

# **National Safety Code Utility Vehicle Threshold Study**

**Terms of Reference**

**March 2010**

**Project Administered by:**

Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators (CCMTA)

**Research Sponsored by:**

Ministère des Transports du Québec (MTQ)

Société de l'assurance automobile du Québec (SAAQ)

Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO)

Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation (MIT)

# National Safety Code Utility Vehicle Threshold Study Terms of Reference

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND .....	2
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	3
1.2.1 <i>Characteristics of a Utility Vehicle</i> .....	3
1.2.2. <i>Characteristics of a Public Utility Vehicle</i> .....	4
1.3 <i>Jurisdictional harmonization issues</i> .....	4
1.4 <i>Project objectives</i> .....	4
<b>2.0 STUDY ORGANIZATION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 PROJECT MANAGEMENT .....	5
<b>3.0 CLIENT RESPONSIBILITIES .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION .....	6
3.2 REVIEW AND COMMENT .....	6
<b>4.0 SCOPE OF STUDY AND DELIVERABLES .....</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1 PHASE 1: DETERMINING CHARACTERISTICS OF UTILITY VEHICLE SECTOR (20% OF EFFORT) .....	7
4.1.1 <i>Major Tasks</i> .....	7
4.1.2 <i>Deliverables for Phase 1</i> .....	7
4.2 PHASE 2: ASSESSING THE COMPARED SAFETY RECORD OF UTILITY VEHICLE SECTOR (50% OF EFFORT) .....	8
4.2.1 <i>Major Tasks</i> .....	8
4.2.2 <i>Deliverables for Phase 2</i> .....	9
4.3 PHASE 3: ASSESSING NATIONAL SAFETY CODE STANDARDS IN RELATION TO CHARACTERISTICS OF UTILITY VEHICLE SECTOR (30% OF EFFORT) .....	9
4.3.1 <i>Major Tasks</i> .....	10
4.3.2 <i>Deliverables for Phase 3</i> .....	10
4.4 PROJECT SCHEDULE.....	11
<b>5.0 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1 PROPOSAL FORMAT .....	11
5.2 SUBMISSION DETAILS .....	12
<b>6.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
6.1 QUALITY ASSURANCE .....	12
6.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE .....	12
6.2.1 <i>Evaluation Criteria</i> .....	12
6.2.2 <i>Payment Schedule and Invoicing</i> .....	13
<b>APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>14</b>
APPENDIX A – DEFINITIONS AND RELEVANT LEGISLATION .....	14
APPENDIX B - POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES FOR THE COMPLETION OF THIS RESEARCH PROJECT.....	15

# 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Since the National Safety Code (NSC) has been implemented, Canadian jurisdictions included in their regulation the same notion of heavy vehicles to be subjected to the various NSC standards. In addition, the federal government, who has jurisdiction over extra provincial transportation, uses the same reference - vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) higher than 4500 kg. There are a few distinctions in some jurisdictions, for example, Québec refers to the vehicle net weight greater than 3000 kg. Still, from a general point of view the threshold used for extra provincial carriers is quite similar.

However, the scenario is quite different for regulations pertaining to intra provincial traffic. Alberta, Yukon and Saskatchewan actually use 11,794kg GVWR as the weight threshold for intra provincial carriers subject to some sections of the NSC. Alberta's decision is supported by an internal review that shows evidence that the risk associated with the vehicles between 4500 kg and 11,794 kg is not higher than the larger vehicles. It is important to note that in Alberta's case the issue is to include those intra provincial vehicles with the rest of the vehicles under the NSC code. The issue for Manitoba, Ontario and Québec is different. These provinces would have to exempt those vehicles actually under the NSC Code.

The regulations of many jurisdictions exempt, totally or partially, some classes of vehicles, or operators, from the application of some NSC standards. Common examples of exemptions concern hours of service (Standard 9) and safety ratings (Standard 14). A number of these exemptions refer to the use of the vehicle, with exemptions for personal use, transportation of farm or sea products, and use during emergency situations, etc. These exemptions are not consistent between jurisdictions and do not necessarily refer to the exemptions allowed in the NSC standards. Many of the exempted vehicles might qualify as utility or recreational vehicles.

