



ISSN 1180-4386

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 38th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 38^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 1 June 2006

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Jeudi 1^{er} juin 2006

**Standing committee on
finance and economic affairs**

**Comité permanent des finances
et des affaires économiques**

Greater Toronto
Transportation Authority
Act, 2006

Loi de 2006 sur la Régie
des transports du grand Toronto

Chair: Pat Hoy
Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Président : Pat Hoy
Greffier : Douglas Arnott

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Copies of Hansard can be purchased from Publications Ontario: 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8.
e-mail: webpubont@gov.on.ca

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Des exemplaires du Journal sont en vente à Publications Ontario : 880, rue Bay Toronto (Ontario), M7A 1N8
courriel : webpubont@gov.on.ca

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES FINANCES
ET DES AFFAIRES ÉCONOMIQUES**

Thursday 1 June 2006

Jeudi 1^{er} juin 2006

The committee met at 0904 in room 230.

**GREATER TORONTO
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
ACT, 2006**

**LOI DE 2006 SUR LA RÉGIE
DES TRANSPORTS DU GRAND TORONTO**

Consideration of Bill 104, An Act to establish the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority and to repeal the GO Transit Act, 2001 / Projet de loi 104, Loi visant à créer la Régie des transports du grand Toronto et à abroger la Loi de 2001 sur le Réseau GO.

The Chair (Mr. Pat Hoy): The standing committee on finance and economic affairs will now come to order. We're here for public hearings on Bill 104. Our first order of business would be to have the report of the subcommittee.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Wayne Arthurs (Pickering–Ajax–Uxbridge): Your subcommittee on committee business considered on Monday, May 15, 2006 the method of proceeding on Bill 104, An Act to establish the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority and to repeal the GO Transit Act, 2001, and recommends the following:

1. That the committee meet in Toronto for the purpose of holding public hearings at 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. on Thursday, June 1, 2006.

2. That the clerk of the committee, with the authorization of the Chair, publish notice of the hearings in English or French, as appropriate, in the following newspapers: Toronto Star, Hamilton Spectator, l'Express, and le Regional Hamilton.

3. That the clerk of the committee, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized to post notice of the committee's public hearings on the Ontario parliamentary Channel and on the Internet prior to the adoption of this motion.

4. That the deadline for receipt of requests to appear before the committee be 5 p.m. on Thursday, May 25, 2006.

5. That the clerk of the committee distribute to each of the three parties on Friday morning, May 26, 2006, a list of those who have requested to appear by the deadline for receipt of requests.

6. That, if required, each of the three parties supply the clerk of the committee with a prioritized list of the witnesses they would like to hear from by 10 a.m. on Monday, May 29, 2006. These witnesses must be selected from the original list distributed by the committee clerk.

7. That the clerk of the committee, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized to schedule the witnesses.

8. That the time allowed for presentations by witnesses be up to 10 minutes for groups and individuals, followed by up to 5 minutes for questioning by committee members.

9. That the deadline for receipt of written submissions be 5 p.m. on Thursday, June 1, 2006.

10. That the research officer provide a summary of presentations prior to the start of the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

11. That proposed amendments to be moved during clause-by-clause consideration of the bill should be filed with the clerk of the committee by 12 noon on Monday, June 5, 2006.

12. That clause-by-clause consideration of the bill be scheduled from 9 a.m. to 11:45 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. on Thursday, June 8, 2006.

13. That the clerk of the committee, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized to commence making any preliminary arrangements to facilitate the committee's proceedings prior to the adoption of this report.

The Chair: Mr. Arthurs has moved a report from the subcommittee. All in favour?

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth): I'd just like to note that, although I have no objections to it, these minutes were modified after the meeting. I just want to have it on record that this doesn't reflect the original discussion of the subcommittee. They have been modified. I have no objection to the modification.

The Chair: Thank you. In agreement? Carried.

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA

The Chair: Now we'll hear from our first presenter of the morning, the city of Mississauga. Would you please come forward?

Good morning. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I would ask you to identify yourselves for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Ms. Pat Saito: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Councillor Pat Saito. I represent the city of Mississauga, and I'm also a region of Peel councillor. I'm here this morning representing Mayor McCallion and members of Mississauga council.

Joining me is Martin Powell. Martin is the commissioner of transportation and works for the city of Mississauga. He can answer all of the tough questions, if there are any, after my presentation.

I'd like to thank you for giving the city of Mississauga an opportunity to address you on this very important piece of legislation. We are strongly supportive of the provincial plans to create the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority, and we thank you for moving forward in this direction.

The GTA is a rapidly growing region with a transportation network that has been very inadequately coordinated and funded over the years, and we are encouraged that this legislation will result in an improvement in this situation.

Mississauga is the largest lower-tier municipality in the province, with a population of over 700,000 residents. We are a net employment importer, with over 425,000 employment opportunities. We are ranked third behind Toronto and Hamilton in a recent review of density in the GTA-Hamilton area. We operate the second-largest municipal transit system in the GTA, which carried approximately 28 million passengers in 2005.

The mobility needs of our community also rely heavily on the provincial highway network and the GO Transit system. Transportation and congestion are consistently identified as major issues in our annual public surveys. We have transportation problems that need to be addressed today. It is essential that the province proceed expeditiously to provide the necessary mandate and resources to seriously tackle gridlock and improve the transportation system, which is critical to the sustained health and growth of all municipalities in the GTA.

However, we do have some concerns with some of the elements of Bill 104, and it's important that we get it right before we move forward.

I would like to focus my comments on the main issues of mandate, governance and funding proposals for the GTTA.

In relation to mandate, Bill 104 outlines the broad mandate of the GTTA. However, we have some concerns regarding the following:

First, the identified GTTA divisions, which will include GO Transit, Farecard and procurement, do not include a division with responsibility for regional transportation planning. Furthermore, to achieve the mandate of the GTTA, municipal official plans should be made to conform to the GTTA transportation plan to provide more integrated regional planning rather than the other way around, as is proposed in the bill.

Mississauga advocates that the provision or delivery of services should be undertaken by the local municipalities wherever possible. However, some selected services may be more efficiently delivered across the

GTA, and the GTTA should have the responsibility for coordinating transportation research, including data collection, along with coordinating intelligent transportation system technologies, freight movement policy and travel demand management programs.

0910

The development of the GTTA transportation plan is to consider all transportation modes, including highways, cycling and walking. In addition, it is to have responsibility to advise on the implications that major development proposals have on the transportation network. However, it is not clear what the GTTA's mandate is in these areas or what tools this body will have to institute these components in Bill 104.

Mississauga has some specific concerns related to the role and mandate of the proposed central procurement agency. The act identifies that the GTTA "shall" undertake procurement responsibilities, although later sections say that municipalities "may" enter into procurement agreements. This needs to be clarified. Furthermore, there is no definition as to what constitutes "equipment, technologies, facilities, supplies and services," or the level of autonomous local control over decision-making on these items. An assessment of the benefits and risks of acquiring goods and services from a central procurement agency should be undertaken. It is essential that the integrity of the process remains competitive and ensures quality, reasonably priced results and doesn't unreasonably delay procurement deadline requirements.

Our next issue is governance. Mississauga has two primary concerns with the proposed governance model found within Bill 104. Clearly, the proposed model, which provides four members to the city of Toronto, recognizes the principle of representation by population. However, the proposed GTTA board will significantly underrepresent the residents of the city of Mississauga. Based upon population levels provided in Places to Grow, the single proposed Peel director would represent the needs of over one million residents, while the other directors would represent communities ranging from 380,000 to 760,000 and averaging 646,000 residents each. This disparity will only increase by 2011, when the single Peel director would represent 1,320,000 people, compared to the average of 762,000.

The second concern is that transit will clearly be a key focus for the GTTA, yet the proposed governance model does not allow for direct representation from the municipalities that exercise responsibility for transit in Peel region. The only transit service provided by the region of Peel is Transhelp. The city of Mississauga operates the second-largest municipal transit system in the GTA and the third-largest in the province, as I noted earlier, carrying 28 million passengers in 2005. Therefore, based upon these combined criteria, the province should make the GTTA board more representative by replacing the single proposed director to be recommended by Peel region with one representative recommended by the council of the city of Mississauga and one recommended by the council of the city of Brampton. If the province

prefers the recommendation to come from the regional municipality, then we request that it be specified that there be one appointment from each of Mississauga and Brampton. If this proposal alters the desired political balance of the GTTA board, this can be rectified through amending the number of provincial or Toronto directors.

Our last issue is funding. The GTTA has been given the responsibility to plan for a multi-modal transportation network, but does not seem to be provided with the financial resources or the tools to allow it to implement this mandate. This was the problem that plagued the Greater Toronto Services Board, and the province must ensure that the GTTA is not hampered by those same restrictions. The GTTA should become the conduit for provincial and federal transportation infrastructure funding. However, it is left unclear as to the municipal role in funding GTTA operating and capital plans. It should be clear that inter-regional transit needs should not be funded from the already overburdened property tax base.

Instead, the GTTA should be provided with broad powers to raise additional revenues by various means, including taxes, levies, toll charges, user fees and motor vehicle charges, to fully undertake their mandate. To augment funding provided by senior levels of government for the growth elements of the GTTA transportation and capital plan, including the GO Transit capital plan, development charges should be applied across the regional area using a flat GTA–Hamilton-wide fee and based upon the approved transportation plan, instead of being limited to historical service levels as identified in the existing Development Charges Act. Any annual operating surplus achieved by GO Transit should not be returned to the province but should be retained for future investment or as reserves.

In summary, Mississauga's position is that we need coordinated transit system planning and development to improve access to transit and strengthen transit links across the GTA. We are encouraged by and strongly supportive of the province's plans to create the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority. We do have concerns with some of the elements of Bill 104 and we feel it is important that we get it right before we move forward. Of particular importance is that need for a GTTA board member from each of Mississauga and Brampton.

Please consider our comments on the mandate, governance and funding for the proposed GTTA in Bill 104. Our council held a special meeting yesterday to review and discuss this very important piece of legislation and endorsed a corporate report dated May 18, 2006, which addressed in more detail the items which I have highlighted today. I believe a copy has been provided to the committee clerk.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would be willing to answer any questions you might have.

The Chair: Thank you. A copy of that report will be given to each of the members of this committee.

This round of questioning will go to the official opposition.

Mr. John O'Toole (Durham): Thank you very much for your presentation this morning. I had a chance to flip through your referenced May 18 report. I think you've pretty well hit on most of the elements, the four elements. First of all, I think you'd find unanimous agreement from all parties that this is something that's badly needed. Having been part of the Harris-Eves government, there was an attempt, as you said, with the Greater Toronto Services Board to do that. I think the report, respectfully, is an honest reconciliation of what actually happened. It became overly politicized and underfunded and couldn't really execute its mandate. I think they're really stuck with the same thing here. So I appreciate that report. I think it's a very good report. I think the four areas that I've mentioned certainly would include what is the actual authority, the mandate. Of course, it's not strong enough or clear enough.

The second one, of course, is going to be the funding; again, that's going to be ongoing, and the governance. They're the three things that need to be clear.

Have you got specific references? I haven't had a chance to reconcile that. What our sense is, the way it's structured—this is sort of a statement but I'd be happy to hear from you in response in this forum or in another forum. If it becomes all politicians, it will be dysfunctional, because they have their little agreements. David and Hazel will get along, and everybody else will get nothing, and this kind of stuff will happen. My area, Durham, is underserved, if you would. In my respect, it is, and growth is there.

How about a non-partisan, non-political governance model? Is there any advice on that that you might have?

Ms. Saito: I did sit on the Greater Toronto Services Board. I was the additional Mississauga representative. So when I speak about the GTSB—Wayne Arthurs over there knows how we struggled on the GTSB because we came forward with what I feel was an excellent transportation strategy and it got nowhere because, as you said, we didn't have the funding and we didn't have the mandate to put into play that strategy.

Mr. O'Toole: But it's the same thing here. That's the problem.

