# City of Richmond

# Report to Committee

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **To:** | Public Works and Transportation Committee | **Date:** | June 1, 2006 |
| **From:** | Victor Wei, P. Eng.<br>Acting Director, Transportation | **File:** | 01-0157-01/2006-Vol 01 |
| **Re:** | **COMMENTS ON "*GVRD RESPONSE TO THE PROVINCIAL GATEWAY PROGRAM*" REPORT** | | |

## Staff Recommendation

1. That the Council resolutions of May 22, 2006 and a copy of the report regarding the GVTA report entitled "*Regional Transportation Implications of the Provincial Gateway Program*" be forwarded to GVRD staff for inclusion in their report back to the GVRD Board.

2. That the GVRD be advised that the City supports the Gateway Program with the incorporation of the following principles regarding the management of land use and regional utility impacts in the development and execution of the Gateway Program:

   (a) at a minimum, there should be no net loss of agricultural and Green Zone lands, including regional parks, impacted by the projects; and

   (b) funding from the Gateway Program budget for expenditures on infrastructure that is directly impacted by the Gateway Program should also include regional utilities.

3. That the GVRD be requested to clarify if its decisions regarding the Gateway Program will be made based on the existing 1996 LRSP or the upcoming LRSP, which will provide a land use and planning context to 2031, and to ask the Province to do the same.

4. That a copy of this report be forwarded to member municipalities of the Greater Vancouver Regional District and to GVRD staff for inclusion in their report back to the GVRD Board.

Victor Wei, P. Eng.
Acting Director, Transportation
(4131)

Att. 3

| FOR ORIGINATING DIVISION USE ONLY | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ROUTED TO:** | **CONCURRENCE** | | **CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER** | | |
| Engineering | Y ☑ N ☐ | | | | |
| Policy Planning | Y ☑ N ☐ | | | | |
| **REVIEWED BY TAG** | YES ☑ DW | NO ☐ | **REVIEWED BY CAO** | YES ☑ | NO ☐ |

## Staff Report

### Origin

At the April 21, 2006 GVRD Board meeting, GVRD staff presented a report entitled "*GVRD Response to the Provincial Gateway Program*" (see **Attachment 1** for the GVRD staff recommendations[1]) that would encompass the GVRD's formal response to the Province regarding the Gateway Program. The GVRD staff report contains a number of recommendations with respect to the specific components of the Gateway Program and their implications for regional issues within the GVRD's realm such as sewer and water utilities, and growth management objectives. At that meeting, the GVRD Board resolved to forward the report to member municipalities of the GVRD for comment, with GVRD staff to summarize the feedback in a report back to the GVRD Board as input to ensuing Board discussion. As requested by the GVRD Board, this report provides comments on the GVRD staff recommendations.

### Analysis

### 1. Provincial Gateway Program

The $3 billion Gateway Program[2] comprises several highway improvement projects that are intended to better integrate ports, airports, rail yards, and border crossings in order to maintain and improve BC's competitiveness as an international gateway.

- *Highway 1/Port Mann Bridge Improvements* ($1.5 billion) – widening of about 33 kilometres of Highway 1 between Vancouver and Langley and twinning the Port Mann Bridge.
- *South Fraser Perimeter Road* (SFPR) ($800 million) – primarily four-lane, intersection-free commercial route along the south bank of the Fraser River extending from Deltaport Way in southwest Delta to 176th St and the Golden Ears Bridge connector road in Surrey/Langley, thereby connecting Highways 1, 91 and 99.
- *North Fraser Perimeter Road* (NFPR) ($ 400 million) – expansion of capacity of existing arterial routes on the north bank of the Fraser River to provide a more efficient commercial route between the Queensborough Bridge in New Westminster and the Golden Ears Bridge in Maple Ridge/Pitt Meadows. A stand-alone component of this project is improvements to the Mary Hill Interchange and Pitt River Bridge, which comprise a new high level six-lane bridge to replace the existing swing bridges connecting Port Coquitlam and Pitt Meadows, and a new grade-separated interchange to replace the current Lougheed Highway and Mary Hill Bypass intersection.

### 2. Previous Council Resolutions re Gateway Program

Staff recently prepared a report that provided comments and recommendations regarding a TransLink staff report that discussed the regional transportation implications of the Gateway Program. At the May 23, 2006 regular Council meeting, Council considered this City staff report and approved the recommendations (see **Attachment 2**), which offer a number of principles to be incorporated in the development and execution of the Gateway Program.

---

[1] See http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/board/agendas/gvrd/april21/agenda.htm for the full GVRD staff report.

[2] Initial Gateway Program cost estimates (2005$) comprise $2.7 billion for construction and $0.3 billion for program contingency.

