


HALIFAX


P.O. Box 1749
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3A5 Canada

Item No. 14.1.13
Halifax Regional Council
November 22, 2016

TO: Mayor Savage and Members of Halifax Regional Council

SUBMITTED BY: Original Signed by 

Jacques Dubé, Chief Administrative Officer

Original Signed by 

Jane Fraser, Acting Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

DATE: November 4, 2016

SUBJECT: Halifax Transit Moving Forward Together Plan – Supplementary Report

ORIGIN

At the April 12, 2016 meeting of Regional Council, Members of Council requested a supplemental report providing further information or consideration on each of 23 items related to proposed changes to the transit network under the Halifax Transit *Moving Forward Together Plan*.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Section 69(1) of the Halifax Regional Municipality Charter provides the legislative authority for the municipality to provide a public transportation service. Section 79(1)(o) provides the authority for Council to expend money required by the municipality for public transportation services.

In addition to the Halifax Regional Municipality Charter, authority is also provided by Section T-5 of the 2014 Regional Municipal Planning Strategy which reads "Transit Service Plans shall be prepared at regular intervals for consideration by HRM. These plans will be developed in consultation with the public and other stakeholders and, upon adoption by HRM, shall provide guidance for investment in transit services."

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that Halifax Regional Council amend the *Moving Forward Together Plan* to retain the existing route numbering associated with the communities of North Preston and Cherry Brook, as per item E.
2. Approve the *Moving Forward Together Plan* as presented at the April 12, 2016 meeting of Regional Council with the inclusion of the change noted above.

BACKGROUND

On February 26, 2013, Regional Council initiated the development of a new five year strategic planning framework for Metro Transit (called *Moving Forward Together: The Metro Transit Five Year Service Plan*). A multifaceted public and stakeholder engagement plan for the first round of consultation was developed and presented to the Transportation Standing Committee in July of 2013. The formal public and stakeholder engagement process began in August of 2013, and continued until October 15, 2013. Based on the feedback received in consultation in January 2014, Regional Council endorsed a broadened scope for the *Moving Forward Together Plan* which included a redesign of the existing transit network. Regional Council also unanimously endorsed the four Moving Forward Principles, the foundation upon which the draft plan was developed.

The draft *Moving Forward Together Plan*, including the proposed future transit network, was released for public consultation in February 2015. The subsequent ten week engagement process was the most diverse and comprehensive consultation strategy ever undertaken by the municipality. A variety of opportunities for consultation was provided to members of the public and stakeholder groups over a ten week consultation period.

On April 22, 2016, Regional Council requested a supplemental report addressing 23 items for further information or consideration. The following report summarizes the staff recommendation on each of the 23 items identified by members of Council.

DISCUSSION

The following section provides a high level overview of each of the 23 items as noted by members of Regional Council on April 22, 2016. Attachment 1 to this report includes a more in-depth discussion of each of the 23 items described within this report. The items requested have been grouped into the following general themes:

1. Administrative Changes
2. Requests for Further Information
3. Items Described in the *Moving Forward Together Plan*
4. Implementation Considerations
5. Retention of Service Proposed to be Eliminated
6. Route Modifications
7. Alternative Network Design
8. Items Contravening Regional Plan Policy

1. Administrative Changes: Item E

Item E represents an administrative change which could be easily implemented:

- E) That the route numbers associated with the bus routes in North Preston and Cherry Brook remain as is.

Retaining existing numbering rather than changing the numbers as previously proposed has no broader impact on the *Moving Forward Together Plan*. This change has been recommended.

2. Requests for Further Information: Items S, T, U & W

Items S, T, U and W represent requests for information on a particular aspect of the transit network including past practices, projected growth, and analysis of the network. These items are as follows:

- S) Provide a history of transit services (planned and actual) to the community of Lucasville, including past budget commitments and changes to the transit boundaries, including options

on how to extend conventional service to the community, present options to provide a peak time service to Lucasville community and include any financial commitments Halifax Transit could commit to provide the alternate service;

- T) Identify other local routes in the proposed plan that through improved service levels or extensions may in the future provide crosstown service as part of a grid network high frequency grid [Potentials include the 29, the 72, the 84 from Sackville and the 32 – all numbers in the new plan];
- U) Implications of the proposed Roslyn Rd route for #1 bus during afternoon peak hours that included rationale for this route, alternatives considered, options for peak hour service, options for identifying traffic calming and how this proposal relates to the Integrated Mobility Plan;
- W) Enabling East-West routes to run across north end peninsula including identifying physical improvements to roads and installation of enhanced shelters at key transfer points in order to allow more riders convenient connections from Bayers Road and Mumford terminals to Barrington Street.

Further information on these items can be found in Attachment 1 and a more detailed discussion on Item S may be found in Attachment T.

3. Items Described in the *Moving Forward Together Plan*: Items V & Q_{ii}

Items V & Q_{ii} represents items which are already reflective of the approved *Moving Forward Together Plan* :

- V) Route 32 Cowie Hill Express which becomes the Route 124 Leiblin Link continue to travel on Summer Street and not Robie Street;
- Q_{ii}) That staff consider extending service for routes associated with Dartmouth Crossing to coincide with working hours.

No further action is required by Regional Council to implement the above items as these items have been described in the approved *Moving Forward Together Plan*.

4. Plan Implementation Considerations: Items D & Q_i

Items D and Q_i, as noted below, represent items which, if implemented, would disrupt the sequencing of plan roll out:

- D) The proposed link into Cole Harbour be implemented prior to 2021;
- Q_i) That staff consider extending service for routes associated with the service industry (downtown areas – Scotia Square/Alderney Gate) to coincide with working hours.

Advancing the implementation of changes to the express services proposed for Cole Harbour is possible prior to 2021. However, because of the interdependencies in the transit network, to achieve this, all of the changes to Cole Harbour and most changes for Dartmouth would need to be advanced as a package, and implementation for another geographic area would need to be deferred.

By increasing the service day of routes serving the downtown core, there would be a substantial impact on the length of time it will take to implement the plan in its entirety. Staff recommend adhering to the approved implementation schedule and route-specific levels of service as described in the *Moving Forward Together Plan*, which was developed strategically based on projected population growth and service needs.

5. Retention of Service Proposed to be Eliminated: Items B, H, K & R

Items B, H, and K describe the retention of service which currently exists but would not be a part of the future network in the *Moving Forward Together Plan*. These items are as follows:

- B) Purcell's Cove bus route 15 be considered to leave the service as is;
- H) Existing 6 Quinpool retained as is;
- K) Determine whether the Sambro Community Transit Route 402 could be removed;
- R) Existing Route 5 which becomes 26 Springvale Avenue continue to travel past Mumford to downtown and not terminate at the Mumford Terminal.

These routes or portions of routes were proposed to be eliminated under the *Moving Forward Together Plan* either because they experience low ridership across most or all of the day, or alternately represent redundant service. Staff recommend proceeding with the route network approved in the *Moving Forward Together Plan*.

6. Route Adjustments: Items A, F, J, L & M

Items A, F, J, L and M describe alternative routings for an individual route described in the *Moving Forward Together Plan*. These items are as follows:

- A) Options providing the residents of Eastern Passage/Cow Bay transit service to Cole Harbour and possibly continuing to Portland Hills terminal;
- F) Consider the proposed alternate Route 370 (Porters Lake) as identified in the Map distributed by Councillor Hendsbee at the Committee of the Whole meeting on April 12, 2016;¹
- J) Proposed Route 93, (Bedford), which goes through the Nottingham Community, determine how it could be expanded to service residents in the area surrounding the Sunnyside Mall and Bedford Place Mall;
- L) Continuing with proposed #10 on the current route #10 on Inglis and Beaufort;
- M) Extending local bus service, such as proposed route 24, to provide service to the Joseph Howe Manor, the seniors residence located at 5515 Victoria Road.

These items generally describe changes to proposed routings which would make the routes less direct, substantially increase operating costs, or otherwise result in a lower-ridership, less attractive route.

7. Alternative Network Design: Items N, O & P

Items N, O & P describe alternative routing ideas which would have broad network implications and a significant impact to the *Moving Forward Together Plan*. These items are as follows:

- N) Consider the detailed report submitted by the Main Street BID as distributed at the COW meeting of April 12, 2016, with respect to adopting its recommendation for Route 63, 68, Route 55, and Route 401;
- O) Consider the Greater Burnside Business Association communication April 8, 2016 to not locate the bus terminal at Wright Avenue and Akerley Blvd. and locate it at or near the Dartmouth 4 Pad;
- P) Direct staff to amend (or add) so there is a corridor route running North South in Dartmouth connecting Burnside, Highfield Terminal, Bridge Terminal, Downtown Dartmouth and Woodside, to improve regional connections to these locations and also make it easier to travel within Dartmouth.

These items generally describe changes to proposed routings which would make some routes or parts of

¹ Attachment B: Map Circulated by Councillor Hendsbee at Committee of the Whole Meeting (April 12, 2016)

the network less capable of meeting the needs of transit users, make the network less efficient, or otherwise represent ideas inconsistent with the Moving Forward Principles.

8. Items Contravening Regional Plan Policy: Items C, G & I

Items C, G & I describe changes which cannot be implemented as they would contravene the Regional Plan Policy T-7, which establishes the Urban Transit Service Boundary. Regional Council approved the Urban Transit Service Boundary as part of the Regional Plan Five Year Review in 2014.

Policy T-7 reads as follows:

The Urban Transit Service Boundary, illustrated in Map 7 of this Plan, shall establish the area within which HRM will direct future investment in public transit services, with the exception of rural commuter express service which may be considered outside of this Boundary. The level of service outside this boundary shall not be increased, but modifications to services may be considered that serve to facilitate operational planning. Existing routes and services not contained within this boundary will continue to exist, and as with any public transit routes or services, any service reductions will be based upon performance standards approved by HRM.

The following items contradict Regional Plan Policy T-7 as noted above.

- C) On extending one small portion of the airport route (320), to come into the community of Fall River as part of its regular route;
- G). Route 55 be considered to be extended and that the following options be evaluated:
 - i) extend Route 55 to the community of Waverly and return;
 - ii) extend Route 55 through Waverly to the Fall River Park and Ride;
 - iii) extend Route 55 through Waverly to Sackville Terminal on Cobequid Road.
- I) Extend Hammonds Plains Busses to Tantallon and Tantallon busses to Hammonds Plains, Peggy's Cove and Hubbards.

Implications

Attachment 1 provides a breakdown of the interdependencies associated with each of the 23 items noted above, including the approximate resource and financial cost to implement any of these items as an amendment to the plan.

It is important to recognize the various interdependencies of the Halifax Transit network as described in the *Moving Forward Together Plan*. Should Regional Council wish to pursue any modifications to the *Moving Forward Together Plan* beyond those which are recommended above, there could be significant implications for the broader transit network in terms of resourcing and the timeline identified in the plan for implementation. Specifically, to include any additional transit service not anticipated in the approved *Moving Forward Together Plan* requires the identification of additional resources, either by way of reducing service elsewhere, increasing funding, or extending the implementation timeline.

In addition, in order to implement the network changes as per the approved *Moving Forward Together Plan*, detailed planning and scheduling of the 2017/18 network changes must begin before the end of December 2016. As a result, confirmation is required that the previously approved plan will not be modified by December 31st, 2016, in order to prevent the delays to both the immediate and overall timeline for implementation.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications associated with this report. If council decides to pursue any of the items described in this report that have financial implications, additional funding would be required. The

source of any additional funding could include reducing service levels on existing transit routes, extending the *Moving Forward Together Plan* implementation period, or increasing tax rates or fares.

