EDMONTON TRANSIT SYSTEM ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING #9, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013
HERITAGE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT: Gordon Smith, Izak Roux, Bruce Robertson, Amy Mannix, John Hayes, John Vandenbeld , Leanne Landry, Vaughan Hoy, Anand Pye, Cristina Stasia, Shannah Sutherland, Bill Bruce (ATU 569)

REGRETS: Christopher Dulaba

GUEST: Lauren Alston, Co-Director, HollabackAB

ETS AND CITY STAFF: Brad Griffith (Director, Capital LRT Design and Construction), Troy Shewchuk (Strategic Planning Officer), Vicki Luxton (Recording Secretary)

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. VALLEY LINE LRT – STAGE 1 – FUNDING & TIMELINE UPDATE (BRAD GRIFFITH)

- *Background:*
  - The preliminary engineering is being wrapped up both on the Southeast and West LRT.
  - The line being worked on presently is Stage 1, Southeast from Churchill Station to Mill Woods Station to the Centre West Station.
  - At Churchill Station there will be a vertical connection to connect to the existing underground LRT line.
  - The funding for this project is a P3, which is a public private partnership.
  - A contract will be put out and a consortium will design it, build it, partially finance it as well as procure it and they will operate and maintain the system for 30 years after it is constructed.
  - The Southeast leg goes first because the operation and maintenance facility is on that leg and the system cannot operate without train storage and maintenance.
- *Project Organization:*
  - B. Griffith outlined the project organization starting with:
    1. City Council
    2. LRT Governance Board
    3. Valley Line – Stage 1 – Project Manager
    4. Special Project Advisors, The Stewart Group who are involved with the Vancouver P3 for the Canada Line
    5. P3 Process Advisors – KPMG, Owners Engineer CTP, Financial Advisor KPMG, Legal Advisor
    6. Fairness Advisor has been tendered and reports to the LRT Governance Board.
    7. City Services report into Valley Line – Stage 1 – Project Manager

- *General Funding*:
    - CoE Funding - $800 million – strategy approved – partial funds in place
    - Federal (P3 Canada) – approved $250 million
    - Provincial (Green Trip) - $235 million and supported by the Capital Region Board and requires the Province to approve it
    - Possible transfer from North LRT - $60 million – not approved
    - Other Federal Funding (Possible Future BCF) – 150 million – not approved
    - Other Provincial Funding - $305 million – not approved
    - Total - $1,800 million
- *Strategies for Funding Sources*:
    - With some strategies approved, the COE is currently pending on land acquisitions estimated to be $102 million
    - $60 million to hire all the advisors, owner's engineer, and utility relocations
    - We are under budget on the NAIT line so there is a possibility of transferring $60 million and that is also Green Trip funding so it will need Provincial and Capital Region Board approval to transfer this money to another project.
    - Out of the $400 million from the Federal Government we are looking at a new fund – Build Canada Fund which came into place in the spring of 2014. We hope to get $150 million from this fund which leaves the Provincial funding of $305 million and there is no funding source for this at present.
    - We cannot go out for RFQ without securing full funding so we are taking the month of October to finish the RFQ and will be completed by November 2013.
- *Recap*:
    - November 14 – final public open house in City Hall
    - November 19 – Council meeting with further discussion on funding
    - Plan to bring the Preliminary Engineering to ETSAB at the end of the year.
    - Funding RFQ out in early December.
- *Questions/Answers*:
    - *(AM) How much have you spent to date?* With the land and the preliminary engineering around $35 million and commitments of $150 million to date.
    - *(JH) In the P3, where is the private money in the $1.8 billion? Is the P3 solely to get the money from the Federal P3 fund?* The borrowing P3 part will be in the $800 million that the City is supplying. So it is considered City debt so the City has to have a source to repay the principal on that so the consortiums is looking at half $1 billion of private financing in this P3. *If it is $800 million from the CoE but it is not from the CoE it is from private consortiums but the City needs to have a funding source in case they do not supply it?* No, they will borrow the money. So we pay back about $500 million of that $800 million. The consortium borrows that money so we have to pay over the 30 years of operating and maintaining. There will be a yearly figure that will say this is how much it costs to operate and maintain it and here is how much the debt is - $500 million and they must paid this back so it is still City debt. The private industry does not put any money into these projects. The reason you get them to borrow money is because you have these creditors that are overlooking these operators and they want their money. It is performance based so if they do not perform than we do

