



**Final Consultation Summary Report
Lions Bay
January 31 – March 28, 2004**

Prepared by:
the Strategic Action Group

April 28, 2004

Table of Contents

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
<u>CONSULTATION PROCESS</u>	2
<u>DRAFT PRE-DESIGN OPTIONS</u>	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<u>Community Concerns and Ministry of Transportation Responses</u>	3
<u>Highway Lane Options</u>	4
<u>Noise Abatement Options</u>	4
<u>Additional Community Issue and Concerns</u>	6
<u>KEY THEME SUMMARY</u>	6
CAG Meeting January 31, 2004	6
Open House/Public Meeting, February 28, 2004.....	6
<u>Highway Lane Options</u>	7
<u>Kelvin Grove Intersection Options</u>	8
<u>Brunswick Beach Intersection Options</u>	10
<u>General Comments</u>	11
CAG/MoT Pre-Design Options Review Workshop Summary March 28, 2004	13
<u>Lane Configuration Options - 4-lanes or 2-lanes</u>	13
<u>Kelvin Grove Intersection</u>	14
<u>Brunswick Beach Intersection</u>	14
<u>Traffic Noise Reduction</u>	14
<u>Interconnectivity</u>	15
<u>Speed Control Design and Zones</u>	16
<u>Speed Enforcement</u>	17
<u>Evaluation of Speed and Noise Mitigation</u>	17
<u>Village Aesthetics</u>	18
<u>Commitment to Full Funding for Construction</u>	18
<u>Ongoing Operations and Maintenance</u>	19
<u>Construction Impacts</u>	19
<u>Next Steps</u>	19
<u>APPENDICES</u>	21
<u>Appendix A - Terms of Reference for Sea to Sky Highway Improvement Consultation Process – Lions Bay</u>	22
<u>Appendix B - January 3, 2004 - CAG Meeting Summary</u>	28
<u>Appendix C - CAG letter to Peter Milburn (via e-mail – Feb. 8, 2004)</u>	30
<u>Appendix D - Peter Milburn letter to Elizabeth Jordan (Feb. 11, 2003)</u>	33

[Appendix E - Options Evaluation Table](#)..... 39

[Appendix F - Open House/Public Meeting Feedback Form Input \(February 28, 2004\)](#)
..... 52

[Appendix G - Open House/Public Meeting Notes \(February 28, 2004\)](#)..... 71

[Appendix H – CAG Letter to Peter Milburn \(March 19, 2004\)](#)..... 78

[Appendix I - CAG/MoT Pre-Design Options Review Workshop \(March 28, 2004\)](#)..... 82

INTRODUCTION

The Sea-to-Sky Highway links communities from West Vancouver to Whistler. Set in a spectacular mountain landscape, the highway presents complex engineering and construction challenges.

British Columbia's Ministry of Transportation (MoT) is undertaking improvements to the highway between Horseshoe Bay and Whistler to improve its safety and reliability. By 2009, extensive highway improvements will make travel along the corridor safer for residents, commuters and tourists. The improvements must be completed prior to the Olympics.

Improvements will include highway widening and straightening, improved sightlines, additional passing lanes and other design innovations and measures to reduce hazards, shorten travel times and increase capacity of the Sea-to-Sky Highway.

The Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project will result in the following:

- 4 lanes Horseshoe Bay to Lions Bay
- 2 lanes Lions Bay to Porteau Cove (3rd lane on rail bed for Olympics)
- 3 lanes from Porteau Cove to Squamish
- 4 lanes within urban Squamish
- 3 lanes from Squamish to Whistler

The \$600-million improvement project will be completed by 2009 and will meet population growth and travel demands until 2020, with additional improvements phased in as required over approximately 20 years. The project will create 6,000 new jobs throughout the province as a result of economic activity generated along the corridor, and will increase provincial GDP by \$300 million over the period of 2010 to 2025.

The primary goals for the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project include:

- Safety improvements
- Reliability improvements
- Capacity improvements
- Project completion by 2009
- Manage traffic flows during construction to minimize disruption and maximize predictability
- Complete the project on time and on budget

More information about the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project can be found at the following website:

<http://www.seatoskyimprovements.ca>

CONSULTATION PROCESS

The MoT has consulted about the scope of highway improvements over the last two years with communities, businesses and residents along the corridor. In total, the MoT project team has attended more than 300 meetings. Much of the consultation has complemented various technical studies undertaken by the MoT on tolling, other route options, and transportation alternatives.

With regards to Lions Bay, the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement project team has met with members of the Lions Bay community more than 25 times since 2002. Regular, at times monthly, meetings with a committee of citizens appointed by Council – the Community Advisory Group (CAG), open houses, and meetings with Council and staff have provided opportunities to review and discuss the scope of highway improvements in the Lions Bay area as well as specific concerns outlined by the community. In addition many more consultations have been conducted by members of the project team with individual residents and through numerous phone calls with CAG members, the CAG Chair, the Mayor of Lions Bay senior staff and others. The Lions Bay community and stakeholders include, but is not limited to:

- The Village of Lions Bay
- Lions Bay Community Advisory Group
- Residents
- First Responders (fire, ambulance, police)
- BC Ferries
- Transportation groups and goods movers
- Tourism organizations

On December 17, 2003, the project team and CAG (through senior staff representative, Lori Pilon) agreed to a Terms of Reference (TOR) for consultation concerning draft pre-design options (*see Appendix A*). In summary the TOR described the overall project goals and specific community issues and concerns as published in the May, 2003 Seagull, which is a local publication. The TOR set out three meetings with the community; a presentation of options to CAG, an open house for residents and a workshop with CAG to thoroughly discuss community issues and concerns and how the draft pre-design options address them.

- **CAG Information Meeting** - The MoT presented Highway improvement options including key characteristics such as access, costs, benefits and how each option addresses project goals and community concerns to CAG on January 31, 2004 (*see Appendix B*). CAG responded to this information with a letter to Peter Milburn outlining their concerns (*see Appendix C*).
- **Open House/Public Meeting** - The MoT consulted with the broader public through an open house/public meeting on February 28, 2004 to gather local area feedback. Highway improvement options and key characteristics were presented and input was gathered through discussion, a question and answer session and a feedback form. Approximately 225 people registered for this event and approximately 125 feedback forms were completed. The combined feedback from

the feedback forms and the public meeting component are summarized in a following section entitled “Key Theme Summary”.

- **CAG Workshop** - The MoT reviewed the public input gathered at the February 28th open house/public meeting via a facilitated workshop with CAG on March 28, 2004. The outcomes of this workshop are also presented in a summary form in “Key Theme Summary”.

The MoT has committed to ongoing highway improvement consultation with Lions Bay including Council, CAG and residents. On February 11th, Peter Milburn, Executive Project Director (MoT) sent a letter to Councillor Elizabeth Jordan (*see Appendix D*) on this matter. This letter articulated the history of consultation that had taken place with the community to that date, summarized community concerns and Ministry of Transportation (MoT) responses, described the draft design options and outlined the MoT’s commitment to ongoing consultation with the Lions Bay Community.

Consistent with the project’s overall consultation plan, the project team has committed to continue to consult with the community through the remaining phases in this project including preliminary design and detailed design stages to ensure community issues such as noise, access, quality of life and village atmosphere are considered and addressed, within technical and financial constraints.

Community Concerns and Ministry of Transportation Responses

In response to the community issues and concerns (including; quality of life, village atmosphere, visitor provisions, safety, emergency services, noise, access, interconnectivity, property values, traffic flows and others) MoT developed a detailed response (*see Appendix E*).

This response provided details of how each addressed the various issues and concerns. Of particular note is the Ministry’s effort to provide options to address noise, which has been identified as a priority concern for the community. The Ministry has responded with significant technical evaluation in an effort to present options that mitigate noise. Options investigated in the pre-design phase to mitigate noise within Lions Bay included a noise shed, quiet pavement, noise-control earth berms, traffic calming and noise barriers such as shoulder barriers, median barriers and terrain barriers.