Budget approval for plan implementation will come each year during the budget approval period.

RISK CONSIDERATION

There are no significant risks associated with the recommendations in this Report. The risks considered rate low.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Public consultation on the draft *Moving Forward Together Plan* included a large number of ways for citizens and stakeholder groups to provide insight and direction into plan refinement. The draft *Moving Forward Together Plan*, including the proposed future transit network, was released for public consultation in February 2015. The subsequent ten week engagement process was the most diverse and comprehensive consultation strategy ever undertaken by the municipality. The following describes the variety of opportunities for consultation provided to members of the public and stakeholder groups. It included the following activities:

- **Project consultation page - *MakeTransitBetter.ca*:** This website allowed residents to access information on proposed routing and frequencies in order to understand the impact the proposed changes would have on their transit trips. The website resulted in over 50,000 unique website visitor and 15,370 survey responses;
- **Pop-Up Engagement Events:** Halifax Transit had hosted 20 pop up engagement events and interacted with 2,480 individuals;
- **Stakeholder Consultation Sessions:** Three stakeholder sessions were held in the first week of consultation, and a fourth one was held near the end of consultation in order to ensure that all groups who were interested had the opportunity to participate. A total of 37 groups or agencies took part;
- **ShapeYourCityHalifax.ca:** The Municipality's online engagement portal served as a source of comprehensive information and provided the opportunity for deeper engagement through discussion forums. At the end of the consultation period, the site had hosted 2,190 unique visitors, of which 605 provided their feedback;
- **Public Opinion Research:** A sample of 800 Halifax residents indicated that there was a 65% awareness of proposed network changes (an increase of 14% over the 10-week engagement period), and a 73% level of public support for proposed changes;
- **Twitter Town Halls:** As part of the consultation strategy, two Twitter Town halls were held in April 2015. These events facilitated direct engagement with residents and allowed significant distribution of information to, and through, Halifax Transit's more than 23,000 Twitter followers. These events together hosted 173 participants, and resulted in 486 tweets;
- **Written submissions:** Nearly 1,000 email submissions were received by Halifax Transit over the 10 week consultation period, consisting of both questions and comments.

No additional public consultation has taken place as a result of this supplementary report.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

It is anticipated that the *Moving Forward Together Plan* will increase transit ridership, reducing private vehicle usage. This would result in a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

ALTERNATIVES

Regional Council could choose to ask for one or more amendments to the *Moving Forward Together Plan* related to the 23 items discussed in this report. However, that is not recommended as there would likely be significant impact to the integrity of the plan and its implementation.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Moving Forward Together Plan Item Summary
- Attachment 2: Item A – Eastern Passage to Cole Harbour
- Attachment 3: Item C – Route 320 to the Community of Fall River
- Attachment 4: Item F – Submission made by Councillor Hendsbee
- Attachment 5: Item G – Route 55 Extensions
- Attachment 6: Item I – Peggy’s Cove and Hubbards Route Extensions
- Attachment 7: Item J – Alternative Routings for Route 93
- Attachment 8: Item M – Transit Service in Proximity of 5515 Victoria Road
- Attachment 9: Item N – Submission made by Councillor Mancini
- Attachment 10: Item O – Submission made by the Greater Burnside Business Association
- Attachment 11: Item S – History of Transit in Lucasville
- Attachment 12: Halifax Transit Moving Forward Together Plan dated March 29, 2016 (Attachments B & C of this report available online: <http://www.halifax.ca/council/agendasc/documents/160412cow3.pdf>)

A copy of this report can be obtained online at <http://www.halifax.ca/council/agendasc/cagenda.php> then choose the appropriate meeting date, or by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 902.490.4210, or Fax 902.490.4208.

Report Prepared by: Erin Harrison, MCIP, LPP, Supervisor, Service Design & Projects 902.490.4942

Item A		
a. Options providing the residents of Eastern Passage/Cow Bay transit service to Cole Harbour and possibly continuing to Portland Hills terminal.		
Policy Considerations		
This is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 1.		
Discussion		
There is insufficient demand to support fixed route transit service; census data indicates relatively low demand both in the 2006 Census and the 2011 National Household Survey. See attachment 2.		
Interdependency		
This has a high to moderate impact, depending on the level of service requested (peak only or all day service). Due to the resource requirements for this route, it is likely that should it be implemented, the implementation of another aspect of the plan would be delayed. This change would also have impacts to the local area in Cole Harbour and would require changes to a number of other local routes.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommends retaining the original routings in Eastern Passage and Cole Harbour as described in the Moving Forward Together Plan. Staff does not support the introduction of transit service connecting Eastern Passage/ Cow Bay to Portland Hills Terminal, as it is not anticipated this service would meet ridership guidelines as described by the Moving Forward Together Plan as approved by Regional Council. Eastern Passage will be on the Corridor Route 6, connecting residents to Woodside Ferry Terminal, Alderney Ferry Terminal, and the Bridge Terminal.		
Overall Impact		
Very high		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
22km	\$500,000	3

Item B		
b. Purcell's Cove bus route 15 be considered to leave the service as is.		
Policy Considerations		
This is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 1.		
Discussion		
<p>Ridership data indicates that transit ridership on the existing Route 15 (proposed Route 415) does not support all day service: During the midday period (between 9am and 3pm) the Route 15 only has 13 boardings per day beyond Williams Lake Road. The busiest part of the route, from Williams Lake Road to Mumford Terminal and Desmond Road, will be served by the Route 25 all day, seven days a week. It is likely that, should existing levels of service be retained on the Route 15/415, it would not meet ridership guidelines as described by the Moving Forward Together Plan as approved by Regional Council. Since a significant portion of the route is outside of the Urban Transit Service Boundary, this area would be a strong candidate to receive funding through the Rural Transit Funding Program.</p>		
Interdependency		
Changes to the level of service proposed on the Route 415 would have implications for the Route 25 Williams Lake Road. Increases in service on the Route 415 could result in delays to plan implementation.		
Staff Recommendation		
<p>Staff recommends implementing the Route 415 as per the Moving Forward Together Plan. Staff does not support the retention of all day service on the existing Route 15/proposed Route 415. The bulk of the population served by this route would be served by the new Route 25, providing all day service, seven days a week. Maintaining the Route 15/415 would be contrary to the Council approved Moving Forward Principles and would have the impact of delaying full implementation of the Moving Forward Together Plan, require a reduction in service elsewhere in the network, or result in an increase in capital and operating costs.</p>		
Overall Impact		
High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	\$350,000-\$400,000	2-3

Item C		
c. On extending one small portion of the airport route (320), to come into the community of Fall River as part of its regular route.		
Policy Considerations		
This is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 1 and the Route Directness Guidelines as described in Section 6.4 of the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Discussion		
Redirecting the Route 320 into the community of Fall River would provide improved access to residents. Of approximately 60 comments made related to the Route 320 Airport-Fall River, ten comments requested better connections between the Park & Ride and the community of Fall River, either by improving pedestrian facilities or by extending the route. At present, it is difficult to access the Route 320 at the Fall River Park & Ride via active transportation. However, if implemented, this diversion will compromise the express nature of this route. This would create additional travel time for those customers currently making use of this service. Furthermore, the additional time required to take this trip (approximately 7 minutes round trip) cannot be accommodated within the existing schedule during rush hour, and so would require additional resources. See attachment 3.		
Interdependency		
Changes to the Route 320 in Fall River would require an additional bus at peak times, when resources are limited. This change could result the introduction of new services being delayed.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend retaining the express nature of this route, as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . Changes to this route would require an additional bus at peak, and would inconvenience those passengers using the route to and from Halifax Stanfield International Airport. To include this change, the unanticipated resource requirements would result in a delay in plan implementation, require a reduction in service elsewhere in the network, or result in an increase in capital and operating costs.		
Overall Impact		
Moderate		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
6 km	\$150,000	1+

Item D		
d. The proposed link into Cole Harbour be implemented prior to 2021.		
Policy Considerations		
No policy considerations noted.		
Discussion		
<p>Recognizing that changes to the transit network described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> represent a substantial improvement to quality of service for users, Halifax Transit staff will look for opportunities to, where possible, accelerate the implementation of the plan. This may be possible if over the implementation period, opportunities to streamline or create efficiencies in the implementation process arise. However, a commitment to a shorter implementation timeline at this early stage is not recommended.</p> <p>It would not be possible to introduce changes to the Link or Express routes in Cole Harbour in advance of other changes to Local routes planned for Cole Harbour. Introducing the new Express network into Cole Harbour would mean changes to the way the network in Cole Harbour and Dartmouth operates, and it would not be possible to implement only a portion of the interrelated changes without compromising the system and making it more difficult to navigate for passengers. Therefore, all Cole Harbour changes would need to be implemented ahead of changes described for another geographic area.</p>		
Interdependency		
To achieve this, a different planned change would need to be delayed.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend adhering to approved implementation schedule as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> , which was developed strategically based on projected population growth and service needs.		
Overall Impact		
High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	N/A	N/A

Item E		
e. That the route numbers associated with the bus routes in North Preston and Cherry Brook remain as is.		
Policy Considerations		
No policy considerations noted.		
Discussion		
The route numbers identified in the plan for Cherry Brook (61 Cherry Brook) and North Preston (68 North Preston) were recommended in order to impact as few riders as possible, and to require fewer changes to on street bus stop infrastructure. However, retaining existing numbering has no broader impact on the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Interdependency		
None		
Staff Recommendation		
Although this comment was not raised through consultation, staff supports the recommendation to retain existing route numbering in Cherry Brook and North Preston.		
Overall Impact		
Low		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	N/A	N/A

Item F		
f. Consider the proposed alternate Route 370 (Porters Lake) as identified in the Map distributed by Councillor Hendsbee at the Committee of the Whole meeting on April 12, 2016.		
Policy Considerations		
This is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 2.		
Discussion		
<p>Today, residents travelling from Porters Lake to Mic Mac Mall can ride the Route 370 to the Bridge Terminal where they can transfer to either Route 10 or Route 55. In the future network, individuals could transfer to one of the following routes to connect from the Bridge Terminal to the Mic Mac Mall: 10, 54, 55, and 56. In addition to this, under the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>, the Route 370 would provide an additional stop on Main Street, where passengers could transfer to either the Route 10, 54, 67, or 72, to reach Mic Mac Mall without first going to the Bridge Terminal. Redirecting the Route 370 to service Mic Mac Mall would compromise the express nature of this route, adding running time and requiring additional resources. From an operational perspective, this type of routing limits the operational flexibility of having buses stationed out of either of the two Transit Centres.</p> <p>Further, this routing change would add five minutes to each one way trip (10 minutes per round trip), prolonging the time sensitive commuting trip. As an additional 10 minutes could not fit into the scheduled route, it would likely require the purchase of another bus in order to retain existing level of service. See attachment 4.</p>		
Interdependency		
This would require additional resources.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend proceeding with the original routing of the Route 370 Porters Lake as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . Staff does not support the modification of the Route 370 to Mic Mac Mall. Of the 50 comments received related to the changes proposed to the Route 370, none request the changes identified in the map distributed by Councillor Hendsbee at Committee of the Whole April 12, 2016. The future transit network includes enhanced connections between Main Street and Mic Mac Mall and between the Bridge Terminal and Mic Mac Mall.		
Overall Impact		
Moderate		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
1-2 km	\$10,000+	<1

