



To: General Purposes Committee

Date: June 11, 2026

From: John Irving
Deputy CAO

File: 01-0060-20-LIEC1/2025-
Vol 01

Re: **Metro Vancouver Sewage Diversion and Funding Agreement**

Staff Recommendation

That Council endorse the key terms for the Sewage Diversion and Funding Agreement between Lulu Island Energy Company and Metro Vancouver.

Executive Summary

Lulu Island Energy Company (LIEC), a municipal corporation wholly-owned by the City of Richmond, is advancing the City Centre District Energy Utility expansion through development of a Sewer Heat Recovery facility in the Oval Village area that will use renewable heat recovered from the sewer system. This report seeks Council's endorsement of the key terms of the Sewage Diversion and Funding Agreement with Metro Vancouver to secure \$10 million in project funding.

LIEC will apply the funding to Metro Vancouver-owned infrastructure and in exchange, provide a portion of the GHG credits that the sewer heat recovery facility would generate to Metro Vancouver, up to a limit of 28,500 tCO₂e. Staff have verified that transferring GHG credits according to the schedule in the agreement and will not affect LIEC's ability to meet the currently projected provincial Zero Carbon Step Code requirements.



Staff Report

Origin

Lulu Island Energy Company (LIEC), a municipal corporation wholly-owned by the City of Richmond, was established to provide district energy services on behalf of the City. As part of the City Centre District Energy Utility expansion plan endorsed by Council in July 2022, LIEC will be constructing an energy centre in the Oval Village service area which will provide service to LIEC customers utilizing renewable sewer heat recovery technology.

The Metro Vancouver board adopted the *Sewage and Waste: Heat Recovery Policy* dated June 23, 2017 to enable the use of waste heat by third parties and provide the opportunity for funding portions of heat recovery projects to support collaborative district energy projects. On June 26, 2025, LIEC and Metro Vancouver entered into a Sewage Diversion Agreement (Access Only), which allowed for access to the Gilbert Trunk Sewer.

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement of key terms that will make up the agreement that will secure funding from Metro Vancouver, in exchange for GHG credits to be provided to Metro Vancouver.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2022-2026 Focus Area #5 A Leader in Environmental Sustainability:

Leadership in environmental sustainability through innovative, sustainable and proactive solutions that mitigate climate change and other environmental impacts.

Analysis

The Sewer Heat Recovery facility will divert flow from Metro Vancouver's sewer trunk and extract heat for use in LIEC's district energy system. At full build-out, the facility will generate 8 MW of renewable heat recovered from the sewer. Detailed design of the facility has been completed and construction is scheduled to commence in Spring 2027, subject to development activity in the Oval Village area.

The agreement includes terms including but not limited to sewage diversion, infrastructure ownership, maintenance, insurance, and liability. The terms of the agreement have been reviewed by Law. A list of key terms is outlined in Attachment 1.

Metro Vancouver initially allocated up to \$20 million in funding for this project. However, after considering eligible costs for Metro Vancouver-owned infrastructure and the number of GHG credits available for transfer, Metro Vancouver updated the funding value to up to \$10 million. In exchange, LIEC will transfer a portion of the GHG credits generated by the project to Metro Vancouver on an annual basis. The below schedule illustrates the percentage of credits that will be transferred to Metro Vancouver each year after the SHR facility begins operation, up to a maximum of 28,500 tCO₂e. This figure is based on 13% of the total carbon credits generated by

the SHR facility over the course of 25 years, reflecting the approximate value of the project funded with the contribution from Metro Vancouver.

GHG Credits (“Credits”) will be transferred to Metro Vancouver based on the following schedule:

- 100% of Credits to be allocated to Metro Vancouver until Metro Vancouver’s total Credits equals 10,000 tonnes or equivalent; thereafter,
- 50% of Credits to be allocated to Metro Vancouver until Metro Vancouver’s total Credits equals 20,000 tonnes or equivalent; thereafter,
- 25% of Credits to be allocated to Metro Vancouver until Metro Vancouver’s total Credits equals 28,500 tonnes or equivalent; thereafter
- 0% of Credits to be allocated to Metro Vancouver.
- All Credits not allocated to Metro Vancouver will be allocated to LIEC/City.

Staff have verified that LIEC is able to transfer GHG credits to Metro Vancouver at this schedule and still meet the currently projected Provincial requirements tied to the Zero Carbon Step Code over this time frame. Staff also believe valuation of the credits represents good value to LIEC.

The Key Terms of the Sewage Diversion and Funding Agreement have been approved by the LIEC Board on June 11th, 2026.

Metro Vancouver staff are planning to present the agreement to their Liquid Waste Committee and Board for approval in July 2026, in order to have the agreement signed by the end of 2026.

Budgetary Implications

Executing the Sewage Diversion and Funding Agreement between LIEC and Metro Vancouver will allow LIEC to receive up to \$10 million in funding towards the Sewer Heat Recovery project.

Conclusion

\$10 million in Metro Vancouver funding will support project delivery while helping maintain low rates for LIEC customers. LIEC will also retain the majority of the GHG credits, enabling continued advancement of the City’s zero-carbon building policies.

Respectfully submitted,

Alen Postolka, Director, District Energy

Report Contributors

This report was prepared by Aaron Yeung, Business Development Manager.

Endorsed by Serena Lusk, CAO

Att. 1: Key Terms of Sewage Diversion and Funding Agreement between LIEC and Metro
Vancouver

**Key Terms of 2026 Sewage Diversion and Funding Agreement
between LIEC and Metro Vancouver**

Amendment and restatement	
1.	This Sewage Diversion and Funding Agreement amends and restates the “Sewage Diversion Agreement (Access Only)”, dated for reference June 26, 2025, and supersedes and replaces the previous agreement in its entirety. (s. 1.4)
Diversion of Sewage	
2.	The Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District (District) will allow LIEC to: (i) construct infrastructure on the Bridgeport Trunk Sewer owned and operated by the District; and (ii) divert sewage from the Bridgeport Trunk Sewer and recover waste heat therefrom pursuant to conditions set out in the Agreement. (s. 8.1)
3.	LIEC accepts the sewage on an as-is basis. In no event will the District be liable to LIEC or third parties for any claims, damages or losses resulting from or in connection with the sewage diverted to LIEC’s infrastructure, including any impact the sewage has on LIEC’s infrastructure. (s. 6.1(i) & 8.2)
4.	During the term, the District may provide access to the waste heat in the sewage to any other person without the consent of LIEC, provided that the District will not provide access to such waste heat to any other person unless: (i) in the reasonable opinion of the District, doing so will not result in a reduction to the temperature of diverted sewage entering the infrastructure; and (ii) if the diversion is within the geographical boundaries of the City of Richmond, the City consents to such access. (s. 8.3)
Conditions Precedent	
5.	The obligations of the District to allow LIEC to construct the District Operated Infrastructure, and to divert the sewage, is subject to the following condition being satisfied by May 29, 2027 (previously May 29, 2025): the District being satisfied that the project will not adversely affect the use, operation and maintenance of the District Infrastructure and/or the sewer (Project Approval Condition Precedent). (s. 2.1)
6.	The obligations of the District to allow LIEC to construct the District Operated Infrastructure and to divert sewage, and the obligations of LIEC to carry out construction and installation work, is subject to the following being satisfied by May 29, 2027 (previously May 29, 2025): (i) LIEC obtaining all necessary permits; (ii) the parties being satisfied with the design plans and specifications; and (iii) the parties having agreed on the construction schedule for the construction of the Phase 1 Infrastructure (Mutual Conditions Precedent). (s. 2.3)
7.	The Project Approval Condition Precedent and the Mutual Conditions Precedent deadline dates can be extended for three consecutive periods of one year each by either party (s. 2.1 and 2.3)
Funding	
8.	The District will fund eligible costs up to a maximum amount of \$10,000,000. The funding can only be applied towards the costs of infrastructure that will be owned by the District. (s. 5.1 and 5.2)
9.	The District is only required to provide its funding if, within 12 months after the Project Approval Condition and the Mutual Conditions Precedent have been satisfied or waived, the