not pay them. *After 30 years they hand over the whole project and then the City is the owner, operator?* If the City wants to or they could put out another contract for another operator. *How do you guarantee that the P3 operators don't essentially use it up and leave you with a worn out system after 30 years?* There is a number of components that happen. There will be life cycle capital cost upgrades within those 30 years so a lot of your electronics for example – ten year life span and it is out of date. You need to replace it or upgrade it. We have identified those and they will put in costs to do that at certain parts throughout their 30 years. We have the right to go every five years to examine and follow the infrastructure and they have to provide us life cycle costing so what they are doing to maintain all of this. The way they work it that out of that $500 million that is theirs that we are paying back we go in at seven years before the hand over and we go in and do detailed analysis of the structure such as a bridge. It should have 70 years with the life so we will get an engineer to analyze it and if it has 70 years of life, okay, if it only has 50 years we are going to take money away from them. We will not pay them all the money that is owed to them because we now have to upgrade that bridge. The trains is an interesting one because the life cycle of a train is 30 years, so we debated about this one so with five years left we will determine if we want to refurbish them or get new ones. We will determine this at that time.

- *(IR) You ask the consortium to buy the vehicles and equipment; does ETS set the standards for this equipment and the compatibility of this equipment?* Because this consortium is responsible to buy the trains, run the trains and maintain the trains, it is more of a performance spec so we say we want a train every five minutes and want to carry this many people and a number of key opponents. We measure that and if they do not meet that then we do not pay their availability payments. We have a reduction measure. Through that year of RFP they will do design submissions to us. We have a general spec on the train – the train must be proven in 30 below weather. We subscribe to them that it has to have the transit colours. We want to be able to pick the architectural features. This train has to run on time, every day and be maintained properly or they do not get paid. *How do you ensure interaction between services?* It will be the same as going from today's LRT to a bus. We are taking the fare box risk so we still control all the money so our people will go and collect the money out of the fare ticket machines and it will be our ticket machines. It will be the same machines that are in the existing line and you can use the same ticket to go this line or the new line. *Do you provide the manpower to run the train?* The company will provide the manpower for operating it and maintaining it.
- *(AM) You are talking about the relationship between the service provider and the CoE but it could also be with the customers? You are saying that the CoE collects the fares but that takes away the importance incentive for the operators to serve their customers.* We judged a lot on this and we looked at a lot of other areas and in England a lot of the ones that had trouble were because of the fare box risk. You are giving that contractor the risk of how many customers are going to ride that train and he is going to take that risk that our estimate is right but what happens if our estimate is wrong and he does not get the money he is suppose to get. The main

reason we wanted to do this is to keep the system seamless. We took this uncertainty away; we want them to build and operate it and take care of those risks.

- *(JV) The CoE has an agreement with their drivers and maintenance people with a union so you are saying this new line is going to be staffed and operated by the consortium, one, how is that going to work with the union and two, if you keep referring to it as a separate line, it is a system, so from a customer perspective it is one system and do not care what line they are taking – it is the LRT. Is there going to be a union driver going to one station and get out?* The existing line is not tied into existing lines; it is a totally different line. Its only connection is a vertical connection at Churchill and downstairs to the tunnel to ride the other one train. It will be up to the consortium to deal with union matters. We had the City's labour lawyer look at this and. many of the people we did markets on said yes, we expect it to be union. So it could be a different local of the existing transit drivers but we are going to let that get set up through the company.
- *(LL) I have seen lots of advertising against the P3s both at the train stations and in other areas so I know the line will go ahead but is the P3 a definite or is it still up for discussion?* Until we put the RFP out for tender, the P3 is up in the air. Once that RFQ goes out we are locked into a P3.
- *(VH) Do you know how much interest there is out there for this RFQ?* There is huge interest. We have had people from Spain, from Australia from England, United States and Canada. We figure when we put this RFQ out we will have eight to twelve interested parties. We will then pick the best three out of the twelve and then the three go to the RFP stage. They all say this is a perfect size for a P3 and there are a lot of P3's going on in Vancouver, Ottawa just awarded their LRT as P3, Kitchener/Waterloo is going P3 with theirs. You spend a year with the best three and at the end of the year what you do is set bars. For example we went out and did public consultation on all the stations. We want these stations to look like we told the public they are going to look like. They will submit what they are proposing to meet the bar. So once we get these three people over the bar then there is that present value. So they will take the capital costs, all operating costs, all inflation out and the person with the lowest price wins the contract.
- *(AP) Do you take risk analysis on the project?* Yes, we do very detailed risk analysis on the project and then with the P3 identify which risks you want to give to the P3 component and then you take it out of your risk bucket and give it to them. So the idea is to give risks that supposedly they are better at managing than we are. In some cases we will share risks and we decided to take the fare box risk on this project.
- *(BB, ATU 569) The question as to whether this is a done deal and we know there is a new Council coming on and so we are hoping to wrap this up with the new Council and fight it to the end.* We originally started this project as design build with the City operating it and that was changed when the P3 decision came in made by Council.
- *(BR) Fairness Advisor – who are they?* The Fairness Advisor is a third party – when we get down to the three components they will spend $20 million on this bid so if there is any leak of information for example, we

