List of Unsolicited Proposals Submitted for 2026 Budget Consideration

By James Douglas Golding

December 31, 2025

firetabletjames@gmail.com / jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

Tel: 437-994-7912

1. **Toronto HomeFirst – Full Proposal (Redacted)**
2. **TTC Super Express A–F – Universal Transit Flow Proposal & (Cover Letter)**
3. **Toronto Congestion Proposals 3 in 1**
4. **TTC Funding and Efficiency Proposal**
5. **Proposal for Sustainable TTC Funding Reform**
6. **Walk of Reflection – Amended Proposal For Veterans in Canada**
7. **Toronto Neglect Surtax & Tenant Protection Framework For Buildings**
8. **Toronto Essentials Reserve Fund Loans**
9. **Canada Post – A Modernized, Cost-Efficient, Youth-Empowered Delivery Model**
10. **Green Lane Landfill Proposal**
11. **Secondhand Harm: How Ontario Shelters Fail the Vulnerable**
12. **Proposal Reforming Ontario's Graduated Licensing System**

Toronto HomeFirst — Homelessness Ending Plan

1. Index — Toronto HomeFirst Full Proposal Roadmap for the housing plan and all supporting documents.

2. Cover Letter — Toronto HomeFirst Framing of the housing solution and its alignment with audit concerns.

3. Program Concept — Toronto HomeFirst Overview of the model, goals, and implementation strategy.

4. Full 12-Month Proposal to End Homelessness Detailed plan with timelines, cost breakdowns, and support systems.

5. Shelter System Transformation — Year Two Expansion Repurposing strategy for existing shelter infrastructure.

6. Shelter Staff Repurposing — Workforce Integration Staffing model for resident support and system transition.

7. Emergency & Service Savings Reinvestment Strategy Funding reallocation model based on avoided crisis costs.

8. Council Motions & Requests for Staff Implementation Formal motions for Council consideration and execution.

9. HomeFirst Bottom Line — System Transition Summary Executive summary of costs, savings, and outcomes.

10. Legal Argument — Housing Rights & Municipal Authority Legal basis for action and policy justification.

11. Declaration of a Homelessness-Free Toronto Proposed amendment and mayoral framing for public commitment.

12. Author Notes — Housing Plan Context & Moral Framing

Cover Letter — Toronto HomeFirst Housing Plan

Subject (for email): Toronto HomeFirst: A Survivor's Blueprint to End Homelessness and Rebuild Our City

October 23, 2025

To: Mayor Olivia Chow, Members of Council, Provincial and Federal Leaders, Toronto Police, Fire, EMS, TTC, Media

My name is James Douglas Golding. I am not a policy expert or elected official. I am a survivor of homelessness, poverty, and institutional failure. I grew up in an abusive home, spent years in the care of the Children's Aid Society, and lived behind prison walls from 1986 to 2010. I've battled mental health challenges, lived in shelters, and relied on public support to survive. Today, I live on ODSP in stable housing thanks to a compassionate landlord and the taxpayers who fund that support.

I created the Toronto HomeFirst proposal not from theory — but from lived truth. It is a fully costed, citywide plan to end chronic homelessness, repurpose shelters, and reinvest emergency savings into housing, safety, and dignity. It is built from public data, personal experience, and a refusal to accept that homelessness is inevitable.

Toronto HomeFirst delivers:

Immediate housing for 15,400–20,000+ residents using existing rental stock and guaranteed 12-month transitional supports

Repurposing of 90 shelters and 30 transitional homes into stabilization hubs

Emergency savings reinvested across police, EMS, fire, hospitals, TTC, parks, and nonprofits

Employment, training, and volunteer pathways for participants

This plan is not just a policy document. It is a survivor's blueprint — a roadmap built by someone who lived through the system and knows what it costs to be forgotten.

I am submitting this plan to Council, staff, and the public because I believe Toronto can be the first city in Canada to end homelessness. If this plan is not implemented here, I believe someone else will. But I will strongly consider running for Mayor if that's what it takes to make this real.

I ask that city Council to treat this plan seriously. Not because I wrote it — but because it works. It aligns with federal and provincial programs. It uses existing housing stock. It protects staff, tenants, and taxpayers. And it does so with full accountability.

I am prepared to brief Council, staff, or media directly, and I welcome a formal response.

Because I keep asking myself: **If this doesn't end homelessness — what will?**

Respectfully,

James Douglas Golding Toronto Resident | Survivor | Builder of HomeFirst
jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | 437-994-7912

Program Concept: *Toronto HomeFirst*

Toronto HomeFirst is a 12-month housing-first initiative (with optional 6-month extension) designed to end homelessness citywide by converting shelter dependency into permanent housing, employment, and dignity—while transforming public assets into long-term revenue-generating infrastructure. It is not just a plan—it's a human movement rooted in dignity, justice, and the belief that housing is a human right.

Core Principles

- **Housing First, Not Shelter Forever** Every homeless individual or family is placed in permanent housing within 12 months. Those requiring clinical treatment are housed in repurposed units with onsite support. By Year 2, all shelters not retained for intake are fully repurposed.
- **Shelter Transformation Timeline**
    - **Year 1**: All 15,400 people housed or in treatment.
    - **Year 2**: 75% of shelters fully repurposed into housing, clinics, nonprofit hubs, or revenue-generating spaces.
    - **Year 3+**: Only 25% of shelters remain as Transitional Homes. The rest generate income or services, reducing the need for future funding.
- **Tenant–Landlord Compatibility & Stability**
    - Tenants and landlords complete online compatibility forms.
    - Landlords may choose from multiple compatible applicants.
    - If a tenancy breaks down, the city, landlord, and tenant decide whether to mediate or rehouse.
    - If replaced, the tenant returns to a Transitional Home and awaits new placement.
    - The lease continues unchanged—only the tenant name is updated.
- **Employment & Volunteer Pathways**
    - Newly housed residents contribute **20 hours/month** of volunteer service for 6 months, followed by 6 months of certificate training and job placement.
    - Participation is based on ability; children are excluded.
    - This demonstrates good faith and shared responsibility—support is not free, but reciprocal.
    - Those unable to secure employment after 12 months may receive up to **6 additional months** of support.
- **Landlord, Homeowner & Investor Incentives**
    - $2,000 per unit incentive to secure 11,287 units.
    - Open to homeowners, building managers, investors, and even rural/farm housing providers.
    - The city signs a 12-month lease with both tenant and landlord.
    - Compatibility matching ensures better outcomes and fewer disruptions.

- **Start-Up Allowance via COHB/IHAP**
    - Prior to move-in, the city may request COHB or IHAP funds to provide a one-time start-up allowance.
    - Suggested amounts:
        - Single person: $1,500
        - Couple or single parent with child: $2,000
        - Families of 3–4: $3,500
        - Families of 5–6: up to $5,000
    - These funds help cover essentials like clothing, transit, food, and basic furnishings.
- **Furniture & Furnishings Drive**
    - The city and local businesses organize donation drives to provide furniture and household items.
    - Every person or family receives support to settle into their new home with dignity and comfort.
- **Portability & Inter-City Transfers**
    - If a tenant wants to move to another city with the same program, they can transfer.
    - Cities may swap tenants to balance housing availability.
    - If a tenancy ends, the unit is filled from the existing compatibility pool.
- **Ontario Science Centre Repurposing**
    - Becomes a multi-use hub:
        - **Indoor sports**: ball hockey, ice hockey, tennis, soccer, squash
        - **Training academy**: trades, hospitality, digital skills
        - **Aquarium**: public attraction and revenue stream
        - **Transitional housing**: for youth in training
        - **Retail & event space**: café, rentals, earned income
    - Generates revenue and public engagement while supporting program goals.
- **Clinical Pathways for Complex Cases**
    - Individuals with severe mental health or addiction issues are housed in repurposed treatment units.
    - Once stabilized, they transition into permanent housing.
    - Clinical care is integrated with housing—not separated from it.
- **Fiscal Sustainability**
    - Year 1 is fully funded through city reserves and shelter-designated tax revenue.
    - Shelter taxes are returned to reserves over time.
    - Each year, the program costs less as more people stabilize and fewer shelters are needed.
    - By Year 3, only a fraction of the original funding is required to maintain the 25% Transitional Homes.
    - The city begins receiving **revenue** from the 80% of repurposed shelters and the Ontario Science Centre.

Toronto HomeFirst — Full 12-Month Proposal to End Homelessness (with 18-month support option)

Submitted by: James D. Golding

Tel: 437-994-7912

Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

Date: October 14, 2025

Executive Summary

Toronto HomeFirst is a decisive, fully costed 12-month operational plan to house all 15,400 people currently experiencing homelessness in Toronto. The plan preserves 25% of existing shelter capacity as short-term Transitional Homes (30 shelters), repurposes 75% (90 shelters) into permanent housing and service hubs, and uses bridging/reserve funds repaid by shelter-designated revenues. Upfront funding required: **$373,759,500**. The plan creates 11,287 rental units via incentives, launches youth employment and training, repurposes the Ontario Science Centre into a high-value multi-use hub (medical clinic, indoor sport, aquarium, training, revenue activities), protects existing workers, and includes measured, audited accountability. Supports may extend to 18 months for individuals needing longer stabilization; full phase-out targeted by month 18. Conservative annual operational savings are estimated at **$170M–$337M**; immediate fiscal buffer per submitted budget logic is **$666,240,578**.

1 Purpose of the Plan

End homelessness in Toronto within 12 months by: housing 15,400 people with tailored monthly supports; keeping 25% of shelter capacity for intake and emergency needs; repurposing 75% of shelters into permanent housing, treatment residences, clinics, training and revenue-generating spaces; employing youth for custodial and program roles; and returning shelter-designated revenues to reserves to replenish bridging funds.

2 Funding Mechanism and Guardrails

Summary: Frontload the program with bridging/reserve funds. Repay the bridge from shelter-designated taxes and revenues into a repayment account until reserves restored. No new permanent taxes for Year 1.

Key figures:

- Upfront bridge ask: **$373,759,500**
    - Housing & supports: **$351,185,500**
    - Landlord/homeowner/investor incentives: **$22,574,000**

Funding steps:

1. City approves bridge authority of $373,759,500.
2. Funds ring-fenced for housing/supports and incentives only.
3. Shelter-designated tax revenue directed monthly to repayment account.
4. Independent audit at Month 6 and Month 12 to confirm reserve restoration progress.
5. Contingency triggers: staged drawdowns, provincial emergency lines, or reallocation if repayment variance exceeds threshold.

Guardrails and protections:

- Strict reporting and publicly available dashboards.
- Legal templates for municipal 12-month leases and landlord incentive MOUs with tenant protections.
- Business certification program to enforce training worker protections.

3 Overall Cost, Units, and Household Breakdown

Summary: House 15,400 people via 11,287 units with tailored supports and landlord incentives.

Units needed (by scenario):

- Singles: 9,000 units
- Couples / Single + 1 child: 750 units
- Families of 3: 308 units (2BR, shared)
- Families of 4: 128 units (3BR)
- Families of 5–6: 101 units (3BR larger)

Financial breakdown by household:

- Singles (9,000): $26,600 per person total → **$239,400,000**
- Couples/Single+1 child (750): $30,200 per household → **$22,650,000**
- Families of 3 (615): $40,100 per household → **$24,661,500**
- Families of 4 (385): $50,000 per household → **$19,250,000**
- Families of 5–6 (302): $75,000 per household → **$22,650,000**
- Landlord/homeowner/investor incentives (11,287 units × $2,000): **$22,574,000**

Total Housing & Support Cost: **$351,185,500** Total Upfront Program Cost: **$373,759,500**

Population allocation:

- Refugees: 3,420 (22.2%) — **$82,956,789**
- Canadian citizens and permanent residence: 11,980 (77.8%) — **$290,802,711**

4 What Funds Pay For — Detailed Uses

Summary: Monthly supports for 12 months (extendable to 18), one-time last-month payment, landlord incentives, medical clinic setup, employment/training programs, repurposing costs and program operations.

Major line items:

- Monthly housing & living supports (per household categories) for 12 months.
- One-time last month or move-in payment per household as specified.
- $2,000 per unit landlord/homeowner incentive to secure immediate leases and participation.
- Funding for rapid repurposing of 90 shelters into mixed uses (fit-ups, minor capital).
- Start-up funding for Ontario Science Centre repurposing (program build, sports surfaces, aquarium preliminary works).
- Employment payroll for youth custodial and program staff (initial hires).
- Operational reserves for 18-month extension cases where clinically required.

Funds are tracked by program stream and reported monthly.

5 Shelter Strategy — Exact Counts and Use Cases

Summary: Toronto has 120 shelters in scope. Keep 25% (30 shelters) as Transitional Homes; repurpose 75% (90 shelters) into permanent housing and service uses.

25% Transitional Homes (30 shelters)

- Purpose: intake, triage, emergency short-term stay.
- Function: assessment within 48–72 hours, immediate medical triage, documentation, rapid match to permanent units.
- Capacity maintained for surges, weather events, and new arrivals.

75% Repurposed Shelters (90 shelters)

- Converted into: Room & Board permanent units; addiction treatment houses; mental-health supported housing; 24/7 medical clinics; nonprofit service hubs; training kitchens; indoor sports/recreation; office microspaces; storage units; social enterprises.
- Selected repurposed sites may include office incubation, storage micro-units, community gardens or small business spaces to generate local income.

6 Transitional Homes: Operation and Rules

Summary: Fast triage centers for new arrivals and urgent cases; short stays; immediate referrals.

Operational rules:

- Intake and full needs assessment within 48–72 hours.
- Short average stay measured in days/weeks; rapid placement priority.
- Transitional Homes coordinate transportation to permanent placement and initial wraparound supports.
- Participation agreements signed for voluntary service components; clinical exemptions permitted.

7 Repurposed Shelters: Operation and Services

Summary: Mixed-use, permanent housing and comprehensive services.

Primary service types:

- Permanent Room & Board units with tenancy sustainment teams.
- Addiction in-house treatment residences with clinical partners.
- Mental-health supported housing with onsite case management and step-down planning.
- 24/7 medical clinics offering primary care, triage, prescriptions and referral pathways.
- Nonprofit hubs for benefits navigation, legal aid, food distribution, employment supports.
- Training kitchens, community rooms, indoor sports and recreation, and small business incubation spaces.

Operational model:

- Partnerships with nonprofits, provincial health, and private sector for service delivery.
- Long-term leases or municipal management with strong tenancy sustainment teams.

8 Ontario Science Centre: Vision, Uses, and Revenue Model

Summary: Transform the Ontario Science Centre into a high-engagement multi-use hub combining training, sports, recreation, an aquarium, retail and revenue activities to support program sustainability and public interest if possible on Provincial approval and available funding that can immediately restore the state of repair.

Core components:

- Training academy: hospitality, trades, digital skills, life coaching, and certificates.
- Indoor sports complex: ball hockey rinks, ice hockey, indoor soccer/turf, tennis courts, squash courts, multi-use courts for community leagues and ticketed events.
- Aquarium exhibit: small-to-medium public aquarium feature to draw families and generate admission revenue.
- Transitional housing modules for youth cohorts in training.
- Event space and retail/café generating earned revenue.
- Maybe a few restaurants or an onsite store and giftshop.

Revenue levers:

- Program fees and ticketing (sports leagues, aquarium, exhibits).
- Rentals and events.
- Corporate sponsorships, naming rights, and partnerships.
- Portion of earned revenue allocated to operational costs and training subsidies.

Social outcomes:

- Public magnet to reduce stigma and integrate residents into community life; training pipeline into local labour markets.

9 Employment, Training, Volunteer Requirements, and Protections

Summary: Paid youth employment; structured business training; volunteer engagement for housed residents; worker protections to prevent exploitation.

Youth employment:

- Paid custodial, maintenance, and support roles in repurposed sites and parks.
- Rotational and permanent hiring pathways; career coaching and job placement.

Training partnerships:

- Certified partnerships with restaurants, hospitality, trades, and farms.
- Municipal certification prohibits businesses from reducing hours or firing existing staff because of program placements.
- Training hours audited and tracked; paid placements where training exceeds municipal thresholds.

Volunteer and certification pathway:

- Residents housed in Year-1: **20 hours/month** volunteer for first 6 months.
- Months 7–12: certificate training and job placement support.
- If needed, supports may extend up to 18 months (volunteer plus extended training or wage subsidy).
- Residents receive transit support and small allowances while volunteering.

Protections:

- Legal MOUs require participating businesses to protect incumbent staff hours and wages.
- Municipal enforcement and complaint pathways for violations.

Agricultural / farm pathways:

- Incentives for participants who choose farm/trade training; paid placements and hiring pathways into seasonal or full-time farming roles.

10 Tenant/Landlord Processes, Portability, and Compatibility

Summary: Municipal 12-month leases, online compatibility matching, inter-city portability, and rapid tenant replacement to preserve tenancy stability.

Key processes:

- Municipal 12-month lease template between City, landlord and tenant with defined supports and eviction protections.
- Online compatibility assessment completed pre-match to improve tenancy fit.
- Inter-city portability: tenants may transfer to partner cities implementing the model; tenant swaps facilitated between municipalities.
- Rapid replacement: if tenancy breaks down, the city re-places tenants promptly and provides mediation supports If necessary.

11 Timeline and Milestones (Detailed)

Summary: Launch Day 0; full housing within 12 months; phase-out and repurposing complete by month 12–16; consolidation to month 18.

Month 0 (Approval & Launch)

- Council approves $373,759,500 bridge authority.
- Landlord incentive program, municipal lease templates, and certification processes launched.
- Identify Transitional Homes (30) and repurposed shelters (90).

Month 1–3 (Rapid Intake & Move-ins)

- Open Transitional Homes; intake and assessment.
- Secure and occupy first cohorts into 11,287 units.
- Begin medical clinic openings and youth hiring.

Month 3–6 (Stabilization) Children & Persons with severe disabilities excluded

- Residents begin 20 hr/mo volunteer obligations if capable (months 3–8).
- Training programs and Ontario Science Centre program builds start.

Month 7–12 (Certificates & Job Placement)

- Residents shift into certificate/training months; intensive job placement; earned income supports.
- Shelter repurposing progress accelerates; units occupied and services live.

Month 12–16 (Phase-out)

- Complete 75% shelter repurposing operationally.
- Transitional Homes maintained as a 25% intake reserve.

Month 12–18 (Consolidation & Extension)

- For residents requiring longer stabilization, support extends up to 18 months with targeted case management and wage subsidies.
- Independent audits at Month 6 and Month 12; final report by Month 18.

Performance targets:

- 100% of 15,400 housed within 12 months (with supports to 18 months if required).
- 6,000 moved from street to home in 12 months.
- 80% phase-out toward sustained stability within 18 months.
- Targeted job placement rates to be refined with agency baseline costing.

12 Estimated Savings Outside Shelter Funding (Conservative Ranges)

Summary: Reduced reactive costs across emergency services and public systems provide significant ongoing savings. Baseline validation required for precise numbers.

Conservative annual savings ranges:

- Police: $40M–$70M
- EMS: $20M–$40M
- Fire: $5M–$12M
- Hospitals/ER: $80M–$150M
- TTC / transit: $10M–$25M
- Nonprofit emergency spending: $10M–$25M
- Parks, bylaw, admin: $5M–$15M

Combined conservative annual avoided costs: **$170M–$337M**.

One-time reserve buffer from submitted allocation logic: **$666,240,578** (city budget + refugee tax math as provided).

13 Measurement, Reporting, and Accountability

Summary: Transparent monthly dashboards, independent audits, and public progress reporting.

Core elements:

- Public monthly dashboard: people housed, units leased, expenditures, volunteer hours, certificates issued, job placements, clinic visits.
- Independent financial and performance audits at Month 6 and Month 12.
- Quarterly public briefings to Council.
- Performance metrics tied to payments to delivery partners where applicable.
- Compliance unit to enforce training business protections and landlord MOU terms.

Reserve repayment schedule:

- Shelter taxes directed monthly to repayment account; independent auditor verifies progress at Month 6 and 12.
- Any shortfalls trigger contingency reviews and provincial engagement.

14 Risks, Mitigations, and Contingencies

Summary: Key risks include landlord uptake, operational capacity, service partner readiness, and baseline savings validation. Each risk has mitigations and escalation pathways.

Risks and mitigations:

- Landlord uptake low → Increase incentives, fast approvals, temporary municipal leasing, or acquisition extend incentives to investors, building management corporations, farming homes, townhouses etc.
- Service delivery bottlenecks → Rapid contracting rounds, deploy provincial mobile teams, use NGO surge capacity.
- Business training misuse → Certify and audit businesses; punitive clauses for non-compliance.
- Clinical complexity → Prioritize treatment residences in repurposed shelters; coordinate with hospitals and provincial health.
- Repayment variance → Contingency drawdown and provincial assistance requests.

15 Recommendations to Council (Actionable Requests)

1. Approve bridge/reserve authority of **$373,759,500** for Year-1 deployment.
2. Confirm shelter designations: **30 Transitional Homes** (25%) and **90 repurposed shelters** (75%).
3. Approve landlord/homeowner/investor incentive program: **$2,000 per unit** for 11,287 units and authorize expedited municipal lease templates.
4. Direct shelter-designated taxes and revenues to a dedicated repayment account and require monthly transfers until reserves restored.
5. Commission immediate agency baseline costing (police, EMS, hospitals, fire, TTC, nonprofits) with a 14-day turnaround to validate savings and refine ROI.
6. Approve Ontario Science Centre repurposing study and seed operational funding to enable rapid program activation.
7. Mandate independent audits at Month 6 and Month 12, and monthly public dashboards.
8. Approve municipal certification program for business training partners and legal protections for incumbent workers.

16 Implementation Appendix (Summary of Operational Needs)

Governance:

- Project Office: City Executive Sponsor; Program Director; Operations Lead; Finance Lead; Clinical Lead; NGO Coordinator.

Staffing (launch estimate):

- Intake teams, housing navigators, tenancy sustainment squads, youth employment coordinators, landlord liaison team, compliance unit — initial launch headcount estimate ~320 FTEs (detailed staffing plan in full appendix).

Procurement:

- Rapid lease MOUs, landlord incentive agreements, RFPs for nonprofit service delivery partners and training vendors, capital fit-up contracts for repurposed shelters.

Daily throughput targets (example):

- Peak throughput target: ~1,200 move-ins/week until target units are secured and occupied.

IT and systems:

- Central case management system, tenant/landlord compatibility portal, public dashboard, mobile intake tools.

Legal templates:

- Municipal 12-month lease; landlord incentive MOU; business training MOU; tenant compatibility form; eviction mediation protocol.

17 Closing Statement

Toronto HomeFirst converts existing political will and municipal capacity into an executed outcome: every person housed, dignity restored, public safety improved, and long-term fiscal relief unlocked. The plan is pragmatic, auditable, reversible, and replicable. It leverages market housing via incentives, repurposes municipal assets for long-term community benefit, protects workers, and builds career pathways for youth. With Council approval of the upfront bridge funds, Toronto can implement the 12-month plan immediately and achieve measurable, human results within a year. This plan can extend Canada wide and can resolve decades old homelessness.

Annex A — Quick Reference Financial Totals

- People to house: **15,400**
- Units required: **11,287**
- Housing & supports: **$351,185,500**
- Landlord/homeowner/investor incentives: **$22,574,000**
- Upfront bridge amount: **$373,759,500**
- Immediate one-time reserve buffer (per submitted logic): **$666,240,578**
- Estimated annual operational savings: **$170M–$337M**
- Supports can continue annually if housing supply is available incentives can continue on an annual basis to keep them homes open or have new available units annually
- Affordable homes can be built in a greater timeframe and this plan allows those affordable homes to be used by any single trontonian if they are not filled.
- Considerations of property tax reduction including refugee and vacant home tax if this plan works I would beg the city of Toronto to reduce property taxes on Sheltering cost for the city shelter base and refugee shelter tax as well as vacant home tax to help stabilize taxpayers pockets this would help with the cost of living and make Toronto more affordable this plan clearly saves over 1 billion dollars and has potential to bring in double and these savings are equivalent to 21.809% property tax i submit other the next year the funding savings are bigger.

Thank you

Sincerely James D Golding

Plan Rating Summary

Attribute	Score (0–10)	Key reason
Impact on homelessness	10	Targets 15,400 people with immediate housing and wraparound supports.
Financial realism	8	Clear cost model and repayment path, needs agency baseline validation.
Operational feasibility	8	Rapid leasing and repurposing plan workable but requires aggressive capacity build.
Political palatability	7	Strong public benefits but needs preemptive community and council engagement.
Scalability / replicability	9	Uses market incentives and municipal tools that scale to other cities.
Protection of workers & rights	9	Includes enforceable protections and tenant safeguards.
Measurement & accountability	9	Monthly dashboards and independent audits are specified.
Overall score	9 out of 10	High-impact, pragmatic, and defensible with targeted validation and operational detail.

Short justification

The plan is highly compelling because it is costed, timebound, and operationally specific: it uses existing housing stock, aligns funding and reserve repayment, protects workers, creates employment pathways, and embeds audit/accountability. The inclusion of the Ontario Science Centre as a revenue and training hub significantly strengthens public buy-in and earned-revenue potential. Remaining gaps are technical and solvable: validating recurring savings with agency baselines, accelerating landlord uptake, and detailing day-by-day operational throughput.

Top 5 prioritized improvements (implement quickly)

1. Agency baseline costing (police, EMS, hospitals, TTC, fire, nonprofits) — produce defensible avoided-cost figures within 14 days.
2. Rapid landlord outreach package — standardized lease, instant $2,000 incentive disbursement mechanism, and guaranteed municipal backstop for early adopters.
3. Operations playbook — daily throughput targets, staffing rosters, intake scripts, transport logistics, and move-in checklists for the first 90 days.
4. Community engagement sprint — local liaisons, preemptive Q&A, and neighborhood mitigation plans for each repurposed site.
5. Tenant/landlord compatibility and portability portal — build the online matching form and back-end to automate matches and inter-city swaps.

Final verdict and recommended immediate ask

This is a 9/10 plan: ambitious but realistic, humane, and fiscally defensible once baseline savings are validated. Ask Council today to approve the $373.76M bridge authority conditional on a 14-day agency costing and immediate launch of the landlord incentive program. That conditional ask preserves prudence while enabling immediate operational momentum.

Shelter System Transformation — Full Repurposing by Year Two (Example)

Objective: Repurpose all 90 existing shelter sites into transitional housing hubs under the HomeFirst model within a two-year timeline, using phased funding and surplus reinvestment.

Timeline & Phasing

- **Year One:** 45 shelters repurposed
- **Year Two:** Remaining 45 shelters completed
- **Total:** 90 shelters fully transformed by end of Year Two

Funding & Feasibility

- **Repurposing cost per site:** $600,000
- **Total repurposing cost (90 shelters):** $54,000,000
- **Funding source:** Covered within the $790M emergency shelter bridge and operational surplus
- **Budget status:** Ample funding available; no additional taxation required

Strategic Impact

- Ends reliance on emergency shelter cycling
- Embeds housing navigation, mental health, and paramedic services at every site
- Creates permanent infrastructure for transitional housing
- Enables full intake coordination and dashboard tracking
- Supports up to **3,750 residents** across 75 active sites during transition
- Preserves 30% of shelters post-transition for emergency and overflow needs

Final Statement

> “All 90 shelters will be fully repurposed within two years using existing funds. No new taxes. No service disruption. Just a permanent end to shelter cycling and a full transition to housing-first infrastructure.”

4.1 Shelter Staff Repurposing — Workforce Integration & Resident Support

As part of the full shelter repurposing strategy, **no staff will lose their jobs**. All shelter workers will be retained and transitioned into meaningful roles within the HomeFirst system, ensuring continuity of care, operational stability, and a unified workforce committed to ending homelessness.

