



Your **Cycling** Connection

HUB Langley Local Committee

Meeting Agenda

15 Mar 2021 - 7pm on Google Meet (<https://meet.google.com/oib-joec-syu>)

- 1. Welcome & Introductions**
- 2. Review & Approval of Minutes from Feb 2021**
- 3. Old Business**
 - a. **Langley City Update - Mitch**
 - b. **Langley Township Update - Mitch**
 - c. **Feather Banner for committee - Tony**
 - d. **Translink Bike Map Distribution - Tony**
 - e. **HUB Awards - Mitch**
- 4. New Business**
 - a. **2021 Local Committee Action Plan (see Annex 1) - Mitch**
 - b. **Hwy 1 Widening Project (see Annex 2) - Mitch**
- 5. Other Business/ Announcements/ Upcoming Events**
 - a. **BTWW/BTSW - May 31 - Jun 4, 2021 - Mitch**
- 6. Next meeting date: Monday, April 19th, 2021 @ 7pm**
- 7. Meeting Adjournment**



Your **Cycling** Connection

Annex 1

Local Committee Action Plan

What are your top three objectives for 2021?

Setting objectives are a way to help prioritize the work in your local committee.

E.g.: Are there opportunities for public engagement through bike education or events?

Are there priority infrastructure gaps affecting your municipality?

Opportunities for relationship-building with key partners, stakeholders, or decision-makers?

Other?

What are some specific actions that your committee will undertake to address these objectives?

Why does this objective matter? Who will lead/be responsible for achieving each objective?

What is an indicator of success for each objective?

Annex 2

Hwy 1 Widening Project - Email from Jeff Leigh (HUB Guru)



Your **Cycling** Connection

Hi Mitch

I am sending this to you, but please share with any members of your local committee who are involved in this issue.

The Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) was recently asked by MoTI to meet with MoTI reps re Hwy 1. We didn't have a detailed agenda in advance, but attended to find out what they had to say. Julie and I attended on behalf of the RAC.

Attendees from MoTI were Doug Hyde, Project Mgr (Doug.Hyde@gov.bc.ca) Mohsin Gohir, Project Delivery Team; and Elena Farmer, MoTI District Mgr for the Lower Mainland. Grant Smith was invited, but was not able to attend. Elena set up the meeting. This follows on a number of recent discussions with MoTI about projects that have not incorporated cycling improvements (most notably the Hwy 7 widening from Maple Ridge) and a lot of discussion about the stimulus fund spending on AT improvements that MoTI recently did without any consultation. I think those other discussions prompted this one, at least in part.

We made the point early that while we appreciated the chance to discuss it with them, we would rely on our local committee to make more specific recommendations. Our comments were more general. I took brief meeting notes, and a summary follows. This isn't formatted for publication. I know you are aware of the project, but I just want to get this down in one place for reference.

- 1) Public engagement will run to March 19th 2021
- 2) We were asked to please use the website, and encourage feedback there. And to encourage our supporters to use it as well. I provided Doug's email, above, in case you don't have it, but that would be more for a meeting request. The general project office email is 216to264widening@gov.bc.ca You could send submissions to the project email address and cc Doug. If things don't through their usual channels they may not form



Your **Cycling** Connection

part of the project record. The project website with storyboards that they used in their presentation to us is [here](#)

3) Scope is 216 to 264, but not including 264 interchange

4) Detail design starting now, completed by early 2022, construction starts early 2022, project completed by 2025. Subject to revision.

5) Subsequent project will address widening to the Whatcom interchange by 2026 (no specifics)

6) Three new structures (but one turns out to be the rail crossing)

7) Project is about more vehicle capacity, more clearance for over height loads on Hwy 1, more predictable travel time for drivers, HOV priority lanes, etc. I didn't hear a specific mention of improving road safety, but it is likely in there as well. For operators and passengers in motor vehicles.

8) We focused on the Glover Rd and 232 crossings as they have AT improvements.

