

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Date: Monday, March 20th, 2000
Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall
Present: Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt, Chair
Councillor Malcolm Brodie
Councillor Derek Dang
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Councillor Ken Johnston
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves
Absent: Councillor Linda Barnes
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, March 6th, 2000, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

2. **EVENT REGULATION (RAVES) BYLAW NO. 7123**
(Report: Mar. 9/00; File: 8060-20-7123; REDMS 141469, 141680)

City Solicitor Paul Kendrick provided information on the history of the preparation of the proposed bylaw, and at the request of the Chair, summarized the report and proposed recommendations with Committee members. Mr. Kendrick advised that rave promoters were concerned about the requirement to pay for the additional police officers required, based on the number of participants which could be accommodated at a rave party.

In response to this concern, he advised that the RCMP were in agreement to an amendment being made to the bylaw, which would require a payment based on the number of people expected to attend the event, rather than the capacity which could be accommodated by the facility. He added, however, that if more than the expected number of participants attended the event in question, then the next time he filed an application, the promoter would be required to make a payment based on the number which the facility could accommodate.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on such issues as:

- the impact which the requirements of the proposed bylaw could have on late night graduation and other similar events;
- standards being proposed in the bylaw and whether these requirements would deter promoters;
- how staff would deal with a promoter who proposed to hold a rave party in a facility which although it met noise baffling and other requirements, was not listed as an approved site in the bylaw;
- the requirement for the submission of the application a minimum of 10 days prior to the event;
- the feasibility of requiring a promoter to post a bond to ensure that all RCMP costs associated with the event were covered.

Mr. Bobby Ghirra, co-owner of the Riverside Palace, 14500 River Road, advised that he did not support the proposed bylaw for two reasons. He spoke at length on the requirement to provide a minimum of 1 police officer be provided for the first 250 persons. He suggested that policing would not be required for any event which anticipated a maximum of 600 participants as on-site security personnel should be sufficient to deal with any problems which might arise. Mr. Ghirra also suggested that a mechanism should be established which would increase the cost of the permit, depending on the number of people expected to attend a rave event.

The second issue which Mr. Ghirra addressed was the fact that the bylaw would only permit rave party events to be held at two locations. He voiced concern about the extra process which he, as a facility operator, would have to undertake to have a site included in the bylaw as an approved site.

A lengthy discussion then ensued among Committee members and the delegation on the issue of how many police officers should be in attendance at rave events, and whether the cost of providing police officers at rave events would make such events too costly for the promoters.

Mr. David Primack, of High End Promotions, addressed a number of concerns which he had with regard to the proposed bylaw. He urged the Committee to take the opportunity to refine the process before proceeding with implementation to avoid problems arising in the future. A copy of his submission is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.

In response to questions, he provided information on (i) the budget allowed for a rave event, (ii) the cost of individual tickets, (iii) policing costs.

During the discussion which ensued, information was provided by Insp. German of the Richmond Detachment of the RCMP, on the need for a police presence at rave party events. Reference was made to comments made by the delegation about the difficulties faced by promoters if they were not permitted to promote or organize the event prior to obtaining a permit. In response, Mr. Kendrick stated that this issue would have to be reviewed to ensure that the promoter assumed responsibility for advertising, etc., at his own risk. The suggestion was also made by Councillor Brodie that the words "promote, organize, or" could be deleted from clause 1.1 of the proposed bylaw, to respond to this concern. Discussion then ensued on the issue of 'liquor permits' and whether alcohol should be banned from rave party events.

Salim Laconi, of 34 East 35th Street, Vancouver, a rave party promoter, expressed concern about the monopoly being created by the bylaw to restrict rave party events to the two venues shown in the bylaw. He questioned how long it would take to change the venues to add other facilities. With reference to the provision of police officers, Mr. Laconi indicated that he had no concerns about the requirements however, he suggested that financing could be an issue..

In response to Mr. Laconi's questions, advice was given that three months would be required to complete process. Discussion ensued on this issue, during which concern was expressed about the length of the process, and the suggestion was made that there had to be another way to obtain approval of a venue which was not approved in the bylaw. Mr. Laconi expressed concern that limiting approval for an event to the locations approved in the bylaw would create a monopoly for that operator.

Scott Meslan, of 2611 Parker Street, Vancouver, spoke about the requirement to provide a minimum of 1 police officer for every 250 participants at a rave party event, and about the number of participants who generally attended such events in Richmond. He indicated that he supported the RCMP being in attendance to provide a presence at the events where there more than 500 to 600 people attending.

