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Minutes of the Public Meeting of the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation (Mayors’ Council) held Thursday, December 13, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in Rooms 427/428, TransLink Head Office, 400 – 287 Nelson’s Court, New Westminster, BC.

PRESENT:
Mayor Jonathan Coté, New Westminster, Chair
Mayor Jack Froese, Langley Township, Vice Chair
Mayor Neil Belenkie, Belcarra
Mayor Malcolm Brodie, Richmond
Mayor Linda Buchanan, North Vancouver City (alternate)
Councillor Craig Cameron, West Vancouver (alternate)
Mayor Bill Dingwall, Pitt Meadows
Mayor George Harvie, Delta
Mayor Mike Hurley, Burnaby
Director Justin LeBlanc, Electoral Area A
Mayor Mike Little, North Vancouver District (alternate)
Councillor Hunter Madsen, Port Moody (alternate)
Mayor Doug McCallum, Surrey
Mayor John McEwen, Anmore
Mayor Ron McLaughlin, Lions Bay
Mayor Mike Morden, Maple Ridge
Councillor Alison Morse, Bowen Island
Mayor Kennedy Stewart, Vancouver
Mayor Richard Stewart, Coquitlam
Mayor Val van den Broek, Langley City
Mayor Darryl Walker, White Rock
Councillor Dean Washington, Port Coquitlam (alternate)
Chief Bryce Williams, Tsawwassen First Nation (arrived 9:12 a.m.)

ALSO PRESENT:
Mike Buda, Executive Director, Mayors’ Council Secretariat
Geoff Cross, Vice-President, Transportation Planning and Policy, TransLink
Kevin Desmond, Chief Executive Officer, TransLink
Steve Vanagas, Vice President, Customer Communications and Public Affairs, TransLink
Sany R. Zein, Vice-President, Infrastructure Management and Engineering, TransLink

PREPARATION OF MINUTES:
Rae Ratslef, Recording Secretary, Raincoast Ventures Ltd.

CALL TO ORDER
A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

1. PRELIMINARY MATTERS
1.1 Adoption of Agenda


It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation adopts the agenda for its Public meeting scheduled December 13, 2018, version dated December 11, 2018.

CARRIED
1.2 **Oath of Office (Director LeBlanc)**

It was acknowledged that new members Director LeBlanc and Mayor Ander declared and signed their Oath of Office in advance of this meeting.

1.3 **Adoption of the Minutes**

*Draft Minutes of the September 21, 2018 Public Meeting of the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation.*

**It was MOVED and SECONDED**

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation adopts the minutes of its Public meeting held September 21, 2018, as circulated.

**CARRIED**

2. **PUBLIC DELEGATES**

Anoosh Kiananesh referred to the on-table and projected presentation titled ‘Sky Bus (The Future of Urban Transit’). He discussed a “means of transportation” comparison table, and pros and cons of various transportation categories. A video providing information on Sky Bus would be forwarded for members’ information.

Chief Williams arrived at the meeting.

Deepak Sharma, former student of SFU, and resident of Surrey, spoke against the proposed SkyTrain extension along Fraser Highway. He suggested that SkyTrain would result in fewer stations and would have less capacity than the approved LRT system, which was planned to serve the densest Surrey centres: Guildford, Central Surrey and Newton. He reviewed several misconceptions about LRT, and encouraged urging the City of Surrey to support LRT.

Phillip Aguirre, President, Newton Business Improvement Association (BIA), referred to the vitality and importance of the Newton and Guildford town centres, noting that LRT was to be the catalyst for their transformation. With the change from LRT to SkyTrain, it is a concern that Newton will be abandoned again when it comes to transit. He spoke in opposition to changing the Mayors’ Council 10-Year Plan based on the results of the 2018 Municipal Election.

Roderick Louis, resident of White Rock, noted concern that the evaluation of mega projects and funding models has been inadequate. For the Millennium Line Broadway Extension (MLBE) the option of creating a separate Canada-Line 2 type system rather than a SkyTrain extension should have been considered, potentially through a public private partnership. The same is true for the proposed Fraser Highway SkyTrain Line. Canada Line uses trains built by Hyundai, which have regular electric motors. The advantages and opportunities for competing versions of this should have been explored. Additionally, there should be public consultation on whether there is support for an above ground option to extend the MLBE to the University of British Columbia.

Mike Soron, resident of Vancouver and transit user, works with Abundant Transit, which advocates for more transit for more people. Transit is needed urgently, without delay. Whichever options are selected in the Regional Transportation Strategy (RTS), he encouraged the Mayors’ Council to move quickly, do more, increase ambitions and update the RTS.
D. Malcolm Johnson encouraged the Mayors’ Council to not proceed with building SkyTrain in Surrey and to rethink the proposed MLBE. LRT is a more affordable option for Surrey, and if there is interest to deal with congestion, there is need to plan for LRT. He commented on the flexibility of LRT, and challenged the view of politicians that LRT is inferior to SkyTrain. He spoke on the limitations of SkyTrain’s capacity, suggested that the SkyTrain extension will cause severe overcrowding on the lines, and will cost $1 billion more than the currently approved LRT.

Albert Melenius, passenger of transit for people with disabilities, expressed concern that peoples with disabilities will have difficulty accessing transit to take them to SkyTrain. The model for transit should follow public need – not guide it. The Mayors’ Council should develop transit that can be increased in stages. There should be analysis of the ridership on various lines. Transit should follow population growth, not precede it and attempt to channel it. He also questioned how reviewing this part of the plan would impact other parts of the plan.

Sukhwinder Sangha, on behalf of friends, family and other concerned citizens of Surrey, noted his objection to the plan to halt the LRT in favour of SkyTrain. He questioned why the communities of Newton, Guildford and South Surrey are being abandoned for transit, and noted concern about investing in a 10-year plan and then changing it in the 11th hour. Surrey communities deserve the transit that was promised. Ridership exists and can be scaled up with LRT on 104th and along King George Boulevard to Newton. He questioned the rationale for SkyTrain service to Langley, and suggested that B-Line service would better service that route. He urged the Mayors’ Council to vote against the proposal for SkyTrain to Langley in this phase, and to reinvigorate Newton, City Central and Guildford with LRT.

Lee Lockwood, representing residents from Surrey to Abbotsford, suggested that SkyTrain is fiscally irresponsible and does nothing to enhance the SOF community. LRT utilizing 104th to City Centre intercepting with King George Boulevard to a terminus in Newton is a far better solution for Surrey, Delta, South Surrey, Sullivan Heights, Cloverdale, Aldergrove, etc. at a fraction of the cost. LRT will service 16 communities, 14 institutions, multiple parks and tourism destinations, and the Abbotsford Airport. In 2009, the SOF Rail Task Force created a 27-minute video and met with then TransLink CEO and staff to present that idea. He referred to a master agreement between BC Hydro and BC Rail, and asked for support to establish a provincially endorsed SOF Community Task Force on this issue.

3. REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

3.1 2019 Work Plan

Report dated December 6, 2018 from Mike Buda, Executive Director, Mayors’ Council Secretariat, titled “Item 3.1 – 2019 Work Plan”.

Mike Buda, Executive Director, Mayors’ Council Secretariat, referred to a distributed and projected presentation titled “2019 Work Plan – Item 3.1”. He discussed major Work Plan elements, and planned topics for the January 2019 meeting.
It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation:

1. Approve the 2019 Work Plan;
2. Direct staff to develop a proposed budget to support implementation of the Work Plan, for consideration at the January 24, 2019 meeting; and
3. Receive this report.

CARRIED

3.2 2019 Committees

Report dated December 7, 2018 from Mike Buda, Executive Director, Mayors’ Council Secretariat, titled “Item 3.2 – 2019 Committees”.

