

**MEETING DATE:** August 29, 2001

**SUBJECT:** Chief General Manager's Report Period 6 June 3 To July 7, 2001

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Commission:

1. receive for information the attached Executive Summary of the Chief General Manager's (CGM's) report covering the period June 3 to July 7, 2001, noting that:
  - i. a \$1 million shortfall is currently expected for the 2001 TTC Operating Budget;
  - ii. the 2001 year-end cash flow for the 2001-2005 Capital Program is currently projected to be under budget by approximately \$4.2 million; and that
  - iii. the current projected year-end unaccommodated rate for Wheel-Trans is 4.3% and the projected budget shortfall is \$118,000; and
1. forward a copy of this cover report and the Executive Summary to each City Councillor for information (noting that the detailed CGM's report is available on request from the Office of the General Secretary of the Commission).

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **1. 2001 TTC Operating Budget**

##### Year-to-Date

Ridership for the first half of the year was 6.3 million rides (3%) over the amended budget. Furthermore, despite the recent fare increase, ridership in June was 1 million rides ahead of last year. Passenger revenue was consequently over the amended budget, by \$9.8 million (3.1%). Meanwhile, expenses were approximately \$2 million (0.5%) under the year-to-date budget.

##### Year-end Projections

The following table summarizes the year-end projections, based on current results and assumptions:

	2001		
(Millions)	BUDGET	PROJECTION	CHANGE
RIDERSHIP	413	422	9
REVENUES	\$655	\$672	\$17
EXPENSES	\$(814)	\$(821)	\$ (7)
SUBSIDY	\$148	\$148	\$ 0
SHORTFALL	\$(11)	\$(1)	\$10

Due to the continuing positive ridership results, year-end ridership is now expected to range from 419 to 426 million. Consequently, the table above now reflects a revised forecast of 422 million rides - an increase of 3 million since the previous report. The corresponding revenues are now forecast to be \$672 million. Expenses are still expected to exceed budget by less than 1% largely due to higher energy costs and employee benefits costs. As a result, it is currently anticipated that the year-end shortfall will now be in the order of \$1 million.

## **2) 2001 Wheel-Trans Operating Budget**

Wheel-Trans continued to experience higher than anticipated levels of demand in the first half of 2001. The unaccommodated rate for period 6 was 3.8% and year-to-date its 3.6%, compared to a target of 2.3%. The year-end unaccommodated rate is expected to be in the 4 to 5% range.

## **(3) 2001 - 2005 Capital Program**

The current projection is that the year-end cash flow for 2001 will be some \$4.2 million less than the budgeted cash flow. This potential under-expenditure would be mainly due to further slippages or deferrals on various projects into 2002 (page A6).

## **(4) Performance Indicators**

The graphs on pages C2 to C5 provide quantitative measures of the regularity of service provided to our customers.

## **Surface Operations** (page C2)

The service performance indicator for bus and streetcar routes is the percentage of service that is within  $\pm 3$  minutes of scheduled headway. The graphs on page C2 show the consolidated results for all routes measured on a period by period basis.

Also shown on the graphs is the target line illustrating the goal of achieving a consistent headway adherence of 75% through 2001. The target line in last year's graphs exhibited a drop during the summer months to reflect our expectations of lower performance due to seasonal service reductions and increased headways. This year a constant target will be maintained and any seasonal variations will be noted as part of the month variance explanations. It should be noted that the  $\pm 3$  minute measurement and the ultimate target level are subject to refinement as we gain experience with headway performance monitoring.

Two headway adherence measures are shown for each period:

1. the unweighted % is the simple average of all routes;
2. the weighted % factors in the size of the routes.

Bus routes typically have a higher unweighted % because the weighted measure puts increased emphasis on the heavy routes on major thoroughfares, which are more susceptible to delays from congestion, accidents, high passenger loads etc.

In contrast, streetcar routes typically have a higher weighted %. Although all streetcar routes are on high volume thoroughfares and subject to similar disruptions, the weighted % has the proportionately increased influence of those routes with more frequent headways.

In Period 6 both bus and streetcar routes experienced a slight deterioration in headway adherence performance. This was primarily due to two factors:

- I. A significant number of new and ongoing road and utility construction projects. Approximately 35 bus routes were affected by road or utility construction during Period 6. In addition the 501 Queen, 504 King, and 508 Lake Shore streetcar routes were affected by major track reconstruction projects in the vicinity of Roncesvalles yard and on The Queensway.
- II. The effect of system-wide scheduled summer service reductions. Service on many routes is reduced during the summer months in response to seasonal lower ridership. This results in wider headways and a greater potential for deviations from the measurement standard of running within  $\pm 3$  minutes of scheduled headway.

We expect that the headway adherence measures of both buses and streetcars will improve as the year progresses. The Surface Transportation Department is placing increased emphasis on route management in 2001. Dedicated Route Management Supervisors commenced their duties on June 10, 2001.

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

**Subway Operations** (pages C3 to C5)

The following table summarizes the subway service performance measures.

<b>SUBWAY SERVICE PERFORMANCE – PERIOD 6 2001</b>				
	<b>Target</b>	<b>This Period</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>On Time Index</b>				
B/D Line	8.0	9.1	8.9	Period & YTD On Target
Y/U/S Line	7.9	9.1	8.6	Period & YTD On Target
<b>Incidents of Delay Per 1,000 Hours of Train Operation</b>				
Uncontrollable	3.6	3.4	3.3	Period & YTD On Target
Controllable	2.9	2.6	2.5	Period & YTD On Target
<b>Minutes of Delay Per 1,000 Hours of Train Operation</b>				
Uncontrollable	30.9	31.2	23.7	Period not on target due to extended delays, totalling 447 minutes, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two Priority One – 120</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>minutes</li> <li>• York Mills broken cable – 173 minutes</li> <li>• Wilson Yard delay – 46 minutes</li> <li>• Gas leak @ Sheppard – 108 minutes</li> </ul> <p>YTD On Target</p>
Controllable	16.2	20.5	15.9	<p>Period not on target due to five Downsview crossover delays, totalling 211 minutes</p> <p>YTD On Target</p>
<b>Average Length of Delay (Minutes)</b>				
Uncontrollable	7.8	9.1	7.2	<p>Period not on target due to extended delays, totalling 447 minutes, as detailed above</p> <p>YTD on target</p>
Controllable	5.5	8.0	6.5	<p>Period &amp; YTD Not On Target due to extended controllable delays during this and the two previous periods</p>

This level of detail on the regularity of surface and subway services will be provided semi-annually. It is available on a monthly basis in the Executive Summary and the full Chief General Manager's Report.

-----

22-Aug-01

42-35-47

Attachment: CGM's Report