Proposed Low Level Road Project

Consultation Summary Report

February/March 2012 Information Sharing and Consultation Program

April 30, 2012

Prepared by: Lucent Strategies Inc.
This report was prepared by Lucent Strategies Inc. for Port Metro Vancouver. Lucent is a Vancouver-based communications consulting firm specializing in community and stakeholder engagement, and was retained by Port Metro Vancouver to conduct the Low Level Road community consultation program, provide an independent report of findings including data entry and analysis of all feedback forms and consultation input received. Port Metro Vancouver will consider the results of the consultation program as it continues to work together with the City of North Vancouver in refining project designs, as well as designing future consultation and engagement activities.

Lucent Strategies commissioned Mustel Group, a professional market research firm to tabulate all feedback forms submitted. It is noted that since respondents self selected, the results should not be interpreted as reflective of the broader community; however, they can be considered as reasonably representative of the opinions of consultation participants.
Table of Contents

Executive Summary ............................................................................................................................................. 1

1. Project Overview and Context ...................................................................................................................... 4

2. Information Sharing Program – December 2011 through February 2012 .................................................. 6

3. Detailed Design Consultation Program – March 2012 ............................................................................... 9

4. Summary of Consultation Input – Highlights ........................................................................................... 15

5. Feedback Form – Detailed Results ............................................................................................................ 19

6. Workshops – Detailed Results .................................................................................................................. 30

7. Port Talk Results ....................................................................................................................................... 38

8. Submissions ................................................................................................................................................ 40

9. Next Steps ................................................................................................................................................ 41

Appendices ...................................................................................................................................................... 42
Executive Summary

The proposed Low Level Road Project is a $100 million road and rail project designed to provide for more efficient operations within the North Shore Trade Area, while maximizing benefits and minimizing impacts to adjacent communities. The project includes elevating and realigning the existing Low Level Road, providing space for two new rail tracks and addressing long-standing safety, recreation and noise challenges in the area.

Port Metro Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver have been working together to engage the community about the proposed project since January 2011. The conceptual and preliminary design phases were presented and discussed with the community from January to August 2011. The Consultation Summary Report from the Conceptual Design Phase is available on Port Metro Vancouver’s website.

This report summarizes the activities and findings from the recent Detailed Design consultation activities – Information Sharing (December 2011-February 2012) and Detailed Design Consultation (March 2012).

The goal of the Information Sharing was to engage the community by providing an update on the proposed project, including details about the March 2012 consultation process, timeline and where options for input were being developed. Activities undertaken included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification for February and March events using advertising, posters, household mail out, email and phone calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7500</strong> household mail out of a two-sided colour postcard to 7,500 North Shore residents and businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Launching the project’s electronic information portal – PortTalk.ca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1350+</strong> more than 1,350 people visited the site during this period, <strong>58</strong> people registered and <strong>41</strong> comments were posted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Displays in high pedestrian-traffic areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>150</strong> approximately 150 people dropped-by to view the displays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1280</strong> @PortMetroVan’s tweets and retweets reached 1,280 Twitter followers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal of the March 2012 Detailed Design Consultation was to seek input on the modified project design and options. Key elements of the consultation program, including methods and participation, included:

Public input was sought on specific consultation topics during the March 2012 Detailed Design Consultation. The topics were outlined in the Discussion Guide, presented at the open houses, discussed during the workshop events and on Port Talk. Specific comments and ideas were gathered through Feedback Forms, Workshop discussions and through comments and questions posted on Port Talk. Key findings and themes from all three input sources are summarized below:

- General support for the revised design as an appropriate response to input from previous consultation; specifically to minimize impacts to residents.
- General Agreement for Option 1 (St. Andrews with Full Intersection) for the Western connection to East Esplanade.
- Concern about potential loss of parking for businesses along East Esplanade.
- General support for St. Georges intersection modifications, with some concern about increased traffic.
- Preference for enhanced greenspace and a combined Spirit Trail and sidewalk instead of a sidewalk on the Low Level Road in the Mid-Section; however, it is noted that several participants also felt strongly about the need for a sidewalk along the road.
- Concern from residents about increase in traffic noise near the eastern Low Level Road connection (near Heywood Street) and a request to extend noise mitigation.
- Mixed feedback on new Heywood Street Access with proposed signalized intersection – there was general support for the proposed safety improvements; however some were concerned about increased wait times and potential for attracting more traffic.
• General support for aspects of the project that will help reduce or eliminate existing noise.
• General support for cycling and pedestrian facilities included as part of the project – both on the road and the Spirit Trail.
• General support for aspects of the project that will improve safety - including slope stability and safety for all road users.
• General support for the inclusion of public art within the project design.

Following completion of joint consultation this spring, Port Metro Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver will confirm whether the proposed project design sufficiently meets the project’s community, cost, environmental and engineering requirements, such that the proposed project can proceed to procurement and construction.
1. Project Overview and Context

1.1 About the Proposed Low Level Road Project

The proposed Low Level Road Project is part of a broader investment and improvement strategy on behalf of the Government of Canada, Province of British Columbia, Port Metro Vancouver, TransLink, the City and District of North Vancouver and the private sector. The strategy is designed to facilitate projected port-related growth to meet international trade demands while maximizing benefits and minimizing impacts on local communities.

As a primary east-west route for the North Shore, the importance of the Low Level Road has long been reflected in community and transportation plans. Upgrades on this road are required to improve safety and better accommodate the needs of all users including cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project is important to Port Metro Vancouver because it provides for more efficient operations for tenants and provides community benefits for the City of North Vancouver. These benefits include minimizing noise impacts from Port operations, a permanent solution to unstable cut slopes above the existing road and completion of the Spirit Trail between St. Georges Avenue and Kennard Avenue.

Key elements of the project include:

- Elevating the Low Level Road and realigning it to the north
- Providing space for two new rail tracks for cargo handling
- Eliminating three existing at-grade rail crossings
- Providing intersection and road safety improvements between the Esplanade/Low Level Road intersection and the East 3rd Street/Cotton Drive/Low Level Road intersection
- Addressing slope stability along the Moodyville bluff
- Addressing long-standing safety, recreation and noise challenges associated with Port operations along the existing Low Level Road
- Completing the Spirit Trail and providing upgraded cycling and pedestrian facilities.

1.2 A Staged Approach to Planning and Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January – August 2011</th>
<th>September 2011 – February 2012</th>
<th>February 2012 &amp; March 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Conceptual Design Consultation</td>
<td>• Review consultation results to date</td>
<td>• Information Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preliminary Design Consultation</td>
<td>• Redefine Project to address consultation input</td>
<td>• Consultation on Modified Design and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation on Information Sharing Process</td>
<td>• Develop modified design and options</td>
<td>View the Consultation Summary Report at PortTalk.ca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April – May 2012</th>
<th>May 2012 &amp; June 2012</th>
<th>Potential Future Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review consultation results</td>
<td>• Consultation on preferred alignment including City of North Vancouver Public Meeting</td>
<td>• Local area consultations on specific project aspects such as noise walls, landscaping, Spirit Trail and construction traffic management plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop preferred alignment and additional consultation measures where appropriate</td>
<td>• City of North Vancouver Council decision</td>
<td>• Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Review of Project Cost, Benefits and Impacts
Development of the proposed project to date has involved extensive stakeholder and community consultation and information sharing. Significant public and community consultation was undertaken from January to August 2011 on the Conceptual Design and Preliminary Design phases. The information and input gained during these phases led to the development of the modified project scope and additional design options for community input that were presented as part of the Information Sharing and Detailed Design Consultation Program from December 2011 to March 2012.

Following joint consultation with the City of North Vancouver in spring 2012, the City and the Port will separately determine whether to proceed with the project. Should a decision be made to move forward with the project, there will be more focused, local area consultations on specific project aspects such as landscaping, noise walls, aesthetic treatments, detailed construction traffic management plans and Spirit Trail implementation.

The Information Sharing and Detailed Design Consultation Program is being undertaken in three distinct phases as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sharing Program and Detailed Design Consultation Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2011 – February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on Modified Design and Design Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Out on Preferred Project Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upcoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report provides details about the first two phases of consultation – Information Sharing and Consultation on the Modified Design.
2. Information Sharing Program – December 2011 through February 2012

2.1 Overview
Between December 1, 2011 and February 29, 2012, Port Metro Vancouver, in conjunction with the City of North Vancouver, undertook public Information Sharing to provide information about the March 2012 Consultation Program including key refinements made to the project design since 2011 as well as areas where options were being developed for community input. This Information Sharing phase of public engagement was undertaken as a direct result of community feedback from the 2011 consultation process, during which people requested information and notice in advance about the content of future consultations.

