



## General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003  
Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Derek Dang  
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Rob Howard  
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai  
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, March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2003, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### DELEGATION

2. *Ms. Jane Bird, Ms. Judy Kirk and Mr. David Rink regarding the results of the Public Consultation Process of the Richmond Airport-Vancouver Rapid Transit project.*

Project Director for the Richmond Airport Vancouver Rapid Transit Project, Ms. Jane Bird, accompanied by Mr. David Rink, of Synovate, and Ms. Judy Kirk, of Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., reviewed the results of the community consultation process. Mr. Rink then reviewed the results of the quantitative research document entitled "RAV Rapid Transit Study" (a copy of which is on file in the City Clerk's Office) with the Committee.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

Following Mr. Rink's review, Ms. Bird examined in detail, the "Community Consultation Summary Report, April, 2003" (a copy of which is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes).

(On file in the City Clerk's Office is a copy of (i) the press release issued by TransLink (dated April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2003) entitled "Strong Public Support for the Proposed Richmond-Airport-Vancouver Rapid Transit Project"; and (ii) the "Consultation Summary Report, RAVP Community Consultation 2003" (dated March 28, 2003).)

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and the delegation on:

- the phrasing of some of the questions asked in the "RAV Rapid Transit Study" document and whether this phrasing skewed the results because of the wording
- the number of respondents who preferred an elevated system if undergrounding was not possible
- the intrusiveness of an elevated system and steps which could be taken to soften the appearance of such a structure
- whether sufficient work had been done to explain to the public the rationale for choosing the Cambie Street corridor over Arbutus Street
- the rationale for not approaching the residents on the Cambie Street corridor by mail about the survey
- the proposed travel times between Richmond and Vancouver and whether any consideration had been given to proposing slightly longer times
- how the information contained in the reports now being reviewed would be presented to other stakeholders in the project
- the future of buses following the implementation of the new system
- the support for the proposed transit system from other communities.

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

## URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

### 3. MUNICIPAL APPOINTMENT TO NORTH FRASER PORT AUTHORITY

(Report: April 1/03, File No.: 0140-20-NFHA1) (REDMS No. 990141)

It was moved and seconded

*That nominees for the position of municipal appointee to the North Fraser Port Authority be sought through advertisement in the City Notice Board.*

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

Prior to the question on the motion being called, the General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan, advised that there was no maximum age restriction placed on appointees to the North Fraser Port Authority.

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

## COUNCILLOR BILL MCNULTY

### 4. **PARKS, RECREATION, AND CULTURAL SERVICES DELIVERY SYSTEM**

(Report: April 1/03, File No.: 0340-20-CSER1) (REDMS No. 990101)

Councillor Bill McNulty, in speaking to his report, commented on the need to address the delivery of parks, recreational and cultural services to the City. He stated that the current model, which had implemented in Richmond in the 1950s needed to be reviewed and improved upon, or replaced with a better model. Cllr. McNulty stated that it was important to recognize that there was a need for a change in the manner in which recreational services were delivered to the City.

Cllr. McNulty, during his commentary, noted that an amendment was required to the first page of his report, to delete the line, "The terms of reference would need to be drafted by the City."

Committee members spoke in support of the proposed recommendation as it was felt that the recommendations, if adopted, would help to resolve some of the problems being experienced with the current service delivery model review. At the same time, discussion ensued on such issues as:

- the source of funding and budget for the proposed \$50,000 expenditure
- how quickly the Working Group would be in operation
- the appointment of two community members at large, and how these two individuals would be selected (the suggestion was made that advertisements be placed in English, Asian and Punjabi newspapers; as well the comment was expressed that these people could be users or potential users of the City's recreational services)
- whether existing programs would continue for the remainder of the year
- when the implementation of the new program would take place
- whether decisions of the Working Group would be by consensus or voting
- the relationship of the review of the recreation service delivery model to the development of a Master Plan for Parks which was currently underway

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- the purpose of the proposed Working Group; whether the current consultation process being undertaken by staff would continue, and whether the Special Public Meeting scheduled for April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2003 would still take place
- the need to recognize volunteers for their service and involvement, both now and in the future
- the need to engage the services of an outside facilitator who was experienced in this type of process
- the need to nominate a representative of the Richmond Committee on Disability to the Working Group.

