

## Transportation Governance Jurisdictional Scan

### Executive Summary

The Capital Regional District (CRD) shares many of the same transportation goals as other metropolitan regions: Ease congestion during peak travel times, reduce emissions, and support higher rates of walking, cycling and transit use. Similarly, the CRD is not the only jurisdiction trying to integrate different transportation modes into a single planning framework, ensure the right authorities are in place and find dedicated funding to meet service levels.

Staff researched three comparable regional examples of different transportation governance models (see *Figure 1, on page 19, illustrating the comparison*). This scan shows that each jurisdiction has combined the three dimensions of transportation governance in different ways.

- 1. TransLink (Metro Vancouver):** TransLink is a regional transportation authority for a region of 2.75 million residents and 21 local governments. TransLink plans Metro Vancouver's Major Road Network and operates the public transit system. The governance structure enables a single planning framework for the major road network and relies on funding to incentivize coordinated decision-making. TransLink has made significant investments to build out and operate a robust public transit system that moves people efficiently.

Decision-making about transportation matters remains complex as TransLink, local governments, the Metro Vancouver Regional District and Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) continue to have authorities over discrete functions. Further, TransLink relies on provincial and federal investments for its major infrastructure projects and does not have stable, sufficient funding to continue its build out of the planned network.

- 2. Auckland Transport (Auckland, New Zealand):** Auckland Transport (AT) is a transportation authority for a region of 1.67 million residents. AT plans, delivers, operates and maintains a multi-modal transportation system of arterial and local roads, footpaths, cycleways, public transit, ferry wharves and two airfields. The governance structure is an amalgamation of eight local and regional councils into one organization.

Amalgamation enabled rapid investment and build-out of public transit by consolidating planning and service delivery authorities in one organization. Local and federal government have authority over funding decisions. AT relies on Auckland Council, the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), and central government for the funding it needs to deliver service level expectations. This creates a governance model that enables the local government to set multi-modal goals but restricts AT's ability to implement those aspirations.

- 3. Halifax Regional Municipality (Halifax, Nova Scotia):** Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) is the local government for 480,000 residents. HRM plans and delivers integrated mobility services through departments responsible for public transit, roads, active transportation, and land use. The governance structure is an amalgamation of four local governments and the elimination of the regional government.

HRM has integrated its transportation and land use functions. The same organization makes planning and operational decisions, guided by an Integrated Mobility Plan. Dedicated funding is provided through a variety of streams, including a transit tax for urban areas within a transit service boundary. Additionally, Halifax Harbour Bridges uses tolls for the operation and maintenance of their two large bridges. Through this governance model, HRM has a comparatively high degree of authority over decisions related to multi-modal mobility, land use and funding. As this governance model has proven successful, a new provincial Crown Corporation has been established to develop a Regional Transportation Plan. The core partners include local, provincial, and federal government, along with harbour bridges, port authority and airport.

### **Key Findings**

- Another level of government created the transportation authorities to improve mobility. The CRD, local governments and agency partners need to provide a strong business case for change, particularly in relation to transit, to be in a position to ask the province for new powers.
- It takes time to become fully operational. Each transportation authority required over a decade for planning and consolidation to take full effect. This confirms a core assumption from a 2014 CRD Transportation Service Feasibility Study: implementation will happen incrementally, likely following a phased approach.
- Success is built from a solid base. Transportation authorities that make decisions over things like mode integration, land use, and funding have greater control over mobility outcomes.

## Introduction

CRD Regional and Strategic Planning staff undertook a jurisdictional scan to examine examples of different transportation governance structures for Board consideration. This report presents three transportation authorities with different combinations of the three dimensions of transportation governance: TransLink, Auckland Transport (AT), and Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM). Each have undergone transformative change and represent archetypes of different governance models. Outlined for each authority are an introduction, history, timeline, key decision makers, key plans, desired outcomes, authority and jurisdiction over various modes, and funding structure. The scan concludes with a discussion of key findings as they pertain to the dimensions of transportation governance.

## Dimensions of Transportation Governance

The 2014 Transportation Service Feasibility Study recommendations were based on three dimensions of transportation governance:

- 1. Level of multi-modal integration:** Full multi-modal integration is when the transportation planning framework – the policy, budget, and service level decisions – extends beyond a single mode and considers a range of transportation, climate action and land use impacts in decision making.
- 2. Decision-making authority:** Unfettered decision-making is when the right authorities are in place to make decisions that will lead to a desired outcome. Strategic planning decisions, often made by a policy board or elected council, relate to transportation policy, budget, and service levels. Operational decisions, often made by technical experts, relate to service delivery, maintenance, and investment in new assets.
- 3. Funding:** Building out the regional multi-modal network and changing travel behaviour costs money. Dedicated, stable funding sources are needed to make capital and program investments to increase service levels, and to operate and maintain existing service levels.

