



MINUTES

**PUBLIC WORKS &
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2001
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Lyn Greenhill, Chair
Councillor Derek Dang
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Acting Mayor Linda Barnes
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, June 6th, 2001, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

2. **GREATER VANCOUVER WATER DISTRICT – PROPOSAL TO ADVANCE THE TIMING OF THE CAPILANO WATER SOURCE FILTRATION WORKS**

(Report: June 13/01, File No.: 0157-20-GVWD1) (REDMS No. 442730)

The Manager, Engineering Planning, Paul Lee, advised that subsequent to the writing of the report, information has been obtained that due to the overwhelming public interest in this matter, another public meeting has been scheduled at the Plaza of Nations on July 11th, 2001. He further advised that at the June 13th public meeting, objections and concerns were strongly expressed about the proposal to implement a “design, build, operate (DBO)” proposal for the Seymour filtration plant. Mr. Lee commented that although the current proposal was for the upgrading of the Seymour system, he was of the opinion that the same process would be applied to the Capilano filtration system.

Councillor Kumagai, as Council's representative on the Board of the Greater Vancouver Regional District, advised that he had requested a financial report on whether (i) the cost of upgrading the Seymour filtration system (\$360 Million) would double as a result of including the Capilano system in the upgrade, or (ii) there would be a cost saving because both systems would be improved at the same time. Cllr. Kumagai suggested that the Committee delay making a decision until the financial costs for the projects were known.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members on this matter, during which the following information was provided:

- the GVWD currently had contracts let to construct an ozonation system at the Capilano water plant and that materials had been purchased in the amount of \$6 Million; if the Capilano plant was upgraded in 2006 instead of 2020 as originally planned, the \$6 Million spent would not be recovered
- with respect to capital costs, staff had been advised that with the advancement of the improvements to the Capilano system, the cost could be \$25 to each user, over and above what the costs would be to municipalities for bulk water costs
- proposal calls would be sought from those companies which have the expertise in designing, constructing and operating water filtration systems
- the successful candidate would recruit or bring in their own staff to operate the plants under contract to the GVRD
- based on the meeting held today, it would appear that the GVRD may approach the Ministry regarding drinking water regulations in an effort to have the new one NTU (nephelometric turbidity units) requirement relaxed.

During the discussion, concerns were expressed about:

- the lack of information on the actual costs to municipalities and homeowners if the proposed improvements to the Seymour and Capilano water systems were approved
- the impact that approval of the project could have regarding the DBO issue because the implications of the DBO proposal have not been recognized.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated June 13th, 2001, from the Manager, Engineering Planning), regarding the Greater Vancouver Water District – Proposal to Advance the Timing of the Capilano Water Source Filtration Works, be referred to staff for report to Committee when there is additional information available on the cost of accelerating plant construction.

Prior to the question on the motion being called, discussion continued, during which in response to questions, advice was given that the GVWD would be making a decision based on the results of a meeting in the District of North Vancouver to be held on June 28th. Mr. Lee added that the City would still be able to make comments.

Mr. Lee further advised that a copy of the legal interpretation on the DBO concept and the implications of NAFTA, the WTO and other international agreements with respect to the proposal, had been requested at today's GVWD staff committee meeting.

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

3. **BOULEVARD MAINTENANCE REGULATION**

(Report: June 11/01, File No.: 8060-20-7174) (REDMS No. 276637, 208741)

Mr. Lee, accompanied by Project Engineer, Engineering Planning, Mark Minson, reviewed the proposed options with the Committee.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the rationale for implementing the proposed bylaw. Reference was made to the situation with Broadmoor area residents regarding illegal ditch and boulevard improvements, and advice was given that those problems had been resolved. Concern was expressed that adoption of the proposed bylaw could create similar situations in other areas of the City. Advice was given that the proposed bylaw was intended to give increased authority to allow the City to advise homeowners of offending violations and to remove the impedance at the expense of the owner. Further advice was given that the proposed bylaw, while providing flexibility to property owners to landscape boulevards, would restrict owners as to what would be permitted, to ensure that public safety would not be compromised.

