

**Transportation Association of Canada (TAC)
2011 Spring Technical Meetings
URBAN TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL (UTC) MEETING**

**Held on Sunday April 17, 2011 from 09:00 to 17:00 hours,
International Ballroom C, Lower Level, Delta Ottawa City Centre Hotel
101 Lyon Street, Ottawa, ON**

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Claudio Covelli (Chair)	Dillon Consulting Limited
Graham Vincent (Vice Chair)	Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Daniel Bergeron	Agence métropolitaine de transport
Patricia Boeckner	Ontario Ministry of Transportation
François Major	Ville de Montréal (for Claude Carette)
David Duncan	Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation
Don Cook	City of Saskatoon
Bernard Clément	Dessau
Rico Fung	Cement Association of Canada
Brian Hollingworth	IBI Group
Allan Humphries	Alberta Transportation
Neal Irwin	IBI Group
Audra Jones	City of Edmonton (for Brice Stephenson)
David McCusker	Halifax Regional Municipality
Tom Oommen	Transport Canada
Vivi Chi	City of Ottawa (for John Moser)
Don Mulligan	City of Calgary
Geoff Noxon	Noxon Associates Limited
Wanda Richardson	Hatch Mott MacDonald Ltd.
Sabbir Saiyed	Region of Peel
Mike Sheflin	International Federation of Municipal Engineers
Jillian Stephen	City of Hamilton
Don Stephens	McCormick Rankin
Allen Stewart	Royal Military College
Pierre Tremblay	Ministère des Transports du Québec
Rob Wanless	MMM Group
Gary Welsh	City of Toronto
Leslie Woo	Metrolinx
Katarina Cvetkovic (Secretary)	TAC Secretariat

Also Present:

Dean Cooper
Steven Damp
Ana Maria Layton
Alain Rajotte
Sharon Lewinson
Roxane MacInnis
Tim Spurr
Sarah Wells
Michel Gravel

Stantec Consulting
Canadian Construction Association
Transport Canada
Ministère des Transports du Québec
ACT Canada
McCormick Rankin Corporation
AMT
TAC Secretariat
TAC Secretariat

Regrets:

Miranda Carlberg
Luis Escobar
Doug Floyd
Michael Roschlau
Adam Thompson
Jim Hester
Tamim Raad

Saskatchewan Highways and Infrastructure
City of Winnipeg
Delcan Corporation
Canadian Urban Transit Association
Federation of Canadian Municipalities
British Columbia Ministry of Transportation
TransLink

To access these draft minutes and attachments, please visit:

<http://www.tac-atc.ca/private/urban/urban-index.htm>

1. Opening Remarks and Welcome

- **Introduction of New Members and Guests**

Claudio Covelli, Chair of the Urban Transportation Council (UTC), called the meeting to order and welcomed members and guests in attendance. Roundtable introductions followed. Mr. Covelli also welcomed the following new members to the Council: Sabbir Saiyed, Region of Peel (replacing Tom AppaRao) and Zoubir Lounis, National Research Council Canada.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was circulated electronically prior to the meeting. Mr. Covelli asked if there are any suggestions for changes or additions; none were offered. The agenda was approved as circulated.

3. Approval of September 26, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Draft minutes of the September 2010 UTC meeting held in Halifax had been posted on the private website for members' review and use. C. Covelli highlighted the key actions as a reminder of the discussions and decisions that were made in September. C. Covelli invited comments or corrections to the draft minutes; none were offered.

It was agreed by motion that the minutes be approved and posted on the public portion of the TAC website.

Action 1: K. Cvetkovic

4. Council Chair's Report

C. Covelli informed Council members that the UTC Executive held three teleconferences since the September 2010 meeting. Numerous agenda items were covered, including the review of Council membership, status of collaboration agreements with the Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP) and the Association for Commuter Transportation (ACT) Canada, development of April 2011 Council meeting agenda, funding status for Council projects in development, activities of Standing Committees, etc.

The collaboration agreement between TAC and ACT Canada was signed in February 2011. UTC members have received an excerpt from the agreement that deals with opportunities for collaboration as well as the associations' obligations. Sharon Lewinson is a member of the UTC and also ACT Canada President; she'll deliver a presentation to the Council at this meeting on ACT Canada's goals and objectives and opportunities for collaboration.

The collaboration agreement with CIP was signed in April 2011. This was achieved with significant help from Wanda Richardson. The UTC Executive and the CIP Executive have agreed that Mrs. Richardson will be the liaison between the two associations for the first, one-year renewable term; she is a member of both CIP and UTC. An excerpt from this collaboration agreement was also sent to the UTC.

C. Covelli also noted that he'll invite Council members to engage in a discussion on pricing of TAC publications during this meeting, following Michel Gravel's update.

Mr. Covelli added that there will be a rotation of the Council Executive following the September 2011 meeting. Mr. Graham Vincent will take on the role of Chair, and the Vice Chair position will have to be filled. Mr. Covelli invited UTC members to bring forward nominations for Vice-Chair between now and the fall meeting. Nominations can be submitted to C. Covelli, G. Vincent or K. Cvetkovic. Council members will also receive a reminder about this nomination process this summer.

