



Public Works & Transportation Committee

Date: Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Linda Barnes, Chair
Councillor Cynthia Chen
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves

Absent: Councillor Derek Dang, Vice-Chair

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, July 19th, 2006, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Wednesday, October 18th, 2006 (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

POLICIES / STRATEGIES (0 ITEMS)

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

DECISIONS / ACTIONS (5 ITEMS)

ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

3. **MUNICIPAL ACCESS AGREEMENT WITH SHAW CABLESYSTEMS LIMITED**

(Report: July 21/06, File No.: 12-8060-02-01) (REDMS No. 1884929, 2007649)

The Manager, Engineering Planning, Siu Tse, accompanied by the Supervisor, Infrastructure Planning, Bill Jones, introduced Chris Ewasiuk, Manager, Government & Regulatory Affairs, British Columbia for Shaw Cablesystems. Mr. Tse then commented briefly on the proposed agreement, noting that this agreement was the first of its type in British Columbia. He added that Shaw Cablesystems Limited had been very cooperative during the development of the agreement, and showed leadership in their field by supplying a superior service to the residents of Richmond. He concluded by indicating that the agreement allowed the City to recoup increased revenue for the infrastructure being installed in the City.

Discussion then took place among Committee members, staff and the delegation on such matters as cost recovery, and whether the City could charge rent. Advice was given that while the City was not allowed to charge rent, 'causal costs' or costs associated to Shaw Cablesystems infrastructure installations could be charged for new development only. In addition, information was provided that the Canadian Radio Television Corporation (CRTC) did not allow the City to charge rent.

Also addressed was the issue of whether the agreement was practical with respect to the installation of new infrastructure and infrastructure relocation. In response, information was provided that a copy of the City's Five Year Plan was provided to Shaw Cablesystems so that the company would always be aware of the City's upcoming plans. Further information was provided that this issue was addressed in the agreement, in that the City was required to provide at least 180 days written notice of any proposed relocation.

The issue of cost sharing was addressed, with information being provided on the relocation and/or replacement of Shaw Cablesystems infrastructure due to changing technology and the responsibility of that company or the City for costs incurred. Also discussed was the feasibility of Shaw Cablesystems being taken over by another company and how that question was addressed in the proposed agreement.

It was moved and seconded

That the Municipal Access Agreement between the City of Richmond and Shaw Cablesystems Limited (attached to the report dated July 21st, 2006, from the Director, Engineering), be executed.

CARRIED

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

4. **RICHMOND LONG RANGE DRINKING WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN: VOLUNTEER WATER METER PROGRAM EXTENSION**

(Report: Sept. 5/06, File No.: 10-6060-02-01/Vol 01) (REDMS No. 2013620)

Mr. Tse introduced Angela Zapp, Director, Service Business, and Mike Middlemass, Senior Project Manager, Neptune Technology Group (Canada) Ltd.

Discussion took place among Committee members and staff on the quarterly \$10 billing fee charged for reading a meter and why this fee could not be included in the base rate. With reference to the \$20 quarterly minimum billing fee, information was provided that this was the amount which the City felt should be charged, even if a metered customer used less than \$20 worth of water. In addition, advice was given that the separate \$10 charge (which was placed into a special reserve) was intended to finance the reading and maintenance of water meters and for replacement of meters in the future. Further advice was given that City staff wanted to be able to differentiate between the cost of water purchased from the Greater Vancouver Regional District and the City's water program.

As a result of the discussion, staff were requested to ensure that the information given was included in the next quarterly billing. Staff also indicated that the website, application form and brochure about the volunteer water metering program would be updated to reflect the information given to the Committee. A brief discussion ensued on the need to ensure that taxpayers were aware of the savings between what they would have been charged on the flat rate system as opposed to the water metering program.

