will be included.

Most sincerely,

**Questions on Traffic Congestion / Flow - Updated (from the East End during rush hour)**

For proper comparison, these questions are to be answered for both the Only Main route and King / Main route.

**A. Basically, what happens to eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at every traffic light intersection?****Specifically:**

- 1) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Redhill Creek Overpass (assuming the extension to Eastgate Mall is to be completed in another phase)?
- 2) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Parkdale Street intersection?
  - a. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?
- 3) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Kenilworth Street intersection?
  - a. Are there any additional considerations due to the Kenilworth Access high vehicle volume hours?
  - b. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?

4) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Ottawa Street intersection?

a. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?

5) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Delta?

a. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?

6) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Gage Street intersection?

a. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?

7) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Sherman Avenue intersection?

a. Are there any additional considerations due to the proximity of the east end termination of Wilson Street one block away?

b. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?

8) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Wentworth Street intersection?

a. Are there any additional considerations during the Sherman Cut high vehicle volume hours?

b. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?

9) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Victoria Avenue intersection?

- a. Are there any additional considerations due to the down bound Claremont Access vehicle traffic?
- b. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?

10) What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Wellington Avenue intersection?

- a. Are there any additional considerations due to the up bound Claremont Access vehicle traffic?
- b. Will there be left or right turn only lanes?

10) i) What happens to the lanes of King Street from Wellington Avenue through to Catharine Street?

- a. What happens to the trees along this same stretch of roadway?
- b. What happens to the underground utilities along this same stretch? Where do they get moved to?
- c. Will left or right turns be allowed?
- d. What happens to the traffic if there is a fire in a building along this stretch of road?

- d. How is traffic detoured if there is a fire in a building along this stretch of road?
- e. What happens to traffic if a building is to be taken down and is being replaced by another building of substantial height (say, 5-10 floors or even more)? How do the construction vehicles, cranes, etc. get in and unload without disrupting LRT and vehicle traffic?
  - i. Mr. Horzelenberg, LRT Manager for the City thought that because the buildings along this stretch of King are mostly heritage type buildings that they would not be replaced. The recent past does not agree with him as the 10-year-old 7 story building on the south side near Denningers and the Ferguson station can attest to. General aging of buildings means eventually some will come down and be replaced.
  - ii. Does the City not wish for there to be major new building construction along the International Village stretch of King Street?
  - iii. How do construction crews as well as fire crews navigate the overhead trolley lines and support poles when having to work several floors or many floors above street level in this section?
- f. What happens to LRT and non LRT traffic if utilities have to be routed under King Street post construction?

11 Whose responsibility are the costs of this expense?

12 How long does the responsible party have to pay these costs?

13 Are there dispute mechanisms in place for challenges to payment responsibility?

11 ii) What happens to the lanes of Main Street from Wellington Avenue through to Catharine Street?

- a. What happens to the trees along this same stretch of roadway?
- b. What happens to the underground utilities along this same stretch? Where do they get moved to?
- c. Is on street parking impacted along this section?
- d. Will left or right turns be allowed?
- e. What happens to traffic if a building is to be taken down and is being replaced by another building of substantial height (say, 5-10 floors or even more)? How do the construction vehicles get through? And if there is a fire in a nearby building at the same time, what happens then?
- f. How do fire crews and construction crews work around the trolley lines and support poles when working several or many floors above street level when there are is just one lane for non LRT traffic and is likely to be full of slow moving vehicles?
- g. What happens to LRT and non LRT traffic if utilities have to be routed under Main Street post construction?
- h. Are there dispute mechanisms in place for challenges to payment responsibility?



j. How long does the responsible party have to pay these costs?

12 What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the John Street intersection? Are there any additional considerations due to the down bound Jolley Cut vehicle traffic?

13 What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the James Street intersection? Are there any additional considerations due to the up bound Jolley Cut and up bound and down bound James Street Hill vehicle traffic?

**a. James Street Spur Line**

i. What happens to the north and south bound vehicle traffic along the James Street North LRT spur line?

ii. Which direction of traffic is removed if only one lane is left for vehicle traffic?

iii. Current afternoon rush hour has James St. North southbound jammed with cars. Do you anticipate any changes necessary to divert this lane of traffic? If so, where will they go?

iv. What happens to the James Street North on-street parking?

v. Would all LRT trains along the B line route need to take the James Street Spur?

1. If not, how does the B line interconnect with the James Street line?

- a. East bound to north bound?
- b. East bound to south bound?
- c. West bound to north bound?
- d. West bound to south bound?