have our floor in the ATB Tower and have moved out from the City. All our doors are locked; we all had to sign confidentiality waivers. It is a huge perception that somebody thinks that somebody else has an advantage on something this big. What we do is hire this Fairness Advisor (third party independent) usually a lawyer and they sit in on all of our doings because we do a lot of stuff like this. So he is there and if anyone accuses us of doing something that is unfair, he goes to court and says no, this is the way they did it, and in my opinion it was all fair and righteous. *With the thirty year vehicles are you going to have a stack of parts with this set of trains and another stack of parts for the other train.* That was a decision that was made during the planning where they went with the different technology. *Regarding the funding, is there a fallback plan; is there someone who is actually working in the background to design an LRT to get to Mill Woods and Lewis Estates that we can actually afford?* What we did is when we originally put out the contract for the preliminary engineering we were going to do a design build and the City was going to run it then we were about two-thirds through that when Council changed to a P3. We made the decision to complete the preliminary engineering as a design build. So in case it does change back we have that done. *In designing the P3 right now there is a huge funding shortfall that may or may not get funded but Mill Woods and Lewis Estates still could use an LRT connection. Are there options to build this LRT that do not cost $3 billion?* Right now there is an advocacy program, there is a Department in the City called Intergovernmental Affairs so they are lobbying the different levels of government for this and the politicians are working with them to lobby for money.

- *(VH) This Board has been through quite a bit during that LRT planning stage with all the stuff that has gone on and been approved with the technologies and all the through we have heard all the issues around funding and the public have heard all the issues around funding and the funding shortfall that has to be topped up by somebody. You are going back to the Province for two separate buckets of money that looks impossible given everything else that is going on in the Province and we have never really heard a B plan for this. There has been a whole pile of people working on this design build, P3 and a lot of energy put into it with consultants doing 30% planning for alignments and station location and still no B plan.* What is the B plan? It has to start at the maintenance facility so we could build from the maintenance facility to maybe Churchill. We have phased a lot of the other programs and that is what we started with by just going that way but it was Council that directed us to go all the way to Mill Woods and so they have to figure out how they are going to do this. You can phase this stuff but the problem is the most expensive parts of this are the tunnel and the bridge. You can build that and have a station going from Churchill to Muttart, it is not going to do much. The other risk with that is you start breaking it apart so then the P3 does not work anymore. So you lose your P3 money. *Question around separate staff and programs?* We are going to use transit's operating rules and rule book so we want them to match the same regulations and rules of our existing system.
- The Board members thanked B. Griffith for his presentation.

3. AGENDA REVIEW

- The following items were added to the agenda under Information Section:
  - DATS and Handicapped Forum
  - Suggested Protocol Items
  - Temporary Board Vice-Chair position

MOVED: by J. Vandenbeld/A. Pye to approve the September 30, 2013 amended agenda. **CARRIED** — Amended Agenda Approved

4. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 26, 2013 MINUTES

- Some of the points missing in the minutes based on the presentation by L. Stewart:
  1. Privacy issue with accounts and fare card
  2. Reliability with the fare card
  3. Accessibility with cash fare.