Provincial differences in the application of the NSC have been frequently discussed at the Compliance and Regulatory Affairs (CRA) committee of the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators (CCMTA) over the last 10 years. Although discussed extensively, provincial differences in application of the NSC remain and inter-provincial harmonization is steadily postponed on the CRA agenda. This impasse is partly the consequence of the lack of convincing safety evidence to support a particular GVWR. Without evidence to support a particular GVWR, there is no impetus for jurisdictions to modify long standing regulations.

The main reason for higher GVWR in some provinces is the desire to alleviate the operators of utility vehicles of the current reporting and compliance requirements, which are uniform in theory under the NSC Code. Those exemptions are often related to types of vehicles that do not fit with a logical definition of commercial heavy vehicle. These may include small vehicles used in the construction industry, large pick-up trucks that pull trailers for the purposes of horse racing/training, race cars, camping trailers, and vehicles used for parcel deliveries. While these reporting and compliance requirements are necessary safety requirements for many commercial vehicles, it has been debated whether these standards are appropriate for utility vehicles.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Historically, multiple weight restrictions were used across Canada, causing difficulty for inter-provincial carriers. To solve this problem, jurisdictions are moving toward harmonization and presently there are two primary weight thresholds. The 4500 kg threshold is applicable for extra provincial transport while a higher threshold of 11794 kg has been adopted intra provincially notably to take into consideration this issue with utility vehicles.

Many stakeholders indicate their utility vehicle operations are so particular that, in some instances, the strict application of the NSC standards would jeopardize public safety. There are a number of examples where this might be the case. These include winter snowploughing, emergency repairs to public services such as gas and electricity, and some specific operations by the oil industry just to name a few. Within the NSC Code, the standards concerning hours of service (HOS) and trip inspection seems to be the most problematic for the utility trucks. Additionally, activities in distant or isolated regions might contribute to making the impact on those activities more severe.

It is to be noted that the construction of vehicles and trailers has been modified since the late 1990s and pick-up trucks or utility vehicles used mainly within the construction industry are now built stronger. This has increased their GVWR, making them subject to NSC Code, when the same type of vehicle was exempt in the past.

### **1.2.1 Characteristics of a Utility Vehicle**

Despite the lack of consensus regarding the appropriate weight threshold for commercial vehicles, there seems to be common thoughts on the characteristics of “utility vehicles.”

Overall, “utility vehicles” can be described by the following characteristics:

- They usually are small vehicles with a GVWR that oscillates between 4500 kg and 11,000 kg.
- Their main purpose is not the transportation of goods.
- They are used mainly to carry equipment, tools and materials for construction, maintenance or restoration, among other uses.
- Driving is not the main task of the individual operating the vehicle. The driver is primarily employed based on qualifications specific to his/her abilities respecting utility maintenance or repair, rather than as a driver. The employer is usually the operator of the vehicle.
- The vehicle is generally operated within a local or regional radius not exceeding 160 km from its base point.
- The driving and maintenance components of the vehicle are considered, by the operator and the driver, as ancillary to their main utility (activities or usage). Most of the time, this utility has nothing to do with the transportation of people or goods (pickup and delivery couriers may be included in the study if their vehicles are greater than 4,500 GVWR).

### **1.2.2. Characteristics of a Public Utility Vehicle**

A sub-category of this type of vehicle is made up of public utility vehicles. To this sub-category, the following characteristics can be added to those enumerated above:

- The main activity of the operator is the construction, maintenance or restoration of public utilities.
- Those vehicles are driven by resources available on a permanent basis to avoid service interruptions in public services or to prevent disasters or damages impacting essential public services.
- Those vehicles carry or are equipped with specialized tools used, in some instances, in emergency situations.

### **1.3 Jurisdictional harmonization issues**

Some jurisdictions intuitively increased their GVWR limit to resolve the issues with utility vehicles described previously. However, this solution does not conform to other jurisdictions such as Québec, Ontario, Manitoba. Additionally, these unilateral moves from the 4500 kg base-line standard by any province fragments and further frustrates the trucking industry's desire for common standards and uniform treatment by all jurisdictions.