Item G_i		
g. Route 55 be considered to be extended and that the following options be evaluated: gi) extend Route 55 to the community of Waverly and return.		
Policy Considerations		
This routing would extend beyond the Urban Transit Service Boundary. Implementing this change would be contrary to Regional Plan Policy.		
Discussion		
The route described by this amendment would extend approximately 8km outside of the Urban Transit Service Boundary, approximately 8.5 km beyond the termination of the Route 55 Port Wallace as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Interdependency		
Changes would require new resources and a substantial increase in operating budget for this route.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend proceeding with Route 55 Port Wallace as described in the Moving Forward Together Plan. The proposal described would extend service beyond the Urban Transit Service Boundary and thus would be contrary to Regional Plan Policy.		
Overall Impact		
High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
17 km	\$300,000-400,000	2-3

Item G_{ii}		
g. Route 55 be considered to be extended and that the following options be evaluated: gii) extend Route 55 through Waverly to the Fall River Park and Ride.		
Policy Considerations		
This routing would extend beyond the Urban Transit Service Boundary. Implementing this change would be contrary to Regional Plan Policy.		
Discussion		
The route described by this amendment would extend approximately 11.5km outside of the Urban Transit Service Boundary, approximately 12 km beyond the termination of the Route 55 Port Wallace as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Interdependency		
Changes would require new resources and a substantial increase in operating budget for this route.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend proceeding with Route 55 Port Wallace as described in the Moving Forward Together Plan. The proposal described would extend service beyond the Urban Transit Service Boundary and thus would be contrary to Regional Plan Policy.		
Overall Impact		
High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
24 km	\$450,000-\$500,000	3-4

Item G_{iii}		
g. Route 55 be considered to be extended and that the following options be evaluated: giii) extend Route 55 through Waverly to Sackville Terminal on Cobequid Road.		
Policy Considerations		
This routing would extend beyond the Urban Transit Service Boundary. Implementing this change would be contrary to Regional Plan Policy.		
Discussion		
The route described by this amendment would extend approximately 15.5 km outside of the Urban Transit Service Boundary, approximately 16 km beyond the termination of the Route 55 Port Wallace as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Interdependency		
Changes would require new resources and a substantial increase in operating budget for this route.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend proceeding with Route 55 Port Wallace as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . The proposal described would extend service beyond the Urban Transit Service Boundary and thus would be contrary to Regional Plan Policy.		
Overall Impact		
High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
31 km	\$750,000-800,000	4-5

Item H		
h. Existing 6 Quinpool be retained as is.		
Policy Considerations		
This is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 2.		
Discussion		
<p>Two concerns were raised related to the existing Route 6 - 1) lack of service on Quinpool Road between the rotary and Connaught Avenue, and 2) lack of a direct connection between Armdale/Stonehaven and downtown Halifax.</p> <p>1) There is some concern that, with the removal of the existing Route 6, there will be no regular service on Quinpool Road between Connaught Avenue and the rotary. This 1.2km segment of Quinpool Road had approximately 43 boardings per day in 2015. The vast majority of residences and frequently used stops on this segment are still within 500m of transit service either on Quinpool Road, Chebucto Road, or Connaught Avenue. This section of Quinpool Road would retain express service during the peak period in the peak direction.</p> <p>2) In the existing network, ridership in Armdale & Stonehaven is not sufficient to support two routes (existing Routes 6 and 22). Maintaining a single seat trip from Stonehaven into Downtown Halifax is contrary to the Moving Forward Principles as it would require increased redundancy in the network between Mumford Terminal and downtown Halifax. At Mumford Terminal, riders may transfer to the Corridor Routes 1, 2, and 9, between them representing approximately 14 buses an hour.</p>		
Interdependency		
Retaining this route would require a reallocation of resources from another route or an increase in budget.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend proceeding with the changes described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . If this routing was retained, the substantial resource requirements associated would need to be recovered by extending plan implementation, reducing service elsewhere in the network, or increasing capital and operating costs.		
Overall Impact		
Very High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	\$750,000	3+

Item I		
i. Extend Hammonds Plains Busses to Tantallon and Tantallon busses to Hammonds Plains, Peggy's Cove and Hubbards.		
Policy Considerations		
This routing would extend beyond the Urban Transit Service Boundary. Implementing this change would be contrary to Regional Plan Policy.		
Discussion		
<p>This would be a very substantial resource requirement. As per Regional Plan Policy, no service may be added outside of the Urban Transit Service boundary, although a not-for-profit service provider may qualify for funding under the Rural Transit Funding Program.</p> <p>BayRides currently provides service to much of this area, funded with assistance of the Rural Transit Funding Program. See attachment 6.</p>		
Interdependency		
Changes would require new resources and a substantial increase in operating budget for this route.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend proceeding with the routing for Route 433 and Route 330 as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . The substantial resource requirements associated with this change would need to be recovered by extending plan implementation, reducing service elsewhere in the network, or increasing capital and operating costs. Further, this change would require an amendment to the Regional Plan.		
Overall Impact		
Very High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
51 km to Hubbards; 58 km to Peggy's Cove	\$150,000-\$200,000 per route, per branch. \$600,000-\$800,000 total	4-6

Item J		
<p>j. Proposed Route 93, (Bedford), which goes through the Nottingham Community, determine how it could be expanded to service residents in the area surrounding the Sunnyside Mall and Bedford Place Mall.</p>		
Policy Considerations		
<p>No policy considerations noted.</p>		
Discussion		
<p>This route could be extended in front of Bedford Place and Sunnyside Malls turning around at either Rockmanor Drive (currently serviced by Route 86), or Cobequid Terminal (in which case routing would duplicate the future Corridor Route 8). However, by serving the Sunnyside and Bedford Place Mall along Bedford Highway, it would be impossible to also serve the Nottingham area due to road geometry. Either option would duplicate other service described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>.</p> <p>Further, as the new Route 93 operates at peak only, in the peak direction only, serving the malls would provide limited benefit as their busiest service hours typically are not at peak commuting periods. See attachment 7</p>		
Interdependency		
<p>If Council decides to amend the routing of the Route 93 Bedford, this route would duplicate a substantial proportion of Route 8 or Route 186, although it would provide riders with additional options.</p>		
Staff Recommendation		
<p>Staff recommend original routing for the Route 93 as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>. Realigning this route so it serves Sunnyside Mall and Bedford Place Mall as it would make serving the Nottingham area impossible due to road geometry (from Bedford Highway right onto Union Street). This routing change may also have the impact of causing parking issues for Sunnyside Mall or Bedford Place Mall, as passengers may use these retail centres as informal Park and Ride facilities.</p>		
Overall Impact		
<p>Low</p>		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
<p>An additional 1.2 km if routed to Rockmanor; an additional 4 km if routed to Cobequid Terminal</p>	<p>\$5,000-\$10,000 for Rockmanor; \$20,000-\$25,000 for Cobequid</p>	<p>Up to 1</p>

Item K		
k. Determine whether the Sambro Community Transit Route 402 could be removed.		
Policy Considerations		
Retaining Route 402 is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 1.		
Discussion		
Route 402 is the lowest ridership route in the Halifax Transit network. If it were to be retained, it is likely that it will not meet the ridership guidelines approved by Regional Council as part of the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . The segment of this route which would no longer have transit service currently has 25 daily boardings. Retaining this route would be contrary to the Moving Forward Principles, as this route would require resources which could have been allocated to another route and carry more riders. This area around the Sambro Loop could qualify for funding under the Rural Transit Funding Program should a local not for profit be able to provide local demand-responsive transit service.		
Interdependency		
Interdependencies are moderate. This change would not impact the network routing more broadly, although resources required to retain this route would delay the implementation of other routes described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . It would also require resources that could be used more efficiently on other routes.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend removal of the route according to the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> due to low ridership. If this route were retained, the associated resources required to operate this service would need to be recovered by extending plan implementation, reducing service elsewhere in the network, or increasing capital and operating costs.		
Overall Impact		
High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	\$250,000	2

Item L		
I. Continuing with proposed #10 on the current route #10 on Inglis and Beaufort.		
Policy Considerations		
This is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 2.		
Discussion		
<p>This section of the existing Route 10 has low ridership over the course of the day, and by retaining service on this part of Beaufort Avenue and Inglis Street, directness of the route is compromised. Although it would appear that the added kilometers and service hours is relatively low, due to the substantial increase in trips for the Route 10 described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>, this seemingly minor route deviation would result in substantial increase in operating costs and the net addition of one bus.</p> <p>Of the ten stops which would no longer be served by the Route 10, the busiest stops (South Street near Dalplex) would still be served directly by the new Route 24, and would still be within 300m of the new Route 10. The busiest stop on Beaufort Avenue is within 250m of a stop to be served by the new Route 24 and less than 500m from the new Route 10.</p>		
Interdependency		
Interdependencies are moderate. While this change would not impact the network routing more broadly, there is a substantial resource requirement associated with amendment.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend implementing the Route 10 as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . It is not recommended to retain the existing Route 10 alignment on Inglis Street and Beaufort Avenue. Maintaining this routing would compromise the directness of the route and substantially increase operating costs, contrary to the Moving Forward Principles.		
Overall Impact		
Moderate		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
1.6 km	\$150,000+	1-2

Item M		
<p>m. Extending local bus service, such as proposed route 24, to provide service to the Joseph Howe Manor, the seniors residence located at 5515 Victoria Road.</p>		
Policy Considerations		
<p>This is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 2.</p>		
Discussion		
<p>This residence is located approximately 220m from stops on South Park Street which under the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> would be served by the Routes 4,10 and 24. It is approximately 250m from stops on Inglis Street to serviced by Route 29. The provision of conventional transit service relies on the ability of passengers to travel a reasonable distance to reach a transit stop. As per section 6.3 of the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>, Halifax Transit considers a resident to be served by transit if they are within 500m of a transit stop or within 1000m of a transit terminal. See attachment 8.</p> <p>Redirecting the Route 24 or 29 to include direct service to Joseph Howe Manor would compromise service on other parts of this proposed route.</p> <p>Access-A-Bus is currently able to provide door to door service to this location for registered users.</p>		
Interdependency		
<p>Interdependencies are considered low to moderate. While this change would not impact the network routing more broadly, there is a resource requirement associated with amendment. The rerouting of either the Route 24 or the Route 29 would also mean that service at one or more existing bus stop on Barrington Street and Inglis Street would not be served (in the case of the Route 29), or South Street (in the case of the Route 24).</p>		
Staff Recommendation		
<p>Staff recommend the implementation of Route 24 and Route 29 as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>. Both of these routes would be within 250m of the residence at 5515 Victoria Road. Amending either of these routes to directly serve 5515 Victoria Road would compromise the directness of the route.</p>		
Overall Impact		
<p>Low</p>		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
<p><1 km</p>	<p>\$15,000-\$40,000</p>	<p><1</p>

Item N

n. Consider the detailed report submitted by the Main Street BID as distributed at the COW meeting of April 12, 2016, with respect to adopting its recommendation for Route 63, 68, Route 55, and Route 401.

Policy Considerations

No policy considerations noted.

Discussion

This submission was submitted during consultation on the *Draft Moving Forward Together Plan*, and was considered seriously at that time. In response to the submission from the Main Street Business Improvement District (BID), an origin-destination study was conducted on board Routes 61 and 68 in 2015. It was determined that the strongest demand for transit users was the regional centre (downtown Halifax or Dartmouth), not Main Street, Tacoma Centre, or Mic Mac Mall.

