



## General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, October 5, 2015

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Derek Dang  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Ken Johnston  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Linda McPhail  
Councillor Harold Steves

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

### MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on September 21, 2015, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### DELEGATION

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), Ed Gavsie, Executive Director, and Pat Watson, Chair, Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives, commented on the collaboration between Volunteer Richmond Information Services and the Richmond Community Foundation and the following information was highlighted:

- Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives' mission is to encourage local philanthropy and to support the charitable sector so that it can better respond to community needs;

## General Purposes Committee

### Monday, October 5, 2015

---

- the Child Care Resource and Referral Centre is a positive resource for parents and provides a wide-range of services such as a lending library, and referral information;
- Youth Now is a program that helps post-secondary students develop their leadership skills, along with their understanding of the roles that boards of directors fill and the benefits of being involved as a community leader;
- the Richmond Christmas Fund supports approximately 700 low income families annually by providing grocery vouchers and toys to families in need;
- in partnership with the Richmond Community Foundation over the course of 25 years, approximately \$1 million has been awarded in grants and scholarships;
- Seniors Community Support Services offers seniors services that allow them to stay independent longer; for instance, trained community volunteers provide grocery shopping assistance so that seniors may remain in their own homes longer;
- as the lead agency in Richmond, Volunteer Richmond offers transportation, friendly visiting and light housekeeping services to seniors through the Better at Home program, which is funded by the Government of British Columbia and managed through the United Way of the Lower Mainland; and
- the Information and Volunteer Centre aims to increase volunteerism in the community; also, the volunteer database allows non-profit organizations to post their volunteer opportunities – <http://volunteer.rcrg.org/>.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Gavsie commented on an upcoming change in the management of Child Care Resource Centres across British Columbia, and advised that Volunteer Richmond will be attending upcoming input sessions. Committee requested that Mr. Gavsie keep Council apprised of the matter.

Also, Mr. Gavsie spoke to the Better at Home program, noting that the program has been renewed until July 1, 2016.

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, October 5, 2015**

---

**FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION**

**1. RICHMOND DIGITAL STRATEGY**

(File Ref. No. 04-1300-01) (REDMS No. 4731547 v. 7)

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), Grant Fengstad, Director, Information Technology, spoke to the proposed Richmond Digital Strategy, highlighting that it will enable a transition from a service-centric model to a citizen-centric environment. He stated that the proposed Strategy aims to optimize and integrate existing business processes to enable new capabilities.

Mr. Fengstad provided a hypothetical example of how the implementation of the proposed Strategy would allow Richmond residents to carry out an array of local government business needs, from registering for recreational classes to paying property taxes, through one portal. He stated that the implementation of the proposed Strategy will extend the reach of all City online services resulting in improved customer convenience as services, such as bill payments, inquiries, licensing and development related applications will be available on demand, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Fengstad advised that the implementation of the proposed Strategy is estimated to be \$5.5 million over the next three years.

Discussion took place on the protection of information collected and ensuring that privacy is maintained. Mr. Fengstad advised that as segments of the proposed Strategy are implemented, staff would examine best practices to ensure that the best and most secure technology is utilized. Also, he remarked that at the core of the proposed Strategy is the City's ability to be innovative and to provide new services or capabilities.

Mr. Fengstad spoke to the implementation of the proposed Strategy, noting that Council will have the opportunity to review and understand each stage of the transition as initiatives will be brought forward for Council's consideration.

Discussion further ensued regarding the protection of information collected and ensuring that privacy is maintained, and it was suggested that the proposed Strategy include a sixth key area on the matter. In response to Committee's discussion, Mr. Fengstad remarked that the protection of information and privacy is fundamental to all information technology services.

As a result of the discussion, the Chair directed staff to incorporate a paragraph emphasizing the protection of information and privacy in the proposed Strategy.

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, October 5, 2015**

---

It was moved and seconded

*That the proposed Richmond Digital Strategy, attached to the staff report titled "Richmond Digital Strategy," dated September 15, 2015, from the Director, Information Technology, be adopted as a framework to guide strategic decisions regarding the City's digital services and infrastructure, in order to enhance the City's services and access for residents and strengthen Richmond's competitive advantage.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place on the most suitable manner to highlight the protection of information and privacy as part of the proposed Strategy.

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

## COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

2. **REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 5540P GARDEN CITY LANDS  
LEGACY LANDSCAPE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION: DESIGN AND  
CONSTRUCTION SERVICES**

(File Ref. No. 06-2345-20-GCIT1) (REDMS No. 4732316 v. 2)

Mike Redpath, Senior Manager, Parks, provided background information and, in reply to queries from Committee, advised that the disparity in proposals received may be attributed to some companies not offering their services in specific areas such as the protection of the bog.

Discussion took place and Committee expressed concern with regard to the large disparity between costs for the design and construction services for the Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan Implementation. Committee requested that detailed proposal information from each proponent be provided to Council.

George Duncan, Chief Administrative Officer, spoke to the difference between a Request for Proposal and a Call for Tender, noting that with the former, parameters are given however proponents are free to submit proposals.

Councillor Steves spoke to past Committee discussions regarding the Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan and circulated his comments regarding the Plan (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1).

Discussion ensued and Committee expressed concern regarding the lack of detailed information regarding the proposal submitted. As a result of the discussion, the following **referral** was introduced:

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, October 5, 2015**

---

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled “Request for Proposal 5540P Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan Implementation: Design and Construction Services” dated September 22, 2015 from the Senior Manager, Parks be referred back to staff to provide more information on the proposals submitted and on the Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan.*

The question on the referral was not called as discussion took place on past comments made by Council that appear to not have been considered as part of staff’s analysis. For instance, the referral made at the March 25, 2014 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee meeting stated that the Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan be forwarded to several advisory committees and stakeholder groups for comments. Also, it was noted that black organic soil is not easily farmed on and instead requires expertise.

