



ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS ACROSS B.C.

Submitted to: Stewardship Agencies of British
Columbia

Recycling Council of British Columbia

rcbc@rcbc.ca

October 2020



CONTENTS

1. Project Scope.....	2
2. Accessibility: A Definition	2
3. Regional District Outreach	2
4. Key Considerations.....	5
5. Classification of centrality	7
6. Conclusion	7
Appendix 1: International Literature Review on Accessibility	8
Appendix 2: Recycling Accessibility Research Survey	10

1. PROJECT SCOPE

To gather accessibility targets & guidelines from a sample of local governments, for their recycling and waste services, in addition to other public services in British Columbia.

2. ACCESSIBILITY: A DEFINITION

A definition derived from Sustainable Cities and Society:

“ACCESSIBILITY CAN BE BROADLY DEFINED AS THE DEGREE IN WHICH RELEVANT DESTINATIONS CAN BE REACHED GIVEN AVAILABLE TRANSPORT MEANS. IT IS INCREASINGLY CONSIDERED A KEY POLICY GOAL IN LAND-USE AND TRANSPORT PLANNING AND HAS BEEN PROMOTED AS THE MOST RELEVANT CRITERION IN POLICY EVALUATIONS.”

* See Appendix 1 for information on Sustainable Cities and Society report

3. REGIONAL DISTRICT OUTREACH

- A variety of public services including but not limited to; fire halls, post offices, schools, hospitals, ambulance services, libraries etc.
- Explore recycling and waste policies e.g. other agencies, waste collection, regional district solid waste management plans etc.

SURVEY RESPONDENTS

A survey was distributed all regional districts through the BC Product Stewardship Council. 14 Regional Districts completed the survey.

Alberni Clayoquot	East Kootenay
Bulkley-Nechako	Fraser-Fort George
Capital	Kitimat Stikine
Central Kootenay	Nanaimo
Central Okanagan	Peace River
Comox Valley	qathet
Cowichan Valley	Squamish-Lillooet

* See Appendix 2 for the complete survey responses

SURVEY QUESTIONS

- 1) Does your government have accessibility standards in place for recycling services for your residents?
 - i) If yes, what is the standard & what are the factors used to set this standard?
- 2) Does your government have an accessibility standard for OTHER services it provides?
 - i) If yes, what is the standard & what are the factors used to set this standard?

SURVEY RESULTS

REGIONAL DISTRICT ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

Regional District	Recycling & Waste	Public Services
Alberni Clayoquot	?	?
Bulkley-Nechako	N	Y
Capital	N	N
Cariboo	N	N
Central Kootenay	N*	N
Central Okanagan	N	N
Comox Strathcona	N	N
Comox Valley	N	N
Cowichan Valley	N	N
East Kootenay	N	N

Regional District	Recycling & Waste	Public Services
Fraser-Fort George	N	N
Kitimat-Stikine	N	N
Metro Vancouver	N	N
Nanaimo	N	N
North Okanagan	N	N
Okanagan-Similkameen	N	N
Peace River	Y	N
qathet	N*	N
Squamish-Lillooet	N	N

* Unofficially follow the SABC standard

9

COMMENT: PEACE RIVER REGIONAL DISTRICT

*“We have manned Tier 1 and Tier 2 rural transfer stations that provide access for residential recyclable and household waste items (bagged waste, wood waste, metal waste, appliances, and tires). **These sites are designed to service a 20 km radius.***

*Factors included for placement of rural transfer station include **population density, traffic flows, and proximity to the nearest solid waste site.**”*

COMMENT: BULKLEY NECHAKO REGIONAL DISTRICT

*“Transfer Station locations per **population densities.** Distance to **travel for rural residents, max 1hr for most.**”*



DIRECT EMAIL:

Five regional districts responded via email to queries on accessibility standards as they relate to waste and recycling. This includes the Cariboo, Comox Strathcona, Metro Vancouver, North Okanagan and Okanagan Similkameen Regional Districts.

