



# City of Surrey

## Transportation Committee

### Minutes

Executive Boardroom  
City Hall  
14245 - 56 Avenue  
Surrey, B.C.  
**MONDAY, MAY 5, 2008**  
Time: 12:40 p.m.

---

**Present:**

Chair - Councillor Bose  
Councillor M. Hunt  
Mayor Watts

**Absent:**

**Guests:**

John Sprung, Fraser Valley Heritage  
Rail Society  
Allan Aubert, Fraser Valley Heritage  
Rail Society  
Peter Holt, Buckley Blair Consulting

**Staff Present:**

Vincent Lalonde, Manager Utilities &  
Transportation  
Ken Zondervan, Design & Construction  
Manager  
Jaime Boan, Transportation Manager  
H. Dmytriw, Legislative Services

---

**A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

It was

Moved by Diane Watts

Seconded by Councillor Hunt

That the minutes of the Transportation

Committee meeting held on February 13, 2008, be adopted.

Carried

**B. DELEGATION REQUEST**

1. Thang Vu, request to appear as a delegation to provide a brief regarding the safety of cyclists and the public in the City of Surrey; the Motor Vehicle Safety Act, and the Motor Vehicle Transport Act.

Vincent Lalonde, Manager Utilities & Transportation provided the following background information:

- In the past, Mr. Vu sent a letter advocating some provincial legislative changes to promote and improve cycling safety.
- The Engineering Department responded to the latest letter of January 2007, advising Mr. Vu to approach the Province with this issue as opposed to each individual community.
- Mr. Vu is not a resident of Surrey.

Committee discussion comments:

- Surrey relies on the Vancouver Area Cycling Coalition as the primary stakeholder voice.
- We need to ensure that delegations heard are appropriate to hear.

Mr. Vu's request is under consideration.

## C. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

### 1. Heritage Rail Project

Peter Holt provided a brief history of the Heritage Rail from the Fraser Valley Heritage Society (FVHS) point of view.

- A report was provided the end of February, 2008.
- The FVHS reviewed the costs and protection requirements. Meetings were held with other agencies regarding funding and support.
- Natural Resources Canada responded that the funding requirements for hydrogen power was high. They have \$50,000 – \$200,000 in available funding, but are not currently releasing funding. Peter Holt thought monies may be released immediately prior to the call for election in February.
- Mayor Watts spoke with Minister Falcon: He stated that the Federal Government is not interested in the project and the Province is not interested. They feel the actual costs would come in substantially higher with unsustainable ongoing costs to operate.
- Allan Aubert said that before the launch of the project they did due diligence. They did meet with and received in writing support from Southern Rail, Transportation Minister Falcon and BC Hydro. They were encouraged from day one. They have been doing all as needed. Something has happened since receiving this letter from Minister Falcon and coming up against a “NO” was a surprise.
- They requested approximately \$250,000 per year for 3 years with various grants. This funding would be needed by mid-June with a hoped for November/December kickoff in order to have a possibility of demonstration runs during the 2010 Olympics. This could only be a pared down plan, possibly between Sullivan and Cloverdale due to the short timeline.
- John Sprung, the Chair for of the FVHRS, has the opportunity to be involved from the ground up. Kwanten University College has supported his 12-month sabbatical to work on Heritage Rail, and see the connection to community service as being quite strong.
- Jaime Boan and Peter Holt met with Frank Butzelaar of Southern Railway a few months ago. He indicated reserved support for the project, but would need to see a detailed implementation and operation plan that he could take to his Board. He noted that in the past the Board has not been supportive of this type of initiative.
- Frank Butzelaar is coming to our next Transportation Committee meeting to outline their strategic direction.
- Councillor Bose recommends that we take that opportunity to have him fill us in on the larger picture of Southern Rail’s plans.

Chairperson Councillor Bose thanked the guests and advised that any further discussions would be in camera.

**D. STAFF PRESENTATIONS****1. 156 Street/Highway 1 Underpass – Community Issues**

Ken Zondervan, Design & Construction Manager provided a presentation on the status of the 156 Street Underpass project and community concerns regarding noise attenuation and possible walkway closures.

