



## General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Cynthia Chen  
Councillor Derek Dang  
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Rob Howard  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Harold Steves

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Tuesday, September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2007, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### DELEGATION

2. *Dr. Jeff Coleman, representing the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, to provide an update on Richmond Health Services.* (File No.: 0150-01)

The Chair stated that Dr. Coleman had indicated that he would be late to the meeting, and he advised that the meeting would continue with the next agenda items while awaiting Dr. Coleman's arrival.

Please see Page 10 for the minutes relating to Dr. Coleman's presentation.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

## BUSINESS & FINANCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT / PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

### 3. **BUSINESS LICENCING OF CLASS A AND CLASS N TAXICABS IN RICHMOND – FOLLOW-UP REPORT**

(Report: Sept. 4/07, File No.: 12-8275-02) (REDMS No. 2070436)

The Manager, Business Liaison, Amarjeet Rattan, accompanied by the Director of Transportation, Victor Wei, indicated that they were available to respond to questions. Mr. Wei then provided Committee members with a copy of correspondence received from Sam Hundal, Secretary and Director, Garden City Cabs of Richmond Ltd., in which information was provided that the company supports the staff recommendations now being considered. Further information was provided that Garden City Cabs had an application pending with the BC Passenger Transportation Board (PTB) to operate a new taxi company in Richmond with 30 vehicles.

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

- staff were of the opinion, based on feedback, that residents were generally happy with the taxi service provided by both companies however stakeholders felt that improvements could be made to the service provided to the disabled
- removal of the cap on the maximum number of vehicle licences which could be issued for Class A and Class N taxicabs could allow more taxi companies to apply for Class N licences, which would result in an increase in the provision of service to the disabled and the City's aging population
- with reference to the completion of a suitable disability awareness training course, the City could choose to provide training, however, the Provincial Government has designated the Justice Institute as being the provider of this course and all taxi drivers must be trained through that agency.

During the discussion, a question was raised about whether the City could impose conditions on a taxi business licence which would prevent the owner of a PTB approved taxi permit from selling that permit. Staff were asked to consider this issue. As well, discussion took place on the process which was followed by taxicab companies to obtain vehicle licences, and the roles of the Passenger Transportation Board, the Passenger Transportation Branch and the City in this process. Also discussed were the applications filed with the PTB by Richmond Cabs Ltd. and Kimber Cabs Ltd. and the rationale for the rejection of the Kimber Cabs application.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

Reference was made to the application pending with the PTB from Garden City Cabs of Richmond Ltd., and a brief discussion took place on whether this company might be issued a vehicle licence. Also discussed was the definition for an 'accessible' cab as compared to a 'user friendly' cab.

Reference was made to the denial of the Kimber Cabs Ltd. application to the PTB because the company had not proven satisfactorily that there was a demand for additional Class N licences in the City. Questions were asked about staff's recommendation that the cap on the maximum number of licences to be issued be removed as a means of meeting the need for additional taxis, when the PTB did not accept that there was such a demand. Information was provided in response that the purpose of the removal of the cap was not intended to meet any demand but rather to simplify and improve administrative efficiency.

Concern was expressed that by removing the cap, the City could lose control over the service provided by taxicabs, and questions were raised about how quality service could be provided to Richmond residents. In response, reference was made to the staff recommendations and information was provided that the proposed amendments to the Vehicle for Hire Bylaw would describe the quality of service which would be expected from local taxi operators. Further advice was given that in the event a taxicab operator failed to comply with the new service standards, there would be provisions in the bylaw to issue fines and to suspend or cancel licences, if necessary.

Questions were asked about whether the City could withhold the issuance of business licences to a taxicab company in the event that the PTB authorized the issuance of 10 vehicle licences, and a brief discussion ensued on this matter. Also addressed was whether Class N taxicabs could be required to provide service to the disabled. With reference to staff recommendation #4, in response to questions about how the need would be assessed, information was provided that staff did not want to include specific figures on the number of taxicabs required, and were of the opinion that the market would determine how many cabs were needed. Further advice was given that complying with the PTB criteria and market needs would eliminate the guesswork of trying to determine the number of taxicabs which were required.

