



**BC JOBS
PLAN**



Ministry of
Transportation
and Infrastructure

GEORGE MASSEY TUNNEL REPLACEMENT PROJECT

PHASE 2 – EXPLORING THE OPTIONS – CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT
AUGUST 2013



This independent report of findings, including data entry and analysis of all the consultation input received, was prepared by Lucent Strategies Inc. for the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. The Ministry will consider the results of this consultation program along with ongoing technical and financial analysis in determining how to move the project forward.

The online survey was conducted using the FluidSurveys platform. Personal information collected in connection with responses to the survey is stored in Canada by FluidSurveys, not by the Government of British Columbia. FluidSurveys (fluidsurveys.com) stores all of its data in Canada and uses the latest firewall and encryption technology to protect private information.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
1. OVERVIEW	1
1.1 About the Report	1
1.2 About the Project.....	1
1.3 Stakeholder and Community Consultation	1
2. PHASE 2 CONSULTATION PROCESS	2
2.1 Overview	2
2.2 Notification	2
2.3 Online Engagement.....	3
2.4 Consultation Discussion Guide and Feedback Form	3
2.5 Small Group Meetings.....	3
2.6 Open Houses.....	4
2.7 Email and Phone Correspondence	4
3. PARTICIPATION	4
4. SUMMARY OF INPUT	5
4.1 Overview	5
4.2 Small Group Meetings.....	5
4.3 Open Houses.....	7
4.4 Feedback Forms.....	9
5. RECAP OF KEY THEMES FROM ALL INPUT SOURCES	11
6. NEXT STEPS.....	13

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Executive Summary

The George Massey Tunnel is a key component of the regional and provincial transportation system, carrying more than 80,000 vehicles each day. It connects to key gateways like the Vancouver International Airport (YVR), the Peace Arch border crossing, the BC Ferries Tsawwassen terminal and the Boundary Bay Airport. It is also an important goods movement route that fuels our national, provincial and regional economy and is a key access point for businesses in Delta and Richmond.

The tunnel is over capacity during the morning and evening rush hours and close to capacity throughout the day. The existing tunnel has about 10 years of useful life remaining before major components will need to be completely replaced. Additionally, while the tunnel remains safe for all users, it does not meet modern seismic standards.

In response to growing concerns about the impact of congestion and recognizing the age and condition of the existing George Massey Tunnel, the B.C. Government announced in September 2012 that planning for a replacement would begin immediately. The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (the Ministry) is leading this initiative and is undertaking a comprehensive project development process to determine the most appropriate solution. This will ensure Highway 99 continues to serve as a key component of the provincial transportation network.

Planning for the future now ensures there is a solution in place within the next 10 years – one that meets the growing needs of the communities, businesses and stakeholders who rely on this crossing.

The Ministry adopted an initial two-phase public and external stakeholder consultation program to support project planning and development. The two-phase consultation process included:

- **Phase 1: Understanding the Need (November to December 2012)** – Focused on understanding the need and potential constraints to develop the project scope and design requirements
- **Phase 2: Exploring the Options (March to April 2013)** – Based on Phase 1 consultation results and preliminary technical work, Phase 2 sought input on the draft project scope and goals, five potential replacement scenarios and on the criteria to evaluate these options

This report summarizes input received from the Phase 2 consultation, which took place from March 11 to April 2, 2013, and included participation from the public and stakeholders from across the Greater Vancouver region. Phase 1 results are available under separate cover and online at masseytunnel.ca.

KEY FINDINGS:

- Support for a new crossing along the Highway 99 corridor, with preference for a new bridge.
- Strong support for resolving the problem of congestion, safety and reliability at the Massey Tunnel.
- Strong desire for transit, cycling and pedestrian improvements, including protecting the Highway 99 corridor for future rapid transit.
- Strong opposition to improvements along a new corridor such as No. 8 Road.
- Doing nothing is not an option; strong opposition to only improving the existing tunnel.
- Continued support for moving forward with interim improvements as project development for a replacement continues.

Key themes of input about the five draft scenarios are summarized in the table below.

