

**Present:**

Councillor Bose - Chairperson  
Councillor Gill  
Councillor Hunt  
Councillor Rasode

**Absent:****Staff Present:**

J. Boan, Manager, Transportation  
V. Lalonde, General Manager, Engineering  
P. Lee, Rapid Transit & Strategic Projects,  
Manager  
L. Luaifoa, Legislative Services

**Guests:**

Brian Fowler  
Bev Fowler  
Brian Clogg

**A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Rasode  
That the minutes of the Transportation

Committee meeting held on July 26, 2011, be adopted.

Carried

The agenda was revised as follows:

- 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue added to "Other Business"
- Park and Ride in South Surrey added to "Other Business"

**B. DELEGATIONS**

There were no delegations scheduled. Brian Fowler, Bev Fowler and Brian Clogg were in attendance as observers regarding 99A Avenue.

**C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS****1. 99A Avenue Traffic Concerns**

The Manager of Transportation provided the following background information:

- The speed limit on 99A Avenue is 50km/h and 30km/h in the school zone during school hours.
- The street width varies from 4.5 m to 6m in width and previously operated as a two-way street with parking permitted on the south side.
- The Fire Department approached the City with concerns of their ability to get through the street in a safe manner. The City normally prohibits parking both sides on streets of 6m or less width to ensure fire trucks are provided safe access; therefore, a parking ban on the south side was implemented.

- Following the ban, residents petitioned the City to allow parking on the south side.
- An extensive review was done by the City that included widening the road to the north.
- The idea of one-way operation was brought forward and generally accepted by residents as it enabled reinstatement of the parking on the south side. The school and their PAC supported the option as well as the Fire Department.
- Residents have in the past and still, are requesting closure to avoid contravention of the one-way operation.
- The City has made signing improvements and used RCMP enforcement.
- In 2008, a Corporate Report recommended against the closure and reasons were: severance of school with neighbourhood, emergency services access and the current situation is temporary as future widening of road with development will restore 2 way operation.
- The school PAC and Principal were in opposition of the closure.
- Residents have expressed on-going concern regarding contravention of one-way and were in attendance at the July Transportation Committee meeting.
- The General Manager of Engineering met with residents on-site in August and agreed to review sight light concerns, signage and video enforcement.
- Engineering operations has now included in their regular maintenance program clearing along the edge of north property to provide adequate sight lines.
- Video monitoring was undertaken over a 3 week period, 24 hours a day. It was reported that 1 percent of vehicles contravening 1 way.
- Video enforcement may be possible, but it is believed that legislative changes would be required and thus is not an immediate solution.
- The City is still in discussion with the property owner on the north side regarding provision of land to allow the City to widen the road. The City would pay for the widening to enable two-way traffic if the owner provided road dedication or a statutory right of way. The owner would thus save on future road construction costs.

The Committee provided the following comments/questions:

- Could the City expropriate property?  
*Staff replied that we could, however, it would be costly and the land will be dedicated at no cost to the City with redevelopment of the property.*
- Something needs to be done. A friendly expropriation of land with tax advantages could be an option.
- If the City had closed circuit TV on 99A Avenue, a sign notifying the neighbourhood of the cameras could be posted above. It may be a good deterrent for the 1 percent of vehicles contravening the one-way.
- The option of installing a camera is favourable as it is an easy and less expensive option to start to resolve the issue and staff could pursue legislation changes to allow this to be enforceable by the police (RCMP).
- Could the road construction costs be charged back to the property owner?  
*Staff replied that it could but would only be payable if the property were developed within 15 years.*

- In terms of the latecomer charge of 15 years, is it regulated by the province? If we had our own charter, could we change that?  
*Staff replied that the province sets the limit and the City follows suit.*
- Suggestion to pursue with the Province new language regarding community safety and benefits that would allow the municipality to put a charge on a property for both land and construction costs so that eventually it would be recoverable. It would facilitate many opportunities missed.
- The committee reviewed an image of the signage at 99A Avenue and 154 Street and resolved that the signage currently in place is adequate.

