

BC FERRY CORPORATION

Horseshoe Bay Terminal Improvement Project

Report Outlining the
Recommendations for Mitigation
In Consultation With
The Horseshoe Bay Community Advisory Committee

July 2001

Tom Tasaka, P.Eng.
 **Pacific Liaison and Associates Inc.**
Consulting Engineers • Management Consultants
A202 – 3823 Henning Drive, Burnaby, BC V5C 6P3
Tel: (604) 299-8860 Fax: (604) 299-8722

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1-1
1.1	Terms of Reference.....	1-1
2	Background.....	2-1
2.1	The current project.....	2-1
2.2	The construction program.....	2-2
2.3	Area Maps.....	2-3
3	Community concerns	3-1
3.1	Community Impact	3-1
3.2	Traffic Safety Issues Related to Proposed Design	3-1
3.3	Air Quality	3-1
3.4	Terminal Holding Compound.....	3-2
3.5	Long-Term Planning.....	3-2
4	The Work of the Committee.....	4-1
4.1	Acknowledgement	4-1
4.2	Concerns with the Mandate of the Advisory Process	4-1
4.3	Fundamental positions	4-2
4.4	Mitigation Measures	4-2
5	Facilitator's Recommendations.....	5-1
5.1	Project Design.....	5-1
5.2	Specific Recommendations	5-1
5.2.1	<i>Air Quality.....</i>	<i>5-1</i>
5.2.2	<i>Long Term Strategic Planning.....</i>	<i>5-2</i>
5.2.3	<i>Transportation Demand Management</i>	<i>5-2</i>
5.2.4	<i>Traffic Safety</i>	<i>5-2</i>
5.2.5	<i>Mitigation During Construction</i>	<i>5-3</i>
5.2.6	<i>On-Site Design Impact Mitigation</i>	<i>5-3</i>
5.2.7	<i>Off-Site Mitigation</i>	<i>5-4</i>
5.2.8	<i>Community Liaison Committee.....</i>	<i>5-4</i>
6	References	6-1

Appendices

I	Terms of Reference
---	--------------------

1 Introduction

On June 28, 2001, the Honourable Judith Reid, Minister of Transportation and minister responsible for the BC Ferry Corporation (BCFC) appointed the Horseshoe Bay Community Advisory Committee (the “Committee”) to “find reasonable ways to mitigate the concerns the local community has with the Horseshoe Bay ferry terminal improvement project (the “project”)”. The Minister appointed me to facilitate the committee’s discussions and present my report outlining mitigation recommendations for the Minister’s consideration.

This report presents two views: the community’s concerns and views as represented by the members of the Committee; and my views based on hearing the Committee through this process combined with my own experience and professional opinion. The text makes it clear which of these views is being expressed.

1.1 Terms of Reference

The Minister provided the Committee with terms of reference (*attached as Appendix I*). These terms of reference specified the scope of the work required and also stated that to minimize any negative financial impact from delaying the existing contracts, I should present this report within three weeks. Briefly, the terms of reference were:

- That the Committee would consist of two representatives of the District of West Vancouver Council (Councilor Alan Williams and Councilor Bill Soprovich), three members of the local community (Liz Byrd, John Moonen and Dr. Bryce Kelpin. John Roberts was later appointed as alternate), and myself, Tom Tasaka, as Facilitator¹.
- That the Committee looks for reasonable ways to mitigate local community concerns within the context of the government’s expressed need to honour existing contracts.
- That the Committee lists community concerns in priority order and suggests mitigation measures. My role would be to facilitate this discussion and investigate the proposed mitigation measures to the end of proposing reasonable and achievable mitigation measures.
- That the concerned residents know that their issues have been dealt with in an unbiased way that is fair and reasonable.

The Committee began work immediately upon appointment and met numerous times over the next three weeks. Committee meetings were held on June 29, July 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 19 respectively.

¹ Other attendees included Mayor Ron Wood, West Vancouver, Dave Stuart, West Vancouver Administrator, Colin Wright, Municipal Engineer, Maria Malcolm, West Vancouver Clerks Office, Steve Nicholls, West Vancouver Planning department, Gordon MacKay, West Vancouver Traffic Engineering and Steve Billington, Pacific Liaison & Associates Community Relations.