MoT has communicated clearly that they remain committed to working with the community to reduce current highway noise by 4 to 5 dB through mitigation measures such as quiet pavement and speed reduction. Further, MoT is prepared to work with the community to make best efforts to incorporate noise barriers and other noise mitigation efforts, which could result in a further 5dB reduction.

Improvements to the section of the Sea-to-Sky Highway in Lions Bay are designed to improve safety, reliability and capacity, consistent with the goals for the overall project and in consideration of community objectives, issues and concerns. Two options have been developed for input and feedback from the community. Options address project goals and community concerns to varying degrees. Each option was visually presented to the Lions Bay Community Advisory Group (CAG) and residents.

Draft Pre-Design Options

Highway Lane Options

The two draft pre-design options presented to the Lions Bay Open House / Public Meeting on February 28, 2004 for consultation were:

4-lane Highway 99 Option

This option would include measures to

- reduce travel speeds through Lions Bay
- a bike lane
- landscaped median
- additional lighting
- traffic calming measures such as a pedestrian pathway, lamp standards and landscaping to increase driver awareness of the village, reducing speed and noise

This option would meet capacity requirements past 2025.

2-lane Highway 99 Option

This option would include measures to

- reduce travel speeds through Lions Bay
- a bike lane
- landscaped median
- additional lighting
- traffic calming measures such as a pedestrian pathway, lamp standards and landscaping to increase driver awareness of the village, reducing speed and noise

Relative to the 4-lane option, this option would move fewer lanes of traffic through the community and would not increase noise. This option would meet capacity requirements to approximately 2017.

Noise Abatement Options

Briefly, noise mitigation options include the following:

Quiet Pavement

Open-graded asphalt is being considered for its noise-mitigation qualities and its excellent drainage properties. This type of pavement is used in the Nanaimo area and members of CAG and a senior member of the project team visited Nanaimo as part of the pre-design process to experience the results. Nanaimo has had a 4 to 5 decibels reduction in traffic noise compared to regular asphalt pavement. The use of open-graded asphalt will mitigate noise impacts, including future noise levels, to below existing noise levels throughout the community.

Noise Control Earth Berms

Earth berms may have limited use in Lions Bay due to the amount of space they require, but their application will be investigated.

Traffic Calming

Traffic calming is used around the world in many difficult situations. There are several opportunities for traffic calming in Lions Bay to enhance the village feel using context-sensitive design, speed-limiting curves, raised center medians with landscape features such as over-hanging trees, gateway portals signifying the entrance to the village, pedestrian pathways, bike lanes, and lamp standards and banners. These are all proven methods of calming and slowing traffic, increasing safety and decreasing noise.

Speed Reduction

MoT will work to reduce traffic speeds through Lions Bay. Further, MoT is consulting with the RCMP to discuss ways in which MoT can facilitate more effective speed enforcement. Examples may include additional pull-outs for RCMP enforcement use.

Noise Barriers such as Shoulder Barriers

Most common in British Columbia, they are placed on the edge of the road and are reflective. There are several noise-barrier options depending on length, height, sound-reflective vs. sound-absorbing, texture, colour, drainage, etc.

Median Barriers

There are several factors to be considered in reviewing the application of median barriers for Lions Bay. For example, the concept requires acoustical modeling, consideration for snow storage and height limits.

Terrain Barriers

There are several factors to be considered in reviewing the application of terrain barriers for Lions Bay. For example, an appropriate balance would need to be struck between the height of the barrier for noise mitigation and the need to retain views from various properties. Consideration would also be given to the need to remove trees.

An additional noise mitigation option investigated was a noise shed of approximately 1600 meters which would enclose four lanes of traffic. This noise mitigation technique underwent technical and financial analysis including work with the community, independent engineering consultants, site visits and cost estimates. Results of the financial review indicated this option was not financially feasible.

Additional Community Concerns

In response to CAG's February 9, 2004 letter (attached). MoT has indicated that it is prepared to work with Lions Bay to consider ways to address specific concerns listed on page two of the letter.

Property Acquisition

Current analysis of draft options indicates that there are very few property requirements to implement the 4-lane or 2-lane option. MoT has had discussions with the potentially affected property owners and notes that it would be pre-mature to engage in specifics regarding possible property acquisition until design and scope decisions are made.

Key Theme Summary

CAG Meeting January 31, 2004

The MoT information meeting with CAG included presentation of the following items related to the highway improvement options:

- 4-lane and 2-lane highway options including a photographic visual with lane configuration over-lay and the benefits/results of each of the options
- context sensitive design information sheet
- intersection design options – this included five options each for the Kelvin Grove and the Brunswick Beach intersections
- elements of the project related to the Village atmosphere
- noise mitigation options and the expected performance of the various options
- a review of community concerns and solutions

Open House/Public Meeting, February 28, 2004

Consultation input was received at the February 28th open house/public meeting with approximately 225 people participating in this event. The first portion of the meeting provided the opportunity for reviewing visual displays and having individual discussions with MoT representatives with regards to the two highway lane configuration options, intersection options for Kelvin Grove and Brunswick Beach, actions taken to review noise mitigation and a summary of other initiatives that will be taken to address community concerns. Following the open house portion of the meeting, a facilitated public meeting was held to provide those in attendance to ask questions of MoT representatives and/or make comments in a public forum. Feedback forms were also provided for all in attendance and encouragement was offered to use this as a means of submitting their comments on the options – approximately 125 feedback forms were

received (*see Appendix F*). Comments were also received at the public meeting component of February 28th (*see Appendix G*).

The following notes summarizes the input from both the feedback forms and the public meeting comments.

NOTE – numbers have been provided in the summaries to indicate how many feedback forms and verbal comments from the open house provided a particular perspective. There is value in understanding the relative level of support for options. However, the reader is encouraged to keep in mind that these numbers are relative and no claim is being made that these represent a statistically valid sampling of the community. It is important to remember that public consultation is not a poll; participants self-select into consultation and do not necessarily represent a broader public view. Polls, on the other hand, are based on statistically significant, randomly selected samples.

Highway Lane Options

Option 1 - 4 lanes

- The majority of comments provided (76) were in support of the 4 lane option while only a few (5) were directly opposed to this option.
- The main reasons provided for supporting this option included:
 - ⇒ best way of addressing current and future needs
 - ⇒ best use of financial investment to do this now as it will be required in the future; also not “going backwards” after meeting the need for the Olympics
 - ⇒ less future construction disruption
 - ⇒ better movement of traffic through the community
 - ⇒ pushes the merge point (to 2 lanes) beyond Lions Bay
 - ⇒ safety
- The reasons provided for opposing the 4 lane option included:
 - ⇒ encouragement for greater speed when the current 60 k/mh speed limit is already exceeded by the majority of traffic
 - ⇒ amount of noise that may be generated by having twice the capacity for traffic as 2 lanes
 - ⇒ the use of Lions Bay as a “pass” zone prior to reduction to 2 lanes north of the Village
- While many simply indicated their support for this option, some of those in support also shared the concerns regarding speed and noise issues that a 4 lane highway will generate.