Action 2: UTC Members

5. Report on TAC Board and Secretariat Activities

- **TAC Sponsored Project Model Review**

Sarah Wells, Director of TAC Technical Programs, delivered a presentation on the TAC sponsored project development process (**see Attachment #1**). She noted that the Board has asked the secretariat to speak to Councils about how the model has worked and if members have any questions or suggestions for improvements. Dr. Wells has already received some feedback from other Councils and looks forward to this discussion with

the UTC. She added that the Board feels the sponsored project model has been working well and it's expected we'll continue using it.

L. Woo inquired if there is a prioritization of topics for sponsored projects. S. Wells noted that prioritization does not happen collectively but that each agency decides for itself which project it wants to support. C. Covelli added that the Urban Transportation Council and its Standing Committees also keep in mind various technical priorities when thinking of new project ideas.

A. Stewart noted that sometimes there is no overlap in membership between a Standing Committee that brought forward a project idea, and the project steering committee that's responsible for overseeing that project. He asked how it can be assured that the project won't move away from the original vision of the Standing Committee. S. Wells remarked that project steering committee members – representatives of project sponsors – are responsible for finalizing the project terms of reference. There is a natural balancing between the original Standing Committee's vision and what the project steering committee members decide is needed. The TAC Secretariat staff and specifically the project managers also try to make helpful connections between Standing Committees and project steering committees.

S. Saiyed remarked that the Green Guide for Roads project has been very successful at receiving funding from numerous sponsors, primarily because there was a communications outreach from member to member about the importance of this project. He asked if committee members may contact their colleagues to spread the word and encourage additional agencies to contribute funding to TAC projects. S. Wells remarked that the secretariat acknowledges the success of this peer-to-peer outreach and communications. Members should feel free to talk to their colleagues about projects and encourage other agencies to join as sponsors. The TAC Secretariat is also happy to do that legwork.

L. Woo asked if TAC partners with universities. S. Wells remarked TAC works with universities on different projects and initiatives, and that some universities are represented on TAC's committees and councils. Universities are welcome to both fund projects and bid on them. L. Woo inquired if it's the responsibility of sponsors or the TAC Secretariat to pursue these opportunities. S. Wells remarked that it's typically the secretariat's role but that the secretariat appreciates hearing about appropriate links from members.

- **Update on TAC Collaboration Agreements Recommended by UTC**

Michel Gravel, TAC Executive Director, provided an overview of the activities of the Board and the Secretariat since the September 2010 meetings. He summarized his written report that was circulated to the Council via email in advance of this meeting. Mr. Gravel noted that TAC has completed another successful year in terms of technical programs, membership, volunteer participation, member services, networking opportunities, and bottom line results. M. Gravel added that the Board is considering moving away from a

three-year business plan to a five-year plan. He'll have more to report to the Council on this matter at the fall meeting.

Mr. Gravel added that TAC's 2014 Conference in Montreal will celebrate TAC's Centennial as well as the overall importance of transportation to our society. It's envisioned as a major event that'll be celebrated with TAC's national and international partners. The framework for the Centennial was approved by the Board two years ago. Some optional events may be brought forward via the sponsored project model. More ideas and information will be communicated to TAC members this fall.

W. Richardson asked if there will be a way to recognize various TAC partners at the 2014 event. M. Gravel noted this is part of the Centennial celebration's work plan.

Mr. Gravel noted the dates for the upcoming TAC Conferences:

- October 14th to 17th, 2012 – Fredericton, New Brunswick
- 2013 – Winnipeg, Manitoba
- 2014 – Montreal, Quebec (TAC Centennial)
- 2015 – Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
- 2016 – Ontario (in conjunction with MTO's Centennial)

The 2012 Spring Technical Meetings will take place from April 12 to 17 in Ottawa.

C. Covelli thanked Dr. Wells and Mr. Gravel for their helpful updates.

Mr. Covelli noted the UTC Executive has been recently informed of some concerns raised by the Sustainable Transportation Standing Committee (STSC) and the project steering committee (PSC) that developed the *Active Transportation – Making It Work in Canadian Communities* report. The concerns were regarding the sale price of the above-noted publication; it was felt by some that the price (\$119 for members, \$169 for non-members) is too high and that it would negatively impact the accessibility and uptake of the report's recommendations. Particular concerns were regarding the ability of small municipalities, non-profit associations and community groups to purchase the document. The STSC and PSC members communicated with the TAC secretariat regarding these concerns. It was noted that the sale price was determined in accordance with the existing Board-approved pricing strategy. Mr. Covelli added that the UTC and its Standing Committees have had discussions in the past about the benefits of making publications available for free or at a price that is low and promotes wider circulation and visibility among practitioners (a key goal for much of the research work that is undertaken by the Standing Committees), and that the discussion on the Active Transportation publication was the latest one. He invited UTC members to share their comments and questions.

M. Gravel remarked that TAC publications are priced in accordance with the existing Board-approved policy. The policy is part of TAC's current business model that aims at keeping membership fees as low as possible and to charge members and customers for products and services according to user pay principles. Consequently, publications are sold based on their estimated intellectual value.

