

**Transportation Association of Canada
Chief Engineers' Council**

Minutes

Dates: September 26 and 27, 2010

Location: Halifax, ON

Part 1: Sunday, September 26, 2010

Chair: Mike Labrecque (Halifax)

Members Present:

Alberta	Bruno Zutautas
AASHTO	Gregory Johnson
Association of Consulting Engineering Companies - Canada	Norm d'Andrea
British Columbia	Dirk Nyland
Calgary	Ryan Jestin
Canadian Construction Association	Ryan Essex
Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers	Andy Vandertol
Canadian Society for Civil Engineering	Susan Tighe
Edmonton	Barry Belcourt
ITS Canada	John Greenough
Manitoba	Lance Vigfusson
Moncton	Jack MacDonald
Montréal	Robert Kahle
New Brunswick	Dale Forster
Northwest Territories	Kevin McLeod
Nova Scotia	Bruce Fitzner
Ontario	Gerry Chaput
Ottawa	Chris Brinkmann
Prince Edward Island	Stephen Yeo
Québec	Anne-Marie Leclerc
Saskatchewan	Ron Gerbrandt
Saskatoon	Angela Gardiner
Toronto	Peter Noehammer
Transport Canada	Jim Lothrop
Winnipeg	Lester Deane
Vancouver	Jerry Dobrovolny
Yukon	Robin Walsh

Regrets:

Newfoundland and Labrador	Gary Gosse
---------------------------	------------

Also Present:

TAC Board Liaison	Rob Penny
Canadian Construction Association	Stephen Damp
Halifax	Ken Reashor
TAC Secretariat	Sarah Wells

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Labrecque called the meeting to order and welcomed members and guests in attendance. Roundtable introductions followed.

2. Chief Engineers' Council Overview and Orientation

Mr. Labrecque observed that changes within member jurisdictions had resulted in a number of recent changes in the Council membership. He noted that one-third of the Council members were attending their first or second meeting and he invited the Secretary to provide an overview presentation about the Council's roles and responsibilities.

3. Minutes of Past Meeting

a) April 2010, Ottawa

Draft minutes of the spring meeting had been circulated in April 2010. Mr. Labrecque invited comments or corrections; none were offered.

It was agreed by motion (Leclerc/MacDonald) that the minutes be approved as circulated.

It was agreed by motion (Tighe/Chaput) that the approved minutes be posted on the public portion of the TAC website. **Action: Secretariat**

b) Business arising from the minutes

The Secretary reviewed business arising from the previous meeting. She reported that:

- The secretariat is making greater efforts to ensure there is communication between steering and standing committees when projects are launched to ensure the vision of the standing committee is understood by the project steering committee.
- An organizational chart depicting the TAC councils and committees was developed and supplemented with information about each of the standing committee's areas of interest. Standing committees have been invited to review the committee descriptions, following which the documentation will be finalized and made available on the TAC website.
- The Council's comments regarding the reporting threshold for property damage only collisions were referred to Transport Canada staff for further discussion with TAC's technical committees.
- Three new signs were approved for the *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Canada*:
 - Vertical visibility constraint sign
 - Identification of left turn signals sign
 - Passing/climbing lane length sign
- An all-way stop control tab sign was reviewed but not approved by letter ballot and was referred back to the Traffic Operations and Management Standing Committee.
- Following the recent resolution of intellectual property rights between the Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers and TAC regarding the *Canadian Capacity Guide for Signalized Intersections*, the document will be issued for letter ballot of the Council.
- As recommended by the Chief Engineers' Council, Awards for Service will be conferred upon Bob Margison, Mike Trites, Henri Alain and Gary Todd. Also as recommended by the Council, Dave Banks and Tom Kazmierowski will receive Awards for Distinguished Service.

4. 2010 Winter Olympics: Lessons Learned

Mr. Dobrovolny presented key findings from the City of Vancouver's transportation efforts during the 2010 Olympic Winter Games. He remarked that extensive data collection had been undertaken before and during the Games that provided data that had not been previously available. He noted the data would be valuable to assess the region's ability to handle large-scale events and the response to sustainable transportation concepts.

5. The Zen of Retaining Talent as Practiced in Lotus Land

Mr. Nyland provided a presentation about initiatives intended to retain talent in the BC provincial government and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure.