2 Background

BC Ferry Corporation's Horseshoe Bay Terminal (the "terminal") has been in operation for several decades and currently handles over 2.5 million vehicles and 7 million passengers per year transiting three routes to and from Vancouver Island, the Sunshine Coast and Bowen Island. The terminal is adjacent to the community of Horseshoe Bay, within the District of West Vancouver. Although the terminal is entirely within the boundaries of West Vancouver it serves as a significant component of the regional transportation network. It is a vital link between the Lower Mainland and the Sunshine Coast and Bowen Island and serves as an important gateway to central and northern Vancouver Island.

In recent years the terminal has been unable to contain vehicles waiting to board ferries on at least one hundred days of the year¹ and traffic backs up out of the existing vehicle holding area onto westbound Highway 1. Projected growth of 2 per cent per year would further increase the overflow onto the highway unless an effective solution is implemented as a priority. Horseshoe Bay currently has the smallest vehicle holding capacity (650) of all the major terminals.² Current traffic overflows on the highway are a hazard for the driving public and have been a major motivation for plans to increase the holding capacity of the terminal.

In 1980 and 1990, BC Ferries undertook the preparation of expansion plans for the terminal. These plans envisaged a large-scale expansion of the operational, vehicle holding and parking infrastructure of the terminal, however these plans were deferred due to the high cost and significant visual impact on Horseshoe Bay. The terminal expansion plans included a double-decking proposal in the early nineties, and a proposed maintenance facility in close proximity to the village in the mid-nineties.

The shortcomings of the terminal, which were not addressed in 1981 and 1991, have now developed to the point where solutions need to be found as a priority.

2.1 The current project

Since June of 1999, BCFC has been in the process of planning the current terminal project. Construction has been underway for several months but many project components are currently on hold pending completion of this report. The overall project is broken into several contractual components, of which approximately 30% have yet to be awarded.³

The current project scope includes:

- a new maintenance building located to the east of Berth #3, at some distance from the village;
- a new passenger/administration building, complete with "kiss and ride" drop area and short-term parking;
- a 450 vehicle parkade under the holding compound;
- a new tollbooth plaza area consisting of 9 booths located near the Highway 99 Overpass;
- and

¹ Some estimates are that overflow conditions occur on over half the days in the year.

² Langdale has the next-smallest capacity at 800.

³ Value of contracts awarded = \$19.4 m. Remaining value of works to be awarded = \$8.3 m.

- an increase in the size of the holding compound from the current 650 automobile-equivalent capacity (AEQ)⁴ to a total 1265 AEQ.

2.2 The construction program

The construction program for the project has been planned in multiple stages to allow terminal activities to continue with the least disruption possible throughout construction. Construction commenced in January 2001 with the Stage 1 Roadworks contracts, which are now complete.

Some of the other contracts are currently ongoing, including construction of the foot passenger/administration building, construction of the first third (the most westerly portion) of the parkade and some widening of the roadway near Exit 1 to improve site-specific safety and to allow improved access to the terminal during the busy summer season. However, much of the other construction work is currently on hold pending the release of this report.

The current status of the construction program components, is as follows:

PROGRAM COMPONENT	STATUS
STAGE 1 ROADWORKS Remove Argyle Street overpass Install new traffic signal for Keith Road access Excavate for west third of parkade	Complete Complete Complete
HIGHWAY 1, EXIT 1 REALIGNMENT Clear and grub Rock blast, excavate and crush	AWARDED – ON HOLD Partially complete Not started – on hold
STAGE 2 ROADWORKS Temporary employee parking area Exit 1 “west widening” for improved access Underground utilities Grading and paving – tollbooth plaza	AWARDED – PARTLY ON HOLD Under construction Under construction On hold On hold
STAGE 3 ROADWORKS Excavate for east two-thirds of parkade Grade and pave holding compound	DESIGN STAGE – 50% COMPLETE Yet to be tendered Yet to be tendered
PARKADE Construction of west third Construction of east two-thirds	AWARDED Under construction Awaiting Stage 3 excavation
TOLLBOOTH PLAZA BUILDINGS	NOT YET AWARDED – ON HOLD

Continued over

⁴ Automobile-equivalent is the number of average-sized cars the space would hold. Longer vehicles such as tractor-trailer units take up more than one AEQ space.