2. How do passengers transfer from one line to the other?

- vi. What happens to the trees along this same stretch of roadway?
- vii. How do fire crews and construction crews work around the trolley lines and support poles when working several or many floors above street level when there are is just one lane for non LRT traffic and is likely to be full of slow moving vehicles?
- viii. What happens to the underground utilities? Where do they get moved to?
- ix. James Street North is free of utility poles as the utilities that use poles were purposely put underground at some extra cost 10-15 years ago. Do we no longer want this clean look with the overhead lines and poles that would be needed by the spur line?
- x. Should Hamiltonian's not be made aware of this major alteration to the streetscape in time to consider whether they want this change?

xi. Movie productions lauded using 'clean' James Street north and used it specifically for that reason in combination with the old architecture. What will be the cost to the city for lost movie production revenue with the addition of the track and overhead lines and support structures?


14 What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Queen Street intersection?  
Are there any additional considerations due to the up bound Queen Street Hill vehicle traffic?

15 What happens to the Locke Street intersection?

16 What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Dundurn Street intersection?

✓ 17 What happens to both eastbound and westbound vehicle traffic at the Main Street West / Hwy 403 on and off ramps?

18 Are there any emergency scenarios that rule out the Only Main Street LRT route?



KITCHENER WATERLOO LRT

**General Questions of the Hamilton LRT proposed route:**

- 1) How close and how far apart can the stops be from each other?
- 2) Do regular busses still travel the LRT route at any time?
- 3) Where is the maintenance yard for the LRT?
- 4) How does the maintenance yard location and its use impact its surroundings?
- 5) Do Hamiltonians accept that there will be overhead lines where there have been none since the old trolley system was removed 40-50 years ago as well the addition of large poles supporting these lines dotting the route every hundred or so metres?
- 6) Do Hamiltonians accept that their beloved James Street North will be severely impacted by the existence of overhead trolley lines and support poles forever changing the vision of the street?
- 7) Where do the underground utilities get moved to?
  - a. What negative impact is there to the homes and business where they get moved to?
  - b. Whose responsibility are these moving costs?
  - c. Whose responsibility are any subsequent costs post initial move? Inevitably, there will be additional work on correcting any errors made in the initial movement of these utilities, whose responsibility will it fall to in order to cover these costs?

- 
- 8) Are we asking the elderly, mothers and fathers with babies in strollers to walk 2x, 3x as far to get to an LRT stop or to come from a stop compared to existing bus stops?
- a. Have blistering hot and bitterly cold days been taken into account if walking distance is extended?
  - b. Doesn't the total extended walking time negate any time saved by using this LRT?
- 9) Are the two tracks always side by side?
- 10) Are the tracks always in the centre of the roadway?
- 11) How long are the pedestrian platforms? Are they raised? If raised, is there a 90-degree curb or is it a sloped curb?
- 12) Do the platforms have pedestrian shelters?
- a. How long are they?
  - b. Do new crosswalks / traffic lights need to be installed to gain access to these platforms?
  - c. Will pedestrian shelters and adjacent single lane of non LRT traffic get in the way of emergency vehicles?
- 10) What traffic impacts are caused in the Westdale Village due to vehicle traffic rerouting?

- 11) How many bankruptcies are statistically foreseen due to construction of LRT throughout its full construction cycle?
- 12) How many properties will need to be expropriated?
- 13) How much total money is budgeted to build the LRT along the Main / King route from McMaster terminus to Queenston Traffic Circle?
- 14) How much total money would be needed to build the LRT along the Only Main route from the McMaster terminus to the Queenston Traffic Circle terminus?
- 15) Which government department ultimately selected the King / Main route?
- 16) What will be the increased deterioration rate for the crosstown routes that will take the King Street or Main Street diverted traffic?
- 17) Alternate crosstown routes to take diverted traffic are:
  - a. Parkdale/Kenilworth/Ottawa/Gage/Sherman/Wentworth/Victoria/Wilson/Cannon/Barton/Burlington/James/Queen/Locke/Dundurn/Hwy403.
  - b. Parkdale/Kenilworth/Ottawa/Lawrence/Gage/Cumberland/Maplewood/Sherman/Delaware/Wentworth/Charlton/Stinson/Victoria/Hunter/Bay/Queen/Aberdeen/Dundurn/Hwy403.
  - c. City of Hamilton has worked hard in the past 20 years at quieting most of these cross town routes from excessive traffic that will now be asked to increase their traffic volume.

i. Do Hamiltonians along these crosstown routes want the increased traffic volume?

