



General Purposes Committee

Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2020

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Chak Au
Councillor Carol Day
Councillor Kelly Greene
Councillor Alexa Loo
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Linda McPhail
Councillor Harold Steves
Councillor Michael Wolfe

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

COUNCILLOR MICHAEL WOLFE

Councillor Michael Wolfe distributed materials (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1) and introduced the following Notice of Motion to appear for consideration on the agenda for the Monday, March 2, 2020, General Purposes Committee meeting:

That Council endorse the following resolution and request that Mayor and Council send a copy of to the Prime Minister of Canada, Premier of BC, Solicitor General of BC, Richmond MPs, Richmond MLAs, and member of local governments of the UBCM:

The City of Richmond calls on the Government of British Columbia and Canada to end any attempt at forced removal of non-violent Wet'suwet'en People from their traditional territories, suspend permits authorizing construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline and commence good-faith consultation with the Wet'suwet'en People.

General Purposes Committee
Tuesday, February 18, 2020

MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on February 3, 2020, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

DELEGATION

1. Lisa MacNeil, Chair, Helen Quan, and Allen Chan, Richmond Sister City Advisory Committee, presented Committee with bookmarks from the inaugural Scenic Bookmarks series and highlighted that the bookmarks complemented the book club that took place in collaboration with the Richmond Public Library.

ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

2. **PHOENIX NET LOFT OPTIONS**
(File Ref. No. 11-7000-01) (REDMS No. 6352306 v. 28)

Staff reviewed the staff report and noted that (i) to preserve the heritage structure the building would be taken apart piece by piece, (ii) the \$19.44M is for the shell of the building without heating and air conditioning, and (iii) options for cost reduction are provided in the report.

Materials were distributed (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 2) and discussion took place on (i) increasing the size of the building with a lean-to, (ii) the potential for a museum in the proposed building, (iii) examples of other buildings that were reconstructed, (iv) function and lifespan of building, and (v) the consultation process.

In reply to queries from Committee staff noted the following:

- demolition would consist of removing the entire building from the site;
- the cost for a brand new building would cost approximately the same as restoring the current one;
- to potentially reduce costs it would be advisable to consider programming and building construction simultaneously;
- it is anticipated that a minimum amount of the original structure will be salvaged;
- the addition of a lean-to was not included in the cost; however, it can be considered;

2.

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2020

- a museum is a feasible option for this space;
- a reconstructed building and a brand new building would have similar lifespan and function;
- the \$19.44M will provide a replica of the current building that is on the site;
- the Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (FLNRO) permit is a two year process and is based on the current footprint of the building;
- the Heritage Commission would be consulted at the appropriate time;
- the consultation process can be reviewed to include other locations;
- various uses for the space can be reviewed to accommodate a museum;
- money from the BC Packers is located in a trust account;
- grants are available for the programming portion of the project; however, staff would have to examine the eligibility for the construction portion;
- as the programming has not yet been determined a refined cost estimate would require additional work;
- if the project is delayed, costs could change; and
- refining the programming options will allow staff to determine the best use for the space.

Discussion ensued with regard to options to restore the building. It was then suggested that the budget be amended and increased. As a result of the discussion, the following **motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the Capital Program budget be amended from the previously approved \$11.5M to \$19.44M for the Phoenix Net Loft preservation project.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place on delaying the project and in reply to queries from Committee staff advised that (i) timing is important as the building continues to deteriorate, (ii) it is difficult to find a contractor to take on such a difficult project, (iii) the FLNRO permit may expire and the process will have to start again, and (iv) the FLNRO permit is based on the restoration without the programming and would need to be revised once programming is determined.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. Loo opposed.

General Purposes Committee
Tuesday, February 18, 2020

Discussion further took place on the consultation process, and as a result of the discussion the following **referral motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the consultation process be referred to staff for additional information on the various program options and the final proposal for the public consultation process, including information on the Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development permit application.

The question on the referral motion was not called as discussion ensued regarding the Seine Net Loft and the First Nations Longhouse.

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

It was moved and seconded

(1) That the difference of the \$11.5M and the proposed \$19.44M (\$7.94M) to be used for the Phoenix Net Loft preservation project be withdrawn from the Capital Building and Infrastructure Reserve Fund; and

(2) That the Consolidated 5 Year Financial Plan (2020-2024) be amended accordingly.

CARRIED
Opposed: Cllr. Loo

DEPUTY CAO'S OFFICE

3. **SISTER CITY TRAVEL**

(File Ref. No. 01-0100-30-SCIT1-01) (REDMS No. 6295105 v. 5)

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that not much information is currently available on the design of the garden, and the Sister City can be consulted with regard to Richmond's input on the design of the garden.

