



MINUTES

**GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

- Date: Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2000
- Place: W.H. Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall
- Present: Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt, Chair  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Malcolm Brodie  
Councillor Derek Dang  
Councillor Lyn Greenhill  
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai  
Councillor Ken Johnston (4:12 p.m.)  
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 Tuesday, September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2000, be adopted as circulated.*

CARRIED

DELEGATIONS

2. **FRASER RIVER PORT AUTHORITY - To provide an overview of the Port, and to address issues relating to Port jurisdiction within Richmond**  
(REDMS 0140-20-FRHA1)

Mr. Geoffrey Day, the Municipal Representative on the Board of Directors of the Fraser River Port Authority, accompanied by Mr. Ed Kargl, the Business Development Manager, were in attendance.

Mr. Kargl then provided an overview of the Fraser Port Authority through a slide presentation, during which he spoke about:

- the corporate structure of the Authority
- the four business units which comprised the Authority, including automobiles, forest products, containers and steel

- the fact that the Port Authority is the largest Canadian auto terminal
- Port operations, which include channel maintenance (dredging) and property administration
- the excellent relationship of the Port with City Council and staff.

(Councillor Johnston entered the meeting at 4:12 p.m., during the above presentation.)

Mr. Kargl then introduced Mr. Patrick Wong, Chair of the Board of Directors, who had entered the meeting during the slide presentation. Mr. Wong spoke briefly about the proposed development of Port lands on the south arm of the Fraser River.

In response to questions from Committee members, the following information was provided:

- with regard to the proposed subdivision of lands, the Port Authority hoped to develop those areas shown for development as part of joint venture with other partners
- Port Authority staff had begun working with City staff about the provision of roads and other servicing needs in relation to the development of their property
- the Port Authority had been approached by the proponents of a race track proposal about the possibility of using Port lands for the project; however, this use did not meet the criteria of the Port's mandate which was to assist Canada with the exporting or importing of various products
- the Port Authority had been approached by the Steveston Harbour Authority about the possibility of Harbour Authority assuming responsibility for the water lots located in the area of the former BC Packers property; advice was given that if those lots were taken over by the Harbour Authority, the expense of dredging in that area would also be passed on to that agency
- with respect to the debris collection program, the Port Authority fully supported the program, however, the Port was only 1 of 5 agencies involved with the project; funding had been extended for the 2000 year, however, at this point, no decision had yet been made on funding for future years; the Port was concerned about the impact which the release of debris material could have on the environment and boaters
- the Port Authority was aware of the problems with the sheer boom (which falls within a number of jurisdictions) however, again, it was a funding issue.

The delegation was thanked for their presentation, and they then left the meeting.

3. **POOL HALL OPERATING HOURS**

Mr. Joseph Choy, of Richmond Snooker City, accompanied by Mr. Alex Cheung, of Hi-Lite Billiards, were in attendance to request an extension of the operating hours for pool halls. Mr. Choy advised that he would like the hours extended to 1:00 a.m. daily, except for Friday and Saturday evenings which would be extended to 2:00 a.m., in addition to a 45 minute grace period. (During his presentation, Mr. Choy circulated to Committee members, a letter signed by the owners of the Exotic Zone, Top Ten and Hot Shot pool halls, in support of the request for an extension to the operating hours. A copy of this letter is on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Cheung advised that many pool halls had closed during the past 4 years because of the reduction in operating hours. He noted that more and more people were working later hours and it was for this reason that he and Mr. Choy were again requesting an extension to the operating hours for pool halls. Mr. Cheung added that their businesses were suffering financial hardship, but they wished to remain in operation because of the job opportunities which they offered.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and the delegation, during which, in response to questions, the following information was provided:

- the 45 minute grace period was essential to allow customers who had commenced playing pool just prior to the closing time, to complete their games
- Mr. Choy had been in violation of the business regulations relating to the operating of pool halls and had been issued tickets for these violations
- the requested extension in operating hours was only being sought for those pool hall operations which were not located in residential areas.

Questions were raised during the discussion about the number of pool hall establishments which had gone out of business during the past few years, and Mr. Bruce advised that he would have staff research the issue and provide the information to Council.

During the discussion, in response to questions, Inspector Al Speevak of the Richmond Detachment of the RCMP, voiced concern that an extension to the hours of operation for pool halls would require a greater delegation of police resources to prevent undesirable activities from occurring at these facilities. He then provided information on the current activities of the officers with respect to gangs in schools and enforcement of adult entertainment regulations.

Concern was also voiced during the discussion that if the request for extended hours of operation was approved, then the City could be faced with similar requests from the owners and operators of adult entertainment businesses.

The delegation was thanked for their presentation and they then left the meeting.

## URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

### 4. RICHMOND COMMITTEE ON DISABILITY

(Report: Sept. 8/00, File No.: 0100-20-RCD11-01) (REDMS No. 185866)

The General Manager, Urban Development David McLellan briefly reviewed the report with Committee members.

Ms. Frances Clark, 8160 Railway Avenue, representing the Richmond Committee on Disability (RCD), referred to a statement made in the report about the Special Needs Programmer position, which indicated that *'Representatives of the RCD are of the view that this position should be utilized solely for the benefit of persons with physical disabilities'*. She advised that this statement was untrue and noted that in their latest presentation on June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2000, the RCD had indicated that it supported people with all forms of disabilities. Ms. Clark urged the Committee to refer the report back to staff for further discussions with the RCD as only one meeting had been held with that Committee prior to the preparation of Mr. McLellan's report.