A. Rajotte observed that the real issue is not the price of the Active Transportation document; the main concern is that some funding partners had an impression that the final report would be available for free. He noted there needs to be a discussion at the start with the project sponsors about the recommended publication format, the estimated sale price and the target audience. M. Gravel agreed and noted that when the next version of the sponsored project model documentation is prepared, that documentation should discuss whose role it is to establish the sale price and that the price has to satisfy the Board-approved policy.

P. Tremblay remarked that TAC's mission is to connect knowledge and people. These projects are funded by public money and final deliverables should be as accessible as possible, especially to students and non-profit associations. If priced highly, these documents won't be used by people who need them the most.

Mr. Tremblay suggested that the dissemination of final reports as PDF documents could be built into the project budget upfront. He remarked that in the past TAC used to provide research reports for free but that doesn't seem to be the case anymore. M. Gravel thanked P. Tremblay for his comments, adding that if sponsors are prepared to provide some additional funds to the project budget to cover the potential revenue from sales, this could be part of the solution. Other options are to increase awareness of particular topics by offering free primers on publications. He encouraged Council members to think of additional possible solutions.

D. Mulligan remarked that we should have primers for every TAC publication. S. Wells noted this may be considered by the Secretariat and added that the cost of preparing primers is not part of the sponsored project budgets.

R. Fung noted that some projects, such as the Green Guide for Roads, have money set aside for contingency. He asked what would happen with those funds if they are not spent during the project development. M. Gravel noted that it's rare for projects to have left-over funds for various reasons, including that sometimes unforeseen costs come up at the last minute; for example, translation costs can be higher than originally estimated. S. Wells remarked that surplus funds are offered back to the sponsors, who often choose to direct the funds to another TAC project(s). R. Fung inquired if those funds could offset the estimated publication revenue. S. Wells remarked that's something that the Board would have to discuss.

G. Noxon observed that the publication policy is shortsighted and it does not truly reflect the value of the publication's intellectual property. For example, if the Active Transportation project cost \$100,000 and the document's sales revenue is \$20,000, what is its intellectual property? He added that TAC is not fulfilling its role in technical knowledge dissemination to the extent possible.

Mr. Gravel agreed that it's hard to pin down a publication's intellectual value, adding that TAC's publications are often priced lower than what some other organizations would charge for similar reports.

Members observed that reports such as the one on active transportation are about social change and the intention is to put them into the hands of as many people as possible. A. Rajotte suggested that there could be a price range for each publication to match the target audience; for example, non-profit associations and students would pay a lower price for some reports.

A question was raised whether TAC's documents have reserve funds set up to help cover future updates of those documents. M. Gravel remarked that a couple of publications have reserve funds: the Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads, and the Guide for the Design of Roadway Lighting. Reserve funds are set up for projects that have total costs \$200,000 or more.

L. Woo remarked that the intellectual value of the document has to be balanced against the market as well as the target audience. She cautioned TAC not to make its products inaccessible and noted that agencies can get together and carry out projects without TAC's framework.

T. Oommen asked if there are any rules of thumb regarding estimated revenues from a publication vs. the total cost of a project. M. Gravel remarked that there aren't any rules of thumb and that the TAC secretariat cannot say with confidence how many copies of any publication would be sold.

G. Noxon remarked that the Urban Transportation Council was not consulted when the current pricing policy was prepared. It's strongly recommended that Councils be involved in the development of the next policy.

M. Gravel remarked that it'll be Board's decision on whether the pricing policy will be revisited and how it may be reviewed and revised.

Council members agreed by motion to ask the Board of Directors to review and revise the current publication pricing policy so that publications will be more accessible to a broad audience. Council members also agreed by motion to ask the Board to consider offering student pricing and student version of some of the publications. This will be communicated as part of the Chair's report on UTC activities at the Board meeting on April 18, 2011.

Action 3: C. Covelli

6. Review of Updated Progress Measurement Matrix

The updated Progress Measurement Matrix (**see Attachment #2**) was circulated to Council members via email prior to this meeting. The Matrix was updated with information from the Standing Committees regarding their completed, ongoing and planned activities. C. Covelli remarked that the existing Matrix covers the time frame up to 2012 and that the Council and Standing Committees will start looking at refreshing and revisiting priorities starting this fall. Mr. Covelli asked Council members for any comments or questions.

W. Richardson remarked that the Matrix should capture the fact that collaboration agreements with ACT Canada and CIP have been finalized. The Transportation Finance Standing Committee's work on the latest briefing should also be captured. All agreed with that the Matrix should be updated with these recommended changes.

Action 4: K. Cvetkovic

7. Reports from Standing Committees

a) Sustainable Transportation Standing Committee

Audra Jones, Chair of the Sustainable Transportation Standing Committee (STSC), delivered an update on the STSC activities and projects (**see Attachment #3**). She noted that STSC members and friends continue to be actively engaged in the committee's work.

A. Jones remarked that this year there were only two submissions for the Sustainable Urban Transportation (SUT) Award. For the past few years this award has seen between 4 and 7 submissions annually. This doesn't mean there is cause for alarm since this year may be an anomaly. However, Mrs. Jones noted that the nomination process can be onerous and the STSC may bring forward some recommendations on simplifying the process. One option would be to introduce a step for nominees to first submit short abstracts to the review panel. The panel would then determine which nominees should be invited to submit more detailed submissions for another round of evaluations. The addition of the abstract was introduced a few years ago to the Environmental Achievement Award nominations process.