## Applicability to the CRD Context

### Capital Regional District (CRD)

The capital region is home to about 440,000 residents (2022) in 13 municipalities and three electoral areas, overseen by the CRD with limited authority and responsibilities. Transportation governance is split by mode. Decision making power is such that local governments have jurisdiction over regional and local roads and land use, BC Transit has jurisdiction over the regional transit network, the Province has jurisdiction over highways, and the CRD has jurisdiction over regional and multi-use trails.

### TransLink

TransLink is the most logical comparator as the CRD and Metro Vancouver are working under the same legislative environment within British Columbia (BC). As well, both contain several local governments. The capital region is the second largest region with significant economic activity in the province, next to Metro Vancouver. However, the population, jobs, density, and economy are significantly larger in Metro Vancouver and thus justify a more robust public transit system.

## Auckland Transport (AT)

AT was chosen to show a model where a senior government exerts a high degree of decision-making authority. AT is federally legislated and comprises a single municipality (amalgamated). The Auckland region underwent significant transportation governance changes in 2010. New Zealand is a commonwealth country and is not an American or European example, which are more challenging comparisons due to significant legislative and built form differences. Like the capital region, Auckland is on an island, was previously composed of several municipalities, and is working to solve affordability issues and accommodate growth.

## Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM)

Halifax and Victoria are both capital cities that are the home ports of the Royal Canadian Navy's Atlantic and Pacific fleets, and they both include suburban and rural communities in addition to their urban cores. The Halifax Region has a very similar population size to the capital region, including a similar proportion of the population aged 65+ (HRM 20%; CRD 23.4%). However, HRM is about twice the size in land area.

The Halifax region has undergone significant change in transportation governance over the past 27-years since amalgamating. Faced with regional transportation challenges, growing community interest in creative, cost-effective ways to reduce vehicle-dependency and a revised Regional Plan, Halifax Regional Council identified the need to re-examine transportation policies and priorities. HRM has since brought together transportation and land use planning and focused on multi-modal integration. HRM also has similar mode-shift goals as the CRD.

## Vancouver–TransLink

### Introduction

TransLink is a regional transportation authority created by the *South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority (SCBCTA) Act*. TransLink plans and manages Metro Vancouver's transportation system with their partners, stakeholders, and operating companies. Metro Vancouver is a federation of 21 local governments, one electoral area, and one Treaty First Nation and home to about 2.75 million residents.

Their governance structure includes a Board of Directors and Mayors' Council on Regional Transportation. The Board has the responsibility and mandate to make decisions in the interest of TransLink within the limits established by the Act.

TransLink has four areas of strategies, plans, and guidelines: Area Transport Planning, Transit and Transportation Planning, Managing the Transit Network, and transit-oriented communities. TransLink's operating budget is approximately \$2 billion (2023).

### History

Transportation was the top issue in the Lower Mainland in the 1990s, as skyrocketing rates of car ownership and gridlock made for difficult commutes, inefficient goods movement, and significant emissions. The proposed solution was a regional response. Thus, the Province created TransLink in 1999 and transferred ownership of some roads that were previously provincial

highways to local governments, while designating TransLink as responsible for providing operation and maintenance funding for the major road network.

TransLink has three key features:

- 1) It is responsible for creating a transportation network to move people and goods efficiently and building capacity to handle population growth and meet the municipalities' economic plans.
- 2) It is responsible for both the major road network and the public transit system – typically the responsibility of separate city departments.
- 3) It has the means to raise its own funds through taxation (a key change from BC Transit).

TransLink is essentially the same entity that was created by the historic agreement of 1999, but its scale is now much larger. Originally, TransLink's operating budget was about \$358 million, and it managed about \$100 million in small capital projects. By 2008, TransLink's operating budget was \$992 million, with about \$4 billion in major capital projects. In 2023, the operating budget is about \$2 billion and capital projects approved and underway total \$4.8 billion.