Deployment Model:

- **Case Worker Assignment:** 1–2 staff per shelter will be reassigned as **dedicated case workers** to support newly housed residents. These staff will provide ongoing check-ins, service navigation, and stabilization support for up to 12 months post-housing.
- **Operational Continuity:** Remaining staff will operate the **repurposed transitional homes and treatment housing units**, ensuring safe, well-run environments with embedded services and intake coordination.

Training & Cost Coverage:

- All staff will receive **targeted training** in trauma-informed care, housing-first principles, tenant stabilization, and inter-agency coordination — **only if required**.
- **No new taxes are needed.** All staffing costs are already embedded in the existing **shelter base budget**.
- Any minor training costs (e.g. fuel, vehicles, materials) can be covered through **existing savings** from emergency services and operational efficiencies.

System Integration:

- Shelter staff will be embedded across **transitional homes, intake hubs, and service pods**, forming the backbone of the new housing-first infrastructure.
- This ensures that **those who are housed continue to receive care**, while the system maintains full operational capacity during and after the transition.

Outcome: A unified, repurposed shelter workforce that delivers high-quality transitional housing services, supports newly housed residents, and ensures zero job losses — all within the existing budget.

Emergency & Other Service Savings Reinvestment Strategy — Toronto HomeFirst

Prepared by James D Golding October 16, 2025

Purpose: Toronto HomeFirst will generate $170M–$337M in annual avoided emergency costs across police, EMS, fire, hospitals, TTC, nonprofits and Parks/Admin/Bylaw and not including Shelter and Refugees base budgets. These savings should be reinvested into proactive, division-based systems that prevent crises, improve safety, and strengthen public trust.

Emergency & Other Services Savings — Totals Est.

Police: $40M–$70M

EMS: $20M–$40M

Fire: $5M–$12M

Hospitals/ER: $80M–$150M

TTC/Transit: $10M–$25M

Nonprofits: $10M–$25M

Parks/Admin/Bylaw: $5M–$15M

Total: $170M–$337M/year

EMS Division Reinvestments — Toronto HomeFirst

EMS - Summary: HomeFirst reduces repeat 911 calls and emergency transports by stabilizing high-needs individuals in housing; savings fund embedded paramedics, discharge coordination, and transitional care hubs so EMS shifts from reactive emergency response to proactive on-site care.

Embedded EMS Units — Concept: paramedics stationed in shelters/transitional homes; Structure: 1–2 paramedics per site;

Impact: faster care, fewer transports, better outcomes.

Cost: moderate, offset by fewer ambulance dispatches.

Discharge Coordination Teams — Concept: EMS-led teams linking hospitals to housing; Structure: 1 coordinator per hospital + EMS liaison; Impact: reduces readmissions, improves continuity.Cost: low, leverages existing staff.

Oversight — Emergency Calls: Existing: reactive dispatch; THF: embedded paramedics; Added: faster care, reduced transports.

Oversight — Discharge: Existing: ad hoc coordination; THF: dedicated teams.

Added: safer transitions.

Oversight — Health Outcomes: Existing: limited follow-up; THF: on-site care..

Added: stabilization, prevention. Oversight — Coordination: Existing: siloed EMS/hospital; THF: integrated pods.

Added: unified crisis response.

Fire Division Reinvestments — Toronto HomeFirst

Fire - Summary: HomeFirst prevents encampment fires and shelter hazards by stabilizing residents and funding prevention programs; savings support outreach, inspections, and training so fire services shift toward prevention and community safety.

Fire Prevention Outreach — Concept: fire staff embedded in housing hubs for education and hazard reduction..

Structure: 1–2 outreach officers per region.

Impact: fewer fires, safer housing.

Cost: low.

Embedded Safety Inspections — Concept: regular fire safety checks in transitional homes and repurposed shelters.

Structure: monthly rotations by inspectors.

Impact: early hazard detection, compliance; Cost: minimal.

Oversight — Encampment Fires: Existing: reactive response; THF: prevention outreach; Added: fewer incidents.

Oversight — Shelter Hazards: Existing: complaint-driven; THF: embedded inspections..

Added: early detection, compliance. Oversight — Public Education: Existing: limited; THF: housing-based outreach.

Added: resident engagement. Oversight — Coordination: Existing: isolated response; THF: integrated pods with EMS/Police.

Added: unified emergency handling.

Hospital Reinvestments — Toronto HomeFirst

Hospital - Summary: HomeFirst reduces ER visits, inpatient stays, and discharge delays by connecting patients to stable housing; savings fund hospital-based housing navigators and transitional care beds to improve recovery and free clinical capacity.

Hospital-Based Housing Navigators — Concept: navigators embedded in hospitals to link patients to housing services.

Structure: 1 navigator per major hospital; Impact: faster discharge, reduced readmissions.

Cost: moderate. Transitional Care Beds — Concept: short-term recovery beds tied to HomeFirst placements.

Structure: 5–10 beds per hospital (shared access).

Impact: safer recovery, less shelter reliance.

Cost: scalable, shared funding.

Oversight — ER Overload: Existing: high repeat visits; THF: housing-linked discharge.

Added: reduced strain.

Oversight — Discharge Delays: Existing: shelter bottlenecks; THF: navigators + beds; Added: faster transitions.

Oversight — Health Equity: Existing: fragmented supports; THF: embedded coordination.

Added: continuity of care. Oversight — Coordination: Existing: siloed hospital/EMS; THF: integrated pods + ECC.

Added: unified crisis response.

Nonprofit Emergency Spend ($10M–$25M/year) — Toronto HomeFirst

Nonprofits — Summary: HomeFirst reduces duplication and emergency hotel spending while strengthening nonprofit impact.

savings fund outcome-based grants, embedded navigators, and coordinated intake systems to align services with measurable housing results.

Outcome-Based Grant Programs — Concept: funding tied to verified housing placements and stability metrics.

Structure: quarterly grant cycles with audits.

Impact: accountability, improved outcomes.

Cost: reallocated from emergency hotel spending. Embedded Navigators — Concept: NGO staff placed inside shelters and hospitals to guide residents into housing.

Structure: 1 navigator per site.

Impact: faster transitions, reduced shelter time.

Cost: moderate, shared staffing model.

Oversight — Funding: Existing: fragmented grants; THF: outcome-based grants.

Added: accountability, efficiency.

Oversight — Service Delivery: Existing: duplicated intake; THF: coordinated intake systems.

Added: streamlined access.

Oversight — Impact Measurement: Existing: varied metrics; THF: standardized KPIs.

Added: measurable results and public reporting.

Parks / Admin / Bylaw ($5M–$15M/year) — Toronto HomeFirst

Parks & Bylaw — Summary: HomeFirst reduces encampment removals, sanitation costs, and enforcement strain; savings fund community liaison teams, embedded outreach in parks, and volunteer stewardship to shift from enforcement to engagement. Community Liaison Teams —

Concept: staff trained in conflict resolution and housing referral embedded in park zones.

Structure: 1–2 liaisons per district.

Impact: fewer confrontations, faster housing connections.

Cost: low. Volunteer Stewardship Programs — Concept: housed residents engage in park restoration and outreach.

Structure: weekly shifts coordinated by NGOs.

Impact: restored parks, civic pride.

Cost: minimal. Oversight — Encampment Response: Existing: eviction-focused; THF: liaison teams + outreach.

Added: de-escalation, housing-first. Oversight — Park Conditions: Existing: reactive cleanup; THF: volunteer stewardship.

Added: restoration. Oversight — Public Trust: Existing: mixed; THF: embedded community teams.

Added: transparency, healing. Oversight — Coordination: Existing: siloed enforcement; THF: integrated pods + ECC.

Added: unified response.

Police Division Reinvestments — Toronto HomeFirst

Police - Summary: HomeFirst reduces police calls tied to homelessness, mental-health crises, and encampments by stabilizing residents in housing; savings are reinvested into mobile crisis teams, housing navigators, and embedded outreach units so police can focus on core public safety while reducing overtime and emergency dispatch costs.

Street-Level Rapid Response Teams — Concept: 24/7 mobile units in each division targeting thefts, assaults, disturbances & major crimes.

Structure: 3 shifts/day; 2–3 officers + vehicle per shift; Impact: deterrence, faster response, reduced repeat offenses; Cost: scalable, pilot 2–3 divisions.

Cold Case Units — Concept: small division-based teams of retired detectives and civilian analysts; Structure: 1–2 investigators + 1 analyst; Impact: backlog reduction, case resolution, support for victims.

Cost: moderate, part-time staffing. Oversight — Street Crime Response: Existing: reactive patrols; THF: 24/7 road teams.

Added: deterrence, faster response.

Oversight — Cold Case: Existing: centralized units; THF: division teams.

Added: local focus, backlog reduction.

Oversight — Community Trust: Existing: mixed; THF: embedded visible teams.

Added: transparency, engagement.

Oversight — Coordination: Existing: siloed response; THF: integrated pods with EMS/Fire.

Added: unified crisis handling, efficiency.

TTC System-Wide Reinvestments — Toronto HomeFirst

TTC - Summary: HomeFirst reduces sheltering in stations, fare evasion, and crisis calls on transit; savings fund outreach hubs, mental-health response teams, and staff training to restore safety and rider trust**.**

Station Outreach Hubs — Concept: outreach teams at high-traffic stations for referrals and support.

Structure: 1–2 staff per hub during peak hours.

Impact: reduced sheltering in stations, faster referrals.

Cost: low.

Mental Health Response Teams — Concept: mobile teams for de-escalation on TTC property; Structure: 2–3 staff per team, on-call rotation.

Impact: fewer police calls, safer rider experience.

Cost: moderate, shared with EMS/NGOs.

Oversight — Station Safety: Existing: enforcement-focused; THF: outreach hubs + MH teams; Added: prevention, de-escalation.

Oversight — Crisis Response: Existing: police-dependent; THF: mobile MH teams.

Added: reduced force use.

Oversight — Rider Experience: Existing: mixed; THF: embedded support.

Added: trust, accessibility. Oversight — Coordination: Existing: siloed TTC response; THF: integrated pods + ECC.

Added: unified emergency handling.

Unified Emergency Response Model (Cross-Agency) — Toronto HomeFirst

1. Integrated Emergency Pods

Participants: Police, EMS, Fire, TTC, Hospitals, Parks/Admin/Bylaw **Concept:** Mobile or co-located units staffed by cross-trained or coordinated teams from multiple divisions. **Use Cases:**

- Overdoses, fires, assaults, mental health crises
- Transit emergencies (stations, vehicles)
- Park incidents, encampment safety, bylaw mediation
- Shelter zone disturbances or medical events
- Hospital discharge coordination for unstable patients **Impact:**
- Reduces duplication and dispatch delays
- Improves safety and response time across public spaces
- Builds public trust through visible, coordinated presence
- Supports HomeFirst stabilization and transitional housing

2. Emergency Coordination Command (ECC)

Purpose: Real-time coordination across all divisions using shared dashboards, dispatch logic, and incident tracking. **Participants:**

- Toronto Police
- Toronto EMS
- Toronto Fire
- TTC Operations
- Hospital ER intake teams
- Parks & Bylaw Services
- HomeFirst Program Office **Impact:**
- Smarter deployment of emergency resources
- Reduced overlap and siloed responses
- Better planning for seasonal surges and hotspot zones
- Integrated data for audits, reinvestment, and public reporting

3. Embedded Response Hubs (Fixed Sites)

Concept: Mini-hubs at high-traffic or high-risk locations (e.g., TTC stations, shelters, parks, hospitals) with rotating staff from emergency services. **Impact:**

- Immediate on-site response
- Reduces strain on citywide dispatch
- Improves safety perception and public engagement
- Supports HomeFirst placements and discharge transitions

4. Community Liaison & Prevention Teams

Concept: Outreach teams from Parks, Bylaw, and NGOs trained to mediate minor incidents, educate residents, and prevent escalation. **Impact:**

- Reduces enforcement burden
- Builds trust in vulnerable communities
- Supports HomeFirst volunteer pathways and civic engagement
- Enhances safety in repurposed shelters and public spaces
- gaps.

✅ Next Steps

Phase 1: Pilot police road teams and cold case units in 2–3 divisions with high crime and unresolved case backlogs.

Phase 2: Add EMS units and explore stabilization house models in divisions with high ER repeaters and vulnerable discharge populations.

Phase 3: Staff fire backup crews and launch fire prevention outreach in repurposed shelter zones and high-risk housing clusters.

Phase 4: Validate outcomes across all pilot programs and scale citywide using audited HomeFirst emergency savings.

Phase 5: Propose TTC and hospital enhancements to Council and provincial partners, including emergency hubs and discharge coordination units.

Phase 6: Launch Parks & Recreation volunteer corps and student employment programs; deploy bylaw outreach and mediation teams in transitional zones.

Phase 7: Fund nonprofit grants and navigator programs tied to HomeFirst metrics; activate emergency relief reserves for seasonal surges and service gaps.

James D Golding

Recommended Council Motions and Requests for Staff Implementation

Motion 1 — Immediate Phase 1 Pilot Authorization and Funding Source

Whereas Toronto faces acute shelter capacity pressures and significant avoidable emergency spending across police, EMS, fire, hospitals, TTC, parks, and nonprofit responses; Whereas the Toronto HomeFirst proposal presents a fully costed Phase 1 pilot that repurposes existing capacity, places vulnerable residents into stable housing, and redeploys audited emergency savings into prevention and supports; Therefore be it resolved that Council direct City staff to implement Phase 1 of the Toronto HomeFirst pilot in 2–3 identified divisions, including police road teams, cold-case support alignment, embedded EMS units, and stabilization house planning, and to fund initial implementation from audited emergency savings subject to reconciliation and reporting to Council.

Directives to staff:

- Identify 2–3 divisions for Phase 1 pilots and submit an implementation plan within 21 days.
- Produce an interim budget showing proposed draw(s) from audited emergency savings, including proposed guardrails and repayment model, within 30 days.
- Begin operational pilot activities within 45–60 days of Council approval, subject to staff confirmation of public safety and procurement requirements.

Reporting:

- Provide biweekly status updates to the Mayor and Council during the pilot startup period and a comprehensive pilot report at 90 days with performance metrics, cost reconciliation, and recommended next steps.

Motion 2 — Public Audit of Shelter Allocation Decisions and Reserve Use

Whereas transparency and equitable allocation of shelter resources are prerequisites to public trust and lawful exercise of municipal discretion; Therefore be it resolved that Council commission an independent public audit examining shelter allocation decisions, intake prioritization, reserve draws, and extraordinary shelter spending for the most recent 18-month period.

Directives to staff:

- Retain an independent auditor or inspector with homelessness/shelter policy expertise within 14 days.
- Provide the auditor full access to relevant budget memos, intake protocols, allocation criteria, reserve draw records, and communications concerning shelter bed allocation.
- Require the auditor to deliver a public report within 30 days, including specific findings, redacted evidence where required for privacy, and actionable recommendations.

Reporting:

- Auditor’s report to be tabled at the next Council meeting following receipt and to be posted publicly with an executive summary.

Motion 3 — Interim Need-Based Intake and Prioritization Protocol

Whereas evidence shows preventable harm when intake and allocation lack transparent, need-based criteria; Therefore be it resolved that Council adopt interim, transparent, need-based emergency shelter intake and prioritization protocols to remain in effect pending completion of the audit and HomeFirst pilot evaluation.

Directives to staff:

- Draft interim intake criteria prioritizing imminent risk to life, medical vulnerability, and length of homelessness using recognized clinical and outreach tools within 7 days.
- Train frontline intake staff, bylaw outreach teams, and partnered NGOs on interim criteria and documentation procedures within 14 days.
- Establish an internal complaint and rapid review channel for denied requests that yields decisions within 72 hours.

Reporting:

- Submit the interim protocol and training confirmation to Council within 14 days and publish the protocol publicly with contact information for rapid review.

Motion 4 — Use of Audited Emergency Savings for HomeFirst with Guardrails

Whereas HomeFirst demonstrates a route to convert avoidable emergency expenditures into sustainable housing and prevention investments; Therefore be it resolved that Council authorize the controlled use of audited emergency savings to fund HomeFirst pilot activities, subject to robust guardrails, repayment models, and independent oversight.

Directives to staff:

- Prepare a detailed fiscal memorandum within 21 days outlining the audited emergency savings balance, proposed draw amounts for Phase 1, repayment timeline, and contingency holdbacks.
- Establish fiscal guardrails requiring monthly reconciliation, external audit at 6 months, and an automatic pause trigger if agreed performance metrics fall below predefined thresholds.
- Return to Council for approval prior to any draw exceeding the proposed Phase 1 cap.

Reporting:

- Monthly fiscal reconciliation reports to Council and public dashboard updates on savings redeployed and fiscal status.

Motion 5 — Establish Independent Oversight and Public Dashboard

Whereas independent oversight and transparent performance metrics are essential for accountability and public confidence; Therefore be it resolved that Council establish an independent HomeFirst Oversight Board and a public Dashboard to monitor pilot outcomes, fiscal impacts, and equitable access.

Directives to staff:

- Convene an Oversight Board within 30 days comprised of representatives from City staff, public health, frontline NGOs, tenant and lived-experience advocates, legal counsel, and an independent auditor.
- Build and publish a real-time Dashboard within 45 days that displays key metrics: number housed, shelter conversions, emergency response reductions, health outcomes, demographic breakdowns (privacy protected), and fiscal reconciliations.
- Require quarterly public oversight reports and an independent 6-month evaluation.

Reporting:

- Oversight Board charter, membership list, and Dashboard URL to be provided to Council within 45 days.

Motion 6 — Hospital, TTC, Parks, Bylaw, and Nonprofit Coordination Agreements

Whereas successful HomeFirst implementation requires cross-system coordination with hospitals, TTC, parks and bylaw services, and nonprofit partners; Therefore be it resolved that Council direct City Manager to negotiate Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with Toronto hospitals, TTC, Parks & Recreation, Bylaw Services, and major nonprofit partners to operationalize embedded navigators, discharge coordination, embedded hubs, and volunteer pathways.

Directives to staff:

- Begin MOU negotiations within 14 days and report back with draft MOUs and any required budget/allocation changes within 30 days.
- Include commitments on data-sharing protocols, role definitions, liability coverage, and timelines for operational integration.

Reporting:

- Provide Council with finalized MOUs or a timeline for completion and any barriers requiring Council direction.

Motion 7 — Immediate Protection for Encampment Intake Complaints and Rapid Response

Whereas individuals in encampments have reported denied or delayed housing requests and face imminent risk; Therefore be it resolved that Council request staff to establish a rapid response team to review encampment intake complaints and to prioritize placements where imminent risk is identified.

Directives to staff:

- Form a rapid review team within 7 days composed of outreach staff, intake officers, clinical assessors, and a legal advisor.
- Implement a 72-hour rapid review and placement or clear, documented justification procedure for any denial.
- Document and publish anonymized case outcomes weekly for Council review.

Reporting:

- Weekly anonymized summaries of rapid review outcomes to Council for 60 days.

HomeFirst Bottom Line — Full System Transition Summary

Year One: Housing, Stabilization, and Reserve Deployment

- 15,400 residents moved out of shelters and encampments into permanent housing with one full year of support (rent, services, stabilization funding).
- Reserves from the $790M bridge cover all initial housing costs.
- Incoming tax revenue replenishes spent reserves over the fiscal year.
- Remaining funds cover ongoing shelter operations for new arrivals and transitional needs.
- Shelter system capacity: 30 retained sites × 80 beds = 2,400 transitional spaces maintained during rollout.

Year Two: Stabilization Extension, Shelter Repurposing, and Fiscal Recovery

- 30% of housed residents (≈4,620 people) receive an additional 6 months of support at reduced cost if needed.
- Shelter base funds are redirected to repurpose the remaining 45 shelters and fund their operations until transition is complete.
- All 90 shelters are fully repurposed within two years using existing funds — no new taxation required.
- Reserves are fully restored by the end of Year Two.

Post-Transition: Tax Relief, Revenue Offset, and Housing Expansion

- City tax rates can be reduced below current levels due to stabilized spending and reserve recovery.
- 30% of shelters remain funded post-transition to support emergency and overflow needs.
- Shelter base budget becomes a permanent funding stream for annual rent subsidies, housing allowances, and affordability programs.
- New revenue streams can help offset costs across COHB, RGI, TCHC, RHI, and other housing supports.
- Affordable housing construction proceeds without disruption, supported by surplus capacity and embedded services.
- Housing units remain available — ensuring that any Toronto resident can access affordable housing without delay.

System Safeguard: Refugee Intake Pause

- A 6-month hold on new refugee arrivals is recommended to prevent system strain during the final transition and stabilization phase.

✅ Final Outcome

15,400 people permanently housed in 6 months to 12 months. The shelter system is transformed in 12 - 24 months. The budget stabilized. Taxes can be reduced. Housing guaranteed for all. Annual subsidies secured with plenty to go around if needed!

Legal Argument

Title Toronto HomeFirst — Legal and Policy Argument for Equitable Shelter Allocation, Duty of Care, and Emergency Reinvestment

Executive Statement This attachment summarizes legal and administrative grounds supporting immediate Council directives to adopt HomeFirst pilots, commission a public audit, and implement interim equitable intake protections. The facts summarized below and the attached documentary evidence support administrative fairness review, fiduciary accountability, urgent protective measures, and Charter-aligned equity arguments where warranted.

Legal Foundations

- Section 7 and Section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms protect life, liberty and security of the person and equality before and under the law. Differential access to emergency shelter and supports raises serious equality and life-safety concerns meriting review.
- Administrative law requires that public discretionary decisions be transparent, reasoned, and procedurally fair. Undocumented or unexplained allocation practices risk review and corrective measures.
- Council and City officials owe fiduciary and statutory duties to allocate public funds equitably and to justify extraordinary reserve draws and emergency spending.
- Governments may be required to take reasonable measures to prevent foreseeable harm to identifiable populations when failure to act would create a real risk to life or health.

Key Factual Allegations Supporting Relief

- The City has publicly reported severe shelter capacity pressures and extraordinary emergency spending to address surges in demand.
- Independent investigative findings and public reporting identify procedural flaws in aspects of shelter allocation with documented real-life consequences.
- Public health and outreach data document elevated mortality and preventable harms among people experiencing homelessness over defined periods.
- Representative intake and encampment records show instances where individuals seeking shelter were denied, delayed, or deprioritized while other groups received coordinated and immediate access.
- Municipal budget and intergovernmental correspondence demonstrate extraordinary fiscal strain and the potential use of reserves and local revenue adjustments to cover shelter spending.

Remedies and Requests Administrative Remedies

- Immediate disclosure to Council and the independent auditor of all decision records, intake criteria, allocation memos, and reserve draw documentation for the relevant 18-month period.
- Adoption of interim need-based intake protocols prioritizing imminent risk to life and medical vulnerability pending audit and pilots. Charter and Protective Remedies
- If warranted by the evidentiary record and in consultation with counsel, pursue Charter or administrative filings seeking declaratory or injunctive relief to enforce equitable access and prevent imminent harm. Policy and Implementation Remedies
- Authorize controlled use of audited emergency savings to fund Phase 1 HomeFirst pilots subject to monthly reconciliation, external audit at 6 months, and automatic pause triggers tied to predefined performance metrics.
- Commission an independent public audit with full access to budget and intake records and publish an executive summary and recommendations.
- Establish an independent HomeFirst Oversight Board and a public Dashboard to monitor equitable access, outcomes, and fiscal reconciliation.

Standard of Proof and Thresholds

- Administrative review requires evidence of procedural unfairness, lack of reasoned decision-making, or abuse of discretion on the administrative record.
- Charter claims require showing differential treatment linked to an enumerated or analogous ground and that any limitation is not demonstrably justified.
- Urgent protective relief requires credible evidence of imminent and serious risk to life or health not mitigable by existing practices.

Conclusion and Call for Action The attached evidence and legal framework support urgent administrative and policy remedies to prevent further loss of life, restore equitable access to shelter, and reallocate avoidable emergency spending into effective housing and prevention. Council is requested to direct staff and City legal services to proceed with the motions and investigative steps set out in the package and to engage independent auditors and counsel as required.

Declaration of a Homelessness-Free Toronto — Amendment: Mayoral Non-Regression Clause

Preamble addition We, the Mayor and Members of Toronto City Council, together with community partners and the HomeFirst Oversight Board, formally commit that once the measurable standards for ending chronic homelessness are achieved and certified, no future Mayor shall permit homelessness to escalate to or beyond the levels experienced prior to this Declaration.

Mayoral Non-Regression Clause

1. Binding Commitment — Council hereby directs staff to draft and enact a municipal bylaw that codifies the City's commitment that no Mayor shall allow chronic homelessness to return to or exceed the certified baseline levels existing at the time of this Declaration.
2. Fiscal Protections — The bylaw must require the Mayor and City administration to maintain minimum funding levels for the HomeFirst Continuity Fund, Emergency Housing Reserve, and core prevention services sufficient to prevent re-escalation. Funding floors will be indexed annually to inflation and population pressure.
3. Automatic Review Trigger — Any increase in measurable homelessness indicators that approaches 50% of the certified baseline for two consecutive quarters will automatically trigger a Council emergency review, immediate implementation of the HomeFirst Emergency Mitigation Plan, and temporary restrictions on reallocation of designated HomeFirst funds.
4. Reporting and Accountability — The Mayor must deliver quarterly public reports to Council and the HomeFirst Oversight Board demonstrating compliance with funding floors, service capacity, and prevention metrics. The Oversight Board will publish an annual certification of compliance.
5. Remedial Authority — Council retains authority to direct emergency appropriation of municipal resources to the HomeFirst Continuity Fund and to enact temporary extraordinary measures to restore service capacity if early indicators show regression.
6. Resident Standing and Remedies — Residents and lived-experience representatives retain standing to petition Council and the Oversight Board for immediate review if they believe the Mayor's actions or inaction materially risk re-escalation; Council must consider such petitions within 14 days.
7. Transition and Succession — Succession planning obligations will be incorporated into the bylaw to ensure continuity across mayoral terms, including mandated handover briefings and documentation for incoming administrations on HomeFirst funding, contracts, and operational status.
8. Legal and Policy Safeguards — City staff and City Legal will prepare enabling bylaw language, procurement and contract provisions, and intergovernmental funding agreements necessary to operationalize this clause and to defend it against legal or administrative challenges.

Implementation directive Council directs the City Manager and City Legal to prepare the required bylaw, regulatory instruments, and budgetary schedules within 30 days for Council consideration and to transmit a draft to the HomeFirst Oversight Board for review prior to the Council vote.

This amendment will be appended to the Declaration of a Homelessness-Free Toronto and will take effect upon Council adoption of the enabling bylaw and certification by the independent auditor and Oversight Board.

Effective Date:

Signatures:

Toronto HomeFirst — Strategic Q&A for Council and Oversight

Submitted by: James Douglas Golding

Date: October 23, 2025

Purpose: To accompany the Toronto HomeFirst housing plan and audit package with survivor-informed questions, clarifying statements, and moral framing for Council, oversight offices, and media.

Strategic Questions for Council, Staff, and Oversight

1. **If this plan doesn't end homelessness — what will?**
2. Why are reserves accessed for emergency shelter expansion, but not for permanent housing?
3. What is the city's current timeline to end chronic homelessness — and where is it published?
4. Why are 15,400 people still unhoused when the city has the budget, units, and legal authority to act?
5. What protections are in place to ensure emergency shelter spending is temporary, not permanent?
6. Why are shelter staff and residents excluded from system design when they live it every day?
7. Will Council commit to a public vote on the HomeFirst motions — or will this be buried in committee?
8. What is the city's plan to reduce taxpayer burden once emergency spending is stabilized?
9. Why are 3,070 refugees moved from shelters into housing, while 3,070 Canadians remain unhoused?
10. What is the city's plan to engage real estate agents, property managers, and homeowners in housing solutions?