Following the conclusion of the presentations, discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on the issues raised by the various speakers. As a result, the following **amended** recommendation was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7123, which regulates late night events (raves), be introduced and given first, second and third reading, subject to the following amendments being made:

- (1) to section 1.1 by deleting the words "promote, organize, or"; and***
- (2) to clause (b)(i) of subsection 2.2.1 by deleting the figure "250", and by substituting "500".***

CARRIED

3. **FIVE YEAR FINANCIAL PLAN**

(Report: Mar. 15/00; File: 0970-01/00 ; REDMS 142304)

Chief Administrative Officer George Duncan briefly reviewed the report with Committee members.

A lengthy discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on such issues as:

- the anticipated increase in tax revenue;
- the various components which comprise the proposed 2000 'consulting costs'; the total amount of consultation fees proposed to be included in the 2000 budget, including their order of priority as set by staff, and the impact which approval of the entire list (or any combination) could have on the final budget;
- the amount of funding being requested for the Corporate training budget; and
- the proposed distribution of the revenue received from gaming.

As a result of the discussion, the request was made that each of the proposed staff recommendations be dealt with separately.

It was moved and seconded

That the year 2000 Operating Budget be adjusted to reflect a total reduction in expenditures of the \$80,000 realized through the elimination of the vacant Manager, Purchasing & Insurance position.

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That subject to verification by the external auditors of the availability of 1999 surplus funding, an additional \$175,000 be allocated to the Year 2000 Consulting Fees Budget -*

(2) *That subject to verification by the external auditors of the availability of 1999 surplus funding, that Council give staff direction regarding the re-allocation of the balance of the \$600,000 requested for Year 2000 Consulting Fees Budget (up to approximately \$425,000) towards the Year 2000 budget.*

The question on the motion was not called, as the following referral motion was introduced

It was moved and seconded

That the following recommendations be forwarded to the Finance Select Committee for review:

(1) *That subject to verification by the external auditors of the availability of 1999 surplus funding, an additional \$175,000 be allocated to the Year 2000 Consulting Fees Budget -*

- (2) *That subject to verification by the external auditors of the availability of 1999 surplus funding, that Council give staff direction regarding the re-allocation of the balance of the \$600,000 requested for Year 2000 Consulting Fees Budget (up to approximately \$425,000) towards the Year 2000 budget.*

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That staff make the necessary changes to the 5 Year Financial Plan for Year 2000 Budget adjustments and include the document as part of the public consultation process.

CARRIED

MAYOR GREG HALSEY-BRANDT

4. LOWER MAINLAND TREATY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (LMTAC)

(Report: Mar. 16/00; File: 0060-20-LMTA1-01; REDMS 142057)

It was moved and seconded

That the following 8 suggested additions or amendments to the LMTAC "First Principles", be endorsed:

- (1) *Local governments strongly support the need for certain and final definitions of Aboriginal Rights. Treaties should provide a final and exhaustive listing of powers that First Nations governments may exercise.*
- (2) *The Governments of British Columbia and Canada should support the expeditious amendment of the Constitution of Canada to provide, protect and prescribe the powers of local government.*
- (3) *Treaty settlement lands within municipalities and regional districts should be taxed at comparable levels.*
- (4) *Locally, nationally and globally significant wildlife habitats in the Lower Mainland area must be recognized.*
- (5) *Amend First Principle #25 to read: Standards and regulations (including enforcement procedures) that apply to treaty settlement lands should meet or exceed established standards set by Federal, Provincial and Local Governments for issues including, but not limited to, environmental protection, public health, labour, safety, fire protection, building codes, noise and licencing.*
- (6) *The rights of all fishers engaged in commercial or recreational fishing should be protected.*
- (7) *No one local government should be disproportionately burdened as a result of treaty negotiations.*

- (8) *A specific deadline should be established for the filing of all Aboriginal claims under the BC Treaty Process.*

CARRIED

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

5. **CORPORATE WELLNESS PROGRAM INITIATIVE**

(Report: Mar. 6/00; File: 1850-02; REDMS 141596)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Council approve the establishment of the Corporate Wellness program and work site wellness centres, (as outlined in the staff report dated March 6th, 2000 from the Director of Human Resources).*
- (2) *That staff be authorized to sign a letter of understanding and establish an acceptable date to conduct a Health Fair in joint venture with Health Fairs Unlimited and Parke Davis.*
- (3) *That Council approve a Corporate Challenge/Picnic being held at King George Park in mid July 2000.*
- (4) *That staff be directed to report to Council on specific financial contributions toward the cost of outfitting and equipping Corporate Wellness Centres at the new City Hall and Works Yard which are available through sources other than the City.*

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the meeting adjourn (6:25 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, March 20th, 2000.

Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant

HIGH-END PRODUCTIONS

#309 – 1037 East 8th Ave • Vancouver, BC • V5T 1V1 • (604) 318-5444 [cell]
www.highendproductions.com • highendproductions@yahoo.com • (604) 873-3940 [fax]

March 20, 2000

Firstly I would like to thank Richmond City Council and staff for the opportunity to have real input into the development of this by-law and I look forward to continue to assist in the fine-tuning of this policy.

I have received a copy of the Richmond's proposed *Event Regulation (Raves) By-Law # 7123*. My comments will be related to the amendments provided by Lauren Melville – file # 8060-20-7123, dated March 10, 2000. In addition, after reading the proposal coming to council today I have also included in brackets the stipulation number to which my comments deal with (where applicable).

A) While it is easier to restrict alcohol for these events at the initial stages of this process, Richmond should keep in mind the Toronto model that does allow for such activity in a safe and responsible manner at these events – and hopefully look to incorporate it at a later date.

C) (1.1) While this sounds good, stipulation 1.1 still states that a person cannot “promote or organize” an event prior to having their permit approved. This is ludicrous that one cannot organize or promote an event prior to approval. This would mean they could not enter into any contracts with DJ's and service providers, nor be able to do any sort of financial planning until after the approval. In addition to promote is to advertise and thus removing the advertising clause is rendered redundant. This is unacceptable and is not required of any other industry similar in nature. As long as the onus of finding an adequate permitted space somewhere else and/or canceling the party should a permit be denied is placed entirely upon the promoter – they must be allowed to promote and organize prior to approval.

E) (2.2.1 b) **Having a minimum policing requirement regardless of the event size does not fairly account for persons wanting to do smaller budget, smaller capacity events (which are inherently easier to manage and control). Policing costs on events under 500/600 persons would effectively crowd out 30-70 % of potential economic gains and would have the unintended result of forcing promoters to hold exclusively larger events. Resolving this point is essential in making this proposed by-law inclusive for all promoters - otherwise those wanting smaller events will continue to hold them illegally.**

F) (2.2.1 b) Policing costs must be based initially on building capacity. However at a determined point leading up to the show, the promoter needs to have the flexibility of scaling back. Eg. If a promoter uses a hall with a 1000 person capacity, they should have to put up a bond for the full bill. However, if a feasibly pre-determined time period

before the event (e.g. 3-4 days) they are able to verify to the city that they have only sold 100 tickets [methodology issues arise] and are not likely to have more than 400-500 patrons, then an adjustment should be able to be made – i.e. less police at the event and returning a portion of that bond. However, the capacity for the event after the alteration would have to be amended to reflect that change.

G) (2.3.1) This by-law cannot simply be one for Riverside Banquet Hall and Riverside Palace. It serves minimal value if this by-law relegates promoters to work within a monopolistic market for venues. **Part of the intention of this by-law is (or at least should be) to recognize the legitimacy of this industry and to treat it as such.** And it is exactly this legitimacy that will help promoters to seek out viable new venues and to create an element of competition in venue supply so that prices may better reflect a more open market. **It is unacceptable that a full by-law amendment should have to be made to change this.** Stipulation (2.2.1 a) carries all the necessary clout to ensure minimal impact to all of Richmond – and thus it does not need this clause to prevent raves in densely populated areas. The combination of all stipulations listed within the by-law give it the power to do that already. **Having appropriate halls in specific areas should be dealt with using Zoning Regulations and should not be embedded into this process.**

H) Perhaps a dual stream application process would deal with this more effectively and with less need for bureaucratic and legislative headaches. One permit application for facilities that have been used in the past and that the city is familiar with (similar to the application included here). And then a second, more detailed, application for new venues. The requisite application time would obviously have to be longer for this type of application. As well, there would be associated costs put to the promoter for verifying the fire and health safety of the venue. It is essential for this by-law to be effective and inclusive to eliminate its legislated monopoly on venue supply. **If not, the result will be an unacceptable status quo, a legislated monopoly on the supply of venues, and the continuation of illegal events in Richmond.**

In conclusion I would like to thank Richmond for taking the foresight to deal with this issue in an inclusive manner. I do feel that a few key amendments to this by-law would set Richmond far ahead of any other municipal body in the Lower Mainland and perhaps across the country. I urge Council not to rush to get a permit process in the books (as did Vancouver rather erroneously) and to fine-tune this by-law with some of the above comments in mind so that it can have the ability to serve in the fullest manner intended.

Sincerely,

David Primack
High End Productions