

**Pilon, Janet**

---

**Subject:** Niagara Regional Transit On Demand Pilot Project - Nov 25 Council Agenda Item 5.2

**From:** Lakewood Beach Community Council <[LakewoodBeachCC@hotmail.com](mailto:LakewoodBeachCC@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** November 22, 2020 8:02 AM

**To:** Pearson, Maria <[Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca)>; Clark, Brad <[Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca](mailto:Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca)>; Collins, Chad <[Chad.Collins@hamilton.ca](mailto:Chad.Collins@hamilton.ca)>; DL - Council Only <[dlcouncilonly@hamilton.ca](mailto:dlcouncilonly@hamilton.ca)>

**Cc:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca); Vander Heide, Jason <[Jason.VanderHeide@hamilton.ca](mailto:Jason.VanderHeide@hamilton.ca)>; Dalle Vedove, Debbie <[Debbie.DalleVedove@hamilton.ca](mailto:Debbie.DalleVedove@hamilton.ca)>

**Subject:** Niagara Regional Transit On Demand Pilot Project - Nov 25 Council Agenda Item 5.2

Dear Clrs Pearson, Clark and Collins (and Honourable Mayor & Council)

*Fiscal Impacts to Municipality* : negative fare box revenue, loss of Gas Tax Revenue (taxi to bus is a transfer (boarding) and not a 'ride'), doubles city's cost per ride of users - all of which adversely impacts present and future funding available to expand conventional transit

*Fiscal Impacts to Stoney Creek Property Taxpayers*: cost of service provided to **Niagara** users Area-Rated to tax base in Stoney Creek

*Fiscal Impacts to Users*: upwards of 70% surcharges (seniors)

The expansion of NRT into the Winona Crossing is a good news story for the intra-municipality transit and for the economic recovery of the businesses located in that area. Unlike other major shopping destinations/employment areas, such as Ancaster Meadowlands, transit to that area however is via Transcab which has significant impacts that are at times overlooked or misunderstood.

By co-incidence, our association wrote to the Planning Staff a couple of weeks ago on Transcab. We are attaching that email of November 8th for your information.

We are at a loss to understand why the Staff Report presented to the Public Works Committee indicated this pilot project has "no financial implications to the City of Hamilton" . Niagara users will be able to use Transcab/HSR transit from Winona Crossing to travel to other destinations. There is **no revenue generated**; on average the city collects \$3.00 per Transcab/HSR ride and pays out \$5.75 to the provider of Transcab. The HSR portion of the "ride" itself is ~ 200% subsidized

Based on information we've been provided with from City Staff in the past, Transcab clearly has significant adverse financial impacts for the city, for the Stoney Creek taxpayers, for the users of the service, and overall for all Hamilton transit users.

As stated in previous emails over the years, we Creekers already pay for Transcab service to locations outside Stoney Creek (specifically the East Hamilton Business Park) and now it appears we will also be taxed for users from a completely different municipality?!? This inequity should end with the implementation of this pilot project.

Respectfully, we are again requesting that the \$1M + ?? cost of TransCab no longer be area-rated (downloaded to the backs) to the properties in Stoney Creek effective with the 2021 budget.

Viv / Anna/ Nancy  
Lakewood Beach Community Council

*P.S. We also would like clarification on Hamiltonian's ability to use Niagara Regional Transit's On Demand service from Winona Crossing and into destinations in Grimsby (at \$3) or Niagara (at \$6). It appears NRT On Demand service (app) is only provided to residents of Niagara.*

---

**From:** Lakewood Beach Community Council

**Sent:** November 8, 2020 11:39 AM

**To:** [steve.robichaud@hamilton.ca](mailto:steve.robichaud@hamilton.ca) <[steve.robichaud@hamilton.ca](mailto:steve.robichaud@hamilton.ca)>

**Cc:** [jason.thorne@hamilton.ca](mailto:jason.thorne@hamilton.ca) <[jason.thorne@hamilton.ca](mailto:jason.thorne@hamilton.ca)>; Fabac, Anita <[Anita.Fabac@hamilton.ca](mailto:Anita.Fabac@hamilton.ca)>; Rybensky, Yvette <[Yvette.Rybensky@hamilton.ca](mailto:Yvette.Rybensky@hamilton.ca)>; Maria Pearson <[maria.pearson@hamilton.ca](mailto:maria.pearson@hamilton.ca)>; [Maureen.wilson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Maureen.wilson@hamilton.ca) <[Maureen.wilson@hamilton.ca](mailto:Maureen.wilson@hamilton.ca)>; [jason.farr@hamilton.ca](mailto:jason.farr@hamilton.ca) <[jason.farr@hamilton.ca](mailto:jason.farr@hamilton.ca)>; Collins, Chad <[chad.collins@hamilton.ca](mailto:chad.collins@hamilton.ca)>; [john-paul.danko@hamilton.ca](mailto:john-paul.danko@hamilton.ca) <[john-paul.danko@hamilton.ca](mailto:john-paul.danko@hamilton.ca)>; [brad.clark@hamilton.ca](mailto:brad.clark@hamilton.ca) <[brad.clark@hamilton.ca](mailto:brad.clark@hamilton.ca)>; [brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca](mailto:brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca) <[brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca](mailto:brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca)>; [terry.whitehead@hamilton.ca](mailto:terry.whitehead@hamilton.ca) <[terry.whitehead@hamilton.ca](mailto:terry.whitehead@hamilton.ca)>; [judi.partridge@hamilton.ca](mailto:judi.partridge@hamilton.ca) <[judi.partridge@hamilton.ca](mailto:judi.partridge@hamilton.ca)>

