



City of Richmond
Urban Development Division

Report to Committee

To: General Purposes Committee
From: Terry Crowe
Manager, Policy Planning

Date: December 2, 2002
File: 4060-05-03

Re: IMPERIAL LANDING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Staff Recommendation


That, as per the Manager, Policy Planning, report dated December 2, 2002 staff be directed to:

1. continue negotiating with the Steveston Harbour Authority to finalize a waterfront property management service agreement, and
2. proceed with an integrated Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy.



Terry Crowe
Manager, Policy Planning

Att. 6

FOR ORIGINATING DIVISION USE ONLY		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Law	Y ☒ N ☐	
Parks Design, Construction & Programs	Y ☒ N ☐	
Cultural Heritage Services	Y ☒ N ☐	

Staff Report

Origin

Note: This report is exactly the same as the previous report dated November 15, 2002, except for a few minor changes made for accuracy. These minor changes are shown in italics and are on page 8 and in Attachment 4. The recommendations are the same.

The purpose of this report is to respond to the following direction given by Council on November 12, 2002:

R02/20-14 - It was moved and seconded:

That:

- (1.) *the current park/trail program in front of the Imperial Landing water lots as the primary vision or this upland area, be maintained; and,*
- (2.) *staff further explore the development of the City waterlots in front of Imperial Landing.* **CARRIED.**

More specifically, the report will address how to manage:

- the many private sector and City development proposals and ideas, and their implications, for the Imperial Landing waterfront, and
- the existing "Requests For Expressions of Interest Regarding the Waterlots, Steveston, issued July 26, 2002.

Summary of Recommendations

The following is recommended:

That, as per the Manager, Policy Planning, report dated December 2, 2002, staff be directed to:

- (1.) continue negotiating with the Steveston Harbour Authority to finalize a waterfront property management service agreement,

Description

Continue to negotiate a refined City/SHA waterlot property management services agreement (e.g., security, minor maintenance, harbour safety), based on up-to-date City requirements. Sign an agreement and refine the agreement, as necessary, as the waterfront vision and development become clearer.

- (2.) proceed with an integrated Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy.

Description

This involves the following sequence:

- (i) consult with the public regarding the preferred development vision for the Imperial Landing waterfront,
- (ii) then, issue a proposal call to determine specific current development proposals for the Imperial Landing waterfront,
- (iii) then, initiate any required Area Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments to accommodate the preferred development vision and specific proposals
- (iv) then implement the revised Area Plan vision and policies, over the long term.

The remainder of this report discusses the reasons for these recommendations.

Findings Of Fact

1. A Chronology of Events

A chronology of events regarding Council's and Committees' directions for the Imperial Landing waterfront, over the last 18 months, is presented in **Attachment 1**.

2. Community Planning Context

The relevant parts of the Steveston Area Plan, Zoning Bylaw, City-developer servicing agreements, City initiatives, and private development proposals, are presented below.

A. The Area Plan

The Steveston Area Plan (SAP) Bylaw, which was prepared with extensive public consultation (1997- 1998), provides the vision and land use, servicing and environmental protection management policy framework for the Steveston waterfront including the Onni development and waterfront.

(i.) Vision

The Steveston Area Plan Vision for the waterfront states the following:

The following vision statement is intended to clarify what kind of place the Steveston Waterfront Neighbourhood will be in the year 2021.

"In the year 2021, the Steveston Waterfront Neighbourhood will serve as a major home port for the commercial fishing fleet around which will exist a unique community, rich in heritage, in which people will live, work and play, and many others will come to shop and enjoy the recreation, heritage and natural amenities of the area."

The Steveston Waterfront Neighbourhood of 2021 will include a number of specific goals:

- The area will serve, as a home port, include moorage for the commercial fishing fleet and land based services that sustain the fleet and cater to the needs of those who work on the boats;
- The area will have a waterfront village atmosphere with a mix of uses;
- Pedestrian and vehicular circulation will be designed to be safe and comfortable while providing ready access throughout the area and especially to the water's edge;
- Nodes of activity will be sensitively linked and buffered with strong connections to the foreshore;
- Urban development will be managed to conserve and enhance the natural environment.

(ii.) Policies

The relevant planning policies include:

- Maximize continuous and unobstructed public access to and along the waterfront.
- Where buildings or structures extend out over the water, developers will be encouraged to incorporate innovative designs to ensure public access along the water side of these developments (SAP 3.2.5);
- Provide a variety of opportunities for public access to the foreshore (SAP 3.2);

- Ensure that the waterfront is accessible to a variety of forms of transportation (SAP 3.2);
- (iii.) Area Plan MMU Uses (**see Attachment 2A**)
 The Area Plan allows the following MMU uses:
MMU means an area set aside to support the maritime economy, with an emphasis on uses which support primarily the commercial fishing fleet, including:
- (a.) Custom Workshops;
 - Enclosed Storage Facilities;
 - Fish Auction and Off-loading;
 - Laundry and Drycleaning;
 - Light Industrial;
 - Maritime Educational Facilities;
 - Moorage;
 - Offices;
 - Other Services Related to Maritime Uses;
 - Parking;
 - Service and Repair of Boats and Marine Equipment.
 - (b.) Retail uses are accommodated as accessory uses in the Maritime Mixed Use Area, between Phoenix Pond and No. 1 Road.
 - (c.) Between Phoenix Pond and No. 1 Road, residential uses are accommodated above grade and only over the dry land portions of the Maritime Mixed Use area as a secondary use. In addition, residential uses are to be situated so as to minimize potential conflicts with other uses.
- (iv.) MMU Development Emphasis
- Encourage the development of commercial and industrial uses that support or complement the maritime economy within a 3.5 ac. "Maritime Mixed Use" area adjacent to the waterfront west of Phoenix Pond.
 - Accommodation for a half acre of parking to support these uses is included in the 3.5 ac.;
 - MMU Master Plan
 - Require a master plan be completed to the City's satisfaction for the Maritime Mixed Use area west of Phoenix Pond prior to any development approvals being issued for this area.
 - The central purpose of the master plan will be to ensure that the objectives of the Maritime Mixed Use area will be met as development proceeds.

Note: Limited Commercial Development

When the Area Plan was prepared, Council limited the amount of commercial development on the Onni property to 10,000 square feet (instead of 65,000 sq. ft. as initially proposed) to protect the viability of the existing Steveston town core from too much commercial development.