The commercial area of Main Street under the *Moving Forward Together Plan* would be served by local Routes 54, 72, 67, and corridor Route 10. These routes provide single seat trips between the Main Street/Tacoma Drive area and Portland Hills Terminal, Mic Mac Mall, Woodside Ferry Terminal, the Bridge Terminal, Highfield Terminal, Burnside Industrial Park, Alderney Ferry Terminal, downtown Dartmouth, downtown Halifax, Dalhousie University and many other destinations in between. It is anticipated that this very high level of service will meet demand in the Main Street BID area now and into the future. Furthermore, all trips from Cole Harbour to the Main Street business district can be accommodated by one transfer at a terminal (either Portland Hills Terminal or Penhorn Terminal). The following describes Halifax Transit's comments on the routings describe end in the Main Street BID submission:

Route 63: Changes to the Route 63 described by the Main Street BID include terminating the route at Tacoma Centre rather than Penhorn Terminal. This would improve connectivity between Tacoma Centre and Forest Hills Parkway and Mount Edward Road, however it would also remove the direct connection between Mount Edward Road and Penhorn Terminal, and thus the most direct trip to downtown Halifax and Dartmouth.

Route 68: Changes proposed by the Main Street BID to Route 68 describe a turnaround in the Cole Harbour Place parking lot, a maneuver currently not supported by Halifax Transit policy. The submission made by the Main Street BID also shows this route continuing along Mount Edward Rd. to Woodlawn Road to Main Street. This would be a second route connecting Mount Edward Road to Tacoma Centre. Mount Edward Road is a relatively low density residential street that likely could not provide adequate ridership to support this level of service. This route appears to continue along Main Street to Highway 111 and likely on to Mic Mac Mall. At present, this route attains adequate ridership to meet standards due to the significant portion of the route which travels along the Portland Street Corridor between Portland Hills Terminal and the Bridge Terminal along Portland Street. Should the routing described by the Main Street BID be introduced for the Route 68, it is very unlikely that Mount Edward Rd and Main Street will provide adequate ridership to achieve minimum ridership standards as approved by Regional Council.

Route 55: Routing changes for the Route 55 were not included on the submission made by Councillor Mancini on behalf of the Main Street BID.

Route 401: Routing changes for the Route 401 were not included on the submission made by Councillor Mancini on behalf of the Main Street BID.

Interdependency		
This has a very high level of interdependency. The Main Street BID proposal has significant implications for routes across Dartmouth and may have significant implications for resource requirements.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommends the implementation of routes in Dartmouth in accordance with the approved <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . While Halifax Transit recognizes the significant development potential of the Main Street BID, the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> describe an appropriate level of service to this area on four routes: 54, 72, 67, and 10. Amending the routes as described by the plan would impact riders, resources, and would be detrimental to the integrity of the network as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Overall Impact		
Very High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	Unknown	Unknown

Item O		
o. Consider the Greater Burnside Business Association communication April 8, 2016 to not locate the bus terminal at Wright Avenue and Akerley Blvd. and locate it at or near the Dartmouth 4 Pad.		
Policy Considerations		
No policy considerations noted.		
Discussion		
<p>The site of the proposed Wrights Cove Terminal as described by the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> was identified to improve connections for individuals travelling between Sackville, Halifax, and Burnside/Dartmouth Crossing. The location at the bottom of Wright Avenue on Bancroft Lane is an important location strategically as requires minimal network redundancy in order for transit routes to service as it does not require the "doubling back" of any particular route. Locating the Wrights Cove Terminal adjacent to the Dartmouth Four Pad would not allow direct access for a number of routes proposed to service the Wrights Cove Terminal including the Routes 3, 51, 84, 87, 182, 183, 185, and 189, all of which would need to be rerouted in order to serve this location. Extending these routes to service a terminal at the Dartmouth Four Pad would compromise the network as designed create significant increase in cost and operating time. It would further take many passengers out of their way and add substantial time to a one way trip, making transit less appealing.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed Wrights Cove Terminal Site on Bancroft Lane is adjacent to significant residential and commercial development. Locating a transit terminal here is in alignment with the principles of Transit Oriented Design due to the mixture of land uses and higher density located adjacent to a high level of transit service. Alternatively, the site adjacent to the Dartmouth Four Pad is surrounded by lower density, single land uses (business park), which will not see sustained demand over the course of the day and week. Service to the four pad would be provided by the new Route 64 during the week.</p>		
Interdependency		
Interdependencies are high. The relocation of the proposed terminal site could have a significant impact on the routing of up to 8 routes. There would be a significant increase in operating cost, and operational efficiencies and transit oriented design goals would not be achieved.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff do not recommend the relocation the Wrights Cove Transit Terminal to adjacent to the four pad. Locating the new terminal in this location would significantly reduce operational efficiency by requiring a redesign of transit service in Burnside and would not further goals to increase Transit Oriented Development. There will be bus stops located near the new four pad development, served by routes in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Overall Impact		
Very High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	Unknown	Unknown

Item P		
<p>p. Direct staff to amend (or add) so there is a corridor route running North South in Dartmouth connecting Burnside, Highfield Terminal, Bridge Terminal, Downtown Dartmouth and Woodside, to improve regional connections to these locations and also make it easier to travel within Dartmouth.</p>		
Policy Considerations		
<p>No policy considerations noted.</p>		
Discussion		
<p>The future transfer based network allows this trip to be made with the use of one transfer: Route 6 from Eastern Passage to Bridge Terminal, transfer to Route 3 to Highfield, and Burnside. These are two corridor routes with Corridor level of service, and therefore a transfer between these routes at the Bridge Terminal would be relatively short (5-10 minutes at most during peak commuting periods). In order to accommodate this change, the Route 3 as approved would need to be broken into two routes at the Bridge Terminal, otherwise, there would be a significant overlapping of service where two corridor routes are not warranted by population or employment density. Future Corridor Route 3 is similar to the existing Route 52, which has nearly 6,000 boardings per day, approximately double that of the existing Route 60, which is very similar to the Corridor Route 6 described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>. Because the Route 3 (existing Route 52) has established travel patterns from Halifax to Burnside and North Dartmouth it would not be recommended to split this route and force a transfer in order to prevent a transfer for another unestablished travel pattern.</p> <p>Further, the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> describes stronger connections between north end Dartmouth and Highfield Park areas to downtown Dartmouth and the Alderney Ferry Terminal through the extension of the Route 53.</p>		
Interdependency		
<p>This change would have very significant implications for two Corridor routes and the structure of the future transit network.</p>		
Staff Recommendation		
<p>Staff recommend retaining Corridor routes as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>. Providing an additional Corridor route to meet the routing described would be redundant and represent a very significant increase in operating costs. Alternately, amending the routing of the Corridor Route 3 and Route 6 would not better meet travel demand patterns.</p>		
Overall Impact		
<p>Very High</p>		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
<p>N/A</p>	<p>Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown</p>

Item Q_i		
q.i) That staff consider extending service for routes associated with the service industry (downtown areas – Scotia Square/Alderney Gate) to coincide with working hours.		
Policy Considerations		
No policy considerations noted. Level of Service Guidelines are identified for each route type in Section 3 of the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Discussion		
To operate an additional two trips on all Corridor routes (i.e. operating until 2am rather than 1am during the week and an additional two trips on each Saturday and Sunday) would represent a substantial incremental cost increase. To operate all Corridor routes 24 hours a day would require a very large increase in resources, but more broadly there would be significant impact on Halifax Transit's operational structure.		
Interdependency		
This would have a high impact due to significant resource requirement and operational implications.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend introducing all Corridor routes at the level of service and span of service identified in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . The <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> prioritizes investment in Corridor routes, and the introduction of late night service may be considered as a later phase of implementation.		
Overall Impact		
High		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	\$1 million+ for additional hour of service on all Corridor routes (7days/week)	5+

Item Q_{ii}		
q.ii) That staff consider extending service for routes associated with Dartmouth Crossing to coincide with working hours.		
Policy Considerations		
No policy considerations noted. Level of Service Guidelines are identified for each route type in Section 3 of the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> .		
Discussion		
Route 56 and Route 72 are each proposed to service Dartmouth Crossing every 30 minutes until midnight Monday-Saturday, and until 11pm on Sundays. This combines to provide a bus every 15 minutes on average in Dartmouth Crossing.		
Interdependency		
No has no impact on the approved <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> . There is currently a 30 minute combined headway provided in Dartmouth Crossing from Monday to Saturday between Route 56 and Route 72.		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend implementing service on Routes 56 and 72 as described in the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> as this fulfills the request.		
Overall Impact		
None		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	N/A	N/A

Item R		
<p>r. Existing Route 5 which becomes 26 Springvale Avenue continue to travel past Mumford to downtown and not terminate at the Mumford Terminal.</p>		
Policy Considerations		
<p>This is contrary to the general intent of Moving Forward Principle 2.</p>		
Discussion		
<p>Retaining the existing Route 5 routing would be contrary to the Moving Forward Principles by increasing redundancy. A number of routes, including Corridor Routes 1, 2 and 9 will be available at the Mumford Terminal to provide an easy transfer to continue into downtown Halifax; these routes combined would provide approximately 5 minute frequency towards downtown. In 2015, 54 passengers using the three AM Peak trips travelled inbound beyond Mumford, 11 disembarked at Mumford. In the PM Peak hours 14 passengers used the Route 5 to travel beyond Mumford Terminal outbound.</p> <p>In addition, there are physical capacity constraints at the Water Street Terminal, particularly during peak times. The addition of the existing Route 5 to other routes serving the terminal during AM and PM peak could exceed the design capacity of the facility.</p>		
Interdependency		
<p>The interdependencies would be low. This would result in redundancies with other routes travelling between Mumford Terminal and Downtown Halifax. This would also require additional resources.</p>		
Staff Recommendation		
<p>Staff recommends implementing the Route 26 as per the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>. Retaining the existing Route 5 between Mumford Terminal and Downtown Halifax as this would be contrary to the Moving Forward Principles. A number of options will be available for transferring at Mumford Terminal during peak period when Route 26 Springfield would be operating, including transferring to three Corridor Routes to downtown Halifax, and one Corridor Route to Dartmouth.</p>		
Overall Impact		
<p>Moderate</p>		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
<p>4.5 km</p>	<p>\$25,000+</p>	<p><1</p>

Item S		
s. Provide a history of transit services (planned and actual) to the community of Lucasville, including past budget commitments and changes to the transit boundaries, including options on how to extend conventional service to the community, present options to provide a peak time service to Lucasville community and include any financial commitments Halifax Transit could commit to provide the alternate service.		
Policy Considerations		
No policy considerations noted.		
Discussion		
See attachment 11.		
Interdependency		
N/A		
Staff Recommendation		
N/A		
Overall Impact		
N/A		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	N/A	N/A

