

**South Fraser Perimeter Road
Pre-design Community Consultation
Nordel Way to 176th Street and the Golden Ears
Bridge Connector Road
May-June, 2006**

Consultation Summary Report
August 1, 2006

Gateway Program

Prepared for the Ministry of Transportation by:

Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd.
402 - 1250 Homer Street
Vancouver, BC V6B 1C6

Executive Summary

The Gateway Program conducted a pre-design community consultation program on the Nordel Way to 176th Street and Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road segment of the South Fraser Perimeter Road from May 19 to June 30, 2006.

The consultation program focused on pre-design concepts for:

1. Local road connections within and between communities along the South Fraser Perimeter Road (SFPR) between Nordel Way in Delta and 176th Street in Surrey where it meets the Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road
2. Pre-design concepts for local access to and from SFPR, including connections to the local cycling network

The consultation consisted of a series of eight stakeholder meetings and five open houses held in North Delta, Surrey and Langley. In addition, all consultation materials, including a feedback form, were available on the Gateway Program website (www.gatewayprogram.bc.ca).

Members of the public were notified of their ability to participate through:

- 23 advertisements in community papers
- Distribution of 4,400 postcards to residents in North Delta
- Gateway Program website, www.gatewayprogram.bc.ca

Approximately 1,100 individuals participated in the consultation program either through stakeholder meetings, open houses, correspondence or through the project website. Over 130 participants attended the stakeholder meetings and approximately 1,000 attended the open houses. Approximately 400 feedback forms were submitted.

Key Quantitative Results from Feedback Forms:

Local Street Connection between Communities on the East and West Sides of the Alex Fraser Bridge

Respondents support a local street connection between the east and west sides of the Alex Fraser Bridge, with 48% supporting a two-way bridge connection for all traffic and 27% supporting an at-grade local street connection for transit and emergency vehicles. Twenty-four percent support “no connection”.

Local Street Connection between River Road and Grace Road

Respondents support a local street connection between River Road and Grace Road, with 52% supporting the connection for general-purpose traffic and 28% supporting the connection for transit and emergency only. Twenty percent prefer “no connection”.

Access to SFPR at 124th Street

Seventy-one percent of respondents support an access to the SFPR at 124th Street to promote access to and from the Bridgeview area.

King Road Connector: Bridgeview Drive to Surrey Road

Fifty-eight percent of respondents “strongly or somewhat” agree with the proposed King Road Connector. Twenty-three percent “neither agree nor disagree” with this option and 19% “somewhat or strongly” disagree with this option.

Access to Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road

Seventy-one percent of respondents support an access to the Golden Ears Connector Road, with 35% preferring accesses at both locations, 22% preferring 182A Street only and 14% preferring 179th Street only. Twenty-nine percent prefer “no connection”.

Cycling Connection between River Road East of the Alex Fraser Bridge and Delta – South Surrey Regional Greenway

Seventy-two percent of respondents “strongly or somewhat” agree with the proposed cycling connection between River Road east of the Alex Fraser Bridge and Delta-South Surrey Regional Greenway, 15% “neither agree nor disagree” and 13% “somewhat or strongly” disagree.

Cycling Connection between SFPR and Surrey Road for Eastbound Cyclists

Seventy-three percent of respondents “strongly or somewhat” agree with the proposed cycling connection between SFPR and Surrey Road for eastbound cyclists, 15% “neither agree nor disagree” and 12% “somewhat or strongly” disagree.

Key Qualitative Results from Feedback Forms:

- Most respondents supported the SFPR and noted concerns they had with potential impacts from the road.
- Many respondents expressing concerns focused on the potential noise and visual impacts that might be created by the road. For some of these participants, the construction of a tunnel as an alternate to the split grade section in the North Delta area was suggested to better address their concerns about these potential impacts.
- Many respondents supported the proposed accesses but expressed concerns about these access points creating the possibility for regional traffic to “shortcut” through their communities, and wanted the Ministry of Transportation and local municipalities to take steps to prevent this from happening.
- Some respondents were concerned about potential impacts on the value of their property.

Key Results from Feedback Stakeholder Meetings:

Business Groups (May 30, 2006)

- Participants generally supported the project and the pre-design concepts.
- Participants had questions about the toll on the Port Mann Bridge (part of the Port Mann/Highway 1 project) and how it might affect traffic on the Pattullo Bridge.
- Participants suggested that, if the SFPR is constructed in phases, the Nordel Way to 176th section should be completed first.