As an example, Provinces west of the Manitoba border requested a regional exemption for vehicles with a GVWR below 11,794kg. Transport Canada refused this proposal to maintain equity and consistency at the national level. Nevertheless, Transport Canada confirmed their willingness to assess this issue with all the jurisdictions concerned. Clearly, trying to define the proper weight threshold with consideration for this category of trucks may continue to be influenced by regional interests, unless the discussion is informed with useful data. Among other things, one of the main objectives of this project is to provide a set of data and information to support further discussion among all jurisdictions in regards to the weight threshold at the CRA of CCMTA.

Given that convincing evidence to support either weight threshold, does not exist, it is difficult to determine what changes should be made to the NSC. One purpose of this study is to determine the weight threshold, or the category of vehicle, the NSC should apply.

### **1.4 Project objectives**

Accordingly, the primary objective of this project can be outlined as follows.

***Is it feasible to use a definition of utility vehicles as a means of exempting (or applying the proper regulatory frame to) particular vehicles from specified NSC standards, as an alternative to the use of Gross Vehicle Weights (GVWRs)? The primary objective of this research project is to develop such a definition for utility vehicles and to determine if this class of vehicles should be subject to all NSC standards, or if they may be exempt from some NSC standards. Alternatively, the study might determine if these vehicles could be subject to a different regulatory regime without compromising safety.***

The implications of the primary objective have two perspectives of consideration. From the perspective of the regulator, public safety issues are of a very high priority. Utility vehicles are typically heavier than light duty trucks and automobiles used by the general public. Consequently,

the damage to property and person is increased when these vehicles are involved in vehicle crashes and many regulators feel the size and weight of the vehicles justify the increased regulations implicit in the NSC. However a detailed assessment of their risk exposure, type of use and areas of operation might bring some nuances in the interpretation of their safety record.

From an operator perspective, the additional regulations stemming from the NSC can seem burdensome. The primary work of the driver and vehicle operator is not the transportation of goods or people, and consequently the regulatory requirements are often viewed as troublesome and interfering in primary duties.

Consequently the project objectives are:

- 1) To develop a definition of utility class vehicle (which may include their weight threshold range) that could be included in the National Safety Code and used by provincial and Federal policy makers to amend jurisdictional legislation to clarify the utility vehicle requirements.
- 2) To develop a “portrait” of utility vehicles with respect to the typical activities and schedules of the operators, radius of operation, typical cargo etc.
- 3) To compile and analyse useful safety and compliance data to frame the regional and national discussions of the regulation of utility class vehicles.
- 4) To compile roadside enforcement issues noted for utility vehicles vs. other type of vehicles and establish their level of monitoring and enforcement compared to the other class of vehicles.
- 5) To make a recommendation, based on data and research of the suitability of the continued application of the National Safety Code to utility class vehicles or the relevancy to apply another form of regulatory frame.
- 6) To outline a plan for implementation and enforcement, in MB, ON, and QC, of the recommendation in objective 6.
- 7) To describe the impact of a modification of the commercial vehicle threshold within the NSC Code on the industry and on the harmonization process with the US.

## **2.0 Study Organization**

### **2.1 Project Management**

This initiative will be managed by a steering committee composed of representatives of Ontario, Québec and Manitoba as follows:

- Benoit Cayouette, representing Ministère des Transports du Québec (MTQ)
- René Desaulniers, representing Société de l'assurance automobile du Québec (SAAQ)
- Peter Hurst, representing the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO)
- Darren Christle, representing Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation (MIT).

CCMTA will administer the funding for this contract. CCMTA will award the contract based on the terms of references approved by the steering committee. The payments to the contractor will be made by CCMTA. The sponsoring agencies will provide technical assistance to CCMTA and give final approval that all TOR have been met.

**The funding ceiling for this project is \$135,000.**

## **3.0 Client Responsibilities**

### **3.1 Background Information**

The three sponsoring provinces will provide to the consultant, at the time of project start up, all available project documentation relevant to the study including but not limited to the following:

- All relevant safety and inspection data for their province; and
- Any relevant internal documents on these issues.

