

Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

Date: October 28, 2010 **Next Meeting:** November 25, 2010

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

Location: CRD Board Room – 6th Floor **Location:** Ambrosia Banquet Centre

Purpose: Meeting #15: October Open House Results

Attendees: Community Liaison Committee **Attendees:** Regrets

- Allan Murphy, VIHA
- Mayor Barb Desjardins, Esquimalt Rep
- Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses
- Mayor Dave Saunders, Colwood Rep
- Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society
- Darrell Wick, 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
- Bill Draper, Island Transformations
- Irwin Henderson, Island Transformations
- John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep
- John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce
- John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society
- Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association
- Pat Danforth, Accessible Transportation Advisory Committee
- Linda Hundleby, Esquimalt Rep

- Brian Bonney, CFIB
- Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep
- Dan Gunn, VIATECH
- Darin Guenette, Captain, DND
- David Wilson, Central Saanich Community Rep
- Doug Backhouse, Island Corridor Foundation
- Jim Carson, Carson Development Group Association
- Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development
- John Manson, Langford Community Rep
- Michael McWhinnie, DND
- Dan Spinner, 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
- Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads
- Neill Connelly, UVic
- Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute
- Patrick O'Connor, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition
- Michelle Mahovlich, Langford Community Rep
- Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun
- Adam Gant, League Assets Corp. (City Centre Colwood)
- Mohan Kang, Taxi Association of Victoria
- Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (Alternate)

- Project Team**
- Adrian South, BC Transit
 - Robert Broe, Pacific Liaison
 - Jack Stuempe, Jack Stuempe & Associates
 - Santino Pirillo, MacElhanney
 - Gamal Shady, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure

Erinn Pinkerton, BC Transit

Attachments: Presentation Materials

	Description	Action Items
1.0	<p>Call to Order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geoff Pearce called the meeting to order at 12:06 p.m. 	
1.1	<p>Approval of Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda was approved with the addition of discussion of Island Corridor and Blue Bridge rail component. 	
2.0	<p>Adoption of Minutes from previous meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the August 26th meeting of the CLC adopted as circulated. 	
3.0	<p>October Open House Results</p> <p>Jack Stuempel reported on the October Open House Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very positive turnout: Victoria had approximately 300 attendees, Langford had a total of 200 attendees. • Participants included representatives from potential technical suppliers Bombardier and the Wright Bus Company. • Open ended feedback had two common responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support for a rail-based solution was heavily favored ○ Second was support for the process BC Transit was utilizing to make project decisions and involve the community • West Shore residents expressed more interest in creating a role for E&N; however, there is a greater understanding that the E&N would have a more specialized purpose than Rapid Transit on the approved alignment. • In Summary: people are happy with the direction of the project and what we've done so far. Even though it was a late addition to the options, the side-running configuration is very popular. People want to see long-term value and support a rail based, vs. bus based technology. Above anything, people want to see Rapid Transit as soon as possible. <p>Comments from the Committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does the "role" of E&N mean? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The public expressed a variety of comments and definitions regarding this. Some thought it should be used as a main route because it would suit their own needs some suggested it be used to complement/supplement Rapid Transit, while others simply do not want to see it lost but had no suggestion for what to use it for. • Can you confirm that we need both the E&N route and the Galloping Goose route? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They each have a role to play in the transportation spectrum. From a 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>Rapid Transit point of view, our job is to focus on the Rapid Transit corridor and the development of that network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car-pooling seems to be a partial solution to our current congestion issues, yet it is not discussed here. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are certainly local organizations who are dedicated to car-pooling, however BC Transit is focusing efforts of the development of a Rapid Transit system. 	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Business Community Survey Results</p> <p>Jack Stuempel reported on the Business Community Survey Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To address the concerns of local downtown business raised during dialogue at the CLC, specifically the impact on their businesses during and after the implementation of rapid transit, BC Transit conducted a survey of downtown property owners, businesses and their customers with the help of Malatest and Associates in July. The purpose was to take a closer look at issues and opportunities for businesses along the alignment. • The survey was a comprehensive survey consisting of 500 businesses and 400 customers. 14.5% of customers reported they were transit users. • Responses from business and property owners included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better streetscapes and improved transit were positive for business - Reduction of parking was negative - Businesses overall were supportive of rapid transit, although some (21%) predicted a decrease in customer traffic as a result; the majority predicted no change or an increase • Responses from customers included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Being in a vibrant and transit accessible area was important and would influence them to visit - Reduction of parking was less important to them than being in a vibrant area and accessible by transit - 93% of customers stated they would be equally or more likely to go downtown - Overwhelming positive support for rapid transit • Survey validated that there are some genuine concerns about access and accessibility, which the project team recognizes and will continue to address with the business community. • Full results of the survey are located on the BC Transit Rapid Transit web site. <p>Comments from the Committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why were Colwood businesses not consulted or included on the survey? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This survey was conducted based on specific concerns brought forward to the CLC by downtown Victoria businesses that could be affected by the implementation of certain Rapid Transit alignments. When preparing to undertake the survey, BCT looked at the alignments and chose those businesses/ property owners who were along the alignment. Due to the 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>different nature of the business accesses in Colwood and Langford, BC Transit felt that there wasn't a need to ask these specific questions, especially regarding on street parking since there is none, and business accesses. The survey is a reflection of the dialogue that has happened in this group. Since the beginning, the project has reserved a chair at the CLC for the West Shore Chamber of Commerce as the voice of West Shore businesses as we have done for their Victoria counterparts. To date BC Transit has not heard concerns raised in this committee from Colwood or Langford businesses, or their representatives. If they would like to raise concerns then of course BC Transit would like to hear from them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business in Langford and Colwood should have a say, regardless of their location relative to the alignment. • For clarification, 79% of businesses thought that there would be no negative effect on traffic due to the implementation of Rapid Transit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct, 21% said there would be a negative effect, so 79% thought it would stay the same or better. • BC Transit should also speak to the landowners as they may have different opinions/experience than those leasing the space for their business. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The survey had a component for both business owners and property owners. They did receive both separate and succinct questionnaires. • Are you differentiating between on street parking and those businesses that have off-street parking? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our study differentiated between on street, on sight and nearby parking. 	
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Alignment Development - Status</p> <p>Robert Broe updated the CLC on developments and status of the alignment design issues, and the multiple account evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main update is the endorsement of segment A from the City of Langford, via Goldstream to Station, then adjacent to the E&N to the Westhills development. This is being presented to the BC Transit Board of Directors today. The initial approval from the BC Transit Board of Directors only showed the alignment to Colwood Corners. • Side-running way has been presented to Colwood as an alternative to the approved curbside configuration. BCT will be meeting with their committee on November 9th to give them updates. • BCT is currently working with View Royal to answer all their questions and work on the alignments there. • On October 18th we presented to Saanich Mayor and Council outlining all the configurations that are under consideration in Saanich. The presentation was well received and we are waiting on a report from their staff to go to council. • The Victoria section of the alignment presents the greatest number of configurations. 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>BCT has recently completed all of the analysis of the five alignments, particularly south of Hillside, and has submitted a report to the city staff. BCT is waiting for comment on the report from the city.</p> <p>Comments from the Committee included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to thank Transit for their good working relationship and effort with us at the City of Colwood. I would like the word “endorsement” substituted until we know what the project is going to cost. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To clarify, we are gaining endorsement of the alignment route not the whole project at this point. • This whole process is taking too long. We keep hearing that it will take 25 years to complete—we need to hurry up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 25 years refers to the time when the whole transit network will be completed, not just the implementation for Rapid Transit. - The reworking of the whole network has actually already started with the construction of the new McTavish Interchange, Park and Ride at Langford exchange, the implementation of the Bay Street bus route, and the Uptown project/exchange just to name a few. • Why the urgency to link Goldstream to Colwood? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There already exists a strong link between Goldstream Avenue heading into the Colwood’s city centre. • Where are the stops along that route between Colwood Corners and Goldstream? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preliminary designs indicate a stop East of Veterans Memorial Parkway, one at Station Avenue, and an extension with a stop in the West Hills area. • As the Chamber of Commerce representative, I want to go on record to state that we think there is too much on the configuration presented to Victoria with the cars, rail, cycle-way and pedestrian sidewalk. That is too much going on and we think something should be removed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have presented all of the options to the City of Victoria. They all require the removal of a GP lane in order to implement. It is much easier to remove something from the lane than to add it once it has been approved. - Removal of a bike lane is not up to us. These lanes are mandated by the City of Victoria and as such BCT must include the bike lanes in the design. Once an alignment is approved, then we will head into the design phase and these options will be reviewed again • Motion suggested: Cost Benefit Analysis of having Rapid Transit connect to E&N • Point of Order: since the agenda has already been approved let us move the motion to the New Business portion of the meeting. There was no mention of this motion prior to this presentation. • It was agreed to defer a motion to have a Cost Benefit Analysis of having Rapid Transit connect to E&N, for consideration under New Business. • Why is the Douglas/Government Street Couplet still on the alignment options to City of Victoria? 	