18) Currently, the City of Hamilton runs an annual deficit of \$200 Million on maintaining its infrastructure and is \$3.5 Billion in debt and growing. How will the City of Hamilton handle the extra cost incurred by point 16 above when the alternate crosstown routes listed in point 17 above are all in major disrepair already at this time?

19) Trevor Horzelenberg, manager of LRT with the City of Hamilton mentioned to me in our meeting that the traffic flow models suggest that in 2031, traffic flow will allow the LRT to be a viable operation.

- a. Is the City going to install at great expense LRT now for some vague idea that in 15 years there will be a need in the east end for LRT?
- b. What initiatives does the City have in place now that will begin to trigger this major development?
- c. Currently, nothing is occurring in the east end at either the Queenston Traffic Circle nor Eastgate Mall, why would the City want to have 10 years of underutilization when another route such as an A line to the Airport currently has major terminus' at each end and would be more useful immediately upon completion?
- d. Has the City considered what mass transit options may be available 10 years in the future?
  - i. Has the City considered the power and size batteries may be capable of possessing in 10 years?



e. Why is the City not trying to improve access to their airport from downtown with this one time traffic funding of \$1 Billion?

i. When will the City have another such opportunity to use so much of the provinces money?

ii. Why would the City not maximize the use of the major City asset, the international airport and neighbouring light industrial land which they are trying to create interest in?

**General observations and comparisons between Kitchener Waterloo (KW) LRT route and proposed Hamilton LRT route (either Only Main or Main / King route):**

- 1) KW LRT route has the following assets (major destinations) along its route:
  - a. Southern Terminus: Fairview Mall
  - b. Kitchener Downtown
  - c. Waterloo Downtown
  - d. University of Waterloo & Laurier University
  - e. Large Software Industrial Technology Zone adjacent to the LRT and University of Waterloo and Laurier University currently experiencing large growth as attested by 6 large cranes at work in the area as of this past Wednesday.
  - f. Northern Terminus: Conestoga Mall

2) The KW LRT tracks are:

- a. In Kitchener, mostly on separate roads hugging one curb, always with a lane of vehicle traffic next to it. Vehicles do not need to stop when LRT stops. It avoids the narrow two lane area of King Street.
- b. Tracks utilize existing or old railway lines effectively through south Kitchener and north of Waterloo Square travelling immediately adjacent the entire length of University of Waterloo with 2 stops.
- c. Wherever the two tracks come together, the centre platform also has lanes of vehicular traffic adjacent.
- d. KW has quick connecting multiple full length bypass routes for vehicular traffic to use:
  - i. Weber Street, Westmount/Fisher Hallman/Homer Watson, Hwy 85. Hwy 7

3) Hamilton LRT has the following assets (major destinations) along its route:

- a. Western Terminus: McMaster University
- b. Downtown Hamilton

4) Hamilton does not have full length bypass routes. It has the following:

- a. Parkdale/Kenilworth/Ottawa/Gage/Sherman/Wentworth/Victoria/Wilson/Cannon/Barton/Burlington/James/Queen/Locke/Dundurn/Hwy403.
- b. Parkdale/Kenilworth/Ottawa/Lawrence/Gage/Cumberland/Maplewood/Sherman/Delaware/Wentworth/Charlton/Stinson/Victoria/Hunter/Bay/Queen/Aberdeen/Dundurn/Hwy403.
- c. City of Hamilton has worked hard in the past 20 years at quieting most of these cross town routes from excessive traffic that will now be asked to increase their traffic volume.

5) Kitchener Waterloo LRT budget in 2012 was \$0.9 Billion. 2016 budget has risen to \$1.9 Billion and is not yet completed.

- a. Hamilton has been provided \$1.0 Billion. If similar pattern occurs as in KW, Hamilton will see its LRT budget grow to \$2.0 Billion. Which level of government is taking responsibility for any budget overruns?
  - i. If Hamilton is on the hook for cost overruns to initial construction, which public works projects are sacrificed? If Hamilton is not on the hook entirely, do the people of Ontario get to weigh in on whether they should be paying for such budget overruns? I don't think the KW budget overruns made news across Ontario.
- b. Is the \$1 Billion offered Hamilton indexed to inflation back to the first official mention by the provincial government of the \$1 Billion grant?

c. Which levels of government are responsible for the 'post' LRT project maintenance costs?

i. What percentages of the annual maintenance bill do each level of government take responsibility for?

ii. Hamilton is currently running a \$200 Million dollar a year public works maintenance deficit. What non LRT Hamilton infrastructure maintenance projects will be delayed due to the additional LRT maintenance bill? How long will these 'on the books' maintenance projects be delayed?

iii. Hamilton is currently approximately \$3.2 - \$3.5 Billion in its overall infrastructure debt. Would the city be showing wisdom by using the \$1 Billion from the province in an alternate manner such that the current level of existing ill maintained infrastructure is reduced by 5 years from being 17 years behind to 12? The City of Brampton Council is requesting the province to allow them to use their transit funding not on an LRT system but in a way that makes sense to their city.