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

## PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

### 3. **UPDATE ON GEORGE MASSEY TUNNEL REPLACEMENT PROJECT – HIGHWAY 99 WIDENING**

(File Ref. No. 01-0150-20-THIG1/2015) (REDMS No. 4741518 v. 2)

In reply to queries from Committee, Victor Wei, Director, Transportation, spoke to the proposed 15-metre Riparian Management Areas (RMA) on the west and east side of the Highway 99 corridor, noting that staff would work to ensure that any widening that effects RMA would be compensated to the satisfaction of the City.

Discussion took place on the October 1, 2015 Legislative Assembly session where during the question period, MLA Lana Popham queried the Honourable Norm Letnick, Minister of Agriculture, on port development on Richmond’s Agricultural Land Reserve lands and Premier Christy Clark’s response to Ms. Popham’s query.

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

It was moved and seconded

*(1) That the staff report titled “Update on George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project – Highway 99 Widening,” dated September 28, 2015, from the Director, Transportation, be forwarded to the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure’s George Massey Tunnel Replacement project team for consideration in the development of the Project Definition Report;*

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, October 5, 2015**

---

- (2) *That a letter be sent by Mayor Brodie, on behalf of Council, to the Agriculture Land Commission and the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure, with copies to all Richmond MLA's, advising of the City's concerns with any potential widening of Highway 99 on the west side impacting existing established institutions and farming of their backlands, and reiterating the City's request for the early provision of the Project Definition Report and financing strategy; and*
- (3) *That a letter be sent to the Agriculture Land Commission confirming that the City wishes to be fully engaged in any discussions regarding the use of Agricultural Land Reserve lands for the George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place on the potential to meet with the Agriculture Land Commission (ALC) to discuss the City's plans for the No. 5 Road backlands. It was noted that a staff referral regarding the overall vision for the No. 5 Road backlands is outstanding; however, following Council consideration of the forthcoming report on the No. 5 Road backlands, it would be appropriate for staff to meet with the ALC to convey Council's vision.

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

The Chair directed staff to circulate to Council the video clip and transcript of the October 1, 2015 Legislative Assembly question period regarding port development on Richmond's Agricultural Land Reserve lands, and to prepare a response to the Premier's comments.

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded  
*That the meeting adjourn (5:12 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, October 5, 2015.

---

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Chair

---

Hanieh Berg  
Legislative Services Coordinator

To: Mayor and Council

From: Councillor Harold Steves

Date: October 5, 2015

Re: "Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan"

Awarding an \$881,442 contract for "Design and Construction Services" for the implementation of the plan may be premature.

On March, 2014 staff recommended that the "Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan" be **adopted to guide** the future detailed planning and development of the garden City Lands."

There was a considerable amount of discussion that the plan was not ready to be adopted.

The recommendation was amended to read that the "Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan" "be **endorsed as a guide** for future detailed planning and development of the Garden City Lands."

Subsequently a referral was made to elicit further input and comments prior to finalizing the plan.

It was moved and seconded

"That the Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan be referred back to staff to consider the **comments of committee members** including:

- (1) Forwarding the plan to the **Agricultural Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee on the Environment, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, and other stakeholders** for comments;
- (2) Revising the Plan to reflect a north/south grid orientation; and
- (3) **Investigating the need for the wetland and the expansion of the bog.**

**CARRIED**

The plan was subsequently revised to reflect a north/south grid orientation.

On May27, 2014, the amended version that the plan **be endorsed** (not adopted) **as a guide for future detailed planning** was approved.

To date it would appear that there has been no request to ACE, the AAC or Kwantlen Polytechnic University, or other stakeholders such as the Garden City Conservation Society for comments on the detailed design of the overall plan.

Furthermore, there has been no report back on the need for the wetland and expanding the bog.

Therefore assigning this contract is premature until the consultations and investigations have been done.

Finally the \$881,442 cost requires much greater detail and analysis.

My Comments on the Garden City Lands Legacy Landscape Plan;

- 1) The perimeter dyke and trail should be straightened to include a laneway for farm equipment and a drainage and irrigation pumping system. Rather than widening the trail into the bog, ditch diggings that have been overcast along the bog edge can be used to improve and elevate the soil in the agricultural area. The only trees should be native Shore Pine.
- 2) The Sanctuary can be part of the bog as shown on the plan or included as part of the farmland. With climate change its' long term use will likely be for urban agriculture.
- 3) The wetland should be included as farmland. A wet area prone to invasive Reed Canary Grass is not an asset and it would be better if the soil was improved for cultivation. A ditch or winding "slough" could be used for drainage from the bog. If drainage occurs through the community hub drainage through the wet area may not be necessary.
- 4) The community hub needs further study, including area reduction, as to any damage to the future agricultural use of that site.
- 5) The orchard should be relocated to higher land, perhaps the Mound. Fruit trees do not like to have their feet wet.
- 6) The mound should be levelled to the same height as the rest of the farmable land.
- 7) Top quality Richmond soil should be mixed with the black organic soil of the farmable area. This will increase height above the water table, improve soil quality similar to what people are accustomed to growing gardens on elsewhere. While crop production can be rewarding it takes special skill to grow crops on Richmonds' organic soils. Soil from the Mound is ideal for this purpose. So is the artificial hill left over from dredging the slough at Terra