



Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, March 5, 2013

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt, Vice-Chair
Councillor Chak Au
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Harold Steves

Also Present: Councillor Linda McPhail

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA ADDITION

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) Youth Sub-Committee Report titled "Feedback on Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents" be added to the agenda as Item 5A

CARRIED

MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, February 19, 2013, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT

1. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING STRATEGY – AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT CIRCUMSTANCE PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS**

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No. 3785757)

Dena Kae Beno, Affordable Housing Coordinator, was present to answer questions.

Discussion ensued and staff was advised that “low income households” should be an additional criteria and not the only criteria for inclusion in the Affordable Housing Special Development Circumstance strategy as per the Richmond Affordable Housing Strategy Addendum No. 4, Item 2.

In response to a query, Ms. Beno advised that, as part of the first component of the Affordable Housing Special Development Circumstances update, staff will engage community stakeholders for their comments on the proposal and are expecting to present a report to Council in mid 2013.

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Affordable Housing Strategy be amended by approving and adding as Addendum No. 4 to the Strategy the Affordable Housing Special Development Circumstance Proposed Requirements (as outlined in Attachment 1 of the staff report dated February 13, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Services).

CARRIED

2. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING STRATEGY: 2013 ANNUAL REVIEW OF INCOME THRESHOLDS AND AFFORDABLE RENT RATES**

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No. 3800705 v.3)

In response to a query, Ms. Beno noted that the Income Thresholds and Affordable Rent Rates are reviewed annually. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) release their data once a year. Additionally, BC Housing updates their housing income limits at the beginning of each year. The City’s review is in accordance with Provincial and CMHC guidelines.

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Affordable Housing Strategy be amended by approving and adding as Addendum No. 5 to the Strategy the 2013 Annual Income Thresholds and Maximum Permitted Rents for Affordable Housing (as outlined in Attachment 1 to the staff report dated February 13, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Services).

CARRIED

Planning Committee
Tuesday, March 5, 2013

3. **HOUSING AGREEMENT BYLAW 8991 TO PERMIT THE CITY OF RICHMOND TO SECURE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS LOCATED AT 8280 AND 8300 GRANVILLE AVENUE (0938938 B.C. LTD.)**

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No. 3806085)

In response to a query, Ms. Beno advised that the affordable housing rates are applied through a City Housing Agreement. The housing agreements are updated with the new rates and developers are notified of the changes.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 8991 be introduced and given first, second and third readings to permit the City, once Bylaw No. 8991 has been adopted, to enter into a Housing Agreement substantially in the form attached hereto, in accordance with the requirements of s. 905 of the Local Government Act, to secure the Affordable Housing Units required by the Rezoning Application 12-615705.

CARRIED

4. **CHILD CARE OPERATOR SELECTION FOR “THE GARDENS” CHILD CARE FACILITY**

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No. 3705870 v.7)

In response to inquiries, Coralys Cuthbert, Child Care Coordinator, noted that no discussion has taken place with respect to other proposed uses. There may be opportunities for after hours and weekend programming in the space but that it is intended that the child care facility be a turn-key operation. Ms. Cuthbert further noted the proposed non-profit operator has been delivering services to other facilities for several years and has the capacity to expand.

Cathryn Carlile, General Manager, Community Services, advised that there is no intention for this space to be used for any other use than a child care centre and that an agreement will be entered into with the operator. If the operator decides there are other opportunities for additional programming then further discussion would take place at that time.

It was moved and seconded

That the Society of Richmond Children’s Centres be approved as the child care operator for the City-owned child care facility to be constructed at 10640 No. 5 Road (PID 028-631-595 Lot F Section 31 Block 4 North Range 5 West NWD Plan EPP12978), adjacent to “The Gardens” development, subject to the Society entering into a lease for the facility satisfactory to the City.

CARRIED

Planning Committee
Tuesday, March 5, 2013

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

5. APPLICATION BY MATTHEW CHENG ARCHITECT INC. FOR REZONING AT 7175 AND 7191 MOFFATT ROAD FROM MEDIUM DENSITY LOW RISE APARTMENTS (RAM1) TO HIGH DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTH1)

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-9005, RZ 11-586988) (REDMS No. 3705419)

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw 9005, for the rezoning of 7175 and 7191 Moffatt Road from "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)" to "High Density Townhouses (RTH1)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

- 5A. RICHMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RCSAC) YOUTH SUB-COMMITTEE FEEDBACK ON "CURRENT ISSUES THAT MAY BE IMPACTING RICHMOND ADOLESCENTS"

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-9005, RZ 11-586988) (REDMS No. 3705419)

Councillor Linda McPhail provided background information on the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) Youth Sub-Committee report titled "Feedback on Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents" (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as **Schedule 1**).

