

Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

Date:	October 29, 2009	Next Meeting:	Tentative February 11, 2010
Time:	12pm to 2pm		12pm to 2pm
Location:	CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor		CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor
Purpose:	Meeting #11: Preferred Alignment and Next Steps		

Attendees:	<p>Community Liaison Committee Allan Murphy, VIHA Barb Desjardins, Esquimalt Community Rep Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society Darin Guenette, Captain, DND Doug Robinson, View Royal Community Rep 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 Mir Ali, Turner Lane (Colwood Corners) Neil Connelly, UVic Pat Danforth, Accessible Transportation Advisory Committee Patrick O'Connor, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition</p> <p>Project Team David Leather, Pacific Liaison Erinn Cousins, BC Transit Robert Lapham, CRD Jack Stuempel, Jack Stuempel & Associates Santino Pirillo, McElhanney</p>	<p>Regrets Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses Bill Draper, Island Transformations (alternate) Brian Bonney, CFIB Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep Dan Gunn, VIATECH David Wilson, Central Saanich Community Rep Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep Darren Marr, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition Doug Backhouse, Island Corridor Foundation Edward Pullman, Uvic Student Society Jim Carson, Carson Development Group Association John Gaipman, Victoria School District John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association Michelle Mahovich, Langford Community Representative (alternate) Mohan Kang, Taxi Association of Victoria 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 Vageli Dadiotis, Pacific Carbon Trust</p>
-------------------	---	--

Attachments: None

	Description	Action Items
1.0	<p>Call to Order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geoff Pearce called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. 	
2.0	<p>Approval of Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jim Hartshorn would like to add to item #4 – a discussion of how the CLC process has worked Agenda approved as amended 	
2.0	<p>Adoption of Minutes from previous meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion to adopt minutes passed. 	
3.0	<p>Consultation Activities</p> <p>Jack Stuempel presented the results of the recent public consultation activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower feedback rate than our prior public consultation open houses Written comments – in general there was a good support for the conclusion and preferred alignment Not a lot of feedback this time on technology Fairly good support of process and information Suggestions on locations and nature of transit exchanges Still support of E&N as a commuter rail and understanding its not for rapid transit Concerns with the compatibility with pedestrians on south Government with the couplet option Overall good buy-in on the process and presentations <p>Comments from the committee as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where does the couplet merge back to go to uptown on the Government couplet option. Answer: Hillside How does this fit in with pedestrian streets based on Gil Penalosa presentation? Answer: You can have a decent mix with your transit systems along with bicycle paths. Comments in the papers that suggested that technology has been selected and we are going with curbside buses. Can you comment on the article and how it was addressed? Answer: The article was from the Goldstream Gazette which inaccurately quoted Manuel Achadinha as saying the technology was Rapid Bus on the shoulder lane. The actual statement at the media briefing was that we are looking at various technologies that may include a shoulder bus lane, or rail. The reporter got our wording of Transit Way confused with Bus Way. Since then Goldstream said they would issue a clarification but we have not seen it yet. Do we know number of web hits and traffic to the website? Answer: Jack will provide stats on web stats from website activity In the next steps on what happens on the ground, Langford has some concerns with the impact to streetscaping etc.? Answer: This will be part of the next steps. 	