  Questions during the presentation:
  1. "Are users of ETS still going to be able to use cash fares when/if the new system is adopted?"
  2. "What has ETS done to mitigate and security concerns regarding customers?"
  3. "With everything being electronic, what happens if the system breaks down?"

MOVED: by J. Vandenbeld/A. Pye to defer the approval of the August 26, 2013 minutes until the next meeting. **CARRIED** — Motion Approved

5. MANAGER'S REPORT (T. SHEWCHUK)

- *Highlights*:
  - *Transportation Services new General Manager*:
    - His name is Dorian Wandzura and comes from the City of Regina where he was the Deputy City Manager. He has a very extensive engineering background and worked with the City of Yorkton and Moose Jaw public works. He has a transportation road background and heavily involved in public transit in Regina. T. Shewchuk had the opportunity to meet him last week. He is in the stages of listening to the staff about what they think are some current challenges. He is quite involved in the Comprehensive Transit Review.
  - *The City Organizational Structure*:
    - The City's organizational structure has not changed and the Transportation Services Department has not changed. Currently there are five branches within the Transportation Services:
      1. Edmonton Transit
      2. LRT Design and Construction
      3. Roads Design and Construction
      4. Transportation Operations
      5. Transportation Planning
    - As for Edmonton Transit as of May 2013, we have made some organizational changes on a temporary basis. A temporary

organizational chart was given to each member. The biggest change is the Business Development area which has been split up into three groups. The first area is around revenue reporting expenditures capital budget so C. Stolte has set up a temporary group to look after the ongoing operations of the operating and capital budgets of transit. The second group is called Edmonton Customer Experience Retention Group is basically honing in on:

1. who are our customers
2. how do we retain customers
3. what kind of consistent experience can we provide customers
4. looking at customer complaints and how can we handle them more effectively.

- The third group is focused on how do we generate more money? Patricia Waisman is managing that group called Yield Management.

- *Transit Service Needs Prioritization – Additional Information Report:*
  - Service Development have developed a very comprehensive list of what they consider to be all of the prioritized service priorities and the routes as well and what it could look like from a cost perspective in 2014.
  - They have identified 59 peak buses required in 2014 at a cost of about $21 million to add about 254,000 service hours. It is basically transit's priorities in the upcoming year and this is how we prioritize them. In September Service Development looked at the low demand, low performing routes and there was about $700,000 cost savings and was able to reinvest that into more high demand routes that were overcrowded. Each year is different. This helps us prioritize our service based on if new dollars are available or existing based on high demand and high frequencies.
- *Comprehensive Transit Service Review Report:*
  - R. Toohey would like to come back to the Board and update members on the Comprehensive Transit Service Review.
  - A report was submitted to Committee with recommendations.
  - The third party which is Stantec made the recommendation to TC that shared services and related services like how HR, Materials Management, and Law Services etc. that "how" the services are provided to transit should remain the same. This was the recommendation from Internal Governance's perspective.
  - ETS uses Corporate Services presently and Stantec says the model works.
  - There was some dialogue about where ETS resides – as a Branch, as a Department and Stantec made a recommendation that ETS should remain a part of Transportation Services Department as a Transit Branch.
  - Fare Policy and Strategic recommendations; there is a need to build a long term fare policy strategy plan. What does the fare policy of transit look like in the next five to ten years? It is not only from a pricing perspective but what is the direction? Is it to set concessions/discounts to generate ridership, what is the direction based on the fare policy development?
  - They are recommending that ETS meet with City Council to build out

what the fare strategic plan will look like for 5-10 years.

- There is a need for a long term corporate transit strategic plan to be constructed. Currently we have a three year business plan.
- What they are really saying is how do we incorporate the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) into the development of a Transit Master Plan.
- At this point T. Shewchuk is not aware of next steps. Right now we are determining the framework that ETS is going to propose to Council.
- Questions/Answers:
  - *(VH) The public Transit Review is not completed yet, they have just done a section of that?* There are two phases: the first phase is around governance and the second phase is around service delivery and operational efficiency and fare policy effectiveness.. The second phase is expected to be released around March.
  - *On the fare structure piece that A. Mannix and group members, did that reach them?* T. Shewchuk confirmed that this report did go to TC members but one thing we have learned is that we do not know if the Councillors are going to look at it because there was not a formal process followed (confirmed by the Office of the City Clerk).