Item T		
<p>t. Identify other local routes in the proposed plan that through improved service levels or extensions may in the future provide crosstown service as part of a grid network high frequency grid [Potentials include the 29, the 72, the 84 from Sackville and the 32 – all numbers in the new plan].</p>		
Policy Considerations		
<p>No policy considerations noted.</p>		
Discussion		
<p>As ridership and service grows there is a possibility that some routes proposed as Local routes may warrant Corridor level service and be converted to Corridor Routes. Routes that may become eligible for this include Route 29, 31, 32, 56, 72, 84, 87, 90. Section 3.2 of the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> outlines the conditions upon which a Local Route may be considered for upgrade to a Corridor Route.</p>		
Interdependency		
<p>N/A</p>		
Staff Recommendation		
<p>Staff recommend allowing time for customers to use new network and determine ridership demands on new routes, and only increasing the number of corridor routes as resources allow and as necessary.</p>		
Overall Impact		
<p>N/A</p>		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Item U		
<p>u. Implications of the proposed Roslyn Rd route for #1 bus during afternoon peak hours that included rationale for this route, alternatives considered, options for peak hour service, options for identifying traffic calming and how this proposal relates to the Integrated Mobility Plan.</p>		
Policy Considerations		
<p>No policy considerations noted.</p>		
Discussion		
<p>The peak direction, peak period routing on Roslyn Road was recommended as an alternative to the routing proposed in the <i>Draft Moving Forward Together Plan</i>, which had the Route 1 travelling on Chebucto Road in order to avoid heavy congestion on Bayers Road. Due to high levels of congestion on Bayers Road in the outbound direction during PM peak, it is recommended that the Route 1 be removed from Bayers Road during this period in order to ensure the reliability of the most frequent route in the network, until such a time that a permanent solution to congestion is implemented on Bayers Road. This option would have approximately 12 buses per day utilizing Roslyn Road. Other options considered included time of day detours from regular routing on Oxford Street to Connaught Avenue via Almon Street, Cork Street, or Young Street and then left from Connaught Avenue to regular routing on Bayers Road. However, it was determined that traffic congestion on Connaught Avenue and delays in the left turn movement from Connaught Avenue to Bayers Road would mean any time savings to transit would be minimal. In addition, these alternative routing options would mean skipping 2-3 bus stops on Oxford Street and Bayers Road during the period of the PM peak routing.</p> <p>It is important to note that the peak direction, peak period routing on Roslyn Road is not a long term or desirable solution to Halifax Transit and a more permanent solution to the congestion experienced by transit vehicles on Bayers Road will be explored in greater detail in the coming months in conjunction with the Integrated Mobility Plan.</p>		
Interdependency		
<p>If the Route 1 must remain on Bayers Road for the entire service day it will continue to experience significant schedule adherence problems.</p>		
Staff Recommendation		
<p>Staff recommend implementing the Route 1 according to the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>. Staff continue to explore ways to improve transit's ability to move through congested areas and determine a longer term solution to congestion on Bayers Road.</p>		
Overall Impact		
<p>Moderate</p>		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>


Item V		
v. Route 32 Cowie Hill Express which becomes the Route 124 Leiblin Link continue to travel on Summer Street and not Robie Street.		
Policy Considerations		
No policy considerations noted.		
Discussion		
This comment was received by staff on the <i>Draft Moving Forward Together Plan</i> and is reflected in revised plan.		
Interdependency		
None		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff recommend implementing the Route 124 Leiblin Express according to the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> as this fulfills the request.		
Overall Impact		
None		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
N/A	N/A	N/A

Item W		
<p>w. Enabling East-West routes to run across north end peninsula including identifying physical improvements to roads and installation of enhanced shelters at key transfer points in order to allow more riders convenient connections from Bayers Road and Mumford terminals to Barrington Street.</p>		
Policy Considerations		
<p>Section 5.1 of the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i> identifies passenger amenity classifications.</p>		
Discussion		
<p>The Route 29 connects Bayers Road and Mumford Terminal through the North End of the Peninsula and Barrington Street into downtown Halifax. Candidate stops for enhanced passenger amenities would have at a minimum of 100 passenger boardings per day.</p>		
Interdependency		
<p>None</p>		
Staff Recommendation		
<p>Staff recommend implementing the Route 29 as per the Moving Forward Together Plan and continue to prioritize stop enhancements at high ridership stops, as discussed in section 5.1 of the <i>Moving Forward Together Plan</i>.</p>		
Overall Impact		
<p>None</p>		
Approximate Additional Round Trip Distance	Approximate Annual Operating Cost	Additional Vehicle Requirement
<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Attachment 2 - Eastern Passage to Cole Harbour (Item A)





Attachment 3 - Route 320 to Fall River (Item C)




PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE ROUTING

Attachment 4: Item F – Submission made by Councillor Hendsbee




BUS ROUTE 370 PORTERS LAKE

-  BUS STOP
-  ACCESSIBLE STOP


 PORTERS LAKE METRO X ROUTE

 METRO TRANSIT DARTMOUTH GARAGE ROUTE

ALTERNATIVE ROUTES

-  INBOUND ROUTE
-  OUTBOUND ROUTE
-  INBOUND - TRANSIT DARTMOUTH GARAGE

N




HRM takes no responsibility for any errors or omissions.
Revised: 07/04/2016

HALIFAX

PORTERS LAKE PARK & RIDE

Continue on Highway #7,
Continue on Highway #107,
Right at Exit #20 to William Porter Connector,
Left on William Porter Connector,
Right on Inspiration Drive,
Right into Porters Lake Park and Ride.



ALTERNATE INBOUND ROUTE DARTMOUTH TRANSIT GARAGE




Continue on Highway #7,
Continue on Highway #111
Take Exit 5 Ramp Off
Left on MicMac Blvd to MicMac Terminal
Terminal Loop - Left at Intersection
Continue on MicMac Blvd
Take Exit 5 On Ramp
Continue on Highway #111 (back on regular route)


ALTERNATE INBOUND ROUTE

Continue on Highway #7,
Continue on Highway #111
Take Exit 5 Ramp Off
Left on MicMac Blvd to MicMac Terminal
Terminal Loop - Left at Intersection
Continue on MicMac Blvd
Right on Glen Manor Dr
Left on Crichton Ave
Right on Ochterloney St (back on regular route)


ALTERNATE OUTBOUND ROUTE

Right On MicMac Blvd to MicMac Terminal
Keep On MicMac Blvd
Right on Highway #111 (back on regular route)


LOCATION	TOTAL DISTANCE OF BUS ROUTE
PORTERS LAKE METRO X - INBOUND	31.9 KM
PORTERS LAKE METRO X - OUTBOUND	33 KM
PORTERS LAKE METRO X - INBOUND TO DARTMOUTH TRANSIT GARAGE	33.9 KM
ALTERNATE PORTERS LAKE METRO X - INBOUND  (Changes were made to this existing route to incorporate MicMac Terminal)	33.5 KM
ALTERNATE PORTERS LAKE METRO X - OUTBOUND  (Changes were made to this existing route to incorporate MicMac Terminal)	33 KM
ALTERNATE PORTERS LAKE METRO X - INBOUND TO METRO TRANSIT DARTMOUTH GARAGE  (Changes were made to this existing route to incorporate MicMac Terminal)	36.4 KM




Attachment 5 - Route 55 Extensions (Item G)




Attachment 6 - Route 330/433 Extensions (Item I)



Attachment 7 - Route 93 (Item J)



Attachment 8 - Joseph Howe Manor (Item M)



Re: Item No. 3 Handout from Councillor Mancini

Summary of Main Street Dartmouth Transit Issues and Proposals

The Main Street Dartmouth Business Improvement District, now branded as the Village on Main, is undergoing a transformation to a more dense residential community with a vibrant commercial hub for Dartmouth East and Cole Harbour/Westphal/ North and East Preston. The Planning department and Our HRM Alliance view the Main Street designation district as a role model for suburban retrofitting.

Regional Council approved and established the Main Street BID to help drive this development and as a result changes of its Land Use By-laws have encouraged a strong urban regeneration of this area. This regeneration is not in the future; it has begun and will accelerate at a pace we have not yet seen since no other established region currently has this capacity.

The Village on Main currently provides a full range of services (schools of every level, churches, shops and a wellness hub) within walking distance. A public infrastructure plan is near completion; the Our HRM Alliance views the Village on Main as an example of a growing Complete Community and the area will be the topic of conversation at a provincial planning conference this spring and a national planning conference later this year. The school of Planning, and school of Sustainability at Dalhousie, the College of Geographic Studies and the 3-D Motion Capstone programs at NSCC have all expressed interest in the area, offering student internships or supporting graduates to work with the BID. This surge of activity is the result of the city's innovative work in establishing form based coding in the district.

The Regional Planning policy emphasizes the importance of good transit linkages to realize Council's ambitious plans for the area. This is also reiterated by the Transport Demand Management Policy, which forms an integral part of the Transportation Master plan for Halifax.

Current State Analysis with respect to Public Transit identifies that the Main St. area:


1. Has a Walk Score of 71 compared to Portland Hills with 20, Penhorn with 52, and MicMac with 51
2. Hosts a total of 45 Health and Wellness Centres (these are not included in the walk score)
3. Has the Demographics and Income that should be able to depend on reliable public transit connections both on and off peak
4. Lacks reliable transit links within communities of Dartmouth, Burnside, Cole Harbour, Cherry Brook, and the Prestons.

Therefore Council Directs Halifax Transit to

Review the detailed report carried out by the Main Street BID in response to the Draft Moving Forward Together with a view to


1. Adopting the recommendations for Route 63, 68, Route 55, and Route 401.
2. Include the development of an implementation plan for a level 4 Transit Centre at or near the Tacoma Centre.

Halifax Transit Proposed Network



- 5 Portland
- 10B MicMac
- 10C MicMac
- 57 Russel Lake
- 58 Woodlawn
- 59 Colby
- 61 North Preston
- 63 Mt Edward
- 65 Caldwell Loop
- 67 Baker
- 68 Cherry Brook
- 72 Dartmouth Cr.
- Terminals
- Inefficient overlaps

Our Proposal



- 5 Portland
- 10B MicMac
- 10C MicMac
- 57 Russel Lake
- 58 Woodlawn
- 59 Colby
- 61 North Preston
- 63 Mt Edward
- 65 Caldwell Loop
- 67 Baker
- 68 Cherry Brook
- 72 Dartmouth Cr.
- Terminals

Attachment 10 Item O – Submission made by the Greater Burnside Business Association

From: [Andrew Inch](#)
To: [Harrison, Erin](#)
Subject: FW: Transit Plan Submission - GBBA
Date: April-08-16 12:44:52 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
Importance: High

FYI below – Thanks for your help, and great job on the work with the new transit plan so far!

Andrew

From: Andrew Inch
Sent: April-08-16 12:44 PM
To: 'barry.dalrymple@halifax.ca'; 'david.hendsbee@halifax.ca'; 'bill.karsten@halifax.ca'; 'lorelei.nicoll@halifax.ca'; 'gloria.mccluskey@halifax.ca'; 'waye.mason@halifax.ca'; 'jennifer.watts@halifax.ca'; 'linda.mosher@halifax.ca'; 'russell.walker@halifax.ca'; 'stephen.adams@halifax.ca'; 'reg.rankin@halifax.ca'; 'matt.whitman@halifax.ca'; 'brad.johns@halifax.ca'; 'steve.craig@halifax.ca'; 'tim.outhit@halifax.ca'; Tony Mancini (tony.mancini@halifax.ca); 'mayor@halifax.ca'; 'clerks@halifax.ca'
Cc: Sean O'Boyle (sean.oboyle@oboylelaw.ca); Derek Brett (dbb@burnsidelaw.net)
Subject: Transit Plan Submission - GBBA
Importance: High

Dear Mayor and Councillors –

I am writing on behalf of the Greater Burnside Business Association (the GBBA), representing more than 1,400 businesses in the Burnside and City of Lakes business parks. Please take into consideration the following comments from our organization when considering the new transit plan on Tuesday.

While we welcome the addition of a new transit terminal in Burnside, as well as the more efficient Crosstown route, and connections in the Northern parts of Burnside such as John Savage Drive, Commodore Dr. connection, and improved frequencies and service times, it appears as though route service levels within and around Burnside are decreased – for example, the removal of MacDonald Ave; removal of the northern end of Joseph Zatzman/Topple/Petipas/Mosher; removal of Fielding Ave., etc. While the new routes are technically within walking distances of the eliminated routes and other locations in Burnside, walkability in Burnside is very challenging, with busy truck and service traffic and several locations which remain without sidewalks.