B. Zoning Bylaw (see Attachment 2B)

The Zoning Bylaw MMU area requirements permit the following uses:

- (1.) CD 104 (west of Phoenix Pond)
 - CUSTOM WORKSHOPS, TRADES, & SERVICES, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - OFFICE, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - AUTOMOBILE PARKING, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - MARITIME EDUCATION;
 - LAUNDRY & DRY CLEANING;
 - MIXED MARITIME/RESIDENTIAL, provided that parts of the building used for Residential purposes are limited to Multiple-Family Dwellings that have no habitable space on the building's ground floor;
 - ACCESSORY USES, BUILDINGS, & STRUCTURES.
- (2.) CD 105 (in the middle of CD 104 and for Lot H - west of Phoenix Pond)
 - LIGHT INDUSTRY, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - CUSTOM WORKSHOPS, TRADES, & SERVICES, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - OFFICE, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - AUTOMOBILE PARKING, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - SERVICE & REPAIR OF BOATS & MARINE EQUIPMENT;
 - FISH OFF-LOADING;
 - FISH AUCTION;
 - MARINA;
 - MARITIME EDUCATION;
- (3.) CD/107 (Phoenix Net Loft - west of Phoenix Pond)
 - LIGHT INDUSTRY, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - CUSTOM WORKSHOPS, TRADES, & SERVICES, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - OFFICE, limited to maritime or commercial fishing-related uses;
 - SERVICE & REPAIR OF BOATS & MARINE EQUIPMENT;
 - MARINA;
 - MARITIME EDUCATION;
 - AUTOMOBILE PARKING;
 - PARK AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE;
 - ACCESSORY USES, BUILDINGS, & STRUCTURES.
- (4.) The relevant Zoning Map is presented in **Attachment 2B**.

C. Development and Servicing Agreements

Based on the above area plan and zoning, the City has agreements with Onni to develop their waterfront lands, in a phased manner. This is successfully proceeding.

D. City Waterfront Strategy

In addition, the City has initiated the preparation of a City wide long term Waterfront Strategy. It is not yet finalized. This Strategy has and will bring new development ideas to the Imperial Landing waterfront.

E. City Tram Home

The City has initiated studies to find a home for the tram. One possible site is the MMU area. The studies are not yet completed.

F. Phoenix Net loft

The City received the Phoenix Net Loft from BC Packers. Current building studies indicate that \$138,000 is needed for safety upkeep and \$1.4 Million for upgrades. The City has not yet decided on an appropriate, viable use for the Net Loft.

G. Filling Lot "H" (see **Attachment 3**)

The City owns "Lot H" and is exploring the implications of first filling and then developing Lot H (e.g., for park, buildings).

H. Summary of Received Private Sector Waterfront Development Proposals

The City has received a variety of solicited and unsolicited development ideas, most with no financial backing. To date, these proposals have included:

1) As Part Of the Waterfront Management Proposal Call

(i.) Mark Glavina & Associates (MGA)

- Wants only the Phoenix Net Loft
- Granville Island under one roof concept
- Maritime Artist Centre for various artists
- Visual and performing arts space
- Entertainment space
- Art gallery space
- Education space
- Lecture hall
- Frame shop
- Public access
- Cultural interpretative centre
- Working studios

(ii.) Steveston Economic Development Group (SEDG)

- Mainly wants Imperial Cannery and wharves redeveloped
- Unclear regarding what other buildings and structures are wanted
- City to own buildings and structures
- SEDG to control uses and wharf in front of Imperial Cannery
- Granville Island public market concept
- Historic Redevelopment
- Fish offloading facility
- Fish retail sales
- Accommodate "Tall Ships"

- (iii.) Steveston Harbour Authority (SHA)
 - Supports City's Home Port Vision
 - Supports commercial fishing industry and fishing vessels
 - Emphasizes commercial moorage, gill net facilities, commercial uses from the westerly pier (e.g., ice plant, moorage)

2) Received After the Proposal Call Deadline

- (i.) Barry Broughton
 - a national maritime museum
 - a cruise ship facility
 - a hotel
 - a convention centre
 - a parkade
- (ii.) First Cambridge Capital Inc.
 - commercial and pleasure craft marina
 - restaurant

I. Britannia Heritage Shipyard

East of the Imperial Landing is the City's Britannia Heritage Shipyard. The City has established a seven year "Development Plan" for the site at an estimated build-out cost of \$2 Million. The Plan is evolving. It is mentioned here because there are possibilities to integrate Shipyard development with the Imperial Landing waterfront development.

Analysis

1. Change

Since the Steveston Area Plan Vision and policies were established in 1998 and the Onni rezoning was approved in May 2001, there have been important changes, for example:

- it was not known that there was a "Lot H" which the City could own and develop
- the City had not initiated its Waterfront Strategy
- waterlot moorage proposals were not evaluated
- the implications of dredging and its contamination were not known
- the costs of upgrading the Phoenix Net Loft were not known
- the options to manage the tram were not clear
- various development proposals had not been received
- the preparations for the Tall Ships celebration had not occurred and the City's interest hosting it on an ongoing basis had not been identified
- while no recent studies are known to have been prepared to determine what the current long term land and water needs of the commercial fishing industry are, with the canneries now gone, there may be less of a commitment to retain the MMU 3.5 acres for the long term needs of the commercial fishing industry, as was initially envisioned.

2. MMU Master Plan

- It is to be noted that the Steveston Area Plan calls for the preparation of a “Maritime Mixed Use (MMU) Master Plan”. This Plan was not done. Instead, the BC Packers’ rezoning proposal was accepted.
- An MMU Master Plan can provide a way to better consider how to manage all these changes and development proposals in a more efficient manner.

3. Review of Recent Waterfront Development Proposals

In 2001 and 2002, there have been various private development proposals for the waterfront. These proposals are summarized in **Attachment 4**.

A general review of these proposals reveals the following:

Pros

- All the proposals are to be regarded as “possibilities” which may become elements of a long term, multi-stakeholder initiative.
- The proposals may add to the vibrancy to the waterfront.
- The proposals appear to have social, economic and financial benefits to the region and City.

Cons

- All the proposals lack detail.
- Many of these proposals contain elements which do not conform to the existing Steveston Area Plan, vision and policies, and the Zoning Bylaw.
- They all have legal, land use, waterlots, servicing, environmental and financial implications for Council, Onni and others.
- *Many proposals* (instead of all proposals) lack a financial commitment from their proponents, senior governments and others.
- *It appears that many proponents* (instead of all proponents) expect Council to champion, lead and significantly fund the development ideas.
- Some ideas may involve a significant long term financial commitment from Council whose resources are limited.
- The proposals do not necessarily complement one another.
- It is not known which mix of proposals is preferable, feasible and beneficial.
- Decisions need to be made to determine which development ideas will be perused, at what time frame and with whose financial and development backing.

