



General Purposes Committee

- Date: Monday, February 2nd, 2004
- Place: M.2004
Richmond City Hall
- Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Derek Dang
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves
- Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, January 19th, 2004 and on Thursday, January 22nd, 2004, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

2. **FINANCIAL STRATEGY**
(Report: Jan 20/04; File No.: 0970-03-01) (REDMS No. 1115373, 1114057)

Chief Administrative Officer George Duncan spoke about the exercise recently undertaken by Council which resulted in the adoption of the Sustainable Financial Strategy. He stressed the importance of ensuring that the implementation of the plan continued to reflect Council's goals; that the Plan was workable; that progress was being made, and that a 'reality' check was undertaken to determine if the plan was working as anticipated.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

Mr. Duncan explained that this meeting would be focussing on (i) core service delivery areas; (ii) what the core services should be and their mandate; and (iii) non-core services. He emphasized that this meeting was intended to be an inter-active session between Committee and staff; that there were no right or wrong answers, and that the meeting was intended to provide staff with an understanding of Council's will.

The Director, Corporate & Intergovernmental Relations, Lani Schultz, through a PowerPoint presentation (a copy of which is on file in the City Clerk's Office), reviewed:

- Background
- Process
- Concept of a Great City
- Inside the System
- Establishing the City's Role in Making Richmond a "Great City"
- Ground Rules
- Framing the Picture

During the presentation, discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on:

- the question of "Why Do We Exist, What Business Are We In?"
- what should constitute core and non-core services
- the need for long term planners and leaders to ensure that the City was examining the newest and best practices
- the need for proper land use planning
- whether the City's vision and mission statements should be reviewed and possibly rewritten
- waste management.

Ms. Schultz then addressed the question of "Do We Have the Right Services?" with the Committee, indicating that the responses of the Committee would determine the criteria/principles by which to choose the City's core services. As a result of the discussion, the following criteria and principles were developed:

1. Is it required by the Community Charter?
2. Does it contribute significantly to the City's vision and mandate?
3. Is there a sound business case for the provision of this service; are we getting value for money?

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

4. Does the service respond to liveability goals and objectives?
5. Does it help to make Richmond a desired/balanced community?
6. Does it build long term community concept?
7. Is it fiscally responsible to our taxpayers?

Using these criteria, Committee members then reviewed the services presently offered by the City and determined (a) whether the service in question should be a core service, and (b) how the service should be delivered, based on the following two sets of questions:

- (a) with respect to the identification of core services, (1) Core – Must Have; (2) Important to Have; and (3) Not essential.
- (b) with respect to the delivery of services, (1) City as a primary provider; (2) Combined City/Partner Provision; (3) Primarily Through Other Parties; and (4) No City Involvement in Provision.

(It should be noted that the percentages shown below are based on the input of all nine Committee members, and that the numbers shown in brackets relates to the above sets of questions, with identification of core services being the first and service delivery the second.)

Services that address the physical development of the City:

Land Use Planning and OCP Implementation:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	89% (1) 11% (2)
Development Applications:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	89% (1) 11% (2)
Zoning Processes:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	100% (1)
Environmental Planning:	78% (1) <u>22% (2)</u>
Service delivery	22% (1) 67% (2) 11% (3)
Transportation planning and development:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	22% (1) 78% (2)
Infrastructure development and maintenance:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	44% (1) 56% (2)

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

Development of short and long range capital plans:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	67% (1) 33% (2)
Agricultural viability initiatives:	67% (1) <u>33% (2)</u>
Service delivery	11% (1) 78% (2) 11% (3)
Urban design plans and initiatives:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	56% (1) 44% (2)
Building permits and inspections:	89% (1) <u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	33% (1) 56% (2) 11% (3)
Works Yard Operations:	78% (1) <u>22% (2)</u> 44% (1) 56% (2)
Land acquisition and disposal:	89% (1) <u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	44% (1) 44% (2) 11% (3)
<i>Services that promote the social development of the City:</i>	
Recreation and cultural programs and services:	89% (1) <u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	11% (1) 78% (2) 11% (3)
Library Services:	78% (1) <u>22% (2)</u>
Service delivery	44% (1) 56% (2)

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

Social Planning:	56% (1)
	<u>44% (2)</u>
Service delivery	11% (1)
	44% (2)
	44% (3)
Community Grants Program:	22% (1)
	56% (2)
	<u>22% (3)</u>
Service delivery	22% (1)
	44% (2)
	22% (3)
	11% (4)

Programs and services that promote sound, sustainable fiscal management:

Development of economic/financial plans:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	56% (1)
	44% (2)
Treasury and Investment Services:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	44% (1)
	56% (2)

Programs that promote community, economic and business development:

Economic development initiatives:	33% (1)
	<u>67% (2)</u>
Service delivery	11% (1)
	78% (2)
	11% (3)
Business liaison services:	22% (1)
	56% (2)
	<u>22% (3)</u>
Service delivery	44% (1)
	56% (2)
Customer service and Front of House:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	100% (1)
Client Services:	67% (1)
	<u>33% (2)</u>
Service delivery	89% (1)
	11% (2)