Note: Government business is conducted in both French and English in Canada. Therefore, consultants can expect relevant information to be provided in either official language.

A partial list of available data sources is compiled in Appendix B. It should be noted that it may be necessary for the consultant to analyse data exported from provincial databases in a raw data format. (The consultant should include information regarding skills in data manipulation in the relevant experience section of their project proposal.)

### **3.2 Review and Comment**

The consultant will submit a framework and working outline for each deliverable in this project a minimum of 6 weeks before the due date of the deliverable. The project sponsors will review the framework and outline, and provide comments to the consultant within a two (2) week period. The purpose of this process is to ensure a quality product is received at the end of each phase and consultant payment can be processed quickly. In the case of Phase 1, where the deliverable is expected within 6 weeks of the contract award, the framework and working outline should be submitted within 2 weeks of the due date of the deliverable, and project sponsors will review and provide comments in a 1 week period.

## **4.0 Scope of Study and Deliverables**

This research project is divided into three phases. Each phase will address specific questions that will assist in answering the primary question. Phase 1 of the study will develop a characterization of utility vehicles, Phase 2 will compare the safety record of utility vehicles with the safety record of other heavy vehicles and passenger vehicles, and Phase 3 will examine utility vehicles, as defined in Phase 1, with respect to each NSC standard, gauging the applicability of each standard to utility vehicles.

The suggested degrees of effort are included as a guideline. If the consultant does not agree with the suggested breakdown of effort, they should include their analysis of required effort in their proposal.

## **4.1 Phase 1: Determining characteristics of utility vehicle sector (20% of effort)**

Phase 1 of the study will develop a “portrait” of the utility vehicles sector in terms of the sector’s characteristics and how the sector functions by compiling and developing relevant information and data from all available sources. Relevant questions to be addressed in Phase 1 are:

1. Starting from the general description of section 1.2, how can utility and public utility vehicles be characterised and defined? In each province, what is the proportion of commercial vehicles defined to be utility or public utility vehicles?
2. How many of these vehicles are included in fleets which also include heavy trucks? How many of these fleets make it to the audit stage with only small vehicles in the fleet?
3. How might the category of utility vehicle be distinguished for the purpose of roadside inspection or during an audit?

### **4.1.1 Major Tasks**

- Literature review of Canadian and international trends related to safety and compliance in heavy vehicles, with a view to compare utility vehicles issues to other issues related to other heavy vehicles. For the international scope, United States, European Union and Australia will provide a sufficient minimum.
- Develop a characterization of utility vehicles suitable for inclusion in provincial policy and legislation.

### **4.1.2 Deliverables for Phase 1**

There is one written deliverable for Phase 1, the *Phase 1 Report*.

**Phase 1 Report** – Documenting the process and results of the major tasks of Phase 1. Based on the research in Phase 1, the Phase 1 report will include the following items:

- Propose formal definitions of “utility vehicles” and “public utility vehicles” appropriate for the inclusion in the National Safety Code, or to be adopted in other regulations.
- Document a “portrait” of utility vehicles in terms of typical hours of service (HOS), shifts, and operating radius, cargo, and driver characteristics.

**Format:** The *Phase 1 Report* will be provided to the project sponsors in both a Microsoft Word and a PDF format. The project sponsors must accept the formal definitions included in the Phase 1 report before using this definition to complete subsequent phases.

## **4.2 Phase 2: Assessing the compared safety record of utility vehicle sector (50% of effort)**

Phase 2 of the study will use Phase 1's utility vehicle definitions to compare the safety record of utility vehicles to other heavy trucks and passenger vehicles. The manipulation of data from provincial databases will likely be required to complete this task properly.