2.2 Approach and Methodology
During the Information Sharing phase, details about the consultation process, timeline and content were made available in a number of ways including:

- Notification, including advertising in local community newspapers and posters in commercial and residential areas near the Low Level Road
- The project’s electronic information portal – PortTalk.ca
- Information Displays in high pedestrian-traffic areas
- Email and Phone correspondence using the Project’s database
- Household mail out
- Websites (www.portmetrovancouver.com and www.cnv.org)
- Social Media (Twitter)

2.2.1 Notification - Advertising and Posters

Paid Advertisements
Port Metro Vancouver placed a series of advertisements in the North Shore News and the North Shore Outlook to notify and encourage public participation in the Information Sharing program and to provide information about the upcoming Consultation program. A sample of the advertisement is included in Appendix A and B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper Outlet</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Shore News</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Outlook</td>
<td>February 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Outlook</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Posters
In addition to newspaper advertisements, posters were distributed and/or posted in 24 shops, restaurants, community centres and establishments in the City of North Vancouver. Commercial areas at either end of the Low Level Road (Main Street, Park & Tilford, Lower Lonsdale and Lonsdale Quay) were targeted. Details of the poster distribution are provided in Appendix B.

2.2.2 Port Talk

Overview
In direct response to community input from previous consultation, and to increase participation, Port Metro Vancouver launched Port Talk (PortTalk.ca), a dedicated website for the proposed Low Level Road Project, in December 2011. In the early part of the Information Sharing stage, the site contained documents and background from the previous consultations, provided helpful links and introduced the project team. In January and February 2012, additional interactive and informative features were added such as:
• Forum discussion questions – started the thread of a conversation to which participants would add their thoughts and ideas and could respond to comments from others
• ‘Quick polls’ – sought responses to specific questions over a specific period of time
• Notices about timing and location of staffed Information Displays
• Calendar of Events - dates and locations of the February Information Displays and the March 2012 Consultation Events
• An Information Centre including project updates and consultation materials from January to August 2011
• Online registration for March 2012 workshops
• A Twitter feed of @PortMetroVan

The following table summarizes key themes and areas of interest from Port Talk from December 2011 to February 2012.

2.2.3 Information Displays
In February 2012, Port Metro Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver hosted two public information displays in high-pedestrian traffic locations in the City of North Vancouver, which consisted of information boards and staff from the Port and the City to answer questions, provide information and assist people who wished to register for the Port Talk web forum or sign up for a March 2012 consultation Workshop. The dates, times and locations of the Information Displays are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, February 11</td>
<td>Lonsdale Quay Market</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 15</td>
<td>John Braithwaite Community Centre</td>
<td>4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4 Email and Phone Correspondence
Between December 2011 and February 2012, three Community Updates were distributed by email to the Low Level Road Project’s 500-person database. The Community Updates were also posted to PortTalk.ca and Port Metro Vancouver’s website (www.portmetrovancouver.com). The updates contained details about the February information displays and the March consultation events and encouraged recipients to visit and participate on PortTalk.ca.

In addition to the Community Updates, targeted phone calls were made between January 30 and February 2 to approximately 50 people who had previously requested to be notified of future project-related events.

2.2.5 Websites and Social Media
Port Metro Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver posted links to Port Talk and information about upcoming consultation events on their respective websites. Additionally, Port Metro Vancouver used Twitter to inform and encourage people to participate in the Consultation Program. Port Metro Vancouver’s @PortMetroVan has 1,280 followers.

During the Information Sharing phase, Port Metro Vancouver sent 13 Tweets about the Low Level Road Project. The hashtag #LLRoad was used to make it easy for people to follow or find conversations about the project.
2.3 Participation

**Port Talk (PortTalk.ca)**
Between December 1, 2011 and February 29, 2012, participation through Port Talk consisted of:

- 1,350+ individuals visited the site
- 58 people registered (registered individuals are able to comment in the forum discussions)
- 41 comments were posted in the forum discussions
- 270 people made 698 downloads of documents from the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Key Theme of Forum Discussions and Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Road Elevation                    | • A number of questions and comments were posted about the elevation of the proposed road, some noting the importance of lowering the proposed elevation and others noting that the road should remain at its existing grade.  
• Generally, comments regarding road elevation were in relation to potential impacts of a higher road, e.g. noise and view impacts. |
| Consultation Process              | • A number of questions and comments about the scope and timing of upcoming consultation activities, noting the importance of involving the community in the process and providing timely information about opportunities for input. |
| Safety                            | • Questions and comments were posted noting support for the slope stability benefits that could result from the project.  
• Questions and comments about safety, noting the importance of providing a safe and accessible area for pedestrians, cyclists and cars. |
| Noise as a Concern                | • Questions and comments about port-related and train-related noise, e.g. shunting, whistling, engine noise. |
| Project Cost                      | • Questions and comments were posted about the overall cost of the project as well as costs for alternative designs.  
• Questions and comments were also posted about funding partner contributions to the proposed project. |
| Spirit Trail and Pedestrian Access| • Comments of general support for developing the Spirit Trail as part of the project as well as improvements for pedestrians in the area. |

**Information Displays**
Approximately 150 people stopped by during the two Information Display sessions to view the display boards and talk with staff from Port Metro Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver.
3. Detailed Design Consultation – March 2012

3.1 Overview
Between March 1, 2012 and March 30, 2012, Port Metro Vancouver, together with the City of North Vancouver, undertook Consultation on the Modified Design and Design Options. Building on the Information Sharing phase (December 2011 to February 2012) and earlier consultation undertaken in 2011, the March 2012 Consultation was developed to:

- Provide an opportunity for people to learn more and get involved
- Share updated project information including next steps and decision making
- Receive community input on the modified project design and proposed design options, to assist in determining a preferred design.

3.2 Consultation Topics
The March 2012 Detailed Design Consultation focused on seeking input on the modified project design and on proposed design options. The consultation information was presented in four key areas. An overview of consultation and information topics are provided below:

- **Western Section – St. Georges Avenue to St. Davids Avenue**
  - Low Level Road/Esplanade Connection Options
  - Proposed St. Georges Avenue Intersection
  - Additional Comments about the Western Section

- **Mid-Section – St. Davids Avenue to Moody Avenue**
  - Minimized View Impacts with Modified Design
  - Pedestrian/Spirit Trail Access Options
  - Additional Comments about the Mid-Section

- **Eastern Section – Moody Avenue to Heywood Street**
  - Refined Heywood Street Intersection Design
  - Additional Comments about the Eastern Section

- **Corridor Wide**
  - Improvements to Rail Operations
  - Community Noise Considerations
  - Anticipated Project Benefits
  - Reduced Local Impacts with Modified Design
  - Spirit Trail Implementation
  - Accommodating Cycling Needs
  - Development of Public Art Options
  - Environmental Assessment
  - Additional Comments

3.3 Approach and Methodology
The March 2012 Consultation included a variety of tools and methods to share information about the project and encourage participation and receive input, including:

- Notification
- Consultation Discussion Guide
- Feedback Form
- Web Based Consultation on Port Talk (PortTalk.ca)
- Open Houses (3 events)
- Workshops (3 events)
- Project Video
- Meetings with community and business groups
3.3.1 Notification
Multiple and various notification methods were used to ensure that the community of the City of North Vancouver including residents, businesses and property owners around the Low Level Road area were informed about the consultation events and opportunities to provide feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Advertising</td>
<td><strong>North Shore News</strong>&lt;br&gt;Notification of March events</td>
<td>February 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>February 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>February 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>North Shore Outlook</strong>&lt;br&gt;Notification of Consultation events</td>
<td>February 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See Appendix F for advertisements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Update Email</td>
<td>Email sent to database of 500 people who had signed-up to receive project updates – also posted on Port Talk</td>
<td>February 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See Appendix G for email)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Mail Out</td>
<td>Two-sided colour postcard delivered by Canada Post to 7,500 households and businesses. See Figure 1 on page 11 for the notification area</td>
<td>February 20 - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See Appendix C for postcard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents and Business Letter</td>
<td>Letter delivered by Canada Post to 550 businesses and residents. See Figure 1 on page 11 for the notification area</td>
<td>February 27 - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See Appendix H for letter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Port Metro Vancouver, City of North Vancouver and Port Talk all posted notifications about March consultation events</td>
<td>March 1 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>@PortMetroVan generated 15 tweets during the month of March to its 1280 followers</td>
<td>March 1 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Signs</td>
<td>Two signs were installed at either end of the project</td>
<td>February - March 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Consultation Discussion Guide
A 33-page Consultation Discussion Guide was used to provide detailed information about the Low Level Road Project and guide participants in understanding the project refinements and the consultation topics. The guide was presented in four key areas. An overview of consultation topics is provided in Section 3.2 above. The Discussion Guide is available for viewing at http://bit.ly/I2bt7Q.