Sustainability Groups (May 30, 2006)

- Generally, participants supported the project as proposed.
- Participants commented about the need to address the environmental concerns along the corridor.
- Participants said that they did not want the SFPR to adversely affect the rail corridor in the area (e.g., rail passengers having to look at concrete walls).

First Responders (May 31, 2006)

- Participants discussed access points and noted the need to ensure as good as or better response times than what they have now.
- Participants requested pullouts on the SFPR, one in each direction, to provide for random truck inspections.
- Participants suggested that good directional signage be installed to assist the public, so that first responders are able to get better information from the public about where they are and what direction they are traveling, in the event of an emergency.

Goods Movers, Trucking, Ports (May 31, 2006)

- Participants supported the project.
- Participants had a number of technical questions regarding speeds, grades, the Barnston Drive portion of the highway, etc.

Sunbury/Annieville Communities (June 1, 2006)

- There was a concern expressed by Royal Heights¹ residents with respect to noise and air pollution. They object to the SFPR as proposed.
- Concerns were raised by representatives of the Sunbury Neighborhood Association regarding potential noise and visual impacts of the SFPR in this area. They are concerned about the proposed height of the SFPR structure over the BCSF rail lines near the Alex Fraser Bridge and the potential impacts on views.
- Participants would like more detailed information on the pre-design concepts.

Bridgeview Community (June 7, 2006)

- Participants understood the need for the project, but were concerned about local impacts.
- Participants asked the project to consider moving the road closer to the CNR and further away from the community.
- Participants expressed concern about the water table and potential flooding in the neighborhood and asked the project to give special attention to this aspect.
- Participants want the project to consider mitigation of any additional noise increases in the community.

Port Kells/Fraser Heights Communities (June 8, 2006)

- Participants expressed concern about noise impacts and asked the project to give special consideration to noise mitigation measures.
- Participants expressed concern about access to the SFPR, especially at 104th Street, and asked the project to consider what steps could be taken to discourage trucks from using the interchange to “shortcut” through local streets.
- Participants wanted more specifics about the buffer between the SFPR and the community – how wide is it anticipated to be?

¹ Residents of Royal Heights attended this meeting along with residents of Sunbury and Annieville neighbourhoods.

Royal Heights Community (June 27, 2006)

- Participants had a number of suggestions on revisions to the alignment to reduce residential impacts.
- Participants had questions about the property acquisition and expropriation process to ensure fair treatment.
- Participants said they did not want an overpass at Elevator Road.
- Participants would like the SFPR moved further north of the railway lands.
- Participants would like the project to consider the potential human impacts of the project, above all other considerations.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Summary Report	1
1. Introduction	
1.1 Background on the Gateway Program	1
1.2 Gateway Program Goals	1
1.3 Goals for the South Fraser Perimeter Road	2
1.4 Consultation Topics for the Nordel to 176th Street Segment	2
2. Pre-Design Community Consultation Program	
2.1 Overview of the Consultation on the Nordel Way to 176th Street Segment	3
2.2 Pre-design Consultation Methodology	4
2.3 Public Notification	5
2.4 Consultation Program Summary	5
3. Key Theme Summary of Input	
3.1 Key Theme Summary of Feedback Forms	7
3.2 Key Theme Summary of Stakeholder meetings	11

Summary Report

Pre-design Community Consultation: Nordel Way to 176th Street and the Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road

1. Introduction

1.1 Background on the Gateway Program

The South Fraser Perimeter Road Project (SFPR), approximately 40 km long, is a proposed four-lane, 80km/h route along the south side of the Fraser River extending from Deltaport Way in Southwest Delta to 176th Street and the Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road in Surrey. SFPR is part of the Province's Gateway Program.

In response to the impact of growing congestion in Greater Vancouver, the Gateway Program was established by British Columbia's Ministry of Transportation to improve the movement of people, goods and transit throughout the region. Gateway Program road and bridge improvements are proposed to complement regional road and transit improvements already planned or underway. These improvements will help create a comprehensive, effective transportation network that supports the movement of people and goods, facilitating economic growth, increased transportation choice and better connections to designated population growth areas.

