

Citizens' Advisory Panel

Date: Friday, April 30, 2010
Time: 12:00 noon to 1:30 pm
Place: Victoria City Hall – Committee Room 1

MEETING NOTES

Attendance

Members: Cara Segger, Jim Kerr, Don Prittie, Andrew Turner, Margaret Lucas and Richard Linzey
Staff: Gail Stephens [Chair], Allison Ashcroft, Peter Sparanese, Katie Josephson, Mike Lai, Kristin Quayle and Chaz Whipp
Guests: Kyle Braid, Ipsos Reid
Joost Meyboom, Jim Fowler, MMM Consulting Group

The Chair called the meeting to order at noon.

1. Minutes of the Meeting

The Minutes of the Meeting held on March 12th, 2010 were circulated via email and have been approved with a minor amendment.

2. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference were approved by deleting the second to last bullet under Item 3 and adding the General Manager, Corporate Services to the list of City Staff members who will form part of the Citizen Advisory Panel.

3. Ipsos Reid Results

Kyle Braid from Ipsos Reid, provided the Committee with an overview of the results of the survey. The sample size of the survey was 600, 200 above the standard size of a public engagement survey in a community with a similar population to Victoria. The 33% response rate is considered strong, noting that the results were weighted in terms of age and gender and appropriately accounted for all regions within the City. The challenge was in reaching the younger generation (cell phone users); it is believed the same challenge will present itself for the referendum.

Generally speaking those surveyed agree that the City should do something with the bridge and are interested in receiving further information regarding proposals

for both rehabilitation and replacement. They also wish to continue to be provided with opportunities to have input into the process. They are in favour of a practical approach and did not place as much value to the heritage preservation aspect. Factors such as cost, improved pedestrian and cyclist access, improving traffic flow as well as traffic safety features were more important than the railway crossing and heritage preservation. The replacement option is seen as a longer term and more expensive solution than the rehabilitation option. There is a general belief that the city will secure outside financial assistance from other levels of government and/or raise taxes to help defray the overall costs.

It was agreed that strong communications about the funding and cost of the bridge would be needed to ensure the public has a clear understanding of the options being presented.

A sample size survey of 200 will be conducted of the downtown business owners to address the economic impact of bridge closures and traffic flow changes.

4. Status of the JSB Project

Joost Meyboom and Jim Fowler of MMM Consulting Group, provided the Committee with a technical overview of the data that will be included in the report they are preparing.

The report will include comprehensive scenarios for both the replacement and the rehabilitation options, with the ability to make direct cost comparisons based on the inclusion (or exclusion) of specific features. They added that either option will honour Federal heritage guidelines. They were surprised with the length of construction time differences related to complete or partial closures as any construction has to recognize that it is a working harbour and schedule closures will be necessary.

MMM Consulting Group has a powerpoint presentation which forms the basis of the report provided at the meeting without the technical details which, it is prepared to share with Council at any time.

ACTION It was agreed that MMM Consulting will provide a brief update to Council at their May 6th meeting and a more in depth report will be provided at the May 20th meeting.

ACTION It was further agreed that the key findings from the public engagement survey will be summarized in a report and presented to Council at the May 20th meeting. It is hoped that the results from the business community survey can be reviewed by this group in time to have a summarized report also presented to Council at the May 20th meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 pm.