It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation:

1. Strike three committees to support the work of the Mayors’ Council:
   a. Regional Transportation Planning;
   b. Finance and Governance; and
   c. New Mobility;
2. Appoint Mayors’ Council members to these new committees as proposed in Appendix A;
3. Ask the Chair and Vice Chair to appoint Committee Chairs after consulting with the Metro Vancouver Chair and Vice-Chair on their committee appointment decisions;
4. Invite the TransLink Board to participate in joint committees, with joint co-Chairs;
5. Ask each committee to finalize a Terms of Reference and 2019 Work Plan for consideration by the Mayors’ Council at a future meeting; and
6. Receive this report.

CARRIED

3.3 2019 Meeting Schedule

Report dated December 2, 2018 from Mike Buda, Executive Director, Mayors’ Council Secretariat, titled “Item 3.3 – 2019 Mayors’ Council Meeting Calendar”.

It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation:

1. Approve the 2019 calendar of Mayors’ Council meetings; and
2. Receive this report.

CARRIED

4. REPORT OF TRANSLINK MANAGEMENT

4.1 Regional Transportation Strategy

Report dated December 5, 2018 from Geoff Cross, Vice-President, Transportation Planning and Policy, TransLink, and Steve Vanagas, Vice President, Customer Communications and Public Affairs, titled “Item 4.1 – Update to the Regional Transportation Strategy”.

Andrew McCurran, Director, Strategic Planning and Policy, and Steve Vanagas, Vice President, Customer Communications and Public Affairs, referred to the distributed and projected presentation titled “Regional Transportation Strategy Update to the Mayors’ Council” dated December 13, 2018. Their presentation highlighted:

- The region’s long-term transport plan
- Our current system, shaped by past plans
- Investments in transit and transportation that will build out Transport 2021 (T2021)
- Remaining challenges
- What’s Next?
- Engaging the public on the Regional Transportation Strategy (RTS)
- Engagement approach and timeline
- Next steps for RTS.

Discussion ensued on:
- Whether there is an opportunity to incorporate the inter-urban lines into the RTS
- Whether there is opportunity to expand the West Coast Express (WCE) further east
- Potential to better utilize opportunities for water movement of people
- Confirmation that TransLink and municipal staff will work closely to coordinate planning processes.

It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation receive this report. CARRIED

4.2 South of Fraser Rapid Transit Planning

Report dated December 7, 2018 from Geoff Cross, Vice-President, Transportation Planning and Policy, TransLink, titled “Item 4.2 – South of Fraser Rapid Transit”.

Geoff Cross, Vice-President, Transportation Planning and Policy, TransLink, and Sany R. Zein, Vice-President, Infrastructure Management and Engineering, TransLink, referred to the distributed and projected presentation titled “South of Fraser Rapid Transit – Item 4.1. (Annex 1) Management Briefing Report to Mayors’ Council”. Their presentation highlighted:

- Resolutions from November 15, 2018 Mayors’ Council meeting
- Financial parameters for Work Plan development
- “Option 2” Work Plan from November 15, 2018
- Questions from November 15, 2018 meeting to be addressed by Work Plan
- Principles applied to design Work Plan
- Project development and transit strategic refresh, including South of Fraser (SOF)
- Surrey to Langley SkyTrain project development Work Plan, timeline, consultation steps and related Mayors’ Council and Board milestones
- Project development Work Plan: opportunities and risks
- Surrey-Newton-Guildford (SNG) LRT expenditure updates
- B-Line bus service implications
- Fraser Hwy B-Line plan to improve bus service to SOF – proposed elements
- B-Line proposed alternative plan
- Past work on Surrey to Langley Rapid Transit
• SOF Rapid Transit growth forecasts: current conditions and future
• Alignment concept summary
• Preliminary reference concepts developed for costing
• Preliminary ridership profile estimates
• Next steps.

In response to questions, staff discussed:
• Confirmation that there are various suppliers interested to compete
• Need to determine the amount of SkyTrain that could be built with available funding
• Information on the consultation process to develop the Mayors’ Council 10-Year Vision and Investment Plan
• Decision by past policy makers to go forward with LRT vs. SkyTrain
• Land use projections from Metro Vancouver, which underpin work to date
• Differences in development along Fraser Highway vs. King George Boulevard
• Estimated costs to develop the business plan for SkyTrain
• Confirmation that estimates include contingency based on the construction methodology contemplated in 2016 and 2017.

Discussion ensued on:
• Cancellation of the SNG portion would leave a need to recuperate millions already expended
• Funding gap of $1 billion between the contemplated and previously approved projects
• Need to identify source of funds other than regional taxation before proceeding
• Concern regarding implications for transit to White Rock, South Surrey and Langley
• Options for supplying cars for a Fraser Highway SkyTrain line
• Importance of cost containment and the wise use of resources
• Suggestion that what the people of Surrey want is not clearly known
• Recognition that the 10-Year Plan was developed on compromise to reach the best solution for the region as a whole
• Surrey Council’s support of the recommendations presented in the staff report

Point of Order
In response to a suggestion that the staff motion should be presented and voted on first and that any new motions would be subject to notice, the Chair noted that past practice has been to use the staff recommendation as a starting point.

• Suggestion that Surrey citizens’ support for SkyTrain is evidenced by the results of the 2018 Municipal Election
• Concern at the cost of changing the technology at this point, and regarding implications for other aspects of the plan
• Need for a more detailed business plan before any decision is made
• Concern that the North Shore has the density and employment and yet is still waiting for rapid bus lines
• Concern about the opportunity cost of staff time and energy being spent on this question, rather than moving forward with other aspects of the plan
• Concern that the new plan for Surrey has not been consulted on
• Concern that this will drive up costs for citizens outside the Fraser Highway corridor
• Various projects originally contemplated in the various phases of the 10-Year Plan
• Need to secure the Phase 3 funding.

The staff recommendation as contained in the distributed report was introduced.

An amendment to the Main Motion was introduced, to strike parts 1A and 1B, to be replaced with new parts 1 and 2:

1. Direct TransLink to identify alternate sources of revenue, other than regional taxation, to address the difference in cost of approximately $1 billion between the previously supported LRT Surrey-Newton-Guildford Phase 1 Project and the proposed SkyTrain route along the Fraser Highway to Langley and the approximately $56 million spent on planning the previous LRT Phase 1 Project, which was initiated in good faith with Surrey’s support and was subsequently cancelled at Surrey’s request; and

2. Report staff to back to the Mayor’s Council prior to commencing a planning project on the expansion of SkyTrain south of the Fraser.

Ruling of the Chair
The Chair ruled that the amendment was a significant departure from the Main Motion and as such, the Main Motion would need to be defeated in order for this motion to be considered.

Discussion ensued on:
• Concern about moving forward if funding is not available
• Decisions do have an impact on scope and technology for future phases
• Decisions points for the Mayors’ Council and Board Review of Draft Business Case and SOF Transit Strategy, Mayors’ Council and Board review of Final Business Case, and Mayors’ Council and Board Approval of Investment Plan
• Concern that we are doing this in the reverse process; usually look at the region’s need but in this case it is a predetermined end result that we are trying to make work
• Concern we are spending staff time investigating a project that is not going to be viable
• View that this is not viable is premature, and that there has been past work on a SkyTrain along Fraser Highway between Surrey and Langley.

