

SOUTH FRASER PERIMETER ROAD PROJECT (SFPR)

TRACKING OF SOCIOECONOMIC ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

FINAL VERSION – June 16, 2008

Purpose: This table compiles the certificate, screening and permitting level issues identified by the Socio-Economic Working Group (SEWG) representatives in their respective comments on the SFPR Application during the Environmental Assessment Review. The table includes a categorization of issues by the Environmental Assessment Office using three *general* categories following discussions with members of the working groups:

C – Certificate Issue – Strategic level issue, within the scope of the environmental assessment, pertaining to the potential effects of the project and/or proposed measures to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects.

S - Screening Issue –To be addressed to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities to complete the federal review of the project. (May also be a certificate issue).

P – Permit Issue – Issue normally addressed/managed through existing processes under other enactments for the issuance of authorizations, licences, permits or other approvals.

(This page is intentionally blank)

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commitment	STATUS
1.	AGRICULTURE				
2.	Application indicates 105 ha of farmland will be lost as a result of the SFPR right-of-way, severance or isolation of parcels. MoT does not propose adding any new lands for agricultural production. GVRD requests that MoT consider opportunities to identify new lands that can be added to compensate for agricultural lands displaced. (GVRD)	As indicated in Technical Volume 6 and the Application, work done by the MOT indicate it is unlikely there are non-ALR lands suitable for agricultural use that can be bought and included in the ALR as compensation for affected areas. As such, MOT is focusing compensation efforts on other activities described in the Agricultural Enhancement Strategy. EAO Note: MoT has committed to implementing the proposed Agricultural Enhancement Strategy as compensation for loss of net agricultural productivity.	C	6.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
3.	MOT has committed to develop and implement a strategy to enhance productivity of agricultural lands in the southwest Delta area in consultation with the Delta Farmers' Institute, the ALC and the BC MAL. GVRD staff suggests that MoT provide details of the strategy for discussion within the EA working group. (GVRD)	The MOT is developing an Agricultural Enhancement Strategy to help achieve the objective of no-net-loss of agricultural production. The MoT is working with the Agricultural Land Commission, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, Delta Farmer's Institute, Corporation of Delta staff, and other stakeholders to support the strategy.	C	6.1 6.4 6.9	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
4.	Delta asks that there be no net loss to agriculture as a result of SFPR development and that indirect impacts be fully mitigated. (Corporation of Delta)	The MoT has submitted a draft agricultural enhancement strategy to compensate for potential impacts to agricultural production in Southwest Delta, and will be working with the Corporation of Delta, DFI, ALC and MAL to finalize this strategy during the Application review.	C	6.1 6.4 6.9	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commitment	STATUS
5.	AGRICULTURE				
6.	Should any agricultural lands be used as staging areas during construction, they must be rehabilitated to ensure agricultural productivity is not negatively affected. That Gateway commit to rehabilitating any staging areas on agricultural land used during construction. (Corporation of Delta)	This is specified in Section 5.2 of the agriculture report under "Soil Management/Reclamation." In addition, the MoT will avoid, to the extent possible, using agricultural lands, outside of the ROW, for staging areas. On a case-by-case basis, MoT may use vegetative buffers, as part of the Agricultural Enhancement Strategy, to mitigate on-site impacts to farms, depending on the wishes of affected farmers.	C	6.6	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
7.	While the Commission has concerns over the potential impact of the proposed SFPR on agriculture in Delta, its previous advice (by Resolution #107/2006) has been that it "has not identified any specific features which would prevent conditional approval of an application provided that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate mitigation is provided in response to farm development or operational problems arising from the construction or operation of the SFPR through the farm area; and Proposed alienation of significant areas of prime farmland is mitigated by a substantial enhancement to agriculture in the region of the SFPR. (ALC) 	The MoT is working with the DFI, individual farmers, Ministry of Agriculture and Land, the Corporation of Delta to develop agricultural mitigation and enhancement measures. MoT will revise its Agricultural Enhancement Strategy to indicate the range of potential agricultural impacts. MoT will resolve the issue with MAL on an ad hoc basis. EAO Note: MoT has committed to implementing the proposed Agricultural Enhancement Strategy as compensation for loss of net agricultural productivity.	C	6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 6.7	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