Reference was made to the taxicabs which provide service to the Airport and to the difficulties faced by local residents in trying to take a taxicab from the airport to their homes because of the relatively short distances. Questions were raised about whether, if the maximum vehicle limit was removed, additional taxicabs could operate at the airport. Information was provided that taxicab operators required an additional licence issued by the Airport and that the Airport controlled the number of taxis which operated from that facility.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

Questions were raised about which authority was responsible for undertaking safety inspections of taxicabs, and advice was given that such inspections were undertaken by the Commercial Vehicle Safety Enforcement Branch and the City which conducted inspections every six months.

Vince Miele, Chair, accompanied by Frances Clark, Secretary, Richmond Committee on Disability (RCD), spoke in support of the staff recommendations. He stated that the RCD had many concerns about the service provided to disabled clients and to those living in Richmond, and he spoke briefly about trying to access a disabled accessible cab after certain hours. Mr. Miele also advised that the RCD had concerns with cab operation and the safety of the passengers.

Ms. Clark commented briefly on the denial of the Kimber Cabs Ltd. application to the PTB for additional vehicle licences, during which she referred to correspondence sent by the City to the PTB which provided information on the performance and safety record of the company. She then spoke about a new dual purpose type of taxicab which was available which could provide service to seniors, the disabled and to those confined to wheelchairs. Ms. Clark added that the needs of the disabled must be addressed and that the RCD was concerned about whether there would be a sufficient number of disabled accessible taxis in the City.

Mr. Miele referred to the difficulties faced by local residents in trying to get a taxicab from the airport to their homes, and he noted that the same problem existed in other cities. He suggested that airport taxi drivers who take local passengers could be issued a 'short trip tag' which would allow them to go to the head of the line when returning to the airport, rather than having to go to the end.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and the delegation, during which in response to questions, the following comments and information were provided:

- the RCD did not receive a response from the PTB about the lack of quality taxicab service for the disabled
- the quality of service; safety of service; hours of service; the reduced number of taxicabs which were available during the evening hours which impacted the number of wheelchair accessible cabs which were available during these hours; and the extended length of time taken to get a taxicab during shift changes, were all issues which had to be addressed
- if responses were not timely, then that seem to would indicate that more taxicabs were needed; the reasons for the lack of response were varied; it may be possible that with additional taxicabs and the competition from additional taxicab companies that service would improve



## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

- the RCD agreed with City staff about the need for standards to regulate the provision of service, quality of service and safety.

During the discussion with the delegation, questions were raised as to whether there was a sufficient number of taxicabs to service Richmond's population now and in the future, especially as Richmond's tourist industry was growing. Also addressed during the discussion was the issue of whether the proposed recommendations adequately addressed 'quality of service', and the need for accessibility for the disabled. Reference was made to the cost of the new dual-access taxicabs and concern was expressed that there could be an additional cost to transport an individual who was in a wheelchair.

Mamood Awan, the owner of a business in Richmond, advised that his experiences with Richmond Cabs had always been positive. He also advised that he was concerned about control and accessibility for the disabled which he felt were two important issues. He further commented that issuing a vehicle licence to another company from outside of Richmond was not going to resolve the problem, and he expressed the belief that guidelines should be written in such a manner that the existing taxicab companies must comply with these guidelines. He added that City should monitor the companies, because ultimately, Council was responsible for the community. Mr. Awan noted that the 2010 Olympic Winter Games were coming and the City needed to prepare for that event. He suggested that additional taxicabs were not going to solve the problem at the present time, and recommended that vehicle licences should not be issued to an outside company which would in turn sell the licences and leave the community.

Mr. Awan referred to the amount of time which had been taken to deal with the taxicab issue over the past year, and he suggested that a task force should be created to obtain advice from the 'grass roots', i.e. taxicab companies and operators. He stated that the concerns of the Council, the community, Richmond Cabs could be addressed by the task force which could then submit recommendations to staff and the Committee. In concluding his presentation, Mr. Awan asked that vehicle licences not be issued to companies 'coming through the back door'.

