

## Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

**Date:** August 26, 2010 **Next Meeting:** October 28, 2010

**Time:** 12pm to 2pm **Time:** 12pm to 2pm

**Location:** CRD Board Room – 6<sup>th</sup> Floor **Location:** CRD Board Room – 6<sup>th</sup> Floor

**Purpose:** Meeting #14: June Open House Results

<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b>Community Liaison Committee</b>  Allan Murphy, VIHA  Barb Desjardins, Esquimalt Community Rep  Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses  Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society  Michael McWhinnie, DND  Patrick O’Conner, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition  Doug Robinson, View Royal Community Rep  Edward Pullman, Uvic Student Society  Erik Kaye, Victoria Community Rep  Geoff Pearce, Citizens for Commuter Rail  Bill Draper, Island Transformations  Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development  John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep  Michelle Mahovlich, Langford Community Rep  Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun  Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association  Mir Ali, Turner Lane (Colwood Corners)  Mohan Kang, Taxi Association of Victoria  Pat Danforth, Accessible Transportation Advisory Committee  John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce  Irwin Henderson, Island Transformations  Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (Alternate)  Randall Garrison, Esquimalt Councillor  Jeremy Watney, ITO  Rob Bennet, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce (Alternate)  Robert Lapham, CRD</p>	<b>Regrets</b>	<p>Brian Bonney, CFIB  Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep  Dan Gunn, VIATECH  Darin Guenette, Captain, DND  Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep  David Wilson, Central Saanich Community Rep  Doug Backhouse, Island Corridor Foundation  Jim Carson, Carson Development Group Association  John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society  John Manson, Langford Community Rep  Mike Wicks, West Shore Chamber of Commerce  Paul McDaniel, BC Ferries  Tracy Olsen, North Saanich Community Rep  Terry Stewart, Victoria Airport Authority  Travis Lee, Urban Development Institute  Representative: West Shore Chamber of Commerce  Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads  Neill Connelly, UVic  Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute</p>
-------------------	---	----------------	--

**Project Team**  
Erinn Pinkerton (EP), BC Transit  
Adrian South (AS), BC Transit  
Santino Pirillo (SP), BC Transit/McElhanney  
Jack Stuempe (JS), Jack Stuempe & Associates  
David Leather (DL), BC Transit/PLA

Regrets:  
Ashok Bhatti, Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure

Attachments: Presentation Materials

	Description	Action Items
1.0	<p><b>Call to Order</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Erinn Pinkerton called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m.</li> </ul>	
1.1	<p><b>Approval of Agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erinn Pinkerton added the introduction of the Transit Future Bus to New Business.</li> <li>• CLC requested to discuss MoT E&amp;N rail study               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EP noted that there were no representatives from MoT present to discuss the study.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CLC inquired as to whether or not MoT is still part of the VRRRT process.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EP noted that MoT is still part of VRRRT process and this has never changed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CLC requested for the next meeting of this committee be dedicated to the discussion of the MoT Rail Study.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Community Liaison Committee is dedicated to Rapid Transit and not the MoT study on Railways. The Project team has allowed the discussion of rail to come up as it pertains to the alignment options. However, the focus of this committee is Rapid Transit and at some point, we must accomplish the goals of this committee.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Motion Proposed: That BC Transit staff request a separate meeting with MoT for the CLC to discuss commuter rail between Langford and Victoria.</li> <li>• Motion Passed.</li> <li>• Agenda Approved.</li> </ul> <p>Post-meeting note: The following response from MoT with respect to the meeting request was received from Ashok Bhatti September 13, 2010:</p> <p><i>The Ministry would like to thank the BC Transit Community Liaison Committee for their inquiry on the EN Railway Study completed by the Ministry and the Island Corridor Foundation. As many of you are aware, the results of the study are available to everyone through our website:</i></p> <p><i><a href="http://www.th.gov.bc.ca//publications/reports_and_studies/Evaluation_ENRailway/">http://www.th.gov.bc.ca//publications/reports_and_studies/Evaluation_ENRailway/</a>.</i></p> <p><i>At the conclusion of this study, a special CLC meeting was held on July 21, 2010 where the results of the study were presented for discussion with the CLC and the Ministry along with the lead consultant (IBI Group).</i></p> <p><i>If there should be further questions on this study, I would encourage you to forward them to me directly and I will attempt to address them. If you have questions on the future of the EN Railway Corridor or more recent developments pertaining to it, I would instead ask that you speak with the Island Corridor Foundation and Graham Bruce who is also a member of the CLC. The Island Corridor Foundation is embarking on a variety of initiatives and are in the best position to speak about activities and the future of their rail corridor. I can also make myself available through the existing CLC meetings (time permitting on the</i></p>	

