

Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

Date:	June 18, 2009	Next Meeting:	July 30, 2009
Time:	1pm to 3pm		12pm to 2pm
Location:	CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor		CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor
Purpose:	Meeting #7: To provide feedback on the open house presentations and participate in the Input Exercises		
Attendees:	Community Liaison Committee Allan Murphy, VIHA Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses Bill Draper, Island Transformations (alternate) Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society Darin Guenette, Captain, DND Doug Robinson, View Royal Community Rep Edward Pullman, Uvic Student Society Erik Kaye, Victoria Community Rep Graham Bruce, Island Corridor Foundation (alternate) John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce John Harris, Metchosin Community Rep John Luton, Capital Bike and Walk Society Karyn Wood, Carson Development Group (alternate) Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association Mike Wicks, Westshore Chamber of Commerce Mir Ali, Turner Lane (Colwood Corners) Mohan Kang, Taxi Association of Victoria Patrick O'Connor, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (alternate) Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads Regrets Barb Desjardins, Esquimalt Community Rep Brian Bonney, CFIB Dan Gunn, VIATECH Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep David Wilson, Central Saanich Community Rep Geoff Pearce, Citizens for Commuter Rail Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development Association John Gaipman, Victoria School District John Manson, Langford Community Rep Kathryn Le Gros, Camosun Neil Connelly, UVic Pat Danforth, Accessible Transportation Advisory Committee 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 Erinn Pinkerton called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. As Geoff Pearce was not in attendance the committee agreed that Erinn would chair the meeting.	
2.0	Approval of Agenda - Bill Draper and John Harris put forth business to add under New Business. - Agenda approved	

	Description	Action Items
3.0	Adoption of Minutes from previous meeting ▪ Motion to adopt minutes passed. ▪ The committee requested copies of the minutes from the meetings with the Municipal Planners and Engineers	Send minutes to CLC Members
4.0	June 23,25,29 – Review Open House Poster Boards Erinn Pinkerton presented and reviewed the slides for the Open Houses to be held June 23, 25, 29 and asked for feedback from the Committee. Erinn explained how some of the slides will be the same as those shown at the first set of Open Houses as a refresher and to make sure that all who attend are provided with all relevant information. These slides are meant to show all of the work that has been done up to this point and to encourage feedback from the public. Comments and suggestions from members of the committee included: SLIDE 1 ▪ Simplify the wording; remove “Early Deliverables”. SLIDE 2 ▪ The picture provides a large impact and is a great addition. ▪ Remove the point “sustainable and affordable”. ○ That is one of the previously agreed Guiding Principles for this project and must therefore remain. ▪ It is one of our jobs as the committee to find a mode of transportation that is affordable for the community. ○ We must think of what it will cost riders and citizens ○ The capital cost is also important if the business case for the transit system is to be approved by government. SLIDE 3 ▪ Bev Highton commented that he felt that the committee did not include representation of people who use the roads every day, and there should be discussion on whether there is actually a need for Rapid Transit. He also had concerns about the guiding principles of securing a dedicated right of way. ○ Comment from the working team: The need for Rapid Transit is captured by the Guiding principles and the Provincial Transportation Plan. The committee was established to represent the diversity of Victoria, and members were asked to review the list to make sure that no group was missed or left unrepresented. There is no single group that represents single occupancy drivers. The committee’s role is to provide the project team with feedback and be a sounding board for Open Houses. The committee has discussed the Guiding Principles at many meetings and has agreed to move forward in the process. ▪ Comment from a member of the CLC: We have the taxi association here, tourism Victoria, people from education institutions, people from large employers; we have a broad range of people represented here. Some of us have walked here some of us rode our bikes or took transit and probably 50% of us drove. That is about the percentage of the population who drive to work everyday. I think we have a very balanced representation of people here. We have had many discussions on dedicated right of way and we came to the conclusion that without a dedicated right of way you do not have Rapid Transit. The mandate of this group is to look at Rapid Transit options, if we continue to argue whether	