8.	AGRICULTURE				
9.	<p>Retain a professional agrologist to develop measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mitigate impact on agricultural operations from severance of areas too small to farm, or conversion of active farmland for biodiversity conservation or enhancement identify any additional measures within context of the project to benefit agricultural and improve utilization of agricultural land within the vicinity of the SFPR such as, but not limited to, opportunities for improved drainage, access or soil conversation and enhancement. (ALC) 	<p>MoT has retained the services of professional agrologists who will continue to guide the development of mitigation and compensation measures to address SFPR-related impacts. The MOT has also provided resources to support retention of an agricultural coordinator (who is a professional agrologist with considerable Delta experience) to liaise with landowners/farmers and the MOT over mitigation and compensation associated with the project.</p>	C	6.3 6.5	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
10.	<p>Severance and isolation effects are underestimated. "Conservative approach" used has underestimated impacts of severing or isolating farm fields along the proposed route. Effects should be recalculated, using the most currently proposed route and the total area affected should be included in the footprint effect. (MAL)</p>	<p>MoT has revised the estimated severance and isolation effects for the modified route (Summit Environmental Memo 30 March 2007 "Footprint severance and isolation effects for alignment 4.1c"). The Application does conclude that both the footprint and severance and isolation effects are permanent losses of agricultural land.</p> <p>EAO Note: MoT has provided revised calculations of footprint impacts for alignment refinement 4.1d.</p>	C	6.4 6.5 6.8	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA.

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION <i>(Agency that provided comments)</i>	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
11.	AGRICULTURE				
12.	Is a 60 m ROW consistent with other sections of the EA that look at footprint impacts? <i>(Corporation of Delta)</i>	<p>The Vegetation and Wildlife impact assessment conducted for the SFPR used the proposed footprint of the SFPR (including fill and cut slopes) plus a 5 m buffer on either side (to account for a potential construction zone) as the area of impact. The width of this impacted area varies depending on the width of the road, but is largely consistent with the 60 m right-of-way analysis conducted for agricultural impacts. For example approximately 83 ha of agricultural and rural infrastructure is impacted in southwest Delta in the vegetation and wildlife assessment, which is broadly consistent with the 60m right-of-way analysis of 90 ha of agricultural impacts (this comparison is based on the footprint 4.1c, June 2006 alignment).</p> <p>EAO Note: The ROW of the SFPR alignment near Burns Bog has been reduced from 60m to 40m, as a proposed design mitigation.</p>	C/P	6.3	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
13.	Page 40 - Potential for land speculation and the resulting economic impacts have been underestimated. To give the clearest indication of the speculation along the route MoT should use data from Corporation of Delta showing property ownership along the proposed route instead of 1992 study and 2001 census. <i>(MAL)</i>	The socio-economic impact assessment was based on Delta's OCP, which details land use plans and confirmation with property owners of affected farms. The SFPR team continues to meet with Delta staff regarding access and future land use.	C	6.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION <i>(Agency that provided comments)</i>	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
14.	AGRICULTURE				
15.	Reporting overlooks the impact that urban and highway edges have on the creation of unused farmland. Unused parcels have reduced investment in terms of farm infrastructure and soil and drainage improvements. Commonly used rationales for ALR exclusion applications are that land cannot be farmed due to its shape or adjacent non-farm uses, or has not recently been farmed. <i>(MAL)</i>	MoT understands the effects of edges and impractical shapes on farm viability and investment. The current route was selected over earlier concepts to minimize these effects, as much as possible. The current concept was developed in consultation with farm operators to maximize the efficiency and potential of remaining agricultural land. In addition, the Ministry is developing strategies for the future use of isolated or severed agricultural land. This work will continue through detailed design that will acknowledge whether the proposed alignment will form a new ALR boundary and clarify land inclusions and exclusions.	C	6.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION <i>(Agency that provided comments)</i>	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
16.	AGRICULTURE				
