

Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

Date:	May 28, 2009	Next Meeting:	June 18, 2009
Time:	12pm to 2pm		1pm to 3pm
Location:	CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor		CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor
Purpose:	Meeting #6: To provide feedback on the preliminary screening of the alignment options		

Attendees:	<p>Community Liaison Committee</p> <p>Allan Murphy, VIHA Barb Desjardins, Esquimalt Community Rep Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society Darin Guenette, Captain, DND David Wilson, Central Saanich Community Rep Doug Backhouse, Island Corridor Foundation 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 (alternate) John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society Michelle Mahovich, Langford Community Representative (alternate) Mohan Kang, Taxi Association of Victoria Neil Connelly, UVic Patrick O'Connor, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads</p>	<p>Regrets</p> <p>Brian Bonney, CFIB Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep Dan Gunn, VIATECH Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep Darren Marr, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition Jim Carson, Carson Development Group Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development Association John Gaipman, Victoria School District Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association Mir Ali, Turner Lane (Colwood Corners) Pat Danforth, Accessible Transportation Advisory Committee Paul McDaniel, BC Ferries Randy Northy, Association of Douglas Street Business Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (Alternate) Tracy Olsen, North Saanich Community Rep Terry Stewart, Victoria Airport Authority Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute Travis Lee, Urban Development Institute</p> <p>Project Team</p> <p>David Leather, Pacific Liaison Erinn Pinkerton, BC Transit Graeme Masterton, BC Transit Robert Lapham, CRD Jack Stuempel, Jack Stuempel & Associates Santino Pirillo, McElhanney (absent)</p>
-------------------	--	--

Attachments:	Victoria Regional Rapid Transit Master Plan Presentation
---------------------	--

	Description	Action Items
1.0	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geoff Pearce called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. 	
2.0	Approval of Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agenda approved 	
3.0	Adoption of Minutes from previous meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion to delete bullet 2 of section 5.0 of the April 30th minutes. ▪ Motion to adopt minutes as amended passed. 	
4.0	Victoria Regional Transit Master Plan Graeme Masterton presented the Victoria Regional Transit master plan. The presentation described the overall process for developing the regional network including rapid transit, looking at where we are and where we want to be in 25 years. What ever we plan for Rapid Transit - the rest of the system has to link in. Graeme provided a summary of the data gathering that has occurred so far as part of the master plan development. Comments from the committee were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add daily averages to the numbers. ▪ The CLC asked to see current routes vs. previous years and changes to routes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transit is using data from 2006 and 2008. There are lots of ways to review data and we are looking to get the best understanding of each route. Data can tell many stories and we need to analyze the data carefully to reach the right conclusions ▪ Who is responsible for the placement of bus stops? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BCT provides suggestions and consultation; Municipalities are responsible for placement. ▪ The colours of the lines are too narrow on the maps and it was requested that the lines be enlarged. ▪ In regards to the Peninsula – When making changes to the routes we want to be cognizant that we don’t increase the number of transfers and therefore increasing travel time. It will be a deterrent for riders. Route 75 has already been chopped up and the ridership has declined significantly. ▪ When looking at other successful systems we should be looking at systems that are comparable in size. ▪ Additional goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To modify in accordance with workforce structuring and business hours ○ Try to provide comfort and appeal to riders i.e. bus stop amenities, on board services etc. 	
5.0	Preliminary Screening of Alignment Options David Leather presented the preliminary screening of alignments options. The presentation described the process, the criteria and how the data was weighted, and it was noted that the weightings reflected the input of the region’s municipal planners and engineers.	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In terms of weighting, where do GHG come in? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That will be assessed when develop the technology options. We are not there yet in the process. We are looking at dedicated right of ways. ▪ Was the Province involved in the process? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Province is involved through the Working Committee and the Steering Committee and is a funding partner in this project. ▪ In the first section items C and D, why is C- 10 and D- 7? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All of these goals are relatively important. In effect what the results are doing is giving us an idea of where to focus initially. The team found it beneficial to discuss each value as a group and not individually. The weighting applied to c is 10 and the weighting for d is 7. This means that the team believes that ‘linking regional centres’ is slightly more important than ‘ how well does the alignment link to the regional network’. ○ There are different mathematical models to evaluate this information, but we are only looking for a starting point to focus our efforts initially. ▪ There don’t seem to have been consultations done with regional communities outside of the three segments. ▪ Why aren’t we measuring a segment that goes from Segment A to Segment C? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The original demographics and analysis showed that two thirds of the trips from the West Shore are branching outside of downtown. Only one third of the trip generation went to the Downtown. Segments were based on the demand side and future demand. ▪ Consider evaluating the pinch point to downtown and the pinch point to Uptown separately. ▪ Could we see rider evaluations from Esquimalt/Vic West to Core as a separate segment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are not evaluating this alignment separately. We are coming up with solutions on how to connect the different segments. ▪ Is it possible on Segment C to put E&N as a 5th option? Does that allow weighting to go from A to B to C? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are basing the information on infrastructure (rights of way) that currently exist and evaluating if this is really the best route. This is an example of where connectivity of the regional network (master plan) comes into play. ▪ There needs to be a separate analysis of segment C, otherwise you take Esquimalt out of the equation. It is important to look at this route through this section. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have always recognized that a regional Master Plan is of upmost importance. Graeme is working diligently in conjunction 	<p>Project Team to make minutes of the DPAC meeting available to CLC</p>