As Council has already considered aspects of the Gateway Program and to avoid duplication, this report focuses on the elements of the GVRD staff report that differ from the TransLink staff report and have not already been addressed in the previous staff report.

## 3. Differences between TransLink and GVRD Staff Recommendations

TransLink staff have prepared a summary matrix (see **Attachment 3**) that compares and contrasts the GVRD and TransLink staff reports. The matrix demonstrates some similarities between the two reports with TransLink staff positing that any differences are largely from each agency's mandate and the policy perspective taken by each staff (i.e., GVRD staff examined Gateway proposals and supporting materials in relation to approved GVRD Board policies and its various mandates while TransLink staff examined the Gateway proposals from the perspective that the project was likely a 'given').

The TransLink and GVRD staff reports share similar recommendations regarding:

- general support for the NFPR (including the new Pitt River Bridge), SFPR and the widening of Highway 1 east of the Port Mann Bridge with conditions such as the introduction of road user priorities (e.g., HOV lanes); and
- development of a regional transport pricing policy to ensure that road capacity improvements are maintained in the long-term as congestion levels rise.

The recommendations of the GVRD staff report primarily differ from those of the TransLink staff report with respect to the following issues:

- request for more information on impacts to regional utilities, parks and the Green Zone as well as air quality given that the twinning of the Port Mann Bridge and the widening of Highway 1 west of the Port Mann Bridge are inconsistent with the Liveable Region Strategic Plan (LRSP);
- support of the SFPR is conditional upon development of a strategy to mitigate and compensate for impacts of the facility on agricultural and regional Green Zone lands, including regional parks; and
- request that early and on-going consultation be undertaken regarding the impacts of the Gateway Program on GVRD utilities (e.g., water mains);
- request for the provision of land use and growth management assumptions used by the Province in the development of the Gateway Program.

## 4. Comments on GVRD Staff Report Recommendations that Differ from TransLink Staff Report Recommendations

The following sections provide comments on the GVRD staff report recommendations that differ from those of the TransLink staff report.

### 4.1 Impact of SFPR on Agricultural and Green Zone Lands

The GVRD staff report recommends that a strategy be developed, in consultation with the GVRD and affected communities, to mitigate and compensate for the impacts of the SFPR on agricultural and Green Zone lands, including regional parks, prior to its implementation.

*Comments:*

- *The western section of the SFPR between Highway 91 and Deltaport Way will likely impact the agricultural areas of south Delta.*
- *Municipalities affected by the SFPR should be involved in the development of strategies to mitigate any negative impacts of the project.*
- *Any compensation strategy should incorporate a minimum principle of no net loss of agricultural and Green Zone lands, including regional parks.*

4.2 Impact of Gateway Program on Regional Utilities

The GVRD staff report recommends that early and on-going consultation be undertaken between the GVRD and the Province regarding the impacts of the Gateway Program on GVRD utilities (e.g., water mains), including agreement on measures to protect, relocate and/or compensate for the impacts.

*Comments:*

- *The GVRD and affected municipalities should be involved in determining any impacts to regional utilities and developing measures to address the impacts.*
- *Neither the GVRD nor the affected municipality should bear the cost of any modifications or improvements to regional utilities that become necessary due to the impacts of the Gateway Program.*

4.3 Provincial Land Use and Growth Management Assumptions

The GVRD staff report recommends that the Province (Ministry of Transportation) provide the GVRD with the land use and growth management assumptions used in the development of the Gateway Program proposals.

*Comments:*

- *The continued integration of land use and transportation planning in the region is critical to ensure the enduring liveability of the region and economic development of the province.*
- *An understanding of the Province's land use and growth management assumptions of the Gateway Program would be beneficial for the GVRD and all member municipalities and stakeholders.*
- *The process to update the existing 1996 Liveable Region Strategic Plan (LRSP) has been initiated; growth targets and land use plans may change significantly in the new LRSP from the 1996 LRSP.*
- *The Province and the GVRD need to clarify if decisions relating to the Gateway Program will be made based on the existing 1996 LRSP or the upcoming LRSP, which will provide a land use and planning context to 2031.*

## Financial Impact

None to the City at this time.

## Conclusion

The GVRD Board has offered the City the opportunity to provide comments on GVRD staff recommendations with respect to the provincial Gateway Program. As Council has previously provided comments on the recent TransLink staff report regarding the regional transportation implications of the Gateway Program, this report focuses comments on the land use, growth management and regional utilities impacts with the intent of enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Gateway Program as well as the liveability of the region.