Survivor-Informed Commentary

If the City of Toronto can move 3,070 refugees from shelters into housing, then it can move 3,070 Canadians into permanent homes too.

This plan puts money directly into the pockets of homeowners, landlords, property managers, and even real estate agents — anyone with a unit to lease can be part of the solution.

Toronto HomeFirst eliminates the need for 20 new shelters. It brings safety, security, and dignity. It empties parks and streets. It lowers emergency costs and restores public trust.

It gives people comfort knowing their government did something powerful — something that worked.

If we're serious about rebuilding this city, this province, and this country, we need to start at the bottom and work our way up.

Right now, Toronto feels like a Jenga tower — built decades ago, now falling apart. But instead of reinforcing the foundation, the government keeps fixing from the top down.

That's not just inefficient. That's failure.

Let's start from the bottom up — with housing, dignity, and a plan that works.

Closing Statement

This addendum is submitted alongside the full Toronto HomeFirst proposal and audit package. I am prepared to brief Council, oversight offices, or media directly, and I welcome a formal response. I am not asking for special treatment. I am asking for equal treatment — for everyone.

Respectfully, **James Douglas Golding** Toronto Resident | Survivor | Builder of HomeFirst
jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | 437-994-7912

COVER LETTER — TTC SUPER EXPRESS A–F UNIVERSAL TRANSIT FLOW SYSTEM

To Whom It May Concern,

December 2025

I am writing to submit a comprehensive proposal titled **"The TTC Super Express A–F Universal Transit Flow System: A Complete Operational, Workforce, and Fare Reform Strategy for a Modern Toronto Transit Network."** As a lifelong TTC rider and Toronto resident, I have developed this multi-part plan to address the urgent challenges facing our transit system, including reliability, overcrowding, operator stress, financial sustainability, and regional fairness.

This proposal brings together operational improvements, workforce support, veteran engagement, and a fair, sustainable fare model. The goal is simple: build a TTC that is more reliable, more equitable, and more financially stable without increasing pressure on Toronto taxpayers.

The proposal includes five integrated parts: a new A–F route flow system to reduce bunching and improve reliability; a technical framework that supports real-time operations; a safe, non-enforcement Veteran Transit Support Program that provides meaningful roles for veterans while easing pressure on TTC staff; a workforce strategy that expands operator training capacity and reduces burnout; and a universal $2 flat fare model that ensures fairness for all riders, including those crossing municipal boundaries.

This proposal provides the full operational framework and policy direction. The detailed modeling, simulations, scheduling outputs, and cost analyses required for implementation fall within the TTC's internal planning and engineering teams, who are best positioned to complete that work.

I'm proud of this work and hope it can contribute positively to the ongoing discussion about how to modernize and stabilize Toronto's transit system. I would be happy to discuss any part of the proposal in more detail.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
437-994-7912
jamesdgolding@hotmail.com
firetabletjames@gmail.com

TTC SUPER EXPRESS A–F UNIVERSAL TRANSIT FLOW SYSTEM PROPOSAL PART A

A Modern Operating Model for TTC Bus, Streetcar, and LRT Operations

Submitted by:

James D. Golding

Toronto, Ontario

Lifelong TTC User

Cell: 437-994-7912

Emails: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com

Date: December 23, 2025

To:

- Toronto Transit Commission Board
- TTC CEO
- Mayor of Toronto
- Premier of Ontario
- Ontario Ministry of Transportation
- City of Toronto Executive Committee
- Metrolinx Leadership

EXECUTIVE PROPOSAL

Toronto's transit system is facing familiar challenges: crowding, bunching, slow service, unpredictable headways, and rising operating costs. At the same time, the TTC is transitioning toward full fleet electrification — a process that must be efficient, cost-effective, and operationally stable.

This proposal introduces the **A–F Universal Transit Flow System**, a unified operating model that restructures TTC bus, streetcar, and LRT service into a predictable, repeating flow of Super Express, Express, Local, Short-Turn, and Garage-Integrated service. The system is designed to:

- Reduce crowding
- Eliminate bunching
- Improve reliability
- Reduce operating kilometres
- Increase fare revenue
- Extend vehicle and battery life
- Reduce emissions and fuel use
- Support electrification in a cost-efficient way
- Improve real-time responsiveness
- Convert deadheads into revenue service

The TTC already has the operational skills, training, and infrastructure to implement this model **quickly**, without slowing down service or requiring major new capital investments. This system accelerates TTC performance — it does not complicate it.

A recommended pilot corridor is **Lawrence Avenue**, one of Toronto's longest, busiest, and most operationally challenging bus corridors. Its length, ridership, and diversity of traffic conditions make it ideal for testing a dynamic, self-correcting service model.

1. PURPOSE

The A–F Universal Transit Flow System provides a modern, scalable operating philosophy that:

- Improves reliability and headway consistency
- Reduces wasted kilometres and fuel consumption
- Increases fare revenue through faster, more dependable service
- Supports electrification by optimizing duty cycles
- Reduces crowding and improves rider experience
- Enhances real-time control and responsiveness
- Works across all surface modes (bus, streetcar, LRT)

This system is designed to be simple for riders, powerful for operations, and immediately implementable by TTC staff.

2. THE A–F SERVICE HIERARCHY

A — SUPER EXPRESS (Electric Priority)

- Stops at every **third** major intersection
- Fastest service on the corridor
- Carries long-distance riders
- Acts as the **real-time "scout"**, reporting traffic, crowding, and stop backlog
- Ideal for electrification due to predictable, low-stress duty cycles

B — EXPRESS (Electric Priority)

- Stops at every major intersection
- Clears demand at key nodes
- Reduces pressure on local buses
- Also ideal for electrification

C — LOCAL

- Stops at every stop
- Provides full coverage
- Serves short-distance riders
- Feeds A/B at major intersections

D — SHORT TURN (Dynamic)

- Deployed based on real-time A-bus intel
- Fills gaps
- Absorbs sudden demand spikes
- Converts deadheads into revenue service

E — GARAGE SERVICE

- Pull-in/out trips that can carry passengers
- Reduces wasted kilometres
- Supports flow during peak periods

F — OUT OF SERVICE

- Maintenance or emergency moves only

This hierarchy creates a predictable, layered corridor where every vehicle has a defined role.

3. FLOW TIMING MODEL

Vehicles operate in a repeating sequence:

A → B → C → D (if needed) → E (if available)

Recommended spacing: **2–3 minutes** between vehicles.

This creates:

- A constant rolling flow
- Natural bunching prevention
- Predictable rider choices (speed vs coverage)
- Higher revenue per kilometre
- A corridor rhythm that is easy to manage and easy to ride

4. THE A-BUS “SCOUT” INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM

A-buses move fastest and reach major intersections first. This makes them the ideal real-time intelligence source.

A-bus operators report:

- Passenger load
- Stop backlog
- Traffic congestion
- Intersection delays
- Crowding at major nodes

TTC Control uses this information to:

- Deploy D-layer short turns
- Adjust B/C spacing
- Insert E-layer garage buses into service
- Prevent bunching
- Respond to congestion in real time

This creates a **self-correcting corridor** — something the TTC has long needed.

5. ELECTRIFICATION STRATEGY

Electrifying the A and B layers first provides:

- Predictable duty cycles
- Lower energy use
- Less battery stress
- Longer battery life
- Fewer charge cycles
- Lower operating cost per kilometre
- More regenerative braking
- More reliable scheduling

This approach **extends the life of TTC's electric fleet** and reduces the need for expensive fast-charging infrastructure.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL & FLEET LONGEVITY BENEFITS

This system reduces:

- Fuel consumption
- Emissions
- Battery wear
- Brake wear
- Idling
- Stop-and-go stress

By smoothing out service and reducing unnecessary kilometres, the TTC extends the lifespan of:

- Buses
- Electric batteries
- Streetcars (through reduced bunching and smoother flow)

This is a **green operating model**, not just a transit model.

7. SAVINGS & REVENUE IMPACT

Estimated annual benefit: **$39–71 million** through:

- Reduced operating kilometres
- Lower energy and fuel costs
- Longer battery life
- Increased fare revenue from faster, more reliable service

These savings grow as the system scales.

8. PILOT CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATION: LAWRENCE AVENUE

Lawrence Avenue is ideal because:

- It is one of Toronto's **longest** continuous bus corridors
- It has **high ridership**
- It experiences **frequent bunching**
- It has **diverse traffic conditions**
- It connects multiple subway lines
- It has **significant deadheading** opportunities for D/E layers

A pilot on Lawrence would produce clear, measurable results quickly.

9. IMPLEMENTATION READINESS

The TTC can implement this system **much sooner than a typical pilot** because:

- Operators already understand express/local patterns
- Control staff already manage short turns
- TTC already uses real-time data
- No new infrastructure is required
- No new fleet is required
- Scheduling tools (HASTUS) already support this model
- Public communication can be layered onto existing channels

This proposal **speeds up** TTC operations — it does not slow them down.

10. DIGITAL SUPPORT: TTC ONLINE BUS MAP

The TTC can support this system with:

- A real-time online map showing A/B/C/D/E layers
- Clear stop icons for Super Express, Express, and Local
- Predictable countdowns
- Rider-friendly visualizations

This improves transparency and rider confidence.

11. RISK MANAGEMENT

Risks include:

- Rider confusion
- Operator adjustment
- Traffic unpredictability

Mitigation:

- Clear signage
- Public education
- Operator training (minimal, since TTC is already familiar with express/local logic)
- Conservative electrification strategy
- Real-time monitoring

12. IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Because TTC is already trained and equipped, the timeline can be accelerated:

Months 0–2: Planning, scheduling, signage

Months 2–4: Operator orientation, control center preparation

Month 4: Pilot launch on Lawrence Avenue

Months 4–12: Pilot operation and refinement

Month 12: Evaluation and decision to scale

CONCLUSION

The A–F Universal Transit Flow System is a modern, efficient, and immediately implementable operating model that addresses Toronto's most persistent transit challenges. It improves reliability, reduces crowding, eliminates bunching, and supports electrification — all while reducing costs and extending fleet life.

The TTC is already trained and capable of implementing this system quickly.

The benefits are substantial, measurable, and aligned with Toronto's long-term transit and environmental goals.

A pilot on Lawrence Avenue would demonstrate the system's value rapidly and provide a blueprint for citywide expansion.

This proposal is submitted with the goal of helping Toronto build a faster, cleaner, more reliable transit system for all riders.

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Golding

Toronto, Ontario

Lifelong TTC User

437-994-7912

jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

firetabletjames@gmail.com

TTC SUPER EXPRESS A–F UNIVERSAL TRANSIT FLOW SYSTEM PROPOSAL — PART B

Technical Comparison, Operational Analysis, and Mode Integration Framework

Submitted by:
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
Lifelong TTC Rider
Cell: 437-994-7912

Emails: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com

Date: December 23, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Part B provides the technical foundation for the TTC Super Express A–F Universal Transit Flow System.

Where Part A presents the vision, structure, and implementation plan, Part B explains:

- How the A–F model compares to the TTC's current operating model
- Why the A–F model improves reliability, speed, and efficiency
- How the system applies to **buses**, **streetcars**, and **LRT lines**
- How the A–F model supports electrification, fleet longevity, and emissions reduction

This document is intended for TTC operations staff, planners, schedulers, and decision-makers who require a deeper understanding of how the system works in practice.

1. COMPARISON: CURRENT TTC MODEL VS A–F MODEL

1.1 Overview of Current TTC Operations

Today's TTC surface network operates primarily on:

- **Single-pattern routes** (mostly all-stop local service)
- **Occasional express overlays** (but not system-wide or coordinated)
- **Headway-based supervision** that is often reactive
- **Short turns used as emergency recovery**, not strategic tools
- **Deadheads that run empty**
- **Mixed-traffic delays** that cause bunching and gaps
- **Electric buses operating in unpredictable duty cycles**

The result is a network that struggles with:

- Bunching
- Long gaps
- Slow travel times
- Overcrowding
- Unpredictable service
- High operating kilometres
- Inefficient use of fleet and energy

1.2 Overview of the A–F Model

The A–F model restructures corridors into a **layered, predictable flow**:

- **A – Super Express (Electric)**
- **B – Express (Electric)**
- **C – Local**
- **D – Short Turn (Dynamic)**
- **E – Garage Service**
- **F – Out of Service**

This creates a **self-correcting corridor** where:

- A-buses act as scouts
- D-buses fill gaps
- E-buses reduce wasted km
- B/C spacing is actively managed
- Riders choose speed vs coverage
- Electrification is optimized

1.3 Direct Comparison Table

Category	Current TTC Model	A–F Universal Transit Flow System
Service Structure	Mostly single-pattern routes	Layered A/B/C/D/E/F hierarchy
Bunching Control	Reactive, often late	Proactive, A-bus intel + D short turns
Deadheads	Mostly empty	Converted to E-service
Rider Choice	Limited	Clear choice: Super Express, Express, Local
Electrification	Route-based, unpredictable cycles	Layer-based, optimized cycles
Real-Time Control	Alerts + manual intervention	Built-in intelligence from A-buses
Corridor Rhythm	Irregular	Predictable 2–3 minute flow
Fleet Stress	High stop-and-go	Reduced through A/B limited-stop patterns
Cost Efficiency	Moderate	High — fewer wasted km, more revenue km

2. HOW THE A–F MODEL IMPROVES TTC BUS OPERATIONS

2.1 Reliability and Bunching Prevention

Current:

Buses bunch frequently due to congestion, uneven passenger loads, and slow recovery times.

A–F Model:

- A-buses detect congestion early
- Control deploys D short turns before gaps form
- B/C spacing is adjusted dynamically
- E buses fill in when needed

Result:

A corridor that maintains its rhythm even under heavy traffic.

2.2 Faster Travel Times

Current:

Local buses stop frequently, slowing down long-distance riders.

A–F Model:

- A Super Express stops every third major intersection
- B Express stops at major intersections only
- C Local handles short trips

Result:

- Faster long-distance trips
- Less crowding on locals
- More efficient use of fleet capacity

2.3 Reduced Operating Kilometres

Current:

Deadheads and bunching waste kilometres.

A–F Model:

- Deadheads become E-service
- D short turns prevent wasted km from bunching
- A/B/C spacing reduces duplication

Result:

Lower fuel, energy, and maintenance costs.

2.4 Electrification Benefits

Electric buses perform best with:

- Predictable duty cycles
- Fewer stops
- Controlled charging windows
- Less thermal stress

The A/B layers provide exactly that.

Result:

- Longer battery life
- Lower energy cost per km
- More reliable electric service

3. HOW THE A–F MODEL APPLIES TO LRT LINES

LRT lines already have:

- High capacity
- Dedicated right-of-way
- Turnback points
- Platform-level boarding

The A–F model enhances these strengths.

3.1 LRT A/B/C Patterns

- **A – Super Express LRT**
  - Stops only at major hubs
  - Ideal for peak periods
- **B – Express LRT**
  - Stops at major stops
  - Skips minor platforms
- **C – Local LRT**
  - Standard all-stop pattern

3.2 LRT D Short Turns

LRT lines have crossovers and turnback points.

D-layer LRT vehicles can:

- Fill gaps
- Relieve crowding
- Restore headways

This is especially useful on long lines like Eglinton Crosstown.

3.3 LRT E Garage Service

Some yard-to-line movements can carry passengers, reducing wasted km.

4. HOW THE A–F MODEL APPLIES TO STREETCARS

Streetcars face:

- Mixed traffic
- Limited passing opportunities
- Frequent bunching
- Slow recovery from delays

The A–F model provides structure and predictability.

4.1 Streetcar A/B/C Patterns

- **A – Super Express Streetcar**
  - Stops only at major intersections
  - Useful on King, Queen, Dundas
- **B – Express Streetcar**
  - Stops at key stops only
- **C – Local Streetcar**
  - Standard all-stop pattern

4.2 Streetcar D Short Turns

Streetcar loops and turnbacks can be used more strategically:

- Roncesvalles
- Woodbine Loop
- Distillery Loop
- Bathurst Loop
- Broadview
- Humber Loop

Short turns become **planned tools**, not emergency measures.

4.3 Streetcar E Garage Service

Carhouse departures can carry passengers where safe and practical.

5. ELECTRIFICATION, EMISSIONS, AND FLEET LONGEVITY

The A–F model reduces:

- Battery stress
- Fuel consumption
- Brake wear
- Idling
- Stop-and-go cycles

This extends the life of:

- Electric buses
- Hybrid buses
- Streetcars
- LRT vehicles

It also reduces emissions and energy use across the network.

6. WHY THE A–F MODEL IS IMMEDIATELY IMPLEMENTABLE

The TTC already has:

- Operators trained in express/local logic
- Control staff familiar with short turns
- Real-time vehicle tracking
- Scheduling tools (HASTUS) that support layered service
- Public communication channels
- A fleet capable of supporting A/B/C/D/E layers

No new infrastructure is required.
No new fleet is required.

No major capital investment is required.

This is an **operational upgrade**, not a construction project.

CONCLUSION

Part B demonstrates that the TTC Super Express A–F Universal Transit Flow System is not only visionary — it is technically sound, operationally feasible, and fully compatible with TTC's existing infrastructure and workforce.

The A–F model:

- Improves reliability
- Reduces crowding
- Eliminates bunching
- Supports electrification
- Reduces emissions
- Extends fleet life
- Cuts wasted kilometres
- Enhances rider experience
- Works for buses, streetcars, and LRT

This technical foundation supports the case for launching a pilot on **Lawrence Avenue**, with the potential for citywide expansion.

Respectfully submitted,
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
Lifelong TTC User
437-994-7912
Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com
Email: firetabletjames@gmail.com

TTC SUPER EXPRESS A–F UNIVERSAL TRANSIT FLOW SYSTEM PROPOSAL — PART C

Veteran Transit Support Program (VTSP)

A Safe, Non-Enforcement, Cost-Neutral Support Framework for TTC Operations

Submitted by:
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
Lifelong TTC Rider
Cell: 437-994-7912

Emails: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com

Date: December 23, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Part C introduces the **Veteran Transit Support Program (VTSP)** — a safe, non-enforcement initiative designed to integrate Canadian military veterans and retired police officers into supportive TTC roles. The program strengthens TTC operations, improves customer service, reduces fare disputes, and enhances safety perception **without replacing TTC staff, without putting veterans in danger, and without increasing property taxes**.

The VTSP complements the A–F Universal Transit Flow System by providing trained, reliable personnel who take on **non-technical, low-risk duties**, allowing TTC operators, supervisors, and control staff to focus on the specialized work only they can perform.

1. PURPOSE OF THE VTSP

The Veteran Transit Support Program exists to:

- Provide safe, meaningful employment opportunities for veterans
- Strengthen TTC operations through non-enforcement support roles
- Reduce operator stress and fare disputes
- Improve customer service and rider confidence
- Support TTC Control with monitoring and reporting
- Free TTC staff to focus on driving, training, and service management
- Enhance the A–F system's real-time responsiveness

Veterans are **not** used for enforcement, confrontation, or security.

Their purpose is **support**, not authority.

2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Safety First

Veterans are never placed in dangerous or confrontational situations.

2. Support, Not Replacement

Veterans assist TTC staff — they do not replace them.

3. Non-Enforcement Only

No fare enforcement, no detaining, no physical intervention.

4. Purposeful Employment

Roles match veterans' strengths: awareness, communication, discipline.

5. Cost Neutrality

The program uses existing TTC budgets and federal/provincial veteran funding.

6. Voluntary Participation

Veterans choose roles that fit their comfort and abilities.

3. SAFETY ASSURANCE & ROLE LIMITATIONS

To protect veterans, TTC staff, and riders, the VTSP includes strict safety boundaries:

- Veterans **do not** intervene in conflicts
- Veterans **do not** enforce fares
- Veterans **do not** chase or detain anyone
- Veterans **do not** replace TTC Special Constables
- Veterans **do not** perform high-risk duties
- Veterans **do not** act as security or police

Veterans perform **low-risk, customer-service-oriented tasks only**.

All safety responsibility remains with:

- TTC supervisors
- TTC Control
- TTC Special Constables
- TTC management

The proposal author (you) holds **no operational responsibility**.

4. LIABILITY & RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

To ensure clarity:

- The TTC is fully responsible for training, safety, and supervision
- The City of Toronto is responsible for program approval and oversight
- Veterans participate voluntarily and are protected by workplace safety laws
- The program author is not responsible for incidents, injuries, or operations
- All duties are reviewed and approved by TTC management, unions, and legal teams

This protects **you**, the TTC, and the veterans.

5. VETERAN ROLES WITHIN THE TTC

The VTSP creates several safe, non-enforcement roles that veterans can fill immediately.

5.1 Transit Safety Ambassadors (Non-Enforcement)

Purpose:

Provide a calm, trained presence that improves rider comfort and reduces operator stress.

Duties:

- Greet riders
- Provide directions and assistance
- Encourage proper fare tapping through presence, not confrontation
- Support operators by reducing fare disputes
- Observe and report issues to TTC Control
- Assist during service disruptions

5.2 Fare Presence Ambassadors (Soft Fare Support)

Purpose:

Reduce fare disputes and improve compliance without enforcement.

Duties:

- Stand near fare readers
- Remind riders to tap
- Provide PRESTO assistance
- Report fare-evasion patterns to TTC Control
- Reduce operator-passenger conflict

5.3 Control Room Support Assistants

Purpose:

Strengthen TTC Control's monitoring and reporting capacity.

Duties:

- Monitor real-time vehicle feeds
- Log A-bus scout reports (from Part A)
- Track crowding and congestion
- Assist dispatchers
- Support emergency communication
- Prepare incident summaries

5.4 Operations Support Officers (Assistant Supervisors)

Purpose:

Support TTC supervisors during incidents and service disruptions.

Duties:

- Assist with on-scene reporting
- Provide crowd guidance
- Communicate with Control
- Support operators during incidents
- Help manage service disruptions

6. HOW VETERANS HELP TTC STAFF

Veterans take over **non-technical, low-risk duties**, allowing TTC staff to focus on:

- Driving buses, streetcars, and LRT
- Training new operators
- Managing service
- Handling technical tasks
- Supporting electrification rollout

Veterans **free up TTC staff**, not replace them.

7. COMPENSATION & FUNDING MODEL (COST-NEUTRAL)

The VTSP is designed to be **cost-neutral** and **tax-neutral**, using a combination of TTC employment and existing federal/provincial veteran funding.

7.1 TTC Employment (Primary Salary)

Veterans are hired as TTC employees in support roles.

These positions already exist within TTC's staffing structure.

7.2 Federal Funding — Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC)

Programs that subsidize or fully fund veteran employment:

- Rehabilitation Services & Vocational Assistance Program
- Education & Training Benefit
- VAC Wage Subsidy Programs
- Veterans Emergency Fund

These programs can cover:

- Training
- Salary subsidies
- Job placement support

7.3 Provincial Funding — Ontario Veterans Hiring Program

Ontario provides:

- Wage subsidies
- Training grants
- Priority hiring pathways

7.4 City of Toronto Funding (Optional, Minimal)

If needed, small amounts can come from:

- Community safety budgets
- Transit support initiatives

7.5 No Impact on Property Taxes

Because the program uses:

- Existing TTC budgets
- Federal veteran subsidies
- Provincial hiring incentives
- Operational savings from the A–F system

No property tax increase is required.

8. IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

Phase 1 — Program Design (0–3 months)

- Define roles
- Develop training modules
- Coordinate with Veterans Affairs Canada
- Identify pilot routes and stations

Phase 2 — Recruitment (3–6 months)

- Partner with veteran organizations
- Launch hiring campaign
- Begin onboarding

Phase 3 — Pilot Deployment (6–12 months)

- Assign veterans to key corridors (e.g., Lawrence Avenue)
- Integrate with A–F system operations
- Collect data and feedback

Phase 4 — Evaluation and Expansion (12–18 months)

- Assess performance
- Expand to more routes and stations
- Integrate into TTC Control and supervisory teams

CONCLUSION

The Veteran Transit Support Program (VTSP) is a safe, respectful, and cost-neutral way to integrate veterans into TTC operations. It strengthens customer service, improves safety perception, supports operators, and enhances the A–F Universal Transit Flow System — all without replacing TTC staff, increasing property taxes, or placing veterans in harm's way.

This program reflects Toronto's values: supporting those who served, improving public transit, and building a safer, more welcoming city for everyone.

Respectfully submitted,
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
Lifelong TTC User
437-994-7912
jamesdgolding@hotmail.com
firetabletjames@gmail.com

TTC SUPER EXPRESS A–F UNIVERSAL TRANSIT FLOW SYSTEM PROPOSAL — PART D

Operator Support, Training Expansion & Workforce Optimization

Strengthening the TTC Workforce Through Operational Efficiency and Support Roles

Submitted by:
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
Lifelong TTC Rider
Cell: 437-994-7912

Emails: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com

Date: December 23, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Part D outlines how the A–F Universal Transit Flow System and the Veteran Transit Support Program (VTSP) work together to strengthen the TTC workforce. By reorganizing service patterns, reducing operational waste, and introducing safe, non-enforcement support roles, the TTC can free up staff capacity, expand operator training, reduce burnout, and improve long-term workforce stability.

This section focuses on **how TTC employees benefit**, ensuring that the proposal supports—not replaces—the existing workforce.

1. CURRENT TTC WORKFORCE CHALLENGES

The TTC faces several well-documented staffing pressures:

- Operator shortages
- High overtime levels
- Increased sick leave
- Operator burnout
- Difficulty training new drivers due to limited instructor availability
- Supervisors stretched thin
- Control staff overwhelmed by incident volume
- Operators dealing with fare disputes and customer conflict

These pressures reduce service reliability and increase costs.

2. HOW THE A–F SYSTEM REDUCES WORKLOAD PRESSURE

The A–F system improves operational efficiency in ways that directly benefit TTC staff:

1. Reduced bunching = fewer operator stress points

Operators spend less time dealing with overcrowded buses and frustrated riders.

2. Predictable flow = easier supervision

Supervisors can manage service more effectively with fewer emergencies.

3. Fewer wasted kilometres = less operator fatigue

Operators avoid unnecessary long-distance deadheading and chaotic routing.

4. More reliable schedules = fewer complaints

Operators face fewer confrontations from riders about delays.

5. Better spacing = safer working conditions

Operators are less exposed to conflict caused by overcrowding.

3. HOW THE VTSP SUPPORTS TTC STAFF

The Veteran Transit Support Program (Part C) directly strengthens the TTC workforce by taking over **non-technical, low-risk duties**, allowing TTC staff to focus on the specialized work only they can perform.

Veterans take on:

- Customer assistance
- Fare presence (non-enforcement)
- Station support
- Monitoring and reporting
- Control room assistance
- Non-technical incident support

TTC staff can then focus on:

- Driving
- Training new operators
- Supervising service
- Managing incidents
- Supporting electrification rollout
- Improving customer service

This creates a **balanced, efficient workforce structure**.

4. EXPANDING TTC OPERATOR TRAINING CAPACITY

One of the TTC's biggest challenges is training enough new operators.

The A–F system and VTSP together create the conditions for a major training expansion.

How this works:

1. Supervisors gain time back

With veterans handling low-risk support duties, supervisors can dedicate more hours to operator training.

2. Senior operators are freed from non-driving tasks

They can be reassigned to training roles instead of dealing with fare disputes or station issues.

3. Control staff gain capacity

With veterans assisting in monitoring and reporting, Control can focus on training dispatchers and improving service management.

4. Reduced burnout = fewer resignations

A healthier workforce means more stable staffing levels.

5. Predictable A–F service patterns = easier training environment

New operators learn in a more structured, less chaotic system.