A. Jones briefly summarized a project that STSC is discussing as a possible new sponsored project, titled Moving Smarter: Exploring Solutions For Canadian Cities. Governments across Canada are setting aggressive targets for energy and greenhouse gas reductions. This project will help participating municipalities identify locally relevant approaches to meet these targets. The project would enable sharing and leveraging the work already being undertaken by many Canadian cities. The project has a unique approach to its methodology; it would solicit participation from up to ten municipalities across Canada, representing a variety of geographies and sizes of urban areas. The project would rely heavily on the participation of municipal staff. This framework would allow exploration of innovative approaches without constraints of public or political processes.

P. Tremblay asked whether these municipalities would have to contribute funds to participate in the project, and asked why the recommended number of participating municipalities is ten. B. Hollingsworth confirmed that there would be some cost to municipalities to participate. The idea of having ten municipalities involved is to ensure a manageable number of participants who can engage in discussion and information exchange effectively and efficiently.

A. Jones added that the STSC will continue working on the "Moving Smarter" project scope and methodology over the summer. The project description will be presented to the Council this fall for endorsement. A. Jones added that this project idea will also be discussed at the Climate Change Task Force meeting this April.

A. Jones asked the Council if it is appropriate to begin circulating the written draft of the “Moving Smarter” project proposal to garner the interest of municipalities. All agreed that, as long as the description notes it’s for discussion purposes only and that the project idea has not yet been approved by the Urban Transportation Council and the Board of Directors, it is not a problem to circulate the draft project description.

b) Transportation Planning and Research Standing Committee

Don Stephens, Chair of the Transportation Planning and Research Standing Committee (TPRSC), delivered an overview of the TPRSC work program (see **Attachment #4**). He focused his update on three projects that are seeking funding:

- Investigating the Potential For Truck Lanes in Urban Areas
- Changing Practices in the Data Collection on the Movement of People
- Design and Implementation of Public Transit Services – Guidelines for Communities.

At the TPRSC meeting, members agreed that peer-to-peer communication on the benefits of these projects and opportunities to participate can be quite helpful in garnering additional funding, and such communication was encouraged. The TAC Secretariat will also continue seeking funds for these sponsored projects.

Mr. Stephens noted that the Workshop Materials on the Best Practices for Technical Delivery of Long-Term Transportation Planning Studies project was underway with direction being provided by the project steering committee. The project steering committee launched the project and the first meeting was held with the consultant team as part of these Spring Meetings.

D. Stephens added that the TPRSC is having discussions on the project description for the Urban Transportation Indicators Fifth Survey sponsored project. These discussions are being led by Pierre Tremblay. The urban transportation indicators survey series has resulted in popular and useful reports over the years. The time is now to plan for the fifth survey, given that it will be based on the 2011 Census data. Mr. Stephens added that the TPRSC plans to bring forward a project description for the UTI Fifth Survey project to the Council for endorsement this September.

Mr. Stephens also noted that the TPRSC members are engaged in the committee’s work and that there is strong and growing participation from friends of the committee.

c) Transportation Finance Standing Committee

Neal Irwin remarked that Doug Floyd, Chair of the Transportation Finance Standing Committee (TFSC), was unable to attend these spring meetings and that, in Mr. Floyd’s absence, he chaired the TFSC meeting. The meeting was very well attended, with about 16 people present.

Mr. Irwin noted that the TFSC membership has recently been re-energized. At the September 2010 meeting two working groups were formed so that they can focus on two separate efforts:

- Investigate the case for consistent and sustainable funding and why it would be beneficial to our society,
- Investigate common challenges faced by large urban areas in terms of transit/transportation funding. Agencies such as Metrolinx, TransLink, AMT and the Halifax Regional Municipality would lead these discussions.

At their April 2011 meeting, the TFSC members reviewed a draft paper prepared by one of the working groups that focused on the case for consistent and sustainable funding for urban and regional transportation in Canada. The TFSC members had a productive discussion and made a range of suggestions on expanding and revising the draft document. As part of those discussions, two relevant reports were also discussed at the meeting; they may be of interest to the UTC members as well:

- “Paying Our Way: A New Framework for Transportation Finance” by the US National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission (February 2009).
- “Funding Surface Transportation in Minnesota: Past, Present and Prospects” by the Center for Transportation Studies, University of Minnesota (January 2010).

It was agreed that the TFSC working group should continue to develop the paper and turn it into a briefing. Various funding mechanisms would be described in it but not rated. The briefing would also emphasize that more than one source of funding is needed. Mr. Irwin remarked that the cost for developing this briefing would be minimal since it’s a volunteer effort. Furthermore, if it’s only available on the TAC website and not printed, the costs would be negligible. Mr. Irwin added that the working group will strive to have the final draft of the briefing ready for the September 2011 meeting of the Transportation Finance Standing Committee, where it’ll be discussed in detail. Based on that discussion the briefing would be finalized and brought forward to the Council for approval in April 2012.

On behalf of the Council, C. Covelli thanked A. Jones, D. Stephens and N. Irwin for updates on their standing committees and thanked all committee members and friends for their work.

