

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Background

As part of the review of the RentSafeTO program, the City conducted public and stakeholder engagement to seek feedback on the building evaluation tool, colour-coded signage system, remedial action framework, and overall experience with the program. The input received from the engagement process was taken into consideration when informing the recommendations outlined in this staff report to Council.

In total, 819 people participated throughout the engagement process from November 2025 to March 2026, through the following channels:

- 585 respondents to a public survey (available January 12 to February 28, 2026)
- 151 participants at ten stakeholder consultations:
 - November 10, 2025: 10 participants (RAC)
 - January 12, 2026: 6 participants (building owner associations)
 - January 12, 2026: 8 participants (community housing providers)
 - January 13, 2026: 18 participants (tenant advocate groups)
 - January 19, 2026: 46 participants (ACORN)
 - January 21, 2026: 8 participants (TCHC)
 - February 4, 2026: 8 participants (TAC)
 - February 20, 2026: 9 participants (HRAC)
 - March 3, 2026: 6 participants (Greater Toronto Apartment Association)
 - March 4, 2026: 32 participants (ACORN)
- 83 people engaged through 10 in-person information sessions at various RentSafeTO buildings

Engagement Approach

Communications and Outreach

The communications and outreach approach was designed to inform participants of the scope of the program review, how and when to participate in consultations, and where to find more information on the review process.

Staff conducted an outreach campaign to encourage participation in the City's engagement process. This included inviting building owner and operator associations, community housing providers, and tenant advocate groups to the consultation directly via email. Broader public awareness was supported through webpage updates and Councillor newsletters. From January to February 2026, staff promoted the online survey through social media ads to encourage participation in the City's consultation process and to provide feedback. These ads received 949,376 impressions and were clicked on 7,972 times.

Stakeholder Engagement

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Ten stakeholder consultations were held with building owner and operator associations, community housing providers, and tenant advocate groups to provide an opportunity for in-depth discussions about potential program changes. Additional feedback was collected through written submissions. Staff met with the Greater Toronto Apartment Association (GTAA), Federation of Rental-Housing Providers of Ontario (FRPO), Signet Group, WoodGreen, Fred Victor, The Neighbourhood Group, ACORN Toronto, Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations (FMTA), Canadian Centre for Housing Rights (CCHR), Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC), as well as the City's Renter's Action Committee (RAC), Tenant Advisory Committee (TAC) and Housing Rights Advisory Committee (HRAC).

Public Engagement

A public survey was conducted to gather further input from building owner and operator associations, community housing providers, and tenant advocate groups, as well as RentSafeTO tenant and building owners and operators. The survey provided an opportunity for participants to provide feedback on their experiences with the program and on potential program changes. In addition, in-person information sessions were held at 10 RentSafeTO buildings to engage directly with tenants and collect further feedback.

Stakeholder Engagement Summary

Building Evaluation Tool

Across stakeholder groups, there was strong agreement that the evaluation tool does not accurately reflect building conditions, particularly in how it undervalues high-risk issues and overvalues administrative and cosmetic elements. Stakeholders emphasized that the severity and frequency of issues, as well as impact on tenants should drive building scores, not cosmetic appearance or administrative compliance. Many argued the system overlooks serious deficiencies and creates inequities across building types, ages, and ownership models. Overall, stakeholders wanted a more meaningful, risk sensitive, and transparent evaluation tool that better represents lived experience and operational realities.

Audit Process, Frequency & Inspection

Stakeholders broadly agreed that the current audit process is slow, unpredictable, and not closely tied to actual building conditions. Stakeholders noted that the extended gap between evaluations conducted in late summer or fall and audits carried out the following spring or early summer allows chronic issues to persist unaddressed for long periods. They further observed that this lag can result in an incomplete or unfair representation of conditions, as circumstances may change significantly between the evaluation and audit phases. Audit fees and administrative requirements were also identified as barriers, especially for smaller and community housing buildings. Across

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

groups, there was strong demand for audits that were more timely, consistent, transparent, and reflective of real building standards and performance.