Reference was made to the City's current policy regarding unauthorized changes to City property, and questions were raised about why the policy had not been incorporated in to the proposed bylaw. Concern was also expressed that the bylaw attached to the report did not reflect the changes now being proposed by staff. Further concern was expressed about the impact which the bylaw could have on industrial/commercial properties and questions were raised about whether the new regulations would apply if the area in question was being redeveloped.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated June 11th, 2001 from the former Director, Engineering), regarding Boulevard Maintenance Regulation, be referred to staff for the preparation of a new bylaw which would incorporate the changes proposed by staff, including (i) a 'grandfather' clause for industrial/commercial properties to allow those properties with hard surfaces on the boulevard prior to adoption of the bylaw, to remain; and (ii) the requirements contained in Policy 9016.

Prior to the question on the motion being called, staff were requested to provide clarification on (i) whether the regulations (as proposed in Option 1) would be applied to industrial/commercial areas which were the subject of redevelopment; and (ii) how staff would address the issue of industrial/commercial properties which had had asphalt placed between the property line and the sidewalk.

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

COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

4. **ADDITIONAL STAFF POSITION – BOULEVARD MAINTENANCE REGULATION**

(Report: May 15/01, File No.: 1810-01) (REDMS No. 325217)

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated May 15th, 2001, from the Manager, Community Bylaws, regarding An Additional Staff Position – Boulevard Maintenance Regulation, be referred to staff until such time as the report on the proposed Boulevard Maintenance Regulation Bylaw is submitted to the Public Works & Transportation Committee.

CARRIED

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

5. **RICHMOND SUB-AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY – RECOMMENDED ROAD IMPROVEMENTS**

(Report: June 4/01, File No.: 6500-01) (REDMS No. 438540)

The Acting Manager, Transportation Victor Wei, through a PowerPoint presentation, reviewed the recommended road improvements with the Committee.

During the discussion which ensued, the following information was provided in response to questions from the Committee:

- the option of extending Rice Mill Road through to No. 6 Road had not been considered further because the results of the study indicated that travel time savings would not be sufficient
- the study was being undertaken in conjunction with the study initiated for the redevelopment of the Fraser Port area
- once phase two of the study had been completed, staff intended to present the results to the Ministry of Transportation to begin discussing strategies.
- staff were expecting that the City would be one of the funding partners for the project, and that once the new Steveston interchange had been constructed, maintenance would most likely be the responsibility of the Ministry of Transportation.

(Councillor Kumagai left the meeting during the above discussion (5:02 p.m.), and did not return.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the following road improvements recommended in Phase 1 of the Richmond Sub-Area Transportation Study, a joint study by the City of Richmond, British Columbia Transportation Financing Authority, Ministry of Transportation, and TransLink, (as presented in the report dated June 4th, 2001, from the A/Manager, Transportation), be endorsed to be carried forward to the next phase of the study for the preparation of functional design and detailed assessment of cost and property requirements:***

- (a) *widening of Steveston Highway between No. 5 Road and Palmberg Road, including the overpass at the Highway 99 interchange;*
 - (b) *new full interchange at Blundell Road and Highway 99;*
 - (c) *widening of Blundell Road to four lanes between No. 4 Road and the new Blundell interchange; and*
 - (d) *extension of Blundell Road from No. 6 Road to Nelson Road as a two- or four-lane road.*
- (2) *That staff work with British Columbia Transportation Financing Authority, the Ministry of Transportation and TransLink to complete the above tasks and to report on an implementation strategy for the recommended road improvements in the south Richmond area.*

CARRIED

6. **SCHOOL AREA, SCHOOL CROSSWALK AND PLAYGROUND SIGN REPLACEMENT PROGRAM**

(Report: May 30/01, File No.: 6450-06-03) (REDMS No. 434635)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That staff develop a sign replacement programme for 2002 through 2004, to comply with new provincial standards of a black graphic on a fluorescent yellow-green background colour for school area and advance warning school crosswalk signs and larger speed limit tabs for school area and playground signs, with the first phase of the programme to be partially financed from funds committed by ICBC as part of the joint City/ICBC Road Safety Improvement Programme for 2000.*
- (2) *That staff explore further funding opportunities with ICBC to support the sign replacement programme for 2002 through 2004, and report to Council on the funding strategy as part of the 2002 Capital Program review process.*

Prior to the question on the motion being called, questions were raised about how the public would be educated about the new sign colours. Advice was given that an article would be placed in the City Notice Board, and would be placed on the City's web site. The suggestion was made that the Provincial Government be encouraged to promote the new signs.

Reference was made to the lack of on-going enforcement of school speed zones by the RCMP, and the suggestion was made that the School District request increased enforcement.

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

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (5:10 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, June 20th, 2001.

Councillor Lyn Greenhill
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant