



City of Richmond

Report to Committee

To: General Purposes Committee
From: W. Glenn McLaughlin
 Chief Licence Inspector & Risk Manager
Re: **Business Licence Bylaw No. 7360**
Amendment Bylaw 9212

Date: January 29, 2015
File: 12-8275-02/2015-Vol
 01

Staff Recommendation

That Business Licence Bylaw No. 7360, Amendment Bylaw No. 9212, that increases the maximum number of Class A Taxicabs to 107 and Class N Taxicabs to 41, be introduced and given first, second and third readings.

W. Glenn McLaughlin
 Chief Licence Inspector & Risk Manager
 (604-276-4136)

Att.

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Law	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE	INITIALS: 	APPROVED BY CAO

Staff Report

Origin

The City of Richmond establishes the maximum number of taxicab vehicles licensed in the City through Business Licence Bylaw No. 7360 and locally regulates them under the Vehicle for Hire Regulation Bylaw No. 6900.

This report deals with an application submitted to the Passenger Transportation Board (PTB) by Richmond Taxi to approve 15 new additional vehicles to their fleet operations comprised of 10 conventional taxis and 5 wheelchair accessible vans. In January of 2015 the PTB made the following decision on the application;

“15 additional vehicles (10 conventional taxis and 5 accessible taxis) are approved”

In light of the decision made by the PTB and at the request of the Richmond Taxi Company, staff are bringing forward a proposed Amendment Bylaw No. 9212 (Bylaw 9212) to increase the number of taxicabs permitted under Business Licence Bylaw No. 7360, which will allow the additional vehicles to be licenced by the City of Richmond.

Findings of Fact

Taxicabs are also licenced by the PTB and provincially regulated under the Passenger Transportation Act. The City looks to the review and diligence carried out by the PTB in the determination of the demand for additional PTB taxicab licences.

In October of 2014 Richmond Taxi submitted an application to the PTB for an additional 15 taxicab vehicles - 10 conventional taxis and 5 wheelchair accessible vans. In their review of the application the PTB takes into consideration, among other criteria, the background of the applicant, the reasoning and statistics provided regarding the increase, and submissions from other parties who wish to speak to the application.

In their decision, the PTB notes that based on all of the information submitted and reviewed that if approved, the increase “would promote sound economic conditions in the passenger transportation business in British Columbia.” The full decision is attached to this report (Attachment 1).

Pursuant to Council Policy 9311, prior to the adoption of Bylaw 9212, the proposed amendment will be published in a local newspaper for two consecutive publications to give persons and businesses who may consider themselves affected by the amendment an opportunity to submit any comments to the City.

Financial Impact

None

Conclusion

Staff are recommending an amendment to Business Licence Bylaw No. 7360 to increase the number of Class A taxicabs by 10 vehicles and Class N taxicabs by 5 vehicles, consistent with the PTB decision.


Joanne Hikida
Supervisor Business Licence
(604-276-4155)

JMH:jmh

Att. 1: PTB Licence Application Decision



Business Licence Bylaw No. 7360, Amendment Bylaw 9212

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts as follows:

1. Business Licence bylaw No. 7360, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsections 2.1.27.3(a) and (b) and substituting the following:
 - (a) for use as Class A taxicabs is 107; and
 - (b) for use as Class N taxicabs is 41.

2. This Bylaw is cited as “**Business Licence Bylaw No. 7360, Amendment Bylaw No. 9212**”.

FIRST READING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED for content by originating dept. 
APPROVED for legality by Solicitor 