TERMINAL MAINTENANCE BUILDING Rock excavation and site preparation Building construction	ON HOLD Awarded – on hold Yet to be tendered
FOOT PASSENGER/ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	AWARDED – UNDER CONSTRUCTION
FERRY TERMINAL ELECTRICAL, TELECOM, DATA, AND SIGNAGE	DESIGN STAGE – 25% COMPLETE

2.3 Area Maps

Attached as *Appendix II* are two maps showing the ferry terminal and Horseshoe Bay area before the project commenced (existing conditions) and what the new infrastructure and the surrounding area will look like when complete (general arrangement).

3 Community concerns

This section of the report represents the existing community views and concerns as expressed by the Committee and from documented comments made at various public meetings.

3.1 Community Impact

The expansion of the Horseshoe Bay ferry terminal and associated infrastructure has been a contentious issue in the local community, particularly because of the geographic conditions and the proximity of the village and residential neighborhoods.

In the two years since development plans began, the current project has generated fierce opposition from local residents who have consistently claimed that the project will negatively impact the community and that the proposed design does not address long-term solutions.

The Committee unanimously acknowledges that the traffic safety issue related to overflow parking on Highway 1 needs to be addressed. However, the Committee feels that the scale of community impacts for any change to terminal configuration must be taken into consideration in all current and future plans because a relatively small change to BCFC's overall operation equates to significant change for local residents in the village of Horseshoe Bay.

3.2 Traffic Safety Issues Related to Proposed Design

The Committee is concerned that the current design introduces a number of new traffic safety issues. On this point, the District of West Vancouver retained a consultant, Bunt and Associates, to review the current design and they identified a number of issues that warrant further review.

One of a number of concerns raised by Bunt and Associates is with respect to the complex divergence point on Highway 1 east of the contemplated tollbooth plaza. This divergence point necessitates multiple complex decisions be made by drivers moving at highway speeds for lane choice, speed reduction, and destination decisions on a compound curve with potential heavy traffic situations.

The Committee insists that BCFC must respond to and address the traffic safety issues identified by Bunt and Associates prior to resuming construction. In addition, the design must take into consideration future major improvements to Highway 99.

3.3 Air Quality

The Committee has stressed that the current design has ignored the concerns of the village of Horseshoe Bay with respect to air quality issues. The Committee was clear that the air quality modeling currently being undertaken jointly by the GVRD and BCFC to determine potential impacts of terminal expansion be completed and that appropriate mitigation measures be clearly laid out in advance before construction resumes. Furthermore, air quality monitoring should be ongoing to ensure that the threshold levels as laid out by the agencies are not exceeded.

3.4 Terminal Operations

The Committee continues to question the premise of a need to increase the size of the existing holding compound. They argue that other terminal operation alternatives must be further investigated, such as:

- consideration of Westport as a ticketing and supplemental holding area; and
- implementation of a full reservation system.

The Committee's feeling is that a full reservation system will reduce the line-ups and would only require a moderate capacity increase to the holding compound.¹ The concern with expansion of the existing holding compound is that safety, visual, auditory and access impacts are all increased for the village with resultant decrease in quality of life for area residents.

3.5 Long-Term Planning

Another issue brought forward by the Committee was the need for a long-term, multi-modal transportation study and implementation plan to deal with increasing ferry traffic (e.g. considering a third Lower Mainland to Vancouver Island ferry crossing; passenger-only ferry service from downtown Vancouver to Vancouver Island, Gibsons/Langdale and Bowen Island; improved transit service to the terminal; additional ferry sailings on various routes, etc.). Community members and the District of West Vancouver feel strongly that reducing Vancouver Island traffic out of Horseshoe Bay would have positive effects for the travelling public. They acknowledge that services to Bowen Island and the Sunshine Coast must remain in Horseshoe Bay, but a much-reduced service for the Vancouver Island link (out of Horseshoe Bay) in the future should limit the need for an increase in holding capacity at the terminal.

The Committee stressed that the study should be conducted with proper public consultation with all stakeholders.

¹ A study conducted by McElhanney Engineering in 1999 states that for a full reservation system at Horseshoe Bay, a holding compound of 980 AEQ would be required.

4 The Work of the Committee

This section of the report deals with the Committee's views as presented by the its members during the past three weeks. I should note that as facilitator of the Advisory Committee, my role was to take an objective approach and work with the Committee to find mitigative strategies to deal with the Community concerns. Therefore, the Committee's views as presented below are not necessarily mine. My own recommendations follow in section 5 and represent a synthesis of the Committee's views and my own opinions based on my understanding of the issues, observations of the current dynamic and my own experience.