	District confirms that the following have been satisfied or waived in writing: (i) the District has obtained a BCUC exemption for its ownership of the District-funded infrastructure, on terms acceptable to the District; and (ii) the District is satisfied with the access rights relating to the District Funded infrastructure. If these conditions precedent are not satisfied or waived by the deadline, the agreement does not terminate, but the District has no obligation to provide funding, and the parties must replace the agreement with an access-only agreement on substantially the same terms as the June 26, 2025 agreement. (s. 2.2)
10.	In consideration for the funding, LIEC will transfer to the District a portion of the environmental attributes created by the project on an annual basis (s. 5.2 and 11.2).
Ownership	
11.	The District will own the District Funded Infrastructure (which will include the sewer, the diversion chamber, the district shut-off valves, the return tie-ins, the piping between the district shut-off valves and the sewer, and any other infrastructure funded by the District), and any replacements (irrespective of who pays for the replacements). LIEC will own all infrastructure, other than the District Funded Infrastructure (LIEC Infrastructure). (s. 5.2 and 6.5)
12.	During the term, the District may require LIEC to purchase, and LIEC may also require the District to transfer, all District Funded Infrastructure (other than District Operated Infrastructure). If the District exercises its option after specified suspension events, or if LIEC exercises its option, the purchase price is the greater of \$1.00 and the District's total funding paid to date if exercised before the Initial Diversion Date, and Net Book Value if exercised on or after the Initial Diversion Date, subject to agreed reductions for impairments from damage. The District may also require transfer for \$1.00 at its sole option. If the Agreement is terminated, LIEC is deemed to have exercised its option to purchase the District Funded Infrastructure. (s. 6.6 and 17.3)
Design and Construction	
13.	LIEC will design all the infrastructure. LIEC must submit the design plans to the District for review and approval. If the District is not satisfied with any aspect of the design plans and specifications relating to the District Funded Infrastructure, the minimum return temperature, the maximum return temperature, the maximum flow rates, the permitted impacts to the District sewer, or the diversion chamber maintenance plan, then LIEC will revise the design plans accordingly. (s. 6.1)
14.	LIEC will construct all the infrastructure. If LIEC fails to construct, install, complete and commission the District Funded Infrastructure then the District may (but will not be required to) construct, install, complete and commission the District Infrastructure at LIEC's cost (which may be offset against the District Funding). (s. 6.3)
Maintenance	
15.	LIEC will commission, operate, maintain, repair and replace all the LIEC Infrastructure. (s. 6.4(a)(i))
16.	LIEC will inspect and maintain the operation of the Diversion Chamber with respect to its function to divert sewage to the LIEC Infrastructure, all in accordance with the Diversion

	Chamber Maintenance Plan. (s. 6.4(b) and 6.4(a)(ii))
17.	The District will maintain, operate, repair and replace the the Diversion Chamber, the District Shut-Off Valves, the Return Tie-ins, and the piping between the Diversion Chamber and the Sewer-side of the District Shut-Off Valves (collectively the “District Operated Infrastructure”) in accordance with the District’s ordinary practices. The District’s obligations to inspect and/or maintain the Diversion Chamber are limited to its function to convey sewage as part of the sewer. (s. 6.4(d))
Access	
18.	LIEC must obtain access rights required by the District for the District Funded Infrastructure, on the District’s standard form or such other terms as may be approved by the District in its sole discretion. (s. 7.1(b))
Costs and Expenses	
19.	No compensation is payable by LIEC for waste heat during the initial 10 years. If, at any time 10 years after the commencement of the agreement, the District’s Heat Recovery Policy is amended or replaced, establishing a District policy to seek compensation for the provision of sewage and/or waste heat by the District, then the District may give notice to LIEC of such policy change. Within six months of the District giving such notice, the Parties will enter into negotiations to amend this Agreement, including to provide for compensation to be payable to the District for the diversion of Sewage and/or taking of Waste Heat by LIEC. (s. 10.2(a))
20.	LIEC will pay for the design and construction of all the LIEC Infrastructure, and the costs for the maintenance of the LIEC Infrastructure and LIEC’s maintenance of the Diversion Chamber in accordance with the Diversion Chamber Maintenance Plan.
21.	LIEC will reimburse the District for reasonable costs incurred by the District to operate, maintain, repair and replace the District Infrastructure. LIEC will also reimburse the District for any incremental costs arising from changes to the physical structure or operation of the sewer, and the District’s costs relating to this Agreement (including design, engineering, consulting, inspection and legal fees). (s. 10.4)
Insurance and Liability	
22.	At all times during construction, installation, and commissioning of the infrastructure LIEC will, at its own expense, maintain construction insurance coverage. At all times throughout the term, LIEC will maintain commercial general liability insurance and pollution liability coverage. (13.1)
23.	LIEC will indemnify and save harmless the District from and against all claims, including any remediation costs or expenses, in connection with any release of contaminants from the infrastructure or any part of the sewer that is impacted by the infrastructure. (8.5)(d))
24.	LIEC will indemnify and save harmless the District from and against all liabilities, claims and losses incurred, arising from, related to or caused by LIEC’s negligence or wilful misconduct, any breach of the agreement by LIEC, any breach of any permit or applicable law by LIEC. (14.1)
25.	LIEC will release the District from any claims or damages relating to the design, construction, performance, operation and maintenance of the Infrastructure, except to the proportionate

	extent that any such liabilities arise out of the District's negligence or wilful misconduct. (14.3)
Suspension of Sewage Diversion	
26.	The District may, without prior notice to LIEC, wholly or partly close the district shut-off valves if any of the following occur: (a) certain conditions occur that do, or reasonably could be perceived to, affect or interfere with the operability of the sewer, the District's collection or treatment of wastewater, or damage the District Operated Infrastructure; (b) any diverted sewage is returned (i) with contaminants that were not presented prior to such sewage entering LIEC's Infrastructure, (ii) at a temperature less than the minimum return temperature or greater than the maximum return temperature, (iii) at a flow that exceeds the maximum flow rate, or (iii) with a composition materially different from that entering LIEC's infrastructure; (c) routine or planned inspections, maintenance or repair works; (d) a release of a contaminants from the infrastructure; (e) if at any time during the term, the BCUC has jurisdiction over the use or operation of the Sewer in connection with this agreement; (f) any BCUC exemption in respect of the District is rescinded or modified; or (g) LIEC becomes subject to any law that could, in the reasonable opinion of the District, detrimentally affect or interfere with the use or operation of the Sewer or the District's collection or treatment of wastewater (9.1).
Term and Termination	
27.	The Agreement will remain effective until it is terminated in accordance with its terms. (s. 17.1)
28.	This Agreement may be terminated as follows: (17.2) (a) by mutual agreement of the parties; (b) the District may terminate the agreement if a suspension event continues for a continuous period of more than two years; (c) by either party in the event the other party is in default; (d) by either party for an ongoing force majeure event; (e) by the District on at least 18 months written notice to LIEC, provided that the right to terminate under this section cannot be exercised for 20 years; (f) by the District on at least five years' written notice to LIEC, if it is, in the opinion of the District (reasonably exercised), no longer practicable to permit the diversion of the diverted sewage in the manner contemplated by this Agreement (without being exhaustive, this includes instances of planned decommissioning, deactivation, relocation and any other material changes to the sewer), provided that the District may only exercise the right under this section by a resolution of the District's board.



To: General Purposes Committee

Date: June 8, 2026

From: John Hopkins
Acting General Manager, Planning and Development

File: 01-0157-30-
RGST1/2026-Vol 01

Re: Response to Metro Vancouver's Referral: Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests

Staff Recommendation

1. That the report titled "Response to Metro Vancouver's Referral: Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests", dated June 8, 2026 from the General Manager, Planning and Development, be submitted to the Metro Vancouver Regional District Board as part of Metro Vancouver's consultation process.
2. That should the Metro Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1456, 2026 be adopted, staff review whether the City of Richmond should pursue identification of any Special Study Areas and report back.

Executive Summary

The MVRD Board has initiated a process to consider amendments to the Metro 2050 Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) in response to requests from three South of Fraser municipalities for greater flexibility within the Urban Containment Boundary (UCB) to support future housing, employment, and infrastructure needs. Following pre-consultation on four proposed amendment options, Metro Vancouver is recommending moving forward with one option on Special Study Areas (SSAs) and not moving ahead with the remaining options due to limited regional support.

SSAs identify lands that may consider future land use changes but require further study before any RGS amendments are considered. The proposed amendment would enable the Township of Langley to add a new SSA for the Fraser Highway Employment Lands, remove two SSAs previously identified, and would permit other member jurisdictions to propose new SSAs until December 31, 2027. Other recommendations from Metro Vancouver include initiating further process improvements to streamline RGS amendments and supporting Surrey's city-led servicing and land use analysis for the Southeast Surrey area.

Should the Metro Vancouver amendment bylaw be adopted, it is recommendation that the City of Richmond consider the possibility of adding any new SSAs prior to the deadline.

Staff Report

Origin

The Metro Vancouver Regional District (MVRD) Board has initiated a process to consider amending the Metro 2050 Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) to permit a new Special Study Area (SSA) for the Township of Langley's Fraser Highway Employment Lands, removal of two previously identified SSAs, and allowing other member jurisdictions to propose any new SSAs prior to December 31, 2027. The recommendations also include initiating further RGS process improvements, and support for Surrey's city-led land use analysis for the southeast area.

At its April 2, 2026 regular meeting, the Board of Directors of the MVRD adopted the following resolution:

That the MVRD Board:

- a) initiate the Metro 2050 amendment process for Special Study Areas option as described in the report dated March 25, 2026, titled "Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests";*
- b) give first, second, and third reading to Metro Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1456, 2026;*
- c) notify affected local governments and post the proposed amendment on the Metro Vancouver website to provide an opportunity for comment as per Section 6.4.2 of Metro 2050;*
- d) direct staff to notify local First Nations via referral offices to provide an opportunity for comment on the proposed amendment;*
- e) direct staff to initiate further process improvements to streamline amendment processes and timelines as described in the report dated March 25, 2026, titled "Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests"; and*
- f) direct staff to continue to engage with the City of Surrey regarding:*
 - i) concerns about Metro 2050; and*
 - ii) technical support regarding the regional servicing implications of potential development in the Southeast portion of Surrey.*

As part of Metro Vancouver's notification process, the City of Richmond has been invited to provide written comments on the proposed amendments (refer to Attachment 1 for the Metro Vancouver letter and accompanying report). The letter indicates a deadline of July 10, 2026; however, Metro Vancouver staff have indicated that comments can be received by July 14, 2026 and can still be incorporated in the staff report which will be presented to the MVRD Board at their regular meeting on July 24, 2026. This review focusses on the proposed amendment and its potential impacts to the City of Richmond.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2022-2026 Focus Area #1 Proactive in Stakeholder and Civic Engagement:

Proactive stakeholder and civic engagement to foster understanding and involvement and advance Richmond's interests.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2022-2026 Focus Area #2 Strategic and Sustainable Community Growth:

Strategic and sustainable growth that supports long-term community needs and a well-planned and prosperous city.

