

Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

Date:	September 24, 2009	Next Meeting:	October 29, 2009		
Time:	12pm to 2pm		12pm to 2pm		
Location:	CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor		CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor		
Purpose:	Meeting #10: Evaluation of Alignment Options				
Attendees:	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Community Liaison Committee Barb Desjaradins, Esquimalt Community Representative Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society Darin Guenette, Captain, DND Dave Saunders, Colwood Community Representative (alternate) 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 Irwin Henderson, Island Transformations Jim Carson, Carson Development Group Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development Association John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun 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 Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (alternate) Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute (VTI)</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Regrets Allan Murphy, VIHA Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses Brian Bonney, CFIB Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep Dan Gunn, VIATECH Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce John Manson, Langford Community Rep Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association Terry Stewart, Victoria Airport Authority Tracy Olsen, North Saanich Community Rep Travis Lee, Urban Development Institute Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads</p> <p>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</p> </td> </tr> </table>			<p>Community Liaison Committee Barb Desjaradins, Esquimalt Community Representative Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society Darin Guenette, Captain, DND Dave Saunders, Colwood Community Representative (alternate) 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 Irwin Henderson, Island Transformations Jim Carson, Carson Development Group Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development Association John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun 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 Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (alternate) Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute (VTI)</p>	<p>Regrets Allan Murphy, VIHA Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses Brian Bonney, CFIB Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep Dan Gunn, VIATECH Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce John Manson, Langford Community Rep Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association Terry Stewart, Victoria Airport Authority Tracy Olsen, North Saanich Community Rep Travis Lee, Urban Development Institute Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads</p> <p>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</p>
<p>Community Liaison Committee Barb Desjaradins, Esquimalt Community Representative Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society Darin Guenette, Captain, DND Dave Saunders, Colwood Community Representative (alternate) 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 Irwin Henderson, Island Transformations Jim Carson, Carson Development Group Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development Association John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun 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 Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (alternate) Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute (VTI)</p>	<p>Regrets Allan Murphy, VIHA Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses Brian Bonney, CFIB Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep Dan Gunn, VIATECH Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce John Manson, Langford Community Rep Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association Terry Stewart, Victoria Airport Authority Tracy Olsen, North Saanich Community Rep Travis Lee, Urban Development Institute Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads</p> <p>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</p>				

Attachments: _____

	Description	Action Items
1.0	<p>Call to Order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geoff Pearce called the meeting to order at 12:05 	
2.0	<p>Approval of Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agenda amended to move the report from study team before the review of alignment options ▪ Agenda approved 	