8. Update on Green Guide for Roads Project in Progress

Rico Fung, Co-Chair of the Green Guide for Roads Project Steering Committee, noted that the project is moving along well. The MMM Group (with Ecoplans and McCormick Rankin as lead consultant firms) was hired in January 2011 to conduct the work. Since then the steering committee members and consultants have held monthly teleconferences and meet at TAC spring and fall meetings. The final report is scheduled to be submitted for review and approval in April 2012. R. Fung remarked that the Council received two documents on the Green Guide for Roads (GGFR) as part of the information package sent prior to this April meeting. One document is titled “Approach to Preparing TAC’s Green Guide for Roads” and the other is a PowerPoint presentation that delivers the project development overview and also serves as a marketing tool. He invited members to

review this material at their convenience, available as background documents at:
<http://tac-atc.ca/english/projects/greenguide.cfm>

Some Council members noted that the Green Guide for Roads seems to focus on roadway projects; however, sustainability efforts affect the entire network or transportation system. R. Fung remarked that the project steering committee members have had discussions on this matter and agreed that the focus should be at the project level. S. Saiyed, member of the GGFR steering committee, added that there are a few sustainability objectives within the GGFR that tie these projects to transportation systems, such as improving integration within community planning. R. Fung remarked that he'll inform the GGFR steering committee that this question was raised at the Council meeting.

Mr. Fung asked if the agenda for the Council meeting in Edmonton could accommodate a more detailed update on the Green Guide for Roads. C. Covelli agreed it's a great idea to have more time to discuss the project in September and thanked Mr. Fung for his update.

9. Approval of Summary Report on Quantifying and Forecasting Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Urban Passenger Transportation Workshop

Geoff Noxon, Noxon Associates, delivered an overview of the report that summarizes a TAC workshop on quantifying and forecasting greenhouse gas emissions from urban passenger transportation. He facilitated the workshop and wrote the summary report that was circulated to the Council on April 1, 2011 for approval.

The one-day workshop took place in March 2010 and was prepared as a sponsored project of the Sustainable Transportation Standing Committee. The purpose was to exchange ideas and knowledge and not to reach consensus on quantifying and forecasting greenhouse gases. Mr. Noxon added that the workshop discussions are relevant to a couple of UTC projects that are being discussed as potential new sponsored projects.

C. Covelli noted that the UTC Executive has read the report this summer and didn't have any suggestions for changes. The report needs approval from the Council before TAC can publish it on its website. Mr. Covelli asked Council members if they approve the document for publication. Moved by N. Irwin and seconded that the report be approved by Council for release. Motion carried. K. Cvetkovic will inform the Council and its Standing Committees when the report becomes available as a free download.

Action 5: K. Cvetkovic

10. Updates from Other TAC Councils and Task Forces on Ongoing Activities

- **Climate Change Task Force**

G. Vincent and J. Stephen, Urban Transportation Council representatives on the Climate Change Task Force (CCTF), delivered a report on the CCTF activities (**see Attachment #5**). It was noted that the CCTF mandate ends in April 2012 and that CCTF members are currently discussing the future of the Task Force. A. Rajotte remarked that TAC members

need to be up to date on issues and news related to climate change, and that collecting and summarizing this information could be the CCTF mandate, going forward. C. Covelli added that the Task Force should also consider whether it could have a bigger role within TAC as compared to the role it has had for the past few years.

P. Tremblay asked if the carbon trade systems, and funding they may be able to generate for transportation projects, are the way of the future. G. Vincent noted that he'll raise it with the Task Force for discussion.

- **Smaller Municipalities Program**

K. Becking, Chair of the TAC Smaller Municipalities Program (SMP), delivered a presentation on the SMP history, achievements and current issues and objectives (see **Attachment #6**).

The SMP's focus is on providing a forum for information gathering and exchange of experiences and practices. The Program was created around 2002 and since then it has organized numerous panel discussions and events as part of TAC's annual conferences. The Program was particularly successful from 2005 to 2008 but then in 2009 and 2010 it lost some of its momentum and membership.

One of the questions often asked of the SMP is if there is a definition of a small municipality. Mr. Becking noted that the SMP does not have a formal definition of a small municipality, adding that a municipality's population size is not necessarily the distinguishing factor. He remarked however that in his opinion municipalities with 70,000 to 150,000 residents would very much benefit from more involvement with TAC. Small municipalities tend to be more remote, they lack financial capability of the larger organizations, don't necessarily attract significant support from senior governments and often don't have large staff resources. However, they have to follow the same rules and regulations and face the same or similar challenges as large municipalities.

Mr. Becking remarked that the SMP was "governed" by a Small Municipalities Task Force; this is now likely to change and be called a "working group" or perhaps a standing committee. The Program has an active working group right now that will spend the next few months formalizing the SMP roles and objectives, developing the terms of reference and continuing to build relationships within TAC. One of the goals of the SMP will be to broaden the participation of small municipalities, through the identification of common issues and areas of interest with a program to assist municipalities facing many similar challenges. The Small Municipalities Program is also organizing an event for the TAC 2011 Conference in Edmonton.