In discussion following the presentation, members commended the commitment of the BC government to develop and retain staff, even in challenging budgetary times.

6. Pre-qualifying Bridge Construction Contractors in Quebec

Mme Leclerc provided a presentation about the Quebec ministry's procedure for pre-qualification of bridge construction contractors.

Following her presentation, members expressed interest in the performance evaluation process. Mme Leclerc noted that a performance rating database will take some time to build but it is important to begin the process.

In response to a question, Mme Leclerc confirmed that performance ratings will be weighted with submitted prices in awarding construction contracts. She offered to provide interested members with the equation that will be used.

7. Federal Funding Allocations Overview

Mr. Lothrop presented an overview about recent federal transportation funding.

In his remarks, Mr. Lothrop suggested that, as projects and programs are concluded, there should be technical tools to collectively evaluate and measure the impacts and outcomes of infrastructure spending. He offered questions to stimulate discussion in the roundtable to follow.

8. Roundtable: The Future of Infrastructure after Recent Investments

In roundtable discussion, members offered the following observations:

- Some jurisdictions experienced increased contract prices, possibly as a result of the rapid influx of stimulus funding; the full value of the funds may not be achieved.
- In some jurisdictions, contract prices were below estimate; not all allocated stimulus funds may be spent.
- Jurisdictions are challenged to work projects into plans and programs when only short notice is provided; the federal government is encouraged to share information early and often to provide adequate opportunity for project partners to align priorities.
- Some project delivery time was lost as concurrence on projects was sought between federal, provincial and municipal agencies.
- Given the short term nature of the stimulus funding and the short construction season, some projects

will not be completed and expected expenses not incurred by the program deadline of March 31, 2011.

- Longer term, sustainable funding programs are needed.

Mr. Lothrop noted that the stimulus fund was a short-term program intended to create jobs and that other longer-term funding programs do exist. He added that it is well understood that longer-term planning yields better results. He suggested that policy discussions about funding programs should be left to the Council of Deputy Ministers' Policy and Planning Support Committee. He urged the Chief Engineers' Council to consider the technical tools that are needed to evaluate the impacts of infrastructure spending.

Mr. Penny concurred that it would be worthwhile to assess the goals, outcomes and the technical progress that is being made as a result of infrastructure investments.

Mr. Labrecque thanked members for contributing to the discussion and observed that it had opened interesting questions for discussion. He suggested the comments could provide direction for further work by the Council's Asset Management Task Force.

9. Canadian Infrastructure Report Card

Mr. Essex introduced Adam Thompson from the Policy and Research Department of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Mr. Thompson provided context for the Canadian Infrastructure Report Card project, which had evolved from a survey conducted by Statistics Canada and Infrastructure Canada, that is now being undertaken by the Canadian Construction Association, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canadian Society for Civil Engineering and the Canadian Public Works Association. He explained that the project is intended to present the state of the infrastructure in a school-type letter grade format and will initially consider municipal infrastructure assets in three categories, one of which will be roads.

Mr. Essex delivered an overview presentation, which had been circulated in advance. He emphasized the objective is to develop a factual document rather than an advocacy document. He also explained that the project is to include the establishment of a robust and repeatable methodology and use a combination of existing data sources. Mr. Essex noted that an invitation has been extended to TAC to appoint a member of the Board of Directors to the Report Card Advisory Board. It was also noted that other experts could be recommended to participate on expert working groups for the report card project.

Several council members expressed serious concerns about the metrics and methodology that will be used to develop the report card.

Mr. Deane noted that the City of Winnipeg is in the process of defining its own rating system and would not want a different rating system to be used elsewhere.

Mme Leclerc expressed strong concerns about the potential for the report card to be used for advocacy purposes and to influence government decision-making processes. She also observed that there should be extensive consultation before municipal data is released to the public. She added that provincial jurisdictions would need to be very careful before participating in a project of this nature using provincial data.

Mr. Lothrop observed that two key challenges will be the methodology, which must be agreed upon, and data availability, which may be problematic. He also concurred that the document would be used for advocacy purposes and questioned whether TAC should be seen to participate in the project.