17.	Drainage and irrigation impacts are very complex and will require both mitigation and compensation. Cranberry farms are especially sensitive to even small changes in their ability to obtain adequate quantities and quality of water. <i>(MAL)</i>	<p>Additional design detail for some portions of SFPR, particularly those between agricultural fields and Burns Bog in southwest Delta is being conducted. This includes drainage infrastructure to address the complex issues associated with farming activities and the adjacent ecologically sensitive areas.</p> <p>A sub-area drainage plan has been developed in consultation with the Corporation of Delta and the DFI, and incorporates historical Burns Bog drainage information as well as new hydrology data gathered over the past 3 years. This plan will guide engineers in effectively designing storm water and drainage infrastructure such that potential impacts due to the SFPR are addressed.</p> <p>The model will be available for use by others, including the Corporation of Delta, who might use it to develop a master drainage plan for southwest Delta. It could also be used to develop compensation for the SFPR if drainage infrastructure is part of the package of works agreed to between the MoT and MAL / DFI in the Agriculture Enhancement Strategy as appropriate compensation.</p>	C	6.3 6.5 6.7	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commitment	STATUS
18.	AGRICULTURE				
19.	Mitigation measures MoT proposes to “avoid, reinstate or rehabilitate” the drainage and irrigation systems should meet all of the criteria listed in section 7.1.5.3 of the EAA report. MOE recommends detailed irrigation and drainage mitigation plan be developed in advance of construction in consultation with MAL, ALC Corporation of Delta and DFI. (<i>Land Remediation, EMB, MOE</i>)	A Sub Area Drainage Plan has been developed. Detailed plans for mitigation will be developed using the model and will be available during the permitting process in advance of construction and will include opportunities for input from MAL, ALC Corporation of Delta, DFI and individual land owners.	C	6.4 6.5 6.7	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
20.	The impervious area of the highway will also impact the agricultural land surrounding it in terms of the quantity of runoff. These water quantity impacts also need to be addressed. (<i>MAL</i>)	A sub-area drainage plan has been developed in consultation with the Corporation of Delta and the DFI, and incorporates historical drainage information as well as new hydrology and hydrogeology data gathered over the past 3 years. This model will guide engineers in effectively designing stormwater and drainage infrastructure such that potential impacts due to the SFPR are addressed. The model will be available for use by others, including the Corporation of Delta, who might use it to develop a master drainage plan for southwest Delta. It could also be used to develop compensation for the SFPR if drainage infrastructure is part of the package of works agreed to between the MoT and MAL / DFI in the AES as appropriate compensation.	C	5.1 5.2 6.7	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
21.	AGRICULTURE				
22.	Strongly support compensation funding for existing farm-based programs to encourage management practices that address wildlife/agriculture issues. Recommend MAL and ALC be involved in the consultation. (<i>MAL</i>)	This is one of the compensation measures proposed by the MoT (EA Application, section 7.7.8, pg. 371) to address residual impacts to vegetation and wildlife. More details on this and other vegetation and wildlife compensation proposals will be made available to the working group during the Application review.	C	6.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commitment	STATUS
23.	Appoint liaison officer, supported by a 24-hour manned telephone number to deal with numerous issues arising during construction phase. (MAL)	The Gateway Program has provided resources for an experienced agricultural coordinator to liaise with landowners / farmers and municipalities regarding mitigation and compensation associated with the Project. (See also MoT response to DFI). A liaison office will be available 24-hours a day, 7 days a week during construction.	C	6.4 6.5	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
24.	NOISE				
25.	Clarify whether night-time work is planned and, if so, plan should be assessed). There is no information on the predicted length of exposure to construction noise of individual receptor sites and the assessment predicts severe impacts to all but nine of these. Recommend that as much as possible, estimates of the duration of exposure be made in order to permit better evaluation of significance. (HC)	Without final design and construction plans, the requirement for, extent and location of potential construction is not known. However, the MoT is committed to development of a noise management plan (as part of the EMP for the project), which will include mitigation measures to minimize the impact of construction noise. Receptor specific data for %HA as a result of the SFPR is available (Technical Volume 13, Tables F1 to F6, pp. 86 -88).	C	4.1 4.2 4.4 9.1 9.2 9.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