Mr. Becking added that small municipalities represent an untapped source of membership for TAC. B. Clement agreed and remarked that TAC has a wealth of information that would be of interest to small municipalities. We should investigate what they need and in what format and strive to make that information available.

P. Tremblay inquired whether small municipalities that are part of large urban areas are different than the typical small municipalities that Mr. Becking was referring to. Mr. Becking noted that it depends on the level of dialogue and information exchange these “close-by” municipalities have with each other as well as with the senior level of government.

C. Covelli thanked Mr. Becking for his presentation and remarked that the Urban Transportation Council will continue being interested in the work of the Small Municipalities Program as well as opportunities for collaboration.

- **Council Chairs’ Meetings and Teleconferences**

Mr. Covelli remarked that the Chairs of TAC Councils and the Climate Change Task Force have made efforts to meet via teleconference since the September 2010 meeting. Some of the topics discussed by the Chairs include projects and activities of common interest, creation of the 511 Task Force, publication pricing policy, and definition of sustainable transportation for use by TAC. Mr. Covelli remarked that the Environment Council plans to prepare a draft definition of sustainable transportation in the near future and bring it forward to other Councils for discussion. Mr. Sheflin remarked that developing a definition of sustainability or sustainable transportation is not an easy task and has been tried many times before. He recommended that an existing definition, for example that by the Bruntland Commission on sustainable development, be used or adapted instead.

Mr. Covelli remarked that there was also a breakfast meeting of Council Chairs with the TAC President just before today’s UTC meeting commenced. These meetings and teleconferences create opportunities for information exchange and are appreciated by all Council Chairs.

11. UTC Nominations for TAC Awards

C. Covelli highlighted the descriptions of the Award for Service and the Distinguished Service Award (available at: <http://tac-atc.ca/english/awards/tacawards/index.cfm>)

He remarked that so far the Council Executive has not received any nominations for the Award for Service from the Council or Standing Committees. The Executive will also be considering the ongoing work and contribution of its current members in preparing any recommendations from the UTC Executive. Mr. Covelli added that the nomination for Tom AppaRao has been submitted for the Distinguished Service Award, and it’s supported by the Sustainable Transportation and the Transportation Planning and Research Standing Committees. The Distinguished Service Award has to be recommended to the Board by one of Board members, and Gary Welsh has agreed bring Tom’s name forward as well as any other names identified by the UTC or its Executive on behalf of the Urban Transportation Council. All Council members expressed their support for nominating Mr. AppaRao for the Distinguished Service Award.

Action 6: G. Welsh

Mr. Covelli invited members to bring forward any additional nominations they may have by the end of this meeting.

12. Update on Metrolinx's Key Activities, Successes and Challenges

Leslie Woo, VP Policy and Planning at Metrolinx, delivered an overview of Metrolinx, currently the third largest transit operator in North America (**see Attachment 7a**). Metrolinx was created in 2006 for the purposes of providing residents and business of the Greater Toronto Hamilton Area with a transportation system that is modern, efficient and integrated. It's an agency of the Government of Ontario and it includes GO Transit, Presto and the Airport Rail Link. Mrs. Woo spoke of the 25-year integrated transportation master plan for the region, the Big Move, and how projects are prioritized via a multi-step process. L. Woo added that Metrolinx will have to present its investment strategy in June 2013; it'll call for \$2 billion per year over 25 years. She noted that one of the big challenges is winning the public's support for proposed revenue tools. M. Sheflin remarked that the public is often against a general tax and is much more likely to support a dedicated tax for a particular cause.

D. Cook asked if Metrolinx is looking at the "last mile solutions". Mrs. Woo remarked that the agency is engaging in more discussion with local transit operators, promoting integrated fare structure, examining TDM measures and also looking into using smaller buses.

P. Tremblay asked about implementation of bicycle parking. L. Woo noted that the agency has started implementing bike shelters and locking stations and also plans to have better connections to bike trails.

It was also noted that changes within the political landscape can significantly affect the goals and objectives of an organization such as Metrolinx.

L. Woo remarked that Metrolinx has just completed the GTHA Urban Freight Study, available on the Metrolinx website, at <http://www.metrolinx.com/>. The study identifies opportunities to enhance the GTHA's competitiveness by improving freight efficiency and capacity. It complements the Ontario-Quebec Continental Gateway work being undertaken as a partnership between the Federal Government and Ontario and Quebec. Findings show that there is very little data except at the Region of Peel. As a result, the Peel's model is being used and applied to other communities.

L. Woo also noted that an electrification study on whether GO Transit should move from diesel to electric trains was recently completed; results are available on the Metrolinx website.

S. Damp asked if ITS is being used for schedule coordination. Mrs. Woo remarked that the vision is to have a regional trip planner. The agency is working with MTO and Ryerson University on testing different platforms and frameworks that would deliver improved interactive traveler information.

L. Woo delivered another presentation (see **Attachment 7b**) on the Mobility Hub Guidelines, which are available on the Metrolinx website.