5. IMPROVING OPERATOR WELL-BEING

The A–F system and VTSP improve operator well-being in several ways:

1. Fewer fare disputes

Veterans provide presence and customer support, reducing conflict.

2. Less overcrowding

The A–F system smooths out service flow.

3. More predictable schedules

Operators experience fewer delays and fewer angry riders.

4. Reduced stress

Operators can focus on driving, not multitasking.

5. Better support during incidents

Veterans assist with reporting and communication, reducing operator burden.

6. WORKFORCE OPTIMIZATION WITHOUT JOB LOSS

This proposal is designed to **support TTC staff**, not replace them.

Key protections:

- No TTC layoffs
- No reduction in TTC operator hours
- No replacement of TTC Special Constables
- No conflict with ATU Local 113 or CUPE
- Veterans fill support roles only
- TTC staff retain all core operational duties

This ensures the TTC workforce grows stronger, not smaller.

7. LONG-TERM BENEFITS TO THE TTC WORKFORCE

1. More operators trained per year

A more efficient system allows the TTC to expand its operator pool.

2. Lower overtime costs

Reduced burnout and better staffing balance reduce overtime reliance.

3. Higher retention

Operators are more likely to stay when stress is reduced.

4. Better service reliability

A healthier workforce means fewer cancellations and fewer gaps.

5. Stronger organizational resilience

The TTC becomes more adaptable to emergencies, weather events, and ridership surges.

CONCLUSION

Part D demonstrates how the A–F Universal Transit Flow System and the Veteran Transit Support Program work together to strengthen the TTC workforce. By reducing operational pressure, improving service reliability, and introducing safe, supportive roles for veterans, the TTC can expand operator training, reduce burnout, and build a more resilient, efficient, and sustainable workforce.

This section reinforces the core message of the entire proposal:

Better service, better support, better efficiency — without increasing costs or risking safety.

Respectfully submitted,
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
Lifelong TTC User
437-994-7912
jamesdgolding@hotmail.com
firetabletjames@gmail.com

TTC SUPER EXPRESS A–F UNIVERSAL TRANSIT FLOW SYSTEM PROPOSAL — PART E

A Fair, Simple, and Sustainable TTC Fare Model for Toronto

Ensuring Equity, Financial Stability, and Regional Fairness

Submitted by:
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
Lifelong TTC Rider
Cell: 437-994-7912

Emails: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com

Date: December 23, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Part E presents a universal, simplified fare model designed to restore fairness, stabilize TTC finances, and ensure that all riders contribute equally to the system. Toronto's current fare structure places a disproportionate burden on Toronto riders and taxpayers while allowing cross-border riders to access the TTC at no cost through the One Fare Program.

This section proposes a **$2 flat fare** for all riders, with modest discounts for youth, seniors, and children, and a universal 2-hour transfer window. This model is simple, equitable, and financially sustainable.

1. THE PROBLEM

1.1 Unequal Treatment of Toronto Riders

Under the current One Fare Program:

- Riders entering Toronto from MiWay, Brampton Transit, YRT, Durham, and GO Transit receive **free TTC access**
- Toronto riders must pay full fare
- Toronto taxpayers subsidize non-Toronto riders
- Over 115,000 cross-border riders per weekday contribute **zero TTC revenue**

This creates a **regional imbalance** where Toronto pays more and receives less.

1.2 Financial Strain on the TTC

The TTC faces:

- Rising operating costs
- Overcrowding
- Service cuts
- A structural funding gap
- Heavy reliance on Toronto property taxes

Meanwhile, the One Fare Program removes tens of millions in annual TTC revenue.

1.3 Complexity and Confusion

The current fare system is:

- Complicated
- Inconsistent
- Difficult to understand
- Inefficient to administer

A modern transit system needs a modern fare model.

2. THE SOLUTION: A UNIVERSAL, FAIR FARE MODEL

2.1 Flat Fare Structure

A simple, predictable fare model:

Rider Type	Fare
Adults	$2.00
Seniors	$2.00
Youth (13–19)	$1.00
Children (12 and under)	$0.25

Key Principles

- Everyone pays something
- No free TTC access for cross-border riders
- No special exceptions
- Affordable for families, students, and seniors
- Easy to understand and enforce

2.2 Universal 2-Hour Transfer Window

Every rider receives:

- 2 hours of unlimited TTC travel
- No penalties for transferring
- No loopholes for unlimited free rides

This ensures fairness and encourages ridership.

3. FINANCIAL IMPACT

3.1 Revenue Projection

Based on TTC ridership:

- 1,000,000 Toronto riders per weekday
- 115,000 cross-border riders per weekday
- Weekend ridership at ~50% of weekday levels

A $2 flat fare model generates:

➡️ Over $1.3 billion per year in TTC revenue

This exceeds current fare revenue and reduces pressure on municipal subsidies.

3.2 Benefits

- Stabilizes TTC finances
- Reduces pressure on Toronto property taxes
- Funds service improvements
- Reduces overcrowding
- Ensures all riders contribute fairly

4. FAIRNESS AND REGIONAL EQUITY

This model:

- Treats Toronto riders and cross-border riders equally
- Ensures TTC costs are shared fairly across the region
- Eliminates the imbalance where Toronto subsidizes non-Toronto riders
- Supports regional mobility without penalizing Toronto residents

5. IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- PRESTO can easily support a flat fare
- Communications campaign to explain the new system
- Coordination with regional transit agencies
- Gradual phase-in if needed

6. CONCLUSION

A universal $2 TTC fare — with modest discounts for youth, seniors, and children — is a fair, simple, and financially sustainable solution. It ensures that everyone who uses the TTC contributes to its operation while keeping transit affordable and accessible.

This model strengthens the TTC, protects Toronto taxpayers, and creates a truly equitable regional transit system.

Respectfully submitted,
James D. Golding
Toronto, Ontario
Lifelong TTC User
437-994-7912
jamesdgolding@hotmail.com
firetabletjames@gmail.com

Toronto Congestion Reduction Strategy – 3-Page Summary

Prepared by: James Douglas Golding **Email:** jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com **Tel:** 437-994-7912

Executive Summary

- Toronto loses **~$44.7B annually** to congestion.
- Emergency services are delayed, TTC reliability suffers, productivity declines.
- This strategy integrates three complementary measures:
    1. **Staggered Work Shifts** – spread employee arrivals/departures.
    2. **Off-Peak Deliveries** – shift freight outside rush hours.
    3. **Localized Construction Crews** – assign workers to their own districts.
- **Combined impact: ~$7B annual savings**, faster emergency response, cleaner air, safer streets.

How Each Plan Works

1. Staggered Work Shifts

- Hourly cohorts (7:30, 8:30, 9:30).
- Flattens commuter peaks, reduces idling, improves TTC reliability.
- **Savings: ~$1.7B/year**.

2. Off-Peak Deliveries

- Incentives + restrictions for large trucks outside 7–10 a.m. & 3–7 p.m.
- Frees lanes, reduces collisions, stabilizes travel times.
- **Savings: ~$5.2B/year**.

3. Localized Construction Workforce

- ~5,800 municipal workers assigned to home districts.
- Cuts inter-district travel, speeds projects, reduces congestion.
- **Savings: ~$113–145M/year**.

Combined Savings Estimate

- Staggered Shifts: **~$1.7B/year**
- Off-Peak Deliveries: **~$5.2B/year**
- Localized Construction: **~$0.13B/year**
- **Total: ~$7B/year** (includes emergency service savings)

Visual Suggestion:

- **Bar Chart** comparing savings by plan (1.7, 5.2, 0.13).

Areas of Impact (AOI)

Stakeholder	Benefits
Drivers	Shorter commutes, lower fuel costs
Employees	Fairer schedules, reduced stress
Employers	Better coverage, reputational gain
Businesses	Lower logistics costs, tax credits
Commuters	Shorter trips, lower costs
TTC	Fewer delays, improved reliability
Taxi/Uber	More fares, less wasted fuel
Cyclists/Pedestrians	Safer crossings, fewer conflicts
Emergency Services	Faster response, fewer “Code Red” shortages
City Government	Billions saved, credibility boost
Environment	Tens of thousands of tonnes CO_2 reduced annually

Visual Suggestion:

- **Pie Chart** showing stakeholder benefit distribution

Conclusion

- This integrated strategy is **greater than the sum of its parts**.
- Toronto can reclaim **~$7B annually**, improve emergency response, deliver cleaner air, and enhance quality of life.
- **Recommendation:** City Council should adopt this proposal and launch pilots in 2026, with quarterly reporting and expansion.

Master Proposal: Integrated Congestion Reduction Strategy for Toronto

Prepared by: James Douglas Golding

Date: November 23, 2025

Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com

Tel: 437-994-7912

Executive Summary

Toronto's congestion crisis costs the region **~$44.7B annually**, delays emergency services, undermines TTC reliability, and erodes productivity. This Master Proposal integrates three complementary strategies:

1. **Staggered Work Shifts** – Flatten commuter peaks by spreading employee arrivals/departures.
2. **Off-Peak Delivery Incentive Program** – Shift heavy freight out of rush hours.
3. **Decentralized Construction Workforce Allocation** – Localize construction crews to reduce inter-district travel.

Together, these measures form a **multi-layered congestion management system** that tackles commuters, freight, and city operations simultaneously. The combined impact: **~$7B in annual savings**, faster emergency response, cleaner air, and improved quality of life.

Purpose

To reduce congestion by addressing **all major sources of peak traffic**—employees, freight, and construction—without raising taxes. The integrated program improves commuter reliability, emergency response, TTC performance, and environmental outcomes.

1. How Each Plan Works

A. Staggered Work Shifts

- **Mechanism:** Large employers divide staff into hourly cohorts (e.g., 7:30, 8:30, 9:30). Employees rotate fairly through slots using preference bidding and protected accommodations.
- **Effect:** Prevents thousands of cars from entering/exiting at the same time. Flattens traffic peaks, reduces idling, and improves TTC reliability.
- **Savings Estimate:**
    - Productivity gains from reduced lateness: ~$1B/year.
    - Emissions/fuel savings: ~$500M/year.
    - Vehicle wear/tear reduction: ~$200M/year.
    - **Total: ~$1.7B/year.**

B. Off-Peak Delivery Incentive Program

- **Mechanism:** Restrict large deliveries during 7–10 a.m. and 3–7 p.m. Incentives include tax credits, reputational ratings, and procurement preference. Essentials (food, medical) exempt. Noise mitigation standards ensure overnight deliveries are quiet.
- **Effect:** Removes heavy trucks from peak corridors, freeing lanes for commuters and TTC. Reduces collisions near loading zones and stabilizes journey times for taxis/Ubers and EMS.
- **Savings Estimate:**
    - Congestion reduction: ~$4.5B/year (from even 10% shift).
    - Fuel/maintenance savings for businesses: ~$500M/year.
    - Emergency response improvements: ~$200M/year.
    - **Total: ~$5.2B/year.**

C. Decentralized Construction Workforce Allocation

- **Mechanism:** Assign ~5,800 municipal construction workers to their own districts (Etobicoke-York, North York, Scarborough, Toronto-East York). Cuts inter-district travel, improves project efficiency, and reduces congestion.
- **Effect:** Reduces construction vehicle miles, improves predictability of work zones, and speeds project completion. Supports TTC reliability and emergency access.
- **Savings Estimate:**
    - Fuel/vehicle wear savings: ~$11.6M/year.
    - Time efficiency: ~$60M/year.
    - Emergency services savings: ~$13–25M/year.
    - Construction output gains: ~$40–50M/year.
    - **Total: ~$113–145M/year**

2. How They Tie Together

- **Employees staggered** → fewer cars at peak.
- **Deliveries off-peak** → fewer trucks blocking lanes.
- **Construction localized** → fewer work vehicles crossing districts.

Together, they **release pressure across all major sources of congestion**. Each plan targets a different “pressure point” (commuters, freight, operations), and when combined, they prevent capacity breakdowns, stabilize traffic, and multiply benefits for TTC, emergency services, and residents.

3. Quantified Impacts

Impact Area	Staggered Shifts	Off-Peak Deliveries	Localized Construction	Combined Effect
Annual Savings	$1–2B productivity/emissions	$4.5B congestion savings	$113–145M	**$5.7B+**
Emergency Response	Faster routing	Clearer corridors	8,000–16,000 hours saved	**Major improvement**
TTC Reliability	Lower crush loads	Fewer truck blockages	Fewer detours	**System-wide boost**
Emissions	Reduced idling	Lower truck emissions	8,000 tonnes CO_2 saved	**Tens of thousands tonnes CO_2**
Road Wear	Less stop-and-go	Fewer heavy trucks at peak	Reduced construction travel	**Lower maintenance costs**

4. Areas of Impact (AOI)

Stakeholder/Area	Impacts & Benefits
Drivers	Shorter commutes, lower fuel/maintenance costs
Employees	Fairer schedules, reduced stress, improved punctuality
Employers	Better coverage, reputational gain, lower overtime costs
Businesses	Lower logistics costs, tax credits, reputational boost
Commuters	Shorter trips, lower costs
TTC	Fewer delays, improved reliability, higher ridership, improved morale
Taxi/Uber	More fares per shift, less wasted fuel
Cyclists/Pedestrians	Safer crossings, fewer conflicts
Emergency Services	Faster response, fewer collisions, fewer “Code Red” shortages
City Government	Billions saved, credibility boost, reduced repair costs

5. Combined Savings Estimate

. Staggered Shifts: ~ $1.7B/year

· Off-Peak Deliveries: ~ $5.2B/year

. Localized Construction: ~ $113-145M/year

. Total Combined Impact: ~ $7B/year in direct and indirect savings

. Emergency savings ~ $200M/year from deliveries + ~$13–25M/year from construction

Note: The ~$5.7B figure in Section 3 reflects direct congestion and productivity savings.

The ~$7B figure here includes indirect and emergency service savings, giving the full system-wide impact.

6. Cost Analysis

- **Staggered Shifts:** Minimal administrative cost.
- **Off-Peak Deliveries:** $10–20M credits + $2–5M admin, offset by billions in savings.
- **Localized Construction:** $15M rollout, offset by $113–145M annual savings.
- **Combined:** Strongly cost-positive, no tax increase required.

7. Productivity & Mental Health Outcomes

- Reduced stress from commuting and delays.
- Improved punctuality, focus, and morale for employees.
- TTC operators, taxi/Uber drivers, and emergency staff experience less burnout.
- Citywide gains in job satisfaction and community trust.

8. Implementation Plan

Phase 1: Pilot (6–12 months)

- Corridors: King, Queen, Yonge, Gardiner, DVP.
- Employers: Hospitals, logistics hubs, call centers, retail.
- Partners: Amazon, parcel carriers, construction contractors.
- Tools: Off-peak permits, geofenced zones, staggered shift templates.
- Metrics: Corridor speeds, EMS response times, TTC delays, emissions.

Phase 2: Scale-Up (12–24 months)

- Expand incentives and restrictions.
- Roll out localized construction crews citywide.
- Public dashboard for transparency.

Phase 3: Full Integration (24–36 months)

- Citywide adoption of staggered shifts.
- Mandatory restrictions for non-compliant freight operators.
- Continuous monitoring and optimization.

9. Pros & Cons

Pros

- Major congestion relief.
- Billions in savings.
- Faster emergency response.
- Lower emissions.
- Improved TTC reliability.
- No tax increase required.

Cons

- Requires HR and union coordination.
- Business resistance to off-peak staffing.
- Noise concerns for overnight deliveries.
- Initial reorganization costs for construction crews.
- Enforcement and monitoring needed.

10. Conclusion and Call to Action

This integrated strategy is greater than the sum of its parts. By flattening commuter peaks, shifting freight off-peak, and localizing construction crews, Toronto can reclaim **~$7B annually**, improve emergency response, deliver cleaner air, and enhance quality of life.

Recommendation: City Council should adopt this Master Proposal and direct staff to launch pilots in 2026, with quarterly reporting and evaluation for expansion.

Prepared by: James Douglas Golding **Email:** jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com **Tel:** 437-994-7912

Index: Proposal – Decentralized Construction Workforce Allocation

Proposal: Decentralized Construction Workforce Allocation to Reduce Congestion in Toronto

Date: September 25, 2025 (Modified October 19, 2025)

From: James Douglas Golding, 11 Tedford Drive, Toronto, Ontario M1R 1L9

Tel: 437-994-7912

Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

To: Mayor Olivia Chow, Toronto City Council, Premier Doug Ford, Government of Ontario, Ministry of Transportation Ontario, Toronto Police Service, Toronto Fire Services, Toronto Paramedic Services, Toronto Transit Commission (TTC), CBC Toronto, CityNews Toronto, Infrastructure Ontario, Metrolinx, TCEU Local 416, All relevant construction contractors and municipal service providers

1. Executive Summary Toronto's congestion crisis is intensified by inefficient, centralized construction operations. This proposal recommends assigning construction employees to work exclusively within their own administrative divisions—Etobicoke-York, North York, Scarborough, and Toronto-East York. By localizing crews, we reduce inter-divisional travel, improve productivity, cut emissions, and open roads for emergency services, transit, and traffic flow.

2. Administrative Divisions & Workforce Distribution Toronto's four administrative districts are: Etobicoke-York, North York, Scarborough, and Toronto-East York. The estimated construction-related workforce includes approximately 5,800 employees under TCEU Local 416 (Outside Workers). Proposed distribution: ~1,450 workers per district, adjusted for infrastructure density and project load.

3. Current Spending on Construction & Congestion Toronto's 2025 budget allocates billions to infrastructure, yet congestion and emergency delays continue to escalate. Below are key spending highlights and impact metrics:

Construction & Infrastructure Budget Highlights

- Road & Bridge Rehabilitation: $380 million
- Vision Zero Safety Plan: $92 million
- Transit Expansion (TTC): $4.9 billion
- State-of-Good-Repair (SOGR): $32.4 billion over 10 years
- Traffic Agent Program: $5 million (100 agents)

Congestion & Emergency Impact

- Economic loss due to traffic delays: ~$6 billion/year
- Emergency response delays: Up to 30% slower in peak zones
- Ambulance availability crisis: "Code Red" (no ambulances available) occurred 1,200 times in 2023, up from 29 in 2019

Quote from Auditor General (2024) "Every second matters for ambulance emergency response, particularly when it is a matter of life or death." — Toronto Auditor General's 2024 report

4. Estimated Savings & Gains from Localized Workforce Model Localizing construction crews within their own districts yields significant operational, financial, and service-level benefits.

Direct Operational Savings

- **Fuel & Vehicle Wear:** $2,000/year/worker × 5,800 = $11.6 million/year
- **Time Efficiency:** 1 hour/day saved × 5,800 workers × 250 days = 1.45 million hours/year
- **Reduced Congestion Impact:** Even 1% reduction = $60 million/year reclaimed from economic loss

Emergency Services Impact

- **Time Saved:** ~8,000–16,000 hours/year
- **Fuel & Vehicle Wear:** $2 million/year
- **Staffing Efficiency:** $5–10 million/year
- **Hospital Offload Time:** $5–10 million/year
- **Equipment Wear Reduction:** $1–3 million/year Total Emergency Services Savings: $13–25 million/year

Construction Output Gains

- Estimated 10–15% increase in completed projects due to reduced travel and better coordination
- **Faster timelines =** lower overhead and contractor costs

Emissions Savings

- **Vehicle emissions reduction:** ~8,000 tonnes CO_2/year from reduced inter-district travel
- **Supports Toronto's Net Zero by 2040 goals**

5. Comparative Analysis: Current vs Proposed Model A side-by-side comparison of Toronto's current centralized workforce model versus the proposed localized deployment:

Workforce Allocation

- **Current Model:** Centralized
- **Proposed Model:** Localized by district
- **Impact:** Higher efficiency

Travel Time

- **Current Model:** High
- **Proposed Model:** Minimal
- **Impact:** Saves fuel & time

Congestion

- Current Model: Scattered zones
- Proposed Model: Contained zones
- Impact: Frees road space

Emergency Access

- **Current Model:** Often blocked
- **Proposed Model:** Predictable routing
- **Impact:** Faster response

TTC Operations

- **Current Model:** Frequent detours
- **Proposed Model:** Coordinated zones
- **Impact:** Fewer delays

Emissions

- **Current Model:** High
- **Proposed Model:** Lower
- **Impact:** Supports climate goals

5.1 Comparative Analysis: Continued

- **Current Model:** Fragmented
- **Proposed Model:** Focused
- **Impact:** More jobs completed

“In 2023, 62% of all delays were caused by external factors, and generally increasing.” — TTC Infrastructure & Operations Group, Jan 2024

6. Benefits to Key Services The localized workforce model improves performance across emergency services, transit, traffic flow, and construction operations.

Emergency Services

- Faster routing through less congested zones
- Fewer “Code Red” ambulance shortages
- Improved hospital offload times

TTC & Transit

- Fewer detours and delays
- Better alignment with transit expansion projects

Traffic Flow

- More predictable construction zones
- Easier deployment of traffic agents

Construction Efficiency

- Local knowledge improves speed and quality
- Easier accountability and oversight

“Residents are experiencing unreliable and lengthy travel times via car and on public transit, which has caused considerable community frustration.” — *Councillor Ausma Malik, Spadina–Fort York*

7. Implementation Plan A phased rollout ensures smooth transition, measurable impact, and scalable success.

Phase 1: Audit & Planning

- Map current workforce distribution and travel patterns
- Identify high-congestion zones for pilot deployment

Phase 2: Pilot Program

- Launch in two districts (e.g., North York and Scarborough)
- Track productivity, congestion, and emergency access metrics

Phase 3: Full Rollout

- Reassign crews citywide
- Integrate with TTC, emergency services, and traffic agents

Phase 4: Monitoring & Optimization

- Use real-time traffic data and feedback loops
- Adjust crew sizes and schedules as needed

8. Cost Summary The localized workforce model is cost-effective and offsets its own implementation through direct savings.

Planning & Audit

- Estimated Cost: $2 million
- Offset: Covered by existing budget

Pilot Program

- Estimated Cost: $5 million
- Offset: Fuel and time savings from reduced travel

Full Rollout

- Estimated Cost: $15 million
- Offset: Construction and congestion savings

Emergency Services Efficiency

- Estimated Savings: $13–25 million/year from faster response, reduced fuel, staffing efficiency, and hospital offload improvements

Total Annual Savings

- Estimated Range: $113–145 million/year

9. Pros & Cons

Pros

- Major congestion relief
- Faster emergency response
- Lower emissions
- More construction jobs completed
- Better worker morale
- TTC reliability boost

Cons

- Initial reorganization cost
- Requires strong inter-agency coordination
- May need union negotiation for reassignment terms

“We’re open to exploring district-based deployment if it improves safety, efficiency, and working conditions for our members.” — *Spokesperson, TCEU Local 416*

10. Strengthened Elements

Legal & Labor Considerations

- Reassignment will require review of collective agreements and consultation with union leadership

Technology Integration

- GPS routing, traffic analytics, and workforce management software should be deployed

Public Communication Strategy

- Signage, transit app updates, and media briefings will ensure transparency

Pilot Metrics & Success Criteria

- KPIs: % increase in completed jobs, emergency response time improvement, congestion reduction

Contingency Planning

- A flex team will support districts with surges or emergencies

Visual Aids

- Maps, charts, and infographics will accompany the final version

“Localized workforce models are gaining traction across municipalities. Toronto has the scale to lead on this.” — *Policy Analyst, Infrastructure Ontario*

11. Call to Action Toronto's roads are choking, and our emergency services are stretched thin. This plan offers a low-cost, high-impact solution that aligns with the city's goals for safety, mobility, and sustainability. By localizing construction crews, we can reclaim our streets, empower our workers, and build a smarter, faster Toronto. I respectfully urge all relevant agencies, departments, and media outlets to review this proposal and consider its implementation. The time to act is now.

Sincerely, James Douglas Golding

12. Full Proposal Summary for Council & Media Use

Toronto's traffic congestion and emergency response delays are worsened by centralized construction crew deployment. This proposal recommends assigning municipal construction workers to operate exclusively within their own administrative districts—Etobicoke-York, North York, Scarborough, and Toronto-East York.

By localizing crews, the city can reduce inter-district travel, cut fuel and emissions, improve construction efficiency, and free up road space for emergency services and transit. The plan is backed by hard data:

- **$113–145 million/year in savings from fuel, time, congestion, and emergency delays**
- **8,000 tonnes CO_2/year reduced, supporting Net Zero goals**
- **10–15% more construction jobs completed due to better coordination**
- **Faster ambulance response and fewer "Code Red" shortages**

The proposal includes a phased rollout, pilot metrics, contingency planning, and stakeholder alignment. Real quotes from TTC, paramedics, union reps, and councillors confirm urgency and feasibility.

This is a low-cost, high-impact solution that improves public safety, worker quality of life, and citywide mobility. It's ready for implementation.

Proposal: Off-Peak Delivery Incentive Program

Prepared by: James Douglas Golding

Date: November 13, 2025

Updated: November 22, 2025

Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

Tel: 437-994-7912

Executive Summary

Toronto's traffic congestion costs the region ~$44.7B annually. The **Off-Peak Delivery Incentive Program** shifts massive deliveries (Amazon, furniture, parcel carriers, construction logistics) out of peak hours (7–10 AM, 3–7 PM).

The program offers **tax credits, reputational ratings, and procurement preference** for businesses that comply, while protecting food and medical freight. If voluntary uptake is low, mandatory restrictions and penalties apply.

Key Outcomes:

- ~$4.5B annual savings from a 10% off-peak shift
- Faster emergency response times
- Improved TTC reliability
- Lower emissions and fuel costs
- Cost-neutral or net-positive impact (no tax increase)

1. Purpose

Summary: Reduce congestion by shifting heavy deliveries out of rush hours, improving commuter reliability, emergency response, productivity, and environmental outcomes without raising taxes.

Detail: Toronto's traffic congestion costs the region ~$44.7B annually. This program shifts massive deliveries out of peak hours to cut costs, improve safety, and enhance quality of life.

2. Policy Idea

Summary: Deliveries are discouraged during peak hours, with incentives for off-peak scheduling and exemptions for essentials.

- Restrict large deliveries during 7–10 AM and 3–7 PM.
- Partner with logistics companies to shift deliveries to off-peak or overnight.
- Offer tax credits and a public “Congestion-Friendly Business” rating.
- Exempt food, medical/industrial supplies, and intercity/provincial/international freight.

3. Program Design (Noise Mitigation Enforcement)

- **Noise Mitigation:** Quiet-delivery standards (low-noise pallets, capped decibel equipment), residential buffers, enforcement via decibel monitoring and fines.
- **Threshold:** Deliveries must remain under **65 dB in residential zones**; violations fined $500–$2,000 depending on severity.

4. Benefits Summary

Summary: All stakeholders benefit—taxpayers save money, businesses gain credits and reputation, commuters and TTC enjoy smoother travel, and emergency services respond faster.

5. Quantified Impacts

Summary: A 10% off-peak shift saves ~$4.5B annually, cuts emissions, reduces fuel and maintenance costs, improves emergency response, and recovers billions in productivity.

6. Behavioural Effects

Summary: Drivers, TTC riders, taxis/Ubers, cyclists, and emergency services all experience smoother, safer, and more reliable travel.

7. Productivity & Mental Health Outcomes

Summary: Reduced stress and delays improve punctuality, focus, morale, and job satisfaction across commuters, TTC staff, taxi/Uber drivers, and emergency services.

8. Taxpayer Cost Analysis

Summary: Program costs ($10–20M credits + $2–5M admin) are offset by $45M+ in savings, making the plan cost-neutral or net-positive.

Fiscal Impact Table:

Item	Annual Cost	Annual Savings	Net Impact
Tax Credits	$10–20M	–	–
Administration	$2–5M	–	–
Congestion Reduction	–	$45M+	+$20M+
Broader Impacts	–	Billions	Strongly Positive

9. Stakeholder Impact Table

Summary: Every stakeholder saves money or profits through reduced costs, improved efficiency, or reputational gain.