26.	As much as possible, Application should estimate the duration of exposure that would be made in order to permit better evaluation of significance. (Health Canada)	MoT is committed to the application of mitigation measures outlined in the noise chapter of the Application. A more detailed, and project specific, noise mitigation plan will be developed once final design and construction plans are complete.	S	9.1 9.2	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
-----	---	-------------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--------

27.	NOISE				
28.	Averaging increased %HA over the entire project or over several receptors is not an appropriate methodology. Significance of adverse effects should be assessed for each receptor site; this approach is consistent with CEAA guidance in aiming to avoid locally significant effects. (Health Canada)	Receptor specific data for %HA as a result of the SFPR is available (Technical Volume 13, Tables F1 to F6, pp. 86 -88).	C	9.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
29.	Provide further information to indicate what measures Proponent expects to put into place to mitigate noise impacts and what the predicted residual effects (after all planned mitigation is in place) will be. (Transportation Canada)	Specific mitigation to address project related noise impacts on communities is identified in the Application and includes the use of quiet pavement, noise walls and berms. The application of such mitigation will be guided by the existing MoT noise policy (MoT, 1993). As the project design progresses, the MOT may undertake additional noise modelling to support the selection of mitigation measures and confirm that such measures are effective in addressing site specific noise concerns. Modeling of noise conditions, after the project is complete, will be undertaken in order to confirm the effectiveness of mitigation and identify where additional mitigation may be required to address noise impacts. The results of additional modelling of noise conditions undertaken during project design, or to confirm the effectiveness of mitigation, will be made available to Transport Canada, local governments and stakeholders. The Application (page 403) identifies the methods that were used to determine residual noise effects associated with the project.	C	1.5 9.5 9.6	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commitment	STATUS
30.	NOISE				
31.	Recommend MOT make a commitment to apply the mitigation and avoidance measures discussed in EA and implement a noise complaint resolution mechanism (<i>Health Canada</i>)	<p>While several other community noise impact metrics are discussed and used in the noise report, residential locations requiring mitigation are identified using the MoT's Revised noise policy of 1993; in the context of SFPR, this approach has been found to be the most inclusive of all those considered.</p> <p>In Section 5.3.2.1 (Page 31 and 32) of Technical Volume 13, under the MoT policy approach, a total of 24 residential sites (enclaves) were found to be either potentially (11) or clearly (13) eligible for mitigation consideration. By comparison, Section 5.3.2.2 shows that the ISO's 6.5 % increases in Highly Annoyed Approach identifies only 21 mitigable sites. Health Canada's own guidelines for the existence of a "serious noise problem" where the daily average noise levels is projected to be Leq(24) 65 dBA or more, identifies only 12 residential sites. Finally the US FHWA approach, which is quantitatively very similar to the HC approach, identifies 14 residential sites. The principal reason that the MoT approach captures more residential enclaves than the HC approach for example is that the former includes a sliding impact scale that recognizes the need for mitigation in situations where future absolute noise levels may not be predicted to be exceptionally high, but substantial increases in noise levels are forecast.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures will be identified in consultation with municipalities and affected communities and detailed plans will be available during the permitting process in advance of construction.</p>	C/S	9.1 9.2 9.3	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION <i>(Agency that provided comments)</i>	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
32.	NOISE				
33.	Vibration impacts (structural and noise) need to be fully assessed due to the soft soils in Bridgeview. <i>(City of Surrey)</i>	<p>Prior to construction, pre-condition surveys will be carried out to document existing state of buildings and facilities in the vicinity of SFPR construction activities. This will form the baseline conditions, against which post-construction condition surveys will be carried out to assess any impacts to buildings and facilities as a result of the SFPR.</p> <p>To minimize potential for impacts during construction, monitoring of ground vibrations will be carried out adjacent to buildings to confirm that vibration levels are within acceptable ranges. Also, modern construction techniques and materials will ensure the long term performance of the road surface eliminating vibration impacts e.g. effective consolidation of these soils, with consideration for ground and stormwater drainage, is key to the performance of road surface and effects on neighbouring soils.</p>	C	4.1 4.2 4.4 9.2 9.9	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
