THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mobility +1, Part 2
Rethinking the Right-of-Way
Regional Leadership Workshop
Summary

Rethinking the Right-of-Way (ReROW) Research Cluster

University of British Columbia

May 2, 2025

UBC Robson Center

Rethinking the Right-of-Way

Rethinking the Right-of-Way (ReROW) is a University of British Columbia (UBC) transdisciplinary research group formed to support the transformation of streets into more healthful, sustainable, and equitable places. To aid us in this effort, we have partnered with Mobility Foresight, a strategic planning advisory firm, to help connect research with practice and build a regional network around ROW issues. As a research cluster, we aim to be a research leader in complex issues and systems converging in the ROW, including the development of a convergent science of street systems, robust partnerships with public agencies, and new educational experiences and workforce development opportunities.

INTRODUCTION

ReROW has held two workshops with regional professionals as part of our effort to build a cross-sectoral network of professional partners involved in shaping streets and public spaces. In October of 2024, we invited members of TransLink's Regional Transportation Advisory Council (RTAC) to join us with a "+1" from outside the mobility sector. In the workshop, we heard from local regional leaders about the challenges and opportunities they face in the planning, design, operation, and maintenance of streets, sidewalks, and other public rights-of-way. Following the success of this first Mobility +1 workshop, ReROW hosted another workshop to implement a vision of regional collaboration that leverages university research and civic needs. The overall goal was to strengthen the mutual understanding of research interests and capacity.

The workshop was held at the UBC Robson Centre in downtown Vancouver on May 2, 2025. ReROW faculty and students were joined by twenty-eight leaders representing a diversity of perspectives from a variety of contexts. Attendees represented the City of Burnaby, City of Coquitlam, City of Surrey, City of Richmond, City of North Vancouver, City of New Westminster, City of Vancouver, Township of Langley, Port of Vancouver, Fraser Health, Vancouver Coastal Health, BC Hydro, and TransLink. A complete list of participants and their affiliations is included in the appendix.

This report, circulated among participants and ReROW researchers only, provides a summary of the closed-door discussion. It is not meant to be circulated more broadly, but can be circulated within your organization.

WORKSHOP STRUCTURE

A full-day workshop facilitated by Dr. Kelly Clifton, ReROW Lead, and the J. Armand Bombardier Chair in Regional Transportation Planning at the School of Community and Regional Planning (SCARP) at UBC. It was organized around three activities:

- Getting to know the ReROW faculty.
- Presentation of an example of a University-Civic collaboration.
- Development of research problem Statements.

The first activity of the day focused on introducing the ReROW faculty to participants. Faculty were encouraged to share what drives their research; what motivated them to be part of the ReROW cluster; what data, tools, or methods they use; and how their research has (or could) influence real-world decisions about urban streets.

First, Dr. Alex Bigazzi, Associate Professor in the Department of Civil Engineering and ReROW Education and Learning Lead, discussed the evolution of his research partnership on e-bike incentives with governments in British Columbia.

The latter half of the day was focused on the development of research problem statements. Prior to this activity, participants ranked their interests from multiple statements that arose from the previous Mobility +1 workshop.

- Defining the right-of-way space and time allocation to uses;
- Good movement, delivery and freight;
- Engagement and communication, models and visualizations, with constituents and users of the right-of-way;
- “State of Our Region” Survey (e.g., tracker);
- Regional data repository and archive: how do we share data across the region;
- Financing the right-of-way: construction, maintenance, and social infrastructure;
- Evaluate the quantity & qualify the economic value of safety improvements, street trees, people walking and cycling, climate mitigation, transportation investments, etc.
- Dynamic curbside management framework and mapping;
- Multimodal performance measures and alternatives to automobile level of service;
- Climate impacts (heat, cold, environmental event) on the right-of-way and adaptation;
- Vulnerable population in the right-of-way; impact of the right-of-way on health outcomes;
- Understanding the impacts and needs of emerging technologies (shared systems, micromobility). Leaders and faculty were assigned to one of the five topics that emerged from the survey, shown in Table 1, with faculty serving as facilitators and students taking notes.

Table 1. Problem statement topics and participants.