Mr. Johnson reported that these sorts of projects have also been undertaken in the United States and concurred that different measurement tools can produce different data. He noted that Michigan created an Asset Management Council to ensure consistent metrics and he suggested more consistent methodologies would soon be used across the States. He observed that undertakings such as the report card project can be useful for providing data.

Mr. Dobrovolny expressed support for the project but stressed that caution would be needed and key sensitivities would need to be considered and addressed.

Mr. Gerbrandt drew attention to the National Highway System (NHS) Condition Report and cited the challenges that exist in providing common metrics for that initiative. He observed that information was simplified so that comparisons could be consistent. He suggested that information in the NHS Condition Report could serve as a starting point and offer some lessons that could be learned in the report card project.

Mr. Labrecque noted that Halifax Regional Municipality sees asset management as a key priority and the report card project could be complementary to asset management efforts.

Dr. Tighe noted that a rigorous survey had been conducted as part of the Pavement Asset Design and Management Guide project, which should provide useful information that could be used in the report card project. She suggested that the Council consider conducting similar such surveys on a regular basis.

Mr. Damp concurred that the project will be challenged to establish a consistent methodology and ensure comparable data is produced. He emphasized that the intention of the report card is to determine how to objectively measure and consistently report data to provide baseline information. He suggested that the goal is to make the data accurate which is why the involvement of TAC is key because TAC's representative would be involved in framing the methodology and the data to be collected as part of the project. Mr. Damp suggested it would be worse not to do the work which could mean that non-vetted, non-engineering and potentially inappropriate data gets generated and into the public domain.

Mr. Thompson noted that Statistics Canada and Infrastructure Canada had already invested a year in the project and had done some of the work to address the valid concerns raised by Council members.

Mr. MacDonald questioned whether having a TAC representative participate on the Advisory Board must necessarily mean the report card is endorsed by TAC. He suggested it could be beneficial to have someone participate on the Advisory Board and bring information back to the Council.

Mr. Thompson confirmed that if TAC does not want its name to appear on the report card then it would not.

Mr. Penny observed that the project is fully funded and the report card will be developed with or without TAC's participation. He suggested it would be better to be involved in the process and that TAC's endorsement of the product could be considered later.

It was agreed by motion (Jestin/MacDonald) to convey the Council's concerns about the challenges of the project to the TAC Board of Directors and to recommend a representative be appointed to the Report Card Advisory Board.

Action: Chair

10. Benchmarking Club – Follow up from April 2010

The Secretary presented a summary of the results of the survey of Council members regarding a possible benchmarking club.

In discussion, **it was agreed** there is sufficient interest in benchmarking amongst Council members to continue efforts to establish a “club.”

Mme Leclerc suggested that the initiative should begin with simple indices, perhaps relating to inventory and costs. It was noted that it would be challenging to compare costs between agencies as several factors can affect costs. It was also noted that definitions must be established so it is clear that comparisons are being made about the same items.

Mr. Greenough suggested that consideration be given to benchmarking about technology implemented on the road system.

It was noted that participation in a club should be voluntary and that data exchanged should be confidential. It was also noted that participation should be open to anyone who can bring data to share with the group.

Mr. Dobrovolny remarked that there had been several discussions about the challenges of collecting data and the importance of having good data. He suggested the benchmarking initiative would be a valuable exercise to begin establishing a database.

It was agreed that a small group of Council members should discuss a potential benchmarking club in more detail and recommend a process to the Council during its next meeting. Mme Leclerc and Messrs Nyland, Dobrovolny, Chaput and Yeo offered to participate.

Action: Leclerc, Nyland, Dobrovolny, Chaput, Yeo

11. Updates

a) AASHTO

Mr. Johnson provided a presentation to update the Council on behalf of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. He explained the current status of federal funding legislation, described AASHTO’s focus areas, highlighted the Standing Committee on Highway’s strategic priorities, and drew attention to recent AASHTO publications and upcoming events.

b) TAC Climate Change Task Force

Mr. Deane provided a presentation on behalf of the Climate Change Task Force, on which he and Mr. Essex represent the Council.