Main Motion
It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation:

1. Endorse the work plan in this report that will have TransLink:
   a. Proceed immediately with planning and project development work for a SkyTrain on Fraser Highway project; and
b. Concurrently, initiate a planning process to refresh the South of Fraser rapid transit strategy, consistent with the 10-Year Vision of building 27 km of rapid transit on the three corridors;

2. Endorse the cancellation of the Fraser Highway B-Line in the Phase One Plan, and instead direct the planned resources to improving the 96 B-Line and existing services on Fraser Highway;

3. Receive this report.

Amendment to the Main Motion
It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the Main Motion be amended to add to the first line “subject to the City of Surrey’s specific agreement to pay compensation, no later than upon signing the Memorandum of Understanding, all work plan costs unnecessarily expended to date”.

CARRIED BY WEIGHTED VOTE

Amendment to the Main Motion
It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the Main Motion be amended in Part 1(a) to replace “project development work” with “and design work”.

DEFEATED BY WEIGHTED VOTE

Question on the Main Motion as Amended

Question was then called on the Main Motion as originally amended to read:

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation, subject to the City of Surrey’s specific agreement to pay compensation, no later than upon signing the MOU, all work plan costs unnecessarily expended to date:

1. Endorse the work plan in this report that will have TransLink:

   a. Proceed immediately with planning and project development work for a SkyTrain on Fraser Highway project; and

   b. Concurrently, initiate a planning process to refresh the South of Fraser rapid transit strategy, consistent with the 10-Year Vision of building 27 km of rapid transit on the three corridors;

2. Endorse the cancellation of the Fraser Highway B-Line in the Phase One Plan, and instead direct the planned resources to improving the 96 B-Line and existing services on Fraser Highway;

3. Receive this report.

DIVIDED
**Question on Part 1A**
Question was then called on the amended Main Motion Part 1A and it was **CARRIED BY WEIGHTED VOTE**

**Question on Part 1B**
Question was then called on the amended Main Motion Part 1B and it was **CARRIED BY WEIGHTED VOTE**

**Question on Part 2**
Question was then called on the amended Main Motion Part 2 and it was **CARRIED BY WEIGHTED VOTE**

**Question on Preamble**
Question was then called on the amended Main Motion Preamble and it was **CARRIED BY WEIGHTED VOTE**

5. **OTHER BUSINESS**
The Chair acknowledged outgoing TransLink Board Chair Lorraine Cunningham for her service.

6. **ADJOURN TO CLOSED MEETING**

**It was MOVED and SECONDED**

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation Public Meeting held December 13, 2018 adjourned to in-camera.

**CARRIED**
(12:28 p.m.)

Certified Correct:

---------------------------------------------
Mayor Jonathan X. Coté, Chair
Rae Ratslef, Recording Secretary
Raincoast Ventures Ltd.
TO: Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation

FROM: Mike Buda, Executive Director, Mayors’ Council Secretariat

DATE: January 15, 2019

SUBJECT: ITEM 2 – Public Delegates

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation receive this report.

PURPOSE:

To introduce the objectives and process for hearing from public delegates.

BACKGROUND:

Public participation at meetings is valued by the Mayors’ Council, and up to one hour is set aside at open meetings to receive public delegations. The Mayors’ Council will only receive public delegations who intend to speak on matters that are within the authority of the Mayors’ Council.

Individuals can apply to be a delegate by completing the online Application Form up until 8:00AM, two business days prior to the meeting. In situations where there isn’t enough time to hear from everyone wishing to speak, the Mayors’ Council encourages written submissions be sent to mayorscouncil@translink.ca.

The webpage for public delegates includes a Protocol for Public Delegates that notes:

- the Mayors’ Council Chair will exercise discretion in maintaining a reasonable level of order and decorum;
- delegates and all meeting participants are reminded that different points of view are respected, and discussions are kept above the level of personal confrontation, disruptive behaviour and profanity.

DISCUSSION:

The deadline to apply to speak to the Mayors’ Council is 8:00am two days prior to the meeting. At the time of this report, not all prospective speakers will have had a chance to complete applications. Accordingly, the list of approved speakers and the subjects they indicated they will speak on, as well as any written submissions, will be provided on table. Any presentations provided by delegates will also be provided to Mayors’ Council members only, on table (up to 10-pages maximum).

Each delegation will be given a maximum of five minutes to address the Mayors’ Council. As a general rule, there are no questions or discussion between Council and delegates.
TO: Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation

FROM: Geoff Cross, Vice-President Transportation Planning & Policy

DATE: January 18, 2019

SUBJECT: ITEM 3.1 – Rail to UBC

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Mayors’ Council receive this report.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report, attached technical report, and briefing slides is to provide the Board and Mayors’ Council with background on the Rail to UBC project, an overview of the conclusion that SkyTrain technology will be recommended as the basis for future work and a work plan to advance the project to the next stage. Management is seeking questions, discussion and feedback from the Committee in anticipation that staff recommendations from this report will be brought back to the next meeting for consideration.

BACKGROUND:

The 99 B-Line route on the Broadway Corridor is the busiest bus route in Canada and the United States, moving 60,000 transit customers a day on articulated buses that run every 3 minutes in peak times. Even with buses running this frequently it is also the region’s most overcrowded bus route. After downtown Vancouver, UBC and Central Broadway are the most significant transit destinations in the region. By 2025, when the Millennium Line extension to Arbutus is forecast to open, it is estimated that peak ridership on the 99 B-Line between Arbutus and UBC will be essentially at the maximum that can be handled by a bus.

More than ten years ago TransLink and the Province partnered with the City of Vancouver, UBC, University Endowment Lands, Metro Vancouver and the Musqueam Indian Band on the “UBC Line Rapid Transit Study”, which was completed in 2012. This work initially screened more than 200 combinations of technology, route and alignment prior to focusing analysis on seven alternatives in detail including Best Bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), two Light Rail Transit options (LRT), Rail Rapid Transit (RRT / SkyTrain) and two combination options of each. Three alternatives showed promise and were moved forward for consideration:

1. LRT 1: LRT from Commercial/Broadway to UBC
2. RRT: SkyTrain extension of the Millennium Line to UBC
3. Combo 1: SkyTrain extension of the Millennium Line to Arbutus with LRT from Main Street-Science World Station to UBC, with a connection at Arbutus.
In 2014 the Mayors’ Council 10-year Vision recommended moving forward with the Broadway Subway Project from VCC-Clark to Arbutus:

“This Vision calls for rapid transit between Commercial Drive and the University of British Columbia. The first 10 years of the Vision targets implementing the first phase: extending the Millennium Line westward from its current terminus at VCC-Clark to Arbutus, with frequent B-Line bus connections continuing to UBC from Arbutus... During the design process for the first phase, all stakeholders will work together to conclude how and when to complete the next phase of rail to the Point Grey campus.”

In 2016, with the project development funding approved in the Phase One Plan, a project office was established to develop the business case for the Broadway Subway Project and bring the project to procurement-readiness. In 2018, the Broadway Subway Project received Provincial approval of the business case and funding for construction through Phase Two Plan (see attached briefing deck for further background information).

With a Millennium Line Broadway Extension to Arbutus underway, TransLink has worked with partners on a technical assessment of connecting rail rapid transit to UBC to determine what, if any, technology alternatives to a further SkyTrain extension, could meet the forecast long-term capacity requirements, and thus warrant additional consideration as we advance planning. The result of that work is the focus of this memo.

**DISCUSSION:**

Phase Two of the 10-Year Vision includes $3 million of funding for Reference Case/Pre-Business Case Development for rapid transit to UBC, which is critical groundwork to design the optimal project that can be the basis for the region to secure funding commitments and move to procurement readiness. Next steps in this project development process include:

- Assessing vertical and horizontal alignment options;
- Preparing detailed concept designs;
- Public and stakeholder engagement;
- Coordination with land use planning at Jericho Lands and UBC;
- Begin discussions related to financial and/or in-kind contributions and agreements from senior governments, UBC, developers along the proposed corridor and the City of Vancouver; Ongoing coordination with partners – including City of Vancouver, First Nations (including the MST Development Corporation), UBC, UEL, and others – related to land use policy and supportive policy agreements; and
- Consideration of potential land value capture opportunities and contributions along the corridor as potential funding sources.