Analysis

Background

In June 2025, the MVRD Board Chair received a joint letter from the mayors of Surrey, Langley Township, and Delta requesting for greater flexibility within the Metro 2050's Urban Containment Boundary (UCB) framework to accommodate future housing, employment, and infrastructure needs. In response, on November 25, 2025, the MVRD Board endorsed four potential amendments to Metro 2050 for pre-consultation with member jurisdictions. The options included:

- Option 1: Add new Special Study Area for the requesting municipalities only.
- Options 2: Re-Classify Rural Regional Land Use Designation Amendments to a Type 3 amendment process (50%+1 threshold rather than a 2/3 threshold).
- Options 3: Expand Amendment Opportunities for Properties Contiguous with the Urban Containment Boundary.
- Option 4: Expand the Use of the 'Flexibility Clause' For Properties Contiguous with the UCB.

The proposed amendments were forwarded to Richmond City Council and on March 9, 2026, Council endorsed the following comments on the proposed options which included:

- The proposed options as presented by Metro Vancouver undermines the intent of the UCB which is to limit sprawl and strive for a compact metropolitan urban form, as well as focus urban growth within the compact urban form through transit oriented, complete communities.
- Planning decisions should be proactive and grounded in strategic long-range thinking, rather than reactive to case-by-case amendment requests. Alternative solutions could involve undertaking a more comprehensive review of the UCB to evaluate broader amendments to the Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District (GVS&DD) sewerage boundary.
- Any amendments to how the UCB may be adjusted would need to be coordinated with how adjustments to the GVS&DD boundary are administered.
- Metro Vancouver would need to provide clarity around how any servicing costs associated with adjusting the GVS&DD boundary would be determined and allocated.

Feedback from other member jurisdictions on the four options was largely mixed, with some expressing concerns that the proposed changes could significantly alter the intent of the growth management strategies contained in Metro 2050. While many respondents acknowledged the growth pressures, housing demand, servicing challenges identified by the South of Fraser municipalities, many member jurisdictions and agencies preferred substantial changes to be addressed through a future comprehensive review of Metro 2050, supported by detailed analysis, regional discussion, and in-depth consultation.

Metro Vancouver staff met with elected officials and staff from Surrey, Langley Township and Delta who indicated that the proposed options would not fully address their concerns. Following this additional consultation, Metro Vancouver has proposed to move ahead with an amended version of Option 1 (Special Study Areas), and not move forward with Option 2, 3 or 4 at this time. Further, the recommendation is for the MVRD Board to direct staff to initiate further process improvements to streamline amendment process and timelines, and to engage with the City of Surrey regarding their specific concerns about Metro 2050, and technical support regarding the regional servicing implications of potential development in the Southeast portion of Surrey.

Summary of Amended Option 1 (Special Study Area)

The amended version of Option 1 would allow all member jurisdictions to propose new SSAs before the December 31, 2027 deadline. At the time of developing this option, Metro Vancouver staff invited the three South of the Fraser municipalities to identify SSA lands outside the UCB. Only the Township of Langley proposed a new SSA for the Fraser Highway Employment Lands, which reflects the technical analysis undertaken over several years to support employment growth. The Township also requested the removal of two existing SSAs. The approximate area of the requested SSA removal is 156 hectares, and the newly proposed SSA is 152 hectares. As such, the proposal would result in a net decrease of about 4 hectares of SSAs.

Figure 1 – Proposed Langley Township SSA to be Added (Yellow) or Removed (Red)



Currently, SSAs are only considered during the update of the RGS. They are meant to be areas identified by the member jurisdiction indicating an intention to alter the existing land use, and is anticipating a future regional land use designation amendment. There is no specific criteria on identifying an SSA, with the exception for areas that are located within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR), where the member jurisdiction is required to consult with the Agricultural Land Commission during the preparation of the planning studies prior to initiating an application to

exclude the lands from the ALR. All SSAs must undergo further study and evaluation before amendments could be considered. Once land use designation amendments are brought forward in an SSA, it would be considered a Type 3 amendment which has a 50%+1 voting threshold.

The proposed amendment bylaw will clarify how new SSAs may be considered in the future. This would allow the MVRD Board to consider evaluating new proposed SSAs only until December 31, 2027. After that, any new SSAs could only be introduced through the development of a new RGS. This time-limited approach helps address emerging planning needs while preventing the ongoing use of SSAs to bypass higher-threshold regional amendment processes for significant land-use changes.

In addition to the proposed amendments to Metro 2050 to address SSAs, the MVRD Board will consider initiating further process improvements to streamline RGS amendments and supporting Surrey's city-led servicing and land use analysis for the Southeast Surrey area. If supported, by the MVRD Board, Metro Vancouver staff will report back to the MVRD Board on progress as this work advances.

City of Richmond Comments on the Proposed Metro 2050 RGS Amendment

City staff have reviewed Metro Vancouver's staff report and conclude that it has limited land use impacts to the City of Richmond, even if new SSAs are designated in other municipalities.

As outlined in the Metro Vancouver staff report, the proposal presents an equitable approach for SSAs in that all member municipalities can propose new SSAs by December 31, 2027, after which any future consideration of new SSAs would only occur through the development of a new RGS. The Metro Vancouver staff report also recommends initiating further process improvements to streamline RGS amendments, and further engagement with Surrey and support for the city-led servicing and land use analysis for the southeast Surrey area to better understand the implications of potential development. Southeast Surrey, which is located adjacent to the U.S. border and the Township of Langley, comprises about 80 percent of the City's Rural lands with most lands outside the UCB and ALR.

Adding new SSAs may identify potential future growth areas, but any servicing extensions would require technical, financial, and capacity reviews through existing Metro Vancouver utility approval processes. Further, any site-specific amendments to Metro 2050 would require further technical and financial analysis.

Staff recommend that this report and the comments described within, be endorsed and submitted to the MVRD Board as part of Metro Vancouver's consultation process.

Special Study Areas for Richmond

Richmond does not currently have any SSAs, and the introduction of any new SSAs within the city is not being considered currently. Should the proposed Metro Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1456, 2026 be adopted, it is recommended that staff review whether the City of Richmond should pursue identification of any SSAs and report back prior to the December 31, 2027 deadline.

Budgetary Implications

None.

Conclusion

Metro Vancouver has provided information on a proposed amendment to the Metro 2050 RGS in relation to permitting new SSAs to be considered in the future, through a time-limited approach. It also proposes a targeted SSA for the Township of Langley's Fraser Highway Employment Lands to support further employment growth on these lands.

Staff conclude that this proposal has limited land use impacts to the City of Richmond and would have limited financial impacts regionally. SSAs may identify potential future growth areas, but any servicing extensions would require technical, financial, and capacity reviews through existing Metro Vancouver utility approval processes, and any site-specific amendments to Metro 2050 would require further technical and financial analysis. Staff recommend that this report be submitted to the MVRD Board as part of Metro Vancouver's consultation process, and that staff bring forward a report on whether the City of Richmond should submit any SSAs prior to the December 31, 2027 deadline should the Metro Vancouver amendment bylaw be adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

John Hopkins, Director, Policy Planning

Report Contributors

This report was prepared by Emily Huang, Planner 2.

Endorsed by Serena Lusk, CAO

Att. 1: Metro Vancouver Staff Report



To: Regional Planning Committee

From: Heather McNell, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Policy and Planning
Jonathan Cote, Deputy General Manager, Regional Planning and Housing Development
Mark Seinen, Senior Planner, Regional Planning and Housing Services

Date: March 25, 2026 Meeting Date: April 2, 2026

Subject: **Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests**

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the MVRD Board:

- a) initiate the *Metro 2050* amendment process for Special Study Areas option as described in the report dated March 25, 2026, titled "Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests";
 - b) give first, second, and third reading to *Metro Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1456, 2026*;
 - c) notify affected local governments and post the proposed amendment on the Metro Vancouver website to provide an opportunity for comment as per Section 6.4.2 of *Metro 2050*;
 - d) direct staff to notify local First Nations via referral offices to provide an opportunity for comment on the proposed amendment;
 - e) direct staff to initiate further process improvements to streamline amendment processes and timelines as described in the report dated March 25, 2026, titled "**Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests**" ~~"Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options in Response to South of the Fraser Mayors' Request – Preliminary Consultation Results"~~; and
 - f) direct staff to continue to engage with the City of Surrey regarding:
 - i) concerns about *Metro 2050*; and
 - ii) technical support regarding the regional servicing implications of potential development in the Southeast portion of Surrey.
-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides information and options for Committee and Board consideration in response to the requests from three South of Fraser Mayors regarding changes to *Metro 2050*'s Urban Containment Boundary and amendment process. In response to MVRD Board direction, staff undertook pre-consultation with affected local governments on four potential *Metro 2050* amendment options developed to respond to the requests.