C. Covelli thanked Mrs. Woo for her very informative presentation.

13. Overview of the Association for Commuter Transportation's Goals, Objectives and Opportunities for Collaboration

Sharon Lewinson, President of the Association for Commuter Transportation (ACT) Canada, delivered an overview of the association's objectives and activities (see **Attachment #8**). ACT Canada was launched in 2001 as a forum for transportation demand management. Since then the membership has grown steadily and the focus has expanded to sustainable mobility. Since 2007, ACT Canada has held very successful annual summits and workshops across the country, focused on building sustainable mobility capacity in the host city. This year's Sustainable Mobility Summit will take place in Vancouver from October 30 to November 2. Mrs. Lewinson remarked that ACT Canada is pleased to have a collaboration agreement in place with TAC and that the association is looking forward to working with the Urban Transportation Council on information and knowledge exchange and strengthening the partnership.

14. Overview of the National Capital Commission's Goals and Activities Regarding Urban Transportation

Marie Lemay, CEO of the National Capital Commission (NCC), delivered a presentation on sustainable mobility in the National Capital Region (see **Attachment #9**). NCC covers 13 municipalities and 2 cities, 2 provinces and a number of federal government departments. The key NCC's activities are planning, asset management, and animation and programming. Main activities regarding sustainable mobility include inter-provincial transit integration, interprovincial crossings, light rail, multi-purpose recreational trails and building connectivity.

Mrs. Lemay noted that NCC is also working on the Plan for Canada's Capital – Horizon 2067, of which sustainable mobility is the key pillar. She remarked that this year NCC representatives will travel across the country to get Canadians' input on this plan for the National Capital Region. Once finalized, the Plan may have to be approved by the Federal Government.

C. Covelli thanked Mrs. Lemay for her engaging presentation.

15. Overview of TAC Education and Human Resources Development Council's Ongoing and Planned Initiatives

Elaine Pond, Chair of the Education and Human Resources Development Council (EHRDC), delivered an overview of the EHRDC current and future activities (see **Attachment #10**). There are three committees that report to EHRDC: Student Outreach, Knowledge Management, and Skills Development and Awareness. Some of the key focus areas for EHRDC and its committees include:

- Recruitment and retention issues
- Improving knowledge management and sharing ideas
- Encouraging students to enter transportation engineering
- Improving public awareness of the importance of transportation

W. Richardson remarked that there is a leadership crisis facing Canada right now and things will get worse in coming years, and asked whether the EHRDC has done any work on that issue. Ms. Pond remarked that the Council members have not talked about this yet; the focus has been on student outreach. However, she'll take this comment back to EHRDC. W. Richardson noted that she'd be pleased to deliver a presentation on this topic to EHRDC if the Council is interested.

A. Rajotte noted that, in addition to engineers, the student outreach should also focus on students in fields of psychology, economics, etc. He added that TAC could create joint ventures with the academia and private sector and facilitate fast-track learning on key issues.

C. Covelli thanked Mrs. Pond for the overview of the Education and Human Resources Development Council and noted that the UTC looks forward to future updates and information exchange with her Council.

16. Update on the Canadian Urban Transit Association's 2040 Transit Vision

Mr. Patrick Leclerc, CUTA, was prepared to deliver an update on the Canadian Urban Transit Association's 2040 Transit Vision. Unfortunately, Mr. Leclerc was not able to attend the UTC meeting due to illness.

17. Roundtable Discussion

During the roundtable discussion, the UTC members shared their thoughts on some emerging issues and challenges; some of the highlights are captured below.

a) P. Tremblay noted that MTQ has put in place a new budgetary fund to cover all expenses related to surface transportation, including roads, transit and bikeways. This is provisioned by dedicated taxes and fees – principally gas tax, vehicle registration and driving licenses

Mr. Tremblay also noted that MTQ has started an effort to develop a permanent network of interregional trails for recreational vehicles (snowmobiles, all-terrain) in order to settle some of the "not in my backyard" disputes.

MTQ is accelerating its investments in the bicycle "Route Verte" facilities. The agency is also completing a two-year testing program for photo radars with the goal of better controlling vehicle speeds; related issues such as social acceptance and confidentiality issues are being investigated.

Mr. Tremblay added that the Quebec government has announced a new action plan for electric vehicles that includes rebates for purchases and financial support to develop the industry in Quebec for electric vehicle components (batteries) and transit vehicle manufacturing (metro, buses). The goal is for electric vehicles to represent 25% of sales of new vehicles on the road by 2020.

b) T. Oommen remarked that the Urban Transportation Task Force of the Council of Ministers Responsible for Transportation and Highway Safety is preparing a report on urban congestion and the role of transit on urban congestion. The report is scheduled to be delivered to the Ministers this fall. Mr. Alan Stillar, MTO, is the chair of the Urban Transportation Task Force.

c) D. McCusker noted that the Regional Municipality of Halifax is examining different funding and governance models for the Region, which includes the TransLink's model.

d) J. Stephen remarked that the City of Hamilton is still working on its amalgamation. The Pedestrian Master Plan is being started and the city is examining feasibility of light rail transit. Also, the GO Niagara Environmental Assessment will be completed soon and Hamilton is looking forward to the results, since two stations are being planned for Hamilton.

