



Highway 101 Alternate Route Planning Study

Virtual Information Sessions - June 23 and 29, 2022

Verbatim questions

Environment/wildlife themes 1

Safety themes 4

Congestion/travel time themes 8

Active transportation and transit themes 13

Property/communities themes 17

Route themes 23

Technical/process themes 28

Cost themes 32

shishalh Nation themes 34

Engagement themes 35

Other/general themes 42

Note: *this document presents all questions asked during the two information sessions. For convenience, they have been grouped by theme, not in the order they were asked during each session. Some have been edited slightly to provide greater clarity/context for people who may not have attended the sessions, to correct typos and/or to remove offensive language. Participants searching for a specific question are encouraged to use the search tool in your PDF browser. Additionally, if you participated in a session and believe your question is missing, please email us at TRAN.WEBMASTER@gov.bc.ca.*



Environment/wildlife themes

Question	Study Team Response
<p>What environmental studies have been completed for the stretch through upper Roberts Creek? There are no specifics or transparency in the engagement documents.</p>	<p>In addition to a site visit by the engineering team, desktop studies were completed using a variety of available sources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental inventories (BEC, VRI, OGMA) • Stream inventories • shishalh cultural data <p>In the next phase of the study, further analysis including ground-based studies of the shortlisted options will be completed.</p>
<p>Has the impact of climate change and severe weather, such as atmospheric rivers, been studied? Last fall and winter there was significant and disastrous washouts and landslides. A new highway would make these problems worse.</p> <p><i>Follow up:</i></p> <p>A new bypass will funnel more water into small creeks through Roberts Creek and destroy homes and property.</p>	<p>Alternate routes that consider resiliency, reliability and network redundancy are a priority as part of the study.</p> <p>Any future new infrastructure will incorporate the Ministry’s guidelines for climate preparedness and climate adaptation (including extreme weather events minimizing alteration of existing creeks and waterways and treating and regulating road runoff). These would be further detailed in subsequent phases of the study at the appropriate time in the future.</p>
<p>Along the purple route [full alternate route along the BC Hydro corridor], there is wildlife that will be impacted, including deer, elk (a permanent resident elk herd resides in the area through Roberts Creek), bear, coyotes, bob cats and cougars. Have they been accounted for?</p>	<p>As part of the environmental impact assessment, the technical team has completed a desktop study. The study team acknowledges that work is not complete. A more detailed process will be completed with shortlisted options in partnership with shishalh Nation and collaboration with Squamish Nation.</p>
<p>Please provide the name of your consultant regarding the displacement of wildlife.</p>	<p>PGL Environmental conducted the desktop study. The study team is also drawing upon shishalh and Squamish Nations’ knowledge based on their traditional and current use of the area.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>The province has a goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. How does building a 4-lane highway help achieve this goal?</p>	<p>As part of the evaluation of shortlisted options, the study will consider potential changes in greenhouse gas emissions as part of the environmental account analysis.</p> <p>The Ministry notes that not all options are a four-lane highway and suggests that the community share feedback as part of the engagement process. The online feedback form is open until August 31, 2022.</p>
<p>How are you justifying the environmental and private property impacts, just to save 2.3 minutes on a 15-minute drive?</p>	<p>The study equally considers all factors in the provincial multiple account evaluation framework (see display board 19). Travel time savings is only one of the factors considered within the customer service account in developing and assessing the options, including the potential for improving Highway 101 in lieu of alternate routes. Potential private property impacts are considered in the socio-community account and environmental effects are considered in the environmental account.</p> <p>As part of the engagement process, the study team is asking participants to share what's important to them, to help refine and continue to evaluate the options.</p>
<p>Considering the huge amount of wildlife displacement and 11 fish bearing water courses being impacted with the Alternate Route to Margaret Road and the Full Alternate Route to Havies Road in the Davis Bay options, how have these options even made it this far?</p>	<p>The purpose of the study is to develop a long-term vision for the corridor, and this is the first step in a much larger process. At this stage, the study identified preliminary options that are technically feasible. As part of the engagement process, the study team is asking participants to share what's important to them. This information will help us shortlist the options and identify required management strategies that will need to be considered for options that move forward for further consideration.</p> <p>Shortlisted options will be further investigated, including environmental and archaeological surveys before confirming a preferred long-term solution.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
My family is unaware of multiple parks and any critical habitat in the area and will be similarly impacted by the Havies Road options.	Reference to parks and key habitat is derived from provincial, regional (SCRD) and municipal databases and considers the full route, not just along Havies Road.