This work, funded from the Phase Two Plan, will result in a recommendation of a preferred concept design to carry forward into a reference case design (required to develop a business case) and procurement readiness program, which would need to be funded through a future investment plan. All decisions to advance to next stages, including business case design and project funding would be brought forward to the Mayors’ Council and TransLink Board. See attached presentation for further information on the potential project delivery timeline and planning approach.
Before beginning this Phase Two funded work, management will be requesting clear direction from the Mayors’ Council on the rapid transit technology that will be the basis of the project development.

**Technology choice**

The Mayors’ Council 10-Year Vision did not define the technology and alignment for rail to UBC, and as such there is no policy guidance if SkyTrain should be the basis or if any of the LRT concepts should be considered that were shortlisted for the entire corridor, prior to the decision to extend the Millennium Line to Arbutus. Due diligence was required to assess (1) what is the updated forecasted transit ridership to UBC, and (2) given that the extension to Arbutus is now proceeding, what technology and alignment options for a rail connection to UBC can provide sufficient long-term capacity, appropriate for rapid transit assets, to warrant additional consideration.

Since late 2017, TransLink has been collaborating with the City of Vancouver and UBC on updating the initial 2012 alternatives analysis with new information and, specifically, assessment of:

- Ridership forecasts and capacity requirements over the medium and longer term, based on the most current land use assumptions and modelling tools;
- Key technology assumptions, including confirming and updating LRT operating assumptions to achieve the maximum capacity achievable;
- Updated cost estimates of the options; and
- Whether demand for UBC could be met with a multiple corridor approach, rather than funneling all demand onto the Broadway corridor.

This work demonstrated that a SkyTrain extension to UBC is the only technology that would accommodate the forecast ridership on the Broadway corridor and allow for future expansion in the longer term (beyond 2045). The option of an LRT from Main Street Science World Station (with a connection to the SkyTrain at Arbutus) would be at maximum capacity by 2045, which is anticipated to be approximately 15 years from when a line could be expected to be operational if it were to proceed.

However, given that people travel to UBC from across the region and that the LRT options on Broadway would experience capacity issues in 2045, the updated assessment also looked at whether the transit ridership could be captured by investing in an LRT network on two corridors, rather than just on the Broadway corridor. The analysis shows that if two LRT lines were constructed — one along Broadway connecting to Main Station and a second along the 41st corridor connecting to either the Canada Line at Oakridge or the Expo Line at Metrotown station — there would be sufficient capacity to meet the forecasted transit ridership in 2045. Compared to the SkyTrain extension, the most extensive LRT network scenarios result in similar ridership to UBC but would likely generate higher ridership systemwide, roughly proportionate to the increase in capital cost. However, given that this would represent significantly more kilometers of rapid transit and given the need for a new operations and maintenance centre, two LRT lines would be considerably costlier than a single SkyTrain extension and require substantial supportive corridor and land use changes. Furthermore, the combined capacity could not be materially increased in the future if needed and the forecasts show that within 15 years of operation, demand is already approaching 80% of their practical capacity. In contrast, a SkyTrain line’s opening day capacity could be roughly doubled over time if needed.

The detailed findings of this analysis can be found in the attached technical report.
NEXT STEPS IN ADVANCING RAIL TO UBC:

TransLink will be seeking policy direction from the Mayors’ Council and TransLink Board in the coming months on technology to advance into project development. Funding is approved in the Phase Two Plan to complete this work.

Work completed in 2018 concludes that an extension of the Millennium Line provides sufficient capacity to meet demand beyond 2045 and is expandable to meet the longer-term transportation needs of the corridor and UBC. The work also provides confidence that other, potentially lower-cost, alternatives have been explored. Single LRT alignments connecting to the Expo or Millennium Line cannot provide sufficient capacity to meet ridership demand. While an expanded network of multiple LRT lines could meet ridership objectives, this comes at significantly higher cost than a single SkyTrain line and the second line along 41st Avenue has yet to be identified in any Municipal, Regional or Provincial documents as a candidate for rapid transit, beyond the rapid bus plans currently in development. All LRT alternatives come with deliverability issues, including the challenge of locating an operational and maintenance facility in the City of Vancouver/UBC.

Based on the technical work completed to date and barring any policy direction to reconsider the initial project objectives, it is anticipated that Management will recommend SkyTrain as the preferred technology to advance to the next stage, including development of alternative concept designs and preliminary business case inputs.

Please refer to the attached Rail to UBC presentation for further information on the potential timeline and planning approach. Based on this timeline, development of a Business Case could begin as early as mid-year in 2020 at an estimated cost between $30 and 40 million that is not currently funded. The Mayors’ Council and TransLink Board would provide direction at each critical decision point.

Regional Engagement

Current work on the UBC Study has been led by staff at TransLink, with involvement from the City of Vancouver, UBC, and the Province, including funding contributions by the City of Vancouver and UBC. Engagement with regional decision makers (including the Mayors’ Council and TransLink Board), First Nations (including the MST Development Corporation), other stakeholders, and the public is anticipated to begin in early-mid 2019.

Results from the Rail to UBC Study will complement TransLink’s upcoming Regional Transportation Strategy update, including consideration of regional rapid transit priorities and funding requirements.

ATTACHMENTS

Technical Report (below)
Rail to UBC Presentation (attached separately due to file size)
Item 3.1 – Attachment #1
Rail to UBC Briefing
Geoff Cross, VP, Planning and Policy

Meeting Purpose

- Advancing the planning work committed to in the endorsed 2019 Mayors’ Council workplan
- Describe the next phase of work for connecting Rail to UBC
- Present technical assessment of connecting rail rapid transit to UBC
  - Due diligence to determine if technology alternatives to a further SkyTrain extension exist that would meet the forecast long-term capacity requirements and warrant additional consideration as we advance planning

Key Decision for the Mayors’ Council and Board in January and February meetings
- Mayors’ Council to provide agreement on technology parameters to study in next stage of work

- Evaluate vertical and horizontal alignment
- Develop concept designs
- Begin funding and project agreement discussions

Future Phases (to be confirmed)
- Business case
- Secure funding and project agreements
The Broadway Corridor

- 99 B-Line is the busiest route in Canada and the United States, moving 60,000 transit customers each weekday
- Bus every 3 minutes in peak times
- The shortened 99 B-Line between Arbutus and UBC is anticipated to be at capacity in the peak hour/peak direction on opening day of the Broadway Subway (2025)

Rail to UBC – Background
2012 UBC Line Rapid Transit Study Evaluation Results

- Defined mission, vision and objectives
- Initial screening of more than 200 technology and alignment options
- Seven alternatives evaluated, including Best Bus, BRT, 2 LRT options, RRT, and 2 combination options
- Three alternatives showed promise in meeting objectives
  - LRT 1: LRT Commercial to UBC
  - RRT: SkyTrain Extension to UBC
  - Combo 1: SkyTrain to Arbutus + LRT from Main St. Station to UBC
Rail to UBC – Background
2014 Mayors’ Council Decision and 10-Year Vision

• In 2014 the Mayors’ Council decided to move forward with SkyTrain from VCC-Clark to Arbutus
• Regarding a connection to UBC, the Mayors’ Council 10-Year Vision commits to provide a rail connection to UBC, but did not define the technology and alignment:
  – “This Vision calls for rapid transit between Commercial Drive and the University of British Columbia. The first 10 years of the Vision targets implementing the first phase: extending the Millennium Line westward from its current terminus at VCC-Clark to Arbutus, with frequent B-Line bus connections continuing to UBC from Arbutus. ... During the design process for the first phase, all stakeholders will work together to conclude how and when to complete the next phase of rail to the Point Grey campus.”
• A rail connection to UBC is not currently funded

Rail to UBC – Background
Status of Funding

Broadway Subway
• June 2018 Phase Two Plan: Funding for construction

Rail to UBC
• June 2018 Phase Two Plan: $3 million to develop concept designs and undertake pre-business case work
Work Completed in 2018

2018 Rail to UBC Transit Study
- Provides an update of the 2012 evaluation to consider technology options, operating assumptions, demand forecasts, and costs.
- Helps answer key questions:
  - Technology
    - Given that SkyTrain is now going to Arbutus, is LRT still a reasonable option?
    - Are there any other alternatives not considered in the 2012 analysis that need to be assessed? (e.g. other corridors or technologies)
  - Demand and Capacity
    - How much new transit ridership does each of the options attract over time?
    - Which options can provide sufficient capacity over the useful design life (over 50 years) to meet possible demand?
    - What are the relative costs of alternatives?