	Description	Action Items
3.0	<p>Adoption of Minutes from previous meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minutes approved 	
4.0	<p>Report from Study Team</p> <p>Jean Bishop reviewed a presentation from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure on the E&N Rail Study which was distributed to CLC members following the previous month’s meeting. Her summary noted that the study is looking at freight rail, tourism, commuter rail and at the condition of all rail assets along the E&N. Stakeholders and individuals along the route were consulted, and open houses and land-use workshops were held to get feedback from the public. It was found that most freight movements are now short-haul rather than long-haul and thus more suited to trucking. The rail market share will depend on its ability to compete with truck and ship delivery time and costs. Rail becomes more efficient and competitive over long distance. Several stakeholders have noted that the mining industry could provide potential traffic for raw commodity movement. There is some market potential for a tourist train service but the surveys only showed a 15% interest in such a train and the survey showed that the interest lay with a heritage themed train service.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does Via Rail have to be involved with E&N? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No. Via Rail is simply the operator, but it is not mandatory that we use them. ▪ Does your study include transport cars for luggage? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. ▪ Does this study keep in consideration the needs of wheelchair users? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Accessibility would be up to the operating company. ▪ You cannot measure day trip demands simply by what is used now for day trips—introduce a better service and more demand will appear. ▪ We must consider the cost of rail vs. the cost of would be to change the highway. ▪ The Island Corridor Foundation agrees the rail must serve multiple markets, but the Steering Committee has not yet received this presentation. There appears to be a pervasive negative bias and a better multiple account evaluation is needed. There has not been consultation with stakeholders of rail and what is being presented is old material. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The full foundation report has been delivered to the Ministry. Following internal review, it will be shared with the ICF Steering Committee and the public. 	<p>Jean to review travel times listed on the presentation and the destinations being measured.</p>
5.0	<p>Evaluation of Alignments</p> <p>See Detailed Screening of Alignment Attachment</p> <p>Erinn reviewed the evaluation criteria and how each segment ranked against the evaluation factors.</p> <p>Segment A: West Shore to Colwood Interchange</p> <p>It was acknowledged that there had been push-back on the original Goldstream alignment; new alternatives have been developed to more closely reflect Langford’s plans. One uses Meaford Avenue, and the other uses Station Avenue via the E&N.</p>	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>The E&N/Goldstream/Island Highway Alignment was ranked number one for Segment A.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would this option pick up passengers along the Island Highway? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, it would pick up from Western Exchange, Colwood Corners as well as two or three intermediate stations along there. So where the Galloping Goose and E&N would have only a few stops, Island Highway/Goldstream would have stops every 800 meters. ▪ But there are no houses along the Island Highway, it is all commercial. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The intent is to serve multiple markets which include shopping, education, leisure as well as to/from work trips. ▪ Are we trying to follow existing development or lead future development? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are trying to look at what already exists and what has the potential to grow and develop, based on the information supplied by the municipal planners and engineers . ▪ The zoning in Colwood Corners is dense with high growth. Both areas intersect at the Highway and Galloping Goose and our engineers are saying that the growth is going to be in this area. Are we going to discuss funding? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes at a future point. ▪ How did you rate/weight the criteria? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We used the weighting which was determined with this committee and the public at the open houses. <p>Segment B: Colwood Interchange to Core</p> <p>The Galloping Goose/Trans Canada Highway ranked number one for Segment B.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We want to make sure we have the best option for transportation in order to take it to the Province. We are looking at creative solutions to pay for this. It will not be left up to the public to fund. We should be working with the municipalities to come up with ways to recover the cost. ▪ Don't overlook Esquimalt Industrial Park; also if Spectrum School is identified as a destination, Esquimalt High should receive similar treatment. ▪ It might be possible to consider two routes to Uptown, with one using part of the E&N. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Master Plan identifies the need for good transit service to Esquimalt, but the E&N does not provide the best route for Rapid Transit. ▪ Maybe add criteria for future Rapid Transit lines. ▪ Need to consider affordability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There will be a need to consider creative ways of financing, such as the development cost charges used in Portland. ▪ The preference for the Galloping Goose/TCH for Rapid Transit is understandable. However, it would be useful to acknowledge the potential for a complementary Commuter Rail service represented by the E&N. <p>Segment C: Uptown to Downtown</p>	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>Douglas Street and Douglas Street/ Government Street Alignments tied for first-place ranking in Segment C.</p> <p>Given the proximity of Douglas Street, Government and Blanshard Street the population/employment numbers are very similar for each alignment. However, Blanshard Street is furthest from the centre, and in certain portions, the corridor is so tight that large portions of occupied land would have to be purchased in order to make room for Rapid Transit on Blanshard.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When you are looking at taking away property from a tax base are you taking that property and tax allocation to that municipality in perpetuity? This is an impact that the CRD is not looking at with regard to sewage treatment and it is something we should be looking at. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In presenting the three alignments to the CRD yesterday, there was support for the idea of turning the downtown into more of a livable community: bigger side walks, separate bike lanes, so there are more people biking, walking and taking transit. Such an approach could be funded with new development. ▪ How closely were the three options ranked? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Douglas and Douglas/Government were very close but Blanshard was much lower due to property impacts and lower development potential in the future. ▪ Did the Planners and Engineers prefer the Douglas Couplet model? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. Right now the couplet model is the preferred option especially from a tourism standpoint. But we have not done enough analysis to conclude that the Douglas Couplet is the best choice. ▪ We have to keep in mind that not both options, Commuter Rail and Rapid Transit, will be able to survive the cuts of infrastructure decision making. <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>We will spend the next month refining this material, meeting with the planners and engineers, planning and holding Open Houses. This is where we need you as our community liaisons to get the word out to your groups, get people to the open houses and to get the interest and enthusiasm levels up. Once we get some buy-in to these alignments then we can get into the work of design, technology etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are you looking for approval from the Commissions and Board of Directors to go forward? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. We will ask them, “Do you support us moving forward to assess these alignments as options for Rapid Transit.” Then we come back to them with full business cases. ▪ Our detailed assessment, including cost, will occur once we have chosen an alignment. ▪ Todd Litman discussed a recent study that looked at changing consumer preferences, finding that the market for large lot housing is saturated. People now prefer housing (even if it is smaller) that is centered around lifestyles and near transit options. We should not focus on the option that has the lowest direct cost associated with it but instead we should look at the option that has the most potential to maximize transit oriented development (TOD) and the additional property value that can be generated. This initiative will fail if the 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>municipalities do not agree and commit to support TOD. The potential for redevelopment on this Rapid Transit Corridor is tremendous; it would be a response to consumer demand and much of the value capture could support the capital costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreed, the municipalities need to commit to the program or there will be no movement to increase density around the transportation. 	
6.0	<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Next meeting October 29, 2009 	

Notes by: Charissa Heagy, October 2, 2009