

Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

Date:	February 25, 2010	Next Meeting:	May 27, 2010
Time:	12pm to 2pm		12pm to 2pm
Location:	CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor		CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor
Purpose:	Meeting #12: 2010 Schedule and Rapid Transit Cross Sections		

Attendees:

Community Liaison Committee

Allan Murphy, VIHA
 Barb Desjardins, Esquimalt Community Rep
 Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses
 Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society
 Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep
 David Wilson, Central Saanich Community Rep
 Doug Robinson, View Royal Community Rep
 Edward Pullman, Uvic Student Society
 Erik Kaye, Victoria Community Rep
 Geoff Pearce, Citizens for Commuter Rail
 Irwin Henderson, Island Transformations
 Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development
 John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep
 John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society
 Michelle Mahovich, Langford Community
 Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun
 Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association
 Mir Ali, Turner Lane (Colwood Corners)
 Mohan Kang, Taxi Association of Victoria
 Rita Fromholt, UVic
 Pat Danforth, Accessible Transportation Advisory
 Committee
 Patrick O'Connor, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition
 Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (Alternate)
 Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute

Project Team

David Leather, Pacific Liaison
 Erinn Pinkerton, BC Transit
 Robert Broe, Pacific Liaison
 Shane Anderson, McElhanney
 Jack Stuempel, Jack Stuempel & Associates
 Peter Murray, BC Transit

Regrets

Brian Bonney, CFIB
 Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep
 Dan Gunn, VIATECH
 Michael McWhinnie, DND
 Doug Backhouse, Island Corridor Foundation
 Jim Carson, Carson Development Group
 Association
 John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of
 Commerce
 Tracy Olsen, North Saanich Community Rep
 Terry Stewart, Victoria Airport Authority
 Travis Lee, Urban Development Institute
 Representative: West shore Chamber of
 Commerce

Attachments:

Presentation Materials

	Description	Action Items
1.0	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geoff Pearce called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m. 	
2.0	Approval of Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Due to the absence of a report from the Province’s E&N Study team, the E&N Study report was removed from the agenda. ▪ New Business: Darrell Wick requested an agenda item be added to discuss public access to the CLC materials in advance of CLC meetings. ▪ Moved by J Harris ▪ Seconded by E Pullman ▪ Agenda is approved as amended. ▪ Carried 	
3.0	Adoption of Minutes from previous meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moved by J. Harris ▪ Seconded J. Luton ▪ Minutes of the October meeting of the CLC be adopted as circulated. ▪ Carried. 	
4.0	Approved Alignment Erinn Pinkerton reviewed the rapid transit alignment which went to the Commission for endorsement and subsequently received BC Transit Board approval. The following alignment was approved by the BC Transit Board in October 2009: <u>Segment “A”</u> : Colwood Corners to Six Mile along the Island Highway. The connection from Colwood Corners to Langford is being assessed with the municipality of Langford. <u>Segment “B”</u> : Six Mile to Uptown between the Trans-Canada Highway and the Galloping Goose. <u>Segment “C”</u> : Uptown to Downtown along Douglas Street. An option that would loop Douglas and Government will also be assessed. Comments from the committee included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion regarding Langford’s streetscape development on Goldstream Avenue and its effects on Rapid Transit routing. ▪ Approval of route to Colwood Corners is premature; should have been approved only as far as Six Mile. ▪ Consideration should be given to splitting the line at Six Mile to feed Colwood and Langford separately. 	
5.0	2010 Schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Erinn provided the 2010 schedule for the project, noting the need to achieve a vision for the corridor while deciding among options within the approved alignment, including curbs, median and couplet alternatives. Discussion with municipalities is required to investigate how best to fit rapid transit into some of the congested corridors within the approved alignment. For example, on Douglas Street, further discussion is required with Saanich and Victoria regarding traffic lanes, bike lanes, 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>pedestrian walkways etc.</p> <p>Key activities in the schedule include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Option analysis & identification of approved arrangement. ▪ Modeling of ridership, traffic, etc. ▪ Multiple Accounts Evaluations (evaluations against a wide range of criteria) ▪ Public open houses at key milestone intervals ▪ Presentation to the Commission and Board in the fall with an update providing a status update on technology, agreed upon alignment etc. ▪ Return to the Board in January 2011 for final approval of alignment/technology combination and the final business case for implementation <p>Comments from the committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What model are you following for the assessment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We are considering a variety of models to apply what makes the most sense. ▪ Are you still considering the alignment first, followed by technology? Shouldn't we choose the technology at the same time as the alignment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We are concentrating first on the alignment, but the ultimate solution will be an alignment/technology combination. ▪ We should include reviews by municipal councils and not just the city planners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Doing so is part of the more detailed plan. We have just sent out an update to all of the municipalities and will continue to update them. ▪ Municipalities should be consulted on what they are doing that might impact the project and its plan. ▪ Need to develop a business model that accounts for land use, carbon benefits, etc. to identify triple-bottom-line impacts. ▪ The City of Victoria is doing a major forum on its OCP in late March; might be useful to have a presence. ▪ Concern that CLC meetings as proposed (May, August, October) are insufficient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – While dates have been set to coincide with key project milestones, Erinn will review the schedule for appropriate additional meeting opportunities. 	
6.0	<p>Photos from recent trip to Vancouver</p> <p>Erinn presented photos from a recent visit to Vancouver's Carrall St. Greenway and Bombardier Street Car.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Carrall Street Greenway is an example of a "complete street project" which completely segregates the bike lane from the sidewalk and the parking lane. The bike lane is a different height from the sidewalk to discourage pedestrians from walking in the bike lane. Drainage systems have also been put into place so that instead of the water run off going directly into the storm water, it is funneled back into the landscaping first and then the secondary flow is into the storm water system. ▪ Bombardier has loaned two street cars to Vancouver from Brussels as a demonstration Street Car project in Vancouver, running between Granville Island and Olympic Station (approximately 1.8 km). Toronto has recently ordered more than 200 of these cars, which are narrow in design and can carry 170 passengers. <p>Comments from the Committee included:</p>	

