Motor Vehicle Act Amendments Resolution

District of Saanich

Motion #1 - Saving money and saving lives: Provincial default 30 km/hr for local streets with no centre line

WHEREAS the current default speed limit on local roads (roads without a centre line) is 50 km/h, and empirical evidence shows that both the likelihood and severity of collisions – particularly involving vulnerable road users – rise sharply as vehicle speeds increase from 30 km/h to 50 km/h, and as a result reducing vehicle speeds on local roads is a proven strategy to improve safety, enhance livability, reduce social costs, and support increased active transportation mode share;

AND WHEREAS existing legislation obliges municipalities to reduce speed limits via bylaws and requires that municipalities install signed speed-limit reductions on every block of local roads, which imposed substantial financial and administrative burdens on municipalities;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the UBCM calls on the Province of British Columbia to amend the *Motor Vehicle Act* to establish a default provincial speed limit of 30 km/h on local roads without a centre line, while preserving municipal authority to increase speed limits on such roads on a case-by-case basis through bylaw and posted signage.

Background

The importance of reducing speed limits on local roads without a centre line is well recognized in BC. For years, UBCM has called on the province to reduce the default speed limits on roads without a centre line (see below), dropping these limits from 50km/h to 30 km/h. The province has thus far declined to make this change, and as a result, many municipalities have independently adopted a 30 km/hr speed limit on some roads through bylaws and posting signs. While this option allows municipalities to improve road safety on their roads independent of provincial action, this process comes with substantial costs. Current legislation requires municipalities to install signs on every stretch of road where speed reductions have been made, which is expensive and unnecessary. This resolution calls on the province to change the default speed limit for local roads (those without a centre line) from 50 to 30 km/h.

Speed Reductions Save Lives

Speeding continues to be a contributing factor in serious Canadian collisions – according to a 2021 Transport Canada report, 27% of fatalities and 19% of serious injuries involve speeding. Numerous studies have established a strong correlation between vehicle speed and both the likelihood and severity of motor vehicle accidents, particularly those involving vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists. A comprehensive meta-analysis published in *Accident Analysis & Prevention* found that for every 1 km/h increase in vehicle impact speed, the odds of pedestrian fatality rise by approximately 11%. Specifically, the risk of fatality is about 5% at an impact speed of 30 km/h, escalating to 50% at 59 km/h, and reaching 90% at 80 km/h. These statistics underscore the exponential increase in danger as speeds rise.

In Canada, the implementation of lower speed limits has demonstrated tangible safety benefits. A study conducted by *The Hospital for Sick Children* in Toronto observed that reducing speed limits from 40 km/h to 30 km/h on local roads led to a 28% decrease in pedestrian-motor vehicle collisions and a 67% reduction in fatalities and major injuries. These findings align with the principles of the Safe Systems Approach advocated by Vision Zero Canada, which recommends 30 km/h as the safe speed in areas with high pedestrian activity to minimize the risk of severe injuries and fatalities.

In June 2016, as part of its position paper, *Modernizing the BC Motor Vehicle Act, the British Columbia-based Road Safety Law Reform Group* recommended a default provincial speed limit of 30 km/hr for local no centre line streets should be included in the *Motor Vehicle Act 1996 c318 (the "MVA")*, with municipalities enabled to increase speed limits on local streets in a case by-case basis by by-law and posted signage. And in 2018, the provincial governments *BC Community Road Safety Toolkit* recommended lower speed limits in downtown areas and residential roads. Recognizing the importance of reduced speed limits, over the years, UBCM has adopted multiple motions calling for reduced speed limits in a number of contexts (see below).

Other Benefits

Reducing speed limits on local roads with no centre line has long been recognized as socially beneficial and necessary to achieve multiple public goals:

- Encouraging mode shift: Lower traffic speeds are associated with increased rates of walking and cycling, as people adopt active modes when they feel safer doing so. A study in Toronto found that for every 1 km/h increase in vehicle speed near schools, the odds of children walking or biking decreased by 3%. A study in Ontario found

that urban environments with lower traffic speeds are associated with higher rates of walking and cycling among students.

