



## General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, April 16, 2018

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Acting Chair  
Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Derek Dang  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Ken Johnston  
Councillor Linda McPhail  
Councillor Harold Steves

Absent: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Alexa Loo

Call to Order: The Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 3:58 p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Acting Chair acknowledged the passing of long time Steveston resident Keith Whittle and Committee expressed condolences to the Whittle family.

## MINUTES

It was noted that Schedule 2 of the minutes were from various sources and that the minutes should be amended to clarify the origin of the materials.

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on April 3, 2018, be adopted as amended.*

**CARRIED**

## ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

## **General Purposes Committee**

### **Monday, April 16, 2018**

---

1. **PHOENIX NET LOFT PRESERVATION**

(File Ref. No. 06-2052-25-BHSY1) (REDMS No. 5698772 v. 11)

In response to queries from Committee, Jim Young, Senior Manager, Capital Buildings Project Development, clarified that (i) the project will restore the building and retain its current appearance while replacing the deteriorated portions of the superstructure and piles, (ii) the proposed foundation will allow for consideration of future programs and uses, (iii) the preservation project would not include insulation for the building however, staff intend to come forward with a separate report for different program options for Council's consideration, which would determine the type of venting and heating required, (iv) the anticipated life expectancy of the building after preservation is approximately 50 years, (v) the building would allow for full public assembly, similar to the Seine Net Loft, and (vi) if the project is approved, consultation would be conducted with area residents over the loss of the 42 parking spaces.

In response to further questions from Committee regarding the forthcoming usage report for the Phoenix Net Loft, Jane Fernyhough, Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services, advised that it would most likely be brought forward prior to the 2020 budget consideration and following the completion of the preservation project.

It was moved and seconded

*That staff be authorized to proceed with Phoenix Net Loft Preservation construction as described in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Preservation," dated March 29, 2018, from the Director, Engineering.*

**CARRIED**

## **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**

2. **RIVER ROAD – PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF SELECTED ROAD SAFETY MEASURES**

(File Ref. No. 10-6450-09-01) (REDMS No. 5783853 v. 6)

In response to questions from Committee, Victor Wei, Director, Transportation, noted that the current lane markings on River Road are historical, as most sections are curved and there are limited straight areas of road to allow for safe passing.

Robert Gonzalez, Deputy CAO and General Manager, Engineering and Public Works, in response to a query from Committee, advised that a long term plan for the dike would be conducted in the future with partnership funding. Mr. Gonzalez further noted that generally a wider dike would be more stable if River Road were to be widened.

## General Purposes Committee

### Monday, April 16, 2018

---

Lynda Parsons, 2491 No. 8 Road, expressed concern over the proposed road safety measures recommended in the staff report and referenced her submission (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 1.) Ms. Parsons commented that she was of the opinion that (i) a site visit by staff should be conducted prior to the conversion of any portion of double solid lines, (ii) the placement of the delineator posts are potentially hazardous, (iii) inroad markers are required and must be left in place as they are critical for safety in fog or heavy rain and inroad markers that can detect and warn against black ice should be explored, (iv) staff should apply for the appropriate permits to allow sign post concrete bases to be buried, (v) RCMP should have input into the optimum placement of any speed reader boards along River Road, (vi) there should be more enforcement of overweight truck violations, and (vii) that the staff report should not be accepted in its current state.

Ms. Parsons also inquired about clarification on immediate implementation for any safety enhancements and what time frame could be expected.

Trudy Haywood, 22160 River Road, expressed support for most of the recommendations for safety enhancement listed in the staff report but noted concern about the installation of shoulder reflective delineators in place of pavement markers. Ms. Haywood further commented that delineator posts have been utilized in the past but were not well maintained. She was of the opinion that they would not be as effective as raised pavement markers (RPMs) and are intended only for cyclists. Ms. Haywood also noted that RPMs would be less intrusive to the view of the river and would not disturb the Riparian Management Area. Ms. Haywood also commented that she was of the opinion that River Road has an average accident rate and that enhanced safety measures implemented are not necessary.

