

Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

Date: July 30, 2009 **Next Meeting:** August 27, 2009
Time: 12pm to 2pm 12pm to 2pm
Location: CRD Board Room – 6th Floor CRD Board Room – 6th Floor
Purpose: Meeting #8: To provide feedback from the open houses, provide summary of alignments under consideration and present draft transit network

Attendees: **Community Liaison Committee**
Allan Murphy, VIHA
Bill Draper, Island Transformations (alternate)
Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society
Edward Pullman, Uvic Student Society
Irwin Henderson, Island Transformations
Jim Carson, Carson Development Group
Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development Association
John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce
John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep
John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society
Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun
Karyn Wood, Carson Development Group (alternate)
Mir Ali, Turner Lane (Colwood Corners)
Mohan Kang, Taxi Association of Victoria
Neil Connelly, UVic
Pat Danforth, Accessible Transportation Advisory Committee
Patrick O'Connor, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition
Randall Garrison, Esquimalt Community Representative (alternate)
Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (alternate)
Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads

Regrets
Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses
Brian Bonney, CFIB
Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep
Darin Guenette, Captain, DND
Dan Gunn, VIATECH
Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep
David Wilson, Central Saanich Community Rep
Doug Robinson, View Royal Community Rep
Erik Kaye, Victoria Community Rep
Geoff Pearce, Citizens for Commuter Rail
John Manson, Langford Community Rep
Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association
Randy Northy, Association of Douglas Street Business
Terry Stewart, Victoria Airport Authority
Tracy Olsen, North Saanich Community Rep
Travis Lee, Urban Development Institute

Project Team
David Leather, Pacific Liaison
Erinn Pinkerton, BC Transit
Graeme Masterton, BC Transit
Robert Lapham, CRD
Jack Stuempel, Jack Stuempel & Associates
Santino Pirillo, McElhanney (absent)

Attachments: _____

	Description	Action Items
1.0	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Erinn Pinkerton called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m. As Geoff Pearce was not in attendance the committee agreed that Erinn would chair the meeting. 	
2.0	Approval of Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agenda approved 	

	Description	Action Items
3.0	<p>Adoption of Minutes from previous meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The committee requested the minutes be sent out again as many did not receive them the first time they were sent. 	Resend minutes to CLC Members
4.0	<p>June Open Houses – Summary of Feedback</p> <p>Jack Stuempel reviewed the feed back from the three Open houses held in June. From the Open Houses it was noted that there is growing interest in the project, with high levels of attendance and feed back from the sessions.</p> <p>Results from the interactive exercises were fairly consistent with the results received from the CLC Committee and the Planner and Engineers.</p> <p>Weighting of the Guiding Principals:</p> <p>Scores were generally the same as those given by the CLC Committee and the Project Team. Differences were found in the guiding principals, “Environmental Responsibility” and “Affordability”. It was noted that there could have been confusion regarding the nature of these Principals.</p> <p>Comments and suggestions from members of the committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Project Team is too concerned with “Affordability”, much more than the committee and the public. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As stated previously, “Affordability” includes the cost for the public in the form of the cost of tickets etc. ▪ The Open Houses were presented very well. However, let us keep in mind that the feedback is just “food for thought” based on randomness as well as the small representation of the general public. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreed. The results are important as they inform us of what some of the public is thinking. But there is no scientific validity to the numbers/ratings gathered. ▪ There is a history of the government intent on maintaining a strong control on how the City of Victoria taxes its citizens; so, keep that in mind, when thinking that some of the funding for the project could come from taxes. <p>Ranking of the Alignment Options</p> <p>The other interactive exercise asked the public to rank the alignment options. The E&N was a very popular first choice. Second and third choices were the Galloping Goose and the Goldstream Island Highway. We found that a lot of people are leaping ahead and predicting what mode of technology will work best. Instead of choosing the corridor they chose the mode and then found the corridor that would accommodate the technology. Douglas Street was the favored choice for the uptown to downtown corridor with Blanchard coming in second.</p> <p>Comments and suggestions from members of the committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ You can not add the scores for the Galloping Goose and the Trans-Canada Highway together. That will produce inaccurate measurements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The exercise was not a vote. We don’t necessarily know where people are coming from in all the selections that they made. These results are not statistically valid. We are interpreting the results—not changing the parameters. The point for us is 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>to see if we have missed any alignments and if we are on the right track. The benefit was to see that we have not missed any alignments.</p> <p>Written Comments A huge range of comments with a wide range of views were received. There was mostly favorable feedback regarding the process thus far. A considerable amount of feedback requesting that the system serve UVic, the Peninsula, James Bay etc. Lots of support for rail based technologies was noted and a desire to accommodate bicycles and other modes of transportation was listed among priorities.</p>	
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Alignment Options – Summary David Leather reviewed a summary of the alignment options. These are the options that are going to be put forward and tested. Actual right of ways for transit along those alignments will be installed. Segment A is the E&N, Goldstream Island Highway and the Galloping Goose; Segment B Galloping Goose and TCH will be put together because they run parallel; Segment C Uptown to Downtown, Douglas and Government Couplet and Blanshard. The plan is to discuss the right of ways on those alignments with the CLC, the engineers and planners and the public.</p> <p>Comments and suggestions from members of the committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Chamber of Commerce would like it taken into consideration access to businesses along the Douglas downtown. Look at the size of Douglas and Blanchard and keep in mind that businesses need to have easy access for their customers. ▪ I think it is important to get these options worked out because they are what is going to drive the next phase. We recognized that some corridor options had inherent technology associated with them. Out of the results of the Open Houses, where people are clearly picking technology before the alignments, might it be sensible to be doing some options that do a routing and technology together? ▪ Clearly other people, including the committee and the public, are talking about technology. Maybe then the project team should talk about technology. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If we have a dedicated right of way it allows more flexibility with technology. We have talked about technology by deciding that that we need a dedicated right of way. At this point it is important to focus on the alignment. ▪ The team handicaps the discussion by not allowing the discussion of technology to begin. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have to make sure that the alignment is where people want to go. If we jump to technology we are at risk of creating a system that does not deliver people where they need to be. Form follows function; we must first choose the alignment. ▪ You can not separate alignments and technology. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We would like to remind you that the Commuter Rail study is going on independently from the Rapid Transit study that we are doing. Therefore we are looking at Rapid Transit options for the E&N and commuter rail is also being assessed. 	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Multiple Account Evaluation: TransDec: Transit Investment Decision Support Tool Erinn Pinkerton introduced the Multiple Account Evaluation system and software that will be</p>	<p>ACTION: Erinn Pinkerton to</p>