1.2 Gateway Program Goals

The Gateway Program consists of three corridors:

- Port Mann/Highway 1
- North Fraser Perimeter Road, including the Pitt River Bridge and Mary Hill Interchange
- South Fraser Perimeter Road

The goals for the Gateway Program are to:

- Address **congestion**;
- Improve the **movement** of people and goods in and through the region;
- Improve **access** to key economic gateways through improved links between ports, industrial areas, railways, the airport and border crossings;
- Improve **safety** and **reliability**;
- Improve the region's **road network**;
- Improve quality of life in communities by keeping **regional traffic on regional roads** instead of local streets;
- **Reduce vehicle emissions** by reducing congestion-related idling;
- Facilitate **better connections** to buses and SkyTrain, cycling and pedestrian networks; and
- **Reduce travel times** along and across the Fraser River during peak periods.

1.3 Goals for the South Fraser Perimeter Road

Each of the Gateway Program projects has a set of goals designed to meet the unique travel demands of each corridor. The goals for the South Fraser Perimeter Road are to:

- Improve the movement of people and goods through the region by providing improved connections to the provincial highway network
- Reduce east-west travel times, particularly for heavy truck movements, by providing a continuous highway along the south side of the Fraser River
- Improve access to major trade gateways and industrial areas and facilitate development in designated industrial areas along the south side of the Fraser River
- Improve safety and reliability
- Restore municipal roads as community connectors by reducing truck traffic on municipal road networks.

1.4 Consultation Topics for the Nordel to 176th Segment

The consultation program focused on pre-design concepts for:

1. Local road connections within and between communities along the South Fraser Perimeter Road (SFPR), between Nordel Way in Delta and 176th Street in Surrey where it meets the Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road
2. Pre-design concepts for local access to and from SFPR, including facilitating connections to the local cycling network

Specifically, the consultation sought feedback on:

- A potential local street connection between Nordel Way and River Road east of the Alex Fraser Bridge (SFPR removes the existing connection)
- A potential local street connection between River Road opposite Gunderson Slough and Grace Road to the east
- A potential access to SFPR in the Bridgeview community at 124th Street
- A potential new road connection between Bridgeview Drive and Surrey Road (SFPR removes the existing link to communities to its south)
- A potential access to SFPR through intersections on the Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road at 179th Street and/or at 182A Street
- Cycling improvements

2. Pre-Design Community Consultation Program

2.1 Overview of the Consultation on the Nordel Way to 176th Segment

Since 1998, the Ministry of Transportation has been consulting with municipalities, TransLink, the GVRD, port authorities, railways, regulatory agencies, First Nations, community groups and the public in planning for the SFPR. With input from these groups regarding their concerns, issues and needs, the scope and alignment concepts have been developed and adjusted.

Between 1999 and 2001, approximately 80 meetings and events were held. Through the public information line and website, the project responded to over 300 inquiries during the development phase of the project.

Public consultation on sections of the proposed SFPR between 176th Street and Highway 91 was conducted in 2001 as part of the Ministry's Planning and Preliminary Design Study.

Community consultation open houses were held in 2000. The results indicated that the principal concerns focused on connections and SFPR's potential impact on property. For example, feedback on proposed intersections at Brooke Road and Terrace Drive to provide access to SFPR resulted in the Project Team developing alternative access concepts and addressing the community's expressed desire to maintain the continuity of River Road for local use.

Additional meetings were held with key stakeholder groups such as government agencies, First Nations, municipal councils and staff, TransLink, businesses and non-government groups. In early 2003, the proposed SFPR was incorporated into the Gateway Program and the project scope was expanded to continue west to Deltaport Way in Southwest Delta and east to 176th Street and the Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road in Surrey.

Ongoing public and stakeholder consultation has indicated overall support for the SFPR and identified specific concerns that have led to subsequent refinements in the concept design.

Follow-up discussion with the residents of North Delta and the Corporation of Delta took place at a community forum in the fall of 2004. Participants in this forum showed a strong preference for no access on and off SFPR in this area. Delta Council passed a resolution in early 2005 supporting that preference. In consideration of this community input, the Gateway Program has removed on/off access options from the initial SFPR conceptual alignment.

Similarly, concerns over SFPR's socio-community impact in the growing Fraser Heights area led to a realignment of the SFPR concept. The participants expressed a desire that the road corridor be located as far as practical from the residential development and this has been achieved with the purchase of land from CN Rail.

Several meetings were conducted in 2004 and 2005 with TransLink and emergency responders in Surrey and Delta in order to ensure that proposed road improvements provide effective transit and emergency vehicle access throughout the SFPR corridor.

On-going Consultation

As the Gateway Program proceeds through various design stages and ultimately into construction, communities and key stakeholders are being consulted. The design stages include:

1. Pre-Design Consultation (**CURRENT STAGE**)
2. Preliminary Design Consultation
3. Detailed Design Consultation

In addition, the SFPR will undergo a harmonized federal-provincial environmental assessment review process and this process includes a public comment period.

