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Study Progress

- Phase 1: Issues and Opportunities (May 2012)
- Phase 2: Vision and Principles (May 2012)
- Phase 3: Foundation Document (In progress)
- Phase 4: Governance Options (pending)
- Phase 5: Funding Strategy (pending)
- Phase 6: Implementation Strategy (pending)
- Phase 7: Engagement Process (In progress)
Engagement Progress

- **Spring 2012**
  - Sub-areas (Core, Peninsula, West Shore)
  - Capital Bike and Walk Society
  - Victoria Car-share
  - Downtown Victoria Business Association
  - BC Transit

- **Summer 2012**
  - BC Ferries
  - Tourism Victoria
  - Greater Victoria Harbour Authority
  - Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition
  - Camosun College
  - University of Victoria
  - Royal Roads University
  - Victoria Airport Authority
  - BC Transit – Accessible Transportation Advisory Committee
  - Camosun College Student Society

- **Upcoming**
  - Vancouver Island Health Authority
  - Victoria Chamber of Commerce
  - Peninsula Chamber of Commerce
  - West Shore Chamber of Commerce
Recent Stakeholders’ Meetings

Key themes and frequent issues:

- Lots of different groups are working on transportation issues
- Need to create a “seamless transportation” system in which all modes are easy to use
- Current governance structure is a challenge from a regional transportation perspective
- Focus efforts on creating a good transit network and maximize utility by connections for walking/biking, in combination with intensified land use
- Recognize unique issues for rural areas – not the same as urban
- Transit capacity is an issue in some areas (e.g. U Vic)
The CRD is at a critical point in its evolution

- Between 2001 and 2011, population increased by 10% but sustainable mode shares stayed the same (equates to more auto trips)

- Between 2011 and 2038, CRD population is projected to grow by 32%; therefore can’t take passive approach to transportation and land use planning
Projected Travel Demands: A Simple Model

2011: Current Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Trip Origins</th>
<th>Sustainable Mode Share</th>
<th>Auto Driver Mode Share</th>
<th>Auto Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>235052</td>
<td>120920</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saanich Peninsula</td>
<td>41168</td>
<td>19539</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>13091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>68669</td>
<td>36700</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>26424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>344889</td>
<td>177159</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>110858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2038: No Change in Travel Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Trip Origins</th>
<th>Sustainable Mode Share</th>
<th>Auto Driver Mode Share</th>
<th>Auto Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>279717</td>
<td>143900</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>84899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saanich Peninsula</td>
<td>51781</td>
<td>24600</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>121952</td>
<td>65200</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>46927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>453450</td>
<td>233650</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>148293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2038: No Growth in Auto Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Trip Origins</th>
<th>Sustainable Mode Share</th>
<th>Auto Driver Mode Share</th>
<th>Auto Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>279717</td>
<td>143900</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>71343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saanich Peninsula</td>
<td>51781</td>
<td>24600</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>121952</td>
<td>65200</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>453450</td>
<td>233700</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>110858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If current mode splits prevailed, CRD would see an increase of some 40,000 auto driver trips and a degradation of sustainable mode shares.
- In order to “hold the line” on auto trip growth (and VKT, GHG emissions, etc.) sustainable mode shares need to be at least 50% or more.

The Big Picture Needs

- Intensify land uses = shorter trips, greater potential for walking, cycling and transit
- Provide supportive infrastructure = greater mode choice
- Adopt new technologies = lower environmental impact, travel substitutes

IBI Group with Boulevard Transportation Group
CRD Regional Transportation Plan
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
September 19, 2012
Regional Travel Patterns – Current Travel Flows (2011)
Regional Travel Patterns – Modal Shares

CRD
AM Peak Trips by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Area</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt Spring Island</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Saanich</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Saanich</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Victoria</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria North</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria South</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saanich North</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saanich East</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saanich West</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Bay</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquimalt</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Royal</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langford</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colwood</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metchosin</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sooke</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Fuca EA</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cowichan Valley</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Travel Patterns – Other Trends