- *137 Avenue Proposed Transit Centre:*
  - ETS is looking at a transit centre at Griesbach and provided some options to TC around what would it look like to decrease the footprint and maximize Transit Oriented Development (TOD). Due date is January 2014.
  - Questions/Answers:
  - *(VH) That is a huge neighbourhood and commercial centre so I cannot imagine why there would not be a proper transit centre there and with a look of today's and tomorrow's model of what they can be and have been.*
  - *(BR) Stated that Option 1 was the superior option in his opinion.*

6. ETSAB PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR 2013

- *Marketing Standing Committee (J. Vandenbeld/C. Stasia)*
  - This group did not meet although the letter that was vetted was sent out to N. Waters. V. Hoy stated it is important to get feedback from administration when the Board works on a project. V. Hoy recommended asking N. Waters to make comment to this letter in the way that N. Waters is most comfortable with.
  - J. Vandenbeld stated the he is involved with the Marketing Standing Sub-Committee and the Long Term Fare Strategy committee and these two groups are two completely different committees. They are not connected in any way.

- *Long Term Fare Strategy (J. Vandenbeld)*
  - J. Vandenbeld stated that this group did not meet but noted with annoyance that he has attempted to get a presentation to this committee from administration (Dennis Nowicki) for the past five plus months.
  - This group will meet and go over what the consultant provided on the Comprehensive Transit Service Review and will report back to the Board at the October meeting.
  - This committee's Terms of Reference (TOR) states that this group should look at the long term fare strategy and fare structure. This transit review seems

to be looking at this independent of what was stated in this group's TOR. J. Vandenbeld would be interested in learning the thoughts of the other members of this group because there now is a lot to review and comment on.

- Questions/Comments:
  - *(VH) The Marketing committee and what you were going to look at has also got the same content showing up on the Long Term Fare Strategy?* No, I was speaking about is that this group would like to have been more involved in the transit review because it directly affects the process and plan that ETSAB approved in January. J. Vandenbeld tried and was mostly rebuked.
  - T. Shewchuk stated there are two primary groups working with this transit review: one is Transportation Planning – R. Toohey as well as T. Burge from the Finance Services and Utilities. A request can go out to R. Toohey to give a presentation next month or a meeting can be set up with this group.
  - B. Robertson stated J. Vandenbeld's frustration comes with getting a presentation outside of the Board with this committee as this would be a more productive way for this committee to get the work done.
- The subject around advertising in transit stations was discussed and it was decided to bring this topic back at a later date to the Marketing Committee.

- *Transit Planning (C. Dulaba)*
  - V. Hoy spoke on behalf of C. Dulaba that a meeting was not held. V. Hoy will get an update from C. Dulaba and possibly this task group could be picked up by another Board Member in the future.

- *Park and Ride (G. Smith)*
  - Two documents were completed for this task group, one by G. Smith and the other by V. Hoy. These two documents were distributed to Board members.
  - G. Smith stated this group met and discussed the ten points that V. Hoy put together and G. Smith narrowed them down to five points.
  - G. Smith commented:
    1. Presently the CoE does not have any incentive to look at Park & Ride as they do not have personnel nor the time.
    2. Metering of some of the spots in the Park & Rides could be a good idea as the parking spots are usually totally filled. The metering parking could be managed by the technology advanced parking meters. It allows some of the parking spots to be used and become available during the day time rather than parking there all day using all the spots. Charging of rates – the entire parking lot could be considered as a revenue source at some later date. It would be a token amount which would facilitate some of the expense. Century Park has 1400 parking spots and some paid parking spots with a waiting list of 900 patrons wanting paid parking.
    3. The CoE is talking about doing away with the Park & Ride lots and it is the consensus of this committee that this would be a bad thing because there should be Park & Ride not just at the end of the LRT line(s) but at locations wherever land is available. It is applicable where they can park and get onto either feeder buses or the LRT.
    4. This committee was taking into consideration ridership from outside of

the CoE proper because as the LRT gets closer to Sherwood Park, Leduc, Beaumont, St. Albert and outlying cities will gravitate towards the Park & Ride and they will not be available to the citizens of Edmonton. Something should be negotiated through the Capital Region in order to make sure that does not happen.

