Preliminary Design and Class Environmental Assessment for the Wolfe Island Ferry and Docking Improvements

Community Advisory Group Meeting #2

June 7, 2016
CAG Meeting #1 Recap

- CAG purpose, role and operating procedures
- Study overview presentation
  - Objectives, components, process, schedule, etc.
- Plenary sharing of perspective
  - KnoWonder exercise
  - Key questions the Study needs to address
  - Key contextual considerations
- Breakout group — topic exploration
  - Problems and potential solutions:
    - Terminal-related (vehicle marshalling; pedestrians/cyclists; service facilities; other)
    - Ferry-related
- Open forum and next steps
- Meeting summary: *Errors or omissions?* 
  GLPi
Public Meeting Summary

• **Attendance**
  - 110-130 people – on Wolfe Island (June 1)
  - 30-35 people – in Kingston (June 2)

• **People were generally supportive of the alternatives and the study’s progress so far.**

• **Other comments received:**
  - some felt that the facilities were too large – too much parking and marshalling
  - concerns about water/ice flow around the new terminals
  - concerns about visual impacts
  - many were interested to know the costs of the improvements
  - concerns about an aging population and accessibility of the ferry and terminals
  - some felt that these improvements would necessitate fares/tolls and/or significant growth and development on the island
  - many would like to have seen information on the proposed ferry
  - most people were interested in how the service would be operated – i.e. both boats to Marysville in summer, restricting truck traffic through Marysville and only operation one boat at certain times of the year, etc.
Generation and Evaluation Process

Step 1: Develop Service Scenarios and Complete Coarse Level Screening to Determine Reasonable Alternatives

Step 2: Generate Terminal Improvements to Address Service Scenarios

Step 3: Evaluate and Select the Best Terminal Improvement for Each Category

Step 4: Evaluate and Select the Best Service Scenario Option

Preliminary Recommendation

To be completed after PIC #1.
Step 1: Develop Service Scenarios

- **SS1 - Kingston to Marysville (Dawson Point Decommissioned)**
  - Year round access to Marysville for both ferries
  - No access to Dawson Point

- **SS2 - Kingston to Dawson Point (Marysville Decommissioned)**
  - Year round access to Dawson Point for both ferries
  - No access to Marysville

- **SS3 - Dual Ferry Operations - Status Quo/Seasonal Access**
  - Flexibility to provide access to Marysville for both ferries under certain weather/water conditions
  - Similar operations to existing - no access to Marysville during the winter

- **SS4 - Dual Ferry Operations - Year round access to Marysville**
  - Flexibility for potential year round access for both ferries to access both island terminals
Step 1: Screening Recommendations

- **SS1 - Kingston to Marysville (Dawson Point Decommissioned)**
  - Impacts the village (noise, traffic, etc) and does not provide the benefits of access to Dawson Point (redundancy, relief from heavy / agricultural vehicles, etc)
  - **Eliminated from future consideration**

- **SS2 - Kingston to Dawson Point (Marysville Decommissioned)**
  - Provides relief to the village from heavy / agricultural vehicles but results in business / tourism impacts to the village and out-of-way travel
  - **Eliminated from future consideration**

- **SS3 - Dual Ferry Operations - Status Quo/Seasonal Access**
  - Provides the flexibility to avoid the impacts of heavy / agricultural vehicles on the village and to provide service to the village during the peak periods to support local businesses
  - **Carried forward for further consideration**

- **SS4 - Dual Ferry Operations - Year round access to Marysville**
  - Provides flexibility to avoid the impacts of heavy / agricultural vehicles and provides service to the village all year round to support local businesses
  - **Carried forward for further consideration**
Evaluation Criteria