What Options Were Studied

- One baseline option and three rail options were studied—they are based on the alternatives identified as most promising from the 2012 study. All assume the Broadway Subway Project to Arbutus is complete.
  - **Baseline** – B-Line from Arbutus to UBC
  - **Modified LRT 1** – LRT from Arbutus to UBC
  - **Combo 1** – LRT from Main Street-Science World to UBC
  - **Rapid Rail Transit (RRT)** – SkyTrain from Arbutus to UBC
2018 Rail to UBC Options

Baseline: BSP and Optimized B-Line

Option 1: Modified LRT 1

Option 2: Combo 1

Option 3: RRT/SkyTrain

Ridership Forecasts and Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline – BSP and Optimized B-Line</th>
<th>Modified LRT 1</th>
<th>Combo 1</th>
<th>RRT/SkyTrain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY: Practical Capacity</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK DIRECTIONAL LOAD (2045)</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Practical capacity</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX PEAK HOUR LOAD</td>
<td>(up to 3,200)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPANDABLE CAPACITY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>(up to 22,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATE OF YEARS UNTIL MAX CAPACITY REACHED (assuming service begins in 2030)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>50+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAILY BOARDINGS (2045)</td>
<td>26,800</td>
<td>66,600</td>
<td>100,600</td>
<td>188,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Arbutus/UBC Segment</td>
<td>141,400</td>
<td>139,800</td>
<td>124,900</td>
<td>193,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Broadway/University Segment</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Science World-UBC Segment</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWDING ON PARALLEL CORRIDORS (2045)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of routes crowded or overcrowded</td>
<td>9 of 10 routes</td>
<td>8 of 10 routes</td>
<td>8 of 10 routes</td>
<td>2 of 10 routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAILY REGIONAL TRAVEL TRIPS (2045)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent increase over baseline</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ridership Forecasts and Capacity

**Baseline: B-Line + BSP**
- By 2030, the B-Line would be overcrowded (124% in the peak) and parallel corridors would experience overcrowding

**Modified LRT 1**
- By 2045, Modified LRT 1 would be nearing practical capacity (96% in the peak) and parallel corridors would experience overcrowding

**Combo 1**
- By 2045, Combo 1 (LRT) would be over capacity (108% in the peak) and parallel corridors would experience overcrowding

**RRT/SkyTrain**
- By 2045, RRT would be nearing practical capacity under the initial service plan/configuration, but capacity can be doubled with frequency and longer trains.

---

**Preliminary Cost Estimates In 2018 Dollars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline - B-Line + BSP</th>
<th>Modified LRT 1</th>
<th>Combo 1</th>
<th>RRT/SkyTrain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost (2018$)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1.70 to $2.08</td>
<td>$2.88 to $3.28</td>
<td>$3.38 to $3.88 (assumes fully tunnelled, partially elevated alternatives to be explored)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Preliminary estimates are in 2018 dollars for purposes of comparison. Costs at the actual time of construction would be impacted by inflation between 2018 and construction period. For example, assuming procurement in 2025, and 2.5% annual inflation, eventual Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars would be roughly 25% higher.
LRT Network Concepts Considered

Since ridership for SkyTrain drew riders from other corridors and ridership demand of a single LRT line experienced capacity issues within 15 years (2045), a network approach with two LRT lines was considered.

Four alignment variations were analyzed, all of which connected Arbutus Station to UBC and added LRT along 41st Ave corridor to either Canada Line or Expo Line.

Note: The LRT Network scenarios were run to consider theoretical demand and capacity to UBC. Alignment along 41st Avenue was used as a hypothetical proxy to study a southern alignment connecting to UBC.

LRT Network findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRT Network</th>
<th>Modified LRT 1 + 41st LRT to Expo Line</th>
<th>Combo 1 + 41st LRT to Canada Line</th>
<th>Combo 1 + 41st LRT to Canada Line</th>
<th>12,240</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY</td>
<td>Practical capacity (rail capacity to UBC)</td>
<td>PEAK DIRECTIONAL LOAD (2045)</td>
<td>AM peak hour load (2 LRT lines)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPANDABLE CAPACITY</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATE OF YEARS UNTIL MAX CAPACITY REACHED (assumed service begins in 2030)</td>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>15-30 years</td>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>15-30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL COSTS (2018$)</td>
<td>$3.79 to $4.38</td>
<td>$4.88 to $5.58</td>
<td>$5.18 to $5.99</td>
<td>$6.28 to $7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAILY REGIONAL TRANSIT TRIPS (2045)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERABILITY</td>
<td>At-Grade Alignment</td>
<td>Business and property impacts</td>
<td>OMC Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LRT Network findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LRT Network 1</th>
<th>LRT Network 2</th>
<th>LRT Network 3</th>
<th>LRT Network 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical capacity (rail capacity to UBC)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK DIRECTIONAL LOAD (2045)</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of practical capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM peak hour load [2 LRT lines]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPANDABLE CAPACITY</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATE OF YEARS UNTIL LINE MAX CAPACITY REACHED (assuming service begins in 2030)</td>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>15-30 years</td>
<td>20-40 years</td>
<td>15-30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL COSTS (2018$)</td>
<td>$3.78 to $4.38</td>
<td>$4.88 to $5.58</td>
<td>$5.18 to $5.98</td>
<td>$6.28 to $7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAILY REGIONAL TRANSIT TRIPS (2045)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT INCREASE OVER BASELINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DELIVERABILITY
- At-Grade Alignment
- Business and property impacts
- OMC Requirements

Analysis

• At the corridor level, only a SkyTrain extension will provide the sufficient capacity in the long-term.

• A network alternative of two LRT corridors could also meet the forecast demand and generate additional ridership, but has limited long-term capacity and would be more expensive than SkyTrain.