The GBBA has advocated strongly for better service in and out and within the business park for years. Employers are challenged in the ability to hire affordable labour when they are limited to employees who own their own cars. In addition, there is unnecessary traffic congestion in the area because transit is not an option.

Ideally, the Burnside and City of Lakes Business Parks community would like to see an additional continuous route or routes with frequent service in and around the local roadways, at a minimum servicing the old route areas and adding new service destinations. We would also like to see a plan for the routing and service options which consider the Burnside-Sackville Expressway, which we understand to be an imminent project. We understand that you are limited by budgetary

constraints, but urge Counsel to consider investing in further transit service for the Burnside and City of Lakes area. This area is one of the primary economic drivers of our City and deserves a high level of investment for the employers and businesses who choose to locate there.

Yours very truly,

Andrew Inch
Vice-Chair, GBBA

Andrew Inch
Corporate Affairs
The Municipal Group of Companies

Office: [REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]



MUNICIPAL GROUP OF COMPANIES

Attachment 11 – Item S: History of Transit in Lucasville

Planned Transit Service to Lucasville

At the **July 8, 2008** Regional Council meeting a motion was passed that staff provide a report with respect to providing bus service to areas of HRM without existing bus service at the urban / suburban boundary funded through the general rate, with an area rate equivalent to that paid by residents in the urban areas. This information was to include, but not be limited to, Eastern Passage, Waverley, Lucasville, Williamswood, Harrietsfield and Sambro. This report was submitted **April 21, 2009**.

At the **February 10, 2009** Regional Council meeting a motion was passed to include funding for a conventional transit route to service the Sambro loop in the 2009/10 budget. At the **March 3, 2009** Regional Council meeting a motion was passed that Halifax Regional Council approve inclusion in the proposed Metro Transit operating budget for the upcoming 2009/10 and subsequent fiscal years, funding for conventional transit routes to service the communities of Prospect, Timberlea, Fall River, Cow Bay, Lawrencetown and Musquodoboit Harbour, and Lucasville Road in a manner fully integrated with the existing Metro Transit services, and examine funding through the general tax rate and/or other means identified by HRM staff and approved by Council; the first service to commence as soon as the required buses were available.

At the **April 21, 2009** Committee of the Whole a report was submitted showing operating costs and ridership estimates for Rural Transit service to all of the communities requested at the March 3, 2009 meeting. Lucasville was projected to carry 5.4 passengers per hour at a 14% cost recovery.

Following discussion on this report it was moved that Halifax Regional Council direct staff to:

1. Proceed with introducing the Sambro Loop Rural Transit route in 2009/10 on a “pilot” basis using available vehicles and funding provided by the fare increase.
2. Defer any requests for the additions of any new Rural Transit Services not currently in the 5-Year Approach to Transit Enhancements until a plan is in place to pay for the expanded services.
3. Develop Rural Transit Service Standards, and return to Council in September 2009 as part of the updated Operational Plan, with an outline approach and a financial plan to introduce Rural Transit Services, including recommendations to help Council determine under what conditions rural service should be expanded, and in what order of priority, recommendations regarding operational issues, service design and required changes to the 5 year Capital Plan, as well as the necessary adjustments required to the current approved 5 Year Approach to Transit Enhancements.

This motion was later passed at the **May 5, 2009** meeting.

At the **November 10, 2009** Committee of the Whole meeting, following a presentation and discussion on the Five year Strategic Operations Plan, a motion was passed that Regional Council approve the Service Standards in the Metro Transit Five Year Strategic Operations Plan for staff to use as a template.

The Community Transit Service Standards required 15 passengers per hour during peak hours, and 10 passengers per hour during off-peak hours.

A report dated **January 6, 2010** was submitted to Regional Council and COW regarding the Metro Transit Five-Year Strategic Operations Plan. This report suggested service would be implemented in Lucasville in 2011/12.

In **September 2010** Metro Transit conducted a survey for the Lucasville and surrounding area to gather origin and destination data for route planning purposes. The 2010-11 Metro Transit Annual Service plan proposed reductions in service to the Sambro Community Transit service due to low ridership.

At the **September 14, 2010** Regional Council meeting, these reductions were discussed. Following this discussion a motion was passed that any changes to Community Transit be held in abeyance until (a requested) report came back to Council.

An information report dated **October 28, 2010** was submitted to Regional Council on **November 9, 2010** stating that:

“Metro Transit will continue to investigate alternative transportation options for the three communities previously identified as candidates for local rural service: Lucasville, Cow Bay, and Lawrencetown.

The level and type of service recommended by staff in these cases will be based on an analysis of the communities' needs and ability to support the service developed and consultation with members of these communities. The process for the first community, Lucasville, is currently underway.”

At the **April 3, 2012** Regional Council meeting Metro Transit's 2012-13 Annual Service Plan was approved and included the following statement:

As part of Metro Transit's continued effort to provide efficient transit service to the residents of HRM, Rural Community Transit expansion to the communities of Lucasville, Cow Bay and Lawrencetown is not included in the Capital Plan. These services are unlikely to generate sufficient ridership to meet Service Standards.

On **July 18, 2012** an Information Report was submitted to the Northwest Transit Advisory Community Council explaining rationale for not including transit service to Lucasville in the budget. The report stated that this service was unlikely to generate sufficient ridership to meet minimum service standards.

On **August 5, 2014**, Regional Council voted to adopt the Rural Transit Funding Program, a grants program through which rural transit operators can apply for funding to subsidize the cost

of operating service in Halifax. This program can provide up to \$10,000 annually and \$0.50 per in service KM for the operation of a community operated transit service.

Effective **October 18, 2014** Regional Council approved, as part of the Regional Plan – Policy T-7, the Urban Transit Service Boundary.

Policy T-7 reads as follows:

The Urban Transit Service Boundary, illustrated in Map 7 of this Plan, shall establish the area within which HRM will direct future investment in public transit services, with the exception of rural commuter express service which may be considered outside of this Boundary. The level of service outside this boundary shall not be increased, but modifications to services may be considered that serve to facilitate operational planning. Existing routes and services not contained within this boundary will continue to exist, and as with any public transit routes or services, any service reductions will be based upon performance standards approved by HRM.

The community of Lucasville is located outside of this boundary; as such conventional fixed route transit service cannot be introduced.

Alternative Models for Transportation in Rural Communities

On August 5, 2014 Regional Council voted to adopt the Rural Transit Funding Program, a grants program through which not for profit rural transit service providers can apply for funding to subsidize the cost of operating their service in Halifax.

In order to be eligible under the Rural Transit Funding Program, the transit service provided must meet the following criteria:

- It serves residents of the municipality: The organization must offer a public transit service within the municipality or is intended to serve the residents of the municipality.
- The service meets an unmet demand: The service must be in an area of the municipality not currently serviced by Halifax Transit or alternately, the service can be in an area which is serviced by Halifax Transit if it can be demonstrated that the rural transit service would complement existing Halifax Transit service and address an unmet need in the community.
- The service is available to the public: The organization offers a public transit service that is available to any member of the public and does not require a membership to access.
- The organization operating the service is a non-profit society or cooperative: The organization which operates the service must be a non-profit society incorporated under the *Societies Act*, R.S.N.S. 1989, c.435 and registered with the Nova Scotia Registry of Joint Stocks, or be a non-profit cooperative incorporated under the *Co-operatives Associations Act*, R.S.N.S., 1989, c. 98 and registered with the Nova Scotia Registry of Joint Stocks. Registered Canadian Charitable Organizations (registered pursuant to the Income Tax Act) also qualify.

If approved, grants provided through the Rural Transit Funding Program are disbursed in two ways:

- An annual lump sum payment between \$5,000 and \$10,000; and
- A flat rate of \$0.50 per kilometer travelled while providing transit service.

Under this funding program a non-profit organization could apply for funding assistance to provide public transit service to the community of Lucasville.



P.O. Box 1749
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3A5 Canada

Item No. 3
Halifax Regional Council
April 5, 2016
Committee of the Whole
April 12, 2016

TO: Mayor Savage and Members of Halifax Regional Council

Original Signed

SUBMITTED BY:

Councillor Tim Outhit, Chair, Transportation Standing Committee

DATE: March 29, 2016

SUBJECT: Halifax Transit Moving Forward Together Plan

ORIGIN

March 24, 2016 meeting of the Transportation Standing Committee

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Section 6 of Administrative Order One states that The Transportation Standing Committee shall

- (a) Review and oversee policy direction and long term funding approach to promote and encourage Transit alternatives as outlined in the Regional Plan;
- (b) Review and oversee specific strategic planning directions related to Transit Services coming from the Regional Plan such as the five year strategic plan, Accessibility Plan, and the Ferry Plan; and
- (c) Promote and enable positive communication between communities, ridership, and the Council and Transit services to enable and support the Regional Transit service to the communities of the municipality.

RECOMMENDATION

The Transportation Standing Committee recommends that the Halifax Transit Moving Forward Together Plan be referred to Halifax Regional Council and addressed during the Committee of the Whole.

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Standing Committee received a staff presentation regarding this report at their meeting on March 24, 2016 and the report was addressed by members of the public during public participation at this meeting.

DISCUSSION

The Transportation Standing Committee did not discuss this item.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

As outlined in the attached staff report dated March 9, 2016.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The Transportation Standing Committee meetings are open to public attendance, a live webcast is provided of the meeting, and members of the public are invited to address the Committee for up to five minutes at the end of each meeting during the Public Participation portion of the meeting. The agenda, reports, and minutes of the Transportation Standing Committee are posted on Halifax.ca.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

As identified in the Staff Report dated March 9, 2016

ALTERNATIVES

None identified

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Halifax Transit Moving Forward Together Plan Staff Report dated March 9, 2016

A copy of this report can be obtained online at <http://www.halifax.ca/council/agendasc/cagenda.php> then choose the appropriate meeting date, or by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 902.490.4210, or Fax 902.490.4208.

Report Prepared by: Cathy Collett, Legislative Assistant, phone: 902.490.6517 email: colletc@halifax.ca

Item No. 12.1.3
Transportation Standing Committee
March 24, 2016

TO: Chair and Members of Transportation Standing Committee

Original Signed

SUBMITTED BY:

Dave Reage, MCIP, LPP, Acting Director, Halifax Transit

DATE: March 9, 2016

SUBJECT: Halifax Transit Moving Forward Together Plan

ORIGIN

On February 26, 2013, Regional Council approved the planning process for the new Metro Transit five-year strategic framework:

MOVED by Councillor Karsten, seconded by Councillor Nicoll that Halifax Regional Council approve the Metro Transit planning process for a new, five-year strategic framework.

On January 14, 2014, Regional Council unanimously endorsed the Moving Forward principles and a change in scope for the *Moving Forward Together Plan* to include a network-wide review:

MOVED by Councillor Watts, seconded by Councillor Whitman that Halifax Regional Council:

- 1. Endorse the four (4) Moving Forward principles; and**
- 2. Endorse the change in scope of the “Moving Forward Together Plan” from a five year plan to an overall system review, as outlined in the January 8, 2014 report to Committee of the Whole.**

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Section 69(1) of the Halifax Regional Municipality Charter provides the legislative authority for the municipality to provide a public transportation service. Section 79(1)(o) provides the authority for Council to expend money required by the municipality for public transportation services.