Scenario Description	Input Summary	Ranking
Scenario 1 Maintain existing tunnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General consensus that this is not sufficient to address the current and long-term needs of the region. • Many participants found this scenario unacceptable. 	Low support
Scenario 2 Replace existing tunnel with new bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall preferred scenario. • Many considered it to be the safest, easiest and most economical way of providing needed capacity. • Comments that it would provide needed capacity for transit and also would be most accessible for cyclists and pedestrians. 	High support
Scenario 3 Replace existing tunnel with new tunnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many participants opposed this scenario. • Concerns about the safety of tunnels for all users but particularly for pedestrians and cyclists. • Concerns that it would be too expensive to construct. 	Low support
Scenario 4 Maintain existing tunnel and build a new, adjacent crossing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some liked that it would make use of the existing tunnel. • Some expressed concerns about the lifespan of the existing tunnel, the additional operating costs associated with maintaining two crossings and limited accessibility in the existing tunnel for cyclists and pedestrians. 	Medium support
Scenario 5 Maintain existing tunnel and build new crossing in a new corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many participants strongly disagreed with this scenario, particularly the agricultural community. • Some people liked the flexibility this scenario would provide, while others felt it would encourage urban sprawl. 	Least support

Sections 1 to 3 of this report provide the overview and context for the project and the consultation process as well as participation levels. Section 4 of this report summarizes the key findings from each input source, including discussions at small group meetings and open houses, and the feedback form responses, while Section 5 provides a summary of key themes from all consultation activities as described above.

Based on consultation results and technical work to date, the Ministry will conduct additional technical analysis, prepare a project definition report and draft business case, assess transit options and continue to pursue interim solutions.

1. Overview

1.1 About the Report

This report presents the findings of the Phase 2 consultation process for the George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project. The findings presented include input received from all sources – meeting notes, online and print feedback forms and formal submissions received during the consultation period. For more information about the consultation process, please see Section 1.2.

The Phase 2 consultation process builds on the Phase 1 consultation, the results of which are available under separate cover (*George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project Phase 1 – Understanding the Need – Consultation Summary Report*, March 2013).

1.2 About the Project

In response to growing concerns about the impact of congestion and recognizing the age and condition of the existing George Massey Tunnel, the Government of British Columbia announced in September 2012 that planning for a replacement would begin immediately. The existing crossing, opened in 1959, is over capacity during the morning and afternoon rush hours and near capacity throughout the rest of the day.

The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure is leading the project development process to determine the most appropriate solution to ensure that Highway 99 continues to serve as a key component of the provincial transportation network.

Planning for a replacement tunnel involves extensive technical and financial analysis, discussions with all levels of government and consultation with residents, businesses and the public.

1.3 Stakeholder and Community Consultation

The Ministry adopted a two-phase public and external stakeholder consultation program to support project planning and development. The consultation program incorporated a variety of methods to enable people to be involved and provide input, including online engagement using the GovTogetherBC platform, open houses and small group meetings, to provide opportunities for people to participate in the way that worked best for them. Consultation phases were structured as follows:

- **Phase 1: Understanding the Need (November to December 2012)** – Focused on developing an understanding of needs and potential constraints to help create project scope and design requirements, which were used to evaluate project options.
- **Phase 2: Exploring the Options (March to April 2013)** – Based on Phase 1 consultation results and preliminary technical work, Phase 2 sought input on the draft project scope and goals, five potential replacement scenarios and on the criteria to evaluate these options.

The Ministry will consider the results of this consultation program along with ongoing technical and financial analysis in determining ongoing project development.

2. Phase 2 Consultation Process

2.1 Overview

The Ministry undertook Phase 2 consultation from March 11 to April 2, 2013. Key objectives in this phase included raising awareness of the need for a long-term solution at the tunnel, developing a project scope, gathering input on preferences for potential replacement scenarios and evaluation criteria, and achieving a high level of participation in the consultation process.

Key tools and activities during the three-week consultation period included advertising and notification, online media and social media engagement, seven small group meetings with community representatives and other stakeholders, three open houses, and a feedback form available in print and online. Details about the forms of notification and timing for each are presented in the subsections below.

2.2 Notification

The Ministry invited public participation through a variety of communication techniques as identified in the following table.