REGIONAL DISTRICT EMAIL FEEDBACK

COMMENT: CARIBOO REGIONAL DISTRICT

*“The Cariboo RD does not have “accessibility standards” for where refuse sites are located. The majority of sites were originally landfills that had been started by the locals in the area. Some time in the 70s and 80s the Cariboo RD took them over and worked with MOE to establish OCs for the sites, later many of them were transitioned to transfer stations. With over 80,000 square km but only 60,000 people we have some very remote landfills still. For example, electoral Areas J and K in the Cariboo RD together have less than 1,600 people, but we have two transfer stations and six landfills between these two EAs. **This is based less on the number of people and more on how far away they are from another refuse site.**”*

COMMENT: REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NORTH OKANAGAN

*“Basically what has determined the location of landfills/transfer stations sites is being in the right place at the right time, rather than being planned based on population density and accessibility. For instance, our main landfill (Greater Vernon) was previously a privately operated landfill that the RD took over. One of our other sites was used for local dumping for many years and was developed into a formal landfill. Our two largest transfer stations were previous rural landfills that were closed....**no intriguing formulas here based on population density, things appear to have evolved based on legacy and use.**”*

COMMENT: REGIONAL DISTRICT OF OKANAGAN SIMILKAMEEN

*“**Local governments do direct public consultation and develop programs based on engineering studies.** Where a need is identified and there is political will then a service area for a transfer station or curbside collection program can be established. The SWMP development process is one of the main tools Regional Districts have to conduct public education and receive the support of the Province to implement new programs or utilities for solid waste.”*

4. KEY CONSIDERATIONS

SITING CONSIDERATIONS FOR RECYCLING FACILITIES

Metro Vancouver

The process for evaluating where to site/build a transfer station is usually unique to the circumstances and involves weighted criteria and standards which can vary.

Key objectives include the following:

MEETING THE CUSTOMER LEVEL OF SERVICE:

- Travel distance/time
- One stop - solid waste & recyclables

LOCAL AND REGIONAL EXPECTATIONS:

- Location
- Land cost
- Transportation network
- Being near the center of waste generation

Some of the accessibility considerations for a transfer station in Metro Vancouver may include:

- Where are the users coming from?
- How long do users wait for service?
- What is the longest drive time to a facility?
- Can we standardize programs to ensure equal access for all users in the region?
- Are we competing with other businesses?
- What is the cost of delivering the service?

OTHER PUBLIC SERVICES: SCHOOLS

Five Year Capital Plan Policies takes into consideration the following education program requirements and trends, including but not limited to:

- operating capacities and current condition of existing facilities
- current and anticipated changes in land use
- student yield rates

- community demographics (census data, vital statistics)
- local community and economic development strategies
- <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/education-training/k-12/administration/legislation-policy/public-schools/five-year-capital-plan>

FIRE HALL

Fire Services Act: https://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/96144_01

Duties of fire commissioner:

- (c)give the advice and recommendations the fire commissioner considers necessary on the establishment of fire departments.

No provincial standard; possible factors may include population density, growth projections etc.

Information at the City of Vancouver is internal and not publicly available.

VANCOUVER HEALTHY CITY STRATEGY

Action Plan: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/Healthy-City-Strategy-Phase-2-Action-Plan-2015-2018.pdf>

ACCESS TO SERVICES -- 43% Estimated residents within 15-minute walk of library, community centre, and neighbourhood house

Our goal: Equitable access to high-quality social, community, and health services

ELECTIONS CANADA

Suitability Checklist for Polling Locations to ensure accessibility includes:

- Public transit stops nearby
- Parking spaces available, well lit, pathway from parking to entrance, parking for persons with disabilities
- Well-known (e.g. community center, church)
- Centrally located

Elections Canada Accessibility Policy includes these considerations:

- Proximity – within a reasonable distance from residence
 - Take into account geography (barriers such as bridges, highways, waterways, railways etc.)
 - Reasonable distance can vary based on service area, e.g. remote regions may require traveling a longer distance

- 
- Reasonable distance may differ for ordinary polling (more accessible, e.g. primary school) vs advance polling (less accessible, e.g. high school).
 - Familiarity – likely to recognize by virtue of it having being used for other services
 - Suitability – balances key principles of accessibility (disability access), proximity and familiarity
 - Operational Requirements – technology, utility services, capacity and security
 - <https://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=vot&dir=spe/checklist&document=index&lang=e>

5. CLASSIFICATION OF CENTRALITY

Definition derived from Sustainable Cities and Society:

“The services for the accessibility analysis are chosen to represent at least three levels of centrality (Lower is more accessible):

low centrality: pharmacies and primary schools

medium centrality: railway stations, hospitals and secondary schools

high centrality: airports, highway entrances and facilities of tertiary education.”