### Timeline

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 1993 | Idea is born; Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) and the Province release Transport 2021 Plan, proposing integration of land use and transportation planning and major service improvements.         |
| 1996 | BC government transfers responsibility for secondary highways to local governments.  |
| 1997 | Negotiators sign and submit a final agreement to create the Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority (GVTA/TransLink).   |
| 1998 | GVTA Act approved by Provincial legislature.   |
| 1999 | TransLink is launched.   |
| 2001 | Province announces additional gas tax funding if TransLink can match revenues from local sources.  |
| 2002 | Vancouver and Whistler win 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.   |
| 2003 | Board and GVRD approve \$4 billion, 10-year Regional Transportation Plan.  |
| 2004 | Province puts \$370 million toward Canada line.  |
| 2005 | New deal returns \$307 million in gas tax funding to TransLink.  |
| 2007 | Independent review of TransLink's governance completed. Transport 2040 process initiated; new Act transforms GVTA into <i>South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority Act</i> , expanding mandate. |
| 2022 | Transport 2050: Metro Vancouver's 30-year Regional Transportation Plan approved.   |
| 2023 | Metro 2050: Regional Growth Strategy (RGS).  |

## Key Decision Makers

The key decision makers for transportation in the region are TransLink, local governments, Metro Vancouver, and the BC MoTI. Each have authorities over different transportation functions.

At TransLink, the Mayors' Council on Regional Transportation provides political direction, and the Board of Directors provides operational direction.

## Key Plans

TransLink's Regional Transportation Plan, Transport 2050, guides work long-term. TransLink is also mandated to prepare 10-year Priorities (Investment Plans) at least once every three years. Once approved by the Mayors' Council, it becomes the strategic plan. Metro Vancouver's RGS, Metro 2050, provides the land use framework for regional transportation planning. Local governments' Official Community Plans (OCP) and Transportation Plans also guide local transportation decisions that can have a regional impact.

## Desired Outcomes

Transport 2050 aims to create a future that provides everyone with access to transportation choices that are convenient, reliable, affordable, safe, comfortable, and carbon free. The aim is to have walking, cycling, and transit be competitive choices that account for at least half of all passenger trips by 2050.

## Authority and Jurisdiction

TransLink gets the authority to make decisions through provincial legislation in the *SCBCTA Act*. The approach to transportation governance and decision making is complex, collaborative, and requires close coordination between TransLink and local governments, Metro Vancouver, and the BC MoTI.

## *Regional Trails and Multi-use Trails*

Local governments own multi-use paths; TransLink builds and maintains them. TransLink also finances multi-use paths and thereby has influence over the build out. There is no legislation regarding TransLink's oversight of multi-use paths, rather it comes from Investment Plans that include visions for cycling and walking infrastructure and language specific to multimodal aspects. TransLink creates program and implementation plans based on consultation with local governments, but ultimately TransLink has the authority to decide how the money is spent. TransLink helps local governments see the regional picture and are deliberate about where infrastructure is to be built out and what type of infrastructure is needed to generate mode shift.

Metro Vancouver completes a Regional Greenways Plan, which is the region's shared vision for a network of recreational multi-use paths for cycling and walking that connects residents to large parks, protected natural areas, and communities to support regional livability.

## *Regional and Local Roads*

TransLink and local governments co-manage the Major Road Network (MRN). Local governments are the owners, while TransLink is responsible for providing operation and

maintenance funding. TransLink has oversight and authority through legislation, which states that local governments cannot make changes to the major road network without consulting TransLink. As per the *SCBCTA Act* Part 2 on Major Road Network 21-1 and 21-1.1, any action that would reduce the capacity of any part of the MRN to move people requires TransLink's approval. Local roads are not part of the MRN and are the sole responsibility of local governments.

### *Regional Transit Network*

If the Regional Transit network is on the MRN, then TransLink has jurisdiction. If the route is on provincial highways or MoTI right-of-way (ROW), then the Province has jurisdiction. The Province also contributes capital and operating funds. Local governments maintain local roads and bus shelters, contribute to transit route planning initiatives, and contribute property taxes to transit operations. Metro Vancouver provides a stronger alignment of planned locations for growth with transit investments through a new tool called "Major Transit Growth Corridors".

### *Land Use – Corridors and Nodes*

Local governments are responsible for land use planning. Metro Vancouver works closely with member jurisdictions, TransLink, other orders of government and stakeholders to coordinate complex land use and transportation decisions. The RGS supports the integration of transportation and land use planning. Metro Vancouver considers TransLink an "affected local government" and their support for the RGS is required. The TransLink Board reviews, comments, and signs off on any amendments advanced for engagement. TransLink and Metro Vancouver could be consulted on OCPs or asked to review local government documents. The Province sets policy guidelines and approvals of development applications adjacent to highway corridors.

### *Provincial Highways*

MoTI is responsible for the planning, operation, and maintenance of provincial highways.

