



Green Timbers Heritage Society

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, June 7th 2017

Surrey Nature Centre | 14225 Green Timbers Way, Surrey, BC

Call to Order

The June 2017 Meeting of the Green Timbers Heritage Society Board of Directors was called to order at 7:03pm on June 7, 2017 at the Surrey Nature Centre by Don Schuetze.

Attendees

Don Schuetze, Amar Virk, Chris Temple, Nathan Ross, Tessa Perkins Deneault, Jim Foulkes, Ellen Edwards, Susan Lehman,

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was unanimously approved.

National Historic Site

A submission was made and rejected in 1993 (Ellen to find original application).

Financial Update – Jim Foulkes, Treasurer

City of Surrey made a \$50,000 Deposit on May 23 (\$20,000 Payroll bi-weekly for 15 people)

\$500 given out of petty cash to Nathan for the gas (5 Vehicles)

Running expenses are \$45,000 a month. (Payroll 40k, 5k vehicles)

SNAP Update – Nathan Ross

Extremely busy for Nathan. Started up last month, busy with training, orientation. Getting people out working and into a rhythm.

Past Volunteer Events: Telus day of giving, Sunny Side Acres event went well, Children's Fest went well.

Future Coming up events: World Oceans Day & and Park Openings

Media: Made Page May13 of the Peace Arch News & BC Almanac on the news.

Job Posting: 2 High School students will be joining at the beginning of July

Volunteer Work Party: 10-2pm every second thursday until the end of summer.

Foreign Invasive Species Management: Japanese Knotweed (Addressed by City of Surrey)

Green Timbers Hedge Trail Pruning occurring

30% of Staff SNAP time spent at Green Timbers

Green Timbers Shoreline Clean-up: Around lake conducted today (June 7th)

Ellen Parks Updates Strategic Plans:

Comments from Parks Session:

Green spaces

More events

More picnic areas

More Playgrounds

Outreach to youth, artists and aboriginals
Community Gardens
Dog-off leash areas
Youth amenities (Skating/biking)
Opening up dykes in Surrey to the public.

Comments from Heritage Session:

Develop Tourism providing more cultural events
Repurposing Heritage Buildings
Get into technology (Interactive)
Watering of trees by lake

Parks, Recreation & Culture Strategic Plan

<http://www.surrey.ca/culture-recreation/3096.aspx>

Nathan gave an update on the SNAP program that will be starting up for the 2017 season next week. His report is enclosed.

Need a list of Heritage Items:

Not listed by last years council (Said there are zero)
Surrey Heritage Inventory Committee

Bill Potma gave a report on the Green Timbers Urban Forest Advisory Committee, chaired by Neal Aven (City –Urban Forests)

100th Ave & 148th (Sign needs to be moved and cleaned up).
100th Ave widening parking lot.
Water fountain by parking lot washrooms
A new sign kiosk by lake (Middle of the lake)
Birch trail sign, motion passed to have it repaired.

Trail Signage

Needs to be better

New Trail

Brainstorming of new paths (No decision made)
Sub-Committee (Tesse, Jim, Chris, Don, Pat)

Meeting Adjourned

9:10pm Don, second Bill.

Communications

May 11, 2017

Hello! Just to continue the theme of severe silting from 100 ave constructions; this pic yesterday of the marsh area just above the falls in the stream leading to GT Lake looks like a Mississippi mud puddle. Normally this is not the case. If a resident would pollute any stream like that (or even a gold miner or lumber company) there would be ramifications?

Bill Kroesen

May 21

to Surrey
Hello Community Contributors and Partners!

We would love to have you as the highlighted community group for one of our upcoming Market days this season. As a highlighted group we do not charge you the Vendor fee to attend and you can plan any activities or events you would like to do to share what you do with the community.

The market runs on Wednesdays from 2pm-6pm starting June 7th until October 4th.

Please let me know as soon as possible if you would like to participate and which Wednesday would work best for you. If you are interested in doing a series of events we can try to accommodate this as well. We'd truly love for you to be involved!

Thanks so much and I looking forward to hearing back from you soon!

Roxci Bevis

May 22

Subject: Deforestation of Green Timbers

Message: Hello mister or madam,

My name is Nikalen Edwards, I am writing an opinion editorial on the deforestation of Green Timbers to widen the highway for my class Semester in Dialogue at Simon Fraser University. I was wondering if I would be able to ask you a few questions about the park and the areas being cut down. Are the trees that are being cut down ones from 1930 replant, or are they naturally grown trees? What do you and/or the Green Timbers Heritage society think should be done instead of the deforestation how could we make the city more accessible? Lastly, do you have any stories about animals being affected by the deforestation?

