City of Richmond

Report to Committee

To:	General Purposes Committee	**Date:**	July 2, 2003
From:	Cathryn Volkering Carlile Acting Chief Administrative Officer	**File:**	-
Re:	**Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Community Working Group Terms of Reference Extension**		

Staff Recommendation

1. That the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Community Working Group Terms of Reference be extended to May 2004.

2. That the 2004 Budget be increased by the one time cost of $75,000.

Cathy Volkering Carlile
General Manager - Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services

Att.

Staff Report

Origin

At the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Community Working Group meeting of June 19, 2003, the Committee requested an extension to the task assigned to the working group.

Analysis

In April 2003, Richmond City Council created a Community Working Group to make recommendations on the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Master Plan and the renewal of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services delivery system adhering to guiding principles with specific recommendations on:

- A framework for a new recreation service delivery system,
- Understanding the current system,
- Improvements including a community involvement model and the roles of the volunteer,
- An implementation strategy for the new model,
- The financial impact.

Staff presented a proposed schedule at the first meeting that outlined a six-month process. The working groups role is to consider the extensive work that has been compiled by staff, the consulting team and feedback from the public.

The Committee agreed with the steps in the process but felt uncomfortable with the short time frame (Attachment 1).

The Community Working Group expressed concern that the task was too large to be adequately addressed in a six-month period. Staff originally felt that it was possible to complete the work within the time frame given the research, public input and information that had been gathered. However, the CWG need time to understand the impact and scope of the project.

A member of the Committee presented a revised schedule. The revised proposal extended the time frame for each phase of the project and expanded the meeting schedule. The Committee agreed that the second proposed schedule better met their needs to thoroughly understand and manage the task assigned to them.

The Committee requested that Council consider extending the timeline for the project a further 7 months to May 2004 (Attachment 2).

Financial Impact

There are direct and indirect financial impacts to the City by extending the process. In April 2003, City Council created the Community Working Group and approved an additional $50,000 to the Master Plan process currently underway. This funding was for increased staff coordination, consulting/facilitation fees, refreshments and miscellaneous meeting expenses.

Impact Summary

Community Working Group	Concludes Oct 2003	Concludes May 2004
Funding	$50,000 (approved)	$125,000 ($50,000 approved, $75,000 in 2004 Budget)
Master Plan Report	To Council Dec 2003	To Council June 2004
Budget	Changes to 2004 Budget	Changes to 2005 Budget
Implementation	Commences early 2004	Commences late 2004/2005
Dedicated Staffing	6 months	13 months
Volunteer	30 hours each	60 + hours each

Funding

This request is to extend the time a further 7 months. The increased costs would be $75,000 including increased staff coordination, consulting/facilitation fees, refreshments and miscellaneous meeting expenses. These additional one-time expenses could be budgeted in the 2004 Budget as an additional level for 2004 only.

Budget

An extension to 2004 does impact the City's ability to make changes within the annual budget cycle. When the transition/change occurs the 2004 Budget may have increased or decreased expenditures and revenues that have not been accounted for in the annual budget process and five-year budget process.

In order to accommodate this change outside of the annual budget cycle, statutory requirements will need to be followed. Implementation of any change will likely be later in 2004 or in 2005.

Consulting Team

The consulting team, Cannon Johnston, have a contract with the City for the development of the Master Plan, which now includes the Community Working Group. This contract will have to be extended and their fees will increase accordingly. To date, the Consulting Group have indicated they have the capacity to extend the dates.

Master Plan

The Master Plan was originally expected to be completed in Fall 2003. Delaying the process will impact the implementation of the recommendations for the entire service delivery managed by Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services. The Master Plan is creating a decision framework,

policy framework and prioritization framework for a 10-year future. This delay will impact capital and operating recommendations and budgets for future years by 6 months.

