

**B.C. Coastal Ferries
Pre-Consultation and Engagement Summary Report
February 2013**

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Pre-Consultation and Engagement: Purpose, Notification and Participation	4
2.1 Purpose	4
2.2 Notification	4
2.3 Participation	4
3. Key Results	4
3.1 Pre-Consultation In-Person Meetings: Key Theme Summary.....	4
3.2 Consultation and Engagement Feedback Form Results.....	6
3.3 Input from the BC Ferry Commissioner	10
3.4 Open-Ended Feedback	11
3.5 Focus Groups – Review of Discussion Guide and Feedback Form	12

1. Introduction

In October 2012, the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) conducted Pre-Consultation and Engagement meetings and interviews with key stakeholders regarding the design and content of the B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012.

The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure then conducted a province-wide consultation and engagement process from October 29 to December 21, 2012 to provide information to all British Columbians about the challenges facing the ferry system and to invite input and feedback on two areas:

- **IMMEDIATE CHALLENGE:** Considerations that should guide the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure in achieving \$26 million in savings to 2016
- **LONG-TERM VISION:** What strategies should be pursued to achieve the long-term vision of connecting coastal communities in an affordable, efficient and sustainable manner

As part of the Pre-Consultation and Engagement process, input was sought through various methods, including:

1) In-person meetings:

- Meetings with the Ferry Advisory Committee (FAC) Chairs and the Regional District Chairs were held to review the Pre-Consultation and Engagement Discussion Paper and Feedback Form

2) Telephone interviews:

- Telephone interviews, to complete the Pre-Consultation and Engagement Feedback Form and gather comments, were held with:
 - Dave Petryk, President and CEO, Tourism Vancouver Island
 - Paul Vallee, Executive Vice President, Tourism Vancouver
 - Tom Syer, Vice President, Policy and Communications, Business Council of British Columbia

3) Pre-Consultation and Engagement Feedback Forms

4) Discussion with BC Ferries Commissioner Gord Macatee

5) Written submissions

6) Focus groups were held in Vancouver, Victoria and Nanaimo

Key results from feedback received through these methods can be found in Section 2 below.

2. Pre-Consultation and Engagement: Purpose, Notification and Participation

2.1 Purpose

During Pre-Consultation and Engagement, MoTI shared information about the upcoming consultation and engagement process, and the two topic areas under consideration, and sought feedback about how participants would like to be engaged. Input gathered through Pre-Consultation and Engagement was used by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure to finalize the public and community stakeholder consultation and engagement process, which took place from October 29 to December 21, 2012.

2.2 Notification

Introductory emails were sent to invite the Ferry Advisory Committee (FAC) Chairs and the Regional District Chairs to participate in Pre-Consultation and Engagement. Times were arranged for in-person meetings with both groups on October 17, 2012.

Four stakeholders were asked to participate in one-on-one telephone interviews to provide their feedback. Introductory emails were sent in advance of interviews. Stakeholders were then contacted for the telephone interviews during the week of October 15, 2012 and on October 22, 2012.

2.3 Participation

25 people participated in meetings or interviews as part of Pre-Consultation and Engagement

- In-person meetings on October 17, 2012 in Nanaimo, B.C. with:
 - Ferry Advisory Committee Chairs (13)
 - Regional District Chairs (8)
- One-on-one pre-consultation and engagement telephone interviews were conducted in the week of October 15, 2012 and on October 22, 2012 (4)

22 pieces of feedback were received during Pre-Consultation and Engagement

- 14 feedback forms were received from FAC and Regional Board members and were completed during telephone interviews
- 8 written submissions were received from FAC and Regional Board members

3. Key Results

3.1 Pre-Consultation In-Person Meetings: Key Theme Summary

The following are key themes from the in-person meetings held on October 17, 2012.

