

**Present:**

Councillor Bose - Chairperson  
Councillor Hunt  
Councillor Rasode

**Absent:**

Councillor Gill

**Staff Present:**

J. Boan, Manager, Transportation, Engineering  
P. Bellefontaine, Transportation Planning Manager,  
Engineering  
V. Lalonde, General Manager, Engineering  
S. Fillion, Manager, Financial Services, Finance &  
Technology  
J. Hughes, Finance & Technology  
L. Anderson, Legislative Services

**Guests:**

M. Bernet  
M. Cremin  
P. Cremin  
L. Halvorson  
J. Kern  
I. Saretzky  
M. Saretzky

---

**A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

1. Minutes of the April 13, 2011 meeting to be adopted.

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt

Seconded by Councillor Rasode

That the minutes of the Transportation  
Committee meeting held on April 13, 2011, be adopted.

Carried

**B. DELEGATIONS**

1. **Country Woods Community Association**

Dave Moffatt, President, and Cameron Taylor, Director, of Country Woods Association, provided a background of the neighbourhood as well as an overview of their written presentation regarding traffic concerns in the Country Woods neighbourhood. Comments were as follows:

- There has been a steady increase of young children, in addition to the aging residents that have lived in the area for many years.
- Over the last few years, traffic has increased in the area substantially, some as a result of parents conveying children to the new Pacific Heights Elementary school on 26 Avenue and some due to traffic back-ups on 32 Avenue from 176 Street (Highway 15) resulting in motorists taking short-cuts through the community. With the increased traffic as development in South Surrey continues, together with the anticipated increase in enrolment at the elementary school (portables are expected to be installed in the near future), the concern for the safety of the pedestrians has also increased.
- A previous request for traffic calming was not supported by the City based on a speed and volume study that fell only a few vehicles short of the required

minimum for traffic calming consideration. Since then the elementary school on 26 Avenue has opened which has resulted in a large increase in the volume of traffic and increased congestion at 32 Avenue and Highway 15.

- Traffic backs up every day to 172 Street on 32 Avenue because of the traffic signal at Highway 15 and 32 Avenue. As a result, some drivers detour up 172 Street to 29 Avenue to get to Highway 15. Since there are no stop signs or other measures to slow down vehicles, drivers travel at high speeds. As many as 40 children are at risk and most residents walk on the roads and trails due to the lack of sidewalks. There are very few with one on Country Woods Drive, one on 29 Avenue and a short length on 26 Avenue at the school. The trails are connected on either side of the roadways (such as 28B Avenue, 29 Avenue and Country Woods Drive), but there are no crosswalks at either end of any of the trails. These are also used daily by the students.

The delegation discussed their map of the neighbourhood noting five trail crossing locations that would be ideal for raised crosswalks as well as two secondary locations that would also benefit from having raised crosswalks. It was further noted that the locations identified also coincide with the various locations of mail boxes, where there is currently further potential of accidents involving vehicles and pedestrians.

In closing, the delegation provided various options for consideration relating to their concerns.

Staff commented as follows:

- The intersections at Highway 15 with 32 Avenue and 24 Avenue are both Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure controlled. City staff are reviewing both intersections.
- As part of the Safe and Active School Program, traffic calming is planned to be introduced at Pacific Heights Elementary School potentially in 2012.
- Country Woods Drive is a collector road. The City's traffic calming policy does not allow traffic calming on collector roads.
- Earlier city plans had Country Woods Drive continuing south to 16 Avenue; due to community concerns during the Grandview Heights NCP process, the city disconnected it at 26 Avenue.

The Committee noted that:

- Panorama Ridge is now using a number of traffic humps throughout that neighbourhood which are not unpleasant to drive over and help to keep speeds down. The costs associated with this type of traffic calming is relatively inexpensive and may be something to consider for the Country Woods neighbourhood following a traffic evaluation of volumes and speeds.
- Consideration should be given to install traffic calming signage on 172 Street at 32 Avenue which would provide advance notice that traffic calming measures have been put in place. The likelihood is that once drivers discover there has been traffic calming put in place, they may not travel that route again.