Pre-design consultation has been completed on the SW Delta and 80th to Nordel Way sections of the SFPR and information about these consultations is available at www.gatewayprogram.bc.ca.

2.2 Pre-design Consultation Methodology

Consultation Approach

The Pre-design Consultation on the Nordel to 176th and Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road Segment was conducted to provide the community with an opportunity to have input on options for this segment of the SFPR.

A list was compiled of groups likely to have an interest in the choice of a preferred route. Groups were identified using the Gateway Program database, the websites of the cities of Delta, Surrey and Langley and directories of community groups.

Contact was then initiated with identified stakeholders:

- Organizations were contacted by telephone and invited to participate in the consultation program.
- Meetings were arranged with interested organizations.
- Participants and representatives of organizations were confirmed by e-mail or a telephone call closer to the date.

All consultation materials, including a feedback form, were available on the Gateway website.

2.3 Public Notification

The public was made aware of opportunities to participate through:

- Advertisements in local papers including:

<i>Delta Optimist</i>	Wed May 24, 31 Sat May 27 Sat June 3
<i>Delta, South Surrey Leader</i>	Fri May 26 Fri June 2
<i>Langley Advance News</i>	Tues May 23, 30 Fri May 26 Fri June 2
<i>Langley Times</i>	Wed May 24, 31 Fri May 26 Sun May 28 Fri June 2 Sun June 4
<i>Surrey / North Delta Leader</i>	Wed May 24, 31 Fri May 26 Sun May 28 Wed June 7, 14 Fri June 2, 9, 16 Sun June 4, 11, 18
<i>Surrey Now</i>	Wed May 24, 31 Sat May 27 Wed June 7, 14 Sat June 3, 10, 17

- 4,400 postcards distributed to residences in North Delta
- Schedule for open houses available on the Gateway Program website

2.4 Consultation Program Summary

Eight stakeholder meetings were held:

- May 30 Business Groups
- May 30 Sustainability Groups
- May 31 First Responders
- May 31 Goods Movers, Trucking, Ports
- June 1 Sunbury, Annieville Communities
- June 7 Bridgeview Community
- June 8 Port Kells, Fraser Heights Communities
- June 27 Royal Heights Community

Five open houses were held:

- May 31 Tynehead Community Hall
- June 3 Walnut Grove Community Centre
- June 6 North Delta Recreation Centre
- June 13 Bridgeview Community Hall
- June 20 Fraser Heights Recreation Centre

Approximately 1,100 individuals participated in the consultation program either through stakeholder meetings, open houses, correspondence, the website, or through a petition submitted to the consultation program. Over 130 participants attended the stakeholder meetings and close to 1,000 attended the open houses. Approximately 400 feedback forms were submitted.

Meeting and Open House Formats

The stakeholder meetings were organized using an informal round-table format. Between two and six SFPR representatives attend all meetings. In addition, each meeting had a facilitator and a note-taker. After introductions, the facilitator provided an overview of the consultation program, the purpose of the meeting and the meeting agenda. A Discussion Guide and feedback form were provided to all participants. Each meeting was facilitated and notes were taken of the discussion. SFPR representatives provided an overview of the Nordel to 176 segment and pre-design options for this segment. Participants were given an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments. At the end of each meeting, ten minutes were set aside for participants to complete feedback forms.

At the open houses, display boards were provided that contained maps of the Gateway Program, the SFPR and information on each of the options. At least 12 Gateway technical staff members were present at each open house to answer participants' questions and gather comments. Discussion Guides were provided to all participants as they registered. Participants were encouraged to complete feedback forms before they left.

3. Key Theme Summary of Input

The following provides an analysis of the feedback form results. The quantitative results are a statistical analysis of the feedback forms. The qualitative results are a summary of the comments provided after each question. (An appendix of all original feedback is available for review at the Gateway Program office.)

