

# Creating a 2051 Transit Work Plan

Peace, Order, and *Good Government*

The City needs to come up with a serious plan on how to achieve the transit system in 2051 that is actually deliverable. The consultant report is not credible, and disrespect the taxpayer.

## Memo



**+To:** Richa Dave, City of Brampton  
**From:** Dennis Kar, Dillon Consulting Limited  
Andrea Piitz, Dillon Consulting Limited  
**cc:** Suzette Shiu, HDR  
**Date:** July 9, 2025  
**Subject:** Input to Future Transit Provisions Technical Report – 2025 Brampton Transportation Master Plan  
**Our File:** 224199

---

This memo provides the foundation required to update the Future Transit Provisions Technical Report for the 2025 City of Brampton Transportation Master Plan.

First thing to note is the report I am criticizing is not a City report, this was by external consultants and City staff are not to blame

## Where the heck is all this money going?

Year	Network (\$M)	Fleet (\$M)	Facilities and Terminals (\$M)	Other Infrastructure / Technology (\$M)	Total Municipal Cost (\$M)	Average Annual (\$M)
2025-2031	3,939M	990M	298M	29M	5,255M	751M
2031-2041	2,355M	1,316M	167M	55M	3,892M	389M
2041-2051	387M	1,837M	167M	55M	2,446M	245M
Total	6,681M	4,142M	631M	139M	11,593M	N/A

The estimated transit spend to 2051 is estimated to be as much as the City's present total assets.

Where is this money going?

- 24% is just the Main Street LRT extension to Brampton GO.
- Excessively expensive network improvement costs
- Miscalculating fleet costs

The Total Municipal spend for Transit infrastructure is estimated at \$11.6 Billion, in comparison the State of Local Infrastructure Report estimates the value of ALL current assets at \$11.6 billion.

## HOT & ZÜM construction costs

### Rapid Transit and Transit Priority Network

This section assesses the cost of the capital infrastructure enhancements required to bring the preferred transit network to fruition. This section outlines the costs associated with implementing these improvements to support the projected transit demand and achieve the city's transportation objectives. The cost estimates and implementation timelines have been provided by HDR. The cost of Higher Order Transit (HOT) upgrades has been assumed at \$55,000,000 per km based on cost estimates used for the 2024 DC Study, validated against other HOT unit costs from sources across the GTA. The cost of Züm upgrades has been assumed to be \$2,500,000 per km based on the cost of the most recent Züm project. These estimates include allowances for property and contingencies. The Preferred Transit Network is illustrated in **Figure 2**. Note that some values have been adjusted due to rounding.

After the \$2.8 billion on the LRT, the next biggest cost is the 64 kilometres of Higher Order Transit which seems to be priced as road widening BRT, because there is absolutely no way to build LRT that cheap. The reality is that in most cases, we do not need road widening BRT, we could do Bovaird as a median running lane conversion BRT for like 90% less, or if you wanted to be as cheap as practical, we could do lane conversion on the outer lane for around a million, which is 98% cheaper. You might be thinking, "but then where will the cars go", and the thing is, a dedicated bus lane can move as much as three car lanes, and if you have it median running with aggressive TSP, you can do as much as four car lanes through it, so a lane conversion outer lane moves as much as a ten lane road, (4 car lanes+6 car lane equivalent), or twelve lanes if you do a median running lane conversion (4 car lanes+8 car lane equivalent). One of the most compelling cases for taking transit is being stuck in traffic and you keep seeing bright red ZÜM buses shoot past you. If you want it cheaper, you can shave off at least a billion, and if you accept a lane conversion option, then you can shave off two, and the genuinely expensive rapid transit needed on Steeles is late 2030's or even 2040's

Are these numbers reasonable? No

Table 6: Cost of Fleet Growth and Maintenance

Year	Growth & Replacement Vehicles	Refurbishment	Total Cost	Average Annual Cost
2025-2031	\$863,280,818	\$126,356,969	\$989,637,787	\$141,376,827
2031-2041	\$1,077,468,348	\$238,283,248	\$1,315,751,596	\$131,575,160
2041-2051	\$1,528,829,275	\$308,066,339	\$1,836,895,614	\$183,689,561

These numbers for G&R are out of whack, and the reason is they did their math badly, really, really badly.

# These numbers are a farce

Table 5: Transit Bus Resource Requirements

Year	AM Peak Transit Ridership	Peak Demand Vehicles*	Adjusted Peak Vehicles**	Spare Vehicles	Total 40'	Total 60'	Total Fleet
2024	44,249	623	418	115	424	109	533
2025	45,171	658	452	125	452	125	577
2031	61,446	865	660	182	609	233	842
2041	89,736	1,264	1,058	292	914	436	1,350
2051	116,114	1,635	1,430	395	1,199	626	1,825

\*Reflects the number of peak vehicles required to achieve 71 AM peak boardings per peak vehicle

\*\* Adjusted to reflect the existing number of vehicles currently in the fleet as a starting point.

Table 9: Operating Costs

Year	Annual Service Hours	Annual Operating Cost	Annual Revenue (50% R/C)	Net Annual Operating Cost
2025	1,503,418	\$234,803,836	\$117,401,918	\$117,401,918
2031	2,194,756	\$342,777,019	\$171,388,509	\$171,388,509
2041	3,519,900	\$549,738,031	\$274,869,015	\$274,869,015
2051	4,755,499	\$742,713,782	\$371,356,891	\$371,356,891

Service Type	Weekday Peak	
	Min Threshold	Improvement Trigger
Züm BRT Routes	50	82
Base Grid Routes	35	65

This is why their G&R numbers are bonkers. The AM Peak is a 3 hour period, which means the adjusted peak vehicles is 35 rides per hour for 2024, and for 2051 they project it to be 27 rides per vehicle per hour, which represents a substantial downgrade when the percent that are articulated buses goes from 20% to 40%, this is not a credible number. As the ridership grows faster than population, and the percent articulated buses goes up, the ridership per hour should go up. At an annual average increase of 1% a year, this gets us to 45 rides per vehicle per hour, which is well within capacity, and is below the class minimum for ZÜM routes. This would reduce the demand for buses by 700 buses, saving over a billion dollars in capital cost, and saving hundreds of millions a year in operating costs. Base on decades of performance, Brampton will likely blow past the 2051 ridership forecast..

## Measure twice, cut once

- The consultant report is fatally flawed
- Transit staff could do a better job
- Give BT funding to procure permanent staff to engage in short, medium, and long term planning. Spending millions on in house staff can save billions in the long term
- Planning should have contingencies for significantly exceeding ridership projection.

The City is currently hiring consultants that do not understand how transit works in this city, and they are making a mess. Brampton Transit could do a much better job if you gave them resources for planning staff. Now that we have a fake long term transit plan to bilk developers on DCs, we need to make a real transit plan that respects the taxpayer. The 2051 transit forecast is far below projections based on long term performance (extrapolation gets 40% higher ridership) and Brampton Transit has shot past ridership forecasts in the current and former five year plans within two years this time and one year last time.