**Addendum #1 – Traffic Congestion, Flow & Economic Additional Concerns**

- 1.** If the south to north James Street traffic lane is removed from Main or King to Barton or Strachan, etc. due to the James St. North Spur Line:
  - a.** Down bound traffic (and more in the future) from the Jolley Cut and West 5<sup>th</sup> accesses will still need to get downtown north of Main or King in particular to the very Go Station and / or the very James St LRT line that closed the James St traffic lane. Overflow traffic due to the James Street North lane closing will divert to alternate routes. These routes are the Claremont and Becket Drive accesses in addition to the continued use of the Jolley Cut and West 5<sup>th</sup> accesses funneling onto John Street and Bay Street using Charlton Street, Forest, Young, Augusta, Duke and Hunter Streets.
    - i.** How will the added volume to these alternate routes affect traffic congestion on these said routes and the smaller interior neighbourhood roads in the Corktown and Durand neighborhoods'?
    - ii.** How will the added volume to these roads impact emergency and visitor vehicles entering and leaving St. Joseph's hospital?
    - iii.** Will the added volume on the Claremont down bound access require the re-opening of its 3<sup>rd</sup> lane?

1. If so, will currently booked maintenance projects be delayed since we already experience \$200 Million annual shortfall in funds or does Hamilton assume even greater deficits?
  2. Would the cost for rehabilitating the Claremont access be entirely Hamilton's?
- b. Assuming the south bound James Street vehicle lane remains open to the James Street Hill and Jolley Cut accesses, the B LRT line and James Street LRT line intersection platform infrastructure should cause James Street north bound vehicle traffic to back up even more than it does today and reroute itself to other up bound accesses.
- i. One route is the Jolley Cut via John Street which at the moment is one way north from Strachan to Burlington Street causing the vehicles from Burlington street to find yet another alternate route to get to John Street at Strachan or Barton.
  - ii. Or these vehicles simply go up the Claremont access. However, there is planning in place to make one of the Claremont up bound lanes a bicycle lane in the near future. How much volume can the 2 Claremont up bound lanes manage during rush hour rather than 3 before it gets overwhelmed?

iii. Have the LRT planners consulted with the Hamilton Cycling Committee regarding the Claremont Bicycle Lane plan?

iv. Will the bicycle lane be eliminated?

The other alternate up bound route taken would be the Queen Street to the Becket Drive access:

v. Burlington Street traffic would need to take James St to either Strachan, Murray, or Barton to Stuart Street then onto Queen. At the same time, fighting with the West Harbour Go Station traffic and LRT. There is no easy flow among any of these routes. All routes would require multiple left and right turn combinations at stop signs and traffic light intersections causing more traffic congestion and pollution in residential areas. Have these issues as well as the safety of pedestrians, including children been taken into account?

vi. At rush hour, how will up to 300 cars merge with the everyday rush hour James Street traffic?

vii. At evening rush hour, will they be able to turn left onto James Street from the parking lot?

2. If the north to south James Street traffic lane is removed from the West Harbour Station to King due to the James St. North Spur Line, the same set



of questions as in 1. come into play but more so since there is no James Street south bound lane.

- 3.** How many different bus routes will now feed passengers to the Queenston traffic circle?

  - a.** How will multiple buses be logistically stopping and leaving at this platform while 4 lanes of vehicles are travelling in the same vicinity?
  - b.** Are the 4 lanes of traffic being reduced to 2 lanes?

    - i.** If there is a reduction in traffic lanes, where does the congestion traffic filter off to?
  - c.** Is the LRT platform entirely on the old City Motor Hotel lot?
- 4.** When is the Phase 2 LRT extension to Eastgate Mall to begin?
- 5.** Is the 2031 due date for when the east end is a viable economic terminus extended by how many years delay the LRT extension takes to reach Eastgate?
- 6.** When is bus service of any kind planned for the Fifty Point residential area?
- 7.** Why is there no bus service there when it is a fully developed subdivision that is extremely disconnected and paying taxes?