Option 2 – 2 lanes

- Many participants (39) said they were opposed to the 2 lane option while fewer (22) were in support of this option
- Reasons provided for supporting the 2 lane option included:
 - ⇒ no need for construction later on to convert to 4 lanes; cost to go back to 4 lanes when needed would be low or an alternative route might be identified post 2017
 - ⇒ ability to handle volume during the Olympics and then reduction of traffic speed and noise with the reversion to 2 lanes
 - ⇒ 2 lanes hold some prospect of keeping noise levels down because it will slow traffic down a little.
 - ⇒ less traffic at any one time going through the Village
 - ⇒ provides for a more aesthetic treatment (treed median, pedestrian pathway)
- The reasons provided for opposing the 2 lane option included:
 - ⇒ will lead to traffic congestion in moving from 4 lanes to 2 at Kelvin Grove
 - ⇒ waste of money and a temporary solution – 4 lanes are going to be needed in the future and this will lead to more construction disruptions in the future as well as increased future costs
 - ⇒ will not provide the noise or speed reduction that proponents believe it will – same amount of traffic

Kelvin Grove Intersection Options

Five optional intersection designs were presented for Kelvin Grove. These included:

- Right In/Right Out Only
- Close access and provide underpass of highway and lower connection to Southview Place/Lions Bay Avenue
- Stop Controlled Intersection
- Signalized Intersection
- Mini Change

A summary of the feedback responses to these options is noted below:

Right In/Right Out Only

- Only 2 people indicated that this option may be acceptable while it was rejected by a significant number of people responding to this item (35); reasons included:
 - ⇒ need to maintain connection between the parts of the community for residents and emergency services

⇒ lack of turn-around access

Close access and provide underpass of highway and lower connection to Southview Place/Lions Bay Avenue

- This option was rejected by 17 people; the reasons provided included:
 - ⇒ inconvenience to residents on Kelvin Grove Way
 - ⇒ need for additional Kelvin Grove traffic to be passed through Southview/Lions Bay Avenue
 - ⇒ too costly for too little benefit
- This option was supported by a significant number of people (29) but noted by a number of them as their second choice, preferring the mini change option; reasons for support included:
 - ⇒ potential to reduce noise
 - ⇒ improved interconnectivity between Kelvin Grove and Lions Bay
- An additional suggestion for this option would be to provide a paved pedestrian path that would be wide enough for vehicular maintenance

Stop Controlled Intersection

- A significant number of people (34) rejected this option while only 1 response indicated support; reasons for rejection included:
 - ⇒ safety concerns
 - ⇒ increased noise due to stop and start traffic
 - ⇒ increased traffic congestion

Signalized Intersection

- A significant number of people (32) rejected this option for the following reasons:
 - ⇒ safety concerns
 - ⇒ increased noise at the intersection
 - ⇒ increased traffic congestion
 - ⇒ negative impact on the character of the Village
- A small number of responses (7) indicated support for this option; the main reason provided was that this may help slow traffic down

Mini Change

- A few responses (5) indicated a lack of support for this option citing noise

- This option was the one with the strongest level of support (84); reasons included:
 - ⇒ safest intersection design
 - ⇒ best able to handle flow of traffic
 - ⇒ provides community connection without going on the highway
 - ⇒ allows higher level of safety for pedestrians
- Suggestions for this option included:
 - ⇒ ensuring adequate provisions for a pedestrian walkway
 - ⇒ providing a berm or other privacy provisions for Sweetwater
- Concerns were expressed that while this option was presented, MoT may be unwilling to do this due to this being the most expensive intersection option; encouragement was provided as this being the best long term solution

Brunswick Beach Intersection Options

Five optional intersection designs were presented for Kelvin Grove. These included:

- Right In/Right Out Only
- Stop Controlled Intersection
- Signalized Intersection
- Protected T Intersection
- Mini Change

A summary of the responses to these options is noted below:

Right In/Right Out

- This option was rejected by a significant number of responses (23) and only supported by a few (3); reasons for not supporting this included:
 - ⇒ safety concerns
 - ⇒ lack of interconnectivity for both residents and emergency services

Stop Controlled Intersection

- This option was also rejected by a significant number of responses (24) and only supported by a few (3); reasons for rejecting this option included:
 - ⇒ safety concerns
 - ⇒ inability to adequately address the volume of traffic

Signalized Intersection

- This option was also rejected by a significant number of responses (21); reasons for rejecting this option included:
 - ⇒ lack of ability to adequately deal with the volume of traffic
 - ⇒ safety concerns, particularly given the location
- This option received a low level of support (5) with the main reason being given to help slow traffic down

Protected T Intersection

- This option was rejected by 15 respondents; no reasons were provided
- This option was supported by a few people (7) with the only reason provided was that this is an option that would work given the low traffic volumes
- A few feedback forms indicated that this option was confusing

Mini Change

- This option was strongly supported (71) and was not rejected by any of those responding to this option; reasons for support included:
 - ⇒ provides the safest option
 - ⇒ best for smooth flow of traffic
 - ⇒ provides best community inter-connectivity
 - ⇒ best long term solution

General Comments

Highway Options

- the highway lane options are not as future thinking as they could be; suggestions include:
 - ⇒ alternative routes
 - ⇒ a covered section of the highway through Lions Bay with municipal infrastructure (e.g. road, amenities) on top

Noise Concerns

- Suggestions with regard to noise mitigation included the following:
 - ⇒ establish a baseline measurement and ensure that this will be maintained on an ongoing basis
 - ⇒ consider grade elevation differences between north and south lanes

- ⇒ utilize noise barriers
- ⇒ address noise from bridge joints
- ⇒ support the use of low-noise pavement
- ⇒ noise energy not decibels should be reduced
- Concerns with noise abatement measures as known to date include:
 - ⇒ need for more information in order to assess if noise mitigation measures will be effective/acceptable
 - ⇒ desire for a commitment from MoT as to maximum sound levels with further improvement if necessary to control noise on an ongoing basis
 - ⇒ berms and fences may be too low for sound waves

Speed Concerns

- Speed issues have both a safety and a noise component – the higher the speed, the more safety concerns are raised and the higher the noise generated
- Suggestions with regard to addressing speed included the following:
 - ⇒ maintain a lower speed limit
 - ⇒ use a center median
 - ⇒ use rumble strips and/or speed bumps
 - ⇒ re-employ photo radar through the Village
 - ⇒ use signalized intersections to reduce speed and raise speed change awareness
 - ⇒ ensure that enforcement measures will be in place and be effective
- Comments made with regard to safety include:
 - ⇒ adopt the mini change design at both Kelvin Grove and Brunswick Beach
 - ⇒ separate the bike lane and pedestrian path from the highway (10 feet)
 - ⇒ consider how road lights affect safety
- Concerns with speed control measures as known to date include:
 - ⇒ need for further assurance and details to assess if speed calming measures will be effective/acceptable
 - ⇒ desire for MoT assurance that speed will be monitored and remedial action will be taken if measures planned are not as effective as hoped

Aesthetics

- Comments made with regard to aesthetics of this project include the following:
 - ⇒ the aesthetics of this area are important to citizens
 - ⇒ median treatment, landscaping and sound mitigation measures must also take aesthetics into account
 - ⇒ residents want to be involved in these aesthetic decisions
 - ⇒ attention must be paid to avoiding light pollution in the Village

CAG/MoT Pre-Design Options Review Workshop Summary March 28, 2004

Following the February 28th Open House/Public Meeting and the issuance of a Draft Summary Consultation Report, a pre-design options review workshop was held with both MoT and CAG participating. MoT initially provided an overview of the public consultation process and then the meeting discussion focused primarily on a review of the matters raised in CAG's letter to MoT (*see Appendix H*). Comments from CAG and MoT responses at the workshop were gathered (*see Appendix I*). Below is a summary of the main points organized by themes with the main issues raised by CAG followed by responses from MoT.