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

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) Youth Sub-Committee report titled "Feedback on Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents" from the Chair dated November 2012:

- (1) be received as information; and*
- (2) be referred to the next Council/Board Liaison meeting for their information.*

CARRIED

Planning Committee
Tuesday, March 5, 2013

5B. POLICY FOR IRON GATES ON TOWNHOUSE COMPLEXES
(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

Discussion ensued concerning the use of iron gates on Townhouse developments.

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

It was moved and seconded

That staff investigate and report back on the propriety or policy for sliding iron gates in Townhouse complexes.

CARRIED

5C. SUBDIVIDING IN LANDS WITHIN THE AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE
(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

Discussion ensued regarding the feasibility of subdividing lands within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR), Zoning Bylaw regulations and the Official Community Plan.

Committee requested staff to comment on a specific property that is being considered by the property owner for subdivision in the ALR and staff reaffirmed Council's position on the matter.

5D. AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AAC)
(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

Councillor Harold Steves made reference to an email from Kathleen Zimmerman, Regional Agrologist – Fraser Valley West, dated January 29, 2013 (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as **Schedule 2**) and noted that the Ministry of the Environment granted, under special circumstances, the B.C. Cranberry Growers' Association permission to use recycled concrete and asphalt material in the construction of berms.

Councillor Steves further referenced another email from Kathleen Zimmerman dated January 29, 2013 concerning the Agricultural Advisory Committee and Conflict of Interest Information (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as **Schedule 3**) requesting that staff investigate the feasibility of extending the City's Conflict of Interest Policy to all Advisory Committee members.

Planning Committee
Tuesday, March 5, 2013

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the information from Kathleen Zimmerman, Regional Agrologist, dated January 29, 2013 regarding fill material for cranberry berms be referred to staff for information; and*
- (2) *That the information from Kathleen Zimmerman, Regional Agrologist, dated January 29, 2013 regarding the Agricultural Advisory Committee Conflict of Interest be referred to staff to investigate the feasibility of extending the City's Conflict of Interest Policy to all Advisory Committee members.*

CARRIED

5E. MOBILE LICENSING

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

Councillor Linda Barnes referenced an article from the Surrey Leader dated November 13, 2012 (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as **Schedule 4**) and noted that a number of Fraser Valley municipalities have implemented a one-year, inter-municipal, business-licence pilot.

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

It was moved and seconded

That staff investigate and provide an update on the feasibility of mobile business licences.

CARRIED

6. MANAGER'S REPORT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (4:25 p.m.).

CARRIED

Planning Committee
Tuesday, March 5, 2013

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, March 5, 2013.

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

Heather Howey
Acting Committee Clerk



**Richmond Community Services
Advisory Committee**

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the
Planning Committee Meeting of
Tuesday, March 5, 2013.

To: Mayor Brodie and Councillors
 From: Rick Dubras and Lisa Whittaker, Co-Chairs, RCSAC
 CC: Cathy Carlile, Lesley Sherlock, John Foster
 Date: January 2013
 Re: RCSAC Youth Sub-Committee report: **Feedback on “Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents”**

Issue	Potential impact	Agency or individuals affected	Suggested action
<p>The RCSAC Youth Sub-Committee was asked by the RCSAC executive committee to review and provide feedback to a report from the Richmond School District regarding issues that may be impacting Richmond adolescents in school.</p> <p>The resulting report, including youth interviews, is attached called: RCSAC Youth Sub-Committee report Feedback on “Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents”</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm positive/negative outcome of the change from the Youth Support Worker positions to the current Adolescent Support Team model. Confirm current effectiveness of the Adolescent Support Team model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adolescent Support Team (AST) staff Youth. Teachers, administrators, school counsellors, and the Youth service agencies and other collaborative agencies in the Richmond community who are attempting to “provide positive programs, services and support for youth in Richmond.” 	<p>That the attached report be received for information, and that a request be made through the Council-School District Liaison Committee that SD#38 evaluate and report back regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact of the change from the Youth Support Worker positions to the current Adolescent Support Team model, and the effectiveness of the current Adolescent Support Team model.