4.1 Acknowledgement

I wish to acknowledge the dedication and the considerable amount of effort that the Committee has put into this advisory process during the past three weeks. The Committee met as a formal group on eight separate occasions and some members continued a dialogue with the residents in the community in the intervening days between meetings. The District of West Vancouver hosted the meetings and their staff participated in the meetings and provided invaluable input in addition to providing support services. Their efforts are much appreciated.

4.2 Concerns with the Mandate of the Advisory Committee

The Committee acknowledges that they now have been given the opportunity for input on matters that have been a concern for many months. Despite this, the frustration expressed by most Committee members is that the limited scope of this advisory process was inadequate in resolving the larger issues. The Committee's feeling is that the mandate was structured such that BCFC's needs were paramount (i.e. the project continues with some late-stage community input) rather than the community's needs (i.e. the project only continues subject to safety assessments and community approval). This fundamental disagreement with the premise of creating the advisory Committee was a considerable obstacle to them accepting the limited mandate as set out.

Another fundamental problem that cropped up was the Committee's lack of trust in BCFC. I acknowledge that there is strong perception within the community, as conveyed by the Committee members, of a lack of planning and community participation on BCFC's part. Determining if this is the case or not is outside my mandate and regardless of what has transpired up to this point, I could not stress enough to the Committee that our focus should remain on finding mitigative solutions and move ahead positively.

In the end the Committee would only agree to speak to community concerns in general, acknowledging that this report would represent two views: that of the members of the Committee and that of my recommendations for mitigation measures.

There was also concern on the Committee's part that the potential mitigation measures recommended in this report are mere details of the project now under construction and these measures do not materially change the overall concept with which the Committee continues to take issue.

4.3 Fundamental positions

Before undertaking this advisory process, Committee members tabled a set of three fundamental positions that they wanted on record:

Fundamental Position #1: The current expansion is designed to perform a function that serves only a short-sighted objective, is based on inadequate or superficial assessment and ignores any short- or long-term planning and analysis.

Fundamental Position #2: BC Ferries must redesign the terminal to achieve maximum safety for and enhance service to the users of the highway and ferry systems and reduce the impact on the host community.

Fundamental Position #3: BC Ferries must create a long-term plan that integrates its operations into local and regional transportation systems.

4.4 Mitigation Measures

Despite the Committee's disagreement with the project in general, as exemplified through their three fundamental positions, the Committee developed the following set of basic principles with which to assess the impact of the various project components and suggest possible alternatives or mitigation measures:

1. Health and safety (for motorists, pedestrians, passengers, workers and residents in adjacent communities).
2. Service (access to service, reduced waiting times, amenities and enhanced services to the travelling public using the westernmost portion of Highway 1 known as Upper Levels highway, Sea to Sky highway and the ferry system).
3. Environmental improvements (all transportation and development activity impacts upon the environment – every effort must be made to mitigate potential damage and contribute in a positive way to environmental conditions).
4. Flexibility in project design (in a changing environment sufficient flexibility must be built into the design to allow for changes necessary to meet changing future needs).
5. Cost efficiency (effective use of financial, human and other resources).
6. Comprehensive long-term planning and analysis must be accepted as an essential ingredient in a project involving significant expenditures of public money on public facilities and services and is critical in the case of provincial transportation systems requiring integration with local and regional transportation systems.
7. Relationship with local communities (provincial projects and services must seek to work with and support local communities, improving quality of life rather than worsening it).
8. Economic sustainability (provincial projects should add to the long-term economic sustainability of the province and the local community).

A tabulation of the Committee's review of each of the major project components (maintenance building; parkade; foot passenger building and short-term parking lot; and holding compound) using the basic principles as set out above is attached as *Table 4-1, Issues Matrix*.

I should note that the Committee was not receptive to the idea of considering only mitigation options without considering fundamental changes to the design and implementation of the entire project. Suggestions were made for operational changes and better long-term planning in an effort to reduce traffic at this terminal.

The Committee brought forward many legitimate concerns. As a group they worked hard both through this special committee process and earlier through previous processes to do what they felt was right and best for the community.

