EDMONTON TRANSIT SYSTEM ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING #4, APRIL 29, 2013
HERITAGE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT: John Vandenbeld, Izak Roux, Christopher Dulaba, Bruce Robertson, Cristina L. Stasia, Amy Mannix, Shannah Sutherland, Vaughan Hoy, John Hayes, Leanne Landry, Anand Pye, Gordon Smith, Stu Litwinowich (ATU Local 569)

ABSENT: None

ETS AND CITY STAFF: Councillor Don Iveson, Dennis Nowicki (Director of Community Relations), Vicki Luxton (Recording Secretary)

1. CALL TO ORDER

- V. Hoy called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

2. CAPITAL REGION BOARD PRESENTATION (COUNCILLOR DON IVESON)

- *Highlights:*
  - Councillor Iveson who is Chair of the Regional Transit Committee made a presentation (attached) to the ETSAB members on the Regional Transit Plan.
  - Qu*estions/Comments:*
  - *(AM) I have a question about the collaborative nature of this, have you ensured that the focus has stayed on the passenger experience?* The second point is what the business case is designed to do whether there is actual value. Do you achieve efficiencies? Are you able to leverage new sources of revenue more efficiently? And can you generate ridership at least from a revenue point of view is an indicator that the passengers are appreciative and supportive of what you are doing? I would say we get the passenger experience less directly and the value for money more directly with the stage we are at in the study. If there is no financial value, and that is a key question for every municipality that has put money on the table to study this, is this going to work out better in the long run financially and if it does not we are not going anywhere. As far as the rider's experience, I think at the high level what we would hope is you have a better service across the region and our case for more LRT is stronger when we are going out with our partners. And we are more likely to get more of it if we have regional allies when we are going out and asking for it. It is the region going out and asking for more LRT rather than Edmonton going out and asking for more LRT. But there could be some changes because if it makes sense for Edmonton and St. Albert to look at interlining their services more surgically, then you might see the opportunity for Edmontonians to get on express buses that they cannot access right now. That could be an improvement to service and on the flip side if you are in St. Albert and find yourself over time expected to make a transfer whereas historically you have not had to make a transfer. There would be winners and losers and the question would be overall are you delivering a better transit service that is moving more

people. Mode shift would be the ultimate measure of this.

- *(JH) Being that it is a provincial animal moving forward, if there is a Calgarian regional structure do you see this as a provincial impetus to get both of them moving forward rather than just one city and the other one not?* It is more complicated than just transit because the same question is being asked as CRB tries to work out some of its kinks. Calgary is going through the same stuff but with different fractures. In both cases, more so here, transit is seen as something people can work positively toward in spite of disagreements over land use because they all want a share of development. But they realize if they can have some share of development they recognize they need someone to come in and help pay for the transit service to connect their new development to existing amenities and employment. There are two ways to hear your question, one may we get stymied if Calgary goes and does something different? Yes if we bogged down. On the other hand, I think as long as we keep a good pace of work, Calgary will keep looking to us. We have been in touch with them and they have seen our documentation and they are following closely. So at this point I think we are leading them and we will be likely to set the mould and they will follow. The Municipal Affairs Minister's flavour right now is not to interfere – work it out yourselves. Meanwhile, there are opportunities to work together with Calgary, for example. Calgary Transit was looking at a Smart Card system and it fell through and what we are hoping and I have talked to a few people is that if our procurement is looking good and we will do what we want there might be an opportunity for either their region or the City of Calgary to jump on that procurement, double the size of it and maybe get better value as a team and then riders could use the same system in either city. And eventually there is high speed rail then it is a no brainer to use that system for high speed rail and move on a better provincial transportation system.
- *(JV) I am encouraged about the study receiving some consultation, I was wondering if there are any plans long term to have an advisory board like ETSAB for the capital region transit? Is there some involvement our Board could have in terms of the Capital Region? Second question, I am wondering if you had considered bus rapid transit as an alternative to LRT in some of the inter-municipal transit?* On the first question we have made a shift so all of the meetings of the Capital Region Board committees and the Board itself are now public, we still go as Council in private to do anything really juicy. Even though the meetings became public, until it got to final recommendations we will still be negotiating in private. But anyone can attend those meetings and they are posted on the CRB web site. We are making one step forward by no longer meeting in private. But as far as setting up an advisory board at this point because the relationship is more discussion-based and diplomatic, it is not a decision-making board, the feeling at the time was until we are a decision-making body and once you have a commission, you would want to have advisory committees, and have folks approving your communications and public engagement. The second technical question about bus rapid transit, we have not used these words per se but just recently Strathcona County has asked about looking at their line on that map as a BRT either as a precursor so that they can actually get it in the next thirty years or looking at whether that is a better solution for them. The question has just been raised by one of the members but in the long term planning is always assumed we were being aspirational in wanting LRT - hoping that if you had

regional buy-in, because everyone sees themselves included in the investment, that you could muster the regional consensus and all three regions of government to invest in the main technology. We did not want to look at a fallback scenario publicly. Now Strathcona is asking about that fallback.