- Reducing Noise Pollution: Exposure to road traffic noise has been linked to a variety of adverse health conditions and social impacts, and these impacts fall disproportionately on lower income communities. Reducing vehicle speeds can mitigate these health risks by lowering ambient noise levels.
- Improving Affordability: Stats Canada calculates that the average Canadian household spent $12,090 on transportation in 2023, with the vast majority of this being spent on private vehicular transport. Active transportation and public transit are more cost effective transportation options, and we can increase affordability by encouraging people to shift towards these modes.
- Achieving Climate Targets: In Canada transportation was responsible for 187.7 megatonnes (28.0%) of overall greenhouse gas emissions in 2021, and the largest proportion was from road transportation, which included all types of vehicles and fuels. By making active transportation feel safer and more attractive through lower traffic speeds mode shift, one of the most impactful climate actions available, is accelerated.
- Increasing livability: All the preceding goals contribute to increased livability through quieter, cleaner, safer and more prosperous communities in which residents are better able to enjoy and benefit from the public space roads occupy.

While the reduction of speed limits on local roads with no centre line is widely accepted as necessary and desirable, adoption of them is constrained by existing legislation.

The Motor Vehicle Act

Given the strong connection between vehicle speeds and the likelihood and severity of an accident, it is little wonder that many municipalities have been exploring ways of reducing speed limits on their roads. The MVA stipulates a default speed limit of 50 km/h within city limits. Municipalities are empowered to adopt reduced speed limits by bylaw, but must post each block of each such road with a speed limit sign, and maintain that signage.

For example, the District of Saanich is gradually adopting reduced speed limits its roads with its ‘Speed Limit Establishment Policy,’ and because it must install speed limit signs on every street, the District has been required to allocate $XXX to implement this policy, and the policy will be rolled out in multiple phases over XXX years. While the cost varies across municipalities, it is a significant burden for those wishing to improve safety, avoid the social

costs of injuries, death and property damage, increase active transportation, improve livability, and achieve climate goals.

Such signage costs, while small in relation to the social benefits arising from reduced speed limits, are significant within a municipal budget and would be largely eliminated by the proposed amendment to the MVA. Rather than requiring municipalities to laboriously and expensively install signs on every local road, the proposed change would establish 30km/h as the default speed on these roads.

This requested amendment preserves municipal authority to increase speed limits on designated local roads through bylaw and signage, the cost of which is lower than having to post all or most local roads. Additionally, a provincial default speed limit accelerates implementation of reduced speeds to realize, province-wide, the multiple benefits identified above.

Conclusion

Given the clear benefits of reduced speeds and the cost burden currently imposed on municipalities, the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure should be asked to amend the MVA to create a province-wide default speed zone of 30 km/hr on local roads without a centre line within a municipality unless otherwise determined by bylaw and posted. Such a province wide default speed limit provides province-wide consistency, eases implementation of locally appropriate speed limits and saves precious financial resources.

Motion #2 - Saving money and saving lives: Empower municipal default speed limits

WHEREAS the current Provincial default speed limit on local roads is 50 km/h, and empirical evidence shows that both the likelihood and severity of collisions – particularly involving vulnerable road users – rise sharply as vehicle speeds increase from 30 km/h to 50 km/h, and as a result reducing vehicle speeds on local roads is a proven strategy to improve safety, enhance livability, reduce social costs, and support increased active transportation mode share;

AND WHEREAS default speed limits are established by the province, existing legislation obliges municipalities to reduce speed limits via bylaws and requires that municipalities install signed speed-limit reductions on every block of local roads, resulting in substantial financial and administrative burdens on municipalities;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the UBCM request the Province amend the *Motor Vehicle Act* to empower municipalities to adopt a default speed limit for unsigned roads within municipal boundaries by bylaw and posting of signs at municipal boundaries, rather than needing to install and maintain signs on every block of every road.

Background

This resolution is offered as an alternative to a province-wide change of the default speed limit on local roads, as a second-best alternative. As with the resolution seeking a provincial default speed limit, its intent is to facilitate the cost effective implementation of reduced speed limits by municipalities. It is "second best" because this alternative does not provide the consistency of a province-wide norm and requires posting at municipal boundaries that would not be necessary with a provincial default speed. Because the application of these limits would be restricted to a municipality, the wording of this resolution gives each municipality the ability to apply those speed limits to roads other than local roads with no centre line, a broader scope of application than a province-wide default speed limit.