Lane Configuration Options - 4-lanes or 2-lanes

CAG

- not able to support either the 4-lane or 2-lane option until the questions raised have been answered
- do not want to support an option that may harm the Village however if the Ministry meets all the community concerns as noted in the Terms of Reference (*see Appendix A*) then CAG can accept the 4-lanes

MoT

- based on the support in the public consultation to date and the project objectives, the Ministry is proceeding to the preliminary design stage with the 4-lane option

Kelvin Grove Intersection

CAG

- the option for connecting a road between Southview and Tidewater needs more work; concerns with the sidewalk being right beside the highway
- would like clarification on whether the Ministry would pay for a bike or pedestrian connection between Southview and Tidewater

MoT

- more engineering work is being done on the Tidewater-Southview connection option so that it can be better evaluated
- terrain is extremely steep and a wall would be needed for both of the connection options; some private properties will be affected with either option
- mini change would cost approximately \$2 million while a connection between Tidewater and Southview would be in the range of \$5 million
- the Tidewater-Southview connection option would result in one less access onto the highway but environmentally there will be one more crossing of Rundle Creek
- Tidewater is not a Ministry road and it would take Municipal Council endorsing this as a municipal road and a resolution of cost sharing matters with Council before this option could be accepted; likewise any agreement reached with Council on a path in this area would require a maintenance and cost-sharing agreement with the municipality

Brunswick Beach Intersection

- CAG and MoT both agreed with the large majority of the responses from the public meeting that a mini change is the best options for the Brunswick Beach intersection

Traffic Noise Reduction

CAG

- there would likely be an increase in noise with the development of 4-lanes

- want a commitment from the Ministry to use best efforts to reduce traffic noise to a maximum level of noise in the Village of 50 decibels at night and 55 decibels during the day (Health Canada reference level)
- concerned that the noise level will grow and wants recognition that there will be safe level of sound for now and the future
- want details on how noise will be measured and quantified through this section of the highway
- believe that a noise shed is the best option for addressing noise in the community

MoT

- all things being equal 4-lanes would be noisier than 2-lanes, however, noise mitigation options will reduce impacts.
- Health Canada values are essentially threshold levels – levels at which some people may feel effects; the Provincial Government policy is based on incremental noise from current values; the Ministry is committed to use noise reduction tools but cannot guarantee the Health Canada thresholds will be met at all times or on all sections of the highway through the Village
- quiet pavement and speed reduction measures can achieve lower noise levels and noise barriers could further reduce noise but there may be some concern with aesthetics - the Ministry is committed to using these tools as outlined in a letter from MoT to Councillor Elizabeth Jordan on February 11, 2004 (*see Appendix D*) and will bring back further information on the expected application and performance of these tools to the community for consideration as part of the preliminary design phase
- further information will be provided at the preliminary design stage on the expected performance of the noise reduction tools and community input will be sought on how these tools might be implemented on this section of the highway
- some aspects of future noise are beyond the Ministry's control (e.g. increased motorcycle usage on the highway)
- with regard to the noise shed, after conducting independent assessments of the cost of such a measure, the Ministry rejected this as being too expensive

Interconnectivity

CAG

- want more options to address community interconnectivity without being tied to the highway

- the highway cuts the Village in half and would like to have the Ministry fund improvements to interconnectivity
- a pedestrian path separated from the highway is needed from Brunswick into the Village center
- would like clarification on whether the Ministry would pay for a bike or pedestrian connection between Southview and Tidewater

MoT

- there are two areas of improvements - within the corridor and outside the corridor and at this point, there is not yet clarity where some of the paths may be
- MoT is interested at the preliminary design stage of looking at the Village of Lions Bay's plan for community interconnectivity and how the highway project can best integrate with this
- responsibility for ongoing maintenance is an issue

Speed Control Design and Zones

CAG

- there is a desire to have 60 km/h continue throughout the entire Village as a matter of consistency to not confuse drivers speeding up and slowing down
- speed control is important as a safety measure for school children and for noise reduction

MoT

- the RCMP will look at options to determine speed behavior and recommend pullouts as part of the preliminary design phase; CAG was advised a representative from the group can participate in the process with the experts to consider the locations
- the Ministry doesn't have the exact location but the range of the speed zone however it likely will be 60 km/h from the interchange to a portal on the north side of the Village with a transition up to 80 km/h; this will be determined when the Ministry determines what is going to happen in the next section of the highway
- some thought needs to be given to the ultimate impact as the further a slow zone is extended, the less chance that vehicles will respect it

Speed Enforcement

CAG

- want affirmation that the Ministry is committed to the issue of speed controls, acknowledging that the Ministry can't commit the RCMP
- speed enforcement through the Village is very important
- thought should be given to how ICBC's speed reduction program can be used

MoT

- there are ties between speeding and road design; the RFP for the operation of the highway which will be issued in July may include some accountability for safety performance; details for this have not yet been determined; the Ministry will be talking with the RCMP about this matter
- additional enforcement may be required
- ICBC has been a very involved in the pre-design consultation and will continue to be consulted on the issue of speed management

Evaluation of Speed and Noise Mitigation

CAG

- for safety reasons and noise reduction purposes CAG wants to reduce speed through the Village
- under the Environmental Assessment Act, a monitoring scheme for speed and noise reductions could be undertaken to ensure that it was occurring
- monitoring is only helpful if there is a consequence and to have a consequence there is a need to have noise thresholds
- need to know the number of cars and traffic composition as part of the noise measurements for them to be meaningful
- the effectiveness of speed mitigation techniques and speed monitoring will need to be evaluated

MoT

- the Ministry wants traffic to move efficiently and not have back-ups
- disincentives are measures to get compliance and incentives are to avoid those disincentives; there are combinations that are reasonable; some speed control measures such as road curvature may not be practical to modify in the future while other measures like additional signage could be used

- evaluation of both speed and noise could be put into the RFP together with remedial action (follow-up); these would be priced accordingly in the contract as part of risk-transference
- the Ministry will meet the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act with respect to trees, streams, etc. but socio-economic issues such as noise monitoring are not part of that Act although they are a project related issue
- there will be monitoring throughout the project in many areas (e.g. noise, seismic activity, blasting, ground acceleration etc.) and this information will be publicly available

Village Aesthetics

CAG

- would like a written commitment that the design options will be aesthetically pleasing and that the Village will be allowed to approve the final options
- would like to see some proposed treatments soon
- lighting should be generally pleasing

MoT

- the Ministry recognizes that a Village feel is an aesthetic cornerstone; after options are further developed at the preliminary design stage, these will be presented to the community and input gathered; this will enable the Ministry to ensure that the communities aesthetics values that also fit with the Ministry's project goals are clearly specified for the detailed design phase
- there is also a need to determine maintenance of aesthetic treatments - some decisions will be at preliminary design and some in detailed design
- the Ministry tends to use standard lighting to ensure spare parts are readily available - the design could be Village specific but there are other competing factors and the Ministry has to develop options that address those competing interests; the Ministry will work with CAG to try and determine the best locations for lighting

Commitment to Full Funding for Construction

CAG

- there is a concern that with the \$600 million cap on the total project that some other sections, notably the possibility of an expensive tunnel at Horseshoe Bay, may result in less money being available for the Lions Bay section

MoT

- this project will soon result in an RFP that will include all the elements of the project determined as part of the preliminary design
- there will be one contractor for the whole project except possibly for Ansell Place to Lions Bay; the contractor will have a contract with the government so if this is not being fulfilled as the community believes it should be, the community will deal with this through the government

Ongoing Operations and Maintenance

CAG

- concerned about the continuity of commitment and follow through with respect to that what is chosen actually gets done; this is related to a question of what would happen if the project “runs out of money” or there is a change in government
- want to understand how performance standards will be enforced

MoT

- the contract will include design, construction and maintenance with about a 20-year horizon after construction and this provides an opportunity to ensure that the performance of various measures will be maintained
- the enforcement of performance standards is generally done monetarily - the first level of punishment is monetary and the second level is various levels of default (performance bonds, etc.) and doing the work ourselves

Construction Impacts

CAG

- a concern was raised about controlling traffic and construction noise while the project is under way

MoT

- there will be an environmental assessment and some language around both traffic disruption and construction noise issues in the RFP

Next Steps

- CAG agreed that the second public meeting that was described in the Terms of Reference as taking place within two weeks of this workshop to discuss the selected options should be delayed until there are more details on some of the matters raised during the workshop

- the Ministry agreed that the amount of new details at this time would not likely warrant a second public meeting and that this would be more productive as part of the preliminary design phase
- the Ministry also committed to provide the relevant items in the project Terms of Reference at a draft level and provide CAG the opportunity to provide comments

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Terms of Reference for Sea to Sky Highway Improvement Consultation Process – Lions Bay*
- Appendix B January 31, 2004 - CAG Meeting Summary*
- Appendix C CAG letter to Peter Milburn (via e-mail – Feb. 8, 2004)*
- Appendix D Peter Milburn letter to Elizabeth Jordan (Feb. 11, 2003)*
- Appendix E Options Evaluation Table*
- Appendix F Open House/Public Meeting Feedback Form Input (February 28, 2004)*
- Appendix G Open House/Public Meeting Notes (February 28, 2004)*
- Appendix H CAG Letter to Peter Milburn (via e-mail – March 19, 2004)*
- Appendix I CAG/MoT Pre-Design Options Review Workshop (March 28, 2004)*

Appendix A - Terms of Reference for Sea to Sky Highway Improvement Consultation Process – Lions Bay

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE SCENIC SEA-TO-SKY HIGHWAY

The Village Perspective – Lions Bay Community Issues and Concerns Presented to the Lions Bay Community Advisory Group: Jim Hughes (chair), Peter Anderson, Michael Broughton, Karl Chowscano, Alix Kerr, Marcus von Krosigk, Myron Loutet, Philip Marsh, Peter Marshall, Richard Mossakowski, Trevor Peach, Louis Peterson, Gilbert Raynard, Andrew Oliver, Connie Spiers, Lori Pilon.