RCSAC Youth Subcommittee

Feedback on *"Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents"*

November, 2012

Completed by:

Danny Taylor
Chair of the RCSAC Youth Subcommittee

Origin

The RCSAC Youth Subcommittee was asked to review the report titled "*Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents*" and submit their results to the executive. We were under the impression that in addition to providing our comments on the report directly, we were also reviewing the impact of the change in School District #38 from having Youth Support Workers in each Secondary School, to the current Adolescent Support Team.

Upon our review, here are our comments and discoveries.

Findings

In effort to provide a rounded review of these changes, our sub-committee was able to secure several diverse sources of experience.

- (a) Danny Taylor, Chair of the RCSAC Youth Subcommittee, was able to interview 3 leadership students from a Richmond school. All 3 leadership students indicated they did not know that there ever existed a Youth Support Worker at their school. At the same time these students were also unaware of the current Adolescent Support Team. These students articulated that had they known about the YSW positions, it would be doubtful they would have needed to access that resource in their lives. In as much, they did not feel a current need to have exposure to the AST staff. Possibly this is a result of the type of students these 3 represent: leadership kids highly motivated by academics and extra-curricular school involvement, socially active and connected to multiple support structures in their lives. By all accounts, these kids would not be considered "at-risk" youth, and would not actively need the support of a "Youth Support Worker".
- (b) Danny subsequently interviewed a grade 11 female student, who we will call "L". L had maintained an active and vital relationship with the YSW from her school, and was devastated by the termination of that position. Attached in **Appendix A** are the comments from this interview. Highlights include the availability and accessibility of the YSW; the supportive relationship that was developed between YSW and L; as she faced issues of substance misuse and family problems L placed a high value on her relationship with the YSW; the YSW provided security and safety in the school environment for L; and L's view that the YSW assisted school admin and teachers in effectively and constructively managing at-risk youth. Currently, the AST seems unavailable and inconsistent, preventing L from utilizing

them since the change. She strongly expressed her disappointment in losing her YSW.

- (c) Danny also was able to secure feedback from a school counsellor in the district, who wishes to remain anonymous. This counsellor's comments can be found in **Appendix B**. To summarize, this counsellor views the termination of the YSWs as a "great loss for the students". The accessibility and approachability of the YSWs was emphasized, as was the unique role the YSWs played in the school, providing a different avenue towards supporting youth than the counsellor role or the admin/teacher positions. The AST approach towards students is viewed as quite different, making relationships of any depth nearly impossible to develop with at-risk students. This counsellor views the loss of the YSW as having a negative impact on the student body, and the AST have not succeeded in replacing this valuable and needed service.
- (d) Carol Hardie, member of the RCSAC Youth Subcommittee, writes in **Appendix C** on the loss youth in Richmond have experienced with the cessation of the YSW positions. According to Carol, the confidential source of information and referral services provided by the YSWs has disappeared, making it difficult for significant at-risk youth populations from accessing available supportive people and programs. The outcome has been a rather "reactive" approach to working with youth, rather than a proactive approach to building resiliency and developing relationship, thereby preventing issues from occurring or developing further. Unfortunately, Carol points out that the current AST model would appear to not provide sufficient staffing levels to service the entire school district from a responsive approach alone, let alone making any preventative efforts.
- (e) Michelle Johnson, member of the RCSAC Youth Subcommittee, articulates her feedback from an interview with one of her clients (see **Appendix D**). Michelle emphasizes the enormous value of the YSW active presence in the schools and their ability to develop relationships with kids. In contrast to the AST, the YSW maintained strong accessibility and flexibility in supporting at-risk youth. Applied to her client's experience with bullying and mental health issues, the inability for the AST worker – despite good intentions – to be available and accessible proved a marked difference from the YSW.

Michelle shifts in her letter to address the actual research and conclusions found in the "*Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents*" report.

Michelle astutely points at the conflicts in the reporting process; especially regarding the questions being asked of youth and who in particular was consulted in drawing the conclusions maintained in the report.