3.1.1 Meeting with Ferry Advisory Committee Chairs – October 17, 2012

Consultation Process

- Participants recommended that the consultation and engagement include more open houses than community stakeholder meetings, that the question and answer session be longer, and that the question and answer session be advertised

- Participants said that consultation and engagement meetings should be held in the evening and on the weekends as much as possible
- Participants said that the utilization tables should include round trips; further, they said that the tables would be easier for the public to understand if round-trip information was included
- Participants said that the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure should commit to an additional consultation and engagement process once specific service reductions are proposed

Immediate Challenge

- Participants said that the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure should not characterize the ferry system as having a \$26 million loss
- Participants said that the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure should include tax increases to all coastal communities

Long-Term Vision

- Participants recommended that the consultation and engagement materials include information about Islands Trust and their opposition to bridges

3.1.2 Meeting with Regional District Chairs – October 17, 2012

Consultation Process

- Participants felt that the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure should add consultation and engagement meetings in the following communities: Quadra Island, Cortez Island, Denman Island, Hornby Island, Sointula, Alert Bay, Saturna Island, Galiano Island, Pender Island
- Participants said that they appreciated the opportunity to be consulted on draft consultation and engagement material, but did not want their input characterized as endorsement of the approach to consultation and engagement
- Participants recommended that most consultation and engagement meetings should be held in the evening
- Participants said that the charts showing vehicle utilization are useful, but should also include a footnote to show passenger information

Immediate Challenge

- Participants said that ridership is falling because ferry fares are increasing
- Participants said that they think the \$26 million shortfall is not a shortfall, but a provincial government funding gap
- Participants said that the coastal ferry service is an essential service like highways, and should be taken back within the government and fully funded so that service levels are maintained
- Participants said the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure and BC Ferries need to recognize that the ferry service is vital to the Island's resource economy, which is vital to the overall provincial economy

Long-Term Vision

- Participants said that they do not support the “vision” section dealing with potential increases to regional property taxes and fuel tax increases
- Participants were divided about whether the idea of fixed-link bridges should be part of the consultation and engagement

3.2 Consultation and Engagement Feedback Form Results

(14 feedback forms)

Participants completed Pre-Consultation and Engagement Feedback Forms at the in-person meetings, through phone interviews or via email. In some cases, feedback forms were completed on behalf of the whole FAC; in other cases, they were completed by individual FAC members.

3.2.1 Question 1 – Consultation and Engagement Process:

Participants were asked how likely they were to participate in a variety of consultation and engagement methods for the B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012.

- In 11 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said they would be very likely or somewhat likely to participate in public open houses
- In 10 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said they would be very likely or somewhat likely to participate using the Consultation Discussion Guide and Feedback Form
- In 9 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said they would be very likely or somewhat likely to participate in small group meetings
- In 9 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said they would be very likely or somewhat likely to participate using written submissions
- In 8 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said they would be very likely or somewhat likely to participate using the online feedback form
- In 5 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said they would they would be very unlikely to participate via webinars

3.2.2 Question 2 – Consultation and Engagement Process:

When asked what other consultation and engagement methods they would be interested in participating in, participants’ comments included:

- Good range of consultation methods
- Should consider meetings to gather associations, such as tourism associations, together in a larger centre, in addition to having meetings organized by community
- This is a provincial issue and needs to have input from other areas of the province (not just ferry communities)
- Some participants made comments about the consultation process and meeting format, including:
 - Meetings should include a combination of small group meetings and public open houses

- The BC Ferry Commissioner set the standard for method, process and location (going to every ferry-dependent community)
- Public open house and stakeholder meetings should be conducted in a town hall meeting format
- There is a need for exhibition of materials in a public place throughout the consultation period to accommodate those who cannot attend a meeting or participate online
- Hold a meeting on the commuter ferry (i.e., at 5:30 p.m.) from Horseshoe Bay to Langdale, as there are approximately 1,200 daily users

3.2.3 Question 4¹ – Consultation and Engagement Process:

Participants were asked to provide additional comments regarding meeting locations and types. These comments included:

- Preference for meeting type is a public open house with a question and answer period
- Need to use local media to provide awareness and notification of the format of the meetings, and that there will be a question and answer session
- Public town hall meetings should take place a week after stakeholder meetings, based on the model currently being used by BC Ferries for consultation about major terminal upgrades
- The BC Ferry Commissioner set the standard for holding public meetings in all communities served by ferries; having a meeting in a neighbouring community is not acceptable
- A recent survey on Bowen Island showed that residents preferred open houses and surveys as consultation methods
- The need to pre-register (RSVP) for meetings may be perceived as restricting participation
- Online and written submissions will allow for those who cannot attend a meeting to participate
- Participants had specific suggestions regarding meeting locations and times, including:
 - All communities dependent on ferry services must be consulted
 - Saturday or evening meetings are preferred to allow maximum participation
 - Add a stakeholder meeting in Victoria/Vancouver
 - Add Thetis, Penelakut, Pender, Galiano, Saturna, Denman and Hornby islands and Gibsons as meeting locations
 - May need to add a public open house on Bowen Island
 - Meeting should not be held in Comox, as it is too remote from communities served by ferries