The Chair granted Mr. Fowler to speak as follows:

Mr. Brian Fowler stated that he spoke with staff three weeks prior and it had been brought to staff's attention that 156 Street and 99A Avenue has a blind spot. The City cleared along the edge of property but it did not clear it far enough down. *Staff advised that they would address this issue and review it on-site with Mr. Fowler.*

The camera that was in place for three weeks was successful; however, people were aware the camera was in place and weren't concerned because there were no repercussions.

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt

Seconded by Councillor Rasode

That staff pursue all of the options that have

been outlined today.

Carried

## 2. **Transportation Funding Update**

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

The following information was highlighted:

- Staff previously highlighted to the Transportation Committee and Council the demand for new Transportation Services and the need to rehabilitate and maintain Surrey's aging transportation infrastructure.
- There was a requirement for Transportation and Finance to develop a feasible 10 Year Financial Plan to address essential areas of funding shortfall.
- The Transportation Committee feedback from June supported objectives and incremental increases to the Levy. At least 1 percent annually and no reductions to General Revenue funding levels was supported. There was debate about ultimate funding levels and State of Good Repair (SoGR) vs. Service Level Improvement (SLI)
- The New Draft Financial Plan 2012-2021 has been developed with the Levy addressing items not previously included such as: inflation/inventory increases; and new maintenance facilities.

- The recommendation from staff is the committee support an annual Transportation Levy increase for the first 6 years of the 2012-2021 Financial Plan to address Phase 1 (Years 1-6) the Good State of Repair (key elements include Paving, Traffic Management Centre, New Works Yard, Shoulder Grading, Pavement Markings & Signage and Safety Improvements)
- Transportation funding needs would be reassessed in the future for Phase 2, (Years 7 – 12) which would address Service Level Improvements and the full change to a Utility (key additional elements include Transit, Active Transportation, Litter and Graffiti and Sweeping).

Discussion ensued regarding the implementation of the Traffic Safety Levy and how the revenue of \$8 M was used for local roads and other transportation programs and initiatives such as implementing traffic safety programs in 50 schools and installing speed humps. The bulk of new funding should be invested in pavement. In the next few years, if Council supports more funding, paving will increase.

Questions/Comments from Committee were made as follows:

- The Works Yard is a capital investment which will be recuperated by utilities, water and sewer and can be funded either by the Levy or through general revenue.
- Earlier investment into transit and active transportation should be planned. Consideration could be given to a Transit Levy.
- The Committee asked if there are examples of a reduced paving program costing a municipality more money in the longer term.  
*Staff responded that they regularly complete a scientific assessment of the roads and predict future conditions based on funding levels. The current condition is consistent with previous projections and demonstrate that it would be cost effective to increase the level of paving at this time.*
- More dialogue with the public would be beneficial to highlight what the City is delivering with their money and receive feedback on approach.
- It was noted that Province has already sealed the cracks on the south side of Highway 10 east bound lanes east of 152nd Street. More monies need to be spent on sealing cracks on City roads to maintain the pavement condition.
- It was recommended that there is not a 12 year plan and that the plan be broken into 2 – 5 year plans.
- More work should be done advertising the work that is being done, e.g. the Serpentine River signs inform the public about the project the City is doing.
- Consider a separate levy for paving and transportation with costs like snow removal included in a paving levy.
- *Staff reported that an increase of \$27 a year would get us on the right road. Levy can be lowered if we take Works Yard out from \$27 dollar levy.*
- Staff will bring back refinements at the next meeting.

**D. NEW BUSINESS****1. Traffic Control Strategy for Work on Roadways**

The Engineering Staff provided an update on the latest efforts and successes for the Traffic Control Strategy for Work on Roadways. A Power-Point Presentation was provided, "Reducing Construction Delays with Safe Traffic Control". The following points were highlighted:

- Due to the rate of development, the City of Surrey currently has considerable construction impact to road operations. About two years ago Council tasked staff with improving the management of construction traffic. Engineering has hired 2 people to manage this issue, with the possibility of a 3<sup>rd</sup> person being hired in the future.
- The process for contractors has always required that they obtain a City Road RoW Use Permit, and a Traffic Obstruction Permit. The City now requires submission of a Traffic Control Plan and is proposing a requirement for a Notification of construction start/end date.
- Other proposed changes include:
  - Working with IT on an Amanda program upgrade to increase the efficiency and convenience of the process.
  - Changes to the By-law which allow the issuance of Municipal Ticket Information (MTI's), New Fees and Security Deposit (User Pay), Inspection fee, Traffic Plan Review Fee and Refundable Security Deposit.
- A strategy to motivate contractors to comply with permit conditions with Temporary Bus Stop Relocations and Parking Disruptions, Traffic Stoppage – Lane Closures, Obstructing Bike Lanes & Sidewalks and Private Driveways and Business Access
- Considerations and flexibility will be necessary in some situations, such as:
  - shorter notice for film industry and paving projects.
  - Road users need for guidance vs. contractors concerns regarding signage costs.
  - Night time noise concerns vs. travel convenience,
  - Maintaining access to business/residents vs. construction delay.
  - Full road closures vs. longer disruption to traffic and fronting properties.
- The general process was reviewed with the Development Advisory Council (DAC) and the DAC seemed supportive.
- Staff requested the Transportation Committee support proceeding with a Corporate Report to Council.

The Committee provided the following comments:

- There were no complaints received for the full road closures at 96 Avenue and 32 Avenue therefore, more frequent road closures may be a consideration.  
*Staff noted that the consultation element is crucial and it has been recorded that residents would rather see construction completed faster.*

- It was questioned where the frequent problems are occurring. *Staff noted that issues arise in a variety of locations, but the impacts are most severe along arterial and collector roads. As such, the requirements for work on local roads are lesser than on the major roads. It was also noted that there are many phases to projects with many subcontractors and thus the permits need to be obtained by the contractor undertaking the work rather than the general contractor.*
- Concern was raised about provisions for cyclists during road construction on major routes, such as King George Boulevard. Additional effort with specific plans for cyclists are needed with these major projects.
- It was suggested that the City utilize media tools such as "Twitter" to provide useful free information such as, notifying drivers of road closures.
- The Committee asked that staff proceed with the original plan to present again to the DAC prior to going to Council with a report.

## 2. Crescent Beach Access Update

Engineering Staff provided an update on Crescent Beach Access and provided a Power-Point Presentation. The following points were highlighted:

- In July 2010 staff submitted a Corporate Report recommending the City not pursue an emergency access route under the wooden trestle bridge and Council directed staff to undertake further work on the issue.
- Staff conducted various reviews and studies including obtaining input from the community. Staff also met with Emergency Services, Transport Canada and the railway. Feedback from the community included: train disruption to access and the need for grade separation, increased train service and increased seasonal visitor demand into the community. Currently there are approximately ten trains a day however numbers are expected to increase to 13-15 a day.
- The Options Review concluded the following:
  - Option 1 and Options 6-10 do not address the community issues and thus should be eliminated
  - Option 3 - Crescent Road Overpass is not recommended based on higher costs, aesthetic impact and operational challenges.
  - Options 4 and 5, McKenzie and McBride Underpasses were not recommended because of the indirect routing, sharp turns, vertical clearance challenges and driveway impacts..
- Option 2 - Crescent Road underpass is the preferred solution but requires further work including a functional level design to confirm constructability and costs. The key risk is a considerable cost increase due to a potential GVRD sanitary main relocation with costs up to \$2 M and BNSF requirements.
- The current order of magnitude is an estimate of \$4 M. Staff will continue to do more work and come back to the committee with better costs.
- Whistle cessation is also a key issue for residents and thus staff have recommended that work towards a whistle cessation be initiated.

The following comments were made:

- Residents who purchased properties were aware of the circumstances as BNSF existed already.
- Crescent Beach has become a top destination with many visitors. It is no longer just an issue for the residents.
- An option is for the City to fund to accommodate emergency access and residents or another funding mechanism fund the additional costs to achieve full public grade separation from the railway.
- The introduction of pay parking is an option for the visitors to the Crescent Beach area.
- Pay parking could fund a portion of the overpass costs and residents could pay a portion.