- *(LL) Edmonton has a limited tax base, not like Calgary that has a large tax base to draw on to work for their system, do you think we are getting adequate compensation from our bedroom communities to fund not only transit but roads infrastructure. Because you look at the majority of the communities that the people commute to Edmonton to work, I am just wondering if you think we are getting adequate compensation?* Yes and no as it is complicated I would say as Chair of the Capital Region Board but as a Councillor I would say no. But it is how do we fix that is either through forced amalgamation, we take over their tax base which has unintended consequences. Right off the bat you have to absorb administrations, you have major political and administrative transitions so that might be a good long term play but it is not easy to do and is not straight forward and it may or may not be necessary. Again the minister is saying can you work these things out yourselves. And there are a number of municipalities in the last couple of years who between their counties and towns have worked out tax sharing agreements for meaningful tax sharing, saying okay, we are all really one economy – lets share the spoils appropriately.
- *(VH) Will commuter rail with its existing corridors allow some outlying transportation network to use their existing corridors to get LRT?* Yes, if you could get the railroads to do that which is low on their priorities around freight. If they are abandoned but I think most of them are still active, which is issue number 1. Issue number 2 is that LRT supports in the shaded [Priority Growth] area, and the rationale is that growth is better if it is contiguous and if it is proximate to employment and if it is proximate to amenities. So that is why you do not have leap-frogging out to areas that are not growth nodes. If you wanted to work with the railroad and you wanted to make it your top priority you probably could put commuter rail out to some of the other communities further out but then you've just undermined the premises of the land use plan. If you were pessimistic and said you were not going to get the LRT done in that period of time what other quick wins could you do in the mean time? You might still look at heavy rail within this for example the connection to the airport and Leduc which is a growth area and goes through this land we are talking about assuming annexing from the County of Leduc. There is a lot of talk right now if we annex we can get the LRT to the airport but I have never understood that this would be a good technology because it will take an hour to make the trip and cost billions of dollars to run it.
- *(AM) How long do you think before we have a new payment system just given the fact the Province does not have any money to spend, how many years away*? If everything goes to plan I think it could be in place in 2015. The procurement and implementation would be two to three years, but if we could get it done in two it would be sometime in 2015. Green Trip is strapped and the Province's commitment to it long term is uncertain but it is a $ 30 million project, $ 10 million of Municipal money actually identified so it is a really easy win for the Province to say yea regional collaboration, yea transit and we think there is a way to move around some Green Trip money that they have already announced. *If not would the City of Edmonton be doing it themselves?* We would have to ask our neighbours to see if they would want to chip in too. If you are putting in 33 cent

dollars then the pay back is really good but 100 cent dollars the pay back is still there it is just longer and probably still worth doing. But if the Province said no, we have just assumed that would say yes to Green Trip but you could probably still put a case together at least in Edmonton for moving ahead with it.

- *(IR) – Do you foresee that your system planning including the Smart Card will hand shake with other operators to continue that service?* The Smart Card service should be scalable, that would be one of the premises of procurement. Who you would let into the system is always a choice but the opportunity is there. If we do not consolidate into some kind of regional transit commission and over time Leduc bought its own buses and started running its own system they could opt in and you could hand over the access to what they call the back of house – all the technology and protocols and issue them readers on a fee for service basis. It is all negotiable and scalable that way. It would be a choice to do that and we did get that question from Redwater who was looking to set up a qausi-private bus service. It would be a choice to do that and trusting that person with your brand, but there would be no technical barrier.
- Councillor Iveson was thanked for his attendance at the meeting.