**156 Street Underpass - Noise Mitigation**

- The Plan for an underpass at 156 Street has been included in City planning documents for many years. This is not a new road. The right-of-way has always been planned to accommodate an underpass or overpass at this location.. Overpass plans have always been there since before the adjacent houses were there.
- Frontage Road is in place on the North-East side. The north half of project extends along 156 Street from Highway 1 to 108 Avenue; the south half from 104 Avenue to Highway 1. The form of adjacent development and the issues are somewhat different between the two halves of the project.
- Fraser Heights residents have been the most vocal about the project. The community as a whole is solidly behind the project, but the immediately adjacent residents voice a number of concerns and opposition..
- Along 156 Street north of Highway 1 there are different conditions on the two sides of the road:
  - i. West side – allows for a larger buffer space and the frontage road. East side properties, the side-yards are closer to the new roadway.
  - ii. Local community was concerned regarding the elementary school on 157 Street and the potential for school children to jaywalk across 156 Street (a fence with continuous hedging will be added along the west side of 156 Street to channel pedestrians to the 108 Avenue intersection crosswalk).
- 3 pedestrian count surveys were done and on average 3 kids were counted as crossing 156 Street south of 108 Avenue.
- The Transportation department have taken every resident comment to heart and undertaken further investigation and development of measures in response.
- The actual numbers of pedestrians potentially jaywalking are rather immaterial as safety is the main issue: even if it is only one child who may jaywalk it is appropriate to construct a fence to direct pedestrians to the crosswalk at 108 Street.
- We feel that the mitigation measures for kids walking to school are appropriate.
- 156 Street will be a two-lane road with cycling lanes having a total 9.6 meters width from curb to curb. In addition there will be a 3 meter wide multi-use pathway along the east side.
- The subdivision lot layout at the cul-de-sac ends in this neighbourhood was done with property side yards abutting 156 Street as opposed to pie shaped lots with the rear yard backing onto 156 Street, as is a more typical cul-de-sac subdivision design

- Two main issues regarding east side lots:
  - i. Walkways connecting to the new multi use pathway
    - Some residents would like to close these walkways citing the safety of children playing in the cul-de-sacs and potential for the walkways to promote crime in their neighborhood as the main reasons. We received a petition last year in this regard.
    - To respond to this request a survey of the neighborhood is being carried out, in accordance with Departmental practice, to determine the level of support for walkway closure.
    - Have a design with walkways to major roads with offsetting fences that have nice split-cedar rail fencing.
    - Have not done a final tally of all the results from the survey but initial indications are that there is not sufficient support for closure.

For future access to the transit station planned south of Highway 1, residents will probably want to use the walkways.

    - These paths as pretty critical to promote walking and transit usage.
  - ii. Noise fencing
    - Cedar hedging, intensive landscaping and trees are all planned as part of the project. Residents want continuous concrete noise wall. City does not currently have a policy with respect to transportation noise attenuation but there is the possibility of creating a policy of dealing with new arterial roads on completely new alignment or in previously unopened road allowance.
    - Looked at idea – arterial adjacent to someone’s yard – what policy can be implemented, exposure, and wholesale implementation costs.
    - Graffiti usually becomes a problem wherever this type of facility is constructed
    - Should we bring forward policy to potentially include concrete noise fences in certain circumstances.
    - There are only a very few locations in the City where such a policy would apply.

Committee comments:

- If you look down 32 Avenue, 32 Avenue will become the reality. Expanding from two to four lanes will give rise to the same complaint and we would not be able to keep the policy confined to only the new roads we will have the same issues as Fraser Hwy and Hwy 10 where noise fencing has been used.
- The public will see noise mitigation as a possibility when we widen our road.
- There is no policy or reference point that says under these conditions. Could look at a draft policy that would look at opening up a new road and side yard and arterial, numbers of cars per day, noise generation, etc.
- Noise mitigation fencing and landscaping in front of properties along 32 Avenue was paid for by the Campbell Heights development.

- What is along Hwy 10 is a Provincial jurisdiction and the Provincial Government does not intend to plant in front of that concrete fencing, road maintenance contractor will have to take care of graffiti. The only stretch of concrete fencing originally planned for was just west of King George Hwy as part of the land negotiations. Since then more and more noise fencing has been added and we now have a corridor tunnel all along Hwy 10. Planting may be less costly than scrubbing concrete fencing.
- Chairperson Councillor Bose voiced the concern that there are some areas that really should have sound barriers. Vincent Lalonde noted that the Transportation section does have a draft policy it has worked on with specific references to its application that can be put forward for review by this committee to deal with the issue of noise mitigation on 156 Street. 156 Street north of Highway 1 is never to become a four lane road, but to remain a two lane road. The committee is not in favour of spending money other than on landscaping.

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Bose  
That the Transportation Committee not  
consider sound barriers on 156<sup>th</sup> between 104 and 108 Avenue.  
Defeated with Mayor and Chair opposed.

Discussion ensued with the following comments:

- We could do fairly intensive landscaping, see how it fills out, and assess afterwards the impacts of this road compared to other similar roads in Surrey.
- Ken Zondervan noted that traffic volumes on opening day will be comparatively low and with the completion of the Gateway project in 2014 traffic will decrease significantly.