Staff were requested to meet with five member Councils, met with the Regional Administrators Advisory Committee, the Regional Engineers Advisory Committee, and the Regional Planning Advisory Committee, and received correspondence from ten member jurisdictions, TransLink, and the Squamish Lillooet Regional District. While feedback was largely critical of the amendment options (including from the requesting municipalities), all of the responses from member jurisdictions and other affected local governments acknowledge the concerns raised by the requesting municipalities, including the challenges of rapid growth and the desire for flexibility and local autonomy.

Key themes in the correspondence include:

- Request for more time and information to consider and analyze the amendment options;
- Concern about undermining the fundamental tenets of the Regional Growth Strategy;
- Noting that *Metro 2050* already contains procedures for amendments that allow for regional dialogue;
- Recommendation that major changes to amendment processes are better managed through the next update to the Regional Growth Strategy; and
- Suggestion to undertake a more comprehensive analysis of the Urban Containment Boundary and sewerage areas.

This report responds to feedback by recommending a targeted Special Study Area for the Fraser Highway Employment Lands, initiating further process improvements to streamline Regional Growth Strategy amendments, and further engagement with Surrey and support for Surrey's city-led servicing and land use analysis for the Southeast Surrey area.

The **Township of Langley** identified the Fraser Highway Employment Lands as a potential Special Study Area where significant local planning and technical study is already completed or underway, and requested that Metro Vancouver bring the area forward for regional consideration. Establishing a regional Special Study Area for these lands acknowledges this work, and provides a structured mechanism for the Township to continue its detailed analysis, while ensuring any future regional land use changes proceed through the established *Metro 2050* amendment process. The Township is also proposing the removal of two existing Special Study Areas. This is reflected in recommendations a) through d).

The **City of Delta** emphasized that its primary concerns relate to the efficiency of the *Metro 2050* amendment process, not the proposed amendment options or voting framework. Through its submission, Delta noted that improving timelines and simplifying procedural steps would better support member jurisdictions when navigating *Metro 2050* amendments. In response, the recommendation includes the implementation of several process improvements identified through this consultation. These actions are intended to reduce administrative steps, shorten review timelines, and make the amendment process more straightforward for member jurisdictions. This is reflected in recommendation e).

The **City of Surrey** indicated that the four proposed amendment options do not meet its aspirations for greater flexibility in accommodating long-term residential and employment growth. Through subsequent discussions, Metro Vancouver and Surrey staff identified the Rurally designated Southeast portion of Surrey as the primary area of interest for potential land use change, and acknowledged that the infrastructure implications of development in this area are not yet fully understood. Both parties agreed that a City-led, and Metro Vancouver supported, study looking at future land use, servicing and infrastructure is a next step to inform future decision making. Staff also committed to continued engagement on broader *Metro 2050* issues. This is reflected in recommendation f).

PURPOSE

This report presents information and options regarding potential amendments to *Metro 2050* developed to respond to requests from three South of the Fraser Mayors.

BACKGROUND

On June 19, 2025, the Board Chair received a joint letter (**Attachment 1**) from the mayors of Surrey, Langley Township, and Delta expressing concerns about *Metro 2050*. The letter argues that the existing *Metro 2050* amendment framework is impeding the ability of South of the Fraser municipalities to meet the growing demand for housing, employment lands, and essential services. The MVRD Board received a copy of the joint letter, along with a summary of the mayors' request, at its July 25, 2025 meeting in a report dated July 11, 2025, titled "Proposed Metro 2050 Amendments: Next Steps in Response to City of Surrey, Township of Langley, and City of Delta Mayors" (Reference 1). At the July 25, 2025 meeting, the MVRD Board directed staff to undertake engagement with member jurisdictions as a precursor to bringing forward for Board consideration, *Metro 2050* amendments reflecting the City of Surrey, Township of Langley and City of Delta mayors' requests.

After meeting with staff and elected officials from the requesting municipalities to better understand the desired outcomes, at the November 28, 2025 MVRD Board meeting (Reference 2), Metro Vancouver staff provided four potential amendment options to address the three South of the Fraser Mayors' request, and received direction to begin pre-consultation on the four options. For clarity, these are not staff recommendations, but rather staff's best effort to identify viable options that both respond to the mayors' requests and fit within the existing legal and policy framework. Since that time, correspondence (**Attachment 2**) was issued to member jurisdictions, adjacent regional districts, and TransLink requesting comment and offering staff-level meetings or presentations at Council or Board meetings. A significant amount of feedback has been received and is summarized in this report, with detailed correspondence provided in **Attachment 3**.

ENGAGEMENT AND AMENDMENT PROCESS

In response to the MVRD Board's July 25, 2025 and November 28, 2025 resolutions, Metro Vancouver staff have initiated a multi-phase process to explore potential amendments to *Metro 2050* that address the concerns raised in the three South of the Fraser Mayors' joint letter. As this proposed amendment process was initiated by the MVRD Board rather than a member jurisdiction, Metro Vancouver must provide all member jurisdictions affected with an opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments before any amendment bylaw is given first reading. The engagement and amendment process includes the following steps.

Step 1: Initial discussions with the three requesting municipalities

Metro Vancouver staff met with staff from the City of Surrey, Township of Langley, and City of Delta to better understand the members' needs and priorities. These discussions helped clarify the intent of the mayors' request and informed the development of policy options that could address their concerns. Metro Vancouver also met with the Mayors of Langley Township and City of Delta; the Mayor of Surrey was not available.

Step 2: Presentation of options to the MVRD Board

On November 28, 2025, a set of potential *Metro 2050* amendment options were provided for the MVRD Board's consideration, based on feedback from the three South of the Fraser member jurisdictions and Metro Vancouver's staff's best assessment of viable policy options. The MVRD Board supported initiating engagement with all member jurisdictions on these options.

Step 3: Pre-consultation with member jurisdictions and other affected local governments

Metro Vancouver began the pre-consultation period by issuing correspondence to member jurisdictions, adjacent regional districts and TransLink requesting comment on the four amendment options and offering staff-level meetings or presentations at Council or Board meetings. Metro Vancouver staff were requested to participate in five Council or Committee meetings, as follows:

Pitt Meadows City Council	February 10, 2026
Port Moody City Council	February 17, 2026
Delta City Council	February 23, 2026
Richmond Planning Committee	March 3, 2026
White Rock City Council	March 9, 2026

As part of this phase, staff engaged with the Regional Administrators Advisory Committee (RAAC), Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) and Regional Engineers Advisory Committee (REAC). Metro Vancouver staff also met with staff from member jurisdictions and other affected local governments as requested to answer questions and explain the pre-consultation process and the options identified.

Steps 4-6: Comments received through pre-consultation have been compiled for consideration by the MVRD Board, along with an amendment bylaw for consideration of initial readings in Alternative 1. If the MVRD Board grants initial readings to the proposed amendment, a formal referral and comment period would begin for the Type 3 amendment. All comments will be compiled and conveyed to the MVRD Board along with the amendment bylaw for consideration of final readings and adoption.

OVERVIEW OF AMENDMENT OPTIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

This section outlines the four potential *Metro 2050* amendment options that were the subject of pre-consultation with member jurisdictions and other affected local governments. Under *Metro 2050*, amendments are categorized into three types:

Type 1: Requires an amendment bylaw passed by a 50% + 1 weighted vote of the MVRD Board and ***unanimous acceptance by all affected local governments within a 60-day period*** (same process to adopt a Regional Growth Strategy).

Type 2: Requires an amendment bylaw passed by a two-thirds weighted vote of the MVRD Board and a formal comment period (Minor amendment)

Type 3: Requires an amendment bylaw passed by a 50% + 1 weighted vote of the MVRD Board and a formal comment period (Minor amendment).

The options that were the subject of pre-consultation are summarized as follows:

Table 1. Summary of Metro 2050 Amendment Options (Note: Land affected for Options 3 & 4 is estimated)

Option	Description	Type of Amendment	Land Affected	
			ha	km ²
1	Add language permitting Special Study Areas and identified Special Study Areas in the requesting municipalities	Type 3	152	15
2	Reduce the amendment voting threshold to make changes to lands with a Rural regional land use designation easier	Type 1	9,126	91
3	Expand amendment opportunities for sites adjacent to the Urban Containment Boundary	Type 1	500	5
4	Expand the flexibility clause for sites adjacent to the Urban Containment Boundary	Type 3	300	3

The sections that follow present further detail and analysis for each of the four amendment options.

OPTION 1: ADD NEW SPECIAL STUDY AREAS IN THE REQUESTING MUNICIPALITIES

Under *Metro 2050*, Special Study Areas (SSAs) are specific locations, usually outside the Urban Containment Boundary, where a member jurisdiction has signaled that it may seek future land use designation changes – both locally and regionally. These areas require additional study before any amendment can be considered. When land is within an SSA, any proposed change to its regional land use designation or to the Urban Containment Boundary is processed as a Type 3 amendment rather than a Type 2 amendment. This means the amendment requires a simple majority weighted vote of the MVRD Board, whereas without the overlay it would be at Type 2 amendment requiring a 2/3rds weighted vote at the Board. In practice, SSAs serve two main purposes: they indicate a municipality's interest in future land use changes, and they lower the voting threshold needed for those changes as they cover areas intended for future land use change, thereby acknowledging the municipality's future plans and aspirations.