In-Unit Conditions & Reactive Scoring

Stakeholders widely agreed that the current scoring system does not adequately capture the severity, frequency, and impact of in unit issues. Reactive scoring was viewed as too low to meaningfully influence building owner/operator behaviour or reflect real building conditions. Others felt the reactive scoring deducted scores too much, noting that it may not adequately account for tenant-driven issues or the complexities associated with repair timelines. Many argued that in unit issues often reflect systemic building problems rather than isolated tenant issues and therefore should play a larger role in determining building scores. Several stakeholders wanted a scoring model that is more responsive and reflective of tenants' lived experiences, and that better captures chronic or repeated violations, others noted that several of the in unit issues appeared to stem from tenant-side negligence linked to mental health, hoarding and limited cooperation, or a lack of timely action, rather than from deficiencies in property management or building systems.

Colour-Coded Signage System

Stakeholders expressed strong and varied opinions on the proposed colour coded signage system, with many raising concerns about stigma, clarity, and the accuracy of the score ranges behind each colour. While some saw signage as a way to increase transparency and pressure building owners/operators to maintain buildings, others feared misinterpretation, particularly that comparisons to DineSafe could unfairly damage reputations or create panic. The effectiveness of the score ranges (0–69% Red, 70–84% Yellow, 85–100% Green) was widely debated, with several groups questioning whether these cutoffs reflect real building conditions. Stakeholders broadly agreed that communication, translation, and thoughtful implementation is crucial for the signage system to be understood and accepted.

Remedial Action

Across stakeholder groups, there was broad agreement that remedial action is an important tool, but one that needs to be used carefully, transparently, and proportionally. Stakeholders consistently expressed concern about unclear triggers, inconsistent application, and the risk of remedial action being used too early or too late depending on the situation. There was strong demand for clearer criteria, better communication, and a balanced approach that prioritizes tenant safety without unfairly penalizing providers addressing long-term capital issues.

Other Feedback

Across stakeholder groups, there was consistent recognition that RentSafeTO's

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

effectiveness is constrained by gaps in policy clarity, fragmented accountability, uneven coordination across City divisions, and unclear communication around building conditions, enforcement and follow-up actions. Many expressed frustrations with unclear escalation pathways, inconsistent interpretations of bylaws, and a lack of integrated data sharing. Many felt that information flow between the City, building owners/operators, and tenants was fragmented and unreliable, undermining trust in the RentSafeTO program. Overall, stakeholders wanted a more cohesive and predictable program that supports the timely resolution of building issues, reduces burden for building owners/operators and tenants, and incorporates clearer expectations, more frequent updates, and stronger accountability mechanisms.

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
Building Evaluation Tool	<p data-bbox="472 625 1013 661"><i>Building Owner/Operator Associations</i></p> <ul data-bbox="500 680 1414 1455" style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly felt that the current risk level weightings are too strict, especially for older buildings with high investment repair needs. • Believed the scoring system treats high-risk and cosmetic deficiencies too similarly, failing to distinguish severity or risk. • Argued that documentation-related categories (e.g. plans and logs) should matter but should not outweigh real-world physical conditions. • Were concerned that score deductions and category weighting did not reflect the complexity of issues or the timelines required for major work. • Believed evaluation categories need clearer descriptions and definitions, especially around cleanliness, pests, and common areas. • Wanted differentiated scoring for building types (low-rise vs. high-rise), noting that small buildings are at a disadvantage because building evaluations do not consider how many floors or areas might have the same issues. • Expressed significant concern about score volatility and how quickly building score could drop by making the evaluation tool stricter. <p data-bbox="472 1497 727 1533"><i>Tenant Advocates</i></p> <ul data-bbox="500 1554 1414 1833" style="list-style-type: none"> • Believed the evaluation tool is too lenient and does not reflect lived experience, especially in deteriorating or older buildings. • Highlighted that some buildings scoring poorly in high-risk categories still received green scores, demonstrating a disconnect between the evaluation tool and lived experience. • Felt cosmetic issues should be deprioritized because they did not affect safety, while vital services and health hazards should have had a larger impact on scores.