Form of Notification	Description	Date(s)
Newspaper advertising	Two public notices placed in the <i>Vancouver Sun</i> and <i>Province</i> , as well as 14 notices in various Lower Mainland community newspapers, including one Chinese language newspaper	March 6 - 12, 2013
Road signs	Five project information signs posted along Highway 99, Steveston Highway, River Road and Highway 17	Since November 2012
Media release and information bulletin	Media release and backgrounder distributed to Lower Mainland media outlets	March 6, 2013
Website	Public notices posted online at masseytunnel.ca	March 6, 2013
Social media	Tweets @TranBC	March 6, 7, 11, 25 and April 2, 2013
Project information line	1-8-555-MASSEY staffed during regular office hours, with target response call within two business days or less	Since November 2012
Email notice	Emails sent to the project database	March 6 and 29, 2013
Stakeholder meeting invitation letters	Invitation letters sent to 130 stakeholders encouraging them to participate in consultation workshop meetings and to invite others to participate	March 15 and 20, 2013

2.3 Online Engagement

Building on the success of the Phase 1 engagement, during which more than two-thirds of those who completed a feedback form did so online, the Phase 2 consultation included a variety of online notices and reminders. As with Phase 1, the primary hub for Phase 2 consultation information was the project website, masseytunnel.ca, which was built and promoted on the GovTogetherBC engagement platform.

2.4 Consultation Discussion Guide and Feedback Form

A 16-page consultation discussion guide provided information about the project and the consultation topics. A six-page feedback form mirrored the topics presented in the discussion guide. Both were available in hard copy and at the open houses and small group meetings as well as online throughout the consultation period.

2.5 Small Group Meetings

The Ministry hosted seven meetings with stakeholders (see table below) to seek input from a broad cross-section of interested groups.

Stakeholder Meeting	Date
First Responders	March 13, 2013
BC Trucking Association	March 14, 2013
Agricultural Groups	March 18, 2013
Port, Business Community	March 19, 2013
Surrey Community	March 19, 2013
Richmond Community	March 20, 2013
Delta Community	March 21, 2013

The meetings were designed to provide an opportunity for in-depth dialogue amongst representatives of groups with similar interests. They included a presentation from project staff followed by a facilitated discussion. A professional note taker captured the key themes and discussion at each meeting. Although arranged primarily by invitation, the meetings also were open to members of the public who were informed through the discussion guide about how to register.

2.6 Open Houses

The Ministry hosted three open houses, as noted in the table below. Each open house included an informal drop-in style session where participants could view information display boards and speak one-to-one with project staff, followed by a 20-minute presentation and a facilitated question-and-answer session. The presentation was the same as the one given during the small group meetings. Each participant was asked to sign in and was provided with a copy of the discussion guide and feedback form.

Open House Schedule		
Community	Date/Time	Venue
Richmond/ Vancouver	Wednesday, March 13 6 p.m. - 9 p.m.	Richmond Olympic Oval 6111 River Road, Richmond
Surrey/Langley	Thursday, March 14 6 p.m. - 9 p.m.	Sullivan Community Hall 6306 152 nd Street, Surrey
Delta	Saturday, March 16 10 a.m. - 1 p.m.	Coast Tsawwassen Inn 1665 56 th Street, Delta

2.7 Email and Phone Correspondence

Throughout the Phase 2 consultation, members of the public continued to make use of the project telephone and email inquiry program that the Ministry established in November 2012 to manage and respond to project-related questions. Contact information was available on all notices, including advertising and road signs and on the project website. Project staff responded to all inquiries, generally within two business days.

3. Participation

- 315 people attended the open houses
- 71 attendees representing more than 40 organizations participated in the small group meetings
- 1,004 visitors to the online survey and 547 completed feedback forms
- 79 people signed up for project update emails (in addition to the 627 people who had signed up in Phase 1). As of June 2013, the database had more than 1,000 names.

4. Summary of Input

4.1 Overview

Input was collected through three key sources – small group meetings, open houses and the feedback form. Key theme summary results from each of these sources are described in the subsections that follow.

4.2 Small Group Meetings

Small group meetings with stakeholders provided an opportunity to engage in more in-depth dialogue and gather input from a cross-section of interested groups. A number of members from the general public also attended these sessions.

Key themes that emerged across all groups include:

- Clear choice for **moving forward with capacity improvements** along the existing corridor, with **preference for a new bridge**
- General **support** for project **goals** and **evaluation criteria**
- Comments on Scenarios:
 - General consensus that **Scenario 1** (maintain existing tunnel) **is not sufficient** to address the current and long-term needs of the region
 - **Bridge** replacement scenarios generally perceived as “**easier**” and possibly less costly
 - Some **specific opposition to Scenario 5** (maintain existing tunnel and build a new crossing in a new corridor near No. 8 Road), particularly amongst the agricultural community
 - Desire for **more information about costing and funding** prior to determining the best solution
- Questions and **concerns about safety of tunnels**
- Requests to ensure plans incorporate long-term **rapid transit solutions**
- Desire for **interim solutions** to address current congestion challenges while planning for a long-term replacement continues

Key themes from each of these meetings are summarized in the following table.