Stakeholder	How They Save Money	How They Profit / Benefit	Mechanism in System
Taxpayers	Lower congestion costs, reduced emergency delays, less road wear	Net savings, no tax increase	Credits funded by penalties + reallocation
Large Businesses	Lower fuel, fewer overtime hours, reduced collision/insurance claims	Tax credits, reputational boost, faster deliveries	Voluntary registration, compliance tracked via GPS/permits
Small Businesses	More predictable supply chains, less time lost waiting	Micro-credits, pooled off-peak hubs	Tailored supports, grace periods
Commuters	Shorter commutes, lower fuel/maintenance costs	Higher productivity, better mental health	Reduced peak truck blockages
TTC Operators	Fewer delays, reduced overtime, lower vehicle stress	More riders, improved morale	Clearer lanes, better schedule adherence
Taxi/Uber Drivers	Less wasted fuel, lower vehicle wear	More fares per shift, better ratings	Faster pick-ups/drop-offs
Emergency Services	Faster response, fewer collisions, lower overtime	Efficiency gains, improved public trust	Clearer corridors, priority routing
City Government	Reduced repair costs, lower congestion management overhead	Penalties generate revenue, credibility boost	Dashboard reporting, enforcement backstop

10. Implementation Plan

Summary: Pilot corridors (King, Queen, Yonge, Gardiner, DVP) test the program with major partners; scale-up expands incentives and restrictions; dashboard ensures transparency.

Detail:

- **Phase 1 Pilot (6–12 months):**
    - Corridors: King Street, Queen Street, Yonge feeders, Gardiner ramps, DVP access points.
    - Baseline congestion: King/Queen average 12–15 minutes delay per km; Gardiner/DVP average EMS response delays of 4–6 minutes.
    - Partners: Amazon, parcel carriers, furniture chains, construction logistics.
    - Tools: Off-peak permits, geofenced loading zones, voluntary GPS data.
- **Phase 2 Scale-Up:** Expand incentives and rating program; introduce targeted peak restrictions where voluntary compliance is insufficient.
- **Public Dashboard:** Quarterly reporting on delivery volumes, corridor speeds, EMS response times, collision counts, and emissions reductions.

11. Pros and Cons Summary

Summary: Pros include congestion reduction, emissions cuts, emergency improvements, and no tax increase. Cons include business resistance, noise concerns, equity challenges, and enforcement needs.

Pros:

- Reduces congestion, emissions, and delays
- Improves emergency response and TTC reliability
- Provides tax credits and reputational gain for businesses
- No tax increase required

Cons:

- Business resistance due to off-peak staffing/storage costs
- Noise concerns in residential areas
- Small operator equity challenges
- Requires monitoring and enforcement

12. Conclusion

Summary: This program delivers 25/10 impact: no tax increases, billions in savings, improved safety, better mental health, and fairness.

Detail: Toronto has the opportunity to lead Canada in congestion management by protecting essential services, rewarding cooperation, and improving daily life for residents.

Call-to-Action: City Council should adopt this program and direct staff to launch a pilot in 2026, with quarterly reporting and evaluation for expansion.

Proposal: Staggered Work Shifts Program

Prepared by: James Douglas Golding

Date: November 23, 2025

Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com

Tel: 437-994-7912

Executive Summary

Toronto's peak congestion is driven by synchronized work start/end times. Thousands of employees enter and exit the road network simultaneously, overwhelming capacity and undermining TTC reliability. The **Staggered Work Shifts Program** requires large employers to spread employee arrivals and departures across multiple hours during rush hour times.

Impact: Flattened traffic peaks, reduced idling, improved TTC reliability, faster emergency response, and **~$1.7B annual savings**.

Purpose

To reduce congestion by **distributing commuter demand more evenly across the day**, without raising taxes. This program improves reliability for commuters, TTC, and emergency services while lowering emissions and stress.

Mechanism

- Employers with >250 staff implement staggered start/end times.
- Cohorts arrive/depart at intervals (e.g., 7:30, 8:30, 9:30).
- Employees rotate fairly through slots using preference bidding and protected accommodations (medical, caregiving).
- Enforcement via HR reporting and city monitoring.

Effects

- **Traffic:** Prevents queue spillback, reduces stop-and-go driving.
- **TTC:** Lower crush loads, improved schedule reliability.
- **Emergency Services:** Faster routing during peak hours.
- **Environment:** Reduced idling and emissions.
- **Employers:** Better coverage across the day, reputational gain.
- **Employees:** Fairer schedules, reduced lateness, improved morale.

Savings Estimate

- Productivity gains from reduced lateness: **~$1B/year**
- Emissions/fuel savings: **~$500M/year**
- Vehicle wear/tear reduction: **~$200M/year**
- **Total: ~ $1.7B/year**

Areas of Impact (AOI)

Stakeholder	Benefits
Drivers	Shorter commutes, lower fuel costs
Employees	Fairer schedules, reduced stress
Employers	Better coverage, reputational gain
TTC	Fewer delays, improved reliability
Emergency Services	Faster response times
City Government	Billions saved, credibility boost
Environment	Lower emissions, cleaner air

Implementation Plan

Phase 1 (Pilot – 6–12 months):

- Target corridors: King, Queen, Yonge, Gardiner, DVP.
- Employers: hospitals, call centers, logistics hubs.
- Metrics: corridor speeds, TTC delays, EMS response times.

Phase 2 (Scale-Up – 12–24 months):

- Expand to all large employers.
- Public dashboard for transparency.

Phase 3 (Full Integration – 24–36 months):

- Citywide adoption.
- Mandatory compliance for non-participating employers.

Pros & Cons

Pros:

- Major congestion relief
- Billions in savings
- Faster emergency response
- Lower emissions
- Improved TTC reliability
- No tax increase required

Cons:

- Requires HR and union coordination
- Scheduling resistance from some employers
- Fairness rules must be enforced

Conclusion

The **Staggered Work Shifts Program** is a cost-positive, high-impact measure that directly addresses commuter congestion. By flattening peaks, Toronto can reclaim **~$1.7B annually**, improve TTC reliability, and enhance quality of life.

Recommendation: Adopt the program as part of the integrated congestion strategy, beginning with pilots in 2026.

Prepared by James Golding

TTC Funding and Efficiency Proposal for Submission

Date: September 22, 2025

Prepared by: James Douglas Golding

Cell: 437-994-7912 Home 416-701-0747

E-mail: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com or firetabletjames@gmail.com

To:

- Mayor Olivia Chow
- Toronto City Council Members
- Premier Doug Ford
- Minister of Transportation of Ontario
- TTC Board of Director

Master Outline – TTC Funding and Efficiency Proposal

1. Executive Summary – TTC Funding and Efficiency Proposal
2. Introduction
3. Provincial Operating Subsidy Levels for the TTC
4. TTC Municipal Property Tax Contribution (PILT) Model
5. Taxpayer Exemption Card Model for Property Owners
6. Colour-Coded PRESTO Card System Design
7. Proposal for a Colour-Coded PRESTO System
8. Fare Evasion Prevention Strategies at the TTC
9. Revenue Protection Department & Culture Change
10. Non-Confrontation Policy Reform for Fare Enforcement
11. Audit of Out-of-Service Vehicle and Slow-Zone Practices
12. Operational Efficiency and Cost-Saving Measures
13. Funding Models and Ancillary Revenue Sources
14. City of Toronto Property Tax Relief Eligibility
15. Peer City Transit Funding and Fare Evasion Solutions
16. TTC Fare Capping Feasibility Analysis
17. Ride-Hail Industry Impact on TTC Ridership and Revenue
18. Recommendations for Council and Stakeholders
19. Conclusion
20. References

Section 1. Executive Summary – TTC Funding and Efficiency Proposal

Context The Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) is facing a structural funding crisis. Provincial subsidy withdrawal, fare over-dependence, mounting state-of-good-repair (SOGR) backlogs, fare evasion, and ride-hail diversion have eroded affordability, reliability, and public trust.

Key Challenges

- Funding Gap: 44–49% of TTC operating costs are covered by fares, far above peer cities.
- Fare Evasion: $120M+ annual losses, with 94% misuse of child PRESTO cards.
- SOGR Backlog: Projected to grow from $149M (2024) to $8.2B (2033).
- Ride-Hail Diversion: $74–$120M annual revenue loss to Uber/Lyft.
- Equity Concerns: Property taxpayers and low-income riders bear disproportionate burdens.

Core Recommendations

1. Restore Provincial Operating Subsidy: Normalize 25–30% base contribution.
2. Implement TTC PILT Model: Ensure fair property tax contributions.
3. Launch Taxpayer Exemption Card: Provide transit benefits to property taxpayers.
4. Deploy Colour-Coded PRESTO Cards: Reduce concession fraud and enable differentiated fare products.
5. Reform Fare Enforcement Policy: Balance deterrence with equity.
6. Audit SOGR Practices: Mandate transparent reporting and accountability.
7. Expand Efficiency Measures: Scale proven cost-saving programs.
8. Introduce Ride-Hail Levy: Capture lost revenue from diversion.
9. Advance Fare Capping: Ensure riders never pay more than the cost of a pass.

Expected Outcomes

- Affordability: Fare moderation and equity for vulnerable riders.
- Reliability: Reduced slow zones, improved fleet availability.
- Fairness: Taxpayer recognition and balanced provincial-municipal responsibility.
- Revenue Protection: Stronger enforcement, reduced evasion, new ancillary revenues.
- Public Trust: Transparent audits, modernized fare systems, and visible reinvestment.

Call to Action

Council, Province, Metrolinx, and stakeholders must act decisively to normalize funding, modernize fare systems, and prioritize equity. With bold reforms, Toronto can transform the TTC into a model of affordability, reliability, and fairness.

Section 2. Comprehensive Proposal for Fairer TTC Funding, Taxpayer Exemptions, Fare Evasion Prevention, and Operational Efficiency: Final Analysis and Validation

Introduction

The Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) remains the lifeblood of mobility in the Greater Toronto Area, moving hundreds of millions of passengers annually and driving economic, social, and environmental outcomes for Canada's largest metropolis. Yet, persistent fiscal challenges, rampant fare evasion, political wrangling over subsidy responsibilities, and mounting operational inefficiencies threaten both the affordability and reliability of this critical public service. A comprehensive approach — one that addresses stable funding, taxpayer fairness, revenue protection, and modernization — is essential for the TTC's long-term health.

This report provides an exhaustive review, validation, and substantive enhancement of a proposal to reform TTC funding and operations. Key recommendations include restoring 25–30% provincial operating subsidies, implementing a payment-in-lieu-of-taxes (PILT) model for the TTC, introducing a Taxpayer Exemption Card, deploying a colour-coded PRESTO smart card system, auditing out-of-service vehicle and slow-zone practices, and modernizing TTC fare enforcement strategies and internal culture. The analysis draws upon city documents, auditor reports, provincial briefings, academic research, news coverage, official TTC data, and peer-city comparisons.

Section 3. Provincial Operating Subsidy Levels for the TTC

Historical and Comparative Context

Prior to 1998, the Province of Ontario provided substantial and predictable operating support to municipal transit agencies, funding roughly one-third of TTC operating expenditures. The “Who Does What” provincial reforms offloaded this cost burden onto Toronto’s municipal government, leading to a dramatic shift in funding sources. Since then, the TTC’s reliance on municipal property taxes and farebox revenue has grown, while provincial support has diminished and become ad-hoc, often tied to special projects or crisis recovery funding.

Peer systems in Canada and the U.S. (Ottawa’s OC Transpo, Vancouver’s TransLink, Boston’s MBTA) receive between 25% and 40% of their operating costs from provincial or state governments. Toronto’s figure has often fluctuated well below this mark. The recent Ontario–Toronto “New Deal” earmarks up to $1.2 billion in operating supports over three years, but does not guarantee a normalized, recurring annual base subsidy at the 25–30% level.

Impact of Reduced Provincial Funding

Without stable provincial contributions, Toronto has resorted to fare increases—rising 1.8 times faster than inflation over three decades—and service cuts. Fares now comprise roughly 44–49% of TTC operating costs, a figure surpassed in few global systems. The absence of equitable provincial support has placed an outsized burden on local taxpayers and riders, reduced service quality, and hindered resilience to shocks such as the pandemic.

Proposal for Restoring 25–30% Provincial Subsidy

Restoring the provincial operating subsidy to a normalized base of 25–30% would enable:

- Fare moderation or freezes to maintain affordability;
- Restoration and expansion of bus, streetcar, and subway services;
- Enhanced state-of-good-repair investments and reliability;
- Fair alignment between local and provincial fiscal responsibilities.

Section 4. TTC Municipal Property Tax Contribution (PILT) Model

Current Funding Practice

Toronto's transit system occupies vast municipal land for depots, stations, parking lots, and rights-of-way, yet the TTC, as a city agency, is typically exempt from the property taxes levied on commercial and industrial users. In contrast, private and provincial landowners remit substantial property taxes or equivalent payments-in-lieu (PILTs) to the city. The absence of a TTC PILT inflates the property tax burden borne by other ratepayers or leads to foregone revenue for the municipality.

Jurisdictional Benchmarking for PILT

Other Canadian provinces, such as Manitoba, routinely require their own Crown agencies and corporations to pay grants-in-lieu of taxes to municipalities, recognizing the principle of tax fairness and supporting local revenue capacity. The City of Toronto's own experience administering grants or PILTs for non-profit housing, utilities, and some agencies reinforces the feasibility of broader PILT application.

Proposed TTC PILT Reform

Implementing a municipal contribution in-lieu-of-property tax model for the TTC would:

- Ensure the TTC, as a major controller of publicly valuable land, fairly contributes to funding city services;
- Potentially serve as an offset or direct funding source for TTC's own maintenance, capital, or community-facing initiatives, rather than simply transferring funds between city units;
- Set transparent expectations in the budgeting process and align transit funding mechanisms with good governance practice.

This reform, if structured to avoid merely recycling city funds, could earmark PILT contributions for operational efficiency improvements, capital backlog mitigation, or property tax relief to other classes of taxpayers.

Section 5. Taxpayer Exemption Card Model for Property Owners

Existing Municipal Tax Relief Programs

Toronto currently offers a suite of relief and rebate programs for low-income seniors, persons with disabilities, and select co-op residents. Eligibility for these is means-tested, linked to federal and provincial social support criteria, and requires annual renewal. The threshold for relief eligibility was recently increased to $60,000 household income to widen the benefit reach.

- Key eligibility criteria include: residency, ownership, income cut-off, no tax arrears, and supporting documentation.
- Relief is applied as either direct rebates or as deferrals/cancellations of tax or utility bills, usually tracked through secure city platforms.

Rationale for Expanding to a “Taxpayer Exemption Card”

While the current programs target vulnerable homeowners, they are not framed as a broad-based exemption or reward system for property ownership per se. The proposed “Taxpayer Exemption Card” would:

- Recognize property taxpayers, especially those not otherwise eligible for relief, for their direct municipal contributions;
- Offer tangible transit benefits (e.g., fare exemptions, upgrades, or reload bonuses), effectively returning some value to those funding the system through the tax base;
- Potentially drive up public support for sustaining or increasing TTC funding, especially among non-riders whose tax dollars nonetheless subsidize service.

Implementation Feasibility

Precedents exist in differentiated smart card systems (e.g., student, senior, or resident passes) in cities such as London (Oyster), Seoul (T-money), or Hong Kong (Octopus). Coordination with property tax databases and PRESTO card infrastructure would enable secure authentication and distribution. Integration with open payment architecture (credit/debit, mobile wallet) is increasingly possible with PRESTO 2.0’s account-based back-end.

However, careful calibration of the benefit to avoid abuse, ensure equity, and avoid incentivizing mode shift away from transit among non-exempt groups is vital. This model must complement existing low-income and accessibility programs, not replace or dilute them.

Section 6. Colour-Coded PRESTO Card System Design

Current Fare Collection and Enforcement Challenges

Toronto's flat-fare, open-boarding, and fully electronic system increases convenience, but also creates an environment vulnerable to fare evasion. Notably, child PRESTO cards (eligible for free fare for riders under 12) are fraudulently used at exceptionally high rates (94% misuse in 2023).

Peer cities that utilize visually differentiated, colour-coded, or branded fare cards for different age groups, concessions, residents, or taxpayers demonstrate significantly improved ease of enforcement and lower fraud rates.

City Comparison

City	Card Name	Visual Differentiation	Groups	Launch Year
Toronto	PRESTO	No (except stickers)*	Adult, Senior, Child	2007
London	Oyster	Yes	Standard, Youth, 60+	2004
Hong Kong	Octopus	Yes	Child, Elder, Adult	1997
Seoul	T-Money	Yes	Child, Youth, Adult	2004

* Child PRESTO cards had a sticker-based, not permanent, differentiation.

Section 7. Proposal for a Colour-Coded PRESTO System

Purpose and Rationale

The TTC and Metrolinx are currently piloting and evaluating a permanent, visually distinct card design for child and concession PRESTO cards, moving beyond disposable stickers or minor markers.

Benefits of Implementation

Such a system would:

- Allow fare inspectors and operators instant, non-digital recognition of pass type, preventing “adult using child card” fraud;
- Streamline customer service and support accessibility training;
- Support further innovation, such as Taxpayer Exemption Cards, municipal resident passes, or dynamic pricing based on proven card identity.

Deployment Considerations

Deployment must ensure accessibility, data privacy, and seamless integration with back-end fare databases, and should follow international best practices in public communications and transition planning.

Section 8. Fare Evasion Prevention Strategies at the TTC

Enforcement and Policy Initiatives

The Revenue Protection Department's multi-pronged approach encompasses:

- Uniformed and plainclothes fare inspectors deployed by mode with focused tactics (e.g., "crush load" inspections at peak streetcar times, zone-based assignments, targeted plainclothes operations for buses).
- Closure of "no-tap" fare gates at subway stations.
- Educational campaigns on the fiscal and service impacts of fare theft.
- Zero-tolerance enforcement for concession card fraud, especially for misuse of child PRESTO cards.
- Body-worn camera program and newly rebranded "Provincial Offences Officers" to enhance accountability and deterrence.

Gaps and Limitations

Despite these efforts, internal TTC reports admit that prior strategies, including non-confrontational fare collection, may have inadvertently encouraged non-payment and failed to distinguish between willful theft and inability to pay. Engineering and technology fixes remain partially deployed (e.g., accessible but physically robust station gates, slow progress on colour-coded smart cards), and inspector coverage is insufficient to alter network-wide compliance rates.

Recommendations from Recent Reviews

- Further automate and physically harden fare gates;
- Continue expansion of body-worn camera use;
- Implement real-time "tap required" prompts and visual signals for valid entry;
- Expand the inspector complement and provide greater discretion for ticketing and on-the-spot payment in line with peer North American reforms;
- Implement distinct colour-coded PRESTO cards.

Section 9. Revenue Protection Department & Culture Change

Structure

- Fare Inspectors: Proof-of-Payment checks
- Transit Special Constables: Safety and chronic offenders
- Analytics Unit: Data-driven deployment

Culture Change Program

In response to oversight complaints, equity reviews, and Ombudsman Toronto recommendations, the department has instituted a comprehensive Culture Change Program, including:

- Mandatory training in human rights, de-escalation, anti-bias, mental health, and conflict resolution;
- Introduction of body-worn cameras and transparent complaint processes, with oversight through the Fare Inspector and Special Constable Complaints Office;
- Recruitment and onboarding reforms to promote diversity and inclusion.

Board-approved Use-of-Force and Discretion policies stress de-escalation and proportionality, aligning with leading international standards and further severing the historic “policing” orientation of fare enforcement in favour of a customer-centric approach.

Section 10. Non-Confrontation Policy Reform for Fare Enforcement

Assessment of Current Policy

Historically, the TTC has championed a “non-confrontation” policy for interacting with suspected fare evaders, especially to prevent escalation with vulnerable customers and minimize reputational risk. Inspectors were discouraged from pursuing, detaining, or forcibly removing non-compliant passengers, particularly if they refused to provide identification.

While defensible on human rights grounds, recent internal audits and public commentaries acknowledge significant unintended consequences: emboldened willful evaders, perception of impunity, and loss of deterrent effect. Political figures and transit experts now explicitly call for reform to encourage “presence, respectful intervention, and lawful ticketing” without reverting to excessive or punitive tactics.

Prospective Policy Corrections

A refined policy would:

- Authorize inspectors to respectfully but assertively require proof-of-payment or identification for willful offenders, especially for repeated or persistent fare evasion;
- Maintain a discretionary, supportive posture for first-time or vulnerable riders unable to pay;
- Include escalation protocols for recalcitrant fare dodgers, involving security and/or police as a last resort;
- Ensure robust, user-friendly complaint and appeal channels to safeguard against misuse or abuse of discretion.

This balances deterrence, fairness, and public trust.

Section 11. Audit of Out-of-Service Vehicle and Slow-Zone Practices

Vehicle Downtime and Service Reliability

A major driver of both operating inefficiency and customer discontent is the recurring backlog of out-of-service buses, streetcars, and slow-zone restrictions on subway lines due to deferred maintenance or repair. State-of-good-repair (SOGR) audits show a growing gap between asset needs and investments, with the TTC's SOGR backlog projected to grow from $149 million in 2024 to over $8.2 billion by 2033.

- Bus and rail vehicle procurement gaps, combined with high rates of out-of-service vehicles (sometimes exceeding seven days), limit capacity to restore or grow service.
- Streetcar overhead maintenance and track repairs show missed preventative inspection targets and delayed corrective work, leading to more frequent and longer slow zones, which can add several minutes per trip and frustrate riders.

Year – TTC SOGR Backlog – % Asset Value

- 2024: $149M – 0.6%
- 2033: $8.2B – 20.7%

Peer City Comparison: Boston's MBTA recently eliminated all slow zones with a dedicated state capital injection and intensive maintenance oversight—a model Toronto is urged to mirror.

Recommended Audit Enhancements

- Mandate routine, public reporting of vehicle out-of-service rates and SOGR delays;
- Fund and empower the Internal Audit, Risk, and Compliance unit to investigate causes and hold management accountable for repeated fleet downtime or backlog growth.

Section 12. Operational Efficiency and Cost-Saving Measures

Recent Achievements

From 2019 to 2024, the TTC claims operating savings and efficiency improvements averaging $48.9 million to $12.9 million annually, including overtime and absence management, aftermarket parts warranty programs, and call centre process optimizations.

Measure – Annualized Savings ($M)

- Absence management: 1.4
- Wheel-Trans call centre: 0.5
- Aftermarket parts warranty: 0.2
- Diesel hedging: 2.5
- Line-by-line reductions: 6.8
- Overtime reductions: 0.8

The efficiency/saving as a % of net expenditures, however, has declined (3.1% in 2025 to 0.2% in 2026), and is generally insufficient to independently close the persistent and large-scale fiscal gaps.

SOGR Investments and Economic Benefits

Strategic investments, such as the $8.95 billion raised for TTC capital needs through the City Building Fund and potential provincial/federal injections for rolling stock and infrastructure renewal, promise significant multiplier effects: every $1 million invested supports 13 new jobs and generates $2.14 million in economic activity, according to the TTC's capital investment plan analysis.

Ongoing Gaps and Unmet Needs

Despite these efforts, over 70% of the TTC's 2024–2038 capital plan remains unfunded, with dire risks to service reliability, system safety, and accessibility if gaps persist.

Section 13. Funding Models and Ancillary Revenue Sources

Contemporary Landscape

The TTC operates on the most fare-dependent funding model among peer North American cities, with approximately 44–49% of costs funded through fares (compared to 25–35% in many U.S. systems and 36% for MiWay or 43% for Brampton). Recent operating budget projections and city briefings underscore the unsustainability of this model:

Year – Gross Expenditures ($B) – Revenue ($B) – Net Subsidy ($B)

- 2024: 2.57 – 1.34 – 1.23
- 2025: 2.82 – 1.43 – 1.39

Ancillary Revenue Options Explored

- **Commercial Parking Levies:** $100–150 million annually, as under consideration by city council.
- **Advertising, Retail, Real Estate:** Important, but insufficient at present scale.
- **Rideshare Levies:** Could directly address the $74–$120 million annual loss to Uber/Lyft mode shift—more than is lost to fare evasion in some years.

Section 14. City of Toronto Property Tax Relief Eligibility

Current Programs

The property tax, water, and solid waste relief program now covers household incomes up to $60,000 for seniors and persons with disabilities. Coverage for non-senior, non-disabled property owners is limited to the Tax Deferral for low-income families and general hardship appeals.

Expansion Potential

Broader expansion of transit concessions or targeted rebates linked to property tax payment could align with the Taxpayer Exemption Card proposal while reinforcing the principle of progressive relief for those most in need.

Section 15. Peer City Transit Funding and Fare Evasion Solutions

Funding Models

- **Vancouver / TransLink:** Mix of provincial, federal, fare, municipal, and carbon-tax revenue.
- **Montreal / STM:** Shared responsibility across city, province, and federal governments, with predictable base contributions.
- **Boston / MBTA:** Recently approved $600 million state investment to eliminate slow zones and upgrade aging fleet—a direct correlation to SOGR capital needs.
- **New York / MTA:** Added $700 million in funding to counter fare evasion, emphasizing technology and targeted enforcement over broad service cuts.

Fare Evasion Solutions

Best-practice recommendations include:

- Visual differentiation of fare types;
- Real-time digital fare validation;
- Combination of warnings and civil administrative fines;
- Grace periods and supports for first-time or low-income offenders;
- Automated, “always-closed” fare barriers at all stations;
- High-visibility enforcement presence;
- Data-driven targeting of hotspots for inspection.

Section 16. TTC Fare Capping Feasibility Analysis

Concept Overview

Fare capping allows riders to pay per trip until they reach a set threshold (daily, weekly, or monthly), after which additional trips are free. This ensures no rider pays more than the cost of a pass, while maintaining flexibility for occasional riders.

Peer City Examples

- **London (Oyster):** Daily and weekly caps automatically applied.
- **New York (OMNY):** Weekly fare capping introduced in 2022.
- **Vancouver (Compass):** Monthly pass equivalency through stored value capping.

TTC Context

The TTC currently offers monthly passes and 12-month pass discounts, but lacks automatic fare capping. PRESTO's account-based system could technically support capping, but requires provincial and Metrolinx coordination.

Benefits

- Equity: Protects low-income riders from overpaying.
- Simplicity: Eliminates need to pre-commit to a pass.
- Ridership Growth: Encourages frequent use without upfront cost barrier.

Challenges

- Revenue risk if caps are set too low.
- Complexity in integrating with cross-boundary systems (GO Transit, MiWay, YRT).
- Requires provincial buy-in and PRESTO system upgrades.

Section 17. Ride-Hail Industry Impact on TTC Ridership and Revenue

Ridership Diversion

Since 2016, Uber, Lyft, and other ride-hail services have captured a significant share of short-haul urban trips, particularly evenings and weekends. Internal TTC analysis estimates annual ridership losses of 8–10 million trips, equivalent to $74–$120 million in foregone fare revenue.

Fiscal Impact

This diversion compounds the TTC's structural funding gap:

- Farebox recovery declines as riders shift to ride-hail.
- Operating costs remain fixed, with fewer riders to share the burden.
- The TTC loses more revenue to ride-hail diversion than to fare evasion in some years.

Policy Options

- **Ride-Hail Levy:** A per-trip surcharge earmarked for transit operations, modeled on New York City's $2.75 congestion fee.
- **Integration:** Explore partnerships for first-mile/last-mile service, with ride-hail companies contributing to TTC fare products.
- **Public Awareness:** Campaigns highlighting the environmental and fiscal costs of ride-hail compared to transit.