Mr. Ken Jang, corporate counsel for Richmond Cabs Ltd., advised that his client supported the recommendations contained in the staff report with the exception of recommendation no. 3. He stated that his client was opposed to the removal of the cap on the maximum number of vehicle licences which could be issued for Class A and Class N taxicabs. Mr. Jang added that his client was willing to work with the City regarding this matter.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

Mr. Jang then reviewed the history of the application made by Richmond Cabs to the PTB in 2006, and the resulting approval for an additional four vehicle licences. Mr. Jang added that part of the referral which was made in October, 2006, required that staff were to have consulted with the industry to improve service and to determine if there was a need for additional licences. He stated that Richmond Cabs would be happy to work with the City to obtain additional licences.

Mr. Jang referred to the proposed removal of the vehicle licence cap and suggested that if additional licences were put on the road without the City having control, the result would have a negative impact on the livelihood of existing taxicab drivers. He added that conflict could arise at some point in the future. He further stated that his client was committed to providing the best possible service in the City, and that his client looked forward to working with the City to make improvements. He also advised that his client was willing to face the scrutiny of the City to determine if the service provided by his client was adequate.

In concluding his presentation, Mr. Jang stated that if more licences were to be issued, then the City should ensure that these licences were issued to current taxicab companies with proven records.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and Mr. Jang, during which in response to questions, he advised that:

- the vehicle licences awarded to Richmond Cabs Ltd. were registered in the name of the taxi company but the vehicles were owned by individual operators who were responsible for these vehicles; Class N type vehicles were more costly to purchase and were less environmentally-friendly than Class A type vehicles
- Richmond Cabs Ltd. was currently considering the idea of submitting a new application to the PTB but was waiting for a decision to be made by the City relating to the taxicab vehicle licence cap issue
- currently if a Richmond Cab operator failed to comply with the company code of conduct, the operator would be fined or suspended
- only seven Richmond Cab operators were not licenced to go to the airport
- if the City felt that there was a particular need for Class N licences, Richmond Cabs would be willing to work with the City to determine the need and to make the appropriate application to the PTB; if Richmond did not support the application and advised the PTB accordingly, then the PTB would take that into consideration
- Richmond Cabs wanted to work with the City to prove itself and to face the scrutiny of staff; Richmond Cabs was of the belief that it was the best taxicab company in the City



## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

- expanding the number of vehicle licences in the City would only create more problems
- if the company received approval for Class N licences from the PTB, the company was required to operate Class N vehicles; to convert existing Class A licences to Class N licences would be a very expensive proposition for the operator and there was no incentive for that individual to go to that expense
- all requests for cabs were handled through the Richmond Cabs dispatch centre which reviewed the availability of all vehicles.

Mr. Haavis Khan, representing Richmond Cabs Ltd., advised that the company had been in operation in the City for more than sixty years, and had more than 300 employees. He added that the company would submit an application to the PTB for additional Class N vehicle licences to provide more efficient service to the Richmond public, if that was the wish of the City.

Mr. Gurveet Singh, a taxicab driver with Richmond Cabs Ltd. at the airport, referred to the application being made by Garden City Cabs of Richmond Ltd. to the PTB for authority to operate a new taxicab company in the City with 30 vehicles, and he questioned whether the City had any input into the decision of the PTB. Advice was given in response that the City was not content with not having any input into that decision.

Mr. Singh then commented on the restrictions faced by airport taxicab drivers. In response advice was given that this restriction had been put into effect by his company and did not involve the City.

Discussion then ensued briefly among Committee members, during which in response to questions, advice was given that vehicle licences were approved and granted to a specific taxicab company and that it was the decision of Richmond Cabs as to how the licences would be allocated to the drivers.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the following **referral** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That Recommendation No. 3, "That staff bring forth amendments to the Business Licence Bylaw 7360 to eliminate the maximum number of vehicle licences that can be issued for Class A and Class N taxicabs", be referred to staff for the preparation of a report which would:*

- (1) *include information on the need, if any, for additional Class A and Class N taxi cabs in the City both now and for the future, and whether this need could be addressed within the City's existing taxi companies or were additional companies required; and*
- (2) *include mechanisms to ensure that the needs of the disabled community were addressed and included in a bylaw, with appropriate fines or licence removal for those companies which did not comply with the City's standards.*

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

The question on the motion was not called, as concern was expressed that the City would lose control if the cap on the maximum number of vehicle licences which would be permitted in the City, was removed. Comments were also made about the need to focus on the provision of better service to the City's disabled and aging population, and about the need for additional information as reflected in the referral motion. Questions were also raised about whether the City could control the number of taxi cabs in the City through the issuance of business licences. As a result of the discussion on this matter, the Chair directed that the following would be added as Part (3) to the referral motion now being considered, *'provide a legal opinion on whether or not the City has the authority to deny business licences for taxi cab companies once approval had been given by the Provincial Transportation Board for the issuance of taxi licences for companies wanting to operate in Richmond'*.