In his presentation, Mr. Deane encouraged members to consider submitting articles to TAC News that highlight climate change issues and initiatives within their own jurisdictions. Dr. Tighe noted that the TAC conference included some climate change-themed sessions and she suggested that papers in those sessions could form the basis for articles in TAC News.

Mr. Deane highlighted work of the Canadian Standards Association to develop a guideline for rainfall intensity-duration-frequency curves. He indicated that the CSA had invited feedback on the guideline, which would be circulated to Council members following the conference. **Action: Secretary**

Finally, Mr. Deane noted that a project recommended by the Road Safety Standing Committee relating to climate change did not have sufficient funding to be undertaken. He asked all members to consider the various projects in development and consider funding opportunities, if they had not already done so.

Mr. McLeod noted that several organizations are also addressing climate change themes in their work. He observed that it can be an issue for jurisdictions when there is a significant draw on the same staff resources by multiple organizations. He suggested it would be helpful to have a chart of all the climate change work going on in Canada.

c) Association of Consulting Engineering Companies – Canada

Mr. d’Andrea delivered a report on behalf of the Association of Consulting Engineering Companies – Canada.

d) Canadian Society for Civil Engineering

Dr. Tighe provided an update on behalf of the Canadian Society for Civil Engineering (CSCE). She drew attention to recent and upcoming CSCE conferences, including the next annual conference in Ottawa in June 2011. She highlighted an upcoming national lecture tour in which the City of Vancouver’s innovative strategies to create the Winter Olympics Host City Transportation Plan will be presented.

Dr. Tighe also identified themes for several upcoming issues of the Canadian Civil Engineer magazine. She suggested that members, or the Council as a whole, consider submitting an article for the Winter 2011-12 edition which will have as its theme “Thinking Outside the Box: Innovations in Transportation Engineering.” She added that the deadline for submitting technical articles for that edition would be October 22, 2011 but that abstracts would be required sooner.

Finally, Dr. Tighe drew attention to a paper competition being organized by the CSCE for the Canadian National Committee of the World Road Association to award prizes as part of the XXIV World Road Congress to take place in Mexico City in September 2011. She explained that prizes will be awarded in three categories (young professionals, innovation, and sustainable development).

e) Canadian Construction Association

Mr. Essex provided an update on behalf of the Canadian Construction Association (CCA).

In his remarks, Mr. Essex noted that the Association remains concerned over the lack of youth choosing to pursue careers in the construction industry. He referenced the Ontario Civil Construction Careers Institute, which focuses on youths speaking to youths about construction sector careers. He invited members to visit the website at <http://www.occci.ca/> for more information.

Mr. Essex also reported that Ms. Wells and Mr. Penny had attended the CCA Road Builders Council meeting in Regina as part of an outreach effort to increase participation from the construction sector in TAC. Mr. Essex indicated that the information presented had been well received and that CCA would look for ways to be more involved with TAC.

f) ITS Canada

Mr. Greenough provided an update on behalf of ITS Canada. He noted that the 2010 ITS Canada conference had been a success and that the 2011 event would be held in Vancouver in June. He remarked that ITS Canada is growing and that ITS technologies are being deployed more broadly. He encouraged greater participation from municipal, provincial and territorial governments in the Society.

Mr. Greenough added that ITS Canada sees many opportunities to collaborate with TAC. In particular, he highlighted the 511 initiative, noting that ITS Canada took on the work to secure the number from the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission and that the Society looks forward to 511 becoming operational in Canada. He stressed that ITS Canada would be ready to assist TAC as a partner or a contractor should TAC become involved in this area.

g) Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers

Mr. Vandertol provided an update on behalf of the Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers.

In his remarks, Mr. Vandertol noted that the *Canadian Guide to Neighbourhood Traffic Calming*, a joint TAC and CITE publication, would likely soon need to be updated and that a project to do so might be recommended by the Traffic Operations and Management Standing Committee.

Mr. Vandertol reported that the CITE is pursuing a seat on the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board but acknowledged that could be challenging to secure.

Finally, Mr. Vandertol drew attention to the next CITE annual conference which would be held in Halifax in 2011.

