Transit Committee

Agenda

Thursday, January 28, 2016
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Meeting Rooms 3 & 4
Strathcona County Community Centre
401 Festival Lane, Sherwood Park, AB

Agenda Items

1. **Call to Order** – Councillor Wes Brodhead, Chair

2. **Chair Opening Remarks**

3. **Approval of Agenda** – Councillor Wes Brodhead, Chair

4. **Approval of Minutes of November 26, 2015** – Councillor Wes Brodhead, Chair

5. **Transit Committee Terms of Reference** – Councillor Wes Brodhead, Chair
   5.1 Review of Terms of Reference – Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager

6. **CRB/CRP Transit Policy Workshop** – Councillor Wes Brodhead, Chair
   6.1 December 4, 2015 Workshop Meeting Notes – Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Transit Committee receive the CRB/CRP Transit Policy Workshop meeting notes for information, and refer them to the Capital Region Board for information.

7. **Project Updates** – Councillor Wes Brodhead, Chair
   7.1 Specialized Transit Needs Assessments (verbal) – Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
   7.2 Transit Priorities List (formerly GreenTRIP list) – Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
   7.3 HOV/Transit Priority Study (verbal) – Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
   7.4 Household Travel Survey – Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Transit Committee receive the Transit Committee project updates for information.

8. **Growth Plan Update 2.0** – Councillor Wes Brodhead, Chair
   8.1 Task Force Update (verbal) – Sharon Shuya, Project Manager

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Transit Committee receive the Growth Plan Update 2.0 update for information.

9. **Adjournment** – Councillor Wes Brodhead, Chair

**Recommended Motion:** That the Transit Committee receive the Transit Committee project updates for information.
Transit Committee

Thursday, November 26, 2015
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 rue Marie-Anne-Gaboury (91 Street), Edmonton

Members:
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert (Chair)
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton (Vice Chair)
Dave Anderson, Strathcona County
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Searle Turton, City of Spruce Grove

Regrets:
Karen Shaw, Sturgeon County (alternate)

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Amanda Borman, Executive Assistant

Guests:
Ashley Bhatia, GOA - Transportation
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Guy Bridgeman, EPCOR
Wade Coombs, Strathcona County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Patrick Inglis, City of Spruce Grove
Craig Mahovsky, Sturgeon County
Mike Vivian, City of Edmonton
Kevin Wenzel, City of Leduc
Forest Yang, Strathcona County

1. Call to Order
Chair, Wes Brodhead called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda
It was approved by unanimous consensus that the Transit Committee agenda of November 26, 2015 be approved.
4. Approval of Minutes, September 3, 2015

Motion: That the Transit Committee minutes of September 3, 2015 be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Decision: Carried unanimously

5. Regional Services

5.1 EPCOR – Presentation by Guy Bridgeman, Senior Vice President & Chief Financial Officer

6. Transit Governance

6.1 Status Update

Motion: That the Transit Committee direct CRB administration to work with City of Edmonton and City of St Albert to develop on-boarding options for additional willing municipalities into the reporting for their ongoing intermunicipal transit discussions.
Moved by: Councillor Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Decision: Carried unanimously

7. 2016/17 Transit Work Plan

7.1 HOV/Transit Priority Study Terms of Reference

Motion: That the Transit Committee approve the proposed HOV/Transit Priority Study Terms of Reference.
Moved by: Councillor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried unanimously

8. GreenTRIP Project List

8.1 Updated List

Motion: That the Transit Committee receive the GreenTRIP Project List for Information.
Moved by: Councillor Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Decision: Carried unanimously

9. CRB/CRP Transit Policy Workshop

9.1 Workshop Update

It was approved by unanimous consensus that the Transit Committee receive the CRB/CRP Transit Policy Workshop Update as information.
10. Growth Plan Update 2.0

10.1 Committee Consultation Summary

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee approve the Growth Plan Update Committee Consultation Summary and that it be referred to the Growth Plan Update Task Force for information.

**Moved by:** Councillor Dana Smith, *City of Leduc*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

11. Transit Committee Meeting Dates

The Committee discussed and requested that Administration confirm an alternate location for the scheduled January 28, 2016 meeting.

12. Adjournment

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee meeting be adjourned.

**Moved by:** Councillor Michael Walters, *City of Edmonton*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

**Next Meeting:** January 28, 2015 at 9:00 a.m., Location to be confirmed.
BACKGROUND
This committee provides leadership and strategic oversight of regional transit projects to support the implementation of the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan.

MANDATE
Reporting to the Board, this standing committee will be responsible for the following:

- To provide strategic advice about the future direction of Intermunicipal transit service that will enable the CRB to achieve its economic, social and environmental objectives, advocating for transit as a convenient and competitive mode of transportation.
- To provide leadership in the planning and implementation of Intermunicipal transit service to support the mobility needs of residents and visitors to the Region.
- To ensure the region’s transit plans are integrated with the Land Use and Transportation Infrastructure Plans for the region.
- To ensure transit plans are incorporated into regional highway plans to allow for alternate modes of transportation for the efficient movement of people throughout the region.
- To ensure policies are developed to support Transit Oriented Development in the region.
- To provide strategic oversight for the implementation and delivery of regional intermunicipal transit services through various studies, projects, policy frameworks and measurement tools that support effective management of public transit, including special transit services for persons with disabilities.