In developing this option, Metro Vancouver staff invited the three requesting South of the Fraser municipalities to identify specific lands outside the Urban Containment Boundary that they are interested in exploring for potential future land use changes.

The Township of Langley was the only municipality to propose changes to its Special Study Areas during this process. As shown on Map 1 below, the Township requested the addition of a new SSA for the Fraser Highway Employment Lands, an area that has been the focus of detailed technical analysis and planning studies by the Township over the past several years. The Township also requested the removal of two existing Special Study Areas: one located west of Murrayville and another located north of 96 Avenue and west of 216 Street. The approximate area of the SSAs requested for removal is 156 hectares; the newly-proposed SSA for the Fraser Highway Employment Lands is 152 hectares. The proposal would therefore result in a net decrease of about 4 hectares of SSAs.

Issues Overview

Special Study Areas were originally contemplated in the 1996 *Livable Region Strategic Plan* through a tool called "Areas under Municipal Consideration", and were formally established with procedures in *Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future (Metro 2040)*. This work was undertaken through the development of the Rural regional land use designation. In *Metro 2040*, a new Rural land use designation contracted the Urban Containment Boundary by about 9,000 hectares, in part to support more efficient provision of urban infrastructure. The Special Study Areas / overlays on land with a Rural regional land use designation were provided to indicate those areas where municipalities contemplated future land use change, but had not yet completed detailed planning or technical studies. The SSAs were not intended to be expanded or added to over time. Recognizing that regional conditions and community needs change over time, the Special Study Area tool could be applied strategically in the future to support further analysis of locations where emerging planning issues or opportunities arise. Establishing a Special Study Area for the Fraser Highway Employment Lands provides a structured and policy-aligned mechanism to respond to the interests raised by the Township of Langley. It recognizes the substantial planning and technical work the Township of Langley has already undertaken on these lands, as well as the significant local interest in assessing their long-term potential to support employment growth. Given the depth of study completed to date and the ongoing local planning efforts, identifying the Fraser Highway Employment Lands as a new Special Study Area is considered a supportable addition within the *Metro 2050* framework.

Map 1. Proposed Special Study Areas to be Added (Yellow) or Removed (Red)

The proposed amendment bylaw will also introduce language clarifying how new Special Study Areas may be considered in the future. Under the updated framework, the MVRD Board would be able to evaluate the addition of new Special Study Areas up to December 31, 2027. After this date, any future consideration of new Special Study Areas would occur only when a new Regional Growth Strategy is being developed.

This time-limited approach will ensure that the ability to introduce new Special Study Areas is not available on a permanent, ongoing basis. Allowing SSAs to be added at any time could inadvertently create a pathway for significant land-use changes to proceed through two sequential Type 3 amendments, thereby bypassing the higher-threshold Type 2 amendment process. This would not reflect the intent of the proposed amendment, nor the purpose of Special Study Areas within the *Metro 2050* framework. This approach provides a defined, time-limited opportunity to address emerging local planning needs, while ensuring that longer-term additions are considered through the comprehensive and region-wide process associated with developing a new Regional Growth Strategy.

Results of Pre-Consultation

Metro Vancouver received mixed feedback from affected local governments regarding Option 1. Comments noted that: new SSAs would have little to no impact on some jurisdictions; new SSAs could encourage additional planning prior to any future land use change; and new SSAs could have a lesser transportation impact than the other options, provided they are limited in geographic scope, contiguous with the existing UCB, and include safeguards against incremental or precedent-setting expansion. Metro Vancouver also heard that introducing new SSAs through a Type 3 amendment risks weakening the *Metro 2050* framework, as new SSAs are regionally-significant.

Proposed Amendment Details

The details of this text amendment are as follows:

1. *Delete policy 6.12.4*, which currently prohibits establishing new Special Study Areas;
2. *Replace Map 12* with a revised Map 12 showing a new Special Study Area and two deleted Special Study Areas as identified by the Township of Langley;

3. Add a new policy 6.10.3:

The boundaries for Special Study Areas as depicted on Map 12 are not to be expanded, nor are additional areas to be created, except as follows:

(a) Additional Special Study Areas may be considered up to December 31, 2027; and

(b) After January 1, 2028, additional Special Study Areas are to be considered only in the development of a new Regional Growth Strategy.

4. Revise Policy 6.10.1 to read:

Special Study Areas as depicted on Map 12 identify locations where, ~~prior to the adoption of Metro Vancouver 2040, Shaping our Future~~, a Member Jurisdiction had expressed an intention to alter the existing land use, and is anticipating a future regional land use designation amendment. Pending Metro Vancouver Regional District Board approval of a regional land use designation amendment, the current regional land use designation(s) applies within the Special Study Area. Amending a regional land use designation within a Special Study Area is considered a Type 3 amendment under section 6.3.4 of the Regional Growth Strategy. This includes any associated adjustment(s) to the Urban Containment Boundary for a Special Study Area. As part of any amendment establishing a change in regional land use designation, the Special Study Area boundaries for those amended lands will be removed from the Regional Growth Strategy. A member jurisdiction may also remove a Special Study Area with an updated Regional Context Statement or with notification to Metro Vancouver supported by a Council resolution.

OPTION 2: RE-CLASSIFY RURAL REGIONAL LAND USE DESIGNATION AMENDMENTS TO TYPE 3

Under *Metro 2050*, amendments to properties with a Rural regional land use designation are currently categorized as either Type 2 or Type 3, depending on the new designation being proposed:

- Type 2: Amendments from Rural to Industrial, Employment, or General Urban (Policy 6.3.3 c).
- Type 3: Amendments from Rural to Agricultural or Conservation and Recreation (Policy 6.3.4 d).

This option would consolidate these policies by classifying all amendments from Rural to any other regional land use designation, including adjustments to the Urban Containment Boundary, as Type 3 amendments. This change would lower the approval threshold for several types of Rural-to-Urban conversions, shifting these decisions from a two-thirds weighted vote to a majority (50% + 1) weighted vote of the MVRD Board. Map 2 illustrates the extent and distribution of Rural-designated lands across the region.

Option 2 is a Type 1 amendment to *Metro 2050*, requiring unanimous acceptance by all affected local governments and an affirmative 50% + 1 weighted vote of the MVRD Board.

Issues Overview

Re-classifying amendments to Rural-designated lands as Type 3 amendments would significantly lower the threshold for enabling urban development in areas that are generally not intended for growth. Because Rural lands are located outside the Urban Containment Boundary, this change could open the door to development in locations that are far from existing utilities, services, amenities, and transit. Such dispersed growth would increase pressure on local and regional infrastructure, including water, sewerage, and transportation networks, and may contribute to higher servicing costs for member jurisdictions. At about 9,100 hectares (9.1 km²) and affecting 12 member jurisdictions, Option 2 would impact by far the largest area of the four options equivalent to about 22 Stanley Parks (at 4 km²).

Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the
Fraser Mayors' Requests

Regional Planning Committee Regular Meeting Date: April 2, 2026

Page 8 of 21

Table 2. Affected Rural-Designated Lands

Member Jurisdiction	Rural-Designated Lands (ha)
Anmore	497
Belcarra	177
Coquitlam	372
Delta	2
Electoral Area A	977
Langley Township	2,479
Lions Bay	275
Maple Ridge	3,088
North Vancouver District	123
Pitt Meadows	727
Port Moody	33
Surrey	376
Total	9,126

Map 2. Affected Rural-Designated Lands**Results of Pre-Consultation**

Throughout pre-consultation, a number of member jurisdictions expressed concerns about the potential impacts and the broader implications for regional growth management. Given the feedback and the risks associated with encouraging development in locations poorly suited to urban expansion, staff do not recommend that this option proceed.

OPTION 3: EXPAND AMENDMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROPERTIES CONTIGUOUS WITH THE URBAN CONTAINMENT BOUNDARY

Metro 2050 contains a policy, 6.3.4 f), which applies to properties with a regional Agricultural and Rural land use designation that are contiguous with (i.e. outside but immediately adjacent to) the Urban Containment Boundary and outside the Agricultural Land Reserve. This policy allows such properties to be amended to an Industrial regional land use **GP-52** as a Type 3 amendment. Option 3 would

expand the amendment opportunities for such sites so that any regional land use designation may be proposed as a Type 3 amendment. The effect of this change would be to lower the MVRD Board voting threshold to 50% + 1 for sites contiguous to the Urban Containment Boundary. This would affect Agricultural and Rural sites that are proposed to be amended to General Urban or Employment that would otherwise be considered Type 2 amendments. The intent of the existing policy framework surrounding contiguous sites is to provide flexibility for sites that are directly adjacent to the Urban Containment Boundary, recognizing that some parcels outside the Urban Containment Boundary may represent supportable extensions of urban development. However, the current definition of Urban Containment Boundary contiguous parcels has, at times, created uncertainty for member jurisdictions. This proposed amendment presents an opportunity to refine and clarify the definition to better support consistent implementation across the region.

Option 3 is a Type 1 amendment, requiring unanimous acceptance by all affected local governments and an affirmative 50% + 1 weighted vote of the MVRD Board.