	Description	Action Items
	<p><i>agenda or at the conclusion of the meetings) to address any comments you may have about the EN Railway Study.</i></p>	
<p><b>2.0</b></p>	<p><b>Adoption of Minutes from previous meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of the May 27 meeting of the CLC adopted as circulated.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3.0</b></p>	<p><b>June Open House Results</b></p> <p>Jack Stuempel reported on the June Open House Results. The response data collected is outlined in the attached presentation materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Victoria had 145 attendees (up 30%), Colwood had 42 attendees (down 23%).</li> <li>Feedback received was much higher than at previous open houses. This may be a result of a more detailed questionnaire and increased public awareness of the options.</li> <li>BC Transit acknowledges that the sample size was very small and should not be taken as a fair representation of the larger population.</li> <li>In Summary: public interest is consistent; there is a lot of vocalized support for Rapid Transit. An all Douglas alignment is preferred, and little to no concern with the loss of traffic lanes.</li> </ul> <p>Comments from the Committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was it clear at the Open House what Rapid Transit is? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We had many displays and have tried to reiterate since the beginning what Rapid Transit means- all day everyday service with high frequency vs. Commuter Rail which only runs at peak periods.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Can you reconfirm that you have not ruled out Commuter Rail? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commuter Rail may be part of the larger transit network but is not a replacement for Rapid Transit.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p><b>Alignment Development</b></p> <p>Erinn Pinkerton presented the alignment configuration options and introduced the “Side Running” configuration as a new addition. Side Running was suggested during the consultation process as a possible option and has been added for consideration as it has some merit for further evaluation. EP reviewed the three configuration options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Curbside</b> - lanes on each side of the street dedicated exclusively to transit. The public is usually most comfortable with this option as it is familiar. However, when choosing the technology this configuration lends itself better to a rubber tired vehicle, as it can go around an obstacle blocking the lane. A rail based system cannot go around, resulting in system shutting down.</li> <li><b>Median</b> - exclusive running way in the middle of the street for transit vehicles only. Infrastructure results in restricted left turns, but allowance for u-turns at intersections. Concerns arise from the public expressing safety concerns while having to wait for transit in the middle of a road. EP noted that safety is a factor of how many lanes the public would need to cross.</li> </ul>	

	Description	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Side Running</b> – exclusive running way running in both directions along one side of the road only. This configuration gives transit improved presence in the corridor as a priority. BCT is looking at how this would influence access to businesses and what alternative options for access businesses could utilize.</li> <li>• EP noted that the project team is not looking for a purist, or one method fits all approach to the configuration. There are complexities to all of the options and some would fit better than others would depending on the alignment location, so the final recommendations might have a mix of alignment configurations.</li> </ul> <p>Comments from the Committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of Rapid Transit, the idea is to get from point a) to point b) in a comparative amount of time to a car. Correct? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes. The goal of Rapid Transit is to be competitive to the alternative modes of travel. BCT is currently looking at the time it takes to get from the West Shore to Victoria and right now the car can get there faster than transit. Next what BCT will do is look at the projected travel times based on population and travel growth to see what the travel time will be in 20 years. Early indications show that Rapid Transit will be quicker than travelling by car.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What is the time difference between travelling from downtown to uptown via car and Rapid Transit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Right now it takes cars 8-10 minutes and transit 22 minutes. Our studies show that once Rapid Transit is in place cars and transit will do it in 15 minutes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• I think if you add in the parking time for cars you would find that the actual travel time increases significantly for car travel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, that is correct. Our studies measure only on-road time.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>EP asked for the CLC’s thoughts on the configuration options. Response from the CLC included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Side running is an interesting option that we have not seen before. The Douglas Street Business Association did a study on the implications of the median option as opposed to the curbside bus way but we were convinced that a median would be detrimental to the businesses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project team requested a copy of this study.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Something we have to remember when looking at these options is that we are trying to plan for the future. We are not talking about current conditions there will be land use changes, and of course businesses will naturally succeed or not whether or not we do anything with transit. If we implement a proper system then more people will be travelling at one time. There will be less vehicles but more people coming into the downtown area to visit the businesses on and around Douglas. Side Running or Median appear to be the fastest option. Curbside is not ideal as it causes a slow down</li> </ul>	<p><b>The Douglas Street Business Association to supply BCT with the median study.</b></p>