4. What is the compliance rate for the fleet of utility vehicles compared with the fleet of other heavy vehicles?
5. How do utility and public service vehicles compare with other heavy vehicles, regulated under the NSC, in terms of safety risk and regulatory compliance?
6. What is the compared contribution to the track record? That is, what is the contribution of vehicles as defined in question 1 as compared to other heavy vehicles in terms of % fatalities, % major injuries, % minor injuries, % of accidents, and how do these statistics compare to passenger vehicles. Risk exposure, and areas of operation will be considered in this assessment.
7. Have any roadside enforcement issues been noted for utility vehicles? What is the rate of roadside inspections of utility vehicles vs. other heavy vehicles? How do the inspection results of utility vehicles compare to other forms.

### **4.2.1 Major Tasks**

- A review of available statistics, including crash, Periodic Mandatory Vehicle Inspections (PMVI), Common Offence Notices (CON), and Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) inspection records related to vehicles currently regulated under NSC standards, with the purpose of comparing safety records of utility vehicles to other heavy vehicles and determining what types of crashes utility vehicles are most commonly involved in. If adequate levels of Canadian statistics are not available, it is acceptable to supplement with US, British, European Union and Australian statistics.
- Develop a research model, and pursue the research and analysis, to attempt to identify the safety compliance rates of utility vehicle carriers and drivers, as compared to other heavy vehicle carriers and drivers. It may not be possible to separate utility vehicle data from other heavy truck data. If that is not possible, a survey of utility vehicle and public utility vehicle operators and owners may be an option, but the consultant can suggest another way of gathering this information. (PMVI inspections records may be one way to attempt to isolate some of this information. In Manitoba it may be possible to get this information from Manitoba Public Insurance (MPI).)

#### **4.2.2 Deliverables for Phase 2**

There is one written deliverable for Phase 2, the *Phase 2 Report*.

**Phase 2 Report** – Documenting the process and results of the major tasks of Phase 2. Based on the research in Phase 2, the Phase 2 report will include the following items:

- Identify and document safety and compliance trends found in Canadian and international research, related to heavy trucks in general, and utility vehicles in particular.
- Identify and document the compared level of safety between utility vehicles and other heavy vehicles, and private motor vehicles and light duty trucks.
- Compare the safety compliance rate for carriers and drivers of utility vehicles to the safety compliance rate of other heavy vehicle carriers and drivers.
- If appropriate, provide a recommendation on the appropriate weight threshold for the application of the NSC standards.

**Format:** The *Phase 2 Report* will be provided to the project sponsors in both a Microsoft Word and a PDF format.

#### **4.3 Phase 3: Assessing National Safety Code standards in relation to characteristics of utility vehicle sector (30% of effort)**

Phase 3 of the study will assess the effectiveness and applicability of the NSC to the utility vehicle sector with respect to each NSC standard. This phase of the study will develop a rationale for exempting totally or partially particular types of utility vehicles from particular NSC standards with reference to how the utility vehicle sector functions. For each standard, the study will assess what the standard requires, how the utility vehicle sector functions in relation to the standard's requirements, and whether it is necessary for that particular NSC standard to apply to the utility vehicle sector.

Phase 3 of the study will use the “portrait” of utility vehicles, the definition of utility vehicles, and the safety and compliance information obtained in Phase 1 and 2 to inform the consideration of the remaining questions.

8. What risk exposure will regulatory agencies be exposed to by choosing to exempt totally or partially utility vehicles from the particular NSC standards?
9. According to their past safety performance and their vehicle design specifications, should utility and public service vehicles be subjected to NSC standards under the same conditions as the other heavy vehicles? If not, what would be appropriate conditions?
10. Given that drivers and owners of utility vehicles are not identified as “truck drivers,” what is their level of knowledge of NSC standards as compared to other heavy vehicle operators? Does this level of knowledge have an impact on the safety and compliance of utility vehicles?
11. How could this category of vehicle be established, monitored and subjected to reasonable levels of enforcement?

12. Would changes to the definition result in any competitive issues from the perspective of the MTA, OTA, and the QTA? Is the perspective of individual carriers consistent with the perspective of the trucking associations?
13. Would changes to the definition have any impact on the existing harmonization with the US?
14. Is there a difference in the safety record of utility vehicles between jurisdiction that apply the NSC to utility vehicles and those that do not?

