



## Public Works & Transportation Committee

Date: Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003  
Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Councillor Rob Howard, Chair  
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai, Vice-Chair  
Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Absent: Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Derek Dang  
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 Public Works & Transportation Committee held on Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

Councillor Kiichi Kumagai questioned whether rates had been established for those residents who wished to purchase water meters and who wished to pay only for the water they used. Advice was given by the Director, Operations, Eric Gilfillan, that the cubic meter rate for purchased water would be the same, and in addition, there would be a rental rate for the use of the meter on the property as the City did not allow residents to purchase meters. Mr. Gilfillan added that the rental fee would provide funds for the future maintenance of the water meters.

# Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

## DELEGATION

2. Mr. Malcolm Johnston, representing the Light Rail Committee, regarding the proposed Richmond Airport Vancouver Transportation System.  
(File No.: 6520-01)

Mr. Johnston spoke to the Committee about the proposed Richmond Airport Vancouver Transportation system, and a copy of his submission is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.

The Chair thanked the delegation for his presentation, and Mr. Johnston then left the meeting.

## ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

3. **AWARD OF 2003 PAVING CONTRACT T.1545**  
(Report: Feb. 7/03, File No.: 6340-20-P.03201) (REDMS No. 960622)

The Manager, Engineering Design & Construction, Robert Gonzales, referred to an amended Appendix A, copies of which were circulated to the Committee.

The Chair spoke briefly about the report, stating that he would address the future handling of information tender reports to the Committee, under 'Manager's Report' later in the meeting.

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003, from the Director, Engineering), regarding the Award of the 2003 Paving Contract T.1545 be received for information.*

CARRIED

4. **AWARD OF CONTRACT T.1546 - ROADWAY AND UTILITIES CONSTRUCTION - GARDEN CITY ROAD FROM PATTERSON ROAD TO BRIDGEPORT ROAD**

(Report: Feb. 24/03, File No.: 6340-20-P.01202) (REDMS No. 964744)

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated February 24<sup>th</sup>, 2003, from the Director, Engineering) regarding award of Contract T.1546 - Roadway and Utilities Construction - Garden City Road from Patterson Road to Bridgeport Road, be received for information.*

CARRIED

# Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

## URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

5. **FEDERAL GOVERNMENT URBAN TRANSPORTATION SHOWCASE PROGRAM – PROPOSED INCLUSION OF RICHMOND “TRAVELSMART” INITIATIVE IN GVRD / GVTA SUBMISSION**

(Report: Mar. 5/03, File No.: 6460-01) (REDMS No. 975587)

Transportation Planner Joan Caravan, accompanied by the Director, Engineering, Gordon Chan, spoke briefly about the proposal. Mr. Chan added that Richmond was one of six municipalities being considered for the program, and that the concept of the program was to influence traffic behaviour for the future to encourage individuals to take use transit rather than their vehicles.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff, during which information was provided that of the six municipalities being considered, Vancouver and Richmond would form the group which would target those individuals residing within the City Centre who chose not to use transit. Information was also provided that the ‘TravelSmart’ program would be 100% funded by others.

It was moved and seconded

*That the inclusion of a TravelSmart initiative in Richmond as part of the GVRD/GVTA submission to the Federal Government’s Urban Transportation Showcase Program, be endorsed.*

**CARRIED**

6. **GATEWAY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES -PROPOSED INCLUSION OF THE BLUNDELL ROAD / NELSON ROAD CORRIDOR IN THE SOUTHEAST RICHMOND INDUSTRIAL AREA**

(Report: Mar. 4/03, File No.: 6460-01) (REDMS No. 975307)

Mr. Chan spoke briefly about the proposal, after which discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on the proposal. Councillor Kumagai suggested that correspondence to the Greater Vancouver Gateway Council (GVGC) should provide an outline on the various warehouse distribution developments which were either under construction or being proposed for the area south of Nelson Road, in order to give an overview of the truck traffic anticipated for the area. He further recommended that information also be provided which would support the fact that Westminster Highway and Nelson Road cannot accommodate the increased traffic..

Mr. Chan in response to the comments made by Cllr. Kumagai, advised that following adoption of the recommendation by Council, that the correspondence to the GVGC would include Cllr. Kumagai’s suggestions. He also urged Committee members to lobby the GVGC in support of the project.

# Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

Discussion continued briefly, during which the suggestion was made that the matter should be referred to the soon-to-be established Economic Development Task Force for its review.