4. Summary of Marina Business Case Analysis

- A summary of the City’s studies to date, regarding the feasibility of establishing a marina and of Onni’s participation is presented in Attachment 5.
- The studies suggest that a marina is not financially viable at this time.

5. Review of The City's Geological Studies

A review of the City's geological reports for the Murikami Boathouse and Boatworks, the Kishi Boatworks and the Britannia Apartments be have not yet been reviewed due to the limited time to report back to Committee.

6. Conclusion

From the above, two things are necessary:

- (i.) clarity is required regarding which land uses are desired, and
- (ii.) if additional development is desired beyond what the existing Area plan and Zoning Bylaw allows, as identified in the above development proposals, a new waterfront vision is necessary and the Area Plan and zoning Bylaw must be amended.

7. IMPERIAL LANDING WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

A. Choice

Upon reviewing the Chronology of Events in **Attachment 1**, over the last 18 months, the Council and some community members have been considering development ideas which involve moving away from the existing formally approved Waterfront Vision 1, to a new Waterfront Vision 2 (**see Attachment 4**).

As there has been no formal decision to do so, it is suggested that it is time to clarify which Waterfront Vision Option is to be achieved, to ensure that limited resources are better co-ordinated and directed towards an agreed-upon common end.

Based on Council's and the community's interest in exploring the benefits of all the development possibilities, it is suggested that Option 2 (a new Vision) (**see Attachment 4**). be explored. A more co-ordinated and integrated approach is, it is suggested, a necessary condition for successful development.

B. Options (**see Attachment 4**).

To develop the waterfront, two clear options present themselves namely:

- (i) **Option 1** - Continue implementing the existing approved Waterfront Vision as established in the Area Plan, or
- (ii) **Option 2** - Adopt A New Waterfront Vision to allow more uses by using a more integrated planning approach (**Recommended**)

The two Waterfront Development Management Options are summarized along with their general implications in **Attachment 4**.

Option 2 - Adopt A New Waterfront Vision - is recommended because:

- there may be significant social, economic, financial benefits
- there are complex varied interests, opportunities and problems to co-ordinate and manage
- there are limited City resources to pursue waterfront development
- there are significant land use, servicing, environmental, legal and financial implications
- progress will be quicker with an integrated approach
- legally, the public must be consulted, before any waterfront development which is beyond what is allowed in the Area Plan and Zoning Bylaw can occur
- public consensus needs to be determined to know if they want change, to what degree, at what cost and for what benefits
- the public will ask many questions which are best answered by an integrated approach and set of answers.

C. Considerations If Adopting A New Waterfront Vision

If the existing Waterfront Vision in the Area Plan is to be changed, the following needs to be considered for legal and planning reasons:

(i) Area Plan considerations

- what kind of place the MMU area is to be, either:
 - for the commercial fishing industry only, or
 - for both commercial fishing and urban uses).

(ii) Land Use considerations (what is wanted)

- which if any additional development possibilities are preferred, feasible and beneficial in the MMU, on lot H and on the waterlots
- how much commercial use there should be in the MMU area
- what types of uses are acceptable
- for Lot H
 - without land:
 - leave it as is, under water
 - leave it as it is under water and with a marina or moorage
 - with land:
 - fill it, without buildings (e.g., use for a park and trail)
 - dredging, its contamination, disposal and refill
 - possibly with a marina
 - fill it (\$1.9 Million minimum) and place buildings on it (e.g., for a tram - \$900,000)
 - possibly with a marina
- Development on Waterlots
 - a floating marina
 - buildings and structures (e.g., restaurants) out over the water
- Tram and associated buildings
 - relocating the tram
 - constructing a tram building

- maintaining a building
 - constructing tram tracks
 - Phoenix Net Loft
 - safety upkeep (\$140,000 in 2003)
 - upgrades (\$1.4 Million)
 - other
 - (iii) Legal considerations
 - obtaining waterlot leases from FRPA
 - renegotiating the City-Onni development and servicing agreements
 - Area plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments
 - environmental considerations and FREMP approvals
 - public consultation
 - (iv) Dredge fill removal, disposal, contamination and refill
 - (v) Partnership considerations (who will help) - the identification of partners, and sponsors
 - (vi) Financial considerations
 - revenues
 - the maximum City financial commitment to each waterfront development
 - Vision and the implications
 - obtaining federal, provincial, private and community funding sources
 - cost estimates for the above
 - (vii) Waterfront security
 - (viii) Servicing considerations
 - (ix) Environmental considerations (e.g., FREMP - see below)
 - (x) Cost Benefit Analysis - to provide a summary of all costs and benefits
 - (xi) Public Consultations
 - Just as the current Area Plan, Waterfront Vision, and land use, servicing and environmental policies were established with public consultation, public consultation regarding any change to the current Area Plan, Waterfront Vision and policies is legally required. Public consultations will also be desirable and essential in obtaining public consensus and support.
 - To successfully conduct, public consultations regarding a new Waterfront Vision, accurate information regarding the proposals and choices will be necessary because the public will have many questions and want accurate answers regarding what is being proposed, the implications, the costs, and how it will affect and benefit them.
8. FREMP Area Designation
- A. FREMP Area Designation
- The current FREMP Designation along the Imperial waterfront is: "Icw" Primary Use: Industry, Secondary Uses: Conservation and Water Oriented Residential/Commercial.
 - To accommodate Recreation/Park uses, an amendment may be needed to the FREMP Area Designation Agreement.

B. FREMP Habitat Coding

- The current FREMP habitat coding in the area between No. 1 Road and the Phoenix Pond is “green”.
- The area where the former Imperial and Brunswick Canneries were located is currently a periodically exposed mudflat. Given the assertive stance taken by Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Some City staff have raised concerns that if vegetation is permitted to take hold in this mudflat, FREMP may consider upgrading its habitat coding status, thereby restricting future development options. Other external agencies, such as the Fraser River Harbour Commission, have expressed similar concerns with several of their properties.
- Fisheries staff have confirmed that where habitat develops in green coded areas, it would need to be considered when assessing a development proposal.
- All proposals involving construction activity outside the crest of the dykes require a review by FREMP.

9. REVISITING THE CITY’S REQUEST FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTERESTS REGARDING WATERLOT MANAGEMENT

A. Original Request For Expressions Of Interests Regarding Waterlot Management

The original City “Request For Expressions Of Interests Regarding Waterlot Management” is presented in **Attachment 6**.