• Unless additional objectives are identified by Board and Mayors’ Council or questions identified, Management will be recommending a SkyTrain extension for the next stage of design development and pre-business case work.
Multi-phase Alternatives Analysis Process

Initial Screening of Alternatives
- Define project objectives, purpose and need
- Long list of all route and technology choices
- High level analysis

Analyze Shortlist of Alternatives
- Multiple Account Evaluation

Select Preferred Technology and Corridor

Design Development and Pre-Business Case
- Conceptual design & community engagement
- Define horizontal & vertical alignment
- Confirm regional need and support

Preferred Concept Design

Business Case and Procurement Prep
- Environmental Assessments
- Reference Design Development
- Secure funding and project agreements

Approve Business Case and Funding Agreements

Procurement, Final Design, Construction

Rail to UBC Timeline and Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Q3 2020 and beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Planning Context
- Regional Transportation Strategy Network Development

Regional Planning Context
- 15-year Blueprint + Phase 3 Investment Plan

Shortlist of Alternatives
- Technology & Alignment Parameters for Alternative Concept Designs (cost: $400,000)

Select Preferred Technology and Corridor (with policy makers)

Design Development and Pre-Business Case
- Develop Concept Designs
- Detailed Evaluation of Alternative(s) (cost: $3 million)

Funded through Phase 2

Preferred Concept Design (with policy makers)

Business Case and Procurement Prep
- Reference Case Design
- Procurement Prep + Finalize Business Case (cost: $30+ million)

Requires additional funding

Approve Business Case and Funding Agreements

Procurement, Final Design, Construction

Partner Collaboration and Consultation

Public and Stakeholder Consultation
Scope for the next stage of work

- Prepare detailed concept designs
- Assess vertical and horizontal alignment options
- Public and stakeholder engagement
- Coordination with land use planning for Broadway corridor, Jericho Lands, and UBC
- Obtain a final alignment (and technology) recommendation from TransLink Board and Mayors’ Council
- Begin discussions related to financial and/or in-kind contributions and agreements from senior governments, UBC, developers along the proposed corridor and the City of Vancouver
TO: Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation

FROM: Geoff Cross, Vice President, Transportation Planning and Policy

DATE: December 11, 2018

SUBJECT: George Massey Crossing Review

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation receive this report.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide background on how the George Massey crossing fits into long-term regional transportation plans and provide considerations for a future of the crossing. The memo will also provide the Mayors’ Council with relevant information required to provide formal input to the Provincial Government on the crossing.

BACKGROUND

Led by the Province of British Columbia, the George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project has been in pre-development, planning and procurement since 2012. On September 6, 2017, the project was halted and the Provincial Government announced an independent technical review of this project. TransLink staff met with the team undertaking the independent review in Spring 2018. The associated report on the independent technical review is now complete and is being reviewed by the Province. The Minister of Transportation has indicated that the report will be released in the coming days and following discussions with staff, it is expected that the next steps will include formally engaging both TransLink and Metro Vancouver for input into the future of the crossing.

In October 2017, the Mayors’ Council requested that TransLink staff, in consultation with Metro Vancouver, provide input to the province on the George Massey crossing. Updates were provided to the Mayors’ Council in January and March 2018. TransLink engaged with Stan Cowdell the independent reviewer on several occasions and provided information on our previous review of the project as well information on the Regional Transportation Model (RTM), which is maintained by TransLink. Following review of the report, we will provide the Mayors’ Council with a detailed review of the findings and recommendations on further technical work (e.g. modelling), policy considerations, and engagement.

DISCUSSION

Role of the Crossing

The George Massey Tunnel and related Highway 99 corridor are part of the provincial highway network in the region and connects communities south of the Fraser River to Richmond, Vancouver, and beyond.
Surrounded predominantly by agricultural lands to the south of the tunnel and industrial lands to the north, the tunnel is the most western crossing of the Fraser River, relative to the other four Metro Vancouver crossings further to the east: Alex Fraser Bridge, Pattullo Bridge, Port Mann Bridge and Golden Ears Bridge.

The corridor has an important role in facilitating the movement of people and goods to and from key transportation gateways such as the United States border, Deltaport, Vancouver International Airport and BC Ferries Tsawwassen terminal. It is the key connection between the cities of Delta and Richmond, and serves several regional destinations such as White Rock and Crescent Beach.

Its operational characteristics include:

- Serving more than 4.5 million transit riders per year, the George Massey Tunnel serves approximately twice as many transit users as the next busiest crossing of the Fraser River (Alex Fraser Bridge).
- Carrying roughly the same amount of large trucks as the Alex Fraser Bridge, despite less capacity, with an estimated volume of 5,900 trucks per day.
- Moving an estimated daily volume of 91,000 vehicles per day, the third highest volume relative to the five crossings of the Fraser River.
- Most direct route from downtown Vancouver to BC Ferries and US border.

The current tunnel design and other constraints result in the following limitations:

- Highway 99 going from 3 lanes in either direction to 2 lanes through the tunnel creates regular congestion;
- To facilitate peak demand, only one lane is available in the off-peak direction during the peak hours;
- Cyclists and pedestrians must cross the Fraser River at this location using transit or a provincially operated bike shuttle;
- BC Tunnel Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulation prohibits the movement of dangerous goods through a tunnel, and the transportation of over-dimensional trucks is constrained due to height clearance and width limitations.

The George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project aimed to address these limitations.

Alignment with Regional Guiding Policy Documents

TransLink’s mandate is to provide a regional transportation system to move people and goods, and support regional objectives as outlined in Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy (RGS). To do so, TransLink’s Regional Transportation Strategy (RTS) sets out long-term (30 year) goals, targets and directions for the regional transportation system and describes the key strategies and actions needed to achieve this. Although undergoing a comprehensive update with completion set for 2020, the current RTS outlines four overarching goals, focusing on choice, people, economy, and environment. These goals can be achieved by designing a transportation system that make half of all trips by walking, cycling and transit; and make it possible to reduce the distances people drive by one-third. In 2017, TransLink approved the first Regional Goods Movement Strategy (RGMS), which also provides guidance on how best to support both safe and efficient movement of goods and neighbourhood livability. These policy documents, along with the Mayors’ Council Regional Transportation Investments: A Vision for Metro Vancouver (Mayors’ Vision), provide the proposed criteria for TransLink’s review of future crossing options, network considerations and project timing / prioritization.
Improving travel time reliability (consistency of travel time) across areas facing significant congestion should be the priority before achieving travel time savings. Land use and demand-management measures are necessary so that new projects enhance goods movement and travel time reliability without increasing general purpose traffic.

Experience in every urban region in the world has shown that expansion of the road system alone cannot solve our transportation and congestion problems. New road connections and capacity will, at first, reduce congestion and shorten travel times for people and goods. However, reducing the cost of driving in this way stimulates, or “induces” demand, and very soon there are more cars on the road, ensnaring commercial goods and commuters in the resulting congestion.

To ensure that major new road capacity investments improve and enhance travel time reliability for people and goods movement, and are not taken over by encouraging more single occupant vehicle trips, some form of transportation demand management (e.g. pricing) will be required. The RTS and the Mayors’ Vision identify the George Massey crossing as a planned Provincial Highway investment, but do not highlight the replacement of the tunnel as a regional priority. How the George Massey crossing relates to these policy documents has been expanded upon below.

**Demand Management**

A key strategy within the current Regional Transportation Strategy is managing the transportation system to be more efficient. The 2015 *George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project: Project Definition Report* notes that at the time, the Province intended on tolling the new bridge, which was generally consistent with the RTS and the Mayors’ Vision, and was a critical component to ensure the roadway capacity that will be provided by the project is used efficiently by the public. TransLink’s Regional Transportation Model showed tolling to be the most effective measure for reducing congestion and encouraging efficient travel choices.

Although the Provincial Government removed tolls on the Golden Ears and Port Mann Bridges in 2017, demand management remains a critical component of TransLink’s strategic direction to ensure that roadway capacity is used efficiently by the public. The Mayors’ Council and the TransLink Board set up a Mobility Pricing Independent Commission to make recommendations on a coordinated approach to pricing transportation in the Metro Vancouver region. As noted in the RTS, investments to add new capacity alone cannot guarantee congestion relief during peak periods. Pricing would help manage demand to encourage the most efficient use of the region’s transportation system. The Mobility Pricing Independent Commission’s final report noted that congestion reduction must be clearly visible to drivers and other road users in the form of reduced travel time delays and increased reliability.