9) At Glover Rd, we commented on the path design. Glad to see separated cycling infrastructure. Except that it is only separated by a painted line, with no apparent buffer zone. We asked about travel speeds, no data at hand on actuals vs posted. We recommended physical separation. This doesn't have to be concrete gravity barriers (which don't always stop vehicles in any case, as they can constitute a crash risk themselves) A base strip with plastic pylons can deter drivers from pulling into the cycle lanes, and add protection this way. We recommended they consider them. Doug called the sidewalk a MUP, but when asked, revised that to a sidewalk. We asked about elevation changes (more of a climb). Alternative is to lower the roadbed on Hwy 1. They didn't appear to have thought about that, and didn't have the elevation changes noted. The roundabout is out of scope at Glover Rd (not MoTI property). We noted the safety risks with the roundabout for AT users, the lack of a continuous bikeway, instructions to dismount, etc. We called the dismount sign a clear indication of a design



Your **Cycling** Connection

failure. We asked why the roundabout at 232 was in scope (MoTI own the property there). They suggested it is up to the local jurisdiction. They said they are talking to them (and the university?) We talked about abrupt ends to AT infrastructure that may make sense from a property ownership perspective, but don't from a user or safety perspective. We recommended that they consider project funding for improvements by others to ease the transitions. This was done on the Port Mann project (Surrey took advantage of the project specific funding and built connections; Coquitlam didn't, and MoTI are still dealing with the fallout) Bouncing this issue to Bike BC co funding doesn't work, as those are annual funding grants, and can't be obtained now for projects to be built years in the future. What happens in practice is that a project is completed, there is a discontinuity, and then it takes years to resolve it, and that can be avoided by MoTI having specific AT improvement funding tied to their projects, over and above the Bike BC funding which is done by MoTI.

10) No changes at 216 as it is new infrastructure. Over to you, as to whether there are any impacts there.

11) 232 design shows MUPs instead of separate infrastructure. More elevation gain with the new overpass, so higher speed differentials on the descent. No good reason was provided for why a MUP and not separated paths. Doug worked on the Lions Gate bridge with us (NS and Vancouver LCs) and knows well the conflicts from using a MUP where it is not appropriate. We pointed out that there are few instances where a MUP is a good replacement for separate bike paths and sidewalks. This is a chance to do it right. A plan could be to paint a line and have paint separated walking and cycling on a MUP, but adherence to that is inconsistent in practice. I believe that these crossings are used by sport cyclists who may be travelling at higher relative speeds, so that should be considered if true. A justification could be that the pedestrian use is expected to be very low. They would need data to confirm that. The default should be separate paths, not MUPs.



Your **Cycling** Connection

12) The roundabout at 72nd was discussed. It is intended to be signalized, which we supported. We asked about the slip lanes (4 of them) and if they would be signalized as well. Even better if they were to be removed. Apparently not. We asked for signal lights for the walk/bike crossings. We didn't ask, but there should be elephant feet as well, or signage indicating that people can cycle in the crosswalk. MoTI has been reluctant to do that on their other projects, claiming that the MVA allows those markings if there is a local bylaw allowing it, and they don't control local bylaws, so not part of their design. The design team didn't understand that an AT user would now have to make 3 crossings instead of 1, and only 1 of those was planned to be signalized. They heard us. Recommend you reinforce these points.

13) We noted that not being familiar with local connections, there may be different issues between the two crossings (maybe all people cycling gravitate to one of them, for example). If there are differences, recommend you address that in your feedback to them.

14) My sense of why the meeting was that they are being pushed to do more public engagement. They have invested in the online tool and storyboards, and I think they will be watching to see how they are used.

Happy to answer questions. RAC is not currently planning to make a submission, but will leave that to your LC team. In some cases we have done joint submissions with the local committee, if you are interested in that. As an example Maple Ridge LC wanted the RAC voice to add to theirs, for Hwy 7 widening, because of the regional significance of that route. If (when) you do send a letter, it is worth a cc to RAC (use my email address) and then we identify it as a Langley LC issue and post it on our RAC wiki as well.

Julie, anything from your notes that I have missed, please add to this.

Thanks



Your **Cycling** Connection

Jeff Leigh

Chair, Vancouver UBC Local Committee, HUB Cycling

Co-Chair, Regional Advisory Committee, HUB Cycling

Member, Board of Directors, and VP, HUB Cycling

vancouver@bikehub.ca