Safety themes

Question	Study Team Response
<p>Why are your options into Sechelt all looking at Havies Road? That doesn't fix Selma Park which is already dangerous!</p>	<p>Options using Selma Park Road were considered but did not meet the Ministry's guidelines for active transportation (grades were not ideal). Havies Road provides better grade and connection.</p> <p>Options that bypassed the Selma Park area (between Havies Road and downtown Sechelt) did not proceed beyond the initial screening stage because these options affect multiple utilities, including new and planned future projects as well as existing roads and residential communities. These options had high anticipated costs, constructability challenges, significant environmental and property impacts, and would require expropriation of homes and recreational areas.</p>
<p>Davis Bay lacks intersections and enforcement of speed limits.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The study team will keep this in mind as the study progresses.</p>
<p>Boards 13 and 17 on your website refer to "safety improvements at bus stops". In my experience, the biggest safety hazard is in attempting to cross the highway to get to a bus stop. What will the proposed safety improvements at the bus stops look like? Will they include crossing infrastructure to improve pedestrian safety?</p>	<p>Our goal is to improve safety along the entire corridor, including intersections, bus stops, pedestrian crossings and cycling routes along the highway.</p> <p>If an alternate route is preferred, the existing highway can be used for local mobility and include features to improve safe crossings, active transportation and access to transit.</p> <p>If an alternate route is not identified, further analysis of the existing Highway 1 corridor will be done to determine the appropriate infrastructure improvements.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Is there safety data on the current highway? I drive the corridor daily. There are difficult curves, multiple driveways, side roads and increasing traffic volume between Gibsons to Sechelt that make this corridor dangerous.</p>	<p>While most of the corridor meets B.C. standards, there are sections that are more challenging than others. In particular, through the Roberts Creek area, the existing terrain and topography result in a curvilinear highway and challenging sightlines.</p> <p>Through the Davis Bay and Selma Park area, multiple unmarked driveways increase the probability of collisions within urban areas, and high demand by pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles impede the performance of the existing highway for through-traffic.</p> <p>This planning study will identify a long-term solution as this area of the Sunshine Coast continues to grow. In the meantime, the Ministry will continue to explore opportunities to improve safety within the existing highway right-of-way.</p> <p>More information on safety statistics is available through ICBC, including online interactive crash maps by region.</p>
<p>I want to ask about safety such as flooding, fires and accidents as a criteria for alternative routes. I would think that alternate routes should serve the needs of emergency vehicles such as police, fire and ambulance, as well as alternate routes for regular traffic. Ambulance access to the hospital should be a priority. Is there a possibility to look again at following the hydro lines behind the airport to the road that links to the hospital?</p>	<p>As part of the evaluation, the study team is looking at the reliability of the highway. Some of the proposed options provide alternate routes to the existing corridor.</p> <p>Options that bypassed the Selma Park area (between Havies Road and downtown Sechelt) did not proceed beyond the initial screening stage because these options affect multiple utilities, including new and planned future projects as well as existing roads and residential communities. They had high anticipated costs and constructability challenges, significant environmental and property impacts, and would require expropriation of homes and recreational areas.</p> <p>The team encourages all suggestions and alternate options to be added to the Q&A in the session and through the feedback form.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Why do you think passing lanes are the only solution for 'safety'?</p>	<p>Traffic volumes through sections of the highway were reviewed. In instances of congestion, drivers want to pass and if there are no safe passing opportunities it can create driver frustration, which can lead some drivers to make unsafe manoeuvres.</p> <p>Passing lanes are one way to address safety. Other options include creating left turn bays at key locations, reducing speed limits and improving sight lines.</p> <p>This comment appears to relate to the information on display board 7, which highlighted limited passing lanes through Roberts Creek as a key cause of safety-related incidents. The intent of this board was to highlight primary safety concerns along the corridor that warrant consideration for improvements and/or an alternate route, rather than suggest a specific proposed improvement.</p>
<p>Lack of safety with multiple driveways directly accessing the highway will not be made safer with passing lanes. Was this considered?</p>	<p>Yes. See above.</p>
<p>Historically on the coast, Rat Portage Hill has been an area of significant accidents and there is a passing lane in the area. Can you speak to why we should be adding additional passing lanes when the history of accidents in Roberts Creek is higher in them?</p>	<p>Passing lanes are an important way of ensuring acceptable levels of service. There are a variety of ways to improve safety where passing lanes exist, for example: providing left turn bays, deceleration/acceleration lanes at intersections, lower speed limits, improved signs and wayfinding, etc.</p>
<p>Building a 4-lane highway where you are proposing will make washouts worse. Roberts Creek already has several alternate routes. It needs a lower speed limit (60 km/h) between Orange and Pell roads to improve driver behavior and reduce accidents. The 4-lane highway will be disastrous for the community who walk on all the side roads (Lockyer, Roberts Creek Road, etc.). You will have multiple pedestrian accidents on your hands if you approve that stretch.</p>	<p>Part of planning, including detailed designs for a future project if this alignment were selected, would be to ensure that any alternate route would comply with Ministry guidelines for environmental protection, including planning for climate change.</p> <p>Proposed improvements to be included in the improved Highway 101 options are based on the 2020 study and would include intersection improvements such as turn restrictions and left turn lanes at specific locations along the</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Why not improve driver behaviour, rather than destroy a whole community?</p>	<p>highway based on traffic operations and safety.</p> <p>Additionally, the Ministry will continue to promote and support broader initiatives designed to improve driver behaviour.</p> <p>Such improvements would be completed over time, as the community continues to grow and change.</p>
<p>We live in Roberts Creek where the November flooding heavily affected roadways. The Ministry and their contractor have been unable to keep a safe and reliable corridor and have not completed a long-term solution since this time. Our community is constantly calling the Ministry to describe our safety concerns, which include major erosion and narrowing of an interim gravel road and interim culvert solution. How can the Ministry ensure there will be adequate resources for maintaining a new highway when existing roads are unsafe?</p>	<p>Thank you for raising these concerns. The Ministry has recently adopted new design standards to help address climate change issues that have significantly affected communities across the Province. The Ministry's operations team is bringing forward this information for consideration as appropriate on the existing Highway 101.</p> <p>Additionally, the Ministry will ensure that alternate routes or a revision to the existing corridor meet an appropriate level of service as described in the highway maintenance agreement.</p> <p>The Ministry welcomes all concerns through the operations team or by contacting the Associate District Manager or District Manager.</p>
<p>I echo the sentiment by a resident about some roads in Roberts Creek that still need to be fixed from the floods. A highway through this community will be susceptible to multiple water issues including flooding.</p>	<p>Part of planning, including detailed designs for future projects after the long-term vision for the corridor is confirmed, would be to ensure that any alternate route incorporates Ministry guidelines for environmental protection and climate change.</p>
<p>Can you provide a historic list of safety incidents in Roberts Creek?</p>	<p>More information on safety statistics is available through ICBC, including online interactive crash maps by region.</p>



Congestion/travel time themes

Question	Study Team Response
<p>Roberts Creek to Wilson Creek is not the issue. The traffic issue is from Davis Bay to Sechelt. Why are there no bypass options for this section?</p>	<p>Between Davis Bay and Sechelt, no feasible alternate route was identified.</p> <p>In this section, several options were considered but did not meet the criteria for further study due to significant economic, geotechnical, structural, environmental or constructability constraints. Please refer to display board 18 for more information.</p>
<p>Why does display board 7/slide 14 of the presentation (Safety, Reliability and Congestion) stop at Davis Bay? The worst congestion is from Davis Bay through to West Sechelt!</p>	<p>No feasible alternate route was identified in this section, so it was not included in the table on this slide of the presentation.</p>
<p>Why is the worst area of the coast for congestion and accidents not shown for a bypass? This includes Nestman Road, Snodgrass Road, Selma Park and Sechelt?</p>	<p>Between Davis Bay and Sechelt, no feasible alternate route was identified.</p> <p>In this section, several options were considered but did not meet the criteria for further study due to significant economic, geotechnical, structural, environmental or constructability constraints. Please refer to display board 18 for more information.</p>
<p>Can you speak to the benefits to local travel times through Gibsons if there is a bypass, which takes traffic from the current 4-lane highway to west of Gibsons?</p>	<p>If an alternate route is built through Gibsons, it is anticipated that by redirecting the through traffic to this alternate route, local travel times within Gibsons will improve. Additionally, the existing Highway 101 could then be used for different roles/functions, including local mobility, transit and active transportation.</p> <p>Local traffic travel times will be improved and opportunities for safer pedestrian crossings can be implemented if there is a bypass/alternate route.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>The presentation indicates three demand scenarios will be considered but I see only two. Can you please clarify?</p>	<p>The demand scenarios considered were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High demand • Low demand • Sensitivity analysis of lower demand (due to significant change in travel mode) or higher demand (due to potential for induced traffic associated with building an alternate route) <p>More information is available on display board 6.</p>
<p>The intersection at the highway and Wharf in Sechelt is a bottleneck. Please address how these alternatives deal with that intersection.</p>	<p>This area was reviewed as part of the 2020 study, and improvements at Wharf Avenue/Dolphin Street and Shorncliffe Avenue/Wharf Avenue are part of the interim solutions that are recommended. Construction timing will be based on provincial priorities.</p> <p>Additionally, some of the long-term options being considered as part of this current study would incorporate significant traffic pattern changes at this intersection, with through traffic continuing straight along Dolphin or turning right on Wharf Avenue, dramatically reducing the problematic left turn movement at this location.</p>
<p>I live on the highway in Roberts Creek and never see anything coming close to 'congestion'. There are some areas for improved safety that do not need to rely on passing lanes. How can you justify community and environmental destruction with the Alternate Route to Margaret Road and the Full Alternate Route to Havies Road in your Davis Bay options, for just 1.8 minutes of improved commute time?</p>	<p>The 2020 study considered passing lane and left turn opportunities along the existing Highway 101, and this could be a potential interim option for improving Highway 101.</p> <p>As part of the current long-term planning study, the options developed will address congestion along with safety and reliability and accommodate active transportation.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>How do traffic forecasts take into account those who live all along the existing road and already have an issue with access to their properties?</p>	<p>The study team used a forecast outlook to 2050, including exploring potential impacts and future growth to the corridor in the next 30 years.</p> <p>Suggested interim improvements from the 2020 study included safety, congestion and seasonal growth. Over the longer term, the improved Highway 101 option identified in the 2020 study contemplates a combination of intersection improvements, passing lanes and turning lanes where appropriate, and active transportation upgrades or connections to off-corridor routes.</p> <p>An alternate route would create opportunities for better access from these properties to the existing Highway 101, as the through traffic would be diverted to an alternate route.</p> <p>With respect to direct access to any main highway, the Ministry’s longer-term goal is to limit access, through road dedication for frontage roads linked to direct highway connections as communities redevelop.</p>
<p>Are the traffic forecast models documented in posted documents? If so, where can we view these?</p>	<p>The assumptions used to populate the traffic forecasting models (including anticipated population growth as per Statistics Canada data and local community plans) are available on display board 6.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>The only congestion I ever experience is Gibsons Way. Will you study how effective the bike lanes are before spending money on creating a whole new road? There was never a traffic congestion issue (other than accidents) until the 4-lanes turned into 2-lanes with the added bike lane back around 2008.</p>	<p>The Ministry has a mandate to work with communities to help improve their active transportation networks and to advance the policy objectives outlined in the CleanBC roadmap. For this reason, active transportation is included in all Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure studies and projects in effort to improve existing facilities. For this study, a gap analysis was completed for cycling facilities along Highway 101, including Gibsons Way. Future projects will include bridging these gaps.</p> <p>An alternate route through Gibsons would divert regional traffic from Gibsons Way, improving local mobility, and would also provide opportunities to enhance active transportation and transit along Gibsons Way.</p> <p>All future cycling improvements will be designed to meet the B.C. Active Transportation Design Guide.</p>
<p>Given that almost 83% of traffic does not go beyond Sechelt, truck traffic represents less than 1.5% of traffic, and that “these findings suggest that current travel demand on Highway 101 is primarily a function of local development and limited alternatives to driving,” why is the focus on providing a regional through route, rather than serving the needs of Sunshine Coast residents?</p>	<p>The Ministry is mandated to provide a connection from Langdale Ferry Terminal to Earls Cove and beyond for all modes of travel, including truck traffic, inter-regional travelers, etc. A key objective for this study is to preserve role and function of the highway. If the role and function of the highway was shifted to an alternate route, then there are other opportunities for the existing highway.</p>
<p>Is the forecast model a linear projection based on population?</p>	<p>Not specifically, although the high growth scenario is near-linear. However, as part of the sensitivity analysis, the study team also considered potential for induced demand and significant changes in mode split (increased use of walking, cycling and transit).</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Congestion in Selma Park is highly likely with all these options. Please explain how this alignment could work through this residential area?</p>	<p>Based on the proposed developments in this area, the Ministry anticipates that this community will see increased use of alternative forms of transportation to help reduce local vehicle demand.</p> <p>In addition, the Ministry is reviewing improvements along the existing Highway 101, such as passing lanes, turning lanes and intersection improvements at specific locations. These were identified in the 2020 study.</p> <p>This combined with improved intersections, passing lanes and turning lanes where appropriate, and active transportation upgrades on Highway 101 will ensure that the highway continues to serve all demand. These changes can be accommodated in the future through property acquisition and/or road dedication as communities redevelop.</p>