	Description	Action Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns on Government street: couplet will hit resistance over whether any traffic should be part of south Government. This will involve some discussions around technology as well. 	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Results of the Board of Directors and Transit Commission Meeting. Erinn and Manuel presented the results of the Board of Directors and Victoria Regional Transit Commission meetings.</p> <p>The following alignment was endorsed by the Commission and approved by the Board of Directors:</p> <p>Segment A – Colwood Corners to Six Mile along the Island Highway.</p> <p>Segment B – Six Mile to Uptown between the TransCanada Highway and the Galloping Goose.</p> <p>Segment C – Uptown to Downtown along Douglas Street. An option that would loop Douglas and Government will also be assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Commission endorsed the preferred alignments and the Board of Directors approved the alignment, with the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The connection from Colwood Corners to Langford needs to be assessed further with the municipality of Langford. - The results of the MOT E&N study need to be incorporated into the master plan <p>Comments from the Committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who sits on the Commission and what area are they from? Does it impact the decisions? Answer: The Commission makes endorsements to the Board and consults on routes and rates. Commission members consist of 2 representatives from Victoria, 2 from Saanich, 1 from the Westshore, 1 from the Peninsula and 1 from Oakbay/Esquimalt. Currently the Commission is made up of the Mayor of Victoria and 1 Victoria Council (awaiting appointment), Mayor Leonard and Councilor Brice from Saanich, Mayor Mar from Central Saanich, Mayor Causton of Oak Bay and Mayor Evans from Sooke. The Board is made up of 4 elected officials and 3 business people. ▪ Geoff Pearce prepared a Report for the municipalities with the E and N rail , and the Municipal Councils have written the Minister that the West Shore municipalities are under represented and the Commission membership needs to be adjusted to be consistent in the representation by population ▪ The Commission referred to a connection to the E&N. How much of the route can be adjusted to allow for such a connection ? Answer: The Board approved the preferred alignment, which provides connectivity at Six Mile. This was always the rationale to have the linkage to the E&N, 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>Galloping Goose, Bike ways etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there connection from E&N station to Douglas and/or Douglas/Government couplet? Answer: Downtown connectivity will depend in part on the outcome of the E&N Rail study. ▪ Did the Commission/Board have any comments about DND/Dockyard workers? This preferred alignment does not do anything for Esquimalt. Answer: This issue was brought up with both the Commission and the Board. The DND/Dockyard area is best served with commuter rail and other elements of the Transit Master Plan. ▪ Manuel noted that the Victoria Regional Transit Master Plan is designed to capture all of the system connections, with a vision looking ahead to the next 20-25 years. The intention is to have Rapid Transit as part of the big picture. The Rapid Transit business case is expected to be completed in about 10 months. 	
<p>4.0B</p>	<p>CLC Committee – How the process worked</p> <p>Comments from the committee included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jim Hartshorne commented on the process to date and expressed concern over the selection of a route independent of technology, and at the exclusion of commuter rail from the scope of the Rapid Transit study. ▪ Erik Kaye offered an alternative view, describing the process as good and clearly laid-out, and the CLC as effective. Disagreement with the outcome should not be blamed on the process. ▪ Dan Pollock: It is time to talk technology now. Also, it should be noted that the project team has made changes as a result of input; there should be documentation of how input has been applied. ▪ John Harris: CLC is not running the show, they are here to report out to and communicating feedback from the communities they represented. We may not be going fast enough, but the process is working. But we should consider short-cuts so we can be ready if an unexpected opportunity arises. ▪ Irwin Henderson: This was a terrific window on the process. Input could be structured better, with clarification of expectations for communicating with constituent groups. Earlier discussions on evaluation criteria for technology would be good. ▪ Bev Highton: Interested in business case detail with respect to technology; can't just load taxpayers. ▪ John Luton: The multiple account evaluation should consider externalities, such as cost of continued reliance on cars, environmental costs of the status quo, etc. <p>Manuel explained that the completion of a business case is 10 months away. The business case will be multi-faceted, not just direct capital cost. Planning will have to consider the commuter rail study as part of the master planning, all the elements to UVIC, what his happening on the Peninsula, we have to look at the region as a whole and where the VRRRT fits into the grand scheme.</p>	

	Description	Action Items
5.0	<p>Moving Forward Next Steps/Future CLC Meetings</p> <p>Erinn suggested a reduction in meeting frequency from the current monthly interval to a series reflecting key milestones in January, May and September. Additional information-sharing would continue via email. The consultation will also include more open houses, workshops with users and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Comments from the committee are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intervals of up to 4 months are too long given the importance and public interest in the project; suggested every two months, the CLC would like to still have input on open houses and workshops etc. ▪ The CLC should be notified of major announcements and media briefings. Also, it would be useful to be provided new background reading on Rapid Transit technologies in preparation for the next meeting and the upcoming phase of work, such as speed, safety, emissions, etc. of various options. 	<p>Erinn will discuss with the team and come back with recommended schedule and dates based on committee feedback.</p>
6.0	<p>Report from Study Team</p> <p>Bob Lapham - CRD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CRD staff will be reporting to the CRD Board on infrastructure priorities. Material will be shared with the CLC after delivery to the Board <p>Ashok Bhatti – E&N Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The scope of the study is looking at all aspects of the entire 220KM line, commuter rail is only one component ▪ The study is behind schedule due to complexity of the corridor and the many different business functions in the many different communities ▪ Nearing conclusion, but nothing to share until information is validated. ▪ Geoff Pearce asked that the Ministry provide a special briefing for the CLC when it is ready to report. 	<p>Bob Lapham to supply report</p> <p>Ministry will consider CLC briefing</p>
7.0	<p>New Business</p> <p>None</p>	
8.0	<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Erinn will circulate a new schedule 	