

Present:

Councillor Bose - Chairperson
Councillor Hunt
Councillor Rasode

Absent:

Councillor Hepner

Staff Present:

J. Boan, Transportation Manager, Engineering
P. Bellefontaine, Transportation Planning Manager, Engineering
P. Lee, Rapid Transit & Strategic Projects Manager, Engineering
V. Lalonde, General Manager, Engineering
T. Mueller, Legislative Services

Guest:

Elizabeth Model, Downtown Surrey BIA

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of the December 2, 2010 meeting to be adopted.

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt

Seconded by Councillor Rasode

That the minutes of the Transportation

Committee meeting held on December 2, 2010, be received.

Carried

B. DELEGATIONS**C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS**

1. **Emergency Access to Crescent Beach Neighbourhood**
File No: 7130-01; 8710-01; 8630-01

The following comments were made:

- On July 26, 2010, a Corporate Report was prepared for Council recommending that Surrey not pursue an emergency access route under the wooden trestle bridge due to:
 1. unacceptable levels of risk exposure to the City
 2. appropriate emergency service protocols being in place
- Council directed staff to review all reasonable engineering alternatives for both emergency and non-emergency access into the community.
- Staff met with the Crescent Beach Community Association in December 2010 and explained the recommendations contained within the Corporate Report, scope of the current study, and preliminary list of options and solicited other ideas from community members. Staff invited further feedback from the group in the following weeks and no further potential solutions were provided.

- Engineering staff completed an extensive review of previous emergency access information including Canadian railway operating rules and regulations applicable to the study location, and developed a comprehensive list of alternative emergency access routes as follows:
 1. Underpass at the Marina
 2. Underpass at Crescent Road (new alignment) due to grade difference of the railway.
 3. Overpass at Crescent Road
 4. Underpass at McKenzie Street
 5. Underpass at Maple Street
 6. Only for evacuation on foot – stairs at 24 avenue
 7. "Porosity" of Stopped Train. Ability to "break" a train.
 8. Pedestrian underpass or overpass
 9. Train Stop Protocol
 10. Helicopter
 11. Barge / Hovercraft
 12. Relocation of Railway Line.

Next Steps:

- Applying an evaluation matrix to the identified 12 options.
- Conducting stakeholder workshops – including emergency services, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) and Crescent Beach Property Owner's Association (CBPOA) representatives. The workshops will allow an open dialogue of identified alternatives, and allow stakeholders to evaluate the results and provide input.
- A follow-up stakeholder meeting will be held to review the short list of alternatives along with various funding options available. Staff noted there are levels of recovery that could be considered.
- A short list of options will be presented to the Transportation Committee for review at the March 9, 2011 meeting, along with a brief overview of the public consultation process.
- A Corporate Report will be presented to Council for consideration in either June or July 2011.

The Committee suggested the use of Surrey's Search and Rescue Boat as a possible solution and asked staff to amend the list to separate mass evacuation planning from individual evacuation planning.

2. **Walking Plan**
File No: 8310-01

The following comments were made:

- Surrey has had a 25% population increase which has led to increased complexity and competing demands on the system. Expanded transportation solutions have been important as the public is more knowledgeable and issues such as the environment have become more important to people.
- The Transportation Strategic Plan has 6 Principles which ensure integration of transportation into broader City policies and objectives.
- The City of Surrey walking plan was one of the items identified in the Transportation Strategic Action Plan.
- In 2009, consultation was undertaken involving stakeholders and the public. Through 2010, there was a testing of understanding of the issues. A successful on-line public consultation survey was undertaken with 400 responses received.

Examples of some of the questions that were asked include:

1. ***What would help you walk more in Surrey?***

Responses:

- More off-street paths/walking further from traffic
- Shorter distances to destinations (good land use planning)
- Increased frequency of transit
- More sidewalks

Four Principles of the Walking Plan (Note: within each of the principles are several actions for change and examples from each were presented):

1. **Making Connections – the importance of networks**
 - Newton Town Centre was reviewed last year. Focussed on holistic, comprehensive approach when targeting neighbourhoods to identify additional sidewalks, lighting, and other needs.
 - Continue to use a flexible, innovative crosswalk warrant (evaluation tool) to provide additional options for crossing treatments.
2. **Walking for all – universal accessibility**
 - Conduct pedestrian audits of road design projects to ensure safety, operation, and connectivity for pedestrians.
 - De-cluttering of sidewalks, removal of impediments to those with disabilities.
 - Employ audible and tactile devices at traffic signals.
 - In 2011, one intersection will be used as a pilot for tactile paving.

3. **Shaping Surrey – new opportunities from new development**
 - The City works with Coast Mountain Bus Company to determine where bus stops are placed. There is the TRIPP funding program from TransLink. Shelters are based on the number of people on the street and number of riders boarding the buses.
 - Maintenance of the assets, sweeping, snow removal. Enhance public awareness of snow removal and vegetation removal responsibilities on major arterials and collectors.
 - Revise traffic impact study requirements for a more comprehensive assessment of pedestrian activities and needs.
 - Undertake a review of City’s road concept plans to support improved routing options and connectivity for pedestrians.
 - Promote community connectivity for all modes through the development of a finer grid network through NCPs and new development.

4. **Streets for people – safety and comfort**
 - Neighbourhoods will be physically walked, reviewed and extensive public consultation will be conducted.

Walking Program Measurement:

1. Monitoring

- Are we achieving plans?
- Are funding and resources appropriate?
- Need for re-prioritization within programs?
- Are we effecting change?