It was Moved by Mayor Watts  
Seconded by Councillor Bose  
That the Transportation Committee  
recommend that the staff proceed as planned with landscaping, but with the  
provision for periodic evaluation after project completion.  
Carried

## 2008 Capital Plan – Maps

Ken Zondervan, Design & Construction Manager, provided a presentation on the 2008 Capital Plan for roadway repaving and rehabilitation, with focus on the works to be undertaken with the new funding for Local Roads rehabilitation and safety.

- Total capital plan for repaving shown on the map provided; arterial road projects shown in red and local road paving shown with colour purple
- Crack sealing program is fairly significant and has been quadrupled compared to previous years.
- We will report to Council on our local road and safety levy expenditures

- Overview of some of the major projects by Ken Zondervan –
  - Arterial paving projects – a lot of extensive patching work and reconstruction such as along 104 Avenue from King George Highway to 152 Street
  - In past, mostly was all mill and repave on arterials. This year there is heavy patching work.
  - Damage due to activity of construction and heavy trucks as well as more severe winter weather effects.

Committee comments:

- Apart from DCCs, in areas like Grandview Heights with high development activity and the associated volumes of heavy trucks, is there something levied for damage due to activity of construction? How much is spent on maintaining those roads until they are upgraded or repaved?
- Vincent Lalonde to bring a report back to this committee in the autumn of 2008, regarding mechanisms for collecting a road-wear fee/levy (dump trucks, etc.) as part of the development fee, to create an interim roads maintenance fund for emergency repairs and rebuilds.
- When will arterial widening projects such as 64 Avenue east of Highway 15 be completed? There has been a shift of funding priority due to regional projects such as the construction of Golden Ears Bridge. This bridge opening will bring a significant spike of traffic along 96 Avenue and widening will be required from 176 Street to 152 Street.
- A new Traffic Coordinator has been hired to start next week.
- King George Hwy and Hwy 10 and 152 Street are having construction work done simultaneously.
- Colebrook Road/152 Street railroad overpass. We have issued requests for proposals for a pre-design study. A traffic signal has been installed and will be in operation in a few days.

A 5 minutes recess was called.

Meeting called back to order.

## **2. South Surrey Transportation Planning Issues**

- A new Emme/2 model has been developed due to:
  - Greater densities than previously anticipated.
  - Updated transit (SoFA and regional data)
  - Enhanced input detail, and accuracy
  - Rapid pace of development – must protect RoW to accommodate future demand
- Future Demographic forecasts show population will be over double & employment forecast show triple the jobs by 2031
- Base Run model assumptions were:
  - 2031 horizon year with build out
  - Updated population and employment
  - 10 year plan projects and select R-91 projects

- Includes 24 Avenue and 152 Street interchanges
- Model split used for South Surrey of:
  - 70% auto
  - 15% passengers (Carpool or Shared Trip)
  - 15% Transit / Walk / Bike (current transit is 4%)
- 2031 results:
  - Double number of vehicles – from 27,000 to 58,000 PM peak trips
  - High proportion of trips staying within South Surrey: 43%
  - 2031 PM base volumes very large with considerable increases in delay
  - Highlights need for additional lanes on Highway 99 and significantly more rapid municipal road improvements than currently able to fund.
- Option Development:
  - Potential improvements that show positive results include:
    - 16 Avenue/Hwy 99 Interchange
    - Highway 99 Widening to 6 Lanes
    - KGH Widening to 6 Lanes (40 Ave to 34 Ave)
    - 20 Ave Overpass (KGH to Croydon Drive)
    - 4 Lane Arterial Standard
- Currently proposed Project priorities based on the modeling results and current transportation issues (subject to change based on development patterns and changing demands):
  - KGH Widening 152 St to Crescent Rd
  - KGH Nicomekl Bridge Replacement & Widening to Hwy 10
  - 24 Ave / Hwy 99 Interchange
  - 32 Ave – Widening
  - 192 St – Widening 24 Ave to Hwy 10
  - 152 St / Hwy 99 Interchange
  - 24 Ave – Widening
  - 20 Ave – Hwy 99 Overpass
  - 152 St – Widening to KGH to Hwy 10
  - 16 Ave – Widening
  - 16 Ave / Hwy 99 Interchange

#### **Ministry of Transportation South Surrey Development Freeze:**

- Ministry of Transportation has advised that they will not approve any developments for which they have jurisdiction south of 40 Avenue along the Highway 99 corridor (800 meters from any intersection along Hwy 99).
- This affects a number of applications including the Grosvener site. The applicants for this site worked with City & MoT to gain support for their project by developing a package of works to improve the 32 Avenue interchange.
- MoT stated in meetings:
  - Need for road improvements on municipal roads (Engineering advised of plans and current works)

- Need for strategy of improvements – work together (Engineering provided updated Emme/2 model and remained available to meet and discuss)
- Want to download KGH Nicomekl Bridge (Engineering undertook functional design and cost estimate to facilitate).
- Want City to contribute to Ministry improvements for Hwy 99 (Engineering advised that they would work with Ministry on interchanges but through lanes on Hwy 99 were considered Provincial responsibility).
- Will not approve anything until agreement reached between City, TransLink and MoT.