Arline Trividic, 22600 River Road, expressed concern over the proposed road safety measures recommended in the staff report and read from her submission (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 2.)

Yves Trividic, 22600 River Road, expressed concern over the single-file signage and noted that he was of the opinion that the signage is not compliant with the *Motor Vehicle Act* as it depicts that cyclists are allowed to take the lane. Mr. Trividic also commented that he is in support of no implementation of any further safety enhancement measures on River Road until fall 2018 and is not in support of the staff report recommendations.

## **General Purposes Committee**

### **Monday, April 16, 2018**

---

In further response to questions from Committee, Mr. Wei commented that this matter was referred back at the last Public Works and Transportation Committee meeting and it was noted during the meeting that there could be some immediate traffic calming measures initiated prior to the RCMP report in the fall. Mr. Wei continued that staff met with residents to discuss various traffic calming measures outlined in the report and that there was strong resident support of the conversion of the double yellow centreline to a dashed single yellow centreline. Mr. Wei further noted that (i) there is the option to do no further enhancements until the fall, (ii) staff could meet with residents regarding the conversion of the double yellow centreline for further explanations on placement, and (iii) the installation of speed humps is still on hold.

Mr. Wei further noted, in response to Committee questions, that the permit for burying the concrete signage is a way to ensure there would be no impact to the Riparian Management Area or integrity of the existing shoulder. He also noted that the process could take 45 days to 2 months and that the public would have a chance to comment. Mr. Wei also advised that staff could look at alternate locations to avoid those areas, which may shorten the permit process period.

Staff added that because of the amount of signs on the pole, it must be buried to 1/3 of the height and the hole would be approximately 1 metre deep and 8 inches wide in the dike core, which would not be recommended. Staff further noted that the permit process for burying the signage could be initiated while awaiting the RCMP report and if approved, the City would not be required to implement burying the signs.

In response to additional queries from Committee, Mr. Wei advised that (i) no areas along River Road are wide enough to allow for the placement of the side-by-side signage, (ii) the raised pavement markers are currently mounted on the right edge of pavement, which may interfere with cyclists and staff recommend they be removed, (iii) staff can review painting a reflective white shoulder line after removing the markers, and (iv) the proposed locations of the speed reader boards were chosen strategically to efficiently target drivers and would be rotated to ensure they continue to be effective.

## General Purposes Committee

### Monday, April 16, 2018

---

Sergeant Nigel Pronger, Richmond RCMP's Road Safety Unit, in response to questions from Committee advised that (i) RCMP are currently in an engagement phase with the cycling community and are connecting with HUB Cycling and other private cycling clubs that use Richmond roads to engage them about concerning cyclist behaviour, (ii) engagement will continue through summer, (iii) RCMP were in attendance on River Road 15 out of the 30 days in March, and in that time, no infractions were witnessed and they are still engaging with cyclists to ensure that future enforcement is effective, and (iv) RCMP reports at the end of summer will break down month by month and by topic all the combined enforcement operations including tracking *Motor Vehicle Act* violations and municipal bylaw infractions, as well as any statistics on motor vehicle incidents.

In further response to questions from Committee regarding comments from the delegations on signage in contravention to the *Motor Vehicle Act*, Mr. Wei advised that staff ensure that all signage proposed is compliant with any Provincial regulations and guidelines. He further noted that the single-file signs proposed by staff are the national standard and are used in other jurisdictions and municipalities.

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the proposed road safety measures on River Road between No. 6 Road and Westminster Highway as outlined in the staff report titled "River Road – Proposed Implementation of Selected Road Safety Measures", dated April 3, 2018 from the Director, Transportation, be endorsed for implementation prior to Fall 2018; and*
- (2) *That resident input be considered wherever possible and implemented when considering the proposed road safety measures, and that staff undertake a field meeting with the residents.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place on the measures to be implemented, and it was clarified that only measures agreed on by both staff and residents should be undertaken.

In response to further questions from Committee, Mr. Wei advised that the staff proposed safety enhancement measures are independent from the RCMP report and can be initiated prior to the fall. He further noted that staff would report back on the outcome of any discussions with residents, including which measures are implemented.