Ms. Saito: And that's why we raised this issue with the funding and the mandate. As far as being—

Mr. O'Toole: What would you do to fix that?

Ms. Saito: As I mentioned in my presentation, the funding is critical. That was the biggest drawback of the GTSB: no funding.

Mr. O'Toole: Right. Raise the taxes.

Ms. Saito: Give the body the means of raising revenue. I've mentioned taxes, levies—

Mr. O'Toole: Let's be specific. I appreciate that. What money? You've got a lot of suggestions here: taxes, fees, parking permits, toll fees, whatever, because it needs money, and you either have to raise taxes provincially across everybody in Thunder Bay and Timmins, or there has to be some kind of levy coming into Toronto or something, like they do in the city of London. What

kind of money, and from where specifically? Tax the car. Will they tax the cars?

0920

Ms. Saito: You can tax the cars. You can raise it, as I mentioned, through the toll charges. I'm not sure that's much of an option at this point in time. But our feeling is that it should not be coming out of the property taxes for inter-regional transportation systems. We are—

Mr. O'Toole: What about the gas tax?

Ms. Saito: The gas tax is an excellent way of raising the funds; development charges for the growth. We have been promoting development charges in Peel region for GO Transit growth. That's how we've been funding the capital plan of GO and we advocate that very strongly.

Your other question was in relation to the political representation. I think the ideal body would have a mix of political and non-political on it. I don't think you can have an entirely non-political board that is dealing with the transportation across the GTA—

Mr. O'Toole: What do you think of the GO board model? Actually, it's a pretty good model.

Ms. Saito: Yes, it is, and it's worked very well.

Mr. O'Toole: It's actually quite a good board, technically, and there's a mix, as you've suggested.

The current sizing and the allocation—one member from Peel, one from York and one from Halton/Hamilton; Toronto, four; and two from the government—sort of boxes it out a bit if you look at it. It's dysfunctional technically, because Hazel and Toronto can just clean up totally. That's it. I don't know how they're going to build consensus there, especially if it's politicized.

Ms. Saito: If it's 100% politicized, I agree.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation.

Ms. Saito: Thank you very much for the opportunity. We appreciate it.

TERRY GOODWIN

The Chair: Terry Goodwin, please come forward. Be seated anywhere there. Good morning. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I would ask you to identify yourself for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Mr. Terry Goodwin: Good morning. Thank you very much. My name is Terry Goodwin and I live in Thornhill, in the Vaughan section of it. I was a member of Vaughan council for four years from 1974 to 1978, when we were designing the new Thornhill-Vaughan—75,000 people. That's almost built up right now.

I also served, prior to that time, as a local school board trustee in the old Vaughan board. I took out my citizenship at that time. I served for five and a half years. During this time, I have sat for about 10 years with an advisory committee here at Queen's Park. We weren't paid, but we developed some thoughts. Most of these thoughts, I have to say, are mine and my comments will be, first of all, on those and then I will comment on Bill 104. These are strictly broad-brush, bare-bones com-

ments, but I hope to learn something today from other people, as I have from the speaker before, with whom I largely agree.

The subject is gridlock; what do you do about it? In most cases, health, education and the hydro problems come first. I say it's the art of the possible. Get one's mind right out of the box. There must be an authority, which could be a pattern for other areas in the province. There should be three commissioners or board members full-time, without a political—municipal—requirement. The Ministers of Transportation, as well as urban and housing, or their deputies, should be members, but not necessarily full-time. Said authority should be regulatory, not operating. It should have the power to bonus operators/municipalities.

It's very hard to get people out of their cars. A good transit system should be convenient and seamless and show a large saving in time. GO rail showed that when they cut their time from Pickering from one hour down to half an hour, the ridership doubled, and the same sort of experience with that of Oakville and Port Credit. So there's a saving in time required to get people out of their cars.

You should have fares for distance, because you have to take care of the local person who wants to go to the shopping area or their dentist or what have you, and also the people who are sitting quite close to the boundaries right now. This postage-stamp business that we have now is just no way.

The greatest opportunity is for GO rail multiple-unit cars, every axle live, with overhead electric, which provides fast acceleration and puts power back in the supply when braking. The Hawker-Siddeley design for the shells of the present cars supported overhead electric. The last submission I heard, informally, about going electric was to bring in big locomotives and use the existing cars that way. It doesn't quite save the time.

I said I came up here to join the air force, yes, and I came from Philadelphia. In 1930, when we were on steam—it was the same distance from Langstaff. At Langstaff, you get on the GO train now, and it takes 35 minutes to get downtown. We were on steam in 1930, and it took us 25 minutes. They put in overhead electric, with every axle live, and we were down to 18 minutes. I respectfully submit that if you put 18 minutes out of Langstaff and the equivalent out of other places, you won't put the Don Valley Parkway out of business but you will certainly take a big chunk, the top part of it, off there. So that's very, very important.

The fare for distance can be as low as 25 cents or 50 cents for a local trip, and then graded up for longer rides. It avoids high combinations across borders and can be divided among the carriers, including rail and service. An operator—the municipality—should be bonused for each passenger-kilometre carried to make the system show a profit, not a deficit. The first thing I heard when I was on council, and I've heard it ever since: "We don't have enough money so we'll cut buses, or we'll cut the service." That's not the aggressive way to get people out of

their cars. The municipality has to make this thing pay, and pay for profit, so that they say, “That is an added way of making money.”

The operating funds—we’ve heard about that question—should come from a transportation levy shown separately on each tax bill. Area-wide lot levies should be required for capital projects; we’ve heard that. The resulting funds can be augmented by the province and the federals. It’s very important to make a place for that.

Roads and highways should be surveyed once every three years, for which the municipality should be reimbursed, particularly for numbered highways. Funds for their improvement should also come from these funds.

Those are the broad strokes. What does Bill 104 do? The authority, by definition, should be available to any other municipalities, such as Kitchener-Waterloo or Ottawa, that want to opt in. Bill 104 creates a board of 11 members, who may or may not be directly elected in their municipalities. By definition and experience, that is dysfunctional, and you heard that from the start. There should be, I say, three commissioners, full-time.

Bill 104 creates a purchasing division with little benefit and creates expenses. Most operators today have sufficient purchasing experience to get the best equipment at a proper price. Why create an additional 3% or 5% expense?

Fare collection and division can be contracted out using smart cards; you’ve heard of that. A function to monitor bonusing is required. At present, there’s only a shell. We’ve heard that in the Hansard; quite a few people said that. A bonus should be paid to each municipality for each passenger-kilometre carried, and no deficit allowed. That bonus opportunity should encourage the operator to be more aggressive and innovative and get more people out of their cars.

Thank you very much. Those are broad strokes, but I’d be glad to answer any questions.

0930

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation. This round of questioning will go to the NDP.

Mr. Tabuns: Thank you, Mr. Goodwin, for coming in and presenting today. Are you aware of any studies that have been done to show how such a regional authority would actually succeed in reducing the number of commuter trips in this area?

Mr. Goodwin: I’m not aware of any full studies, but I’ve just pointed out that when GO rail decreased their time from Pickering to downtown—cut it in half—and the equivalent from Oakville and Port Credit, their ridership doubled. That is one of the principal things, because otherwise you just go out to your garage, press a button and get in the car. It’s the most convenient sort of thing to do. You’ve really got to work at this thing. Whether it’s lot levies, as explained a bit earlier—they have to be set on the local area, and area-wide, because you can’t have one competing against the other: “I’ll give you 5% off; I’ll give you 10% off.” There are no studies. You’ll probably pay \$100,000 or better for some con-

sultant to give you that. If he knows what you want, that’s what you’ll get. I’m a little bit cynical.

Mr. Tabuns: I don’t blame you.

Your comment on cutting the time to get into downtown Toronto from the suburban area vastly increasing the ridership is interesting. It strikes me, then: Why don’t we just put our time and effort into expanding GO and making sure it can move people as quickly and conveniently as possible? Why do we try to patch together all these municipalities and their different transit systems? Do you see the logic in going forward with this patch-together?

Mr. Goodwin: Well, I would rather see us keep the mix of operations we have right now, simply because they’re much more efficient as far as money is concerned. If you had the TTC take over everything, our bills would be doubled at a minimum. There’s an awful lot of money required to do this, and I think I began to realize this at that committee when the roads people said that if growth kept on the way it was—this is 10 or 15 years ago—they were going to need \$20 billion over the period of time just to pour the concrete—nothing for the increased widths. Where are you going to put these things?

That’s one reason that GO rail was started, and GO has suffered for lack of money. It takes a long time just to get your environmental things done. You can’t just snap your fingers. So no, the big studies will come as you get things going, as you tell people they’re going to have money to do these things. That’s what you have to do. You have to be able to assure them that some monies will be available, not just this year, this week or next budget, but for a period of time. You have to set that formula.

I think that’s the biggest job this committee can do, plus the concept of bonusing each of the municipalities. The TTC gets a big one, and that bonus might even—I’m throwing a number out in the air; I have no validation. What if you paid them 10 cents for every passenger-kilometre carried? Would they jump at that? Wouldn’t they cut their deficit off? You wouldn’t do that directly. You’d have to have one fee right across the whole served area, a separate fee for the people in Kitchener-Waterloo and a separate one for Ottawa. And the people out in the rural area are not going to get caught on that. They don’t have to pay in Owen Sound for something that’s going on in Toronto. That’s the way on that.

I’d be glad to answer more questions.

Mr. Tabuns: I have no further questions.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation before the committee.

SMART, McMASTER UNIVERSITY

The Chair: I call on SMART McMaster University to come forward, please. Good morning. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I would ask you to identify yourself for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Mr. Robert Hicks: It's a pleasure to be here today. My name is Robert Hicks. I am a member of the board of directors of the Ontario Public Interest Research Group at McMaster University, and I am here to represent SMART, which is an OPIRG working group I formed two years ago. SMART stands for Student Math Action Research Team, and its slogan and aim is, "Making mathematics matter more for the environment and the community."

I'd like to begin with a question: If a chicken and a half lays an egg and a half in a day and a half, then how many eggs does a chicken lay in a day?

The reason I begin with that mathematical puzzle is to point out that mathematics can play tricks with our minds. This is a brainteaser question. Many people would quickly say "one egg," but that would be the wrong answer. It would still take a chicken and a half to lay one egg in one day. The correct answer is two thirds of an egg per chicken, per day.

A similar question would be: If a car and a half produces a tonne and a half of greenhouse gases in a year and a half, then how many tonnes of greenhouse gas does a car produce in a year?

The answer would be two thirds of a tonne, similar to the two thirds of an egg in the chicken-and-egg question. But you might be interested to know that two thirds of a tonne would mean the car burned 278 litres of fuel over the 52-week period and only 5.34 litres of fuel a week. The reason for that is, a tonne of greenhouse gas is produced for every 417 litres burned. If you paid exactly \$1 per litre, that two thirds of a tonne would mean only \$5.34 a week at the pumps.

This math matters. Therefore, it is very important that people, and especially community decision-makers, understand the math behind it. Whenever the stakes are very big, it is very wise to seek out the math that can help us, because making mistakes can be very, very costly to our community and to our environment.

I have come here today to tell you that for the past two years, SMART has been looking very closely at the mathematics that matter a great deal to Bill 104. Specifically, we have researched in great depth the tonnes of greenhouse gases produced every day by every vehicle in over 4,800 communities across Canada. As a result, we have generated some important statistical numbers. We feel these are numbers that matter a great deal to Bill 104 and Ontario's future.

We have come here today to tell you about the number 3.36, the number 0.00041, the number 2,256 and the number 940,000. But before I tell you what these numbers represent, I will tell you where they came from.

0940

The Office of Energy Efficiency of Natural Resources Canada in Ottawa provided SMART with a very valuable, very large spreadsheet of very important data. This spreadsheet analyzed the fuel efficiency of over 14 million registered vehicles across Canada in the year 2003 in 61 fuel-efficient categories.

