

## General Purpose Committee

Date: Monday, March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2000

Place: Council Chambers  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt, Mayor  
Councillor Linda Barnes (4:37 p.m.)  
Councillor Malcolm Brodie  
Councillor Derek Dang (4:42 p.m.)  
Councillor Lyn Greenhill  
Councillor Ken Johnston  
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Harold Steves

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2000, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### INTRODUCTION OF NEW EMPLOYEES

2. The following new employees were introduced by their respective supervisors:

Susan Kopeschny, Administrative Assistant  
Division - Finance and Corporate Services (City Clerk's Office)

Rae Williamson, Manager, Human Resources  
Division - Finance and Corporate Services (Human Resources)

Ricky Malhotra, Firefighter  
Division - Community Services (Fire-Rescue)

Brad Glahn, Firefighter  
Division - Community Services (Fire-Rescue)

Rowan Vrooman, Firefighter  
Division - Community Services (Fire-Rescue)

Jeffrey Dalziel, Firefighter  
Division - Community Services (Fire-Rescue)

Darryl Wellsted, Firefighter  
Division - Community Services (Fire-Rescue)

### **ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION**

#### 3. **GARRY POINT FACILITY PROJECT COSTS**

(Report: Feb. 25/00; File: 2325-20-006; REDMS 138865)

The General Manager, Engineering & Public Works, Chuck Gale, reviewed the report with Committee members. In response to questions, he provided the following information:

- the redesignation of design fees to the Steveston Road Ends account would help to remind staff that a process exists which spreads the benefit of the design over a number of projects
- with respect to off-site servicing (undergrounding of hydro lines), the City did obtain a better facility in spite of the additional costs, however, the problem was the fact that this undergrounding occurred without the prior approval of Council
- with respect to the crediting of funds to the Steveston Road Ends account, the funding for the project was obtained from that account and it was staff's intention to credit the amount of the future savings on building designs to that account
- with respect to the rationale for installing of plate glass windows, steel hand dryers, epoxy paint, and heavier gauge steel doors and frames, even though a caretaker was located on the site, staff were influenced by a number of events which had occurred, and had not addressed the question of whether this type of equipment was required because a caretaker was located on-site; the advisability of installing such equipment in future facilities would be evaluated on a site-by-site basis
- the revenue generated from future design fee savings would be dependent on the number of times the design was utilized, and would be credited to the Steveston Road Ends account.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That the allocation of \$62,000 from the Steveston Road Ends account be utilized to fund the additional expenditures required for the completion of the Garry Point washrooms; and***
- (2) ***That future savings for design fees attributed to Park Facilities based on the standard design, be credited back to the Steveston Road Ends account when the prototype plans are used.***

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued on whether the future savings on design fees should be credited back to the Steveston Road Ends account. As a result of the discussion, the recommendations were dealt with separately.

The question on Part (1) of the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

The question on Part (2) of the motion was called, and it was **DEFEATED ON A TIED VOTE.**

OPPOSED: Mayor Halsey-Brandt  
Cllr. Greenhill  
Johnston  
Kumagai

#### **COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION**

#### **4. FINDINGS OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 20 ACRE CITY-OWNED RIVERPORT SITE**

(Report: Feb. 25/00; File: 1000-08-013; REDMS 129607, 134567)

The Director, Parks Dave Semple, reviewed the feasibility study and its recommendations in detail with the Committee. A lengthy discussion then ensued among Committee members and Mr. Semple, on such issues as:

- the request of the Sports Council to construct a larger sports facility
- the rationale for the proposal that an existing sand cell be upgraded to an artificial turf field rather than constructing such a field; (considerable discussion took place on the feasibility of constructing an artificial turf field, and in particular on such issues as (a) the approximate cost of constructing such a field; (b) the use of artificial turf and the perception that users faced increased injuries on these fields; (c) the anticipated maintenance and replacement costs, and whether or not sufficient revenue could be generated to justify the cost of constructing an artificial field; and (d) the need for a report on the refurbishing of sand cell fields to artificial fields.
- the status of the RCA Forum (advice was given that staff would be submitting a report on available options to relocate the user groups in this facility)
- the feasibility of installing removable artificial turf in a building as a means of providing a multi-use facility for lawn bowling and other uses
- whether any action should be taken at this time with regard to the development of the 20 acre City-owned property at Riverport
- the accuracy of the information obtained from the sports survey
- the status of a previous suggestion that "pay and play" be initiated for City sports facilities
- whether or not the restructuring of City fields would meet the future needs of sports groups
- whether any of the needs of the Sports Council and local sports could be accommodated at the present time
- the City position's on the use of fields all year round for soccer and other sporting events

- whether any consideration had been given to the feasibility of booking time and providing subsidies for people who want to play on artificial fields in other municipalities.

