

Subject: RE: "Does Transit Really Reduce Congestion?" Misleading rhetoric promotes misunderstanding of transit goals and congestion outcomes
From: DOUGLAS CURRAN <dougcurran@shaw.ca>
Date: 08/05/2015 4:25 AM
To: fonvca@fonvca.org, Corrie Kost <corrie@kost.ca>
CC: Mathew Bond <bondm@dnv.org>

Corrie,

The linked reference to the blog post, "Does Transit Really Reduce Congestion?" (FONVCA draft Minutes April 2015) presents a rhetorical statement that is badly framed and tends to misdirect readers into thinking that increasing transit options offers little or no benefit.

The reader must parse through the post itself to arrive at a clear understanding that transit in and off itself will not cure congestion. It is the combination of transit options, land use and other considerations (environmental, public health, total vehicle miles, etc.) that become apparent if readers make their way through the comments offered in response to the short-sighted and simplistic position offered by the blogpost subtitle, "Despite what you may think, bus and rail may not do much to ease gridlock. "

The comments section sets out much better balanced premises framed within a wider understanding of the function of transit and human behaviour, such as this one:

"Several studies described in the study show that cities with such transit systems do have substantially lower per capita congestion delay. Congestion does not disappear, but it is never as bad as it would be if the transit system did not exist. High quality transit complements other congestion reduction strategies such as road pricing...."

Your notes on the linked post do suggest that the comments are interesting, but I would offer that reading the comments is **essential** to properly aligning the problem with workable approaches to a solution.

regards, Doug