Overview

On Wednesday, October 9, 2019, the TTC hosted the first of two sessions for the final round of city-wide stakeholder meetings for the TTC’s 5-Year Service Plan & 10-Year Outlook. Approximately 31 people attended, in addition to staff from the TTC, City of Toronto, and the project consultant team.

The purpose of the meeting was to share the draft 20-Point Action Plan that is the core element of the TTC’s new 5-Year Service Plan & 10-Year Outlook, explain how consultation feedback and technical work informed the draft Plan, and to seek feedback on any final refinements for the TTC to consider.

The meeting included an overview presentation, full-room question and answer period, small group discussions, and plenary discussion. This meeting is part of a broader consultation program for the development of the 5-Year Service Plan & 10-Year Outlook which aims to provide a transparent blueprint for continuous service improvements from 2020-2024.

Attachments included: Attachment A. Agenda, Attachment B. Participant List, Attachment C. E-mailed Feedback

This meeting summary was prepared by Swerhun Inc., the third-party facilitation and engagement team retained by the TTC to support the consultation process. The intent of this summary is to capture the range of feedback shared at the meeting. It is not intended to serve as verbatim transcript. This meeting summary was subject to participant review before being finalized.
Themes in the Feedback Shared at the Meeting

The following themes reflect a summary of the feedback received from participants during the meeting. The remainder of this summary provides additional details regarding these points, as well as many others, shared by participants.

Many participants expressed general support for the draft Plan. More than half of the participants said that the draft Plan presented is generally moving in the right direction. They said that the Plan will greatly improve transit in Toronto if implemented successfully within five years. Others said that the vision statement for the draft Plan is a good foundation and should be kept in mind when developing plans to improve transit in Toronto.

Important pieces, such as accessibility and fare integration, are missing in the draft Plan. Some participants flagged gaps in the draft Plan, particularly related to accessibility and fare integration with other transit agencies. They strongly recommended that these pieces be included in the 5-Year Service Plan.

Latent demand should be considered when identifying areas to invest transit improvements. Some participants said that they would like the TTC to also consider latent demand when addressing Toronto’s surface transit needs for the next five years. It was also suggested that the TTC needs to look at neighbourhoods that are not served by higher-order transit but are anticipating developments and population growth to support changes in these areas.

Develop a more ambitious plan and we’ll advocate for it. Some participants said that the draft Plan is good, but it needs to be more ambitious. Many participants expressed interest in advocating for what’s in the draft Plan, and also for additional improvements.

Questions of clarification

Following the presentation, participants asked questions of clarification. The questions are included below in bold, followed by responses from the project team in italics.

- **What are your plans for enforcement of the bus-only lane?** Enforcement is a key part of the plan for bus transit lanes. The first steps of implementing bus-only lanes would happen in 2020, which would include painting of the lanes. Beyond 2020, TTC will work with the City to explore enforcement options.

- **How does the 5-Year Service Plan & 10-Year Outlook interact with existing strategies, such as the Ridership Growth Strategy?** The 5-Year Service Plan supersedes the Ridership Growth Strategy.

- **Are you doing consultation with bus and streetcar operators? They have a good insight on service operation.** We have an internal feedback process where vehicle operators share their feedback to their managers which we consider as part of our broader consultation process. There’s also a technical working group that has been involved as part of the development of this Plan, and this group includes representatives from different departments in the TTC.

- **What criteria determined the identification of the top 5 corridors for Action 4.1 “Explore bus transit lanes”?** Determining the first corridors to implement bus transit lanes...
started with our team identifying which corridors have the highest transit ridership, then estimating the vehicle traffic numbers in the corridor (i.e. how many private vehicles vs transit riders), then reviewing the right-of-way, and which corridors would allow us to implement bus transit lanes easily and quickly. The five corridors (Eglinton East, Steeles West, Jane, Finch East & Dufferin) are the corridors we’ve chosen for this 5-Year Plan, and we will continue exploring other corridors for future bus transit lanes.

- Could you explain Action 1.7 ‘Apply an equity lens to service planning, and the mapping tool that will be used in this action, does this tool include data on people with a disability?’ Our mapping tool is based on the City’s Open Data and census data. Unfortunately, the census data does not have reliable data on people with disability, but location-based data (e.g. hospitals and rehabilitation facilities) are included in the mapping tool. When reliable data on people with disability, and other Diversity and Inclusion Lens groups, becomes available we will incorporate the data into this consultation process. In addition, TTC consults and will continue to consult with the Advisory Committee on Accessible Transit for major service changes and will make efforts to reach people with disabilities in the general public who are affected by service changes.

- Are you doing background research on the amount of traffic coming outside the city? Unfortunately, no, because we cannot look at license plates for private vehicles, which means we cannot track the traffic coming outside the city.