- Changes in household characteristics
  - Increase in vehicles per households
  - Lower average household size
- More auto drivers, fewer auto passengers
- Longer auto trips and shorter sustainable trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel mode</th>
<th>Average Trip Length (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto driver</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto passenger</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All trips</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Issues and Needs – West Shore

ISSUES
1. HIGHWAY 1 CONGESTION
2. GETTING DEVELOPERS TO BUILD TOD
3. EMERGENCY ACCESS (SOOKE, JUAN DE FUCA)
4. CONGESTION DELAYS FOR BUSES
5. REVERSE PEAK CAPACITY IS UNDERUTILIZED
6. PARK-N-RIDE COULD BE FARTHER WEST
7. MULTIPLE STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN TDM INITIATIVES
8. IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON INFRASTRUCTURE
9. MALAHAT HIGHWAY SAFETY

NEEDS / OPPORTUNITIES
1. GETTING THE RIGHT EMPLOYMENT TO FACILITATE SELF-CONTAINMENT
2. LRT, WHICH WILL ADD CAPACITY BUT ALSO HELP SHAPE LAND USE
3. E&N RAILWAY FOR BOTH COMMUTER AND INTER-REGIONAL TRAVEL
4. BUS LANES OR QUEUE JUMP LANES
5. MORE REGIONAL TRAILS TO COMPLEMENT GALLOPING GOOSE
6. FACILITATE CAR-POOLING
7. INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM/SIGNAGE
8. EXPLORE POTENTIAL FOR COMMUTER FERRY
9. INNOVATIVE ROAD PRICING TO FUND TRANSIT
10. COORDINATE PLANNING EFFORTS BETWEEN MUNICIPALITIES
Key Issues and Needs - Peninsula

ISSUES
1. PAT BAY HIGHWAY SAFETY AND CAPACITY
2. COMMERCIAL VEHICLE ACCESS AND INFILTRATION IMPACTS
3. AIRPORT NEEDS AND IMPACTS
4. INTER-MUNICIPAL TRANSIT CONNECTIONS (CURRENTLY TRANSIT-ORIENTED TO VICTORIA/FERRY)
5. TOUR BUS ACCESS AND IMPACTS
6. ABILITY TO PROTECT LAND FOR INTERCHANGES
7. TSAWOUT DEVELOPMENT CHANGE TRAFFIC PATTERNS
8. ABILITY TO MAINTAIN INFRASTRUCTURE (E.G. SIDEWALKS, BIKE LANES)
9. LOCHSIDE TRAIL COULD BE ENHANCED
10. CYCLING CONNECTIONS TO CORE

NEEDS/OPPORTUNITIES
1. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT TO SUPPORT SELF-CONTAINMENT
2. ADVOCATING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS (E.G. INTERCHANGES)
3. TRANSIT PRIORITY ON PAT BAY HWY
4. LOCAL TRANSIT SHUTTLE
5. WORKING WITH EMPLOYERS TO FACILITATE / PROMOTE TDM
6. COORDINATING CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AMONG MUNICIPALITIES (TO SAVE MONEY)
7. COORDINATED MESSAGING AND PUBLIC EDUCATION
Key Issues and Needs - Core

ISSUES
1. IMPACTS OF COMMUTER TRAFFIC
2. DOUGLAS STREET CORRIDOR
3. EXPANDING CYCLING NETWORK
4. MAINTAINING EMPLOYMENT AND ATTRACTING RESIDENTIAL (TO MAINTAIN SELF-CONTAINMENT)
5. MAINTAINING ACCEPTED MODAL HIERARCHY (PEDS>BIKES>TRANSIT>CARS)

NEEDS/OPPORTUNITIES
1. IMPROVE BIKE CONNECTIONS TO E&N RAIL TRAIL
2. RAPID TRANSIT/LRT
3. E&N RAILWAY
4. COORDINATE TDM EFFORTS
5. PARKING MANAGEMENT AS TOOL FOR INFLUENCING MODE CHOICE
6. FOCUSED PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS
7. MOBILITY HUBS
8. FACILITATE CAR-SHARING, BIKE SHARING, ELECTRIC VEHICLES
Key Issues and Needs - General