It was moved and seconded

***That the recommendations contained in the report titled "Review of Indoor/Outdoor Organized Sports Facility Needs and Land Use Options for the 20 Acre City-Owned Riverport Site" (attached to the report dated February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2000 from the Director, Parks), be endorsed.***

Prior to the question being called, staff were requested to provide a summary of the recommendations to the March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2000 Council Meeting.

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

## 5. **DESIGNATED DOG OFF-LEASH AREAS**

(Report: Feb. 28/00; File: 8060-20-7099; REDMS 138394, 139020)

The Co-ordinator, Partnership & Stewardship, Mike Redpath reviewed the report in detail with Committee members. In response to questions, the following information was provided:

- with respect to the use of Rideau Park as a dog off-leash area – 25 to 30 parents of children who attended the school were not interested in having the park designated as such an area; however, letters had been received from the same number of area residents who wanted the designation; the biggest concern dealt with the fear that advertising the park as a dog off-leash area would attract dog owners from outside the neighbourhood and the City
- the existing bylaw only allowed dogs to be off-leash outside the dyke east of No. 3 Road, the amendment would remove that restriction; any designated dog off-leash area would be signed appropriately
- many residents of Garry Point Park have requested 'time zones' for dogs, and staff would be reporting further on this in the future
- the dog off-leash program requires the owner to control his dog when the animal is off-leash
- the biggest issue of dogs being off-leash was the irresponsibility of the owners to clean up after their dogs; part of the program was to ensure that owners maintained the area in a clean manner, and if that did not occur, staff would report to Council with a recommendation that the area in question no longer allow dogs to be off-leash
- staff would be examining other areas for potential dog off-leash areas on a park by park basis; however before making a recommendation to Council on a particular park, a consensus of the residents would be required
- patrol of the dykes was undertaken by the SPCA on a reactive and proactive basis – in 2000, SPCA officers would be increasing enforcement of City dog regulations

- the SPCA is under contract with the City to enforce dog regulations and statistics were currently being reviewed to determine their effectiveness, City bylaw enforcement officers worked with the SPCA to bring complaints to court but these employees did not patrol the dykes.

During the discussion, the comment was made that the City had to exercise greater control over existing dog off-leash areas before the program was expanded to include new areas. Reference was made to the patrols undertaken by the SPCA, and the comment was made that perhaps in June, the City could initiate a more concerted educational program. It was suggested that individuals be located at each road end adjacent to the West Dyke and at the entrance to Garry Point Park, to educate dog owners about their responsibilities when their dogs are on or off leash. A further comment was made that it would be difficult for the City to obtain the support of the general public on future dog off-leash areas if dog owners were not being held responsible for their pets.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That Bylaw No. 7099, which initiates changes to Pound and Dog Licencing Bylaw No. 4323 with respect to "Designated Dog Off Leash Areas", be introduced and given first, second and third readings.***
- (2) ***That staff be directed to continue the off leash program on a permanent basis, monitoring the existing six off leash areas following the amendment of the Pound and Dog Bylaw No. 4323, and report to Council on an as needed basis to expand or reduce the number of Designated Dog Off Leash areas in Richmond.***

**CARRIED**

## **FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION**

### **6. VISUAL IDENTITY PROGRAM**

(Report: Feb. 25/00; File: 0265-01; REDMS 138869)

The General Manager, Finance & Corporate Services Jim Bruce, briefly explained the history of the project. The Co-ordinator, Customer Service Technologies, Colleen Smith, then reviewed the changes which had been made as a result of concerns expressed at the previous meeting, about the use of the Heron logo and the City Coat of Arms.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and Ms. Smith on the proposed recommendation, during which the following comments were made about the available options:

- reference was made to the placement of the address in 1(a), and a question was raised as to why the address could not be included in the letterhead template
- the use of a smaller logo would provide more space on the paper, thereby providing an opportunity to contain the letter on one page
- the City logo should be larger and more distinctive at the top of the page, the Richmond Island by Nature tag line should be smaller, and the watermark eliminated
- the use of the Richmond Island City by Nature detracted from the Coat of Arms shield

- with regard to the recommended 1(a), the suggestion was made that the line be deleted, and the shield relocated slightly to the left which would provide additional space to increase the size of the shield
- the shield shown in 1(a) should be larger, the address could be moved to the bottom of the page, and either the Heron logo or watermark (or both) eliminated
- address duplication of the address shown in 3(a) – retain the address at the top of the page and eliminate the address included in the signature block
- alter the print in 3(a) to something other than a square block; make the words “City of Richmond” smaller and square this block with the logo on the left.