Section 18. Recommendations for Council and Stakeholders

Core Recommendations

- **Restore Provincial Operating Subsidy:** Normalize a 25–30% base contribution to TTC operating costs.
- **Implement TTC PILT Model:** Ensure fair property tax contributions and earmark funds for transit improvements.
- **Launch Taxpayer Exemption Card:** Provide tangible transit benefits to property taxpayers, reinforcing fairness and public support.
- **Deploy Colour-Coded PRESTO Cards:** Reduce concession fraud and enable broader differentiated fare products.
- **Reform Fare Enforcement Policy:** Balance deterrence with equity, ensuring inspectors have authority while maintaining non-confrontational principles.
- **Audit and Address SOGR Backlog:** Mandate transparent reporting and prioritize capital funding to eliminate slow zones and vehicle downtime.
- **Expand Efficiency Measures:** Scale proven cost-saving programs and reinvest in reliability.
- **Introduce Ride-Hail Levy:** Capture lost revenue from Uber/Lyft diversion and reinvest in TTC service.
- **Advance Fare Capping:** Ensure riders never pay more than the cost of a pass, improving equity and ridership.

Stakeholder Engagement

- **Council:** Adopt reforms and allocate funding.
- **Province:** Commit to normalized operating subsidy and PRESTO system upgrades.
- **Metrolinx:** Partner on fare technology and integration.
- **Business Community:** Support PILT and ride-hail levy as fair contributions.
- **Riders and Residents:** Engage in public consultations and benefit from improved affordability and reliability.

Section 19. Conclusion

Summary of Findings

Toronto's transit system faces a structural funding crisis rooted in provincial subsidy withdrawal, fare over-dependence, and mounting state-of-good-repair backlogs. Fare evasion, ride-hail diversion, and inequitable property tax burdens compound the challenge.

Path Forward

A comprehensive reform package—restoring provincial operating contributions, implementing a TTC PILT model, introducing taxpayer exemption cards, deploying colour-coded PRESTO, reforming enforcement policy, auditing SOGR practices, and capturing ride-hail revenue—offers a viable path to stabilize finances, restore service reliability, and rebuild public trust.

Call to Action

Council, province, and stakeholders must act decisively to normalize funding, modernize fare systems, and prioritize equity. Without immediate intervention, Toronto risks further service erosion and fiscal instability. With bold reforms, the TTC can become a model of affordability, reliability, and fairness.

Sincerely James D Golding

Section 20. References

1. www.toronto.ca — TTC Subsidy Period 2014–2020 – City of Toronto
2. news.ontario.ca — Terms of the New Deal Between Ontario and Toronto
3. fao-on.org — Ontario's Public Transit Agencies: Ridership, Finances and Operating …
4. www.mass.gov — Healey-Driscoll Administration Delivers $600 Million to MBTA
5. www.cbc.ca — Ontario has promised Toronto over $1B in new funding. Here's how it …
6. www.toronto.ca — 2024 Budget Notes Toronto Transit Commission
7. www.toronto.ca — Property Tax, Water & Solid Waste Relief – City of Toronto
8. www.reminetwork.com — Toronto boosts property tax relief threshold – REMI Network
9. en.wikipedia.org — List of public transport smart cards – Wikipedia
10. www.toronto.ca — Fare Collection Update – City of Toronto
11. www.ttc.ca — 5-Year Fare Policy and 10-Year Fare Collection Outlook – TTC.ca
12. pw.ttc.ca — The TTC's Revenue Protection Strategy
13. scan-cards.com — Custom Transit and Transportation Cards
14. www.ttc.ca — TTC launching enhanced fare compliance campaign
15. www.cbc.ca — Fare evasion cost TTC nearly $124M last year, staff report says
16. www.mta.info — Blue-Ribbon Report on MTA Fare and Toll Evasion
17. www.ttc.ca — TTC Fare Inspectors to be known as Provincial Offences Officers
18. toronto.redfm.ca — TTC rebrands fare inspectors as Provincial Offences Officers to tackle …
19. www.ttc.ca — Special Constable Service and Revenue Protection Department Policies
20. www.toronto.ca — Briefing Note 9 – 2024 Capital Budget Briefing Note – State of Good …
21. pw.ttc.ca — TTC's 2024–2038 Capital Investment Plan: A Review
22. www.torontoauditor.ca — Audit of the Toronto Transit Commission's Streetcar Overhead Assets …
23. toronto.citynews.ca — TTC to consider fare capping and eliminating current $156 monthly pass
24. www.cbc.ca — The TTC is losing more revenue to Uber and Lyft than to fare evasion …
25. www.blogto.com — The TTC is losing more money to Uber and Lyft than to fare evasion – blogTO
26. www.chrismoise.ca — Tax and Utility Bill Relief Program: Apply by October 31!
27. www.torontotoday.ca — TTC eyes capping monthly fares, making rides free after 40 trips

Proposal for Sustainable TTC Funding Reform

Date: December 8, 2025

To:

- Ontario Ministry of Transportation
- Ontario Ministry of Infrastructure
- Premier of Ontario
- Toronto City Council
- Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) Board of Commissioners

From: James D. Golding Toronto Municipal Property Tax Advocate Toronto, Ontario Tel: 437-994-7912 Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

Executive Summary

The Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) is the backbone of mobility in Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). In 2024, the TTC's **gross operating budget was $2.568 billion**, with **422 million annual rides**. Fare revenue covered only **$1.337 billion**, leaving a **$1.231 billion shortfall** subsidized by the City of Toronto through property taxes.

Toronto homeowners cannot continue to subsidize a regional transit system alone. This proposal recommends:

1. **Regional cost-sharing agreements** under the *Transportation for the Future Act, 2023 (Bill 131)*.
2. **Nominal fares for children and youth** (25¢ and 50¢ respectively).
3. **A $1 cross-boundary rider fee** for non-Toronto residents using TTC.

Together, these measures could generate **$165–170 million annually**, reduce TTC's reliance on property taxes, lower fares by **25–50¢ per ride**, and create a surplus to reinvest in other city priorities.

Conclusion: This plan is fair, plausible, and sustainable. It ensures all riders contribute while protecting affordability.

Background and Problem Statement

- **TTC Funding Gap:** In 2024, TTC required $2.568 billion in expenditures but faced a $1.231 billion shortfall.
- **Property Tax Burden:** Toronto homeowners faced an **8% residential property tax increase in 2024**, largely to cover municipal service shortfalls including TTC.
- **Regional Riders:** Riders from York, Peel, Durham, and Halton benefit from TTC services, especially with fare integration programs, but contribute nothing directly to TTC's operating costs.
- **Children & Youth:** Free rides for children under 12 and discounted youth fares were introduced for affordability, but times have changed — everyone must contribute.

Conclusion: Toronto taxpayers cannot continue to subsidize a regional system alone. Without reform, TTC's funding gap will grow, forcing further property tax hikes.

Legislative Context

- **Transportation for the Future Act, 2023 (Bill 131):** Allows TTC to enter agreements with other municipalities for shared operations and funding.
- **GO Transit Station Funding Act, 2023:** Allows municipalities to levy developer charges to fund GO stations. A similar model could apply to TTC stations serving regional riders.
- **Toronto–York Spadina Subway Extension precedent:** York Region contributed to the extension into Vaughan, proving inter-municipal cost-sharing is viable.

Conclusion: Provincial legislation already provides the framework for regional cost-sharing. Toronto must use it.

Proposed Funding Measures

1. Child & Youth Fares

- Introduce 25¢ fare for children, 50¢ for youth.
- Estimated 50 million annual child/youth rides → **$15–20 million revenue**.
- **Fix for backlash:** Pair with systemwide fare reductions (25–50¢) so families see a net benefit. Expand Fair Pass to cover low-income children/youth.

Conclusion: Everyone contributes fairly, while affordability is preserved.

2. Cross-Boundary Rider Fee

- Charge $1 for non-Toronto residents using TTC.
- Estimated 50 million annual cross-boundary rides → **$50 million revenue**.
- **Fix for fairness:** Municipalities may subsidize the fee for their residents, or Ontario can match contributions.

Conclusion: Fairness requires outside riders to pay their share.

3. Regional Cost-Sharing Agreements

- Neighboring municipalities contribute proportionally to TTC operations.
- Target contribution: **$100 million annually**.
- **Fix for politics:** Ontario facilitates negotiations under Bill 131, offering provincial matching funds to incentivize agreements.

Conclusion: Regional cooperation ensures TTC sustainability.

Financial Impact

- **New Revenue Streams:** $65–70 million (child/youth + cross-boundary fees).
- **Regional Contributions:** $100 million.
- **Total New Funding:** ~$165–170 million annually.
- **Fare Reduction Potential:** $165 million ÷ 422 million rides ≈ **39¢ per ride**.
- **Scenario with Provincial Matching Funds:** Fare reductions could exceed **50¢ per ride**.
- **Surplus Use:** Funds could offset property tax increases or be reinvested in housing, infrastructure, and public safety.

Conclusion: This plan creates a surplus, easing property tax burdens and strengthening city services.

Rider Affordability and Equity Safeguards

- Maintain and strengthen the **Fair Pass program** (36% discount on adult single fares, 21% discount on monthly passes).
- Protect low-income families from child/youth fare changes.
- Allow municipalities to subsidize the $1 cross-boundary fee for their residents.
- Annual monitoring of ridership, fare burden, and equity outcomes.

Conclusion: Equity protections ensure affordability for vulnerable riders while spreading responsibility fairly.

Implementation Plan

- **Phase 1 (0–6 months):** Intergovernmental working group, PRESTO data-sharing, public consultation.
- **Phase 2 (6–12 months):** Finalize agreements, update PRESTO fare tables, communications campaign.
- **Phase 3 (12+ months):** Launch, monitor, and adjust policies annually.

Conclusion: A staged rollout ensures stakeholder buy-in and measurable public benefits.

Risks and Mitigations

- **Public backlash on child/youth fares:** Neutralized by pairing nominal fares with systemwide fare reductions and Fair Pass expansion.
- **Cross-boundary identification challenges:** Addressed via PRESTO residency attributes; municipalities can opt for block contributions.
- **Municipal resistance:** Mitigated by provincial facilitation, matching funds, and York Region precedent.

Conclusion: Risks are manageable and outweighed by benefits.

Final Conclusion

A healthy TTC is non-negotiable for Toronto and the GTA. This proposal aligns funding responsibility with actual benefit, asking every rider to contribute a little so everyone can pay less overall. By combining modest child and youth fares, a $1 cross-boundary fee, and regional cost-sharing under existing legislation, we can stabilize TTC finances, reduce fares, and relieve pressure on Toronto's property taxpayers — fairly, plausibly, and durably.

Respectfully submitted, James D. Golding Toronto Municipal Tax Advocate Toronto, Ontario
Tel: 437-994-7912 Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

Optional Appendices

Appendix A: TTC Operating Budget, Ridership, and Subsidy Overview

- **2024 Gross Operating Budget:** $2.568 billion
- **Fare & Other Revenues:** $1.337 billion
- **City Subsidy (Shortfall Coverage):** ~$1.231 billion
- **Annual Ridership (2024):** 422 million trips
- **Average Fare Revenue per Trip:** ~$3.18
- **Trend:** Shortfalls have grown steadily, requiring larger City subsidies each year.

Conclusion: Toronto taxpayers are covering over $1.2 billion annually to keep TTC running, while regional riders benefit without contributing.

Appendix B: Legislative References

- **Transportation for the Future Act, 2023 (Bill 131):** Enables TTC to enter agreements with other municipalities.
- **GO Transit Station Funding Act, 2023:** Provides precedent for shared funding through developer charges.
- **Toronto–York Spadina Subway Extension (2017):** York Region contributed funding, proving inter-municipal cost-sharing is viable.

Conclusion: Existing legislation already provides the framework for regional cost-sharing.

Appendix C: Illustrative Revenue Scenarios and Fare Reduction Calculations

- **Child/Youth Fares:** 25¢–50¢ per ride → ~$15–20 million annually.
- **Cross-Boundary Rider Fee:** $1 per ride → ~$50 million annually.
- **Regional Municipal Contributions:** Target ~$100 million annually.
- **Total New Funding:** ~$165–170 million annually.
- **Fare Reduction Potential:** $165 million ÷ 422 million rides **≈ 39¢ per ride**.
- **Scenario with Provincial Matching Funds:** Fare reductions could exceed **50¢ per ride**.

Conclusion: New revenues directly translate into lower fares and reduced reliance on property taxes.

Appendix D: Equity Impact Assessment Framework

- **Fair Pass Program:** Maintains discounts for low-income riders.
- **Safeguards:** Protect families from child/youth fare changes; municipalities can subsidize cross-boundary fees.
- **Monitoring:** Annual reports on ridership, fare burden, and equity outcomes.

Conclusion: Equity protections ensure affordability for vulnerable riders while spreading responsibility fairly.

Sincerely James D Golding (Toronto Municipal Property Tax Advocate)

TORONTO NEGLECT SURTAX & TENANT PROTECTION FRAMEWORK

A Comprehensive Policy for Housing Justice, Tenant Safety, and Accountability in Multi-Residential Buildings

Submitted by:

James D. Golding

Toronto, Ontario

Tenant Advocate

December 25, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Toronto faces a growing crisis of building neglect, unsafe living conditions, and chronic landlord non-compliance. Buildings such as **500 Dawes Road**, with **84 active property standards violations**, demonstrate a systemic failure in enforcement, tenant protection, and accountability.

The **Toronto Neglect Surtax** is a 25% annual revenue surtax applied to multi-residential buildings with chronic violations. The surtax is paired with:

- A protected reserve fund
- Tenant relocation support
- Food security assistance
- Mental-health stabilization
- A guaranteed right-to-return
- A city-wide enforcement and accountability framework

This framework ensures that neglect becomes financially unsustainable, tenants receive direct support, and the city gains a stable, protected revenue source dedicated to housing justice.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Approach

This proposal is based on:

- Municipal inspection data
- CBC reporting on 500 Dawes Road
- Tenant testimony
- City property standards documentation
- Multi-residential revenue analysis
- Municipal taxation powers
- Relocation and right-to-return frameworks from other jurisdictions
- Public health research on unsafe housing

2.2 Case Study Selection

500 Dawes Road was selected due to:

- High number of violations
- Severity of conditions
- Revenue scale
- Public documentation
- Representation of systemic issues

2.3 Surtax Calculation Method

The 25% surtax rate is based on:

- Annual rental revenue
- Repair cost comparisons
- Need for strong financial incentive
- Revenue required for tenant supports

2.4 Tenant Impact Assessment

Assessed through:

- Displacement cases
- Financial hardship reports
- Mental-health impacts
- Costs of relocation, food loss, pest contamination

2.5 Limitations

- Revenue estimates approximate
- Violation counts change
- Tenant impacts vary

Conclusion:

The methodology is evidence-based and grounded in real conditions.

3. DEFINITIONS

Chronic Violation:

A building with 10+ active property standards violations OR repeated non-compliance within 12 months.

Unsafe Condition:

Any condition posing risk to health, safety, or habitability, including mold, pests, structural decay, or lack of essential services.

Multi-Residential Building:

A building with 6+ rental units not owner-occupied.

Purpose-Built Rental:

A building constructed for rental housing, not converted from another use.

Temporary Relocation:

A city-funded move required due to unsafe conditions or major repairs.

Right-to-Return:

A legal guarantee that displaced tenants may return to their original unit at the same rent.

Completion of Repairs:

All violations resolved, building passes inspection, and all returning tenants reinstated.

Annual Rental Revenue:

Total rent collected from all units in a 12-month period.

4. LEGAL AUTHORITY

The City of Toronto has authority under:

4.1 City of Toronto Act (COTA)

- Section 267: taxation powers
- Section 267(2): ability to impose surtaxes
- Section 8: broad powers to govern for health, safety, and well-being

4.2 Precedent: Vacant Home Tax

Toronto already imposes a revenue-based surtax on residential properties.

4.3 Municipal Act

Supports municipal taxation for regulatory purposes.

4.4 Charter & Constitutional Compliance

The surtax:

- Does not violate property rights
- Is not discriminatory
- Is tied to public health and safety

Conclusion:

The surtax is legally permissible and consistent with existing municipal taxation frameworks.

5. CASE STUDY: 500 DAWES ROAD

500 Dawes Road has:

- 84 active violations
- Rats, bedbugs
- Water damage
- Broken elevator
- Rusted balconies
- Unsafe conditions

Estimated revenue: **$6.5 million annually**.

Conclusion:

This building exemplifies systemic failure and the need for a revenue-based penalty.

6. SYSTEMIC ANALYSIS OF NEGLECT

Toronto has widespread issues:

- Chronic violations
- Repeated non-compliance
- Pest infestations
- Structural decay
- Unsafe living conditions

Causes include:

- Weak enforcement
- Low penalties
- High profitability of neglect
- Lack of tenant protections

Conclusion:

A city-wide surtax is required.

7. HUMAN IMPACT ANALYSIS

7.1 Financial Impacts

Tenants face:

- Food loss
- Pest control costs
- Missed work
- Higher heating bills
- Medical expenses
- Inability to save
- Paying full rent for unsafe housing

7.2 Mental-Health Impacts

Tenants experience:

- Anxiety
- Depression
- Sleep disruption
- Fear of retaliation
- Chronic stress
- Loss of dignity
- Social isolation

7.3 Public Health Impacts

Unsafe housing contributes to:

- Respiratory illness
- Infection risk
- Injury risk
- Pest-borne illness

Conclusion:

Neglect is a public-health crisis.

8. THE NEGLECT SURTAX

A 25% surtax on annual rental revenue.

For 500 Dawes Road:

$6.5M×0.25=$1.625M

Applies until:

- All violations resolved
- Building passes inspection
- All returning tenants reinstated

Conclusion:

Neglect becomes more expensive than compliance.

9. ENFORCEMENT MECHANISM

9.1 Inspection Cycle

- Annual inspections for all multi-residential buildings
- Quarterly inspections for buildings under surtax

9.2 Violation Scoring

- Each violation assigned a severity score
- Chronic violation threshold triggers surtax

9.3 Revenue Verification

- Landlords must submit audited revenue statements
- City may audit independently

9.4 Non-Payment Penalties

- Interest charges
- Liens
- Legal action
- Seizure of rents

9.5 Surtax Removal

Only after:

- Full compliance
- Inspection clearance
- Tenant reinstatement

Conclusion:

The surtax is enforceable and transparent.

10. TENANT PROTECTION MEASURES

Landlords under surtax:

- Cannot raise rent
- Cannot apply for AGIs
- Cannot impose fees
- Cannot evict tenants
- Cannot retaliate

Conclusion:

Tenants are shielded from financial harm.

11. USE OF REVENUE

A. Homelessness Support

- Supportive housing
- Rapid housing
- Rent supplements
- Mental-health services

B. Tenant Relocation & Stabilization

- First/last month’s rent
- Moving costs
- Temporary housing
- Storage
- Furniture replacement
- Start-up essentials
- Rent top-ups

C. Food Security Support

- Grocery gift cards
- Food bank funding
- Emergency food replacement

Conclusion:

Funds directly support affected residents.

12. PROTECTED RESERVE FUND

The reserve:

- Is separate from city budgets
- Cannot be transferred
- Cannot be borrowed from
- Cannot be taxed
- Is publicly reported annually

Conclusion:

Funds remain protected and transparent.

13. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

13.1 Lead Division

Municipal Licensing & Standards (MLS)

13.2 Supporting Divisions

- Shelter, Support & Housing Administration
- Toronto Public Health
- Revenue Services
- Social Development, Finance & Administration

13.3 Tenant Support Office

A dedicated office to:

- Process relocation
- Distribute funds
- Manage right-to-return

Conclusion:

Clear administrative roles ensure smooth implementation.

14. IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Phase 1 (0–3 months):

Legal review, policy drafting, staffing.

Phase 2 (3–6 months):

Public communication, landlord notification.

Phase 3 (6–12 months):

Initial inspections, surtax activation.

Phase 4 (12–18 months):

Tenant support rollout.

Phase 5 (18–24 months):

Full enforcement and reporting.

15. FINANCIAL MODELING

15.1 Estimated Revenue

City-wide estimate:

- 150–250 buildings likely eligible
- Estimated revenue: **$80M–$130M annually**

15.2 Program Costs

- Tenant supports: $40M–$70M
- Homelessness supports: $20M–$40M
- Administration: $5M–$10M

15.3 Net Impact

Positive net revenue for reserve fund.

16. EQUITY & HUMAN RIGHTS ANALYSIS

The surtax:

- Protects vulnerable tenants
- Reduces displacement
- Supports low-income households
- Aligns with human rights principles
- Addresses systemic inequity

17. RISK ASSESSMENT & MITIGATION

Risks

- Legal challenge
- Landlord non-compliance
- Administrative burden
- Revenue volatility

Mitigation

- Strong legal basis
- Clear enforcement
- Dedicated staffing
- Reserve fund stabilization

18. RELOCATION FRAMEWORK

City-funded relocation includes:

- Temporary housing
- Moving costs
- Storage
- Food support
- Rent supplements

Tenants are relocated only when necessary for safety or repairs.

19. GUARANTEED RIGHT-TO-RETURN

Tenants displaced for repairs have:

- Right to return to same building
- Right to same unit
- Right to same rent
- No re-application
- No denial

Surtax remains until all tenants are reinstated.

20. FINAL CONCLUSION

The Toronto Neglect Surtax & Tenant Protection Framework establishes a comprehensive, enforceable, and equitable system for addressing building neglect. It protects tenants, supports the unhoused, stabilizes communities, and ensures landlords cannot profit from unsafe conditions.

This framework ensures that safe housing becomes a right, not a privilege.

Submitted by

James D. Golding

Toronto, Ontario

437-994-7912

jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

Firetabletjames@hotmail.com

Walk of Reflection – Comprehensive Proposal (Amended & Unified)

Submitted by: James D. Golding

Date November 26, 2025

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Tel: 1-437-994-7912

Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com | firetabletjames@gmail.com

Dedication (Personal Foreword)

This proposal is dedicated to all Canadian veterans and their families who served in times of war — whether they gave their lives or returned home forever changed. It is also a personal tribute to my own family members who served, representing the countless Canadian families with similar stories of sacrifice and resilience.

- Private Reginald Golding — My great uncle, and my grandmother's brother, served in World War II. His name is preserved in the Canadian Virtual War Memorial, a testament to his ultimate sacrifice.
- James Albert Gregory Golding — My grandfather, born April 1, 1925, served in World War II as a member of the Carleton and York Regiment. He fought bravely in Europe and lived to share his experiences, passing away on February 11, 2005.
- Other Family Members — Several other relatives also served Canada during wartime. Because they survived, their records are not publicly available in the Canadian Virtual War Memorial, but their contributions remain part of our family's legacy of duty and service.

By sharing my family's story, I hope to highlight the shared experiences of thousands of Canadian families. The Walk of Reflection is not only a personal tribute, but a collective act of remembrance for all who served, sacrificed, and especially those who gave their lives.

1. Executive Summary

The Walk of Reflection is a proposed annual Canadian commemorative initiative to honor veterans of World War I and World War II. Anchored on June 28, a date of profound historical symbolism, the event will combine parades, educational programming, and a community walk to raise funds exclusively for Canadian veterans' organizations.

This initiative expands remembrance beyond November 11, creating multiple opportunities throughout the year for Canadians to reflect on the costs of war and the value of peace. It is designed to be both educational and honorary, ensuring that all funds raised go directly to veterans and not into administrative misuse.

2. Symbolic Significance of June 28

- 1914: Assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo, sparking World War I.
- 1919: Treaty of Versailles signed, formally ending World War I.
- Personal: June 28 is the proposer's birthday, aligning personal meaning with global history.

This alignment of beginnings and endings makes June 28 a natural day of reflection — a chance to honor sacrifice, acknowledge resilience, and recommit to peace.

By anchoring the Walk of Reflection on June 28, we connect this pivotal moment in history to the sacrifices of Canadian soldiers and families. It reminds us that peace is fragile, that war often begins with a single violent act, and that the consequences ripple across generations.

This symbolic connection ensures that the Walk of Reflection is not only a Canadian tradition, but also a global reminder of the costs of war and the importance of remembrance.

3. Proposed Event Structure

A. Parades

- WWI Parade (July 28): Commemorating the outbreak of World War I, featuring WWI uniforms, vehicles, reenactments, and Canadian regimental history.
- WWII Parade (August 15 – V-J Day): Honoring Canada's role in WWII, with military bands, vehicles, flyovers, and storytelling booths.

B. Walk of Reflection (June 28)

- Community walk through Toronto (or rotating Canadian cities).
- Stations representing milestones from WWI and WWII.
- Veterans and families invited to lead the walk.
- Fundraising through registration, sponsorships, and donations.
- Closing ceremony with lantern release and moment of silence.

C. Remembrance Day (November 11)

- Continued observance of traditional ceremonies, tied into the broader cycle of remembrance.

4. Objectives

- Commemoration: Honor Canadian veterans of WWI and WWII.
- Education: Provide accessible historical programming for schools and communities.
- Fundraising: Ensure all funds raised go directly to veterans' organizations.
- Community Engagement: Create inclusive events that unite Canadians in reflection and gratitude.

5. Budget & Financial Plan (Estimates)

Category	Estimated Cost (Toronto launch)
Permits & Security	$25,000
Parade logistics (vehicles, bands, reenactors)	$40,000
Walk logistics (route setup, stations, lanterns)	$30,000
Marketing & Outreach	$20,000
Educational programming (materials, school kits)	$15,000
Accessibility & medical support	$10,000
Contingency fund	$10,000
Total Estimated Cost	$150,000

6. Revenue & ROI Projections

Revenue Streams

- Participant Registration: 5,000 participants × $25 = $125,000
- Sponsorships: 5 sponsors × $20,000 = $100,000
- Donations: 10,000 attendees × $20 average = $200,000
- Merchandise: 3,000 items × $10 net = $30,000

Total Revenue Estimate: $455,000 Expenses: $150,000 Net Funds for Veterans (Year 1): ~$305,000

ROI (Return on Investment)

ROI=305,000150,000×100≈203%ROI = \frac{305,000}{150,000} \times 100 \approx 203\%

For every $1 spent on event operations, approximately $2 goes directly to veterans.

Growth Potential Expansion to 5–6 major Canadian cities could generate $2–3 million annually for veterans' organizations.

7. Logistics & Operations

- Location: Toronto launch, rotating annually to other Canadian cities.
- Route: 5–10 km walk with historical stations.
- Safety: Police coordination, medical tents, volunteer marshals.
- Accessibility: Wheelchair-friendly routes, multilingual signage.
- Volunteers: Partner with schools, cadet corps, and community groups.

8. Marketing & Outreach

- National campaign through TV, radio, and social media.
- Partnerships with CBC, CTV, and local newspapers.
- School outreach: lesson plans and student participation.
- Branding: logo, slogan (“Reflect. Remember. Recommit.”).

9. Educational Programming

- School Kits: Lesson plans tied to WWI/WWII milestones.
- Interactive Exhibits: Pop-up museum tents along the walk.
- Digital Engagement: Mobile app with stories, maps, and veteran interviews.
- University Partnerships: History departments to provide research and speakers.

10. Veteran Involvement

- Veterans as parade marshals and walk leaders.
- Oral history booths to capture stories.
- Inclusivity: recognition of Indigenous, immigrant, and women veterans.
- Expansion to later conflicts (Korea, Afghanistan, peacekeeping).

11. Community & Inclusivity

- Multilingual programming (English, French, Indigenous languages).
- Family-friendly activities (children’s history zone, art projects).
- Partnerships with cultural associations to ensure broad participation.

12. Evaluation & Sustainability

- Metrics: Attendance, funds raised, media reach, school participation.
- Annual Review: Adjust programming based on feedback.
- Long-Term Vision: Establish Walk of Reflection as a permanent Canadian tradition.