	Description	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a huge difference between Carrall Street and Douglas Street. Douglas Street is arguably the busiest street in Victoria and does not lend it self to have a designated bike lane. ▪ Streets are public rights of way for all users, and the complete street concept is relevant to Douglas Street. ▪ Could the Bombardier street cars run on the E&N track? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The track would need to be upgraded. Significant upgrades were made to the track in Vancouver just to run the demonstration. ▪ Can the Bombardier street cars be run by modes other than over head electric? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Yes, Bombardier has developed a new technology, that powers the street car from below, eliminating the need for overhead wires, but it is a new technology and BC Transit is investigating further. ▪ Bombardier is a leader in accessible vehicles. 	
<p>7.0</p>	<p>Alignment Development & Cross-Sections</p> <p>Shane Anderson discussed some of the relative implications for median and curbside transit way approaches. Then he reviewed a range of cross section possibilities containing various options for the number and types of lanes and sidewalk configurations. The summary included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Curbside can be accessed directly from the sidewalk, allowing the sidewalk to become part of the platform. ▪ The median transit way offers true segregation from the general purpose traffic which among other things guarantees reliable transit time. ▪ The placement of cyclist lanes is a concern for a curbside alignment as it is not desirable to put a bike between a rapid transit lane and a general traffic flow. ▪ There is more flexibility on the Island Highway in the West Shore than on Douglas Street in downtown Victoria. ▪ BC Transit has set up workshops with the affected municipalities to discuss options for parking, bike lanes, sidewalk width, traffic lanes, business access etc. <p>Comments from the committee included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion over the relative convenience of curbside vs. median alignments for pedestrians, including the observation that half the people have to cross the whole roadway with the curbside option, or all the people have to cross half the roadway with the median option. ▪ Douglas Street businesses had issues with the median busway concept due to the loss of left turns and safety concerns. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Curbside takes up less total cross-section but with the loss of some travel speed and increased side-friction. Right turns become an issue. ▪ What has been the experience of other communities that have implemented the median system? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The main concern has been when people rush to get to the platform. When we inquired there were no known incidences of injury to pedestrians because of the medians. ▪ A lengthy discussion with the committee developed around the use of bike lanes and whether they should be accommodated on the same road that supports the Rapid Transit alignment, and on the inside or outside of the transit way in a curbside 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>system. Views included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cyclists should be segregated off of major corridors such as along Douglas Street. ○ Douglas Street is not big enough for everyone. ○ We are not talking about banning cyclists, just not providing designated bike lanes along congested roadways. Those who want to cycle on congested routes can do so at their own choice. ○ The City of Victoria supports bike lanes on Douglas and will expect that they are included as part of the rapid transit development. ○ There is no problem with bicycles being on congested road ways as long as they comply with the rules of the road. Leave the bicycle lane off the critical parts of Douglas and let the riders use the car lanes just as they have been doing for many years. ○ Give cyclists an alternative option. ○ Concern over pedestrians crossing a bike lane to board rapid transit. ○ There is no perfect system. A bike lane won't make driving impossible but will make things safer for the less experienced cyclist, thereby increasing the likelihood of reducing dependency on cars. ○ Need to provide redundancy; we don't have parallel routes in Victoria so the "complete streets" approach needs to be taken. ○ The Committee's views on bike lanes on Douglas are irrelevant. ○ With issues like these, the technology needs to be considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build on the vibrancy potential of wide sidewalks. Should consider different roads for different options. ▪ 5-metre sidewalks are excessive outside the downtown core. 	
<p>8.0</p>	<p>Transit Master Plan Update</p> <p>Peter Murray provided a presentation on the BC Transit 25-year Master Plan for the Greater Victoria area. He discussed vision, goals and objectives of the plan as well as some of the different levels of service that will be offered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Master Plan is the big picture which provides the context for the Rapid Transit Plan. ▪ Up to this point we have been collecting data on current and future land use etc. and doing an extensive review of the current transit system (some of this data has been provided here at the CLC as part of the Rapid Transit project). ▪ The master plan is developed based on a transit hierarchy of services that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Rapid Transit: A very high level of service, very frequent for direct intercommunity and regional trips, with high level of passenger amenities such as real time information, off-board ticket purchasing, exclusive right of way. – Frequent Transit: featuring guaranteed service, frequent minimum of 15 minute service 15 hours a day, using major corridors and transit priority technology. – Local & Neighborhood Bus: Anything that does not meet the service guarantee of Rapid or Frequent Transit would be classified here, local and community services, standard transit stops and features. – Handy Dart: specialized & limited service. 	