The premise of the original request was to seek interested partners for two activities:

- (i) waterfront property management services, and
- (ii) waterfront development proposals (partners with dollars).

The initial proposal call was based on the premises that:

- the existing Area Plan, Zoning Bylaw, and City-Onni development agreements would be met;
- that applicants would be capable of:
 - providing the services and developments which they said they would, and
 - implementing their development proposals, with their dollars.

The original Proposal Call asked for either or both of the following:

- a property manager, to assist the City, at its discretion, with a variety of City authorized uses.
- waterfront development proposals with capable developers with financial backing to implement their proposals.

B. Steveston Harbour Authority Application

The SHA Expression of Interest application was accepted by Council because the SHA is a stable partner, knows the Steveston waterfront, is flexible, capable and professional, and can assist the City in managing the waterlots and variety of development.

The SHA is not intended to be a developer but rather a property manager, as determined by the City. Any development which the SHA may undertake will be controlled by the City, at its discretion.

The SHA is proposing the following property management services:

- Security Services (e.g., building, waterfronts, No. 2 Road pier, Phoenix Net Loft)
- Minor Maintenance Services
- Planning Services (e.g., assist if necessary in planning any facility upgrades, dredging, moorage layouts and new facilities).
- Property Management Services including:
 - Phoenix Net Loft (e.g., tender for net use, collect money for the City, ensure that nets are stored properly and are protected),
 - City pier (e.g., oversee moorage activities)
 - waterlots (e.g., ensure safe boat movement and harbour activity)
- Harbour Operational Standards (e.g., regarding safety, water, moorage operational and environmental standards)
- Accounting System Services including:
 - administer the City's fee policies for the use of its properties
 - collect all fees and revenues (e.g., net storage, moorage)
 - keep separate accounts regarding all work under this agreement
 - provide the City with quarterly reports.
 - provide an annual audited statement.

C. Current Status

The City and SHA have drafted an agreement which the SHA has approved in principle in January 2001. The agreement has not been brought to Council to date because City staff have been re-examining the feasibility of moorage and finalizing details.

D. Options

(i.) **Option 1 - Retain the SHA (Recommended)**

Description

Continue to negotiate a refined City SHA waterlot property management services agreement (e.g., security, minor maintenance, harbour safety), based on up-to-date City requirements. Sign an agreement and refine the agreement, as necessary, as the waterfront vision and development becomes clearer.

Pros

- does not jeopardize the City's or private sector's long term waterfront development interests because the envisioned City-SHA relationship proposes that the SHA provide primarily property management services, not act as a developer
- the SHA is a stable partner who:
 - knows the Steveston waterfront
 - is flexible and capable
 - can assist the City in managing all City waterlots and buildings, etc.

- avoids the City having to hire extra staff to manage the waterlots and City properties, and to provide security.
- can work with all other City partners and private developers
- avoids having to reissue the proposal call for property management services.

Cons

- will need to refine the details of the draft City-SHA agreement.

(ii.) Option 2 - Reissue Waterlot Request For Expressions of Interest**Description**

- rescind Council's resolution to select the SHA
- advise the SHA, the City cancellation of the Proposal Call
- clarify what services are wanted
- prepare and issue a new Proposal Call
- select a new partner

Pros

- enables the City to renegotiate:
 - waterlot property management service, and
 - waterlot development
- will enable potential developers to:
 - prepare new expressions of interests for the two types of service, and
 - raise dollars to support their proposals.

Cons

- it is suggested that the City will still require property management services to assist in managing the waterfront, whatever the waterfront vision and development is
- requires reissuing the proposal call
- takes time.

E. Conclusion Re Waterfront Property Management

Option 1 - Retain the SHA is recommended because it provides waterfront property management services, and does not jeopardize the City's or private sector's waterfront development interests or possibilities.

10. Legal Considerations

- (1) Regarding the Waterfront Development Management Options, if a new Waterfront Development Option is chosen as per **Attachment 4**, some or all of the following may be required depending on the actual additional development:
- (i) the Area Plan must be amended
 - (ii) the Zoning Bylaw must be amended
 - (iii) Onni needs to be consulted
 - (iv) Onni-City development and servicing agreements may need to be amended
 - (v) public consultation is required before any bylaw amendments
 - (vi) FREMP needs to be consulted.

(2) Regarding the SHA Expression of Interests Agreement

Legally, the City can cancel:

- the "Request For Expressions of Interest" regarding the waterlots, and
- the finalization an agreement with the SHA.

11. Next Steps

(1.) General

The suggested next steps are to proceed with an integrated Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy which involves the following sequence:

- (i) continue negotiating with the Steveston Harbour Authority to finalize a waterfront property management service agreement, and
- (ii) proceed with an integrated Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy which involves the following sequence:
 - (a) consult with the public regarding the preferred development vision for the Imperial Landing waterfront,
 - (b) then, issue a proposal call to determine specific current development proposals for the Imperial Landing waterfront,
 - (c) then, initiate any required Area Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments to accommodate the preferred development vision and specific proposals
 - (d) then implement the revised Area Plan vision and policies, over the long term.

(2.) Timing

(i) Work Program - for An Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy

Imperial Landing Waterfront Work Program	
Action	Time
A. Waterfront Property Management Services	
- continue negotiating with the Steveston Harbour Authority to finalize a waterfront property management service agreement	January 2003
B. Waterfront Development	
1. Clarify	
- hold preliminary discussions with Onni to determine their views and degree of co-operation in changing the Plan vision and policies on the waterfront because they have a direct interest in which vision is selected	January 2003
- City to clarify each waterfront development vision and its implications	March 2003
2. Public Review of Options	
- City to consult with the public regarding development options	April 2003
- City to determine public preferences for development	April 2003
- City to select vision	June 2002
3. Call for Development Proposals	
- Call for and Select proposals	July - Sept. 2003
4. Area Plan and Zoning Bylaw Amendments	
- based on specific proposals, Area Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments are initiated	Fall 2003 onward
5. Implementation	
- implement vision as finances and resources allow.	Fall 2003 onward

- (ii) Timing of Additional Development
 - Additional development which conforms to the Area Plan and Zoning Bylaws and FREMP requirements, etc., can occur at any time, upon the approval of viable proposals.
 - Additional development which requires legal regulatory changes, will take longer (e.g., see above Work program).