¹ **Question 3:** Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each of the proposed meeting locations and type (small group meeting and/or public open house). Participants chose to provide additional comments about meeting locations and types in Question 4, as opposed to indicating level of agreement.

3.2.4 Question 5 – Immediate Challenge:

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with seeking feedback regarding considerations that should guide the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure in determining the best way to achieve \$26 million in service reduction savings over the next four years.

- In 11 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said that they strongly agree or somewhat agree with seeking feedback regarding considerations

Additional Comments – Immediate Challenge:

Participants were asked for any additional comments regarding this question.

Comments provided included:

- The Ministry should identify service reductions or a range of options and present those for public engagement and consultation
- The public is expecting a discussion of specific service reductions and the rationale for why; if that conversation is not happening now, then additional consultation will be needed
- Consultation on service reductions has been promised by the provincial government
- The considerations are a given, and putting these out for consultation will frustrate people
- People are worried that service reductions will be done without public consultation, as was done in 2008
- BC Ferries needs to be treated as part of the provincial highway system, or other provincial transportation infrastructure, and funded accordingly
- Disagree with seeking feedback in determining the best way to achieve \$26 million in service reductions; the \$26 million has been caused by lack of adequate provincial government contribution
- The public/ferry users cannot be expected to have the knowledge of ferry operations that would allow them to provide meaningful feedback on costs and how they could be saved
- Need to reduce number of directors on BC Ferries Board and implement all suggestions from the Comptroller General on salaries
- Potential of increasing ridership on underutilized sailings needs to be explored; BC Ferries has not thought enough about increasing revenues/better marketing to increase ridership
- The *Coastal Ferries Act* is a limitation – need to look at ferries beyond that framework

3.2.5 Question 6 – Long-Term Vision:

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with seeking feedback regarding the long-term vision topic and potential strategies to ensure that coastal communities continue to be connected in a sustainable manner.

- In 11 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said they strongly or somewhat agree with seeking feedback regarding the long-term vision topic and potential strategies

Additional Comments – Long-Term Vision:

Participants were asked for any additional comments regarding the long-term vision.

Comments provided included:

- Valuable question that needs to be discussed – needs to be considered in a format that allows for pros and cons of options
- Use of liquefied natural gas (LNG) is a technical decision that should be made by BC Ferries based on technical/cost analysis
- BC Ferries needs to be treated as part of the provincial highway system, or other provincial transportation infrastructure, and funded accordingly
- This section of the consultation seems designed to shift focus from the immediate problem
- Options listed are too restrictive
- Wider issues of improving accessibility to transit on both ends of the ferry journey and the governance and delivery of the ferry service need to be addressed
- Urgent need for public consultation about the vision to connect coastal communities in an affordable, efficient and sustainable manner; strategies must be developed to provide clarity about what this high-level vision means and to develop and implement strategies that support it
- Consultation participants will likely expect more information on these options

3.2.6 Question 7 – Funding:

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with seeking feedback about potential options to fund the B.C. coastal ferry system.

- In 9 of the 14 feedback forms completed, participants said that they strongly agree or somewhat agree with seeking feedback about potential options to fund the B.C. coastal ferry system

Additional Comments – Funding:

Participants were asked for any additional comments regarding potential options to fund the B.C. Coastal Ferries. Comments provided included:

- The funding options listed need to be discussed
- Local governments need to be a part of this discussion
- Should look at a fare structure that differentiates residents from non-residents
- The cost of providing ferry service should be treated the same as providing highway access and maintenance
- The provincial government contribution has not kept pace with escalating costs; increased provincial funding should be an option on the table
- Not in agreement with additional property or fuel taxes as a funding option

3.2.7 Additional Comments – Overall:

Participants were asked to provide any further comments they had regarding any aspect of the B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012. Comments provided included:

- Some participants asked what about what the next steps are in this process, what will happen to the input, and when details on service reductions would be made known and consulted on
- Some participants felt that the consultation program as presented did not represent “meaningful consultation”
- Some participants felt that the pre-consultation process was too rushed and would have liked to have had the documents in advance of the meeting
- Some participants felt that the ferry system is part of the provincial transportation infrastructure and should be funded as such
- Some participants expressed that consultation should be about actual service adjustments, not guiding principles

3.2.8 Question 8 – Notification:

Participants were asked if they would like to receive updates on the B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012.

