

James Bay Neighbourhood Association

jbna@vcn.bc.ca Victoria, B.C., Canada www.jbna.org

January 20, 2016

Mayor & Council, City of Victoria.

Dear Councilors,

Re: Parking Stand Allocations under the Vehicles for Hire

Four years have passed since we last had the opportunity to comment to Mayor and Council on the Vehicles for Hire program. The short notice of the proposal provides limited time for response, and all information may not be available to neighbourhoods affected by this program.

As seen from review of the CoV staff report and recommendations before you, little progress has been made towards the goals espoused by the City and by most Council members over the past year(s). Indeed, the report and recommendations can be seen as a regressive step whereby the City's approach may be seen as an attempt on the City's part to insulate itself from the responsibility of managing the use of our streets.

The Report and recommendations fail in many ways:

O Unlike 2011/12, the City has not **consulted** with the neighbourhoods most impacted.

 Consideration of resident quality of life impacts has not been included (including indirect routing impacts).

The report is silent on the pyramidal-hierarchy of transportation modes wherein **pedestrian** needs are on top.

The City appears to have relied on GVHA for leadership in this matter, raising questions of the City's competence and commitment to public process and **community well-being**.

O **Statements** are made within the report, some of which may not be substantiated.

O The recommendation favoured by staff is the weakest of the three proposed and essentially represents the **status quo**.

The proposed monthly fee schedule appears low, hence may not represent optimum public interest.

The choice of the least effective alternative may contribute to the growing concern of residents of a **bias** against or in favour of a particular operator; such a bias may also diminish public interest and create a non-level playing field for business interests.

Following is a discussion of the forgoing and requests for changes to the proposal.

Following rather than Leading:

The rationale behind the City's delay of the Vehicles for Hire report, to align with GVHA's work, must be challenged. GVHA's long-standing "10-year plan" has been offered up in previous years. The term has become in itself "spin". GVHA has commissioned at least three studies directed towards the development of a transportation strategy. The most substantive report, with targets to guide implementation, is the Boulevard report dated May, 2012. The recent Dillon Report, dated November 2015, does not build on the Boulevard study. It offers less in the way of targets and objectives. And where it does offer targets, such as 25% of fleet renewal in 5-10 years, it condemns both residents and the City to decades of renewal to reach where other jurisdictions are now. By contrast, the Boulevard report set guides for the retiring of sub-current buses. One measure identified/used to guide transformation of the fleet was Exterior Noise levels:

May 31st, 2012: Boulevard Transportation Group memo

Cruise Seasons	Exterior Noise Level	Interior Noise Level
2013 – 2014	No vehicles > 75 dBA Max 20% vehicles = 70-75 dBA	Max 20% vehicles = 76-80 dBA Min 80% vehicles ≤ 75 dBA
	Min 80% vehicles ≤ 70 dBA	
2015 – 2017	No vehicles > 70 dBA	No vehicles > 75 dBA
	All fleet ≤ 70 dBA	All fleet ≤ 75 dBA
2018 - 2022.	No vehicles > 65 dBA	No vehicles $\geq 70 \text{ dBA}$
	All fleet ≤ 65 dBA	All fleet ≤ 70 dBA

In late 2014, after months of discussion, we had anticipated that GVHA would announce that it would limit access to Ogden Point for pre-1999 buses. Instead, it committed to limiting the age of buses being added to the fleet, with no phase out of old technology buses.

Some GVHA Board members have openly questioned whether GVHA has been co-opted by the cruise-industry. The City's willingness to veer from its role, its responsibility to lead, begs the question "has the regulator been captured by those regulated"? Further, it raises questions of the City's competence and commitment to public process and community well-being.

Questionable Statements:

The City report appears to mirror communications with, or accepts assertions made by, GVHA without testing or addressing the validity or appropriateness of the statements. For example, although the avowed intent of the City is to effect a reduction in bus emissions through the licencing stand program, it implies that the reflecting "best practices in Victoria's sightseeing vehicle industry" is meaningful. However, it is likely that the best practices in Victoria would not be accepted in cities striving to become more environmentally responsible. Indeed, much

...4

apparent that new technology is available. There seems to be an over-riding concern for one operator, namely Wilson's Transportation. The choice of the least effective alternative contributes to the growing concern of residents of a **bias** against or in favour of particular operators; such a bias may also diminish public interest and create a non-level playing field for business interests.