It was moved and seconded

*That the Greater Vancouver Gateway Council be requested to consider including the Blundell Road / Nelson Road corridor in the southeast Richmond in the list of transportation infrastructure priorities as outlined in its Major Commercial Transportation System to support the development of a comprehensive and integrated regional transportation network.*

**CARRIED**

## 7. MANAGER'S REPORT

- (1) Mr. Gonzales reported that the annual public open house to explain the proposed 2003 civic construction program to Richmond residents would be held on Thursday, April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2003, and he invited the Committee to attend the event.
- (2) The Chair referred to the information reports dealt with earlier in the meeting on the awarding of tenders, and directed that in future, he would like to see these matters dealt with as part of the Manager's Report, with a one page report prepared on the project in question.

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (4:34 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

---

Councillor Rob Howard  
Chair

---

Fran J. Ashton  
Executive Assistant

**Ashton, Fran**

SCHEDULE A TO THE MINUTES OF  
THE PUBLIC WORKS &  
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY,  
MARCH 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2003

**From:** Donald Malcolm Johnston [dmjohnston@imag.net]  
**Sent:** March 18, 2003 8:53 PM  
**To:** Ashton, Fran  
**Subject:** LRC's presentationa copy for council

## Light Rail Committee

Box 105 ~ DELTA, B.C. V4K 3N5 ~ CANADA

Phone 604-889-4484 ~ Fax 604-943-5314 ~ Email dmjohnston@imag.net

### Presentation to Richmond's Transportation Committee

What is the Light Rail Committee?

An independent citizens group that comments on modern Light Rail Transit in the GVRD.

What is LRT?

The Light Rail Transit Association's handbook *Light Rail Transit Today*, defines LRT: "LRT is a mode that can deal economically with traffic flows of between 2,000 and 20,000 passengers per hour, per direction, thus effectively bridging the gap between the maximum flow that can be dealt with using buses and the minimum that justify a metro."

Some things that TransLink doesn't tell you about modern LRT:

LRT is considered one of the safest public transit modes in the world.

The Tuen Mun LRT in Hong Kong carries over 25,000 pphpd!

The Sheffield LRT's maximum grade is 10%, the steepest station is on a 9% grade.

Modern LRT can operate on tramways (streetcars); light rail (Arbutus Corridor), or on regular railway tracks, as a commuter train!

Calgary's LRT carries over 187,000 customers daily, yet it's total cost is under \$600 million. The completed SkyTrain Expo Line carries about 100,000 customers a day yet cost over \$1.5 billion!

There is no evidence that automation saves operational costs.

Since SkyTrain was first marketed, in the late 1970's, only four such systems are in operation. During the same period over 75 new light rail systems have been put into operation.

You can loose upward of 70% of potential ridership per transfer.

The LRC's solution, lets bring back the interurban!

The Richmond-Airport-Vancouver

Just reinstate the interurban from Vancouver to Steveston, using the Arbutus Corridor and existing infrastructure; cost \$700 million to \$800 million.

(RAV)

Rapid Transit Project

Because of several letters written to international transport journals, I was asked to do an informal clipping service sent to several transit specialists, of newspaper articles on the RAV project. This came about because of the RAV projects search for private funding or PPP, overseas. The experts wanted to know, through informal channels, the politics, personalities, etc. of the various people involved as reported in local newspapers. The response from several transit specialists leaves one to wonder if RAV is well planned. Example:

*"We really become more and more bemused at this."*

*"Really, we look at this stuff in growing disbelief."*

*"Understand the X lies were filmed in you part of the world. Perhaps that explains it."*

*"Certainly I can imagine that the powers that be in Vancouver cannot begin to imagine the reputation they have managed to generate in the wider transport community in the rest of the world!"*

The problem with RAV is simple, it's a very expensive rapid transit system designed solely for the SkyTrain proprietary mini-metro. No one has planned for much more affordable LRT!

Rapid Transit systems generally fail to attract much new ridership because the high construction costs for extensions into the suburbs are prohibitive. To be successful rail transit must penetrate into the suburbs as well as city centres! SkyTrain was supposed to carry 20,000 pphpd by the year 2000, yet its ridership is slowly declining and now carries about 7,000 pphpd because people do not wish to

transfer from bus to SkyTrain. Even after major identification along the Expo Line, this still has not increased ridership! Predictions of 100,000 riders a day seem hollow with the experience of the Expo Line.

It could well be that Richmond may get the rump of a SkyTrain mini-metro that may not attract predicted ridership and very well force more people into their cars rather than attracting them to transit!