From these data we can tell you that the average engine size of all light-duty vehicles in Canada in the year 2003 was a 3.6 litre engine: That is a six-cylinder engine. This is important to know because, sitting in a traffic jam, a six-cylinder engine burns a lot more fuel and produces a lot more greenhouse gases than a smaller four-cylinder engine, and it tells us that we should be trying to cut back on the number of eight-cylinder engines on the road, that can produce double the greenhouse gas of a four-cylinder engine, in order to improve the fuel efficiency of the average vehicle on the road.

From these data we can tell you with considerable confidence in the accuracy the following: that 0.00041 tonnes of greenhouse gas are generated in one year by the average Canadian vehicle for every second that vehicle idles in a parking lot, at a red light or in a traffic jam. This also means that for every second each day our vehicles also waste over 940,000 litres of fuel a year. That leads us to these numbers.

It means that for every 10 minutes each day that all light-duty vehicles in Ontario are delayed by traffic congestion, we produce over 1.35 million tonnes of greenhouse gas and we burn over 560 million litres of fuel, a non-renewable resource, valued at about \$560 million. For 20 minutes, you can double that. It would produce 2.7 million tonnes of greenhouse gas a year and waste over \$1 billion in fuel and a billion litres of fuel.

What does this tell us? It tells us a number of things. It tells us that we must not just think about the lost time and the productivity losses caused by traffic congestion; we must also concentrate greatly on the massive amounts of greenhouse gas produced and the massive amounts of fuel we burn and waste at the same time.

It tells us we need to work hard to educate people better, to deliver the message more effectively, that people must try to conserve more, carpool more, combine trips and drive less, walk more and perhaps ride a bike more.

It tells us that bicycles should immediately become tax-exempt and people should be encouraged to buy one and ride it.

To encourage people to get out of their vehicles as much as possible, the new GTTA will need to put into higher gear efforts to educate people about the high costs of congestion and fuel waste, and also the massive amounts of greenhouse gases produced by large volumes of vehicles every day.

Firstly, SMART recommends the following: that the total number of light-duty vehicles in every community, and the average engine size of those vehicles, be posted on all signs in Ontario that welcome people to a community and state the population of the community. This one measure would be effective to promote discussion of the related issues by all citizens and send a strong message to the public that their co-operation is needed to effectively address the problem.

Secondly, we would like to point out the following: A major objective of the new GTTA will be to ensure that commuters spend less time waiting for a connecting bus

or train. That would be a good thing. However, the major problem is that it will not help very much if the people who own cars are not interested in those public transit improvements. Therefore the citizens of Ontario need to be convinced and sold on the idea that it is critical they help solve the problem by getting out of their cars as much as possible.

It is true that today, more than ever, we need a seamless transportation network to help reduce congestion on our roads. But it is also true that every day our overall fleet of vehicles in the province is increasing because of an ever-increasing population and because of sprawl development. The thinness of sprawl of a suburb, combined with the fact that every 417 litres of fuel burned produces one tonne of greenhouse gas, is largely responsible for Canada not being able to achieve its Kyoto Protocol commitments. Yet sprawl is allowed to continue. Continued sprawl means continued growth in automobile ownership, and that means continued growth in congestion. Yet sprawl is being allowed to continue.

A growing body of evidence suggests that expansion of the highway networks has helped fuel the increase in driving. The expansion of highways triggers changes in driver behaviour and land use that spur additional vehicle travel, a phenomenon called induced travel. Extending a highway into a new area effectively opens that area to large-scale development, often of the sprawling, auto-dependent variety. This government and the new GTTA will need to recognize, acknowledge and consider the broader negative long-term impacts of highway and road enlargement proposals. The public will need to understand and should be, and hopefully will be, encouraged to debate the multi-layered problems involved in continuing auto-dependent development.

Effective planning requires judgment, sensitivity and creativity, but solving this problem will also require a lot of mathematics. SMART hopes that the new GTTA will do a lot of math and be honest and open with the public about the numbers this math will generate. Many of those numbers may present unwelcome news, since we know that cheap oil will not last forever and global warming will not be addressed effectively if millions of vehicles sit idling in traffic jams every day.

We hope the Ontario government and communities all across Ontario and Canada will put the number 0.00041 to good use. We call it the SMART factor for the average Canadian vehicle. We believe it is a useful environmental indicator whose time has come. It can be used to easily calculate the greenhouse gas and fuel savings generated by even minor traffic flow improvements that are possible at most intersections, and it can be used to easily calculate the added greenhouse gas and added fuel consumption that would be caused by an added new traffic light to an already congested road to accommodate a new commercial development. When cities see those numbers, they might want to reconsider adding the stoplight.

In closing, we are attaching to this presentation a report we published on March 30 titled *The SMART report: Blowing the Numbers Out of Canada's Tailpipes;*

Blowing the Whistle on the Lack of Action. We hope you will read it. Also, there was more to today's presentation than these 10 minutes would allow, so we hope that you will read that also. If SMART can be of assistance in any way, we would be happy to help out at any time in the future. That's all I have to say. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation. This round of questioning will go to the government. Mr. McNeely.

Mr. Phil McNeely (Ottawa–Orléans): Thank you, Mr. Hicks, for coming in this morning and for making us think. Just looking at those four signs that you have in your brief: They certainly would be signs to let individuals know of the major problem we have on our transportation networks. Anything we're going to do in the future has the major challenge of even keeping up with the growth in automobiles and the growth in travel.

Mr. Hicks: The numbers for those are available because of the registration of the licence plate system. It would be really terrific if one community could see that their average engine size was lower or higher than the one beside them. It would motivate people to downsize their engine sizes.

0950

Mr. McNeely: Yes, and I think it would ask the people the question of their habits. You'd see these signs along the highways, and they wouldn't be very high-cost.

One of the difficulties, of course, is the cultural change that's involved in transportation, and it's something that is happening at the local level and at other levels of government. Certainly the federal government had many issues to curtail travel to try to save. What do you see as the best direction we should be going in, in trying to change the culture?

Mr. Hicks: I think the best direction is you've got to speak with the public more. You've got to put it out more. You've got to use the newspapers with half-page or full-page ads, being totally blunt and honest with them, saying, "People of Ontario, we have a problem. We have too much congestion. We are going to do what we can to fix it, but we will not succeed to the extent that we really need to unless you help us."

You have to ask the people of Ontario to help you. You have to get them talking about the problem at the water coolers in the offices where they work and saying, "Okay, finally I'll get together with the guy who lives down the street and we can drive together." You've got to motivate the millions of people in this country. Widening the highway is not going to solve the problem. You've got to get to the source of the millions of people who get into one car and drive in a slow, congested way, back and forth to work. You've got to get them out of their cars, and the best way to do that is to ask them to get out of their cars and keep asking them, and do it in clever ways.

Mr. McNeely: Thank you very much. I have no other questions.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Hicks: Thank you. My pleasure.

ANDREW SCHULZ

The Chair: I call on Andrew Schulz to come forward, please. Good morning. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I would ask you to identify yourself.

Mr. Andrew Schulz: My name is Andrew Schulz. I live in Scarborough, Ontario, and I took the subway to come down here today.

I wanted to start off with some stories and on-the-ground observations. I frequently take the GO train to visit my girlfriend in Oakville, and one time, the train was five minutes late. The buses there are scheduled to leave exactly five minutes after the train arrives, to give you time to transfer. To my despair, I ran out of the train to catch the bus and all the buses were leaving the station. Since they only have hourly service, I decided to walk the five kilometres rather than wait a whole hour. This is indicative of the kind of situation that many people face in the greater Toronto area.

Other observations: Very often in the Toronto Transit Commission, I've seen bunched buses, where you have sometimes up to three or four buses bunched and then people are kept waiting up to half an hour for the next vehicle. I don't understand why drivers cannot be empowered to just have one express go ahead to improve the service. I think it's due to the way that drivers are treated. There are always rules and regulations. I think they should have the power to just run express if they see a service problem, because by the time an inspector gets there, it's far too late.

Other observations: Steeles Avenue, where Toronto meets York region, is an artificial boundary, but not for people who live there. I very often see bicycles left, locked to trees, poles and those guy wires holding utility poles. This demonstrates the demand for cycling to bus stops. People think no one's going to ride a bike to a bus stop, and here, they do. It also shows that York region residents are not happy with their transit service. First of all, they have to pay an extra fare, and it's for infrequent service.

My final story is attached to the end of my brief. I think you all have a copy of it. I call it my Brampton Transit odyssey. I hope you all had a chance to read that, because I would guess that none of you has ever taken a trip like that. It's eye-opening. Even when people want to take a trip like that, there are all these hurdles thrown in their way, but when you want to jump into a car, it's just snap your fingers and you go. You don't need to think about it very much. Why does it have to be an odyssey to cross the GTA? That, to me, should be the primary objective of this new agency: to remove all those obstacles. It's really a number of little things that need to be done to remove those obstacles.

Now I'll go to my written brief. I've written it in the form of questions. I pose a number of questions: Who? Why? What? How? When? Where?

First of all, who? Who will be represented on the board of the GTTA? This is my most important recom-

mendation: I believe that ordinary transit riders should be on this board. I have heard from a fellow whose name I won't identify—you probably all know him—who, when he was first appointed to the GO Transit board, hardly even knew what GO was. He probably had never set foot on a bus in 20 years. That is not acceptable. There should be people on this board who are passionate about transit and who actually use it. So I would strongly recommend that at least one of the provincial appointees be someone like myself—and I could name other people—who would understand the system from the ground and use it. They should be people who have a system-wide view, not a particular regional axe to grind.

There are precedents for this, in case you think it can't be done. I serve currently on the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority board. I am one of the city of Toronto's citizen representatives there. I think it's very useful to have someone like me on a board like that, because the councillors all have a different idea as to how things should go. The library boards in most municipalities have citizen appointees. Many US transit systems have citizen appointees to their boards. And of course the Toronto Transit Commission originally had people on there who were not councillors.

Next question: What is the mandate of the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority? I feel that its mandate should not include running the GO Transit system. I would keep GO Transit as it is, as a stand-alone agency. The new agency should focus on coordinating services, planning and fares. They should look at the big picture, the region-wide picture. As well, they should be looking at some smaller-scale projects to address some system-wide objectives that I'll identify later. These are things like making it easier to walk to bus stops, to address those concerns I addressed in my Brampton Transit odyssey.

If you go ahead and merge GO with the GTTA, I fear there's going to be organizational chaos, because GO is a large, bureaucratic organization. Does anyone remember the situation when Air Canada took over Canadian Airlines and the turmoil there was? There's always resistance to change, so why risk that? GO is okay as it is; just leave it alone. Set up the GTTA separately.

Next question: Why are meetings closed to the public? We really should want transparency. There should be a constituency to demand better transit, and making meetings open to the public I think will engage people. The way the bill is drafted right now, it says, "Here are all the reasons that a meeting can be open." It should be the other way around: "Here are the two or three reasons why a meeting should be closed." I think that sends out the wrong message.

Related to that—just a comment—here at Queen's Park, I remember years ago I used to be able to just walk into the building. I don't think it's right the way it is now, that you have to sign in. It shows a message to the public that we're not welcome here—especially the transit connection. I tried to take the tunnel below, and you can't get in that way.

How to select projects is the next question. Are we going to be looking at expensive, parochial megaprojects such as the Sheppard subway, or this proposed subway in Scarborough that is going to cost billions of dollars and serve few riders, because some councillors want to champion them as their little pet project? Mega-projects are always sexy. No one is interested in putting in transit shelters or a bike lock-up at a bus stop, but those things, I think, are important to attracting riders. I don't know if building a huge subway that hardly anyone is going to use is worth it.

The GTTA should look at smaller local projects instead to achieve some GTTA-wide objectives. These are things like improved pedestrian access to all of the stations. I can take any of you to any of the GO stations, and there's horrible pedestrian access to most of them from the surrounding communities. There should be many improvements made to bus stops, which I've outlined in my brief. We should make efforts to accommodate bicycles on vehicles, and the disabled. These are all little projects, but these are things that the GTTA could provide important recommendations and guidance on.