- Given that the City had recently declared a climate emergency, which also expressed a commitment to accelerating strategies to achieve its targets, how does the transit plan support that? On a general basis, we are in line with the City’s climate action plan. Also, public transit is a very environmentally friendly mode of transportation, and we are transitioning our fleet to electric vehicles. We are always working closely with the City to ensure that our plans are in line with the City’s plans.

- How will climate change affect service, in particular service in Neighbourhood Improvement Areas? Given that this is a 5-year plan, how climate change will affect service was not included in the plan.

- Is there a plan to make bus stops safer, particularly making crossing of the street safe? Yes, it is part of Action 2.3 Improve placemaking at key stop areas. There is also a report going to the TTC Board which responds to Vision Zero 2.0 and making wide street pedestrian crossings safer. We’ve included money in our budget for a comprehensive review to address this issue at/near TTC stops.

- Would you consider shifting your metrics to accommodate population growth differently and to find a mechanism to increase service and ridership in higher growth areas but are distant to higher-order transit? We recognize that there are specific challenges in specific communities and we will take your comment as a piece of advice. We will look into what improvements could be made in dense, low transit but high growth areas that have a lot of potential transit customers.

- How will you improve bike parking space to better integrate the first and last mile? We have existing funding dedicated to expanding bike parking at stations, and that is in the works. We will also continue working with the City to identify where the demand is required.
• With the number of initiatives planned each year, how much is the Plan going to cost? Very roughly, the additional operating costs will be approximately $10 million each year, which means the Plan will cost over $50 million by the end of five years. In terms of capital costs, some of the proposed improvements are already funded and captured in the TTC’s, City’s and Metrolinx’s capital budgets. Note added after the meeting: The numbers provided at the meeting were a rough estimate only and did not include key projects. Additional detailed work around costing has been undertaken, and the number that will be presented to the TTC Board in December will be larger.

• What is the status of fare integration? We will be reporting to the TTC Board soon about our findings regarding fare integration, including: conversations with Metrolinx on TTC fare integration with GO Transit to help provide relief on Line 1 Yonge-University, which does not yet have support from Metrolinx; the low number of Toronto riders on GO, and the number of transfers benefitting. We are considering running service integration pilot projects with Mississauga and York Region transit agencies to see what the shared risks and benefits for each transit agency would be so no one’s losing money.

Detailed Feedback
Participants had several opportunities to share their feedback on the draft 20-Point Action Plan, including at the small group discussions, plenary discussion, in written feedback forms, and by e-mailing feedback after the meeting. All feedback shared by participants were organized into appropriate topic areas below. Note that the numbering of points does not intend to imply any type of priority.

What they like about the draft Plan
Participants said they generally support the draft 20-Point Action Plan, but expressed particular support for the following Actions and Pillars:

• **Action 4.1 Explore bus transit lanes.** Several participants said they strongly support Action 4.1 as it has the greatest potential to improve customer experience. Participants are looking forward to seeing bus transit lanes expanded to other bus routes. They also like that the bus transit lanes will build upon Eglinton East LRT. They like that bus transit lanes will extend to University of Toronto Scarletberough Campus (UTSC), especially since there is a strong case and need for it to be implemented. However, some participants noted that the language for the action plan should be strengthened by replacing “explore” with “implement”. Other shared concerns regarding pushback from residents due to potential traffic caused by the bus transit lanes.

• **Pillar 1: Enhance the transit network.** Participants said that the actions in Pillar 1, particularly the deployment of new streetcars highlight the necessity to fund the TTC Capital Plan to meet the ridership demand.

• **Pillar 3: Improving service reliability.** Participants support improving service reliability and schedules. A participant said they would like to see more ten-minute or better service.

• **Action 2.1 Expand customer amenities at stops.** Installing more and improved shelters was supported by participants.
• **Action 5.4 Enhance integration with cycling.** Participants like the plans for increasing bike infrastructure, particularly bike parking at stations.

**Key points missing in the draft Plan**

• **Accessibility Plan.** A participant expressed disappointment that the Accessibility Plan was not reflected in the draft 5-Year Service Plan. The participant noted that the draft Plan does not address the anticipated increase in Wheel-Trans ridership as a result of the re-assessment of people using Wheel-Trans.

• **Fare integration.** Many participants said that more and better fare integration with other transit agencies should be a priority to make transit affordable. People who often need to travel across municipal boundaries are charged with multiple fares. Participants noted that students residing in the 905 area (York, Durham, Brampton, etc.) and attending schools in Toronto (e.g. UTSC and Seneca College) are particularly impacted by the lack of fare integration between transit agencies. They said that fares should reflect what students can afford. Others also said that the TTC Premium Express buses should not charge a double fare as they are very expensive.

• **The draft Plan is not addressing the foreseeable increase in demand on Line 1 over the long-term.** Participants are concerned that the service improvement for 2020-2022 (Line 5 - Eglinton LRT) will be inadequate in dealing with the transit needs in the next 5-10 years. Many developments are coming to the city in the next few years, particularly in the Yonge corridor and the proposed extension to Richmond Hill, which presents concerns on the demand it will add to the existing transit infrastructure.