It was moved and seconded

***That the Heron Logo and “Island City by Nature” tag line be adopted for use, in conjunction with the Corporate Shield, in City brochures, signage and any other “less formal” publications.***

The question on the motion was not called, as information was requested on the types of ‘less formal’ publications which would qualify for use of the Heron Logo and “Island City by Nature” tag line. Concern was also expressed by Chief Administrative Officer George Duncan about the cost of having two separate stationery, however, advice was given that adoption of this recommendation would not impact the use of City letterhead, as the Heron logo was only intended to be used for brochures, etc.

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

It was moved and seconded

***That the Corporate Shield remain the dominant image for use in official documents such as City stationery, minutes, agendas, proclamations and certificates, (as set out in Item 3(a) circulated with the report dated February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2000 from the Co-ordinator, Customer Service Technologies).***

**CARRIED**

OPPOSED: Cllr. Barnes  
Dang  
Johnston

It was moved and seconded

***That the meeting recess and reconvene at 7:00 p.m. (6:31 p.m.)***

**CARRIED**

The meeting reconvened at 7:14 p.m.

7. **YEAR 2000 OPERATING BUDGET  
YEAR 2000 OPERATING BUDGET ADDITIONAL LEVELS**

Mr. Bruce briefly explained the format for the proposed discussion on the proposed operating budget and additional level requests. The material circulated to Committee members was then reviewed in detail, during which Mr. Bruce provided an explanation (and responded to questions) on various components of Table 1 – Analysis of Tax Increase – Non-discretionary Items.

During the discussion, concerns were raised about the proposed level of the training budget, and staff were requested to provide information on the amount of this budget for the past five years.

Mr. Bruce then continued his review of the various materials circulated to the Committee, during which he responded to questions on such matters as the 1999 operating surplus and why the surplus could not be used to finance on-going programs.

The additional level requests for the 2000 operating budget were then reviewed and questions responded to by Mr. Bruce and division managers on such issues as:

- why the monetary amount shown for the RCMP additional levels had only been calculated for ¼ of the year's costs
- when the anticipated start time would be for the 10 additional members requested, whether these members were actually required because of the fact that the detachment was currently understaffed and had been for a number of years, and whether the Federal 10% contribution to fund these additional members had been approved
- the number of RCMP members which the detachment required to deal with serious and organized crime issues
- why grass cutting was being included as an additional level of funding when it was already an annual operating item
- whether it was necessary to provide 24 hour security at the new City Hall
- the proposal to add \$50,000 to the budget to carry out needed repairs on the dykes, and the use of equipment to cut vegetation growing along the dyke
- the request for funding to make up the shortfall required to recap roads in the City, and the rationale for maintaining a reserve account in the amount of \$500,000 for such roadwork
- the rationale for approving additional funding to remove silt and other debris from box culverts and to undertake ditch repairs
- the need for additional level funding to fund consultants and minor capital items.

As a result of the discussion, the following motions were introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That the changes to the Year 2000 Provisional Budget which will now set the Operating Budget portion at \$127,624,787, be approved; and***
- (2) ***That this new operating budget be approved as the first year amount for the Five Year Financial Plan.***

**CARRIED**

It was moved and seconded

***That the proposed tax rate for the additional level operating budget be reduced to 3.52% by removing \$126,000 in projects, and that this amount be set as the first year plan of the Five Year Financial Plan for the public process.***

Prior to the question being called, discussion ensued on the rationale for using the gaming revenue to fund specific additional level requests received from the RCMP. As a result of the discussion, the above motion was **WITHDRAWN**.

It was moved and seconded

***That \$243,000 of the gaming revenue amount be used to reduce the impact of the hiring of the additional RCMP members.***

**CARRIED**

It was moved and seconded

***That the Treasurer go to the public with a proposed property tax increase of 2.87%.***

**CARRIED**

Opposed: Cllr. Steves  
McNulty

### **5 YEAR FINANCIAL PLAN – PUBLIC PROCESS**

Mr. Bruce reviewed the proposed plan, and briefly explained the schedule of timelines for the completion of the 5 year Financial Plan. During the discussion which ensued on this schedule, information was provided on the requirements set out in Bill 88, which related to the completion of this plan.

As a result of the discussion, it was agreed that staff would provide a 4 year financial plan to Council for review, and that a open house would be held to present the proposed five year financial plan for the City. It was also agreed that Committee members would review the proposed plan and submit their comments to staff on March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2000.

### **8. ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

***That the meeting adjourn (9:25 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 6<sup>th</sup>, 2000.

---

Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt,  
Chair

---

Fran J. Ashton,  
Executive Assistant