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER

Licence Application Decision

Taxi – Additional Vehicles

Application #	AV260-14	Applicant	Richmond Cabs Ltd.
Trade Name (s)	Richmond Taxi		
Principals	BASRA, Opinder Pal Singh MANN, Charanjit Singh SANDHU, Yadwinder Singh SINGH, Gurdeep	MANGAT, Manjinder S. SANDHU, Harpal Singh SOHI, Indermohan Singh	
Address	2440 Shell Road, Richmond BC V6X 2P1		
Applicant's Representative	William McLachlan, McLachlan, Brown Anderson		
Current Licence	70391 (copy attached)		
Application Summary	Additional Vehicles - Taxi Add 15 vehicles (10 conventional and 5 accessible). This will increase the maximum fleet size to 77 vehicles (66 conventional and 11 accessible).		
Date Published in Weekly Bulletin	October 22, 2014		
Submitters (and representatives)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kimber Cabs Ltd. • Garden City Cabs of Richmond Ltd. (GCCR) (Marshall Pawar, Counsel) • Grewal Bimalpreet Singh (late submission – not considered) 		
Board Decision	15 additional vehicles (10 conventional taxis and 5 accessible taxis) are approved		
Decision Date	January 19, 2015		
Panel Chair	Spencer Mikituk		

I. Introduction

This is an application from Richmond Cabs Ltd. (RCL) dba Richmond Taxi. The applicant is applying for 15 additional vehicles, 10 conventional taxis and 5 wheelchair accessible vans (WATs). RCL currently holds a passenger transportation licence, #70391, with a Special Authorization: Passenger Directed Vehicles. RCL is permitted to operate a fleet of 62 vehicles, of which 56 are conventional taxis and 6 are WATs. RCL is also authorized to operate an additional 2 conventional taxis, provided the Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA) has approved airport licences for 71 or more vehicles in RCL's fleet or its

corporately related company, Coral Cabs Ltd. (Coral). Coral, under passenger transportation licence #70363, is authorized to operate a maximum fleet size of 19 vehicles, all of which are conventional taxis. RCL and Coral are located in Richmond, British Columbia.

II. Background

The applicant states that although this application is in the name of RCL, the RCL licence is operated in conjunction with Coral, as if it was one operating entity. With the 64 taxis in RCL's fleet and the additional 19 taxis in Coral's fleet there is an overall fleet of 83 taxis. This fleet runs as if it was one unit. As a result, the statistics, the projections, and the business model enclosed with this application are based on operating a fleet of 83 taxis, not just the 64 taxis of RCL. RCL and Coral have common corporate control and operate through a common dispatch; common business offices and administration supplied by the management company Richmond Taxi Co. Holdings Ltd.

The past applications and decisions included the following:

- AV1622-05, addition of 15 taxis, approved in part (2 conventional and 2 WATs), published July 26, 2006
- AV2633-07, additional 15 taxis refused, published July 9, 2008.
- AV83-09, additional 20 taxis, approved in part (2 conventional and 2 WATs), published September 9, 2009;
- 384-09, addition of Express Authorization for flip seats in 6 WATs, approved, published April 7, 2010;
- AV271-12, addition of 10 taxis, refused, published December 14, 2012.

Information received with this application:

- Letter from applicant's counsel
- Municipal notice
- Business plan
- Public need indicators
- Disclosure of unlawful activity and bankruptcy
- PDV vehicle proposal
- Accessible service plan
- Financial information
- Disclosure of passenger transportation ownership

-
- Grewal Bimalpreet Singh (late submission). I have reviewed this submission and have determined that it would not be of assistance in the decision making process. Therefore, I am not considering it in my review of this application.

The submission from Kimber Cabs Ltd. (Kimber) noted these areas of concern:

- Richmond is one of the fastest growing cities in the province. The PT Board should also consider that Kimber has a pending application.
- Adding more taxis to RCL as well as Kimber will improve taxi waiting times and promote business locally as well as British Columbia.
- Trip volumes have shrunk at the Vancouver International Airport (YVR) and drivers are becoming more dependent on local (Richmond) taxi business.