- (f) Following on Michelle's concern for the report itself, the Youth Subcommittee additionally found several issues drawn from "*Current Issues that may be Impacting Richmond Adolescents*" worthy of attention, such as:
- a. We are very concerned that all of the youth service agencies (Touchstone Family Services, Richmond Addiction Services, MCFD, etc.) and other collaborative agencies (CAP program, etc.) were not consulted and remain absent from this report. Only the RCMP, SD38, and the City have had their voice heard. With the changes to the YSW positions, is it not imperative to find out the ripple effects on the appropriate youth service agencies in our Richmond community? It would be extremely useful to ask questions on the key issues to key service providers/agencies.
 - b. The report identifies that the 2 workers were involved with 131 clients. The report is not clear on how these numbers were captured, nor the specifics of how 2 workers were involved with their 131 clients. What was this clinical relationship like? How were 2 workers able to establish constructive and supportive relationships with this massive number of clients? These massive direct service hours seem unreasonable and far too difficult to provide a comparative service to the YSW positions.
 - c. There is no mention in the report of kids "falling through the cracks" (drop outs, leaving). The YDW brought advocacy for these kids, let alone the simple awareness that these youth even existed. Where are these at-risk youth being represented and how are they being advocated for now?
 - d. The report fails to mention the effect of the dissolution of the YSW positions on Teachers and Administration. It would be valuable to hear more from their experience, following on the feedback Danny received from an SD38 school counsellor.
 - e. The unique school culture / effectiveness of each individual YDW will invariably produce very subjective evaluation depending on the student

and school in question (and yes, the sub-committee is aware this same logic applies to their feedback above).

Conclusion

- Youth who would not be considered “at-risk” for the most part did not access the Youth Support Workers, nor do they currently access the Adolescent Support Team. These services are largely targeting a vulnerable “at-risk” youth population.
- Youth who would be identified as “at-risk” (such as L from Danny’s interview, the anecdotal story of a student from the SD38 counsellor, and Michelle’s client) did benefit from an available and accessible Youth Support Worker. These youth would without doubt continue to access and benefit from an YSW today. Unfortunately, the current AST strategy does not sufficiently provide access and relationship in a preventative way for “at-risk” youth in Richmond.
- The YSWs filled a necessary role in the school environment, different from a school counsellor or a school teacher, and provided valuable contribution to each individual school climate throughout the district.
- Teachers and Administrators need to be interviewed for their opinion on the changes.
- Youth service agencies and other collaborative agencies need to be, and should be, consulted for an accurate review of the effect of the YSW change and the current AST model.

We would generally agree with Kate Rudelier from the report that “the conclusions from this report are mixed...youth who had a positive connection with the YSW in their particular school were impacted by the loss of the YSW position. For youth who did not work with the YSW, there was no measurable impact. For youth requiring support previously received from the YSW, the counsellors and other staff have stepped up to fill that gap in service.”

We would challenge however, that we cannot underestimate the significance of the impact on those students who were experiencing a positive connection with their YSW. As our review has indicated, this change was largely experienced as negative and the positive connection with their YSW is greatly missed. Equally, we have no clear idea on what the opinion is of the “counsellors and other staff” who have had to step up to fill in a legitimate “gap in service”. Has this added responsibility been a

welcome addition to their already busy roles in the schools? As the counsellor included in this review has mentioned, as has L from Danny's interview, the elimination of the YSW positions has been a negative one for the staff in the school who must now attempt to fill in the missing component that the YSW vacancy has left. Unfortunately, the AST model is not substantial enough to meet the needs of our schools and the vacancy left by the YSW positions. As Kate continues in her report conclusion, *"it is too early to tell the ultimate effectiveness of the new service delivery model"*. It would be invaluable to now attempt to gather information on the effectiveness of the new AST model. Our sub-committee would greatly encourage this new report to include the voices of teachers, administrators, school counsellors, and the Youth service agencies and other collaborative agencies in the Richmond community who are attempting to *"provide positive programs, services and support for youth in Richmond."*

Appendix A

Why did you value the YSW?

- Available all day, every day.
- No appointment needed.
- Different than counsellors – non-judgemental, totally open and listened, didn't overreact.
- Was there for more than just a job or a pay check, she cared and was always available – even before/after school hrs.
- She would check in with specific at risk kids (the “freaks”) and would even pull them out of class randomly to see how you were doing. This showed that she cared. We didn't have to go to her, she'd come to us.
- She shared from her own experience, was honest. (Real relationship and connection established).

How did she help you personally?

- The issues I was having at the time, drugs – I could talk to her about the things that I wouldn't/couldn't talk to my family/friends about.
- If I was being bullied or was feeling sad, and didn't want to go to class, I could go to her and sit and chat.
- She helped me deal with my past, showing me how to accept things and move on.
- She helped me with my anger management – if I acted out, I could go to her and talk it through (even if I was facing some punishment!)
- School Violence: she took pressure off the principals by helping manage and mediate issues between kids. This helped the principals and since she has left there is a major impact on teachers to manage kids more.
- She helped kids with substance issues stay in school.

Why were you sad she was gone?