3.3.3 Feedback Form
A 24-question Feedback Form was organized using the same four areas as the Discussion Guide. Participants could choose to fill out a Feedback Form on paper at the Open House or Workshop events, or electronically through the Port Talk website between March 2 and 30, 2012. The Feedback Form is included in Appendix E.

Findings from responses to the Feedback Forms are presented in Section 4 (summary) and 5 (detailed) of this report.

3.3.4 Web-Based Consultation on Port Talk (PortTalk.ca)
Port Talk (PortTalk.ca) was an important component of the March 2012 Consultation. The site was designed to be the hub for news, information and consultation materials related to the project – accessible to the public at any time. Port Talk also included online forum discussion topics for registered members of the public to engage with each other and project team members about the project, the process and post comments and questions in an open, publicly accessible place.

The content of Port Talk was changed and updated periodically, as new content became available. In general, the following materials or information was available during the March 2012 Consultation:

- March Consultation Materials, including the Discussion Guide, Feedback Form and Project Video
- Project FAQs
- Information about March 2012 Consultation Events
- Online registration for Workshops
- A calendar of March 2012 Consultation Events
- A Twitter feed of @PortMetroVan
- Quick Polls
- Responses from project team members to questions and comments posted to the discussion forums
- Short videos illustrate current conditions on the Low Level Road.

Key themes from these forum discussions are included in Section 4 (summary) and 6 (detailed) of this report.
3.3.5 Open Houses
Three open houses with identical content were held as part of the March 2012 Consultation Program as noted in the table below, to provide information about the project through a series of presentation boards (Appendix D) and a project video. Port Metro Vancouver and City of North Vancouver staff were available to respond to questions and provide additional information to participants. Each attendee was asked to sign in as they entered the event and were offered a copy of the Consultation Discussion Guide and Feedback Form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ridgeway Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Pinnacle at the Pier Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ridgeway Elementary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.6 Workshops
Three facilitated 2.5-hour Workshops were held as part of the March 2012 Consultation Program as noted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ridgeway Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>6:00p.m. to 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Fraternal Order of Eagles Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24</td>
<td>1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ridgeway Elementary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each Workshop included welcoming remarks from Port Metro Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver, a brief presentation by a Low Level Road project team member, small group discussions focused on one of the four topic-specific areas outlined in the Discussion Guide, summary presentations and plenary discussion. A copy of the presentation slides are provided as Appendix K.

Each small group discussion was led by a facilitator, and a technical resource person from the project team was assigned to every group to help present the options and answer questions. Facilitators led a 90-minute brainstorming discussion, gathering and recording feedback on the “benefits” and/or “limitations” of options presented using sticky-notes and flipcharts. At the end of the small group discussion, a representative chosen by the group was asked to present to the plenary group a summary of the ideas, suggestions and feedback their group had discussed.

Participants were asked to register in advance for the Workshops and select a preferred topic area. While all three Workshops covered the same information, each session was different as a result of the input offered from the individuals who participated. Attendees were encouraged to visit other tables during the Workshop and join more than one conversation. Group sizes varied for each topic area and Workshop, with between 5 and 30 participants per group.

A detailed summary of key themes from the Workshops can be found in Section 4 (summary) and 7 (detailed) of this report.

3.3.7 Project Video
A project video, featuring a computer generated animation of what the proposed Low Level Road project could look like, was developed and used during the consultation phase. In addition to being shown at the Open House Workshop events, the video was posted on YouTube and a link was set up on PortTalk.ca. The video received approximately 1,200 total views on YouTube (at the time of this report) and it was also viewed 218 times through Port Talk between March 1 and March 30.
3.3.8 Meetings
The project team was available throughout the March 2012 Consultation Program to present to community or business organizations on request. During the month-long consultation program, the project team met with the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 6, 2012</td>
<td>North Vancouver Chamber of Commerce Executive</td>
<td>North Vancouver Chamber of Commerce offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 2012</td>
<td>Western Stevedoring employees</td>
<td>Western Stevedoring office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27, 2012</td>
<td>Integrated Transportation Committee</td>
<td>CNV Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27, 2012</td>
<td>Parks and Environment Advisory Committee</td>
<td>CNV Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27, 2012</td>
<td>Waterfront Industrial Noise Control Committee</td>
<td>CNV Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Discussion Guide and Feedback Form were distributed at each of the meetings, which included the same presentation as provided during the Workshops, followed by a Question & Answer session.

3.4 Consultation Participation

3.4.1 Summary
More than 1,000 people participated in the March 2012 Consultation Program, including:

- 251 individuals attended the three Open House events (indicates the number of unique participants, as some people attended more than one Open House)
- 112 people attended the Workshops (indicates the number of unique participants, as some people attended more than one Workshop)
- Approximately 40 people attended the on-request Meetings
- 978 unique people visited Port Talk (PortTalk.ca)
- Port Metro Vancouver received 5 submissions and correspondence
- 166 Feedback Forms were submitted
- More than 1,200 views of the project video on YouTube

3.4.2 Open House Participation
The following table shows the attendance at each of the three Open Houses. A total of 268 people attended the three Open House events. Based on the information gathered when participants signed-in, there were 251 unique participants as some people attended more than one Open House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>Ridgeway Elementary School</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>Pinnacle at the Pier Hotel</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24</td>
<td>Ridgeway Elementary School</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Attendees 268

Total Individual Attendees 251
3.4.3 Workshop Participation

Three Workshops were held as part of the March 2012 Consultation Program and were attended by a total of 127 people. Based on the information gathered when participants were asked to register, there were 112 unique participants, since people attended more than one Workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>Ridgeway Elementary School</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>Fraternal Order of Eagles Hall</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24</td>
<td>Ridgeway Elementary School</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Attendees** 127  
**Total Individual Attendees** 112

3.4.4 Port Talk Participation

Port Talk (PortTalk.ca) is the dedicated website for this phase of the proposed Low Level Road Project. Launched in December 2011, Port Talk was an important component of both the Information Sharing stage (December 1, 2011-February 29, 2012) and the Community Consultations (March 1-30). The following participation statistics are presented for each period, and as a total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dec 2011 to Feb 2012</th>
<th>March 2012</th>
<th>Total to March 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits (Number of times the site was visited)</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>6,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors (Unique visitors to the site)</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>2,059 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors who Registered (Registration required to post comments or take poll)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (Number of comments in the online discussion forums)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Downloads (Number of documents downloaded from site)</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>1,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The total number reflects that some people visited during both periods.

** The total number reflects that 14 people registered during the consultation periods, but didn’t activate their accounts by March 30.
4. Summary of Consultation Input - Highlights

4.1 Overview
The Feedback Form was the primary tool used to collect input during the consultation program, however feedback was also provided through Workshop discussions, Port Talk forum discussions and comments posted on Port Talk during the consultation. The following section provides a high level summary of input received from all sources, followed by detailed results of findings from each source in Sections 5 through 7.

4.2 Feedback Form - Summary of Feedback
The following provides a key theme summary of all feedback received through the 166 Feedback Forms submitted during the March 2012 Consultation.

- General support for the Modified Design in terms of responding to input from previous consultation and minimizing impacts to residents.
- General agreement with the proposed option to provide access to East Esplanade businesses from Low Level Road via St. Andrews Avenue with Full Intersection (Western Section Option 1).
- Concern about potential loss of parking for businesses along Esplanade and suggestion for maintaining and/or improving current parking and access in front of businesses.
- General support for St. Georges Avenue intersection modifications, with some noting concerns about increased traffic.
- Preference for an enhanced greenspace and a combined Spirit Trail and sidewalk instead of a sidewalk on Low Level Road; however, it is noted that several participants also felt strongly about the need for a sidewalk along the road.
- Concern about increase in traffic and noise from port operations in the vicinity of the Neptune/Cargill overpass area and near Heywood Street and East 3rd Street.
- Mixed feedback on proposed Heywood Street intersection; some respondents requested that the current configuration be maintained, while others indicated support for the redesign, and some offered alternative proposals such as use of Kennard Avenue.
- General support for cycling and pedestrian facilities that would be provided through the implementation of the proposed project.
- General support for the implementation of the Spirit Trail as part of the project. Various suggestions for additional improvements to the proposed Spirit Trail design to maximize green space and further improve safety.
- General support for aspects of the project that will improve safety, including slope stability, and safety for all road users.
- General support for the inclusion of public art. Respondents provided various suggestions for artistic themes.