Multi-modal performance measures and alternatives to automobile level of service	*Alex Bigazzi (facilitator) - Civil Engineering UBC, Rosemarie Draskovic - City of Vancouver, Mirtha Gamiz – TransLink, Tammy Liu – Township of Langley, Douglas McLeod - City of Coquitlam, Po Sun - City of Burnaby, Tony Vi – TransLink, Muskan Verma (notetaker) - School of Community and Regional Planning UBC.*
Impact of right-of-way on health outcomes	*Keun Park (facilitator) – Forestry UBC, Kendra Cheeseman - Fraser Health, Laura Chow - Vancouver Coastal Health, Kyle Gooderham (rerow) – Kinesiology UBC, Amber Heckelman - Fraser Health, Justin Ng -City of Richmond, Tyler Semler - Vancouver Coastal Health, Shuoqi Ren (notetaker) - Institute for Resources, Environment, and Sustainability UBC,*
Climate impacts and adaptation of the right-of-way	*Mahmudur Fatmi (facilitator) -Civil Engineering UBC, Melissa McHale (facilitator) -Forest Resources Management UBC, Erin Gorby -City of Coquitlam, Brandon Green - City of North Vancouver, Rob Landucci - City of Surrey, Christel Lindgren - City of North Vancouver, Deborah Tan - Port of Vancouver, So Hoi Kay (notetaker) – Forest Resources Management UBC.*
Engagement and communication models	*Dale Bracewell (facilitator) - Mobility Foresight, Erick Villagomez (facilitator) - School of Community and Regional Planning UBC, Janna Gamache - BC Hydro, Lacey Hirtle - City of New Westminster, Greta Isac – TransLink, Erin O'Melinn – TransLink, Thomas Thivener - City of Coquitlam, Esther Zipori (rerow) – School of Community and Regional Planning, Diana Sanabria (notetaker) – Civil Engineering UBC,*
Defining the right-of-way space and time allocation	*Kelly Clifton (facilitator) - School of Community and Regional Planning UBC, Mike Anderson - City of New Westminster, Nathan Andrews - City of Richmond, Renee de St. Croix – City of Coquitlam, Glen Chua – City of Coquitlam, Sheena Soon – City of New Westminster, Sam Tomkins – City of Burnaby, Charlotte Lemieux (notetaker) – School of Community and Regional Planning UBC.*

MEET THE REROW FACULTY

The first Mobility +1 workshop focused on understanding the issues that agencies are facing in the planning, operations, and maintenance of public streets, plazas, and other rights-of-way. Because faculty were mostly in a listening role previously, we wanted to highlight their research interests, motivations, and approaches and cater to discussions of agency interests. To do this, we used a “speed dating” format. There were six tables comprising 5 or 6 partners. Each faculty member spent 10-15 minutes at each table.

CIVIC – UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

Dr. Alex Bigazzi presented the story arc of his research efforts studying e-bike rebates in the region, covering project inception, partnerships, funding, and key outcomes. Sparked by a conversation with city staff about municipal strategies to promote e-bike adoption, this research began in 2017 with the City of Victoria and evolved over eight years with different partners and outputs.

The project goal was to increase cycling by incentivizing the purchase of e-bikes. Bigazzi emphasized that the project was iterative and collaborative, shaped by ongoing partnerships with public agencies and opportunities for applied academic work.

City of Victoria: A scoping study led by Bigazzi's team at UBC, funded by SSHRC, looked at global strategies to encourage e-bike use. The study identified e-bike rebates as a promising but under-researched policy tool. The team built a theoretical economic model to estimate potential impacts of such rebates in Victoria, but funding diversion during COVID-19 response efforts stalled the collaboration.

Saanich: The District of Saanich developed a program model similar to what was proposed for the City of Victoria to build a business case for the local council. They then implemented a novel income-based e-bike rebate program, with goals of climate mitigation and equity. Focusing on GHG emissions reduction and cost-effectiveness, the study portion of the project was funded through an NSERC Alliance grant. Although conducted as a 2-year study, the project included interim reports to meet the partner's need for quicker insights.

Expansion at the Provincial Level: Success in Saanich influenced the British Columbia provincial program (2023), which was modelled on the Saanich approach. A new UBC study, a collaboration with the University of Toronto, Simon Fraser University, and the Mobilizing Justice research partnership, examined equity outcomes of the provincial rebates.

This kind of work sits at the intersection of academic research questions and public sector needs. It is a small but powerful space of mutual interest. But it takes effort to identify and align those goals. Bigazzi outlined a few key considerations from his experience.

Alignment of interests: When cities try new things (infrastructure investments or policy innovation), it creates fertile ground for research, particularly when prior evidence is lacking or not applicable in the desired context. However, there is always a need to balance academic rigour with practical relevance. For example, in Bigazzi's studies, not all the early work was publishable in academic journals, but it opened doors to future, impactful research.