Active transportation and transit themes

Question	Study Team Response
<p>Why is active transportation a requirement for selected routes?</p>	<p>Through the province’s CleanBC program, the Ministry has a mandate to make it easier for people in B.C. to make greener choices. This includes incorporating active transportation along new highways.</p> <p>For options that would improve the existing Highway 101, this study will consider what is appropriate and feasible within the existing geographic constraints.</p>
<p>I agree active transportation should be considered, but not to preclude otherwise viable routes. Have you excluded any routes so far because of the active transportation requirement?</p>	<p>No. Although for an improved Highway 101, the active transportation connection could be either through upgrades to the highway or connections to off-corridor routes.</p>
<p>Have you considered that you would be eliminating the walkability of large areas of what is a very connected and peaceful community (Roberts Creek)? A large community of school children who are all friends will no longer be able to walk to each other, and even their school bus would be cut off.</p> <p>The 4-lane option through Roberts Creek increases dangers. Please go back to the drawing board with the Roberts Creek route. It is not difficult to lower the speed limit on the existing highway, which is rarely congested.</p>	<p>These potential impacts are considered in the Socio-Community account of the multiple account evaluation framework (see display board 19). Some are also noted specifically in the display boards. As part of this engagement, the study team invites participants to share their interests, concerns and preferences. This will support continued evaluation of the options.</p> <p>The study identified feasible alternate routes as well as an option for an improved Highway 101. While the study partners believe all feasible options have been identified and are now evaluating the relative benefits and impacts of each, the study team is open to other suggestions if they are technically viable.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>The Ministry is responsible for all roads in the Sunshine Coast Regional District, not just Highway 101. If any of the bypass options are built, how would the Ministry commit to improve pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure on Highway 101, including shoulders, pedestrian activated crossing signals, etc.?</p>	<p>Safety is a top priority and all active transportation facilities will be designed in accordance with the B.C. Active Transportation Design Guide.</p> <p>Should an alternate route be identified as the preferred solution, it would open up the possibility to incorporate additional pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure along the existing Highway 101 by reallocating road space from cars.</p>
<p>What about investment in transit? If there were more buses (so people do not have to wait an hour if they miss one) then more people would be prepared to take transit, therefore easing traffic volumes.</p>	<p>All the alignment options being considered are designed for all vehicles, including transit, where new transit routes can be located to improve the transit network on the Sunshine Coast.</p> <p>Decisions about transit frequency are made by BC Transit and the Sunshine Coast Regional District, not the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure.</p>
<p>More regular buses on existing routes would solve a lot. It does not sound like this has been advanced.</p>	<p>The Ministry acknowledges this. This study focuses on long-term improvements, including working with BC Transit to understand their long-term plans for transit service.</p> <p>While currently there is no long-term plan that would significantly change vehicle demand volumes, the sensitivity analysis conducted for this study allows for this possibility.</p>