- All participants expressed interest in receiving updates

3.2.9 Question 9 – Further Information:

Participants were asked how they would like to receive further information about the B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012.

- The most popular methods that participants selected were email updates, the B.C. Coastal Ferries Engagement website and through the media.

Addition Comments – Further Information:

Some participants provided additional comments about receiving further information, including:

- Information needs to be made available in an off-line form that is accessible to those without Internet access
- Information should be provided on the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure’s website
- The public will expect that information will be available from the engagement website, the media and additional public meetings before there are any significant changes in service levels

3.3 Input from the BC Ferry Commissioner

A telephone interview was conducted with the BC Ferry Commissioner, Gord Macatee, on October 22, 2012. His responses to the quantitative feedback form questions are included in the Feedback Form Results section above, and his additional comments are below.

Additional Comments – Pre-Consultation and Engagement:

- The range of consultation methods makes sense; the approach ensures that all British Columbians have an opportunity to provide input, including ferry users and those who live in coastal communities
- The communities in which meetings will be held, with the addition of the 6–8 suggested by the FAC Chairs, makes sense, particularly as there are also opportunities for other British Columbians to provide input via the online methods and by written submission, if they so choose
- This considerations or principles approach to the immediate challenge is consistent with the advice in my report to government regarding how to approach this consultation
- The dialogue about the vision is a key part of the consultation, as it deals with the longer term
- At the end of the day, it is important that government, BC Ferries and ferry users come to terms with having to share the burden of running a ferry system that is efficient, affordable and sustainable

Additional Comments – B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012

In addition, the BC Ferry Commissioner provided comments regarding the draft discussion guide intended for use during the consultation and engagement. His comments are summarized below:

- **Context-setting information:** Good, clear context-setting information
- **Immediate Challenges (to 2016):** Very good information; the summary table showing vehicles and passenger utilization, financial performance, etc. is excellent and will be very useful to the consultation
- **Vision piece:** This section is generally good, though it could be more positive to help people see that the system could be improved with greater overall benefits to users over the longer term
- **Feedback Form:** The feedback form seems clear and will be a very useful tool to collect feedback; asking for innovative ideas and additional comments is very useful in addition to the specific questions
- **Overall comment:** Overall, this Discussion Guide looks very good, the number of communities looks comprehensive, and providing online opportunities for all British Columbians to provide input is important

3.4 Open-Ended Feedback

(8 submissions)

In addition to the feedback provided through meetings and feedback forms, open-ended feedback was also received through eight written submissions to the Pre-Consultation and Engagement process.

Key Themes:

Consultation Topics/Service Adjustments

- There is an expectation that this consultation would include discussion on specific service adjustments or options for service adjustments

- Principles to guide consideration have already been specified; seeking feedback on these will frustrate people
- If this consultation is not about service adjustments, it needs to include a clear statement on how/when consultation on service adjustments will occur
- A desire to know how service will be impacted as soon as possible

Next Steps

- Need clarity on next steps; when and whether there will be subsequent consultation, and how decisions about service adjustments will be made before the deadline of June 30, 2013
- Expressed that there needs to be consultation about service adjustments before they are implemented

Pre-Consultation Process

- Expressed that FACs should have been involved earlier and mentioned that FACs had offered to meet with the Ministry earlier in the process
- Expressed that the pre-consultation process was too rushed and did not provide enough time to review materials, which limited usefulness of input