12. Administrative Implications

To achieve the above Work Program, the following choices appear:

A. With City Staff Team

- (1.) A City Staff Team can do the work in house, but Policy Planning Department(PPD) work would be significantly delayed, for example:
 - a. Steveston Area rezonings,
 - b. the \$50,000 City ESA Review and Inventory update report which is $\frac{3}{4}$ done
 - c. the \$100,000 Flood Management Strategy which is just starting
 - d. proposed Provincial Streamside Regulation monitoring
 - e. proposed Provincial regulations regarding fish in ditches (affects the City's ability to cover ditches when upgrading roads)
 - f. the City's co-ordination with FREMP
 - g. other Department (e.g., Law, Parks, Engineering, Development Applications) work
- (2.) Time to do complete the work - 2003- 2004.

B. Consultant Assisted

- (1.) A consultant to assist a City Staff Team would cost \$80,000.
- (2.) There will be less work delayed.
- (3.) Time: - June 2003 - May 2004.

C. Rationale for Consultant

- Implementing the proposed Work Program in a timely manner is important so as to take advantage of any opportunities.
- The work is complex.
- While the time to complete the Work program is about the same with or without consultant assistance, without a consultant, there would be a significant delay of important and committed other City authorized work which, it is suggested, cannot be deferred without incurring unwanted consequences (e.g., modifying existing legal contracts, receiving complaints from developers and customers and reducing expectations).
- It is important to note that the \$80,000 for consultant assistance can be regarded as an investment in generating significant revenue generation for the City.

13. Summary Recommendations

The following is recommended:

A. The Waterfront Property Management Proposal Call - Option 1 – Retain the SHA

Description

Continue to negotiate a refined City SHA waterlot property management agreement (e.g., security, minor maintenance, harbour safety), based on up-to-date City requirements. Sign an agreement and refine the agreement, as necessary, as the waterfront vision and development becomes clearer.

B. Waterfront Development Management Strategy

The suggested next steps are to proceed with an integrated Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy.

Description

This involves the following sequence:

- (1.) consult with the public regarding the preferred development vision for the Imperial Landing waterfront,
- (2.) then, issue a proposal call to determine specific current development proposals for the Imperial Landing waterfront,
- (3.) then, initiate any required Area Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments to accommodate the preferred development vision and specific proposals
- (4.) then implement the revised Area Plan vision and policies, over the long term.

Financial Implications

1. Of The Waterfront Implementation Strategy

Activity	Cost	Benefits
1. The Waterfront Property Management Proposal Call - Option 1 - Retain the SHA	- TBD - the annual cost of a City-SHA agreement is to be determined before signing	- secures a quality property management service

2. Revenue Implications Of Additional Waterfront Development

The identified integrated Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy has the potential to generate long term social, economic and financial benefits to the City and region (e.g., increase revenues through additional property taxes, increased jobs, beneficial partnerships and increased tourism).

Conclusion

There seems to be interest in considering additional development at the Imperial Landing waterfront, beyond what is allowed in the current Area Plan and Zoning Bylaw.

Information and options are presented.

Recommendations are made to:

- continue to negotiate a refined City-SHA waterlot property management agreement (e.g., security, minor maintenance, harbour safety), and
- initiate an integrated Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy.

Terry Crowe, Manager
Policy Planning
TTC:cas

A Chronology of Events

The following is a summary chronology of events regarding the management of the waterfront at Imperial Landing, Steveston:

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| September 1998 | <u>Steveston Waterfront Area Planning</u> process completed
<u>Current Steveston Area Plan</u> approved |
| May 21, 2001 | Zoning approved for BCPackers site |
| June 25, 2001 | <u>Waterfront Lease From FRPA</u>
Council approves applying to lease the waterlots |
| July 27, 2001 | <u>Waterlot Management – Proposal Call and Selection</u>
City authorized waterlots management proposal call goes out |
| August 2001 | <p>Proposal call period ends with 3 proponents making submissions, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1.) Steveston Harbour Authority (2.) Mark Glavina (3.) Peter Dodge <p>A proposal comes in from First Cambridge Capital, but after the close of the proposal call.
City sends a letter to inform Cambridge that they missed the deadline</p> |
| Aug. 27, 2001 | <p>Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selects SHA as the successful applicant for the waterfront management proposal call, and - directs staff to negotiate an agreement with SHA. |
| Nov. 2001 | <p><u>Application By City to FRPA To Lease The Two Waterlots In Front of Imperial Landing, Onni Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The City applies to the Fraser River Port Authority to lease the two waterlots in front of the Onni development. - This process is still underway and will require the City to pay for a new waterlot survey (estimated to be approximately \$5,000) - This process is expected to be finalized in spring of 2003. - Lease cost is unknown |
| Sept 2001 - Jan 2002 | <p><u>City-SHA Negotiations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The City staff and SHA discuss a proposed agreement whereby the city would have the SHA manage the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1.) security along the waterfront, the Phoenix Net Loft and No 2 Road pier, (2.) building and managing new marina facilities, (3.) managing the City-owned pier in front of the Onni development - This is a flexible, mutually beneficial agreement. - The SHA Board approves the draft agreement, for City consideration, on January 17, 2002. - The draft agreement is not presented to Council and is put on hold because of the City directions outlined below. |

- Feb. 2002 City Waterfront Amenity Strategy Studies
Council reviews a draft of the Waterfront Amenity Strategy, and directs staff:
- (1.) to make application to dredge the waterlots,
 - (2.) complete a geotechnical and an environmental assessment of the waterlots, and
 - (3.) prepare a comprehensive business case of the various options for these lots in order to present a recommended option regarding their use.
- April 2002 Tram Study
Tram feasibility study (dyke route) introduced.
The Parks, Recreation and Cultural Committee directed staff to conduct a Tram Feasibility Study, with one of the routes to be along the water.
- May 2002 Waterfront Amenity Strategy Study Implementation
City Approves:
- dredging of waterlots
 - building of the SHA boardwalk
 - upgrades to No. 3 Road pier.
- Summer 2002 Contamination
- Serious contamination is discovered in dredging materials, so only partial dredging completed
- September 24, 2002 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee
Tram Study
Committee directed staff to:
- provide an ownership plan of all rights of way between Garry Point Park and London Farm
 - investigate the possibility of utilizing dredged material to widen the dyke in front of the Maritime Mixed Use Area
 - examine other dredge revenue strategies
 - provide revenue generation options that could contribute to the funding to the Steveston Interurban tram project
 - discuss with Onni Corporation, and other entities the development of public/private partnerships
 - enter into discussions with the Steveston Harbour Authority regarding the use of rights of way, cost sharing in the tram project and the possible future utilization of the two waterlots in front of Onni property.
- September 2002 Council
The Business Case Regarding A Marina
- The City prepared Business Case on proposed marina facilities on the waterlots indicates that, at this time, it would not be good revenue decision to build and operate a marina in this location
 - Also, the idea emerges that there could be a joint revenue opportunity if these facilities were built and marketed as part of the upland owners (Onni) development.
 - Council directs City staff to talk to Onni about this possibility, and report back to Council
 - Discussions are ongoing at this time.
- October 21, 2002 General Purposes Committee directed:
- (1.) that the original proposal call for the development of the Imperial Landing waterlots be closed, and

- (2.) that the proponents advised accordingly, and
- (3.) that a new proposal call be issued to determine the revenue potential of creating marina facilities in a partnership arrangement, and
- (4.) to report the findings of these discussions to Council, and that

It was also determined that the above be referred to staff for comment and report to the next closed meeting of the General Purposes Committee on Monday November 4, 2002.