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly supported raising green thresholds (recommended 95–100%) to ensure buildings truly meet adequate standards before being labelled satisfactory. • Wanted the evaluation tool to reflect patterns of recurring issues rather than isolated incidents or problems. • Repeatedly stated that building owners/operators are using higher building scores to appear compliant, despite serious issues remaining unresolved. • Emphasized that building evaluations should incorporate in unit issues, not just common areas issues. <p><i>Community Housing Providers & Non-Profits</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed with the intent of increased weighting for high risk items but cautioned that longstanding structural issues, capital backlogs, and chronic underfunding could make this approach punitive rather than reflective of actual risk management. • Raised concerns that pest and cleanliness related categories may disproportionately impact large, aging buildings and do not always account for tenant driven factors or the need for long-term interventions. • Noted that tenant driven issues such as hoarding, lack of preparation for pest treatments, and vandalism can unfairly affect building scores, as these conditions are often beyond the immediate control of owners/operators. • Expressed concern that increased weighting could negatively impact scores during major, multi-year repair or capital projects, even when corrective work is actively underway. • Highlighted that documentation related categories can be administratively burdensome and not always reflective of building conditions, while also stressing the importance of stability where significant investments have already been made. • Emphasized that social and public housing providers operate under different funding models and constraints and should not be evaluated in the same way as private housing.
Audit Process, Frequency & Inspection	<i>Building Owner/Operator Associations</i>

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about high audit and administrative fees, feeling that money would be better spent on repairs rather than audits. • Believed audits are sometimes triggered without meaningful benefit to the building or tenants. • Urged consideration of building size when selecting audited buildings, noting that smaller buildings are disproportionately impacted by costs and scoring outcomes. • Wanted clearer and updated language in Chapter 354, Apartment Buildings, noting that some building owners/operators may contest whether the RentSafeTO program applies to their building (e.g. a “purpose-built rental building”). • Sought greater transparency around how audit thresholds are set, why buildings are selected, and whether audits are applied consistently. • Wanted clarity on whether the City tracks repeat audits of the same buildings, suggesting that repeat audits may indicate systemic failure rather than neglectful building owners/operators. <p><i>Tenant Advocates</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly believed audits occur too late and infrequently, allowing building owners/operators to ignore tenant concerns for months or years. • Stated that even when audits occurred, conditions did not improve or serious issues are sometimes marked “closed” without actual repairs, deepening distrust in the process. • Advocated for surprise inspections rather than scheduled audits, noting that advance notice gives building owners/operators time to make superficial fixes. • Wanted audits sooner after building evaluations for buildings with multiple chronic complaints (e.g., mold, pests, heating, and structural concerns). • Many stakeholders felt that the current scheduling (evaluations in summer/fall followed by audits the following spring/summer) is unrealistic and enables landlords to deflect seasonal issues, resulting in an unfair portrayal of conditions <p><i>Community Housing Providers & Non-Profits</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasized that many buildings manage aging infrastructure, large portfolios, and multi-year capital plans;

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
	<p>audit outcomes should account for long-term projects in progress and avoid penalizing buildings undergoing major repairs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that audit timing can conflict with scheduled capital work, creating situations where orders and notices are issued during planned repairs. • Raised concerns that audits impose administrative burdens that stretch limited staff resources, particularly related to documentation preparation and accompanying officers during inspections. • Expressed the need for earlier notice of which buildings will be audited to allow providers to allocate resources effectively and proactively address issues.
<p>In-Unit Conditions & Reactive Scoring</p>	<p><i>Building Owner/Operator Associations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argued that increased reactive score deductions could unfairly penalize building owners/operators for tenant-created conditions outside of their control which would unfairly reduce the score. • Warned that increased reactive score deductions could drive up audit frequency and administrative burden, particularly in older or larger buildings. • Expressed frustration that owners can receive duplicate orders for the same issue, raising appeal costs and administrative burden. <p><i>Tenant Advocates</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argued that the current reactive score deductions are too small to motivate building owner/operators, who can absorb the penalty without making repairs. • Wanted higher score deductions and compounding penalties. • Highlighted that buildings with several complaints still maintain scores far above what tenants deem appropriate based on their experience. • Stressed that in-unit issues often reflect building wide systemic failures (e.g. plumbing and heating systems, pest spillover), not tenant-driven issues. • Demanded that tenants have a right to appeal building scores and speak with inspectors, especially when building owners/operators claim compliance despite persistent in-unit issues.