April 25, 2003

INTRODUCTION

The Village of Lions Bay, situated on the eastern shore of Howe Sound, some eleven kilometers north of Horseshoe Bay and about twenty-five kilometers from downtown Vancouver, was a very small community when first incorporated in 1971. It has now grown to include the areas, often thought of as separate entities, of Kelvin Grove, Central Lions Bay and Brunswick Beach, the latter joining the village some four years ago. The current population of about 1500 is expected to rise to 2100 in twenty years (OCP, page 16). The Village has a K-3 school, which caters to and relies on the population of communities beyond its boundaries (Furry Creek, Ocean Point, and Strachan Creek). The Village Emergency Service Building, housing an Ambulance and a Volunteer Fire & Rescue Department, services a significant portion of the highway as well as the local community.

The aspirations for the future of the Village are set out in the recent Village of Lions Bay Official Community Plan, Bylaw 326, January 21, 2002. The OCP describes the community vision and values in terms of fundamental considerations that lead to seven core themes, intended to direct the Village plans and actions. It speaks of “our unique sense of place”, “a natural habitat --- a legacy --- to be preserved for our own enjoyment and for future generations” (OCP, pages 2,9). While the document provides a highly detailed “road map”, intended for local municipal use in the unique shaping of the future for Lions Bay, it is helpful for our purposes to be mindful of the list (not prioritized) of the seven core themes (OCP, page 3):

- Respecting nature;
- Community strengthening;
- Ensuring a safe community;
- Maximizing mobility choices;
- Providing effective services;
- Maintaining a sense of place;
- Meeting responsibilities in governance.

April 28, 2004

The Council of the Village of Lions Bay appointed a Community Advisory Group (CAG) in January 2003, with the role of providing input to SNC-Lavalin on issues, concerns and design details on behalf of the residents of the Village. While the CAG involvement is likely to extend to the end of 2005. The CAG has sought input from all residents of the Village, and has engaged in extensive discussions of matters that affect the community. Certain concerns that are beyond the scope of SNC-Lavalin's mandate have emerged, but have nevertheless been noted. These include an opposition to tolling, and opinions that an alternative route will ultimately be inevitable and would provide a preferable solution to the corridor transportation problems if considered at this time. We applaud the Ministers announcement of April 23, 2003 regarding tolling and appreciate that it is completely consistent with the CAG position that tolls are absolutely out of the question for the sea to sky highway. The highway itself, while a major commuter route, is considered by many as an outstanding spectacular scenic attraction for local weekenders and tourists alike.

While we recognize that the upgrading of the Sea-to-Sky Highway is driven by interests essentially external to Lions Bay, we also appreciate that the continued expensive maintenance of the highway is only justifiable in the context of the needs of a broad range of other stakeholders. Nevertheless, our thinking is guided by, and is intended to be consistent with, the principles of the Official Community Plan. We are also guided by the input obtained in the first phase of our work, from two public meetings, a few in-person submissions, numerous letters to the CAG or the Seagull as well as a petition opposing 4- lanes, which was publicly posted within the community.

(see a "Resource Binder" available at the Village Office).

The task of formulating Terms of Reference, within a Community Sensitive Context, to guide the Technical Design process is one requiring considerable sensitivity, given the nature of community concerns and differing concepts of our Community Values and our sense of Value of Community. With this in mind, the CAG has identified principles important to the community, consistent with the Official Community Plan.

One outcome is a need for the Terms of Reference for the Technical Design, as prepared by SNC-Lavalin, to provide for the development of several design options, to demonstrate a careful consideration of these differing points of view. For instance, members of the community have suggested 2-lane, 3-lane and 4-lane possibilities as partial solutions to some of the identified problems. While recognizing these opinions, the CAG wishes to emphasize that these are considerations, and not design options. The design process is not to be limited to any one option.

The concerns of the community can be broken into physical regions requiring attention (i.e., intersections, access/egress points, noise reduction (close to highway residents) etc) have been identified on a comprehensively annotated map of the Village (prepared by Mr. Ron Lee of SNC-Lavalin; Appendix B of Lavalin's Terms

of Reference for Design Consultants). It is important to note that the CAG fully expects to work with the design consultants to develop and review several design options presented, that address the problems and concerns noted by the residents. These options will then be presented to a Public Forum and the Village Council for final approval.

The combination of issues of concern, relevant criteria and underlying principles - some specific to Lions Bay, others of broader importance - include the interrelated items listed below. Many of these items are dealt with in the Official Community Plan, to which limited references are given.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS and ACCESS EGRESS ISSUES

QUALITY OF LIFE may be seen as encompassing many factors, including: (i) safe and efficient travel to and from places of work or school or recreation - for residents, school children, friends, visitors and tourists; (ii) a sense of security in the knowledge of efficient response by emergency service personnel in times of need; (iii) enjoyment of one's home and garden for residential and recreational living, and as a valuable asset of future financial value; (iv) absence of unwanted noise and other forms of pollution, including air, water and visual pollution; (v) enjoyment of the community by virtue of its spectacular location on Howe Sound, in a largely natural environment, by acceptable standards of aesthetics where the natural environment is impacted, and by the potential for pathways, cycle lanes, and convenient interconnectivities for pedestrians and vehicles. Improved designs for the highway should enhance the factors that contribute to Quality of Life.

THE VILLAGE ATMOSPHERE: This topic almost defies definition. "Atmosphere" appeals remotely to our senses. Lions Bay is located in an area of exceptional scenic value, on the slopes of a forested mountain slope overlooking the waters of the Howe Sound inlet (OCP, page 9). The "Village" may share some qualities common to other small communities and towns, but we see its "atmosphere" as "village", not "urban". It is a place of escape from modern pressures, a place of rural or village informality with a level of disorganization based on tolerance and freedom of expression, an unobtrusive place, a place in which to be left alone. Improved designs for the highway should enhance the factors that contribute to the Village Atmosphere.

VISITOR PROVISIONS may be thought to include travelers and tourists as well as friends and family – a place for rest, a meal, to visit commercial establishments, to enjoy the view ---- Convenience of access to and from the highway is needed.

SAFETY ISSUES; Safety on the highway is a matter of importance to all who use it and coexist with it. There are many factors that contribute to safety or the lack of it. These include speed, overdriving road conditions, driver fatigue, frustration, poor access/egress and traffic volume. Although there are many ways to control these the

best, most effective and easily maintained are DESIGNED INTO THE ROADWAY. This falls within SNC-Lavalin's current mandate.

Within the Village of Lions Bay, attention is drawn to a need for improved safety designs in the following areas: (i) for the Kelvin Grove and Brunswick Beach intersections; (ii) for all access lanes and egress lanes within the Village; (iii) for visibility or line-of-sight requirements; (iv) for bus stop requirements (school and public); (v) for pedestrian (adult and children) requirements, including interconnectivity; (vi) for all users of the highway both within and without the Village; (vii) for traffic calming measures to promote safe driving habits (OCP, page 6, 7). Improved designs for the highway should enhance the factors that contribute to Safety.

EMERGENCY SERVICES: Improved designs must include highway access and egress provisions for easy, timely and safe access to emergency situations by emergency services personnel both within and without the Village (OCP, page 8).