**Advice to improve the draft Plan**

**General advice**

• **Ensure that the Plan is developed using the lens identified in the vision statement** as it addresses the core transit needs in the city.

• **Transit improvement plans need to be implemented faster.** Participants would like to see transit plans implemented quickly. A participant suggested doing a more frugal bus transit lane plan so it could be implemented faster and help improve surface transit issues.

**Related to Pillar 1: Enhance the transit network**

• **Ensure that there are plans to address potential crowding increase at Eglinton Station due to the opening of Line 5 Eglinton.** Participants shared concerns that the opening of Line 5 Eglinton LRT will feed more people onto the already crowded Eglinton Station on Line 1 Yonge-University. They would like the TTC to ensure that there are plans in place to keep ahead of potential crowding.

• **Provide supplementary services along Line 5 – Eglinton.** Participants shared a couple of suggestions to support Line 5 – Eglinton service, including:
  - Providing supplementary services to supplement the further spaced LRT stops with shorter more accessible stops. *TTC staff said that this may happen for short stretches where it is needed but not along the entire route. There will be further consultation conducted for that specific re-routing plan next year.*
• Providing a bus route along the underground section of Line 5 – Eglinton.

**Build more transit infrastructure to accommodate demand.** Participants suggested creating an additional bus garage to accommodate the growing bus fleet and avoid constraining service due to limited storage space. Others also suggested building a Relief Line to accommodate the ridership demands on the subway.

• **Add more stops along the Premium Express bus routes.**

• **Equity should be imbued throughout the planning of the transit network**, particularly at community buses, overnight routes and bus shelters.

• **Consider extending the 503 Kingston streetcar to UTSC** since there will be no LRT to UTSC.

**Related to Pillar 2: Enhance the customer experience at key surface transit stop areas**

• **Improve wayfinding at stops and stations.** Several participants shared suggestions to improve wayfinding, including:
  o Providing additional wayfinding at stations to make it easier to find the correct exits. Work with Google Maps to provide indoor mapping of subway stations;
  o Providing additional wayfinding during construction so people can easily find temporary stops. The temporary stops should also include the route numbers they serve;

• **Improve communication of information to customers** by:
  o Providing next vehicle arrival screens at more stops and ensuring that the information displayed is accurate;
  o Providing information in multiple languages at stop locations, especially where there is a high concentration of diverse populations;
  o Providing the route name, direction of travel and route destination at stops to help customers who are unfamiliar with the route/stop;
  o Using a larger font size to display service information;
  o Posting service schedules at stops; and
  o Communicating subway delays in more prominent screens and signs at station entrances.

• **Implement improvements to speed-up passenger boarding/exiting**, including:
  o Implementing all door boarding on all bus routes, particularly the Express network;
  o Updating platform design to improve passenger flow and reduce conflict with traffic (e.g. at Spadina Station, Spadina streetcar platforms, and Wellesley bus platform); and
  o Considering on-street fare payment to speed up bus/streetcar boarding.

• **Improve pedestrian and customer safety** by:
  o Placing bus stops at far sides of intersections
  o Installing cameras at front windshields of buses to capture vehicles making illegal right turns in front of buses;
  o Improving pedestrian safety at busy intersections (e.g. at Dufferin St & Steeles Ave W where cars coming in and out of gas stations next to bus stops could present danger to pedestrians);
Building a second platform at Bloor-Yonge Station to accommodate the high number of riders waiting on the platform;
Snow clearing at bus stops to ensure they are accessible and safe during winter months; and
Ensuring all stops have adequate lighting, particularly at older bus/streetcar stops.

Related to Pillar 3: Improve service reliability
• **Address vehicle bunching and service gaps on bus routes.** Participants expressed the importance of addressing vehicle bunching and gaps, especially on routes with less frequent service. One participant suggested placing bus stops at far sides of intersections to help reduce bunching.

• **Operate additional vehicles** to ensure that schedule reliability improvements will not impact service frequency and capacity.

• **Provide continuous service at off-peak hours on bus routes along Kingston Road.** There is a lot of development coming in Kingston Road and bus schedules should be increased to accommodate this growth.

• **Increase surface transit service**, especially in winter time and at 3 pm on routes with middle schools and high schools to ensure there is enough service to accommodate the influx of students and reduce overcrowding.

Related to Pillar 4: Prioritize surface transit
• **Implement more transit priority across the city.** Identifying more corridors to implement transit priority, like bus transit lanes, are well supported by participants. They expressed the importance of addressing congestion and having the buses move faster to decrease customer journey time. Some suggested implementing bus transit lanes on Lawrence Ave East, Sheppard Ave East, and Markham Road because these corridors have a high transit ridership but have more priority for cars. Others said transit priority should also be explored in the busy downtown streets, including: Queen St, College St, and Dundas St.