### *A note on First Nations Relations*

Tsawwassen has a seat at the Mayors' Council, but TransLink is in the early stage of an initiative to work better with other regional Indigenous Nations. TransLink is currently staffing up to better understand their role and exploring the potential of providing transit to reserves.

### *Funding Structure*

The four main funding sources supporting current operations include transit revenues, property taxes, motor fuel taxes, and parking rights tax. However, TransLink also has several funding sources, including hydro levy, government transfers and interest income, for example.

There are also several capital funding and partner government contributions, including investing in Canada infrastructure program, permanent transit fund, zero emissions transit fund, Canada community-building fund, provincial contribution to the 10-year vision, development cost charges, real estate development and investment fund distributions, revolving land fund.

## Auckland–Auckland Transport

### Introduction

AT is a council-controlled organisation that combines the transport expertise and function of eight former local and regional councils and the Auckland Regional Transport Authority. Auckland is home to 1.67 million residents.

Established in 2010, AT keeps Auckland moving by planning, delivering, operating, and maintaining Auckland’s transport system to meet the needs of current and future Aucklanders. AT’s operating budget is \$1.180 billion (2023/2024).

AT is the regional guardian of \$21.1 billion of publicly owned assets. This includes 7,638 km of arterial and local roads, 7,431 km of footpaths, 348 km of cycleways, a growing fleet of electric trains, rail and busway stations, bus shelters, ferry wharves and two airfields on the Gulf Islands.

### History

The establishment of AT in 2010 marked the first time in history that all local transport functions and operations for the city have come under one organization. National agencies continue to manage the highways and interregional rail networks. Prior to 2010, public transit service delivery was undermined by a fragmented governance model. Public transit operations were vested in a comparatively small and poorly resourced regional provider, while road activities and asset ownership remained with geographically smaller but more strongly resourced “territorial local authorities”. A user-based funding model tended to reproduce existing transit patterns and did not support large scale investments in city-shaping infrastructure. A review in the 2000’s found that Auckland was not accommodating growth properly, and so the Central Government called for reform to create a super city.

### Timeline

- 2003 Rail brought back into the heart of the city for the first time in 70+ years (\$204 million).
- 2004 Auckland Regional Transport Authority formed as the central co-coordinating agency for mixed-mode transport in Auckland. Disestablished in 2010, it had in six years delivered a 97% increase in rail usage and a 10.2% increase in bus patronage.
- 2010 Amalgamation of Auckland’s local authorities (eight former local and regional councils and the Auckland Regional Transport Authority).
- 2010 Auckland Council is formed, with AT as the council-controlled organisation delivering all of Auckland’s land transport needs, excluding motorways.
- 2011 Construcciones y Auxiliar de Ferrocarriles (CAF) wins contract to supply 57 three-car electric trains to be owned by AT (\$500 million).
- 2012 Public transport trips exceed 70 million for the first time since tram lines were pulled out. Auckland Manukau Eastern Transport Initiative project under way with new

bridges constructed, and first new line in over 80 years. *AT HOP* integrated ticketing system introduced on trains and ferries.

2013 First train is officially unveiled in Auckland.

2014 Use of *AT HOP* cards tops 200,000 in March as the smartcard is rolled out on the bus network. Rail patronage reaches 11 million.

### Key Decision Makers

The key transportation decision makers in the region are AT, Auckland Council, the NZTA, and central government.

Auckland Council sets the overall spatial direction for the region and identifies funding for approximately half of the transport activities in a 10-year Regional Long-Term Plan. Central government provides the other half share of funding via a combination of the NZTA and direct government contribution. AT prioritises investment across the local road and public transport networks via the Regional Land Transport Plan.

### Key Plans

Key Plans for transport in the region include:

- AT's Regional Land Transport Plan, Regional Public Transport Plan, Future Connect, Roads and Streets Framework, Network Operating Plan, Asset Management Plan.
- Auckland Council's Auckland Plan 2050 (Auckland's 30-year development strategy, and Long-Term Plan (budget).
- Central Government's Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, National Land Transport Programme, and AT Alignment Project.

### Desired Outcomes

The Regional Land Transport Plan aims to:

- Provide and accelerate better travel choices for Aucklanders,
- Improve the resilience and sustainability of the transport system and significantly reduce the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions it generates,
- Better connect people, places, goods, and services,
- Make Auckland's transport system safe by eliminating harm to people,
- Enable and support Auckland's growth through a focus on intensification in brownfield areas and with some managed expansion into emerging greenfield areas,
- Provide sound management of transport assets,
- Provide local board programs, technology, and organizational improvement initiatives.