Mr. Lothrop inquired if the CITE maintains a list of Canadian universities with the level of transportation engineering education that is offered. Mr. Vandertol said the CITE does not. Dr. Tighe remarked that transportation engineering course offerings are fairly limited in Canada. She observed that many of the courses are offered by sessional lecturers and that it is difficult to attract students to programs unless there are full faculty members committed to those programs. Dr. Tighe also remarked that the status of university curricula in transportation engineering was one of the issues that triggered the development of TAC's Education and Human Resources Development Council.

12. Spring Agenda Planning: Council Priority Interests

Mr. Labrecque reminded members that during the fall 2009 Council meeting three themes had emerged among the Council's priorities and these were technical issues, environmental issues and administrative issues. He suggested that considerable progress had been made in exploring asset management, one of the Council's key technical interests, and that good direction had been given to the Asset Management Task Force. He also indicated that progress is being made with administrative issues, such as enhancing communication with the Council's standing committees as well as the other TAC councils. However, Mr. Labrecque suggested that more focus should be given to the environmental interests of the Council. In that context, he suggested members consider topics that should be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Nyland proposed time be spent discussing engineering adaptation to climate change. Members agreed that infrastructure adaptation would be an appropriate theme for the spring meeting agenda.

Dr. Tighe suggested that the Education and Human Resources Development Council be invited to provide a presentation on the state of transportation engineering education in Canada.

Mr. Lothrop suggested that a roundtable discussion be planned about the tools to assess the technical benefits of infrastructure investments.

13. Council Administration

a) Election of Council Vice Chair

Mr. Labrecque noted that his term as Chair of the Council would conclude at the end of the conference and that Mr. Chaput would become Chair at that time. He added that the Council would need to elect a new Vice Chair and he invited members to express their interest in the position. To allow time to consider the opportunity, Mr. Labrecque deferred a decision on this item until the end of the meeting the following day.

b) Executive Committee Report

Mr. Labrecque reported on the activities of the CEC Executive Committee since the last Council meeting.

He noted that the Executive Committee had endorsed the recommendation of the Road Safety Standing Committee that the Road Safety Engineering Award be conferred upon Alberta Transportation for its median cable barrier program.

Mr. Labrecque also noted that the Executive Committee had received a request to establish a standing committee addressing traveller information and 511 services and had referred it to the Council for discussion.

Mr. Labrecque also reported that the Council Chairs had met by teleconference in May 2010 to discuss projects and issues of mutual interest. He observed that more frequent meetings and teleconferences seem to be of interest to the group and will continue, with another meeting planned in Halifax before the councils report to the Board of Directors.

c) Submission to Board of Directors

Mr. Labrecque drew attention to the report to the Board of Directors that had been submitted on behalf of the Council. He invited comments or suggestions for future reports; none were offered.

d) Project Report

The Secretary drew attention to the status report on CEC projects that had been circulated in advance of the meeting and she provided a summary presentation.

She reported that \$347,276 currently resides in the reserve fund for the *Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads* and \$26,300 has accumulated in the reserve fund for the *Guide for the Design of Roadway Lighting*. She explained that the Council can access those funds, which are intended to support updates to, or rewrites of, the related guides, by recommendation to the TAC Board of Directors.

The Secretary provided some historical information about the Council's sponsored projects, noting that the Council has generated over \$5 million in funds to conduct 62 projects since the sponsored project approach was adopted in 2000/01.

e) Executive Director's Report

Michel Gravel, TAC's Executive Director, drew attention to his written report, which had been circulated in advance. He noted that the Association had a successful year and he highlighted the new positioning statement ("Transportation Association of Canada: Connecting Knowledge and People") and that the French language services task force had submitted recommendations to be considered by the TAC Board of Directors. In response to a question, Mr. Gravel clarified that no significant complaints had been made about the Association's French language services but that some members had identified some irritants that should be addressed.

Mr. Gravel offered to answer any other questions relating to his report; none were raised.

14. Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned until 2 PM on Monday, September 27th.