The importance of reducing speed limits on local roads without a centreline is well recognized in BC. For years, UBCM has called on the province to reduce the default speed limits on roads without a centre line (see below), dropping these limits from 50km/h to 30 km/h. The province has thus far declined to make this change, and as a result, many municipalities have independently adopted a 30 km/hr speed limit on some roads through bylaws and posting signs. While this option allows municipalities to improve road safety on their roads independent of provincial action, this process comes with substantial costs. Current legislation requires municipalities to install signs on every stretch of road where speed reductions have been made, which is expensive and unnecessary. This resolution calls on the province to change the default speed limit for local roads (those without a centre line) from 50 to 30 km/h.

Speed Reductions Save Lives

Speeding continues to be a contributing factor in serious Canadian collisions – according to a 2021 Transport Canada report, 27% of fatalities and 19% of serious injuries involve speeding. Numerous studies have established a strong correlation between vehicle speed and both the likelihood and severity of motor vehicle accidents, particularly those involving vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists. A comprehensive meta-analysis published in *Accident Analysis & Prevention* found that for every 1 km/h increase in vehicle impact speed, the odds of pedestrian fatality rise by approximately 11%. Specifically, the

risk of fatality is about 5% at an impact speed of 30 km/h, escalating to 50% at 59 km/h, and reaching 90% at 80 km/h. These statistics underscore the exponential increase in danger as speeds rise.

In Canada, the implementation of lower speed limits has demonstrated tangible safety benefits. A study conducted by *The Hospital for Sick Children* in Toronto observed that reducing speed limits from 40 km/h to 30 km/h on local roads led to a 28% decrease in pedestrian-motor vehicle collisions and a 67% reduction in fatalities and major injuries. These findings align with the principles of the Safe Systems Approach advocated by Vision Zero Canada, which recommends 30 km/h as the safe speed in areas with high pedestrian activity to minimize the risk of severe injuries and fatalities.

In June 2016, as part of its position paper, *Modernizing the BC Motor Vehicle Act, the British Columbia-based Road Safety Law Reform Group* recommended a default provincial speed limit of 30 km/hr for local no centre line streets should be included in the *Motor Vehicle Act 1996 c318 (the "MVA")*, with municipalities enabled to increase speed limits on local streets in a case by-case basis by by-law and posted signage. And in 2018, the provincial governments *BC Community Road Safety Toolkit* recommended lower speed limits in downtown areas and residential roads. Recognizing the importance of reduced speed limits, over the years, UBCM has adopted multiple motions calling for reduced speed limits in a number of contexts (see below).

Other Benefits

Reducing speed limits on local roads with no centre line has long been recognized as socially beneficial and necessary to achieve multiple public goals:

- Encouraging mode shift: Lower traffic speeds are associated with increased rates of walking and cycling, as people adopt active modes when they feel safer doing so. A study in Toronto found that for every 1 km/h increase in vehicle speed near schools, the odds of children walking or biking decreased by 3%. A study in Ontario found that urban environments with lower traffic speeds are associated with higher rates of walking and cycling among students.
- Reducing Noise Pollution: Exposure to road traffic noise has been linked to a variety of adverse health conditions and social impacts, and these impacts fall disproportionately on lower income communities. Reducing vehicle speeds can mitigate these health risks by lowering ambient noise levels.
- Improving Affordability: Stats Canada calculates that the average Canadian household spent $12,090 on transportation in 2023, with the vast majority of this being spent on private vehicular transport. Active transportation and public transit

are more cost effective transportation options, and we can increase affordability by encouraging people to shift towards these modes.

- Achieving Climate Targets: In Canada transportation was responsible for 187.7 megatonnes (28.0%) of overall greenhouse gas emissions in 2021, and the largest proportion was from road transportation, which included all types of vehicles and fuels. By making active transportation feel safer and more attractive through lower traffic speeds mode shift, one of the most impactful climate actions available, is accelerated.
- Increasing livability: All the preceding goals contribute to increased livability through quieter, cleaner, safer and more prosperous communities in which residents are better able to enjoy and benefit from the public space roads occupy.