The question on the **referral** motion, as amended to read as follows:

*"That Recommendation No. 3, "That staff bring forth amendments to the Business Licence Bylaw 7360 to eliminate the maximum number of vehicle licences that can be issued for Class A and Class N taxicabs", be referred to staff for the preparation of a report which would:*

- (1) include information on the need, if any, for additional Class A and Class N taxi cabs in the City both now and for the future, and whether this need could be addressed within the City's existing taxi companies or were additional companies required;*
- (2) include mechanisms to ensure that the needs of the disabled community were addressed and included in a bylaw, with appropriate fines or licence removal for those companies which did not comply with the City's standards; and*
- (3) provide a legal opinion on whether or not the City has the authority to deny business licences for taxi cab companies once approval had been given by the Provincial Transportation Board for the issuance of taxi licences for companies wanting to operate in Richmond."*

was then called, and it was **CARRIED**, with Cllrs. Barnes, Evelina Halsey-Brandt and Steves opposed.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) That staff bring forth amendments to Vehicle for Hire Bylaw 6900 to:*
  - (a) add a Standard of Service section for all Class A and Class N taxicabs, including a provision that Class N taxicabs must give priority of service to people with disabilities;*
  - (b) require that all taxicabs display an enhanced tariff decal that includes information regarding the process for customers to register comments about the service they receive;*



## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

- (c) *require that all taxicab drivers must complete a suitable disability awareness training course offered by the Justice Institute of BC and approved by Council;*
  - (d) *strengthen provisions that Class N taxicabs must have adequate equipment for transporting people with mobility aids with such equipment to be maintained in proper working order; and*
  - (e) *add a Chauffeur Permit requirement section that specifically addresses application and appeal procedures.*
- (2) *That staff bring forward a report to add specific fines for violations made under the Vehicle for Hire Bylaw 6900.*
  - (3) *That a letter be sent to the Passenger Transportation Board requesting that any future taxi licences issued for Richmond-based taxicab operators provide for an increase in the number of accessible taxis available to serve Richmond.*
  - (4) *That the City request Commercial Vehicle Safety and Enforcement to jointly participate with City staff and Richmond RCMP in annual vehicle inspections of Richmond taxi operators with this inspection to coincide with one of the City's semi-annual inspections.*
  - (5) *That the curriculum of the disability awareness and sensitivity training course offered by the Disability Resource Centre be forwarded to the Justice Institute of BC for its consideration in the development of a new disability awareness course for taxicab drivers.*
  - (6) *That a copy of this report be forwarded to the Passenger Transportation Board for information.*

CARRIED

### LAW & COMMUNITY SAFETY DEPARTMENT

#### 4. APPOINTMENT OF BYLAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER – SHIH YU ARTHUR HSU

(Report: Aug. 15/07, File No.: 01-0172-03) (REDMS No. 2266562, 2266515)

It was moved and seconded

*That Shih Yu Arthur Hsu be appointed as a Bylaw Enforcement Officer in accordance with section 36 of the Police Act, and confirm that such appointment is for the term of his employment as a Bylaw Enforcement Officer with the City.*

CARRIED

At this point in the meeting, Dr. Coleman entered the room, and the Chair advised that the Committee would now hear Dr. Coleman's presentation.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

2. *Dr. Jeff Coleman, representing the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, to provide an update on Richmond Health Services.* (File No.: 0150-01)

Dr. Coleman gave a PowerPoint presentation (a copy of which is on file in the City Clerk's Office), regarding the status of services provided by Richmond Health Services, and in particular on:

- VCH Planning – Future Demand
- Projections: Richmond Hospital; Inpt Cases & Days, SDC Cases Based on Current Model/Assumptions
- Housing – A Basic Health Need
- Housing – Residential/Group Homes
- Mental Health & Addictions – Supportive Housing
- Current Seniors Housing – Capacity
- Seniors Housing – Future Needs
- Acute Services
- Acute Services (not yet approved)
- Public Health Update.