#### **4.3.1 Major Tasks**

- Through the use of good research techniques, identify and document the constraint of applicability and the level of understanding of the NSC, of utility vehicle drivers and owners, and compare these constraints and this understanding to other heavy truck drivers and owners.
- Consider each NSC standard as it pertains to the utility class of vehicles defined in Phase 1. Based on evidence gathered in Phase 1 and 2, make a recommendation on the applicability of each regulation to utility class vehicles. Justify the recommendation with statistics, evidence from the literature, or independent research gathered for the study.
- Based on the recommendations regarding the applicability of the NSC to utility vehicles, assess the effect of potential change to the definition, on the trucking industry's perception of fair competition and on the actual harmonization with the US. This assessment might be conducted at both the association level, ie. OTA, QTA, and MTA, and at the level of individual carriers. The assessment concerning US harmonization might be conducted at the US federal level.

#### **4.3.2 Deliverables for Phase 3**

There are two written deliverables for Phase 3. These are the *Phase 3 Report* and the *Final Executive Summary Report*.

**Phase 3 Report** – Documenting the process and results of the major tasks of Phase 3. Based on the research in all three phases of the study, the Phase 3 report will include the following items:

- Assess and document the level of understanding or constraint of applicability, of the NSC, of utility vehicle drivers and owners. Compare this understanding or constraints to other heavy truck drivers and owners.
- Recommend, based on safety, operator compliance, vehicle design specifications, legislation, risk to regulators, and carrier acceptance information gathered, the applicability of the each individual NSC standard to the utility vehicle class. If these recommendations deviate from the current GVWR, propose guidelines for monitoring and enforcing reasonable safety compliance for consideration by the funding provinces.
- Assess and provide a summary of carrier perceived issues regarding fair competition and the impact of harmonization with the US, based on the proposed changes.

**Final Executive Summary Report** – including key recommendations from all three phases of the report.

**Format:** The *Phase 3 Report* and the *Final Executive Summary Report* will be provided to the project sponsors in both a Microsoft Word and a PDF format.

#### **4.4 Project Schedule**

The project schedule will be largely determined by the consultant's availability and the ability of the provinces to provide the required data in the desired timeframes. If all data is readily available it is expected the project end date should not be later than 7 months after the award. Phase 1 of the study should be completed by no later than 6 weeks after the award. The characterizations of utility vehicles must be approved by the project sponsors before the subsequent phases are undertaken. Unless otherwise advised by the consultant or modified as a result of data availability, the project sponsors will expect the project deliverables to be received as follows:

<i>Phase 1 Report</i> (definition of utility vehicles)	within 6 weeks of the award
<i>Phase 2 Report</i>	within 5 months of award
<i>Phase 3 Report</i>	within 7 months of award
<i>Final Executive Summary Report</i>	within 7 months of award

### **5.0 Submission of Proposals**

#### **5.1 Proposal Format**

All proposals will be formatted on single sided paper with a minimum one (1) inch margins, header and footer. Proposals, excluding cover, cover letter, table of contents, graphics and appendices will be limited to 7 pages maximum. Proposals will be organized and submitted in accordance with the following format and general page count guidelines:

- 1.0 Project Overview (2p)**
  - 1.1 Understanding of the Assignment (1p)
  - 1.2 Philosophy and Approach (1p)
- 2.0 Relevant Experience (1p)**
- 3.0 Proposed Methodology, Schedule and Budget (3p)**
  - 3.1 Methodology (1p)
  - 3.2 Schedule and Budget (2p)
- 4.0 Quality Assurance Measures (1p)**
- 5.0 List of Figures**
  - Figure 1: Conceptual Project Process
  - Figure 2: Project Budget

Consultants who propose to deviate from the degrees of effort and the time lines outlined in the Terms of Reference should indicate in their proposal where the deviations will occur and why.