Issues Overview

Expanding Policy 6.3.4(f) to allow any regional land use redesignation on parcels contiguous with the Urban Containment Boundary (UCB) would significantly broaden opportunities for development outside the UCB. The existing policy is intentionally narrow, providing a pathway for conversions to Industrial, in locations where proximity to the UCB offers the potential for more efficient servicing. Allowing conversions to General Urban or Employment uses could make residential and mixed-use development more attractive than Industrial. As a result, proposals that could have contributed to the region's limited industrial land supply may instead shift toward residential forms, unintentionally creating competition between land uses and reducing the effectiveness of the policy's original purpose. The proposed change would make expansions beyond the UCB more likely. Although the 520 hectares of total land area affected (Table 3) is smaller than under Option 2, the lowered voting threshold for these amendments would introduce more opportunities for growth in areas not intended for urban development. Such expansion would increase pressure for new or extended infrastructure and could lead to incremental fragmentation of Agricultural and Rural lands.

Results of Pre-Consultation

Throughout pre-consultation, a number of member jurisdictions expressed concerns about the significant impacts and broader implications for regional growth management. Given feedback and analysis, staff do not recommend that this option proceed.

Table 3. Affected Urban Containment Boundary-Contiguous Rural or Agricultural Lands

Member Jurisdiction	Rural Lands (ha)	Agricultural Lands (ha)	Total (ha)
Anmore	93		93
Coquitlam	68		68
Delta		41	41
Langley City		1.3	1.3
Langley Township	18	0.7	19
Maple Ridge	143	6.0	149
North Vancouver District	0.5		0.5
Pitt Meadows		1.1	1.1
Port Moody	13		13
Richmond		64	64
Surrey	53	25	78
Total (estimate)	389	139	528

Map 3. Affected Urban Containment Boundary-Contiguous Agricultural or Rural Lands**OPTION 4: EXPAND THE USE OF THE 'FLEXIBILITY CLAUSE' FOR PROPERTIES CONTIGUOUS WITH THE URBAN CONTAINMENT BOUNDARY**

Metro 2050 contains a policy (6.2.7), commonly referred to as the *flexibility clause*, which allows member jurisdictions to make limited changes to regional land use designations within the Urban Containment Boundary without requiring a formal *Metro 2050* amendment. The flexibility clause is deployed by notifying Metro Vancouver; mapping is then updated through housekeeping amendments to *Metro 2050* and the member jurisdiction's Regional Context Statement, respectively. The Regional Context Statement update occurs when a member jurisdiction's Official Community Plan or Official Development Plan is amended or newly-adopted. The flexibility clause is subject to specific conditions, including limits on the size of eligible sites, additional allowances for Industrial sites in close proximity to rail rapid transit, and lifetime usage limits based on the member jurisdiction's total land area within the regional land use designation being changed.¹

Option 4 proposes to expand the scope of Policy 6.2.7 to include sites located just outside the UCB, provided they meet 1) the conditions currently required for flexibility clause use and 2) the geographic definition of "contiguous" sites. This change would allow member jurisdictions to exercise greater local discretion over these sites and, in some cases, proceed without a *Metro 2050* amendment. Option 4 would not change the amendment process for any sites that are not contiguous with the UCB, nor any sites within the Urban Containment Boundary where the flexibility clause may currently be used.

Option 4 is a Type 3 amendment, requiring an affirmative 50% + 1 weighted vote of the MVRD Board.

¹ The aggregate area of land affected by all re-designations under section 6.2.7 (a) and (b) together cannot exceed two (2) percent of the Member Jurisdiction's total lands within each applicable regional land use designation as of July 29, 2011.

Issues Overview

The original intent of the flexibility clause was to provide procedural options for member jurisdictions for amendments considered too minor to warrant regional dialogue. Limiting flexibility clause usage to small sites within the Urban Containment Boundary was an important step in ensuring that the flexibility clause could not be used to effect land use changes of regional significance. Option 4, like Option 3, would only affect parcels contiguous with the UCB. However, Option 4 would not be limited to only Rural and Agricultural parcels. Instead, Option 4 would be limited to small parcels only (i.e. one hectare or under), consistent with the existing flexibility clause. For these reasons, Option 4 affects a similar total land area (400 ha) compared with Option 3 (500 ha), but about six times as many properties (1,885 compared with 314; see Table 1).

The flexibility clause is designed to accommodate minor, locally focused land use adjustments, and its intent depends on keeping it restricted to changes that do not carry regional implications. The absence of regional review means neighbouring jurisdictions and other affected agencies may not be aware of, nor able to comment on, land use changes before they occur. For this reason, the clause is intentionally limited to small sites within the Urban Containment Boundary, where changes are unlikely to have regional consequences. Under Option 4, however, the flexibility clause could be applied outside the UCB, including on Conservation and Recreation, Rural, and Agricultural lands. This would enable land use changes in areas that are potentially regionally significant.

Table 4. Affected Urban Containment Boundary-Contiguous Lands Under 1 Hectare

	Regional Land Use Designation (ha)				Total ha
	Conservation & Recreation	Rural	Agricultural	Industrial	
Anmore	0.4	9.8			10
Burnaby					
Coquitlam	8.3	3.4	3.8		15
Delta	5.5		11	0.3	17
Electoral Area					
Langley City			0.03		0.03
Langley Township	1.0	4.9	27		33
Maple Ridge	4.7	23	43		71
New Westminster					
North Vancouver City					
North Vancouver District	37	0.5			38
Pitt Meadows			8.2		8.2
Port Coquitlam	0.05		0.9		1.0
Port Moody	1.4	0.3			1.7
Richmond	2.0		66		68
Surrey	2.4	5.0	35	0.2	43
Tsawwassen First Nation					
Vancouver	0.1		7.4		7.5
West Vancouver	7.9				7.9
Total	71	47	203	0.5	322

Note: These numbers are estimates

Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the
Fraser Mayors' Requests

Regional Planning Committee Regular Meeting Date: April 2, 2026

Page 12 of 21

Map 4. Affected properties contiguous to the Urban Containment Boundary**Pre-Consultation Results**

Throughout pre-consultation, a number of member jurisdictions expressed concerns about the potential impacts and broader implications for regional growth management. Given this feedback and analysis, staff do not recommend that this option proceed.

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION RESULTS

All correspondence from member jurisdictions and other affected local governments is retained in Attachment 3 and summarized below. Unless otherwise noted, all affected local government comments were endorsed by their respective Council or Board. The correspondence is sorted by date received and presented in the following order:

- requesting member jurisdictions;
- other member jurisdictions; and
- other affected local governments.

While the feedback is largely critical of the amendment options, all of the responses from member jurisdictions and other affected local governments acknowledge the concerns raised by the requesting municipalities, including the challenges of rapid growth and the desire for flexibility and local autonomy.

Key themes in the correspondence include:

- Request for more time and information to consider and analyze the amendment options;
- Concern about undermining the fundamental tenets of the Regional Growth Strategy;
- Noting that *Metro 2050* already contains procedures for amendments that allow for regional dialogue;

- Recommendation that major changes to amendment processes are better managed through the next update to the Regional Growth Strategy; and
- Suggestion to undertake a more comprehensive analysis of the Urban Containment Boundary and sewerage areas.

Feedback from Requesting Member Jurisdictions

City of Delta

Delta's correspondence, expresses concerns about the proposed options and requested that Metro Vancouver staff continue to explore policy reforms aimed at streamlining the *Metro 2050* amendment process while maintaining appropriate regional oversight. In particular, Delta's feedback highlights three key issues:

- There is no immediate need for Special Study Areas in the City of Delta;
- The options offer limited improvements to processes because they lower voting thresholds while maintaining a process that is viewed as lengthy, complex and duplicative of municipal processes; and
- The options do not address broader procedural improvements that could streamline amendment timelines.

Delta's submission focuses on process improvements, acknowledging that Metro Vancouver, in its MVRD Board report dated November 14, 2025, identified several process improvements that would not require a *Metro 2050* amendment. Delta's letter expresses support for each of these improvements:

- Streamline application intake through a dedicated email address or web portal;
- Ensure that the 45-day comment period on *Metro 2050* amendments begins immediately following third reading;
- Introduce a pre-application process to allow the submission of amendment materials prior to local third reading; and
- Remove RPAC review of minor and straightforward applications.

Delta also identifies additional opportunities to streamline the amendment process, as follows:

- Reduce duplication of local and regional staff planning and technical analysis by implementing standard submission requirements;
- Reduce duplication of the referral process of external review agencies where approval or comments have been previously provided (i.e. where TransLink comments were provided as part of the local review process and/or where ALR exclusion has been approved by the Agricultural Land Commission);
- Explore opportunities for delegation of authority to staff for amendment requests that are of a minor or technical nature; and
- Consider opportunities to reduce pre-consultation and/or consultation requirements for some applications given the limited member jurisdiction participation for the majority of recently approved RGS amendments.

Delta's feedback regarding process improvements is consistent with the comments received from other member jurisdictions and includes several additional suggestions beyond the process changes identified in the November Board report. Metro Vancouver staff will explore these additional opportunities, together with the process improvements already underway to further streamline amendment processes and timelines. This direction is reflected in the Recommendation for this report, which proposes that staff be directed to advance this work. Staff will report back to the MVRD Board on the full set of process and streamlining improvements.