34.	There is no reference to vibration impacts or effects on areas where poor soils are noted. With respect to vibrations the area of concern is in Bridgeview where existing traffic and small potholes have been found to create significant effects from vibrations and noise to the local community. Soils are extremely soft and vibrations are easily transmitted through these soils. <i>(City of Surrey)</i>	See above response	C	4.1 4.4 9.2 9.9	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION <i>(Agency that provided comments)</i>	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commitment	STATUS
35.	NOISE				
36.	Noise mitigation measures are described for some areas along the SFPR – in Bridgeview the use of noise walls was suggested. Again the construction and maintenance of these walls could be an issue on the soft soils. Point loading is not possible without incurring significant settlements in most areas of Bridgeview. <i>(City of Surrey)</i>	Geotechnical work has been undertaken and the condition of the soil is understood. Noise walls will be constructed taking into account soft soil conditions.	C	4.1 4.2 4.4 9.1 9.5	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
37.	Where noise from high speed traffic with a high percentage of trucks may impact nearby residential land uses, it should be expected that the proponent will incorporate sound mitigation measures regardless of fixed Ministry guideline formulas. <i>(City of Surrey)</i>	MOT is committed to working with communities to identify appropriate and effective mitigation measures where required, including open graded asphalt and noise barriers.	C	4.1 4.2 4.4 9.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
38.	Similarly, in cases where there are adjacent noise generators such as trains or industry, the proponent should be expected to moderate the guideline formulas that currently consider that this existing background noise reduces the need for further mitigation. <i>(City of Surrey)</i>	Ambient and background noise is considered during noise modeling and assessment.	C	4.1 4.2 4.4 9.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
39.	ARCHAEOLOGY AND HERITAGE RESOURCES				
40.	Archaeology Branch at this time, does not know the nature and full extent of all the potentially affected sites (with notable exception of St. Mungo and Glenrose Cannery sties), the nature and full extent of impacts and measures necessary to mitigate (i.e. complete or partial site avoidance, data recovery or a combination of measures). Therefore, Branch is unable to prove detailed site-specific management direction to the proponent or specify with any confidence the level of effort that will be required to mitigate anticipated adverse impacts to identified sites, particularly the St. Mungo and Glenrose Cannery sites. Due to the project design having not been finalized and problems with access to some properties at the time of the assessment, the Archaeology Branch is not in a position to provide the proponent detailed, site-specific management direction. Changes in project design could necessitate further field studies and/or additional comment, in addition to already having to complete the assessment of a number of areas assigned archaeological potential which could not be accessed at the time of the field study. (Archaeology Branch, MTSA)	As access to lands required for the SFPR project become available, those areas will be assessed under the terms and conditions outlined in Heritage Conservation Act Permit 2004-052. These future assessments will include further investigations at archaeological sites identified in Technical Volume 14. The MoT is currently working with archaeologists to identify and design ways to avoid or minimize impacts to archaeological sites within the SFPR alignment. With respect to the St. Mungo and Glenrose Cannery Sites, SFPR design in this area is being advanced to allow for more detailed assessment of the extent and nature of potential impacts to these sites, to avoid impacts where possible, and to plan mitigation options.	C/P	16.1 16.3	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
41.	Page v – Statement citing need for “additional detailed study” as one of several available mitigation options is incorrect. Impact management measures flow from the assessment process. Additional detailed study is to fulfill our information requirements to provide informed impact management direction in the way of mitigation. (Archaeology Branch, MTSA)	Edits and revisions to amend the identified sections of the Archaeological Impact Assessment will be included in the final <i>Heritage Conservation Act</i> Permit report.	P	16.1 16.3 16.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
42.	ARCHAEOLOGY AND HERITAGE RESOURCES				
43.	Concur with specific recommendations to address those areas assigned high, moderate and low archaeological potential, that have yet to be assessed in the field as long as lands modelled as having moderate archaeological potential are subject to archaeological field assessment of a representative sample, combined with monitoring of initial land altering activities within the balance of these lands. (Arch Br MTSA)	MOT accepts the recommended modifications to the archaeological inventory and impact assessment strategy in areas identified as having moderate archaeological potential.	P	16.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