## **5.2 Submission Details**

Proposals will be submitted in accordance with the following requirements:

### **Due Date:**

Proposals are due by: April 9, 2010

### **Submit to:**

Mr. Sylvain Tremblay  
Programs Manager  
Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators  
2323 St. Laurent Blvd.  
Ottawa, ON K1G 4J8  
Email: [stremblay@ccmta.ca](mailto:stremblay@ccmta.ca)  
Tel. 613-736-1003 (ext 250)

### **Quantities:**

1 electronic PDF copy (submitted by e-mail)

## **6.0 Evaluation of Proposals**

### **6.1 Quality Assurance**

MIT, MTO, SAAQ, and MTQ are committed to a value-based approach for this initiative. Within this context, consultants are recommended to identify any value-added aspects to their proposals (such as enhanced levels of analysis, project liaison, presentation materials and deliverables) as well as submit details on their approach to Quality Assurance regarding project documentation, schedule fidelity, cost controls and project reporting.

### **6.2 Evaluation Criteria and Payment Schedule**

#### **6.2.1 Evaluation Criteria**

Evaluation criteria and weightings will be utilized to review and select a consulting team.

Proposal Quality	15 points
Relevant Experience	20 points
Methodology and Approach	30 points
Project Schedule and Deliverables	10 points
Quality Assurance Measures	15 points
Price	10 points

## 6.2.2 Payment Schedule and Invoicing

Task Completed	Deliverable	Payment
Phase 1- Determining characteristics of utility vehicle sector	Phase 1 Report	20% of Total
Phase 2 – Assessing the compared safety record of utility vehicle sector	Phase 2 Report	50% of Total
Phase 3 - Assessing National Safety Code standards in relation to characteristics of utility vehicle sector	Phase 3 Report	30% of Total
	Final Executive Summary Report	

The consultant will invoice for 20% of the total cost of this study after the completion of Phase 1, 50% of the total cost after the completion of Phase 2 and 30% of the total cost at the end of Phase 3. The invoices will be addressed to CCMTA at the following address:

### Phase 1, 2, and 3 Invoices – Address to:

Mr. Sylvain Tremblay  
Programs Manager  
Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators  
2323 St. Laurent Blvd.  
Ottawa, ON K1G 4J8  
Email: [stremblay@ccmta.ca](mailto:stremblay@ccmta.ca)  
Tel. 613-736-1003 (ext 250)

Prepared by: Janice Miller, 204.945.8117

On Behalf of:

Darren Christle  
Executive Director  
Motor Carrier Division  
Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation

# Appendix

## Appendix A – Definitions and Relevant Legislation

**Operator** – refers to the owner of the heavy vehicle. Under NSC Standard 11, operators are responsible for mechanical safety of their heavy vehicles, although the driver of the vehicle has some safety responsibilities as well.

**Driver** – refers to the person driving the heavy vehicle. Drivers have safety responsibilities under NSC Standard 13.

**National Safety Code (NSC)** – The National Safety Code for Motor Carriers is a series of sixteen standards and was developed by the member jurisdictions of CCMTA in conjunction with the motor carrier industry. Online version available at:

<http://www.ccmta.ca/english/produstandservices/publications/publications.cfm#NSC>

**Utility vehicles** (utility class vehicles) – heavy vehicles with a GVWR of between 4,500 kg to 11,794kg.

**Heavy vehicles** – vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) higher than 4,500 kg.

**Gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR)** – A gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) is the maximum allowable total weight of a road vehicle or trailer when loaded - i.e. including the weight of the vehicle itself plus fuel, passengers, cargo, and trailer tongue weight.

Manitoba Highway Traffic Act

<http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/h060e.php>

Ontario Highway Traffic Act

[http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws\\_statutes\\_90h08\\_e.htm](http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_90h08_e.htm)

Quebec Highway Safety Code

[http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=2&file=/C\\_24\\_2/C24\\_2\\_A.html](http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=2&file=/C_24_2/C24_2_A.html)

R.S.Q., chapter P-30.3 An Act respecting owners, operators and drivers of heavy vehicles

[http://www.mtq.gouv.qc.ca/portal/page/portal/ministere\\_en/ministere/lois\\_reglements](http://www.mtq.gouv.qc.ca/portal/page/portal/ministere_en/ministere/lois_reglements)