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

MOVED: by J.Vandenbeld/L. Landry to approve the agenda.	**CARRIED**	Agenda Approved

4. REVIEW OF MARCH 25, 2013 MEETING MINUTES

MOVED: A. Pye/C. Stasia approve the March 25, 2013 minutes.	**CARRIED**	Minutes Approved

5. PROPOSED NEW POLICY GOVERNING CIVIC AGENCIES

- ETSAB comments need to be sent to V. Gunderson, Office of the City Clerk, by May 2nd.
- Discussion followed on the No. 14 – *Conditional Support Comment*.
  - J. Hayes stated that ETSAB members were quite concerned about the fact that right now ETSAB's mandate is such that the members can generate ideas and bring them forward and then take them to the Transportation Committee (TC) but the way this reads is that it is not a function that ETSAB could do from here on. This says the advisory committee's structure is where Council wishes to receive citizen feedback on an issue they will be making a policy decision, and that is essentially the whole function of an advisory committee as defined here. J. Hayes stated that narrowly interpreted this could mean that ETSAB does nothing unless ETSAB receives direction from Council to reply to it. J. Hayes is concerned that a narrow interpretation might be made at some time if ETSAB says something that is not particularly popular. ETSAB's role is to represent the citizens of Edmonton to Council and TC. J. Hayes is not saying this is going to happen but it certainly provides no leverage for a future ETSAB to come and say no, ETSAB's members want to talk about this. There is no flexibility on that.
  - A decision was made by the members to reword the comment as follows: "Where Council wishes to receive citizen feedback on an issue where Council will be making a policy decision, or where the advisory committee wishes to present information to Council which it believes is of importance to the City of Edmonton."

MOVED by: C. Stasia/J. Hayes to amend Bylaw Comment No. 14.	**CARRIED**	Motion Approved

6. MANAGER'S REPORT (D. NOWICKI)

- *Highlights*
  - Customer Satisfaction Surveys:
    - D. Nowicki circulated some reports to ETSAB members on both the regular and DATS services earlier in April. Question to ETSAB members "Would ETSAB like to see a presentation on either or both of the reports in the near future?" J. Vandenbeld commented that it is important to get riders feedback. D. Nowicki stated that this has been done in other surveys but this is an element that ETS always follows up on.
  - June Sign-up:
    - This begins on June 30th through August 31, 2013. The main elements of the June sign-up are:
      - Cancellation of school trips and school routes for the summer months.
      - Seasonal reduction of some regular service for the summer months.
      - Preparation of schedules for K Days and Canada Day.
  - Transit Service Review RFP:
    - RFP to select a Consultant closed today.
    - Project Schedule as stated in proposed RFP:
      - Review of current state and environmental scan – June 30
      - Phase 1 Governance and Fare Structure Review – August 31
      - Phase 2 Draft Project Report – January 31, 2014
      - Final Project Report – March 31, 2014
  - Edmonton Transit System Changes to Organization:
    - L. Stewart is taking on the role of interim Director of Technology and Project Delivery within Edmonton Transit for a period of up to 12 months.
    - ETS reviewing its organizational structure; major driver is technology.
    - Possible additional changes.
  - Transportation Committeee May 1:
    - Two reports going to TC on May 1st: NW LRT Concept Plan and Remembrance Day Service.
  - Accessibility Audit Stakeholder Meeting:
    - May 21, 2013 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm at DATS – Percy Wickman Garage. Two ETSAB members volunteered to attend the Stakeholder Meeting: C. Stasia and G. Smith.

7. ETSAB PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR 2013

- **Marketing Standing Sub-Committee (J. Vandenbeld)**:
  - This committee met with P. Waisman of Business Development and discussed the items on the Transit to the Airport Report, working with other sub-committees to increase the level of white papers and other communications on ETSAB City web site, as well as the Smart Card. Also put forward ideas to P. Waisman about the way ETS is marketed – "The Every Day Way" slogan could be improved by using less acronyms. A safety campaign and marketing perks were also discussed.
  - The members of this Sub-Committee will be providing P. Waisman with a list of some ideas for quick wins and long term aspects of marketing that can be improved.

- J. Vandenbeld thanked C. Stasia, J. Hayes, B. Robertson and A. Mannix for attending this meeting.

- **Transit Planning Sub-Committee (C. Dulaba):**
  - This Sub-Committee received a presentation from Transportation Planning on the NW LRT extension. A decision was made to put forth a formal response to this presentation as some things need to be addressed, in particular the proximity of transit centres. There is one transit centre proposed on Castledowns Road and 153 Avenue, and another centre one-half mile south on the corner of 137th Avenue, and the Northgate Transit Centre one-half mile east. Three transit centres in close proximity to each other does not make sense. C. Dulaba will put together a response as a fast action item and send the letter to V. Luxton.
  - The presentation members received tonight from Councillor Iveson on the CRB Transit shows that there is a significant amount of work being done on regional transit. ETSAB may require an update from Councillor Iveson in the future.

