



General Purposes Committee

- Date: Monday, March 5, 2007
- Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
- Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Cynthia Chen
Councillor Derek Dang
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves
- Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, February 19th, 2007, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

DELEGATION

2. *Ahlay Chin, Executive Director, The Chinese Mental Wellness Association of Canada, regarding their application for a grant.*

Mr. David Wong, representing Ms. Ahlay Chin who could not be in attendance, accompanied by Mr. Larry Chan, read aloud correspondence dated February 16th, 2007, which talked about the services offered by the Chinese Mental Wellness Association of Canada (CMWAC), and the partnerships which had been formed to provide services to local residents. (A copy of this correspondence is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.)

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

Discussion then took place among Committee members and the delegation, during which in response to questions, Mr. Wong provided information to Committee on the funding sources available to the CMWAC. He also explained that if additional funding was not received, then the CMWAC might be forced to close its doors as the organization could not afford to remain in operation. Comments were made during the discussion about the possible closure of the CMWAC if the request for additional funding (in the amount of \$3,250) was not approved.

Reference was made to the list of organizations with which the CMWAC had partnerships, which had been requested previously by Committee, and questions were raised about the effectiveness of these partnerships. During the discussion, the request was made that if approval was given to award the remaining grant funds to the CMWAC, that an assessment be undertaken of those organizations in partnership with the CMWAC to determine the effectiveness of their programs and the number of people involved.

In response to questions, staff advised that the CMWAC had an annual operating budget of \$140,000; that the CMWAC had applied for a grant in the amount of \$40,900 for 2007; that in 2006, the organization had received a grant in the amount of \$12,000, and that the CMWAC had received only \$7,500 for 2007 because of the lack of clarity on the issue of partnerships. During the discussion which ensued, information was provided that the CMWAC had lost out on funding from Vancouver Coast Health because of questions about the issue of partnerships and whether the organization was able to fulfil its contracts with the funding organizations.

Further discussion took place on the issue of partnerships, during which the suggestion was made that staff should be requested to determine the status of these partnerships.

During the discussion, the work of the Canadian Mental Wellness Awareness Association was acknowledged for the services the organization provided to not only Richmond residents but to residents in other areas. At the same time however, reference was made to the \$140,000 operating budget of the CMWAC and the comment was made that the CMWAC should have approached Committee about a program which was in jeopardy rather than indicating that the organization would have to close its doors if the request for additional funding was not approved.

The Chair thanked the delegation for their presentation, and they then left the table.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

COUNCILLOR CYNTHIA CHEN

3. THE CHINESE MENTAL WELLNESS ASSOCIATION OF CANADA - GRANT APPLICATION

It was moved and seconded

That the matter of an additional grant in the amount of \$3,250 being awarded to the Chinese Mental Wellness Association of Canada be referred to staff to:

- (1) verify the situation with respect to partnerships; and*
- (2) provide information on the programs offered; how the amount of \$3,250 would affect these programs; the program to which the \$3,250 would be applied; and the rationale for the funding cuts by other agencies.*

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued on the referral to staff, and on the need to have staff review the grant application process. The comment was made that the Grant Review Committee should develop guidelines with respect to those organizations which do not receive the amount of the grant for which they had applied.

Also addressed was the question of funding, with a comment being made that the Provincial Ministry of Health should be providing funds to the CMWAC. The suggestion was made that perhaps City staff could provide assistance to Ms. Chin to access mental health funding as it was felt that property taxes was not the appropriate source of funding.