13. Partnerships & Support

- Veterans Affairs Canada: National recognition, funding, programming.
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Cultural heritage and event support.
- Royal Canadian Legion: Local branches across Canada.

14. Timeline (Year 1 – Toronto Launch)

- January–March: Secure approvals, permits, and sponsorships.
- April–May: Marketing campaign launch, volunteer recruitment.
- June 28: Walk of Reflection.
- July 28: WWI Parade.
- August 15: WWII Parade.
- November 11: Remembrance Day ceremonies.
- December: Annual report and planning for next year.

15. Honoring the Fallen (Amendment)

While the Walk of Reflection celebrates the resilience of veterans who returned home, it must also solemnly acknowledge those who never made it back. Their absence is felt in families, communities, and across Canada's history.

The Walk of Reflection will include:

- Memorial Stations along the route, featuring names and stories from the Canadian Virtual War Memorial.
- Lantern Release Ceremony dedicated to those who gave their lives, symbolizing light carried forward in their memory.
- Moment of Silence during the walk, marked by a bugle call or bell toll, to honor the fallen.
- Symbolic Displays such as empty boots or helmets, representing the lives cut short.

This ensures that remembrance is complete: honoring both the veterans who returned and those who never came home.

16. Impact Statement (Amended)

The Walk of Reflection will directly benefit veterans and honor the fallen by:

- Raising an estimated $300,000 net funds in Year 1.
- Increasing public awareness and respect through multiple commemorative events.
- Strengthening community bonds by involving schools, families, and diverse cultural groups.
- Ensuring transparency and integrity in fundraising, with independent audits and public reporting.
- Providing a solemn tribute to those who never returned home, ensuring their sacrifice is permanently woven into Canada's collective memory.
- Connecting Canadian remembrance to global history by acknowledging the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand as the spark that ignited World War I.

17. Closing Statement

The Walk of Reflection is more than an event — it is the beginning of a new Canadian tradition. By anchoring remembrance on June 28, alongside July 28, August 15, and November 11, Canadians will gain a cycle of reflection that ties history, community, and support together.

This amended proposal respectfully requests consideration and support from Veterans Affairs Canada, the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and the City of Toronto to bring this vision to life — ensuring that both veterans and the fallen are remembered with dignity and gratitude.

Sincerely, James Douglas Golding

TORONTO ESSENTIALS RESERVE FUND

Full Integrated Proposal — Created & Prepared by James Douglas Golding

December 11, 2025

Executive Summary

Toronto residents are facing unprecedented affordability pressures, with rising costs of groceries, transit, and essential daily needs. Many households — including seniors, veterans, newcomers, working families, people experiencing homelessness, and those on ODSP or Ontario Works — face short-term financial gaps that push them toward high-interest credit cards or predatory lenders.

The **Toronto Essentials Reserve Fund** is a **$100 million, self-sustaining, revolving loan program** funded entirely by **existing municipal surpluses**. It provides **up to $400 once per year**, repaid within the **same calendar year**, with a **5% interest rate** and a **flexible repayment schedule chosen by the resident**.

The fund is protected by strict rules ensuring it **cannot be used for any other purpose**, and all surpluses remain locked inside the reserve. Loans are **exempt from ODSP and Ontario Works income rules**, ensuring vulnerable residents are not penalized.

This program is fair, sustainable, fiscally responsible, and designed to help **250,000 residents per year** without raising taxes.

1. Purpose of the Fund

The Toronto Essentials Reserve Fund provides short-term, low-cost financial support for essential needs, including:

- Groceries
- Transit passes
- Emergency bills
- School supplies
- Winter clothing
- Prescription costs
- Rent shortfalls
- Basic necessities for people experiencing homelessness

The goal is to give residents **breathing room** during periods of financial strain, preventing deeper crises and reducing reliance on predatory lenders.

2. Funding Model

The fund is created using:

- Property tax surpluses
- Land transfer tax surpluses
- Year-end departmental underspending
- One-time provincial/federal affordability contributions

This mirrors the structure of the **Refugee Response Reserve**, but with a key improvement: **The Essentials Reserve replenishes itself through repayments.**

3. Loan Structure

- **Maximum loan:** $400 per resident per year
- **Interest rate:** 5%
- **Total repayment:** $420
- **Repayment deadline: December 1**
- **Grace window: December 1 → December 31**
- **Late fee:** Up to **5%**, never higher
- **Final deadline: December 31**

Residents may choose their own repayment plan, including:

- Monthly payments
- Bi-weekly payments
- Two lump-sum payments
- Full repayment on a chosen date

Early repayment is allowed at any time.

4. Loan Application Window

To ensure fairness and predictable repayment:

Loan Window:

February 1 → November 1

Repayment Deadline:

December 1

Grace Window:

December 1 → December 31

Program Reset:

January 1 → January 31 (For reconciliation, reporting, and preparation)

5. Repayment Rules & Missed Payments

Standard Repayment

Borrowers must repay the full amount by **December 1**.

Grace Period

If payments are missed, borrowers have until **December 31** to catch up.

Late Fee

A late fee may apply but must be:

- **Equal to or lower than 5%**
- **Never punitive**
- **Only applied to missed payments**

Non-Repayment Consequence

If the loan is not fully repaid by **December 31**:

- The borrower becomes **ineligible for future loans**
- No exceptions
- No forgiveness
- No rollover

This protects the reserve from abuse.

6. Income Eligibility Rules

To ensure fairness and sustainability:

Minimum income requirement

Applicants must show **some income**, ensuring they can realistically repay.

Maximum income threshold

Residents above a defined income limit (based on Toronto's Low-Income Measure or Market Basket Measure) are **not eligible**.

Automatic eligibility for vulnerable groups

Regardless of income:

- Veterans
- Seniors (65+)
- Residents below the poverty line
- People experiencing homelessness
- ODSP recipients
- Ontario Works recipients

These groups face the highest affordability pressures and deserve guaranteed access.

7. ODSP & Ontario Works Exemption

Loans will be classified as:

- **Non-income**
- **Non-asset**
- **Repayable advances**

This ensures:

- No ODSP clawbacks
- No Ontario Works reductions
- No loss of shelter or transitional housing eligibility

The City will formally request provincial confirmation and issue documentation to recipients.

8. Reserve Protection & Anti-Abuse Rules

The reserve is fully protected

It may **never** be used for:

- Budget gaps
- Operating shortfalls
- Capital projects
- Wage pressures
- Shelter overruns
- Any purpose outside this program

The reserve may never be used as a taxation tool

The fund **cannot** be used to:

- Replace lost tax revenue
- Offset or justify tax increases
- Balance the budget in place of taxation
- Reduce the City’s tax obligations
- Mask or subsidize tax hikes
- Serve as revenue for tax planning

This reserve is a resident support tool — not a tax instrument.

Surplus funds are also protected

All interest and surplus earnings remain **locked inside the reserve** and may not be transferred, reallocated, or used for any other municipal purpose.

No repeat loans for unpaid borrowers

If a borrower fails to repay by **December 31**:

- They are permanently **ineligible** for future loans.
- No exceptions.

Fraud prevention

The City will implement strict safeguards, including:

- Identity verification
- Residency verification
- Duplicate application detection
- Random audits

9. Capacity & Financial Impact

With a $100 million reserve:

Residents served annually

$100{,}000{,}000 \div 400 = 250{,}000$

→ **250,000 residents can be supported each year**

Total repaid

$250{,}000 \times 420 = 105{,}000{,}000$

→ **$105 million is repaid into the reserve**

Annual surplus

$105\text{M} - 100\text{M} = 5\text{M}$

→ **The fund generates a $5 million surplus each year**

Conclusion

The reserve grows by $5 million annually, ensuring long-term sustainability and expansion of the program.

10. Strengths of the Program

1. Helps 250,000 residents in the first year gradually increasing that number annually

2. Self-sustaining and cost-neutral

3. No new taxes, and the reserve cannot be used to justify or offset tax increases

4. Supports the most vulnerable

5. Reduces reliance on payday lenders

6. Predictable annual cycle

7. Strict anti-abuse protections

8. Flexible repayment options

9. Fair income-based eligibility

10. Exempt from ODSP/OW clawbacks

11. Weaknesses / Challenges

- Requires provincial cooperation for ODSP/OW exemption
- Administrative capacity needed for high application volume
- Risk of defaults (mitigated by income rules and small loan size)
- Public misunderstanding if not communicated clearly

12. Comparison to the Refugee Response Reserve

Feature	Refugee Reserve	Essentials Reserve
Purpose	Refugee emergency support	Essential needs for residents
Funding	Surpluses	Surpluses + repayments
Structure	Special-purpose reserve	Special-purpose reserve
Sustainability	One-way spending	Self-replenishing
Political framing	Humanitarian response	Affordability response
Cost to taxpayers	None	None

The Essentials Reserve is structurally similar but **more financially sustainable**.

Conclusion

The Toronto Essentials Reserve Fund is a smart, compassionate, and fiscally responsible response to the city's affordability crisis. By relying solely on existing municipal surpluses — not new taxes — it creates a sustainable revolving fund capable of supporting up to 250,000 residents in its first year.

With strict reserve protections, flexible repayment options, ODSP and Ontario Works exemptions, and a clean calendar-year structure, the program is fair, durable, and built to last. It strengthens Toronto's social safety net, reduces reliance on predatory lenders, and provides real, immediate relief to residents — even if the loan amount is modest.

Most importantly, it delivers essential support to a broad range of residents while fully protecting taxpayers and maintaining strong financial discipline. This is a program Toronto can implement confidently, proudly, and sustainably.

December 11, 2025

James D Golding

1-437-994-7912

jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

firetabletjames@gmail.com

A Modernized, Cost-Efficient, Youth-Empowered Delivery Model for Canada Post

Comprehensive National Modernization Blueprint

Executive Summary

Canada Post is facing rising operational costs, declining letter mail volumes, and increasing parcel demand. This proposal introduces a modernized delivery system that restructures delivery frequency, aligns mail distribution with real government payment cycles, reduces operational costs, and creates a national youth employment program with strong safety protocols.

Key Outcomes:

- Annual savings of **$750M–$950M**
- Predictable weekly delivery
- Monthly government-aligned mail cycles
- Dedicated urgent-mail team
- Youth flyer workforce with supervision
- Reduced environmental impact

Conclusion: This proposal is a financially responsible, socially beneficial, and operationally realistic blueprint for the future of Canada Post.

1. Weekly Regional Delivery Model

Overview

Toronto's postal regions (M1–M9) are reorganized into a weekly delivery schedule based on mail volume.

Weekly Delivery Schedule

- **Monday:** Downtown / Old Toronto (M4–M6)
- **Tuesday:** North York (M2–M3)
- **Wednesday:** Scarborough (M1)
- **Thursday:** Etobicoke (M8)
- **Friday:** East York (M4) + York/West Toronto (M6)

Summary

This reduces fuel, labour hours, overtime, and sorting pressure.

Conclusion

A weekly regional model maintains service reliability while dramatically lowering operational costs.

2. Monthly Mail-Type Delivery Cycle

Overview

Mail is delivered according to real government payment cycles.

Monthly Cycle

- **Week 1:** Light government mail
- **Week 2:** Sorting + light mail
- **Week 3:** OW/ODSP
- **Week 4:** CPP/OAS/CRA

Summary

Delivery aligns with when Canadians actually receive payments.

Conclusion

Essential mail arrives on time while reducing unnecessary daily delivery.

3. Dedicated Urgent-Mail Team

Overview

A specialized team delivers:

- Priority mail
- Medical items
- Legal notices
- Urgent parcels

Summary

Essential services remain daily.

Conclusion

No disruption to critical communications.

4. Monthly Flyer Delivery

Overview

Flyers delivered once per month instead of weekly.

Summary

Reduces sorting time, labour, and paper waste.

Conclusion

A monthly flyer system is more efficient and environmentally responsible.

5. Flyer Opt-Out System

Overview

Households choose:

- No flyers
- Digital flyers
- Grocery-only
- Community-only

Summary

Reduces waste and improves targeting.

Conclusion

Modernizes flyer distribution and supports sustainability.

6. Youth Flyer Delivery Workforce

Overview

Flyer delivery shifts to a supervised youth workforce.

Cost Benchmark

- Toronto funds **911 crossing guards** for **$31.2M**
- Scaling across 5 postal regions = **4,555 youth workers**
- Maximum theoretical cost: **$156M**
- Realistic cost: **$20–30M**

Summary

Youth handle low-priority flyers; postal workers focus on essential tasks.

Conclusion

Creates jobs and reduces Canada Post labour costs.

7. Youth Safety, Supervision & Delivery Protocols

Safety Measures

- Designated delivery days
- Mandatory adult supervision
- Dogs must be secured
- Skip unsafe homes
- Safety training
- Reflective gear
- Adult coordinators

Summary

Youth safety is fully protected.

Conclusion

A responsible, supervised employment model.

8. Transition Plan

Phase 1: Planning (3–6 months)

- Task force
- Route mapping
- Union consultations

Phase 2: Toronto Pilot (12 months)

- Weekly delivery
- Monthly cycle
- Youth workforce

Phase 3: Evaluation (3–6 months)

- Analyze data
- Adjust operations

Phase 4: National Rollout (18–24 months)

- Expand to major cities
- Standardize schedules

Phase 5: Continuous Improvement

- Technology upgrades
- Ongoing monitoring

Conclusion

A phased rollout ensures stability and public trust.

9. Union Considerations (CUPW)

Benefits

- No job losses
- Reduced burnout
- Predictable schedules
- Improved safety

Strategy

- Early consultation
- Joint planning committees

Conclusion

Strengthens working conditions and protects union roles.

10. Toronto Pilot Program

Pilot Components

- Weekly regional delivery
- Monthly mail cycle
- Urgent-mail team
- Youth flyer workforce

Metrics

- Delivery reliability
- Cost savings
- Customer satisfaction
- Environmental impact

Conclusion

Toronto is the ideal test environment.

11. Risk & Mitigation Plan

Risks & Solutions

- Public confusion → communication campaign
- Youth safety → supervision + dog rules
- Sorting backlogs → Week 2 reset
- Weather → urgent-mail team

Conclusion

Risks are predictable and manageable.

12. Communications Strategy

Channels

- Public notices
- Digital tools
- Community outreach
- Opt-out portal

Conclusion

Clear communication ensures a smooth rollout.

13. Technology Integration

Upgrades

- Route optimization
- Youth safety app
- Digital flyers
- Delivery day lookup tool
- Sorting automation

Conclusion

Technology supports efficiency and modernization.

14. Budget & Financial Impact

Annual Savings

- Labour: $500M
- Fuel: $100–150M
- Flyers: $150–200M
- Sorting: $50–100M

Total Savings: $800M–$1B

Annual Costs

- Youth program: $20–30M
- Supervision: $5–10M
- Technology: $10–15M
- Communications: $2–3M

Total Costs: $37–58M

Net Savings: $750M–$950M per year

Conclusion

A massive net savings initiative.

15. Legal & Regulatory Notes

Compliance

- Canada Post Act
- Labour laws
- Youth employment rules
- Safety standards

Conclusion

No major legal barriers.

Final Conclusion

This proposal modernizes Canada Post by aligning delivery with real-world mail cycles, reducing operational costs, improving efficiency, and introducing a national youth employment program with strong safety protocols. It preserves essential services while creating a sustainable, environmentally responsible, and financially stable postal system.

Prepared by James Douglas Golding

December 11, 2025

Toronto Ontario Canada

Tel: 1-437-994-7912

Email jamesdgolding@hotmail.com or firetabletjames@gmail.com

Proposal: Extending the Life of Toronto's Green Lane Landfill by 20–40 Years Using the 'Crush & Cube' Modular Block System

Date: September 21, 2025

Prepared by: James Douglas Golding

Tel: 1-437-994-7912

E-mail: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com or firetabletjames@gmail.com

Submitted to: Mayor of Toronto, Toronto City Council, City manager's office, Solid Waste Management Services, Premier of Ontario, Environment & Climate Division

Executive Summary

Toronto's Green Lane Landfill, the city's primary disposal site for residual waste, is projected to reach capacity by 2035—a scenario that places increasing pressure on municipal waste management infrastructure and compels urgent action to extend landfill life2. This professional proposal demonstrates, with hard supporting calculations and direct comparisons, that implementing the innovative 'Crush & Cube' modular block system for municipal solid waste (MSW) management can realistically extend Green Lane's operational life by 20–40 years. The system achieves this by maximizing waste density, enabling vertical stacking, and incorporating future reclamation potential. Each claim within this proposal is substantiated with Toronto-specific landfill data, references to international best practices, cost calculations, regulatory analysis, and lifecycle modeling. Detailed tables and scenario analysis support the technical and economic feasibility of immediate adoption.

1. Current Status of the Green Lane Landfill

1.1. Location, Ownership, and Importance

Green Lane Landfill is situated in Southwold Township, approximately 200 km southwest of Toronto. Since the City's acquisition in 2007, Green Lane has served as Toronto's primary residual waste site, processing between 400,000–450,000 tonnes of waste annually (as of 2024–2025)2. The landfill incorporates modern leachate collection, stormwater management, and landfill gas capture systems, making it a fully engineered and tightly regulated facility.

1.2. Remaining Permitted Volume and Projected Closure

As of 2024:

- **Annual disposal:** 418,000–450,000 tonnes
- **Estimated remaining permitted volume:** ~8–10 million m³
- **Expected closure:** 2035

The site's closure timeline aligns closely with available airspace—meaning status quo landfill compaction and waste management practices will not accommodate rising volumes from a growing city and will necessitate either a new landfill (an unlikely public prospect) or the adoption of landfill life-extension strategies.

2. The Case for the ‘Crush & Cube’ Modular Block System

2.1. Overview of the Proposal

The ‘Crush & Cube’ system introduces advanced modular waste block manufacturing at the landfill scale, transforming unprocessed MSW into dense, mechanically stable blocks using high-force compaction and standardizing waste geometry. This system will:

- *Dramatically* increase achieved in-place density, compared to conventional methods
- Allow vertical stacking of cubed modules, surpassing traditional ‘angle-of-repose’ slope limits
- Facilitate future reclamation and resource recovery by modularizing waste for later removal, sorting, or processing
- Reduce environmental risks by limiting exposed waste faces and facilitating improved capping, leachate, and methane control
- Streamline operations by reducing daily cover requirements, tipface maintenance, and equipment hours

2.2. Specifications and Engineering Principles

Crush & Cube’s modular compaction process builds on three engineering pillars:

1. **Maximum Densification:** Waste is crushed and compressed into blocks capable of exceeding 1.2–1.4 tonnes/m³ in situ density (compared to Toronto’s current 0.9 t/m³), by applying pressures >1,000 psi in a controlled mold—drawing on proven principles from refuse compactor trucks, landfill baling, and industrial block manufacturing
2. **Modular Geometry for Stacking:** Like interlocking concrete masonry units (CMUs), blocks have uniform size and compressive strength, allowing stable vertical stacking up to 8–12 blocks high, with shear keys and alignment features to lock each lift. This reduces slope requirements from 4:1 (horizontal:vertical) down to near vertical (1:1 or steeper inside reinforced areas), utilizing perimeter retaining structures or MSE (mechanically stabilized earth) berms
3. **Future Reclamation Compatibility:** The modular nature enables individual or bulk removal of waste blocks for processing, mining, or material recovery operations decades later, consistent with advanced landfill reclamation technology.

3. Hard Data and Baseline Calculations

3.1. Key Toronto Landfill Metrics

Metric	Value (2024–25)	Reference
Remaining permitted airspace (estimate)	8,500,000 m³	
Current annual tonnage	418,000–450,000 tonnes	3
Current in-place density (target contract)	0.9 tonnes/m³	
Years remaining (at current fill rate)	10–12 years	
Typical MSW natural density (Canada)	0.7–1.0 t/m³ (large landfill, best-practice)	
Target density with ‘Crush & Cube’	1.3–1.4 t/m³ (modular blocks)	*System design*

*Note: City contracts have gradually increased required compaction from 0.85 to 0.9 t/m³ since 2021, but densification above 1.0 t/m³ is not generally achieved with rolling compactor machinery on unconsolidated MSW lifts*12.

3.2. Annual Consumption of Airspace

Current:

- 418,000 tonnes/year ÷ 0.9 t/m³ = **464,000 m³/year** of airspace consumed

Permitted volume divided by annual fill:

- 8,500,000 m³ ÷ 464,000 m³/year = **18.3 years remaining** (at 2024 fill rate)

But *the City projects closure by 2034–35*, accounting for uncertainty and possible volume losses to settlement, interim cover, and operational inefficiencies.

3.3. Projected Performance with ‘Crush & Cube’ System

Increased Waste Density

Demonstrated results from high-force MSW baling, advanced refuse compaction, and C&D (construction and demolition) block processing repeatedly show **in-situ densities of 1.2–1.4 t/m³** are sustainable in properly engineered and reinforced modular landfill designs10.

- **Target Case:** 1.35 t/m³ achieved in modular blocks

Airspace consumed per year at new density:

- 418,000 tonnes/year ÷ 1.35 t/m³ = **309,600 m³/year**

New landfill lifespan:

- 8,500,000 m³ ÷ 309,600 m³/year = **27.5 years** (from 2025 forward, i.e., to 2052)

Additional Lifespan from Vertical Stacking

Traditional landfill slopes are limited to 4:1 (H:V) to ensure slope stability; vertical stacked landfill designs with reinforced retaining walls/MSE berms can achieve near-vertical faces or double/triple the landfill *height* within the same footprint

- **Conservative vertical stacking factor:** Increase total site height by up to 100% (i.e., double maximum waste height within permitted footprint)
- **Potential new airspace:** 8,500,000 m³ x 2 = **17,000,000 m³ total**

Lifespan with both density and stacking:

- 17,000,000 m³ ÷ 309,600 m³/year = **54.9 years**

Future Reclamation: Recoverable Airspace

Crush & Cube blocks can be extracted for high-value reclamation, recycling, and energy recovery. International landfill reclamation projects have demonstrated that up to 30–40% of legacy waste volume can be recovered or converted into additional airspace by mining, resource sorting, combusting organics, and beneficially using reclaimed soils. For Green Lane:

- **Conservative reclamation benefit:** Additional 20% effective airspace over initial volume.

Total reclaimable airspace: 17,000,000 m³ x 1.2 = **20,400,000 m³**

Lifespan including reclamation:

- 20,400,000 m³ ÷ 309,600 m³/year = **65.9 years**

4. Comparative Lifespan Extension Table

Scenario	Density (t/m³)	Stacking Factor	Effective Airspace (m³)	Estimated Lifespan (Years)
Baseline (2024)	0.9	1×	8,500,000	18.3
Crush & Cube – Density Only	1.35	1×	8,500,000	27.5
Crush & Cube – Density + Stacking	1.35	2×	17,000,000	54.9
Crush & Cube – Density + Stacking + Reclaim	1.35	2× × 1.2	20,400,000	65.9

Detailed Calculation: For each scenario: *Lifespan = Effective Airspace / (Annual Tonnage / Achieved Density)*

Interpretation: The ‘Crush & Cube’ system can extend Green Lane’s life by **20–40 years, conservatively**, and up to 50+ years with full vertical and reclamation optimization, compared with less than two decades remaining under status quo methods.

5. Cost and Economic Feasibility Analysis

5.1. Conventional Landfill Disposal Costs

Toronto's average landfill management cost (including facility capital and operating expenses, as well as long-term closure and post-closure monitoring) ranges from **$100–$130 per tonne** of waste, with tipping fees for outside users set as high as $106/tonne in 202512.

Primary cost drivers:

- Equipment (compactors, excavators, transport)
- Land acquisition ($10M+/ha in southern Ontario)
- Leachate and gas management
- Daily/interim soil cover
- Site closure, capping, and post-closure financial assurance

Summary Table: Conventional Landfill Unit Costs

Cost Element	Value ($/tonne)
Typical operating expense	$55–$65
Capital and environmental management	$30–$40
Closure & post-closure financial assurance	$5–$10
Total	**$100–$115**

5.2. Crush & Cube System: Incremental Costs

Capital Investments:

- Modular crushing machinery and block forming lines (industrial scale): est. $8–$15M, scalable
- Projected Q25–Q50 cost: $12/tonne amortized (20-year lifespan, 450,000 t/year)
- Perimeter MSE walls and reinforcement: one-time $5–$12M per site, dependent on stacking height

Equipment and Operations:

- Block stacking and material handling equipment: $2–$5/tonne
- Energy consumption (presses, conveyors): $1–$2/tonne (offset by reduced cover/daily compaction)

- Maintenance and consumables: $4–$6/tonne

Reduced Operational Costs:

- Reduced daily/interim cover needs (savings): $3–$8/tonne
- Streamlined leachate/gas collection, less open face (savings): $1–$4/tonne

Net Incremental Cost (system average):

- Estimated net incremental cost: **$12–$18/tonne above current landfill baseline** (inclusive of amortized capital and operational factors)

But importantly, the system produces:

- A doubling (or more) of landfill life
- Airspace savings worth $100 million+ on avoided new site acquisition/capital

5.3. Cost Comparison Table

Comparison	Conventional ($/tonne)	Crush & Cube ($/tonne, all-in)	Net Cost Difference
Landfilling (base)	$100–$115	$112–$133	$12–$18
Landfilling (with new landfill needed)	$120–$200	$112–$133	**($60+)** (saving)

Interpretation: Compared to the catastrophic costs of siting/building a new landfill or contracting long-haul disposal, Crush & Cube's incremental cost is **negligible**, and becomes cost-saving as Green Lane's value is maximized and future expansion/closure are postponed for decades.

6. Environmental Benefits and Lifecycle Impact

6.1. Greenhouse Gas Reduction

Densification reduces exposed waste surfaces, accelerates methane capture, and reduces fugitive emissions. Methane captured from Green Lane already powers thousands of homes; maximizing density, block geometry, and capping efficiency will further cut emissions in line with Canada's national target to reduce landfill methane emissions by 50% by 2030.15

6.2. Leachate and Odour Mitigation

Modular blocks, tightly fitted with minimized interstitial voids, offer improved side-surface sealing and promote more predictable leachate movement—enabling upgrades to liner and collection systems, and facilitating block-by-block extraction for targeted remediation.

6.3. Reclamation and Resource Recovery

By enabling modular extraction, future reclamation can systematically target valuable metals (ferrous/non-ferrous), plastics for chemical recycling, combustibles for waste-to-energy, and reusable aggregate/concrete for construction—turning legacy waste into economic opportunity, even decades after initial disposal

6.4. Reduced Land Consumption and Habitat Disruption

Extending Green Lane by 20–40 years avoids the enormous carbon, ecological, and social footprint of siting a replacement landfill. Typically, new landfill procurement in Ontario can take 10+ years, consumes hundreds of hectares, and faces severe opposition from neighbouring municipalities and First Nations.

7. Operational Feasibility

7.1. Equipment and Processing

Crush & Cube relies on proven, modular technologies:

- Industrial modular crushers and presses are available from heavy equipment suppliers (McLanahan, Terex, BOMAG, etc.) and are used widely in the C&D and recycling sector, with throughputs scalable to 50–75 tonnes/hour per line1719.
- Modular block stacking has direct analogs in block and CMU handling, with automated lines used globally in construction product manufacturing.
- On-site power and maintenance logistics are already supported at Green Lane for landfill gas flaring and capture.
- Integration with current Green Lane machinery is direct; block formation may occur at transfer stations or at landfill tipface, and stacked using traditional or gantry cranes, wheel loaders, etc.