### 3. Transit Update

The following comments were made:

- Staff worked with TransLink staff and consultants to refine the analysis. There are currently eleven alternatives still on the table. In October/November, the goal is to reduce the number of alternatives from 11 to 2 or 3.

### 4. Pattullo Bridge Update

Engineering Staff provided an update on the Pattullo Bridge Project.

- The Pattullo Project is about to be re-initiated after the project was suspended in the fall of 2010. The Province had put the project on hold pending further review of options including rehabilitation of the existing bridge. TransLink consultants (Delcan) completed a bridge analysis in the late spring of 2011 and the Province has approved moving forward with the project.
- The issues raised by Surrey including full connectivity to SFPR, reconfiguration of Scott Road/King George interchange to optimize traffic flow and free up developable lands along with improvements to the 128 Street/King George Boulevard intersection to suit the extension of 128 Street from 108 Avenue to King George Boulevard would be addressed with the current concept.
- The exact Surrey Alignment is still under review

Councillor Gill left the meeting at 5:00pm

- A review of a 6-lane versus a 4-lane cross-section has been raised due to the elimination of the NFPR and traffic concerns in New Westminster.
- The need for good cycling and pedestrians was highlighted, as the bridge connects to two major regional cycling routes, linking Vancouver, New Westminster and Surrey City Centre.
- Current Translink Plans propose 2.5m on either side of the bridge. Surrey Staff have requested 4 m or at a minimum 3.5 m on each side to properly accommodate cyclists and pedestrians.

- The Brooklyn Bridge was used an example of a bridge purposely built for people to walk over.

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt  
 Secoded by Councillor Rasode  
 That Council endorse staff to continue efforts  
 to secure a 6 lane cross-section and pursue a minimum 3.5 wide cycling/pedestrian  
 pathway on both sides of the bridge.  
Carried

**E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**

**F. CORRESPONDENCE**

1. MP Olivia Chow – National Transit Strategy

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt  
 Secoded by Councillor Rasode  
 That the correspondence from MP Olivia  
 Chow be received.  
Carried

**G. INFORMATION**

**H. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue (Proposed Road Expansion)**

At the July 26, 2011 meeting, a delegation from the 32nd Avenue neighbourhood brought forward their concerns with the proposed road expansion. The delegation has met with Engineering staff as well as the Transportation Committee.

The following comments were made:

- The City has undertaken considerable efforts in reviewing this issue and has provided the delegation with all available information when requested.
- Some potential options exist to minimize impacts of the project including :
  - Shifting the road alignment to minimize tree removal
  - relocating the power lines to facilitate an alignment shift
  - narrowing the median
  - varying the typical approach for cycling provision
- Staff will explore the options and will bring forward further information for discussion again in the new year.

- Staff confirmed that a new paved surface will decrease the noise and vibration from the vehicles and trucks along 32 Avenue.
- The elimination of 32nd Avenue as a truck route would have implications on the other truck routes in South Surrey (16 Avenue and 8 Avenue) along with the movement of goods through Surrey. The City does not have the authority to remove a truck route, only TransLink has this authority.
- The construction of the 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue interchange at Highway 99 would result in a reduction of truck traffic on 32 Avenue thus providing considerable benefit to 32 Avenue residents.
- Gravel hauling along 32 Avenue from the Province's Campbell Heights pit will stop after October.

## 2. Park and Ride – King George Boulevard

Staff noted with the following:

- The issue was raised that there are approximately 30 cars parking on King George due to over capacity of the Park and Ride lot.
- Staff reported that 56 additional stalls were created by re-stripping of the parking lot.
- The Ministry of Transportation has offered land across King George for TransLink to develop an additional lot.
- TransLink is undertaking preliminary work for this project.

## I. NEXT MEETING

The next Transportation Committee is scheduled for Monday, October 24, 2011, at 3:00 p.m., in the Executive Boardroom.

## J. ADJOURNMENT

The Transportation Committee adjourned at 5: 23 p.m.

---

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

---

Councillor Bose, Chair  
Transportation Committee