- V. Hoy made a list of ten elements that would be in the executive style summary. J. Vandenbeld suggested to G. Smith and V. Hoy that the following elements be removed from the TOR:
  1. Element 5 - Joint venture opportunities between CoE and private sector. J. Vandenbeld views this to be operational and if strictly applied inappropriate because that would be negotiating on behalf of the City which would be problematic.
  2. Element 3 – HOV program which is also viewed mostly operational
  3. Element 6 – Functional Issues – this is viewed mostly operational
  4. Element 7 – Rates – this is the same element as Element 2 – parking rates/ monthly pass
- This would bring the list of elements down to six from ten.
- J. Vandenbeld stated he would like this project wrapped up by the end of the year as G. Smith is retiring from the Board at that time which would allow G. Smith to see this through.

MOVED:	by J. Vandenbel/A. Pye to accept the Terms of Reference for the Park & Ride project. **CARRIED**	Motion Approved

- *Fare Structure and Payment System (A. Mannix)*
  - A. Mannix sent the White Paper to the Councillors and got a reply from D. Iveson.
  - This group may want to meet again but the fare structure part is done. This group met on September 23 and A. Mannix plans to draft a letter of comments to Administration regarding the smart fare business case review. As well as a list of guiding principles for an upgrade of the payment system, both to be brought to the next meeting.
  - The Comprehensive Transit Review reflected some of the recommendation that this group came up with and A. Mannix was pleased to see this.

- *Alternate Transit Modality (J. Hayes)*
  - J. Hayes suggested this group hold a meeting on Tuesday, October 15 at 6:00 pm to discuss the results of all of the items that were discussed.

- *Public Art (V. Hoy)*
  - V. Hoy stated a meeting was held but nothing further was done.

- *Public Security (I. Roux)*
  - I. Roux stated that this group identified harassment as an issue on transit and C. Stasia would like to make a short presentation to the members on sexual harassment and assault on Edmonton Transit. This presentation was co-presented by C. Stasia and Lauren Alston, who is M.Sc student in Neuroscience at the University of Alberta and Co-Director of HollabackAB which is a movement to end street harassment.

- *Highlights*:
  - C. Stasia met with R. Gabruck, Director of Customer Safety and Security for ETS to discuss the current policy on this subject. There were 27 reported cases of sexual assault on ETS in 2012. Only 80% of sexual assaults incidents are reported to ETS.
  - Previously ETSAB had a presentation on User Survey with Customer Satisfaction and C. Stasia noted a few things that were not really working on gathering incidents of sexual assaults and harassment. One is the User Survey does not ask you about sexual assault or harassment. It also does not break down the responses on how safe riders feel by gender. So we have no idea what the gender breakdown is when 92% of the riders say they feel safe on transit. It is also done in person at ETS stations so if someone does not feel secure enough to ride on transit they do not have an opportunity to participate in the survey.
  - C. Stasia wanted to get a clear understanding of this issue so she worked with Gloria Hollaback. On HollabackAB people submit their stories of sexual assault and harassment. In addition, Lauren conducted an on-line survey sent out on Facebook and Twitter with 600 participants to gather information on sexual assault and harassment on transit between September 12-29, 2013.
    - There were 591 responses
    - 83% (488) identified as female
    - 15% (87) identified as male
    - 3% (16) either didn't identify with either gender
  - All the questions were specific to ETS. One of the questions was "Where does street harassment occur, please select all that apply".
    - 95% (528) have been harassed on the street
    - 30% (168) have been harassed on ETS
    - 1% (3) on DATS
    - 27% (150) on LRT
    - 34% (189) at any transit or LRT stops
    - 26% (145) at shopping malls
    - 10% (56) on school property
    - 13% (74) other places
  - *Question: (VH) Are there any stats as to what times of day?* No, we did not have time but that would be a question to ask on the next survey. Thanks for bringing that up.
  - Second question was "Has harassment on Edmonton public transit ever affected you (This includes waiting at bus and train stops)".
    - 40% (229) No this has never happened to me
    - 5% (27) Yes have been harassed but it did not bother me
    - 40% (232) Yes have been harassed and it was bothersome
    - 13% (73) Yes have been harassed on public transit, and as a result I am uncomfortable on public transit
    - 3% (16) Yes have been harassed on public transit and it has made me scared to use public transit.
    - So this is over half the number of people surveyed reporting instances of harassment on public transit and having a problem with it.