Question	Study Team Response
<p>Board 8 on the website refers to 2.0 m shoulders and board 13 refers to 1.5 m shoulders on the improved Highway 101.</p> <p>The B.C. Active Transportation Design Guide recommends shoulders be 2.0-3.0 m and notes “A minimum width of 2.0 metres should only be considered in exceptional circumstances, including in undeveloped rural contexts with very low volumes of people walking and/or cycling and if there are significant constraints such as property or natural features including significant trees, ditches, or slopes.”</p> <p>The <i>BC Supplement</i> to the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) <i>Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads</i> provides for 2.5 m shoulders on roads with speeds over 70 km/h.</p> <p>Given that the Ministry is talking about purchasing additional right-of-way and more than doubling the overall width of Highway 101, why would the Ministry not at least meet its own minimal standards in providing shoulders for pedestrians and cyclists?</p>	<p>Typical cross-sections for different alignment options meet the B.C. Active Transportation Design Guide. As shown on display board 8, the typical cross sections for this study assume that new routes would have either a 3-metre-wide multi-use path or 3-metre-wide shoulders, whereas an improved Highway 101 would have 2-metre shoulders. Board 13 identifies a minimum of 1.5-metre-wide shoulders on an improved Highway 101 because some areas are highly constrained. The goal would be to achieve 2-metre-wide shoulders.</p> <p>Shortlisted options could be proposed as a fully protected facility or other safety measures can be proposed to improve active transportation.</p> <p>The typical cross-section dimensions (including shoulder widths) identified on display boards 8 and 13 were selected to minimize private property impacts. Wider shoulders could be considered during detailed design for any future projects arising as a result of the study.</p>
<p>Has any consideration been given to a Mass Rapid Transit system, such a light rail link to the Lower Mainland? Linear communities like the Coast are better served by a rail line. With the unknown advances in vehicle technology and personal movement options, by 2050 humans will hopefully not be travelling in single occupancy vehicles anymore, thus avoiding traffic congestion.</p>	<p>The study has not specifically considered rapid transit options; however, traffic forecasting for the study considered the potential of an induced shift to transit and/or active transportation. As noted, even in a high demand scenario, there is no need for an alternate route based on traffic volumes alone.</p> <p>Our current goal is to shortlist improving Highway 101 or alternate route options. Rapid transit options can be considered in future projects arising as a result of the study.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>CleanBC calls for a significant modal shift from driving to walking, cycling, transit to 30% by 2030, 40% by 2040 and 50% by 2050. 2 m or 3 m shoulders do not meet the B.C. Active Transportation Guide's recommendations for a highway with our volumes and speeds and are unlikely to be comfortable for most residents.</p> <p>Is separated active transportation infrastructure being considered for the improved Highway 101 and the rural alignment?</p>	<p>Improvements to the existing Highway 101 are being considered to accommodate active transportation within the existing road right of way. The intent is to provide 2-metre-wide shoulders where possible, with a minimum of 1.5-metres in some areas, to minimize impacts on adjacent properties.</p> <p>Future project concepts for shortlisted options may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider shoulders • Multi-use path in urban sections • Active transportation • Transit considerations • Goods movement considerations
<p>The CleanBC Roadmap targets “modal shifts” to walking, cycling and transit of 30% by 2030 and 50% by 2050, respectively. As Transportation Planners, can you comment on which of the alignment options would best support achieving those targets?</p>	<p>All of the options would support modal shifts because they all will provide improved facilities for active transportation as well as provide additional bus service opportunities.</p> <p>Alternate route options have greater potential to induce new traffic by creating new vehicle capacity. On the other hand, these options also create an opportunity to revisit how road space on the existing Highway 101 is allocated in urban areas to support more active transportation. These are trade-offs that will need to be considered as the study team continues to analyze the options in consideration of community input received through this engagement process.</p>
<p>The 'uphill' alternate route is good for cars but not so good for buses because most of the population lives below the existing highway. Cycling and pedestrian access also needs to be along the current route as it is where people live. Can you improve the current route for transit and active transportation and limit the alternate route to vehicles?</p>	<p>While the alternate route options would accommodate cyclists and transit, the study team’s working assumption is that local transit buses and most active transportation travellers would continue to use the existing Highway 101, which would have less vehicle traffic than today.</p>



Property/communities themes

Question	Study Team Response
<p>Why is a route through people homes acceptable?</p>	<p>Understanding and addressing concerns about potential private property impacts is specifically considered with the evaluation methodology and an important part of the shortlisting process.</p> <p>Any of the options would potentially have impacts on private properties, including improvements to Highway 101.</p> <p>The options put forward for public input are technically feasible based on work completed to date. The study team is seeking public input to help shortlist the options to complete additional detailed studies to further evaluate the options.</p> <p>Although this is a long-term study that is defining the corridor vision for next 30 years, for transparency, this information is shared as a high-level estimate of potential impact to support informed feedback. The current estimate of potential impacts is subject to change as the shortlisted options continue to be refined. Additional analysis and dialogue with local municipalities would follow before selecting a preferred route.</p> <p>This approach follows the standard planning process for a corridor vision and technical feasibility assessment.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>There is a housing crisis on the coast. Most of your options involve acquiring private properties, which will end up in the landfill (which is almost full). Please go back to the drawing board with many of these options.</p>	<p>The intent of this study is to create a long-term vision for the corridor that will support the Ministry and local governments in making future land use decisions. There are no plans for any immediate acquisition or construction. The study will recommend a preferred alignment to facilitate future land dedication as areas are developed. More detailed review of the alignment will be completed to determine if property acquisition can be avoided.</p> <p>Once future projects are funded, in areas where property impacts cannot be avoided, acquisition could take place using a variety of tools such as private purchase from willing sellers.</p>
<p>Many of your options talk about appropriating properties. Why do you not cite the number of properties per option? Have you contacted those property owners?</p>	<p>This is a high-level planning study to determine feasible routes that will need to be agreed upon. The next step is to shortlist options for further technical analysis.</p>
<p>Are any private properties located under the BC Hydro lines?</p>	<p>Based on the desktop analysis completed to date, the only area where private properties are under BC Hydro's lines is between Wharf Avenue and Trail Avenue. Further analysis and review will be completed for shortlisted options.</p>
<p>What consideration is being given to the large development currently being considered on Havies Road at Laurel Avenue?</p>	<p>The Ministry reviews all proposed new developments within 800 metres of the highway right-of-way. This includes consideration of traffic engineering and highway design to ensure standards are met. Based on the review, the Ministry may require improvements to accommodate the development, approve it or deny the development as proposed.</p> <p>For the purposes of this long-term planning study, any known large developments planned along the alignment options have been considered.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Which existing communities are you referring to with the Sechelt bypass? There is virtually no one over those mountains.</p>	<p>Between Davis Bay and Sechelt, an alignment along the B.C. Hydro transmission line would pass through residential areas in the shishalh swiya (world, lands, birthplace, “Territory”).</p>
<p>The purple route through Roberts Creek [full alternate route along the BC Hydro right-of-way] would encourage development up the mountain. Recent logging has made a devastating impact on erosion and flooding.</p>	<p>Resource developments and their impact (positive and negative) have been considered while developing the alignment options.</p> <p>For any alternate route option, the new highway would be built to Ministry standards, which include erosion protection.</p>
<p>The purple route through Roberts Creek [full alternate route along the BC Hydro right-of-way] would require multiple families to be displaced.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback.</p> <p>The intent of this study is to create a long-term vision for the corridor that will support the Ministry and local governments in making future land use decisions and allow for future land dedication as areas are redeveloped. There are no plans for immediate design, acquisition or construction.</p>
<p>There is a proposed development that is right in the middle of the route down Havies Road. Has this been discussed with the District of Sechelt?</p>	<p>The study team met with District of Sechelt staff and council. Council has not yet provided feedback. Further discussions are planned following public engagement.</p>
<p>A 4-lane highway right through the community of Roberts Creek would destroy community, safety, the environment, wildlife, and ruin the area, to save just 1.8 minutes of a commute.</p> <p>Please explain how this option made the shortlist.</p>	<p>The purpose of this study is to determine feasible options of alternate routes for the highway. The Ministry has heard and is responding to community concerns about the current highway capacity limits and safety standards.</p> <p>The alternate route will take into consideration safety, reliability and environmental impacts, and include active transportation and other features.</p> <p>The study team understands that not every route is ideal for everyone. The goal is to identify a future alignment option everyone can agree upon for the long-term.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Can you give us an estimation of how many private properties would be directly impacted with the full bypass option?</p>	<p>The display boards provide relative comparisons. In the next phase of the study, additional analysis of the shortlisted options will be completed.</p>
<p>Why does the impact to the community matter around Selma Park in Sechelt, but not upper Roberts Creek?</p>	<p>Community impacts are considered with all options. The initial phase of the study sought to confirm and optimize historic options and to identify additional technically feasible options for public input. Following this engagement process, the study team will shortlist the options and conduct additional analysis, including analysis of socio-community considerations, to identify a preferred long-term solution.</p> <p>Options that bypassed the Selma Park area (between Havies Road and downtown Sechelt) did not proceed beyond the initial screening stage because these options affect multiple utilities, including new and planned future projects as well as existing roads and residential communities. They had high anticipated costs and constructability challenges, significant environmental and property impacts, and would require expropriation of homes and recreational areas.</p>
<p>Are you aware that many of your off-ramps are at roads which are regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders in Roberts Creek?</p> <p>The proposed route would slice a community in two. Will you come and meet the residents and walk the roads?</p>	<p>The study team understands and has considered current use, including current use of the existing Highway 101, as communities continue to grow. All of the alternate route options would include safe multi-modal access across the route.</p> <p>Several members of the study team live on the Sunshine Coast. The technical team also conducted a site visit.</p> <p>The study partners appreciate this feedback and will further consider it as part of the multiple account evaluation process.</p>
<p>A short cut will not justify destroying neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. It will be considered as part of the evaluation process.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Are you aware that Selma Park is a different location from Davis Bay?</p>	<p>The study team is aware that Selma Park and Davis Bay are different locations. The option descriptions used for the engagement process are intended to distinguish general geographic areas.</p>
<p>Studies show that if you build more roads, you do not necessarily improve congestion. There is no congestion through Roberts Creek so some of your suggestions do not make sense.</p> <p>Is there a plan to turn the Sunshine Coast into the density of North Vancouver?</p>	<p>Congestion is only one of the reasons that improvements are being studied. As noted in the engagement materials, other reasons include safety and route reliability (see display board 7). As part of the engagement process, participants are invited to share what's important to them as the study team refines and continues to evaluate the options.</p> <p>The intent of this study is to create a long-term vision for the corridor that will support the Ministry and local governments in making future land use decisions. There are no plans for any property acquisition or construction.</p>
<p>A "line on a map" is people's communities and safety.</p>	<p>The intent of this study is to create a long-term vision for the corridor that will support local governments in making future land use decisions. There are no plans for any land acquisition or construction.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Will you apologize for using the term “just a line on a map” multiple times in the last presentation. Some of these proposed routes have significant impact on the environment and community and that comment has not been appreciated and has caused much anxiety for residents.</p>	<p>The study team acknowledges that use of this term in the first public information session was distressing for some participants who were concerned about private property impacts.</p> <p>On behalf of study team and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, we apologize. It was not our intent to cause any anxiety. We wanted to be transparent and to share with the public what is being considered in this high-level long-term study, including potential private property and environmental impacts to facilitate future land dedication as areas redevelop.</p> <p>The Ministry appreciates this feedback and thanks those who expressed their concerns. The Ministry and the study team will be mindful of the words used and will adjust how information is presented going forward. It is important for us to hear when we don’t get things right.</p>