Thank you for taking the time to answer my questions, I hope to hear from you soon.

Nikalen Edwards

May 23

Hi Don,

Here is an excerpt from the Board minutes in 1993.
Sometimes a resubmission with a different emphasis will be successful.

Mike Starr

Commemorations Officer, National Historic Sites
Coastal BC Field Unit
Parks Canada / Government of Canada
23433 Mavis Ave. Box 129, Fort Langley, BC V1M 2R5
mike.starr@pc.gc.ca / Tel: 604-513-4785 / Cell: 604-961-9256

* * * *

November 1993

The Green Timbers Forest Station and its Inaugural Plantation, Surrey, British Columbia

During the course of its discussion, the Board noted that the Green Timbers Forestry Station appeared to be of considerable provincial importance. The station's opening was a landmark in the history of the forest industry in British Columbia indicating as it did the province's commitment to the principle of active reforestation as a means of renewing its timberlands. None the less, on the basis of the information before it, the Board was not prepared to recommend that the forestry station or its inaugural plantation were of historic significance at the national level as by 1930 many provinces had long been active in reforestation and as the station itself did not appear to be in the forefront of the implementation of silviculture advances.

May 26

to planningdevelo., parksrecculture, me

Good Afternoon,

I am writing to express my concern about the rapid rate of vegetation loss in the City of Surrey.

I grew up in Surrey and interpret our forested areas and trees to be a foundation of why we love living here and what we value.

The rate at which trees are being removed to make space for residential development is just sickening and, environmental concerns aside, I fail to see how this adds any value to esthetics and our natural habitat. As a past municipal councilor I understand the zoning and community development process; however, I just wanted to voice my concern about the perceived unfettered development that is occurring at the expense of our green space. I also understand that developers attempt to preserve a quota of green space; however, this is really not hitting the mark and it is just depressing to see large plots of greenery get replaced with condos.

Specifically, I am concerned with the following corridors: Green Timbers park, and the South Surrey area (Redwood Park/Kensington Prairie/Grandview Heights).

Please pass on my request to city planning management that some review is desperately needed to reopen the discussion about striking a better balance between the appetite for accommodating growth and preserving what is of value to long time residents of our city. At some point, we need to just say no more.

I appreciate your time.

Kindest regards,
Nicole McLaren

May 30

Dear Sir or Madam:

Re: South of Fraser Rapid Transit –Surrey-Newton-Guildford Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project Stakeholder Workshops

TransLink and the City of Surrey invite you to attend a stakeholder workshop to help inform the ongoing planning of the Surrey-Newton-Guildford LRT Project. We appreciate your insights on the project and contributions towards transforming transportation South of the Fraser. The Project is an important component of the Metro Vancouver Mayors' Council 10-Year Vision and key to shaping Surrey's growing communities to be more connected, complete and livable. Surrey-Newton-Guildford LRT will provide a modern, urban-style rapid transit option that will improve travel throughout the region, as well as connecting Surrey residents to their homes, jobs and major destinations within City Centre, Guildford and Newton.

In January 2017, the project completed a re-engagement stage and received feedback from stakeholders and citizens on their interests and concerns. In this next phase of engagement, we are seeking input on four key aspects of project design: 1) LRT operations, 2) LRT stop design and features, 3) Roadway and transit integration and 4) Environmental interests.

Space in these workshops is reserved by invitation only (please view PDF attachment).

There will be two workshop sessions that will cover the same information.

Workshop 1 – Day Session
Tuesday, June 13, 2017
1 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Surrey Central Library – R. 418
10350 University Dr.

Workshop 2 – Evening Session
Thursday, June 15, 2017
5 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.
Surrey Central Library – R. 120
10350 University Dr.

Please RSVP by Friday, June 9 to confirm your preferred workshop date by emailing surreylrt@translink.ca.

Yours truly,

Kevin Desmond
CEO

TransLink

Linda Hepner
Mayor
City of Surrey

May 29

Dear Sirs:

My name is Steven and I live in Whalley. We have a forest, Hawthorne Park, in our community and it is going to be devastated by the city's plans to build a two lane road right through the middle of it.

I have been networking with the community over the last few weeks and your name came up a few times and people suggested that I contact you. I know that your society has dealt with things like this before.

Any advise or support that you could provide would be most appreciated.

Please contact me at stevengp@telus.net

Thank you,

Steven

June 2

Hi Green Timbers,

I'm wondering if anyone at your society is aware of where to find nursery stock of blister-rust resistant western white pine? (*Pinus monticola*). Otherwise would anyone be aware of a young tree around to take cuttings from for propagation?