44.	Page 432 – Borehole 05-86 and Borehole 20 – Additional fieldwork is required to confirm where these are imported cultural deposits and, if not, establish the spatial extent of the deposits. Should the final alignment be anywhere “near” these boreholes then the extent of these deposits has to be known (this applies also to Boreholes M and 14). (Archaeology Branch, MTSA)	As property access issues have been resolved, lands in the vicinity of Boreholes 05-86, 20, M and 14 will be further assessed provided those areas are still within, or near, the SFPR alignment.	P	16.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
45.	Neither Site Alteration nor Investigation permits can be issued without identifying site or sites to be affected. A Heritage Investigation permit could also include an archaeological monitoring component, either under terms and conditions of the same permit or under the terms and conditions of a separate s. 12 Site Alteration permit. For a project of this scale, complexity, and involving such a range of archaeological resources, proponent can expect to require all three types of HCA permits. (Arch Branch, MTSA)	MOT acknowledges the Archaeology Branch’s requirements concerning <i>Heritage Conservation Act</i> Permits for the SFPR project.	P	16.3	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
46.	UTILITIES				
47.	<p>That Gateway ensures that the integrity of Delta sewer infrastructure is not impacted by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ providing for bypass and continued system safe operation throughout the construction; ▪ ensuring that settlement will not adversely affect the long term sewer system operation. ▪ constructing a parallel forcemain system along the SFPR alignment north of Burns Drive to McAllister Road, complete with Right of Way; and, ▪ providing a Right of Way within the SFPR to construct a new forcemain from McAllister Rd. and 72nd Street to the GVRD South Surrey Interceptor. (Corporation of Delta) 	The MoT is committed to continued coordination and consultation with the Corporation of Delta, and utilities providers, during pre-load planning, preliminary design, final design and construction, to ensure that project related activities do not impact existing utilities.	P	1.5 4.1 4.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
48.	<p>That Gateway ensures that the integrity of Delta water infrastructure is not impacted by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing for bypass and continued system operation throughout the construction; • installing new pipes that provide for a shallow depth and adequate access; and, • ensuring that settlement will not adversely affect the long term water system operation. (Corporation of Delta) 	The MoT is committed to continued coordination and consultation with the Corporation of Delta, and utilities providers, during pre-load planning, preliminary design, final design and construction, to ensure that project related activities do not impact existing utilities.	P	1.5 4.1 4.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
49.	UTILITIES				
50.	Sections of the SFPR run through areas that have potential impact on planned GVRD utilities construction projects. GVRD wants to ensure that all components of the SFPR be compatible with all existing facilities and will not compromise the integrity of any future upgrades. Essential that GVRD Engineering and Construction staff have opportunity to provide input into the design of SFPR to ensure continuity and compatibility with GVRD utilities. (GVRD)	MoT is continuing discussions with GVRD operations and maintenance staff over the potential impact on regional utilities, and measures by which the services of these utilities will be maintained or improved.	P	1.5 4.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
51.	Ensure existing GVRD utility operation and maintenance service levels are unchanged or improved. Provide GVRD Operations and Maintenance staff timely access to project information and details as they become available and include adequate opportunity for GVRD staff to assess impacts on the access, operation and maintenance, safety, protection, relocation and other aspects of existing and future GVRD facilities. (GVRD)	MOT is continuing discussions with GVRD staff over potential impact on regional utilities, and measures by which utilities service will be maintained or improved. MOT will keep GVRD informed about design details for the SFPR.	P	1.5 4.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
52.	Consultation and application for approvals and construction notifications required from GVRD on all construction, over or in close proximity to any existing GVRD facilities. Additional required designs including facility protection, system alteration, construction monitoring and bypass must be approved by GVRD prior to construction. (GVRD)	MOT is continuing discussions with GVRD staff over potential impact on regional utilities, and measures by which utilities service will be maintained or improved. MOT will keep GVRD informed about design details for the SFPR.	P	1.5 4.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