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

Community Safety and Protective Services:

Fire Rescue:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	100% (1)
Policing Services:	89% (1)
	<u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	56% (1)
	44% (2)
Snow removal programs:	78% (1)
	<u>22% (2)</u>
Service delivery	22% (1)
	56% (2)
	22% (3)
Community bylaws development and enforcement:	89% (1)
	<u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	44% (1)
	44% (2)
	11% (3)
Recycling and Environmental programs:	78% (1)
	<u>22% (2)</u>
Service delivery	11% (1)
	56% (2)
	33% (3)

Corporate Governance and Administration

City Council and Mayor's Office:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	100% (1)
City Clerk's Office:	89% (1)
	<u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	89% (1)
	11% (2)
Various public processes:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	56% (1)
	44% (2)
Budget and accounting services:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	78% (1)
	22% (2)

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

Corporate and strategic planning:	78% (1) <u>22% (2)</u>
Service delivery	67% (1) 33% (2)
Tax collection:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	78% (1) 22% (2)
Payroll and Benefits:	89% (1) <u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	78% (1) 22% (2)
Fleet Management:	78% (1) <u>22% (2)</u>
Service delivery	33% (1) 56% (2) 11% (3)
Purchasing:	78% (1) <u>22% (2)</u>
Service delivery	56% (1) 44% (2)
Risk Management:	89% (1) <u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	33% (1) 44% (2) 22% (3)
Legal/legislative services:	89% (1) <u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	22% (1) 78% (2)
Corporate Records Management:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	67% (1) 33% (2)
IT Services:	89% (1) <u>11% (2)</u>
Service delivery	33% (1) 56% (2) 11% (3)

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

Human Resources:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	78% (1) 22% (2)
Administrative Services:	<u>100% (1)</u>
Service delivery	100% (1)

During the discussion, it was agreed that specific services, including Economic Development Initiatives, Business Liaison Services, and Emergency Services, needed to be better defined. It was also agreed that further discussion was required on: (i) the provision of police services, (ii) social planning, (iii) the Community Grants Program, and (iv) Economic Development Initiatives.

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be recessed until 4:30 p.m., on Tuesday, February 3rd, 2004 (6:10 p.m.).

CARRIED

The General Purposes Committee meeting reconvened at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 17th, 2004, with Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt absent.

Ms. Schultz referred to the memorandum and material circulated to the Committee (a copy of which is on file in the City Clerk's Office), and reviewed briefly the results of the February 2nd meeting of the Committee.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on :

- the definition of 'core service' to be an essential service
- whether the City should be the primary provider
- whether a category should be created between 'important service' and non-essential service
- the need to break major issues down into more manageable components
- the question of, if the City's policy was to have a safe community, why was the primary provider only listed as a 5, and what would the alternatives be.

At the request of the Chair, the Manager, Budgets & Accounting, Jerry Chong, reviewed the display boards which provided a comparison of rates between Richmond, Delta, Burnaby, Surrey, Coquitlam, New Westminster and Vancouver, for business and residential taxes.

Discussion then ensued on:

- Richmond's industrial tax rate

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

- how the revenue from taxes from the industrial business and other classes compared to the City's residential tax base
- the comparison presented by staff of municipal recreational and community facilities with other Lower Mainland municipalities
- the options which were available to the Committee with regard to taxation, (i) keep tax rates low relative to its competition and reduce service levels; (ii) keep tax rates around the mid-point relative to its competition with average service levels; or (iii) increase tax rates in order to provide greater service levels and choices
- how the City could become more desirable to families and businesses
- the most important issues facing the City and the impact which the available tax options could have on planning and future development
- the availability of other options, including finding efficiencies within the City and additional revenue sources
- the impact which the loss of \$5 Million in municipal grants had had on City reserve funds
- the City's long term financial sustainability strategy and the purpose of that strategy to increase revenue in the reserve funds
- the need to find a way to attract high quality, industrial and commercial developments which required close proximity to the Pacific Rim and to the United States
- the feasibility of having businesses adopt community centres, similar to the City's 'adopt a trail' program
- the City's tax rates in comparison to other Lower Mainland jurisdictions and whether Richmond's rates should be higher, lower or in the middle of Burnaby's and Surrey's rates; whether the City could have low taxes and at the same time, a high quality of living

During the discussion, it was agreed that the topic of "the City as a primary provider" should be discussed in greater detail at a future meeting. Information was also requested on the amount of funding which other cities and municipalities had in their reserve funds on a per capita basis, and on a comparison of which jurisdictions had business taxes and property taxes. Also requested was information on potential efficiencies and alternative revenue sources.

Reference was made during the discussion to the preparations for the 2004 Budget and advice was given that a budget meeting had been scheduled for Tuesday, March 2nd, 2004.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and Tuesday, February 17th, 2004

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (7:30 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, February 2nd, 2004, and on Tuesday, February 17th, 2004.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant, City Clerk's Office