4.3 Workshops – Summary of Feedback
The following provides an overall key theme summary from the three Workshops held during the March Consultation. Key themes are organized by the small group discussion areas, i.e. Western Section, Mid-Section, Eastern Section and Corridor Wide. A detailed summary of each small group Workshop discussion is included in Section 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Western Section** | • Regarding proposed changes to the existing St. Georges/Esplanade intersection, participants at one workshop recommended consideration of a left turn lane/advanced green signal to facilitate access onto St. Georges.  
• Regarding the Low Level Road/Esplanade connection options, participants at all Workshops generally expressed a preference for Option 1 – Access at St. Andrews Avenue with Full Intersection. During Workshop #1, participants specifically noted that their preference for Option 1 was based on community, traffic and industrial access, and agreed not to discuss either of the other two options.  
• Participants noted that preservation of parking for businesses and residents is important. At one Workshop, participants recommended reducing green space in the 200-block of Esplanade, to maximize parking availability.  
• Participants at two Workshops also specifically noted the need for businesses along the 200 and 300-blocks of Esplanade to have loading access.  
• Participants offered several suggestions to improve the safety and efficiency of the St. Andrews Avenue/Low Level Road intersection, including options that would not require a traffic signal.  
• Specifically, during Workshop #1 participants suggested a modification to Option 1 that would maintain westbound access.  
• Some participants expressed concern about sightlines at this intersection as vehicles traveling westbound on Low Level Road come around the corner and then have to stop at a traffic signal.  
• Participants suggested that the Spirit Trail remain on the south side of Low Level Road as far east as feasible through this section. Participants also recommended constructing a pedestrian/cyclist overpass or crossing east of St. Andrews Avenue.  
• Some participants suggested that parking meters should be eliminated, while others felt that parking meters help to prevent long-term parking, which facilitates business and commerce in the area.  
• At one Workshop, participants recommended use of quiet pavement and extending noise walls as far west as possible to minimize noise impacts from the new road.  
• Some participants asked about future plans for Port-owned land at 300 Low Level Road and whether this land could be exchanged as parkland as an additional community benefit, or used for parking. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mid-Section   | • Participants expressed a preference for the sidewalk to be at road level, while others wanted the sidewalk incorporated into the Spirit Trail above the road. The primary reason given for preferring the sidewalk at road level is safety, while the primary reason for preferring the sidewalk above is providing a greater buffer between the road and residences.  
• Regardless of which option is selected, participants expressed a desire for good pedestrian connections between the Lower Lonsdale community and the Park & Tilford commercial area.  
• At one Workshop, some participants suggested eliminating the proposed pedestrian component of the Spirit Trail expansion through Moodyville Park, and using the existing on-road route instead.  
• In addition to comments noted about road height in the corridor-wide section above, participants were particularly concerned about the height of the road in the 500 and 600 block of East 1st Street and in the vicinity of existing ravines.  
• Participants stated that they did not believe that protecting a single eagles’ nest at the expense of the lowered road was important.  
• Participants recommended extending soil anchors to help lower the road even more than presented in the Modified Design, recognizing the requirement for restrictive covenants on private property.  
• Participants requested additional information about lighting standards along this section of the Spirit Trail.  
• Participants requested provision of additional cross sections to better understand the road height requirements throughout this section of the proposed project. |
| Eastern Section | • Participants appreciated efforts by the project team to maintain a left turn from Heywood Street to eastbound East 3rd Street; however, many participants felt that the potential for increased noise resulting from a new traffic signal and requested that further modifications be made; others noted that they did not feel appropriately consulted in the development of the Modified Design.  
• Participants’ primary comments related to potential for increased noise due to the increased elevation of the Low Level Road, traffic growth, and new congestion caused by a signalized intersection at Heywood Avenue/East 3rd Street. During all Workshops, participants recommended consideration of noise mitigation in this section.  
• Participants also noted that a signalized intersection potentially would result in safety concerns for cyclists, particularly with regard to accessing Low Level Road.  
• At one Workshop, participants suggested having pedestrian access on the north and south sides of East 3rd Street/Low Level Road.  
• Participants expressed concern with regard to safety for vehicles as a result of sightlines at the proposed signalized Heywood Street/East 3rd Street intersection as well as proposed plans for two lanes in each direction through the intersection, which then merge into one.  
• At two of the Workshops, participants suggested that the proposed signalized intersection be moved to the existing East 3rd Street/Kennard Avenue intersection and that the Heywood Street intersection be maintained as per existing conditions. At one Workshop, participants also suggested that a signal be considered at the Queensbury/East 3rd Street intersection.  
• Participants commented that trees in this area provide protection against noise and dust and requested that as few trees as possible be removed. |
Section Summary

**Corridor Wide**
- Participants generally agreed that the road should be as low as possible. Some felt that the Modified Design appropriately addressed height concerns associated with the previous design, while others felt that the road needed to be further lowered.
- Participants expressed concern about the carbon footprint associated with the new road, including the volume of concrete required for retaining walls and potential for increased congestion on parallel routes during construction.
- Participants expressed support for the use of public art and suggested use of local artists as well as incorporating interpretive signage and observation points. At one Workshop, other suggestions included "electricity," "port now and then," or "the existing artistic theme on the GVRD trail" as specific themes.
- Participants expressed a desire for efficient cycling and pedestrian access, particularly as density in the central Lonsdale area continues to grow.
- At one Workshop, participants suggested that the two designated cycling lanes be merged into a single multi-user path on the south side of the new road.
- Participants advocated for the use of curved noise walls to help further mitigate noise from all sources.
- Participants suggested that any traffic signals along the proposed new road should be coordinated to minimize start-stop traffic conditions as much as possible.
- Participants noted that the primary noise concern is noise from terminal operations and that the proposed Low Level Road would not address these concerns. Some suggested that tenant mitigation should be tied to project approval.
- Participants asked whether mitigation of coal dust could also be considered as part of the project.
- Participants expressed concern about noise generally. Some felt that the proposed new road would decrease rail noise while increasing road noise and as result. Several participants expressed interest in seeing the results of the noise studies currently underway.
- Regarding project funding, some participants suggested that terminals and rail companies should provide additional funding and should be more involved in the consultation process.

**Consulation Process**
- Some participants noted that they would have preferred to discuss all aspects within each Workshop group rather than having to choose a specific area.

### 4.4 Port Talk – Summary of Feedback

The following themes were identified from the 19 questions and discussions posted on Port Talk during the consultation period. A detailed key theme summary is provided in Section 7.

- Traffic Congestion & Traffic Flow - comments about congestion, the importance of an efficiently functioning Low Level Road and concerns about the potential effect of adding traffic signals along the corridor.
- Safety - general support for the project based on safety improvements, particularly the Neptune-Cargill overpass, the proposed pedestrian and cycling improvements and slope stabilization.
- Noise - general concerns about noise from existing port operations as well as potential increases in road traffic noise as a result of the project.
- Project Value for the Community - comments and questions about the value of the City’s monetary and property contributions as well as questions about ongoing maintenance costs and private property owner compensation.
- Cycling - support for the proposed improvements and comments about existing cycling conditions.
- Overall Design - questions about timing of rail expansion and suggestions for project design modifications.
5. Feedback Form – Detailed Results

The following section provides a detailed summary of feedback received through the 166 Feedback Forms submitted during the Consultation. Of the 166 forms submitted:

- 101 forms were submitted online
- 40 forms were submitted at the open houses
- 6 forms were submitted at the Workshops
- 10 forms were submitted by mail
- 9 forms from the on-request meetings

The feedback form, along with a 33-page Consultation Discussion Guide, was presented in four geographic or topic specific areas of the proposed project and the detailed results are presented in the same order:

- Western Section – St. Georges Avenue to St. Davids Avenue
- Mid-Section – St. Davids Avenue to Moody Avenue
- Eastern Section – Moody Avenue to Heywood Street
- Corridor Wide – Noise, Spirit Trail, Public Art, Cycling & Pedestrians, Environment

Western Section – St. Georges Avenue to St. Davids Avenue

Low Level Road/Esplanade Connection Options

1. Three options for connecting Low Level Road to Esplanade have been developed. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1: St. Andrews Access with Full Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.2% Agree (61.0% Strongly and 26.2% Somewhat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1% Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7% Disagree (2.0% Somewhat and 8.7% Strongly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*149 Respondents

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 64 respondents provided additional comments about this option. Key themes are:

- Respondents noted the importance of maintaining/providing unimpeded traffic flow in front of businesses. Respondents also noted the importance of providing a two-way frontage road on Esplanade.
- Respondents noted that this option provides better parking and access opportunities for businesses, as well as minimizes impacts for local residents.
- Respondents noted a preference for the inclusion of only one traffic light.
Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 57 respondents provided additional comments about this option. Key themes are:

- Respondents expressed concerns about traffic congestion.
- Respondents commented that they did not like the one-way frontage road provided in this option due to potential for reduced traffic flow in front of businesses.
- Respondents noted the importance of providing parking for business patrons and ensuring access to businesses remains similar to the current situation.

