



PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP

Held January 24, 2004, 8:00 am
8th Floor
Richmond City Hall

In Attendance:

Working Group:

Danielle Aldcorn
Julie Halfnights
Michael McCoy
Vince Miele
Linda Shirley
Kuo Wong

Olive Bassett
Shawkat Hasan
Bill McNulty
Bob Ransford
Harold Steves

Nicky Byres
Jim Lamond
Sharon Meredith
Greg Robertson
Jim Tanaka

Facilitator:

David Roach

Recorder:

Roxanne Glavina

Staff:

Cathy Volkering Carlile
Greg Buss
Vern Jacques
Dave Semple
Denise Tambellini-Abraham

Gord Barstow
Jane Fernyhough
Simon Johnston
Kate Sparrow

Consulting Team:

Cheryl Hodgson
David Roach

Absent:

Joann Wong Bittle

1. Opening Remarks

Cathy Volkering Carlile opened the workshop and outlined the schedule for the day's workshop. Each participant was encouraged to think outside of their stakeholders' realm and toward the future.

Background information was discussed including the Community Charter, adopted in January 2004.

Cathy Volkering Carlile introduced the Meeting Community Needs discussion paper. This is a portion of the Master Plan on which the CWG is making recommendations.

Alan Gottlieb's Toronto address, "The Challenge of being an international city," was distributed. It discussed Toronto's main framework components and the roles of the City, the individual and the community.

Discussion arose about the importance of flexibility to adapt to and lead change. In times of (historical) financial restraints, there has often been a focus on planning outcomes. However, community gems such as the City trail system and the Gateway Theatre resulted more from spontaneity, special interest and community activism rather than by design.

The Committee discussed cultural issues, ethnic media and local businesses that cater only to a specific segment of the community. Those issues tend to solve themselves over time as the younger generation grows up and integrates into the community.

2. Discussion Groups

Three discussion groups were formed. Each tested the model and made comments.

- The format was good, but additional time in the small groups would be useful.
- There was a commonality between each group's presentation, and it was useful to see how the other groups approached the same case study.
- The framework works, because it makes one thoughtful and purposeful in intent.
- Community groups could use this model as a planning tool and that the Framework is simply an application of logic. There were other components to the Framework that have not been included.
- The model allows for the issue to be broken up into manageable chunks, with the ability to go back as needed.
- Understanding what the real need is, not necessarily the "visible" need, is important.
- The 12 steps could be applied to any process.

There was consensus that the framework was appropriate to address community needs, to ensure that they are met and that customer service is enhanced.

Staff will prepare the remaining discussion papers, and distribute to the CWG to review each paper prior to the regular Thursday meetings.

Cathy Volkering Carlile proposed that the group allow extra time on the regular Thursday meetings, rather than schedule additional meetings. Members were prepared to maintain the Thursday schedule and re-address the problem if there is insufficient time to prepare their recommendations.

It was generally agreed that the recommendation would likely offer a choice of options, with a specific option being recommended.

Michael McCoy asked if the CWG's mandate could be displayed and posted at each meeting as a visual reminder of the job at hand.

3. Homework – Individual review of the 2nd Case Study.

Adjourned at 2:15 pm