- **Park & Ride Sub-Committee (G. Smith):**
  - G. Smith thanked B. Robertson, C. Dulaba and V. Hoy for submitting some questions. A meeting was held and there is no formal direction at this point in time but it is in ETS's sights but not any further work in the work plan at the moment. D. Nowicki put together a number of questions that this sub-committee needs to address so another meeting will be held in a couple of weeks time.
  - G. Smith stated that the Century Park & Ride will need to be addressed as it will be closed in four years as that is when the lease for the property runs out. G. Smith will email all members the date for the next meeting of this sub-committee.

- **Fare *Structure and Payments Sub-Committee (A. Mannix)*:**
  - A. Mannix made a short presentation on the work this Sub-committee has completed and will be reporting on the White Paper at the next meeting.

- **Alternate Transit Modality Sub-Committee (J. Hayes):**
  - No report.

- **Transit Amenities Administration Report (J. Hayes):**
  - Closed and D. Nowicki will advise J. Stein.

8. INFORMATION SECTION (V. HOY)

- *ATU Local 569 Report (S. Litwinowich)*
  - On April 28 a Day of Mourning was held to recognize workers killed or injured on the job.
  - Alberta Federation of Labour marked the day at Grant Notley Park; the Mayor and a number of City Councillors spoke at the event.

- *Tuesday, June 4 and Wednesday, June 5 Transit Skills Competition (D. Nowicki)*
  - An offer was made to ETSAB members to participate in the driving skills competition. There are two vehicle types, a regular forty foot bus, and the community bus. If members are interested in driving a regular size bus, the suggested date/time slot will be Wednesday, June 5 after 0900h.
  - Location is the City Centre Airport (NE corner) off approximately 123 Avenue.

- There is no special bus service to the site.
- Should allow 1.0 to 1.5 hours.
- Also available is the opportunity to drive a community bus. This bus has more flexibility with dates and times as there is lower demand to drive these units in the skills competition.
- You can attend to watch as a spectator.
- Organizers are working on the registration now, so ETS need expressions of interest today.
- J. Hayes, B. Robertson, J. Vandenbeld and I. Roux expressed interest.

- *Gerry Wright Better Transit Award*
  - A letter was received from the Edmonton Trolley Coalition (ETC) asking if this Board would like to take over the guardianship of the Gerry Wright Better Transit Award because the Society of Citizens for Better Transit has concluded its operation.
  - A suggestion was made by J. Hayes to table this motion in order to ask ETC some questions about the time line and how sponsorships are arranged.

MOVED:	by J. Hayes/J. Vandenbeld to table this for one month in order for the Chair or Deputy Chair to contact ETC to ask a few questions. **CARRIED**	Motion Approved

Route 747 Update (G. Smith)

- G. Smith rode on the bus route 747 on the 7th of April and both operators did not know the regulations for putting the tie-downs on the wheelchairs. There was another wheelchair passenger on the bus and the operator did not make any attempt to secure this passenger, and the passenger almost fell out of the wheelchair. At Century Park G. Smith asked the operator to attach the tie-downs but the operator did not know how to do this. On the return trip the operator said he had never had this question asked of him before, but he would gladly tie them down. The operator did not know there were retractable tie-downs.
- G. Smith's point is that from a safety standpoint both operators had not been educated on tying down wheelchairs and when the bus is at highway speed the wheelchair passenger could fall out of his chair and/or have no control of the wheelchair.

9. TOPIC(S) OF THE NIGHT

Presentation on CRB transit was excellent, and the Board encouraged the CRB is more accessible and open.

MOVED:	by L. Landry/A. Pye to adjourn the April 29, 2013 ETSAB Meeting at 8:25 pm. **CARRIED**

Next meeting: Monday, May 27, 2013 in the Heritage Room, City Hall

MEETING DATES

~~January 19, 2013~~	August 26, 2013
~~January 28, 2013~~	September 30, 2013
~~February 25, 2013~~	October 22, (Tuesday) 2013

~~March 25, 2013~~	October 28, 2013
~~April 29, 2013~~	November 13 (Wednesday), 2013
May 27, 2013	November 18, 2013
June 24, 2013	December 16, 2013
July 22 (3rd Monday), 2013	January 18 (Saturday), 2014