8. Currently, a multi-year hydroelectric feeder line project to increase availability of electricity is now nearing completion at the John C Munro Hamilton International Airport and its adjacent airport lands area to help entice industry to locate there.
- a. Why does Hamilton, a city which has an international airport as well as ready, accessible serviceable but underutilized airport land and a straight line major thoroughfare (Upper James – Claremont – Victoria – Main Street) connecting the airport lands to the city core not take advantage of it by placing an LRT route along it when it has one chance to do so?
  - b. Why are the province and the city so disjointed in its collective approach to growth in Hamilton when it comes to already in ground major investments?
  - c. What level of municipal debt can Hamilton carry before declaring bankruptcy?
9. How many properties along the A Line would need to be expropriated to accommodate an A Line LRT service?

In closing,

I thank you again for taking my questions openly and seriously. I trust that the LRT group as well as Hamilton Council will openly want to have the answers to all these questions before choosing what option to take in their quest to improve economic viability, traffic congestion / flow and current state of infrastructure in Hamilton.

I apologize beforehand to everyone who has visited Kitchener Waterloo to examine their LRT system, as I would like to strongly suggest that any person involved in Hamilton's LRT route selection or alternative traffic project who has not yet spent a day directly examining the Kitchener-Waterloo LRT route do so as soon as possible. It is an eye opener and would be a disservice to Hamilton for anyone involved in our LRT not to see how theirs will operate and what assets they have along its entire length. Also, to see what the overhead lines and support structure actually look like and transfer that vision to our International Village and James Street North districts.

I believe that Hamilton with their long standing inability to reduce their annual infrastructure deficit and overall debt, cannot afford to hope and wait 15 years and more if the Eastgate extension is not completed soon after this current proposed phase for possible growth let alone the intense growth needed to make the east section and terminus viable (again please compare this area with Waterloo's already existing tech hub which is what I am assuming we envision being emulated here by 2031). It is, I believe paramount, to use the transit funds to immediate benefit by connecting to a known major asset, our international airport and airport lands for reasons outlined above. The east end of Hamilton at the traffic circle is showing no signs whatsoever of any intensive business growth, nor has it any major assets nearby in which to attract ridership to it.

To willingly watch our debt and interest payments rise in the next 15 years by perhaps another \$3 Billion in principle at current rates for a hope is in my opinion foolhardy to say the least. Rather, why not take a really good solid chance with in the ground, ready to go real assets right now and parlay an LRT system that would connect our core to our long suffering John C Munro International Airport and the severely under-utilized airport lands? Especially since the airport lands are currently nearing completion of a major hydro-electric power project that will act to serve new industry very shortly. As well, accessible large tracts of land are far more readily available for an LRT maintenance yard near the airport than anywhere along the proposed east west line.

That we are not leveraging this one time chance to connect our core to this major asset now is akin to how we have wasted the Haida, the Chedoke Ski area, the townhouse complex on the Chedoke/Studholme Lapp property. Those are just 3 projects that I come up with at the moment. Simple logic just is not being followed in any of these cases.

In my opinion, that the LRT decision makers, in short order, shortened their east end terminus to quickly accommodate the West Harbour GO station tells me that they are reacting in a poorly planned knee jerk manner rather than following a long term vision. It also tells me that they are not confident about their growth models for the east end. If the east end was such a good destination in the first place over and above the airport and city core line, then how could it be so quickly dropped in favour of the James Street Spur line that will itself cause so many drastic alterations, not to mention the construction period chaos, to a street that is becoming all on its own, a real destination for tourists and locals with its clean street appearance which the city purposely created 10-15 years ago?

As water finds it's easiest path downward, the proposed LRT route once in place will act naturally and quickly to attract people who commute to Mississauga and Toronto to live near all the residential LRT stops (which are the majority of the stops) taking advantage

of the relatively low house and condominium prices, driving those prices higher and higher towards Mississauga levels. This will not help Hamilton as it will make these homes too expensive for local working people to afford. During the period until 2031 when the population models contentiously suggest the east end will grow into a hub of economic activity making it a viable end point to the LRT, the house prices will continue to artificially rise relative to what is occurring in Hamilton economically. How will this entice businesses to want to locate en-masse in the east end along Queenston road especially when the terminus ends at a residentially enclosed traffic circle or further east when there still is no LRT connection?

The proponents for this route suggest, 'if you build it they will come', but it isn't being built to the end point originally planned and is ending in a no man's land for economic growth so their argument no longer holds water. There is no guarantee that the extension to Eastgate is going to occur. Hamilton had to wait 30 years to get better Go train service, what makes anyone believe, provincial or federal money for the Eastgate LRT extension will occur in a timely manner especially when our provincial government is over \$300 Billion in debt? The most recent repaving road work along Queenston Road from Nash Rd to Eastgate Mall means that the City is not planning to extend the LRT to Eastgate for at least 10 years from today otherwise they would not have spent valuable road maintenance dollars here. It is again foolhardy to hang one's hat on the presumption that the LRT will get extended to Eastgate Mall.