J Caravan

Joan Caravan
Transportation Planner (4035)

Building A Sustainable Region www.gvrd.bc.ca
Greater Vancouver Regional District 4330 Kingsway, Burnaby, BC, Canada V5H 4G8
Greater Vancouver Regional District • Greater Vancouver Water District
Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District • Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation

Committee Meeting Date: April 7, 2006

To: Land Use and Transportation Committee

From: Hugh Kellas, Manager
Policy and Planning Department

Date: March 30, 2006

**Subject: GVRD Response to the Provincial Gateway Program**

*Recommendations:*

a) That the GVRD Board advise the Minister of Transportation that the Board:
   1. Supports the overall goals of the provincial Gateway Program to improve the movement of people and goods in and through the region, improve access to key economic gateways, reduce vehicle emissions, facilitate better connections to transit and other alternative modes, improve the quality of life in communities, and improve road safety and reliability;
   2. Finds that the provincial Gateway Program proposals to increase general purpose traffic capacity on the twinned Port Mann Bridge, the widened Highway 1 west of the Port Mann Bridge, and the new Pitt River Bridge are not consistent with the Livable Region Strategic Plan;
   3. Supports the proposed North Fraser Perimeter Road, the new Pitt River Bridge, the South Fraser Perimeter Road, the widening of Highway 1 east of the Port Mann Bridge, and the extension of HOV lanes in the Highway 1 corridor, provided that:
      i) The New Pitt River Bridge includes dedicated HOV capacity, or an appropriate commitment to introduce HOV capacity on the new bridge when congestion levels warrant it and when a contiguous HOV system is established;
      ii) Prior to proceeding with the South Fraser Perimeter Road project, a strategy is developed, in consultation with the GVRD and affected communities, to mitigate and compensate for the impacts of this facility on agricultural and regional Green Zone lands, including regional parks;
      iii) A comprehensive regional demand management strategy is developed, including regional transport pricing and tolling, in collaboration with the GVTA;
      iv) A regional goods movement strategy is developed in collaboration with the GVTA and other regional partners to ensure that improvements to the movement of goods achieved through new or expanded roads and highways are maintained in the long-term as congestion levels rise;
      v) Early and on-going consultation with the GVRD is undertaken regarding the impacts of Gateway Program projects on regional utilities, and that prior to these projects proceeding, agreements are reached between the province and the GVRD regarding measures to protect, relocate and/or compensate for impacted regional utilities;

b) That the GVRD Board request the GVTA Board to advise the Board on the implications of the proposals to twin the Port Mann Bridge and widen Highway 1 ahead of the timing assumed within the regional growth management strategy, specifically with regards to:
   1. Whether proceeding with these projects in a similar time frame as other provincial government transportation projects within Greater Vancouver, and regional transportation priorities identified in the GVTA's Strategic Transportation Plan and 10-Year Outlook, is the most efficient and cost-effective phasing of these initiatives for achieving regional transportation objectives;
   2. Whether deferring these projects and proceeding with the currently committed Golden Ears Bridge, replacement of the Pitt River Bridge, improved transit connections to the regional rapid transit system and the introduction of transportation demand management measures such as tolls, would adequately address the need to improve the movement of people and goods in this corridor;

c) That the GVRD Board request the provincial Gateway Program to provide the GVRD with the land use and growth management assumptions used in the development of Gateway Program proposals;

d) That the GVRD Board direct staff to report back on the results of the GVTA's analysis of the Port Mann Bridge and Highway 1 projects, the information provided by the Gateway Program on land use and growth management assumptions, and the implications of advancing these projects on:
   1. The timing and funding of regional utility programs;
   2. What new measures may be required to ensure that regional growth management objectives will be achieved in the affected parts of the region;
   3. The implications for Greater Vancouver's air quality and greenhouse gas objectives;
   4. The implications for regional parks and the regional Green Zone.

**Regular Council Meeting**

**Tuesday, May 23rd, 2006**

# MINUTES

**COMMENTS ON GVTA'S "REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROVINCIAL GATEWAY PROGRAM" REPORT**
(Report: Apr. 25/06, File No.: 01-0154-01/2006 – Vol 01; xr: 10-6500-01) (REDMS No. 1813342, 1890506)

R06/10-17 It was moved and seconded

*(1) That City Council reaffirm its past resolution regarding the twinning of the Port Mann Bridge that the enhancement of the movement of commercial, transit and high occupancy vehicles be the primary objective of the project and advise TransLink that this primary objective should also be applied to the other projects in the Gateway Program.*

*(2) That TransLink be advised that the City supports in principle, the recommendations of the TransLink staff report entitled "Regional Transportation Implications of the Provincial Gateway Program" and that the following principles be incorporated in the development and execution of the Gateway Program:*