The plan is focused on completing transport projects that are already underway, investing in new electric trains and infrastructure to meet the expected patronage boost, and maintain momentum

on core priorities like reducing the number of people being killed or seriously injured on the transportation network.

### Authority and Jurisdiction

AT is responsible for all the region's transport services, from roads and footpaths, to cycling, parking and public transport. All decisions relating to the operation of AT are made by or under the authority of the Board in accordance with the *Local Government Act*. However, AT is heavily dependent on government funding, so while the statutory responsibility is there, the funding is not as simple.

### Regional and Multi-use Trails

AT owns and operates cycling and walking within the road corridor. Auckland Council provides cycling and walking facilities within parks and other off road community facilities and partially funds AT Projects. The NZTA provides cycleways and walkways within the state highway network and partially funds AT projects.

### Regional and Local Roads

AT owns, manages, operates, maintains, renews, plans, and improves the local road network on behalf of its 100 percent shareholder, the Auckland Council. Council partially funds AT's road activities in partnership with the NZTA. The NZTA works with local government to ensure that the state highway network links seamlessly into the local road network. NZTA also partially funds AT projects and activities, including maintenance and renewals. Central government sets legislation that determines the powers and responsibilities of Road Controlling Authorities like AT. This can include setting maximum parking fines or administrative charges.

### Regional Transit Network

AT plans, manages, contracts, and controls public transit services, plans, and delivers improvements on the local road network and above track on the rail network. AT also prepares the Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan. Auckland Council is a part-funder, with NZTA, of AT's public transport services and improvement projects. NZTA plans, funds, and delivers transit improvement projects on state highway corridors. Central Government provides Crown funding for some rapid transit projects. Central government can also fund and deliver projects on its own, via special purpose entities.

### Land Use – Corridors and Nodes

Regional and territorial councils, like Auckland Council, are responsible for the development of spatial plans and approving new developments. Discretion over approval has been limited by central government intervention to allow greater development rights for townhouse type development in particular. AT prepares the Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan. AT also works with developers to mitigate effects of development on the network and ensure new streets and other facilities vested to AT meet design standards. The NZTA seeks to influence land use decisions to support transport outcomes and minimize negative impacts on state highway operations. Meanwhile, central government enacts planning legislation, but can use policy

statements to set specific rules for urban Councils. Central government also acts as a developer through the social housing arm.

### *Provincial Highways*

NZTA is the controlling authority for the state highway network. They are responsible for the planning, design, building, maintenance, funding, and operation of 11,000 km of state highways. AT is a very interested party and coordinates with NZTA on some project delivery. In theory, AT has a project prioritization role through the Regional Land Transport Plan. Auckland Council provides coordination from a land use perspective. Central Government sets broad strategic outcomes and can provide additional “top-up” funding to accelerate some state highway projects.

### Funding Structure

AT gets roughly 50% of its funding from Auckland Council and 40% from NZTA and then find remaining 10% piecemeal.

## **Halifax – Halifax Regional Municipality**

### Introduction

HRM was formed in 1996 with the amalgamation of four former local governments and the elimination of the Halifax Regional Authority. The growing region is now home to more than 480,000 residents, with a 4.4% population growth in 2022.

HRM’s operating budget for transit is about \$135 million (2023/2024).

### History

Even post-amalgamation, various transportation functions were performed by various departments. The approach was disparate and not strategic, with each group having their own plans (i.e., transit plan, bike plan, parking strategy). For example, the traffic department was focused on moving vehicle traffic, the transit department ran buses, the finance department maintained on street parking, and the pavement management group maintained the roads and would occasionally build sidewalks with a small budget.

In 2017, a multidisciplinary group with representatives from HRM’s Transportation and Public Works, Halifax Transit, Planning and Development, as well as Nova Scotia Public Health developed the Integrated Mobility Plan (IMP). It is a joint plan stemming from municipal policy direction on public transit and transportation and land use and growth centers contained within the Regional Plan, including the following:

- Implement a sustainable transportation strategy by providing a choice of integrated and connected travel options emphasizing public and community-based transit, active transportation, carpooling and other viable alternatives to the single occupant vehicle;
- Promote land settlement patterns and urban design approaches that support fiscally and environmentally sustainable transportation modes;

- Forecast the municipality’s need for mobility and provide service and infrastructure to meet this demand while influencing choice towards transportation sustainability; and
- Design complete streets for all ages, abilities, and travel options.

The IMP identifies corridors of interest for active transportation and transit, and staff from various departments now work together to make strategic multimodal transportation and land use decisions. For example, the parking department is responsible for parking, but are not simply interested in making money (as they were in the past); they are invested in the role of parking in transportation demand management. Transportation planning is now embedded in land use planning, with the aim of ensuring that growth centers are in spaces more conducive to active transportation and transit.