The Motor Vehicle Act and Status Quo

Given the strong connection between vehicle speeds and the likelihood and severity of an accident, it is little wonder that many municipalities have been exploring ways of reducing speed limits on their roads. The MVA stipulates a default speed limit of 50 km/h within city limits. Municipalities are empowered to adopt reduced speed limits by bylaw, but must post each block of each such road with a speed limit sign, and maintain that signage.

For example, the District of Saanich is adopting reduced speed limits its roads with its 'Speed Limit Establishment Policy,' and because it must install speed limit signs on every street, the District has been required to allocate $XXX to implement this policy, and the policy will be rolled out in multiple phases over XXX years. While the cost varies across municipalities, it is a significant burden for those wishing to improve safety, avoid the social costs of injuries, death and property damage, increase active transportation, improve livability, and achieve climate goals.

Such signage costs, while small in relation to the social benefits arising from reduced speed limits, are significant within a municipal budget and would be reduced by the proposed amendment to the MVA. Rather than requiring municipalities to laboriously and expensively install signs on every local road, the proposed change would enable municipalities to establish default speed limits by bylaw and posting signs at municipal boundaries.

While the reduction of speed limits on local roads is widely accepted as necessary and desirable, adoption of them is constrained by existing legislation. The cost burden imposed by the current MVA has not, to our knowledge, been addressed in prior UBCM motions and may be an unintended consequence of the current legislation.

Conclusion

Given the clear benefits of reduced speeds and the cost burden currently imposed on municipalities, the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure should be asked to amend the MVA to enable municipalities to adopt default speed zones on local roads.

Municipally determined default speed limits with posting at municipal boundaries enables municipalities to adopt appropriate speed limits without incurring the significantly greater costs currently imposed by the MVA.

Motion #3 - Right turns on red

WHEREAS the *Motor Vehicle Act* permits right turns on red lights unless otherwise signed;

AND WHEREAS right turns on red lights are a significant source of crashes involving vulnerable road users, in part because drivers' attention is often directed left as they turn right, and prohibiting right turns on red, unless signed as permitted, has been demonstrated to significantly reduce the number of crashes:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the UBCM request the Province amend the *Motor Vehicle Act* to include a ban on right turns on red lights at all intersections except where signed as permitted.

or

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the UBCM request the Province explore options for implementing a ban on right turns on red lights in BC.

Background

Right turns by a motor vehicle at a red light ("RTOR") have long been recognized as a significant source of injuries, deaths, property damage and a deterrent to the use of active transportation. Prior to the 1970's such turns were illegal in most North American jurisdictions and are illegal today in some.

The primary risks associated from RTOR arise from the fact vehicle drivers pull forward and look to their left for cross traffic in the lane(s) they wish to enter. Drivers are, understandably, focused on avoiding a collision with high speed traffic coming from the left. To obtain an unobstructed view to the left, drivers may pull forward from the stop line into a crosswalk.

An increasing number of jurisdictions are considering, or have re-instituted, RTOR bans to improve road safety. In the US, those jurisdictions include Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle. New York City and the European Union have, for the most part, retained a RTOR ban for decades.

History of RTOR

In many North American locations, RTOR were prohibited for safety reasons until 1975 when, during the oil crisis, the US federal government required states to permit them as an energy saving measure as a condition of receiving federal funding. While negligible fuel savings have been attributed to enabling RTOR, the resulting reduction in safety is clear.

Safety and RTOR

In December, 2024 the Mineta Transportation Institute released a study which found RTOR were responsible for 39,000 collisions and 217 fatalities between 2011 and 2022 in California. Over half involved a pedestrian or cyclist. Their review of crash data and earlier studies revealed RTOR movements are generally unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers and hinder the livability of streets for vulnerable road users. The study noted that "most drivers (one study found 70%) do not come to a complete stop and instead roll through" the red light, creating a safety hazard for pedestrians in the crosswalk.

The Mineta study also noted drivers are often looking left for oncoming traffic while making right turns and do not look for pedestrians in the crosswalk to their right. The study's authors recommend that states should allow cities to prohibit right turns on red as the default practice and only allow such maneuvers at select intersections. Cities could allow right turns on red based on intersection design, the amount of pedestrians and bicyclists at specific intersections and their proximity to transit stations.

A 1982 study by the US National Highway Traffic Safety Administration analyzed crash data from the mode to late 1970's and found that permitting RTOR led to a 43% to 107% increase in pedestrian crashes and a 72% to 123% rise in cyclist crashes, depending on the jurisdiction. Fortunately, the relatively low speed of the impacts resulted in few fatalities, a finding revealed in other studies as well.