MEMBERSHIP
Membership for this committee requires the participation and expertise of the existing transit operators in the region and those who currently contract with the existing operators. It will consist of seven members: Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, City of Leduc, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Strathcona County and Sturgeon County. Membership will be reviewed by the Board, every two years.

LEADERSHIP
At its first meeting, the committee will select its Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst its membership. If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES
The CEO will support this committee, drawing upon CRB administration as required.

This committee will also be supported by consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support a committee project.
MEETING FREQUENCY

It is proposed that this committee meet bi-monthly or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

AUTHORITY

All meeting groups established by the Board are considered advisory bodies to the Board and therefore must, by a passed motion, provide recommendation(s) to the Board for decision.

EX-OFFICIO

The Board Chair will be considered non-voting ex-officio member of this committee.

Whenever viable, Provincial and/or key stakeholder representatives will be invited to attend committee meetings as ex-officio members to contribute their expertise and knowledge towards a particular outcome.

DECISION-MAKING

Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by the committee will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote. All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

The approved Governance Model for Transit requires a majority vote (four of seven) including unanimous support of the three transit operators (Edmonton, St. Albert, and Strathcona County) on matters pertaining to conventional transit.

QUORUM

Quorum is defined as 50 percent plus one of standing membership.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative committee operations and decision-making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Board for discussion and resolution.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Chief Executive Officer will act as the single point of contact for all communications requests for this committee and will determine the appropriate level of response required. This may result in responses being required from the Board Chair/Interim Chair, the committee Chair, members, Board administration, or the Chief Executive Officer.

STATUS OF MEETINGS

Committee meetings are open to the public including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public.
Individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/committee members may be invited to participate in specific agenda items. Committee minutes are public records.

Section 602.08 (1) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) states that the committee may close all or part of their meetings to the public if a matter to be discussed is within one of the exceptions to disclosure in Division 2 of Part 1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

All members (elected and administrative) attending the in camera session shall respect the confidentiality of the in camera items.

REPORTING

This committee is expected to provide the Board, through established communication channels and schedules, sage advice and recommendations to resolve existing issues, and progress as it relates to its mandate and expected deliverables.

MEETING AGENDAS AND MINUTES

All meeting agendas, minutes, reports, briefings and supporting documentation will be provided in an electronic format.

In general, meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, will be provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.

The committee will include its meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
CRB/CRP Regional Transit Policy Workshop
December 4, 2015
Black Knight Inn, Red Deer, AB
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Attendees:

CRB Transit Members:
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert, Chair
Dave Anderson, Strathcona County
Wayne Bokenfohr, Sturgeon County
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Bill Steinburg, City of Spruce Grove
Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County

CRP Transportation Members:
John Borrowman, Town of Canmore, Chair
Lora Peterson, Town of Irricana
Richard Pootsman, City of Calgary
Bob Sobol, Town of Strathmore
Ray Watrin, Town of Okotoks
Gail Smith, City of Chestermere
Dona Fluter, Town of Turner Valley
Michel Jackson, Town of Black Diamond
Candice Kolson, City of Airdrie
Jim Stevenson, City of Calgary
Ruth Goodwin, Town of Black Diamond

Capital Region Board:
Mayor Nolan Crouse, City of St. Albert, Chair of CRB
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Manager, Regional Projects
Sharon Shuya, Manager, Regional Projects
Amanda Borman, Executive Assistant, CRB

Calgary Regional Partnership:
Mayor Bill Robertson, Town of Okotoks, Chair of CRP
Colleen Shepard, Executive Director
Ettore Iannacito, Manager of Regional Transportation, CRP
Alison Graf, Program Coordinator

Alberta Transportation:
Honourable Brian Mason, Minister
Greg Bass, Deputy Minister
Shaun Hammond, ADM
Ashley Bhatia, Director, Next Generation Transportation Systems
Joan Mmbaga, Policy Advisor

Guests:
Representatives from Capital Region and Calgary Region Municipalities

Prepared: January 8, 2016
Meeting Notes:

10:00 a.m. Welcome
CRB Chair, Mayor Nolan Crouse and CRP Chair, Mayor Bill Robertson welcomed members from the CRB Transit Committee and CRP Transportation Committee and guests to the workshop.

10:10 a.m. Introductions
CRB Transit Committee Chair, Councillor Wes Brodhead, and CRP Transportation Committee Chair, Mayor John Borrowman, introduced themselves as co-chairs of the workshop and then invited attendees to the workshop to introduce themselves.

10:20 a.m. Regional Transit Updates
Neal Sarnecki, Regional Projects Manager with the CRB provided an overview of the recent work being undertaken by the Transit Committee of the Capital Region Board. Ettore Iannacito, Manager of Regional Transportation at the CRP gave a brief presentation of the On-It Regional Transit Pilot Project and Alison Graf, Program Coordinator presented an overview of the public engagement program for the pilot project.