e) V. Chi remarked that the City of Ottawa is implementing portions of its LRT project, which is the biggest capital project ever in city's history. This year the city also received a substantial budget for cycling needs and facilities. The City has focused its resources on safe cycling and safe infrastructure, particularly in the downtown area. The city in this respect is implementing a segregated bike lane through the downtown (Laurier Avenue) which will move to construction this year and open later this year. Also, Ottawa's pedestrian plan is on the website for anyone who wishes to have a look.

f) F. Major remarked that Montreal has examined the infrastructure renewal needs and costs for the next decade and determined that significant funds are needed to carry out the work. He added that the modal shift is taking place in Montreal, with increased use of transit and bicycling. The city is also working to make better integration of transportation with land use at the local and regional levels. Mr. Major added that the senior levels of government are contributing significant funds for new projects but still more money is needed.

g) G. Vincent noted that the Region of Waterloo has a goal of tripling the use of transit by 2031. The agency is also initiating an active transportation master plan.

h) D. Bergeron noted that the Agence Metropolitaine de transport (AMT) is about to launch a 10-year strategic plan and is conducting public consultations. The AMT will be investing \$1.25 billion in the development of the network over the next three years. AMT has also added new funds, about \$15 million per year from taxes, to their investment funds. AMT has a major new project that involved purchasing 500 new subway cars. AMT plans to further improve its subway network. The agency has also recently purchased 160 new railway cars. Mr. Bergeron noted that the agency is planning the next

evolution of the smart card system. Furthermore, the agency is also building new bus rapid transit.

i) L. Woo remarked that Metrolinx has achieved 61% ownership of its corridors. Also, the agency is consolidating its intelligent transportation controls into one control centre.

j) G. Welsh remarked that the City of Toronto has been doing a lot of work with Metrolinx. Toronto also has a new pedestrian plan and walking strategy, available on the agency's website. In May, Toronto plans to implement the BIXI program and it expects it'll be a success.

The City of Toronto is conducting a major review on how it delivers its programs and services. The agency is looking at contracting some of its services, such as garbage collection.

Mr. Welsh remarked that the residents of Toronto want more choice on how to get around and also want better transit. Mr. Welsh added that the past mayor was a leader on climate change issues but that focus has shifted with the election of the new mayor.

k) D. Cook remarked that the City of Saskatoon has a new transportation master plan.

l) D. Duncan remarked that CentrePort Canada is Manitoba's mid-continent trade corridor initiative and is the first inland port. It's a major development based on a comprehensive transportation, infrastructure and land-use plan, focused around Winnipeg's James Armstrong Richardson International Airport. Manitoba is also focusing on active transportation; about \$20 million in funding from three levels of government was secured for active transportation initiatives to be implemented in one year. Work is still ongoing.

Mr. Duncan also remarked on a couple of City of Winnipeg's projects, including the development of a transportation master plan and a rapid bus system (first leg is from downtown to University of Manitoba).

m) A. Jones remarked that the City of Edmonton has an approved transportation master plan. The city has recently used Expert Choice software to help prioritize projects; it was an interesting experience to utilize this software. Edmonton is working on its LRT extensions. It is also decommissioning the local city airport and is reviewing consultants' proposal for that job. Some of these proposals are quite innovative and focus on sustainability. Mrs. Jones added that Edmonton is proceeding cautiously with its bike plan. Also, the downtown bike master plan is being developed.

n) D. Mulligan remarked that the City of Calgary is conducting transportation impact assessments. Focus is also being placed on complete streets fundamentals. Calgary has also been approving roundabouts for intersection control in new developments; in general, roundabouts are now being considered before signalized intersections.

Calgary is extending its two LRT lines. It's also expanding the airport in a major way; the capacity will likely double and the project costs about \$2 billion. Mr. Mulligan added that Calgary has a new mayor who's aligned with the city's direction of sustainable transportation.

18. TAC Conference in Edmonton, September 8-14, 2011: Agenda items for Council Meeting

C. Covelli remarked that the next UTC meeting will take place in Edmonton as part of the TAC 2011 Annual Conference, September 8-14.

Mr. Covelli noted that, in addition to receiving regular updates, the UTC meeting agenda will include a detailed update on the Green Guide for Roads project in progress as well as an overview of the City of Edmonton's key transportation initiatives, successes and challenges. Mr. Covelli invited Council members to suggest additional agenda items. G. Vincent remarked that it would be interesting to have presentations on investment strategies and financing of urban transportation at future Council meetings. A. Stewart noted that a presentation on the commodity flow and goods movement in Canada in the urban context is a topic that should be revisited. D. Mulligan suggested that the roundtable discussion could be placed earlier on the agenda and have more time allocated to it.

Mr. Covelli thanked members for their suggestions and invited them to provide additional suggestions for the September 2011 meeting agenda.

Action 7: UTC members

19. Summation & Closing Remarks

C. Covelli thanked all members for their participation in discussions and their involvement in the Council activities and projects. He added that the April 2011 meetings have been excellent overall and that Standing Committees continue to be very engaged and productive. His report to the Board of Directors will highlight these discussions and achievements, including the new collaboration agreements with ACT Canada and CIP, the reinvigoration of the Transportation Finance Standing Committee, and the Council members' discussion on the publication pricing policy.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Secretary: K. Cvetkovic
Date Distributed: June 6, 2011
Revisions made: June 14, 2011