ISSUES
1. PREVAILING LAND USE PATTERNS WILL INHERENTLY TRANSLATE TO MORE AUTO USE ASSUMING CURRENT BEHAVIOUR – NEED TO HIGHLIGHT THIS ISSUE
2. COORDINATING TRANSPORTATION PLANS, POLICIES
3. MANY POLICIES ARE AUTO-ORIENTED

NEEDS/OPPORTUNITIES
1. PLAN GROWTH TO MINIMIZE TRAVEL EFFORT/MAXIMIZE TRANSIT/AT POTENTIAL
2. USE DATA TO HIGHLIGHT CHALLENGES AND NEEDS
3. IMPLEMENT TRANSIT FUTURE PLAN
4. ADOPT ‘DESIGN CHARRETTE’ APPROACH TO SOLVE MAJOR CHALLENGES ONE AT A TIME
5. COORDINATE TDM AND PUBLIC EDUCATION
6. ADDRESS FUNDING CHALLENGES
7. MOBILITY HUBS
8. TAP POTENTIAL OF TECHNOLOGY (CAR-SHARING, EVS, ALTERNATIVE FUELS, TRIP PLANNING TOOLS, ETC.)
9. COORDINATE PLANNING
Breakout Session # 1

- World-café style
- Confirmation of issues
- Discussion of needs and opportunities
Defining a Regional Multimodal Network (RMN)

- Rationale and definition of a regionally significant network
- Approaches
Why a RMN?

- Ensures consideration of all modes
- Provides for coordination of transportation and land use planning with other regional matters (e.g. housing, economy, GHG reduction)
- Facilitates planning for regional travel needs
- Helps identify and influence matters of regional interest
Defining regional significance

- Serving a majority of *inter-municipal* and *inter-regional travel*

- Providing *access to regionally-significant destinations* that serve region-wide demand (e.g. hospitals, LRT stations, dense residential neighbourhoods, or employment nodes)

- Providing a common *regional identity* and purpose

A more regionally significant corridor is one that serves more regional destinations, more travel, more transportation modes, and embodies a stronger regional identity.
Lots of work has been done in recent years:

- Transit Future Plan: 2011
- Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan (PCMP): 2011
- Highway corridor studies: 2009, 2007 (3)
- Draft Transportation Corridor Plan (2010)

The Transportation Corridor Plan (TCP) took a first step at defining a multi-modal network that spans the Region...
Defining a Regional Multimodal Network

The TCP Approach:

■ Identified strategic modal networks
  – Built upon existing plans at the time (e.g. Travel Choices)
  – Provides connectivity among generators/attractors, key external gateways and regional growth centres

■ Combined modal networks to get Strategic Transportation Corridors Network

■ Defined and assigned functional roles (priorities) by mode

■ Identified typical functional standards for each corridor
Benefits and limitations of TCP Approach:

- Intended as “first cut” at regional network, including priorities
- Prior to Transit Future and PCMP
- Modes treated somewhat independently
- Not intended to be a “master plan”
- Identification of standards raised issues
Defining a Regional Multimodal Network

Alternative approaches:

- Develop autonomous modal plans only
- Nodes and corridors (spider network)
- Demand-based
- Combine / integrate existing plans
- Move forward with TCP modal networks

*All plans combined*
Defining a Regional Multimodal Network

A fresh look – proposed **hybrid approach**:

- Use previous and existing plans as springboards
- Incorporate recent modal plans (e.g. Transit Future, PCMP)
- Consider future travel demand forecast from Regional Transportation Model
- Consider future land-use forecasts to address connectivity issues (link residential, employment areas, and mobility hubs)

Key elements:

- Link to a collaborative planning process and policy, based around priorities
- Identify levels of priority
- Identification of performance targets, not defined standards
- Iterative approach
Defining a Regional Multimodal Network

Emphasis is on “Multi-modal”

Every corridor assigned a score for each mode.