	Description	Action Items
	used to develop options for the preferred alignment selected. These options should be evaluated using a multiple accounts evaluation approach. There are 5 accounts that will be examined: Financial performance; Customer Service; Economic Development; Environment and Social. The new software developed to measure these 5 accounts is called TransDec—transit investment decision software tool and this technology will be used to evaluate the options.	send out link to TransDec
7.0	<p>Draft Transit Master Plan Network</p> <p>Santino reviewed the studies that have been presented up to this time: frequency of travel, current routes, and ridership. These studies have proven that there is a need for a restructuring of the bus system from Uptown to Downtown. 45% of the people being transported along the Douglas corridor are being done by Transit. Yet, the corridor is full beyond vehicle capacity; however, we still need to be able to carry more people which means we need to change the system to allow more travelers without increasing the number of buses. The suggestion is to have Uptown to Downtown run predominantly with Rapid Transit. Through Hillside and Fort Street up to UVic would be another Rapid Transit corridor and then Downtown to Sidney.</p> <p>Comments and suggestions from members of the committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We should eliminate car use in the downtown core. ▪ There are more people travelling on buses during the day then during the peak periods. We have a highly utilized bus system. The buses are full all day everyday. 	
8.0	<p>Report from Study Team</p> <p>Jean Bishop reviewed the feedback given at the Open Houses, both those shared with BC Transit and those which were hosted in Courtenay, and one in Parksville. There was significant feedback with a common response indicating an interest in cycling along the corridor and having the ability to bring bicycles on to trains. Other concerns mentioned by the public were an increase in access for tourists, and the addition of commuter rail. The study team is going to hold follow up meetings with the municipal stakeholders (planners and engineers) to get feedback on land use plans along the corridor and station locations. As well, they will hold meetings with their steering committee, and will follow up with more open houses in order to present updates to the public.</p>	
9.0	<p>New Business</p> <p>Erinn Pinkerton announced that speaker Gil Penalosa, CEO of Walk and Bike for Life, will be coming to Victoria to speak about linking transportation networks, including walking, cycling and bus in a sustainable system. Gil will be speaking at UVic on September 22nd; however, Erinn will send out formal invitations to everyone on the committee. The event will be held by invitation only. Erinn asked that members of the committee notify her if there are other people they think should be invited.</p>	
8.0	<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Next meeting August 27, 2009 	