During the discussion, questions were raised as to whether or not any consideration had been given to appointing a member of the Richmond School Board to the Working Group. In response, the comment was made that the Council/School Board Liaison Committee would be the appropriate forum. Advice was given that this matter would be discussed by the Committee at its May 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Reference was made to the proposal of the Intercultural Advisory Committee to have focus groups with respect to such issues as cultural policies and community involvement, and a question was raised as to whether this group could be included in the Working Group. In response, advice was given by the General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services, Cathy Carlile, that she would have discussions with Urban Development staff to determine what would be effective and whether there were comparable issues which could be addressed.

Further comments were also made about the current service delivery model, it being felt that the current program would not be able to continue into the future; that a new model was required which would delivery comprehensive recreational services to the majority of Richmond residents; and that a new model was required which was patterned after the needs and demographics of the City.

Reference was made to the appointment of two Council representatives, and the Mayor advised that he would recommend that Cllrs. McNulty and Steves be appointed as non-voting Council representatives to the Working Group.

Mr. James Sullivan stated that it was important that people with disabilities be included in the Working Group. He agreed with previous statements that the current service delivery model could not maintain itself and required changing, and he voiced his support to the proposed resolution which would seek consensus from so many members of the community. Mr. Sullivan stated that there had been misinterpretation and misunderstanding about the new model proposed by staff, but reiterated that there had to be changes to the manner in which programs were delivered.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

Mr. Greg Robertson, representing the Council of Community Associations, and the South Arm Community Association, spoke in support of the proposed resolution. He questioned the proposed timeline for implementation, noting that the contract with the Richmond Fitness Association to provide fitness instructors would expire in July of this year, and he expressed concern about the loss of continuity within the system, if the instructors were not replaced.

Discussion continued among Committee members and staff about whether a representative of the School Board should be included as a member of the Working Group. The suggestion was made that a member of the School Board be invited to attend Working Group meetings, rather than being appointed as a member, and this was agreed to by the Committee.

As a result of the discussion, the following **amended** resolution was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Richmond City Council establish a Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Renewal Community Working Group consisting of the following volunteer representatives:*
  - (a) *three representatives nominated by the Council of Community Associations;*
  - (b) *one representative nominated by the Richmond Sports Council;*
  - (c) *one representative nominated by the Richmond Chinese Community Society;*
  - (d) *one representative nominated by the Richmond Heritage Commission;*
  - (e) *one representative nominated by the Child Care Development Board;*
  - (f) *one representative nominated by the Community Arts Council;*
  - (g) *one representative nominated by Intercultural Relations Committee;*
  - (h) *one representative nominated by the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee;*
  - (i) *one representative nominated by the Seniors Advisory Council;*
  - (j) *Councillors Bill McNulty and Harold Steves as the non-voting Council representatives;*
  - (k) *two community members at large, who would be selected following an advertising campaign;*
  - (l) *one representative nominated by the Richmond Committee on Disability; and*
  - (m) *one representative of City youth.*

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- (2) *That the Working Group's Terms of Reference are to make recommendations to Council on the Master Plan and the renewal of the parks, recreation, and cultural services delivery system adhering to the guiding principles for the service delivery system adopted by Council, with specific recommendations on:*
  - (a) *a framework for a new Recreation service delivery system that identifies weakness in the current system and necessary improvements including a community involvement model including the roles of the volunteer, an implementation strategy for the new model and the financial impact.*
- (3) *That the City commit funds related to managing and supporting the process for up to \$50,000, with a report to Council on the budget and source of funding.*
- (4) *That the Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Renewal Community Working Group report to Council by the end of September, 2003.*

The question on the motion was not called, as staff were requested to provide Council with a proposed budget and source of funding prior to the April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2003 Council Meeting.

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

### ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

#### 5. **VIKING WAY WATERMAIN REPLACEMENT**

(Report: March 28/03, File No.: 6340-01) (REDMS No. 989159)

It was moved and seconded

*That the proposed Gilbert Road Watermain replacement project identified in the 2003 capital program be substituted for the Viking Way Watermain replacement project.*

**CARRIED**

### FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

#### 6. **ROAD EXCHANGE BYLAW 7510 SHEPHERD DRIVE**

(Report: March 29/2003, File No.: 8060-20-7510) (REDMS No. 989314, 989313)

It was moved and seconded

*That Road Exchange Bylaw 7510 be forwarded to Council for introduction and first, second and third readings.*

**CARRIED**

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

7. **4100 NO. 5 ROAD – RIGHT OF WAY SANITARY SEWER AT KING GEORGE PARK**

(Report: March 19/03, File No.: 2285-01) (REDMS No. 982175)

It was moved and seconded

*That a right of way for sanitary sewer be granted over a portion of 4100 No. 5 Road, (as outlined on the sketch plan attached to the report dated March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003, from the Manager, Lands & Property).*