**Timeline**

1996	Amalgamation of four municipalities and one regional authority (April).
2006	Regional Plan (updated 2014 and 2021); Active Transportation Plan.
2010	Transportation Demand Management Functional Plan.
2014	Making Connections Active Transportation Priorities Plan.
2015	Council directs staff to develop a strategic plan aimed at increasing the modal split of sustainable forms of transportation as per the Regional Plan which integrates both land use and transportation planning and includes comparative costing analysis of road and ROW infrastructure upgrades and widenings as compared to other forms of transportation.
2016	Moving Forward Together (Transit) Plan approved by Council.
2017	Integrated Mobility Plan approved by Council.
2019	Centre Plan (Land Use Plan emphasizing infill in Regional Centre) approved by Council (updated 2021).
2020	Rapid Transit Strategy published.
2021	Bill 61 passes for creation of the Joint Regional Transportation Agency (JRTA) in November. Launch of Cogswell District Redevelopment Project: the largest city-building project in HRM’s history.
2022	JRTA formed.

**Key Decision Makers**

The key transportation decision makers in the region are Halifax Regional Municipality, the Nova Scotia Department of Public Works, and a newly forming JRTA. Halifax Transit is a department within Halifax Regional Municipality. Halifax Harbour Bridges, the Port of Halifax, and the Halifax International Airport Authority also make decisions about their respective modes and assets.

Regional Council is the main decision-making body for the Halifax Regional Municipality, providing strategic planning decisions related policy, budget, and service levels. There are also two committees that report to Regional Council on transportation matters: the Active



Transportation Advisory Committee, which includes citizen volunteers, and Transportation Standing Committee, composed of municipal councillors.

### Key Plans

The primary municipal planning strategy (i.e., official community plan) for HRM is the Regional Plan. There are also several secondary municipal plans intended to support zoning and land use controls, the most up to date of which being the Centre Plan.

The Regional Plan's municipal policy direction on public transit and transportation and land use and growth centres and the Regional Council's 2017 endorsement of a new vision for moving people and goods in the region led to the creation of the IMP. The IMP serves as a guide for investment in active transportation, transit, transportation demand management, goods movement, and the roadway network in Halifax. The Plan's vision is to create connected, healthy, affordable, and sustainable travel options, which is supported by four principles: Complete communities, moving people, managing congestion, and integrating solutions.

### Desired Outcomes

The desired outcomes of HRM's transportation system are to have at least 30% of trips made by transit and active transportation and no more than 70% of trips made by private vehicle by 2031.

### Authority and Jurisdiction

HRM has jurisdiction over regional and local roads, regional and multi-use trails, land use corridors and nodes, and the regional transit network. The Province has jurisdiction over provincial highways.

### *Regional and Multi-use Trails*

HRM is responsible for the planning, design, operation, maintenance, regulation, and funding of the regional trail system and the Transit Department supports the integration of active modes with transit. Several trails are on an old railway right of way and as such, HRM has a letter of permission from the Province's Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to use the space while DNR is a passive player.

### *Regional and Local Roads*

HRM currently owns 41% of roads in the region and is responsible for maintaining and redesigning the regional and local road network as council sees fit. The Province owns and is responsible for maintaining the bulk of roads in rural areas, including 90% of roads outside the urban service boundary. The Province owns all roads in the former Halifax County constructed prior to the 1996 amalgamation, while HRM owns all local roads constructed after 1996.

### *Regional Transit Network*

HRM has developed a Rapid Transit Strategy that builds on the vision of the IMP and is focused on the urban areas of Halifax. It establishes a vision for a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Network with four fixed-route lines, proposes a new ferry service with three routes, and sets a direction for land use policy to align with Rapid Transit. There are extensive transit priority measures proposed to

ensure that the BRT can reliably compete with driving, 60% of the network is proposed to have transit priority lines. There are also three Regional Express Routes that are commuter focused with service tied to peak direction.

HRM also maintains the bus shelters, roads, and sidewalks and contributes property taxes to transit operations. Funding for the transit network comes through user fees and taxes in the transit boundary-taxpayers who live within 1 km of a bus stop pay a transit tax, establishing a transit service boundary. Bus shelters are maintained through advertisement revenue. Transportation funding from the Federal government comes through the province to local governments.