TRAFFIC NOISE is already an environmental issue of major concern, particularly for homes close to the highway, and will become even more serious if traffic volumes – particularly truck/commercial traffic - increase. During peak morning and late afternoon periods, and for extended periods during summer days, outdoor activity is extremely unpleasant, even intolerable. We have been advised by SNC Lavalin that the noise options will improve these noise concerns largely by reducing noise production at its source.

THE HIGHWAY AS A RESIDENTIAL ROADWAY: The suggestion here is that drivers on an expressway should be aware that the expressway ends upon entering a residential community, by a design change from “expressway” to “roadway”, and by specific entrance design features creating traffic calming measures. Improved designs for the highway should enhance the factors that denote a Residential Roadway.

TRAFFIC SPEED: Traffic speed through the Village often exceeds specified speed limits, contributing to increased traffic noise and decreased safety for all highway users, and in particular for the vehicles entering the highway. Improved designs must include traffic calming provisions at both entrances to the Village, and throughout the Village portion of the roadway, to encourage safe Traffic Speeds.

AESTHETICS: “Beauty is in the eye of the beholder”. While a highway is always an architectural creation, the needs of a community differ greatly from those of an uninhabited landscape. Structures such as retaining walls, bridges, overpasses, and underpasses should be designed to be as unobtrusive and visually acceptable as possible. Attractively designed barriers, berms, median strips, community signs and landscaping features contribute to traffic calming, noise abatement, community pride and property values. Improved designs for the highway should enhance Aesthetic factors.

THE SCHOOL CHILDREN: The K-3 school in Lions Bay is a resource used by families outside the Village, in Furry Creek, Ocean Point and Strachan Creek, thus maintaining a viable school population. Future development will be enhanced by securing the future existence of the school, a factor to be considered in the designing of the highway beyond Village boundaries, in ways convenient to parents. Some private school children and children in Grades 4-12 travel into town by school bus, thus requiring safe stops, and safe pedestrian interconnectivities within the Village (OCP, pages 5, 13). Improved designs for the highway should enhance the factors that contribute to safety for School Children.

INTERCONNECTIVITY relates to the safe and convenient linking of the various sections of the Village by pedestrian pathways and/or roadways (OCP, page 7). The sections of the Village are Upper and Lower Kelvin Grove, Upper and Lower Central Lions Bay, and Upper (potentially) and Lower Brunswick Beach. In general, interconnections are not present or are inconvenient and/or unsafe, indicating a need for improvement. As a major design feature, interconnectivity among the various areas in the Village, could significantly improve the impact on the village residents and highway users alike.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS: It is easily recognized that the upgrading of the Sea-to-Sky Highway is a project of major proportions, and that inconveniences disruptive to residents and to all highway users are inevitable. The project is likely to extend over a substantial period of time. The movement of commuters, public transport and school buses, commercial traffic and emergency service vehicles may be negatively impacted. Increased noise, air pollution and dust level problems will arise from crushing machinery and heavy equipment. A need for the provision of automobile access to a temporary detour roadway along a short section of the BC Railway was suggested in an early proposal as part of the upgrade effort. It is CAG's understanding that there is agreement that any detour using the Railway bed will be constructed north of the village boundary (beyond Magnesia Creek), and that the homes nearest to the railway line on Lions Bay Avenue, Seaview and Brunswick Beach Road will not be affected by construction work associated with paving of the track, removal of paving, or detoured traffic. It need scarcely be said that residents of Lions Bay and all other road users hope that disruptions will be kept to a minimum. While most of the matters mentioned in this paragraph belong in the details of an operational contractual document, the Terms of Reference for the design process should facilitate and not encumber the writing of such details.

EXPROPRIATION/ENCROACHMENT: Philosophically, the expropriation of property may be seen as an extra-ordinary measure, only to be invoked in extreme situations and with a full measure of compensation for those affected by the measure. Expropriation may do injury to a community. Improved designs for the highway should be done in such a way as to minimize the negative impacts associated with Expropriation.

PROPERTY VALUES: The presence of a highway affects property values in differing ways. While values may increase at distances from the highway, properties close to the highway are likely to be negatively affected. For many, a home is the major family asset whose value is important if conditions impose a sale or liquidation. For homes closest to the highway, design options should include considerations that minimize detrimental effects.

BRUNSWICK PIT AREA: This area is used by the Fire Department for training exercises, and as a helicopter pad in emergencies. The area needs to be accessible for these purposes during the period of construction. In the long term, this area may be a resource for housing and other community use (OCP, page 13). Improved designs for the highway should be done in such a way as not to compromise the future potential and value of the Brunswick Pit Area.

TRAFFIC FLOW or total number of vehicles and type of vehicle using the highway is beyond the control of designers, but some measure of control over rate of flow (number of vehicles per unit of time) is possible. Improved designs should ensure that rate of flow does not compromise Quality of Life and/or related community values.

RECREATION: As a component of Quality of Life, residents expect to be able to enjoy their homes and gardens, to enjoy the scenic qualities of the area, and to participate in recreational amenities common to our culture. Improved designs for the highway should enhance the factors that contribute to Quality of Life and Recreational needs.

OTHER LAND USE ISSUES: Within Lions Bay there are areas where prime real estate development in the future may be possible. For example, the East Brunswick Beach hillside has the potential to become like Upper Kelvin Grove in the future. The Village boundaries may be extended to include further undeveloped land, or possibly developed lands. Improved designs should be done in such a way (including factors relating to aesthetics) that the potential value of current and future developments would not be compromised unduly.

Thankyou

Appendix B - January 31, 2004 - CAG Meeting Summary

Lions Bay Community Advisory Group
Pre-design “Options” Presentation by Sea to Sky Project Team
Jan 31/04 Lions Bay Community Center

On January 31/04 a pre-design Options presentation was held to provide the Lions Bay Community Advisory Group (CAG) with information to enable CAG to represent it’s perspective on the options, which will be presented by the Sea to Sky Project Team at a public meeting.

Presenting the information on behalf of the STS Project Teams was-
John Cavanagh – Project Director for Lions Bay
Rob Ahola – Senior Project Manager

The information provided (including concept drawing):

Lane configuration:

- **Four lane- 4-lane Highway 99 Option** – This option would include measures to reduce travel speeds through Lions Bay. It would include a bike lane, landscaped median, additional lighting and traffic calming measures such as a pedestrian pathway, lamp standards and landscaping to increase driver awareness of the village, reducing speed and noise.
- **2-lane Highway 99 Option** -- This option would include measures to reduce travel speeds through Lions Bay. It would also include a bike lane, landscaped median, additional lighting and traffic calming measures such as a pedestrian pathway, lamp standards and landscaping to increase driver awareness of the village, reducing speed and noise. Relative to the 4-lane option, this option would move fewer lanes of traffic through the community and it is anticipated it would not increase noise. Infact, overtime as demand increases, congestion will slow traffic down, reducing noise. This option meets capacity requirement until approximately 2017.

Intersection design options:

There are two intersections within the Lions Bay Village limits that require upgrading to increase safety, reliability and capacity requirements. Details of construction options to be presented at the Open House on Feb. 28th for Kelvin Grove and Brunswick Beach intersections are as follow:

Kelvin Grove intersection:

Option 1 – Right in/ Right out

Option 2 – Close access and provide underpass of highway and lower connection to Lions Bay Ave.

Option 3- Stop controlled intersection

Option 4- Signalized intersection

Option 5- Mini Change – provides a roadway under Highway 99 for pedestrians, cyclist and vehicles.

Brunswick Beach intersection:

Option 1 – Right in/ Right out

Option 2 – Stop Controlled intersection

Option 3 – Signalized Intersection

Option 4 – Protected T Intersection

Option 5 – Mini Change- provides a roadway under Highway 99 for pedestrians, cyclist and vehicles.

Other information presented:

- Photographic visual with lane configuration over-lay
- Detailed review of the option (matrix)
- Context Sensitive Design information sheet
- Village computer graphic- pre construction
- Village computer graphic- Village atmosphere
- Village computer graphic- Noise walls
- Community Concerns/solutions Map and review
- Noise mitigation options and attached graph

Community Advisory Group feedback:

CAG received the presentation material and would provide written feedback to the Ministry of Transportation at a later date.