**CARRIED**

## PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION

8. **WOODEN BOAT FESTIVAL**

(Report: March 31/03, File No.: 7400-01) (REDMS No. 989212, 989812)

The Director, Parks, Dave Semple, accompanied by Site Supervisor, Britannia, Brian Klassen, indicated that they were available to answer questions from the Committee.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on such issues as:

- the reasons why the Britannia Heritage Shipyard Society and the Britannia Advisory Board were not interested in taking control of the project
- the rationale for requiring a decision at this time on whether to host the Wooden Boat Festival
- whether wooden boat festivals held in other locations had been successful in obtaining grants from other levels of government
- whether it was realistic to expect (i) that sponsorships would be found for the Wooden Boat Festival, based on the City's experiences in endeavouring to find sponsors for the Tall Ships Festival; and (ii) sponsorships in 2005 for the Tall Ships Festival after holding the Wooden Boat Festival in 2004
- the final 'drop dead' date by which a decision would have to be made on whether to proceed with the festival
- the proposed location of the Wooden Boat Festival, and how access to the boats would be permitted
- the use of volunteers to operate concession stands
- the need to address parking for visitors to the Festival
- the need to use existing resources rather than renting equipment, such as tents, for the event
- the proposed budget, and whether the figures given for revenue and expenses were realistic.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

During the discussion, reference was made to the proposal to charge a \$5 per person gate fee, and the suggestion was made that this fee should be reduced to \$1.

Discussion continued, during which comments were made that an event should be held annually to showcase the Steveston waterfront; and that the Wooden Boat Festival should be held the week leading up to July 1<sup>st</sup> and the Steveston Salmon Festival. However, concerns were also expressed that adoption of the staff recommendations would mean that the City was endorsing the concept, which it was felt, could open the door to future requests. Further comments were made that staff should be approaching interested groups and asking them if they wanted to assume responsibility for the festival, with the City having only a minimal role.

Reference was made to the issue of sponsorship of the event, and comments were made that it was important to have a commitment for the funds before proceeding any further.

Questions were asked about the status of the Wooden Boat Festival in 2005, when the Tall Ships Festival was proposed to be held, and advice was given that the two events would be combined into one.

Mr. Bob Ransford, a member of the Britannia Heritage Shipyard Society, questioned the extent of the City's commitment to the project as it had been noted during the discussion that neither the Britannia Heritage Shipyard Society or the Maritime Society had requested the event. He also questioned what would happen if the Federal Government did not provide a financial contribution, and who would be responsible if the financial support was less than needed.

A brief discussion then ensued among Committee members and Mr. Ransford regarding the proposed Wooden Boat Festival and who would be responsible for the cost of the event, signing cheques and approving invoices. During the discussion, Mr. Ransford brought to the Committee's attention, an apparent shortfall between the revenue and expenses of 'City in-kind'.

As a result of the discussion, the following **referral** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2003, from the Director, Parks and the Manager, Heritage & Cultural Services), regarding the Wooden Boat Festival, be referred to staff to provide staff with the opportunity to approach those groups which might be interested in becoming involved with the festival, and that staff report to Committee with a plan which would include (i) the City's responsibilities and obligations, including a budget, and (ii) the names of the interested parties, along with the roles in which the members of those groups would be involved.*



# General Purposes Committee

Monday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

The question on the motion was not called, as staff were requested to complete the work as quickly as possible. Staff were also requested to prepare a revised budget which did not include any financial contributions from the Federal Government, and to correct the discrepancies in the current budget between expenses and revenue and the City's contribution.

Discussion also ensued on the timing of the report being prepared on the hosting of events and whether that report should be dealt with prior to dealing with the Wooden Boat Festival proposal. During the discussion, the comment was made that the event report would not answer the question of whether the Wooden Boat Festival should be held.

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

9. **RICHMOND LIBRARY PROJECT**

(Report: April 2/03, File No.: 2052-01) (REDMS No. 989039)

It was moved and seconded

*That the East Richmond Branch Library project and the first phase renovations to Brighthouse Library, each be proceeded with, as outlined in the 2003 Capital Budget process.*

**CARRIED**

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (6:31 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, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

---

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Chair

---


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



---


# Community Consultation Summary Report April, 2003

Note: Synovate has reviewed the tables that summarize the quantitative consultation results and found that the calculations are correct. Any minor differences are accounted for by rounding.