Thanks very much for any advice,

Chad

May 29

Hi Don,

Thank you for your e-mail regarding rapid transit through Green Timbers, this has been passed along to me in the Transportation Division for this response.

As you've indicated the early (and fairly conservative) analysis during Phase 2 of the SRTAA Study was completed in August 2012. This pulled together all the previous work on the principles that drove generation and evaluation of the wide range of feasible corridors and technologies. This stage of the project was geared towards shortlisting appropriate design solutions based on measured outcomes against a set of defined account/criteria, considering the best information available at that time.

In response to your questions:

- Further review into the use of BRT flagged the following issues:
 - o Limited vehicle capacity, BRT vehicles are typically 22m long, the very latest generation reaching up to 30m. LRT vehicle lengths far exceed these lengths.
 - o For a reliable service BRT will also require substantial construction of its own segregated travel lanes similar to LRT
 - o Once BRT reaches its capacity there are significant challenges to upgrade to the next technology level (LRT):
 - § If utilities have not been previously removed for BRT, then these would need to be relocated at this point requiring full reconstruction of the separated lanes
 - § The need to retrofit power and signalling equipment, and the obvious rail tracks
 - § The need to deal with the thousands of BRT passenger that would be displaced for the next 2-3 years as infrastructure upgrades are made
 - § For these reasons very few (if any BRT) systems globally are ever upgraded to LRT.
 - o Phase 2 work indicated that BRT would need to operate at up to 2min frequencies between services and still rely on an intensive local bus service operating at up to every 3.5min to deliver the capacity required. In the real-world even with signal priority 2min services are not workable (that's a bus from either direction going through the intersection on average every 1min, which would not work with the signal timings and would prevent any crossing movements of other traffic), when you additionally include the high frequency local buses too, you realise this simply will not work.
 - o BRT with its high frequency and lower capacity would require a much larger fleet size to satisfy the demand (versus LRT)
 - § More drivers
 - § More vehicles, more maintenance needs/parts/staffing, more fuel, larger storage facilities and land requirements, etc., etc.
 - § Vehicle costs. If you assume a cleaner energy vehicles (hydrogen/electric) to be comparable to LRT (instead of the diesel buses) these would also need to be purchased at a premium cost.
 - o Due to the above limitations BRT was dropped from further consideration.
- LRT requires the 'exclusive use of lanes', for it to effectively reach posted speed limits without it being impeded by other traffic. This provides:
 - o Reliable travel times as the vehicle is not stuck in congestion (which will increasing become common place with a growing population); and
 - o Safer journeys as LRT vehicles are kept separated from other road users
- The SNG Line has been supported by all levels of government with approx.. \$2.1B funding made available for the Mayors Council regional transportation projects, which includes the LRT project and associated works.
 - o In reference to the quotes from the Phase 2 study (E4. Key Findings and Conclusions), see my earlier comments as to why BRT was not selected.

In response to Chris' e-mail comments/questions:

- The current working cross-section assumptions for the green timbers section can be found in the corporate report link provided further below. Note the alignment continues to remain conceptual subject to on-going refinements. The design will:
 - o avoid a planted centre median to minimize cross-sectional impacts
 - o provide two traffic lanes in each direction
 - o provide a separated corridor for the rapid transit system
 - o cycling and pedestrian facilities
 - o This information is articulated in the following corporate reports:
https://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/CR_2015-R085.pdf
 - § Note the cross-sections within this report a subject to further refinement/potential reduction through the LRT project design process.

- Articulated B-Line services are planned for Fraser Highway and will be delivered by TransLink subject to available funding. Fraser Highway rapid transit is planned to commence immediately after the construction of the SNG Line in late 2022/early 2023.
- Current plans indicate widening of Fraser Highway between:
 - o Whalley Blvd to 96Ave within the next 1-3 years; and
 - o 96Ave to 148St, within 4-6 years
- Re:widening at Fraser/148St, the extra width would be required to provide left-turn lanes and space associated for the future LRT platforms at this location.

Hopefully I've covered all the key points raised in your e-mail. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Regards,

MANA DANIWALL | TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
 CITY OF SURREY
 Engineering Department
 13450 104 Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8
 T 604.591.4555 | F 604.591.8693 www.surrey.ca

* * * * *

June 6, 2017

I understand that Mana Daniwall has already responded to your earlier e-mail, so I trust my response will further clarify and add to Mana's.