We also need frequent all-day basic service across the GTA. Most of the GO rail lines do not offer service during the day; only rush hour in and rush hour out. This needs to be improved. Anyone coming from Europe would laugh at our system right now. It's 20 years overdue, and it should be done almost immediately. Again, this is one of the reasons I think GO Transit should be kept separate, because their mindset is to just run service inbound and outbound. They have a specific idea of who their market is. I remember one time I was working at Humber College, trying to commute there from Scarborough. I would complain to them about the connections of some of their services, and they basically said, "You're weird. You're not really our customer." I'm sorry; that attitude shouldn't be the one applied. The goal should be trying to serve all the people in the greater Toronto area. So this new agency, I feel, can have that broader mandate of looking at everyone in the region. Again, all-day, two-way service across the region is what is needed.

1000

The Toronto Board of Trade—this is not in my brief—wrote a study about a decade ago about commuter rail that could cost-effectively implement something like this. The GTTA should dust off this study and go ahead and implement it. If you don't have it, I think I have a web link at home I could e-mail to you folks. Maybe someone else has also made some suggestions about that.

There's another good example of what I'm talking about. There's a new Viva transit system you've all heard of in York region. They built a new terminal up in Richmond Hill that's right beside a GO station. Guess what? You can't walk from that new bus terminal to the GO station. There's a fence in the way, and the walk involves about a kilometre to go around it. Again, little things like that should be addressed.

The next one: When is the province going to provide adequate funding? Why bother planning and coordinating all these services if there's insufficient money to implement this? I suggest something radical: a carbon tax. I know it's not politically saleable, but I hope that some of you as MPPs have the courage to champion that, because we do need it for climate change and other purposes. As well, we have a big deficit in terms of transit versus spending on highways, if you look at budgets.

The last question I ask is about vehicle procurement. The central procurement agency overall is a good idea, but I wonder if there's going to be too much pressure to exclusively buy products in Ontario. There might be more reliable products available outside the province. I do like the idea of added bargaining power, though, to buy better vehicles and get volume discounts. One suggestion I have for when they procure vehicles is that they look at flexibility in vehicle seating and layout so that they can easily be redeployed across the region. Why couldn't Mississauga Transit, if they had growth on one route, take vehicles back from the TTC? But now, the way they're laid out, they maybe cannot do that easily. They can do it in minivans; they can change around seats easily. Why can't you do it in transit vehicles?

Those are my remarks.

The Chair: Thank you. I apologize that those bells had to be ringing while you were giving your presentation. They were calling members to the House.

We'll begin this round of questioning with the official opposition.

Mr. O'Toole: Thank you very much for your presentation: quite innovative and certainly customer-focused, that's for sure. It looks like you have a great deal of experience and insight into where we've come from and where we should go.

With respect to the governance model, I'm not being flippant, but you currently have an appointment by David Miller to the conservation authority, whichever one. I would approach David Miller to give up one of his seats, perhaps his own, so that you could replace him. Have you done that? You're on the public record here. Here's your time to say it: "David Miller, please appoint Andrew Schulz to this board."

Mr. Schulz: I'm actually going to go one step further. I want it written into the legislation that one of these people has to be a transit user, regardless of who the city appoints. So I'd say it really should be one of the provincial appointees.

Mr. O'Toole: I think he's actually appearing here, or some member of his staff will be appearing here today. We'll kind of put that question to him if we have a chance.

Mr. Schulz: Okay, sure.

Mr. O'Toole: The other one is the idea, as you said, of convenience. Certainly, whether it's persons with special needs or access issues, I completely agree. It's got to be completely accessible and integrated, as has been suggested, not just seamless cards but also the connecting links and how the service is weighed for schedule and

how it's all coordinated. I kind of disagree with you on the idea that this should be all separated into nice, little autonomous groups, GO Transit having their own thing. You've got to integrate it.

Here's the most surprising part of this whole thing, including the perception of your submission here: This is actually the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority. They've drafted this with no time on their hands, I think, because, quite frankly, this is all about transit, but the bill is called "transportation." When you look at smart growth and all their fancy plans here, they have no plan, technically; they've got a bunch of reports that haven't been put together yet. They have to be looked at in a coordinated, succinct way. Transportation; that is, regional collector roads and all that—the infrastructure of roads and cars—and public transit have to be coordinated. Highway 407 should have a transit corridor within its design, and certain stop and start points and connections between universities and hospitals. That's what I think is missing from this.

Have you got any suggestions on that? How do we make this report something more than just—actually, nothing's going to happen with this. There's no authority; there's no money; there's no plan. I think the people who applied to appear before this committee have got it right: Nobody applied. Do you know why? Because it's not going to do anything. It will be 2011 before they get the smart card working, and it will probably cost them \$40 million—

Mr. Schulz: I agree.

Mr. O'Toole: —and there's no money. Look, I support the idea. We tried, and we failed. The Greater Toronto Services Board failed—there's no question about it—because of the governance and because of the money. There's nothing in this, unless there are some amendments that are going to be tabled by Mr. Arthurs, who knows more about this than most of us, to make this thing functional. There's no action plan, not just to remove these barriers that you talked about. I'm just wondering, have you got any specific issues?

I want to say one other thing—we get such limited time to speak on this. Here's the other thing: I think there really is a plan; there is a larger plan. The plan is called the 3C plan, to eliminate the 3Cs: cigarettes, coal and cars. Those are the 3Cs.

The Chair: You only have about a minute left, Mr. O'Toole.

Interjections.

Mr. O'Toole: No, no. I heard this. The SMART presentation here was very good. He definitively described that the solution to greenhouse gases, gridlock and everything is to eliminate the car.

The Chair: Let's allow him to find an answer to that multitude—

Mr. O'Toole: Quite frankly, you've said that it's killing us all. It's sort of like cigarettes are killing us; we should stop them.

The Chair: Mr. Schulz, I'll give you an opportunity to answer.

Mr. O'Toole: Could we not have unanimous consent for more time? Because I think he probably had the most unique presentation of all. It was all about transit, mind you.

The Chair: We'll let him answer. Go ahead.

Mr. Schulz: Well, thank you. It's hard to follow that one up.

Mr. O'Toole: I don't know. You can just jump in there any time.

Mr. Schulz: Okay. On a couple of comments you made, the 407 transit lanes were designed into the highway. I remember I was involved in looking at the highway when it was first designed. To me, they were just thrown in there as a little bone to the environmentalists, to say, "Hey, we're going to put in transit." Then, of course, they never will. They'll just use them to widen the highway later on.

I don't agree with you that this is a long-term plan to eliminate cars. Cars still have way more access, when you look at my Brampton Transit odyssey story, compared to anything else. We're only talking here about levelling the playing field a little bit; I mean, cars are still way up here and transit and everything else is way down there. We're talking about lifting it a little bit. I don't think anyone is talking about eliminating cars here.

But you're right: There's no money. I agree with you there. There is no money; there is not a proper plan to do this. I'm hoping this agency will come up with something, and at the same time can develop a constituency who will push the government. I'm hoping there will be an all-party consensus in the future that transit is just the way to go. We won't have this debate anymore.

Mr. O'Toole: I think we support that. We certainly support transit, but there's no plan—

The Chair: Thank you. Time has expired. Thank you for your presentation before the committee.

Mr. Schulz: Thank you so much. The best of luck in your deliberations.

ONTARIO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The Chair: I now call on the Ontario Chamber of Commerce to come forward, please.

Good morning. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I would ask you to identify yourselves for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Mr. Len Crispino: Good morning, Mr. Chair. My name is Len Crispino. I'm the president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce. I'm glad to have with me my colleague Stuart Johnson, who is our vice-president of policy for the Ontario Chamber of Commerce.

Thank you for the opportunity to help make Bill 104 a stronger and more effective piece of legislation. I've provided the clerk with our submission and will keep my remarks brief to allow for some questions.

1010

The Ontario Chamber of Commerce represents some 57,000 companies across this province and, along with

our GTA members, we've been calling for a regional transportation authority for some three years now.

Early on, we recognized the need for a coordinating body to help solve the gridlock crisis in the province. We have been vocal that gridlock is a substantial disadvantage to Ontario's competitive position. Like delays at our border crossings, gridlock has an immediate and dramatic impact on our economy. We were very pleased when we learned that the Minister of Transportation was working on an announcement for a transportation authority. It is, in our opinion, long overdue and much needed. We would like to commend the current and past ministers for their commitment to this initiative and to the ministry for its thoughtful consideration of our members' concerns.

This legislation is a solid start—a good foundation, if you will—toward solving some of the region's traffic woes. However, it is missing some critical pieces and I fear, if unamended, this legislation will create a powerless bureaucracy, unable to achieve its objectives or implement solutions.

In a joint letter with the Toronto Board of Trade, we made six recommendations to the ministry following first reading of the bill.

First, the GTTA's powers must be defined in legislation to allow the agency to plan, prioritize, finance and, most importantly, execute transportation investment across this region.

Next, the legislation should provide the GTTA with the authority to coordinate municipalities' official plans along boundaries in order to conform to the GTTA's regional transportation and infrastructure plans. Serving merely in an advisory capacity to municipalities and the province, in our opinion, is not sufficient to achieve the government's stated goals for this authority. Related to this, the legislation should be strengthened to give the GTTA authority over land use planning, particularly in transit corridors, to encourage intensification and to maximize investment in transportation infrastructure.

Next, we would recommend an amendment to clearly define a dispute resolution mechanism. I have no doubt that in working with a group of municipalities with unique interests, such a mechanism will be essential to the success of this agency.

Our fifth recommendation is that this committee enshrine in legislation sustainable financial sources and revenue-raising tools for the agency, which will be used to finance the GTA and the Hamilton region transportation network.

Finally, we would recommend that the legislation set criteria to ensure the board of directors has majority representation from the private sector. We believe that leaving the criteria open or leaving it to regulation will subject this agency to undue political influence. Ideally, the legislation would set out specific criteria for each director of this agency. Our membership believes that representation on the agency should be made up of those with specific expertise, experience and knowledge of the transportation sector.

The key to this becoming an effective agency is for the private sector to play its role in providing solutions, as

promised by the previous minister. We believe that this principle must be protected and assured in legislation. As I've said, this bill is a solid foundation, a good starting point. But the real question is whether the government wants to create a real, effective, proactive transportation agency or if it wants merely to create another red-tape-generating institution, unable to advance and implement solutions. However, without the proper tools and powers, it will lack the ability to solve any of this region's transportation requirements.

The GTTA must be proactive and action-oriented. As we continue to see record growth in both population and economic development in this region, we must have a body that can provide real solutions and have the power and financial resources to make those solutions happen.

I would ask that this committee put forth amendments to the legislation that will allow the GTTA to achieve its full potential. I think we have a great opportunity to make this legislation even greater, and I would ask all members on both sides of the House to ensure that happens. I'd be happy to take your questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much. This round of questioning will go to the NDP and Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Tabuns: Thank you very much for the presentation this morning. Has your organization had a chance to do any modelling to look at how much car traffic will be reduced by introduction of this authority?

Mr. Crispino: I think there are various—and I'll ask Stuart to respond a bit further. There have been various studies that we've looked at. We have not ourselves conducted specific research in this area.

Mr. Stuart Johnston: That's correct. Through the government's own studies, we realize that gridlock in the GTA alone costs a significant amount of money—\$2 billion. Common sense would dictate that if we have a regional approach to transportation planning writ large, the coordination of transit and transportation will indeed serve over time to reduce the reliance on traffic and move toward more of a transit-oriented culture, but it'll take some time. It'll actually take this comprehensive review. That's why we're so pleased about the GTTA.

Mr. Tabuns: And if in fact this body receives neither the funding nor the authority, as you've recommended, do you expect that it will have any impact on gridlock in the GTA?