On another note, having an LRT run south north may actually also allow a good number of mountain buses to not have to go downtown at all as they can run more simple east west routes and connect to an Upper James LRT that takes passengers towards the airport or downtown and then connect to the lower city east and west routes that take them to their destinations. Upper James Street to be frank, is the best suited road in the city for an LRT line. Its entire length out to the airport is ready for greater growth and

business development. Residential areas are nearby but set apart by a good block for mostly all the way to Rymal Road. Binbrook and even Caledonia are fast growing areas and it wouldn't take much to introduce buses that connect to the LRT near the airport and take them then quickly into the city wherever they wish to go without having to use their car. Making Hamilton prosper more. Just another advantage is that these people would otherwise have to drive their vehicles into the city. Now they can leave them at home.

There are multiple full length by-pass routes with an A Line LRT that go right to the core of Hamilton so people who need to use their vehicles are not disrupted as will the downtown major and minor streets with the implementation of the east west route. Upper Wellington, West Fifth, Garth/Queen, Upper Sherman, Upper Ottawa all connect directly to mountain accesses and do not encounter a north south LRT. There is no such scenario for an East West Main/King LRT.

The major assets now along an A Line LRT in comparison to the earlier mentioned B Line are:

- a. Downtown Core - 4 distinct perimeters of square encircling the core
- b. Mohawk College
- c. Upper James entire 8km length to John C Munro International.
- d. Fennel Street platform for bus connections
- e. Mohawk Road platform for bus connections

- f. Limeridge Mall and Meadowlands bus connection platform at the Linc
- g. Stonechurch Road platform for bus connections
- h. Binbrook and Caledonia bus connections to southern most LRT node
- i. John C. Munro International Airport Lands
- j. John C. Munro International Airport

In my opinion, Hamilton will cement its inability to reach its economic potential with LRT by placing the first and perhaps last LRT line along the proposed east west route rather than committing to truly connecting our airport lands to the city core and thereby letting the rest of the city and region including aggressive Region of Waterloo's International Airport connect to Hamilton in an efficient manner. Region of Waterloo airport is making serious efforts and making headway in connecting with the Toronto Airports to establish 20 minute flights back and forth to help facilitate the movement of 200,000 tech employees. Downtown Kitchener - Waterloo's technology zone is roughly 20 – 30 min relatively from their airport by transit. If Hamilton joins into this regional air network with LRT alongside, our core is also 20-30 minutes away with efficient LRT but our tech zone (read airport lands) would be a very favourable 5 – 10 min away. Do we want to miss out on becoming a significant part of this extremely powerful future business network? If you believe in the 'if you build it they will come' motto then you have to agree that John C. Munro International is a much more attractive hub than the Queenston traffic circle.

Hamilton will need to figure out how to move a north south LRT up and down The Claremont Access. I am no engineer but solutions to this technical difficulty using

perhaps locked mechanisms similar to roller coasters or aircraft carriers are most likely already used in other cities around the world. We deserve to educate ourselves as to whether it can be done and if it can then we would have something special & unique, helping brand Hamilton as a place separate from Toronto. The cost for such a mechanism could mirror the cost for the dedicated LRT bridge that would be built over Hwy 403 for the proposed east west LRT route.

Please compare the potential growth along this route over the next 15-year period to 2031 and beyond to what can be expected in the east end at the traffic circle. Drive both of these routes and consider where we want the future to head. Visit the Kitchener Waterloo LRT & see the breadth of assets stretched along its entire length. We could be embarking on an entirely new book of prosperity for Hamilton or sinking with a massively expensive, irreversible multi-generational blunder. We have to finish connecting the dots to our airport. The LRT connection to the airport via Upper James and The Claremont would obviously be a significant piece in this connection.

'Making Hamilton Prosper More NOW' rather than 'Hope and Maybe in 15 years' should be our motto. This is a major legacy item for Hamilton. Be ambitious. Reach for it. Grab it. Hold on and enjoy the ride (especially the view down The Claremont).

Sincerely,



## Question number 8

### OUR MAJOR CONCERN:

The east end oaf the line, last stop is at Queenstown Rd.

It DEFINITELY should continue to Eastgate Square which is a transportation hub.

b. There is no parking shown in the drawings presented. Where is your foresight.???

c. No major roadways for easy access to this area.