53.	Sanitary sewer forcemain, drainage and water utility upgrades required to address the impacts of the SFPR. (Corporation of Delta)	MOT continues to work with the Corporation of Delta to ensure utilities service will be maintained or improved. This includes the development of the Sub-Area Drainage Plan for southwest Delta.	C	1.5 4.1 4.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commitment	STATUS
54.	UTILITIES				
55.	Proposed works could significantly impact the Surrey sewer system, yet no mention has been made in this regard. Similarly large Terasen Gas crossings, GVS & DD water main trunks and sanitary trunks may be also impacted. Further work on this topic needs to be conducted. (City of Surrey)	The Project team has been and continues to be actively involved with municipal staff and Utility owners regarding utility conflicts throughout the corridor. These works will form part of the initial stages of construction and are of a high priority.	C	1.5 4.1 4.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
56.	SOCIO-COMMUNITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC				
57.	SFPR is near the Royal Heights, South Westminster, St. Helens, Bridgview, Bolivar Heights, Port Mann, Fraser Heights and Port Kells communities within Surrey. For issues of noise, access, community severance and visual intrusion, consultation with the community is required to ensure that mitigation measures are attractive and non-intrusive. (City of Surrey)	The MoT is committed to continued coordination and consultation with the City of Surrey and community groups through the Municipality during pre-load planning, preliminary design, final design and during construction, to ensure that project related activities are coordinated with and complimentary to initiatives planned or underway on lands under the jurisdiction of the City of Surrey. The range of issues that will be addressed during such consultations include but are not necessarily limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and recreational access to and across the corridor • Stormwater and drainage management; • Fisheries compensation; • Mitigation of construction related impacts, including noise and vibration impacts, on adjacent residential communities; • Flood protection requirements; • Traffic management during construction; and • Consultation processes with adjacent residential communities 	C	4.1 4.2 4.4 19.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION (Agency that provided comments)	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commitment	STATUS
58.	SOCIO-COMMUNITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC				
59.	Care needed in Bridgeview areas to ensure local access east of the Pattullo Bridge does not encourage shortcutting traffic through this area which has limited number of sidewalks, narrow streets and a significant number of school-aged children. (City of Surrey)	<p>The MoT is committed to continued coordination and consultation with the City of Surrey and community groups through the Municipality during pre-load planning, preliminary design, final design and during construction, to ensure that project related activities are coordinated with and complimentary to initiatives planned or underway on lands under the jurisdiction of the City of Surrey. The range of issues that will be addressed during such consultations include but are not necessarily limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and recreational access to and across the corridor • Stormwater and drainage management; • Fisheries compensation; • Mitigation of construction related impacts, including noise and vibration impacts, on adjacent residential communities; • Flood protection requirements; • Traffic management during construction; and • Consultation processes with adjacent residential communities 	C	1.5 4.1 4.2 4.4 5.3 8.2 8.3 19.1	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA
60.	Maintain natural landscape buffers between the Fraser Heights area and the SFPR and preserve network of trails and open spaces. A detailed tree retention policy and landscaping plan is required to identify potential visual intrusion impacts in this area. (City of Surrey)	The Project team recognises the importance of the existing vegetation and landscaping through the entire corridor, and will implement strategies during construction to minimize construction impact on the environment. This information, and the development of these construction plans, will be a part of ongoing Project development.	P	1.5 4.1 4.4	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA

ROW	AGENCY COMMENTS/ISSUES ON SFPR APPLICATION <i>(Agency that provided comments)</i>	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE	(C) (S) (P)	MoT Commit ment	STATUS
61.	SOCIO-COMMUNITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC				
62.	Page 117 – Capital costs are shown at \$800M, with \$555M going towards constructions costs. Are there any further capital costs breakdowns to show how funding will be divided/spent on the various sections of the project? <i>(MECDV)</i>	In terms of capital cost breakdowns, the SFPR project team is currently updating project cost estimates as changes are made resulting from public and agency comments in the EA process. An update will be available as the project moves closer to completion of the EA review process.	C	N/A	Satisfactorily addressed for purpose of the EA