Part 2: Monday, September 27, 2010

Chair: Gerry Chaput (Ontario)

Members Present:

Alberta	Bruno Zutautas
AASHTO	Gregory Johnson
Association of Consulting Engineering Companies	Norm d'Andrea
British Columbia	Dirk Nyland
Calgary	Ryan Jestin
Canadian Construction Association	Ryan Essex
Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers	Andy Vandertol
Canadian Society for Civil Engineering	Susan Tighe
Edmonton	Barry Belcourt
Halifax	Mike Labrecque
ITS Canada	John Greenough
Manitoba	Lance Vigfusson
Moncton	Jack MacDonald
Montréal	Robert Kahle
New Brunswick	Dale Forster
Northwest Territories	Kevin McLeod
Nova Scotia	Bruce Fitzner
Ottawa	Chris Brinkmann
Prince Edward Island	Stephen Yeo
Québec	Anne-Marie Leclerc
Saskatchewan	Ron Gerbrandt
Saskatoon	Angela Gardiner
Toronto	Peter Noehammer
Transport Canada	Jim Lothrop
Winnipeg	Lester Deane
Vancouver	Jerry Dobrovolny
Yukon	Robin Walsh

Regrets:

Newfoundland and Labrador	Gary Gosse
---------------------------	------------

Also Present:

TAC Board Liaison	Rob Penny
Halifax	Ken Reashor
TAC Secretariat	S. Wells, A. Baluch, K. Cvetkovic, S. Majkic

Standing Committee Representatives:

Asset Management Task Force	Kim Mathisen
Geometric Design Standing Committee	Larry Purcka, Carl Clayton
Maintenance and Construction	Moh Lali, Ron Weatherburn
Pavements	Ahmed Shalaby
Road Safety Standing Committee	Cam Nelson
Soils and Materials	Mark Popik, Hugh Donovan
Structures	Brian Wood

1. Opening Remarks

Mr. Chaput welcomed participants back to the meeting. He conveyed the regrets of Mr. Labrecque who had other commitments associated with the TAC conference and would join the meeting late.

2. Project Presentations

a) Winter Road Condition Terminology

Bob Hodgins, representing Ecoplans Limited, provided a presentation about this project conducted under the auspices of the Maintenance and Construction Standing Committee. He explained that the work had focused on establishing a consistent set of winter road and visibility condition terms for Canada and the development of a users guide to provide guidance to staff gathering information so that it may be reported consistently.

In discussion following the presentation, some members expressed concern about how black ice conditions would be handled and the colours chosen to identify the various road conditions.

It was agreed by motion (Greenough/Leclerc) to review the guide by letter ballot. **Action: Secretary**

b) Signs and Markings for Multilane Roundabouts

Phil Weber of Ourston Roundabouts Canada provided a presentation about this project conducted under the auspices of the Traffic Operations and Management Standing Committee. He explained that the project deliverables constitute a recommended new Division 7 for the *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Canada* (MUTCDC).

It was agreed by motion (MacDonald/Brinkmann) to review the project deliverables by letter ballot.

Action: Secretary

c) Collision Prone Location Screening Guidelines

Geni Bahar of NAVIGATS, Inc. provided a presentation about this project conducted under the auspices of the Road Safety Standing Committee. She described the deliverables which are intended to facilitate network screening for collision-prone locations.

In discussion following the presentation, Ms. Bahar noted that a need for training on the screening process had been expressed by project participants and other stakeholders.

It was agreed by motion (Gardiner/Greenough) to review the guidelines by letter ballot.

Action: Secretary

d) Recommended Practices for Posting Ramp Speeds

Gerry Forbes of Intus Road Safety Engineering provided a presentation about this project conducted under the auspices of the Traffic Operations and Management Standing Committee. He described the deliverables and identified new devices recommended for the MUTCDC.

It was agreed by motion (Vigfusson/Tighe) to review the recommended practices by letter ballot.

Action: Secretary

e) Recommended Practices for LED-Embedded Traffic Signs

Mr. Forbes also provided a presentation about this project conducted under the auspices of the Traffic Operations and Management Standing Committee. He explained that the project resulted in the recommendation that LED-embedded traffic signs should be included in the MUTCDC, with their use restricted to Stop and Yield signs.

It was agreed by motion (Jestin/Kahle) to review the recommended practices by letter ballot.

Action: Secretary

f) Guide for the Accommodation of Utilities within Freeway Rights of Way

Anne Baril of the Ministère des transports du Québec provided a presentation about this volunteer project conducted under the auspices of the Maintenance and Construction Standing Committee.