Discussion continued, with comments being made about the need for a policy to deal with non-cycle grant requests. Comments were also made about the need to work with the CMWAC to improve accessibility to that organization and to what they were trying to accomplish. Also discussed were the funding cuts being experienced by the CMWAC.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

4. RICHMOND OLYMPIC OVAL PROJECT AND 2010 OLYMPIC GAMES RELATED BUSINESS PERFORMANCE STATUS REPORT

(Report: March 5, 2007. File No.: 01-0370-03-01) (REDMS No. 2085960)

The Acting Director, Richmond Olympic Business Office, Gary Young, accompanied by Chief Administrative Officer George Duncan, reviewed his report with the Committee. Discussion then took place among Committee members and staff on:

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

- the timing of the release of information regarding Legacy funding and the results of the Oval land sales
- the need to ensure, through the media, that Richmond citizens were aware of (i) the role that the City was playing with respect to the 2010 Olympic Games, and (ii) the scope and quality of the Richmond Oval project
- the tendering process and the risk, if any, which could be applied to the remaining tenders which could have a negative impact on the contingency and owners allowance; the options which would be available to increase the contingency fund if needed
- governance - whether there would be three levels or only one; how the risk factor had been reduced for this component
- the Torch Relay and the feasibility of the City holding its own torch relay to the Oval as one of the activities being proposed to take place from now until the 2010 Olympic Games
- with reference to the fact that the Oval project was \$2.5 Million under budget, whether City staff would be reporting on options to fund the proposed rowing tank (advice was given that funding of the rowing tank could be included as an option to consider); whether the amount of \$2.5 Million could be maintained
- whether there were any scope changes to the Oval project which had not been included in the overall budget for the facility
- the rationale as to why the risk factor association with VANOC had remained the same from 2005 to 2007
- parking revenues and whether there was any flexibility on how this issue would be addressed as the City moved forward
- the Olympic 'rings', commercial sponsorship, marketing and 'branding'
- the construction cost tender process and the eventual or possible negotiations to convert the contract from an 'at risk' to a stipulated amount; whether this conversion would take place, and whether this concept would reduce any risk factor which remained
- the goal achieved by City Council that the capital funding for construction and completion of the Oval facility would not impact annual property taxes, and the importance of communicating to the public that the Oval project would not be financed through an increase in property taxes
- the status of the Vancouver-based Olympic capital projects
- the rationale for the retention of outside professional resources, including separate project management and construction management services

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

- the partnership between the City, the First Nations and VANOC
- public support and the importance of ensuring that Richmond citizens were fully aware of the post-Games uses proposed for the facility
- the feasibility of reinstating the enhanced community legacy lobby into the design of the Oval building if funding was available (advice was given that staff had been directed to obtain cost estimates on a number of possible additional projects, including the enhanced community legacy lobby, which would be submitted to Council for consideration in the future, at the same time maintaining the owners allowance, contingencies, etc.).

During the discussion, reference was made to the staff report and specifically to the section and bullets under "Components of our Mission Include", and a question was asked about the need for a bullet to emphasize that the primary use of the Oval facility would be for community use. Mr. Duncan indicated that the staff report would be amended prior to the upcoming Council meeting to emphasize this statement. Further comments were made during the discussion on this matter that it was important to emphasize that the Oval facility was primarily for community use and that it would prove to be a tremendous benefit to the City.

Also addressed was the progress made by City staff with respect to risk reduction which had taken place since the time two years ago when Council made the decision to pursue the Olympic Speed Skating venue.

During the discussion, staff were congratulated on the preparation of an excellent report. Staff were also congratulated on ensuring that the Oval facility would be completed on time and on budget.

Addressed during the discussion were the comments made previously by the media about the Oval project being over budget, and advice was given that the Committee would be considering at some point in the future, a recommendation that an outside expert be hired to undertake a review and assessment on the final construction costs for the project. Also commented on was the frustration felt by Council that the community had not fully embraced the Oval project because of the inaccurate reporting in the media.