The submission from Garden City Cabs of Richmond Ltd. (GCCR) noted these areas of concern:

- There is no need for licensing more wheelchair accessible taxis in Richmond. GCCR notes that in 2013, counsel for RCL stated in a submission to a GCCR application that: from October 2012 to June 2013, wheelchair dispatch trips vary from 0.72% to 0.91% of the total number of RCL trips. *"RCL is the significant taxi provider in Richmond and there is simply no accessible business in Richmond that is not being properly serviced."*
- Before the PT Board approves the addition of any more conventional vehicles to the RCL/Coral fleet of vehicles, RCL/Coral needs to conclusively establish that the 2 companies are unable to make more effective use of their existing fleets by adjusting the scheduling of their vehicles at YVR.

The applicant responded to the submissions as follows:

- The Kimber Cabs submission urges the Board to grant all the requested licences to RCL, because Kimber Cabs acknowledges a strong demand for additional taxis in the City of Richmond. Although RCL submits that its application is well supported for the addition of 15 taxis, RCL does not acknowledge the Kimber Cabs' contention that trip volumes have shrunk at

YVR, nor does RCL acknowledge that it supports the pending application by Kimber Cabs.

- In response to GCCR submissions, the YVR monthly report on the Taxi Service Group will confirm that RCL is already reducing its intended operations at YVR to cover shortages in the City of Richmond. Part of the rationale for requesting additional taxis is to allow RCL to resume reasonable operations at YVR with its fleet.

The Board gives more weight to submissions that back up general claims with facts or details. I have considered the submissions and the responses in my review of this application.

V. Reasons

- (a) *Is there a public need for the service that the applicant proposes to provide under special authorization?*

Taxi companies who want more vehicles are expected to show that there is a public need for more taxis. Companies are expected to show why their current fleet is not large enough to handle more trips and why they need a specific number and type of vehicles for which they have applied. The Board wants to be satisfied that there is a reasonable connection between the number and type of vehicles requested and public need. Applicants should explain why other taxis in the area are not meeting the public need.

The applicant has provided the following evidence to support public need for additional vehicles:

- *Census Profile (2006) and Population Increase Statistics (1996-2014) for the City of Richmond.* The applicant states that in comparing the City of Richmond population growth over the past 10 years with the additional licences granted to RCL, the population growth has totaled 14% while the additional licences for RCL total in the 3% range.
- *RCL's HandyDart Customer Quick Report, dated June 30, 2009 through June 30, 2014, and an agreement dated August 8, 2014 between RCL and HandyDart.* The applicant states that there has been a significant increase in the volume of HandyDart business commencing in the summer of 2013. The statistics confirm that the business since summer 2013 has more than doubled the range of business from

2009 to summer 2013. The agreement with Handy Dart is anticipated to again significantly increase the taxi business that RCL will be receiving from HandyDart, given that HandyDart has adopted a business model of shifting some HandyDart van business to private taxis. In the case of the City of Richmond, that business is through RCL. RCL is the only taxi operator in the City of Richmond with a written contract with HandyDart for provision of taxi services.

- *Canada Post Quick Report, for provision of services to Canada Post June 2009 through June 2014.* This data shows a significant upturn in the Canada Post contract business occurring in 2011 towards the end of that year. Monday through Friday, Canada Post requires 148 trips each day to transport letter carriers to and from their routes.
- *Customer Quick Report with RCL and Translink.* A review of RCL's TransLink business from 2009 to present shows an increase of approximately 50%.
- *Customer Quick Report between RCL and the Workers Compensation Board.* This report shows a steady number of taxi trips between 2013 and 2014.
- *List of the new regular accounts that have been added to the RCL charge account customer list over the past 18 months as at August 6, 2014.* The applicant states that these new regular accounts are adding significant additional business that requires additional taxis.
- *Information on the RCL fleet at YVR which included a summary of trips monitored by transponder.* All statistics are provided by YVR. These statistics show a very significant increase in YVR business occurring in May 2014. An increase of approximately 15% has occurred from the earlier months of 2014 and the statistics from 2011-2013. The applicant states that the YVR business is increasing and there is no indication that it is temporary.
- *Summary of taxi charges on RCL account, Visa, MasterCard, Amex, and Debit (years 2009-2014).* The applicant claims that this summary of charge card activity is representative of the overall increase in business for RCL. The volume of charge card business has increased 2.5 times in the time period 2009-mid 2014.
- *Email correspondence between the YVR Ground Transportation Manager, Commercial Services and the General Manager of RCL.* The topic of the emails is the taxi shortages at the YVR South Terminal. The South Terminal is only served by RCL and Kimber Cabs. RCL has stated that they are not able to maintain its presence at the South terminal given the increase in business at YVR Main Terminal and the City of Richmond.

