



**PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP**

**Held Thursday February 19, 2004 at 5:30pm
8th Floor
Richmond City Hall**

In Attendance:

Working Group

Danielle Aldcorn
Julie Halfnights
Bill McNulty
Bob Ransford
Harold Steves

Olive Bassett
Shawkat Hasan
Sharon Meredith
Greg Robertson
Jim Tanaka

Nicky Byres
Jim Lamond
Vince Miele
Linda Shirley
Kuo Wong

Facilitator

David Roach

Recorder

Roxanne Glavina

Staff

Cathy Volkering Carlile
Dave Semple

Simon Johnston
Kate Sparrow

Consulting Team

Cheryl Hodgson

Absent:

Joann Wong Bittle
Greg Buss
Michael McCoy

1. Opening Remarks by David Roach

2. Records of Meetings No. 9 & 10

The Minutes of the Meetings dated January 15, 2004 and January 24, 2004 were approved.

3. Discussion Paper

The second Discussion Paper – “Encourage Community Involvement and Establish / Maintain Effective Relationships” was introduced. As stated in the January 2004 discussion paper, “The city is responsible to provide leadership and ensure community needs are addressed, consistent with our resources.”

The proposed City leadership responsibilities include:

- market research and analysis
- system wide planning and development
- system wide sustainability and stewardship
- relationship development and management with appropriate community involvement
- strategic communications
- asset management
- system standards and performance expectations
- marketing of customer service
- evaluation and reporting
- equitable allocation of resources to achieve a balance to meet broad community needs

There was CWG consensus on the City responsibilities with Greg Robertson dissenting.

There was discussion throughout the meeting on “leadership.” It was felt that both the City and the groups it has relationships with, need to demonstrate leadership in a respectful, trustful and cooperative manner. There needs to be a Culture of Community Involvement with the City and community working together.

Cathy Volkering Carlile committed that the City will work with community based organizations, NGO’s and the community at large.

Staff put two sample situations through the Process Model.

Other suggestions to be considered for inclusion in the CWG’s recommendation:

- the City to be able to assess and subsequently refuse requests of groups that do not demonstrate a willingness to be pro-active on their own behalf
- in order to develop a relationship with the City, the group must share the City’s values, principles and standards (or agree to be guided by them)

There was consensus that the Process Model was a good foundation, which introduces standards of service and accountability and is inclusive and inviting. It was important to not allow the process to consume the outcome. Greg Robertson dissented.

Several members of the CWG expressed the desire to “test” the process with practical examples. As a homework assignment, Julie Halfnights will test Fitness through the Process Model, and Danielle Aldcorn will choose a “creative” example. Both assignments will then be presented to the group at the next meeting.

Cathy Volkering Carlile reviewed the CWG’s mandate as well as the timeline for future meetings. The table of contents for the Final Report to Council was distributed to the CWG members. Production process of the final report will be discussed at the next meeting in March.

4. The next meeting has been set for Thursday, March 18, 2004 at 5:30pm in room M.2.004.

Adjourned at 8:40 pm