---


## CONSULTATION SUMMARY

- More than 1500 people participated in the community consultation in March, 2003.
  - Approximately 555 people attended the three public workshops; 75 in Richmond, 180 at VPL and 300 at the Plaza 500.
  - Participants accessed information and provided feedback through the web, by fax and through written correspondence.
- 




## FEEDBACK FORM RESULTS

- An 18-page Discussion Guide and a newspaper information piece encouraged feedback through a feedback form.
- The following summarizes quantitative feedback from 1334 feedback forms.



### Support for Proceeding with the proposed line.


- 82% somewhat or strongly agree with the project proceeding at an estimated cost of \$1.5-1.7 billion.






**Support for the Route -  
No.3 Road, Grant  
McConachie Way, Cambie  
Street to Waterfront Station  
in downtown Vancouver.**

- 73.2% of consultation participants support the proposed route its entirety.




(n=1136)



**Direct Travel**



- 91.2% of participants somewhat or strongly agree it is important to provide direct travel between Richmond City Centre and downtown Vancouver.
- 89.4% of participants somewhat or strongly agree that it is important to provide direct travel between the Airport and downtown Vancouver.







## Travel Time

- 89.1% somewhat or strongly agree with the statement, with a new rail rapid transit line, the travel time from Richmond Centre to Waterfront Station should be no more than 30 minutes.
- 87.4% somewhat or strongly agree with the statement, the travel time from the Airport to Waterfront Station should be no more than 25 minutes.




## Underground, At Street, Above Street (Elevated)

- 64.6% of participants prefer elevated to at street level if underground is not possible.
- 71.1% of participants prefer underground to elevated if at street level is not possible.
- 82.1% of participants prefer underground to at street level if elevated is not possible.



## Transit Use


- 79.5% of participants would be somewhat or very likely to use the RAV line if the rail rapid transit service is completed.




## System Preferences



Participants rate travel time, reliability of the system and easy connections as the three most important factors if they were to use the line.

- Lower Mainland Residents -  
- Among Those Making A Choice -







**Future Consultation**  
 Participants selected a variety of consultation methods for the future, showing a preference for newspaper information pieces.



**Travel in the Corridor**

- 62.1% of participants have taken transit within the last 30 days.
- 85% of participants have travelled between Vancouver and Richmond in the last 30 days.






## KEY THEMES

### ● Cambie Corridor

Many of those who provided comments support the Cambie Corridor as the proposed route saying it has the highest density and would serve the most people.

Others oppose the use of the Cambie Corridor citing concern for the boulevard trees and green space. In opposing the use of Cambie Corridor, some participants suggest that the Arbutus Corridor would be a better choice because a rail corridor already exists there.




## KEY THEMES

### ● Arbutus Corridor

Many of those who provided comments said that the Arbutus Corridor would be a superior choice for a rail rapid transit relative to the Cambie Corridor. Some are of the opinion that it would be less expensive because of the existing rail corridor on Arbutus.

Some participants were critical that they were presented with a proposed rail rapid transit line on Cambie rather than a full comparison of Cambie and Arbutus.








## KEY THEMES

- **Buses**

Buses were mentioned by many people as a rapid transit technology option worth considering rather than the proposed rail rapid transit project. A desire for improved bus service is mentioned by many people. Some participants express strong support for SkyTrain saying it has low operating costs and high carrying capacity. Some say SkyTrain is a safe and fast train that is very frequent - all things that make it attractive to users.




## KEY THEMES


- **No.3 Road**

Participants expressed concern about the existing congestion on No.3 Road and whether the RAV line would increase the congestion.

- **Underground, at street level, above street (elevated)**

Participants expressed a preference for underground along Cambie Street. Others preferred above-ground for the views. Still others are concerned about the safety issues with a street-level system.






## KEY THEMES

- **Cambie Heritage Boulevard Preservation**

Participants supported the preservation of the Cambie Heritage Boulevard and expressed the opinion that the boulevard is important to Vancouver in terms of quality of life as well as the positive impression on tourists.



## KEY THEMES

- **Bicycles**

Participants agreed that the RAV should be able to carry bicycles as well as have stations situated in bicycle accessible 'park and ride' areas.

- **Proceed with the Project**

Many participants said get on with building the RAV rapid transit line as soon as possible.





---

## Next Steps in Consultation

- Subject to project approval, a *Neighbourhood Consultation* program will include discussions with individuals, organizations and neighbourhoods along the RAV line.
  - Discussions could include:
    - ▶ Station area planning
    - ▶ System integration into communities
    - ▶ Bus connections
    - ▶ Service amenities
- 