

From: ["Mochrie, Paul" <Paul.Mochrie@vancouver.ca>](mailto:Paul.Mochrie@vancouver.ca)
To: ["Direct to Mayor and Council - DL"](#)
Date: 3/28/2023 6:11:11 PM
Subject: Questions - Broadway Active Transportation Lanes

Good afternoon Mayor and Council,

We are providing the following information in response questions we have received from Council regarding the report that you will be considering tomorrow.

Best,
Paul

1. Are current station blocks designed to provide multi-modal connections with existing active transportation routes going E-W or N-S?
Staff are looking at all stations to improve N/S active transportation connections. Some will be implemented on opening day (eg. Arbutus), some will come with redevelopment, and others will likely be delivered later.
There are 6 new stations on the Broadway Subway and all have some form of planned active transportation connection.
 - Great Northern Way/ Emily Carr and Arbutus Stations have connections to the Central Valley and Arbutus greenways
 - Mount Pleasant Station- has a planned connection to the station through the laneway to be connected with future development
 - Broadway City Hall has a planned connection through the future City Hall development site as well as a mobility hub.
 - Oak/ Laurel- has a planned connection through the future Laurel Greenway
 - South Granville Station – has a potential connection through future development and a laneway connection.
2. Do we have estimates of the incremental additional cost of adding active mobility lanes now while we are already rebuilding the street vs adding them as new work in 10-20 years?
The urgent decision is whether to try to add AT Lanes to the station blocks as we rebuild them. The costs to modify the design now may be significantly higher to incorporate them into the project due to the size of the overall project and required changes to the contract. There is also no certainty that the project would accept design changes at this point. Staff are looking at lower-cost options to add AT lanes after construction, if Council chooses to do so.
3. The report mentions that our Transportation 2040 Plan, Climate Plan, and Vancouver Plan all support advancing active transportation. Why aren't those mentioned more in the report? How do the proposed options each align with those plans?
All options improve Broadway for walking and/or cycling, which aligns with our long-term plans. The overall Broadway plan is grounded in T2040, CEAP, and VanPlan, but approaches to different streets will vary, depending on the specific needs.
4. My understanding was that staff weren't going to recommend an option - just provide the choices - given that Council had already provided this direction. Why did that change?
Staff were very mindful of the direction from the previous Council in preparing this report. That direction called on staff to undertake further analysis that was not available to Council in making that original decision. Given the outcome of that analysis, the financial and other implications, and the fact that this will be the first instance in which the present Council has considered the matter, we believe it is appropriate to provide a staff recommendation for Council's consideration, along with the other identified alternatives.
5. Do we have any info about the percentage of people cycling or using micromobility devices on the sidewalk on Broadway?

In August of 2022, CoV conducted a survey at the 600 West Broadway at Heather St. Approx. 160 bike and micro-mobility users were observed per day. Of these, about 65% were riding/rolling on the sidewalk, and 10% walking with their device. On Broadway there was about 1 micro-mobility device for every 5 bikes. On parallel corridors (eg. 10th) it was about 1 micromobility device for every 17 bikes. This is likely due to the types of trips on the different corridors.

6. Given the growth of e-scooters and food delivery services, for Option 1, where do you envision people would ride their e-scooters and other micro-mobility devices?

In the near-term, cyclists, e-scooters and other micro-mobility users would continue to access Broadway as they do today. We expect these users to use the parallel AAA bikeway and greenway routes and access Broadway safely via north-south connections. In the long term if AT lanes are implemented incrementally along Broadway, users will be able to begin using the new facilities where present.

7. How would Option 1 line up with a shared e-scooter pilot program in the city's core?

A shared e-scooter system would look at ways to minimizing sidewalk riding. People using e-scooters could access Broadway using local N/S streets.

8. If we go with Option 1, how would we be able to fit in active mobility lanes in the future after the subway construction is complete and the station blocks are rebuilt? Won't it be quite costly and disruptive to add them to station blocks in the future?

Once the subway is operational, we will have a better sense of trade-offs to further reallocate road space to accommodate active lanes. Station blocks will be more constrained, so we will have to review how and when is the best time to incorporate future active lanes. Non-station blocks could be delivered incrementally either geographically or using temporary construction materials at first, to be replaced with permanent infrastructure as redevelopment occurs. The cost of retrofitting could be inexpensive, depending on treatment (eg. low-cost paint and/or tactile delineation). There may also be opportunity for some to be delivered through adjacent redevelopment

9. Is there a three-lane option – something between options 2 and 3 – that adds active mobility lanes, and leaves space for turning lanes, etc?

Yes, option 3 proposes a single vehicle travel lane in each direction and would also include left-turn bays at select local streets. If directed to proceed with Option 2 or 3, staff would look in more detail where additional turn/travel lanes would be beneficial and report back to Council on final design options/recommendations.

10. Three weeks ago, the Province announced that it is significantly increasing funding for walking and cycling infrastructure to \$100 million over the next three years. The Federal Government also has an Active Transportation Fund to support expanding active transportation networks. Could this project be eligible for either or both funding source?

Our understanding is that this project does not qualify as the \$100M is expected to be dedicated to supplement their existing Capital projects to add active transportation features to regional connections. Federal and other Provincial funds could support this project but we have no certainty yet on which fund or the timing for them.

11. The report says that option 3 reduces road capacity. Isn't reducing road capacity part of what Council had voted to support in the past? Related, table 1 of the staff report identifies more space for private vehicles as a positive outcome. Why is that a positive when we're supposed to reach a 80% sustainable mode share target for this area?

All options reallocate traffic lanes. Options 1 and 2 propose the reallocation of 2 lanes (one in either direction) – reducing vehicular capacity and deprioritizing vehicles. Option 3 adds reallocation of an additional 2 lanes (a total of 4 lanes). This further reallocation of road space will have greater impacts on traffic, goods movement, etc. While we have an overall target of 80% sustainable mode share target, some key streets will benefit from higher vehicle capacity to support access to the area for people and goods.

12. Table 1 of the staff report shows option 2 has no benefits to walking. Wouldn't option 2 provide more protection and comfort for pedestrians b/c people cycling and scootering would be in separated active transportation lanes instead of on the sidewalks?

All options have some improvements for walking, as there will be full-time separation between traffic and pedestrians. Option 2 does offer separation from traffic and improved safety/reduction of conflicts for cyclists and pedestrians. However, in comparing to the other options, it offers less space for walking and public spaces such as seating and patios.

Paul Mochrie (he/him)
City Manager
City of Vancouver
paul.mochrie@vancouver.ca



The City of Vancouver acknowledges that it is situated on the unceded traditional territories of the xʷməθkʷəy̍əm (Musqueam), Snw̓x̓w̓ú7mesh (Squamish), and səliwətaʔ (Tseil-Waututh) Nations.