- *Meeting with R. Gabruck*:
  - C. Stasia stated that when she met with R. Gabruck we went over the current policies and strategies in place to prevent sexual harassment or assault on ETS. Currently there is no strategy in place to prevent sexual harassment or assault on ETS. More troubling there is no training for transit officers or operators in having to deal with this issue. This becomes especially troubling because transit officers are the first responders in cases of sexual assault on transit but they have no training on how to approach a victim of sexual assault or how to question a victim of sexual assault. Transit officers also make the call about the case of sexual assault and forward it on to EPS. With discussions with R. Gabruck was wondering how they make that call without training. Also transit officers are called upon to make first witness testimony on cases of sexual assault on ETS, so they do go to court and do play a role in trial. Yet they take those statements and do not have training in cases of sexual assault.
  - Lastly victims are more likely not to report to law enforcement or any authority if that authority does not have training in dealing with victims of sexual assault.
  - *Questions*: *(VH) T. Shewchuk is this operationally confirmed?* I do not have confirmation so cannot comment on this information. C. Stasia confirmed she has a four page report that R. Gabruck sent and she will forward it to ETSAB members.
  - ETS does attempt to send a female transit officer in cases of sexual assault; however, this is rarely possible. Of the 73 transit officers, there are 12 female officers (16.4%). There are nine male sergeants and one female sergeant (0.11%). Six men and one woman are designated as relief sergeants (0.17%).
- *Research done on other public transportation systems to address Sexual Harassment and assault on public transit*:
  - A dozen campaigns world wide and the four being focused on are in the United States. No public transit system in Canada currently has a policy but Ottawa and Vancouver are making rapid progress to get one.
  - In Boston they had an award winning public service campaign where they posted on the subway and in the train stations alerting people that sexual harassment and assault would not be tolerated on transit. Thanks to that campaign they saw a 74% increase reported of sexual harassment and police made 28 arrests for indecent assault and battery, a 40% increase in arrests as compared to the same period prior to that campaign. This has been in place since 2008 so they have had time to gather the data to reflect how affective this has been.
  - Chicago quickly followed suit initiating their first PSA campaign and initiated for transit officers training on sexual harassment and assault.
- *Three-Pronged Approach Recommendations*:

  1. Public Awareness Campaign

2. Data Collection via Online Reporting Tool
3. ETS Employee training

- *Questions/Comments:*
  - *(VH) The task group is doing research and putting forward a proposal but what you are saying sounds like you are actually putting together a work plan that could be submitted with cost benefit?* (IR) The task group's recommendation is training, more awareness of harassment on ETS system and by making people aware and possible solutions to the problem. This is just one step, we have identified twelve items to look at and this is one step where we think we can get some results in the short term and set goals for next year. At least this is a short term first step to improve security on ETS. *(VH) There seems to be a big gap between making reporting more comfortable and accessible and something being done about it at the other end. You can report all you want but if you are not dealing with the culture of doing something about it, monitoring it, and consequences in the middle of that then all you are doing is getting more people reporting. So I don't quite understand that piece. I see the program and the awareness, absolutely, and the program for training a transit operators on how to handle incidents like this but there seems to be a gap between reporting and either transit or police following up on it. (BB) The peace officers should call Control, so Control would be another big part of this group that needs to be trained.*
  - *(LL) Crime Mapping, ETS already does that and we had a presentation on that and they know where the hot spots are on the transit system. Good presentation. How did you solicit a response, who was your target audience and how did you reach out to them?* On-line using social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, Central Assault contact, and University contacts as well and word of mouth.
- C. Stasia stated she has a draft report which will be sent to the whole Board. R. Gabruck suggested that one way to deal with this was by using Bylaw 8353, Section 10 - Harassment already in place. *(VH) Does ETS exercise that bylaw very often?* R. Gabruck was not able to run any data on this at the time of the discussion.
- V. Hoy stated his only one concern with this task group is that this subject could be researched in its own task group due to the complexity of the issue.
- The members thanked the presenters for their presentation.