-
- *User Support statements.* Thirty seven user support statements were received, of which 25 were from frequent users of the service and refer to wait times/availability as an issue. Four of these user support statements referred to WATs. The remainder of user support statements (14) were either general in nature or state that they were satisfied with the service.
 - *A spreadsheet summary of data extracted from RCL's Pathfinder computer dispatch system into an Oracle database from February 2013 to July 2014.* This information relates to 77 conventional taxis and 6 WATs operated in the RCL/Coral fleet. The spreadsheet included the following information:
 - An analysis of monthly conventional taxi trips broken down by trip types, i.e., dispatched, flagged and YVR Airport.
 - An analysis of the monthly WATs trips broken down by trip types, i.e., conventional dispatched trips for the wheelchair accessible vehicles, flags for conventional transportation, and actual wheelchair trips.
 - The daily average number of vehicles on shift each month: The average number of trips that each vehicle has completed on a daily basis and the average number of trips per hour.
 - Waiting times: The dispatched trips are grouped into 3 categories, peak, medium, and low, based on the amount of time waited. Wait times are derived from computer records for dispatched time and meter on. Peak period is from 07:01 to 10:00 and 15:01 to 18:00. Medium period is from 10:01 to 15:00 and 18:01 to 01:00. Low period is from 01:01 to 07:00.
 - The number of dispatched trips that were cancelled by the customer or no show upon arrival at the pickup address.
 - The business performance target for RCL is to provide customer service on all trips within 10 minutes.
 - The applicant's wait time data shows that approximately 80% of conventional taxi trips are being provided within the intended 10 minute window. Most of the remaining 20% of trips are being provided within a range of 10 to 30 minutes.
 - For wheelchair accessible taxis (WATs), approximately 70% of the trips are being provided within the intended 10 minute window. Most of the remaining 30% of WATs trips are being provided within the 10 to 30 minute timeframe.
 - Monthly trip volume data was provided for the 19-month period of February 2013 to July 2014. The Board did a year-over-year comparison of same-month data. For the overlapping 6 months of 2013 and 2014, trip volumes with conventional taxis increased 14%.

-
- For wheelchair accessible taxis, monthly trip volume for the overlapping 6 months (February to July) increased 9% from 2013 to 2014.
 - The applicant provided vehicle usage statistics that include average trips per vehicle by shift and by hour, and hours per shift. On average, *vehicles on shift* is at or near 100%, and other vehicle usage statistics appear consistent with a taxi operation that is well used.
 - RCL states that the addition of 10 conventional taxis and 5 WATs calculated into the number of individual trips that can be accomplished by one taxi is the number of vehicles required by RCL to bring both conventional and WATs accessible taxis under the 10 minute range.

RCL has submitted a considerable amount of public need indicators. In particular, the applicant has, in this case, provided substantive evidence that trip volumes have increased for the taxi fleet as a whole. RCL has shown that on average, the amount of vehicles on shift is at or near 100% for both conventional and WATs vehicles. It also shown that wait times appear high for the Richmond area, particularly for people who rely on wheelchair accessible taxi services. I have assigned strong weighting to the following evidence which substantiates my findings:

- the spreadsheet summary of data extracted from RCL's Pathfinder computer dispatch system from February 2013 to July 2014;
- RCL's HandyDart Customer Quick Report, dated June 30, 2009 through June 30, 2014, and an agreement dated August 8, 2014 between RCL and HandyDart;
- Canada Post Quick Report, for provision of services to Canada Post June 2009 through June 2014;
- customer Quick Report with RCL and Translink;
- customer Quick Report between RCL and the Workers Compensation Board;
- a list of the new regular accounts that have been added to the RCL charge account customer list over the past 18 months as at August 6, 2014.;
- information on the RCL fleet at YVR which included a summary of trips monitored by transponder and email correspondence between the YVR Ground Transportation Manager, Commercial Services and the General Manager of RCL;
- User Support statements.