### *Land Use – Corridors and Nodes*

Multiple community plans that allowed widely dispersed development were supplemented by an overarching Regional Plan that aims to focus growth on strategic centers, though that is not totally apparent yet because old bylaws are still in place. In 2017, the Centre Plan further emphasized the benefits of maximizing growth in the urban core. HRM is currently embarking on a suburban plan to identify growth nodes that replace community plans. The plan is to hinge growth nodes within 800 metres of transit stops. The Province provides policy guidelines and approvals of development applications adjacent to highway corridors.

### *Provincial Highways*

The Nova Scotia Department of Public Works is responsible for all 100-series highways as well as other highways called trunks and routes.

### *Funding Structure*

The municipal budget is responsible for sidewalks, regional trails, active transportation. This includes transit tax and user fees, gas tax, and other Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP) funding streams. Parking revenue goes to general revenue, and it funds various department budgets. The harbour bridges are tolled and operated by Halifax Harbour Bridges, a crown corporation of the Province. The Province controls funding from the Federal government.

### *Joint Regional Transportation Agency*

A need was identified for a forum to bring multiple jurisdictions and agencies together for holistic planning and as a central place to make regional transportation decisions. As such, *Bill 61*, an act to establish a JRTA, was passed in November 2021.

The JRTA is a crown corporation, and the Ministry of Public Works is the sole shareholder of the Agency. The Advisory Board of the JRTA is comprised of executive leaders of all partner organizations, not elected officials, with the aim of having vertical integration of the agencies. It brings together municipal, Provincial, and Federal government and covers the region extending beyond HRM to include 14 other local governments. The JRTA's purpose is to provide a coordinated strategic vision for the regional transportation system, to integrate transportation land use decision making and guide transportation infrastructure investments, and to maximize the impact of strategic investments. The plan will look at arterial and collector road levels and

corridors where growth is desired. It is not an authority, but rather focused on positive collaboration, bringing people together from a transportation and land use perspective.

Per *Bill 61*, the objects of the Agency are to conduct:

(a) a comprehensive review of all modes of transportation associated with the Municipality including roads, bridges, highways, ferries, transit, rail, airports, and ports for the purpose of creating a master transportation plan to ensure

(i) a regional approach to transportation consistent with the Municipality's growth and development, and

(ii) the safe, efficient, and co-ordinated movement of people and goods; and

(b) any other activities deemed necessary to fulfill the intent of this *Act* in accordance with the regulations.

## Discussion and Key Findings

With each authority examined, it has taken a significant amount of time to yield results and there have been clear catalysts affecting their access to stable funding, ability to plan through an integrated multi-modal lens, and capacity to take action integrating land use with transportation.

### TransLink

#### *Funding*

- TransLink has committed funding through property and gas taxes toward operational costs but does not have a stable source of funding sufficient for capital projects to continue its build out of the planned network.

#### *Level of multi-modal integration*

- Language specific to the multimodal aspect of transportation is found in Board approved investment plans.
- TransLink has access to significant funding and determines how it is spent, giving them power to influence local government infrastructure investment decisions. For example, TransLink has been very deliberate about where and how the cycling network is to be built out. They set the parameters so that funding is only available for class one, All Ages and Abilities (AAA) facilities.

#### *Degree of organizational control (formality/authority)*

- Significant collaboration and relationship building with Provincial, regional, and local governments is required in this complex model.
- There is language in Section four of the *SCBCTA Act* that allows TransLink to be involved in coordinated land use/growth management, though some of the language is quite broad and implies that TransLink must comment on every OCP amendment. It could be stronger if it

were more tailored so that TransLink is mandated to comment on municipal transportation plans.

- TransLink staff have mandates in the *SCBCTA Act* about working with local governments, but it is not mirrored in the *Local Government Act*. This means that it is left up to relationship building, which can be quite powerful, but does not always work as well as if it were mandated.
- There could be benefit to a stronger working relationship between TransLink and Metro Vancouver for land use planning and climate planning.

### *Other*

- TransLink also conducts a vast amount of research plays an educational role in providing the regional context of how infrastructure connects through the local governments. This function is key to the behaviour change that is needed to shift transportation modes.

## Auckland Transport

### *Funding*

- Despite governance structure and statutory responsibility, it is funding that ends up being critical in how decisions are made and who makes them.
- There is a gap between aspirations and the political reality of implementing measures. The cost of operating public transit is significant and building out the network takes time.

### *Level of multi-modal integration*

- As an agency, AT has a decent amount of control over the way the network is managed and implemented. For example, AT can significantly change bus network toward transfer-based without having to coordinate multiple local governments. They can plan and coordinate. The foundation is there, but the struggle is that AT is reliant on multiple other agencies for funding.