October 29, 2002

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee:

- (1) The report to Council states the following:
 - (i) Regarding the filling of lot H:
 - it could technically be filled in, but that
 - it would be very problematic, expensive and limited in use;
 - (ii) Progress regarding the marina Business Case analysis
- (2) First Cambridge Capital re-introduces their proposal for a restaurant and marina facilities in the area.
- (3) Committee Direction to Staff
 - (i) Overall
 - The current park/trail program in front of the Imperial Landing water lots as the primary vision for this upland area, be maintained; and,
 - The development of the City waterlots in front of Imperial Landing is to be explored.
 - (ii) Filling Lot H
 - prepare options and estimated costs of filling Lot H.
 - include that further geotechnical studies would be necessary for the determination of what buildings could be supported on the site.
 - information on this issue is to include:
 - i. a table outlining the possible options; and
 - ii. a map or diagram identifying those options.
 - (iii) Geological Reports
 - the geological reports for the Murikami Boathouse and Boatworks, the Kishi Boatworks and the Britannia Apartments are to be reviewed.
 - (iv) First Cambridge Capital Proposal
 - the material presented of Mr. Doug Day be reviewed.
 - the identification of similar types of development for the site.
 - (v) Draft City – SHA Agreement
 - In response to questions, Ms. Volkering Carlile said that service agreements and regulatory issues would be reviewed, and a proposal call, which would include the proposal of Mr. Day, opened.
 - (vi) Regulatory Issues - review
 - review the:
 - Waterfront Management Proposal Call
 - existing City-ONNI Servicing Agreement
 - prepare a status report on those agreements including a clarification from the Law Department, and an interim report, be provided.

November 12, 2002 - Council directed

That:

- (1) the current park/trail program in front of the Imperial Landing water lots as the primary vision for this upland area, be maintained; and,*
- (2) staff further explore the development of the City waterlots in front of Imperial Landing.- CARRIED.*

ATTACHMENT 4

Waterfront Development Management Options For Imperial Landing, Steveston, Richmond BC						
Element	Does The Existing Area Plan Allow?	Does The Existing Zoning Bylaw Allow?	FREMP Approval Required?	Public Consultation Required?	Onni-City Agreement Modified?	City Costs
Vision 1 (Current Vision - conforms to Area Plan)						
(1.) Current Theme						
► Maritime Mixed Use (MMU) concept accommodates the commercial fishing fleet and related commercial & industrial uses.						
(2.) Permitted Existing Development						
(1.) the existing shoreline	Yes	- N/A - zoning does not affect shorelines	Done	Done	Done	
(2.) the dyke / trail	Yes	Yes	Done	Done	Done	
(3.) public access along the waterfront	Yes	Yes	Done	Done	Done	
(4.) the City pier (as an MMU element)	Yes	Yes	Done	Done	Done	Likely
(5.) the Phoenix Net Loft	Yes	Yes	- any new structure require a review as part of Rezoning and DP review	Done	Done	- \$140,000 for safety maintenance in 2003 - \$1,400,000 for upgrades

Waterfront Development Management Options For Imperial Landing, Steveston, Richmond BC						
Element	Does The Existing Area Plan Allow?	Does The Existing Zoning Bylaw Allow?	FREMP Approval Required?	Public Consultation Required	Onni-City Agreement Modified?	City Costs
Vision 2 (Possible Alternate Vision – includes the above uses plus the following)						
(1.) Changing MMU Area Concept to allow for more urban uses						
Requires changing the approved Area Plan Maritime Mixed Use (MMU) concept:						
- From accommodating the commercial fishing fleet and related commercial & industrial uses, and limited residential uses, - To accommodating primarily urban and tourist interests.	Requires an Area Plan amendment	- Lot H is zoned CD 105 - A marina is OK on Lot H - Waterlots - Currently waterlots do not have zoning - Should zone the waterlots	Yes	Yes, to allow a change in the Area Plan	Likely as a new concept may affect Onni's interests	TBD
(2.) Lot H Development						
Note						
- Lot H area is zoned CD/105 - No zoning south of Lot H						
(i) To fill Lot H - No Buildings						
To fill Lot H which can be used as a park and trail, without buildings	- Yes, filling is OK - a park/trail requires an amendment.	need SPU zoning	Yes, for fill	Yes	Yes	- Minimum of \$1.9 Million for park/trail - More for buildings
(ii) Use Filled Lot H for Buildings						
To fill Lot H which can be used for buildings						
(a) City's Ideas - tram buildings - other	Requires area plan amendment	- Lot H area is currently zoned CD/105 - Requires rezoning	Yes, for buildings	Yes	Yes	\$900,000 for tram building

Waterfront Development Management Options For Imperial Landing, Steveston, Richmond BC						
Element	Does The Existing Area Plan Allow?	Does The Existing Zoning Bylaw Allow?	FREMP Approval Required?	Public Consultation Required	Onni-City Agreement Modified?	City Costs
(b) First Cambridge Capital Inc. Ideas:						
- fish market	- restaurant	- Lot H area is currently	- Yes, for	Yes	Maybe	TBD
- restaurant	requires area	zoned CD/105	buildings &		(instead of Yes)	
- marina	plan amendment	- Requires rezoning	structures			
(c) Barry Broughton's Proposals						
Use area of the former						
Phoenix Cannery Site and						
waterlots for a world class						
tourism & recreation centre						
including:						
- pocket cruise ship	- Requires area	- Lot H area is currently	- Yes, for	Yes	Yes	TBD
- terminal, convention	plan amendment	zoned CD/105	buildings &			
- centre, hotel, parkade	for some uses	- Requires rezoning	structures			
(d) Mark Glavina & Associates (MGA)						
Wants only the Phoenix						
Net Loft						
- Granville Island under	- Requires	- Requires amendment	Depends	Yes	Yes	- \$140,000
one roof concept	amendment as it	as it is not a				for safety
- Maritime Artist Centre	is not a	commercial fishing				upkeep
Space for:	commercial	oriented use				\$1.4 M for
- performing arts,	fishing oriented					upgrades
- entertainment, art	use					
- gallery, education,						
- lecture hall, frame shop,						
- cultural interpretative						
- centre, working studios						
- Public access						
(3.) Dredging of Waterfront	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	No	Yes
(4.) Development on Waterlots						
Yes, because the						
water is designated						
MMU						
(i) a marina	- Yes, because the	- Currently there is no	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	water is designated	zoning over waterlots				
	MMU	- Requires rezoning				
(ii) buildings and	- Yes, because the	- Currently there is no	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
structures out	water is designated	zoning over waterlots				
over the water	MMU	- Requires rezoning				