Consultation Process

- Questions about province-wide consultation versus community engagement; input from regular ferry users will be different than from those who use ferries for leisure only
- It is important to know where input is coming from (i.e., regular ferry users and specific area) when looking at the results
- Suggestions for meeting locations and times, in particular need for meetings to be held on Saturdays or evenings, and for meetings to be held in every ferry-dependent community
- Meetings should include opportunity for people to listen and be heard, and meetings should be more than two hours in length

Potential Options for Long-Term Vision and Funding

- Need for more detail and viability on the potential options for long-term visions and funding
- Ferries should be considered part of B.C.'s provincial transportation infrastructure, like highways, and should be funded accordingly
- There should be a discussion of how increased fares have impacted ridership

3.5 Focus Groups – Review of Discussion Guide and Feedback Form

In October 2012, six focus groups were conducted to review the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form to be used as part of B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012. The key objectives of this research were:

- To test for general understanding of the discussion document's content
- To understand if the challenges faced by BC Ferries (pages 4–5 of the document) are understood and if they are presented in a clear way

- To determine if the outlined considerations (page 6) are well understood
- To determine if the feedback form is well understood

3.5.1 Methodology and Respondent Selection

Six focus groups, consisting of 8–10 respondents each, were conducted: two in each of Vancouver, Victoria and Nanaimo. In each location, the groups were broken down as follows:

- Mix of ages, income and marital status
- Must ride on BC Ferries a minimum of twice a year

The groups were conducted in facilities with viewing capabilities and were videotaped. All groups ran for approximately 1.5 hours in duration and were moderated by Kathleen Roach, Mustel Group Market Research. Based on the findings of the focus groups, revisions and clarifications were made to the final Discussion Guide and Feedback Form.

3.5.2 Key Findings

Respondents were taken through the document section by section. The key findings for each section are below:

- **How can I participate in B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012?**

The information presented here was clear. Everyone was aware that there are many ways in which they can participate in the process and how their input will be considered. The document also outlines other considerations that will affect the outcome.

- **A Consultation and Engagement on B.C. Coastal Ferry System**

Respondents were clear that this section of the discussion guide is suggesting that “they have to cut costs and find more money, and they have a plan”.

Some respondents thought that this section identified the immediate challenge, but the long-term vision, while referenced, was not really defined.

A few respondents suggested that this section might be more comprehensible if the reference to \$30 million dollars in savings over the next four years was replaced by a reference to the amount needed per year. Again, for most, the reference to \$30 million over four years was acceptable.

Some respondents commented on the shifting time frames and amounts contained in the draft discussion guide. It first makes references to \$30 million to 2016, then \$16 million in the current fiscal year, and then \$5 million over 5 years. Due to these different amounts and time frames, the information presented here was confusing to some.

- **BC Ferry Commissioner’s Report: A Warning and a Call to Action/The Provincial Response**

For many, the information presented in the report was clear. Others suggested it was too wordy, particularly The Provincial Response. Some thought the reference to

lowering fares and setting price caps “sounds like shop talk” and would not be understandable to the average person.

Most thought that the chart showing 25 years of change was clearly laid out and supported the notion that ferry rates have increased consistently over time. However, a few did not think the chart offered enough information. They thought the cost of commercial transportation on ferries should be included in the chart, and not simply car and driver. One person remarked that the ferry service from Rupert to Skidegate, for example, exists to transport trucks for the forest industry. So, offering a per-vehicle subsidy without mentioning the commercial revenues paints an incomplete picture.

- **Declining Ridership and Increasing Costs**

The immediate response from some respondents was “they are telling us what we know – no surprises”. This suggests that “the ferries are too large in a lot of cases; they are running a Cadillac with one person in it – need to build smaller ferries and bring them in when needed”.

Rising Fuel and Labour Costs

The information presented here was clear.

For several respondents, the reference to a “3.7 million litre reduction in fuel usage” was meaningless. Knowing the percentage of fuel reduction would make more sense.

Similarly, the reference to rising labour costs caused a few individuals to wonder what percentage of those rising costs are associated with labour versus management.

Declining Ridership

While everyone understands that ridership is declining, some felt that the reference to Washington State Ferries was an inappropriate comparison, particularly since the piece outlines the percentage in declining ridership on Washington State Ferries, but does not give a similar percentage for the decline in ridership on B.C. coastal ferries. Comparisons warrant equal references, according to these individuals.