**Impact on the Movement of People**

A design that prioritizes transit, cycling and pedestrian movement has the potential to support the goals identified in TransLink’s guiding policy documents such as the RTS and Mayors’ Vision as well as those identified in the Regional Growth Strategy. The design in the 2015 Project Design Report provided increased capacity, bus priority lanes and active transportation improvements. The project included one median transit / HOV lane, three general purpose lanes, one curbside climbing/merging lane and a multi-use walking / cycling path in each direction. The path included connections, on either side of the bridge, to local walking/cycling networks.
By increasing opportunities for people to walk, cycle and take transit, transportation investments can support growth in urban centres and along frequent transit corridors. TransLink supports the improvements to transit and cycling / walking across the bridge as they advance the RTS targets to see half of all trips made by walking, cycling and transit. The goal is a system that enables people to walk, cycle, take transit or drive safely, comfortably with increased travel time reliability.

**Impact on Transit**

The Highway 99 corridor does not currently experience any major transit speed and reliability issues due to the transit priority in place on either side of the tunnel. However, there is an opportunity to better serve transit demand in this area of the region by providing additional transit priority measures and improved transit connections on the corridor.

Project design concepts include median bus / HOV lanes to accommodate future transit service along Highway 99. The transit / HOV lanes represent an opportunity to improve transit in the corridor, but only if accompanied by the needed supporting infrastructure, namely direct access to and from these lanes, and median transit stations. In particular, a direct ramp allowing buses to exit and enter the Highway 99 median transit / HOV lanes to and from Bridgeport exchange, with minimal delay from the anticipated congestion near the Oak Street Bridge, will be key to the success of the median transit / HOV lanes.

As transit currently has a competitive advantage over private vehicles through the tunnel during peak periods, a new crossing could reduce that gap and erode transit market share unless other priority measures and amenities are provided.

**Impact on Pedestrians and Cyclists**

The bridge replacement project could significantly improve walking and cycling facilities and connections in the Highway 99 corridor. The current tunnel presents a barrier to cycling in this area and the potential inclusion of a multi-use path would significantly improve walking and cycling conditions.

TransLink’s *Regional Cycling Strategy* outlines a range of strategies to help the region realize two important goals: more cycling and safer cycling. For the pathway to be a meaningful improvement, it must be designed in coordination with municipal partners and prioritize connections to local cycling and pedestrian networks on both sides of the crossing. In particular, a key connection will be on the south side of a bridge, where a facility designed to be comfortable for users at all cycling levels will be critical for access to and from BC Ferries. A pathway on both sides of a bridge further enhances the safety, efficiency and comfort of this facility for cyclists, and helps to advance the goals of the RTS further than does a single side pathway.

**Impact on Goods Movement**

The George Massey crossing is part of an important goods movement corridor. Replacing the tunnel with higher capacity infrastructure, coupled with demand management measures such as pricing, would improve the reliability and efficiency of this important link for goods movement. It would also improve or provide access to over-dimensional commercial vehicles and vehicles that transport dangerous goods that are currently not able to use the Highway 99 corridor due to the limitations imposed by the tunnel.

Consistent with TransLink’s other guiding policy documents, the Regional Goods Movement Strategy identifies mobility pricing in tandem with future major transportation investments as a policy direction, and specifically identifies coordinating with the Province on the replacement of the George Massey Tunnel. By helping to support more efficient goods movement, the proposed bridge is also consistent with the RTS goal of enabling a sustainable economy.
Alignment with Regional Growth and Land-Use Objectives
As mentioned above, TransLink’s mandate includes supporting the Regional Growth Strategy; specifically, the importance of coordinating land use and transportation, recognizing that the location of jobs and housing fundamentally determines where and how much people, goods and services need to travel. As population growth and economic activities continue to rise along the corridor and within the region, the challenges facing the tunnel will increase.

In early 2014, at the request of the Metro Vancouver Board, TransLink conducted a number of illustrative model runs using the Regional Transportation Model to provide an order-of-magnitude understanding of how the project (a new tolled bridge) might affect travel behavior and how it may impact the distribution of population and jobs over the long term. This analysis found that changes in transportation accessibility for land uses in the corridor are likely to shift some residential and employment growth patterns relative to Metro Vancouver’s current RGS projections, including:

- Shifts in the growth of single family residential units to South Surrey and South Delta from West Richmond and Steveston;
- South Delta and South Surrey may receive a slightly higher share of population-serving employment (e.g. retail and service employment), while West Richmond and Steveston may receive a slightly lower share;
- More rapid development in light industrial land uses in Richmond, Delta and parts of South Surrey, shifting from South Burnaby and North Surrey.

These land use changes may shift travel demand, but because of the resulting redistribution of employment trips, this factor does not appear to affect crossing volumes or mode share. However, the results could differ under a no-pricing scenario.

Conclusion

Although not a priority in any of TransLink’s existing guiding policy documents, the crossing remains an important connection across the southern arm of the Fraser River with unique local context.

Based on a review of our existing policy documents, TransLink will be examining the Provincial report with a range of perspectives:

- Use of demand management: To ensure that major new road capacity investments improve and enhance travel time reliability for people and goods movement, and are not taken over by encouraging more single occupant vehicle trips, some form pricing to manage the demand should be considered.
- Transit facilities: Although the Highway 99 corridor does not currently experience any major transit speed and reliability issues due to the transit priority in place on either side of the tunnel, there is an opportunity to better serve transit demand in this area of the region by providing additional transit priority measures and improved transit connections on the corridor.
- Transit facilities: A direct ramp allowing buses to exit and enter the Highway 99 median transit / HOV lanes to and from Bridgeport exchange, with minimal delay from the anticipated congestion near the Oak Street Bridge, will be key to the success of the median transit / HOV lanes.
• Active transportation: The current tunnel presents a significant barrier to pedestrian and cycling connections in this area and the potential inclusion of a multi-use path would provide an excellent opportunity to increase walking and cycling conditions.

• Goods movement: A bridge would alleviate certain truck restrictions, improving the movement of goods. The network connections to the crossing and corridor will also impact the efficiency of goods movement.

• Efficient movement of people: examining how any significant new road capacity investments may impact travel time reliability for people and goods movement, single occupant vehicle trips, and accessibility to jobs and services.

TransLink staff will review all materials released by the Province regarding the Massey Tunnel crossing with assessment based on the analysis in this memo and discussion with the Mayors’ Council. TransLink will engage with provincial staff and will report back to the Mayors’ Council with a detailed review of the findings and recommendations on further technical work, policy considerations, and engagement.
TO: Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation

FROM: Mike Buda, Executive Director, Mayors’ Council Secretariat

DATE: January 17, 2019

SUBJECT: ITEM 5.1 – 2019 Mayors’ Council Budget

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation:

1. Allocate $611,295 towards projected 2019 expenditures, out of an estimated total 2019 budget envelope of $1.181 million, leaving $569,705 unallocated until or unless otherwise directed;
2. Direct the Chair and Vice-Chair to oversee the 2019 Mayors’ Council budget, and report back on plans and results as needed to the Finance and Governance Committee, and the Mayors’ Council;
3. Determines that all costs and expenses approved by the Mayors’ Council Executive Director, Chair or Vice-Chair are necessary for the Mayors’ Council on Regional Transportation to perform its duties under the South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority Act; and,
4. Receive this report;

PURPOSE:

This report provides a brief summary of the Mayors’ Council 2018 revenues and expenditures, and proposes a 2019 budget.