• **Implement transit signal priority** at the following locations:
  - Yonge St & Hendon Ave
  - Left turn and right turn on Yonge St to Steeles Ave
  - Sheppard Ave W & Allen Rd

Related to Pillar 5: Accelerate integration with regional transit agencies and complementary modes of transport
• **Enhance integration with cycling by:**
  - Improving security and weather coverage for bikes by installing lights/cameras and covered bike parking;
  - Increasing bike parking at stations;
  - Reviewing the bike parking policy at stations with underutilized bike parking (e.g. Victoria Park Station) to increase usage;
  - Allowing e-bikes onto bus racks; and
  - Reducing the bike restriction hours on the subway. The current restricted hours are too long. A participant suggested to reduce the hours from 6:30 am – 10:00 am and 3:30 pm – 7:00 pm to 7:00 am – 9:00 am and 4:00 pm – 6:00 pm.
• **Improve service integration with the 905 transit agencies**, particularly York Region Transit.

• **Consider the impact of integration with private microtransit services.** Participants were concerned that integrating with private services such as Uber or Lyft could result in lower TTC ridership. *Note of clarification added by TTC staff after the meeting: Integration with private microtransit services means that the TTC will improve connections for private shuttle operators with 7 or more passengers that connect to TTC stations (e.g. employer shuttles, Smart Commute shuttles or IKEA shuttles). Improvements will include piloting priority parking at pick-up and drop-off areas. To improve customer trip planning, improvements to integration between TTC and private microtransit services will also include: improved wayfinding such as adding signage and stop markers; a new TTC webpage dedicated to describing private microtransit services information which will include maps and timetables; and integration of TTC and unrestricted shuttles (e.g. IKEA shuttles and Evergreen Brickworks shuttles) schedule information.*

**Other advice**

• **Good customer service is important.** Participants said that customers should receive good customer service from the front line TTC staff (i.e. bus and streetcar drivers). For example, they would like drivers to wait on customers if they see them running for a bus or streetcar. A bad experience could lead to a negative perception of the TTC.

• **Improve the design of buses.** The design of buses should better accommodate riders with mobility devices or strollers to prevent bottleneck by the front door. Participants also suggested moving the rear doors to a location that promotes better distribution of customers onboard the bus.

• **Allow PRESTO card payment using mobile phones.**

• **Implement free Wi-Fi on TTC buses.**

• **Make text messaging to NextBus for vehicle predictions free.**

**Next Steps**

Kathleen Llewellyn-Thomas, TTC Chief Customer Officer, thanked participants for their enthusiasm during the discussion and for helping the TTC as they develop the 5-Year Service Plan & 10-Year Outlook. Nicole Swerhun committed to sharing the Powerpoint slides to participants by email the following day and sharing a draft of the meeting summary to participants for review before finalizing. She also informed participants that the TTC will be hosting another session of the City-wide Stakeholder Meeting next week on Thursday, October 17, 2019 to accommodate those who could not make tonight’s meeting.
Attachment 1. Agenda

TTC 5-Year Service Plan & 10-Year Outlook
City-wide Stakeholder Meeting 2
Wednesday, October 9, 2019
6:00 – 8:00 pm
Scarborough Civic Centre, 150 Borough Drive

Meeting Purpose:
To share the draft 20-point Action Plan that is the core element of the TTC’s new 5-Year Service Plan & 10-Year Outlook, explain how consultation feedback and technical work informed the draft Plan, and to seek feedback on any final refinements for the TTC to consider.

AGENDA

6:00 pm Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review
Kathleen Llewellyn-Thomas, Chief Customer Officer, TTC
Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator, Swerhun Inc.

6:10 Overview Presentation
Mark Mis, Manager, Strategy & Service Planning, TTC

6:45 Questions of Clarification

7:00 Facilitated Discussion

1. Is there anything missing from the list of Actions and Initiatives included in the draft 20-point Action Plan? Are there any suggested refinements you would like the TTC to consider? If so, what are they?
2. To what extent do you think that this draft 20-point Action Plan will support the TTC’s commitment to moving large volumes of customers safely, reliably, and swiftly across Toronto?
3. To what extent do you support the draft 20-point Action Plan?

7:15 Report Back and Plenary Discussion

7:55 Wrap-up & Next Steps

8:00 Adjourn
Attachment 2. Participant List
Listed below are stakeholder groups the TTC invited to participate in the City-wide Stakeholder Meeting. Organizations listed in **bold** attended the meeting. Note that some stakeholder groups had more than one representative in attendance.