	Description	Action Items
	or not we are looking at Rapid Transit we will never accomplish anything. Fundamentally, the decisions have been agreed upon by the people in this room. SLIDE 4 ▪ Can we find out how many people travel from the West Shore to government jobs? If we had that statistic we could lobby government to put more offices in the West Shore. ○ It is unlikely that figure would be available due to privacy laws. ▪ Vacant office space would just be rented out by another agency, thus continuing the commute for other people. You can not control commuters by moving offices. ▪ Need to define “urban core”. SLIDE 5 ▪ Add guided buses to the description of BRT ▪ Change the word “Commuter”; it could confuse people into thinking that “Commuter” is for long services only. SLIDE 6 ▪ Will this be on-line? ○ Yes ▪ Do not put the “experts” choices on the board; you do not want to influence the public. ○ We will remove the project team scoring from the exercises, but will show the results at the end of the panels so the public can see what the results are so far. ▪ “Affordable” should be removed. “Affordable” transportation is not a priority. ○ Affordability is a priority. It is important that transit is affordable or people will not use it. It is irresponsible not to consider the costs; affordability and sustainability are serious considerations. ▪ Change the title to: Evaluating the Alignment Options or add the word Corridors in the title to make it clear. SLIDE 7 The Queen Alexandra and Gorge Road Hospitals will be removed or coloured differently on this slide as they are not major hospitals. ▪ We need to switch over from calling it “E&N” to “The Southern Railway of Vancouver Island” ○ The proper name is the “E&N” and is consistent with the terminology being used in the E&N study. SLIDE 8-10 ▪ These slides are too text heavy. They are hard to absorb. Perhaps cut the information in half. ▪ What you have listed as the “Colwood Interchange” is actually in View Royal. ▪ Again, do not show the public what the project team has rated the options or you will absolutely cause bias. ○ We do not want to influence the public; however, we recognize that many people will want to know what we, the project team, have chosen. We want to make our findings available so that the public can challenge us and give input into our findings. ▪ These slides need more pictures of the areas you are discussing, pictures that represent the different options. ○ A binder will be produced displaying pictures of all of the alignments under consideration for use during the open houses	

	Description	Action Items																		
	SLIDE 11 - The colours of the flags and the numbers need to correspond. - What will be your response if the public comes up with completely opposite ranking to what the project team has found? - We have not come up with our decision yet as to which option to implement. These are still preliminary findings. We will review the public ratings, the ratings of the Community Liaison Committee, and those from the Engineers and Planners before completing our analysis. - You should let the public know of your process to analyze the findings so that they know their opinions are being heard. - Yes, and that is the next step. We want the public to look on our web site where we will post the results from the three open houses and the amalgamation of all of the rankings. SLIDE 12 - The bar chart is confusing and unreadable. This slide needs to be simplified. SLIDE 13 - You need to have definitions of terms presented. OTHER - To obtain funding to implement Rapid Transit, will the business case be comprehensive? - A full and complete business case will be prepared.																			
5.0	Input Exercise #1 & #2 Members of the committee took part in exercises #1 & #2. This activity yielded a number of specific suggestions for improvements to the panels which were noted by the team. The results of the exercise were as follows: Input Exercise #1 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Project Team</th><th>CLC Exercise June 18. 09</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TO DEVELOP TRANSIT OPTIONS THAT OFFER AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE SINGLE OCCUPANCY VEHICLE - Does the alignment take people where they want to go, today and in the future?</td><td>10</td><td>9.7</td></tr> <tr> <td>MAKE TRANSIT MORE ATTRACTIVE AND CONVENIENT - Does the alignment have the ability to segregate transit in the right of way (ROW) to improve travel time, reliability, ease of use, and to allow for the implementation of a number of rapid transit technologies?</td><td>8</td><td>7.6</td></tr> <tr> <td>LINK REGIONAL GROWTH CENTRES THAT ENCOURAGE TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT - Does the alignment link Regional Growth Centres, major employment centres, hospitals, gateways, education centres, etc?</td><td>10</td><td>7.4</td></tr> <tr> <td>SUPPORT AN INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK - How well does the alignment link to the regional networks and support various transportation modes (cycling, walking, transit, movement of goods, etc)?</td><td>7</td><td>7.8</td></tr> <tr> <td>DEVELOP AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE SOLUTION - Environmental impacts to develop a rapid transit corridor relative to other alignments (vegetation, wildlife, noise, etc)</td><td>5</td><td>6.4</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Project Team	CLC Exercise June 18. 09	TO DEVELOP TRANSIT OPTIONS THAT OFFER AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE SINGLE OCCUPANCY VEHICLE - Does the alignment take people where they want to go, today and in the future?	10	9.7	MAKE TRANSIT MORE ATTRACTIVE AND CONVENIENT - Does the alignment have the ability to segregate transit in the right of way (ROW) to improve travel time, reliability, ease of use, and to allow for the implementation of a number of rapid transit technologies?	8	7.6	LINK REGIONAL GROWTH CENTRES THAT ENCOURAGE TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT - Does the alignment link Regional Growth Centres, major employment centres, hospitals, gateways, education centres, etc?	10	7.4	SUPPORT AN INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK - How well does the alignment link to the regional networks and support various transportation modes (cycling, walking, transit, movement of goods, etc)?	7	7.8	DEVELOP AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE SOLUTION - Environmental impacts to develop a rapid transit corridor relative to other alignments (vegetation, wildlife, noise, etc)	5	6.4	
	Project Team	CLC Exercise June 18. 09																		
TO DEVELOP TRANSIT OPTIONS THAT OFFER AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE SINGLE OCCUPANCY VEHICLE - Does the alignment take people where they want to go, today and in the future?	10	9.7																		
MAKE TRANSIT MORE ATTRACTIVE AND CONVENIENT - Does the alignment have the ability to segregate transit in the right of way (ROW) to improve travel time, reliability, ease of use, and to allow for the implementation of a number of rapid transit technologies?	8	7.6																		
LINK REGIONAL GROWTH CENTRES THAT ENCOURAGE TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT - Does the alignment link Regional Growth Centres, major employment centres, hospitals, gateways, education centres, etc?	10	7.4																		
SUPPORT AN INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK - How well does the alignment link to the regional networks and support various transportation modes (cycling, walking, transit, movement of goods, etc)?	7	7.8																		
DEVELOP AN ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE SOLUTION - Environmental impacts to develop a rapid transit corridor relative to other alignments (vegetation, wildlife, noise, etc)	5	6.4																		