Mr. Crispino: I wish I could say yes, but I think our interpretation and the interpretation of our own members across the province is that this will be very much a watered-down organization. It will essentially turn into more of a bureaucratic tool. It's our hope that this is not the route the government will take. This is such an important issue, I think it behooves all of us—the business community and all the other interests across this province—to come to the plate and make sure that in fact we have the very strongest possible organization, with strong representation.

Mr. Tabuns: Okay. One of the things that's proposed in here—in fact, it's a signature element—is this idea of a fare card right across the region. Do you have any

thoughts as to how the revenues from that fare card should be apportioned between the participating municipalities?

Mr. Johnston: We did not study that aspect of it. It was our assumption and presumption that the GTTA itself would determine how those revenues would be divvied up, if in fact they are.

Mr. Tabuns: So you don't have a recommendation on that, then?

Mr. Johnston: Not on the specific, no.

Mr. Tabuns: For the most part, I like what you've brought forward. I think you've thought it through. I think your analysis has a lot of validity. One concern I have is that if the bulk of the members of the governing board for this GTTA are appointed from the private sector, in a lot of ways they're not accountable politically. You're suggesting that they have the power to do planning that would override the plans determined by democratically elected councils. I find that somewhat troubling. Have you thought through the implications of essentially ceding planning powers from democratically elected councils to an appointed board?

Mr. Crispino: A couple of points: I guess our view is that the magnitude and the importance of this issue is so great that it's time we ensure that we've got the most powerful body in place, that we have people who are knowledgeable in finance, that we have people who are knowledgeable in planning, transportation and urban planning, that there's depth and breadth on the committee. There's still accountability. The minister is still accountable for this body, so it's not as if all of a sudden there's no longer accountability. There will be all sorts of people during these discussions who, from a political standpoint, will talk very heavily about their region's needs and their region's concerns and that they need to be fully represented. While that may be true to a large degree, we still believe that the majority of this group needs to be people from the private sector with the breadth and depth to make sure that this in fact will work.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation this morning.

1020

CITY OF BRAMPTON

The Chair: Now I call on the city of Brampton to come forward, please.

Good morning. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I'd ask you to identify yourselves for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Ms. Elaine Moore: Absolutely. Thank you very much, and thank you to the clerk for passing out our submission this morning, which I assume everybody has at this point.

Good morning, Chair Hoy and ladies and gentlemen of the standing committee on finance and economic affairs. My name is Elaine Moore, and I am a regional councillor in the city of Brampton. As such, I sit on two

councils: Brampton city council and Peel regional council.

Her Worship Mayor Susan Fennell was unable to attend this morning. As you know, many mayors are attending the FCM conference in Montreal. However, I am joined here this morning by Mr. Clay Connor, a director with our legal services department for the city of Brampton.

On behalf of Brampton council, I would like to thank you for giving me this opportunity to express for your consideration Brampton's position and recommendations for Bill 104. My message to you today is to express the city of Brampton's support for the intent of Bill 104 and its goals to coordinate public transit service delivery and to manage the transportation network in the GTA.

The city of Brampton has recommendations for your consideration which we believe will increase the effectiveness of this bill and its ability to address transportation planning and public transit integration in the greater Toronto area. These recommendations have been endorsed by Brampton council, and a copy of the staff report is included in our submission to you today.

Brampton has demonstrated its commitment to transportation planning and the seamless integration of public transit in the GTA through our growth management program, our transportation and transit master plan, our AccelRide rapid transit initiative, and our partnership, such as the GTA fare card and the integrated routes that we have with GO, Mississauga and York transit.

Brampton must, however, disagree with the proposed composition of the board. We believe that Brampton will not be adequately represented by one representative from the region of Peel. The city of Brampton has a progressive, dynamic and successful public transit system with a solid plan to position ourselves well to respond to the needs of our growing city. For the GTTA to provide comprehensive transportation planning and GTA-wide transit service integration, Brampton must be at the table. We are a major transit system operator and we are deserving of representation, we believe, on the GTTA board.

I would like to explain why Brampton's direct representation on this board is critical for the success of the board's mandate and objectives:

Unlike some regional governments in the GTA, the region of Peel does not provide community transportation planning or transit service delivery except for TransHelp. In Peel, this is done by the cities of Brampton and Mississauga.

Brampton's public transit system is the fifth-largest in Ontario and fourth-largest in the GTA, next to Toronto, York and Mississauga. Brampton is the 10th-largest city in Canada. Brampton is experiencing the second-fastest population growth out of Canada's 20 largest cities. Brampton is the third-largest city in the GTA and the second-largest city in the 905 region. Brampton is the second-fastest residential growth city in Canada. Our current population of 433,000 people is expected to double by the year 2031.

Brampton is a vibrant and fast-growing community committed to growth management and transportation planning. We were one of the first communities in Canada to implement a growth management program and a 30-year transportation and transit master plan to coordinate infrastructure with development. Our master plans are coordinated with a 20-year capital investment plan for roads and transit, our official plan, plans of subdivision and the delivery of a conventional bus system.

Brampton's experience in growth management and transportation planning allows us to provide input to the Places to Grow Act, the greenbelt legislation, planning reforms of the strong communities act and, most recently, the draft plan for the greater Golden Horseshoe. In the Places to Grow Act, the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal designates Brampton as a priority urban area to manage and invest in GTA-wide transportation services. Brampton has developed the AcceleRide program, a rapid transit proposal connecting to York, Mississauga, GO Transit and the TTC. The province has recognized this critical link in the GTA by awarding AcceleRide \$95 million in their Move Ontario strategy budget. Brampton has been a municipal partner in the provincial initiative for a GTA fare card.

National and provincial organizations such as CUTA have recognized Brampton's leadership with our use of biodiesel fuel and other innovative technologies. Brampton has successfully introduced initiatives to provide a seamless bus service to our neighbours in Mississauga and York region and with GO Transit. Brampton manages a critical public transit system in the GTA and employs a strategic planning model consistent with provincial objectives.

With Brampton's transportation delivery responsibilities, it is a critical link. We strongly believe that the proposed GTTA board composition must be amended to provide for Brampton's decision-making capability. As you well know, Bill 104's current proposal provides for 11 board members: four from Toronto, one from Hamilton and one from each of the regions of Peel, York, Halton and Durham, with two to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. There is a chart in our submission that shows board member representation based on population, and it clearly shows that a director from Peel will represent over twice as many people as a director from any other municipality except for the region of York. In addition to representation by population, the requirements of Bill 104 call for board members to have extensive consultation with municipalities that plan and operate local transit systems. Therefore, it is imperative that Brampton be able to provide input with respect to Brampton's local transportation issues and to best represent the interests of our local taxpayers.

For the GTTA board to fulfill its mandate to coordinate transportation effectively, we respectfully recommend that the board composition be revised to provide for representation from each of the cities of Brampton and Mississauga, rather than only one from the

region of Peel. Again, you will find a chart in our submission that shows the equitable representation to the board by eliminating one from Peel and replacing it with one from each of Brampton and Mississauga. We would further propose, in recognizing the need to balance representation more evenly between the 416 and the 905 areas, that the city of Toronto receive one additional seat, for a total of five.

The city of Brampton has discussed these recommendations with both the cities of Mississauga and Toronto. In a report dated May 18, the city of Mississauga clearly indicated its support for an alternative governance model which adds an additional representative from Peel, providing for representation from Brampton as well as one from Mississauga.

Chair Hoy and members of the committee, the comprehensive submission from Brampton that you have been provided with includes several other recommendations today; however, we would ask that you review them at your convenience and give them due consideration for your final report.

I would like to thank members of the committee for hearing our submission, and at this time I would be more than happy to respond to any questions you might have. If I can't answer them, perhaps Clay Connor can.

The Chair: Thank you. This round of questioning will go to the government. Mr. Arthurs.

Mr. Arthurs: Welcome, Councillor Moore. It's great to see you here. I'm sure that your municipal colleagues are enjoying themselves in Montreal at FCM. It was always one of my favourite opportunities to connect with municipal colleagues in the province and from across the country. You're probably wishing you were there.

Ms. Moore: I drew the short straw.

Mr. Arthurs: Did you?

Two things, really: First, congratulations on AcceleRide. I know it's been a long time in planning and preparation, getting to the point now where you'll be able to really implement it. Maybe you can comment, irrespective of the governance model, on how you see that integrating itself or how the GTTA structure and activity will benefit from AcceleRide—what they might learn from your experience. If you would comment on that, it would be helpful for me to see where there are opportunities for the GTTA.

1030

The second issue for me, though, is the one of governance, which you raised, and the difficulties, as I see them, having served municipally and being on the GTSB and all those kinds of issues we deal with. As you start to move the system around to accommodate, in this instance, the operation of transit by the two lower-tier, albeit large, municipalities in Peel, how do you juxtapose that against York region's size and growth, apart from rep by pop, and how do we then rationalize the issues around Halton, where I believe Oakville and Burlington have their own lower-tier transit systems operating independent of Halton? That's my understanding; correct me if I'm wrong.

There are issues for us to deal with. One can rationalize it by rep by pop, but then again, York is a region as well and, on the Halton side, they have lower-tier operating transit systems, although not as large by any means as Brampton's or Mississauga's, but nonetheless having the same kinds of operational and responsibility issues to deal with.

Ms. Moore: Wow. Clearly I should have brought our director of transit with me this morning to respond. But I guess I'll give a political response in terms of AcceleRide and our experience with developing the AcceleRide program, having gone through the extensive process of lobbying for the appropriate funding in order for us to roll out that program. I think we've sort of demonstrated that it is something that will not only meet the transportation and transit demands of our community, but we've also included the communities of York and Mississauga. We understand that we don't operate in isolation, and we recognize the need to not only move our residents in and around our city but beyond the borders of our city, as well as assisting those who live beyond the borders of our city and bringing them in. That obviously required some very strategic negotiation with our neighbouring municipalities in order to bring them to the table. If we didn't have anyplace for AcceleRide to go—a willing host, if you want to put it that way—then it would be a program that would not have been recognized through the significant funding we received.

I don't know whether you want to add to that.

Mr. Clay Connor: I can answer part B for you, if you like.

Mr. Arthurs: I think probably that gets to the essence of what I was looking to hear, and that's the issue of taking value-added from your experience—whether it's as Brampton or through Peel or whatever—to the GTTA, that negotiated capacity to put in place an AcceleRide system with multiple partners that meets a whole pile of demands. I think that's a kind of value-added that Brampton, either directly or through its Peel-related representation, can bring to the table.

Ms. Moore: We very much understand Brampton's location in the world, if you can put it that way: our proximity to the airport, our reasonable travelling distance not only to downtown Toronto but to our neighbouring municipalities and regions. So we understand very much the need to move people around and that we don't operate in isolation.

I will allow Mr. Connor to respond to the second part of your question.

Mr. Connor: With regard to the representation issue, I struggled with that when I was working on drafting our staff report. Rep by pop is the basic tenet we're operating under. The population of the city of Brampton exceeds the population of the region of Halton. Mississauga and Oakville are both about 150,000 people; we're over 400,000. So I guess my answer to you, Mr. Arthurs, is if you can't solve both problems by giving Oakville, Burlington, Brampton and Mississauga a seat at the table, you can at least solve one by what we're proposing. I

think rep by pop and our extensive transit experience are justifications for your doing so.

Mr. Arthurs: I'm not speaking for government, but say this just from my personal experiences and my engagement here. You'll appreciate the difficulty I would have in wrestling with the issue, having had the debate around Mississauga's desire to be a stand-alone, single-tier city and the negotiation activity that went on not all that long ago in the context of Peel region/Mississauga, thus trying to wrestle through that at the same time, having dealt with that matter in the fashion that it was negotiated out at the end and looking at this and seeing how those things fit together, or do they need to?

Mr. Connor: I think you'll be glad to know that this is not the battle of Bill 186 redux. Brampton and Mississauga are on the same side on this one.

The Chair: Thank you for your submission before the committee this morning.

The committee is recessed until 4 this afternoon.