In 2016, the BC based Road Safety Law Reform Group touched on this issue in

recommending that municipalities be permitted to install no right turn on red arrow traffic signals to reduce collisions with vulnerable road users. In 2018 the UBCM endorsed the Road Safety Law Reform Groups recommendations in full:

https://www.bikehub.ca/about-us/news/new-westminster-city-council-calls-for-modernizing-the-motor-vehicle-act

Subsequently there have been other UBCM motions around the MVA, as well as the province recently amending the MVA to include explicit safe passing laws:

https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2024MOTI0046-000476

Need additional studies on this to hammer the point home.

Additional point to make would be one more paragraph concerning alternative operative clause 2, such that it explains how we want to give the province some flexibility in how it approaches this. For example, only banning RTOR in busy urban settings.

A few studies I was able to identify:

Characteristics of Left- and Right-Turning Vehicle-Pedestrian Crashes and What Can Be Done About Them (CARSP, 2019):

- Approach: Analysis of 3,878 serious pedestrian injury or fatality crashes in Canada, focusing on turning vehicle movements at intersections.
- Findings: Right-turning vehicles were involved in 9.4% of serious pedestrian crashes at intersections. While left-turning vehicles posed a higher risk, right-turn incidents still represent a significant safety concern.
- The study recommends countermeasures such as banning RTOR, implementing leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs), and redesigning intersections to enhance pedestrian safety.

Links to possibly useful studies, I have not had a chance to review these. Info dumping them here in case you have time:
https://www.smartcitiesdive.com/news/right-turn-on-red-ban-pedestrian-safety-effective-research/728750/

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0022437582900019

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19439962.2018.1490368

https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=afb8209696d3d016c31fd6c43a34c2f55c18d88a

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1369847815001679

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2046043024000170

https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/75582

https://tsr.international/TSR/article/view/26012

https://archives.sfmta.com/cms/rhomepd/documents/DPT_right_turn_on_red.pdf

https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A617186&dswid=-3187

https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/25909

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/12265934.2016.1183511

Finally:
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/mti_publications/527/

“Our findings reveal that RTOR movements are generally unsafe for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers, while only marginally useful in lowering emissions and only under certain contexts”

Literature on impact of RTOR on vehicle flow. We may want to address this as it is the first concerns folks raise:
https://ascelibrary.org/doi/abs/10.1061/9780784485514.019

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3141/2553-04

Conclusion

RTOR were widely recognized as unsafe, and therefore banned, when road safety laws were developed in the last century. In response to the 1970’s oil crisis, the US government

incentivized states to permit RTOR in the hopes of saving fuel. Research demonstrates such turns do greatly increase collisions between motor vehicles and vulnerable road users, justifying the earlier banning of them. The clear safety benefits and minimal inconvenience for drivers support the growing number of jurisdictions reinstating bans on these turns. BC should similarly amend its MVA to ban right turns on red lights.

Motion #4 - Permit use of red arrow traffic signals

WHEREAS the *Motor Vehicle Act* does not authorize or define the use of red arrow traffic signals to signify when a right-turning vehicle is prohibited from turning;

AND WHEREAS most crashes occur at intersections, making clarity in relation to rights of way particularly important at intersections:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UBCM request the Province to amend the *Motor Vehicle Act* to enable the use of red arrow traffic signals to signify when a right-turning vehicle is prohibited from turning.

Background

The *Motor Vehicle Act* (the ”MVA”) does not authorize or define the use of red arrow traffic signals to signify when a right-turning vehicle is prohibited from turning. Given the importance of prohibiting right turns in many circumstances, it is important municipalities have the power to install traffic lights indicating when a right turn is not permitted.

Right turns by motor vehicles have long been recognized as a significant source of injuries, deaths, property damage and a deterrent to the use of active transportation. Prior to the 1970’s right turns on red lights (“RTOR”) were illegal in most North American jurisdictions and are illegal today in some.