Small Group Meeting	Key Themes
First Responders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario 1 (maintain existing tunnel) is not an acceptable option due to narrow lanes and lack of appropriate emergency access. • Emergency responses are challenging in the tunnel. • Preference for a solution that includes a new bridge; however, if a tunnel is selected, it should be constructed to modern standards for lane and shoulder width, lighting and ventilation. • It is important to explain the analysis and evaluation process at public meetings so that people understand all of the potential impacts will be assessed.
BC Trucking Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for a bridge replacement option, assuming it would be faster and easier to construct and have less environmental impact. • Questions about the lifespan of the existing tunnel. • Questions about cost of the different options and how a replacement would be procured, including if the cost would be lower if procured through a public-private partnership (P3).
Agricultural Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong opposition to Scenario 5. • Scenario 1 (maintain existing tunnel) is not an acceptable option. • Suggestion that the goal to “minimize” agricultural impact should be “no” agricultural impact. • Request that a full agricultural impact assessment be conducted before short-listing the scenarios, including lands required, lands bisected and parcels affected. • Request that lanes and ramps be built wide enough to support farm vehicle traffic. • Interest in more information about how input will be weighted and concern that the needs of the agricultural community will be outweighed by the desires of the general public. • Interest in how different scenarios will affect traffic north of the Fraser River. • Questions about plans for port-related traffic growth, including Terminal 2, and if these plans are factored into the traffic analysis. • Questions about the cost of each option.
Port, Business Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for options that would remove the existing tunnel. • Discussion of river clearances and the importance of the Fraser River for trade and commerce; the capacity and depth of the existing tunnel prevents long-term growth. • Desire to extend the project scope to consider the wider region and include future river, road and ferry traffic. • Comment that the goals focus on trade and commerce. • Discussion about for whom congestion should be addressed – all users or priority to specific users. • Suggestion to build flexibility into the evaluation criteria. • Important to establish the priority of this project relative to other projects in the region.

Small Group Meeting	Key Themes
Surrey Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario 1 (maintain existing tunnel) is not an acceptable option. • Use evaluation criteria based on future costs, technical requirements and growth predictions. • Improved signage in the short term is important to help alleviate congestion, including encouraging drivers to use routes. • Interest in more information about the cost of all scenarios.
Richmond Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of Richmond opposes Scenario 5. • Request that all scenarios include provision for future rapid transit. • Consider working with the Port to encourage nighttime operations as a means of relieving congestion during peak periods. • Investigate the feasibility of a park-and-ride option on the Delta side of the tunnel.
Delta Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in additional technical and cost-estimate information before making a final decision on the preferred option. • Ensure other transportation options and alternatives are true alternatives. • Design options to include future light rapid transit. • Suggestion to implement a higher level of scrutiny in environmental assessment for each scenario. • Ensure the needs of private residences adjacent to the tunnel are appropriately considered and measures to mitigate noise and visual impacts are sufficiently developed.

4.3 Open Houses

The Ministry held three open houses, which included a facilitated question-and-answer session.

Key themes that emerged throughout all open houses are:

- **Support** for moving forward, including support for the **project scope** and **goals**.
- Preference for a **bridge instead of a tunnel**, due to safety concerns and accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Importance of having dedicated lanes for **transit, cyclists and pedestrians**.
- Interest in more **technical, cost and environmental impact information** as planning moves forward.
- Strong **desire for interim solutions** as planning for the long term continues.
- **Comments about the importance of river transportation** and the role of Port Metro Vancouver in selecting a preferred scenario.

Key themes from each open house are summarized in the following table.