*(a) the effective integration of regional transportation improvements, including rapid transit improvements, into the elements of the Gateway Program, as recommended by GVTA staff, is essential to maximize the efficiency of the transportation network;*

*(b) transportation demand measures should be employed to ensure that the expanded roadway capacity for goods movement, high occupancy vehicles, cycling and transit does not become overwhelmed with single occupancy automobile traffic;*

*(c) funding from the Gateway Program budget for expenditures on Major Road Network (MRN), transit and cycling infrastructure that is directly impacted by the Gateway Program should also include municipally-owned roadways outside the MRN;*

*(d) any transport pricing policy must be equitable across the region and applied concurrent with significant transportation infrastructure improvements, and all affected municipalities must be involved in its development;*

*(e) any local road improvements required to support the elements of the Gateway Program as well as any future expanded rail and marine transportation for inter-provincial goods movement be jointly explored, pursued and implemented by all levels of government; and*

*(f) full co-ordination and collaboration between the GVRD and municipalities is critical in the development and implementation of strategies to address any land use impacts of the Gateway Program that are contrary to the LRSP.*

*(3) That a copy of this report be forwarded to TransLink staff for inclusion in their report back to the TransLink Board.*

**CARRIED**

# Comparison of GVRD and GVTA Staff Recommendations Regarding the Provincial Gateway Program
## Prepared by TransLink Staff

| GATEWAY PROPOSALS | GVRD STAFF RESPONSE | GVTA STAFF RESPONSE | COMMENTARY |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Context** | GVRD staff examined Gateway proposals and supporting materials in relation to approved GVRD Board policies and its various mandates. | GVTA staff examined the Gateway proposals from the perspective that the project was likely a 'given'. | Each staff's suggested frame of reference influences the nature of the each report and recommendations |
| **Facility -South Fraser Perimeter Road** | Support, subject to development of strategies to address impacts on the Green Zone and agricultural lands, and regional strategies for transportation demand management, goods movement and regional utilities. | Support, with a request of the Province to ensure goods movement improvements are maintained over time. | Both staff support the project. Both express concern about retaining the gains made for goods movement. GVRD's support is subject to several regional strategies being put in place. |
| **Facility - North Fraser Perimeter Road** | Support, subject to: (i) HOV capacity on the new Pitt River Bridge, or commitment to introduce HOV capacity in the future; (ii) development of strategies for Green Zone and agricultural land impacts, TDM, goods movement and regional utilities. | Support, with a request of the Province to: (i) Assume responsibility for GVTA portion of NFPR; (ii) Ensure goods movement improvements are maintained over time. | Both staff support the project. Both express concern about retaining the gains made for goods movement. GVRD's support is subject to several regional strategies being put in place, and responding to the region's objectives for the HOV network. |
| **Facility- Highway 1 and Port Mann Bridge** | Support HOV aspects and highway widening east of Port Mann Bridge. Further information and analysis sought on the implications of Port Mann twinning and Highway 1 widening west of the Bridge with respect to regional interests. | Support, subject to: (i) introduction of tolls and other transport pricing mechanisms; (ii) introduction of road user priority system; (iii) not promoting Patullo Bridge as a free alternative, and (iv) a long-term strategy for the Pattullo prior to final decision on Port Mann. | GVTA staff support the entire project conditional upon tolls, priority measures, and dealing with the Patullo Bridge. GVRD staff support elements that are consistent with the LRSP and seek more analysis before the GVRD takes a final position. |
| **Policy – Tolling** | Prepare regional strategy for bridge tolls and road pricing. Existing Board policy supports bridge tolls. | Support tolls/road pricing on Port Mann/Highway 1, and initiate a dialogue on the roll of transport pricing in the region. | Both staff recommend a broader examination of regional transport pricing. |
| **Policy – Road User Priority (Goods, Transit, HOV)** | Prepare a regional approach to TDM, including a regional goods movement strategy. | Identify need to ensure that transit and goods movement have a high priority on any widened Port Mann/Hwy #1. | Both staff note need for road user priority incl. HOV, etc. GVTA staff detail need for transit on Port Mann/Hwy #1 and to protect truck movements from general congestion. |
| **Funding Implications** | Agreements and strategies are required to address the financial implications for regional parks and regional utilities. | Request 50% provincial cost sharing for Evergreen LRT and fast bus/park and ride services along Highway 1. | Both staff highlight the need for the Province to address the implications of the projects on the cost of regional infrastructure. |
| **Other Regional Needs** | Notes the potential implications for established regional growth management objectives. | Request Province to budget for addressing impacts on the Major Road Network and regional transit/cycling infrastructure. | Both reports recognize the implications for other regional needs. GVTA specifically identifies 'Evergreen Line'. |