The power of pilot studies: Innovation is by nature groundbreaking work, and thus, there is little precedent to guide decision-making. The associated risks of doing new things can hamper agencies' willingness to depart from established standards and practices, even when there are known issues with current practices. Pilot demonstration projects provide the opportunity to test the project's effectiveness or policy, allow public engagement, and gather valuable data before permanent or large-scale implementation.

Alignment of timelines: Academic research can be slow, particularly the funding and peer-review processes. It is also inherently uncertain. Public agencies often need actionable insights with short timelines. But there are some mechanisms that can help meet the academic needs of universities and the knowledge needs for policy guidance. Interim reports, internal memos, and policy briefs can be used to inform decisions before research findings are published in academic journals.

Data privacy and ethics: The ethical conduct of research and protecting the privacy of the public are concerns for public agencies and universities alike. Both often have data storage and management controls and ethics oversight. University ethics review boards and public agency privacy offices can restrict the types and methods of data collection, how information is stored and for how long, consent and notification requirements, data access permissions, and dissemination of results. Managing these challenges is necessary to ensure the ethical and safe conduct of research. Research partners need to work with these oversight entities to find creative solutions and compromises that meet privacy & ethics requirements and allow for research goals to be met.

Independence and risk: Academic research must retain independence of thought and academic freedom. Universities do not allow research partners to suppress findings. Public agencies must accept the risk that research may show that a program or policy does not work as intended or is contrary to their expectations and needs. Also, because

research is uncertain, research designs may need to be adjusted or changed during implementation due to unforeseen events (e.g., global pandemic).

Knowledge translation: Designing research that is directly useful to policymakers and communicating findings to decision makers and the public are important skills. It requires collaborative efforts between researchers and public agency staff early in the research process. When results are ready to be disseminated, partners should work together to craft effective messaging that balances accuracy and nuance, ensuring that the documentation remains accessible and understandable to a broad audience.

Real innovation comes when public agencies and researchers work together—taking risks, experimenting, and developing long-term partnerships. These collaborations must be founded on trust. Researchers must understand public sector needs, and public partners should understand academic constraints. These partnerships are most successful when both sides respect each other's constraints and co-develop the research from the preliminary stages, allowing time for iterative processes, having frequent interactions, and being patient.

While Bigazzi presented the history of his partnership around e-bike incentives, there are also alternative models for collaboration among municipalities, nonprofits, and universities. Some engage with students directly, including through structured courses like the SCARP Capstone course and the Sustainability Scholars Program at UBC. Other ways to engage include technical and community advisory boards to advise on academic and practical projects. Overall, impactful university-civic partnerships can result from good communications, shared research goals, and careful planning.

DEVELOPING PROBLEM STATEMENTS

The goal of this session was to further develop topics identified at the previous Mobility +1 workshop. The structured conversation was organized around three discussions: idea generation, defining research questions, and future collaboration.

Participants were seated at tables arranged by topic based on their interests. They were asked to consider the reasons behind their topic of area selection during the first section of the conversation. We encouraged them to consider the problem they are attempting to

solve and the people affected by it. Finally, we asked the discussant to consider how research can guide choices or actions.

Much of the discussion was devoted to formulating research questions. Table participants were asked to reflect on a topic or two within a broader theme and try to hone in on a core question, reflecting on what a satisfactory answer would look like. Prompts were provided to help discussants identify the aim of their research question(s), whether it is to explain, evaluate, or predict. We encouraged teams to identify existing experiences, knowledge, methods, and data that can be built on, while also identifying what is missing. We asked participants to assess practitioners' roles in the research and its possible type, such as a pilot project, a case study, or a real-time decision that offers a natural setting for the theme.

To conclude the discussion, we asked participants to reflect on future collaboration in the face of the previous discussion: what would success look like, and what would be the next step after this workshop?

All the teams had rich conversations, but many struggled to hone a specific question or how to move forward due to the complex nature of all the topics. The nuance of the complexities themselves was a significant part of the discussion. A common challenge was identifying the balance of what benefits practitioners and is relevant to UBC researchers. However, many noted that the workshop opened an avenue for partnerships, and as the conversation of the day becomes synthesis, the next steps may become clearer.

The following sections summarize conversations around each of the five topics.