Considerable discussion then ensued among Committee members and the delegation on the rationale for referring the report back to Committee, during which the following comments were made:

- the RCD were of the opinion that the report required additional work as there were statements to which the Committee did not agree, such as the inability of the City to adopt a parking bylaw which would prevent parking in designated parking spaces on private property
- the resolution adopted on June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2000 required that staff address issues in consultation with the RCD, however, since that time, only one meeting had been held, and that meeting had only occurred after the RCD had received a copy of Mr. McLellan's report; the RCD was of the opinion that the report should be have prepared after consultation and not before
- with respect to the Special Needs Programmer position, there is a need in this community for more than the City can currently provide; a second Special Needs Programmer would help to alleviate the situation
- the RCD was concerned that adoption of the report would mean that the current situation as the RCD saw it would continue
- the RCD was of the opinion that more effort should be made to provide programs for people with disabilities, as it was not always possible to integrate disabled people into programs with able-bodied people.

During the discussion, concern was expressed that referral of the report to staff would delay the implementation of the recommendation. The comment was also made that the staff recommendation was adequate to act as a starting point for further discussions with the RCD, and would allow the Committee and staff to work towards mutually agreed upon goals. A further comment was made that the RCD could address issues at the time its annual work plan was submitted to Council.

Support for the referral was expressed however, because it was felt that the philosophy of support for the RCD and what the City needed to do, was not reflected in the staff report. The comment was also made that a more easily identified work plan should be provided as part of the new report and that if there was a difference of opinion between staff and the RCD on a particular issue, a clearer explanation should be provided on the rationale for the disagreement. Concern was expressed that the report was very vague about what was required to integrate people with disabilities into the community and the suggestion was made that the next report could provide more detailed information on how this could be accomplished.

During the discussion, in response to some of the comments made by Committee members, Ms. Clark spoke at length about the disabled in Richmond. She expressed concern that the RCD had never received a 'piece of the pie' and that people with disabilities were being discriminated against. She referred to a number of programs which were intended for the disabled which she felt were not being financially supported by the City.

It was moved and seconded

***That report (dated September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2000, from the General Manager, Urban Development), regarding the Richmond Committee on Disability, be referred to staff for meetings with the Committee.***

Prior to the question on the motion being called, discussion continued on whether a referral was required. Comments were made that (i) additional dialogue was required with the Committee on their concerns and a future report would provide clarity on where the issues lay; (ii) the philosophies and financial issues had to be separated; (iii) it was important to know what was currently available with regard to programs for the disabled and those areas where improvements were required. However, opinions were also voiced that adoption of the staff recommendation would accomplish the same thing, as the result would be further discussion with the RCD on their issues.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

OPPOSED: Mayor Halsey-Brandt  
Cllr. Dang  
Kumagai  
Greenhill

5. **FRASER BASIN COUNCIL - FLOOD PROTECTION ISSUES UPDATE**

(Report: Sept. 8/00, File No.: 6045-11) (REDMS No. 185851)

Mr. McLellan gave a short PowerPoint presentation on flood protection issues. In response to questions, he provided the following information:

- based on the response of the public at the recent symposium held at the Vancouver International Airport and the interest shown in the flood proofing sessions, staff were confident that there would be a good turnout for the public consultation program
- the proposed mid-island dyke, in combination with other methods, was being considered as part of the increased requirements for flood protection.

It was moved and seconded

***That staff initiate a public consultation program to determine the level of acceptance for increased flood construction requirements in Richmond.***

CARRIED

6. **PARKING PROGRAM**

(Report: Sept. 12/00, File No.: 6455-01) (REDMS No. 177714, 172601)

It was moved and seconded

***That an additional Parking Patroller position be created and added to the City's position complement control.***

Prior to the question being called, advice was provided by the Manager, Community Bylaws & Administration, Sandra Tokarczyk that staff were in the process of filling the 3 vacant positions, and that 4 parking patrollers were required to deliver and maintain an acceptable level of service in the community and to other City departments.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

## FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

7. **BOARD OF VARIANCE ESTABLISHMENT AND PROCEDURE BYLAW NO. 7150**

(Report: Aug. 31/00, File No.: 8060-20-7150) (REDMS No. 181693, 164161)

It was moved and seconded

***That Board of Variance Establishment and Procedure Bylaw No. 7150 be introduced and given first, second and third readings.***

CARRIED

8. **WELLNESS CENTRE AT CITY HALL**

(Report: Sept. 14/00, File No.: 1850-02) (REDMS No. 158564, 156924)

It was moved and seconded

***That Council authorize a financial contribution of \$70,000, of which 50% would be paid back by employees on a user fee system, toward the cost of outfitting and equipping a Corporate Wellness Centre at City Hall.***

Prior to the question being called, questions were raised about whether there would be sufficient user support to repay 50% of the cost. Advice was given by the Director, Human Resources Mike Kirk that based on the number of people who were currently participating in the City's Wellness Program, repayment should not be an issue. Discussion also centred around the feasibility of allowing the City Centre Community Association to operate a program at the Wellness Centre with their own staff, and using the City's equipment. It was suggested that the fee charged participants of the program could be used to help pay for the equipment. Mr. Kirk advised however, that this scenario had not been considered as the centre was a City, not a joint use, facility.

Discussion continued briefly, during which the comment was made that once the centre had been open for a period of time, a review should be undertaken to determine if sick days were reduced as a result of providing this service. The suggestion was also made that an investigation should be undertaken to determine if a similar centre could be provided at the Works Yard.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded  
*That the meeting adjourn (6:08 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, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2000.

---

Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt  
Chair

---

Fran J. Ashton  
Executive Assistant