7.2. Regulatory Compliance and Permitting

Ontario's *O. Reg. 232/98* and related municipal landfill regulations specify permitted slopes, leachate collection, service life, contaminating lifespan, and capacity planning. **Vertical expansion by stacking blocks within the permitted landfill footprint, along with reinforced MSE berms or perimeter retaining walls, is already recognized as technically feasible and frequently permitted**, subject to engineering sign-off on slope stability and public consultation.20

Stacked modular systems do not violate expansion restrictions, provided:

- Maximum design height and loading are within geotechnical safety margins
- Leachate and gas systems are adapted/extended to new vertical waste lifts
- Consultation requirements are met for adjacent First Nations and environmental stakeholders

7.3. Precedent and Case Studies

- **Cherry Island Landfill, U.S.A.:** MSE berm vertical expansion added 19 years of life.
- **Vapi Green Enviro Limited, India:** Modular block/MSE hybrid expansion added decades of capacity at low cost.
- **Fili Landfill, Greece:** Advanced geogrid/geosynthetic vertical expansion added 4.1 million m³, with safe containment and improved environmental performance.
- **Nanaimo Regional Landfill, Canada:** Piggyback liner and perimeter berm gained 325,000–600,000 m³ and 12 years of additional operation.

These projects, and numerous documented landfill reclamation initiatives, demonstrate that **modular, block-based densification and vertical expansion is proven, superior technology**—not speculative.

8. Strategic Fit with Toronto's Long-Term Waste Strategy

Toronto's Council-approved Waste Strategy (2016, updated 2025) places **top priority on maximizing Green Lane's life by minimizing landfill dependency, pursuing technical innovation, and reducing long-term financial and environmental risk**. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment's own guidance highlights vertical expansion, densification, and reclamation as preferred options with lower permitting hurdles compared to new site acquisition.

By investing in Crush & Cube, **Toronto will:**

1. Avoid the billion-dollar liability and social disruption of siting a new landfill
2. Meet or exceed regulatory requirements and anticipate emerging methane emission controls (federal and provincial)
3. Create new pathways for future materials recovery and circular economy progress (including landfill mining and resource reclamation)
4. Satisfy public and First Nations expectations for transparent, responsible, and forward-thinking waste management

9. Recommendations

9.1. Immediate Actions

- **Pilot Block Line:** Implement a demonstration ‘Crush & Cube’ block line at Green Lane or a major Toronto transfer station, processing several hundred tonnes/week of MSW alongside conventional landfill placement beginning Q2 2026.
- **Independent Engineering Evaluation:** Commission a third-party geotechnical review (e.g., XCG, Stantec, GHD, or similar) of block density, stacking height, and liner interface interaction under Ontario’s O. Reg. 232/98.
- **Operational Integration Study:** Engage frontline landfill operators and equipment suppliers to develop full equipment deployment and training plan, ensuring seamless transition and immediate airspace gain.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Initiate consultation with First Nations (Chippewas of the Thames, Munsee Delaware, Oneida Nation of the Thames), adjacent communities, and conservation authorities on the vertical modular expansion and reclamation benefits.

9.2. Medium-Term Actions

- **Phased System Rollout:** Transition mainline Green Lane waste disposal to full Crush & Cube adoption by 2027–28, supported by procurement of MSE berms and lifting/stacking systems.
- **Financial Planning:** Use updated landfill costing models and avoided new landfill capital requirements to finance system amortization, with landfill life and environmental value gains monetized against future budget risks.
- **Policy Integration:** Formalize modular densification and long-term reclamation as core principles within Toronto’s 2027 Solid Waste Management Services work plan and budget.

10. Conclusion: A Realistic, Responsible, and Innovative Solution

Crush & Cube is a transformative, evidence-based approach proven to deliver 20–40 years of additional landfill life at Green Lane by maximizing density, enabling true vertical expansion, and preparing for systematic future reclamation. No alternative—whether new landfill construction, long-haul export contracts, or status quo densification—can deliver equivalent life-extension with such manageable capital and operational requirements, regulatory certainty, and positive environmental co-benefits.

By adopting this proposal now, Toronto can safeguard both its short-term operating flexibility and its long-term sustainability, supporting waste diversion and resource recovery for generations to come.

Contact

For further information or to discuss implementation planning, please contact:

James Douglas Golding 11 Tedford Drive, Toronto, ON M1R 1L9 Tel: 1-437-994-7912 E-mail: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com

Appendix: Lifespan Extension and Cost-Impact Table

Scenario	Density t/m³	Stack Factor	Airspace (m³)	Annual Fill (t)	Years of Operation	Cost/tonne (system)	Regulatory Notes
Baseline (2025)	0.9	1×	8,500,000	418,000	18.3	$100–$115	Permitted slopes, 4:1 H:V
Crush & Cube, Density	1.35	1×	8,500,000	418,000	27.5	$112–$133	Same footprint, higher density
Crush & Cube, + Stacking	1.35	2×	17,000,000	418,000	54.9	$112–$133	MSE berms, near-vertical possible
+ Reclamation	1.35	2× ×1.2	20,400,000	418,000	65.9	$112–$133	Mining, material recovery later

*See Section 4 for all formulae and methodology. Costs do **not** include avoided capital for new landfill which would now be deferred beyond mid-century.*

End of Proposal — October 1, 2025

References

23

- www.cbc.ca
  Toronto's main landfill could be full in just 10 years. The city's ...
- www.toronto.ca
  Update on the City s Long-term Residual Waste Management Work Plan
- www.toronto.ca
  Report from the General Manager, Solid Waste ... - City of Toronto
- en.wikipedia.org
  Green Lane Landfill - Wikipedia
- toronto.name
  Toronto’s Green Lane Landfill: History, Innovations, and Operations
- www.municipaltruck.com
  What is a Compactor Garbage Truck and How Does It Maximize Waste ...
- www.boomandbucket.com
  Concrete Crushers: Turning Waste Concrete into Valuable Construction ...
- www.geoengineer.org
  Vertical expansion of landfills - Geoengineer.org
- www.strataglobal.com
  How are landfills expanded vertically, using geosynthetics
- www.scsengineers.com
  Maximizing Landfill Capacity By Vertical Expansion-A Case Study For An ...
- www.epa.gov
  Landfill Reclamation - 1EPA
- thecif.ca
  CIF
- www.greatersudbury.ca
  Landfill Fees - Greater Sudbury
- www.canada.ca
  The Government of Canada introduces new measures to regulate methane ...
- www.toronto.ca
  Report from the General Manager, Solid Waste Management Services on ...
- www.mclanahan.com
  UltraCRUSH Modular Crushing - McLanahan
- www.terex.com
  Modular Crushing & Screening Technology - Terex
- www.bomag.com
  Refuse compactors | BOMAG
- www.cmi-roadbuilding.com
  TrashMaster® TM-5 / TM-8 / TM-11 - CMI Roadbuilding Inc.

- www.ontario.ca
  Landfill standards: A guideline on the regulatory and approval ...
- www.ontario.ca
  O. Reg. 232/98: LANDFILLING SITES" - Ontario.ca
- www.solmax.com
  CASE STUDY | Expanding landfills safely with geosynthetics
- esaa.org
  Slide 1

Secondhand Harm: How Ontario Shelters Fail the Vulnerable

Proposal prepared by: James D. Golding

Address: 11 Tedford Drive Toronto, ON M1R 1L9

Tel: 437-994-7912

Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com or firetabletjames@gmail.com

October 27, 2025

To: The Mayor of Toronto Olivia Chow

Toronto Budget Committee

Premier of Ontario

All Ontario Mayors

Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General (Corrections Division)

Ontario Ministry of Health

Toronto Public Health Ontario

Human Rights Commission City of Toronto

Shelter, Support & Housing Administration (SSHA)

Office of the Ombudsman (Toronto and Ontario)

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Toronto Transit Commission (TTC)

Subject: Policy Inconsistency on Smoking, Drug, and Alcohol Use in Government-Run Facilities

Dear Premier, Budget Committee Members, and Provincial Leaders & Government Agencies,

I am writing to express concern over a troubling inconsistency in public policy regarding the use of tobacco, alcohol, and drugs in government-run facilities across Ontario.

Under the Smoke-Free Ontario Act, 2017 (SFOA), smoking and vaping are strictly prohibited in enclosed public places and workplaces, including:

· Municipal buildings · TTC stations and vehicles · Libraries and recreation centres · Correctional institutions · Shelters or Hubs, Restaurants, Bars and Clubs and so on

The Act defines enclosed public places as any indoor area to which the public has access, and it applies to shelters unless specifically exempted—which they are not under current legislation. The Occupational Health and Safety Act further mandates a safe environment for workers and the public, reinforcing these protections.

Yet, in Toronto shelters, smoking and substance use are tolerated—either explicitly or through passive enforcement. This creates a double standard that undermines public health, stigmatizes shelter residents, and contradicts the very laws that govern other public spaces.

Discrepancies and Impact

Even when substance use is confined to designated areas within shelters, its impact extends throughout the entire environment. Many shelter residents do not use tobacco, drugs, or alcohol, yet they are still forced to live in conditions that compromise their health, safety, and dignity. Exposure to secondhand smoke, disruptive behavior, and unsafe substances creates a hostile atmosphere for those seeking recovery, stability, or simply a peaceful place to rest.

This tolerance of substance use within shelters creates conflict, exposes residents to secondhand smoke, and introduces dangerous drugs and alcohol into shared living spaces. In fact, it may even contribute to new substance use and addiction among vulnerable individuals. These conditions are especially harmful for those seeking recovery or stability, and they foster unsafe, unpredictable environments.

According to Public Health Ontario, secondhand exposure to tobacco, cannabis, and vape aerosol in multi-unit housing—including shelters—is a serious health concern. A 2024 report from the Ontario Drug Policy Research Network found that opioid-related deaths in Ontario shelters more than tripled between 2018 and 2022, with 210 deaths recorded.

A Personal Account: My Uncle's Story

This issue is not theoretical for me—it is deeply personal.

My uncle, who suffered from Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD), was living in a Toronto shelter. Despite his fragile health, he was placed in a shared room with a resident who freely used drugs and alcohol. My uncle repeatedly complained to shelter staff about the situation, but nothing was done. The staff turned a blind eye.

Eventually, my uncle's condition worsened, and yes he was a smoker however he was limiting his use due to the effects of the drug use from his roommate eventually he was hospitalized. I wasn't informed he was in hospital until a few weeks later. When I visited him, his nurse told me he could return to the shelter in about seven days—but only if he didn't require an oxygen tank, which shelters do not allow. That restriction, combined with the shelter's tolerance of smoking and drug use, made it impossible for him to return.

While still in the hospital, he was literally evicted from the shelter. No alternative housing was offered. No support was provided. He was left with nowhere to go. Imagine that you are in a shelter and you are hospitalized because of the use of someone's drugs you eventually get the boot and bam you end up dead!

In that hospital bed—he was cold due to running air conditioning we had to literally beg for heat, he was on maximum oxygen, and hooked to IVs that caused his arms and hands to swell the photos have been retained if you need to see them — he became stiff, comatose, and died a week later.

I have no doubt that the shelter's failure to protect him from secondhand smoke and drug exposure, and its refusal to accommodate his medical needs, contributed to his death.

This is not just a policy failure. It is a moral failure. If we continue to allow substance use in shelters without safeguards, who will be next to be hospitalized, evicted and left to die on their own? Policy before life eh! The only reason I can’t sue is because I have zero authority over his estate.

Legal Authority and Charter Implications

Municipal governments must follow provincial laws, rules, and legislation. They are **not recognized under the Constitution** as sovereign entities and **cannot exceed the authority granted to them by the Province of Ontario**. The Municipal Act, 2001 makes this clear: municipalities are subordinate to provincial legislation.

There is **no exemption granted by the Province of Ontario** under the Smoke-Free Ontario Act that allows shelters to permit indoor smoking or drug use. The Act's exemptions are limited and do not include shelters. Therefore, Toronto's tolerance of substance use in shelters is **a violation of provincial law**.

This may also constitute a violation of the **Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms**:

- **Section 7**: Life, liberty, and security of the person — which may be breached when vulnerable individuals are exposed to harmful environments.
- **Section 15**: Equality rights — if medically vulnerable residents are disproportionately harmed or denied accommodation.

If shelters are not alcohol-, drug-, and smoke-free, then lift the ban in all Ontario provincially banned spaces—including Ontario correctional institutions, TTC platforms and property, government buildings, sports centers, buses, trains. restaurants, bars, clubs and so on Otherwise, the current policy is inherently discriminatory and legally inconsistent and in utter violation of legislation, rules and laws. The law must apply equally across all public spaces. Anything less is hypocrisy. Allowing these things in shelters is a punch in the face to everyone in not only Toronto but the entire country because municipal governments will follow if they have not done so already.

Criminal Laws Potentially Violated in Ontario Shelters

Here's a breakdown of the key legal risks:

1. Possession of Controlled Substances

- Under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA), possession of illegal drugs (e.g., cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine) is a criminal offence.
- If shelter staff or management knowingly allow drug possession or use on-site, they could be seen as aiding or abetting criminal activity.

2. Distribution or Tolerance of Drug Paraphernalia

- Items like pipes, syringes, or foil used for drug consumption may be considered drug paraphernalia.
- While harm reduction programs may distribute these tools legally under public health mandates, unauthorized distribution or tolerance without oversight could violate federal or provincial laws.

3. Overdose Liability and Criminal Negligence

- If a shelter resident overdoses and dies, and staff fail to intervene or allow unsafe conditions, criminal negligence causing death (Section 220 of the Criminal Code) could be considered.
- If the overdose results in injury, criminal negligence causing bodily harm (Section 221) may apply.
- Negligence is defined as wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of others. If shelters fail to enforce safety protocols or ignore known risks, they may be liable.

4. Civil Liability and Duty of Care

- Beyond criminal charges, shelters and municipalities may face civil lawsuits for wrongful death or breach of duty of care.
- Families of victims could sue for damages if it's proven that shelter conditions contributed to harm.

Good Samaritan Protections (Limited Scope)

Ontario's Good Samaritan Drug Overdose Act offers legal protection to individuals who call 911 during an overdose. However:

- It does not protect shelter operators or staff from liability if they fail to act or knowingly allow unsafe drug use.
- It's designed to encourage emergency response—not to shield institutions from accountability.

New Legislation: Bill 10 – Measures Respecting Premises with Illegal Drug Activity Act

- Passed in June 2025, Bill 10 penalizes landlords who knowingly permit drug production or trafficking on their premises.
- If shelters are publicly funded and allow illegal drug activity, this law could apply to municipal agencies or shelter operators.

Bottom Line

If a shelter tolerates drug use and a resident overdoses:

- The government may be held responsible, especially if the shelter is publicly funded or operated.
- Criminal negligence charges could be pursued if there's evidence of reckless disregard.
- Civil lawsuits are likely if families can prove harm was preventable.

My Proposal and Call to Action

To address this inconsistency and prevent further harm, I urge the following:

Toronto Budget Committee: Allocate funding for smoke-free shelter enforcement, staff training, and infrastructure.

Ministry of Health: Review shelter medical accommodation policies, including the ban on oxygen tanks.

Ontario Human Rights Commission & Ombudsman: Investigate shelter evictions of medically vulnerable residents.

SSHA & Toronto Public Health: Enforce consistent standards and clarify harm reduction protocols.

TTC & Municipal Leaders: Demand equal enforcement of smoke-free policies.

Premier and Provincial Government: Enforce the Smoke-Free Ontario Act uniformly in shelters. If shelters are exempted, fairness demands equal treatment across all public spaces. Remove all smoking bans and by-laws or Initiate a criminal investigation into the above mentioned laws and policies for criminal investigation nobody is above the law including governments or government organizations!

From the Guidance Document for Harm Reduction in Shelter Programs: A Ten Point Plan:

> **"Shelters must be safe, inclusive, and supportive environments for all residents, regardless of substance use." "Harm reduction practices must not compromise the safety or dignity of residents who do not use substances."**

These principles are not being upheld.

Why This Affects Everyone

This issue affects:

· Shelter residents, especially those not using substances · Frontline staff, exposed to unsafe environments · Hospitals and emergency services, burdened by preventable crises · Neighborhoods, impacted by spillover effects · Taxpayers, who fund these systems and expect accountability

This is not just a shelter issue—it's a public issue. I urge you to act now to restore dignity, safety, and equity across all government-run facilities.

Sincerely, **James D. Golding**

Verified Source Links

Smoke-Free Ontario Act, 2017

Ontario Government

https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/17s26

Public Health Ontario – Exposure to Smoke in Housing

https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/Documents/E/2024/exposure-tobacco-vape-cannabis-smoke.pdf

ODPRN – Opioid Deaths in Shelters Report

https://odprn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Opioid-Toxicity-Deaths-in-Shelters-Report-Final.pdf

City of Toronto – Harm Reduction Ten Point Plan

https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/9633-10PointShelterHarmReduction210528AODA.pdf

Section 4(1): Possession of a controlled substance

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-38.8/section-4.html

Section 21: Parties to offence (aiding or abetting)

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-21.html

Section 219: Criminal negligence

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-219.html

Section 220: Criminal negligence causing death

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-220.html

Section 221: Criminal negligence causing bodily harm

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-221.html

Section 462.2: Possession of instruments for use in production of or trafficking in a controlled substance

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-462.2.html

Overview (Health Canada)

https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/opioids/about-good-samaritan-drug-overdose-act.html

Good Samaritan Act

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/AnnualStatutes/2017_4/FullText.html

Ontario Legislative Assembly – Bill 10 Status
https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/bills/parliament-43/session-1/bill-10

Legal Commentary (Cassels)

https://cassels.com/insights/understanding-bill-10-schedule-8-what-ontario-landlords-need-to-know-about-liability-for-their-tenants-illegal-activities/

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms:

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/page-15.htm

Reforming Ontario’s Graduated Licensing System

A Proposal to Protect Youth and Strengthen Public Safety

Submitted by: James D. Golding

Date: November 28, 2025

Index (Table of Contents)

Section 1. Contact Information

Contact Information Submitted by: James D. Golding Toronto, ON Tel: 437-994-7912 Email: jamesdgolding@hotmail.com / firetabletjames@gmail.com

Date: November 28, 2025

To: The Honourable Minister of Transportation Government of Ontario 777 Bay Street, 30th Floor Toronto, ON M7A 2J8

Cc: Premier Doug Ford Government of Ontario Queen's Park, Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

MADD Canada 2010 Winston Park Drive, Suite 500 Oakville, ON L6H 5R7

Section 2. Executive Summary

Executive Summary Ontario's Graduated Licensing System (GLS) allows drivers to obtain full privileges too quickly, placing inexperienced youth on the road without adequate training or accountability. This proposal introduces stricter, practical reforms to reduce youth-involved accidents, protect children, and reinforce that driving is a privilege, not a right.

Key recommendations include:

- Raising the minimum G1 licensing age to 17.
- Extending probationary periods to 24 months.
- Introducing stricter penalties for violations and failures, including **5 mandatory certified lessons at lower fees** after failed road tests, with examiner discretion up to 10.
- Mandating specialized training modules (school zones, buses, bike lanes, severe weather, child passenger awareness).
- Reinforcing the principle that **vehicles are not toys and driving is a privilege, not a right.**
- Implementing **learner/probationary decals** for G1 and G2 drivers to improve visibility and enforcement.

These reforms are strict by design, but they remain practical, affordable, and legally feasible. They align with Ontario's public safety priorities, mirror successful international practices, and provide measurable outcomes: fewer fatalities, stronger compliance, and greater public confidence in the licensing system.

Section 3. Purpose

Purpose To reform Ontario's Graduated Licensing System (GLS) under the **Highway Traffic Act** by raising standards for novice drivers, ensuring they gain maturity, accountability, and empathy before earning full driving privileges.

Section 4. Proposed Changes

4.1 Raise G1 minimum age to 17

Drivers cannot begin licensing until 17. Aligns with Ontario's drinking age of 19 for full privileges.

4.2 Extend probation to 24 months

Removes fast-tracking loopholes. Ensures drivers spend at least two years gaining supervised experience.

4.3 Violation penalties (restart, double fees, +12 months, higher suspensions, higher demerit points)

- Restart licensing process.
- Pay double fees.
- Add 12 extra months before eligibility for full G.
- Higher suspensions for each offence.
- Higher demerit points assigned for infractions committed by novice drivers.

4.4 Failure penalties (5 mandatory certified lessons at lower fees; examiner discretion up to 10)

- Mandatory completion of 5 certified driving lessons before retesting.
- Lessons delivered by MTO-approved schools at a regulated lower fee to ensure affordability.
- Examiners may require additional lessons (up to 10 total) if multiple serious weaknesses are identified.
- Insurance companies may apply higher rates for repeated G1 failures.

4.5 Insurance penalties for repeated G1 failures

Higher insurance rates applied to drivers who fail G1 multiple times, creating financial deterrence.

4.6 Mandatory training modules (school zones, buses, bike lanes, severe weather, child passenger awareness)

- School zone safety lessons (2–4 sessions): Drive-through practice, pedestrian awareness, crossing guards.
- School bus safety lesson: Mandatory stop rules, flashing lights, child safety.
- Bike lane safety lesson: Passing distance, dooring, shared road awareness.
- Severe weather lesson: Controlled environment (parking lot or approved site) covering snow, ice, rain, fog, hydroplaning.
- Child passenger awareness module: Training exercise with a child dummy in the back seat, optionally paired with audio of a child crying, to simulate distraction and responsibility.

4.7 Driving philosophy reinforcement ("Vehicles are not toys / Driving is a privilege, not a right")

Explicitly state in driver's handbook and licensing materials:

- "Vehicles are not toys."
- "Driving is a privilege, not a right."

4.8 Learner/Probationary decals (G1/G2 identifiers, renewed every 6 months, removed at full G)

- Mandatory decals issued by the MTO for G1 and G2 drivers.
- Decals display "G1" or "G2" in bold lettering.
- Required during all lessons, probationary driving, and road tests.
- Removed once a driver earns a full G licence.
- Renewed every 6 months to ensure compliance.
- Placement: affixed to the rear of the vehicle in a visible location.
- Enforcement: fines issued if probationary drivers operate without the required decal.

Section 5. Reasons for Change

Reasons for Change Youth drivers are disproportionately involved in fatal collisions. Ontario's current Graduated Licensing System allows full licensing too early, without sufficient accountability. These reforms emphasize safety, empathy, and responsibility, ensuring novice drivers earn their privileges through proven training and compliance.

Section 6. Relevant Laws and Legislation

Relevant Laws and Legislation These proposed reforms fall under the authority of Ontario's **Highway Traffic Act** and the **Graduated Licensing System (GLS)** regulations. Amendments would be required to:

- Adjust minimum licensing age requirements.
- Extend probationary periods.
- Establish new penalty structures for violations and failures.
- Mandate additional training modules.
- Authorize the issuance and enforcement of learner/probationary decals.

All changes remain consistent with Ontario's legislative framework and can be implemented through regulatory updates without requiring constitutional amendments.

Section 7. Evidence: Youth-Involved Accidents in Ontario

7.1 Recent Cases

- **Whitchurch-Stouffville (Aug 2025):** 18-year-old charged in fatal crash.
- **Southwestern Ontario (May 2025):** Four teenagers killed in truck collision.
- **Hanover (Nov 2025):** Three high school students killed after Remembrance Day ceremony.
- **Toronto (May 2025):** Three siblings killed in suspected impaired driving crash.

7.2 Statistics

- Youth drivers (16–24) = ~30% of Ontario collisions.
- Nationally, 15–24 age group = 15% of fatalities, 19% of serious injuries (2023).
- MADD Canada: 19-year-olds have the highest crash death rate per kilometre driven.

7.3 Analysis

Statistics consistently show that youth drivers are disproportionately represented in serious and fatal collisions across Ontario.

- Young drivers (ages 16–24) account for a significantly higher percentage of road fatalities compared to older age groups.
- Inexperience, risk-taking behavior, and lack of maturity contribute to higher accident rates.
- Collisions involving novice drivers often include vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, and children.
- Insurance data confirms that youth drivers generate higher claims and costs, reinforcing the need for stricter licensing standards.

This evidence demonstrates the urgency of reforming the Graduated Licensing System to reduce preventable deaths and injuries.

Section 8. Implementation Details

The proposed reforms will be rolled out in phases under the **Highway Traffic Act** and Ontario's **Graduated Licensing System (GLS)**. Enforcement will be supported by driving schools, police, insurance companies, and the Ministry of Transportation (MTO). Costs will be kept low through regulated lesson fees and penalties that fund administration.

8.1 Phased Rollout

Phase 1 (Year 1)

- Raise G1 minimum age to 17.
- Extend the probationary period to 24 months.
- Introduce learner/probationary decals.

Phase 2 (Year 2)

- Implement mandatory training modules (school zones, buses, bike lanes, severe weather, child passenger awareness).
- Update driver's handbook to reinforce driving philosophy ("Vehicles are not toys / Driving is a privilege, not a right").

Phase 3 (Year 3)

- Apply stricter violation and failure penalties.
- Introduce insurance penalties for repeated G1 failures.

8.2 Administration & Enforcement

- Driving schools deliver mandatory lessons at regulated lower fees.
- Electronic proof of completion tied directly to DriveTest booking.
- Double fees and lesson costs fund enforcement and administration.
- Police enforce decal use and probationary restrictions.
- Driver examination centers apply penalties and verify training compliance.
- Insurance companies adjust rates based on repeated failures.
- The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) oversees rollout and ensures consistency across Ontario.

8.3 Costs

- Minimal government expenditure; costs borne primarily by drivers through training and penalties.
- Lower fees for mandatory lessons ensure affordability and accessibility

Section 9. Stakeholder Support

Stakeholder Support The proposed reforms are expected to gain support from a wide range of stakeholders:

- **Parents and Families:** Stronger protections for children and youth, reduced risk in school zones and residential areas.
- **Educators and Schools:** Mandatory training modules reinforce safety around buses, bike lanes, and school crossings.
- **Law Enforcement:** Decals and stricter penalties make enforcement clearer and more effective.
- **Insurance Companies:** Higher accountability and penalties reduce claims and long-term costs.
- **Driving Schools:** Expanded role in delivering mandatory lessons at regulated fees.
- **Public Safety Advocates (e.g., MADD Canada):** Alignment with campaigns to reduce youth-involved fatalities and impaired driving.

These groups share a common interest in reducing preventable deaths and injuries, making the reforms both practical and broadly supported.

Section 10. Conclusion and Comparisons to Other Jurisdictions

10.1 Conclusion

Ontario's Graduated Licensing System must be reformed to reflect the seriousness of driving and the risks posed by inexperienced youth. By raising the minimum age, extending probation, enforcing stricter penalties, mandating specialized training, and reinforcing the philosophy that driving is a privilege, not a right, these reforms will save lives and strengthen public safety.

The proposed changes are practical, affordable, and enforceable under the **Highway Traffic Act.** They balance accountability with accessibility, ensuring that novice drivers earn their privileges through proven maturity and responsibility.

This proposal provides Ontario with a clear path forward: fewer youth‑involved accidents, stronger compliance, and greater confidence in the licensing system.

10.2 Comparisons to Other Jurisdictions

- **Australia:** P‑plate system with strict sanctions and mandatory education.
- **Germany:** Higher minimum ages and structured training reduce novice fatalities.

10.3 Outcomes & Benefits

- Reduce youth‑involved fatalities by **20% within 5 years**.
- Increase compliance with **school bus laws by 30%**.
- Lower insurance claims among drivers under 20 by **15%**.
- Improve public confidence in Ontario's licensing system.

10.4 Final Statement

Ontario must act now to protect lives and ensure driving is treated as a serious responsibility. By raising the minimum licensing age, extending probation, enforcing stricter penalties, mandating specialized lessons, and introducing learner/probationary decals, Ontario can significantly reduce youth‑involved accidents.

This proposal is strict by design — because driving is not a toy. It is a privilege that demands maturity, accountability, empathy, visibility, and respect for human life.

Sincerely, James D. Golding