The main areas of concern as specifically related to design issues are:

- Unnecessary increase in size of the holding compound that extends terminal impacts into the community and interferes with ease of access to the village;
- The potential for increased air pollution as a result of expanding the holding compound; and
- Traffic safety on Upper Levels highway, Sea to Sky highway, approaches into the village of Horseshoe Bay and access to the parkade and all terminal facilities.

Table 4-1: Issues matrix

Preliminary Assessment of Ferry Terminal project components' impact on the basic principles established by the Committee.

- + positive impact relative to the basic principle
- = neutral/no impact relative to the basic principle
- negative impact relative to the basic principle
- N/A indicates unknown impact/effect relative to the basic principle and therefore was not assessed

Project Components	8 BASIC PRINCIPLES								Comments/Concerns	Possible Alternatives/Suggested Mitigation Measures
	Safety	Service	Environment	Flexibility/ Ability to Meet L/T Needs	Cost-efficiency	Integrated with Regional Transportation Plan	Relationship with Local Communities	Positive Economic Impact on Horseshoe Bay		
Maintenance Building	=	=	-	+	+	=	=	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible noise • hazardous materials • spills • blasting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise mitigation • no ferry fuel storage • minimize blasting
Parkade	=	+	-	+	N/A	+	-	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transients/passenger safety • poorly designed vehicle access/egress • obtrusive visual impact on community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve vehicle access/exit • mitigate visual impact by moving further away from community and improved landscaping • consider terracing of design/landscaping
Foot Passenger Building & Temporary Parking Lot	+	+	=	+	N/A	+	=	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vehicle access • unattractive building design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review signal and traffic patterns • review building façade to make more compatible with community • look for better integration with Horseshoe Bay to encourage pedestrian visitors • greening of parking lot • Bay businesses benefit from parking lot operation • waterfront beautification/cleanup
Holding Compound (including tollbooth plaza, transportation access issues, including access to Terminal facilities, signal access to Horseshoe Bay and Sea to Sky access)	-	-	-	-	N/A	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unsafe vehicle access to and egress from tollbooths • no access to tollbooths from Horseshoe Bay or from Highway 99 • single lane access to Horseshoe Bay • single lane access to compound • immediate negative impact on Highway 99 access; Exit 2; truck/brake check • traffic confusion • inadequate signage re highway lane divergence • very confusing signage • building for more capacity than required if reservation system introduced or other operational changes made, i.e., a modified schedule of arrivals or departures or increased no. of sailings) • air pollution concerns for waiting passengers and community • short shelf life of current design (will need expansion in less than seven years) • no demand management in practice (reinforces use of vehicles rather than encourages passenger only alternatives) • insufficient planning/studies • grade/slope still extreme for parking • loss of runaway lanes • design perpetuates culture of waiting • proximity to school • visual and noise impact • destruction of community ambiance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review tollbooth area and queuing to ensure it works • deal with highway divergence issues by moving decision points up the highway • review traffic pattern • remove traffic signal and provide access to Bay via a 2 lane grade-separated route along side of parkade (this will also allow two lanes into compound) • review signage program recognizing both ferries and Horseshoe Bay • complete long-term plans – integrate into local/regional transportation plans • reduce capacity to that required to handle reservation system • complete air quality modelling and examine operational changes to reduce air pollution • build a highway to Port Mellon • relocate holding compound to Westport Road • minimize/redirect majority of Nanaimo run traffic • introduce a reservation system, with full reservability • provide no charge/discount reservations to encourage use • introduce or consider Bowen/Langdale passenger ferry to reduce traffic • increase number of sailings • review sailing scheduling and operations (including fee structure) • provide better landscaping solutions to mitigate noise and visual concerns • improve community linkages to support tourism and economic sustainability

5 Facilitator's Recommendations

5.1 Project Design

It appears to me that the terminal improvements as proposed are conceptually reasonable. My general comment on each of the major design components is as follows:

Holding Compound

I believe that increasing the holding compound capacity to 1265 AEQ and increasing the number of tollbooths from six to nine is a reasonable design that is appropriate for the projected traffic within a terminal accommodating three distinct routes, of which two can be considered as major routes. The selected location for the holding compound is in my opinion an optimal solution for its size.

Parkade

The provision of 450 long-term parking spaces, of which 150 are reserved for staff is reasonable, based on the projected demand at this terminal and also by comparison to other terminals.