The committee recessed from 1035 to 1602.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

The Chair: The standing committee on finance and economic affairs will now come to order. To begin this afternoon's presentations, I ask the Urban Development Institute to come forward, please. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I would ask you to identify yourself for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Mr. Neil Rodgers: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Neil Rodgers, and I am the president of the Urban Development Institute of Ontario, UDI. We are very pleased to have this opportunity to offer you our views on Bill 104.

UDI members play a crucial role in the provincial economy and its sustainable growth. The development and construction industries are vital contributors to the province's wealth. The industry and its related construction activity accounts for over 10% of the total provincial gross domestic product, some \$50 billion, and employs over 350,000 men and women. The tax revenue generated by this economic growth is essential to the government in order that it may deliver quality health care, education and infrastructure to all Ontarians.

UDI has long supported the creation of a regional transportation authority. Our support precedes the Liberal government's commitments to strong communities. In fact, during the previous administration, UDI was instrumental in the 2003 provincial budget announcement of the creation of a central Ontario transportation authority, which, if implemented, would have closely resembled the proposed GTTA.

It is critical for the province, through the GTTA, to find ways to ease the congestion and gridlock that are currently occurring in Ontario, particularly in the greater Toronto and Hamilton region. This congestion is impairing Ontario's productivity and obstructing the realization of its true economic potential, not to mention negatively

impacting the environment and quality of life of Ontarians.

In introducing Bill 104, the McGuinty government has delivered what is, in our view, one of the more critical Liberal campaign commitments. Generally speaking, the bill is welcome news to UDI and its members. A coordinated and efficient regional transportation system complements well-planned communities. The combination of the province's budget commitments to transit infrastructure and the launch of this initiative sends a clear message to us that the province is focused on easing gridlock while keeping the economy moving forward.

We are pleased to see that the GTTA is not, and must not become, focused on transit to the exclusion of the rest of the transportation network. While we recognize that public transit is an integral and important piece of the solution to our inter-regional and intraregional transportation problems, the GTTA, during its planning, operation and investment, must address the full spectrum of the transportation network, which includes roads, rail and other modes, such as bicycles. To be successful, we believe that the authority's core mandate should encompass the following priority functions:

- partnering with transit operators in the GTA-H to ensure that coordination is achieved to serve commuters;

- developing strategic priorities and prioritizing capital projects that complement the growth plan being prepared for the greater Golden Horseshoe;

- facilitating financing schemes via alternative financing procurement in accordance with the government's principles of public accountability and fiscal transparency to leverage private sector capital;

- coordinating the integration of fare card technology; and

- advocating for transit and developing public awareness and education programs.

For the most part, this bill incorporates these core functions.

The GTA-H is the economic engine of Ontario; therefore its future prosperity depends on a reliable transportation system that moves goods and people effectively and efficiently in, around and through the GTA-H and beyond. Our transit and transportation problems and solutions are inter-regional in nature, traversing numerous municipal boundaries; therefore, we must take a region-wide, systems-based approach that gives priority to commuters. The GTTA will play a critical role in planning for a seamless, integrated transportation network. To be direct, no one municipality should own the GTTA. The public wants solutions; the province needs its policy objectives realized. Continued political gridlock is unacceptable, and failure is not an option.

No issue has garnered as much attention on this matter as governance. In fact, other presenters here today, I believe, have strong opinions on this issue, as do we. We ardently believe that the GTTA should not follow in the footsteps of the former Greater Toronto Services Board. Its key failing, in our respectful opinion, was both the size of the board and its composition. UDI submits that

protracted parochial debates at the GTSB were the result of direct political representation on the board, hindering the organization's ability to make decisions. UDI Ontario wishes to state for the record that while we appreciate the care that has been taken in drafting this bill, to balance the interests we would prefer to have seen a board of the GTTA modelled as follows, with eight private sector appointees and six municipal sector appointees, each from the cities of Toronto, Hamilton and the 905 municipalities. It is our view that this would provide the appropriate balance to the debate and facilitate good decision-making. The bill, as currently drafted, permits the participating municipalities to recommend "persons" to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, which is sufficiently vague to include non-elected officials. We suspect that this is the intention of the government, and we encourage participating municipalities to recommend qualified non-elected persons to sit on the board. However, the bill does not address requirements respecting criteria or qualifications of prospective board members. To clarify the province's expectations, we therefore recommend that guidance on this matter be addressed through regulation.

The government has accepted our advice with respect to the GTTA board being required to deliver a transportation plan, prepare a business plan which would include a five-year capital plan and investment strategy, and file an annual report, as well as granting the Provincial Auditor authority to audit the corporation—all important instruments designed to heighten transparency and accountability.

We believe that adequate provisions for public engagement have been instituted through the establishment of advisory committees representing a diversity of interests and permitting the public to attend certain meetings of the authority. All of the foregoing are positive measures to ensure that the authority remains accountable to the public and focused on delivering results.

However, we note the absence of a regular mandatory review of the legislation. Such a provision is common in most legislation enacted in the province. We are hopeful that the GTTA will succeed. An opportunity should be provided to review, assess and amend the legislation if it is determined that it is not working as originally contemplated. On that basis, UDI would recommend that the bill be amended to require a statutory review three years after the bill receives royal assent.

1610

In conclusion, we believe that the introduction and implementation of the authority is long overdue. The residents and businesses living and operating in the GTA-H and the greater Golden Horseshoe want results that will improve the economic, social and environmental prospects for their communities, both today and tomorrow. We urge the government and the committee to consider our advice.

The Chair: Thank you for the presentation. This round of questioning will go to the official opposition.

Mr. O'Toole: Thank you very much, Neil, for your presentation. I do appreciate the work that UDI does in

terms of giving advice to the government, whether it's on Smart Growth plans or Places to Grow, and seeing the integration of urban planning as well as the transportation component.

The first comment is that it's good to see some of the presenters looking at this bill as if it should look at the whole transportation framework, not just transit. That's important. Quite a few of the presenters are basically just talking about transit; they think it's a GO Transit board and just about transit, and that's disappointing. So there has to be some clarity, you're right, in terms of that.

One of the dysfunctional things we see in the board is its structure. You've described the four—one from each of the regions, including Hamilton, and two from the province. What's your thinking in terms of participation and trying to get out of the politics of it? If they're all regional chairs—we saw that Brampton and Mississauga are all wanting special treatment—it's just more politicians, like here, arguing for 10 years about the same thing. Our GTSB did not work when we were in government, primarily because of the governance model and, secondarily, possibly the funding issues. You've made it clear: Would you like to restate your concerns about governance and the types of people that should be identified?

Mr. Rodgers: The governance question has been the 700-pound gorilla in the room that really nobody wanted to address, because if it was addressed properly, we would have had a GTTA six years ago. That's water under the bridge.

We remain quite concerned as to the governance structure. Ultimately, political decisions were made in various rooms and promises were made to various municipalities, I can only guess. The reality is, we can hope that this thing works, but there is pretty well unanimous opinion from what I would call the private sector—the boards of trade, ourselves. Whether or not you adopt a model that has an all-private-sector board, our model is perhaps the middle of the road. I think there's only one option left, and that is, what's wrong with trying it? What's wrong with trying a board that has a healthy balance between private sector and public sector interests?

Mr. O'Toole: First of all, the second failure of the previous version of this—which you had a role in and are quite knowledgeable of, the service board model, which is basically the same thing. You're right: The same groups—the Toronto Board of Trade, the chambers of commerce—have all been calling for this, and now they're saying they're doing it. Actually, this is a framework; there's actually nothing in it. We've got to make it clear here in our amendments, on the simple one day of adding—quite frankly, on behalf of John Tory, we want this thing to work.

Mr. Rodgers: If the government chooses not to take the advice of the groups that are advocating an alternative governance model, I am seeing the suggestion that we've made about the statutory review as the oversight that the Legislature ultimately has if the representatives who are appointed to the board are not performing to the expectations that the government originally contemplated. I

would also suggest that there would be nothing wrong with municipalities saying, "We have very qualified people who live in our community, who understand transportation and transit etc., and we would be well served by having them on the board," perhaps, rather than just all politicians. I don't think that's going to happen, though.

Mr. O'Toole: I appreciate your input, Neil, very much.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation before the committee.

TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE

The Chair: Now I call on the Toronto Board of Trade to come forward, please.

Good afternoon. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I would ask you to identify yourself for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Ms. Angela Iannuzziello: Thank you very much. Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to present our comments to the committee this afternoon. My name is Angela Iannuzziello, and I'm the chair of the Toronto Board of Trade's infrastructure committee. With me today is Cecil Bradley, who's the vice-president of policy at the Toronto Board of Trade, and Elaine Shin, one of our policy advisors, who was really the lead in drawing up our deputation for today.

Let me start by saying, on behalf of Toronto's business community, how much we really appreciate the introduction of the draft legislation for the creation of the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority. Our 10,000 members, who make up a broad cross-section of industry and size of businesses, tell us that traffic gridlock continues to be one of their top three business concerns. The Toronto Board of Trade has long called for the establishment of the GTTA, and you'll find our detailed opinions on the need for this body and on how it should be constituted in the policy papers that are included in our submission brief.

This is Ontario's chance to create a legacy in its economic heartland, to establish a system that will help to tackle gridlock today and to prevent it from growing tomorrow and that will help to ensure the quality of life and the standard of living for our city, our region and our province. To us, it's important that we get this right the first time around and not repeat the mistakes of the previous Greater Toronto Services Board. I think you've heard this.

While the board welcomes the intent of Bill 104 and commends the government on living up to its commitment, we are concerned that this legislation does not, in its current form, provide the proposed GTTA with the tools needed for its success. The GTTA requires real authority to provide leadership, substantial resources to deliver its plans, and a governance structure that makes decisions for the benefit of the broader community.

First, the board believes that Bill 104 should empower the GTTA to act in all ways that are necessary to plan,

finance and implement transportation infrastructure in this region. The agency must have the authority to execute its regional plan, which will guide others in building a stronger regional transportation system and to push for its transportation strategies to be reflected in municipal planning.

Secondly, the costs to implement the strategy will far exceed the funding that has been identified, and therefore we strongly recommend that the legislation specify a range of revenue sources that are segregated for the GTTA to draw from to implement the transportation plan. Without the funds to support the implementation, the agency will find it difficult to garner co-operation from the municipalities or to provide the investor confidence required to attract private sector investment in transportation infrastructure.

Our submission brief contains a discussion paper outlining many options for financing the GTTA. We're not advocating any specific method or a mix of the methods, just simply stating some options that could be available. The government must decide soon how it will ensure sufficient funding.

Lastly, the board recommends that Bill 104 set out specific criteria and qualifications to help the regions select their representatives for the GTTA board and to guide the Minister of Transportation in making appointments to the board.

An effective GTTA will require governors with a firm understanding of transportation systems and planning and infrastructure financing, who are able and willing to make decisions that benefit the entire region. With a board of directors dominated by elected officials, there is a serious risk that parochial interests would impede real progress.

This government has taken the vital first step of introducing legislation, backing up its words with action. Now we need to make sure those actions match your intent and the real-world needs.

We look forward to working with you to improve Bill 104 so that the GTTA has the powers and financial clout it needs to be successful. Thank you.

1620

The Chair: Thank you. This round of questioning will go to the NDP.

Mr. Tabuns: Thank you for your presentation; I appreciate it.

In its current form, without amendment along the lines that you're proposing for governance authority and financing, will this bill have a measurable impact on gridlock and congestion in the GTA?

Ms. Iannuzziello: We believe that the impact on gridlock will not be significantly improved. The—

Mr. Tabuns: That's a straightforward enough statement, thank you.

With the changes that you have put forward, to what extent do you believe that this authority, with the work program or the objects given to it, could reduce gridlock?

Ms. Iannuzziello: The reduction of gridlock is a question that is affected not just by the available alternatives

but also is affected by the growth and the economic development within the region. The important impact, we believe, of the ability of the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority to improve transportation infrastructure is to provide an attractive alternative so that people have choice in terms of moving around adequately within the region. So the impact on gridlock is really to give people an opportunity to either avoid it or to find a different alternative. Right now, today, we don't have any.