MULTI-MODAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES TO AUTOMOBILE LEVEL OF SERVICE

Participants: Alex Bigazzi - Civil Engineering UBC (facilitator), Rosemarie Draskovic - City of Vancouver, Mirtha Gamiz – TransLink, Tammy Liu – Township of Langley, Douglas McLeod - City of Coquitlam, Po Sun - City of Burnaby, Tony Vi – TransLink, Muskan Verma (notetaker) - School of Community and Regional Planning UBC.

From the previous Mobility +1 workshop, participants raised the challenge of multimodal planning and the lack of tools and measures to guide decision-making and design. The design and operations of streets have been heavily influenced by the automobile level of service (LOS), which emphasizes efficiency and speed of traffic flow. With these measures, non-automobile modes are often treated as an impediment to the flow of automobiles. Thus, new approaches are needed to reflect these modes and a broader set of goals outside of the transportation system.

The group discussed the need for new performance measures for multi-modal transportation systems, moving beyond traditional automobile-focused metrics. Participants highlighted the lack of adequate data and measures to truly capture the functionality and user experience of integrated systems. They explored ideas for comprehensive metrics or indices that consider factors like convenience, affordability, accessibility, reliability, and inclusivity across all modes of transport. The discussion also touched on the importance of quantifying user perceptions and the potential for collaboration, aiming for a mobility index or rubric. While a specific problem statement was not formally defined, the session successfully identified the core challenges with current transportation performance measures and generated tangible ideas for developing a new, more comprehensive framework. The concept of a "mobility index cube" as an overall framework for evaluating measures and their trade-offs in different contexts emerged as a promising direction. The discussion also highlighted the value of collaboration between practitioners and researchers and the need for further data collection and testing.

Several research questions emerged from this session:

- What constitutes a good metric that captures multi-modal performance?

- How can we effectively measure and quantify the user experience of multi-modal systems?
- How can we develop a comprehensive index or rubric that incorporates multiple performance criteria across all modes?
- What data is needed to support the development and implementation of new multi-modal performance measures, and how can it be collected?
- How can we define and measure "fair" levels of service for all users?
- How can we effectively communicate the value and benefits of new multi-modal performance measures to decision-makers and the public?

THE RIGHT-OF-WAY AND HEALTH OUTCOMES

Participants: Keun Park – Forestry UBC (facilitator), Kendra Cheeseman - Fraser Health, Laura Chow - Vancouver Coastal Health, Kyle Gooderham (rerow)– Kinesiology UBC, Amber Heckelman - Fraser Health, Justin Ng- City of Richmond, Shuoqi Ren (notetaker) - Institute for Resources, Environment, and Sustainability UBC, Tyler Semler - Vancouver Coastal Health.

The group established that creating healthy built environments in the public right-of-way includes understanding how people gain mobility, access nature, interact with each other, engage in play and recreation, and are exposed to health risks. An emphasis was placed on health equity and how health outcomes vary across different population segments. Moreover, participants emphasized that these issues are not recognized by decision makers. Overall, a diverse systems approach to health is rarely used, in part because of a lack of evidence and the siloed nature of existing approaches for informing policy, planning, and design.

Participants emphasized the need for a high-level model that goes beyond the traditional public health understanding of health outcomes and takes into consideration both alternative and culturally specific frameworks that are inclusive of Indigenous ways of thinking about health and wellbeing. The focus needs to be on creating a framework that converges evidence from diverse sources, providing local, applicable, and universal evidence of interventions/measures. It is not intended as a grading system but as a simplified, high-level, directional tool. When discussing the available evidence, methods,

and data to build on, participants pointed to the abundance of health data across sectors and the barriers to sharing it. A theme discussed by other teams as well. Furthermore, team members reiterated that while numerical evidence is a strong communication tool, alternative measures regarding public health offer new ways of thinking.

As part of the discussion on a future framework, the team identified several questions about the nature of the model:

- How does ROW design account for our future selves? *Mobility-challenged populations are excluded from active transportation and sidewalks. The focus of contemporary design is on healthy users, but planning needs to shift to reflect changing physical abilities and social needs. People's ability to walk or bike diminishes over time.*
- How do we create standardized regional design standards? *There is no consistent design across municipalities that are focused on accessibility.*
- How do we make the connection between health outcomes and the ROW? What is the evidence? In what aspects of the ROW is it needed?
- How can we communicate and distribute that information to policymakers and other professionals working in the ROW?
- How do we connect planners and engineers with health professionals? *There are data gaps, including data that are not being collected, because health authorities are not involved in any ROW decisions. At the same time, public health evidence is not always understood or used by planners.*
- How can we better integrate HIA in ROW decisions and vice versa? *Health Impact Assessments (HIA) are often underused (e.g., Vancouver's HIA toolkit).*
- How do we measure interventions and their progress? *There are many policies and guidelines for the ROW with multiple actors influencing how health is understood.*
- How do we integrate indigenous knowledge and culture into how we define health outcomes? *Indigenous and culturally grounded health definitions are missing in dominant frameworks.*

- How could we better incorporate a healthy city framework, especially context-specific strategies, through urban planning and development processes?