ATTACHMENT 5

Summary
Marina Business Case Analysis - Imperial Waterlots, Steveston, BC

Summary Date: November 10, 2002

Purpose

The following is a brief summary of the business case analysis for a marina on the Imperial Landing water lots.

Background

In January 2002, City Council directed staff to conduct a business case analysis of potential uses of the water lots fronting the Imperial Landing site in Steveston.

Findings

Study 1 - Consultant findings on marina options and viability:

The study found that a marina operation on its own would not result in any significant financial returns to the City, though some community benefits would result.

Along with consultants, the City explored the economics and engineering of various marina options along the waterfront at Imperial Landing.

The options included:

- rental moorage (monthly, annual)
- strata development (slips sold upfront with long term water lease)
- combination of rental and strata moorage.

These options included up to 190 berths of varying lengths, use of the {Phoenix Net Loft for retail and commercial purposes, provision of one acre upland for parking and services, phased in development in line with market trends.

Various management options were also considered including contract, partnership, strata council, or City operation.

The findings of this portion of the study showed that a marina is a net neutral revenue venture at best.

Study 2 - Consultant's findings on financial gain to upland property:

The findings of the consultant's study on comparable waterfront developments indicated that while there is not a precise valuation of economic gain, it is suggested that a 10-20% increase in value could be attributed to having a marina associated with residential development.

Staff are currently engaged in a discussion with Onni Development Corporation to determine if a marina partnership is feasible.

Prepared by - Development Applications Department

ATTACHMENT 6

3:00 PM July 26, 2001

**City Proposal Call
Request for Expressions of Interests
Waterlots, Steveston, Richmond, BC
City of Richmond**

1. Purpose

The purpose of this "Request for Expressions of Interest" is to identify those who are interested in operating (e.g., by sub-lease, lease, management contract, or other arrangements) the two waterlots, certain buildings, structures and moorage from the City, in front of the BC Packers (1999) Ltd. site in Steveston, Richmond, British Columbia, Canada.

2. Waterlots

The waterlots in question are:

- in Section 11 Block – 3 North - Range 7 West
- in District Lots:
 - 5690 (the west waterlot)
 - 6316 (the east waterlot) (only part of this waterlot).

3. Background

The waterfront in front of the BCPackers site is located along the South Arm of the Fraser River between No.1 Road and Railway Avenue, in the Steveston neighbourhood of Richmond, British Columbia, Canada.

In 1998, the City adopted a revised Steveston Area Plan which contains a waterfront vision and policies to guide development.

The 2021 Waterfront Vision is:

"In 2021, the Steveston Waterfront neighbourhood will serve as a major home port for the commercial fishing fleet around which will exist a unique community, rich in heritage, in which people will live, work and play, and many others will come to shop and enjoy the recreation, heritage and natural amenities of the area".

In 2001, Council rezoned the BCPackers site for redevelopment.

As a result of this process the City:

- (1) will become the owner of the Phoenix Net Loft and an upgraded westerly pier
- (2) intends to acquire control of the two waterlots from the Province and Fraser River Port Authority (FRPA)
- (3) intends to exercise its riparian rights along all of the waterfront of the BCPackers site.

As part of the City's management strategy for the waterfront and waterlots in front of the BCPackers site, the City is inviting "Expression of Interest" proposals from parties who have water-based, land use, development, servicing, environmental and financial (e.g., profit sharing) objectives which are consistent with those of the City.

Specifically, the City is interested in working with parties who are interested in operating (e.g., by lease, sublease, agreement, etc.) the two waterlots, the City-owned Phoenix Net Loft and westerly pier, and moorage.

This call starts the process to achieve this phase of the City waterfront management strategy.

4. "Expression of Interest" Status of Calls

This "Expressions of Interest" approach is chosen, because, at this time, the City:

- has not yet leased the waterlots from the FRPA
- does not yet own the buildings and structures (from BCPL (1999) Ltd.), as this will take some time.

Accordingly, the City does not yet know the partnership terms which it will apply, including the:

- waterlot lease rate
- Phoenix Net loft lease rate
- pier lease rate
- exact use(s) of the existing Phoenix Net Loft
- exact use(s) of the westerly pier.
- final location(s) and usage of any new waterlot moorage (e.g., short and long term)
- the City' conditions in exercising its riparian rights (e.g., use, approval).

Note:

- The Steveston Area Plan designates the western upland portion of the BCP site a Maritime Mixed Use (MMU) Area.
- The purpose of the MMU area is to encourage the development of commercial and industrial uses which support and complement the maritime economy and commercial fishing related uses.
- At this time, the exact land uses, buildings, and structures, and their locations in the designated "MMU Area" are not known.

5. Assumptions

(1.) General

Your proposal is to be based on the following facts and assumptions:

- the Steveston Area Plan applies
- the City has obtained all land ownership along the BCPackers waterfront
- the City will have all the riparian rights along the BCPackers waterfront
- the dyke will be reconstructed with new public waterfront access which will be maintained by the City.
- the City will obtain the leases to the waterlots from the Fraser River Port Authority (FRPA)

(2.) Existing Building and Structure to be Maintained

It is to be assumed that the City will own the existing:

- Phoenix Net Loft
- westerly pier which will be upgraded to facilitate public access to the water.