Reference was made to a statement in the report about complaints being received relating to 'thermal expansion', and that these particular complaints were no longer an issue. In response, information was provided on how these problems, which had occurred mainly in older single family homes, had been addressed. Reference was also made to the proposal to include multi-family buildings in the volunteer program, and information was provided that one master meter would be installed for each building as the cost to provide individual meters was too excessive.

Also addressed was the issue of water meter replacement and the life expectancy of these meters.

Discussion then centred on the financial impact of the proposed extension of the program, and the benefits of the program to Richmond and its residents such as (i) the program promoted water conservation; (ii) users were paying for their true water consumption; (iii) staff were able to quickly calculate the amount of water used in single occupant households; (iv) leaks in the water system could be identified quickly; and (v) the City achieved huge cost savings.

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

Questions were raised about making the water meter program mandatory, and in response, the comment was made that such a course of action would only result in unhappy residents. Advice was given that it was felt that the higher increase in flat rates for water use would prove to be more effective in convincing individuals to switch to water meters.

Discussion then took place on the rationale for not seeking another company to manage the volunteer water metering program. Staff indicated that Neptune was being recommended because that the personnel of that company had a good understanding of the City's process and it would be beneficial to Richmond residents to continue with this company. Further comments were made that the Neptune staff worked in conjunction with City works crews, and had developed a good working relationship over the past three years. As well, it was felt that it would be more efficient to continue with Neptune because of the length of time required (two years) and intensive training needed to understand the City's methods of operation.

Angela Zapp came forward and advised that Neptune had maintained the same rates for the past three years, even after costs had increased for the material needed to construct the meters. She added that Neptune would work closely with the City to ensure that the contract benefited the City as it was to the company's benefit to have a good working relationship with the City.

The General Manager, Engineering & Public Works, Jeff Day, suggested that Part 2 of the recommendation could be amended to indicate that staff would meet with Neptune to negotiate a new contract and return that contract to Committee for approval.

As a result, the following **amended** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the Richmond Long Range Drinking Water Management Plan: Volunteer Water Meter Program be extended for another three years.*
- (2) *That the extension of a contract be negotiated with Neptune Technology Group, subject to Council approval.*

CARRIED

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

5. **TRANSLINK 2007 CAPITAL PROGRAM COST-SHARING SUBMISSIONS - MAJOR ROAD NETWORK, BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSIT-RELATED ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE**

(Report: Sept. 8/06, File No.: 01-0154-04/2006-Vol 01) (REDMS No. 1992359)

The Director of Transportation, Victor Wei, circulated a memorandum to Committee members, which provided details on an additional submission to the TransLink 2007 MRN Minor Capital Program/Bicycle Infrastructure Capital Cost-Sharing Program.

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

Mr. We4i asked that Committee give consideration to amending the staff resolution to add an additional recommendation relating to the cycling lane portion of the No. 3 Road streetscape enhancements.

As a result, the following **amended** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the submission of various road and traffic signal improvement projects for cost-sharing as part of the TransLink 2007 Major Road Network (MRN) Minor Capital Program, (as described in the report dated September 8th, 2006, from the Director, Transportation), be endorsed.*
- (2) *That the submission of pavement marking improvements on bicycle routes for cost-sharing as part of the TransLink 2007 Bicycle Infrastructure Capital Cost-Sharing Program, (as described in the report dated September 8th, 2006, from the Director, Transportation), be endorsed.*
- (3) *That the submission of various transit facility improvements for cost-sharing as part of the TransLink 2007 Transit-Related Road Infrastructure Program, (as described in the report dated September 8th, 2006, from the Director, Transportation), be endorsed.*
- (4) *That the submission of the cycling lane portion of the No. 3 Road streetscape enhancements for cost-sharing, as part of the TransLink 2007 Major Road Network (MRN) Minor Capital Program or Bicycle Infrastructure Capital Program or both, be endorsed.*
- (5) *That, should the above submissions be successful, the General Manager, Law and Community Safety, or her delegate, be authorized to execute the funding agreements.*