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
	<p><i>Community Housing Providers & Non-Profits</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasized that many in-unit issues stem from complex tenant realities, including mental health challenges, hoarding, mobility issues, and other barriers that affect unit maintenance and issue reporting. • Noted that increasing reactive or high-risk scoring would disproportionately impact large, aging portfolios where existing issues (e.g. pests) are already difficult to manage due to scale and long-standing underfunding. • Stressed that the system must clearly differentiate between -tenant created issues and systemic building issues to avoid unfair penalties. • Highlighted that limited digital literacy among tenants makes information sharing and issue resolution challenging, reinforcing the need for in person outreach and engagement.
<p>Colour-Coded Signage System</p>	<p><i>Building Owner/Operator Associations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly concerned about stigma, especially for buildings receiving a red sign, believing it unfairly harms reputation and tenant relationships. • Questioned the justification for the score ranges and argued that buildings with scores between 75-85% are good buildings that are deserving of a green sign. • Believed that naming green buildings as “satisfactory” downplays efforts made to meet standards and may mislead the public about the level of work involved. Suggested to change the language to “compliant” or “good”. • Criticized the lack of opportunity to speak to councillors before adopting the signage system. • Worried the signage system will be perceived similarly to DineSafe, leading to misinterpretation that a red sign means buildings are unsafe. • Requested better transparency on all associated fees and enforcement actions linked to different colour categories. • Suggested improvements to enforcement training and public facing education materials, noting that signage will prompt heightened public scrutiny. <p><i>Tenant Advocates</i></p>

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly supportive of signage as a transparency tool but believed the score ranges are too lenient and need to be higher, notably for green buildings. • Strongly emphasized concerns about stigmatizing of tenants living in buildings with red signs, noting that it would shame communities and discourage reporting; however some argued that the real stigma comes from deteriorating building conditions. • Called for more accessible and multilingual signage, noting many tenants do not speak English as a first language. • Urged that signage be posted at all building entrances to ensure it is visible to all tenants. • Requested more tenant education on what the colours mean to prevent panic or misunderstanding (e.g. Red ≠ unsafe to live in). • Advocated for a potential “orange” category to reduce the gap between yellow and red and to avoid association with DineSafe. • Expressed concern about the system being adopted without enough tenant-focused consultation and believed more public engagement is needed before rollout. • Argued that high-risk issues such as elevators, pests, mold, garbage chutes, heating failures, and structural issues should automatically push buildings into yellow or red categories. <p><i>Community Housing Providers & Non-Profits</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concern that signage may stigmatize vulnerable tenants and entire communities, particularly in older, aging, or underfunded buildings, even when issues are actively being addressed. • Highlighted that large, aging portfolios are more likely to fall into lower colour categories during major repair work, which may not accurately reflect safety or habitability. • Emphasized the need for clearer definitions of what each colour signifies, to avoid misinterpretation by tenants and the public. <p>Expressed concern that red or yellow signage may be misunderstood as indicating unsafe, uninhabitable, or eviction-related conditions, underscoring the need for stronger tenant education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised questions about how signage changes will be communicated to tenants who rely on inperson or door-to-

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
	<p>door outreach, and stressed the importance of translations and accessible signage for diverse tenant populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voiced concern about broader political and public perception impacts, particularly where large numbers of community housing buildings may be visibly categorized as yellow or red.
Remedial Action	<p><i>Building Owner/Operator Associations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed remedial action is currently used too quickly in some cases, especially for older buildings with major capital needs that can't be resolved rapidly. Concerned remedial action can duplicate work already underway or force compressed timelines that are unrealistic for contractors. Wanted clear, measurable, and publicly available criteria that define when remedial action is used. Argued remedial action should be reserved for chronic, high-risk negligence or repairs delayed due to procurement issues. <p><i>Tenant Advocates</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly supported the use of remedial action and believed it is under used, especially for building owners/operators with long histories of non-compliance. Argued remedial action should be used earlier or automatically for high-risk or persistent issues. Wanted remedial action timelines tightened and publicly reported so tenants understand what work has been ordered and its progress. Emphasized remedial action must prioritize tenant health and safety. <p><i>Community Housing Providers & Non-Profit</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raised concern that remedial action may be triggered by tenant driven issues that providers cannot fully control but that significantly impact compliance outcomes. Supported remedial action in principle but cautioned that heavy reliance on it could unfairly penalize buildings undergoing long-term redevelopment or capital renewal. Emphasized the need for remedial action criteria to account for large, aging building portfolios, capital backlogs, and structural constraints.