- Evaluation will consider the positive and negative impacts of the alternatives
- Each alternative will have a different set of positive and negative impacts
- To assist the Study Team, we would appreciate your views on which evaluation criteria should be given greater or lesser emphasis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Impacts to be considered</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>• Private Residences&lt;br&gt;• Businesses&lt;br&gt;• Farmland&lt;br&gt;• Aesthetic Impacts&lt;br&gt;• Emergency Services&lt;br&gt;• Changes to noise sensitive receptors&lt;br&gt;• Changes in traffic patterns&lt;br&gt;• Municipal Planning Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>• Designated Natural Areas&lt;br&gt;• Vegetation&lt;br&gt;• Aquatic Habitat&lt;br&gt;• Species at Risk&lt;br&gt;• Air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>• Built heritage resources&lt;br&gt;• Cultural heritage resources&lt;br&gt;• Potentials for archaeological finds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>VEHICLE AND VESSEL OPERATIONS</td>
<td>• Vessel loading/unloading&lt;br&gt;• Vehicle movement in and out of the terminal&lt;br&gt;• Parking&lt;br&gt;• Transit integration&lt;br&gt;• Operational flexibility of the vessel&lt;br&gt;• Impact to external road network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS</td>
<td>• Pedestrian/Cyclist circulation&lt;br&gt;• Pedestrian/Cyclist vessel loading&lt;br&gt;• Pedestrian/Cyclist to waiting locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTRUCTABILITY</td>
<td>• Bubbler systems&lt;br&gt;• Dredging&lt;br&gt;• Impacts to the user and vessel during construction&lt;br&gt;• Complexity/duration of construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>• Total cost of construction&lt;br&gt;• Cost of the project over its lifetime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatives for each of the 3 ferry docks were generated based on the following criteria:

1. The Service Scenarios carried forward:
   a. Service Scenario SS3, with seasonal access to Marysville; and
   b. Service Scenario SS4, with year round access to Marysville

2. Able to accommodate all vessels that may use the system
3. Ability to accommodate all facilities required to support the ferry services, including:
   a. Parking (Public / Priority / Staff)
   b. Marshalling (Destination / Priority / General)
   c. Buildings (Passenger / Services)
   d. Drop-off and Pickups
   e. Docking Ramps

4. Ingresses, Egresses and Integration with Municipal traffic and transit systems.
5. Engineering requirements, including:
   a. Coastal Engineering
   b. Structural and foundations
   c. Traffic Engineering

6. Services

7. Operational requirements (flexibility)
Project Cost has not been determined at this time.
Some alternatives for Kingston were screened out after meeting with CFB Kingston due to:

- Security
- Heritage; and
- Environmental impacts
Kingston Alternatives

Alternatives Applicable to SS3 and SS4

• K1 – Expansion to Queen Street Dock Property
• K2 – Similar to K1 with Inbound from Queen Street
• K3 – Vessel Docking In Line With Approach
Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.

- **259 Lane-m of Marshalling for Heavy Vehicles**
- **Dual Left Turn Lanes Departing Terminal**
- **Maintains Northern Edge of Pier**
- **Two Passenger Waiting Areas Including Indoor Sheltered Space**
- **Two Permanent Docking Spaces and Ramps**
- **Passenger Pick Up and Drop Off**
- **93 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 5 Accessible**
- **Split Marshalling 73 Small Vehicle Spaces to Dawson Point**
- **60 Small Vehicle Spaces to Marysville**

**PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**
Kingston Alternative K2

Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.

- Outbound Traffic via The Tragically Hip Way
- Dual Left Turn Lanes Departing Terminal
- 218 Lane-m of Marshalling for Heavy Vehicles
- Split Marshalling: 89 Small Vehicle Spaces to Dawson Point, 92 Small Vehicle Spaces to Marysville
- Two Passenger Waiting Areas Including Indoor Sheltered Space
- Intersection Improvements Including Widening of The Tragically Hip Way
- 95 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 5 Accessible
- Passenger Pick Up and Drop Off
- Two Permanent Docking Spaces and Ramps

PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
Kingston Alternative K3

Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.