	Description	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BCT has reviewed all of the options and have made a recommendation of one of the options to the City of Victoria. All options were evaluated against strict criteria and our report to the City summarizes that. While it has not been formally eliminated, the couplet has scored the lowest and will likely be the first to go. • What is the recommended alignment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are not at liberty to say as it is still before the City of Victoria. 	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Technology Evaluation</p> <p>Robert Broe updated the committee on the technology options listing some of the cost, capacity and travel time benefits of each technology. Currently the systems considered are a bus-based system and a rail-based system. Key fundamentals show that with the rail-based system we see a potential ridership increase in the opening year compared to today of up to 50%. Final evaluations and data collection are near completion and are expected for the final meeting.</p> <p>Some comments from the committee include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we are in support of Rapid Transit then we do not want to encourage allowing more vehicles on the highway by expanding the highway. We need the highway to stay congested so that people realize the benefits of taking transit. • Is Rail on the table? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BCT is considering both rail and bus based technologies. • Are you considering the amount of GHG's each option emits? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, each option is analyzed for its environmental footprint along with the other criteria. • Are you looking at only bus and rail options? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BCT refers to them bus based or rail based. Many options fit into those two categories. For example, the tram is under the rail-based system. • Therefore, we could put a tram on the E&N rail track. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the E&N were the corridor we had approved then perhaps, but remember that we are looking at the approved Rapid Transit alignment. • You should have clear definitions listed on each page of the reports and presentations because people do not remember all of the terms. • Your chart says that the goal is to get 3 minute headways—that seems unrealistic. I am not aware of any system that runs that fast. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many systems have a smaller headway: In Vancouver they have 90 second headways to 45 second headways. A three minute headway is within reason for our system. • What will it cost to convert from bus to rail? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BCT has not done the cost analysis to comment on that. We will not implement a system until we have the results from all of the studies. • Why does it take two more years to implement a rail based system than it would to implement a bus-based system? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The logistics of constructing a rail based system are more complicated. • Is an electric bus an option? 	

	Description	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have considered this. The electric bus is very different from the electric trolley. You do not get the same level of efficiency and time advantage with the electric bus. • Please give us all of the options you are looking at. Is there a way to see if they meet with the environmental targets set by the Provincial Government in 2008? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This report is coming from our multiple account evaluation. The draft of that evaluation will be ready for you at the next meeting. • Do we have concerns about electricity capacity at this point? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is unknown at this point, BCT has not discussed this with BC Hydro. • Have we looked at these numbers on a per capita basis? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most analysis will look at cost as a per kilometer amount. Nevertheless, yes, we can put the costs as per household amount. 	
6.0	<p>New Business From the CLC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion: to have a Cost Benefit Analysis of having Rapid Transit connect to E&N passed. 	
7.0	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>The next regular meeting will be on November 25, 2010. Subject to confirmation, the meeting will take place at the Ambrosia Centre.</p>	
8.0	<p>Meeting Adjourned</p> <p>Meeting Adjourned at 1:56</p>	