



PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP

Held Thursday October 16, 2003
Room T.8.150
Richmond City Hall

In Attendance:

Working Group

Danielle Aldcorn
Olive Bassett
Joann Wong Bittle
Nicky Byres
Julie Halfnights
Shawkat Hasan
Jim Lamond

Michael McCoy
Vince Miele
Bob Ransford
Greg Robertson
Linda Shirley
Jim Tanaka
Kuo Wong

Facilitator

David Roach

Recorder

Mary Lou Phillips

City Staff

Greg Buss
Cathy Volkering Carlile
Dave Semple
Kate Sparrow

Absent:

Bill McNulty
Sharon Meredith
Harold Steves
Simon Johnston

1.0 Opening Remarks

David Roach welcomed the CWG. Tonight's focus will be "Understanding the Current Reality".

2.0 Record of Meeting No. 5

The Record of Meeting of the September 18, 2003 session was adopted as circulated.

3.0 Focus Group Update and Feedback

The first focus group was randomly selected from the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services “Book-It” system. The primary objective was to attempt to get a community measure of the values and visions developed at the last CWG meeting. These were overwhelmingly supported by the focus group and accurately capture what they believe the community values are. The “Focus Group Summary” is included in the agenda package.

4.0 Understanding Current Reality

4.1 Richmond Profiles – Discussion and Comment

Members of the CWG were given an opportunity to discuss and provide comments on the “Market Profile” report distributed at the last meeting. The following are their comments and observations:

- Richmond has an ethnically diverse, growing population, neighbourhoods will continue to age, people will primarily settle in western or central areas of the city
- Social issues and settlement issues of non-visible minorities are a concern
- Statistical information on non-visible minorities is available from the City Planning Department
- How do we get the disengaged people to participate in a focus group? We may need to reach out to the community by other than open houses – household surveys, polling etc.
- Richmond has shown a shift to multi-family living
- 47% of families are two or less people - yet we target families – what is a “family”?
- Nothing included in the report in terms of income. Knowing the average or median income would be a helpful tool, as well as knowing whether families rent or own their homes.
- Nicky Byres advised that UBC just did a mapping of 1300 school children on income, education, moving within Richmond. She will pass the information on to staff for circulation in the next agenda package.
- Immigration laws have an impact. New immigrants come here to have a safe place for their kids to grow up. Frustration at not being able to find a job sometimes forces them to return home to make money, often leaving their kids here.
- Have to stay close to the market and be flexible and open to change
- Neighbourhoods have changed – size, structure, income, closure of schools; people with children are moving; complexion is changing
- Need to design model that’s nimble and responsive – find out how things change and reach out to the groups
- Being more flexible is going to have other implications, the way we finance, long-term planning

- There is a lot of migration and movement within the community. How much commitment do you make to transient groups?
- Don't have to hit every value – not everyone has to appreciate everything. In terms of services we provide and fund – hit the majority
- Everybody has similar basic needs – to be physically active, feel a sense of safety and be part of the community, but may have different motivators
- Growing interest in the Arts, both from audiences and participants

4.2 Issues, Topics and Framework for Consideration

A “Current Reality Evaluation Tool” draft template was included in the agenda package. Bob Ransford and Julie Halfnights also developed a template for consideration by the CWG. A copy was distributed to each member.

The two tools were similar, although Bob and Julie's model was more detailed and provided a mock evaluation using Britannia Shipyard as a test model.

The CWG broke into smaller groups at this point to discuss the tool. The findings of the group were that there would need to be a guide; some of the titles will need to be reworded; participating stakeholder groups to be identified. Staff will prepare a compilation and provide it to the stakeholder groups. There could also be an orientation session, utilizing staff as a resource.

4.3 Stakeholder Presentation Format

The following three questions were put to the CWG:

1. What do you want to learn from stakeholders?

How does it work today – measured against guiding principles; and identify the gaps?

2. Who do you need to hear from?

The CWG came up with a list of 34 groups that they would like to hear from. It was suggested that the groups be kept general, not specific. To accommodate everyone, a shorter list was proposed, i.e.

environment	heritage	social
sports	seniors	childcare
arenas	disabilities	community centres
aquatics	health	libraries
arts	culture	youth

3. What will you do with what you've learned?

Cathy Volkering Carlile proposed setting some ground rules in terms of stakeholder presentations. The terms of reference of CWG members states that members cannot be in a conflict of interest. Therefore none of the members of the CWG can present as stakeholders.

5.0 Delegations

5.1 John Karlsson

Mr. Karlsson is an independent interested member of the public and past President of West Richmond Community Centre. He delivered a powerpoint presentation on contract services delivery, a copy of which was included in the agenda package. He stated that Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services should be the best possible service with resources available.

Mr. Karlsson answered questions from CWG. He clarified that he thought the City should pay a unit rate per person. After meeting contractual obligations, any excess revenue would belong to the service provider (community association). The contract service provider in return would provide the services and staff to meet their obligations.

5.2 Frank Claassen

Mr. Claassen, representing RACA, made a presentation to the CWG. (A copy is attached). Mr. Claassen believes the current RACA service delivery model works; it does not suffer as stated in the staff report. He clarified that the City pays the cost of repairs and upkeep of arenas, as well as the lease costs. When asked whether any thought had been given to meeting halfway, Mr. Claassen stated that he felt they were on the middle road.

6.0 Summary and Closing

“Yikes” and “good” were the general consensus of the group.

Future agenda packages will include the name of the organization delegations represent – not just the name of the presenter.