Township of Langley

The Township did not submit formal feedback through Council. However, Metro Vancouver staff worked closely with Township staff to identify the underlying objectives based on the initial Mayor's request and develop a policy resolution through the Special Study Area option.

City of Surrey

Initial feedback from the City of Surrey, provided through its February 13, 2026 letter and accompanying staff report, advised that the City does not support any of the four proposed amendment options and requested further engagement with Metro Vancouver to explore alternative pathways. In this correspondence, Surrey emphasized that the proposed options do not sufficiently address its desire for greater flexibility within the *Metro 2050* framework to support long-term residential and employment growth.

In response to Surrey's February 13, 2026 letter, Metro Vancouver again offered to meet with staff and Council to discuss Surrey's concerns and requests. Metro Vancouver and Surrey staff met on March 13, 2026 to discuss the four amendment options and other opportunities to address the City's needs. Surrey staff expressed the City's overall objective of achieving greater autonomy and decision making authority. A key outcome of this meeting was the identification of Southeast Surrey (Map 5) as the area where the City is most interested in exploring potential future land use change. Southeast Surrey is a Rural-designated area located between the Township of Langley and the international border. At 300 ha (3 km²) in size, Southeast Surrey comprises about 80 percent of the City's Rural lands and represents the majority of lands in Surrey outside the Urban Containment Boundary that are also outside the Agricultural Land Reserve.

Metro Vancouver and Surrey staff acknowledge that the infrastructure and other implications of potential development in Southeast Surrey, both regionally and locally, are not fully understood. Both parties agreed that a City-led planning study that considers servicing needs, costs, and land use planning objectives for the Southeast corner of Surrey is an appropriate next step. To support this work, Metro Vancouver staff, including GVS&DD and GVWD, will provide technical support. Staff also committed to continued engagement on broader *Metro 2050* issues.

Map 5. Location of Southeast Surrey Area



Feedback from Other Member Jurisdictions - Presented in order of date received

City of Coquitlam

At its February 23, 2026 Regular Meeting, Coquitlam City Council passed a resolution requesting that pre-consultation be extended:

That Council send a letter to the Metro Vancouver Board requesting an extension to the engagement period for proposed Metro 2050 amendment options outlined in the January 20, 2026 letter from Metro Vancouver.

Coquitlam's letter and analysis cautions that "any of the four proposed amendment options could alter the very foundation of the Regional Growth Strategy and may have unintended consequences." "Given the nature and complexity of the proposed amendments... additional time is required to complete a thorough analysis and to receive Council input on that analysis."

City of Pitt Meadows

The City of Pitt Meadows' letter voices concerns about:

- regional impacts (e.g. long-term regional servicing costs, added pressure on road and transit networks, and air quality and climate impacts);
- cross-boundary land use conflicts (e.g. development adjacent to agricultural or environmentally sensitive lands); and
- incremental boundary adjustments gradually shifting regional growth patterns, potentially affecting the integrity of the Regional Growth Strategy.

Pitt Meadows notes that, given the information available at this time, the implications of the proposed amendment options remain unclear and may be challenging to support moving forward. It concludes by recommending additional time for review and consideration.

Village of Belcarra

The Village of Belcarra concludes that the proposed amendment options could increase regional servicing and infrastructure costs, add pressure to transportation systems, and contribute to environmental impacts. Belcarra noted potential risks associated with development near agricultural or environmentally sensitive lands. The Village also highlighted that the regional servicing and cost implications of the options have not yet been fully assessed, making it difficult to support any of them at this time. Belcarra emphasized that the existing *Metro 2050* amendment process already provides clear pathways for change while maintaining regional dialogue, and that past amendments demonstrate the region's ability to accommodate change within the current framework.

City of Richmond

Richmond's correspondence included four Council-endorsed comments:

- The proposed options as presented by Metro Vancouver undermine the intent of the Urban Containment Boundary which is to limit sprawl and strive for a compact metropolitan urban form, as well as focus urban growth within the compact urban form through transit oriented, complete communities.
- Planning decisions should be proactive and grounded in strategic long-range thinking, rather than reactive to case-by-case amendment requests. Alternative solutions could involve undertaking a more comprehensive review of the UCB to evaluate broader amendments to the GVS&DD sewerage boundary.

- Any amendments to how the UCB may be adjusted would need to be coordinated with how adjustments to the GVS&DD boundary are administered.
- Metro Vancouver would need to provide clarity around how any servicing costs associated with adjusting the GVS&DD boundary would be determined and allocated.

The correspondence concludes that: “The proposed amendments would have little benefit to the City of Richmond and instead primarily increases flexibility for the three South of the Fraser municipalities, which have submitted the majority of amendment requests since 2023. This approach undermines the intent of the UCB to limit sprawl and strive for a compact metropolitan urban form, as well as focus urban growth within the compact urban form through transit-oriented, complete communities.”

City of White Rock

The City of White Rock indicated that it does not object to the introduction of new Special Study Areas (SSAs) and noted that SSAs can support transparent, evidence-based planning, provided their scale and criteria remain aligned with regional objectives. White Rock acknowledges that lowering voting thresholds for Rural-designated lands or UCB-contiguous sites may help streamline amendment processes; however, the City stressed the importance of safeguards and clear criteria to ensure that any resulting land-use changes align with regional planning goals. Finally, White Rock noted that expanding use of the flexibility clause may reduce administrative burden, but stressed the importance of monitoring cumulative impacts to ensure regional planning objectives are not compromised.

City of Burnaby

The City of Burnaby’s letter indicates that the amendment options are inconsistent with the Goals of both *Metro 2050* and *Burnaby 2050*, and that the rushed process puts the region at risk of unintended consequences. Burnaby goes on to outline nine major concerns and considerations regarding the proposed amendment options:

1. Inconsistent with Burnaby 2050 Values and Goals
2. Financial Impact on Regional Utilities, Especially DCCs
3. Financial and Operational Impact on TransLink
4. Rushed Consultation Process Risks Unintended Consequences
5. Intensification is Preferable to Sprawl
6. Negative Impacts of Growth Structuring Objectives and Targets
7. Loss of Regional Coordination and Consensus on Significant Changes
8. Negative Impacts on Regional Food Security.

Across several of these dimensions, Burnaby notes that Options 1 and 2 would be particularly detrimental. The letter concludes with the statement that “the City of Burnaby urges the MVRD Board to slow down and provide members with the time and information needed to properly weigh the benefits and consequences of these changes to the regional plan.”

City of Port Moody

The City of Port Moody notes that lowering voting thresholds, and thereby facilitating future to *Metro 2050*, could be perceived as running contrary to or diluting the original agreed upon regional goals and may risk further erosion of *Metro 2050* in the future. Port Moody’s submission identifies pros and cons for each of the four Options:

- Option 1 offers a practical solution using an existing *Metro 2050* policy mechanism. However, new SSAs could be precedent-setting and could result in perceived inequity if only the three requesting municipalities are permitted to identify SSAs.

- Option 2 addresses the South of the Fraser Mayors' request to reclassify UCB expansions as Type 3 amendments while maintaining the current amendment process, allowing for continued regional dialogue. However, this option would undermine the integrity of the Urban Containment Boundary, could lead to isolated pockets of development, and would impact a large amount of land.
- Option 3 addresses the South of the Fraser Mayors' request to allow contiguous UCB extension, but undermines the integrity of the UCB by lowering the voting threshold for some expansions.
- Option 4 addresses the South of the Fraser Mayors' request for a streamlined "minor re-alignment" allowance, yet is contrary to the original intent of the flexibility provision (i.e. limited application within the UCB) and would allow for changes to the UCB without notification to other member jurisdictions.

City of Langley

The City of Langley's staff letter recommends that the decisions on the proposed amendments be postponed and instead advanced forward and considered as part of the process to develop the next Regional Growth Strategy. The following reasons are provided:

- The proposed amendments – notably, the reduction of voting thresholds – represent major changes to the RGS and its foundational growth management mechanisms; and
- The current RGS policy and amendment framework was established through a comprehensive consultation and technical review process.

Feedback from Other Affected Local Governments

Squamish Lillooet Regional District

The Squamish-Lillooet Regional District (SLRD) outlines two key concerns in its letter to the MVRD Board:

- Option 1: The addition of new Special Study Areas may be regionally significant. Considering the addition of new Special Study Areas by way of a Type 3 (minor amendment) may result in a weakened RGS framework/policies. It is noted that the addition of new Special Study Areas enables future land use changes within these areas to be considered under a lower voting threshold.
- Option 4: the expansion of the flexibility clause to allow for extensions to the UCB may be regionally significant. Considering UCB changes by way of a Type 3 (minor amendment) may result in a weakened Regional Growth Strategy framework / policies. It is noted that the expansion of the flexibility clause to allow regional land use designation changes on sites contiguous to the UCB to be changed without an RGS amendment may provide a two step amendment process reducing the effectiveness of the UCB and RGS.

TransLink

TransLink's correspondence concludes that "many changes to the UCB amendment process that lower approval thresholds or weaken regional involvement would have negative and enduring impacts on the regional transportation system. Each of the four options you have asked us to comment on would make it easier to expand the UCB into locations that are potentially more difficult and more costly to serve with transit, with long term implications for service efficiency and affordability."