CLIMATE IMPACTS, ADAPTATION & THE RIGHT-OF-WAY

Mahmudur Fatmi – Civil Engineering UBC, Erin Gorby – City of Coquitlam, Brandon Green - City of North Vancouver, So Hoi Kay —Forest Resources Management UBC, Rob Landucci - City of Surrey, Christel Lindgren - City of North Vancouver, Melissa McHale – Forest Resources Management UBC, Deborah Tan – Port of Vancouver.

The interactions between climate change and streets remain a key concern. How streets contribute to extreme climate and how they function during (and after) disasters are a part of streetscape planners' design considerations. Discussants shared concerns over the lack of connection between the complex value of greenery and trees with preparedness for emergencies and the future. Specifically, the need to think about trees not as individual components but as a broader ecosystem with economic, health, and social benefits. The group discussed the need to think about the structure of urban spaces, quantifying different environmental scenarios, including hazard planning and cultural expectations, while comparing them to different ecosystem services, meaning how an ecosystem strategy may differ along different streets, e.g., a laneway, local, collector, minor, or major arterial street.

Participants were concerned about how to discuss the benefits gained instead of the losses that result from changes to the ROW ecosystem. While cost-benefit analysis is a powerful tool to highlight the cost of having something or not having it, members emphasized the need to think through mutual benefits for competing uses under climate scenarios to communicate with the public and decision makers. For example, looking at green-water infrastructure and stormwater runoff values. There was some interest in the group to think through some of the high-tech solutions that can be used to maintain trees and their associated costs. This was also raised as a concern in relation to the survivability of trees in different conditions (e.g., limited soil volume).

Broadly, the group's robust discussion contained several questions under the themes of greening and trees and developing a framework for prioritizing adaptation.

- How do we make decisions on key corridors in terms of which should be prioritized for emergency adaptation and remediation, and what priorities currently exist?

- How do we transition/plan for streets that are functioning ecosystems using more active travel modes?
- How do we develop a rigorous prioritization framework amidst diverse interests and competing uses across scales? What is required to maintain/grow the benefits of trees and other ecosystem services of nature, especially when considering competing uses of spaces?
- How can we increase data sharing to work towards cross-sector and cross-organizational collaboration on complex climate issues more effectively?
- How do we develop a framework to measure the costs of implementing adaptive strategies? How do we improve the current ways we measure the values and costs of components versus services?
- How should we prioritize urban greening (or other ecosystem services) within different spatial contexts? What are the ways in which political complexities may complicate this?
- What are some of the high-technology interventions that can be used for adaptation to achieve large-scale adaptation?
- How can we rethink surrounding infrastructure, such as service connections, to promote ecosystem services and diffuse tension around competing uses?

ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION, MODELS AND VISUALIZATIONS, WITH CONSTITUENTS AND USERS OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY

Participants: Dale Bracewell (facilitator) – Mobility Foresight, Janna Gamache - BC Hydro, Lacey Hirtle - City of New Westminster, Greta Isac – TransLink, Erin O'Melinn – TransLink, Thomas Thivener - City of Coquitlam, Erick Villagomez (facilitator) – School of Community and Regional Planning UBC, Esther Zipori (rerow) – School of Community and Regional Planning, Diana Sanabria (notetaker) – Civil Engineering UBC.

Modifications to the ROW are a difficult political, emotional, and technological procedure. The discussion centered on the importance of using the lived experiences and storytelling of community members to challenge preconceived notions about travel modes and habits;

reestablishing inclusive communication channels through collaboration with community-based organizations; redesigning engagement to reach those who are usually excluded; identifying common strategies for effective municipal communication and engagement for politically sensitive and/or large-scale projects; and moving beyond surveys to have direct conversations with current support networks.

The conversation made clear that to maintain momentum, communication should not only assist an ongoing project but also help stakeholders and decision makers develop a more comprehensive perspective. One recurring theme was that, when integrating various voices and types of expertise (including not only technical or planning voices but also those of health professionals, community members, and other researchers), communications must concentrate on demonstrating to people—both the community and decision makers—what they stand to gain rather than what they might lose. Emphasis was made on the need for human-centered storytelling and visualizations that show diverse, familiar faces (e.g., everyday people in work clothes or cultural dress or people with visible disabilities) to build empathy and trust.

Participants discussed the need to identify gaps and best practices in the region. A conversation emerged around the potential for cross-jurisdictional collaboration in the region by sharing resources and strategies to improve communication outcomes and public trust. There was interest in understanding how communication resources (human and technology) vary across jurisdictions and how they are leveraged. The group felt that there is immense potential to share resources and scale up when practitioners share the strategies they are using and the challenges they face when influencing behaviour (public) and decision makers.

The emerging research questions focused on the gaps in communication tools, skills, and capacity within local government that limit their ability to effectively engage with the public.

- What types of communication/engagement strategies are most effective at different points of understanding (public) and support (political)?
- How do we visualize complex benefits of ROW interventions like reliability and reduced commute variability?

- How can we use human-centered design to help people emotionally and experientially understand the impacts of transportation changes on their daily lives?
- How can infrastructure and service communications better reflect the regional nature of travel and use patterns, rather than being constrained by municipal boundaries?
- Can we learn from successful urban transformations in European cities like Paris, Amsterdam, and Barcelona, and can their solutions be adapted to the Canadian context? What successful and unsuccessful models and practices exist, and what are the key factors for replicating success in the region?
- What information is useful for urban practitioners to be able to share with decision makers and the public?
- How can transit and municipal data be shared?

DEFINING THE RIGHT-OF-WAY SPACE AND TIME ALLOCATION TO USES

Participants: Kelly Clifton (facilitator) – School of Community and Regional Planning UBC, Mike Anderson – City of New Westminster, Nathan Andrews - City of Richmond, Renee de St. Croix – City of Coquitlam, Glen Chua – City of Coquitlam, Sheena Soon – City of New Westminster, Sam Tomkins – City of Burnaby, Charlotte Lemieux (notetaker)– School of Community and Regional Planning UBC.

Discussants considered the need to strike a balance between the different demands of citizens and government agencies in the ROW. Participants pointed to the growing discussions within and between departments on how to allocate space. While recent plans place the pedestrian at the top of the mobility triangle, in practice, not all streets prioritize pedestrians. Movement dominates the function of streets and is almost exclusively understood as vehicle movement, not people (walking, biking, taking public transit) movement. On the other hand, the debate on the street as a gathering and social space for communities continues to challenge that perspective.

The team underlined the necessity of a road categorization framework in which all modes of travel are accessible at the network level rather than attempting to add them to the same streets. This is a component of a broader shift away from the traditional

departmental approach to street design, use, and funding toward a multipurpose roadway that intersects with several departments. Reflecting the need for system thinking on the region's distinct street styles, the team discussed the fundamental design strategy in the region. The value of a commonplace typology, when applied to measuring outcomes, would allow the development of a framework to better assess the success of redesigned ROWs.

The team acknowledged the growing spatial complexities between the priorities and needs of different street users. For instance, curb management becomes increasingly complex as some request to allocate more spaces for restaurants while, at the same time, deliveries are increasing and taking up more and more curb space. When discussing parking, participants noted that the prevailing perception is that every street need parking, as businesses cannot service otherwise. As the team focused on the idea of a street as a place to stay, a discussion emerged on the need to better assess the possible success of ROW redesign as well as better understand who is going where, for what reasons, when, and using what mode of transportation, as part of a larger ongoing process of getting a consensus baseline of what is happening on streets in the region.

The emerging research questions from the team's rich discussion are part of what the team identified as a priority: the need to negotiate space for “place” activities in existing streets, alongside meeting other needs such as curb delivery management.

- How do we build “place” in the existing framework of street design and development?
- What does it mean to have a street with more place function?
- What is the measure of a successful place?
- How do we quantify qualitative data?
- How do we adapt streets to the needs of people?
- How do we know that people will use space as designed?
- What is the difference between walking pedestrians and staying pedestrians? Is there a difference?

SUMMARY

All teams had rich conversations reflecting the complexities of the topics at hand. Teams struggled to produce one specific question; instead, multiple ideas were generated. Many of the teams concluded that revisiting the ideas discussed at the tables with fresh minds would allow participants to identify more specific next steps.

A common struggle among the different teams was finding the balance between practitioners and academic needs. However, many teams were able to identify multiple avenues to pursue future collaborations of a different nature.

On the next page, we have summarized the discussion into a table, including the dominant questions the team members were concerned with.

Topic		Emerging questions
Defining the right-of-way space and time allocation to uses	Discussants considered the need to strike a balance between the different demands of citizens and government agencies in the ROW. The team underlined the necessity of a road categorization framework in which all modes are accessible at the network level rather than attempting to add them to the same streets.	● How do we build “place” in the existing framework of street design and development? ● What does it mean to have a street with more place function?
Multi-modal performance measures and alternatives to automobile level of service	The group discussed the need for new performance measures for multi-modal transportation systems, moving beyond traditional automobile-focused metrics. They explored ideas for comprehensive metrics or indices that consider factors like convenience, affordability, accessibility, reliability, and inclusivity for all modes of transport. The concept of a "mobility index cube" as an overall framework for evaluating measures and their trade-offs in different contexts emerged as a promising direction.	● How can we effectively measure and quantify the user experience of multimodal systems? ● How can we develop a comprehensive index or rubric that incorporates multiple performance criteria across all modes? ● How can we effectively communicate the value and benefits of new multi-modal performance measures to decision-makers and the public?
The right-of-way and health outcomes	The group established that creating healthy built environments in the public right-of-way includes understanding how people gain mobility, access nature, interact with each other, engage in play and recreation, and are exposed to health risks. Participants emphasized the need for a high-level model that goes beyond the traditional public health understanding of health outcomes and takes into consideration both alternative and culturally specific frameworks that are inclusive of Indigenous ways of thinking about health and wellbeing.	● How do we make the connection between health outcomes and the ROW? What is the evidence? In what aspects of the ROW is it needed? ● How do we measure interventions and their progress? ● How do we integrate indigenous knowledge and culture into how we define health outcomes?

Climate impacts, adaptation & the right-of-way	Discussants shared concerns over the lack of connection between emergency and future preparedness of streets regarding how greenery and trees are valued. Specifically, the need to think about trees not as individual components but as a broader ecosystem with both economic, health, and other social benefits.	● How do we make decisions on key corridors in terms of which should be prioritized for emergency adaptation and remediation, and what priorities currently exist? ● How do we transition/plan for streets that are functioning ecosystems using more active travel modes?
Engagement and communication, models, and visualizations, with constituents and users of the right-of-way	Modifications to the ROW are a difficult political, emotional, and technological procedure. The discussion centered on the importance of using the lived experiences and storytelling of community members to challenge preconceived notions about travel modes and habits. Participants discussed the need to identify gaps and best practices in the region. A conversation emerged around the potential for cross-jurisdictional collaboration in the region by sharing resources and strategies to improve communication outcomes and public trust.	● What types of communication/engagement strategies are most effective at different points of understanding (public) and support (political)? ● How do we visualize complex benefits of ROW interventions like reliability and reduced commute variability? ● What information is useful for urban practitioners to be able to share with decision makers and the public?

CONCLUSIONS & NEXT STEPS

This summary is not intended as a comprehensive coverage of issues facing the ROW. Rather, it reflects the interests and needs of discussants during the full-day workshop. The Mobility +1 workshops offered valuable insights into the issues agencies are facing in the Vancouver region in planning our streets. We also generated some ideas about how we can work together and build a network to share best practices and research findings. The discussions of the day revealed that there is interest in growing partnerships around the transformation of streets, building a regional evidentiary base, and sharing information and resources.

To mature our partnership and continue the discussion, we invite you to reach out about your agency's or municipality's interests for a follow-up meeting with ReROW members.

Please save the date for our upcoming workshop on January 21, 2026, intended to bring together planners, researchers, and health professionals to explore how data, quantitative and qualitative, can support a deeper understanding of active transportation along prioritized active transportation corridors and bikeway networks in urban centers in the region. In collaboration with Vancouver Coastal Health and TransLink, the workshop will examine active transportation through multiple lenses, including mobility and place, health and wellbeing, environment and sustainability, travel modelling and forecasting, urban greening and climate resilience, gentrification and equity concerns, participation action and community engagement, psychological dimensions of travel (stress, comfort, safety), lived experience of active transportation trips, mobilities of care, urban heat/wildfire smoke/flooding vulnerability and climate equity, and the impact of land use on cycling infrastructure uptake.

For those interested, our UBC-hosted listserv (REROW-COMMUNITY@lists.ubc.ca) was created to foster ongoing discussions and to share information. You may join this mailing list by sending an email to: listserv@lists.ubc.ca. In the body of the email, write: subscribe REROW-Community. Do not have any other text or signatures in the body of the email. This information and more can be found on the ReROW website (rerow.ubc.ca).