Discussion took place on (i) reducing the amount of travel due to the climate emergency, (ii) Pierrefonds and the referendum, (iii) the Pierrefonds Garden by the Minoru Chapel, and (iv) the number of delegates to Sister Cities.

It was moved and seconded

(1) That the proposed travel budget of \$16,925 for 2020, as outlined in the staff report "Proposed Sister City Travel for 2020", dated January 27, 2020, from the General Manager, Community Safety, be funded from the Council Contingency account; and

4.

General Purposes Committee
Tuesday, February 18, 2020

- (2) *That the Sister City Advisory Committee report back to Council annually to bring forward a finalized travel itinerary and budget for any Sister City related travel between 2021 to 2023.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued regarding the reducing the number of participants to Sister Cities. As a result of the discussion, the following **amendment motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the number of participants as outlined in the staff report titled “Proposed Sister City Travel for 2020”, dated January 27, 2020, from the General Manager, Community Safety, be reduced to five, including, the Mayor or Acting Mayor, two Councillors, one City Staff member and one Sister City Advisory Committee member.

CARRIED

Discussion further took place on the stated declaration of climate emergency and reducing the travel required. As a result of the discussion the following **referral motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the staff report titled “Proposed Sister City Travel for 2020”, dated January 27, 2020, from the General Manager, Community Safety, be referred back to staff to reconsider the travel component in view of the stated declaration of climate emergency.

DEFEATED

Opposed: Mayor Brodie
Cllrs: Au
Loo
McNulty
McPhail
Steves

Discussion then took place on the Richmond Sister City Advisory Committee Policies and Procedures and examining the number of participants as delegates to Sister Cities.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Sister City Advisory Committee Policies and Procedures be referred back to staff to review the number of participants as delegates to Sister Cities.

CARRIED

General Purposes Committee
Tuesday, February 18, 2020

The question on the main motion, as amended, which reads as follows:

- (1) *That the proposed travel budget of \$16,925 be adjusted accordingly for five participants, including the Mayor or Acting Mayor, two Councillors, one City Staff member, and one Sister City Advisory Committee member, and the budget be funded from the Council Contingency account; and*
- (2) *That the Sister City Advisory Committee report back to Council annually to bring forward a finalized travel itinerary and budget for any Sister City related travel between 2021 to 2023.*

was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (5:24 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 Tuesday, February 18, 2020.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Sarah Goddard
Legislative Services Coordinator

City of Richmond

Council Member Motion

For the General Purposes Committee Meeting

Date: February 18th 2020
From: Councillor Wolfe
Subject: Declaration of Solidarity with Wet'suwet'en People

Recommendation:

That Council endorse the following resolution and request that Mayor and Council send a copy to the Prime Minister of Canada, Premier of BC, Solicitor General of BC, Richmond MPs, Richmond MLAs, and member local governments of the UBCM.

Resolution:

The City of Richmond calls on the Governments of British Columbia and Canada to end any attempt at forced removal of non-violent Wet'suwet'en People from their traditional territories, suspend permits authorizing construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline and commence good-faith consultation with the Wet'suwet'en People;

Rationale:

The Wet'suwet'en Hereditary Chiefs, whose representative role is recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada, have indicated a lack of consent for the Coastal GasLink pipeline through their unceded territory. Significant RCMP resources are currently being deployed away from municipal operations. The City Council in both Victoria and Port Moody have passed similar resolutions. Many of our residents are members of large unions: BCGEU and NUPGE, and/or large organizations: Council of Canadians and Sierra Club of BC, which have also declared solidarity. The United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the BC Human Rights Commissioner have called on the Governments of British Columbia and Canada to respect Wet'suwet'en law, rights and title by suspending permits authorizing construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline until they grant their free, prior and informed consent, following the full and adequate discharge of the duty to consult. Canada has endorsed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, which includes a commitment to "... consult and cooperate in good faith with the indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free, prior and informed consent before adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them."

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Councillor Harold Steves

Richmond Museum Requirements;

DATE: Jan. 19. 2005

In the long term list of priorities a museum was to be constructed after the Gateway Theatre. The museum has been a priority in Richmond longer than the field house proposed for the Olympic Oval, new fire halls or a new police station.