At the conclusion of the presentation, discussion then took place among Committee members and Dr. Coleman on:

- how new capital projects were funded
- the replacement of Lions Manor and whether the new facility could be constructed on the same site
- whether the 'per capita' money spent in Richmond on health care was equivalent to other areas within British Columbia
- the rationale for opting to construct a low rise health care facility to replace Lions Manor rather than a high-rise building, as had originally been proposed a number of years ago.

The Chair thanked Dr. Coleman for his presentation, during which he indicated that the City wished to work with him to improve the provision of health services to the City, and he asked that Dr. Coleman advise him of any assistance that the City could provide.

Dr. Coleman then left the meeting.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

## PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

### 5. **GARDEN CITY LAND (5555 NO. 4 ROAD) UPDATE**

(Report: Aug. 30/07, File No.: 08-4105-20-2007387179) (REDMS No. 2269718)

The General Manager, Planning & Development, Joe Erceg, accompanied by the Senior Manager Corporate Communications, Ted Townsend, and Senior Coordinator, Major Projects & Development Applications, Cecilia Achiam, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee.

Mr. Greg Lyle, of Innovative Research Group, then gave a PowerPoint presentation to review with Committee, the results of the *Richmond Community Survey* which had been commissioned by the Canada Lands Company (CLC) to understand the public views about the Garden City Land tri-partite agreement. A copy of this document is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, Mr. Lyle and staff on:

- the rationale for the City becoming the applicant for the ALR Exclusion application
- the timing of the completion of a conceptual plan for the future development of the Garden City land
- the findings of the survey as they related to various issues, including:
  - o "Plurality support Garden City lands agreement"
  - o "Why do you support/oppose?"
  - o "Parkland and general use elements strongly supported"
  - o "Two-fifths are familiar with the ALR"
  - o "Development seen as inevitable; desire to preserve green space"
  - o "Half need to know more about agreement before supporting removing land from the ALR"
- how participants in the survey were selected and the relationship of the percentages shown
- the words 'net benefit to agriculture' and whether the City would be in a position to add this benefit in its application to the ALR
- the format in which consultation with the public regarding the Garden City land would be undertaken
- the uses which would be permitted if the Garden City lands were to remain in the ALR, and whether playing fields, parkland or golf courses would be allowed.



## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

During the discussion, the suggestion was made that the *Richmond Community Survey* be included in the City's application to the Agricultural Land Commission.

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2007, from the Acting Director of Development), regarding the Garden City Land (5555 No. 4 Road) Update, be received for information.*

The question on the motion was not called, as Councillor Steves expressed his displeasure at two statements made in the staff report which related to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). He also voiced his opposition to the results of the survey. Cllr. Steves then spoke at length about his concerns with the staff report, and suggested that no action should be taken until a decision was reached relating to a dispute which the Musqueam was having with the Greater Vancouver Regional District.

Cllr. Steves then circulated material to the Committee which provided updated information on a proposal which he had previously submitted regarding the Garden City lands, and he asked that Committee consider these new recommendations. A copy of this material is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

Discussion then took place among Committee members on (i) whether the City should take the next step and file a new application for removal of the Garden City lands from the ALR; (ii) the impact to the City if the MOU was declared invalid; (iii) whether by receiving the report and survey results for information, Committee was expressing its tacit agreement to the proposal; and (iv) whether those surveyed understood the question relating to the agreement between the City, the CLC and the Musqueam to develop the Garden City lands.

During the discussion, Cllr. Barnes indicated that even though she would receive the report for information, she did not accept all of the conclusions contained in the survey.