Open House	Key Themes
Richmond Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for a bridge replacement rather than a tunnel. • Questions about timing for a decision and for construction. • Need additional lanes for transit. • Interest in more information about the cost of the various options, including relative to other options like improving rapid transit. • Discussion about the importance of river traffic, how this is factored into the evaluation criteria and what role Port Metro Vancouver plays in the decision-making process. • Interest in more information about the traffic demand modelling process and how the Ministry is working with TransLink and municipalities to ensure all agencies are planning the same way. • Support for Scenario 5 as a means to help moderate traffic growth across municipalities and take some pressure off Highway 99. • Concern that local governments may become responsible for addressing increased traffic on municipal streets once new capacity is added.
Surrey Community	<p><i>No formal Q&A session held since most participants spoke one-to-one with project staff and departed before the scheduled start of the Q&A session. During the informal session, key themes from the one-to-one discussions were:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to move the project forward. • Interest in more information about the options as planning continues.
Delta Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong desire for interim solutions to address existing deficiencies. • Interest in whether the existing tunnel would be removed or just capped and left in place once decommissioned. • Interest in more information about costs of each scenario. • Interest in more information about the role of Port Metro Vancouver in evaluating scenarios. • Suggestions for use of HOV lanes in improving transit options. • Suggestion to consider a crossing for transit, cyclists and pedestrians only.

4.4 Feedback Forms

The Ministry received 547 responses during the Phase 2 consultation period. Following is a high-level overview of findings.¹

4.4.1 Feedback on Draft Project Scope

In addition to potentially replacing the George Massey Tunnel, the project also considers all interchanges within the Highway 99 corridor from Bridgeport Road in Richmond to the Canada/U.S. border in Surrey, as well as connections to other provincial highways, and regional and local routes.

Key theme responses were:

- General agreement with the draft scope as presented in the discussion guide
- Suggestions to consider expanding the project scope to include other bridges and routes
- Various comments about preference for specific options
- Suggestions that all scenarios include addition of rapid transit – a small number of respondents also suggested that improvements should focus on transit only
- Comments about the importance of minimizing impact on the environment and maintaining agricultural land

4.4.2 Feedback on the Six Project Goals

- **Relieve Congestion:** Reduce congestion and travel times for all users;
- **Improve Safety:** Improve traffic and seismic safety, as well as emergency response capabilities;
- **Support Trade and Commerce:** Improve access to local businesses and gateways;
- **Support Objectives for Regional People Movement:** Increase transit ridership and protect the Highway 99 corridor for future rapid transit and provide cycling and pedestrian access;
- **Protect the Existing Land Base:** Minimize impacts on agricultural, park and industrial lands, and minimize environmental impacts;
- **Involve Community:** Involve communities, businesses and stakeholders in the project.

Key theme responses were:

- General agreement with the project goals, with some suggesting order of priority, particularly congestion relief
- Strong support for the project goal of providing transit, pedestrian and cycling access
- Expressions of preference for a specific scenario

4.4.3 Scenario Preferences

Respondents were asked to provide feedback on their level of agreement with each of the five scenarios and were also invited to provide written comments about each option.

Taking all scenarios together, respondents expressed a clear choice for moving forward with capacity improvements along the existing corridor, with preference for a new bridge. Key themes for each scenario are listed below.

¹ The reader is cautioned that since respondents to this survey were self-selecting and not a random sample, the findings in this report should be considered as indicative only, and cannot be statistically projected to the population at large.

Scenario 1: Maintain existing tunnel

- Does not address project goals/meet current and future needs
- Short-term solutions are needed now
- Improve transit through the existing tunnel
- More than half of respondents disagreed with this scenario

Scenario 2: Replace existing tunnel with new bridge

- Numerous comments that this is the “best” option
- Provides options for transit, pedestrians and cyclists
- Accommodates future needs (traffic, shipping)
- Safest solution
- Concern about environmental impacts (farmland, noise, views)

Scenario 3: Replace existing tunnel with new tunnel

- Concern about safety for all users and accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians (vs. bridge)
- Concern that it might be too expensive/questions about cost
- Limits future river traffic expansion
- Accommodates current and future traffic
- More than half of respondents disagreed with this scenario

Scenario 4: Maintain existing tunnel and build a new, adjacent crossing

- General comments of support
- Expressions of preference for tunnel or bridge, and concerns about safety of cyclists and pedestrians if a tunnel
- Concern about lifespan of existing tunnel
- Concern about expense/additional operating costs
- Concern about environmental impacts

Scenario 5: Maintain existing tunnel and build new crossing in a new corridor

- Concern that impact on agricultural land is too great
- Concern that it would encourage urban sprawl
- Suggestions to connect across the North Arm of the Fraser to Boundary Road
- Provides flexibility, including opportunity to separate commercial traffic
- More than half of respondents disagreed with this scenario

4.4.4 Evaluation Criteria Importance

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinions about the importance of the six draft evaluation criteria. Based on the responses provided, the order of importance of the evaluation criteria is as follows:

- Efficient transportation for all users
- Safety
- Environment
- Jobs and the economy
- Social and community considerations
- Agriculture

It should be noted that the many respondents provided written comments about the importance of **all** evaluation criteria.