It was agreed by motion (McLeod/Yeo) to review the guide by letter ballot.

Action: Secretary

3. 511 Traveller Information Standing Committee Request

On behalf of the 511 Task Force of the Policy and Planning Support Committee, Mr. Lothrop provided a presentation about 511 traveller and weather information systems.

Mr. Lothrop also drew attention to the material that had been circulated in advance of the meeting, which conveyed the request of the PPSC 511 Task Force that the Chief Engineers' Council establish a standing committee on the subject. Mr. Lothrop recommended that the Council consider forming a task force to define formal terms of reference and mandate for a 511 committee and to identify specific deliverables that would be expected from its work.

Mr. Vigfusson acknowledged there should be a forum for discussion of 511 issues but expressed caution about establishing a standing committee to report to the Council. He remarked that it takes considerable resources to sustain a standing committee and the Council needs to be careful before adding to its list.

Mr. Nyland concurred and added that 511 has progressed to an operational stage in many jurisdictions. He drew attention to the information that indicated there will be a requirement to report to the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission about implementation of 511 in Canada. Mr. Nyland observed that participation on TAC committees is voluntary and that TAC could not be expected to collect data or report to the CRTC on jurisdictional activities.

Mme Leclerc concurred with the concerns expressed by other members. She also noted that implementation of 511 will be an issue for municipalities and there may be interest from TAC's Urban Transportation Council to participate on a 511 committee. Mr. Chaput suggested that the matter could be discussed during the next meeting of the Chairs of TAC's councils.

Action: Chair

Mr. Greenough indicated that ITS Canada would support the establishment of a TAC 511 committee and would be interested to assist as necessary.

In concluding the discussion, **it was agreed** to propose to the TAC Board of Directors that a short-term task force be formed, reporting to the Chief Engineers' Council, to define a mandate, terms of reference, work plan and deliverables for a potential 511 committee.

Action: Chair

It was further agreed that a meeting room should be provided in conjunction with the TAC spring meetings for interested TAC members to work on the development of the required documentation. Mr. Lothrop indicated that Susan Spencer (Transport Canada, co-chair PPSC 511 Task Force) had offered to work with others in this capacity. **Action: Secretariat**

4. Standing Committee Presentations and Project Proposals

a) Traffic Operations and Management

Cathy Robertson (City of Burlington) provided a report on behalf of the Traffic Operations and Management Standing Committee (TOMSC).

On behalf of the TOMSC, Ms. Robertson recommended that a new funded project be undertaken to develop a light level reduction and power efficiency guide for roadways and walkways, as a supplemental document to TAC's *Guide for the Design of Roadway Lighting*. She suggested a consultant assignment of \$80,000 would be required.

It was agreed by motion (Vandertol/Brinkmann) to seek funding to conduct the project. **Action: Secretary**

b) Structures

Brian Wood (Stantec Consulting) provided a report on behalf of the Structures Standing Committee (SSC).

On behalf of the SSC, Mr. Wood recommended that training to accompany the recently published *Guide to Bridge Traffic and Combination Barriers* be developed. It was noted that funding to develop the training material would be needed, subject to discussions with the consultant that developed the Guide.

It was agreed by motion (MacDonald/Nyland) to seek funding to support the development of training material. **Action: Secretary**

It was noted that TAC had been requested to endorse the BridgeLife conference being organized in Ottawa in November 2010. Mr. Wood indicated that some members of the Structures Standing Committee will speak as part of the program. Council members observed that the conference is being organized by private sector partners. **It was agreed** that TAC should not endorse the conference but that information about the event could be shared with members.

c) Soils and Materials

Mark Popik (Applied Research Associates Inc.) provided a report on behalf of the Soils and Materials Standing Committee (SMSC).

Mr. Popik reported that the SMSC had met jointly with the Pavements Standing Committee at Dalhousie University where members also had the opportunity to tour the university's facilities, including the pavement, geotechnical, structural and concrete laboratories. Mr. Chaput commended the committees for working together and for the interesting meeting format.

d) Road Safety

Cam Nelson (Morrison Hershfield) provided a presentation on behalf of the Road Safety Standing Committee (RSSC).