7. FAST ACTION PROCESS (V. HOY)

- Discussion focused on adding another point in the Fast Action Process between point 7 and 8 that states if the feedback includes significant objections from three or more respondents the fast action approval shall be held to the discussion at the next ETSAB meeting. And to add point 10: "No vote is a yes vote".

MOVED: by A. Pye/B. Robertson to add a point on the Fast Action Process between 7 and 8: "If feedback includes significant objections from three or more Motion

respondents it shall be held to the discussion at the next ETSAB meeting" and add point 10: "No vote is a yes vote". **CARRIED**	Approved

- Review the draft at the next Board meeting.

8. INFORMATION SECTION (V. HOY)

- *ATU 569 Report (B. Bruce))*
  - No report.
- *DATS Update (G. Smith)*
  - This session opened as a brain storming session with more DATS administration in attendance than invitees.
  - DATS advocated what DATS is doing and how they were going to improve facilities for the handicapped.
  - Did not mention the two hour cancellation policy that was implemented the first of September.
  - There was a round table discussion put forward but there was no agenda put forward to the invitees so they did not know what was going to be discussed at the meeting.
  - They did not indicate if there was going to be minutes published or who was in attendance.
- *Temporary Vice-Chair*
  - J. Hayes has volunteered to fill in for C. Dulaba for the short term while C. Dulaba is away.
- *Suggested Protocol Items(V. Hoy)*
  - Of the four protocols the one V. Hoy commented on was to ensure you have two people with you. Yourself or either your Co-Chair or one of your members on your task group. We do not like one-on-ones as there is no second ear to carry or validate and maintain the transparency in whatever the discussions you have.
  - J. Vandenbeld commented on two points:
    1. The fourth item – "Meeting with ETS Administration", second and third line, please substitute the wording to: "minimum of two Board and/or Sub-committee members present" from "majority of the Board sub-committee members present (Chair plus one other member). An exemption of this rule would be the Budget Review with C. Stolte and luncheon meetings with Councillors.
    2. On the third item – "Communicating Reports with Transportation Committee/CoE Administration", - Administration will work with the groups in constructing Committee Reports. J. Vandenbeld stated Administration could be a resource but ETSAB will construct these reports. T. Shewchuk advised that Administration was referring to formatting the report with the CoE template when they used the word constructing.
  - T. Shewchuk spoke to the points 1 and 2 of the Protocol list.
  - The changes will be made to the Suggested Protocol Items as suggested by J. Vandenbeld.
- *Work Plan/Annual Report (V. Hoy)*
  - Deferred this to the next board meeting in October due to time restraints.
- *CoE Bylaws and Policy (V. Hoy)*

- T. Shewchuk advised the members that after meeting with V. Gunderson of the Office of the City Clerk she confirmed that in August, 2013 there was a Bylaw 16516 called "Council Committee Appointment Term and Term Limits Amending Bylaw" which has been approved by Council. This allows Council to make modifications to further extend Board member's terms. This is the only clause that has been modified.
- For the Agencies, Boards and Committees, there are five policies being consolidated into one policy. The draft policy has been created and will be circulated within Corporate Services and will be made available to all Boards in early January 2014.

- *December 16, 2013 Social Date*
  - Deferred to the next meeting.
- *CUTA Representative/Calgary CUTA Conference (V. Hoy)*
  - November 26th has been confirmed for five members to attend the one day conference. CUTA was provided five names, A. Mannix, A. Pye, B. Robertson, C. Dulaba and V. Hoy.
  - Two designated drivers for the rental van are A. Mannix and B. Robertson.
  - I. Roux is interested in attending as well, and will be slotted in if there is a conflict with another attendee.

8. TOPIC(S) OF THE NIGHT

- Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault on ETS presentation.

MOVED:	by B. Robertson/I. Roux to adjourn the September 30 ETSAB Meeting at 8:36 p.m. **CARRIED**	Motion Approved

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