(3.) Other Waterlot Buildings and Structures

- (a) The current owner of the other waterlot buildings and structures (e.g., Imperial, Brunswick and Phoenix Canneries and their wharves, and the two easterly piers) is BCPL (1999) Ltd.
- (b) BC Assets and Lands (Crown Provincial) has a role in determining how buildings and structures on waterlots are redeveloped or demolished.
- (c) BCPL (1999) Ltd. wishes to have these other waterlot buildings and structures demolished; however, the option of retaining most of the Imperial Cannery and a portion of the Brunswick Cannery was anticipated in the Steveston Area Plan (e.g., the redevelopment of these buildings and structures may occur without requiring major changes to the Steveston Area Plan upland land use plan policies and the Zoning Bylaw requirements).
- (d) Any proposal(s) which involves the retention and redevelopment of all or part of these other waterlot buildings or structures (e.g., Imperial, Brunswick and Phoenix Canneries and their wharves, and the two easterly piers) must have, when the proposals are submitted, specific redevelopment proposals and details.
- (e) The retention and redevelopment all or part of these other waterlot buildings and structures are subject to subsequent approval of:
 - the owner - BCPL (1999) Ltd., and
 - BC Assets and Lands (Crown Provincial).

6. Application Details

Application must contain the following details:

(1) Who

- the name of the organization who is proposing to manage the waterlots from the City, along with their name address, telephone, fax and, if available, their E-mail address
- the officers of the organization
- the organization's legal status
- the organization's purpose and if appropriate, its legal mandate.

(2) Proposal

Applicant proposals must contain the following:

A. Scope of Interest:

Whether the applicant wants to be involved with:

- all or part of the two waterlots along the BCPackers waterfront
- the Phoenix Net Loft
- the westerly pier
- moorage,
- any other buildings, structures or properties in addition to those in which the City is committed.

B. Waterlots:

What uses, access and support requirements the applicant is proposing to develop, manage and maintain

C. Phoenix Net Loft:

What uses the applicant proposes to develop, manage and maintain

D. City Pier:

What uses the applicant intends to develop, manage and maintain.

E. Proposed new moorage:

What moorage the applicant proposes to develop, maintain and manage including moorage type, access, etc.

F. Any Upland Support Facilities:

What, if any, upland facilities (e.g., access) are proposed to support the applicant's proposal and how this will be achieved

G. Other:

Applicants may propose other buildings, structures and improvements which can maximize City objective and revenues.

H. Achievability

How the Applicant:

- will make their proposal work (e.g., uses, services, access, tenants, tenant requirements, form of partnership, etc.)
- can meet all the City objectives and requirements (known and assumed at this time)

I. Financial Terms:

The applicant's proposed capital investment plan:

- for managing and developing:
 - the waterlots,
 - the Phoenix Net loft, pier and moorage, as appropriate
 - other as may be proposed by the applicant
- for generating revenue for the City from the buildings, structures and moorage (e.g., Phoenix Net loft, westerly pier and moorage)
- for providing building and structure removal guarantees, if and when the agreement with the City ends
- other, appropriate.

J. Applicant's Experience:

The applicant's experience in successfully developing, managing, maintaining, leasing, financing and generating revenue from waterlots, piers, moorage, buildings and structures, and how the experience will be successfully applied.

7. Alternatives

- If applicants choose to propose alternatives to this proposal call, such may be considered.
- All alternatives must be clearly described, justified and explained.

8. City Information Available

The following information is relevant:

(1) City:

- Steveston Area Plan vision, goal, objectives and policies (excerpts attached)
- relevant Zoning Bylaw requirements (attached)
- maps of the BCPackers site and waterlots (certain maps)
- Other
 - the City's land use, servicing and environmental requirements for the redevelopment of the BCPackers site
 - the City's riparian rights and objectives
 - City approved Park Plan for the BCP site
 - Council approved:
 - BC Packers Heritage Interpretative Plan, and
 - other documents submitted as part of the Steveston Area Plan and rezoning process.
- These documents are available for viewing from the City offices.
- Many are quite large.
- Copies will be made available at cost.

(2) Note:

Applicants should be aware that there are other jurisdictions and matters (e.g., dredging,) which influence the proposal including:

- federal and provincial governments,
- Fraser River Port Authority (FRPA) (e.g., as the approving authority for the installation of any works in the waterlots),
- Steveston Harbour Authority (SHA), (e.g., maintaining the Steveston Harbour for the commercial fishing fleet)
- Fraser River Estuary Management Program (FREMP) (e.g., to review environmental considerations of any construction applications submitted to the FRPA)
- other.

9. Evaluation Criteria

Applications will be reviewed based on the following criteria:

(1) Applicants**(a) General**

- ability to implement their proposal
- ability to pay for their proposal and
- ability to generate revenue, rent and taxes for the City.

(b) Due Diligence

The City retains the right to perform due diligence on applicants and may request:

- the full disclosure of the applicant's company/organization records, and
- information regarding its officers, assets, standing with financial institutions, audited financial statements, etc'

(2) Proposals

- Degree of certainty and achievability
- Ability to achieve all of the City waterlot, land use, development, servicing, environmental and revenue objectives
- Compatibility with City, FRPA, SHA, and federal and provincial objectives.
- Time to implement proposals
- Financial backing
- The degree of required support from others and its certainty.

(3) City Revenue - revenue to the City which may be in the form of rent, revenue sharing and/or taxes.

10. Confidence

All proposals will be subject to Provincial Freedom of Information legislation.

11. Next Steps

- (1) The City reviews proposals.
- (2) City identifies a preferred applicant(s).
- (3) City will finalize the matters which are necessary partner to operate and manage the assets (e.g., secure waterlots).
- (4) The City may request a preferred applicant(s) to clarify and modify their proposals.
- (5) It is not known how long it will take to finalize all matters; however, the City will proceed in a diligent and timely manner.

12. Reservation

- (1) The City may accept or refuse any application.
- (2) The City may cancel this call at any time.

13. Deadline

The City will receive applications:

- marked "2337P – Waterlots Proposal – Expression of Interest"
- until 4:00 p.m. local time, Friday, August 17, 2001.

14. Submit To

Applications are to be submitted to:

Manager, Purchasing and Insurance,
Information Centre
Main Floor, Richmond City Hall
6911 No 3 Road,
Richmond, BC
V6Y 2C1

15. Contact

For clarification, please contact:

Terry Crowe, Manager, Policy Planning Department City Hall 6911 No 3 Road, Richmond, BC Phone: 1-604-276-4139 Fax: 1-604-276-4052 -V6Y 2C1	or	David Brownlee, M.A. (Planning), Planner 2 Policy Planning Department City Hall 6911 No 3 Road, Richmond, BC Phone: 1-604-276-4200 Fax: 1-604-276-4052 - V6Y 2C1
---	-----------	---

16. Attachments

- Steveston Area Plan vision, goal, objectives and policies (excerpts attached)
- relevant Zoning Bylaw requirements (attached)
- maps of the BCPackers site and waterlots (certain maps)

Prepared by:
Urban Development Division,
City of Richmond