1989 report

After other sports and recreational facilities and the Gateway Theatre had been constructed Richmond Council approved the construction an 8,000 sq. ft. Richmond Museum in the new Cultural Centre at a cost of \$2 million. Construction of the museum was postponed when the \$12 million Arts Centre went \$2 million over budget. That was 15 years ago.

1991 report

In 1991 city staff implored that there was an “urgent need for 5,700 sq. ft. of space”. Important artifacts were being turned down, some artifacts transferred to other museums, and some artifacts were outdoors under plastic tarps at Works Yard.

1992 report

In 1992 staff reiterated the need stating that an 8,000 sq. ft. resource centre was required in addition to the 1800 sq. ft. provided at the Art Centre.

“Staff are not acquiring or seeking acquisitions as there is no space.” There remains significant gaps in the collection of Richmond’s history as staff have not had the time nor the space to secure the required artefacts.” The collection gaps include ... textiles...agriculture...food processing. ...furniture....transportation...industrial objects, etc.

The “resource centre” would be the “hub of activity for museum services”, volunteer training, meeting space, exhibit space and “open” storage open for viewing, exhibit preparation, etc.

2005

In 2005 the need is far greater than it was in 1989 and the area needed is much greater than 8,000 sq. ft.. Staffing has been restructured to better curate the collection and preserve the artifacts. Donations have increased and there are substantial fishing industry artifacts from BC Packers. Presently the Richmond Museum is in storage with little opportunity for the public to ever see items in the collection on display, even once, over the next 25 years.

To: Mayor and Councillors

From: Councillor Harold Steves

I recently attended two workshops at the Gulf Of Georgia Cannery, planning for the future. It is becoming increasingly clear that we must get on with the job of completing the Britannia Shipyard site for a combined heritage destination. That includes a site for a Richmond Museum.

Previous estimates for a museum in Richmond were aimed at a 60,000 sq. ft. "destination" museum where people come to Richmond to see major international travelling exhibits. That is contrary to the concept of interactive, open air, museums on local and BC history that are already underway at Britannia, London Farm and Gulf of Georgia.

When I asked for the cost of putting fill under the Phoenix Gillnet Loft I was considering the use of the building for a 20,000 sq. ft. "City Museum". When I suggested museum use several years ago concern was expressed by staff that a museum should not be over water. In my opinion, there is little in the city museum collection that can't be displayed in a building over water..... Do we need fill to have a museum over water?

If we don't have to put fill under the building we don't have to re-apply to FLNRO as Option C "Interpretive Centre" covers it.

While 20,000 sq. ft. is the smallest museum size recommended by staff, it would compliment adjacent museum sites and total over 60,000 sq. ft. Should more than 20,000 sq. ft. be desired the lean-to addition that was added on the west side in WWII could be put back. Since the lean-to was demolished we have kept logs on that area to keep it from being put in the red zone. \$4.2 million in the restoration fund for the Phoenix Gillnet Loft came from the sale of property at the foot of No 2 Rd that was supposed to be for an artists market. The lean-to could provide additional space to accommodate that use.

A replica is better than no building at all. The Murakami Boat Shop is a replica. We tried to restore it but it fell apart in the process. However maintaining it as a true heritage building is important..... Can we restore the Phoenix Gillnet Loft without tearing it down?

I am concerned with the conservation of the building and replacing siding because of lead paint. When we restored the Seine Net Loft we didn't worry about the fact the building was sheeted in asbestos. We simply painted over it, presumably with a special paint that is available for painting asbestos. The staff report calls for an expensive abatement process and doesn't answer my question. The four still houses at Britannia were all painted with paint over lead based paint. Also the London Farm House, Steveston Court House, Steveston Museum, Gulf of Georgia Cannery, Minoru Chapel, Branscombe House, McKinney House, Ida Steeves House and Vermillion House, were all painted over lead paint without "abatement".Why can't we paint the building like we did with all of the others?

The 2015 Conservation Review apparently missed the most important fact, the integrity of Cannery Row. When BC Packers was rezoned the city had the option of saving the Imperial Cannery, which was my choice, or the Phoenix Gillnet Loft. The Phoenix Gillnet Loft was chosen and donated by BC Packers to maintain and interpret a small section of Cannery Row. As we have lost most of Cannery Row it is important to retain the building and retain it's existing size to match the sister building.

In 2019 it was estimated that a 60,000 sq. ft. destination museum would cost \$56,520,000. At \$35,440,000 we save \$21,000,000 which could be used to finish the Britannia Shipyard site and London Farm, projects totalling more than 60,000 sq. ft. After 31 years, it is also the only option of getting a museum in the near future.