6. GATEWAY THEATRE REVIEW

(Report: October 6, 2006 , File No.: 11-7025-01) (REDMS No. 2028257, 2028745)

A brief discussion ensued among Committee members, during which the suggestion was made that Part (1) of the staff recommendation should be amended to read *'That the consultant's report (Attachment 1) on the Gateway Theatre Review be forwarded to the Richmond Gateway Theatre Society Board of Directors for their consideration and analysis, and the possible implementation of some of the recommendations."*

Ms. Janice Chapman came forward and expressed her appreciation that the concerns which had been expressed about the operation of the Gateway Theatre had been taken seriously. She noted that a majority of the concerns which had been raised were investigated and answered in the report, and she urged the Committee to accept the report as presented.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and Ms. Chapman on the role of the City and the Gateway Theatre Board with respect to the operation of the theatre. Also addressed with Ms. Chapman was the need to determine at the end of the twelve month period, whether all of the recommendations had been implemented and had addressed the concerns which had been raised.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the following **amended** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

(1) That the consultant's report (Attachment 1) on the Gateway Theatre Review be forwarded to the Richmond Gateway Theatre Society Board of Directors for their consideration and analysis, and the possible implementation of some of the recommendations;

(2) The City identifies its expectations of the Richmond Gateway Theatre Society and forward them to the Society; and

(3) That the Committee request the Richmond Gateway Theatre Board to report on their progress regarding these recommendations in 12 months.

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued on the recommendations contained in the consultant's report, and in particular, the meaning of the recommendation that clarification be sought from the City regarding its annual expectations. Also addressed was the question of whether the new operating agreement with the Theatre could form the basis for the new operating agreements with other City boards.

Reference was made to those recommendations which had budget implications, and the comment was made that the budget would have to be reviewed and the appropriate increase made, otherwise volunteers would be fund-raising for personnel rather than programs. A further comment was made that the Gateway Theatre Society Board would need to consider budgetary constraints as it reviewed the consultant's recommendations.

During the discussion Committee members commented on the positive nature of the consultant's report.

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