PARTICIPANTS

Regional Leaders		
Tony Vi	TransLink Strategic Planning & Policy	tony.vi@translink.ca
Erin O'Melinn	TransLink Transportation and Land Use Planning	erin.omelinn@translink.ca
Greta Isac	TransLink Communication	greta.isac@translink.ca
Mirtha Gamiz	South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority (TransLink) Strategic Planning and Policy	mirtha.gamiz@translink.ca
Sam Tomkins	City of Burnaby Transportation	samuel.tomkins@burnaby.ca
Po Sun	City of Burnaby Transportation Engineering	po.sun@burnaby.ca
Thomas Thivener	City of Coquitlam Transportation	tthivener@coquitlam.ca
Glen Chua	City of Coquitlam Engineering & Public Works	GChua@coquitlam.ca
Erin Gorby	City of Coquitlam Urban Forestry	egorby@coquitlam.ca
Douglas McLeod	City of Coquitlam Engineering & Public Works	DMcLeod@coquitlam.ca
Renee de St. Croix	City of Coquitlam Community Planning	rdestcroix@coquitlam.ca
Rob Landucci	City of Surrey Parks	robin.landucci@surrey.ca
Amber Heckelman	Fraser Health Fraser East (Abbotsford through Hope and Boston Bar)	amber.heckelman@fraserhealth.ca
Kendra Cheeseman	Fraser Health Built Environmental Health and Health Promotion	kendra.cheeseman@fraserhealth.ca
Janna Gamache	BC Hydro Local Government Partnerships	janna.gamache@bchydro.com
Laura Chow	Vancouver Coastal Health Healthy Environments & Climate Change	laura.chow@vch.ca
Tyler Semler	Vancouver Coastal Health Healthy Environments and Climate Change	tyler.semler@vch.ca

Justin Ng	City of Richmond Transportation	jng4@richmond.ca
Nathan Andrews	City of Richmond Transportation	nandrews@richmond.ca
Lloyd Bie	City of Richmond Transportation	LBie@richmond.ca
Brandon Green	City of North Vancouver Engineering	BGREEN@CNV.ORG
Christel Lindgren	City of North Vancouver Engineering, Public Realm Infrastructure	clindgren@cnv.org
Rosemarie Draskovic	City of Vancouver Transportation Planning	rosemarie.draskovic@vancouver.ca
Mike Anderson	City of New Westminster Engineering Services	manderson@newwestcity.ca
Sheena Soon	City of New Westminster Parks planning	ssoon@newwestcity.ca
Lacey Hirtle	City of New Westminster Engineering - Transportation	lhirtle@newwestcity.ca
Tammy Liu	Township of Langley Transportation Department	tliu@tol.ca
Deborah Tan	Port of Vancouver Planning and Development	Deborah.tan@portvancouver.com
ReROW Members		
Kelly Clifton	ReROW Lead, Professor, Community and Regional Planning	kelly.clifton@ubc.ca
Dale Bracewell	ReROW Strategic Partnership Lead, Mobility Foresight	dale@mobilityforesight.com
Keun Park	ReROW Associate Lead, Assistant Professor, Forestry	keun.park@ubc.ca
Alex Bigazzi	ReROW Education and Learning Lead, Associate Professor, Civil Engineering	abigazzi@civil.ubc.ca
Mahmudur Fatmi	Associate Professor, Engineering	mahmudur.fatmi@ubc.ca
Melissa McHale	Associate Professor, Forestry	melissa.mchale@ubc.ca
Erick Villagomez	Instructor, Community and Regional Planning & Architecture	Erick.Villagomez@ubc.ca
Kyle Gooderham	Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Department of Psychology	kyle@psych.ubc.ca
Esther Zipori	ReROW Coordinator, Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Community and Regional Planning	esther.zipori@ubc.ca
Charlotte Lemieux	PhD student, Community and Regional Planning	c.lemieux@ubc.ca

Shuoqi Ren	PhD student, IRES	shqren@student.ubc.ca
Muskan Verma	PhD student, Community and Regional Planning	muskanv9@student.ubc.ca
Diana Sanabria	PhD student, Civil Engineering	dianasan@student.ubc.ca
So Hoi Kay	PhD student, Forestry	hoikay22@student.ubc.ca
Eldad Zipori	Undergraduate student, Engineering	eldad.z.zipori@gmail.com