Appendix C - CAG letter to Peter Milburn (via e-mail – Feb. 8, 2004)

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Hughes

To: Milburn, Peter TRAN:EX; Cavanagh, John TRAN:EX

Cc: Elizabeth Jordan; Douglas Miller; Trevor Peach; Rudy Luethy; Philip Marsh; Peter Anderson; Michael Broughton; Marcus von Krosigk; Louis Peterson; Lori Pilon; Karl Chowscano; Jim D. Hughes; Gilbert Raynard; Connie Spiers; Andrew Oliver; Alix Kerr

Sent: 2/18/04 10:50 PM

Subject: Written response to our letter of February 8.

Peter and John.

Subsequent to our meeting of, January 31, 2004, with John Cavanagh and Rob Ahola, the Lions Bay Community Advisory Group communicated to you in a letter, our comments on the options.

The Lions Bay Community Advisory Group supported the concept of a Noise Shed for Lions Bay because it appeared to be the only option that potentially could address all our Terms of Reference. More specifically, it appeared to be the only option that we felt could deal with the concerns that have been expressed regarding noise from the highway.

We appreciate that you are attempting to deal with this noise issue and we acknowledge that there may be less costly ways of achieving the desired end result. Unfortunately, to date, even after our meeting with Peter Milburn on February 9th, we still have not been given directly, any assurances that the measures which you are currently investigating will be effective, given the nature of the problem and the terrain in our Village.

The purpose of our letter, was to get a commitment in writing from MOT on these issues. This has not happened to-date.

While we believe the noise shed is the preferred option, we wish to work to achieve a solution provided that it reasonably solves the noise problem.

The Village of Lions Bay will be resistant to proposals that may not work. To that end, the Village of Lions Bay may consider your noise mitigation option provided the Ministry is committed to working with the community to solve the noise problem and is willing to commit to reducing current highway noise by at least 5dB through mitigation measures such as quiet pavement and speed reduction. Further, the Ministry is (subject to community consent) prepared to make best efforts to incorporate noise barriers/structures and other noise mitigation efforts, which will result in additional noise reduction of at least 5dB. These and other noise mitigation measures will be maintained to ensure the highway noise level at any residence in Lions Bay is below the 55dB level.

Regarding the Options which were presented which consisted of the following:

- * Option 1 - Four lane highway
- * Option 2 - Four lane highway (to be restricted to two lanes post-Olympics)

We see this as only one option which consists of a four lane highway which raises a number of comments including the following:

Comments From South to North:

April 28, 2004

- * We support the gateway concept south of Lions Bay;
- * We support the split highway and preservation of a treed and/or landscaped median
- * We suggest two levels of roadway at Kelvin Grove, where possible, to create sound deflection on lower level and improve the aesthetics of the proposed noise walls;
- * We wish to connect Tidewater to Southview to provide internal connectivity within the Village;
- * We wish to separate the sidewalk/pathway wherever possible for safety and to create a calmer feeling and to maintain pedestrian connectivity;
- * The aesthetics of the open noise shed concept should be improved/advanced;
- * The onramp design at the store appears too steep for Fire Vehicles;
- * The median design north of Alberta Creek appears inadequate. Widening the median and providing landscaping treatment will maximize the impact of traffic calming all the way to the Northern Gateway. (see northern gateway below);
- * Noise treatment is required at Brunswick Beach (in particular on the West side of the interchange)
- * Quiet pavement used all the way to M-Creek will control sound created for the entire four-lane section;
- * Develop a gateway to the Village, north of Brunswick Beach to maximize the traffic calming;
- * Use option 2 for the upper Brunswick Beach roadway. Do it once, right.

Based on the information presented to the CAG, on January 31, we are not ready to go to a public meeting. There are significant deficiencies in the presentation that must be resolved before the scheduled date. All of the issues listed, **MUST BE CLEARLY PRESENTED and DEALT WITH** in the presentation. If you are prepared to go to the public on Feb 28, you have a lot of homework to do quickly.

Some suggestions

- * Explain the noise shed option to the community and note that it has been pursued in good faith and that the cost was prohibitive (the Village has embraced this idea in some cases and it must be addressed).
- * The public meeting must address expropriations. This issue has caused much anxiety for many Village residents.
- * Maps of highway should show the existing highway, the right of way, and the footprint of the new highway. This can be easily done with dotted lines of different colours etc....
- * Most importantly, Village residents must be able to visualize how the highway project will affect them and their neighbours. Overall steps must be taken to improve the presentation in this regard. The computer generated visual showing the proposed noise walls is inadequate, we suggest more visuals (possibly as many as five cross sections at different locations throughout the Village showing proposed sound mitigation options with aesthetic treatment)

The announcement letter (for Feb 28) which was sent for approval yesterday, is inadequate as it does not address the issues. We must proceed cautiously, if we intend to get public buy-in.

Do not underestimate the will of the community in Lions Bay. Show the village you are listening and prove to them the options are what you say they are.

Do not brush the noise issues aside.

Respond to our letter in writing showing your commitment.

Thankyou

Jim Hughes

Chair, for Village of Lions Bay Community Advisory Group

Appendix D - Peter Milburn letter to Elizabeth Jordan (Feb. 11, 2003)

February 11, 2004

Elizabeth Jordan
Village of Lions Bay
Village Office
PO Box 141
Centre Road
Lions Bay, BC V0N 2E0

Dear Elizabeth Jordan:

In preparation for the Feb. 12th meeting of the Socio-Economic Working Group, this letter provides the following:

- a) A summary of consultation with the Village of Lions Bay
- b) A summary of community concerns and Ministry of Transportation (MoT) responses
- c) A brief description of current draft design options that are the subject of ongoing consultation with Lions Bay and
- d) An outline of the MoT's commitment to ongoing consultation with the Lions Bay Community

First, I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the entire project team, to thank Council, the Community Advisory Group (CAG) and the residents of Lions Bay for their assistance in defining the scope of improvements included in the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project. The time and attention elected officials, staff and community members have provided will contribute significantly to our ability to meet the project's safety, reliability, capacity, schedule and road closure goals.

A Summary of Consultation with the Village of Lions Bay

Since 2002, the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement project team has met with members of the Lions Bay community more than 25 times. Regular, at times monthly, meetings with CAG, open houses, and meetings with Council and staff have provided opportunities to review and discuss the scope of highway improvements in the Lions Bay area as well as specific concerns outlined by the community. In addition many more consultations have been conducted by members of the project team with individual residents and through numerous phone calls with CAG members, the CAG Chair, the Mayor of Lions Bay, senior staff and others.

Most recently, the project team and CAG (through senior staff representative, Lori Pilon) agreed to a Terms of Reference (TOR) for consultation concerning draft pre-design

April 28, 2004

options. In summary, the TOR described the overall project goals and specific community issues and concerns as published in the May, 2003 Seagull, which is a local publication.

The TOR set out three meetings with the community; a presentation of options to CAG, an open house for residents and a workshop with CAG to thoroughly discuss community issues and concerns and how the draft pre-design options address them. The CAG meeting was held Jan. 31, 2004 and the open house is tentatively scheduled for Feb.28, 2004. The CAG workshop has not yet been scheduled.

The Ministry of Transportation is committed to ongoing consultation with Lions Bay including Council, CAG, residents, and individuals and businesses. Consistent with the project's overall consultation plan, the project team will consult with the community at the pre-design, preliminary design and detailed design stages to ensure community issues such as noise, access, quality of life and village atmosphere are understood and addressed, within technical and financial constraints.

Community Concerns and Ministry of Transportation Responses

The Village of Lions Bay has provided a list of community issues and concerns including; quality of life, village atmosphere, visitor provisions, safety, emergency services, noise, access, interconnectivity, property values, traffic flows and others. MoT has developed a detailed response to the issues and concerns indicating how a **four-lane highway 99 option** or a **two-lane highway 99 option** could address the issues and concerns. The detailed response is called the *Village of Lions Bay Options Review* and is attached.