1LoveMalvern Transportation Working Group
8-80 Cities
**Access Alliance**
Access Point on Danforth
Advocacy Centre for Tenants
Albion Neighbourhood Services
All IN
Alliance for Equality for Blind Canadians
Alliance of Seniors-Older Canadians Network
Anishnawbe Health Toronto
AODA Alliance
**A Voice for Transit**
Bread & Bricks Social Justice Group
Canadian Centre for the Responsibility to Protect
Canadian Council of the Blind, Toronto Chapter
**Canadian Hearing Society**
Canadian Pensioners Concerned
Canadian Urban Transit Association
Centennial College Student Association Inc.
**Centre for Independent Living in Toronto**
Chinese Canadian National Council - Toronto
CivicAction
CNIB Foundation
CodeRedTO
Community Associations of Northern Scarborough
Community Head Injury Resource Services
Community Living Toronto
Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations
**Connect Sheppard East**
Council of Agencies Serving South Asians
Cross-Cultural Community Services Association
CycleTO
CycleTO - Midtown
Deep Quong Non-Profit Homes
**East Scarborough Storefront/Centre for Connected Communities**
Eglinton 2020
Eva's Initiatives
Evergreen
Fair Fare Coalition
Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations
**Federation of North Toronto Residents' Association**
Federation of Urban Neighbourhoods
Fred Victor
Free Transit Toronto
Friends and Families for Safe Streets
Gilda's Club Greater Toronto
Guelph-Humber Student Association (Ignite) Homes First
Housing Connections
HousingNowTO
Jane Finch Action Against Poverty
Jane-Finch Action for Neighbourhood Change
Jane's Walk
KCWA Family and Social Services
Let's Get Scarborough Moving!
**Lytton Park Residents' Organization**
Malvern Action for Neighbourhood Change
North American Native Plant Society
Older Women's Network
Ontario Active School Travel
Ontario Good Roads Association
Ontario Motor Coach Association
Ontario Public Transit Association
Our Greenway
Out of the Cold. Overnight Hostels
pointA
Rexdale Community Hub
Ryerson Students' Union
Salvation Army
**Scarborough Campus Students' Union**
**Scarborough Civic Action Network**
Scarborough Community Renewal Organization
**Scarborough Cycles**
Scarborough Residents Unite
**Scarborough Transit Action**
Seneca College
Seneca Student Federation
Senior Tamils' Centre of Ontario
Senior's Strategy Leader
Serve!
Share the Road Coalition
Smart Commute - North Toronto, Vaughan
Social Planning Toronto
Society of Sharing: Inner-City Volunteers
Sound Times Support Services
**South Etobicoke Transit Action Committee**
St Clare’s Multifaith Housing Society
Students Association of George Brown College
Sunshine Centres for Seniors
The Centre for Active Transportation
Toronto Alliance to End Homelessness
Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas
Toronto Bicycling Network
Toronto Community and Culture Centre
Toronto Community Benefits Network
Toronto Community Care Access Centre
Toronto Council Fire Native Cultural Centre
Toronto Council on Aging
Toronto Disability Pride March
Toronto Electric Riders Association
Toronto Environmental Alliance
Toronto Green Community / West Donlands Committee
Toronto Seniors Forum
Toronto Trucking Association
Toronto Workforce Innovation Group
**Toronto Youth Cabinet**
**Transport Action Ontario**
Transportation Equity TO
Transportation Options
**TTCriders**
**University of Toronto Scarborough**
University of Toronto Students Union
University of Toronto Transportation Research Institute
Walk Toronto
Waterfront Regeneration Trust
West Side Community Council
York Federation of Students
Youth Action Network
Youth Employment Service
Attachment 3. E-mailed Feedback

Four e-mailed feedback were received related to the meeting. The first e-mailed feedback was shared by a stakeholder group who could not attend the meeting in-person, and the second, third, and fourth e-mailed feedback were shared by participants after the meeting. The feedback has been included below as they were received.

**E-mailed feedback #1, October 8, 2019**

(Feedback received from Friends and Families for Safe Streets)

I am writing to thank you for the invitation to the TTC 5-Year Plan stakeholder meeting. Unfortunately, none of our volunteers has the capacity to come to the meeting tomorrow evening.

However, as you know we are a group dedicated to road safety, and we understand the TTC has a big role to play in this domain in Toronto. We would be interested in seeing the material you’re going to present at the meeting, if it’s possible to send it to us separately, so that we can comment on it further.

Based on the summary of the last stakeholder meeting, and thinking of road safety improvements relevant to the TTC, we can offer immediate comment on a few issues.

**TTC stops and signalized crossings**

We would like to see all TTC stops have a signalized crossing, especially on wide, high-speed, multi-lane suburban arterial roads. Crashes like the one that killed Celeste Jones in Scarborough, for example, could have been prevented had a signalized crossing been present. As a ‘solution’ to the issue of mid-block crashes where people are trying to reach public transit, the local councillor for that ward proposed taking out the TTC stop. We do not recommend removing access to transit, because it is grossly unfair to penalize transit users for the dangerous behaviour of drivers and the failure of those who designed and built road infrastructure for vehicle speed instead of safety for all users.