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Called for a more collaborative, problem solving approach before enforcement, including clearer timelines, improved communication, and opportunities to demonstrate ongoing work.
Other Feedback	<p><i>Building Owner/Operator Associations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed inconsistent interpretations of standards across divisions (e.g. Municipal Licensing & Standards, Toronto Public Health, Toronto Fire Services, Toronto Building, Housing Secretariat, Solid Waste) and and frustrated by unclear escalation pathways and which issues fall under which divisions. Encouraged a single point of contact for complex buildings requiring the involved of multiple divisions. Wanted clearer, more predictable communication around building evaluation and audit processes, fees, standard operating procedures, and officer training materials. <p><i>Tenant Advocates / Tenant Groups</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly felt that siloed City operations result in delayed action and missed accountability for issues that involve multiple divisions, allowing problems to persist. Wanted a more integrated system where tenants receive clear explanations of what each division is responsible for and how issues are escalated to reduce policy gaps. Strongly believed tenants do not receive timely or accessible communication about building evaluations, audits, and orders and notices. Emphasized the need for multilingual and accessible communication, including door-to-door outreach and flyers, especially before audits, evaluations, or signage changes, as many tenants lack digital access. Felt there is insufficient clarity on the duration of orders and notices, when they are closed, when they are followed up with, and when improvements are expected to be made. Noted that tenants often must self-organize and create their own communications (e.g. posters and flyers) because City communication is incomplete or delayed. <p><i>Community Housing Providers & Non-Profit</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighted that housing providers often face multiple inspections or evaluations from different City divisions for the

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Theme	Summary of Feedback Received
	<p>same issue, without unified recommendations, timelines, or coordinated follow up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasized the need for clearer, more coordinated communication and feedback after evaluations or audits, noting that scores are often received with limited explanation. Stressed the importance of predictable coordination across City divisions, particularly for large and complex housing portfolios, to support proactive staffing and planning. Noted that meaningful tenant engagement requires accommodation for lowtech and in-person communication methods, including door-to-door outreach and physical notices.

Public Survey Results

Questions for All Respondents

Which of the following best describes you?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Tenant in a RentSafeTO-registered building (building with 3+ storeys and 10+ units)	396	67.7%
Building owner/operator of a RentSafeTO-registered building (building with 3+ storeys and 10+ units)	158	27%
Tenant association or advocacy group	38	6.5%
Building owner/operator association	19	3.2%
Community housing provider	22	3.8%
None of the above	0	0

What was your estimated total household income before taxes last year?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
0 - \$29,999	71	12.6%
\$30,000-\$49,999	97	17.2%
\$50,000-\$69,999	68	12.1%
\$70,000-\$99,999	83	14.7%
\$100,000-149,999	71	12.6%
\$150,000 or more	38	6.7%

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Don't know	6	1.1%
Prefer not to answer	129	22.9%

How many people live in your household, including yourself?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
1	177	31.4%
2	164	29.1%
3	65	11.5%
4	55	9.8%
5	13	2.3%
More than 5	15	2.7%
Prefer not to answer	74	13.1%

Based on your experience, are the 50 evaluation categories clear and easy to understand?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	383	65.5%
No	118	20.2%
Unsure	84	14.4%

After looking at the 50 evaluation categories and their weighting, do you think any of them should be given more or less importance?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	242	41.4%
No	343	58.6%

How well do you think your current building score reflects the actual conditions your building?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
My building score is too high; conditions are worse than the score suggests	241	41.2%
My building score is too low; conditions are better than the score suggests	68	11.6%
My building score accurately reflects my building conditions	171	29.2%
Unsure	105	17.9%

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Do you think the temporary score deductions for unresolved violations are fair and encourage issues to be fixed (e.g. a building's score is reduced by 1% for a minimum of 30 days for each 'Order to Comply' or 'Notice of Violation')?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	284	48.5%
No	176	30.1%
Unsure	125	21.4%

At a minimum, for how long should temporary score deductions affect a building's score?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Less than 30 days	73	12.5%
30 days (current approach)	125	21.4%
2 months	59	10.1%
3 months	168	28.7%
Other	160	27.4%

Temporary score deductions for ongoing violations should:

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Remain the same (1% deduction)	136	23.2%
Reduce a building's score by a larger amount (e.g. more than 1%)	315	53.8%
Reduce a building's score by a smaller amount (e.g. less than 1%)	46	7.9%
Unsure	88	15%
Remain the same (1% deduction)	136	23.2%

How effective is the trigger for Targeted Engagement at identifying buildings that need extra education or engagement (e.g. when a building's score is lowered by 5% for 2+ months)?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Not effective at all	150	25.6%
Slightly effective	156	26.7%
Moderately effective	205	35%
Very effective	55	9.4%
Extremely effective	19	3.2%

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

What is the best way for you to get information about the program from the City of Toronto? Select all that apply.