Mr. Tabuns: At this point, the board of trade has not done an analysis to show what the potential would be from a fully functioning, fully resourced, enabled authority. Is that correct?

Mr. Cecil Bradley: I think it's fair to say that we haven't done any modelling, because the modelling has to presume a certain plan. One of the things that we openly acknowledge is missing in the region is a transportation plan.

Mr. Tabuns: Fair enough.

Ms. Iannuzziello: One other—if I may add?

Mr. Tabuns: Yes, please.

Ms. Iannuzziello: One other item to recognize as well is that when we take a look at a transportation plan, in the city of Toronto and the greater Toronto area that we're dealing with here, we really do have a lot of catching up to do in terms of our available infrastructure. We've gone many, many years without adequate investment and building of infrastructure to keep up with the growth that has already taken place in this region. So we've got a lot of catching up to do first.

Mr. Tabuns: Just on the smart card, because the board of trade has a fair amount of policy resources—I've read your reports in the past—how do you think revenue from the smart card should be apportioned between the different member municipalities that would be covered by this GTTA? Obviously, if you pay \$1.50 or \$3 in Hamilton and at the end of your trip you're in Oshawa, a number of authorities will have some claim on those initial dollars. How do you see apportioning those funds?

Ms. Iannuzziello: My understanding of the smart card is that it is a tool to assist in the collection of fare revenue that is currently collected by a number of different mechanisms. The fares that are currently received are really to offset the costs of running the municipal transit services and certainly some of the inter-regional services that are currently being made available. The question in terms of reallocating the fares is not necessarily just a question of a smart card but is really a question of how we reallocate revenues and the impacts on the costs of providing transit—not just municipal transit, but transit—in the greater region.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation before the committee.

Mr. Tabuns: Yes, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

CITY OF TORONTO

The Chair: I now call on the city of Toronto to come forward, please.

Good afternoon. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I'd ask you to identify yourselves for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Ms. Sandra Bussin: I'm Sandra Bussin, city councillor, Beaches–East York, ward 32, and deputy mayor for the city of Toronto.

Mr. Howard Moscoe: I'm Howard Moscoe, chair of the Toronto Transit Commission.

Ms. Bussin: Thank you for this opportunity to appear before the standing committee today to speak about Bill 104. Mayor Miller could not attend today, as he is at the FCM meetings in Montreal. I'm here with Howard Moscoe, the chair of the Toronto Transit Commission.

This city of Toronto and TTC response to Bill 104 is based on the critical importance of TTC services to the growth and development of the city of Toronto and the GTA. The TTC carries 1.4 million passengers a day and accounts for 80% of all transit trips in the GTA. Toronto's success, identity and culture as a city are inextricably tied to the TTC. As demonstrated by events on Monday, the TTC is critical to the economy and quality of life in Toronto and the entire GTA. The city of Toronto supports coordinated transportation planning across the GTA. Given the TTC's vital role, we all need to ensure that this initiative also supports the health and future of the TTC. A strong TTC is a strong GTA.

Bill 104 proposes a governance and accountability structure that clearly defines the GTTA as a crown agency. As the GTTA is to coordinate transportation planning across the GTA and Hamilton, the authority will need to effectively engage the participating municipalities, not just the board members, in collaborative decision-making or coordination of municipal infrastructure investments. In order to do this, Bill 104 should include provisions for involving the participating municipalities in business planning and annual reporting of the GTTA.

We recommend that Bill 104 be amended to provide that the GTTA business plan be submitted to and approved by the minister and by the participating municipalities. We recommend that Bill 104 be amended to provide that the annual report be submitted to the minister and the participant municipalities. We also recommend that Bill 104 specify that meetings of the board will be open and subject to the same provisions as the proposed city of Toronto act and the Municipal Act.

Bill 104 provides the GTTA with duties and responsibilities that could have a significant impact on municipalities. The bill also provides for the making of regulations that could significantly alter the powers and responsibilities of the authority, including regulations for raising revenue. It is anticipated that the actions of the authority could have financial implications for the participating municipalities.

1630

We recommend that Bill 104 be amended to provide that, prior to the minister making any regulation or the GTTA taking any action that would have a financial impact on any participant municipality, the consent of the affected participant municipalities must be obtained. This is consistent with a respectful government-to-government relationship and the principles included in the proposed city of Toronto act. As the GTTA is a crown agency, we request confirmation that the operating costs it incurs will be the responsibility of the province and not passed down to the municipalities.

Toronto supports the creation of the GTTA and providing it with the responsibility to develop a transit-supportive transportation plan consistent with the Places to Grow growth management strategy. Toronto supports the authority having a leadership role in coordinating decision-making and investment for the provision of transportation infrastructure and services. These are both positive and long-awaited steps. However, capital plans and priority setting cannot be developed without the funding to implement them. Maintaining and rehabilitating transit infrastructure and replacing transit vehicles is very costly. Building new transit facilities and expanding services is costly. Keeping roads in good repair is costly.

Significant progress has been made in recent years with the provision of provincial and federal funding that has permitted addressing the most pressing TTC needs of vehicle replacement and facility rehabilitation. Will the GTTA provide new funding to significantly improve transportation and extend transit services in the GTA? Will the TTC have sustained, predictable funding to keep TTC infrastructure in a state of good repair to continue serving over 1.4 million riders a day?

The answer is, we don't know. The province has not announced any new funding in conjunction with the GTTA or suggested that existing funding may be altered or realigned. Transportation, and specifically transit in the GTA, has been underfunded for many years, leading to the current congestion problems that could ultimately stymie our growth.

Increased funding is necessary to maintain and rehabilitate existing transportation infrastructure and services and to aggressively expand transit to accommodate the additional two million residents expected in the GTA. Significant investment in GTA transportation is necessary for the GTA to maintain its strong economy and quality of life that is critical to our province and our country.

I'll now turn it over to Howard.

Mr. Moscoe: This legislation is flabby. It lacks content. It will therefore be written by regulation. Because there's a financial commitment at stake, we're wary that the TTC will get the short end of the stick. That will not serve the people in this region well, and we must be party to the writing of the regulations that will determine the ultimate powers of the GTTA.

The TTC is the largest transit operator in the country, carrying over 430 million trips a year and growing. The TTC operates at the lowest operating subsidy in the GTA by recovering 78% of its operating costs through the fare box. The TTC has over 2,400 buses, streetcars and subway vehicles. More than 10,500 men and women are employees of the TTC. The TTC has sophisticated business practices developed over decades of experience.

It's interesting that when the minister announced this legislation, he asked each transit system to bring a bus. We were tempted to bring 10 buses, three streetcars and a subway train to demonstrate the size of the TTC compared to the other transit systems. The TTC is the elephant in the room. When there's a disruption in service, as there was earlier this week, it affects the entire GTA. Most of the transit services outside of Toronto are dependent on the high level of effective integration that currently exists between the TTC and other systems. The TTC, for example, provides all the north-south routes, 50% of the transit service, in York region.

The TTC is different than any other transit system. It's impractical and counterproductive to apply the same rules and practices to the TTC as to other transit operations. While the TTC and Toronto do not object to the GTTA having the responsibilities for transit vehicle and equipment procurement and the transit fare card system, we do have a great concern if Bill 104 makes city and TTC participation in these programs mandatory.

The TTC is the largest purchaser of transit vehicles in the country and the third largest on the continent, behind Mexico City and New York. We have developed specifications and procedures for purchasing that are effective, timely and provide the TTC with the best value for money. There is no benefit for the TTC to have its procurement activities provided by the GTTA, and there may be significant disadvantages in terms of delay and costs. The TTC is more than willing to share its procurement expertise with other transit systems and the GTTA and, where appropriate, include orders for other transit systems when making purchases. But you're attempting to mate an elephant and a mouse: It can be done, but it has to be done very, very carefully. We recommend that Bill 104 be amended to clarify that participation of any transit system in GTTA procurement activities is optional and not mandatory.

The TTC has been a participant in the Ministry of Transportation's fare card study since late 2004, but it has not committed to long-term participation in the fare card program. The TTC has made it clear that there is no need to replace its fare collection system and that, given the size and complexity of the TTC system, any change to the fare system would incur enormous costs. Consideration of a new fare collection system for the TTC system requires a comprehensive review and assessment of the costs and benefits in the short and long term. Such a review is currently under way. The future of the TTC fare system should be determined by the TTC and the city of Toronto. It is essential that any changes to the TTC fare system meet the needs of its 1.4 million riders.

We are recommending that Bill 104 be amended to clarify that the participation of any transit system or municipality in the unified fare collection system is optional and not mandatory.

With respect to GO Transit, the city and the TTC recognize the high level of service and valuable contribution that GO makes to transportation in the GTA. We also recognize that GO has successfully weathered a number of changes to its governance and accountability in recent years. We urge the provincial government to ensure that the transition to the GTTA for GO Transit is as seamless as possible. We note that municipalities are currently required to pay a portion of GO Transit funding. We expect that the authority will provide municipalities paying into GO a say in how the funding is spent and how much is contributed.

The handouts of these remarks include the specific amendments we have outlined as well as additional technical and procedural amendments we urge the committee to recommend to the Legislature. We've also included an overview of TTC purchasing procurement for your information.

I thank you for this opportunity to address Bill 104. We'll be happy to take questions.

The Chair: Thank you. This round of questioning will go to the government. Mr. McNeely.

Mr. McNeely: Thank you for the presentations. I can see where the TTC is a very large part of the overall transportation in this much enlarged area that we're talking about. You mentioned some of the things that you see are necessary. Would you go through some of the positive things that you see about the direction we're going, to look at the full area from Hamilton to almost Oshawa?

1640

Mr. Moscoe: We've always been a supporter of co-ordination of public transit systems. I think people have to realize that there will be 10 million people who have to be served by public transit in this region in the next decade, and the only way you're going to do it is to enhance public service. We work very closely with our compatriots in the other transit properties and we wish to continue to work closely with them. This bill can provide us with opportunity for further co-operation.

Mr. McNeely: The investments that are coming up with GO Transit—I believe there's almost \$1 billion in improvements from the federal-provincial agreement. You have, under Move Ontario, major dollars. I think in 1996—I was just looking at ridership, and there hasn't been much increase in travel on the TTC in those 10 years.

Mr. Moscoe: No, that's actually inaccurate. We projected our ridership to be a 1% increase annually. We're experiencing a 3% annual increase in ridership. We're short 300 buses this year over our projections, which we have no money to purchase yet.

Mr. McNeely: This relates, I think, to the new federal dollars coming to support public transit. I'd just like your opinion on that. For most cities, I think it's probably a

positive thing. For your city, you've just said that you haven't got your full capacity now. What are your comments on that? Is that the right direction to go?

Mr. Moscoe: The money that's coming is welcomed, both from the province—two cents a litre—and the five cents a litre from the federal government, plus the Jack Layton amendment that provides additional funding. But given all that, nobody should have the impression that we're financially rich. In fact, we're barely meeting service in terms of the capital costs of our system, and we don't have enough to provide vehicles for the annual growth of our system at the moment. So we're really starving. We're happy that the province and the feds have come to the table, finally, and tried to restore some of the funding, but we are nowhere near where we were with the previous governments.

Ms. Bussin: I think too—I'm also a TTC commissioner—each year we look at which routes we need to pare, because we still don't have sufficient funds to provide the level of service that we wish to give. That level dropped significantly when our share of provincial funding to the TTC dropped considerably in past years. I'm sure you're reading in the paper that we now have Scarborough councillors and residents requesting that there be improvements to public transit in Scarborough, that our light rail is failing, that we're trying to make decisions that aren't necessarily the best, based on limited funds. We are hopeful, of course, that we will see the extension of the Spadina expressway—subway; sorry. But also, the Sheppard line is critical to the continuation of providing appropriate movement of our riders. It's only four stops at this time. I think too we need to be looking at whether or not those stops should be closer together, because it's still not encouraging people to get out of their cars and take public transit.