This mirrors point #10 under ‘Enhance Customer Experience at Busiest Stops’ in the summary from the last stakeholder workshop.

**Pushing for Complete Streets**

As alluded to above, the wide, high-speed, multi-lane arterial roads in Toronto’s suburbs are especially deadly for vulnerable road users. Our wish to see these roads transformed into complete streets would dovetail with the need to improve transit in suburbs, which also dovetails with the need to reduce automobile emissions (which are highest in the suburbs) in order to mitigate climate change. We were happy to see the discussion about complete streets in the summary of the last meeting. Complete streets are safer for people to travel to and from TTC stops, and make it safer to board and disembark from TTC vehicles. The TTC has a role to play in advocating for these infrastructure improvements, which would benefit their users and every resident of Toronto.

**Transform Yonge**

We are strong proponents of the ‘Transform Yonge’ project where Yonge St in Willowdale (between Finch and Sheppard) would be re-built with narrowed car lanes, protected cycle tracks and many other road safety improvements. The Toronto City Council vote about the project was
delayed on the basis that further investigation about the project’s impact on area bus routes was needed. We ask that the TTC try to ensure that impact on bus routes does not derail the Transform Yonge plan. We see no reason that surface bus routes should be more affected than any other motor vehicle traffic, and best estimates say that motor vehicle traffic might experience a 30-60 second delay over current congestion conditions. This should not be the minor factor that is allowed to derail safety improvements for an important, vibrant, ‘second-downtown’ corridor that is home to about 80,000 people, many of whom are families with children in the nearby schools. These residents deserve to enjoy a safe main street, and the current design of Yonge St in that area has an abysmal safety record.

**Conflict at TTC stops beside cycle tracks**
When more streets are transformed into complete streets (or so we hope), conflict can arise between transit users and other vulnerable road users, such as cyclists using a dedicated cycle track that runs beside a transit stop. We urge the TTC to keep up with and push for best design practices to mitigate or eliminate such conflicts. See for example NACTO’s guide for cycle tracks and transit stops: [https://nacto.org/publication/transit-street-design-guide/stations-stops/stop-configurations/shared-cycle-track-stop/](https://nacto.org/publication/transit-street-design-guide/stations-stops/stop-configurations/shared-cycle-track-stop/)

**Aggressively expand transit priority corridors to more routes**
The King St Crosstown project has done wonders for improving safety and comfort for vulnerable road users on King St by restricting motor vehicles from traveling more than one block. We would suggest emphasizing this approach especially on more heavily-traveled TTC streetcar corridors, such as Queen St, College St, and Dundas St. This kind of change has the added benefit of requiring minimal capital investment to see massive improvements in safety and reliability. Though all kinds of public transit should be prioritized over single-occupancy cars, it is especially important to expand this priority to streetcar routes to reduce the opportunity for people to drive cars past streetcars and kill or injure people getting on and off, and because people on bikes need space to navigate safely around the dangerous streetcar tracks – many people on bikes are badly injured when they are forced near the tracks (for example by parked cars or negligent or aggressive drivers) and their wheels become trapped. Prioritizing public transit, people walking and people riding bikes over motor vehicle traffic opens up the street to move more people more efficiently and much more safely. If safety isn’t persuasive enough, transit priority has proven to be very good for businesses, too.

Other than the above, we appreciate and echo all comments from the last workshop regarding improved walking and cycling integration at transit stops and improving pedestrian walkways.

Thank you very much for reaching out to us. We appreciate it and hope that these comments are helpful, and that we can offer further feedback on any other material you can provide.

**Email feedback #2, October 21, 2019**

TYC Comments- Draft 5-Year Service Plan

To Whom it May Concern,

We want to thank the TTC for allowing the Toronto Youth Cabinet the opportunity to participate in the 5-Year Service Plan stakeholder advisory group. Instead of filling out the discussion guide at the stakeholder meetings we were informed it would be acceptable to submit our feedback by email in order to give us more time to review the Draft Action Plan and provide comments.
The Toronto Youth Cabinet strongly supports the Draft 20-Point Action Plan. Toronto’s Youth (13-24 year olds) use transit for a higher proportion of trips than any other age group and this plan has the potential to greatly improve public transit in Toronto. Below are detailed comments with some suggested refinements and additions to the Draft Plan.

**Pillar 1: Enhance the Transit Network**

Pillar 1 highlights the necessity of the TTC Board and City Council to fund the TTC Capital Plan in order to meet increasing ridership and service. Specifically, funding an additional order of streetcars is essential to implementing the Action Plan. In the future, an additional bus garage will be necessary to accommodate a growing bus fleet for which funding must be provided in order to avoid constraining service by a lack of storage space. As part of service improvements on express routes the TTC should consider implementing the recommendation in the 2017 Express Bus Network Study to pilot all-door boarding and explore expanding all-door boarding throughout the express network. This initiative has the potential to reduce the time express buses spend at stops and speed up service.