From a financial perspective, TransLink notes that, "As the Board for Metro Vancouver's regional transportation authority, we have a fiduciary responsibility to manage region-wide revenues prudently and to avoid policy choices that knowingly increase long-term costs to regional taxpayers and system users. From this perspective, weakening the regional framework for UCB decisions raises significant concern."

With respect to the particular amendment options, “TransLink does not support Options 2 or 4, as they would materially weaken the regional safeguards that help ensure transportation investments remain cost-effective, fiscally responsible, and aligned with shared regional objectives.” The letter suggests that “Options 1 or 3 would represent comparatively lesser risk only if applied with constrained conditions ... the key conditions including clear limits on geographic scope, contiguity with the existing UCB, and safeguards to prevent incremental or precedent setting expansion over time. Even under these conditions, TransLink remains concerned about the cumulative fiscal and service impacts associated with gradually eroding the current regional approach as considered in all four options.” Metro Vancouver staff note that the proposed Township of Langley SSA contemplated as part of Option 1 appears to meet TransLink’s conditions.

Feedback from Member Jurisdiction Staff Advisory Committees

At its February 13, 2026 and March 13, 2026 meetings, members of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) expressed that:

- Discussions about fundamental changes to *Metro 2050* should occur during the development of a new Regional Growth Strategy. Fundamental *Metro 2050* elements and processes should not be changed through a Type 3 amendment.
- The pre-consultation process has been too short, with too little information available to make informed decisions.
- Expanding the UCB will result in high costs for regional servicing (both capital and operating), particularly in the context of existing challenges surrounding the cost of infrastructure and related impacts of Development Cost Charges (DCCs).
- There is no demonstrated need for urban expansion outside the UCB.
- The amendment options would cause significant environmental impacts, including:
 - Loss of sensitive ecosystems and ecosystem connectivity,
 - Decrease in tree canopy cover,
 - Increase in impervious surfaces (more stormwater run-off, higher risk of overland flooding, poorer water quality),
 - Increase in greenhouse gas emissions, and
 - Decrease in carbon storage and sequestration.
- Any expansion of the UCB would make providing cost-efficient transit difficult and would draw transit resources away from the rest of the region.

Regional Administrators Advisory Committee (RAAC)

At both its January 22 and March 19, 2026 meetings, RAAC members expressed concerns about:

- The short timeline of the pre-consultation process;
- The significant nature of the South of Fraser Mayors requests that may be more appropriate for discussion during the development of an updated Regional Growth Strategy; and
- That the proposed changes risked undermining the main tenets of collaborative regional planning in *Metro 2050*.

Regional Engineering Advisory Committee (REAC)

At its February 6th, 2026 meeting, REAC expressed concerns about:

- Significant cost implications for regional infrastructure if the Urban Containment Boundary is expanded need more information and consideration; and
- Impacts to the sewerage area extension process.

IMPLICATIONS FOR METRO VANCOUVER UTILITY SERVICES

Liquid Waste Services (GVS&DD)

Metro 2050 designates properties eligible for sewer services using “Urban” Regional Land Use Designations (i.e. General Urban, Employment and/or Industrial). Moving beyond eligibility to an actual connection to the regional sewer system requires the properties to be approved for inclusion within a sewerage area by the GVS&DD Board.

Under the *GVS&DD Act*, member jurisdictions must submit plans for new sewers, drains, alterations, connections, or extensions to the GVS&DD for review and approval. As outlined in the *Metro 2050 Implementation Guideline – Extension of Regional Sewerage Services*, applications undergo a technical and financial review by Metro Vancouver Liquid Waste Services staff, including assessment of sewerage area inclusion, system capacity, service levels, financial implications, and compliance with applicable acts and bylaws.

Changes to sewer servicing eligibility under *Metro 2050* will not change the GVS&DD review process and still require applications to undergo site-specific technical and financial review.

Water Services (GVWD)

The same challenges and need for coordination and information sharing also apply to regional water services planning, which is done by Water Services staff under the legal entity of the Greater Vancouver Water District (GVWD). Metro Vancouver Regional Planning staff routinely share information provided by member jurisdictions regarding anticipated growth and new land use plans to assist with utility planning. Member jurisdictions are encouraged to have early and ongoing engagement with Water Services when updating or creating a new pressure zone, Official Community Plan, or neighbourhood plan, or when a development proposal is greater than 1,000 equivalent population. Metro Vancouver also encourages member jurisdictions to share any plans to upgrade or build new reservoirs and/or pump stations.

In addition, members are strongly encouraged to provide a digital copy of their Water Master Servicing Plan to Metro Vancouver Regional Planning and Water Services staff every time it is updated (normally every five years). This would assist Water Services staff with keeping up-to-date on growth-driven projects within member jurisdictions and understanding if they need to be taken into consideration in the regional water system planning.

Changes to servicing eligibility under *Metro 2050* will not change the GVWD direct connection review process and still require applications to undergo site-specific technical and financial review for any new development.

NEXT STEPS

If a Type 3 amendment is initiated and the associated bylaw receives an affirmative majority weighted vote of the MVRD Board at 1st, 2nd, and 3rd readings, it will then be referred to all affected local governments (including all member jurisdictions, TransLink and adjacent regional districts), and local First Nations. It will also be posted on the Metro Vancouver website for a minimum of 45 days to provide an opportunity for public comment. All comments received will be summarized and included in a report advancing the bylaw to the MVRD Board for consideration of final adoption.

ALTERNATIVES

1. THAT the MVRD Board:
 - a) initiate the *Metro 2050* amendment process for Special Study Areas option as described in the report dated March 25, 2026, titled "*Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests*";
 - b) give first, second, and third reading to *Metro Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1456, 2026*;
 - c) notify affected local governments and post the proposed amendment on the Metro Vancouver website to provide an opportunity for comment as per Section 6.4.2 of *Metro 2050*;
 - d) direct staff to notify local First Nations via referral offices to provide an opportunity for comment on the proposed amendment;
 - e) direct staff to initiate further process improvements to streamline amendment processes and timelines as described in the report dated March 25, 2026, titled "*Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests*" ~~"Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options in Response to South of the Fraser Mayors' Request — Preliminary Consultation Results"~~; and
 - f) direct staff to continue to engage with the City of Surrey regarding:
 - i) concerns about *Metro 2050*; and
 - ii) technical support regarding the regional servicing implications of potential development in the Southeast portion of Surrey.
2. THAT the MVRD Board receive for information the report dated March 25, 2026, titled "*Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests*" and not initiate a *Metro 2050* amendment process.
3. THAT the MVRD Board direct staff to conduct further exploration of Options 2, 3, and/or 4, as outlined in the report dated March 25, 2026, titled "*Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests*" and report back with related amendment bylaws for consideration.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications associated with the work undertaken to prepare this report. All analysis to date has been completed within existing staff resources. However, changes to the Regional Growth Strategy amendment framework, particularly those affecting the Urban Containment Boundary, could have future regional infrastructure implications, including potential impacts on sewerage and water servicing, transportation, schools, day cares and other amenities. Any site-specific amendments or proposed adjustments to sewerage areas would require further technical and financial analysis, and Metro Vancouver staff would report back with detailed assessments at that time.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

If the Recommendation is approved, the proposed amendment will enter a formal referral and comment process with all affected member jurisdictions. This stage would also initiate formal engagement with local First Nations through referral offices, providing an opportunity for feedback and comment consistent with *Metro 2050* procedures.

CONCLUSION

This report summarizes the pre-consultation process initiated in response to the joint request from the three South of the Fraser municipalities. Over the past several months, Metro Vancouver staff met with member jurisdictions, technical advisory committees, and affected local governments to assess four potential *Metro 2050* amendment options to gather feedback. The process highlighted broad concerns about impacts to growth management, infrastructure servicing, and altering the amendment framework, while also identifying jurisdiction-specific priorities, including the Township of Langley's request for a Special Study Area, Delta's focus on streamlining amendment procedures, and Surrey's interest in exploring long-term land use potential in Southeast Surrey.

This report's recommended approach responds to this feedback by advancing a targeted Special Study Area for the Fraser Highway Employment Lands, initiating further process improvements to streamline Regional Growth Strategy amendments, and supporting Surrey's city-led servicing and land use analysis for the Southeast Surrey area. If the Recommendation is approved, staff will report back to the MVRD Board on progress as this work advances.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Letter from South of the Fraser Mayors, titled "Urban Containment Boundary – Urgent Need for Policy Reform", dated June 19, 2025.
2. Outgoing correspondence to member jurisdictions and affected local governments.
3. Incoming correspondence from member jurisdictions and affected local governments.
4. Metro Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1456, 2026
5. Presentation re: Reporting Back on Metro 2050 Amendment Options and Consultation Results in Response to Three South of the Fraser Mayors' Requests.

REFERENCES

1. McNell, H. (2025). *Proposed Metro 2050 Amendments: Next Steps in Response to City of Surrey, Township of Langley, and City of Delta Mayors*. [Staff report to MVRD Board Meeting, July 25, 2025]. <https://metrovancover.org/boards/GVRD/RD-2025-07-25-AGE.pdf#page=385>
2. McNell, H. (2025). *Proposed Metro 2050 Amendments in Response to South of the Fraser Mayors' Request*. [Staff report to MVRD Board Meeting, November 28, 2025]. <https://metrovancover.org/boards/GVRD/RD-2025-11-28-AGE.pdf#page=407>

80848297