The other public need support material and information supplied by RCL, while not as persuasive, provides corroboration that the applicant is not able to manage the trip volume increases with its existing fleet and that there is a public need for additional capacity.

The applicant has provided significant factual information and verifiable evidence to indicate that market demand is not currently being met and that a public need exists for the proposed number and type of vehicles.

The applicant has satisfied me that there is a public need for its proposed fifteen additional vehicles.

(b) Is the applicant a fit and proper person to provide that service and is the applicant capable of providing that service?

The Board looks at fitness in two parts:

- (i) is the applicant a “fit and proper person” to provide the proposed service; and
- (ii) is the applicant capable of providing that service?

Richmond Taxi Co. Holding Ltd., was founded over 80 years ago. It is referred to throughout the application as the Richmond Taxi Group and is the parent company for Richmond Cabs Ltd. and Coral Cabs Ltd. They share a common group of shareholders, operate under one dispatch system and both use the trade name Richmond Taxi. The applicant is one of the subsidiaries, Richmond Cabs Ltd., incorporated on April 22, 1965. The company is owned primarily by its owner-operators.

The disclosure forms of Unlawful Activity and Bankruptcy and Passenger Transportation Ownership were completed to the satisfaction of the Board. There has not been any information brought to my attention to prove that the applicants are not fit and proper.

RCL and Coral National Safety Code certificates are in good standing.

RCL has submitted their Accessible Service Plan and the supporting training program, which were reviewed and found to be acceptable to the Board.

I note that the file from the Passenger Transportation Branch contained information regarding various complaints regarding operating outside the service area. During 2012/2013 five administrative penalties were imposed. In 2013/2014, two administrative penalties were imposed. RCL reports that it has a process in place for progressive discipline, enforcement activity and consequences for the drivers who do not comply. The

Board carefully considered the issue of applicant fitness. The Board expects licensees to comply with their obligations as set out in the Passenger Transportation Act, regulations and their terms and conditions of licence. Given these circumstances, and the reduction in administrative penalties, I find that the administrative penalty record would not, in and of itself, be a barrier to the application approval.

Financial information included the following consolidated financial statements: balance sheet, statement of deficit, statement of income, and statement of cash flows for the years 2011, 2012, and 2013. They indicate that RCL has been viable and stable over this period of time. RCL has also supplied 3 year financial projections showing the additional 15 vehicles and detail the income and the assumptions that pertain to this fleet addition. RCL has stated that management estimates revenues to increase by 3% a year (from normal operations), which provides the RCL a strong financial base to absorb the initial startup cost for the 15 additional vehicles if approved. RCL has stated that it believes that the company has adequate cash and other sources (shareholders loans) on hand to effectively manage the additional vehicles without having to make significant changes in their current structure of assets and liabilities.

The applicant has previously been deemed fit, proper and capable in order to obtain and maintain its licence. If this application were approved, the applicant states that there will be no change as to who is in care and control of the operation or vehicles. RCL has its infrastructure in place and is an established taxi operator with a history of running a viable taxi service. RCL appears to have the resources and skills to manage the proposed expansion of its fleet.

I find the applicant to be a fit and proper person with the skills and resources to be capable of managing and providing the service.

(c) *Would the application, if granted, promote sound economic conditions in the passenger transportation business in British Columbia?*

The Board looks at the "economic conditions" issue from a wide-ranging view. The economic conditions of the "transportation business in British Columbia" are considered ahead of the economic and financial interests of an individual applicant or operator. The Board supports healthy competition. The Board discourages competition that could unduly harm existing service providers.