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

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, April 16, 2018**

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (4:47 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  
16, 2018.

---

Councillor Bill McNulty  
Acting Chair

---

Amanda Welby  
Legislative Services Coordinator



I realize that there is a lot going on in Richmond right now and that the River Road Safety Enhancements have become a real thorn in your paw, but to those of us who live and work here this issue surpasses anything that is happening elsewhere in the City of Richmond – this is our safety at risk.

On March 26, 2018, eight area residents and business owners took time away from our schedules to meet with Staff. We discussed various recommended safety enhancements to implement on River Road prior to the report due at the end of the summer.

The area residents and business owners attended this meeting because River Road is the only access to our property, we drive this road on a daily basis, and our opinions should matter. We asked Staff to acknowledge that, because River Road **is** the only access that we and emergency vehicles have to our properties this be the primary focus when reviewing safety enhancements. As Staff clearly point out in the report that the safety measures are not exclusively for residents or cyclists I am not sure that they understand our position.

I have reviewed the Staff report dated April 3, 2018, and offer the following observations:

**Conversion of Double Solid Lines** (map on page GP-38)

1. 400m just past the corner of No. 6 Road
2. 340m is in front of Tom Mac Shipyard.
3. **350m is the 30k speed zone that has 6 speed bumps installed.**
4. 300m tree area
5. 450m near Rail Bridge
6. 330m near Pump Station



As River Road is unique in location and design, I hope that a site visit was used to confirm the safety of the locations indicated as safe to pass, and not just a screenshot of this portion of the City of Richmond maps used to determine that these locations are safe to pass.

**I would like to know if a site visit did occur.**

**Delineator Posts**

Placing the delineator posts along the curves at each entrance/exit may seem to make sense, however, the trucks that are turning at these locations will undoubtedly hit these and replacement would be constant. Eliminating the trucks will solve this problem, however, the delineator posts should not take the place of in road markers in any area.

We would like to see the money spent on cleaning and maintenance of the road rather than on delineator posts – as indicated on page GP 47, the cost of extra maintenance is \$15,000.00 – as the “sharrow markers” proposed on June 26, 2017 for \$12,000.00 were never installed and are not required as River Road is not a cycling lane, and the delineator posts should not be placed, the funding for additional cleaning and maintenance should be achievable within the approved budget.

**We stand firm that the in road markers are required and must be left in place. Where they have already been removed they need to be replaced immediately – these are for our safety and 100% required. We are NOT in agreement to remove any in road markers, and insist that those already removed are replaced.**

**At the March 26, 2018 meeting, in road markers that can detect and warn against black ice were discussed - I would also like to know if any inquiries have been made into these.**

### **Single File Signage & Caution Signage**

We agree with the number of signs being reduced, however, we continue to believe that the concrete bases are dangerous and should be removed. After reading the report it has become apparent that in order to put the posts into the ground Staff must apply to the Province for a permit due to the Riparian Management Area status. We feel that the inconvenience to Staff of applying for the permit is minor compared to the potential harm that the concrete bases pose.

**We would like to see the number of signs reduced and temporarily placed while waiting for the required permits in order to place the posts into the soil and eliminate the dangerous concrete bases.**

### **Speed Reader Boards**

Placing the speed reader boards at Valmont Way may not be as effective as placing them further east, perhaps between the CN Rail Bridge and Nelson Road. There are areas along this stretch of road where signs can be installed without affecting any Riparian Management Areas as there is a gravel road between the River and River Road on the north side and on the south side a little further west the ditch has been filled in on the south side of River Road.

**We would like to see RCMP input on the optimum locations for these signs, as they are most aware of where speed is more of an issue.**

**I would also like to know why the recommendation is to purchase 4 and install 2?**

We also want the traffic radar data collection units installed and the information gathered and analysed to aid in the enforcement of traffic violations. These are NOT the moveable speed reader boards - these were bought and paid for with our tax dollars in 2015 and even though Staff reported that they would be installed in the 22000 block of River Road from any information provided, these were never put into use as noted – our money has been spent and we want to see the traffic radar data collection units installed and the results known.