Route themes

Question	Study Team Response
<p>Are the routes proposed through the study the final ones?</p>	<p>The study team is completing a high-level study to determine what is feasible; the options proposed are not final.</p> <p>The study team wants to learn more about people’s concerns and opinions about the options. The goal is to narrow it down to options where further investigation and analysis can be completed.</p>
<p>Can you please address the routes through Roberts Creek?</p>	<p>This question was asked during one of the information sessions and the moderator asked the participant to share a follow-up question to clarify.</p>
<p>Have you considered the route from the airport behind Tsain-Ko Centre, across Wharf Avenue and Trail Avenue?</p>	<p>Options that bypassed the Selma Park area (between Havies Road and downtown Sechelt) did not proceed beyond the initial screening stage because these options affect multiple utilities, including new and planned future projects as well as existing roads and residential communities. They had high anticipated costs and constructability challenges, significant environmental and property impacts, and would require expropriation of homes and recreational areas.</p>
<p>The Roberts Creek route from Reed Road to Ranch Road was not approved previously. Why is it being brought back as an option?</p>	<p>The initial phase of the study sought to confirm and optimize historic options and to identify additional technically feasible options for public input. Following this engagement process, the study team will shortlist the options and conduct additional analysis, including analysis of socio-community considerations, to identify a preferred long-term solution.</p>
<p>Will you be providing more information on the historic options that were eliminated?</p>	<p>The question was acknowledged during the information session and addressed as part of the discussion. More information is available on display board 18.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>How was an option determined as no longer viable?</p>	<p>Several criteria were reviewed to determine options that are not feasible (e.g., property acquisition, socio-economic, environmental, constructability). More information is available on display board 19.</p>
<p>Have you considered the BC Hydro lines land? It has already been cleared and will not interfere with the residents.</p>	<p>There are constraints when working around high power transmission lines. Legislation prohibits placing a highway directly under an existing transmission line. The alternate route could potentially be within the same right-of-way, as long as it is the required minimum distance from the transmission line.</p>
<p>Why there is there no discussion about the route above Selma Park and behind the hospital?</p>	<p>This area was studied, including consideration of potential options that would connect past Sechelt.</p> <p>No technically feasible option was identified, as the area has multiple challenges, including crossing water, high infrastructure cost, high impact to community and habitat.</p>
<p>Where can I find the three options that are no longer viable?</p>	<p>Information is available on display board 18.</p>
<p>Have you considered a strictly controlled access on the full alternate route as only a two-lane highway, instead of a four-lane highway?</p>	<p>Proposed options must meet the role and function of a B.C. highway, including inter-regional traffic, regional traffic and goods movement.</p> <p>For the purposes of this long-range planning study, a 4-lane highway corridor was identified to help define the potential impacts. The Ministry agrees that a 2-lane highway could be considered and implemented in some areas, as part of a staged construction.</p> <p>Once the options are shortlisted, further analysis will be completed.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>What road configuration do you envision from Havies Road through downtown Sechelt? Please be specific.</p>	<p>For planning purposes, the study assumes intersection improvements and turn lanes between Havies Road and matukwum lane (formerly Monkey Tree Lane), as well as at Wharf Avenue. It also assumes minimum shoulder width of 1.5m for bicycle accessibility and safety improvements at bus stops.</p> <p>Additional details would be developed as part of the design for future projects that may arise as a result of this study.</p>
<p>I didn't think the Hydro right-of-way dropped down south enough to parallel Reed Road or intersect with Pine Street. It does stay further north and is parallel to Cemetery Road and curves north well above Pine Street. Is this option then to connect to Ranch Road still feasible?</p>	<p>The alternate route options generally follow the transmission line; however, in this section, the optimized alignment was to drop below it to facilitate connections at Payne Road and Pine Street.</p>
<p>Did the land transfer to the mine that happened recently impact some of the options in Sechelt?</p>	<p>This was a consideration, but not the reason. More information about alternative routes considered between Havies Road and Chelpi Avenue is available on display board 18.</p>
<p>At what level (BC Government elected officials, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure management) was the decision made to keep the focus on providing a regional through route?</p>	<p>The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure is responsible for preserving the functionality of the highway for people and goods movement through the Sunshine Coast and beyond, to support communities along the corridor.</p> <p>All projects are vetted through a robust internal process, which allows the Ministry to deliver projects from a regional perspective and consider all provincial priorities. The current initiative is a long-term planning study.</p> <p>These engagements are important so that feedback from the public, including what is important to you, is heard and can be applied to the multiple account evaluation. This process supports the Ministry in providing solutions that best support the region.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Are you considering widening the highway along Gibsons Way within the town? That would have serious impacts on a lot of very expensive commercial and School District 46 properties, making it difficult to imagine that would be cheaper than an alternate. Why not improve Reed Road or alternate route?</p>	<p>The study team is aware that Reed Road is currently used as an informal bypass in the Gibsons area. This route was considered in the 2020 study.</p> <p>One of the alternate routes identified for this study is Reed Road to Ranch Road. Additionally, the improved Highway 101 option also includes limited improvements along Gibsons Way.</p> <p>There are a several accesses, including schools and commercial activity, along parts of Reed Road. The current study identified that if the Reed Road alternate route were extended further to the east, these accesses would need to be closed to accommodate forecast traffic volumes. This would significantly impact the community and deteriorate mobility over the long-term. It was determined to not be as good a long-term option as the parallel transmission line route nearby.</p>
<p>How will the improved Highway 101 route help with the already large concerns, including climate change, flooding, increase in traffic in the past two years and ferry traffic noise?</p>	<p>Throughout the province, the Ministry of Transportation is working to make highways more resilient to climate change, including on Highway 101.</p> <p>All options are proposed to accommodate forecast growth in traffic. Specific noise mitigation measures, where warranted in accordance with the Ministry’s noise policy, would be considered in future projects that may arise as a result of this study, should this option be identified as the preferred long-term solution.</p>
<p>There is no "mature" forest on the purple route [<i>alignment identified on display board 18 as not feasible</i>]. It is mostly a gravel pit, and the rest is subject to development.</p> <p>What "critical habitat" are you referring to? It's substantially a gravel pit.</p>	<p>Near Chapman Creek, the Sunshine Coast Regional District has identified mature forest and riparian areas. This area is also home to critical Marbled Murrelet habitat.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>So wait, you don't mind suggesting a route close to homes in Roberts Creek, but you 'couldn't find one' around Sechelt? Come on...</p>	<p>The area between Selma Park and downtown Sechelt has several challenges, including geotechnical, structural, environmental and constructability constraints. More information is available on display board 18.</p>
<p>Your initial levels of analysis were very poorly done for the Roberts Creek 4-lane through the power lines to have made it to this stage. Wow. Shocking.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The study team followed standard practice for planning studies.</p>
<p>It is incorrect to imply that three options are not viable. That is your opinion, only.</p>	<p>The study identified options that are technically feasible. As part of the engagement process, participants are invited to share what's important to them. This information will help us shortlist the options and identify required management strategies that will need to be considered for options that move forward for further consideration.</p>
<p>Some of the options have the alternate route returning to Havies Road. That route has a lot of accidents and is congested and will have additional re-routed traffic speeding to get through Sechelt. I suspect this will be a bottleneck and safety issue.</p>	<p>Options that include use of Havies Road would include improvements to Havies Road and related intersections to ensure that it would safely and effectively accommodate the increase traffic.</p>
<p>Have you considered the area near the gravel pit?</p>	<p>Yes. More information about alternative routes considered between Havies Road and Chelpi Avenue is available on display board 18.</p>