CARRIED

6. **TRANSLINK PRINCIPLES FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT – COMMENTS FROM CITY OF RICHMOND**

(Report: Aug. 31/06, File No.: 01-0154-00/Vol 01) (REDMS No. 1989571)

It was moved and seconded

That TransLink be advised that the City supports TransLink's proposed principles for public consultation and community engagement and that the following comments be considered in the refinement and execution of the principles in order to enhance their effectiveness:

- (1) *clarify how public opinion and views at the local municipal level will be solicited and considered, separate from local Council resolutions;*
- (2) *define the terms "key" decisions and "major" projects, policies and programs as well as what criteria will trigger public consultation; and*

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

- (3) *provide a public consultation web page within the TransLink website that clearly states TransLink's principles for public consultation and directs viewers to appropriate areas where public consultation reports, opportunities for feedback and other related information can be accessed.*

CARRIED

7. **ICBC ZERO CRASH MONTH CHALLENGE – OCTOBER 2006**

(Report: Sept. 1/06, File No.: 10-6450-09-01/2006-Vol 01) (REDMS No. 2014571)

Alex Lee, of ICBC, provided information to the Committee on the upcoming 'Zero Crash Month Challenge'. He noted that the majority of automobile crashes occurred close to home; that in British Columbia a vehicle crash occurred every two minutes and that someone was injured every seven minutes. Mr. Lee stated that a prediction had been made that in October, in British Columbia, there would be 22,000 vehicle crashes, with 6,000 people injured, which he indicated was totally unacceptable.

Mr. Lee then talked about Richmond, indicating that the City would be in the category of 40,000 and above; and that Richmond currently had a rate of 86 crashes per 10,000 population, which was an improvement over 2005. He stated that the winning municipality would receive a \$35,000 road safety grant, and that prizes would also be awarded to individuals who participated in the challenge. In concluding his presentation, Mr. Lee requested that Richmond residents be urged to drive safe and be safe with their driving, especially during the month of October.

Discussion then took place among Committee members, Mr. Lee and staff on:

- the rationale for using the colour 'blue' on the 'speed kills' signs posted at specific locations to alert motorists to the potential for accidents (a suggestion was made that 'hot pink' might be a better colour to catch the attention of motorists)
- the marketing strategy proposed for Richmond, and whether the local newspapers would receive the same campaign package which had been provided to all members of Council
- whether the City would be challenging, or be challenged by, another municipality to have the least number of motor vehicle crashes
- the types of motor vehicle accidents which occurred in Richmond
- whether there was any information accessible to drivers from other municipalities on problem intersections which should be avoided, and whether this information could be publicized on the City website.

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the City endorse and participate in ICBC's Zero Crash Month Challenge during October 2006, (as described in the report dated September 1st, 2006 from the Director, Transportation), to help reduce vehicle crashes and road-related harm in the community.*
- (2) *That a proclamation be issued to indicate that Richmond will be an official participant in the Zero Crash Month Challenge.*
- (3) *That the Challenge be referred to various community groups and City-related organizations.*

CARRIED

INFORMATION / AWARENESS (0 ITEMS)

8. MANAGER'S REPORT

There were no reports made.

9. RECYCLING OF RAIN AND 'GREY' WATER

It was moved and seconded

That staff investigate the feasibility of incorporating recycled rain and/or grey water into specific development areas and/or commercial and industrial developments.

CARRIED

10. REQUIREMENTS FOR DUAL FLUSH TOILETS

It was moved and seconded

That staff investigate the feasibility of incorporating requirements for dual flush toilets into new home building construction in specific areas and/or commercial and industrial developments.

CARRIED

11. INTERNET/COMMUNICATION NETWORKS

It was moved and seconded

That staff investigate and report on various City-wide internet and/or communication networks.

CARRIED

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (5:01 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, September 20th, 2006.

Councillor Linda Barnes
Chair

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