RMN corridors classified into 3 categories:

- **Primary**
  - 3 or more high priority modes, based on previous plans
  - Significant infrastructure (e.g. LRT)
  - High priority connections to mobility hubs

- **Strategic**
  - 1 or 2 high priority modes AND regionally strategic for at least 1 other mode

- **Moderate**
  - Any other corridors identified in other regional plans
  - Note: does not include low priority routes from PCMP
Classification of RMN priorities (for discussion):

**CRD**

**RMN Weighted Priorities**

- Primary
- Strategic
- Moderate
Defining a Regional Multimodal Network
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- Strategic
- Moderate
### Defining a Regional Multimodal Network

- Linked process, policy, and performance targets:

### Actions

- CRD will assist to secure Provincial or Federal funding (for all modes) together with municipalities.
- Set & monitor performance targets on an annual basis (suggested by City of Colwood)
- Projects should involve regional public consultation strategies
- Organize regular project meetings between regional stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RMN Priority</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linked process, policy, and performance targets (cont’d):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CRD will provide feedback on consistency with regional policies</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highlight and mediate discontinuities between local plans</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CRD will provide staff resources to review projects for consistency</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with AT design guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pro-actively maintain a web portal of information on regionally</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Others? …</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defining a Regional Multimodal Network

Ideas for *performance targets*, for discussion:

- No increase in VKT along all primary corridors (achieved through mode shift and trip avoidance)
- 1% annual increase in non-SOV travel along entire RMN
- Doubling of densities within 800m of primary corridors
- 5% annual reduction in serious injury and fatality rates along primary and strategic corridors
- 10% annual increase in km of bikeways and sidewalks along entire RMN, following PCMP
- 5% annual increase in cost of parking within 800m of primary corridors
- 10% reduction every 5 years in median commute distances for residents and employees in mobility hubs
- All primary corridors to be Electric Vehicle friendly by 2020
What are Mobility Hubs

- Place of connectivity and seamless integration of various modes
- Concentration of working, living, shopping and/or playing opportunities
- Origin / destination / transfer point for a significant portion of trips
Objectives

- High priority levels for sustainable modes
- Attractive and convenient transitions between modes
- Mixed-use and higher-density developments
- Greater opportunities to live, work, learn, shop and play
- Sustainable urban structure (reducing urban sprawl) by focusing on future growth
- Connectivity between hubs via RMN
- Focus for technology deployment (e.g. EV charging stations)
Mobility Hubs

Criteria

- Enhanced transit service (rapid and frequent transit network)
- Ability to achieve significant levels of active transportation
- Market demand to attract future growth and high-density, mixed-use development
- Inter-regional destination
- Unique or tourism destination
- Strategic location within region
Mobility Hubs

Preliminary classifications

■ Regional Growth Centres
■ Urban Transit Nodes
■ Suburban Transit Nodes
■ Rural Transit Nodes
■ Unique Destinations (e.g. Universities / colleges interchanges, airport, ferry terminals)
Mobility Hubs
CRD Electric Vehicle Planning Initiative

Supporting and accelerating electric vehicle (EV) planning & adoption in the capital region.

Main Objectives:

■ Support local organizations in applying directly for CCI charging station funding.

■ Increase public knowledge of EV technologies, regional infrastructure and anticipated GHG reduction benefits.

■ Work with stakeholders to identify a network of desired PEV infrastructure and integrate emerging vehicle technology considerations into transportation planning.
Primary Components

- Supplements at home charging
- 3 types of charging stations depending on time to charge
- Planning to have 65 stations; level 2 stations installed by April 2013
- EV stations can be part of a family of multi-modal initiatives facilitated by technology (e.g. car-share, bike share, station cars, etc.)
Breakout Session # 2

- Review preliminary classification of corridors
- Discuss performance targets and other policies
- Input on mobility hub locations and EV stations
Next Steps

- Draft Foundation Document
- Continue stakeholder meetings
- Advance RTP in conjunction with RSS