11:10 a.m. Regional Transit Roundtable
Minister Mason thanked members for inviting him to the Workshop. He congratulated the successful municipal applicants on recent GreenTRIP grant funding. He advised the Workshop that the 2015 provincial budget included $330 million dollars for new Transit Initiatives – next version of GreenTRIP, program yet to be established. The new program needs to establish the criteria that supports Regional Collaboration. Also, they will be announcing a 3rd call for submissions for GreenTRIP funding. $415 Million is left in the GreenTRIP program, $150 Million for CRP, $285 Million for other municipalities within the Province. The CRB has exhausted its allocation of GreenTRIP funding.

The Minister then opened up the floor to questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Minister Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Provincial Transit Strategy; Desire for municipalities to partner with Province, key cornerstone in Transit and Economic Development; Kneeling Buses, Overnight changes | • Working on long range Transportation Plan, going through/reviewing directions for Policy  
• Focus on emerging technologies and needs  
• Regional Public Transit Priority in the Long Range Plan  
• Commented on the Federal Transit Funding and its possible application |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GreenTRIP funding 3rd call, When?</td>
<td>Open January, closed by spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$330 million in new Transit funding - for operating costs?</td>
<td>That’s the idea but no decision on what the new criteria will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining money in GreenTRIP will follow the original criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities want to be an active Partner - 3 year Business Plan,</td>
<td>Excellent suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Initiatives, 11 are Transit related. Are you going through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultation on funding policy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit Needs Assessments, it’s about Health Care. How do</td>
<td>Air quality is a Health issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we use Health Money to support?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$415 Million uncommitted GreenTRIP dollars. Will you revisit previously</td>
<td>Yes, please resubmit original applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rejected submissions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate, use to work together</td>
<td>Carrots not sticks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenTRIP funding?</td>
<td>$330 million is NEW money and will not go out yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton Region is already paid out for their portion from the original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GreenTRIP funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenTRIP, how do you weight out something collaboratively and/or direct</td>
<td>Political decisions have to be made, hard decision need to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to municipalities?</td>
<td>Can’t promise anything, will be fair and takes into consideration the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenline (Calgary LRT leg) still being considered? Have several</td>
<td>Could suck up the money left but we need to be fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smaller projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will Provincial Public Transit Policy be available for review?</td>
<td>Will be developed with the Long Range Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political review is ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green light for formal consultations happening the next 60/90 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB/CRP first then to smaller communities moving people into major areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use (TUC), access to TUC land for transit purposes such as Park n Ride facilities - Policy decision would be appreciated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following up on Seniors Transportation, Medical Transportations high priority for rural areas...chemo, dialysis etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralleled Transit for seniors in rural/hamlets needed/identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need paralleled or funding infrastructure, getting off the farms and into the major systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary transportation system to get remote seniors to municipalities then into the major systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of desire to do it but no funding stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of 16 million for specifically rural transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan proponents providing buses in the sector, one is for medical reasons, hoping to supplement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please send information to Ministers Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV lanes and encouraging people to use them. Two different jurisdictions, conversations to allow both groups to continue discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a part of the Long Range Plan study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to see the Transit Plan integrated with the Infrastructure Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work together to plan the future, don’t want wall to wall with a million interchanges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUMA &amp; AAMDC involved in conversation design and cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Range Plan study timeline clarification - Early 2016 to review, fall 2016 for comments back from CRB/CRP?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds about right, also want some public consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$330 Million of new funding - same kind of criteria as GreenTRIP? Should be biggest bang for buck, smart dense communities, planning as criteria. It’s about smart planning and makes us accountable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increasing need for the Greenline (Calgary LRT leg), stabilize growth and energy. Transit is vital to our economy.

11:50 a.m. Lunch

12:50 p.m. Joint Transit Initiatives & Transit Advocacy Priorities

Joint Transit Initiatives

Through a facilitated discussion the members explored the opportunities for the CRB and CRP to work together on joint transit initiatives and studies that further support regional transit.

Most of the discussion revolved around educating the various transit stakeholders on the value of transit, the cost to maintain transit systems, the link between infrastructure cost/cost to public, making transit convenient/attractive, etc.

Transit Advocacy Priorities

Through a facilitated discussion the members discussed future advocacy priorities that should be pursued with other levels of government.

The discussion was summarized into four priorities:

1. A Provincial Strategy that sets the vision and provides the support for long term planning (transit corridors) that prevent costly obstacles in the future.
2. Tools that empower regional and municipal levels to achieve funding goals that support sustainable transit (capital and operations).
3. Advocate for the benefits transit provides for health and wellness including rural transit which allows residents to stay in their communities but have access to services.
4. Educate public, municipal councils, provincial and federal leaders on the costs and benefits of transit.

2:00 p.m. Provincial Direction on Public Transit

Deputy Minister Greg Bass briefly commented on the work being undertaken by Alberta Transportation. Heard loud and clear message from members to make sure the O&M conversation is hammered out.