Underutilized Routes

Most considered this section to be clearly presented. Some respondents suggested that it might be necessary to cut some crossings and/or have smaller ferries to accommodate these underutilized routes. The fact that the graph below this section uses 20% as a baseline caused a few to think that the information about underutilized routes was not being fully presented.

Additional Capital Costs

This section was thought to be clear, and there were no significant issues associated with it.

- **Immediate Challenge: Considerations to Achieve \$26 Million in Savings**

While a number of respondents disliked the repetitive element of this presentation, everyone felt the information presented in the longer version of each discussion area was clear.

Significant Annual Losses

Everyone understood this subsection's message – that there are routes that lose money consistently. Reductions in service on these routes might be considered.

Low Annual Utilization

Again, this was very clear to everyone. It suggests that routes that are underutilized and incur high financial losses should be examined for potential adjustments to service.

Low Round-Trip Utilization

Some respondents were confused by the reference to low round-trip utilization. Some did not even understand what round-trip utilization meant. When explained, the subsection made sense.

Basic Levels of Service

That basic service levels should be maintained was clear to everyone.

Routes Requiring Vessel Replacement

Again, this subsection was clear to everyone. The idea of comparing the utilization of the route and the capacity of the vessel, and reconfiguring where appropriate, made sense to everyone.

Complexity of Multiple-Stop Routes

This also made sense to the majority of respondents. Many of these individuals have travelled on multi-stop routes and appreciated that a change on any of those sailings may affect travellers in making their connections. That such considerations need to be taken into account was clear and considered necessary.

Summary of B.C. Coastal Ferry Routes

This chart "tells the story", according to most. The chart "illuminates the problem" and triggered most respondents to suggest that reductions are necessary in sailings on some routes, that smaller ferries should be used on some, and that a general reconfiguration of routes is necessary.

- **A Vision for the Future: In the longer term, what elements should be pursued to ensure an economically sustainable ferry system?**

Future Challenges

The outlining of future challenges was clear to the majority of these individuals.

A Vision for the Future

While everyone clearly understood this subsection, a few objected to the use of the term “interoperability”, which they thought many in the general population might not understand.

The reference to bringing fare increases in line with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) did not make sense to some respondents. When looking at the increase in fuel costs, which is extremely high, and the increase in labour costs, it seems impossible to achieve the goal of keeping fare increases in line with the cost of living.

Long-Term Vision

The long-term vision as presented was clear, with a few respondents suggesting that protecting basic ferry service levels and ensuring that British Columbians are engaged and consulted on trade-offs and strategies are important.

- **Rethinking the Coastal Ferry System**

This section was thought to be clear, but it raised a few issues for respondents. Many of the ideas presented here were good, but some individuals felt they did not have the whole story. The use of LNG to power ferries, for example, is a good idea, but they wanted to know the cost of outfitting the ferries to operate on that fuel.

Similarly, the idea of creating better cycling connections was well received, but they wondered about the cost of the infrastructure necessary in communities to make that possible.

The second part of this section (Best Way to Fund Ferry Service) was clear, but respondents noted that it presented only two options, whereas several options were presented in the previous section. A few respondents commented that there should be more funding options so that it does not appear to be less important.

- **Route-Specific Information Sample**

Respondents were presented with a sample of route-specific information for three BC Ferries routes (Routes 1, 19 and 26). These samples included tables that were colour-coded to indicate times of day that are highly utilized and those that are underutilized. The colour-coding made the route utilization abundantly clear to everyone.

B.C. Coastal Ferries

Pre-Consultation and Engagement Input and Considerations

February 2013

Overview

In October 2012, the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) conducted Pre-Consultation and Engagement meetings and interviews with key stakeholders regarding the design and content of the B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement, Fall 2012.

Input received during Pre-Consultation and Engagement was considered by MoTI in finalizing the public and community stakeholder and engagement process which took place October 29 to December 21, 2012.