**Subject:** Transcab Impact re Residential Infill Developments

Good Morning Steve,

Our LPAT hearing is finally over. Regardless of the Tribunal's decision, we think some good can come from our research & evidentiary documents.

It was concluded that Transcab (specifically Stoney Creek which has 2 'zones') is one of the most misunderstood forms of transportation & the adverse impacts to the municipality/Hamiltonians haven't been talked about. We opined, Transcab, in & of itself, from a planning perspective, is not consistent with our UHOP and the Growth Plan for the reasons outlined below:

- UHOP Public Transit Network, is silent on Trans-cab being a Council (& Ministry) approved form of 'public transit' to serve and the meet the needs of users within the Urban boundaries. It is noted however, Transcab is listed as a form of Public Transit in the city's *rural* Official Plan.
- 
- high cost to the user (surcharges of upwards of 70%) which leads to affordability issues & builds in Transcab zones that won't meet the needs of current or forecasted population's income levels.
- 
- has a goal of ridership, like HSR; however – ridership which profits a private organization
- 
- is **heavily** subsidized by Public Works, Transit Budget which leads to less funds available for infrastructure investments; including Transit expansions
  - a. - service cost is lost fare revenue for HSR
  - b. - billed cost more than doubles the per trip cost for the municipality which leads to less funds available for infrastructure investments

- doesn't qualify as a "ride" for other levels of government funding (Gas Tax) which results in additional lost revenue to the municipality & even less funds Infrastructure projects; including Transit.
- is in direct competition with other transit investments from limited Transit Area-Rated property tax levies
- is available to some properties (residential/employment), but is not area rated to them. (paid for by property owners outside the service zone)
- exponentially increases the vehicles into that Road Network shown earlier. (1 user = 2 vehicles per one-way trip. 2 users = 4 vehicles, 3 users = 6 vehicles and so on.)
  - So even if the occupants don't own a car, they are still dependent on a vehicle
- adversely impacts the climate resiliency of the area.
- more vehicles on the roads is more wear & tear and increases maintenance costs
- negatively impacts modal share targets (unlike conventional Public Transit)– just more people dependent on a vehicle to get around.
- is ineffective (doesn't allow users to conveniently travel between the 2 Transcab "boundaries".\* (see example below)
  - \*Example, recent Amazon announcement for 1500 jobs in Hamilton with a facility located in the SC Biz Park. To take public transit from the subject lands to the SC facility located only 6.3 kms away, it is just over a 1 hour commute – 37 mins of walking to bus stop & destination plus 25 mins on a bus
- is restrictive (can't use if destination & origin are within the same "zone") – no means to use to get to SC Employment lands to the south, to friend's homes or to amenities/services
- is unreliable - response time is "upto an hour" but not a guaranteed pick-up
- does not allow for mass commuting, nor does it have regular schedules that allow for consistency of service

Transcab is a form of transportation that *lowers the quality* of the experience of using Public Transit and *adversely* impacts the *viability* of servicing the areas in the future with conventional public transit

The **complete opposite** of the Growth Plan & City's OP Definitions of Transit Supportive developments which is: Transit Supportive developments make transit *more viable* **and** also *improve the quality of the experience* of using Transit.

Transcab is only available in 2 of the 15 wards so understandably our group, Council, City Planning Staff, & other expert professionals feel none of us have truly been provided with a clear understanding of Transcab & the uniqueness of this form of transportation's impact in regards to infill developments. From what we've been able to piece together it was a *temporary* service put in place 30 years ago. It looks like it dug a hole in Stoney Creek, and is digging us deeper into that hole

It was also noted that Studies provided to support developments such as the Traffic Impact Study & Transportation Demand Reports are **not** reflective of what the 'vehicle' trips will be in Transcab areas; nor do those studies include the Transcab turning movements.

The purpose of this email was to give you some info we gathered from experts & the likes. Info which might help you determine whether or not future residential intensification development applications coming into the city should possibly be evaluated with a different lens during the planning process.

When time permits, we'd like your thoughts on the above please Steve.

Respectfully,

Viv / Anna/ Nancy  
Lakewood Beach Community Council