

**ANALYSIS**

Responding to a Board request, staff examined five different transportation governance structures and four key observations were identified in the subsequent tables:

1. Those jurisdictions with one level of authority have the greatest ability to align plans with implementation practices.
2. The more levels of governance involved the more complexities and grey areas there are around responsibilities and mandate.
3. There is a clear need for dedicated funding sources for all modes of transportation otherwise some modes are unlikely to capitalize on their potential. This is particularly likely to disproportionately negatively impact the active modes that are traditionally more reliant on competitive grants from higher levels of governments.
4. Federal or provincial highway networks fall outside of the scope of all these governance structures and as such there is a loss of decision making control along key corridors.

	<b>VRTC</b>	<b>TransLink</b>	<b>Central Okanagan</b>	<b>Halifax</b>	<b>Auckland</b>
<b>Approximate Population Covered</b>	400,000	2,600,000	190,000	450,000	1,700,000
<b>Governing Body</b>	BC Transit Board and Victoria Regional Transit Commission (VRTC)	TransLink Board (Operational) and Mayors' Council (Strategic)	Sustainable Transportation Partnership of the Central Okanagan (STPCO)	Regional Municipality of Halifax - Standing Committee. Active Transportation and transit advisory committees report back to it.	Auckland City Council under banner of Auckland Transport
<b>Municipal make up</b>	13 municipalities and one EA	21 municipalities, one EA and one First Nation	Regional District, four municipalities and Westbank First Nations	Single municipality. (amalgamated)	Single municipality
<b>Authority</b>	Provincially Legislated	Provincially Legislated	Formal Partnership Agreement	Local Administrative Order	Federally Legislated
<b>Modes of Transportation</b>	Transit only – bus only at present	All modes but focus predominately on transit. TDM	All modes but transit and active transportation focused. TDM.	All modes and TDM	All modes and TDM

## Appendix C: Transportation Governance Structure Scan

There are advantages and limitations for each of the governance models highlighted. However, none of the governance models would complement the particular makeup of the CRD. The CRD does not operate as a singular municipal government and as such does not have the capacity or authority to oversee implementation of regional policy in relation to land use and transportation integration for instance. Unlike the Central Okanagan, the CRD does not have a single partner such as Kelowna who accounts for an exponentially higher and growing and disproportionate population and employment base. Having one municipal partner in the CRD taking on a lead role would not be appropriate as the CRD is more decentralized and as such a more nodal approach to transportation is required. The CRD does not have access to dedicated transportation funding as is the case in Metro Vancouver and the Victoria Regional Transit Commission (VRTC) mandate limits its role to transit.

Governance Entity	Relationship of Land Use & Transportation	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>VRTC (status quo)</b>	Limited ability to directly impact land use decisions or incentivize mixed use and higher density developments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relatively small decision making body.</li> <li>• Clear authority as laid out in legislation.</li> <li>• Ability to pivot and align to changes in provincial policy.</li> <li>• Funding secured through agreement with the Province and local fuel tax.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership is not fully representative of all paying participants.</li> <li>• Decision making not done in conjunction with land use and broader priorities.</li> <li>• Focused purely on transit.</li> <li>• Staff are not independent as work for BC Transit as opposed to VRTC or municipal partners – focus on corporate as opposed to local priorities.</li> <li>• Fuel tax levy is charged in the region which results in lower percentage of provincial funding than is received in other BC Transit jurisdictions.</li> </ul>
<b>TransLink</b>	Some ability to incentivize mixed use and higher density development through agreements when introducing new high order transit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centralized skills base.</li> <li>• Board comprised of appointed professionals with specific expertise removing a political layer.</li> <li>• Access to 95% of areas gas tax funding providing a predictable and stable funding source.</li> <li>• Stable funding base from the Province.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confusion over role of Mayors' Council and Board.</li> <li>• Focus very heavily skewed to transit even though other areas in mandate.</li> <li>• Priorities do not always align with the local municipalities and regional district.</li> <li>• Decisions made operationally by the appointed Board are worn by politicians.</li> <li>• Juggling of major infrastructure projects and needs for smaller communities to access basic transit.</li> <li>• Major projects are decades in the making, often with a very large turn over in Mayors during the project lifecycle. Changes in direction can shift with political cycles, resulting in years of lost work and resources or project inertia.</li> <li>• Still needs high levels of coordination with Metro Vancouver on matters related to long-term land use and transportation needs.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C: Transportation Governance Structure Scan**

Governance Entity	Relationship of Land Use & Transportation	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Central Okanagan</b>	Allows for greater flexibility and cooperation over integration of modes and land use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides for strong levels of voluntary support involving compromise and prioritizing regional travel needs.</li> <li>• Recognizes that there is one major employment and service centre that all residents need to access.</li> <li>• Staff-led technical role allowing for integration in to local plans.</li> <li>• All partners have representation at the table.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant disparity in population and employment base of membership – Kelowna by far the most populous partner and key service and employment centre.</li> <li>• Voluntary in nature so no regulated structure to resolve impasses.</li> </ul>
<b>Halifax Regional Municipality</b>	Allows for greater control over integration of modes and land use as same body making both decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated planning aligning with municipal priorities.</li> <li>• Strong interdepartmental working relationships - all in house.</li> <li>• Consideration given to how best to integrate all modes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too urban focused.</li> <li>• Covers a massive geographic area including large portions of rural lands.</li> <li>• While one standing committee there are numerous operating entities and advisory committees which adds complexities.</li> </ul>
<b>Auckland</b>	Allows for greater control over integration of modes and land use as same body making both decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated planning aligning with municipal priorities.</li> <li>• Appointed members have varying backgrounds and specializations, allowing for transit planning to include multiple expert perspectives.</li> <li>• Direct relationship with federal government.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rapidly growing population and employment base.</li> <li>• Increasingly technical in nature.</li> <li>• Challenges meeting growth demands.</li> <li>• Numerous advisory committees reporting back adding complexities and blurring responsibilities.</li> <li>• Local community level decision making is reduced making it more challenging to contest controversial local projects.</li> </ul>