Intersections and Crashes

In many North American locations, RTOR were prohibited for safety reasons until 1975 when, during the oil crisis, the US federal government required states to permit them as an energy saving measure as a condition of receiving federal funding. While negligible fuel savings have been attributed to enabling RTOR, the resulting reduction safety is clear. For example:

- In December, 2024 the Mineta Transportation Institute released a study (https://transweb.sjsu.edu/sites/default/files/2347-Appleyard-Pedestrian-Bicyclist-Safety-Intersections-Policy.pdf) which found RTOR were responsible for 39,000 collisions and 217 fatalities between 2011 and 2022 in California. Over half involved a pedestrian or cyclist. Their review of crash data and earlier studies revealed RTOR movements are generally unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers and hinder the livability of streets for vulnerable road users. The study noted that "most drivers (one study found 70%) do not come to a complete stop and instead roll through" the red light, creating a safety hazard for pedestrians in the crosswalk. That study also noted drivers are often looking left for oncoming traffic while making right turns and do not look for pedestrians in the crosswalk on the right. The study's authors recommend that states should allow cities to prohibit right turns on red as the default practice and only allow such maneuvers at select intersections. Cities could allow right turns on red based on intersection design, the amount of pedestrians and bicyclists at specific intersections and their proximity to transit stations.
- A 1982 study by the US National Highway Traffic Safety Administration analyzed crash data from the mode to late 1970's and found that permitting RTOR led to a 43% to 107% increase in pedestrian crashes and a 72% to 123% rise in cyclist crashes, depending on the jurisdiction. (com/news/right-turn-on-red-ban-pedestrian-safety-effective-research/728750/) Fortunately, the relatively low speed of the impacts resulted in few fatalities, a finding revealed in other studies as well.

"Section 130 of the MVA provides for the use of green and yellow arrow signals. In both cases, the signals indicate when turning traffic that otherwise has a green or yellow signal has the right of way because all through traffic is stopped. Red arrows could similarly be used to indicate when right-turning traffic must not proceed because through moving traffic, including cyclists in a through lane, have the right of way. The rationale for this recommendation is the same rationale set out above in relation to clarifying rights of way as between cyclist through-traffic and turning motorist traffic. The use of red arrow traffic lights can provide additional assistance to road users, clarifying when a right-hand turning vehicle must stop."

In 2016 the BC based Road Safety Law Reform Group recommendations

(https://bikehub.ca/sites/default/files/modernizing_the_bc_motor_vehicle_act_nov_2017.pdf) recommended that RTOR be banned in BC unless signed otherwise. *(Note - I do not see*

this in the recommendations, but may have read them too quickly) In 2018 the UBCM endorsed the Road Safety Law Reform Groups recommendations in full:

https://www.ubcm.ca/convention-resolutions/resolutions/resolutions-database/updating-bc-motor-vehicle-act-improve

https://www.bikehub.ca/about-us/news/new-westminster-city-council-calls-for-modernizing-the-motor-vehicle-act

Subsequently there have been other UBCM motions around the MVA, as well as the province recently amending the MVA to include explicit safe passing laws:

https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2024MOTI0046-000476

Given the adverse safety implications of inadequately controlled right turns, the authority to install red arrow traffic signals at some intersections is an important element of a municipalities ability to improve road safety.

Add content regarding jurisdictions that have adopted this policy and any empirical evidence concerning its effectiveness.

Motion #5 - Update name of MVA

WHEREAS the name of the Motor Vehicle Act RSBC 1996 c318 ("the MVA") does not reflect its purpose of regulating rights and responsibilities in relation to all road users nor of its primary goal of ensuring safety;

AND WHEREAS roads must serve a wide range and growing number of users in addition to motor vehicles, including pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians, those using other mobility devices and public transit:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the UBCM request the Province to change the name of the MVA to the *Road Safety Act*.

Background

At its core, the purpose of the *Motor Vehicle Act* is to promote safe use of roads. Its name should reflect that objective, be neutral between different road users and not emphasize motorists in particular. As an increasing share of road users are vulnerable or active transportation users, a name such as the *Road Safety Act* is not only more accurate and descriptive, it helps to instill an understanding that all lawful users of the road “belong.”

The UBCM endorsed this recommendation in 2018 when it endorsed the recommended Motor Vehicle Act amendments in the report of the BC based Road Safety Law Reform Group, The recommendation to change the name of the Motor Vehicle act is the first of the report's 24 recommendations.