Multilevel Governance and the Developmental City: the Case of Vancouver

Dr Tom Hutton CHS-UBC

Making Greater Vancouver a World City

Project Context and Research Model

- SSHRC MCRI Project: "Multilevel Governance in Canada" (Bob Young, PI: UWO)
- 2. SSHRC National Research Cluster: Urban Transformation in Canada (Larry Bourne and Tom Hutton)
- 3. SSHRC "Social Dynamics of Innovation and Creativity in the City-Region" (David Wolfe and Meric Gertler PIs: U of T)
- 4. The New Economy of the Inner City (Routledge 2008): production systems, labour formation, industrial restructuring and place-making in London, Singapore, San Francisco and Vancouver)

Developmental Context: Trajectories of Urbanization and Urbanism in Vancouver, 1980s to the present

- 1. High growth since the deep recession of the early 1980s: pressures on the land base
- 2. Post-staples /postindustrial development trajectory
- 3. 'Urban transnationalism' as defining trajectory: sustained high levels of immigration
- Comprehensive social change: multiculturalism and rise of a 'new middle class' of professionals, managers, entrepreneurs
- 5. Exemplary planning and local policy models: notably in the metropolitan core

Making Greater Vancouver a World City

Factors and Forces Shaping Vancouver's Development

- 1. Markets: commodity markets, capital, and property
- 2. Global economic forces and industrial restructuring (including deep recessions as well as structural change)
- 3. Social forces: coalitions, communities, leaders, business interests nb. MCRI finding on the latter
- Role of the state: institutions and agencies active players in shaping Vancouver's development in the postwar period: indirectly in resource boom of 1950s-1970s; increasingly important 1980s and after

Increasing Importance of Multilevel Governance in Vancouver's Development

Expansion of multilevel governance associated with:

- 1. Growing complexity of policy issues: 'stretch' the policy capacity of (especially) local government
- 2. Multiscalar nature of development processes: global-local interactions require policy innovation
- 3. Expanding importance of cities in the national life
- 4. Need to combine resources (financial, regulatory etc.) of two or more levels of government
- 5. Opportunity to bring in social forces and other NGOs/CBOs

Making Greater Vancouver a World City

Vancouver as an Instructive Case Study in Multilevel Governance: Experimentation and Innovation

Vancouver's contemporary development (economic, social, cultural, physical and spatial) shaped by mix of forces, including multilevel governance

MCRI Project encompassed major policy fields including infrastructure, image-building, urban aboriginal policy, emergency preparedness, federal properties

Focus here on Infrastructure (and image-building) as salient 'world city' developmental processes

Multilevel Governance and Urban Infrastructure

General significance for Vancouver:

- Capital-intensive nature of public infrastructure provision ('lumpy' expenditure profiles)
- 2. High rates of urban-regional growth: sustained demand for services and infrastructure; primacy of growth management programs at the regional level
- 3. Vancouver's 'gateway functions' and world city aspirations, linked especially to Asia-Pacific linkages
- 4. Complex jurisdictional setting for important infrastructural investments (ports, YVR, highways)

Making Greater Vancouver a World City

Multilevel Governance and Urban Infrastructure

Case study of the Gateway Project and the Canada Line

- 1. Major capital program for infrastructure underpinning Vancouver's 'gateway functions', notably for the Asia-Pacific
- 2. Multiscalar / multimodal project scope: capital improvements to port, YVR, highways, transit throughout the Western Gateway
- Multilevel government scope of project: framing of goals at national, provincial and local-regional level has generated conflicts as well as synergy
- Planning for the Canada Line (formerly RAV line) connecting downtown Vancouver and YVR vividly illustrates both potential advantages and more problematic features

Multilevel Governance and Urban Infrastructure: Case Study of the Canada Line Project

- Complex array of stakeholders and interest groups, including each level of government, YVR, business community, and coalition of transit users
- Compare with initial fixed rail transit project ('Skytrain'), constructed in advance of Expo '86
- Macro-level goal of enhancing both local transit service provision and efficiency of Western Gateway operation in the form of a fixed-rail link between downtown Vancouver and Vancouver International Airport
- Importance of federal funding: 'Canada Line' designation, in support of western gateway; but also a form of regional/industrial policy

Making Greater Vancouver a World City

Multilevel Governance and Urban Infrastructure: Case Study of Canada Line Project

- Canada Line project at strategic level successful example of multilevel governance, in combining resources, powers and aspirations of all three levels of government in a major developmental project
- Illustrates role of political leadership in public megaprojects (notably BC Premier and ministers, federal officials)
- Contribution to 'image-building' dimension of multilevel governance as well as important operational goals: Canada Line scheduled to open in advance of Vancouver 2010 Olympics

Canada Line Case Study

- . . . But at finer spatial resolution of analysis, Canada Line discloses aspects of policy conflict and dissonance
- Interview program with key officials and documentary analysis reveals important contrasts in policy goals at each level
- 2. Federal involvement stresses international gateway and Vancouver's emergent world city potential: 'national interest' argument
- Provincial policy rhetoric underscores BC Government 'mega-project' mentality – a fixture of all governments since the 1950s (Siemiatycki 2006)
- 4. At regional level political discomfort illustrated by problems in getting gateway program and RAV/Canada Line through the regional board: concerns that fixed rail project a low regional priority, and one that displaces needed investments in buses (as well as bicycle-ways and other transportation priorities)
- 5. Canada Line also not highest priority for extensions of fixed-rail

Making Greater Vancouver a World City

Canada Line Case Study

. . . And other localised policy / planning issues

- Conflict with the City of Vancouver's transportation priorities of bus services, bicycles, and pedestrian movement, supported by housing policy ('eco-density', cf London example) and transit demand management (TDM)
- 2. Debate over preferred routes: Cambie (higher ridership) vs. Arbutus Corridor (rail right-of-way already in place)
- Initial commitment toward bored tunneling for Canada Line compromised by escalating costs; shift to disruptive, highexternality cut-and-cover construction
- 4. High costs borne by individuals, businesses (nb Harvey's definition of social justice as the capacity/will to compensate)
- Social forces: business community (excluding those along route) strongly 'on board'; broader community ambivalent

Concluding Observations

... Some lessons from Vancouver ...

- 1. Multilevel governance an important institutional apparatus for urban development, and more particularly world city aspirations (Expo '86, 2010 Olympics)
- Vancouver at macro-level, strategic-scale has been a major beneficiary of multilevel government programs, investments and initiatives, especially since the 1980s
- 3. Canada Line represents an example of multilevel government, articulated in the high-level meshing of multiscalar goals and purposes (= not otherwise feasible)

Making Greater Vancouver a World City

Concluding Observations (. . . Cont.)

- 4. That said . . . Research program over past two years discloses inter- multi-level government policy conflicts and dissonance: relates to jurisdiction, constituencies, need to 'sell' expensive capital projects
- 5. Canada Line project case study also demonstrates power asymmetries in policy-making for capital projects
- 6. In particular, the clear differences in the roles of 'social forces' reinforce impression of strategic-level goals enunciated by senior government can lead to 'suboptimal' outcomes at the regional and local level
- 7. Next stage: finalization of Vancouver paper for MCRI project