III. Relevant Legislation

Division 3 of the *Passenger Transportation Act* (the "Act") applies to this application. The Act requires the Registrar of Passenger Transportation to forward applications for Special Authorization licences to the Passenger Transportation Board (Board). Section 28(1) of the Act says that the Board may approve the application, if the Board considers that:

- (a) there is a public need for the service the applicant proposed to provide under any special authorization.
- (b) the applicant is a fit and proper person to provide that service and is capable of providing that service, and
- (c) the application, if granted, would promote sound economic conditions in the passenger transportation business in British Columbia.

I will consider each of these points in making my decision.

IV. Rationale and Submissions

(a) Applicant's Rationale

RCL states that due to the increase in dispatch calls, the reduced quality of service and loss of business over the period of February 2013 to July 2014 has made it imperative to add additional 15 taxis to better serve their community. Additional vehicles, including wheelchair accessible vehicles, are required to reduce wait times for individual and corporate customers. The additional vehicles will also reduce the number of cancelled calls. With more vehicles in the RCL fleet, RCL can also better serve the remote areas of Richmond.

(b) Submissions & Applicant's Response

Submissions were received from:

- Kimber Cabs Ltd.
- Garden City Cabs of Richmond Ltd. (GCCR) (Marshall Pawar, Counsel)

Reviewing this particular application, the applicant has demonstrated to my satisfaction that RCL is not meeting customer expectations regarding waiting times and reliable taxi service. It would also appear that the growing Richmond/YVR marketplace can absorb these additional vehicles.

At the time of writing this decision, the Board has not published any recent applications from Kimber Cabs to add vehicles to its fleet. Therefore, Kimber's reference to a "pending application" is not relevant to my decision. With regard to the submission from GCCR, I find that the applicant addressed the issue of airport service and RCL's exclusive HandyDart contract dated August 8, 2014 has resulted in a significant increase in WATs business commencing in the summer of 2013.

As a result, I find that the application, if granted, would promote sound economic conditions in the passenger transportation business in British Columbia.

VI. Conclusion

For the reasons above, this application is approved.

I establish the activation requirements and the terms and conditions of licence that are attached to this decision as Appendix I. These form an integral part of the decision.

Licence Required to Operate Vehicles	The Registrar of Passenger Transportation must issue the applicant a licence before the applicant can operate any vehicles approved in this decision.
Approval of application may expire	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant must activate at least 50% of the vehicles within 6 months of the date of this decision. 2. If the applicant does not meet the requirements set out in 1 above, this Special Authorization expires. 3. The Passenger Transportation Board may vary the requirements set out in 1 above, if circumstances warrant it. 4. If an applicant needs more time to activate its vehicles, then the applicant must make a request to the Board before the end of the 6 month activation period. <p>(Note: "activate" means that the applicant has submitted the documents required to obtain a Special Authorization Vehicle Identifier to the Registrar of Passenger Transportation.)</p>
Notice to Registrar	<p>The Registrar must not, without direction from the Board, issue the applicant a licence or any Special Authorization Vehicle Identifiers if the applicant has not activated at least 50% of the vehicles within 6 months of the date of this decision.</p> <p>(Note: activated means that the applicant has submitted to the Registrar of Passenger Transportation the documents required to obtain a Special Authorization Vehicle Identifier.)</p>

Special Authorization: Passenger Directed Vehicle (PDV)	
Terms & Conditions:	
Maximum Fleet Size:	<p>At any time - a fleet size of 77 vehicles may be operated; of which 66 may be conventional vehicles.</p> <p>YVR Contract - The licensee may operate an additional 2 conventional taxis if the Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA) has approved airport licenses for 71 or more vehicles in fleet of the licensee and its corporately related company, Coral Cabs Ltd.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. When making application for renewal of its licence, Richmond Cabs Ltd. must submit a letter to the Registrar of Passenger Transportation from Ground Transportation, Vancouver International Airport Authority, stating that its contract with Richmond Cabs Ltd. remains in good standing. b. The letter referred to in (a) must confirm the number of airport licenses approved for Richmond Cabs Ltd. c. If the number of airport licenses is 71 or less, the licensee must return 2 identifiers for conventional taxis to the Registrar.