Technical/process themes

Question	Study Team Response
What is the width of the right-of-way?	The team acknowledged this question and advised that upcoming presentation slides will share typical cross-sections. More information is available on display board 8.
Would the future four-lane highway look similar to the existing bypass?	The team acknowledged this question and advised that upcoming presentation slides will share cross-sections. More information is available on display board 8.
Do the words corridor, alignment and highway all mean the same thing?	<p>Corridor refers to the full study area from one end to the other. In this study, it refers to the area from Stewart Road to Trout Lake.</p> <p>Highway is used to describe a multi-lane roadway under Ministry jurisdiction, including shoulders and active transportation lanes. In this study, “highway” refers to both Highway 101 and any alternate route that bypasses a community.</p> <p>Alignment is the physical orientation of a roadway. In this study, it is used interchangeably with “option”.</p>
Will the road widths be implemented in 100% of the route through Sechelt?	<p>The purpose of the study is to develop a long-term vision for the highway corridor between Stewart Road and Trout Lake. Information about typical road width assumptions is available on display board 8. It will not identify a proposed timeline for implementation.</p> <p>Specific road widths would be determined as part of detailed planning for future projects that may arise as a result of this study.</p>
What is an acceptable grade/slope for a highway? The hill down Havies Road is very steep.	Road grades vary based on speed, mix of vehicles, topography and accommodation of active transportation. A maximum grade of 5% is preferred to accommodate active transportation; however, short distances of steeper grades are permitted, if accompanied by flat sections.



Question	Study Team Response
<p>What does constructability mean?</p>	<p>For the purposes of this study, constructability refers to engineering review of the terrain and geotechnical conditions. A desktop geotechnical study has been completed.</p>
<p>How are “urban” areas being defined on the Sunshine Coast?</p>	<p>Generally, downtown areas of Sechelt and Gibsons were considered as “urban” areas, in consideration of land use, density and high volume of pedestrian traffic in these areas. Other areas with multiple developments, such as in Selma Park, were also considered to be “urban” areas.</p>
<p>Has this just been a desktop study?</p>	<p>In keeping with the nature of this study to develop a long-term vision for the corridor, research to date is primarily through desktop analysis and information sharing; however, the technical team also conducted some fieldwork and additional fieldwork will be undertaken to further explore the shortlisted options.</p>
<p>Have left turn lanes been considered in Roberts Creek (instead of passing lanes), especially at Fume Road and Margaret Road?</p>	<p>The improved Highway 101 option in this area includes left-turn bays and other safety improvements at intersections. Flume Road also was identified for safety improvements (left-turn bay) as part for the 2020 corridor study.</p> <p>Short-term localized improvements to address safety through the corridor are reviewed and addressed by the Ministry’s Lower Mainland district team (members are located on the Sunshine Coast). The team is always looking for safety suggestions and opportunities. Requests are carefully considered and the Ministry has a defined process for evaluating and programming.</p>
<p>What are the relative timelines on these decisions and how does this process actually inform a building process?</p>	<p>The purpose of the study is to develop a long-term vision for the highway corridor between Stewart Road and Trout Lake. It will not identify a proposed timeline for implementation.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>What is the road configuration through Selma Park?</p>	<p>The existing Highway 101 through Selma Park can be challenging because of the number of accesses and narrow right-of-way.</p> <p>For planning purposes, the study assumes intersection improvements, turn lanes where appropriate, a minimum shoulder width of 1.5m for bicycle accessibility and pedestrian/transit safety improvements at bus stops.</p>
<p>What road width configuration do you see viable for Selma Park? Please be specific.</p>	<p>For planning purposes, the study assumes a road width of up to 14.8 metres in areas where turn lanes or intersection improvements would be made. More information about typical road configurations is available on display board 8.</p>
<p>There seems to be various options for different routes presented but is there an overall cohesive plan?</p>	<p>Our goal is to develop a long-term corridor between Gibsons and Sechelt that is supported by the public and stakeholders, which local governments can use to guide future development and that the Ministry can use to budget for future road improvements. This long-term vision would be a combination of the alternate route options presented and Highway 101 improvements.</p>
<p>Various recommendations were made in past studies but never acted on, what is different this time?</p>	<p>The 2020 study looked at different improvements for the existing highway over the short- to medium-term. One improvement proposed was the Joe/Orange Road intersection project that is currently under construction.</p> <p>The current study assesses all options for the future, including an improved Highway 101 or potential alternate routes. It expands on previous studies, including reassessing options previously considered and potential new options with the added lens of climate change adaptation and resiliency.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>What is the time frame for this study? How long will it take to make a decision on selected options? How long for the detailed studies? What will the time frame be for construction?</p>	<p>The study is anticipated to be completed in early 2023. The purpose of the study is to develop a long-term vision for the highway corridor. It will not identify specific future projects or a proposed timeline for implementation.</p>
<p>Is there an engineering consultant the Ministry is working with?</p>	<p>R.F. Binnie & Associates is leading a technical team that is conducting the traffic analysis, alternate route option development, geotechnical desktop analysis, structural desktop review and environmental desktop analysis.</p> <p>Field reviews as needed to supplement have been conducted by the technical team. Further review and analysis will continue for shortlisted options.</p>
<p>Who is the “specialist consultant”?</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>What development companies are involved in the route planning?</p>	<p>No developers are part of the study team.</p>
<p>The Havies Road connector to Highway 101 involves a 15% grade and an approximate 80-degree turn.</p>	<p>Preliminary investigation suggests that an 8% grade is achievable and that a conventional intersection with the existing Highway 101 would provide adequate service and minimize private property impacts.</p>
<p>Is the slope from Havies Road to the highway not too steep?</p>	<p>No. The investigation suggested that an 8% grade is achievable.</p>