2. Focus on Value

- Capital sidewalk programs, missing links, new multi-use pathway, road crossings implemented or improved, accessible bus stops, and school travel planning programs.
- Linking pedestrian provision with locations of higher need such as high density neighbourhoods, routes to schools and hospitals.

Next Steps:

- Complete drafting of Plan
- Report to Council February 2011 with new Plan

The Transportation Committee suggested that shirt-sleeve sessions may be valuable, at the discretion of the Chair, for more significant transportation issues which require Council input.

Council suggested that Traffic impact studies should be re-named to “**Transportation Impact Study**”, which would better reflect all transportation modes.

The Transportation Committee suggested the City needs to focus attention on monitoring TransLink improvements. When new transit routes are added to an area, traffic studies should be conducted to review safe crossing, sidewalk placement, accessibility issues; and; if the criteria are met, installation of bus shelters.

The Transportation Committee suggested that Engineering consider enlisting the help of Boy Scouts, local community / volunteer groups, i.e., adopt-a-street groups, to assist in conducting area improvement surveys. Staff noted that the City is working with BEST on these types of surveys.

The Transportation Committee requested an update on when the hydro pole will be removed from Venture Way; staff will provide an update at the February 1, 2010 meeting.

The Transportation Committee requested staff to place more effort on promotion of active living/walking programs and noted every school newsletter should receive information on the walking program; staff was encouraged to work closely with PAC's, teachers, and principals. Staff noted that through the Safe and Active schools program there was a high level of communication between these stakeholders and staff in the development of plans.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Rapid Transit Update File No: 8740-01

The following comments were made:

- The Fraser Valley Rail working group will meet on Wednesday, January 19. Paul Lee, Rapid Transit & Strategic Projects Manager, will be making a presentation to bring the Fraser Valley communities up-to-date on what Surrey is doing and how the rapid transit plan fits compliments the interurban service.
- TransLink is entering into Phase 2 of the Rapid Transit Plan; short listed alternatives in terms of design and analysis will be reviewed. A civil engineering firm will be producing design concepts and costing them out.
- Phase 2 started in December 2010 with developing a list of alternatives. Evaluation of alternatives will begin in January 2011. The General Manager, Engineering will be attending a steering committee meeting with stakeholders. The intent is to provide the conclusion of the report, along with Surrey's recommendations relative to the proposed transit network and the phasing.
- Timing is critical, it is important to ensure project timelines do not slide. The main elements of the plan include:
 1. Refining evaluation framework – to set the rules to compare the 10 different options.

2. Developing conceptual designs for shortlist alternative. For each alternative there will be feeder buses going into them.
 3. Defining bus transit service for analysis.
 4. Preparing inputs for Phase 2 evaluation.
 5. Documentation (report/design workbook).
- Alternatives for three proposed transit corridors include:
 1. 104 Avenue from Guildford to City Centre. There is some potential for connecting to the TransCanada Highway. The study will be looking at whether it makes sense to have a freeway connection
 2. Fraser Highway corridor into Langley – Includes alternatives in the linkage between Fleetwood and City Centre.
 3. King George Boulevard corridor. The first section is from City Centre to Newton. Alternatives are included for an extension to Semiahmoo/White Rock (BRT or LRT).
 - Technologies will be evaluated for the three corridors and relative priorities. Surrey will provide information regarding the City's view of the proposed network and prioritize what needs to be completed first.
 - Staff noted that the Rapid Transit Study determined that the interurban corridor was eliminated in the screening process from further consideration for rapid transit at this time. The city is identifying this corridor as future transit corridor.
 - Next Steps:
 1. Evaluate shortlist alternatives as per MAE framework
 2. Conduct Sensitivity Analysis – Land Use and others (TBD)
 3. Present to the public – MAE Matrix
 - The Transportation Committee suggested that Surrey explore a full transit loop based on the Portland Model. Establishing the "Clover-belt" would be a great way to help the businesses; BIAs could help to fund the infrastructure to create synergies of building business. Consideration should be given to a downtown Surrey urban circulator to attract and keep and hold business. Staff explained that Surrey is much better off with an investment that goes from City Centre, Newton to Fraser because Surrey's largest concentrations are in Guildford and Newton.
 - The Transportation Committee requested staff to take the Portland model and overlay it over Surrey's 50 year plan to show the scale.

E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

F. CORRESPONDENCE

G. INFORMATION ITEMS

H. OTHER BUSINESS

**1. Committee Recommendations to Council
Regular Council Public Hearing – December 13, 2010**

(a) Letter from South of Fraser Community Rail Task Force
File No: 0480-20; Resolution No: RES.R10-2225

(b) Surrey's Major Road Needs
File No: 8630-01; Resolution No: RES.R10-2226

2. Planned Agenda items for 2011

The following comments were made:

- This item was deferred to the February 1, 2011 meeting for further discussion.

3. Prepare review of role/function of the Transportation Committee for February meeting:

(a) Discuss items initiated and completed by TC in 2010

The following comments were made:

- This item was deferred to the February 1, 2011 meeting for further discussion.
- Review Committee TOR and discuss action items and business for the balance of the year including financing of transportation issues, moving to transportation as a utility.

I. NEXT MEETING

The next Transportation Committee Tuesday, February 1, 2011, from 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m., Executive Boardroom, City Hall.

J. ADJOURNMENT

The Transportation Committee adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

Councillor Bose, Chair
Transportation Committee