

Re: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION  
ORGANIZATION AND FINANCING

ITEM	19
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	5
COUNCIL MEETING	Jan. 24/77

Council are in receipt of a letter dated January 3, 1977 from Mayor G.J. Blair, Chairman of the G.V.R.D. Transportation Committee, together with several attachments and copies of the following documents:

1. A Proposal: Regional Transportation Organization, December, 1976.
2. A Proposal: Financing Regional Transportation, January, 1977.
3. Transportation Brochure Draft, December 1976.
4. Terms of Reference for a Preliminary Design of LRT for Greater Vancouver, August 1975.
5. Dollar Burden of Growth, December 1976.

At a special meeting held on Wednesday, January 19, 1977, held in the Municipal Hall, Council heard submissions on the subject of Regional Transportation from representatives of the G.V.R.D. including Mr. Gunn speaking on behalf of the G.V.R.D. Transportation Committee, Mr. W. T. Lane, Director of Regional Development, Mr. G. Farry, Director of Planning and Mr. D. Spaeth, Transportation Specialist.

Council's attention was drawn particularly to the following recommendations that the G.V.R.D. Transportation Committee is making to the G.V.R.D. Board and which are set out on page 3 of the Regional Transportation Organization document:

- 1) THE BOARD URGES THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT TO ESTABLISH A PROVINCIAL-G.V.R.D. TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TO BRING TOGETHER THE TRANSPORTATION RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PROVINCIAL, REGIONAL AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS WITHIN THE GREATER VANCOUVER REGION, AS OUTLINED IN THE ATTACHED LEGISLATION.
- 2) THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION SHOULD ADOPT ANNUALLY AN OFFICIAL FIVE YEAR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FOR REGIONAL ROADS AND PUBLIC TRANSIT, CONSISTING OF THESE ELEMENTS:
  - a) An identification of transportation needs in the Region,
  - b) Estimates of the funds to finance the Program annually from all sources for the next five years,
  - c) Plans, schedules, financing and responsibility for construction, operation and maintenance of transportation facilities included in the Program, and
  - d) A statement of expenditures on transportation facilities funded by the Program and completed last year or in progress.
- 3) THE PROGRAM SHOULD DETERMINE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES. ALL PROVINCIAL AND REGIONAL EXPENDITURES ON TRANSPORTATION SHOULD BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROGRAM, ONCE IT HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL.

If the facility does not cross the Fraser and LRT vehicles are paid for by the G.V.R.D., the estimated cost in 1975 dollars would be \$245,000,000. The 1980 mill rate shown above would be reduced to 2.61 mills and the 1984 rate, 12.69 mills. Representative costs to Burnaby would be \$1,660,000 in the year 1980 and \$9,440,000 in the year 1984. This would result in a tax levy on the average residential property cited above of \$54.71 and \$266.04 respectively.

If Federal funding and a return is received from G.V.R.D. ownership of land in the area of stations, the 1984 tax levy may be as low as 3 mills.

The whole matter of LRT financing has to be considered as being very preliminary, and cannot be defined further until the study advances so that more definitive costs can be estimated.

4. There should be a clear understanding of the actual dollar impact on local residents and of the related question of the accrual of increased values arising from the development potential that is created in the vicinity of transportation nodes (e.g. LRT stations).

With reference to the latter, we have clarified that the intent is that lands acquired by the agency for station locations could also be used for commercial purposes or for high density housing and that the monies accruing from the sale or lease of these lands would be used to offset the costs of LRT. The agency would pay taxes on these lands and the increased taxes resulting from higher values would accrue to the municipality.

5. With reference to the cost to the taxpayer, further information is required on the availability of Federal financing; on the reasons for the Region assuming the capital costs of LRT, and on the possible effect on the mill rate if the accrual of development funds or other sources does not transpire.
6. There will need to be a clearer understanding of what is meant by "Regional" and "Local" roads in order to ensure that the Municipality is not saddled with a greater road burden by defining heavy travelled routes as local roads. This is particularly significant in Burnaby with its high percentage of east-west commuter traffic.

We have received some clarification that initially before a final commitment is made there will be agreement with the municipality on the designation of Regional roads. In the future as traffic growth causes a road to change its function, this will be taken care of in the process of the annual review of the Five Year plan, and the normal procedures for obtaining the views of the Municipality.

7. Appendix B in the document, Financing Regional Transportation, initially caused the staff some concern as it implies that under a Managed plan we will only be faced with \$5 million in road improvement costs by 1986 whereas a Trend plan will result in costs in the order of \$55 million. This is an extremely misleading and simplified exercise with which we do not agree, our own view being that Burnaby will require all the improvements listed by 1986. However, we have clarified with the G.V.R.D. staff that the figures shown in Appendix B should not be taken literally as they were used only to obtain some idea of the magnitude of Regional cost. The appendix is not intended to show that Burnaby will not get all the improvements shown, or even more if in fact they are needed facilities. The exercise was needed so as to set a "line" of estimated costs to be provided for in any financing proposal. The final "line" chosen was chosen on the average as being part way between Trend and Managed growth costs.

ITEM	19
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	5
COUNCIL MEETING	Jan. 24/77

Enough has probably been said to indicate that there is a considerable amount of discussion to take place but also, hopefully enough to show that with good will on the part of all involved, detailed matters can be clarified and resolved. There may also be other points to be reviewed, but we see the above points as the major ones.

Even though the staff have only had a limited time to review the matter since the presentation to Council on January 19, it is totally recognized that coordination of Regional Transportation is essential if we are to improve public transit facilities for our community, and the staff recommend that Council endorse in principle as a basis for continuing discussion the three recommendations referred to earlier in this report and shown on page 3 of the document "A Proposal: Regional Transportation Organization".

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the Municipal Council endorse in principle the three recommendations referred to earlier in this report and specifically shown on page 3 of the document "A Proposal: Regional Transportation Organization - December 1976", subject to continuing discussion on the points raised in this report item; and
2. THAT a copy of this report item be forwarded to the Premier and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; and
3. THAT a copy of this report item be forwarded to the three Burnaby M.L.A.s and members of Council individually pursue the matter with the three M.L.A.s; and
4. THAT a copy of this report item be forwarded to the G.V.R.D.