**Why have these not been installed?**

### **Relocate Bike Route Sign**

This can be done immediately, however, the cost of \$200.00 to remove this sign appears to be quite excessive.

**Why does it cost \$200.00 to remove a couple of bolts, and where do I sign up for that job?**



As the overweight trucks have long been an issue, we hope to see more enforcement of these. The report states:

*Richmond RCMP advise that joint enforcement operations are regularly conducted with Community Bylaws staff, who have primary responsibility for enforcement of trucks on weight-limited roads.*

I am unclear on what is determined to be “regularly conducted”, as the March 16, 2018 enforcement was the first in a very long time. The fact that within a few hours a total of 18 violations were issued to truck drivers shows the magnitude of this issue. Enforcement of the overweight trucks should be a lot more frequent going forward.

**We would like to see more frequent and continued enforcement of these trucks confirmed.**

During discussions at a City Council Meeting, regarding flood protection, it was stated that the dike has been raised substantially over the years, and so, at the March 26, 2018 meeting I asked Staff if the ditches are still required, and whether the ditch could be filled to create a temporary cycling/pedestrian lane, as the widening and re-building of River Road will be years from now. This would ONLY be for cyclists/pedestrians and NOT as a widening of vehicle lanes as this would require extensive engineering.

**I would like to know the status of any discussions on filling the ditch now to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians by filling the ditch completely or installing oversized culverts.**

I urge you NOT to accept this report in its current state, as there are some important details, as noted that need amending or clarification prior to implementation.

- 1. Ensure that the double solid lines are changed to broken centerlines only where safe to pass following an actual site visit.**
- 2. Replace all in road markers. DO NOT REMOVE ANY in road markers**
- 3. Apply for permits so that the sign posts can be permanently mounted into the ground thus eliminating the dangerous concrete bases**
- 4. Place Speed Reader Boards as recommended by the RCMP – apply for any required permits.**

When these issues have been reviewed and resolved, I would like to have “**immediate implementation**” clarified, as for example, conversion of the double solid lines was approved by Council on June 26, 2017 for **immediate implementation**, yet remain unchanged to date.

The report presented today indicates that the measures are to be “for immediate implementation” page GP 34 - what is the actual time frame once all issues are resolved?

Notes for General Purposes Committee Meeting April 16 2018

My name is Arline Trividic and I live at 22600 River Road

According to the staff report GP-30 from MR. Wei on page GP-33 he states that on March 16 2018 Richmond RCMP conducted a joint operation with the city bylaws staff

18 bylaw infraction tickets were issued to truckers and 24 speeding tickets were issued by the RCMP to other vehicles

Although I applaud these efforts and hope that they will continue, there are however a few concerns that I have regarding enforcement

1<sup>st</sup> CONCERN: I don't see similar types of enforcement being applied to the other users of the road, namely cyclist. Enforcement needs to be applied to ALL users EQUALLY not any one group should be given preferential treatment. All users who break the law need to be punished in an equal and just manner. When I say the law I am referring to the motor vehicle act. Also could the RCMP please provide data as to how many cyclist infractions have been noted since the increased enforcement began. From my observation every weekend I have witnessed little or no enforcement when it comes to the cyclist who continually disobey the rules of the road (side note- hard to ticket 2 or more side by side what about uturns at the pumping station over a double line in groups to head back west)

2<sup>nd</sup> CONCERN: As it seems that a lot more data is being collected mostly on trucks and cars as well as the enforcement being targeted mainly at these two groups this could possibly end up skewing the results

3<sup>rd</sup> CONCERN: The single file signage presently in place will considerably impede the RCMP's ability to properly enforce the law ... namely section 183 paragraph 2(C) of the motor vehicle act. Again this could have an adverse effect on the data collected for the RCMP report at the end of the summer

Since there are still many contentious issues to be reviewed or settled I would strongly suggest this report not be accepted or endorsed by this committee for implementation and that we should return to the original plan of no implementation of the points mentioned in this report along with the speed humps until we can review the RCMP report at the end of the summer