Option 3: St. Patricks Access

- 7.3% Agree (4.4% Strongly and 2.9% Somewhat)
- 8.1% Neither Agree or Disagree
- 84.6% Disagree (18.4% Somewhat and 66.2% Strongly)

*136 Respondents

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 65 respondents provided additional comments about this option. Key themes are:

- Respondents generally noted a general disagreement with the proposed design presented in Option 3 (i.e. Intersection at St. Patricks Avenue).
- Respondents expressed concerns about traffic congestion.
- Respondents expressed concerns about the road elevation with this option and resulting negative impacts on residents, particularly with respect to viewscapes.
2. When identifying your level of agreement for each option above, how important to you were each of the following design considerations?

Respondents noted safety, noise and road elevation as the most important factors when considering the three access options, as noted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Consideration*</th>
<th>Important**</th>
<th>Not Important**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Elevation</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Proximity to Residences</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Trail and Community Connections</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Views</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Parking</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of Respondents varies

** “Important” combines those who responded either “very important” or “somewhat important”; “Not Important” combines those who responded either “not very important” or “not important at all”

3. Please use this space to provide comments about the three proposed Low Level Road/Esplanade connections discussed above.

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 55 respondents provided additional comments about the three proposed connection options. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Respondents noted general support for Option 1 (i.e. St. Andrews with Full Intersection)
- Respondents noted the importance of maintaining traffic flow and access for Esplanade businesses.
- Others also noted that parking must be maintained or increased in this area.
- Respondents noted that they would prefer one signalized crossing for all modes (i.e. general and Spirit Trail) as opposed to the two crossings currently proposed.
- Other comments provided in this section included protection of the eagles’ nest, concerns about noise for nearby residents and ensuring the proposed project design addresses safety for all modes.
St. Georges Access

4. What comments, if any, do you have about the proposed St. Georges Avenue intersection design?

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 64 respondents provided additional comments about the St. Georges Avenue intersection design. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Respondents noted general support for the proposed St. Georges Avenue intersection design as presented.
- Suggestions were provided to improve the proposed intersection designs, including:
  - Provision of a dedicated left hand turn lane (westbound)
  - Provision of an advance green arrow
  - Widening the curve at the southeast corner
- Respondents also commented on how best to accommodate the Spirit Trail and noted the importance of including green space in this area.
- Respondents noted concern about the potential increase in traffic in the area as a result of the proposed intersection design and function as port access.

5. What additional comments, if any, do you have about the Western Section?

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 50 respondents provided additional comments about the Western Section. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Respondents noted general support for the Modified Design as presented for the proposed Low Level Road Project.
- Some respondents noted concern about the potential increase in traffic in the area as a result of the proposed improvements (i.e. St. Georges Avenue).
- Respondents noted concerns about potential impacts the proposed project could have on local residents, particularly with respect to road elevation.
- Respondents commented, with respect to the Low Level Road/Esplanade connection options, that the preferred design should consider options that reduce the elevation of the road.
- Respondents commented that maintaining and/or providing additional parking for businesses was of utmost importance.
6. A key objective for the modified project design was to minimize view impacts in this section of the proposed corridor. Do you agree or disagree that the modified design has minimal impact on views?

More than 65% of respondents agreed that the modified design has a minimal impact on views, as noted in the following chart.

- 65.0% Agree (33.6% Strongly and 31.4% Somewhat)
- 17.1% Neither Agree or Disagree
- 17.9% Disagree (8.65% Somewhat and 9.3% Strongly)

*140 Respondents

7. What comments do you have, if any, about the modified project design in this section?

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 60 respondents provided additional comments about the modified design in the Mid-Section. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Respondents noted general support for the modified design presented for the proposed Low Level Road Project in the St. Davids Avenue to Moody Avenue section, particularly as a result of the lowered road elevation and reduced potential for visual impacts.
- Respondents commented that the road elevation should be reduced further.
- Respondents noted concern about the potential for roadway lighting to impact nearby residents.
- Respondents commented on the importance of maintaining residential views and green space in the area.

8. Options for pedestrian/trail access between St. Davids Avenue and Moody Avenue have been developed. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the options.

Option 1: Enhanced Spirit Trail with no roadway sidewalk

- 69.2% Agree (54.9% Strongly and 14.3% Somewhat)
- 11.3% Neither agree nor disagree
- 19.5% Disagree (9.0% Somewhat, 10.5% Strongly)

*133 Respondents
9. When identifying your level of agreement with each option above, how important were each of the following design considerations?

Respondents noted Spirit Trail and Community Connections as the most important factor when considering the two sidewalk access options, as noted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Consideration*</th>
<th>Important**</th>
<th>Not Important**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Trail and Community Connections</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Elevation</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Proximity to Residences</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Viewscapes</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of Respondents varies

** “Important” combines those who responded either “very important” or “somewhat important”; “Not Important” combines those who responded either “not very important” or “not important at all”

10. Please use this space to provide comments about proposed pedestrian/trail access options between St. Davids and Moody Avenues.

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 74 respondents provided additional comments about the proposed pedestrian/trail access options in the Mid-Section. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Respondents generally supported the development of a sidewalk along the existing lane. Some noted the importance of providing a continuous Spirit Trail, others noting that maximizing green space in this area was important.
- Respondents noted that a sidewalk along Low Level Road was important to them, others stating that a sidewalk along the road could be unpleasant and unsafe.
- Respondents commented that the existing Spirit Trail should remain unchanged.
- Other comments included general support for Option 1 noting that there was a potential to lower the road even further.
11. What additional comments do you have, if any, about the Mid-Section?

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 32 respondents provided additional comments about the Mid-Section. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Generally, respondents commented that the design in the Mid-Section was improved, some commented that best efforts should be made to lower the road even further.
- Respondents noted concerns with respect to potential increase in road and Port-related noise as a result of the proposed project.
- Respondents commented on the importance of providing a sidewalk along the roadway, while others commented that it was important to provide as much green space as possible between the residences and the road.

5.3 Eastern Section – Moody Avenue to Heywood Street

12. As a result of previous consultation, the refined design now includes provisions for a left turn from Heywood onto Eastbound East 3rd Street. How well do the design refinements in this area address your needs?

More than two thirds of respondents indicated that the Heywood intersection refinements addressed their needs, as noted in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well do the design refinements in this area address your needs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>63.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*129 Respondents

13. Please use this space to provide comments about your response to Question 12.

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 64 respondents provided additional comments about the provisions for a left turn from Heywood onto Eastbound East 3rd Street. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Respondents noted concerns about the potential increase in noise due to the addition of a traffic light in the area, which may lead to congestion and traffic starting and stopping on the East 3rd Street hill.
- Respondents commented that they did not support the proposed changes at Heywood Street noting concerns about a potential increase in travel time.
- Respondents recommended improvements to the Kennard Avenue intersection rather than the Heywood Street access.
14. What additional comments, if any, do you have about the Eastern Section?

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 46 respondents provided additional comments about the Eastern Section. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Respondents commented that they did not support the proposed changes at Heywood Street as the current configuration was sufficient. Others noted concerns about potential increased traffic in residential areas. Some suggested moving the intersection east to Kennard Avenue.
- Respondents noted that the proposed design could be challenging for cyclists and pedestrians, particularly with respect to adding travel time and distance in order to access the crossings. Others commented that they would like to receive additional information about the Spirit Trail configuration, including the proposed overpass, in this area.
- Respondents noted that the proposed design could lead to an increase in traffic and port-related noise, others noting the noise mitigation should be considered as part of the design.

5.4 Corridor-Wide

15. Key aspects of the modified design were designed to respond to previous public input and to reduce local impacts. Please indicate your level of agreement with how the modified design meets this goal.

More than 71% of respondents agreed that the modified design responds to public input and reduces local impacts.

16. Please use this space to provide comments about your response to question 15.

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 62 respondents provided additional comments about their response to question 15 about how the modified design responded to previous public input and reduced local impacts. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- Respondents noted support for the proposed project based on the modified design, as well as support for the consultation process.
- Respondents commented about the road elevation, some noting that the modified design has sufficiently lowered the road to minimize impacts, while others noted that the road could be lowered further.
- Respondents noted that they were concerned about the potential increase in noise as a result of the proposed project, and generally from port operations.
17. How important to you is each of the following anticipated project benefits?

Respondents primarily indicated roadway safety and drainage improvements and reducing landslide risk as important benefits of the project. Other benefits are also noted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Project Benefits*</th>
<th>Important**</th>
<th>Not Important**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway safety and drainage improvements</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing landslide risk on Moodyville bluff</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing rail-related noise</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling and pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of key components of the Spirit Trail</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth from increased trade</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of Respondents varies

** “Important” combines those who responded either “very important” or “somewhat important”; “Not Important” combines those who responded either “not very important” or “not important at all”

18. Do you agree or disagree that the project scope as designed will help achieve the City of North Vancouver’s objectives for the development of the Spirit Trail?