- Fraser Highway timeline: As adopted in the 2014 Mayors' Council Regional Transportation Investment Plan Surrey LRT is to be delivered in two phases within a 12 year timeframe.
 - o Phase 1: Surrey-Newton-Guildford (SNG) Line, expected to be delivered by 2022/23, and
 - o Phase 2: Surrey-Langley (SL) Line on Fraser Hwy, by 2027/28.
- Technology Flexibility/Growth:
 - o 104 Ave, KGB and Fraser Hwy are well established and heavily utilized transit corridors. This coupled with City land use plans and future aspirations for City employment and residential growth have supported the selection of these corridors for rapid transit. In reference to Fraser Hwy, this corridor continues to see increasing commercial and residential densities within the established communities, with particular reference to Fleetwood and East Clayton, which are supported by the existing high transit ridership along this corridor.
 - o I noted your reference to current 'low population density', so I should clarify that Fleetwood and East Clayton continue to demonstrate growing levels of compact form density developments supportive of rapid transit. Certainly from a planning perspective the City would not to limit our solution choice to current day situations but rather to incorporate on-going and future growth, to ensure the technology choice for these corridors supports not only future growth and transportation needs, but just as importantly delivers our overarching vision to provide for complete, connected and livable communities for the generation to come.
 - o The LRT technology supports current day needs and is expandable to meet future needs with its high capacity and ability to extend vehicle lengths – something that's not possible with BRT
 - OCP and densification:
 - o The OCP has multiple policies and references supporting increasing densities along Fraser Highway. A key factor to supporting these policies was connecting back to the Regional Growth Strategy which required municipalities to direct growth within Town Centres, City Centres and specifically along Frequent Transit Corridors or Networks (FTN). Fraser Highway is identified regionally as a Frequent Transit Network (I believe this is also the case regionally and by TransLink). With that in mind, the OCP has

several places where the idea and concept of increasing densities along these FTNs is supported: Theme A: Growth Management, Theme B: Centres, Corridors and Neighbourhoods, Theme D: Infrastructure and Facilities and also to some extent in our Regional Context Statement. Specifically, there are also four separate maps in the OCP that illustrate Fraser Highway as an existing Frequent Transit Network and also a Proposed Light Rail Transit Corridor. These figures are referred to in policies that speak to supporting increased densities in these areas (for example, policies A2.1, A2.6, B3.2, B3.4, B3.6 and C2.24). There is also the Land Uses and Densities section that allows for density increases in Town Centre areas where sites fall adjacent to existing or planned rapid transit stations, of which several have been identified along Fraser Highway. To conclude, there are multiple areas throughout the OCP that support increasing densities along Fraser Highway, specifically as it relates to its FTN classification, and making the most of accessing public transit options, particularly as they relate to a rapid transit system.

- o In summary the OCP sets the foundation to support our growing city and densification requirements along our LRT corridors and its planned station areas.

- Streetcar Systems and Subsidies:

- o Rapid transit is an umbrella term used to describe a technology with a broad range of possible operational/performance outcomes. This includes express buses, BRT, Streetcar, LRT and metro systems. All these variants provide different functionality in terms of speed, capacity, costs, experiences, etc.. To be clear, Surrey LRT cannot be compared to streetcars, the latter is typically a transit solution on the lower end of the spectrum with low capacity, slower operation and tends to operate in shared traffic lanes with other road users. Surrey LRT is designed for longer and expandable vehicles (for future growth), the system will operate in its own segregated travel lanes to allow reliable and faster travel times (not stuck in street congestion and operating at posted speed limits with transit priority at intersections to avoid undue delays) and modern design (very similar look and feel to latest Skytrain vehicles).

- o Most transit systems around the world require public subsidy, recognizing the benefits of public transit in offsetting congestion, reducing the number of vehicles on the road, reducing pollution and keep our growing cities moving and productive. Subsidies are applied through a wide range of established mechanisms but generally in some form of localized taxation. Very few systems worldwide can forego subsidies and these tend to be in Asia where the mega-cities with huge populations generate the levels of ridership and farebox revenue to sufficiently offset capital/operating costs.

Hopefully these responses provide better clarity on the LRT technology and supportive land use plans along the rapid transit corridors, to allow the directors of the GTHS to better understand some of the benefits of LRT.

Best regards,
PAUL C. LEE, FEC, PEng. | LRT PROGRAM MANAGER

COS_Tag_pp_cmyk-200

CITY OF SURREY
Engineering Department
13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8
T 604.591.4175 | F 604.591.8693 | C 778.846.0488
plee@surrey.ca www.surrey.ca