Of particular note is the Ministry's effort to provide options to address noise, which has been identified as a priority concern for the community.

The CAG has identified noise as a priority concern and the Ministry has responded with significant technical evaluation in an effort to present options that mitigate noise. A noise shed, quiet pavement, noise-control earth berms, traffic calming and noise barriers such as shoulder barriers, median barriers and terrain barriers are all under consideration to mitigate noise within Lions Bay.

In response to CAG's concerns regarding noise, MoT is committed to working with the community to reduce current highway noise by 4 to 5dB through mitigation measures such as quiet pavement and speed reduction. Further, MoT is prepared to work with the community to make best efforts to incorporate noise barriers and other noise mitigation efforts, which could result in a further 5dB reduction.

Briefly, the following noise mitigation techniques are under consideration:

A Noise Shed – A noise shed of approximately 1600 meters would enclose four lanes of traffic. This noise mitigation technique is undergoing technical and financial analysis including work with the community, independent engineering consultants, site visits and

cost estimates. Results of the financial review indicate this option is not acceptable to MoT.

Quiet Pavement – Open-graded asphalt is being considered for its noise-mitigation qualities and its excellent drainage properties. This type of pavement is used in the Nanaimo area and members of CAG and a senior member of the project team recently visited Nanaimo to experience the results. Nanaimo has had a 4 to 5dB reduction in traffic noise compared to regular asphalt pavement. The use of open-graded asphalt will mitigate noise impacts, including future noise levels, to below existing noise levels throughout the community.

Noise Control Earth Berms – Earth berms may have limited use in Lions Bay due to the amount of space they require, but their application will be investigated.

Traffic Calming – Traffic calming is used around the world in many difficult situations. There are several opportunities for traffic calming in Lions Bay to enhance the village feel using context-sensitive design, speed-limiting curves, raised center medians with landscape features such as over-hanging trees, gateway portals signifying the entrance to the village, pedestrian pathways, bike lanes, and lamp standards and banners. These are all proven methods of calming and slowing traffic, increasing safety and decreasing noise.

Speed Reduction – MoT will work to reduce traffic speeds through Lions Bay. Further, MoT is consulting with the police and the RCMP to discuss ways in which MoT can facilitate more effective speed enforcement. Examples may include additional pull-outs for enforcement use.

Noise Barriers such as Shoulder Barriers – Most common in British Columbia, they are placed on the edge of the road and are sound-absorbing. There are several noise-barrier options depending on length, height, sound-reflective vs. sound-absorbing, texture, colour, drainage etc.

Median Barriers – There are several factors to be considered in reviewing the application of median barriers for Lions Bay. For example, the concept requires acoustical modeling, consideration for snow storage and height limits.

Terrain Barriers -- There are several factors to be considered in reviewing the application of terrain barriers for Lions Bay. For example, an appropriate balance would need to be struck between the height of the barrier for noise mitigation and the need to retain views from various properties. Consideration would also be given to the need to remove trees.

Additional Community Issues and Concerns -- Please note the *Technical Issues and Comments* attachment, which provides further responses to specific issues and concerns raised through correspondence and earlier community consultation.

Draft design options for ongoing consultation with Lions Bay

Three draft pre-design options have been presented to Lions Bay for consultation.

- **4-lane highway 99 Option** – This option would include measures to reduce travel speeds through Lions Bay. It would include a bike lane, landscaped median, additional lighting and traffic calming measures such as a pedestrian pathway, lamp standards and landscaping to increase driver awareness of the village, reducing speed and noise.
- **2-lane highway 99 Option** -- This option would include measures to reduce travel speeds through Lions Bay. It would also include a bike lane, landscaped median, additional lighting and traffic calming measures such as a pedestrian pathway, lamp standards and landscaping to increase driver awareness of the village, reducing speed and noise. Relative to the 4-lane option, this option would move fewer lanes of traffic through the community and it is anticipated it would not increase noise. In fact, overtime as demand increases, congestion will slow traffic down, reducing noise.
- **Noise Shed Option**– This option would include full-enclosure structures covering four lanes with para-glass walls and roof. The noise shed would be approximately 1600 meters long (approximately 10 city blocks). The attached *Options Review*, which provides MoT responses to community issues and concerns, does not include the Noise Shed Option because results of the financial review indicate this option is not acceptable to MoT.

In response to CAG’s February 9, 2004 letter (attached). MoT is prepared to work with Lions Bay to consider ways to address specific concerns listed on page two of the letter. In addition, MoT will provide more information on the following prior to the tentatively scheduled Feb. 28 open house.

Property Acquisition – Current analysis of draft options indicates that there are very few property requirements to implement the 4-lane or 2-lane option. Once design and scope decisions are made, MoT will provide additional information regarding the property acquisition process. MoT will do everything possible to minimize property acquisition requirements.

Maps showing the right-of-way and highway footprint – Maps of this type will be made available prior to the Feb. 28 open house.

Cross-sections of possible noise barrier options – Representative cross-sections will be developed to assist Lions Bay residents in understanding the options under consideration. However, it is important to note that these illustrations are representative and may change with additional geotechnical or geometric design information.

MoT's Commitment to Ongoing Consultation

Corridor-Wide Community Consultation¹

The Ministry of Transportation (MoT) has consulted about the scope of highway improvements over the last two years with communities, businesses and residents along the corridor. The MoT project team has attended more than 300 meetings. Much of the consultation has complemented various technical studies undertaken by the MoT on tolling, other route options, and transportation alternatives.

MoT is committed to ongoing consultation with municipalities (elected officials and staff), and organizations such as Technical Liaison Committees, the Lions Bay Community Advisory Group (CAG), Community Advisory Groups in the SLRD, Howe Sound Community Forum, Squamish advisory groups, Tourism Whistler, One-Whistler, Chambers of Commerce, environmental organizations and the public.

Traffic Management

A key priority of the Ministry of Transportation is to minimize the disruption and maximize the predictability of traffic delays during construction. Communities along the corridor have been consulted about seasons, days of the week and hours of the day when highway construction would cause the least disruption.

As a result of this consultation, road closures and delays will be limited to non-peak periods.

Consultation on Highway Improvement Design

As the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement project proceeds through various design stages and ultimately into construction, communities and key stakeholders are being consulted. The design stages include:

- Pre-Design
- Preliminary Design
- Detailed Design

Best practice in community consultation suggests that community consultation should be gathered during the pre-design and preliminary design stages to ensure designs consider community objectives as well as primary project goals as early as possible in the design process. The detailed design and final design stages usually involve relatively more financial and technical analysis than community consultation to ensure the designs are financially and technically feasible.

Consultation Summary Reports

An important step in consulting with communities is reporting back to participants summarizing their input and, as much as possible, providing information about how their input was considered or used. *Consultation Summary Reports* are generally organized in key themes for consideration by design experts.

Commitment to Ongoing Consultation in Lions Bay

¹ Refer to Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project Corridor-wide Consultation Plan.

The project team is committed to ongoing consultations with CAG, residents and businesses in Lions Bay, at key milestones throughout the project. This is consistent with the project's commitment to ongoing consultation with all corridor communities and corridor-wide stakeholders such as the tourism sector and goods movers. An open house is tentatively scheduled for Lions Bay for Feb.28, 2004 and smaller meetings with individual residents and groups of residents are planned for the coming weeks and months as we consult about draft pre-design options, preliminary design options and detailed design options.

In closing, thank you for the opportunity to provide a detailed response to issues and concerns raised by Lions Bay. Please treat the attachments to this letter as an integral part of this response.

I look forward to an ongoing, constructive dialogue as we implement improvements that deliver better highway safety, reliability and capacity throughout the corridor.

Sincerely,

Peter Milburn
Executive Project Director

cc: John Cavanagh, Project Director, Lions Bay
Lions Bay Community Advisory Group (CAG)

Attachments: Options Review
Technical Issues and Comments
Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project Corridor-Wide Consultation
Plan

April 28, 2004