Cost themes

Question	Study Team Response
Who will be responsible for the cost of maintenance for the new highway?	When ready to proceed with construction, a project request would go through the same process as other Ministry projects. The project will be weighed against other provincial priorities and if approved to move forward, will be funded as a capital project and ongoing maintenance costs would then be part of the Ministry's annual budget.
How much have you spent so far on this study? What will be the total cost?	The budget for this study is \$1 million and it is currently tracking on budget.
So, you're just spending money with no checks and balances?	The Ministry is committed to demonstrating financial accountability in accordance with the <i>Budget Transparency and Accountability Act</i> . The Ministry follows a rigorous budgeting and reporting process for all studies.
Have you considered future costs? For example, the improved Highway 101 may be cheaper now but how long will it be viable before a bypass is required at even greater cost?	The costing analysis in the next phase of the study will apply a standard multiple account evaluation approach, as noted on display board 19. The financial account will incorporate current costs and escalation considerations over the term/horizon year for the evaluation to ensure that all options are equally evaluated.
Have you considered maintenance costs? New stretches of road require increasing our maintenance budget and higher elevations are likely to need more snow clearing.	The team will cost shortlisted options, including capital and operations/maintenance considerations as part of the next phase of this study.
Has any costing been completed and is there an overall budget for this?	Costing of the shortlisted options will be completed as part of the next phase of this study. There is no pre-defined budget threshold for the long-term solution.
What are the estimated tax hikes associated with these new bypasses?	The costing analysis in the next phase of the study will confirm estimated costs. Budgets for design and construction of future projects that may arise as a result of this study would be developed as part of the Ministry's annual capital and budgeting cycle.



Question	Study Team Response
<p>How were the estimated cost terms such as “high,” “medium” and “low” determined? Is there a limit on any overall budget?</p>	<p>These are order of magnitude estimates using standard highway engineering unit costs – based on total distance and number of lanes and major structures such as river crossings – as well as professional judgement on potential property impacts.</p> <p>This is appropriate for the current high-level planning study and will be used for relative comparisons.</p>
<p>What level of cost was deemed to be "prohibitive"?</p>	<p>No option has been eliminated based on cost alone. In the next phase of analysis, relative costs of the options will be analyzed and weighed against the relative benefits and other impacts to support selecting a preferred long-term solution as part of the multiple account evaluation framework (see display board 19).</p>



shishalh Nation themes

Question	Study Team Response
What is shishalh Nation’s position in this project?	shishalh Nation is a partner in this study, working with the Ministry and collaborating with Squamish Nation.
Does shishalh Nation have a preferred route? Does the Nation support one route over other routes?	<p>shishalh Nation is consulting with membership, elders and community. shishalh Nation is following the teachings of ancestors and families within the shishalh community regarding stewardship and use of swiya and contributing this information to the study.</p> <p>shishalh has some concerns with certain routes and areas and is particularly cognizant to impacts to wildlife, biodiversity, the environment and the swiya. shishalh has not identified preferred routes at this early stage of the study.</p>
Is shishalh Nation okay with all traffic going through Selma Park?	Given that no feasible alternative route was identified between Selma Park and downtown Sechelt, shishalh is open to considering an improved Highway 101 in this area.
Thank you for sharing the Nation’s process.	Acknowledged.
I see this presentation includes the shishalh logo, does this mean the Nation supports a bypass?	shishalh Nation is partnering with the Ministry and collaborating with Squamish Nation to deliver this study. shishalh agrees that all of the options put forward are technically feasible and will continue working with the Ministry to complete the study.