More than 70% of respondents agree that the project will help achieve the City’s objectives for the Spirit Trail.

Do you agree or disagree that the project scope as designed will help achieve the City of North Vancouver’s objectives for the development of the Spirit Trail?

- 70.6% Agree (36.0% Strongly and 34.6% Somewhat)
- 17.6% Neither Agree or Disagree
- 11.7% Disagree (8.8% Somewhat and 2.9% Strongly)

*136 Respondents
19. Please use this space to provide comments about your response to question 18.

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 55 respondents provided additional comments about their response to question 18 about how the project scope will help achieve the City’s objectives for the Spirit Trail. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

• Respondents support the Spirit Trail as a means to facilitate improved pedestrian and cycling connections along the North Shore as population in the area continues to grow.
• Support for the current Spirit Trail alignment.
• Respondents commented that the Spirit Trail will be completed regardless of whether the project proceeds and should not be described as part of the project; others expressed support for the project as a means to complete the Spirit Trail earlier than planned.
• Respondents questioned whether the new road might negatively affect user experience on the existing Spirit Trail.
• Interest in additional information and consultation about the overall Spirit Trail.

20. Do you agree or disagree that the proposed project scope appropriately accommodates the needs of cyclists?

More than 70% of respondents agree that the project appropriately accommodates the needs of cyclists.

![Pie Chart](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>Agree (31.6% Strongly and 38.3% Somewhat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>Disagree (7.5% Somewhat and 7.5% Strongly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*133 Respondents

21. Please use this space to provide your comments about your response to question 20.

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 55 respondents provided additional comments about their response to question 20 about how the project scope appropriately accommodates cyclists. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

• Respondents support the proposed cycling improvements.
• Respondents commented about cycling conditions of the existing road and the important safety benefits of the proposed wider lanes and reduced grades.
• Various comments/requests to make the entire Spirit Trail cyclist friendly (i.e. stairs, grades, width, etc.)
• Several concerns about safety of cycling conditions at the Eastern end of the proposed new road, with suggestions for improving cyclist access.
• Respondents requested a physical barrier between bikes and vehicles along the Low Level Road.
• Respondents commented that the proposed cycling improvements may not be the best use of funds.
22. The proposed project will include public art that reflects the history of the Moodyville area. What do you think the project team should consider in further developing public art options?

Of the 166 Feedback Forms received, 62 respondents provided comments. The following represents a summary of the most commonly mentioned themes:

- General support for use of public art.
- Suggestions to incorporate public art within the proposed noise walls in addition to the retaining walls.
- Various suggested themes for the artwork including local history and culture, Moodyville history, environment, marine, wildlife, First Nations history, modern designs, use of local artists.
- Respondents suggested incorporating live plants as part of the public art.
- Respondents suggested that potential for graffiti and graffiti removal be considered when determining which artistic theme to use.
- Respondents commented that the money used for public art should be redirected to further lowering the road or reducing noise.
- Respondents suggested use of historical plaques, viewing areas and benches.

Additional Comments

23. Overall Additional Comments

Many respondents used this space to reinforce comments they made in other sections, which are already noted in the preceding questions - particularly noise and road elevation. The following comment summaries are for themes not already identified:

- Generally positive comments about proposed project and how the design revisions have addressed previously identified concerns; however, some respondents provided specific comments about concerns with the proposed design.
- Various comments of support and appreciation for the revised consultation process and the project video.
- Various comments about existing noise levels and air quality/dust from port and rail operations.
- Respondents commented that rail companies should be providing more funding for the project.
- Requests for ongoing communication as the project moves forward.
- Respondents commented that the project should move forward to construction.
- Respondents asked about security along the Spirit Trail, particularly with respect to lighting.
- Concerns about traffic impacts during construction and growth in port traffic over time.

24. How often do you use the existing Low Level Road?

Almost two-thirds of respondents use Low Level Road at least twice per week. The following chart provides a more detailed breakdown of frequency of use.

![How often do you use the existing Low Level Road?](chart.png)

*133 Respondents*
6. Workshops – Detailed Results

Overview

6.1 Workshop #1, March 3, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Section – Key Theme Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| St. Georges Avenue Intersection     | • Participants noted that the existing design is preferable for this access.  
• Participants recommended a dedicated left-turn lane for residential access as well as port access.  
• Participants suggested retaining the landscaped boulevard between the Spirit Trail and the road. |
| Low Level Road/Esplanade Connections| • Participants noted the importance of providing for a future pedestrian overpass.  
• Participants commented on the importance of recording traffic counts on Esplanade and St. Andrews Avenue.  
• Participants suggested that parking meters should not be installed in this area.  
• Participants further noted the importance of a traffic management plan and traffic calming measures. |
| Overall Design                      | • Participants suggested closing the street at St. Andrews Avenue to industrial traffic, as this would remove the need for a traffic light.  
• Participants recommended reconsidering the Spirit Trail crossing and suggested considering an underground tunnel or overpass.  
• Participants suggested the project team consider a design that would avoid the installation of traffic signals at St. Andrews Avenue.  
• Participants commented that one-way traffic provides traffic calming but reduces access to businesses.  
• Participants commented that traffic calming is necessary if Option 1 or 2 are considered.  
• Participants noted that a pedestrian tunnel is not a safe option.  
• Participants expressed opposition to Option 3 because they considered it too high and not favourable to residents.  
• Some participants noted that Option 2 was the preferable option. |
| Noise Mitigation                    | • Participants suggested a directional noise wall could provide improved noise mitigation over transitional noise mitigation designs.  
• Participants requested the installation of ‘quiet’ pavement as a noise mitigation solution. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-Section</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Increase in Noise / Light Pollution| • Participants were concerned about an increase in noise resulting from the proposed Low Level Road elevation change.  
• Participants were concerned about potential lighting impacts with the elevation of the road. |
| Safety | Participants noted that a concrete barrier should be installed to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists.  
Participants commented that pedestrian traffic to the terminal should be limited to improve safety.  
Participants noted that a well-lit, open sidewalk on the south side of the road is an important safety consideration.  
Participants commented that increased density at Lonsdale would require additional pedestrian infrastructure. |
|---|---|
| Design | Participants voiced their concerns regarding the trucking of fill that may be necessary to raise the level of the road.  
Participants noted they would like a provision for a future potential pedestrian overpass at St. Andrews.  
Participants commented that Option 2, which provides a sidewalk along the Low Level Road in addition to the Spirit Trail, has the potential to cause traffic jams.  
Some participants commented that Option 2 would provide tourists to the area access to Park & Tilford shopping centre.  
Participants noted that Option 1, which includes the construction of the Spirit Trail from St. Davids Avenue through to Moodyville Park, is the preferred option, particularly those residents of the 500-600 blocks of East 1st Street.  
Participants requested the inclusion of wider green space south of the Spirit Trail.  
Participants commented that the road elevation should be lowered in this section. |
| Environmental Effects | Participants were concerned about the potential carbon footprint of trucks bringing fill to the project site.  
Participants expressed concern about emissions arising from the construction phase of the project.  
Participants were concerned about the possibility of losing some green space that currently exists as a result of the Project. |
| Low Level Road Improvements | Participants appreciated the opportunity to include public art in the Low Level Road Improvement Project, particularly the installation of interpretive signage.  
Participants suggested including a walkway along the waterfront as part of the improvements.  
Participants noted this project could include ‘good’ after-hours parking for community events and suggested that parking meters should not be installed along Esplanade or the frontage road in the Western Section. |