ADM Shaun Hammond added comments regarding a Fraser Institute study article. Just because you build the transportation does not mean people would/will use it. There is a need to have a system wide approach in consultations.
### Questions/Comments for Deputy Minister

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions/Comments for Deputy Minister</th>
<th>Deputy Minister Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public consultations but at some point we need to get something going</td>
<td>Ears are ringing&lt;br&gt;One more round of consultation and moving quickly&lt;br&gt;There is much desire to see this completed using the original timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and awareness on transit</td>
<td>There is certainly a place&lt;br&gt;Transportation safety plan and drive down on fatalities significant reduction despite increase in drivers, roads and vehicles – education is key&lt;br&gt;Will not be able to accomplish without municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No consultation that we are a part of currently, that needs to be updated. We hope that the previous consultations were not in waste.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2:40 p.m. Closing Comments
- Canadian Urban Transit Association (CUTA) - approach for funding and support
- FCM 2017 – Collaborate to Compete (Regional Forum at FCM), consider using Ottawa to focus on transit as a theme for 2017 event
- Next meeting – Unanimous support to meet again after consultation with province in the spring of 2016

#### 2:45 p.m. Adjournment

---

Mayor John Borrowman  
CRP Committee Chair  

Councillor Wes Brodhead  
CRB Committee Chair  

Prepared: January 8, 2016
Report for the Minister of Infrastructure: Honourable Brian Mason on the Need for Alternate Transportation for Seniors in Rural and Urban Alberta

Follow-up from the December 4, 2015 Capital Region Board and Calgary Regional Partnership Joint Transit Policy Workshop, Red Deer

Prepared by Dr. Bonnie Dobbs, Professor and Director, MARD, University of Alberta
bdobbs@ualberta.ca / 780-492-0374
Executive Summary

This report has been prepared, on request, for the Honourable Brian Mason. The request came about as the result of a Regional Joint Transit Policy Workshop in Red Deer, Alberta, on December 4, 2015, hosted by the Capital Region Board. During that Workshop, the topic of transportation needs of seniors and persons with disabilities (PWD) were identified by a number of workshop attendees. This report highlights a number of research and knowledge translation initiatives on the transportation needs of these two segments of our population in rural and urban Alberta conducted by the Medically At-Risk Driver Centre (MARD). MARD is a research and knowledge translation centre in the Department of Family Medicine at the University of Alberta, with funding from the Alberta Ministry of Seniors. MARD initiatives include, but are not limited to, regional and provincial surveys of alternate transportation for seniors (ATS) service providers; an international scan of existing models of seniors' alternate transportation; regional and provincial surveys on perceptions and use of ATS services in rural and urban Alberta; community needs assessments of ATS service; analysis of ride-scheduling software to promote efficiency and increase capacity in delivery of ATS in rural and urban communities; initiating and collaborating on a rural pilot on the development and implementation of ATS service and transportation for PWD; and development of a Transportation Toolkit for implementation of ATS in rural and urban Alberta. We believe that our research and knowledge translation activities related to the transportation needs of seniors and PWD have resulted in advancements of knowledge and service delivery. We look forward to working with you and to continued collaboration with our provincial and municipal governments and community-based partners in building capacity in this area for the benefit of all Albertans.
**Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to provide the Minister with information related to the unmet needs of seniors and persons with disabilities (PWD) in rural and urban Alberta, and to provide an overview of the research, knowledge translation activities, and stakeholder collaborations being done by the Medically At-Risk Driver Centre at the University of Alberta (MARD) to address these unmet needs.

**Current Situation**

On December 4, 2015 the Capital Region Board (CRB) and the Calgary Regional Partnership (CRP) held a Regional Joint Transit Policy Workshop in Red Deer, Alberta. Goals of that meeting were to report on intermunicipal transit activities and initiatives, to discuss transit services and transportation infrastructure in the province, to discuss opportunities for joint transit initiatives between the two organizations, and to discuss priority actions to be taken in advocating to Provincial and Federal Governments for transit funding and support. During Breakout Session #1, a summary of the March 26, 2015 Joint Transit Policy Workshop was presented. In that session, the discussion was focused on ‘What we, as a region, are trying to achieve with Intermunicipal Transit.’ Both CRB and CRP members identified Social Responsibility and Regional Land Use as priority areas.

Desired achievements identified under Social Responsibility included: Support mobility for general public as well as for non-drivers, seniors, PWD and others with special needs; Reduce isolation for all age groups; Needs of changing demographic: and, Support for aging in place.

Desired achievements identified under Regional Land Use included: Support movement through region and Community viability.

The identified Challenges/Barriers to Intermunicipal Transit included: Ability to provide quality and reliable service; and Sharing and collaboration process among municipalities (sharing of assets, how to serve everyone, and connectivity).

During the December 4 Joint Transit Policy Roundtable, unmet transportation needs of seniors and PWD in rural and urban Alberta were identified by a number of workshop attendees including Dr. Bonnie Dobbs from MARD. MARD is a research and knowledge translation centre
that was established in 2008 with funding from the Ministry of Seniors. The grant funding from the Ministry of Seniors has supported many of the initiatives described below, including the soon-to-be released Toolkit for Alternate Transportation for Seniors in Rural and Urban Alberta.

**Background on Transportation Needs of Seniors and PWD**

Alberta’s population is aging. Based on a medium growth scenario, the proportion of seniors is expected to be almost 20% throughout the province over the next 30 years with the proportion of seniors projected to be 20% or greater in 12 of the 19 (63%) census divisions in Alberta in this same time period.¹ Seniors, as well as PWD, often face challenges in satisfying their mobility needs²-⁵ and, as such, often require ‘alternate’ or ‘specialized transportation’ that exists outside of the traditional modes of transportation (e.g., public transportation and/or private vehicles). In 2012, almost 3.8 million Canadians were living with a disability.⁵ It also is the case that the percentage of individuals who report having a disability increases with age. Specifically, Canadian statistics show that in 2012, 4.4% of individuals 15 to 24 years of age reported having a disability, with this percentage increasing to almost 43% for individuals 75 years of age and older.⁵

Lack of access to transportation for seniors and PWD often results in unmet needs including reduced access to medical services and other ‘necessary’ services such as grocery shopping and banking and an inability to attend social and religious activities. Lack of access to transportation also can compromise the ability to age in place and to stay connected with the community.²,³ An age-friendly community is one “where all individuals can be full and meaningful participants in their community”.⁶ In an age-friendly community, policies, services, settings, and structures related to the physical and social environments are designed to optimize opportunities for health, participation, and security. This encourages active aging and enhances the quality of life as people age.⁷ The availability of responsive forms of transportation is central to making our communities age-friendly.

MARD activities have resulted in an increased understanding of the transportation needs of seniors and/or PWD and have led to the development of solutions to meet those unmet needs. An overview of a number of MARD initiated projects is provided below.
2009 Survey of Edmonton ATS Service Providers

Key objectives of this project were to: 1) conduct a literature review on models of ATS service provision nationally and internationally; 2) survey Edmonton and Area ATS service providers to identify strengths and gaps in alternate transportation provision; and 3) assist in the development of an online, searchable database of ATS service providers.

Results related to Objective 1: Despite the well-recognized demand for ATS service provision, there is a paucity of research in the area, with an even greater paucity of literature on models of ATS service provision. Five factors identified as critical to transportation for seniors are Availability, Acceptability, Accessibility, Adaptability, and Affordability. These five factors, which have come to be known as ‘the 5 A’s of senior-friendly transportation,’ serve as a useful and standardized heuristic for measuring the responsiveness of ATS service provision within and across jurisdictions.

Results related to Objective 2: Thirty-three community-based, ATS service providers in Edmonton and Area Municipalities were identified and interviewed, using a standardized questionnaire. From the interviews, it was evident that the service providers are dedicated and often work tirelessly to provide ATS services in Edmonton and Area Municipalities. They also play an important role in advocating for and championing the need for improvements in ATS service. However, despite the commitment, dedication, and efforts of ATS service providers in Edmonton and Area Municipalities, the demand is much higher than available resources, resulting in unmet needs in this area. For an overwhelming number of service providers, funding is a constant concern. For those service providers using volunteer drivers, the recruitment of volunteer drivers is a growing concern.

Results related to Objective 3: To begin to better address the transportation needs of seniors and to streamline the process by which they can access transportation services, the results from this survey have been used as the basis for developing an online searchable database. The goal of the online searchable database is to provide seniors (and/or their caregivers) with a resource on ATS service provision. This resource allows seniors and caregivers to search for ATS service providers using specific ride requirements that are most closely aligned with their needs. (Note: The learnings from this
project were used by MARD to develop a resource for seniors in the province of Alberta – see 2009 and 2010 below).

2009 Identification of ATS Service Providers in Rural and Urban Alberta

The primary objectives of this study were to identify ATS service providers in the province of Alberta, to examine the responsiveness of those service providers in terms of the 5 A’s of senior friendly transportation (that is, alternate transportation that is Available, Acceptable, Accessible, Adaptable, and Affordable), and to develop a paper-based and web-based compendium of those service providers. ATS service providers were identified using various methods (web-based searches of community websites; known ATS service providers, and seniors’ organizations; hand searches of seniors’ service directories; and phone contacts with known ATS service providers and seniors’ organizations). Data were collected from identified ATS service providers through face-to-face or phone interviews using a structured data collection form. Seven hundred and ninety eight organizations were identified as potentially providing ATS services in the province. Of those, 197 organizations were established as providing ATS services.

2010 Development of an Online Compendium of ATS Service Providers in Rural and Urban Alberta

ATS has been identified as an unmet need in many jurisdictions worldwide. Increased longevity and the aging of the baby boomers have resulted in an increased demand for transportation services outside of the traditional public transportation setting. To address this demand, many ATS services are being implemented in our communities. However, awareness of these services is limited. To address this need, the goal of this project was to compile and develop a searchable online database of ATS service providers (e.g., volunteer driver programs, for-profit transportation programs for seniors) in urban and rural Alberta. These listings of ATS service providers are routinely updated and revised. The website hosting the online compendium is accessed on a regular basis, with access exceeding 12,000 since inception.