Discussion followed with regard to traffic signal spacing on Highway 15 between 16 and 32 Avenues with the anticipated development of Grandview Heights NCP Area #4. It was noted by the delegation that Highway 15 is under Provincial jurisdiction and as such the likelihood of additional signals being installed along that portion of the road would be low.

The delegation was advised that their issues would be reviewed by staff, further assessment undertaken and presented to the Committee, at which time the delegation would also be invited to attend.

The Agenda was varied to consider the following new item:

## **E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**

### **1. Delegation Request**

At the Regular Council Public Hearing meeting of June 13, 2011, Council passed a motion that Ms. Pauline Cremin, with members of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Neighbourhood Community, be heard as a delegation before the Transportation Committee to discuss concerns over the widening of 32 Avenue from the 15400 block to the 16000 block, into four lanes.

Ms. Cremin and members of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Neighbourhood Community were in attendance, as observers, for any discussion the Committee had with regard to their concerns. In order for the Committee to gain a thorough understanding of those concerns, staff were asked to prepare a briefing of the information for the July meeting at which the delegation will be scheduled. It was further requested that the briefing also be copied to the delegation in advance of their presentation to the Committee.

The following was noted:

- There is an urgency from the delegation to be heard as they are concerned with the work that is planned on 32 Avenue.
- Staff reported that the design phase is complete and that normally a request for tender would follow (typically a 1-2 month period). However there have been concerns raised and as such, the tender request has not yet been issued.

The Chair granted Ms. Cremin permission to speak as follows:

- It is the request of the citizens of the area that there be a suspension on any further activity until the delegation has been heard. It was noted that at a recent meeting the local school gymnasium was filled.
- A presentation will be prepared by the delegation for the Transportation Committee's July meeting. It was requested that the display boards used at the public open houses also be available for the presentation in July.

The Chair thanked Ms. Cremin for her comments and again noted that copies of the briefing prepared by staff will be provided in advance to the delegation and

asked that the delegation similarly provide any presentation material in advance of the meeting.

## C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

### 1. Transportation Funding

File No. 8630-01

A PowerPoint presentation was provided by Engineering staff and staff from Finance and Technology were in attendance to provide any further clarification as required. Comments were as follows:

- Finance and Engineering staff have been working together to get a full assessment on the City's financial situation pertaining to transportation funding.
- The assessment is timely as the City is at the end of the Roads & Traffic Safety Levy (Levy), which currently generates \$8m a year.
- The presentation provided an overview of current funding, how budgets are allocated and used and options for moving forward.
- A series of approved strategies are fundamentally changing the transportation role and services:
  - Provincial emission targets
  - TransLink 50% non car mode share target
  - Within Surrey, several new policies including:
    - Sustainability Charter;
    - Plan for Social Well-Being;
    - Child- and Youth-Friendly City Strategy;
    - Transportation Strategic Plan; and
    - Walking Plan.
- Surrey is growing rapidly, which increases the complexity of the transportation system in terms of planning and design, the need for new technologies (e.g. intersection control), but also raised public expectations. In addition, there is an increasing amount of assets and enhanced level of treatments that need to be maintained.
- Based on a 3% annual growth (2001-2011), it is expected that there will be a 47% increase in population by 2031. Based on a 4.3 % vehicle registration increase between 2001-2009, car ownership growth would be even higher.
- Addressing the extra traffic will require: an increase in transit ridership, optimizing intersection management, increasing walking and cycling and increasing road capacity.

A review of the current transportation funding, broken down into the capital side and the operating side, was provided and comments continued:

- Regarding the DCC's, each year staff review the 10 year capital plan and the DCC rates. DCCs are limited to growth related works, primarily road widening. The DCCs are internally balanced over a three year period to reduce fluctuations with an average of \$45m a year identified. Actual DCCs have been less than projected.