THE END OF THE LINE MUST BE EXTENDED TO EASTGATE SQUARE.  
where there is parking and easy access

### JAMES STREET NORTH EXTENSION

James Street North is a fairly narrow quaint arty developed area, thus making downtown Hamilton more viable and attractive.

I cannot picture James street north and Art Crawl surviving the LRT going down the middle of the street.

The goal of downtown Hamilton is to bring people back to the downtown area, making it more vital.

The goal is NOT to provide fast and easy access to EXIT the downtown area.

Those of us who will want to use the LRT from east end, Stoney Creek and beyond, want easy accesses to the Hamilton Hospitals.

Our alternative suggestion is

A line south at James to Mountain would help to access both St Josephs and Juravinski

THIS IS IN OUR OPINION. Please give some serious consideration to our suggestions.

October 4, 2016

To Hamilton LRT Project Team:

**Requesting a B-Line LRT Bay Street Stop**

The B-Line LRT Project is an unprecedented economic development opportunity for Hamilton. In recognition of its potential, the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce has been an active participant, stakeholder and advocate throughout the planning process.

Our LRT Task Force extensively reviewed best practices from around North America, with a particular focus on the “business case” for rapid transit implementations. The LRT Project promises significant economic uplift for businesses, potential investors and current property owners. This will be realized through increased population and employment density around hubs, and by increasing transportation options for local residents, commuters and visitors.

**The Need for a Bay Street Stop**

LRT station stops were planned during the ongoing project design phase by the City of Hamilton released to the public on April 27, 2016. For the critical “Highway 403 through Downtown” segment of the B-Line, there are currently only four stations proposed (Dundurn St., Queen St., James St. and Catherine St.).

While these station choices come with significant merit and consideration, after consultation with subject matter experts, businesses and anchor institutions located within the 400 metre vicinity of the Bay-King intersection, we believe that an additional stop at Bay Street is necessary to unlock transit oriented development in a key location in Downtown Hamilton.

As indicated in the appendices, and despite the fact that the intersection is plagued with 270° of surface parking lots, the station would be in close proximity to both Hamilton’s densest employment and economic clusters. The station would be used by visitors to some of Hamilton’s most prominent economic, health, civic and recreation destinations, including:

- Hamilton City Hall
- Art Gallery of Hamilton
- Government of Ontario
- Government of Canada
- Standard Life Building (120 King Street West) and Jackson Square Shopping Centre
- First Ontario Centre (Hamilton Bulldogs Hockey & entertainment venue)
- Hamilton Convention Centre
- Hamilton Place
- McMaster University, David Braley Health Sciences Centre
- Sheraton, Homewood Suites, Staybridge Suites

important and popular destinations and would precipitate the most dramatic examples of transit oriented development anywhere along the length of the B-Line Corridor, leading to the transformation of one of Hamilton's most important, but underperforming intersections.

It is not a stretch to assume that the Bay Street Station would immediately be the second busiest station between the two end nodes of the B-Line. What it could unlock would make its presence even more essential.

Sincerely,




Keanin Loomis,  
President & CEO, Hamilton Chamber of  
Commerce



Dr David Price, Chair, Department of Family Medicine,  
McMaster University  
David Braley Health Sciences Centre



Shelley Falconer  
President & CEO, Art Gallery of Hamilton



Lorraine Hamilton  
Collège Boréal




Sue Bennison  
District Vice President, Meridian Credit  
Union

DocuSigned by:  
*Leonardo Quattrociochi*  
5AC40DE865BA498

Broker of Record

Ambitious Realty Advisors Inc



Scott Warren  
General Manager, Core Entertainment



PJ Mercanti, CEO Carmens Group



Lilian Kwok  
Director, Business Development & Human  
Resources  
Nations Fresh Foods



Vrancor  
GROUP

In my opinion, LRT is not a good form of transit for Hamilton. The main reason for this that I see a disadvantage in is that it will limit movement of cars on a major route linking east and west Hamilton. In the world major cities are either putting transit underground (subway) or using railroads.

I do not see subways as good for Hamilton because of their high construction costs. I do see rail as advantageous. All it needs is some minor improvements and we could have fast transit between east and west Hamilton. Not only Hamilton, but neighbouring communities as well, and with the construction of multistory parking garages people who live outside of Hamilton and commute in by driving. Through an integrated transit system passengers could travel with one fare from their home to work using trains and buses. Passengers could purchase a fare at each stop from a machine, or purchase a weekly or monthly pass.

