



McLENNAN ROSS LLP
LEGAL COUNSEL

Our File Reference: 162612

Gavin S. Fitch, Q.C.
Direct Line: (403) 303-9120
e-mail: gfitc@mross.com

Radha Singh, Assistant
Direct Line: (403) 303-9112
e-mail: rsingh@mross.com

Fax: (403) 303-1668

PLEASE REPLY TO CALGARY OFFICE

March 26, 2021

SENT BY EMAIL

Natural Resources Conservation Board
19th Floor, 250 5th Street SW
Calgary, AB T2P 0R4

Attention: Laura Friend, Manager, Board Reviews

Dear Ms. Friend:

**Re: Alberta Transportation - Springbank Off-stream Reservoir Project
(SR1) - NRCB Application No. 1701**

Further to the above captioned matter, please find enclosed the response of Alberta Transportation to the undertaking given by Mr. Hebert on March 24, 2021 (see Vol 3; pg. 792; ln 23).

Yours truly,

GAVIN S. FITCH, Q.C.

MOC/rs
Enclosure

cc William Kennedy, General Counsel, Natural Resources Conservation Board
Ronald M. Kruhlak, Q.C., McLennan Ross LLP
Michael Barbero, McLennan Ross LLP
Marika Cherkawsky, McLennan Ross LLP

00162612 - 4139-6146-3084 v.1

Edmonton Office

600 McLennan Ross Building
12220 Stony Plain Road
Edmonton, AB T5N 3Y4
p. 780.482.9200
f. 780.482.9100
tf. 1.800.567.9200

Calgary Office

1900 Eau Claire Tower
600 – 3rd Avenue SW
Calgary, AB T2P 0G5
p. 403.543.9120
f. 403.543.9150
tf. 1.888.543.9120

Yellowknife Office

301 Nunasi Building
5109 – 48th Street
Yellowknife, NT X1A 1N5
p. 867.766.7677
f. 867.766.7678
tf. 1.888.836.6684

Springbank Off-stream Reservoir Project (SR1) - NRCB Application No. 1701

UNDERTAKING RESPONSE OF ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION																																	
Reference	Volume 3; March 24, 2021 Pg. 792 / ln. 23																																
Undertaking	To advise if AT would consider moving Springbank road to allow uninterrupted access for residents in the event of a design flood or a flood of record.																																
Response	<p>As part of the SR1 project design three options were considered for traffic along Springbank Road during high diversion events. These included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. raise Springbank Road, 2. retain existing Springbank Road and during significant diversion events detour traffic along Range Road 40 and Township Road 250, and 3. realign Springbank Road to the south along the top of the dam. <p>The evaluation of the three options considered the planning level construction cost, environmental and historical impacts, development impacts, flood impact (road remediation) cost, road user cost, and travel distance as outlined in the table below.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Option 1</th> <th>Option 2</th> <th>Option 3</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning Level Construction Cost</td> <td>○</td> <td>●</td> <td>◐</td> <td rowspan="2">Good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Environmental/ Historical</td> <td>○</td> <td>●</td> <td>◐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Development Impacts</td> <td>◐</td> <td>◐</td> <td>◐</td> <td rowspan="2">Average</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flood Impact/ Road Remediation (2013 flood event)</td> <td>●</td> <td>○</td> <td>●</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Road User Cost (RUC)</td> <td>●</td> <td>●</td> <td>○</td> <td rowspan="2">Poor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel Distance</td> <td>●</td> <td>●</td> <td>○</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Of significance in the evaluation of Option 2 was the estimate that Springbank Road would need to be closed for diversion events above approximately the 1:40 flood return period. This results in a relatively infrequent occurrence of traffic detours along Range Road 40 and Township Road 250.</p> <p>Option 2, as the preferred option, was presented to Rocky View County during engagement for the SR1 project. During discussions that took place on March 25, 2021 with Rocky View County, Alberta Transportation committed to upgrading Range Road 40 to a county collector as well as upgrading the intersection of Township Road 250 and Highway 22 as part of the preferred option. The upgrades can be completed prior to construction completion for the SR1 project.</p>		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3		Planning Level Construction Cost	○	●	◐	Good	Environmental/ Historical	○	●	◐	Development Impacts	◐	◐	◐	Average	Flood Impact/ Road Remediation (2013 flood event)	●	○	●	Road User Cost (RUC)	●	●	○	Poor	Travel Distance	●	●	○
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3																														
Planning Level Construction Cost	○	●	◐	Good																													
Environmental/ Historical	○	●	◐																														
Development Impacts	◐	◐	◐	Average																													
Flood Impact/ Road Remediation (2013 flood event)	●	○	●																														
Road User Cost (RUC)	●	●	○	Poor																													
Travel Distance	●	●	○																														