* See Appendix 1 for information on Sustainable Cities and Society report

6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, often there is no standard when providing access to public services. Local agencies are most likely to rely on key considerations when determining access and types of facilities. Key considerations can include environmental, social, cultural, technical, economic and/or legal requirements. Often the delivery of public services is balanced with other financial and social requirements by local governments.

MAPPING ACCESSIBILITY TO GENERIC SERVICES IN EUROPE: A MARKET-POTENTIAL BASED APPROACH

Sustainable Cities and Society, Volume 47, May 2019, 101372:

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210670718312630#bib0300>

DEFINITION:

“Accessibility can be broadly defined as the degree in which relevant destinations can be reached given available transport means. It is increasingly considered a key policy goal in land-use and transport planning and has been promoted as the most relevant criterion in policy evaluations.”

SCOPE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

This study proposes a novel approach to cope with this problem and maps generic (‘generated’ or ‘general purpose’) service accessibility in Europe. At first, it defines three types of generic services based on their minimum number of users: local, sub regional and regional services. Then it uses this definition to estimate the spatial distribution of services and, finally, to assess probable accessibility to services across the EU. It applies a method that is based on the local market potential (i.e., potential users or clients) and aims to find answers to the following questions:

- How is accessibility to generic service areas and facilities structured in Europe?
- How does accessibility to services differ among countries and regions and to what extent can these differences be explained by different patterns of population distribution?
- Considering accessibility to generic services, how large is the gap between urban and rural areas.
- What percentage of people may be able to walk or cycle to their services? How does that differ among different services, e.g. at local or regional level?

(These questions seem relevant to why and how accessibility should be considered.)



SPATIAL ACCESSIBILITY OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE UTILISING THE TWO STEP FLOATING CATCHMENT AREA METHOD: AN ASSESSMENT OF RECENT IMPROVEMENTS

International Journal of Health Geographics: Volume 11, Article number: 50 (2012):

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/1476-072X-11-50>

ACCESS DETERMINATION METHODOLOGY:

“The two step floating catchment area (2SFCA) method has emerged in the last decade as a key measure of spatial accessibility, particularly in its application to primary health care access. Many recent ‘improvements’ to the original 2SFCA method have been developed, which generally either account for distance-decay within a catchment or enable the usage of variable catchment sizes. This paper evaluates the effectiveness of various proposed methods within these two improvement groups. Moreover, its assessment focuses on how well these improvements operate within and between rural and metropolitan populations over large geographical regions.”

(One possible methodology to consider should there need to be a recalculation of accessibility.)

DEFINITION ON TWO STEP CATCHMENT AREA:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Two-step_floating_catchment_area_method

ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES OF GENERAL INTEREST IN EUROPE

Romanian Journal of Regional Science: <http://www.rrsa.ro/rjrs/V7SP1.Milbert.pdf>

THE FIVE A'S OF ACCESSIBILITY:

“The literature of accessibility mainly picks out the physical access by overcoming distances as physical barriers. But “access” can also be refused by high costs, less facilities or unacceptable quality. Penchansky and Thomas (1981) firstly mentioned the so-called five A’s of access to medical care services which are: affordability, availability, accessibility, accommodation and acceptability (Penchansky and Thomas 1981). For the authors “access reflects the fit between characteristics and expectations of the provider and the clients”



(McLaughlin and Wyszewianski 2002). The five A's of access explain on the one hand the provider's abilities to supply Services of general interest and on the other hand the client's abilities to use Services of general interest. Their approach does not solely focus on the consumer's perspective but also include the providers of services and their expectations."

(A way to envision how access should be considered on both the client and the provider's side.)

CLASSIFICATION OF CENTRALITY (LOWER IS MORE ACCESSIBLE)

"The services for the accessibility analysis are chosen to represent at least three levels of centrality:

- *low centrality: pharmacies and primary schools*
- *medium centrality: railway stations, hospitals and secondary schools*
- *high centrality: airports, highway entrances and facilities of tertiary education."*

(Where would recycling facilities and collection depots fall under? Most likely somewhere between low and medium centralities.)

APPENDIX 2: RECYCLING ACCESSIBILITY RESEARCH SURVEY (SEE ATTACHED)