2011 A National and International Scan of Existing Models of Seniors’ Alternate Transportation and Identification of Unique Models and Innovative Solutions (conducted for the Federal/ Provincial/ Territorial Ministers of Seniors)
The objectives of this project were to conduct a national and international scan to identify unique and/or promising ATS service models and innovative solutions, and to use the information to advance our understanding of present and future ATS service delivery in rural and urban Canada. Results of the international scan indicated that there is a diversity of ATS service providers (For-Profit, Not-for-Profit, Blended Funding). In 2011, the majority (81%) of ATS service providers that we identified were Not-for-Profit, but it appears that For-Profit ATS service providers are becoming more common. All For-Profit ATS service providers rely on a ‘sole source’ of funding. The vast majority (90%) of Not-for-Profit service providers rely on multiple sources of funding (blended funding). The majority of For-Profit and Not-for-Profit ATS service providers, irrespective of funding, provide services other than transportation (~2/3 of ATS service providers across categories provide multiple services). A greater diversity of models exists in urban settings versus rural settings. The use of a ‘Coordinating Agency’ appears to be a new trend in ATS service delivery. The Coordinating Agency does not provide transportation per se. Rather, the focus is on managing/leveraging resources and transportation service integration, which can result in improvements in ATS service delivery. Recommendations based on our environmental scan are as follows: 1) further exploration of the Coordinating Agency approach to determine its feasibility, particularly in Canadian cities with populations <100,000, and in suburban and rural areas; 2) further analyses that would allow for ‘matching’ of identified models of ATS service provision in identified/selected jurisdictions in Canada; and 3) examination of policies that may facilitate/hinder ATS service provision.

2011 Provincial Survey of 901 Seniors in Rural and Urban Alberta on Perceptions and Use of Alternate Transportation

The objective of this research was to ‘hear from the seniors themselves’ what they consider important in ATS service provision. Areas of ATS service provision of specific interest included the respondents’: 1) perceptions of the importance of the 5 A’s of senior friendly transportation; 2) awareness of alternate transportation options in their community; 3) use of both public and alternate means of transportation; and 4) satisfaction with transportation options in their community. The responses from 901 community dwelling seniors in rural and urban areas of Alberta indicated that the vast majority of the respondents relied on traditional forms of transportation to meet their needs (e.g., private vehicle). Few (21%) of our respondents had planned for the day that they could no longer drive. Notably, compared to their male counterparts, a greater percentage of females in
our sample reported not driving. The need for ATS service for a variety of needs (e.g., essential, social, religious) was important irrespective of driving status. This need was particularly acute for transportation for medical needs, particularly for seniors in rural locations. Cost of alternate transportation is clearly an important consideration, with the majority of respondents (85%) indicating that they could afford to and would be willing to pay $14 or less for a one-way ride.

Overall, the findings serve as a guide to the provision of ATS service in both urban and rural areas. That is, ATS services can be shaped to fit the needs that seniors themselves perceive as being important as opposed to unfounded assumptions of the transportation needs of this important segment of our population. Utilizing these findings as a guide can result in the best fit in service provision, emphasizing the highly desired attributes of ATS service by seniors and de-emphasizing the attributes considered as less important. These attributes include an extensive array of features which go well beyond just scheduling and cost. Results from the survey also included the importance of driver training on aging, of providing assistance to the client (e.g., through the door ‘delivery’, escorts during service procurement), the cleanliness of the vehicle, and preferred methods of payment. The challenge is to utilize that information to develop an effective array of ATS services to support our aging population.

2013–

2014 Community Needs Assessment of Alternate Transportation in Wainwright and Area and Collaboration with Wainwright on Development and Implementation of Alternate Transportation in Wainwright and Surrounding District

The objective of this project was to work collaboratively with a community in rural Alberta in the development and implementation of a sustainable, responsive model of ATS. In the fall of 2012, a Request For Proposals for a rural Albert pilot on ATS was sent out to communities and groups in Alberta, with 17 applications received. An adjudication committee reviewed the applications and the Wainwright and District Handivan Society was chosen as the successful applicant. One of the first steps in the project was a Community Needs Assessment, with the results used to inform on the development and implementation of the ATS service model. Service provision was initiated in August of 2013. Since inception of the ATS service, rides have increased from less than 20 per month in August of 2013 to more than 150 rides per month in October of 2015.
learnings from the Wainwright pilot are being used in the development of a *Transportation Toolkit for the Implementation of Alternate Transportation for Seniors in Alberta*. MARD continues to collaborate with the Wainwright and District Handivan Society through presentations and knowledge translation to other ATS service providers in the province of Alberta.

### 2014 Analysis of Ride-Scheduling Software for Alternate Transportation Providers

The overall goal of the project was to identify ride-scheduling service providers available for use by community-based organizations providing transportation ATS services and to compare and contrast the features and capabilities of service provision across the identified ride-scheduling software programs. One of the objectives was to use the information to develop an easy-to-read resource guide of ride-scheduling software programs for use by community-based ATS service providers interested in the use of this technology to enhance their services. Eleven ride-scheduling software companies were interviewed.