### Eastern Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Participants commented that a noise wall should be considered to mitigate noise from the proposed new road, as well as from current port operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Participants commented that separating vehicle traffic from railway operations is an important safety benefit of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views</td>
<td>Participants commented that the proposed modified design for the Low Level Road allows for existing views to be maintained, as the road is well below the existing slope.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Environmental Effects | Participants commented that best efforts should be made to preserve the eagle tree in the area  
Participants also noted that the removal of trees for road construction could worsen air quality in the area. |
### Corridor Wide Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Noise Mitigation** | • Participants commented that installation of directional sound walls should be considered. In addition, participants indicated that the installation of quiet pavement was an important consideration and recommended that the project team speak with Lions Bay Council regarding benefits of quiet pavement.  
  • Residents of 500 and 600 block of East 1st requested a copy of the ‘baseline data’ for both noise and air quality. |
| **Safety**         | • Participants suggested that a sidewalk should be located on the south side of the road and, in addition, the sidewalk should be well lit and open.  
  • Participants commented that increased density at Lonsdale would require additional pedestrian infrastructure.  
  • Participants suggested that pedestrian access to the terminal should be monitored and limited. |
| **Design**         | • Participants asked if the proposed road height was determined due to technical considerations or cost factors and requested the road be lower than the Modified Design that was presented as part of the March 2012 consultation. In addition, participants were interested in comparing costs of the modified road design and a road that would be three metres higher than the current road grade.  
  • Participants noted that the improvement project created an opportunity for interpretative signage.  
  • Participants noted the road profile changes from west to east and commented that at St. Davids Avenue, the proposed road should be level with the Neptune overpass.  
  • Some Participants recommended that excavated material be used for fill. |
| **Green Space**    | • Participants were interested in knowing how much, the usefulness of, and the location of green space in the Low Level Road Improvement project design.  
  • Some participants requested a much wider green space south of the trail. |
| **Environmental Effects** | • Participants noted their concerns regarding the removal of trees and vegetation in and around Moody Park.  
  • Participants requested information about how the creek will be affected by lowering the road and noted the creek is not a salmon spawning stream. |
| **Spirit Trail**   | • Participants commented that the project provides an opportunity for the installation of washrooms, benches and garbage cans along the Spirit Trail.  
  • Participants commented that the grade of the trail should be at existing property levels.  
  • Participants requested inclusion of a sidewalk beside the Spirit Trail to allow for more green space. |
| **Cycling**        | • Participants noted that the video shows the road grade rising and lowering and requested that the grade be lowered, as it is difficult for cyclists going up and down the road. |
## Western Section – Key Theme Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1 Design</strong></td>
<td>• Participants commented that the road should be two lanes, all the way from the Low Level Road to St. Georges Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants noted that the width of the proposed road would negatively impact access to businesses and would result in the loss of approximately 20 parking spaces. They sought clarification regarding the number of parking spaces that could be eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants further commented that the proposed design options would negatively impact the loading/unloading area for businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants expressed concern about potential loss of business during the construction phase, further noting a request for compensation for loss of business. Some participants recommended that a ‘loss of business’ agreement should be instituted before construction begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants sought clarification of who would be responsible for future maintenance of additional green space/landscaping, retaining walls and the road. Participants noted that presently the City of North Vancouver pays for this maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants commented on the trade-offs created by the proposed road improvements, i.e. loss of parking spaces vs. increased landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants commented that coordination of signalized intersections is an important consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One participant suggested constructing an additional overpass to access the port in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants recommended a reduction in proposed landscaping to gain additional parking spaces in the 200 block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants were interested in the benefits that CN would gain from the proposed improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spirit Trail</strong></td>
<td>• Participants recommended moving the Spirit Trail south, crossing to the north, at St. Patricks Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Georges Avenue Intersection</strong></td>
<td>• Participants commented that coordination of signalized intersection is an important consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants questioned how future traffic capacity is determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants commented that trucks turning onto Esplanade travelling east require more time to come up to speed and noted truck traffic may need more run distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants noted a dedicated left-turn lane was an important consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Mid-Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td>• Participants commented that a directional sound wall would be a more effective noise mitigation solution rather than a transparent noise barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants suggested that noise walls would have a limited effect as noise mitigation on an elevated road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants commented that the proposed road could lead to a decrease in rail noise but an increase in traffic noise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Design
- Some participants commented that the Spirit Trail should not continue through Moodyville Park.
- Participants recommended the installation of a cantilevered sidewalk through the mid-section of the project.
- Participants requested to see a cross-section of the 600 block of East 1st Street.
- Participants commented that the road elevation should be lowered in this section.
- Participants questioned the design and asked if there could be an alternative design/elevation that allowed for a lower road.
- Participants requested more information for what is planned for the 300 block of Low Level road and suggested that the 300 block should be retained for community purposes.
- Participants suggested that installing two additional traffic lights is not a ‘green’ solution for traffic.
- Participants recommended that only an overpass at Cargill is necessary, since industrial traffic predominantly travels east.

### Eastern Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Design</td>
<td>Participants recommended that if the proposed Heywood intersection modification proceeds, it should remain un-signalized and the traffic signal should be moved to the existing Queensbury/East 3rd Street intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants also recommended an alternative to the proposed design, which would maintain the existing Heywood intersection as it is today and move the signalized intersection to Kennard Avenue/East 3rd Street and adding crosswalks for better pedestrian and cycling access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Participants commented that a sidewalk should be included along the upgraded Low Level Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants noted the importance of improving sightlines at Moody Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants questioned the need for safety improvements at Heywood Street/East 3rd Street, noting that currently there are few left turn accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants commented that the proposed signalized intersection with additional lanes at Heywood Street and East 3rd Street might result in accidents caused by merging traffic. As well, they noted no second eastbound lane would be needed on East 3rd Street if the intersection were to remain as it is today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Participants suggested that a larger buffer would be required for Heywood area residents, to minimize noise-related impacts from vehicular traffic if the intersection is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants commented that the proposed signalized intersection at Heywood Street and East 3rd Street could increase noise in the Queensbury neighbourhood, due to cars and trucks stopping and starting, and potentially would increase traffic in their neighbourhood as people detour through the community to avoid congestion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Corridor Wide Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost and Design</td>
<td>Participants suggested that CN and other tenants should provide more funding for the project. In addition, CN and the other tenants should be involved in the planning and design of the improved Low Level Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants commented that only one new rail track should be provided, as opposed to the two that are proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Western Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>• Participants noted that parking in front of businesses is essential. &lt;br&gt;• Participants further noted the need for additional stopping/loading lane in front of 200/300 block. &lt;br&gt;• Participants commented that parking spaces should be considered for the 300 Low Level Road area, and also suggested reducing green space or pedestrian and cycling areas at St. Georges, or moving to three lanes between St. Andrews Avenue and St. Patricks Avenue. &lt;br&gt;• Participants further noted the road lanes should be reduced at St. Andrews Avenue to facilitate parking. &lt;br&gt;• Participants recommended that parking controls are necessary to ensure spaces are available for businesses and residents in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Georges Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>• Participants noted the proposed parking in front of the 200 block of East Esplanade is not sufficient. &lt;br&gt;• Participants suggested that the project consider reducing the land dedicated for cycling, pedestrians and green space in order to accommodate additional parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>• Participants noted the importance on constructing a pedestrian overpass between St. Patricks Avenue and St. Andrews Avenue. &lt;br&gt;• Participants wondered if the savings derived from the cost of the St. Patricks overpass could be used for the construction of noise walls. &lt;br&gt;• Participants unanimously rejected Option 3. &lt;br&gt;• Participants noted that additional stopping/loading lane in front of the 200/300 block is an important consideration. &lt;br&gt;• Participants discussed the potential for eliminating the right hand turn from Low Level Road onto St. Andrews Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Mitigation</td>
<td>• Participants noted the importance of extending the noise wall west of St. Patricks Avenue on the north or south side to mitigate train noise. &lt;br&gt;• Participants further noted that a curved noise wall is beneficial for noise mitigation. &lt;br&gt;• Pedestrians recommended the installation of ‘quiet’ pavement in the Western section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Trail</td>
<td>• Participants noted the Spirit Trail overpass between St. Andrews and St. Patricks Avenue is necessary to address pedestrian safety and traffic flow. &lt;br&gt;• Participants further noted that cyclists would need to loop back to access the designated bike route at St. Andrews Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>• Participants noted that cyclist safety is a concern at St. Andrews Avenue due to the steep grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mid-Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>• Participants noted that lighting along pedestrian facilities is necessary. &lt;br&gt;• Participants commented that installing stairs in the Mid-Section could encourage criminal activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Increase in Noise / Light Pollution
- Participants expressed concern that a potential increase in traffic/road noise may result from the proposed design.
- Participants further noted there could be an increase in pollution from a potential increase in traffic.
- Participants recommended the project team look for light standards that would deflect light from the homes.

### Design
- Participants commented that in order to design a lower road, sidewalks should not be included in the design.
- Some participants commented that anchoring the retaining wall would be appropriate if it meant that the road could be lowered.
- Participants recommended priority cross-sections for every 20 metres of the Low Level Road along East 1st Street.
- Participants suggested in order to lower the road, ‘shotcrete’ should be considered as a stabilization alternative.
- Participants commented that Option 1 is preferable only if this would result in a lower road and lower retaining walls.

### Environmental Effects
- Participants commented that the road elevation appears to be too close to the eagle’s nest.
- Participants requested a cross-section of homes near the eagle’s nest.

### Spirit Trail
- Participants recommended that the Spirit Trail should not be located in the 500 block of East 1st Street.
- Participants suggested that the Spirit Trail south of East 1st Street should be designed as a ‘country lane’ as formerly proposed by the City of North Vancouver.
- Some participants expressed concern that if the Spirit Trail is included in the 500 block of East 1st Street, lighting along the trail could be disruptive to residences.