Foot Passenger Building and Short-Term Parking

The foot passenger building to accommodate the kiss and ride operation complete with a provision of 180 short-term parking to replace the present totally inadequate facility on Bay St. is a major improvement to traffic safety and customer service.

Terminal Maintenance Building

The terminal maintenance building being located inside the terminal away from village sight lines has no significant impact on the community.

5.2 Specific Recommendations

5.2.1 Air Quality

Once the joint GVRD and BCFC air quality modeling study is complete, create a mitigation plan to deal with potential negative effects of emissions, if such are positively identified. Furthermore, regardless of the study results, continue with a monitoring program to confirm compliance.

Continue to place on hold work related to blasting, rock removal and toll booth plaza preparations near the Highway 99 Overpass until the study results and the mitigation plan (if required) have been made public. In order to minimize unnecessary delay costs, BCFC should proceed with tendering remaining works but not award any further contracts until this condition has been met. The tender documents must have cancellation clauses and flexibility to include design revisions.

Regardless of the results of the air quality modeling study, incremental improvements to air quality in the terminal area should be promoted by amending operational procedures, such as:

- Requiring vehicles in the holding compound to turn off their engines while waiting; and
- Reducing the queue at the tollbooth as soon as possible by opening the spare tollbooths in a timely manner.

5.2.2 Long Term Strategic Planning

As with any community, the residents of Horseshoe Bay are quite justified in their concerns regarding long-term community growth and transportation planning. Questions regarding BCFC's long term plans for the terminal are legitimate and must be addressed, such as: "what is going to happen in 20 years?" and "will BCFC be increasing the holding compound again?"

BCFC should develop a long-term strategy in consultation with all stakeholders, including municipal governments and local communities. This strategy should integrate with local and regional transportation plans and community development plans.

5.2.3 Transportation Demand Management

In the short to medium term, BCFC and the Province should develop a plan to implement appropriate and effective Transportation Demand Management (TDM) to manage further increases in traffic, especially during peak times, which cause the majority of the traffic problems at the terminal. Techniques that must be considered include:

- Introducing a full reservation system to replace the first-come-first-served system, first for the Nanaimo service as a pilot project and if successful, to be followed by full reservation for the Langdale service;
- Partner with transit agencies to improve bus services to and from the terminal to encourage more foot passenger use of the ferry;
- Review the toll structure, including parking fees, to encourage the use of transit instead of driving to the terminal and parking.

5.2.4 Traffic Safety

BCFC must address traffic safety issues related to the design as identified by Bunt and Associates and communicate the solutions to the Committee and District of West Vancouver Engineering Dept. prior to proceeding with construction of those design components.

Major issues identified include:

- The divergence point for Highway 99 northbound traffic and the traffic to the ferry terminal and the village of Horseshoe Bay. The safety assessment should take into consideration the future upgrading of Highway 99.

- The operation of the queuing area at the approach area of the tollbooths.
- The at-grade signalized traffic intersection at Douglas Street. I recommend maintaining this design, but by modeling continuously monitor and upgrade its operation for maximum efficiency. In addition, confirm that this entire access is a road right-of-way to ensure it will not be closed in the future.
- The existing Highway 99 and Marine Drive intersection – determine present and future operation. If upgrading is required, include this in future highway improvement programs.

5.2.5 Mitigation During Construction

The Construction Manager appears to have the following under control, but during construction these need to be enforced or ensured:

- Haul trucks be 1994 models or newer to ensure that the most up-to-date emissions standards apply to on-road trucks;
- Ongoing maintenance of exhaust systems on construction equipment;
- Ongoing maintenance of muffling equipment on construction equipment and haul vehicles for noise reduction;
- Unpaved surfaces should be frequently watered to control dust in construction areas. Consider paving high-use temporary roads and detours. Water spray spoil and storage dumping operations to reduce dust; and
- Work conforms to all local and regional bylaws.