	Description	Action Items
4.1	<p>as soon as something blocks the lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lane reductions on Esquimalt Road did not increase travel time and there have been no public complaints for removing lanes. Side running is the best option.</li> <li>• It's almost not worth doing if we do choose Curbside because people will just use the dedicated lanes for their cars. Side running is the best option.</li> <li>• One size may not fit all; consider a charrette approach.</li> <li>• The biggest issue for me is safety. You need a physical barrier between cars, transit and cyclists. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCT is conducting a safety study and will address any issues that are exposed as a risk.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Who makes the final decision? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BC Transit works in partnership with the municipalities to obtain their endorsement. The Victoria Transit Commission and BC Transit's Board of Directors have the final level of approval.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Downtown Business Association is most concerned with what the construction and final system impact will be on the businesses operating downtown.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alignment Development by Municipality</b></p> <p><b><u>Langford:</u></b> Currently discussions have re-opened around the alignment options for Langford. On September 14<sup>th</sup>, the team will attend the Transportation and Public Works Committee meeting to sort through some of the alignment options and with the referral from that committee the team will go to Mayor and Council on September 20<sup>th</sup>. BC Transit is hoping there will be an alignment from Langford to share with the public at the October open houses.</p> <p><b><u>Colwood:</u></b> In July the team went to Colwood City Council and the City of Colwood have written their first letter of endorsement for exclusive curb side transit lanes on the Old Island Highway from the Colwood section and into View Royal. Side running was not an option at the time, however Colwood has since said that they would like to consider it. Colwood would like joint meetings with View Royal to discuss the configuration, and are leaning towards a side running solution.</p> <p><b><u>View Royal:</u></b> The team will make a recommendation to the committee on September 14<sup>th</sup> in favor of side running. As for the section of the alignment in View Royal along the Trans-Canada highway, discussions with MoT are still underway.</p> <p><b><u>Saanich:</u></b> The team is working on screening criteria and evaluation, in partnership with Saanich and Victoria, to discern between the three configuration options. For this section of the alignment there is no removal or loss of general-purpose traffic lanes to the network.</p> <p><b><u>Victoria:</u></b></p>	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>There are still many options on the table with Victoria. Traffic simulations and discussions with Mayor and Council are underway. The team has met with and will continue to meet with the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Business Association, Downtown Residents' Association, James Bay Residents' Association and others.</p> <p>Comments from the Committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please send out a list with the details and locations of the public presentations you are delivering.</li> <li>• We would like alignments presented with their technology. We understand that the team cannot choose the technology at this time, but we would like the alignments presented with the technology that would work best with them.</li> </ul>	<p><b>BC Transit to supply the dates and locations of all the upcoming public presentations.</b></p>
<p><b>5.0</b></p>	<p><b>Business Community Survey - update</b></p> <p>Jack Stuempel discussed the methodology behind the business community survey along the Douglas Street corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intent was to identify the implications for business owners and customers along the corridor.</li> <li>• Content of the survey was developed in conjunction with key business associations</li> <li>• Responses received from over 400 businesses and 400 customers.</li> <li>• Results are being compiled, the intent is to share the results with the businesses along the corridor</li> <li>• Initial results show some inconsistencies between the views of customers and the business owners.</li> </ul> <p>Comments from the Committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What provision is the Uptown development making for Rapid Transit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCT is working with Uptown to locate a major exchange adjacent to the Uptown site. BCT has an agreement in principle with the developer.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There is a concern that riders will not continue to travel along the route from Uptown to downtown if they get off at the exchange. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCT shares some of this concern, however we looking at specific technologies to try to avoid or at least minimize this issue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Are you considering a tramway downtown? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCT is considering all technologies at this time.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A good rapid transit option for the public will bring people downtown even if they have to transfer at one point to do so. Today a lot of people are not travelling downtown because of the issues with parking and traffic congestion.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6.0</b></p>	<p><b>New Business</b></p> <p><u>Transit Futures Bus</u></p> <p>Erinn Pinkerton presented the Transit Future Bus, a tool BC Transit is using to increase public awareness and generate feedback for the overall transit network plan.</p>	

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
	<p>The Transit Futures Bus is a decommissioned transit bus that has been refurbished with a special interior and external livery in order to stand out, attract attention, and engage the public. Participants are encouraged to visit the bus and provide feedback through on-board survey's and interactive games.</p> <p>The Transit Future Bus will be showcased at a number of different public events, such as Victoria Seals games, the Sidney Market, Camosun and UVic campuses etc. in order to reach as many people as possible. The schedule for appearances of the Transit Future Bus is located on the BC Transit web site.</p>	
<b>7.0</b>	<p><b>Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Public Open Houses to be held October 5th &amp; 6th.</p> <p>Additional CLC meeting September 23<sup>rd</sup> to review the Open House Panels. The location will be decided at a later time.</p> <p>The next regular meeting will be on October 28th, 2010.</p>	
<b>8.0</b>	<p><b>Meeting Adjourned</b></p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 2:02 pm.</p>	

Notes by: Charissa Butler  
August 27, 2010