1. In the east there could be one stop in Stoney Creek through east Hamilton to the GO Station and it could continue into west Hamilton/Dundas and all the way into Copetown. Stops could be placed every 500 to 800 meters and connected with local bus service in the fare zone.
2. From the downtown GO Station a train could go to Gage Park and from there to the north with multiple stops, all the way to the James Street North GO Station
3. From the downtown GO Station, another line could go to Caledonia with a side track to Mount Hope and Hamilton Airport, with multiple stops on the mountain. On this route I would also build a multi-story parking garage so that commuters from Hagersville and Jarvis could transfer from their cars and buses to the train. Only HSR buses would run from Mount Hope to Hamilton.
4. A bus from Brantford would run along Highway 2, and then along Trinity Road to Copetown to the train station there. HSR buses would go from the intersection of Highway 2 - Trinity Road to the industrial area in Ancaster with the possibility to transfer to another bus at Garner/Rymal Street
5. Buses from Cambridge could end at train stations in Copetown or Dundas
6. A train station close to McMaster from where buses could deliver students to each building
7. Many train stations could be built on the Hamilton-Grimsby rail line, with parking lots in Stoney Creek and Grimsby. Buses from Niagara would not have to go into Hamilton Downtown, but could end in Stoney Creek or at Eastgate Mall

From each train station, buses - including smaller ones - could deliver passengers throughout the local area.

### Advantages of commuter trains over LRT:

Trains would not interrupt traffic on major roads (Main, King) and adjacent streets.  
Transit from East-West would be faster and safer for passengers

### Disadvantages of LRT:

Restricted traffic flow on King and main Streets. This slows traffic down on major roads (Main, King, Wilson, Cannon) and causes traffic jams even on perpendicular streets (James, John, Wellington, Wentworth, Queen, Dundurn, etc.) In the event of an accident it will be almost impossible for an ambulance to bring someone quickly to a hospital. It will also be difficult for fire trucks to get quickly to a fire. With John and James Street changing to two-way streets there are traffic jams during rush hour around St Joseph's hospital and the removal of traffic lanes on Charlton and Herkimer the situation has gotten even worse. LRT will complicate the situation around St Joseph Hospital even more, and there will also be traffic jams around General Hospital and McMaster Hospital. Also, an even worse situation is today on Dundurn Street, where during afternoon rush hour there is a line of cars several kilometers long. In general it will be difficult to supply businesses around the LRT. In the event of an accident on the 403, when drivers use Plains Road, York Boulevard, King Street West, Main Street West and Wilson Street into Ancaster the entire road network could collapse in the area, and this collapse would go all the way into the Downtown and eastward and on to the Mountain Accesses. Not only would cars stop, but also HSR buses would be stopped, including buses to the mountain and GO buses to Toronto. Restricting traffic around the 403 will cause traffic jams on the 403. LRT will have priority signalization, which will cause stoppage of traffic on roads crossing the LRT tracks, and this will cause the HSR buses to slow down as well.

The biggest disadvantage that LRT will bring is pollution, especially in the summer. Cars that will be stopped will be burning gas or diesel. This will lead to health problems for many people, including seniors, many of whom live in seniors homes in the downtown.

8. continued from reverse:

My ~~the~~ major concerns:

④ Please do not install any TV screens or computer monitors on the trains. Please ~~do not impose~~ <sup>do not impose</sup> moving pictures of any kind on the passengers of the LRT (or HSR!). Some people, like myself, have sensory processing issues, autism spectrum conditions, etc. that make it almost painful to be in the presence of moving pictures on TV screens. <sup>They can be disorienting, overstimulating, can assault on the body & senses.</sup>

(Currently, on the rare and horrible occasions when I ride one of the HSR buses that has a TV screen, I need to close my eyes and make an effort not to turn my head in the direction of the screen.)

~~So please~~ To make public transportation truly accessible to all people ~~with disabilities~~, please do not provide news, advertising, or entertainment via TV screens/monitors.

On the same note, please don't ever even consider piping in any kind of background music on the trains, buses, or at the stops. If that were to happen, I would not be able to ~~use~~ use the service at all. Unwanted background music can render an environment inaccessible for people. It can be a sensory assault.

(On a side note, I love Gore Park and, years ago, I would eat my lunch there on But, a couple years ago, speakers ~~playing~~ <sup>piping</sup> music were introduced ~~into Gore Park~~ <sup>lunkbrecks</sup>. This was devastating to me. The past couple of years, I've had to wear earplugs and rush through Gore Park when that music is piped in. I pray that the renovated Gore Park will NOT have piped-in music. (Live music/concerts is fine + great).)

\* So please, respect the visual and auditory sensitivities of many people by not forcing extra visual and/or auditory stimulation ~~on~~ on us.

⑤ ~~I cannot~~