**Pillar 2: Enhance the Customer Experience at Key Surface Transit Stop Areas**

Improving and expanding bus and streetcar shelters presents an opportunity to ensure lighting is provided at as many stops as possible. While most new shelters include lighting, many older shelters do not. In some cases coordinating with the City to ensure streetlights adequately light the sidewalk at bus stop locations should be explored. In recent years the TTC has added route numbers to bus stops which is a positive initiative. It would greatly benefit customers if this information was accompanied by the route name, direction of travel and destination. If a customer is not familiar with a stop or route this would inform them as to which side of the street they should wait. Finally, posting the frequency of service at frequent stops and restoring stop schedules at less frequent stops would help customers who do not have a smartphone. Improving wayfinding at subway stations with multiple exits, possibly by lettering exits should be considered.

**Pillar 3: Improve Service Reliability**

Service reliability continues to be a concern, specifically in the form of bunching and service gaps. This has the greatest impact on less frequent routes and outside of peak hours when service is less frequent. The Plan should place additional focus on reducing bunching. Service reliability improvements are a positive initiative which can increase on-time performance however, additional vehicles should be added to routes in order to minimize capacity impacts and reductions in frequency where necessary.

**Pillar 4: Prioritize Surface Transit**

We believe this section of the plan has the greatest potential to improve the customer experience. The Toronto Youth Cabinet has been advocating for a citywide network of transit priority corridors, which would allow surface vehicles to avoid traffic congestion, better serve Neighbourhood Improvement Areas with no access to rapid transit, improve the commutes of existing riders and attract new riders. The language in the Draft Plan should be strengthened to indicate that bus lanes will be installed as opposed to studying whether they should be installed. As some participants at the Stakeholder Meeting pointed out, significant study of light rail on Eglinton Avenue and Kingston Road has already taken place which can inform the bus lane implementation. Enforcement of the proposed bus lanes will be key to their success. In addition to bus lanes in the inner suburbs, transit priority should be explored on additional corridors in the Downtown including; Queen, College and Dundas.
Pillar 5: Accelerate Integration with Regional Transit Agencies and Complementary Modes of Transport

We support increased bike parking at stations, but providing secure bike parking within stations where possible would further incentivize using active transportation for first mile and last mile trips. The Toronto Youth Cabinet strongly supports fare integration with 905 transit agencies, especially York Region Transit. Improving coordination with Google Maps to strengthen directions using public transit would assist customers.

Sincerely,

Eli Aaron
William Pham
Budget Lead
Transit Lead
The Toronto Youth Cabinet

Feedback provided by SETAC (South Etobicoke Transit Action Committee)

General Feedback

The 5-Year Plan outlines many positive initiatives and proactive transit interventions. Establishing more priority signals and lanes for surface transit, and improving wayfinding and passenger information display are important, and the pending completion of new LRT lines will greatly improve the network for many Torontonians.

While it is in general a thorough planning exercise and laudable as a versatile and multi-faceted strategy for improving across the city, the TTC’s 5-Year Plan offers disconcertingly little in the way of improvements to south Etobicoke specifically, despite the pronounced growth in density in the area. The number of new residents added to Humber Bay Shores will easily exceed 30,000 once all development projects that are completed, under construction, or projected to be completed within the 10-year outlook horizon are factored in.

As the slide accompanying Action 1.1: Accommodate Growth clearly indicates, Humber Bay Shores is one of the largest and densest development hot spots in the city, yet it is also the furthest from higher order transit that either exists or is under construction.

The levels of residential density in Humber Bay Shores have not snuck up on the city and have been well known to city transit, transportation and infrastructure planners, as well as to city council, for decades. The need for better transit in south Etobicoke was first identified as early as 1993 during the Waterfront West LRT EA process. Waterfront West LRT was part of the 2007 Transit City plans, included in 2008 in Metrolinx’s Big Move 15-Year Plan.

The key objectives of the 5-Year Plan and 10-Year Outlook include:
- “Reduce single-occupant auto vehicle trips”
- “Grow transit infrastructure along with development”
- “Improve reliability”
- “Plan new priority bus and streetcar corridors”

It is difficult to see how any of the strategies outlined in the 5-year Plan and 10-Year Outlook will meet these key objectives for south Etobicoke. There is no mention of the Waterfront West
LRT or even the Waterfront Transit Network in the 10-Year Outlook under “New Services”. The only budget item included in the 2019-2028 Capital Budget and Plan is the allocation of funding, between 2019-2021 to complete the preliminary design for a connection between Exhibition and Dufferin Loop.

Specific Comments

- The slide associated with Action 1.6: Enhance streetcar network was not explained at the stakeholder workshop and subsequent discussion suggests that in fact, the TTC has effectively degraded 501 service to Long Branch by shifting LRVs from 501 to 504 and preventing the restoration of 501 Queen through service to Long Branch. Enhancements to 501 Queen referred to as scheduled for 2022-2023 are apparently contingent on the purchase of additional LRVs and seem far from a certainty.