Discussion ensued with the following comments:

- There is the need to engage Council regarding this issue. We have the capacity to do analysis that shows the 800 Meter RoW and need to determine what proportion of this will grow within the radius and how much growth will be outside that radius.
- Vincent Lalonde noted that this freeze started a year ago and then MoT pulled back from this position. Starting about 3 months ago they again stopped approving applications.
- Densities in this area are needed to reduce the housing demand further east which would result in more urban sprawl and more traffic.
- Staff will prepare a corporate report to focus on the MoT issue and present to CIC (2 hours) in one month.

It was

Moved by Councillor Bose

Seconded by Councillor Hunt.

That the Transportation Committee request staff provide a corporate report to be presented to Council at an extended CIC.

Carried

Ken Zondervan departed the meeting at 1:30pm

### 3. 2008 Median Update

Jaime Boan, Transportation Manager, provided the committee with a review of the past, current and proposed approach to median installation:

#### Recommended Practice

- Capital Projects:
  - Consultant to –
    - Review collision history with ICBC
    - Evaluate opportunities for shared left-in only turn lanes and U-turn facilities
  - Project Manager to review recommendations with business owners/operators
  - Review with Transportation Committee

- Development Applications:
  - Revise design criteria – consistent treatment, clear understanding for developers
  - Driveways restricted to R-in/R-out only.  
If safe, L-in from Arterial considered for a:
    1. Multi-family site of 200 or more units;
    2. Commercial site of 150,000 sq.ft. GFA or more;
    3. Industrial site of 10 ha or more;
    4. Shared driveway of three (3) or more properties; or
    5. Benefits operation of surrounding road network.

The Transportation Committee indicated support for the proposed practice.

**Median Projects Update**

- **KGH – 77 Avenue Intersection –**
  - Left turn lane on KGH to be cut into median for 77 Avenue.  
Construction is expected to start in July.

**Proposed Median Projects (refer to attached figures and notes for details – Appendix I: Median Update –Apr 2008 for minutes.ppt)**

- 140 Street – 96 Avenue to 100 Avenue
- Ocean Park – 16 Avenue and 128 Street
- 88 Avenue - 132 Street to King George Hwy
- 96 Avenue - 125 Street - 128 Street
- King George Hwy - 156 Street
- Fraser Hwy and 64 Avenue

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

The Transportation Committee indicated support for all the proposed projects but wanted all of Council to see the proposed projects through the Meeting Minutes and be able to comment.

It was

Moved by Councillor Bose  
Seconded by Mayor Watts  
That the Transportation Committee receive

this report as information.

Carried

**F. CORRESPONDENCE**

**G. INFORMATION ITEMS**

1. Cultural Capitals of Canada – Civic Treasures Award  
Received funding for artwork. 6 project areas.

It was  
  
this as information.

Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Bose  
That the Transportation Committee receive

Carried

**H. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Closed Meeting – Section 90 (1)(d), (e) and (k)**

The Transportation Committee passed a motion to hold a Closed Meeting in accordance with Section 90 (1)(d), (e), & (k), of the *Community Charter*, which states:

*"A part of a council meeting may be closed to the public if the subject matter being considered relates to or is one or more of the following:*

- (d) the security of the property of the municipality;*
- (e) the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interest of the municipality;*
- (k) negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public."*

It was  
  
meeting be closed in accordance with Section 90 (1)(d), (e) and (k) of the *Community Charter*.

Moved by Councillor Bose  
Seconded by Mayor Watts  
That the regular meeting recess and the

Carried

Mayor Watts departed the meeting at 2:12 pm.

The Regular meeting reconvened at 2:45 pm.

**I. NEXT MEETING**

The next Transportation Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 21, 2008 at 8:30 am – 10:30 am at the Executive Board Room.

**J. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

1. Frank Butzelaar, Southern Rail to provide a presentation regarding high-level strategic review of long term needs of the railway.
  
2. Propose that the Mayor to use this opportunity for a joint meeting for Surrey and Langley to discuss the business of moving freight, long term strategies and core business (e.g. coal) and other uses of rail and the impact on the city and conflicts:
  - Straight issues of working with current situation in long term
  - Current issues as it unfolds
  - Issue of passenger rail

**K. ADJOURNMENT**

It was  
  
do now adjourn.

Moved by Councillor Bose  
Seconded by Councillor Hunt  
That the Transportation Committee meeting

Carried

The Transportation Committee adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

---

Jane Sowik, Acting City Clerk

---

Councillor Bose, Chair  
Transportation Committee