Mr. Moscoe: You may recall that the Rae government committed to four new transit lines. The Harris government scrapped them all except one, which was too far constructed, and that's the Sheppard subway, which should have gone to the Scarborough Town Centre. So that was a major setback for the growth and expansion of public transit in this region.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation.

SOUTHERN ONTARIO GATEWAY COUNCIL

The Chair: I'd ask the Southern Ontario Gateway Council to come forward, please. Good afternoon. You have 10 minutes for your presentation. There may be up to five minutes of questioning following that. I'd ask you to state your name for the purposes of our recording Hansard.

Mr. John Best: My name is John Best and I'm the executive director of the Southern Ontario Gateway Council. I thank you for this opportunity to appear before this committee and present the views of our organization on Bill 104.

We are a relatively new organization that brings together most of the major transportation stakeholders in the southern Ontario region. The Southern Ontario Gateway Council was conceived in early 2005 as a means of trying to provide a multi-modal, multi-jurisdictional approach to transportation planning in southern Ontario. Our members represent virtually every sector and most of the political jurisdictions in the region, including both national railways—Canadian National and Canadian Pacific—the airports of both Toronto and Hamilton, the port authorities of Hamilton and Toronto, Purolator Courier, St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corp., Railway Association of Canada and Ontario Trucking Association. Our resource membership list includes virtually every municipality in the GTA, along with key stakeholders like the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association, numerous chambers of commerce and boards of trade. Our membership also includes both the federal and the Ontario transportation ministries. When I mention the senior levels of government, I'd like to mention that at our inception last year, we secured the agreement of both the federal and the Ontario ministers of transport to serve as our honorary co-chairs. We're in the process of renewing that invitation now to the current holders of those posts and we're optimistic that we'll get a positive response.

We're unique as an organization in that we bring together all levels of government, most of the major transportation providers and other key transportation stakeholders, including—and we think this is important—key private sector players in an advisory organization whose goal is to ensure that transportation planning in southern Ontario is multi-modal and multi-jurisdictional in its approach. Of course, that is clearly what the GTTA legislation purports to do. This multi-modal, multi-jurisdictional approach seems like a simple concept, but the reality is that up until now there's been no single organization with this mandate in southern Ontario. Transportation planning has historically been very compartmentalized in Canada, highways being a provincial responsibility, local roads a municipal responsibility—of course, we have 25 municipal jurisdictions in the GTA alone—and rail, marine and air have been traditionally regarded as federal responsibilities. Similarly, there has been very little planning and collaboration taking into account the five different modes of transportation: road, air, rail, marine etc. So the various modes of transport have tended to address their issues in isolation from the other modes, and hence opportunities have been missed.

We think that the Southern Ontario Gateway Council will become a valuable resource in ensuring that transportation policy and planning in southern Ontario proceeds in a manner that capitalizes on the strengths of the existing transportation network, enhances multi-modalism and is strategic in its approach to the expansion of the system. Our goal is to promote and preserve the economic competitiveness of the southern Ontario gateway in the global economy, to provide advocacy and

research that will ensure that whatever transportation solution is in front of us, it is the best possible solution for the region. What we offer governments, clearly, is an opportunity to reach many of the major stakeholders in one forum as government works to develop policy or plan infrastructure.

Our council is patterned after very successful gateway councils in Vancouver and Halifax. If I could refer to the Greater Vancouver Gateway Council, which has played a very successful role in helping develop good transportation initiatives in the BC lower mainland for the last 10 years, I would point out that they have an excellent working relationship with the Vancouver equivalent of the GTTA, which is called TransLink there. In fact, the executive director of TransLink is actually a very active member of the Greater Vancouver Gateway Council.

1650

So from the standpoint of the Southern Ontario Gateway Council, our first point with regard to Bill 104 is that we think the GTTA has the potential to cut across some of the jurisdictional barriers that I alluded to earlier, and we're excited about the possibility of working closely with the GTTA as it takes on the task of integrating transit and planning infrastructure for the greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Indeed, we are open to considering some sort of formal, ongoing relationship that might include membership or representation of the one body on the other. That's entirely open, in our view.

We support the GTTA concept in part because, although our primary focus is on goods movement and economic development, we recognize that the transit portion of GTTA's mandate is critical to maximizing the efficiency of the transportation network in southern Ontario. The more people can access public transit, the more road capacity is freed up for the movement of goods and services. We all know that there are limitations from a financial and land use standpoint for future massive expansions of the highway system, so efficient use of the existing system is critical.

Freight traffic through and within our region will grow by more than 40% by 2020. During the same period, we'll add two million to two and a half million people to our population. Integrated transportation planning, both with regard to public transit and the movement of goods and services, is crucial.

I referred a moment ago to TransLink in lower mainland BC. We know that this government has looked closely at the TransLink model in developing Bill 104, and we know that undoubtedly you've been made aware that there are those who feel that TransLink would have been more effective had it had better access to funding and a stronger mandate for resolving planning disputes. A number of our members on the Southern Ontario Gateway Council have been involved in the development of the position paper that you're receiving from the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, and I would tell you that the Southern Ontario Gateway Council is in general concurrence with the Ontario chamber position.

Without getting into the details of governance structure and funding mechanisms, what we know for sure is that effective, region-wide transportation planning will require a robust organization that can prevail in the face of parochial political considerations, and it needs to have decision-making powers, which normally implies some independent access to funding.

We know that the government understands this because the greenbelt and Places to Grow initiatives for the first time addressed the need to introduce broader planning concepts that crossed multiple jurisdictions, and most would agree that there has been success. There is a much more coordinated approach to planning in the GTA than existed before. People are starting to think about land planning in regional rather than hyper-local terms. Hopefully, the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority can do for integrated transportation what has been achieved for land use through greenbelt and Places to Grow. We would add, however, that just as green space needs to be protected, so too do transportation corridors. They must be preserved for future use.

The Southern Ontario Gateway Council, focused as it is on coordinated planning and maximizing efficiency in the transportation system, will be a strong supporter of the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority. We will seek to form a collaborative and supportive relationship with the GTTA, whatever that form ultimately takes, and we very much support the view that the agency should possess the tools that it needs to do the job that it's being asked to do.

Thank you for your attention, and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

The Chair: Thank you for the presentation. This round of questioning will go to the official opposition. Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. O'Toole: Thank you very much, Mr. Best, for an interesting presentation—kind of different from what we've heard traditionally over this very short and limited public consultation on this bill. I'd just like to comment that you concur, I think as you said, with the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, but I'd also like to commend to your attention the Toronto Board of Trade's work on this, as well as the TTC, whose submission you've just heard here today.

The idea you mentioned, the multi-modal, is extremely important. In fact, that's what has been somewhat missing from some of the presenters, if you have been watching or listening. It has been focused on transit, and that's the problem. You can't plan when your eyes are closed or only looking at one object. As Howard Moscoe said, there needs to be a plan, and I couldn't agree more.

I was intrigued when I looked at your membership list, because it's all linked ultimately to the economy. If I go back to 1994, when the economy was tanking and we had a huge deficit—and it wasn't Bob Rae's fault, nor Floyd Laughren's; it's kind of the cyclical nature of things, I guess—there was no gridlock. I drove from Durham, and it was about an hour and 10 minutes; now it's two hours and 10 minutes, and we have a full economy. So how you

size the capacity of the infrastructure is very important. This is an economic issue. It's an environmental issue. We had a presentation this morning from the SMART group, who talked about the amount of greenhouse gases related to idling in gridlock.

I just wanted to commend you for bringing that perspective and for volunteering to be consulted. I'd certainly like to get your card and talk to you, because we're doing a lot of work on gridlock, a broader look, similar to what you're doing, right from the border issues in Windsor straight through to Hull, that backs up right through the whole 400 series into Hamilton and Toronto, how it affects our economy and the drag on our economy as related to all those parts.

But one of the more recent reports I've read—I was going to ask if you're familiar with it. The automotive parts manufacturing sector just issued a report, and I kind of responded to it in Hamilton a couple of weeks ago. I was giving some remarks, and quite an informed group of presenters talked about the Red Hill Creek Expressway. This is not unique to Toronto. It can't be Toronto-centred. I like your idea that this should be a broadened membership, integrating the links in Northumberland as you move out beyond into Woodstock, as you move out into Ontario. That's where the province has a role. They really certainly do. On highway size they do for sure. Now they need to have one on the transit, GO and the fixed rail side. Am I totally blowing smoke here? There's nothing in this bill, technically.

Mr. Best: Our view is that we want the GTTA to succeed in its role, because we don't think transportation planning can be focused strictly on Toronto. I certainly don't want to join the debate that occurred earlier, but our view is that what has been missing almost forever has

been any sense of—there's so much, for instance, road and highway planning that takes place within municipalities. Visiting and talking to our own members as we put the organization together, if you visit a regional headquarters and you're sitting in a boardroom having a discussion, typically in a municipality's office there's a map on the wall, a map of the region, and typically it's got a big black line around the outer edge of the region on the map. I think that's symbolic of the problem we have, certainly at a municipal level, trying to address problems against huge financial challenges. To add that layer of thinking outside of how something in Durham might ultimately impact something in Halton region, for instance, is going to have to take us to another level. I think that's what our organization is going to endeavour to do. We really see this as a multi-jurisdictional requirement—

Mr. O'Toole: And multi-modal, as you said.

Mr. Best: —and multi-modal, very definitely, because certain parts of the system are close to being maxed out. Obviously the highway system is under great stress.

Mr. O'Toole: But here's the problem, if I could interrupt. We're very limited here in time, unfortunately. The problem is this—

The Chair: The time allotted for questions is completed, Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. O'Toole: See how this isn't a fair process?

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation.

That concludes our hearings this afternoon. I want to remind committee members that proposed amendments to be moved during clause-by-clause consideration of the bill should be filed with the clerk by noon on Monday, June 5. We are adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1700.

CONTENTS

Thursday 1 June 2006

Greater Toronto Transportation Authority Act, 2006, Bill 104, Mrs. Cansfield / Loi de 2006 sur la Régie des transports du grand Toronto, projet de loi 104, M^{me} Cansfield.....	F-471
Subcommittee report.....	F-471
City of Mississauga.....	F-471
Ms. Pat Saito	
Mr. Terry Goodwin.....	F-474
SMART, McMaster University.....	F-475
Mr. Robert Hicks	
Mr. Andrew Schulz	F-478
Ontario Chamber of Commerce.....	F-480
Mr. Len Crispino; Mr. Stuart Johnston	
City of Brampton	F-482
Ms. Elaine Moore; Mr. Clay Connor	
Urban Development Institute	F-484
Mr. Neil Rodgers	
Toronto Board of Trade.....	F-486
Ms. Angela Iannuzziello; Mr. Cecil Bradley	
City of Toronto.....	F-488
Ms. Sandra Bussin; Mr. Howard Moscoe	
Southern Ontario Gateway Council.....	F-490
Mr. John Best	

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Chair / Président

Mr. Pat Hoy (Chatham–Kent Essex L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Phil McNeely (Ottawa–Orléans L)

Mr. Ted Arnott (Waterloo–Wellington PC)
Mr. Wayne Arthurs (Pickering–Ajax–Uxbridge L)
Mr. Toby Barrett (Haldimand–Norfolk–Brant PC)
 Mr. Pat Hoy (Chatham–Kent Essex L)
Ms. Judy Marsales (Hamilton West / Hamilton-Ouest L)
 Mr. Phil McNeely (Ottawa–Orléans L)
 Mrs. Carol Mitchell (Huron–Bruce L)
Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York / Beaches–York-Est ND)
 Mrs. Liz Sandals (Guelph–Wellington L)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Jim Brownell (Stormont–Dundas–Charlottenburgh L)
 Mr. John O’Toole (Durham PC)
Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Douglas Arnott

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Jerry Richmond, research officer,
Research and Information Services