

Governance Review Subcommittee of Livery Transport Advisory Committee

Report to Standing Policy Committee on Community and Protective Services

2017 November 17

LTAC GOVERNANCE REVIEW

SUMMARY

On 2017 November 15 LTAC carried the following Motion moved by the Chair of the Governance Review Subcommittee.

“LTAC adopt a combination of options A.1 and A.2 and direct LTAC Governance Review Subcommittee author an attachment for the 2017 December 6 SPC report outlining LTAC’s recommendations; develop an implementation plan (for LTAC’s approval) including committee membership, number of members and qualification selection matrix and report to SPC by end of Q1 2018.”

LTAC had requested a review of governance of the livery industry in Calgary in view of the accelerated evolution of the industry in Calgary. The review was awarded to Hara and Associates who worked with Livery Transport Services and Livery Transport Advisory Committee to review the governance model and Terms of Reference for LTAC. The report was delivered to the LTAC Governance Review Subcommittee on 2017 November 7, and to LTAC on 2017 November 10. The Subcommittee proposed the above noted motion to LTAC which adopted the motion as presented.

The summary and background information contained in LTAC2017-53 is correct and not repeated here.

INVESTIGATION

As indicated under “investigation” in LTAC 2017-53 Hara Associates detailed options for Council’s consideration and summarized these options on page 2 of 3 of that report.

The Hara report does make a recommendation. On page 33, Hara and Associates “recommends A.1: *An improved LTAC reporting through Administration.*” The report goes on to say “the introduction of TNCs has removed much of the rationale for having an advisory committee to Council” and “a better approach is to replace LTAC with a similarly structured advisory group whose role is to advise City Administration”. The Hara report points out the introduction of often remotely owned TNCs has removed much of the local industry’s interest in co-operation to preserve the public’s tolerance of a shared monopoly. The result is that many of the industry are disenchanted with LTAC, and feel they have no option but to approach the Mayor and Councillors directly on their issues. It is none the less, a desire of some industry members that some form of oversight of LTS be maintained.

In considering the Hara and Associates report, the Governance Review Subcommittee had a wide ranging discussion which included input from a Taxi and a Limousine Broker – both long term members and participants in the industry and the various governance models used in Calgary.

It was generally agreed the committee was too large, and often internally conflicted. Too cumbersome to be effective, and the recommendations of the committee were often seen to be “filtered” through Administration’s reporting process. Communications with Council – the body to which LTAC was to report – was, with rare exceptions through Administration.

Given LTAC and LTS are funded by the industry – not by mill rate – the industry representatives are of the opinion LTAC was a waste of their time and money. Doubly so because regardless of LTAC’s activities Industry still had to deal directly with Administration and Councillors with respect to their issues.

The Subcommittee was of the view that consultation with both the Public and Industry would be better conducted by Administration relying on the *Engage!* process and principals. Communication with the public, and the industry including drivers would be better conducted by Administration. However, the need for oversight of LTS, in the view of industry members remains.

There is agreement resources – human and monetary can be better used and better results obtained by restructuring the mandate, composition and operation of LTAC. Administration spends an inordinate amount of time preparing for monthly meetings where quarterly meetings may suffice. For that reason the Subcommittee recommended to LTAC that a combination of recommendations A.1 and A.2 be developed. And, to that end the Subcommittee has considered the size, composition, and role of LTAC and is prepared to recommend an outline of a proposed structure and to work with Administration and Council to implement a revised structure not later than the end of Q1 2018.

RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

LTAC recommends Council direct Administration to work with LTAC to develop an implementation plan for LTAC based on Hara and Associates recommendations A.1 and A.2 including mandate, membership, number of members and qualification matrix for Council’s consideration not later than the end of Q1 2018, for implementation on Council Organization Day 2018.

REFERENCES

Option A.1: An improved LTAC reporting through Administration. An LTAC of reduced size would advise on its own account and be freed of the obligation to hold public meetings to collect input. Responsibility for broader consultation would be assumed by Administration on a case-by-case basis.

Option A.2: An industry advisory committee reporting through Administration. The standing advisory Committee would have just six industry representatives. Administration would consult with other stakeholders separately, in addition to any public consultations as per Option A.1.

Option A.3: No standing advisory committee. The administration would undertake consultations with stakeholders on a case by case basis, as per the current approach in Toronto and Edmonton. This could include separately convening driver representatives or TNCs. Where larger issues are at hand, comprehensive consultation would be designed to suit the case.