Reference was made to upcoming reports to be submitted to Committee, and a question was asked about whether one of these reports would deal with the issue of the retention of outside professional resources, including separate project management and construction management services. The comment was made that it would be helpful for the public to know that the cost of retaining outside personnel was 'money well spent' as it had allowed staff to continue with their day-to-day activities.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

In concluding the discussion, the Chair referred to the Oval-related reports being considered at today's meeting, and commented on the depth of the information provided in these reports. He asked that the staff who prepared the reports in question be congratulated on their thoroughness.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That staff establish a standardized format for producing semi annual reports in keeping with this report; and*
- (2) *That staff bring forward detailed follow up, progress and status reports which cover specific items identified in the risk assessments registry and other pertinent matters resulting from this report.*

CARRIED

5. PRELIMINARY REPORT - MAJOR EVENTS STRATEGY

(Report: February 19, 2007, File No.: 11-7400-20-OLYM1) (REDMS No. 2087395)

Chief Administrative Officer George Duncan briefly reviewed his report with the Committee. Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on:

- the scope of the role which the City would play if the official designation of the City as an Olympic venue was approved; the need for the City to be 'in the driver's seat' with respect to any major events held in the City relating to the 2010 Olympic Games; the economic benefits to the City as a result of being named an Olympic venue
- the 2002 Tall Ships Festival and the accounting practices which had been used to determine the overall cost of that event; the need to include only direct cash costs plus any incremental costs for staff overtime or new staff who were not on the payroll prior to the event, in the costs for that event
- the need to clarify the role of Tourism Richmond in the City's overall strategy
- the number of visitors which could be expected to visit the City during the 2010 Olympic Games
- the amount of time needed to host future tall ship events and the need to make the event fit the budget; the cost of success and the need to know what it would cost to undertake future tall ship events
- the roles of Tourism Richmond and the Chamber of Commerce in the City's overall major events strategy to attract tourism and investment to the City prior to, during, and after 2010
- the ability of City staff to be the lead player in major events if additional staff and resources were not added
- the need to include an analysis of the direct and ongoing benefits of major events

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

- the possibility of the City hosting an arts and cultural event which could coincide with the 2010 Olympic Games
- the need to ensure that the City's accounting practices were set up to undertake future costing of major events properly.

During the discussion, Mr. Duncan provided his rationale for seeking an independent financial reporting on the financial results of the 2002 Tall Ships event.

Also during the discussion, staff were complimented on the preparation of an excellent and very thorough report.

Reference was made to the purpose of the Major Events Plan to provide the means to ensure that the City could take full advantage of tourism and economic development before and after the 2010 Olympic Games, and to the action required by the City to accomplish this. In response to questions, advice was given that the Major Events strategy and a number of other reports would provide Council with a complete picture of what was required for the future.

In concluding the discussion, the Chair commented on what he felt to be the negativity of the consultant's report, especially with statements made about the commitment of the City to the 2002 Tall Ships event. Mayor Brodie talked about the success of this event, and voiced support for a tall ships event in 2008, stating that 'done the right way, it could be a major success.'

It was moved and seconded

That staff be authorized to prepare and bring to Council a Major Events Plan and make recommendations on signature events that are best suited for Richmond, based on Option 1 (as outlined in the staff report dated February 19th, 2007, from the Chief Administrative Officer).

CARRIED

6. MAJOR PROJECTS & EVENTS COST REPORTING

(Report: February 23, 2007, File No.: 11-7400-00) (REDMS No. 2087398)

Discussion took place among Committee members and Mr. Duncan on:

- the issue of accounting for staff time, and the need to know the type of resources dedicated to the activities pursued by the City; how staff time costs would be charged against specific projects
- the need for an economic impact study to be undertaken for each major event proposed by the City; the need to ensure that the costs for all future projects, including the Olympic Oval, were calculated on an equal basis
- how the success of an event would be measured
- the accounting of staff time with respect to the 2002 Tall Ships Festival and the impact which this had on the overall budget for this event.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

