

LONDON AND DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL



The London and District Labour Council is in full support of an immediate moratorium on all new drive-throughs in the City of London.

My name is Jim Mahon and I am chairperson of the The London and District Labour Council's (LDLC) Environment Committee. The LDLC is in full support of an immediate moratorium on all new drive-throughs in the City of London.

We are always concerned about any potential job losses in the London region. However, the Canadian Autoworkers, the union of which I am a proud member have a saying, "It's not Job's or the Environment it's Job's and the Environment that has to be considered.

In other words, without a healthy environment we lose everything. Jobs are important to us all but not at the cost of our environment. Without our environment we, and our families, lose our health and quality of life.

In this case, if walk-in customer load is increased by eliminating the drive-through load then in store staff will be shifted from the drive-through to the store counter.

This suggests no impact to jobs, from moratorium, on new drive-throughs and preservation of our and our families health and environment.



We find the RWDI report selective, manipulative and in some respects merely makes the case for why drive-throughs generate a greater burden upon climate change and air quality, even though the report's conclusions suggest otherwise.

The fast food industry touts the RWDI report as proof that drive-throughs are better for the environment but in looking at the report we find the report selective, manipulative and in some respects merely makes the case for why drive-throughs generate a greater burden upon climate change and air quality, even though the report's conclusions on page 24 (18-490) suggest otherwise.



The focus of the RWDI report seems to be on the morning peak rush hour, using a Tim Horton's restaurant on Bank Street in Ottawa as the "control" example of emissions from a non drive-through facility.

The focus of the RWDI report seems to be on the morning peak rush hour, using a Tim Horton's restaurant on Bank Street in Ottawa as the "control" example of emissions from a non drive-through facility.



The RWDI report concludes that drive-through emissions are lower relative to the non drive-through restaurant.

Yes this is true, but only for the one hour that the study focuses upon.

The RWDI report concludes on page 24 (18-490) that drive-through emissions are lower relative to the non drive-through restaurant.

Yes this is true, but only for the one hour that the study focuses upon.



The RWDI report states quite clearly that in a restaurant where there is ample parking the GHG emissions are less than 1/3 for someone parking their vehicle compared to using the drive-through.

By extension one has to ask the question what would be the emissions profile during non-peak hours, and what would be the emissions profile at a restaurant that had ample parking.

The RWDI report states quite clearly that in a restaurant where there is ample parking the GHG emissions are less than 1/3 for someone parking their vehicle compared to using the drive-through.

By extension one has to ask the question what would be the emissions profile during non-peak hours, and what would be the emissions profile at a restaurant that had ample parking.

Looking at the report I would call your attention to Appendix D which presents “Emission Calculations by store and by Scenario”

If you compare Appendix D (18-514) item 2.4 “Drive-Through Emissions for the individual stores you will find the emissions 70% higher than in the item 2.5 below “Parking Lot Emissions” listed immediately below.

Our conclusion is that this shows that given ample parking non-drive-through facilities are better for our environment.



At restaurants where there is ample parking, the statistics clearly demonstrate that drive-throughs are a contributor of greater GHGs...

By extension, Tim Horton's should be closing down all of their drive-through windows where this situation exists.

RWDI can't have it both ways.

At restaurants where there is ample parking, the statistics shown in Appendix D on page (18-514) of the RWDI report clearly demonstrate that drive-throughs are a contributor of greater GHGs...

By extension, Tim Horton's should be closing down all of their drive-through windows where this situation exists.

RWDI report can't have it both ways.

LONDON AND DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL



Vermont Idle-Free Zone

<http://www.idle-freevt.com/idlingfacts.index.html>

As an auto worker, I am particularly aware that cars pollute however they are a important part of our society.

The following is a quote from the Vermont Idle-Free Zone website.

Drive-throughs except if driving a hybrid vehicle which seldom idles--should be avoided. By far, what is best for both drivers and all people in the vicinity is to park the vehicle, turn it off and go into the place of business. Besides providing some exercise, this will save fuel, engine wear-and-tear and keep emissions out of the atmosphere.

LONDON AND DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL



End

Thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the London and District Labour Council, to the London City Planning Committee, on this important topic. I want to conclude this presentation by noting that the London and District Labour Council believes that leadership on this issue is now needed from London City Council.