3.1 Key Theme Summary of Feedback Forms

Question 1: Local Street Connection between Communities on the East and West Sides of the Alex Fraser Bridge

A proposed local street connection could link the local road network east of the Alex Fraser Bridge with Nordel Way and the Sunbury area to the west of the bridge. All options except no connection would provide for pedestrian/cyclist connections. *Please indicate which connection option you prefer, if any.*

Quantitative Results

Option A	A two-way bridge connection for general purpose traffic, to the south of SFPR between Nordel Way and River Road at Centre Street.	48%
Option B	A local street connection, at grade, for transit and emergency vehicles only, between Nordel Way and River Road at Centre Street.	27%
Option C	No connection.	24%

Qualitative Results (comments on feedback forms)

- Many respondents expressed concern about the potential noise, view, air-quality and property value impacts of the SFPR on their homes. For many of these respondents, the construction of a tunnel as an alternate to the split grade section in the North Delta area was suggested to better address their concerns about these potential impacts.
- Some respondents expressed a concern about the possibility of truck traffic using neighbourhood streets. These respondents want the project to make sure trucks do not use any proposed connection between the east and west sides of the bridge to access local streets; some would prefer no connection, to ensure this does not happen.

Question 2: Local Street Connection between River Road and Grace Road

A potential local street connection could provide a link between River Road and Grace Road. *Please indicate which connection option you prefer, if any.*

Quantitative Results

General Purpose Traffic	52%
Emergency and Transit only	28%
No connection	20%

Question 2 (continued)

Qualitative Results (comments on feedback forms)

- Although the majority of respondents support the connection between River Road and Grace Road, they expressed concern about the potential for regional traffic to “shortcut” through neighbourhoods.
- Many respondents, expressing preference for a tunnel option in the previous question, reiterated their support here.

Question 3: Access to SFPR at 124th Street

A potential connection at 124th Street would provide access to and from SFPR and the Bridgeview area. The City of Surrey has expressed an interest at this location to support its planned development of this area. *Please indicate which connection option you prefer, if any.*

Quantitative Results

No access	29%
Access at 124th Street	71%

Qualitative Results (comments on feedback forms)

- Many respondents support this option and a few respondents still had concerns about the potential for regional traffic to “shortcut” through their neighbourhood, especially if there is an accident or congestion on the SFPR.

Question 4: King Road Connector: Bridgeview Drive to Surrey Road

The SFPR removes the existing connection through 116th Avenue, King Road and 116A Avenue. The potential “King Road Connector” follows 114B Avenue east from Bridgeview Drive and then 115th Avenue to 136th Street. From 136th Street the King Road Connector links to 116th Avenue, then to King Road, and finally along 116A Avenue where it joins up to Surrey Road. The King Road Connector could provide access between the communities south of SFPR that 116th Avenue currently serves. *Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the potential King Road Connector.*

Quantitative Results

Strongly Agree	32%
Somewhat Agree	26%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	23%
Somewhat Disagree	4%
Strongly Disagree	15%

Question 4 (continued)

Qualitative Results (comments on feedback forms)

- Respondents supporting this option noted that they use the existing road for connection to work and other activities and would like the connection maintained by building the proposed King Road Connector.
- Respondents disagreeing with this option noted their concerns about pollution and additional traffic in their neighbourhoods.

Question 5: Access to Golden Ears Bridge Connector Road

There are four options for providing a connection to Golden Ears Bridge Connector, which links the SFPR and the Golden Ears Bridge between 104th Avenue and 183rd Street. Intersections at 179th Street and/or 182A Street could provide a connection to SFPR and the Golden Ears Bridge Connector from the North Port Kells community. *Please indicate which connection option you prefer, if any.*

Quantitative Results

No connection	29%
179th Street only	14%
182A Street only	22%
Both 179th Street and 182A Street	35%

Qualitative Results (comments on feedback forms)

- Respondents who do not want these connections commented most often. The most frequent reason for not wanting the connections was a concern about impacts on the residential neighbourhood adjacent to the Connector Road.
- The few comments from respondents supporting an access suggested that local residents should be consulted on which one they preferred and that a connection might be important for emergency vehicles.

Question 6: Cycling Connection between River Road East of the Alex Fraser Bridge and Delta–South Surrey Regional Greenway

A potential cycling connection is proposed to provide a direct route between River Road, east of the Alex Fraser Bridge and the Delta-South Surrey Greenway. *Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the connection.*

Quantitative Results

Strongly Agree	54%
Somewhat Agree	18%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15%
Somewhat Disagree	4%
Strongly Disagree	9%

Question 6 (continued)

Qualitative Results (comments on feedback forms)

- Many respondents expressed a concern about whether people would use the shoulder of a major road for cycling. Some of these respondents suggested using a roadside barrier to more safely separate cyclists and vehicles.
- Many respondents said that new cycling infrastructure was a great idea. Some of these respondents noted that this might encourage cycling use and that providing alternative transportation methods was a positive step forward.