Reference was made during the discussion, to the wording of Recommendation No. 4, and as a result, it was agreed that Recommendation No. 4 would be amended to add the following words, *'as calculated through the Major Projects Administrative Overhead Rates Schedule'*.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That staff develop an administrative procedure through which to apply the special event and major project scope, budget, and costing principles and procedures (outlined in the staff report dated February 23, 2007 from the Chief Administrative Officer).*
- (2) *That administrative costs associated with planning and delivery be charged to the budgets and included in the final accounting of costs on all major projects and events including the Canada Line, Richmond Oval Project, and the (February 2007) Countdown Event, in accordance with the scope, budget, and costing principles and procedures outlined in the report (dated February 23, 2007 from the CAO).*
- (3) *That the value of the internal administrative overhead charge calculated through the new major special event and major project scope, budget and costing procedure overhead rate schedule, (as outlined on page 4 of staff report dated February 23, 2007 from the Chief Administrative Officer), be charged against the approved \$178 million Richmond Oval Project budget.*
- (4) *That the Oval Project consultants be advised that the Project budget will be revised to absorb the resulting administrative overhead cost, as calculated through the Major Projects Administrative Overhead Rates Schedule.*
- (5) *That the current quarterly administrative overhead cost reporting format adopted on the Oval Project, the post-Games Oval conversion plan, Olympic Games-related business, and Oval site land sales be eliminated in favour of applying the proposed scope, budget, and costing administrative overhead procedure as would be appropriate.*
- (6) *That where staff time invested in special events or major projects produces revenue from external sources beyond the total amount of revenue budgeted, the cost or value of the administrative overheads and any staff time charged against a special event or major project should be reported, but offset in the final costing report by up to the value of the staff time or overhead charged.*
- (7) *That where a major event generates a surplus in revenue beyond the event costs, the surplus revenue be deposited into a Major Events Fund to be utilized to support the delivery of future events.*

CARRIED

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

7. ADDRESSING RICHMOND'S SUSTAINABILITY PROFILE

(Report: February 22, 2007, File No.: 10-6125-01) (REDMS No. 2085982, 2085808)

The Manager, Fleet & Environmental Programs, Suzanne Bycraft, accompanied by the Director of Engineering, Robert Gonzalez, and George Duncan, provided a brief overview of the purpose of the report.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the use of the term "Triple Bottom Line" and whether this term was appropriate. Concern was voiced during the discussion that evaluation of social or economic criteria as they related to a specific project could conceivably outweigh the environmental criteria. The opinion was voiced that the environmental criteria should be given greater consideration than the economic criteria. At the same time, comments were made that City staff would always provide Council with the three factors and that Council would make the decision on how to proceed.

Reference was made during the discussion to supporting the Kyoto Accord, and the belief was expressed that the Council of the day had attached a number of conditions to the acceptance of that agreement. Concern was expressed that the report did sufficiently address the economics aspect of sustainability and the need for a health economy.

Discussion continued, with information being provided by staff in response to questions, on how the determination was made that a project was a 'major project'.

(Cllr. Howard left the meeting – 7:03 p.m.)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That an enhanced sustainability initiative (as outlined in the staff report dated February 22nd, 2007, from the Chief Administrative Officer), be adopted.*
- (2) *That the concept of evaluating major City projects and initiatives based on Triple Bottom Line (TBL), which includes social, economic and environmental evaluation criteria, be adopted.*
- (3) *That staff report on a policy and implementation concept for measuring conformance with TBL.*
- (4) *That the concept of enhanced investment in the social fabric of the community, with internal resources to support social programs, be supported.*

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 5, 2007

The question on the motion was not called, as questions were asked as to whether the City would be measuring its programs in any way and whether this measurement would be part of the next phase. Reference was made to a statement in the report that the "Triple Bottom Line" (TBL) evaluation criteria be made mandatory for the private sector in five years' time. The comment was made that the private sector was already following this process and the suggestion was made that this time frame should be dramatically reduced.

(Cllr. Howard returned to the meeting – 7:05 p.m., during the above discussion.)

Comments were also made during the discussion regarding the need to evaluate major projects for the City Centre based on the Triple Bottom Line Concept.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (7:10 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Monday, March 5, 2007.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant, City Clerk's Office



February 16, 2007

Dear General Purposes Committee,

Thank you for this opportunity to appeal the cut in funding for the CMWAC.