BACKGROUND:

As set by the South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority Act (SCBCTA Act), in 2018, the Mayors’ Council is allocated a maximum budget of $1.181 million, which is based on 0.07% of TransLink’s gross revenue in the previous fiscal year.¹

One challenge of this formula is that the 2018 gross revenues will not be available until the year-end financial reports are complete in March 2019. Gross revenue figures fluctuate somewhat due to one-time accounting issues (for example, TransLink’s 2017 gross revenue figure was $1,688,399,000, while the 2016 figure was $2,152,346,000), which in turn would impact the Mayors’ Council’s allocation.

To account for these fluctuations, the 2017 gross revenue estimate, which is lower the previous several years results, will be used as an interim baseline from which to estimate our 2019 budget allocation. Once the final 2018 gross revenue figure is confirmed, the Mayors’ Council budget allocation will be updated, and if necessary, budgeted expenditures adjusted.

¹ TransLink’s 2017 gross revenues were $1,688,399,000, while the 2016 figure was $2,152,346,000; the 2018 figure is not yet available but is expected to be slightly higher than 2017. 0.07% of the 2017 figure is $1,181,879.
DISCUSSION:

There are several mandated or basic costs that the Mayors’ Council must budget for every year:
1. Meeting expenses (facility costs, A/V services, food and refreshments, etc.)
2. Recording Secretary
3. Members’ remuneration and expenses
4. Statutory responsibilities (costs, usually related to research or consultants, associated with our oversight and/or approvals of long-term strategies, investment plans, short-term fare increases, customer satisfaction/complaint process, disposition of major assets, directors’ remuneration and executive compensation).

In addition to these basic costs required to run the Mayors’ Council, or that are associated with discharging legislated responsibilities, the Mayors’ Council has in the past also chosen to undertake:
1. Secretariat and office expenses: The Mayors’ Council has engaged the services of a full time Executive Director to oversee the operations of the Mayors’ Council Secretariat and provide advice and support to the mayors. This position represents an additional ongoing expense. The 2019 budget will propose the addition of a coordinator position to support the new committees.
2. Consulting support for strategic projects: The Mayors’ Council has, from time to time, engaged consultants to assist with its work, undertaking projects in past years that included the development and implementation of a high-profile provincial election outreach and engagement strategy, and communications activities in support of investment plans. In 2018, this work was limited to an independent analysis of the City of Vancouver contribution to the Broadway Subway project, and communications support for the federal election strategy.
3. Travel: In 2018, limited travel was undertaken by Mayors’ Council to support intergovernmental negotiations in Victoria and Ottawa. More substantial travel in 2019 is expected to support federal election-related intergovernmental relations work.
4. Website: The Mayors’ Council website (www.mayorscouncil.ca) was established in 2014 to support the release of the 10-year plan. Modest management costs for running this site (server and software costs, hosting fees, etc.) were covered by TransLink for the first year, and are now born by the Mayors’ Council at a nominal cost.

2018 Report

The Mayors’ Council’s 2018 budget envelope from TransLink was originally estimated at $1.610 million using TransLink’s 2016 gross revenue figure. TransLink’s 2017 gross revenues ended up being $464 million lower than 2016, reducing the Mayors’ Council’s available budget envelope to $1.181 million.

The Mayors’ Council allocated $638K to projected expenditures at its January 2018 meeting, 40% of its total budget envelope of $1.181 million from TransLink in 2018, leaving $543K unallocated. The Mayors’ Council has allocated 35-60% of its total available budget envelope for many years.

The 2018 year-end report (January 1 to December 31, 2018) is provided in Table 1 below. Total expenses were $185K, or 29% under budget, with 90% of that difference driven by:
- lower meeting remuneration for members because not all committees originally proposed for 2018 actually met.
- Lower consulting expenditures than budgeted

2 2017 gross revenues were higher than normal reflecting the sale of the Oakridge Transit Centre.
TABLE 1: 2018 Budget Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017 Actuals</th>
<th>2018 Budget</th>
<th>2018 Actuals</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total budget envelope from TransLink</td>
<td>$1,506,000</td>
<td>$1,610,000</td>
<td>$1,181,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting costs (food, facilities)</td>
<td>$582</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,637</td>
<td>($637)</td>
<td>-64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff support (Executive Director, Recording Secretary)</td>
<td>$219,408</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$215,647</td>
<td>$14,353</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>$459,596</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$44,689</td>
<td>$55,311</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member meeting remuneration</td>
<td>$211,798</td>
<td>$297,540</td>
<td>$187,686</td>
<td>$109,854</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td>$339</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and accommodations</td>
<td>$8,810</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$1,622</td>
<td>$5,878</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website management</td>
<td>$2,062</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,235</td>
<td>($235)</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses:</strong></td>
<td>$902,595</td>
<td>$638,540</td>
<td>$453,514</td>
<td>$185,026</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated budget envelope</td>
<td>$603,405</td>
<td>$543,339</td>
<td>$727,486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses as % of total TransLink budget envelope</strong></td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed 2019 Work Plan and Budget

The Mayors’ Council used only 37% of its allocation from TransLink in 2018, as has been the case for many years. It is proposed that a similar pattern continue in 2018, with higher expenditures representing about 52% of the available envelope, to account for the increased work load to support three committees (as opposed to 1-2 as has been the practice in past years). However, a portion of the $569K in unallocated budget envelope will need to be allocated to support the Federal Election Strategy which will be determined at the February and March meetings.

The 2019 budget proposed in Table 2 assumes the following:

- Meeting remuneration of $575 per member per meeting and other associated meeting costs (Recording Secretary, refreshments, A/V, etc.) for 10 meetings of the full Mayors’ Council plus 10 meetings of each of the three committees, with 7 members on each committee.
- A new Coordinator position to support the Executive Director and TransLink staff to ensure agenda packages for Council and committee meetings are produced and distributed on time and of consistent quality, and to work with the Council and committee Chairs to ensure meetings are set up to maximize quality of discussion.
- Consulting services to produce 1-3 independent reports at the direction of the Mayors’ Council to support statutory duties.
- Limited travel to Victoria and Ottawa for the Executive Director and/or members for intergovernmental meetings.
- Executive Director salary and benefits
- Limited website management support
TABLE 2: 2019 Proposed Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2018 Actuals</th>
<th>2019 Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget envelope allocated by TransLink</td>
<td>$1,181,000</td>
<td>$1,181,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting costs (facilities, A/V, refreshments, etc.)</td>
<td>$1,637</td>
<td>$9,400</td>
<td>$7,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (Exe. Dir., Recording Secretary, Coordinator)</td>
<td>$215,647</td>
<td>$293,145</td>
<td>$77,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>$44,689</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member meeting remuneration</td>
<td>$187,686</td>
<td>$252,250</td>
<td>$64,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and accommodations</td>
<td>$1,622</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$2,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website management</td>
<td>$2,235</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses:</strong></td>
<td>$453,514</td>
<td>$611,295</td>
<td>$157,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unallocated budget envelope:</strong></td>
<td>$727,486</td>
<td>$569,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenses as % of allocated budget envelope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 Actuals</th>
<th>2019 Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Note**: It is anticipated that TransLink’s 2018 gross revenue figure will be higher than the 2017 figure used to calculate the Mayors’ Council 2018 budget envelope. This will increase the size of the Mayors’ Council budget envelope.

The Mayors’ Council budget is mostly driven by the number of meetings planned. With an additional committee and a more ambitious, broad-based committee workload approved, meeting expenses are higher than in 2018.

As has been past practice, it is also recommended that the Executive Director, and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Mayors’ Council be delegated authority to approve expenditures incurred on behalf of the Mayors’ Council according to TransLink’s existing financial control policies.

**NEXT STEPS**

Budget updates will be provided to the Finance and Governance Committee as requested through the year. Proposals to allocate a portion of the currently unallocated budget envelope, for example to support the federal election strategy, must first be reviewed by the Finance and Governance Committee before being considered by the Mayors’ Council.