Engagement themes

Question	Study Team Response
<p>What is the final count of people attending this information session?</p>	<p>On June 23, there were 49 attendees. On June 29, there were 39 attendees.</p>
<p>Is the session being recorded and will it be available afterwards?</p>	<p>The information sessions are not being recorded. The presentation will be recorded separately and all Q&A from the information sessions will be documented. Both will be available on the webpage following the second session next week. <i>(Subsequently posted on July 27 and August 12 respectively)</i></p>
<p>You said you reached out to residents for this study. One of the sites is going through my back yard. This is the first I have heard of this!</p> <p>Can you provide a list of all the people you have talked to?</p>	<p>This is a high-level planning study to determine feasible routes that will need to be agreed upon.</p> <p>As part of early engagement in 2021, the study team spoke with a number of organizations, including staff from local and regional governments, first responders, local business and economic development organizations, and community stakeholders. The study team used this input to help define the problem definition and the vision for this study and to confirm perceptions about historic route options.</p> <p>The study team is now engaging with the public to seek your input. Notice of this engagement opportunity was advertised in the <i>Coast Reporter</i>, as well as through social media. Local governments also were invited to share the Ministry’s social posts through their networks to help ensure the community is aware of this engagement opportunity and to encourage broad participation.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Is there a list available of community stakeholders who were consulted?</p>	<p>A list of stakeholders who participated in technical engagement is included on display board 3. The study team also reached out to government, community and tourism organizations to participate in early engagement earlier last year, to learn about community interests and concerns. Their inputs were used to support the development of the options and evaluation framework.</p> <p>A full list of community stakeholders the study team met with will be available in the engagement summary report at the end of this phase.</p>
<p>We went through this with BC timber services. Transparency is a must.</p>	<p>The engagement summary report will share which organizations participated. The report will comply with section 26(c) and 26(e) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (“FOIPPA”).</p>
<p>Have you consulted with residents?</p>	<p>The work completed in advance was with community groups, local governments and associations. Current engagement is to seek feedback, input and suggestions from local residents.</p> <p>The study team encourages everyone to complete an online feedback form and to advise family, friends and those who live in the area about the engagement.</p>
<p>Are you aware of community stakeholder groups that advocate keeping the highway as is?</p>	<p>Yes. The study team has received a wide range of feedback, ranging from people who support a full bypass and people who would prefer that the Ministry focus on transit and active transportation in lieu of any vehicle capacity improvements.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Were local government consulted? Please provide the list of the actual organizations you reached out to and when you spoke with them.</p>	<p>The study team has engaged local government staff in the options development phase, and shared draft public engagement materials with local and regional government elected officials prior to launch. The study team anticipates further engagement with government staff this fall.</p> <p>A full list of stakeholders that have been contacted and met with will be available in the engagement summary report.</p>
<p>Local governments and tourism are not an accurate assessment of residents' opinions. There should be greater resident involvement.</p>	<p>As part of early engagement in 2021, the study team spoke with a number of organizations, including staff from local and regional governments, first responders, local business and economic development organizations, and community stakeholders. The study team used this input to help define the problem definition and the vision for this study and to confirm perceptions about historic route options.</p> <p>The current engagement phase seeks input from residents and the study team encourages everyone to complete the online survey.</p>
<p>The presentation appears to be different from what was posted last week on the website. Will this be available somewhere?</p>	<p>The presentation is structured differently than the display boards on the website to facilitate discussion; however, there is no new information in it.</p> <p>A presentation video will be shared.</p>
<p>Thank you all very much for the discussion and the work completed. Appreciate the engagement.</p>	<p>Thank you for attending.</p> <p>There will be an additional information session on June 29, 2022.</p>
<p>When engaging with the community, are you considering social media or local community Facebook pages?</p>	<p>During the public engagement period, the study team is monitoring publicly available social media and continuing to share information through Ministry social media channels. To ensure your input is considered, please complete the online feedback form.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Can we rank route preferences, or can we only select a single option?</p>	<p>The online feedback form asks for input on all options. It does not ask people to rank their preferences. Should you wish to do this, please use the open-ended response fields to note this additional feedback.</p>
<p>The online survey format is biased, which makes the "results" unreliable. For example, I want the "purple route" <i>[full alternate route]</i> through from the airport to Sechelt but I cannot select this as an option <i>[not one of the feasible options identified for engagement]</i>. Will you modify your online survey to allow more creative input?</p>	<p>The online feedback form invites respondents to share their preferences for the technically feasible options identified. Please use the open-ended response fields to share other input.</p> <p><i>Note: this response has been updated. During the public engagement session, the facilitator misunderstood the question as a challenge in selecting a preferred option in one area based on the preference in an adjacent area, rather than as a suggested new option.</i></p>
<p>Is this your intended form for public participation? Any chance of actual dialog?</p>	<p>In respect of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the Ministry's current practice for planning level studies is limited to online engagement.</p>
<p>Will questions asked in this session that have not been addressed be part of the official record of this meeting and be addressed in the future?</p>	<p>All the questions asked in the information sessions will be documented. Similar questions may be combined, and responses will be shared on the website.</p>
<p>What responses did you get from our local governments? Please be specific about each government's response(s).</p>	<p>District of Sechelt council and the Sunshine Coast Regional District board have acknowledged the update provided by the study team and requested additional dialogue after public engagement is complete.</p> <p>Gibsons council thanked the study team for the update and encouraged us to continue working with staff to complete the study.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Kindly publish all questions live when they are asked.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. To protect privacy of the participants, questions posted as “anonymous” will be shared through the Zoom Q&A tool.</p> <p>All the questions asked in the information sessions will be documented. Similar questions may be combined, and responses will be shared on the website.</p>
<p>Did you contact the Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Committee?</p>	<p>Not directly – with respect to community planning, engagement to date has been with local government staff, including the Sunshine Coast Regional District. Additionally, the study team reviewed all current Official Community Plans as part of initial analysis during the options development phase.</p>
<p>It was mentioned pre-consultation was completed in the Spring/Summer 2021 with community groups. However, the Roberts Creek Director nor the Official Community Plan Committee received any communication and the first they heard about this was 2 weeks ago. Can you explain?</p>	<p>The study team engaged with a number of different groups, including local/regional government staff, first responders and community organizations that previously indicated an interest in the study.</p> <p>The purpose of this public engagement process is to hear from everyone, including members of the public and community organizations, on their thoughts and input about what has been completed.</p>
<p>The Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Committee had previously expressed an interest in your study and yet were not reached out to with this new engagement.</p>	<p>The study team reviewed the Roberts Creek Official Community Plan as part of the analysis. The Ministry’s standard practice is to meet with local government staff and not the committees per se. The study team understands this committee may have provided input during the 2020 study, which also was considered as part of the development of options.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Will you have an opportunity to meet with the Sunshine Coast Highway Society?</p>	<p>The study team sought input from this group during the early engagement phase in follow up to their letter to the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure, and is aware that members of this group are participating in this public engagement process.</p>
<p>Will you, as a full team, come to meet with residents of Roberts Creek (those who are opposed to this as well as the Highway Society) to walk some of the roads you are proposing to impact and to have full meaningful dialogue with the whole neighbourhood/community who would be impacted if a couple of these routes are approved?</p>	<p>The study team appreciates your comments through the public info session or the feedback form. There are no plans to conduct a community walk-through or in-person open house at this time.</p> <p>The options put forward for public input are technically feasible based on work completed to date. The study team is seeking public input to help shortlist the options to complete additional detailed studies to further evaluate the options.</p> <p>Although this is a long-term study that is defining the corridor vision for next 30 years, for transparency, this information is shared as a high-level estimate of potential impact to support informed feedback. The current estimate of potential impacts is subject to change as the shortlisted options continue to be refined. Additional analysis and dialogue with local municipalities and communities would follow before selecting a preferred route.</p> <p>This approach follows the standard planning process for a corridor vision and technical feasibility assessment.</p>
<p>Can you please provide a link to the website? I don't see any reference to a previous session or a list of community groups you contacted.</p>	<p>A link to the website (gov.bc.ca/highway101) was provided during the information session.</p>
<p>Is using a pointer possible? <i>[asked during the presentation as options were being described].</i></p>	<p>The facilitator acknowledged the suggestion and obliged.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
When answering a question asking for more info on Roberts Creek, why are you showing the Sechelt map?	The facilitator acknowledged the suggestion and advanced the slide.
Please show all participants on the screen.	Participants in the information sessions were not shown on screen to respect their privacy.
Thank you for hosting [<i>the information sessions</i>].	The facilitator acknowledged the comment and thanked everyone for attending.



Other/general themes

Question	Study Team Response
<p>How many times did each of you visit the coast and drive the route?</p>	<p>All members of the study team are familiar with the area and have driven/walked the Highway 101 corridor; and some members of the team live there. The technical team has visited the area to complete research work on the terrain and conditions that has informed the study team's understanding of opportunities and constraints.</p> <p>The study is being conducted in collaboration with shishalh and Squamish Nations, who have lived in the area since time immemorial. Additionally, the Ministry draws upon the knowledge of employees who work in the area.</p>
<p>People that do not live on the coast should not be making decisions on what the future of the coast should be.</p>	<p>The study is being conducted in collaboration with shishalh and Squamish Nations, who have lived in the area since time immemorial. The Ministry draws upon the knowledge of employees who work in the area.</p> <p>The purpose of the public engagement process is to seek input from local residents to inform the shortlisting process and further analysis.</p>
<p>Are there any immediate plans for improving Chapman Creek Bridge?</p>	<p>Not at this time. The study will help inform future planning.</p>
<p>Is the current work at Orange/Joe Road pre-empting some of this work?</p>	<p>The Joe Road improvements are underway.</p> <p>The Ministry receives ongoing feedback from the community, maintenance contractor and Ministry staff in the field. Any safety-related issues are addressed as quick as possible.</p>



Question	Study Team Response
<p>Would an electric train connector along the hydro lines ever be a possibility? If people were out of their cars much of the traffic would be mitigated.</p>	<p>This is not part of the study scope as it may not serve the needs of all users. However, through the traffic sensitivity analysis, the study does consider the potential change in demand for the existing Highway 101 in a “high transit” scenario and confirmed that there would still need to be a designated highway corridor.</p>
<p>Has a future fixed link been considered for optimal alignment? I believe there was a recent study.</p>	<p>This study, completed in 2017, did not identify a preferred alignment. More information is available on the Ministry's website.</p>