Specialty Vehicles:	The accessible taxis must be operated in accordance with the <i>Motor Vehicle Act Regulations</i> including Division 10 (<i>motor carriers</i>) and Division 44 (<i>mobility aid accessible taxi standards</i>), as amended from time to time, and in accordance with any other applicable equipment regulations and standards.
Vehicle Capacity:	Vehicles can accommodate a driver and not less than 2 and not more than 7 passengers.
Express authorizations:	(i) Vehicles must be equipped with a meter that calculates fares on a time and distance basis. (ii) Vehicles may be equipped with a top light. (iii) The operator of the vehicle may, from within the originating areas only, pick up passengers who hail or flag the motor vehicle from the street.
Flip Seat Authorization:	Passengers may be seated in moveable "flip seats" or "let down seats" that are installed behind the driver in accordance with Division 10.07(5) of the Motor Vehicle Act Regulations.
Service Priority Limitation:	Persons with mobility aids who require the accessible taxi for transportation purposes are priority clients for the dispatch of accessible taxis. The applicant must at all times use a dispatch and reservation system that dispatches accessible taxis on a priority basis to clients who have a need for accessible vehicles.
Service 1:	<i>The following terms and conditions apply to Service 1:</i>
Originating Area:	Transportation of passengers may only originate from any point in the City of Richmond, including the Vancouver International Airport.
Destination Area:	Transportation of passengers may terminate at any point in British Columbia.
Return Trips:	The same passengers may only be returned from where their trip terminates in the <i>destination area</i> to the City of Richmond, excluding the Vancouver International Airport, if the return trip is arranged by the time the originating trip terminates.
Reverse Trips:	Transportation of passengers may only originate in the <i>destination area</i> if the transportation terminates in the City of Richmond, excluding the Vancouver International Airport, and the cost of the trip is billed to an active account held by the licence holder that was established before the trip was arranged.
Service Limitation:	A minimum of 2 accessible taxis must be operated and available for hire 24 hours each day every day of the week.
Service 2:	<i>The following terms and conditions apply to Service 2:</i>
Originating Area:	Transportation of passengers may only originate from any point in the City of Richmond including the Vancouver International Airport.
Destination Area:	Transportation of passengers may terminate at any point beyond the British Columbia/United States border when engaged in an extra-provincial undertaking.
Taxi Cameras:	Taxi camera equipment may only be installed and operated in vehicles when the licensee is in compliance with applicable taxi camera rules, standards and

	orders of the Passenger Transportation Board.
Taxi Bill of Rights:	<p>a) A Taxi Bill of Rights issued by the Ministry of Transportation (“Taxi Bill of Rights”) must be affixed to an interior rear-seat, side window of each taxicab operated under the licence.</p> <p>b) The Taxi Bill of Rights must at all times be displayed in an upright position with the complete text intact and visible to passengers.</p> <p>c) Licensees may only display a current Taxi Bill of Rights.</p>
Eco-friendly taxis:	Any additional non-accessible vehicles approved for this licence on or after June 11, 2007 and for which a passenger transportation identifier is issued, must be operated as 'eco-friendly taxis' as defined by Board Policy Guidelines in effect at the time the vehicle is issued a passenger transportation identifier.
Taxi Identification Code:	On or before June 16, 2014, each vehicle operated by the licensee must have a unique taxi identification code (TIC) affixed to the inside and outside of the vehicles in a manner that complies with applicable rules, specifications and orders of the Passenger Transportation Board.
Transfer of a licence:	This special authorization may not be assigned or transferred except with the approval of the Board pursuant to section 30 of the Passenger Transportation Act.