4.4.5 Additional Comments/Questions as Planning Continues

Respondents were invited to note questions and additional comments, and just under one-third of respondents chose to do so. Key mentions were:

- Transit, pedestrian and cycling needs should be a priority, including rapid transit
- Requests for more information about costs
- Questions as to whether consideration had been given to extending CanadaLine
- Suggestions to include options to minimize use of single occupant/private vehicles
- Questions about tolling

5. Recap of Key Themes from All Input Sources

- Strong support for resolving the problem of congestion, safety and reliability of the Massey Tunnel.
- Preference for capacity improvements within the existing Highway 99 corridor as compared with only upgrading the existing tunnel or building a new crossing in a new corridor.
- Preference for a new bridge, for various reasons including safety and attractiveness for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Strong desire for transit, cycling and pedestrian improvements, including protecting the Highway 99 corridor for future rapid transit.
- Desire for more information about costing and funding as planning continues.
- Requests to ensure cyclists, pedestrians and transit options are incorporated into all scenarios to encourage these forms of travel.
- Support for project goals and evaluation criteria.

- Continued support for moving forward with interim improvements as planning for a replacement continues.
- Comments and preferences for various scenarios as summarized in the table below.

Scenario	Key Themes From All Sources	Ranking
Scenario 1 Maintain existing tunnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General consensus that this is not sufficient to address the current and long-term needs of the region • Does not address project goals • Interim solutions are needed now • Improve transit through existing tunnel • Many participants found this scenario unacceptable 	Low support
Scenario 2 Replace existing tunnel with new bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall preferred scenario • Many considered it to be the safest, easiest and most economical way of providing needed capacity • Provides needed capacity for transit and also would be most accessible for cyclists and pedestrians • Accommodates future needs (traffic, shipping) • Concern about environmental impacts (farmland, noise, views) 	High support
Scenario 3 Replace existing tunnel with new tunnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that it might be too expensive/questions about cost • Concern about safety for all users and accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians (vs. bridge) • Accommodates current and future traffic • Limits future river traffic expansion • Concern about safety of cyclists and pedestrians (vs. bridge) • Many participants opposed this scenario 	Low support
Scenario 4 Maintain existing tunnel and build a new, adjacent crossing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressions of preference for tunnel or bridge, and concerns about safety • Some expressed concerns about the lifespan of the existing tunnel, the additional operating costs associated with maintaining two crossings and limited accessibility in the existing tunnel for cyclists and pedestrians • Some liked that it would make use of the existing tunnel • Suggestions to reserve new capacity for rapid transit • Concern about environmental impacts 	Medium support
Scenario 5 Maintain existing tunnel and build new crossing in a new corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that impact on agricultural land is too great • Some people liked the flexibility this scenario would provide, while others felt it would encourage sprawl • Concern about environmental impacts • Suggestions to connect across the North Arm of the Fraser to Boundary Road • Many participants strongly disagreed with this scenario, particularly the agricultural community 	Least support

6. Next Steps

Based on consultation results and technical work to date, the Ministry will conduct additional technical analysis, prepare a project definition report and draft business case, assess transit options and continue to pursue interim solutions.

Additional technical work will include more detailed traffic, structural and corridor analysis, additional origin-destination studies, geotechnical drilling, marine clearance studies and environmental work. Additionally, ongoing dialogue with municipalities, TransLink, Metro Vancouver and area First Nations will continue.

For more information:

Email: masseytunnel@gov.bc.ca

Web: masseytunnel.ca

Phone: 1-8-555-MASSEY (1-855-562-7739)

Mail: George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project
Suite 310 – 1500 Woolridge Street
Coquitlam, BC V3K 0B8



**BC JOBS
PLAN**



Ministry of
Transportation
and Infrastructure

GEORGE MASSEY TUNNEL REPLACEMENT PROJECT

PHASE 2 – EXPLORING THE OPTIONS – CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT

AUGUST 2013