The vast majority of the ride-scheduling software programs are web-based, which allows for easier access to the software, access to the software by multiple users, regular database backups, and storage of data on secure servers. A comparison of software features and capabilities across service providers indicated that there was little in the way of differences among the ride-scheduling software programs related to Client and Driver Profiles and features related to Planning Route and Trip Status. It also is the case, based on interviews with the 11 included software program providers, that there are few differences across ride-scheduling software programs in terms of *administrative aspects of service provision* (Client Payment Invoicing; Driver Reimbursement Statements; Reporting and Statistics; Training and Support; and Privacy and Security). In terms of costs, there also were similarities in terms of charges for different aspects of the software (e.g., start-up costs, customization, training, updating and maintenance costs, etc.), with those costs available to interested organizations on a one-on-one basis. The greatest differences noted across the 11 ride-scheduling software programs were related to *booking and notification of the trip* (e.g., Booking and Dispatching; Notification to the Driver of an Assigned Trip; Notification to Client of an Accepted Trip). It is important to note however, that the ride-scheduling software programs that are available are easily configurable and
customizable. As such, additional fields of interest specific to an organization's needs are likely easily addressed.

**2015 Capital Region Board Transportation Needs Assessment (Sub-region)**

Within Alberta's Capital Region, the 2009 Intermunicipal Network Plan\(^9\) has identified the provision of "specialized public transit services to seniors and persons with disabilities" (p. 58) as one of its mandates, as well as the provision of "special transit for persons with disabilities" (p. 15). Improvement of regional delivery of specialized intermunicipal transit services also has been identified as a need within the Capital Region. The goal of this project was to assess the transportation needs for two vulnerable segments of the population – seniors and PWD – in a sub-region of the Alberta Capital Region. The targeted sub-region for the *Transportation Needs Assessment* was Lamont County including the Town of Lamont, Town of Bruderheim, Town of Mundare, Andrew, Chipman, Hilliard, St. Michael, Star, Whitford, and Wostock, and the Town of Redwater.

The data were collected using random digit dialing with 413 interviews conducted by the University of Alberta's Population Research Laboratory under contract to MARD. Overall, 413 individuals aged 27 to 98 were interviewed, with an average age of 65 years. Although the majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ currently drove, 8% to 16% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that they had unmet transportation needs (i.e., unable to go to medical appointments, shop for groceries, get together with family, or attend social functions or religious activities in the last six months because they did not have a ride). Approximately one-third to one-half of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in their community were being met 'not at all well' for different types of trips (i.e., trips for health-related services, essential services such as grocery shopping and banking, visiting with family and friends, social activities, and for religious activities). One-half or more of PWD indicated that their transportation needs for health-related services, visiting with family and friends, and for social and religious activities were being met 'not at all well'. In terms of the importance of ATS services for different types of trips (i.e., health-related trips such as medical appointments, essential trips such as grocery shopping and banking, social activities, visiting with family and friends, and for religious activities), all trip purposes were rated as highly important (85% and greater rated all these trips as 'somewhat/very important'). Notably, the majority of participants indicated they were willing to pay for services, with both the 45–64 and 65+
aged participants indicating that they thought seniors in their community could *afford* to pay and were *willing* to pay approximately $8 for a one-way ride of 10 km. PWD participants indicated that they could *afford* to pay $10 for a one-way ride of 10 km but would be *willing* to pay $13. With respect to funding, the vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (97% and 98%, respectively) indicated that it was ‘somewhat/very important’ to have municipal funding available to offset the cost of providing ATS services in the community. When asked about the importance of intermunicipal transit services, 93% of the 413 participants indicated that having intermunicipal transit service available in the Capital Region was ‘somewhat/very important’.

Overall, the results from this study provide an important step toward understanding the adequacy and needs of relevant transportation services for seniors and PWD. That is, knowledge about the adequacy of current transportation services, and, if inadequate, knowledge about the perceived transportation needs is requisite to meeting the mobility needs of these two vulnerable segments of the population. Expansion of the *Transportation Needs Assessment* throughout the Capital Region is needed to inform on policy and planning initiatives related to the transportation needs of seniors who voluntarily or involuntarily stop driving and of PWD of any age in rural and urban settings.

**2015 Transportation Toolkit for the Implementation of Alternate Transportation for Seniors in Rural and Urban Alberta**

While viewed by many as important and desired, access to ATS services often are limited or non-existent. When available, services such as community-based vans, volunteer driving programs, and for-profit service providers may not be designed to adequately meet the unique mobility needs of seniors. Despite its importance, there are a number of challenges to implementing ATS service in rural and urban communities. The absence of ‘easily accessible’ and targeted information on implementing or expanding ATS services is one of the challenges. Building on the learnings garnered from the Wainwright and District Handivan Society alternate transportation pilot project, MARD is currently developing a *Transportation Toolkit for the Implementation of Alternate Transportation for Seniors in Alberta*. The *Toolkit* that can be used by individuals, communities, or existing service providers to develop, implement, or expand ATS services. To disseminate the information provided in the *Toolkit* and to facilitate the uptake of the *Toolkit* at the municipal level, 6 workshops were held throughout Alberta in the fall of 2015. The learnings from those
workshops are currently being integrated into the Toolkit. The Toolkit will be available for broad dissemination in early 2016.