### Eastern Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Participants commented that the proposed merge lanes had the potential to create an increase in accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants suggested that a concrete barrier be installed in the median to improve safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>Participants commented that the design is not favourable for cyclists, since the proposed traffic light at Heywood Street and East 3rd Street would require cyclists to travel uphill and then dismount at the light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants suggested that the grades should be more gradual at the eastern end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Mitigation</td>
<td>Participants commented that continuing the noise wall through the eastern limits of the project area could help address current and future noise concerns, particularly with respect to the height of the Neptune-Cargill overpass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants commented that a “curved” noise wall could provide more noise mitigation than traditional noise mitigation designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic in</td>
<td>Participants commented that the proposed traffic signal at Heywood Street/East 3rd Street could lead to an increase in traffic on East 4th Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential areas</td>
<td>Participants commented that traffic calming would need to be included in the design for this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Increase in Noise/ Pollution | Participants commented that the addition of a signalized intersection at Heywood Street would require vehicles to stop on a 7% grade, which could lead to an increase in noise and air pollution.  
| | Participants further noted that the potential removal of trees in the area to construct the signalized intersection could lead to an increase in noise and air pollution. |
| Views | Participants noted that a raised Low Level Road could make traffic more visible to the lower East 4th Street community. |
| Overall Design | Participants commented that the intersection at Heywood Street should be maintained as it currently exists and a signalized intersection should be constructed with a reduced grade at Kennard Avenue.  
| | Participants commented that two lanes eastbound could negatively affect traffic flow and increase accident risk as vehicles slow when the two lanes merge into one. |
| Low Level Road Improvements | Participants commented that the Low Level Road Project would result in the following improvements:  
| | Reduced train shunting/whistling noise  
| | Increased municipal tax base and increased local business as terminals grow  
| | The new overpass would reduce confusion for cyclists and provide better access for emergency vehicles. |

### Corridor Wide Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Participants noted the need for a sidewalk on East 3rd Street and stroller access all along the full length of project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Noise Mitigation | Participants commented that sound walls containing absorbing material to reduce noise bounce-back should be considered.  
| | Participants requested that noise reduction initiatives be tied into the project.  
| | Participants commented on the need to eliminate train whistling.  
| | Participants noted that port tenants add to noise production. |
| Design | Participants commented that is an opportunity to coordinate traffic signals.  
| | Participants commented that a merge lane at East 3rd may not be a favourable solution for motorists.  
| | Participants requested 'living walls' be part of the design as this would assist in eliminating graffiti.  
| | Participants commented that the project should use the existing GVRD path and move it east.  
| | Participants would like the design team to consider the end uses of the Spirit Trail.  
| | Participants questioned why there are two existing GVRD accesses. |
| Cycling | Participants recommended that a four-metre path be installed on the south side of Low Level Road.  
| | Participants commented that consideration of cyclists should be included in the traffic management plan.  
| | Participants noted that a bike lane along St. Davids Avenue is too steep.  
| | Participants commented on the difficulty of cycling beside a wall/ditch particularly if there is debris beside the bike lane.  
| | Participants noted the steepness of the road in the Heywood area is a challenge for cyclists. |
| Spirit Trail | Participants questioned if another Spirit Trail is necessary.  
| | Participants requested the project team review the Spirit Trail crossings and confirm whether stopping distances are adequate.  
| | Participants recommended that the design team consider installing a wooden bridge in the ravine section of Spirit Trail. |
7. Port Talk Results

All visitors to Port Talk were able to view the forum discussions and Quick Poll, but only registered participants were able to post and reply to comments and participate in the poll. Project team members representing Port Metro Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver were clearly identified and active in the forum discussions, posting replies and answers where appropriate. There were a total of 19 comments or replies posted during the period of March 1 - March 30, 6 of them were from the project team. Eight forum discussion topics appeared throughout the March 2012 Consultation and the following is a summary of the 19 comments, questions and discussions posted on Port Talk during the same period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port Talk Key Theme Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Theme</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Traffic Congestion & Traffic Flow | • Concerns about adding pedestrian/traffic lights along the Low Level Road corridor and potential impacts to traffic flow  
• Comments about how the Low Level road should be an east-west “flowing artery”  
• Comments about existing difficulties driving/cycling around the North Shore generally  
• Comments about current congestion on Low Level Road – support for Neptune/Cargill overpass to reduce congestion caused by at-grade crossing |
| Safety | • Support for project upgrades to cycling lanes and safety improvements, comments about current “unsafe” conditions  
• Support for Neptune/Cargill overpass to address safety of people and issues with train-vehicle collisions  
• Acknowledgement that the project addresses slope stability  
• Expressions of interest in safe and quiet facilities for walking and cycling |
| Noise (Port Operations) | • Discussions about train whistles at current-at-grade crossings; comparisons to West Vancouver, question about why they can’t be closed now, whistling at night and dissatisfaction with CN’s policies and handling of complaints  
• General concern about noise at night from port operations  
• Discussion about noise from Cargill operations – gravity-feed system, fans, filters and questions about their noise reduction plans |
| Noise (Road traffic-related) | • Comments and concerns about increase in road traffic noise in the Cloverly area (Eastern section) as a result of new intersection configuration paired with the raised road  
• Suggestions for noise reduction measures for the intersection/neighbourhood |
| Project Value for Community | • Discussions about City of North Vancouver’s land and monetary contribution to the project – land area, value, land-use, compensation for land, ownership of land  
• Questions about whether community receives fair value in exchange for the land/money – responses about noise reduction, safety upgrades and other project benefits  
• Comment about compensation for property owners and community  
• Questions about project and ongoing costs – who pays for road construction, Spirit Trail and ongoing maintenance |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycling</th>
<th>Overall Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Support for expanding bike lanes and adding a sidewalk</td>
<td>• Comment about lowering the rail lines and the road to attract attention from CN and the Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suggestion for speed control measures to ensure cyclists safety</td>
<td>• Question about the timeline for construction of two additional tracks if the project moves ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns about current access to Low Level Road westbound and a suggestion for a proper waiting/merging facility to allow bikes to safely get to the road</td>
<td>• Suggestion to leave the Heywood intersection as it is today</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quick Poll**

In the month of March the question was asked, “Which aspect of the project are you most interested in discussing?” Participants were asked to choose from the following:

- Cycling, walking and recreational uses
- Road and safety improvements
- Road elevation
- Slope stabilization
- Noise
- Port Growth

Results from the poll were:

![Pie chart showing the results of the Quick Poll]

**Which aspect of the project are you most interested in discussing?**

- Cycling, walking and recreational uses: 23.3%
- Road and safety improvements: 23.3%
- Road elevation: 26.7%
- Slope stabilization: 16.7%
- Noise: 10.0%
- Port Growth: 16.7%

*30 Respondents*
## 8. Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March 7, 2012   | Eric Choi, P. Eng  
Envirochem Services Inc | An email was submitted to Port Metro Vancouver, providing an expression of support, particularly with respect to the safety improvements and economic benefits. |
| March 14, 2012  | Mr. Mark Stewart, on behalf of six strata corporations in the 100 block of East Esplanade | A letter was submitted on March 14, 2012 by Mr. Mark Stewart on behalf of six strata corporations in the Lower Lonsdale area. The submission notes concern about the removal of the St. Patricks Avenue overpass from the proposed project scope and provision of access to western port facilities via the St. Georges Avenue intersection. |
| March 29, 2012  | Jonathan Whitworth, CEO  
Seaspan Marine Corporation | A letter was sent to Mayor and Council and copied to Port Metro Vancouver, providing an expression of support for the proposed project, particularly with respect to the project benefits. |
| March 29, 2012  | Brad Eshleman, President  
Western Stevedoring | A letter was sent to Mayor and Council and copied to Port Metro Vancouver, providing an expression of support for the proposed project, particularly with respect to the project benefits. |
| March 30, 2012  | Ms. Heather Drugge, Vancouver Area Cycling Coalition | The submission provides feedback primarily in relation to the proposed cycling and Spirit Trail facilities, and notes the importance of providing suitable grades for cyclists and recommends providing a multi-use path for cyclists and pedestrians along the south side of the Low Level Road and a painted bike lane on the North Side. |

* See Appendix L for Submission Letters

** Port Metro Vancouver will respond directly to the submissions where questions were raised and responses requested.
9. Next Steps

Port Metro Vancouver, working with the City of North Vancouver, will review the Consultation Summary Report and consider consultation feedback along with technical and financial inputs to develop a Preferred Project Design for public feedback in May 2012.

Port Metro Vancouver will develop an Input Consideration Memorandum, which will provide Port Metro Vancouver’s response to the consultation summary report. This document will be posted on Port Metro Vancouver’s website (www.portmetrovancouver.com) and on PortTalk.ca.
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