We are a grassroots charitable organization struggling to survive through a mix of private donations and public grants. Your role in this is crucial. The programs that we run are of significant benefit to the Richmond community, particularly as it helps those most vulnerable to falling between the cracks in our health care system. Specifically, it fills the gap between the services offered, and the consumers' ability to access these services if there are barriers due to language and cultural stigma.

The issue of partnerships is indeed relevant. As you have noted, we have formed partnerships with other organizations in terms of referrals, workshops, training and consultations. In terms of "partnerships in providing services": the following is a specific list of what we have done:

- 1) CMHA Vancouver/Burnaby Branch – Chinese Depression Screening Project – Stella Lee
- 2) CMHA Richmond Branch – Providing housing support for Chinese clients - Susan Knight
- 3) CMHA Simon Fraser Branch – Provision of Mental Health Support to Chinese clients referred. – Rodney Baker
- 4) Richmond Mental Health Team – Continuation of support to the Chinese clients referred by the Team – Karen Efron
- 5) Regional Peer Support Committee – Strategic Planning for Peer Support
- 6) Richmond Hospital (2 West) – To provide peer support to the Chinese clients regularly – Louise Avery
- 7) Richmond Rehabilitation & Housing Committee & Richmond Consumers Families Advisory Council
- 8) Richmond Consumers & Families Council – Strategic planning of the council

- 9) Affordable Housing Strategy Committee – Strategic planning of housing
- 10) Richmond Kwantlen College – Member of the Advisory Board for Psychiatric Nursing Program
- 11) Richmond Disability Resource Centre – Mutual promotion of mental health wellness education – Ella Huang
- 12) Committee on Postpartum Depression, Richmond Health Department – Promotion of mental wellness towards Chinese population in Richmond – Heather Campbell
- 13) Senior Chinese Association in Vancouver – Mutual support for Asian seniors with depression
- 14) Mood Disorder Association (Chinese) – Joint promotion of mental wellness education
- 15) BC Schizophrenia Society – Joint promotion for mental wellness education and support for the Chinese clients
- 16) SUCCESS's Senior Group – Joint promotion of mental health education – Peter Wu
- 17) Traditional Chinese Medicine Association – Mutual support for TCM education – Dr. John Yang
- 18) Rutherford University – Joint promotion of mental health education – Dr. Hassam
- 19) Golden Age Academy – Mutual support for seniors by running senior programs
- 20) Riverview Hospital – To provide volunteer services
- 21) Forensic Psychiatric Services – To provide Peer Support if needed
- 22) Morning Star Choir – To support members to join the Choir for therapeutic healing
- 23) Vancouver Chinese Choir Association - To support members to join the Choir for therapeutic healing.
- 24) Canadian Red Cross – Joint effort to operate health training – Jenny Moss
- 25) The Integration Youth Services Society – Joint effort in promoting and training youth in the field – Esther Ho
- 26) Richmond Chinatown Lions Club – Joint support and promotion of mental wellness – Aster Liew

We think that the above demonstrates that there is co-ordination and co-operation with other groups to prevent duplication of projects, programs, services or events. Furthermore, the context is important. Mental health consumers tend to be an under-serviced group. With so much need in the community, there is little danger of duplicated services going to waste. Rather, the issue is the need to expand services to this community. We will happily engage in even more partnerships for bigger projects

should they arise in the future. However, this will depend on your support to keep us going as we are experiencing unforeseen funding cuts.

The projects that we propose to continue provide service to the community and particularly to Richmond residents.

- The Wellness Line handles about 300 calls per month, mainly from Richmond residents.
- Counselling Program provides services to roughly 5-6 clients a week.
- The English class teaches 10-15 people per week.
- The Peer Support Resource Centre will help coordinate the peer support volunteers for the community. There are currently at least 10 active volunteers at any given time, and there is a support group for them. It provides information and educational literature, as well as doing translation and interpretation services.
- The Choir of Love provides visits to Old Age Homes and hospitals

We hope that you can see your way to fund the above projects and help ensure our organization's survival.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours truly,

Dr. Edwin Tam
President of CMWAC