Conclusion

Alberta’s population is aging. This demographic change has widespread implications in many areas of our society including the economy (e.g., an aging workforce, an expected labour shortage due to retirement, increased pressures on the public pension plan), the health care system (e.g., the delivery of health care services to an aging population), and pressures on other social structures (e.g., housing and other segments of the built environment). The issue of viable and responsive forms of transportation for seniors (and PWD) is an important issue today, and will continue to be for years to come. Yet, information about the transportation needs of seniors and persons with disabilities (PWD), and how to fulfill those needs, has been lacking. Importantly, the transportation needs of seniors and PWD when left unfulfilled affect not only those people, but also impact the lives and economic contributions (e.g., work absenteeism) of family members. The research and knowledge translation activities conducted by MARD have been instrumental in not only advancing our understanding of the transportation needs of seniors and PWD, but also in developing responsive solutions to enhance the mobility of these two vulnerable segments of our population. Through continued collaboration with our provincial and municipal governments and community-based partners, we can continue to build capacity in this area for the benefit of all Albertans.
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### Capital Region GreenTRIP Priorities

(Round 2 Applications, funded as of September 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Ranking</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Shovel Ready *</th>
<th>GreenTRIP Application (millions)</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Valley LRT Line - Stage 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$1,800.00 $250.00</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional Smart Card (funding partners: Edmonton, St. Albert, Strathcona)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$42.15 $28.08</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>Bus purchases, Park &amp; Ride and transfer station</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$11.07 $7.30</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Transit service - buses and transit stops, etc</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$1.50 $1.17</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride and transit facility</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$3.50 $2.20</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Bus purchases - 4 electric 12 meter buses (2014-2016)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$3.20 $2.13</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Bus purchases - 22 double decker buses</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$15.90 $10.70</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Costs - total (millions)** $1,877.32

**Capital Region GreenTRIP Round 2 Applications - total (millions)** $301.58

**Capital Region GreenTRIP Round 2 Budget (millions)** $266.00

### Capital Region Transit Priorities

(Additional transit projects considered, as of October 16, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Ranking</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Shovel Ready *</th>
<th>Project Costs (millions)</th>
<th>Application (millions)</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Heritage Valley Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$30.60</td>
<td>$20.20</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Smart bus - subject to Council approval</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>All other bus system upgrades (NE Transit Facility)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Transit garage expansion</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Intelligent transportation system (Smart Bus)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>All other LRT projects</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>LRT design and construction (Campbell Rd TUC to Downtown Edmonton)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>LRT design and construction (North Transit Centre to Downtown Edmonton)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Regional Park &amp; Rides</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Bus purchases (2016-2022)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Bus purchases - 6 double decker buses (future years)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>North Transit Centre and Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Baseline Road transit priority corridor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Transit priority measures along Mark Messier Trail</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Bus storage, maintenance and office facility</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Lifeline service for municipalities (&lt; 3500 population)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Downtown parking structure (500 Spaces)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shovel ready means the project is ready for tender by 2016 and in the case of bus purchases, are on order.
Household Travel Survey Update  
By Howaida Hassan, Project Manager, City of Edmonton  
December 2015

A quick update for the Household Travel Survey Working Group as the year comes a close.

December 11 marked the last scheduled travel day for households to log their travel data for the survey. Malatest will continue to keep the lines open for folks to enter their logged travel data.

I’m happy to report that we have exceeded our 19,000 completed survey target and as of today have retrieved 21,565 surveys - 13% higher than our target. District level targets in the city have all been exceeded and of the regional districts only rural Leduc County will fall short of its survey target at 90% of target surveys retrieved.

The Highlights

- Attempted to contact 253,000 households in Edmonton and the Region.
- 28,400 households have been recruited and 21,560 completed surveys retrieved - overall 75% completion rate.
- For the Transit Oversample 1,268 have recruited and 790 retrieved.
- A total of 192,500 trip records have been captured for householders five years of age and older (*includes the Transit Oversample householders).
- 2,900 individuals have signed up for the GPS study.
- A News Release was issued on October 26 to encourage further regional participation and update the public on progress to date.

Next Steps

- Close off data collection likely by end of December - beginning of January.
- Finalize data quality control criteria, Malatest to launch the data cleaning phase of the project - through January and February 2016.
- Data expansion exercise to commence once cleaned data set is signed off by the City project team - March 2016.

Interesting facts

1. 86% of survey completers initially said that they wanted to do the survey online, however only 71% of survey completers did so entirely online.

2. Of those who initially expressed a preference for doing the survey retrieval via telephone, almost 11% ended up completing it online rather than over the phone.

3. 52 issues/concerns/comments have been escalated by Malatest to the City for response.