	Description	Action Items
	<p>to this project to ensure that we will have an integrated system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Segment C – Around the issues of right of way on Douglas and Blanshard. Isn't this already in place on Douglas Street from over a decade ago? ▪ Consider impact of recent announcement of 1400 new jobs related to DND modernization in Esquimalt. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Link to news article on this announcement: http://www.timescolonist.com/news/Jobs+dollars+pour+modernize+Esquimalt/1552357/story.html. <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To start detailed option development with technology consideration ▪ Timeline for this to be completed, approximately 8 Weeks 	
6.0	<p>Report from Study Team on E&N Study - Jean Bishop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IBI Group has been selected as primary consultant. They have partnered with Hatch Mott McDonald. Hatch Mott McDonald will be focusing on the rail assessment part of the study. ▪ The consultants have on hand the majority of information with the goal to produce 4 working papers on each of the following topics: freight, passenger, seasonal/eco-tourism and commuter analysis. The due date for the papers is the end of June. ▪ These four papers will make up the foundation for Phase 1 of the study. ▪ June 9th we will have a stakeholder workshop. Primarily made up of board members from the ICF as well as three advisory committees. Geoff Pearce will be invited but this meeting is not open to the public. ▪ We will also be participating with BCT at their open houses. We are also planning our own open houses in regional districts and communities; we are establishing dates for those. ▪ We will be sending out requests to present at regional districts. ▪ After all of this, the foundation paper is to be completed by the end of August. ▪ We are moving forward as quickly as possible ▪ We will be present the foundation papers at the CLC meeting when they are completed. 	
6.0	<p>Municipal Liaison Committee Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In addition to the CLC and we have been engaging the Municipal Liaison Committee made up of planners and engineers from all the municipalities. ▪ The working group has set up monthly meetings for the last Friday of every month. ▪ The working team hopes to get the two groups together to hear what each group is talking about. In the meantime Erinn will work on getting their minutes and sharing ours with them. 	
7.0	Open Houses	

	Description	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have three open houses in June. Based on feedback from the last open houses we have switched locations – one on the Gorge, one in Colwood and a long session at Victoria City Hall to catch people on their lunch and after work. Erinn will send out the dates. ▪ To enable the CLC to review the open house materials before they are presented to the public, Erinn is recommending that we move the CLC meeting to June 18th at 1pm. ▪ This was agreed to by the committee. ▪ Because of concerns over holding open houses during the summer vacation period, the next round of open houses will be held after the summer. 	<p>Erinn to send out dates and exact locations of open houses.</p>
<p>8.0</p>	<p>New Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Doug Backhouse introduced the new Director of the Island Corridor Foundation, Graham Bruce. Doug will stay on CLC as the liaison for ICF. ▪ McTavish Interchange – Given that there is a proposal for a new interchange at McTavish, is there concern about the impact of this new interchange and a new LRT system on our project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Santino Pirillo from our working group is working closely with MOT to ensure that all transit needs are being met. 	
<p>9.0</p>	<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Next meeting June 18, 2009 	

Notes by: Dodie Cox
May 28, 2009