5.2.6 On-Site Design Impact Mitigation

On-site design impact mitigation measures should be provided along the western boundary of the terminal, from the passenger/administration building to the proposed tollbooth plaza area, to address the visual and sound impacts on the community from the expanded holding compound and parkade. The mitigation measures should enhance the area by providing a theme in keeping with the village atmosphere. The measures could be developed by a landscape architect/urban designer in consultation with the community and the municipality and could include features such as:

- Improvements to Ron's Walk area by replacement of removed trees, terraced planting on the steep slopes and repair of walkway surfaces;
- Addition of decorative fencing and additional trees in selected areas to act as a buffer to reduce the noise and visual impacts on the adjoining properties;
- Upgrading of Keith Road bus-bay area as a pedestrian-friendly zone with wider sidewalks and streetscaping, including pedestrian-oriented lighting to fit into the village theme;

- Provision of landscaping to the short-term parking lot. Consider free parking within this lot for patrons of the businesses in the Horseshoe Bay village;
- Consider providing a picnic/dog walk/amenities facility in the vacant area to the east side of the holding compound north of the Marine Drive overpass; and
- Ensure direct pedestrian access from the holding compound to the village is maintained.

5.2.7 Off-Site Mitigation

In partnership with the District of West Vancouver consider projects such as:

- Construction of a waterfront boardwalk between the terminal and Government Dock;
- Upgrading of the municipal waterfront park to mitigate damage/litter in part caused by ferry users; and
- Connect these improvements to Ron's Walk to create a complete pedestrian-oriented thoroughfare with the village.

5.2.8 Community Liaison Committee

The present Committee should continue as a Community Liaison Committee to work with the BCFC project team to develop the mitigation measures recommended above and to provide input throughout the construction phase.

6 References

Reference was made to the following reports:

BCFC (1999) Horseshoe Bay Development Plan Review.

BCFC (2001) Reservations Strategy.

BCFC (2001) Horseshoe Bay Improvement Project: Project Report for Government Transition Team.

BC Ministry of Transportation and Highways (not dated) Questions and Answers: Rockwork and Highway 99 North Re-alignment in Preparation of Horseshoe Bay Terminal Improvement Project.

BKL Consultants Ltd. (2000) Noise Impact Assessment for Proposed Improvements to Horseshoe Bay Ferry Terminal.

Bunt and Associates (2001) Horseshoe Bay Terminal Improvement Project Traffic Operations Review.

District of West Vancouver (2001) Horseshoe Bay Improvement Project Correspondence.

McElhanney Engineering (1999) Draft Report to BC Ferries Terminal Construction for Horseshoe Bay Terminal Holding Expansion.

PBK Engineering (1991) B.C. Ferry Corporation Horseshoe Bay Ferry Terminal Uplands Redevelopment. [Double-decking proposal]

Supreme Court of British Columbia (2001) Gleneagles Concerned Parents Committee Society vs. British Columbia Ferry Corporation – Reasons for Judgement

Appendix I

Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Horseshoe Bay Community Advisory Committee

Structure:

The committee will consist of representatives of West Vancouver Municipal Council, local groups concerned about the terminal work, (preferably total of four individuals who are willing to work on ways to mitigate the impacts of the ferry terminal expansion on the local community and are fair minded as well as being representative of the community), and Mr. Tom Tasaka who will act as facilitator.

Purpose:

The committee's purpose is to find reasonable ways to mitigate the concerns that the local community has with the terminal improvement project. This has to be done with the understanding that the government wishes to continue with the project and honour existing contracts.

Method

The committee will list the concerns of the community, prioritize them and suggest ways that those concerns can be mitigated. The facilitator will investigate the proposed mitigation measures with the full co-operation of BC Ferries. From this, the facilitator will propose a set of mitigation measures that he considers reasonable and achievable within the context of the project, discuss these with the committee, and then report out to the Minister through the Chair of the Board of the BC Ferry Corporation.

Results Expected

The residents will know that their issues have been dealt with in an unbiased way that is fair and reasonable. They will receive the information necessary to help them understand the problems facing government, such as government having to honour the contracts that have been let, as well as information as to the project to address their concerns. BC Ferries will work with the facilitator on an ongoing basis to look for solutions and implement all reasonable suggestions. The BC Ferry Corporation will implement those measures that the Minister and the Chair of the Board have agreed to, and liaise with the community throughout the rest of the project to minimize the impacts of the construction activity. BC Ferry Corporation may wish to use Mr. Tasaka to assist in this ongoing process. It is important that the contact person from BC Ferries is acceptable to the community and has appropriate authority with the Corporation's organization to effectively represent the community's concerns.

Time Frame

To minimize any negative financial impact from delaying the existing contracts, time is of the essence. The process should start immediately. The committee should work intensively over the next two weeks and the facilitator should present his report as soon as possible but no later than one week after that.

June 28, 2001