- All Ferry Traffic Diverted to Intersection
- Dual Left Turn Lanes Departing Terminal
- 182 Lane-m of Marshalling for Heavy Vehicles
- Two Passenger Waiting Areas Including Indoor Sheltered Space
- Split Marshalling
- 97 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 5 Accessible
- 86 Small Vehicle Spaces to Dawson Point
- 74 Small Vehicle Spaces to Marysville
- Intersection Improvements Including Widening of The Tragically Hip Way
- Two Permanent Docking Spaces and Ramps
- Passenger Pick Up and Drop Off

PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
Alternatives Applicable to SS3 and SS4

- M1 – Extension of Pier Outward – Entrance Widening
- M2 – Extension of Pier Outward
- M3 – Widening of Pier, Parking on East Side
- M4 – Widening of Pier, Parking on West Side
Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.
Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.
Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.
Marysville Alternative M4

- 65 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 4 Accessible
- 71 Marshalling Spaces for Small Vehicles
- Signalized Intersection for Improved Departure
- Passenger Pick Up and Drop Off
- Passenger Waiting Area Including Indoor Sheltered Space
- Backup Docking for Emergency Use
- Single Permanent Docking and Ramp
- Boat Launch Relocated

Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.
Dawson Point Alternatives

Alternatives for SS3
• DA1 – Inline Marshalling, Widening to North
• DA2 – Inline Marshalling, Widening to South
• DA3 – Terminal Extension Into Open Water

Alternatives for SS4
• DB1 – Inline Marshalling, Widening to North
• DB2 – Inline Marshalling, Widening to South
• DB3 – Terminal Extension Into Open Water
Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.
Dawson Point Alternative DA2

- 145 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 6 Accessible
- Widening to the South for Inline Marshalling
- Passenger Pick Up and Drop Off
- 248 Lane-m of Marshalling for Heavy Vehicles
- 76 Marshalling Spaces for Small Vehicles
- Two Passenger Waiting Areas Including One Indoor Sheltered Space

Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.
Dawson Point Alternative DA3

Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.

- **No Terrestrial Property Taking**
- **145 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 6 Accessible**
- **283 Lane-m of Marshalling for Heavy Vehicles**
- **2 Passenger Waiting Areas Including One Indoor Sheltered Space**
- **Two Permanent Docking Spaces and Ramps**
- **60 Marshalling Spaces for Small Vehicles**

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
Dawson Point Alternative DB1

**Key Features:**
- **Passenger Pick Up and Drop Off**
- **Passenger Waiting Area Including Indoor Sheltered Space**
- **One Permanent Docking Space and Ramp**
- **Backup Docking for Emergency Use**
- **140 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 6 Accessible**
- **245 Lane-m of Marshalling for Heavy Vehicles**
- **80 Marshalling Spaces for Small Vehicles**
- **Widening to the North for Inline Marshalling**

**Additional Information:**
Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.
Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.

### Dawson Point Alternative DB2

- **Passenger Pick Up and Drop Off**
- **145 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 6 Accessible**
- **Widening to the South for Inline Marshalling**
- **76 Marshalling Spaces for Small Vehicles**
- **248 Lane-m of Marshalling for Heavy Vehicles**
- **Passenger Waiting Area Including Indoor Sheltered Space**
- **One Permanent Docking Space and Ramp**
- **Backup Docking for Emergency Use**

**Capacity Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles Marshalling</td>
<td>248 Lane-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Vehicles Marshalling</td>
<td>80 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Parking</td>
<td>140 Spaces, Plus 2 Van, Plus 6 Accessible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dawson Point Alternative DB3

- No Terrestrial Property Taking
- Passenger Pick Up and Drop Off
- 145 Parking Spaces Plus 2 Van and 6 Accessible
- Passenger Waiting Area Including Indoor Sheltered Space
- One Permanent Docking Space and Ramp
- Backup Docking for Emergency Use
- 60 Marshalling Spaces for Small Vehicles
- 283 Lane-m of Marshalling for Heavy Vehicles

Once a preferred alternative is selected, additional design work will be undertaken to integrate the footprint of the facility with the surrounding environment.
Next Steps

1. Refine Alternatives based on feedback received.
2. Undertake additional field work and technical analysis.
3. Evaluate and select a Technically Preferred Alternative.
4. Develop Preliminary Design and proposed mitigation measures.
5. Hold Public Information Centre (PIC) #2 to present the Technically Preferred Alternative (tentatively scheduled for Winter 2017)
6. Undertake agency consultation to discuss impacts and proposed mitigation.
7. Finalize Preliminary Design and proposed mitigation measures.
8. Prepare and file a Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) for a 30-day Public Review period.
9. Upon completion of the TESR review period, the formal Environmental Assessment process will be complete. This will allow MTO to proceed to Detail Design and ultimately to construction.