- Action 1.6 is followed by “1.7: Apply an equity lens to service planning,” but it doesn’t seem that TTC service planning, or the infrastructure development that would facilitate substantive upgrades to service reliability and travel time, have been equitably distributed at all from the perspective of south Etobicoke. A new Park Lawn GO station running every 30 minutes with a prohibitively expensive combined GO-TTC fare would not be considered a rapid transit plan in other parts of the city, and it isn’t in south Etobicoke. While it is certainly true that the TTC has allocated resources to establish the 145 Humber Bay Express, it is a premium fare and limited service. The 176 Mimico GO is expressly designed to integrate with GO, but the combined GO-TTC fare is subject to the changing priorities of Metrolinx, the Provincial Government, and the TTC, and is set to rise with the elimination of the co-fare subsidy. These newer services reinforce the fact that south Etobicoke is poorly connected to higher order transit, and they are band-aids, not solutions.

- SETAC supports comments raised separately relating to the importance of monitoring schedule reliability throughout a given route and not only with reference to arrival at or departure from a terminus. We believe that the 10-year outlook should be incorporating better methods for real-time service monitoring and tracking of vehicles along route. Software and GPS should presumably be able to alert supervisors to changes in headways and alert operators to maintain sufficient spacing and avoid bunching as far as traffic conditions allow. Better management of fleets along routes might very well permit slight reductions in vehicles while meeting or improving on existing service levels, saving costs and offsetting the investment in new fleet management technology.

- Pillar 3 refers in the section title slide to new route management initiatives including a single transit control centre. However, it isn’t entirely clear why a single control centre is better for suburban portions of the network than a network of distributed control centres. Many of the reliability issues experienced by 501 users in south Etobicoke over the years have arguably been exacerbated by supervisors being focused on the downtown core and short-turning too many vehicles to meet performance targets elsewhere. How does a single control centre manage monitoring network extremities? How are supervisors evaluated and held accountable?

Recent problems at the Humber Loop, with operators leaving vehicles on the westbound track during layovers (instead of moving them around the loop) have defeated the purpose of the 508 providing limited through service during peak PM hour, as the 508s end up stuck
behind 501s on layover. This problem continued for some time due to increases in running time, but how is it possible that a control centre either isn’t aware of the problem or ignores it?

- Slide #9 “TTC surface transit key stop locations”: What constitutes a “location”? It seems, visually, to privilege intersections where there would be a single transfer point between routes. But if you take the intersection of Park Lawn and Lake Shore Boulevard West, that “location” is extremely busy, but distributed across a few adjacent boarding locations rather than a single transfer point. What was the methodology here? Does it really make sense to say that a cluster of two or three adjacent stops that together generate 4,500+ daily onboardings aren’t “a location”?

Thank you for including SETAC in the Stakeholder Meeting and for providing us with an opportunity to provide feedback on the 5-Year Plan and 10-Year Outlook.

David Meurer  
Co-Chair  
SETAC (South Etobicoke Transit Action Committee)  
www.setac.ca

Emailed feedback #4, November 15, 2019

For a plan that has to work within the constraints of the limited budget that it was given, this one moves in the right direction. But a $50 million, five-year plan is a paltry response to the overwhelming imperative that Toronto move quickly to get people out of cars. The Transform Toronto report on climate change has a map that shows that Scarborough has the highest per-capita greenhouse gas emissions from personal vehicle use. The reason for this is obvious: lack of accessible, affordable transit that takes people where they want to go.
A five-year, $50-million city-wide plan is also an inadequate response to the need to create equity and eliminate poverty. John Stapleton’s recent report, Double or Nothing, demonstrates the need for Scarborough to have more Neighbourhood Improvement Area designations. His map shows the existing ones in yellow and his proposed ones in purple.

What is striking about his map is that Scarborough is almost entirely represented in colour. The essential thing that will remove the need for these colours is a rapid transit system that connects Scarborough’s neighbourhoods.

Here’s another map. This one from the Toronto Foundation’s 2019 Vital Signs report. It shows how Scarborough has moved over time from being a high and medium income area to one that is predominantly low income.
Transit data show that only 6 per cent of commuters from Scarborough are travelling downtown. Some are going to other parts of the city but the majority are trying to get around in our part of the city. In Scarborough we have hundreds of large and small employers, we have world class healthcare centres, educational institutions and recreational facilities, we have schools, shopping centres and places of worship, we have countless amazing restaurants. But the only way to get to these places is by car or slow, crowded bus, or, if you can’t afford that, then by walking.

We need a rapid transit network in Scarborough and we need it now, not 5 years or 10 years from now.

Thank you kindly, for considering this feedback.

Best regards,
Moya Beall