INPUT	CONSIDERATION/RESPONSE	DETAILS
<p>Consultation and Engagement Process</p> <p>Participants requested that additional communities and meetings be added to the consultation and engagement meeting schedule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 communities were added to the original list of communities shown to Pre-Consultation and Engagement participants, for a total of 30 communities 20 small group meetings or public open houses were added to the original list, for a total of 40 events (27 of which are public open houses) The original consultation and engagement program included 20 public engagement meetings in 15 communities. The revised program includes 40 public engagement meetings in 30 communities. 	<p>Original communities: Bella Coola, Bowen Island, Campbell River, Chemainus, Comox (Courtenay), Gabriola Island, Gibsons, Masset, Mayne Island, Nanaimo, Powell River, Port Hardy, Queen Charlotte City, Salt Spring Island, Vancouver, Victoria</p> <p>Communities added: Alert Bay, Bella Bella, Cortes Island, Denman Island, Galiano Island, Hornby Island, Klemtu, Pender Island, Penelakut, Quadra Island, Sandspit, Saturna Island, Sointula, Texada Island, Thetis Island</p> <p>Additional small group meetings or public open houses (more than one meeting in each community): Nanaimo, Salt Spring Island, Comox (Courtenay), Powell River, Vancouver, Victoria</p>

INPUT	CONSIDERATION/RESPONSE	DETAILS
<p>Consultation and Engagement Process Participants requested that meetings be held in the evening and on weekends whenever possible</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many of the small group meetings that were originally scheduled during daytime hours were changed to evening or weekend public open houses Additional small group meetings or open houses were scheduled for evenings or weekends 	<p>Original small group meetings (to be held during the daytime): Bella Coola, Bowen Island, Gabriola Island, Masset</p> <p>Changed to public open houses (evenings and weekends): Alert Bay, Bella Bella, Bella Coola, Bowen Island, Cortes Island, Denman Island, Gabriola Island, Galiano Island, Hornby Island, Klemtu, Masset, Pender Island, Penelakut, Quadra Island, Sandspit, Saturna Island, Sointula, Texada Island, Thetis Island</p>
<p>Notification Participants said that local media should be used to create awareness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Print ads notifying of the engagement program meeting times were placed in local media outlets In addition, local media received the information bulletin from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, and local media attending many consultation meetings 	<p>Advertisements were placed in the following newspapers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Northern View (Oct. 24, 31) Queen Charlotte Islands Observer (Oct 25, Nov. 1) The Province (Oct. 30) Vancouver Sun (Oct. 29) Victoria Times Colonist (Oct. 30, Nov. 21, 28) Nanaimo Daily News (Oct. 29, Nov. 6) Gabriola Sounder (Oct. 29, Nov. 5) Ladysmith Chronicle (Oct. 30, Nov. 6) Gulf Islands Driftwood (Oct. 31, Nov. 7, 14, 21, 28) Island Tides (Nov. 1, 15, 29) The Powell River Peak (Nov. 7, 14, 21, 28) Coast Mountain News (Nov. 8) North Island Gazette (Nov. 8, 15) Bowen Island Undercurrent (Nov. 9, 16) Coast Reporter (Nov. 9, 16, 23) Comox Valley Record (Nov. 21, 28) The Flagstone (Nov. 26) Discovery Islander (Nov. 25) Hornby Denman Island Grapevine (Nov. 29, Dec. 6)

INPUT	CONSIDERATION/RESPONSE	DETAILS
<p>Notification Participants said that the format of public engagement meetings, the location, and whether the meetings would include a question and answer session should be advertised</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Print ads included information about open houses, including information about the question and answer session for the last 90 minutes of each three-hour open house • This information was also included on the B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement website 	
<p>Discussion Guide Content Participants said that the utilization of ferry routes would be more meaningful if they included round-trip utilization in addition to one-way utilization</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The utilization tables were revised to illustrate round-trip utilization 	
<p>Discussion Guide Content The Islands Trust chairpersons requested that their opposition to fixed-link bridges, per the Islands Trust Policy Statement, be included in the Discussion Guide</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A footnote was inserted into the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form to note the Islands Trust's opposition to bridges anywhere in the Gulf Islands 	<p>Footnote on page 9 of the B.C. Coastal Ferries Consultation and Engagement Discussion Guide and Feedback Form: Islands Trust has expressed their opposition to bridges, including in their Policy Statement: <i>"It is Trust Council's policy that no island in the Trust Area should be connected to Vancouver Island, the mainland or another island by a bridge or tunnel, notwithstanding the existing bridge between North and South Pender Islands."</i> (Policy 5.3.2)</p>