The 1982/83 buses illustrate the issue. If a transportation provider purchases a bus with lower emissions at a cost of, for example, \$800,000, it cannot be expected to compete against a transportation provider, which could purchase old buses at \$8,000. We are not talking about fleet renewal when old buses are purchased such as the 1982/83 buses that are no longer used in Alaska or Seattle. The words Seattle and Alaska were still visible on the 1982/83 Wilson's buses as of last season.

Providers of new technology, or newer, are at a disadvantage if they are trying to respect the City's and societal expectations for more environmentally responsible transportation, while others do not.

In conclusion, we ask that Council send this report back to staff with the objective of staff:

- Filling the information gaps of impacts of the stands and types of buses (age/emissions/noise) on the neighbourhoods,
- o Proposing licensing limit numbers of tour bus operations, and/or hop-on hop-off bus operations, as done with the more environmentally-friendly, modes of transportation,
- Proposing a balance of transportation routing for bus tour and hop on/off operators which includes the transportation associated with events and cruise-industry activities,
- Obtaining the highest financial return possible for the City for seasonal and nonseasonal use of the stands as befitting use of the most premier locations in the City,
- Creating a truly incentive based pricing system with a significant charge differential for old technology versus new technology, such differentiation to be based on age of bus (2004 *vs* built before 2004) or based on noise and emission levels, and

• Consulting with all stakeholders, on equal footing.

Respectfully submitted,

Marg Gardiner President, JBNA

Cc: Shannon Craig Chris Coates

Attachment B: Other jurisdictions

The greening of cities throughout Europe and North America is progressing at a good clip. Initiatives and analysis recently in the news include but are not limited to the following:

http://www.fastcoexist.com/3040634/7-cities-that-are-starting-to-go-car-free?utm_content=buffer37bd8&utm_medium=social&utm_source=facebook.com&utm_campaign=buffer#3

By 2020, the mayor of Paris plans to double the number of bike lanes in the city, ban diesel cars, and limit certain high-traffic streets to electric cars and other ultra-low-emission vehicles.

India to ban old trucks and buses to curb pollution



India will ban trucks and buses more than 15 years old to curb record pollution levels, the government says.

3 December 2015

http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-34998622

http://www.transitchicago.com/electricbus/

Breathe easier. With lower harmful emissions, operating one electric bus is the equivalent of removing 23 cars from the road each year! Reduction in harmful emissions also reduces incidents of illnesses and respiratory diseases, which is valued at \$55,000 annually per bus, or \$660,000 over the expected 12-year bus lifespan.*



JBNA

James Bay Neighbourhood Association

234 Menzies St Victoria, B.C. V8V 2G7

www.jbna.org

Vehicles for Hire ByLaw Review: JBNA Principles

- **1. Consultation:** The people most affected by the socio-environmental impacts of vehicles for hire, and particularly large highway-sized tour buses, should first and foremost be consulted about changes in the vehicles for hire bylaw.
- **2. Community Livability:** People most affected include many James Bay residents. The 2009 James Bay residents' survey, with 573 respondents, identified tourist bus volume and tourist bus noise as the top two problems requiring priority attention from the perspective of community livability.
- **3. Measurement:** Recent traffic counts undertaken by the City of Victoria indicate that each average-sized cruise ship call at Ogden Point generates an additional 384 vehicle movements along Dallas Road of which 42 are large highway-sized bus movements. Given the scheduling of cruise ship calls, many of these movements occur during the evening hours.
- **4. Nature of Vehicles:** One of JBNA's long-standing priorities is to "establish near-term goals to reduce systematically, until phase out, the number of large highway buses that are licensed to transfer cruise ship passengers, replacing these buses, where necessary, with lighter, more community friendly vehicles". Rewrite of sections 4(1), 15 (6)(h) (passenger fee per bus passenger also see point 5).
- **5. Noise & Emissions:** To remedy the gap between the Noise, Nuisance, and Vehicle for Hire Bylaws the City could:
- (a) implement noise and emissions testing of all motor vehicles for hire;
- (b) deny licenses to vehicles that do not comply with current legislated limits; and
- (c) implement differential fees assess higher fees to noisier and more polluting vehicles.
- **6. Bus Parking:** Short-term tour bus parking, for passenger pick-up and delivery purposes, should only be permitted in front of hotels. Overnight tour bus parking (other than for cruise-related buses) should be outside of James Bay. It is inefficient to bring these buses into a *cul-de-sac* to park at water's edge. Indeed, another long-standing JBNA priority is for the City to "locate a dedicated parking lot outside of James Bay for non-cruise-related buses of all kinds so that Ogden Point is no longer used for this purpose". The Motor Coach Driver's Guide should be amended to reflect re-location.