Reference was made to the staff report which is proposed to be submitted to Committee within the next few months, and the request was made that the report include information on the uses which would and would not be permitted on land located within the ALR.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. Steves opposed.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

6. **AIRPORT NOISE MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

(Report: Sept. 14, 2007, File No.: 10-6125-03-02) (REDMS No. 2279285)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, advised that Mr. Doug Louth had requested that consideration of this matter be delayed until the Airport Aeronautical Noise Management Committee had reviewed this issue at its October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2007 meeting. He further advised that Ms. Anne Murray, the Vice President, Community & Environmental Affairs, for YVR, had agreed to the delay. Mr. Crowe advised that City staff could report to the October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007 meeting of the General Purposes Committee with the results of the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2007, from the Manager, Policy Planning), regarding Airport Noise Management Update, be referred to staff for report to the October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007 meeting of the General Purposes Committee.*

The question on the motion was not called, as request was made that Mr. Peter Dhillon, the City's representative on the Board of Directors of the Vancouver International Airport Authority, be requested to attend the October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007 meeting.

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

(Cllr. Evelina Halsey-Brandt left the meeting at 7:50 p.m., and did not return.)

## CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

7. **HOLLYBRIDGE CANAL BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS – PUBLIC ART**

(Report: Sept. 10/07, File No.: 10-6340-20-P.05208/Vol 01) (REDMS No. 2277472)

It was moved and seconded

*That the transfer of \$40,500 from the Public Art Program (2003) and \$55,066 from the Public Art Program (2006) to the Hollybridge Canal Bridge Art project, be approved.*

**CARRIED**

8. **RECOMMENDED STRATEGIC CLIMATE CHANGE RESPONSE AGENDA FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND**

(Report: August 20, 2007, File No.: 10-6125-07-02) (REDMS No. 2250832)

The Assistant Manager – Environmental Programs, Margot Daykin, in response to questions, advised that staff would be submitting a report to Committee in the Spring of 2008 on the next steps to take. Further information was provided that the City would be permitted to sign the UBCM Climate Change Charter after the conclusion of the UBCM convention.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

Discussion then took place among Committee members and Ms. Daykin regarding the proposed Climate Change Charter and how this document would relate to the Sustainability Initiatives adopted by Council earlier in the year. Questions were raised about the rationale for not including those solid waste facilities which were regulated under the *Environmental Management Act* in operations covered within the Charter. In response advice was given that these facilities contribute such high emissions that the goal to be carbon neutral by 2012 could not be achieved.

During the discussion, reference was made to the future staff report, and staff were requested to include information on 'how everything fit'.

Also addressed during the discussion was the impact of urban growth and climate change on the City with respect to specific areas, including the Nature Park and Sturgeon Banks.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the Climate Change Response Agenda (as outlined in Attachment 3 to the report dated August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007, from the Chief Administrative Officer), be adopted;*
- (2) *That staff report back to Council on a recommended level of service for advancing the Climate Change Response Agenda based on the findings from the City's enhanced sustainability initiative and its review of the City's sustainability needs and priorities; and*
- (3) *That Richmond Council support the UBCM Climate Change Charter in principle.*

**CARRIED**

### 9. 2009 BC SENIOR SUMMER GAMES

Councillor Bill McNulty referred to correspondence received from the Chair of the Richmond Sports Council, Mr. James Lamond, in which information was provided that the Sports Council unanimously endorsed a recommendation that a bid be submitted to host the 2009 BC Senior Summer Games. A copy of the correspondence is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

It was moved and seconded

*That the City of Richmond submit a bid to host the 2009 BC Senior Summer Games.*

The question on the motion was not called, as Cllr. McNulty spoke in support of the proposal, stating that hosting this event would provide an opportunity to show the community's support for its senior citizens and would provide an excellent lead-in to the 2010 Olympic Winter Games.



## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007

---

Discussion ensued, with Committee members expressing general support for the proposal, but requesting information on the potential costs related to the hosting of the event, including staffing, etc. The suggestion was made that the matter should be referred to staff to provide the required information, however, concern was voiced that a referral would result in the City not having sufficient time to submit a bid for the 2009 Games.

As a result of the discussion, the following **referral** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That the request to submit a bid to host the 2009 BC Senior Summer Games be referred to staff for report to Committee on the viability of the proposal, including the implications of hosting the event and addressing volunteer issues, in sufficient time to allow the submission of a bid in a timely manner, if deemed to be appropriate.*

**CARRIED**

OPPOSED: Cllr. Dang  
McNulty  
Steves

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (8:18 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 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

---

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Chair

---

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