	Description	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Master Plan is set to be completed by fall of 2010. <p>Comments from the committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When did this 25 years start? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We are creating the plan now for the next 25 years. ▪ These maps don't show service to the Dockyard. Esquimalt needs better service. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We have two Frequent Transit routes which begin in Dockyard. There is a whole layer of connections and services not shown on this draft map. ▪ Not enough attention is being paid to rapid/frequent service between the West Shore and Esquimalt. ▪ Acknowledge the presence of the E&N line on the maps. ▪ Moved by J. Hartshorn. ▪ Second by I. Henderson. ▪ That the community liaison committee request that commuter rail service on the E&N tracks between Langford and Downtown Victoria, through Esquimalt, be included in the Victoria BC Transit Master Plan hierarchy and routes. ▪ Carried. 	
9.0	<p>Report from Study Team E&N Study - Jim Hester – Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure</p> <p>This item was informally restored to the agenda with the arrival of BCMoT representative Jim Hester, who explained there have been unexpected delays with the study but the Ministry plans on providing the results soon.</p> <p>Comments from the committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We want commuter rail and we are concerned that there is no plan for it. ▪ It would be a disappointment to use buses instead of rail for commuter service. ▪ The committee requested that BCMoT present the results of the E&N study to the CLC. 	
9.1	<p>New Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Darrell Wicks suggested that the information for the meetings be posted on the website for public viewing before the meeting. It was agreed that agendas will be posted in advance, while presentation materials will be posted following the meeting, along with approved minutes. 	
10.0	<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May 27, 2010 	