	Description			Action Items
	DESIGN A SUSTAINABLE AND AFFORDABLE TRANSIT SYSTEM - Right of way (ROW) costs to acquire or reconfigure property, including residential and/or business impacts relative to other alignments.	8	6.4	
	Input Exercise #2			
		Project Team	CLC Exercise June 18, 2009	
	Segment A: West Shore to Colwood Interchange	E&N GG TCH Goldstream/Island Highway Island Highway	GG E&N TCH Goldstream/Island Highway Island Highway (No Score)	
	Segment B: Colwood Interchange to Core	TCH GG E&N Esquimalt Craigflower/Island Highway Gorge Rd/Island Highway	E&N TCH GG Esquimalt (No Score) Craigflower/Island Highway (No Score) Gorge Rd/Island Highway (No Score)	
	Segment C: Uptown to Downtown	Douglas Blanshard Government	Douglas Blanshard Government	
6.0	Report from Study Team Erinn Pinkerton explained how the project team is meeting with Municipal Planners and Engineers, working with them to find out specific growth areas. At the same time, the Study Team is consulting with the Municipalities to discuss how developments within each Municipality will affect the other Municipalities and how they can work together. As well, presentations are being made to various municipalities to give updates on the project. Ashok presented an update on the E&N Rail Study. Ashok explained there will be a number of open houses, including one in Courtney and in Parksville in an effort to get people outside of the CRD involved in the project. The goal is to introduce the public to the objectives around the project and give them context into the different business lines that are being examined—possible freight market, tourism, commuter etc. as well as the base line reference report which is to be completed and will look at the infrastructure, condition of the track. There will be time lines around the project so everyone understands when the project is planned to be completed and how it will fit in with the Rapid Transit project and explain how the information is coinciding. Comments from the committee to Ashok regarding the E&N were as follows: ▪ Have you contacted the River Line in New Jersey, which is almost an exact parallel to the E&N? ○ The consultant, IBI, has done a number of peer reviews. They have looked at lines that handle freight, tourism, commuter service and some mixture of all of the above. And the River Line was one of the ones they studied. ▪ Are you aware that according to the plan you have 12 more days to come up with your			

	Description	Action Items
	report? We were told that the report would be completed by the end of June and we were expecting a presentation by that time. - o We are still working toward completing the information by the end of June. It's a matter of reporting the information. While the information and the data are in raw format we need to polish it up before we can present it to the public. ▪ We would appreciate any interim reports that you can provide us with. Ashok asked the committee if they had any suggestions on how to get information from the public on where they are travelling. ▪ Travel to Qualicum Beach and speak to the tourists there as that is a spot people often visit for the day on the train. ▪ Speak to other tourist operators. ▪ Ride the train and speak to the travelers.	
7.0	New Business Bill Draper put forth a motion to review and clarify the Guiding Principles. This motion was broken into parts. First Motion: In the text of Principle One delete, "single occupancy" and replace with, "private passenger". There was extensive discussion regarding the fact that the guiding principles reflect the mandate long established and approved by the Commission and any changes would require Commission approval. It was agreed that it would suffice to clarify the accompanying definition bullets. Motion Amended: Change the definition of the Principle and not the Principle itself. Motion passed. Second Motion: In the text of Principle Six after the word "basis" in bullet one add the word "end" and add another bullet to add, "include a sensitivity analysis based on variations on the prices and availability of fossil fuels to transit vehicles during the project's life cycle." Following extensive discussion, the Committee agreed that, rather than amend the Guiding Principle to prescribe analysis methodology, the project team should produce an evaluation framework for review and comment by the committee. Motion withdrawn. Third Motion: Clarification of the title to include: "Rapid Transit includes both bus and rail modes as stated in BC Transit's legislative mandate" Motion passed. John Harris requested a discussion on the McTavish Interchange; the committee felt such a discussion was not relevant to this project or the roles and responsibilities of the committee.	ACTION: definition of guiding principle #1 to be changed to: "Reduce reliance on private passenger single occupancy vehicles" ACTION: At the next CLC meeting, a draft evaluation framework will be provided to the CLC members for comment ACTION: Add clarification to title of Guiding Principles document

	Description	Action Items
8.0	Next Meeting Next meeting July 30, 2009	

Notes by: Charissa Heagy
June 18, 2009