In addition to the Halifax Regional Municipality Charter, authority is also provided by Section T-5 of the 2014 Regional Municipal Planning Strategy which reads “Transit Service Plans shall be prepared at regular intervals for consideration by HRM. These plans will be developed in consultation with the public and other stakeholders and, upon adoption by HRM, shall provide guidance for investment in transit services.”

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Transportation Standing Committee recommend that Regional Council:

1. Approve the 2016/2017 Halifax Transit Annual Service Plan;
2. Approve the *Moving Forward Together Plan* as the strategic direction for the growth and development of the Halifax Transit network;
3. Approve the Moving Forward Principles as the guiding principles for Halifax Transit over the life of the *Moving Forward Together Plan*;
4. Direct staff to prepare for implementation of the future transit network as described in the Plan and Appendix A Network Maps; and
5. Adopt the Performance Measures, including the Ridership Guidelines, as described in Part 6 of the *Moving Forward Together Plan*.

BACKGROUND

On February 26, 2013, Regional Council initiated the development of a new five year strategic planning framework for Metro Transit (called *Moving Forward Together: The Metro Transit Five Year Service Plan*).

A multifaceted public and stakeholder engagement plan for the first round of consultation was developed and presented to the Transportation Standing Committee in July of 2013. The formal public and stakeholder engagement process began in August of 2013, and continued until October 15, 2013.

Based on the feedback received in consultation in January 2014, Regional Council endorsed a broadened scope for the *Moving Forward Together Plan* which included a redesign of the existing transit network. Regional Council also unanimously endorsed the four Moving Forward Principles, the foundation upon which the draft plan was developed. The principles are:

1. Increase the proportion of resources allocated towards high ridership services.
2. Build a simplified transfer based system.
3. Invest in service quality and reliability
4. Give transit increased priority in the transportation network

DISCUSSION

The draft *Moving Forward Together Plan*, including the proposed future transit network, was released for public consultation in February 2015. The subsequent ten week engagement process was the most diverse and comprehensive consultation strategy ever undertaken by the municipality. The following describes the variety of opportunities for consultation provided to members of the public and stakeholder groups.

Engagement Overview

MakeTransitBetter.ca: The primary means of gathering public feedback was through an online survey on *MakeTransitBetter.ca*. Resources on the website included an introductory video, an interactive map, and the proposed changes to the Halifax Transit network. This website allowed residents to access information on proposed routing and frequencies in order to understand the impact the proposed changes would have on their transit trips. The website resulted in over 50,000 unique website visitor and 15,370 survey responses.¹

Pop-Up Engagement Events: These were hosted in high traffic locations throughout the transit service area to create awareness and encourage online participation. Transit staff were on hand to answer questions directly and people were encouraged to provide their feedback online at *MakeTransitBetter.ca*.

¹ Of which 11,607 were complete surveys

At the end of the consultation period, Halifax Transit had hosted 20 pop up engagement events and interacted with 2,480 individuals.

Stakeholder Consultation Sessions: The purpose of the stakeholder sessions was to provide a thorough briefing on the draft plan to those organizations which were considered stakeholders in the process. At these events, transit staff answered questions, and gathered valuable feedback on the strengths of the plan and on how it could be improved. Three stakeholder sessions were held in the first week of consultation, and a fourth one was held near the end of consultation in order to ensure that all groups who were interested had the opportunity to participate. A total of 37 groups or agencies took part.

ShapeYourCityHalifax.ca: The City's online engagement portal served as a source of comprehensive information and provided the opportunity for deeper engagement through discussion forums. At the end of the 10 week consultation period, the site had hosted 2,190 unique visitors, of which 605 provided their feedback either via a submitting a comment or question, posting on a forum, or participating in a quick poll.

Public Opinion Research: Two telephone surveys were conducted by Corporate Research Associates as part of the Halifax Urban Report, one in February and again in May 2015. This survey was used to measure the impact of the engagement program on public awareness of the changes coming to Halifax Transit and to assess the level of public support for the proposed network redesign. A sample of 800 Halifax residents indicated that there was a 65% awareness of proposed network changes (an increase of 14% over the 10-week engagement period), and a 73% level of public support for proposed changes.

Twitter Town Halls: Twitter Town Halls are informal consultation sessions which allow interested members of the public to engage in a Town Hall style meeting online. Using the hashtag #MakeTransitBetter, participants could "tweet" questions about the draft plan and have their questions answered in real time by Halifax Transit staff. As part of the consultation strategy, two Twitter Town halls were held in April 2015. These events facilitated direct engagement with residents and allowed significant distribution of information to, and through, Halifax Transit's more than 23,000 Twitter followers. These events together hosted 173 participants, and resulted in 486 tweets.

Written submissions: Stakeholder organizations were invited to make formal submissions on behalf of their organizations, providing their detailed feedback on the draft Plan. Seven organizations made submissions by email at movingforward@halifax.ca. Nearly 1,000 email submissions were received by Halifax Transit over the 10 week consultation period, consisting of both questions and comments.

Feedback Summary

Halifax Transit staff reviewed over 20,000 comments received through the consultation period, each of which was considered by Halifax Transit staff. In reviewing the feedback, a number of themes emerged.

Attachment A includes a summary of the fourteen comments most frequently heard through consultation, the approximate number of comments received related to the topic, and how the comments were or were not addressed in the revised plan. All feedback was reviewed carefully, and the revised Moving Forward Together Plan was able to address many of the concerns raised by the public. However, requests for changes that were not consistent with the Moving Forward Principles were not accommodated, as well as those that would have required resource reallocation from higher ridership services.

A number of comments were received which were not specifically about transit routes. Many of these comments can be grouped into the following broad categories:

- The draft *Moving Forward Together Plan* did not make a strong enough commitment to Transit Priority Measures;
- The *Moving Forward Together Plan* does not address the quality of customer service;
- The *Moving Forward Together Plan* implementation should be shorter; and
- Features of the *Halifax Transit Technology Plan* should be implemented faster.

Where applicable and feasible, changes were made in the plan to address incorporate feedback. Changes were subject to feedback being aligned with the Moving Forward Principles outlined above.

The Moving Forward Together Plan

The proposed transit network outlined in the revised *Moving Forward Together Plan* (Attachment B) represents a significant improvement to existing transit service in Halifax. It prioritizes service to areas with high ridership and areas with higher ridership potential. It proposes new service in growth areas such as the Governors Brook subdivision, Washmill Lake Road and West Bedford. It reduces inefficient, low ridership services. It describes a network which is easier to understand and easier to navigate for existing and potential transit users, and identifies a clear need for the introduction of Transit Priority Measures in order to make transit service faster and more competitive with private vehicles. It provides a more consistent and cohesive approach to service provision, designed to better meet the needs of residents today and into the future.

The Plan furthers the four Moving Forward Principles identified by residents and endorsed by Regional Council in the following ways:

Building on the Principles

The *Moving Forward Together Plan* **increases the proportion of resources allocated towards high ridership services** by establishing ten high ridership Corridor Routes that form the spine of the transit network, providing expanded commuter focused services to move large volumes of passengers during peak periods, providing coverage service in off-peak periods, and by reducing or eliminating low ridership services. The plan also includes performance measures intended to provide direction related to the level of ridership expected, and measuring the success of the routes described in this plan.

The *Moving Forward Together Plan* works toward **building a simplified transfer based network** by being designed to facilitate transfers, reducing redundancy, streamlining routes and making the network easier to understand. This principle is also furthered by proposing improvements to passenger amenities, and the introduction of two new off-street facilities: the Wrights Cove Terminal in Burnside, and a West Bedford Park & Ride.

The *Moving Forward Together Plan* **invests in service quality and reliability** by proposing to address capacity, demand, frequency and service issues on existing routes during the implementation process. This is accomplished by using route structures which support schedule adherence and shorter travel times, by balancing fleet recapitalization and fleet expansion, and by applying quality of service guidelines.

The *Moving Forward Together Plan* works to **give transit increased priority in the transportation network** by supporting the implementation of transit priority measures (TPMs) in both the short term and long term, prioritizing TPMs in key transportation corridors, and by seeking opportunities for low cost TPMs. Although this plan does not include an exhaustive list of large scale TPMs, two critical areas (Bayers Road and Gottingen Street) have been identified as corridors which require significant investment in TPMs. A further 11 additional locations have been identified that provide more immediate opportunities for intervention.

Implementation Timeline

In the short term, implementation of the Plan will be focused on reconfiguring the existing route network to adopt the proposed redesigned network. This will take place over approximately five years, in phases based loosely on geographic areas. In the longer term, implementation of the Plan will consist of balancing investments in service quality and reliability with the introduction of new services, both in developing areas, and within the existing network.

Fiscal Year 2016/2017: The first phase of implementation for the *Moving Forward Together Plan* will be undertaken. As this year will also see the introduction of significant technology advancements, including the launch of real time public interface delivery and stop announcements, the resultant routing changes are necessarily minor to accommodate staff and resource availability. In addition, route changes are limited during this period as a relatively static transit network is critical in order to thoroughly test and ensure the success of new technology features such as stop annunciation.

Changes which would take place during the 2016/2017 fiscal year include:

- An additional trip on the Route 330 Tantallon; and
- Changes to Route 56, discontinuing service to Portland Hills Terminal and introducing a new connection to Bridge Terminal.

These changes are described in more detail in 2016/17 Halifax Transit Annual Service Plan (Attachment C).

Fiscal Year 2017/2018: The second phase of implementation for the *Moving Forward Together Plan* will be undertaken. This will also primarily include smaller changes, and will include the elimination and realignment of low ridership routes/route segments (Routes 402, School Specials), the introduction of some additional express service (Route 186, 330), and changes to several routes (Routes 6, 22, 7, 370).

Fiscal Year 2018/2019: The third phase of implementation for the *Moving Forward Together Plan* will be undertaken. This will primarily include changes to routes in Clayton Park, Fairview, and Timberlea. This phase coincides with the expansion of the Burnside Transit Centre.

Fiscal Year 2019/2020: The fourth phase of implementation for the *Moving Forward Together Plan* will be undertaken. This will primarily include implementation in Spryfield and parts of the Halifax Peninsula.

Fiscal Year 2020/2021: The last phase of adopting the new transit network will be undertaken. This will primarily include the implementation of routes in Sackville and Bedford. It includes the introduction of the Wrights Cove Terminal, West Bedford Park & Ride and the Margeson Drive/Middle Sackville Park & Ride. It will also include the implementation of routes in Dartmouth, Eastern Passage, and Cole Harbour.

Accelerating Plan Implementation

Recognizing that changes to the transit network described in the *Moving Forward Together Plan* represent a substantial improvement to quality of service for users, Halifax Transit staff will look for opportunities to, where possible, accelerate the implementation of the plan. This may be possible if over the implementation period, opportunities to streamline or create efficiencies in the implementation process arise. However, a commitment to a shorter implementation timeline at this early stage is not recommended for the following reasons.

Resource Availability

There are significant cost implications, both capital and operating, to accelerating plan implementation. In order to provide high quality transit service which better meets the needs of Halifax residents into the future, the revised *Moving Forward Together Plan* includes a significant increase in the level of service provided on road today, particularly in the busiest parts of the network. As a result, the number of transit vehicles, operators, and service hours required for implementation includes the use of all existing resources, as well as additional expansion resources that are anticipated through the budget process.