### *Degree of organizational control (formality/authority)*

- Before 2010, there wasn't agreement between Auckland Council, who wanted public transport, and Central government, building motorways. The organizations have since developed a non-statutory mechanism to get some degree of certainty and agreement.
- AT is in a challenging position, unable to deliver on Council's aspirational goals. It is difficult for AT to provide a clear stream of advice to Council in this governance model.

## Halifax Regional Municipality

### *Funding*

- A transit service boundary allows HRM to collect transit tax for households within 1 km of a conventional or community transit stop. This funds the conventional transit operations of

Halifax Transit and is a way of ensuring that the vast rural population does not pay for a service they do not receive.

- Halifax Harbour Bridges (HHB) is a commission of the Provincial government that collects revenue through tolls to pay for the ongoing maintenance and operations of the Macdonald and MacKay bridges. HHB receives no funding from the government.
- The Province essentially offers as subsidy on roads as they own and maintain roads in the former Halifax County constructed prior to amalgamation, 100-series highways, and the bulk of roads in rural areas.

#### *Level of multi-modal integration*

- The high degree of integrated transportation planning among different modes with regional goals minimizes inefficiencies.

#### *Degree of organizational control (formality/authority)*

- Integration of land use and transportation is important. As HRM has authority over both land use and transportation decisions, planning tools can be directly applied to benefit design and reduce costs related to transit and active transportation services (e.g., upzoning, by-right development, form-based codes, site plan approvals processes, design guidelines, mandatory inclusion of ground floor commercial along transit spines, exclusion of some uses from some areas).
- A key finding is that doing proper corridor planning first is crucial, identifying areas with potential for active transportation and transit and ensuring that land use policies are in alignment with desired growth nodes.
- Consider land use planning approvals in the context of transit service needs and ridership.

#### *Other*

- It's important to be transparent and specific to Council and the public about the trade offs that are required to reach Council's goals. For example, to improve transit safety and bike networks, it is often necessary to remove on-street parking and/or accept greater degrees of traffic delay.
- The Halifax Regional Municipality is a single entity governed by the Halifax Regional Council of 16 councillors and an elected mayor. The capital region contains 13 municipalities each with their own mayor and council, and three electoral areas, overseen by the CRD with limited authority and responsibilities.

## **Conclusion**

Information from this jurisdictional scan will be used to prepare updated governance concepts for the CRD and to serve as a reference in future work including business case development for a preferred governance option.

*All three authorities were created by another level of government to improve mobility.*

Through amalgamation, Auckland and HRM reduced the number of decision makers to consolidate disparate authorities into one organization. TransLink was created to provide Metro Vancouver with a new level of decision-making and coordinate among multiple jurisdictions. It is incumbent on the CRD, its member local governments and various agency partners to articulate a strong business case for the need to make changes to existing authorities particularly in relation to transit.

*All three took time to become fully operational.*

Each jurisdiction required over a decade for the planning and consolidation of authorities to take full effect. This confirms the core assumption from the feasibility study: That implementation needs to happen in steps, with each step proving feasible before moving to the next. This suggests that while the creation of a full authority in the region may take time, there is an opportunity through this Board term for the CRD and local governments to make changes within their control to prove viability for further regionalization of transportation governance.

*Success is built from a solid base.*

The jurisdictions that rely on other organizations for decision-making about discrete transportation functions, land use, and funding have less control towards achieving their mobility objectives. In considering the scope and scale of desired governance change, the CRD and all its partners need to weigh up the trade-offs associated with decision-making authorities and funding sources in relation to objectives for mobility, climate action and liveability.



Making a difference...together

Appendix A

	 CRD	 TransLink	 Auckland Transport	 HRM
Governance features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mechanism to collectively address impact of decisions</li> <li>Compete for funding</li> <li>Focus on planning alignment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding incentivizes collective decisions on regional network</li> <li>Limited funding source</li> <li>Complex decision-making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single local government</li> <li>Local and Federal government control of funding</li> <li>Does not set mobility outcomes; deliver on local government goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single local government</li> <li>Significant control over mobility outcomes</li> <li>Product of amalgamation</li> </ul>
Regional and Multi-Use Trails	CRD	TransLink   Metro Vancouver	Auckland Transport	HRM
Regional and Local Roads	Local Governments	TransLink   Local Governments	Auckland Transport	HRM   Province
Regional Transit Network	BC Transit	TransLink   Local Governments	Auckland Transport	HRM
Land Use – Corridors & Nodes	Local Governments	Local Governments   Metro Vancouver	Local Government	HRM
Provincial Highways	Province	Province	Federal Government	Province

Figure 1: Comparison of transportation governance authorities