Staffing/Workplan Priorities

The 2003 PRCS staff work plans had an emphasis on completing the Master Plan and the service delivery process. Delaying this will impact the work plans for 2004 and may limit staff the ability to respond to other priorities. Staff at the community centres are all looking forward to change, a delay in the change will continue to impact their operations.

Community Working Group

Staff has consulted with the Community Working Group members and asked whether there was commitment to fulfilling the Terms of Reference if an extension was granted. Each member responding, agreed that more time was needed and that once fully oriented to the challenge, that they would be able to have a better result. Some members of the CWG have expressed their concern that if the term was extended that they may no longer be affiliated with their sponsoring agency.

Customer Service

At the outset of this process, the City committed that there would be little impact to those participating in programs. Staff would continue to support that commitment to ensure that customers are not impacted negatively throughout this process. However, taking more time to complete the process will result in a later implementation date to the service delivery.

Conclusion

The newly established Community Working Group has been charged with a large task. They are to make recommendations on the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Master Plan and the renewal of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services delivery system. The working group has expressed their concerns that the time frame to understand the scope of work and make recommendations is too large for the time frame set.

Staff and the City's budget will be impacted negatively by the extension. Emerging priorities may not be advanced due to staff being involved in supporting the Community Working Group. The implementation of the Master Plan recommendations will also be delayed by 6 months - 1 year.

The CWG is more comfortable with the extended timeframe and feels that they can do a better job. Staff are supportive of extending the timeframe only if it is financially supported and it will enhance the outcome of the process.

Cathy Volkering Carlile
General Manager - Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services

:cvc

City of Richmond

RICHMOND

Community Working Group

Work Plan Schedule

Meeting No.	Date	Purpose / Topic	Resource Materials	Outcome
1	May 15	Orientation	Work Book	Awareness
2	Jun 19	Reviewing the Future Vision	Community Leaders Workshop Summary Staff Working Group Report Best Practices	Support
3	Jul 17	Understanding Current Reality (What Works Well)	City Analysis Consultant Analysis (Staff Working Group Report) Others Analysis	Awareness
4	Aug 21	Exploring What Needs to Happen (By When By Whom)	Master Plan Options	Input/Advice
5	Sep 18	Reviewing the Two Options	Open House Materials	Advice/ Support
6	Oct 16	Confirming the Preferred Option	Open House Summary Prepared Option	Support/ Consensus

Master Plan

Consultation Program

Public Process	Focus Groups
Community Leaders Workshop (June 5-6)	Round 1 (June)
Open House No. 1 (July)	
Open House No. 2 (October)	Round 2 (October)
Open House No. 3 (November)	Round 3 (November)

City of Richmond
Parks Recreation and Cultural Services Community Working Group
Proposed Schedule

Meeting Number	Purpose Topic	Resource Materials	Outcome
1.	Orientation	Work Book	Awareness
2.	Visioning Stage 1	Community Leaders Workshop	Critical Review/Input/Advise
3.	Visioning Stage 2	Staff Working Group Report on Visioning	Critical Review/Input/Advise
4.	Visioning Stage 3	Best Practices Crafting of overall vision	Critical Review/Input/Advise Sign off Vision
5.	Understanding the current reality (what works/ what doesn't)	City Analysis Consultant Analysis	Awareness/Critical Review
6.	Understanding the current reality (what works/ what doesn't)	Input from Stakeholders Delegations Committee Analysis	Discussion/Critical Review/Support
7.	Exploring what needs to happen (by when/ by whom)	Master Plan options in context of Council adopted principles	Discussion/Critical Review/Support Understanding the Current Reality signed off
8.	Exploring what needs to happen (by when/ by whom)	Service Delivery Model Options	Discussion/Critical Review/Support
9.	Reviewing the options	Open House Presentation	Critical Review/Input/Advise
10.	Confirming the preferred option	Open House summery and prepared option	Support/Consensus/Draft final report
11.	Review final report	Final draft	Support Final Report signed off.

Proposed by: Bob Ransford, June 2003
Approved by CWG: June 19, 2003