

Community Liaison Committee Minutes of Meeting

Date:	August 27, 2009	Next Meeting:	September 24, 2009
Time:	12pm to 2pm		12pm to 2pm
Location:	CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor		CRD Board Room – 6 th Floor
Purpose:	Meeting #9: To provide an overview of the alignment options under consideration.		
Attendees:	<p>Community Liaison Committee</p> <p>Allan Murphy, VIHA Barb Desjaradins, Esquimalt Community Representative Bev Highton, Association of Douglas Street Businesses Brian Tucknott, Colwood Community Rep Dan Gunn, VIATECH Dan Pollock, Uvic Graduate Students Society Darin Guenette, Captain, DND David Wilson, Central 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 Irwin Henderson, Island Transformations John Espley, Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce 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 Pat Danforth, Accessible Transportation Advisory Committee Patrick O'Connor, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition</p>	<p>Regrets</p> <p>Brian Bonney, CFIB Darrell Wick, Saanich Community Rep Jim Carson, Carson Development Group Jim Hartshorn, Westshore Development Association John Manson, Langford Community Rep Ken Kelly, Downtown Victoria Business Association Neil Connelly, UVic Randy Northy, Association of Douglas Street Business Sheila Brown, BC Ferries (alternate) Terry Stewart, Victoria Airport Authority Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Institute (VTI) Tracy Olsen, North Saanich Community Rep Travis Lee, Urban Development Institute Vageli Dadiotis, Royal Roads</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</p>
Attachments:			

	Description	Action Items
1.0	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geoff Pearce called the meeting to order at 12:05 	
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"> ▪ Minutes approved 	

	Description	Action Items
4.0	<p>Review of Alignment Options</p> <p>Santino Pirillo presented the short list of Alignment Options that were screened as part of the preliminary screening evaluation. Santino presented a draft of each option and asked for feedback from the committee.</p> <p>Segment A: Island Highway/Goldstream Curbside Transit Way</p> <p>The overview included the observation that each corridor contains some constraints, including effects on existing streetscapes. The desire is to maintain or create “complete” streets that are both practical and attractive. The area near Six Mile Road has excellent potential as a major exchange which would work for all alignments and provide relief for the Juan de Fuca exchange which will likely become overloaded in the future.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A lot of money has been spent on beautifying this area. I doubt the city will agree to dig up the newly built walkways and roadside gardens in order to put Rapid Transit in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As mentioned in the description of this segment, we recognize that this could be the case, but it is our job to present to the committee all of the potential options from an engineering point of view ▪ City planning exercises go on for years, long before your plan came along. You should be in contact with the municipalities so that they are aware of the changes before they implement further changes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We meet with the municipal planners and engineers once a month and have shared these alignments with them. ▪ You are making it difficult by not looking at the corridors already in place. Why bother with coming up with new corridors? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A thorough study requires that we go through a process of elimination that begins with consideration of all options. ▪ I agree with the project team that we must look at all alignment options and should look at all of the alignments before we pick it apart. ▪ The Six Mile location would be compatible with the E&N <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. It would lend itself well to large ridership because it is in a location that supports many modes of transportation as well as a Park & Ride facility. ▪ BCTFA are constantly looking for organizations to buy their land. Have you been in touch with them? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. <p>Segment A: Galloping Goose Transit Way</p> <p>Santino noted that if the Galloping Goose alignment were used in Segment A, there would still be a need to use portions of the roadway. There is little density, but noise impacts would be an issue. However, the Transit Way would be able to coexist with recreational trail use and allow for future expansion of the trail if required.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Galloping Goose works well and serves well at all connections and would give better 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>access to Royal Roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, this route hits many stops but it would have to cross onto the road in order to pick up those along the road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Let's not compromise the Galloping Goose. We must preserve the integrity of the trail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have looked at making sure the trail is divided into 2 lanes (walking and cycling) and expanded to 6 meters to make sure the trail is preserved. ▪ What are the safety implications of road crossings? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are rules of thumb for types of crossings vs. traffic volumes. Grade-separated crossings would be warranted here. ▪ Would it cause problems for system operation if grade separations were not built until later? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In some cases, it would be too disruptive to build the separated crossings later. <p>Segment A: E&N Transit Way</p> <p>Santino drew attention to the difference between rapid transit and commuter rail, with rapid transit having a higher-frequency and all-day service compared the lower frequency and peak-hour service that might be provided by commuter rail. Rapid transit frequency will require a double track, which might impact on other uses of the E&N alignment. The alignment also would have similar noise issues as the Galloping Goose alignment in this segment. There are also numerous informal accesses that would need to be addressed, and more earthworks would be required to give sufficient width.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If you put Rapid Transit on this route would it be unavailable for commercial movement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would depend on the technology used ▪ How much space do you need for the trail to have a double track? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 9-11 meters ▪ Would you have to have a double track? Could you have sidings instead? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sidings would not be enough for Rapid Transit frequency. ▪ Vancouver spent millions of dollars upgrading their transit system-- I do not want my tax dollars contributing to an upgrade like the one seen in Vancouver. ▪ We either spend the money now or we spend it in the future when it is going to cost more. Our roads are over crowded and can support Rapid Transit. ▪ We do not have enough demand to support Rapid Transit. ▪ We need to ignore the cost, the opinions and simply look at the facts which prove that Victoria needs Rapid Transit. <p>Segment B: E&N Transit Way</p> <p>Santino described the need for a new bridge over the Island Highway, which would also accommodate the Rail Trail. The necessary double-tracking would be the biggest challenge in this segment, and there would be many road crossings. Low density in this area means fairly long distance between stops. A station could be located at Colville to serve DND. A grade separation would be required at Esquimalt Road, and a connection into downtown would be challenging due to the need for a double track, while only a single track is contemplated for the Johnson Street Bridge.</p>	

Description	Action Items
<p>Comments from the committee were as follows: The Base Commander has some flexibility on DND land use, so a Colville station could work well. Admirals might also be an option. Even an internal shuttle could be considered if it would reduce car use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The base is subject to federal government policies & priorities. ▪ Could the line terminate in Vic West? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, but passengers who travel that far will generally want to go downtown either as a destination or transfer point. ▪ The City is determined to maintain the railway station on the east side of the Johnson Street bridge. <p>Segment B: Galloping Goose/TCH Transit Way Santino noted that a transit way would fit easily on this alignment without significant impacts on existing uses of the Galloping Goose. It would also be very easy to build and expand in stages.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would there be a station at Tillicum? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This concept suggests a station with a park and ride at McKenzie, and Saanich has expressed a desire for a station at Burnside Road to serve the Tillicum area. ▪ Based on what you've presented, would using this route mitigate the bus traffic going up and down Douglas Street? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Significantly. This route would benefit the whole region by decreasing the number of buses along Douglas Street. ▪ What discussions have taken place with the developers who are redeveloping Uptown? With the transit exchange, we may want to put a station there. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have been meeting with them for that purpose. <p>Segment B: TCH Bus on Shoulder Lanes Santino described this option as more of a short-term or temporary option. It would require some highway modifications and probably more bridges than the Galloping Goose alignment in this segment.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is building HOV lanes more expensive than the other options? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, an HOV arrangement would require extra lanes as well as shifting parts of the highway. <p>Segment C: Douglas Street Median Transit Way This arrangement would look similar to last year's Busway proposal, but bigger stations would be needed. Disadvantages include the likely loss of left turns, and all passengers would have to cross the street to board. Like all Segment C options, there would be changes to the street character.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our biggest concern is access to the businesses on Douglas Street, how do you address 	

	Description	Action Items
	<p>that concern?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any of the Rapid Transit options will displace something, so choices will need to be made. The need to maintain business access is acknowledged. <p>Segment C: Blanshard Street Curbside Transit Way</p> <p>While Blanshard is used by many vehicles as a faster route to leave downtown, especially for vehicles destined for the Peninsula, Santino explained it would represent major challenges for Rapid Transit, especially with respect to routing through Uptown toward the West Shore.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If Uptown is the hub, is an alignment into Downtown really necessary? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, despite the Uptown hub, a Rapid Transit alignment to downtown will still be required to serve the ridership demand. <p>Segment C: Douglas Street Curbside Transit Way</p> <p>Applying the streetcar concept, this alignment would retain driveway accesses and would support high volumes of passenger on/off movements. Stations would be located at the curb. Exclusive right of way would be required, although right-turn lanes might be shared with vehicles.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If we do not have an exclusive right of way to and from downtown we will not have any benefit in terms of increasing ridership. ▪ Have you looked at the Rapid Transit connection from Douglas Street to the E&N? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, although a Rapid Transit connection there would rely on the Johnson Street Bridge ▪ Could the bridge be used only at peak periods? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Johnson Street Bridge is in use throughout the day. Its unscheduled openings would disrupt the Rapid Transit service frequency of every 15 minutes or better. <p>Segment C: Douglas/Government Curbside Transit Way Couplet</p> <p>This couplet concept has similar benefits to the Douglas Street curbside concept, with the additional advantage of reducing the impact on Douglas Street. It would also likely achieve better travel time.</p> <p>Comments from the committee were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Without this being subterranean or overhead, how do you get over the timing of stop lights? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With transit priority signals, the light would always be green for an approaching Rapid Transit vehicle. ▪ The Parliament buildings are already very crowded with traffic and pedestrians, how would Rapid Transit work around the presence of some very necessary attractions such as the kabuki cabs and horse drawn carriages? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Rapid Transit vehicles would go behind the Parliament buildings, but details such as these would need to be looked at more closely at the next stage. 	

	Description	Action Items
5.0	Report from Study Team Geoff Pearce requested that the report on E&N rail study be put as the first item on the next agenda.	
6.0	Next Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Next meeting September 24, 2009 	

Notes by: Charissa Heagy September 4, 2009