Question 7: Cycling Connection between SFPR and Surrey Road for Eastbound Cyclists

It is possible to create a pedestrian and cyclist access to Surrey Road from the SFPR. *Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the creation of this pedestrian/cyclist access.*

Quantitative Results

Strongly Agree	54%
Somewhat Agree	19%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15%
Somewhat Disagree	4%
Strongly Disagree	8%

Qualitative Results (comments on feedback forms)

- Most respondents commented that providing cycling options was important to encourage alternative transportation modes and some of these respondents expressed concerns about safety, suggesting a barrier between the road traffic and cyclists.

Additional Comments (at end of feedback form)

- Many respondents supported the construction of the SFPR, with some suggesting that it needed to be done sooner rather than later.
- Many respondents expressed concern about the potential noise impacts of a new road and suggested that quiet pavement and sound barriers would be important to mitigate impacts on local residents.
- Some respondents, while not objecting to the SFPR, said that they would prefer a tunnel as an alternate to the proposed split grade section in the North Delta area.
- Some respondents asked for more information on the project, such as studies on noise impacts and options for mitigating impacts.
- A few participants expressed concern about their property values and wanted more information on how the project will address this issue.

3.2 Key Theme Summary of Stakeholder Meetings

The following provides a summary of the key themes from the discussion at each of the stakeholder meetings.

3.2.1 Key Themes – Business Groups (May 30, 2006)

- Participants generally supported the project and the pre-design concepts.
- Participants had questions about the toll on the Port Mann Bridge (part of the Port Mann/Highway 1 project) and how it might affect traffic on the Pattullo Bridge.
- Participants suggested that, if the SFPR is constructed in phases, the Nordel Way to 176th section should be completed first.

3.2.2 Key Themes – Sustainability Groups (May 30, 2006)

- Generally, participants supported the project as proposed.
- Participants commented about the need to address the environmental concerns along the corridor.
- Participants said that they did not want the SFPR to adversely affect the rail corridor in the area (e.g., rail passengers having to look at concrete walls).

3.2.3 Key Themes – First Responders (May 31, 2006)

- Participants discussed access points and noted the need to ensure as good as or better response times than what they have now.
- Participants requested pullouts on the SFPR, one in each direction, to provide for random truck inspections.
- Participants suggested that good directional signage be installed to assist the public, so that first responders are able to get better information from the public about where they are and what direction they are traveling, in the event of an emergency.

3.2.4 Key Themes – Goods Movers, Trucking, Ports (May 31, 2006)

- Participants supported the project.
- Participants had a number of technical questions regarding speeds, grades, the Barnston Drive portion of the highway, etc.

3.2.5 Key Themes – Sunbury/Annieville Communities (June 1, 2006)

- There was concern expressed by Royal Heights² residents with respect to noise and air pollution. They object to the SFPR as proposed.

² Residents of Royal Heights attended this meeting along with residents of Sunbury and Annieville neighbourhoods.

- Concerns were raised by representatives of the Sunbury Neighborhood Association regarding potential noise and visual impacts of the SFPR in this area. They are concerned about the proposed height of the potential SFPR structure over the BNSF rail lines near the Alex Fraser Bridge and the potential impacts on views.
- Participants would like more detailed information on the pre-design concepts.

3.2.6 Key Themes – Bridgeview Community (June 7, 2006)

- Participants understood the need for the project, but were concerned about local impacts.
- Participants asked the project to consider moving the road closer to the CNR and further away from the community.
- Participants expressed concern about the water table and potential flooding in the neighborhood and asked the project to give special attention to this aspect.
- Participants want the project to consider mitigation of any additional noise increases in the community.

3.2.7 Key Themes – Port Kells/Fraser Heights Communities (June 8, 2006)

- Participants expressed concern about noise impacts and asked the project to give special consideration to noise mitigation measures.
- Participants expressed concern about access to the SFPR, especially at 104th Street, and asked the project to consider what steps could be taken to discourage trucks from using the interchange to “shortcut” through local streets.
- Participants wanted more specifics about the buffer between the SFPR and the community – how wide is it anticipated to be?

3.2.8 Key Themes – Royal Heights Community (June 27, 2006)

- Participants had a number of suggestions on revisions to the alignment to reduce residential impacts.
- Participants had questions about the property acquisition and expropriation process to ensure fair treatment.
- Participants said they did not want an overpass at Elevator Road.
- Participants would like the SFPR moved further north of the railway lands.
- Participants would like the project to consider the potential human impacts of the project, above all other considerations.