Canadian Motor Vehicle Transport Act

<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/M-12.01/FullText.html>

## Appendix B - Possible Data Sources for the Completion of this Research Project

*Commercial motor vehicle driver fatigue and alertness study* (1996)  
<http://www.tc.gc.ca/innovation/tdc/summary/12800/execsummary.htm>  
<http://www.tc.gc.ca/innovation/tdc/projects/road/d/8274.htm>

*Investigation of commercial motor vehicle driver cumulative fatigue recovery periods: Napping literature review* (2006) (TP 14614E)  
<http://www.tc.gc.ca/innovation/tdc/summary/14600/14614e.htm>

Regehr, J., Montufar, J. and Rempel, G. *Safety performance of longer combination vehicles relative to other articulated trucks*, Can. J. Civ. Eng. 36(1): 40–49 (2009) <http://article.pubs.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/RPAS/rpv?hm=HInit&journal=cjce&volume=36&calyLang=eng&afpf=108-109.pdf>

Montufar, J., Regehr, J., and Rempel, G. *Long Combination Vehicle (LCV) Safety Performance in Alberta: 1999–2005: Final Report*  
<http://www.transportation.alberta.ca/Content/docType61/production/LCVFinalReport2005.pdf>

*Canadian Heavy Trucks Collisions 1994 - 1998 (2001)* (TP 2436 E) (Fact Sheet RS 2001-05)  
Prepared by Road Safety and Motor Vehicle Regulation Directorate  
<http://www.tc.gc.ca/media/documents/roadsafety/rs200105e.pdf>

*Canadian Motor Vehicle Traffic Collision Statistics: 2006* Transport Canada, Road Safety and Motor Vehicle Regulation, Collected in co-operation with the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators (TP 3322 Cat. T45-3/2006 ISBN 978-0-662-05229-6 December 2007)  
<http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/roadsafety/tp-tp3322-2006-menu-586.htm>

*Canadian Motor Vehicle Traffic Collision Statistics: 2005* Transport Canada, Road Safety and Motor Vehicle Regulation, Collected in co-operation with the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators (TP 3322 Cat. T45-3/2005 ISBN 0-662-49667-1 December 2006)  
<http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/roadsafety/tp-tp3322-2005-menu-645.htm>

*Canadian Motor Vehicle Traffic Collision Statistics: 2004* Transport Canada, Road Safety and Motor Vehicle Regulation, Collected in co-operation with the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators (TP 3322 Cat. T45-3/2004 ISBN 0-662-69386-8 December 2005)  
<http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/roadsafety/tp-tp3322-2004-menu-691.htm>

*Canadian Motor Vehicle Traffic Collision Statistics: 2003*. Transport Canada, Road Safety and Motor Vehicle Regulation, Collected in co-operation with the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators (TP 3322 Cat. T45-3/2003E ISBN 0-662-38046-0 October 2004)  
<http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/roadsafety/tp-tp3322-2003-menu-630.htm>

*Trends in Motor Vehicle Traffic Collision Statistics 1988 – 1997*. (2001) (TP 13743 E February 2001 Prepared by Road Safety and Motor Vehicle Regulation Directorate)  
[http://www.tc.gc.ca/media/documents/roadsafety/trends\\_88-97.pdf](http://www.tc.gc.ca/media/documents/roadsafety/trends_88-97.pdf)

2008 NWT Traffic Collision Facts Department of Transportation. NWT Road Licensing and Safety Division, September 2009.

Canadian Traffic Accident Database <http://www2.itssti.hc-sc.gc.ca/clf/clfinventory.nsf/idview/030204164922-KC-LJ?OpenDocument&lang=E>

Manitoba Annual CVSA Inspection Reports (1999-2009)

US Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Large Truck and Bus Crash Facts 2008: Early Release <http://ai.volpe.dot.gov/CarrierResearchResults/PDFs/LargeTruckCrashFacts2007.pdf>

US Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Crash Statistics Data <http://ai.fmcsa.dot.gov/CrashProfile/CrashProfileMainNew.asp>

US Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Large Truck Crash Causation Study <http://ai.fmcsa.dot.gov/ltccs/default.asp>