A shorter implementation period would require front loading bus purchases currently anticipated for purchase over the five year implementation period of the plan. In addition to this, the associated operating costs including labour, maintenance, and fuel would also be required sooner than anticipated. Planned capital investment in new facilities such as Wrights Cove Terminal would also need to take place earlier than currently forecasted, and other capital projects may need to be delayed as a result. To accommodate the increased funding required to accelerate the implementation, it may be necessary to

increase the existing Local Transit Area Rate, increase transit fares, or delay the implementation of other capital projects.

Planning and Scheduling Lead Time & Capacity

The changes required to implement the *Moving Forward Together Plan*, in terms of analysing schedule adherence data, scheduling new routes, and making on-street bus stop changes, are significant. It is critical to the integrity of the plan that the new routes be implemented with a high degree of accuracy and reliability. To these ends, the revised Plan proposes implementation in large phases based on geographic areas, with one to two phases being implemented each year. By phasing in implementation over time, any issues which arise through the implementation process may be resolved and lessons can be applied to subsequent phases.

It is anticipated that due to the volume and nature of changes required, each of these phases, which could include ten to fifteen transit routes, would require scheduling staff to begin scheduling the changes approximately one year in advance of the changes taking effect. The additional workload required by an accelerated timeline cannot be accommodated by existing Halifax Transit staff resources. Accelerating the implementation timeline would require additional resources which would impact the operating budget.

Integration with Technology Roadmap

The implementation of the *Moving Forward Together Plan* coincides with the roll out of several significant technology projects; including the Computer Aided Dispatch/Automatic Vehicle Location (CAD/AVL) project, stop annunciation, fare management, and a scheduling software upgrade or replacement. These initiatives have a number of dependencies, including the collection and reporting of schedule adherence data to support the implementation of the *Moving Forward Together Plan*, and the need for bus stops, routing, and schedules to be static during the testing and implementation of key technology initiatives.

In addition, the technology projects and the *Moving Forward Together Plan* all require significant Planning & Scheduling staff resources to be successful. As such, a balance of staff resources is required between the two significant undertakings, and should the *Moving Forward Together Plan* timeline be accelerated, there would be increased risk to the timelines and success of both projects.

Risk Management

Overall, any efforts to accelerate the implementation timeline result in a substantial increase in the level of risk to the project, both in the ability to meet timeline commitments, to stay within budget, and to the quality of the resultant transit service provided.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications associated with this report. Changes proposed for the 2016/2017 fiscal year fit within the proposed 2016/2017 budget, and changes proposed for future years will be subject to future budget approval processes.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

As outlined in the Background and Discussion sections above, public consultation on the draft *Moving Forward Together Plan* included a large number of ways for citizens and stakeholder groups to provide insight and direction into plan refinement.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

It is anticipated that the *Moving Forward Together Plan* will increase transit ridership, potentially reducing private vehicle usage. This would result in a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

ALTERNATIVES

The Committee could choose to not recommend approval of the plan. This is not recommended as it was developed based on the Regional Council endorsed Moving Forward Principles and in consultation with the various stakeholders and the larger public.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Public Consultation Feedback Summary Table

Attachment B: Moving Forward Together Plan

Attachment C: 2016/17 Halifax Transit Annual Service *Plan*

A copy of this report can be obtained online at <http://www.halifax.ca/commcoun/index.php> then choose the appropriate Community Council and meeting date, or by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 902.490.4210, or Fax 902.490.4208.

Report Prepared by: Erin Harrison, MCIP, LPP, Acting Supervisor, Service Design & Projects 902.490.4942

Original Signed

Report Approved by:

Patricia Hughes, MCIP, LPP Acting Manager, Planning & Scheduling 902.490.6287

Geographic Area	Approximate Number of Comments Received	Comments	Does revised plan address these concerns?	Rationale
West End Peninsula	600-700 comments, and a petition with 408 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep the Route 1 as it is (servicing Bayers Road and Oxford Street) Replacement with the proposed Route 24 is inadequate for Oxford Street Changing the Route 1 will disconnect the West End of the Peninsula from downtown Service in two directions on Gottingen Street is good 	Yes	The existing Route 1 routing is proposed to be retained in the West End Peninsula. The Revised Plan proposes that the Route 1 will travel on Oxford Street and Bayers Road. This Plan identifies urgent need for Transit Priority Measures in the Bayers Road corridor in order to provide reliable service to transit users on this and other routes. In the interim, the proposed service would be removed from Bayers Road in PM Peak in outbound direction, and instead would travel on Roslyn Street or another alternative route in order to avoid delays due to traffic congestion.
Sackville, Bedford & Bedford Highway	550 – 600 comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep the Route 80 servicing Robie Street and Spring Garden Road; these connections to Dalhousie and the Hospital are important Keep Route 80 the same, connection from Bayers Road to Bedford Highway is important Having a fast trip downtown is good, but most riders' destinations are on Spring Garden Road or Robie Street, not at Scotia Square Routes 80 and 90 carry many students; the proposed alignment would not serve Universities well 	Yes	The proposed Route 8 has been amended to reflect the routing of the existing Route 80. The route will continue to service Robie Street and Spring Garden Road in order to retain important connections to Bedford Highway, hospitals, shopping districts, and universities. In addition, to address the comments from residents who wanted a faster way from the Bedford Highway to downtown, the revised plan proposes the introduction of the Route 93. This Route will travel during peak periods only, and will provide a shorter trip to downtown Halifax.
Purcells Cove	450 – 500 comments, and a petition with approximately 300 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the Route 15 as it is today, do not discontinue service past Williams Lake Road 	Yes	In 2015, the 11km round trip between York Redoubt and Williams Lake Road saw 52 boardings per day, operating at a cost of \$18.18 per person. This represents an increase over previous years, which saw a cost of \$32.56 per passenger. This increase may be attributable to the communities' efforts to increase ridership on the service. As the bulk of passengers using the Route 15 travel during AM and PM peak hours, proposed routing in revised plan reintroduces peak-only transit service beyond Williams Lake Road to York Redoubt, in the form of the Rural Route 415.
North End Peninsula	300 – 350 comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep routing in North End Halifax; there are many steep hills, difficult to walk around or to walk further to bus stop 	Yes	The revised plan includes changes to the Route 7 which strikes a balance between streamlining the route and retaining the existing routing. The revised route includes bidirectional service on Kencrest Avenue and Glebe Street to improve accessibility for residents. Currently, service is only provided in one direction on these streets. The revised plan does not include service on one block of St. Paul's Street or one block of Vestry Street as currently provided. This represents removal of service to two bus stops.
Clayton Park	130 – 200 comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed network does not provide adequate service to Mount St. Vincent University from Clayton Park Need for a direct connection between Mount Saint Vincent University and Dalhousie University The trip from Clayton Park to the Hospitals and Downtown Halifax should not require a transfer 	Yes	Changes to proposed Route 8 to reflect the existing routing of the Route 80 as well as revisions to the Route 90 improve the connections between Clayton Park/Fairview and the Bedford Highway to Mount St. Vincent University and Dalhousie University. Changes to the proposed corridor Route 4 also improve connections between Clayton Park and downtown to the Hospitals and Dalhousie University.
Herring Cove to Hospital	150-200 comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the existing Route 20 routing around the hospitals. 	Yes	The proposed corridor Route 9 was revised to reflect the existing routing of the Route 20. Therefore, the trip from Herring Cove and Spryfield to the Hospital would be the same in the proposed network as it is today.
Porters Lake, Grand Desert, West Chezzetcook, Seaforth	110-130 comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not truncate the Route 401 and eliminate service in Grand Desert/Chezzetcook 	No	The proposed routing in revised plan is the same as proposed routing in draft plan. The Route 401 in revised plan terminates at Porters Lake Park & Ride. The land uses adjacent to this segment of the route are rural in character and low density, and experience very low ridership. In February 2016, this route had approximately 7 boardings per day, and operated at a cost of approximately \$81.20 per person.
Quinpool Road	100- 125 comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to retain some service on Quinpool Road near the rotary as many seniors live in the area and need hospital access 	No	The proposed routing in revised plan is the same as proposed routing in draft plan. Quinpool Road, between Connaught Ave. and the Armdale Rotary which is currently served by the Route 6, would no longer have transit service. However, most residents would still be within 500m of a bus stop on Quinpool Road, Connaught Avenue, or Chebucto Road.
Port Wallace	100 – 150 comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not truncate the route on Charles Keating Drive, eliminating service from the last segment of this route. 	No	The proposed routing in revised plan is the same as the proposed routing in draft plan. The Route 55 in the revised plan turns around on Charles Keating Drive The land uses adjacent to this segment of the route are rural in character and low density, and experience very low ridership. In 2015, this 6km round trip between Charles Keating Drive and the end of the route saw an average of 23 boardings per day, operating at a cost of \$54.26 per person.

Beaver Bank	75-100 Comments, and a petition with 221 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not shorten this route, access to Beaver Bank Villa is important 	No	The proposed routing in revised plan is the same as proposed routing in draft plan. The Route 400 would turn around at Kinsac Road. The land uses adjacent to this segment of the route are rural in character and low density, and experiences very low ridership. In Fall 2015, this route segment saw approximately 12 boardings per day, and operated at a cost of approximately \$66.32 per person.
Main Street Dartmouth	70 – 75 comments, and a petition with 2,224 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a bus on Main Street A route should exist to connect Cole Harbour to Main Street via Forest Hills Pkwy 	No	<p>Through the plan revision process, a number of options were examined to revise existing transit service to the Main Street Business Improvement District. It was noted by the Main Street Business Improvement District in their submission that residents of Cherry Brook, East Preston or North Preston may prefer a transit connection to Main Street and Mic Mac Mall rather than travelling to the Portland Hills Terminal and towards downtown via Portland Street. A survey was conducted on two routes in the area to establish the final destination of transit users, and it was discovered that the bulk of passengers were headed in a variety of destinations, with no one clear destination to inform the realignment of a route.</p> <p>The revised plan includes a large volume of transit service on sections of Main Street, Dartmouth, including one branch of the Corridor Route 10, as well as the Route 72, Route 67, and Route 54. These routes serve the largest trip generators in the area, including the Nova Scotia Community College and Tacoma Centre. Some sections of the Main Street corridor are not well suited to conventional transit service due to lack of pedestrian infrastructure, high travel speeds and very low levels of residential and employment density, particularly adjacent to the Water Commission lands where development is not permitted.</p>
Eastern Passage to Cole Harbour via Caldwell Road	A petition with 928 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A petition was received from residents requesting that transit service connect Eastern Passage to Cole Harbour via Caldwell Road 	No	<p>An analysis of National Household Survey data and Census data indicated that there is not a high level of demand between these two locations for commuting purposes.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to the amount of undeveloped land on either side of Caldwell Road between Cole Harbour and Eastern Passage, it was determined that there are not enough ridership generators to create a viable route. In addition to these factors, anecdotally, some feedback indicated that this service is in demand due to the travel patterns of high school students from Eastern Passage, a demand which is likely to be greatly reduced once a new high school is built in Eastern Passage.</p>
Sambro	140 comments, and a petition related to Access-A-Bus with 10 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service should be retained in Sambro (Route 402) 	No	The revised plan continues to recommend removal of this route. In Fall 2015, the 34km round trip saw an average of 25 boardings per day, costing \$64.42 per person.
Lawrencetown	An online petition gained media attention but was not received by Halifax Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Media articles advised that an online petition requesting from Lawrencetown residents requesting transit service in their community had gathered over 300 signatures 	No	As per Regional Plan policy, the Urban Transit Service Boundary does not allow for new transit service to be introduced in Lawrencetown and it was not considered as part of this plan.