- Some funding for specific infrastructure and programs is also obtained from TransLink and senior government, but this presentation is focussed on City funding.
- On the general revenue side, traditionally there has been a base level of funding and often special “one- time funding”.
- In terms of the Roads and Traffic Safety Levy, since 2008, 1% per year has been added on to property taxes (ending 2011) to be used for roads and traffic safety. The Levy now provides \$8m a year of stable funding.
- Other funding sources are currently relatively small and include the bus shelter and bench contracts (until 2016). Presently that money is allocated to the traffic operations group (approx. \$0.25m a year).
- Use of digital media money is currently planned for other city priorities.
- No net revenue has been realized on pay parking at this point.

Graphs representing the Roads and Traffic Safety Levy funding (2008–2011) and the general revenue funding (2005–2010) were reviewed and discussed noting that the Levy funding increased to \$8m after 4 years. Over the same period of time, general revenue funding to capital decreased due mainly to the loss of special “one time funding”. Comments continued:

- Programs have been optimized to reflect the available funds, but additional funding is needed to deliver the level of services required to meet our vision and objectives.
- With regard to paving, 29% of Surrey’s major roads are classified as “poor” or “very poor” condition. Typically municipalities aim to keep this less than 15%.
- It is important to note that timely paving and preventative maintenance reduces long term costs. The maintenance cost per m<sup>2</sup> increases significantly with deterioration.
- One measure of pavement condition is the percentage of cracks on the road system. There has been a steady increase - average cracking increased to 9.0% in 2010. The City should be targeting 3% cracking.
- An investment of \$10m per year for the repaving of the major road network has been identified as necessary to achieve this.
- Paving needs are reduced by \$1m (DCC’s) due to road widening projects.
- For local road paving, \$6m per year is needed.
- With regard to transportation utility needs, the following was noted:
  - As of 2011, the \$8m collected from the Levy is calculated as an average fee per single family property of \$48.72 per year. In comparison, the similar fee for Langley Township is approximately \$300 per year.
  - The full needs are still being finalized but preliminary work indicates that under the current levy model (levy plus general revenue), a minimum \$170/yr/avg. single family home, would be needed to fund transportation needs.

Discussion ensued regarding various additional funding options; whether to phase in or not, if the ultimate goal is to create a full stand-alone utility in 10 years. It was noted that no reserves are being developed and although there is some infrastructure replacement, it is not a large amount. Comments continued:

- The Levy has been a success, there haven't been any citizen complaints and it has accomplished what was intended.
- Consideration needs to be given as to whether the existing funding approach continues (levy vs general revenue) or if transportation should become fully funded from the levy.
- The most pressing need is repaving.

Discussion followed with the Committee making a number of recommendations.

- Support additional funding to finance transportation paving and service level improvement needs.
- Allow levy funding to be used for all transportation needs.
- No desire for lowering general revenue provided to Transportation by increasing future levy.
- A minimum funding option discussed was that levy increases be applied at 1% until transportation needs are fully funded.
- In future consider adding commensurate fee to secondary suites.

**D. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. Delegation Request**

The e-correspondence from Mr. Brian Fowler regarding the traffic concerns on 99A Avenue, between 154 and 156 Streets, was considered.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>It was</p><br><br><p>delegation to the Transportation Committee upon completion of the investigation and review of the information collected (CCTV camera monitoring) that is underway.</p> | <p>Moved by Councillor Hunt<br/>                 Seconded by Councillor Rasode<br/>                 That Mr. Fowler be invited to appear as a</p> |
|--|---|

Carried

**E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**

**1. Delegation Request**

This item was dealt with earlier in the meeting.

**F. CORRESPONDENCE**

**G. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**1. May 11, 2011 Transportation Committee Meeting**

It was  
Committee meeting held on May 11, 2011, be received.  
Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Rasode  
That the notes of the Transportation  
Carried

**H. OTHER BUSINESS**

**I. NEXT MEETING**

The next Transportation Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, July 12 and was subsequently changed to **July 26, 2011** at 3:00 p.m. in the Executive Boardroom.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

The Transportation Committee adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

---

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

---

Councillor Bose, Chair  
Transportation Committee