As part of his presentation, Mr. Nelson noted that the RSSC is reviewing the description of the project about climate change and road safety, which is currently underfunded, to ensure its scope is clear and that the impacts on transportation design are identified.

Mr. Nelson also noted that the RSSC had reached consensus on a project recommended by its Work Zone Safety Subcommittee to develop a reference guide to effective practices for work zone safety.

e) Pavements

Ahmed Shalaby (University of Manitoba) provided a report on behalf of the Pavements Standing Committee.

f) Maintenance and Construction

Moh Lali (Alberta Transportation) provided a presentation on behalf of the Maintenance and Construction Standing Committee (MCSC).

As part of his report, Mr. Lali noted that a representative from Environment Canada had expressed interest in sponsoring the project to update TAC's *Salt Management Guide*. It was noted that the secretariat had issued the invitation several times to Environment Canada to sponsor the project but that no response had been received. The Secretary offered to follow up with a new contact to be identified by the MCSC. **Action: MCSC Chair, Secretary**

Mr. Lali informed the Council that the MCSC has concerns with Environment Canada's Water Quality Task Force report on the Canadian Water Quality Guideline for the Protection of Aquatic Life. It was noted that this could be an issue that would affect all jurisdictions.

It was agreed by motion (Leclerc/Zutautas) that a letter, with technical content to be provided by the MCSC, should be sent on behalf of the Chief Engineers' Council to Environment Canada expressing the concerns on this issue. **Action: MCSC, Council Chair**

g) Geometric Design Standing Committee

Larry Purcka (Northwest Territories Department of Transportation) provided a presentation on behalf of the Geometric Design Standing Committee (GDSC).

On behalf of the GDSC, Mr. Purcka recommended that a new funded project be undertaken to develop a Canadian Roundabout Design Guide. He suggested a consultant assignment of \$150,000 would be required.

It was agreed by motion (MacDonald/Forster) to seek funding to conduct the project. **Action: Secretary**

Carl Clayton (Stantec Consulting) drew attention to information that had been circulated in advance regarding three proposed revisions to the *Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads* (GDG).

It was agreed by motion (Yeo/Gerbrandt) to review the revisions pertaining to horizontal clearance on bridges and rumble strips by letter ballot. **Action: Secretary**

Mr. Clayton explained that the third revision would add the passing sight distance model used in the MUTCDC as an option to that already contained in the GDG. He reported that replacing the GDG model with the MUTCDC model is not recommended at this time.

It was agreed by motion (Vandertol/Walsh) to review the passing sight distance revision by letter ballot.
Action: Secretary

h) Asset Management Task Force

Kim Mathisen (New Brunswick Department of Transportation) provided a presentation on behalf of the Asset Management Task Force.

As part of her report, Ms. Mathisen explained that the Task Force had developed a survey about the state of organizations' asset management practices. **It was agreed** that the survey should be circulated to Chief Engineers' Council members. Council members committed to ensure that managers responsible for all assets, not just bridges and pavements, would complete the survey. **Action: Secretary, All members**

5. Other Business

Mr. Labrecque revisited the issue of the Council Executive that had been deferred from earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Labrecque reminded members that Mr. Chaput would become Chair following the meeting.

He also informed the Council that, as a result of his changed responsibilities within the Halifax Regional Municipality, he would resign his seat on the Council, leaving vacant the Past Chair position on the Executive Committee. He noted that Mr. Penny, as Board liaison to the Council as well as a past Chair, had agreed to serve on the Executive Committee.

Mr. Labrecque opened the floor to nominations for Council Vice Chair. Mr. MacDonald was recommended and no other nominations were proposed.

Mr. Labrecque added that Mr. Vigfusson and Mr. McLeod had agreed to continue serving as additional members-at-large on the Council Executive Committee.

It was agreed by motion (Yeo/Penny) that the Chief Engineers' Council Executive would comprise Mr. Chaput (Chair), Mr. MacDonald (Vice Chair), Mr. Penny (Past Chair) and Mr. Vigfusson and Mr. McLeod.

On behalf of the Council, Mr. Chaput thanked Mr. Labrecque for his leadership as Chair of the Chief Engineers' Council for the last two years. Mr. Labrecque thanked his colleagues for their support and commitment to the Council.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by: Sarah Wells
Distributed: October 2010