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Email	431	73.6%
Letter mail	217	37%
Information booths in your lobby	185	31.6%
Door-to-door visits	98	16.7%
Flyers or posters	183	31.2%
Webpage updates	123	21%
Social media	169	28.8%
Information sessions (online or in-person)	109	18.6%
Other	37	6.3%

Do you think that the proposed colour ranges will accurately reflect building conditions?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	371	63.4%
No	165	28.2%
Unsure	49	8.4%

Do you agree with the proposed colour-coded sign designs?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	406	69.4%
No	135	23.1%
Unsure	44	7.5%

Are the proposed signs clear, easy to read and understand?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	491	83.9%
No	94	16.1%

Do you anticipate any challenges with the colour-coded signage system? Select all that apply.

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
May create negative perceptions of lower-rated buildings	192	32.8%
Sign visibility	144	24.6%

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Sign maintenance (e.g. removal or damage by tenants or landlords)	250	42.7%
Signs that do not match the building's score	194	33.1%
People may misunderstand what the colours mean	135	23%
I don't anticipate any challenges with the colour-coded signage system	104	17.7%
Unsure	47	8%
Other	88	15%

What are the best ways for the City to share updates and information about the colour-coded signage system (e.g. sign design or building colour changes)? Select all that apply.

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Email	418	71.4%
Text message	89	15.2%
Letter mail	271	46.3%
Flyers or posters	265	45.2%
Online updates (e.g. webpage, social media)	233	39.8%
Other	58	9.9%

Questions for Tenants

How many times in the past year have you contacted the City about an issue in your building?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Never	247	62.4%
1 - 2 times	76	19.2%
3 - 5 times	37	9.3%
More than 5 times	36	9.1%

Did contacting the City help resolve your issue(s)?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
I have never contacted the City about an issue in my building	232	58.6%
Yes (please explain)	35	8.8%
No (please explain)	76	19.2%

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Somewhat (please explain)	53	13.4%
---------------------------	----	-------

What prevents you from reporting building issues to the City? Select all that apply

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Unsure who to contact	126	21.5%
Concern that landlord might respond negatively (e.g. raise rent, threaten eviction, etc.)	176	30.1%
Past negative experiences (e.g. long wait times for issues to be addressed)	97	16.5%
Language barriers	4	0.7%
I don't have any building issues to report or nothing prevents me from reporting building issues	101	17.3%
Unsure	17	2.9%
Other	85	14.5%

Has your building received an audit within the past year?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	48	12.1%
No	79	19.9%
Unsure	269	67.9%

Were you informed about the audit before it took place?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	11	22.9%
No	37	77.1%

During the audit, did you speak with City staff?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	6	12.5%
No	42	87.5%

Did the audit lead to improvements in building conditions?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	7	14.6%
No	30	62.5%
Somewhat	11	22.9%

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Overall, did you find the audit helpful?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	4	8.3%
No	30	62.5%
Somewhat	14	29.2%

In the past year, have RentSafeTO staff visited your building to speak with tenants (e.g. Targeted Engagement)?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	24	6.1%
No	223	56.3%
Unsure	149	37.6%

Were you informed about the visit before it took place?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	13	54.2%
No	11	45.8%

Did you speak with staff during the visit?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	11	45.8%
No	13	54.2%

Overall, did you find the visit helpful?

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	13	54.2%
No	6	25%
Somewhat	5	20.8%

Question for Building Owners and Operators

What do you think are the main barriers that make it hard to meet RentSafeTO requirements? Select all that apply.

Option	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
Lack of awareness, information or guidance on what the requirements are	41	7%

Attachment 1: Stakeholder Engagement Summary and Survey Results

Cost of maintenance, upkeep and repairs	109	18.6%
Difficulty accessing units	46	7.9%
Delays from external contractors or service providers	65	11.1%
Unsure	13	2.2%
Other	58	9.9%