- I lost my “comfort place” at school (school is an environment I don't like).
- I have to face stuff alone – (I don't have the same connection with counsellors).
- I have to “retell” my life story to new AST person...I don't want to...
- The AST people said they'd be around twice/week ...I never see them.
- She was a place I could talk about issues and she would truly listen, but her absence removed this.

Why don't you just see your school counsellor now?

- I do see mine, but just not as often as the YSW. Counsellors are not as available as the YSW. Counsellors have to teach classes. Time issues. And the Counsellors

really seem like they “work” as teachers. The YSW was more like a “really chill family member – like an aunt” but the counsellors seem like “staff members”.

Appendix B

Overall, it is a great loss for the students. Counsellors' loads are excessively big so we do not always have the time to take care of the smaller but important needs of the students, and to be always accessible to the students in a less "formal" way. The YSW used to run *(different)* programs, be a mentor for the students, and help with the fundraising efforts *(for the school)*.

Some *(were)* that other parent/mentor figure for the students they know well. It was comforting for students to know that the YSW was there on a daily basis and could be approached anytime for specific needs. That is no longer the case, and I know the students miss that. I had a grad who told me he was set on the right path because the YSW told him in no uncertain terms what he was doing with his life. He benefitted greatly from it and wanted me to do the same for his brother.

The AST's presence and function appears to be entirely different. It is difficult, if not downright impossible, for them to form that kind of relationships with the students. And of course, they can't be around all the time. The same kind of bonding simply does not happen. I have seen only limited success with the AST (I connected them with several students last year). In some cases, the relationship worked out poorly.

In a nutshell, the AST does not come close to replacing the YSW, and in needier schools, losing the YSW has highly negative impacts on the student body.

(Italics added to protect the identity of this School District #38 Counsellor at their request).

Appendix C

RCSAC – Feedback – Impact of RSB loss of Youth Workers

As an adolescent community support in Richmond, the loss of school based youth workers has had a clear, unfortunate impact. The youth workers provided a visible, available school support in compliment to academic advising provided by counselling team. Youth Workers were often accessed by youth who may be struggling with issues relating to academics, home life, relationship issues, health, bullying, drug and alcohol to list a few. Youth Workers provided a necessary, confidential support and often also acted as a referral source to supports 'outside the school setting'.

Once the fiscal decision to delete these positions came to fruition, I strongly believe that the youth lost a necessary adult support and in many occasions, situations had to become much 'worse' in order for youth to reach out for help. This results in community youth work support being very 'reactive' in nature, versus 'preventative'. Research clearly shows this to be not as effective and not in the scope of promoting 'development asset' model, as we all subscribe to. Our community support offered through the Day Program has 'picked up' many youth who normally would have accessed internal school support. Sadly, this is a result of those who are aware of the program. I assume many youth are not getting the help they need simply due to lack of awareness of what is available in the community.

To replace the loss of school based youth workers, there are now 2 FTE youth worker similar positions, with the intent that these two positions service the entire RSB secondary school system?! I empathize with the people in these positions. How daunting and unrealistic the task must be to provide suitable, meaningful connections and relationships with vulnerable youth across the city. I am not convinced this is a fair solution, nor one with the student's well- being as a priority. The ratio of student versus youth worker alone, clearly demonstrates that.

I think it's important as 'youth advocates' that we continue to share feedback and communicate these concerns to administration responsible, so that perhaps, with collaborative community involvement, decisions such as these will be more seriously reconsidered in the future.

Thanks.

Carol Hardie
Member of the RCSAC Youth Subcommittee

Appendix D

Attention: RCSAC committee

The biggest asset that YW's provided was prevention, especially in terms of bullying in school. Their presence and relationships with all the students could make a difference in the amount and frequency of bullying. I have permission from my client to speak about the bullying she endured last year. She was severely bullied, both in and out of school. This led to her missing a third of the school year. This is when the Connection Worker became involved with my client. Although she was a great support to my client, she was not there on a daily basis to monitor, deter, or give support in the moment, which I believe would have made a difference. My client was very forthcoming with the school that the bullying was causing her anxiety and sleep issues but she was never visited by the Adolescent Mental Health Worker. I also believe that not every behaviour or issue that arises for students is a mental health issue and I feel that so much can be prevented if someone was monitoring in the school daily.

Accessibility is what makes the YW so effective and this is difficult to achieve with only two Connections workers for the entire community. Flexibility and expertise in issues impacting youth is what builds the relationship youth need for accessing support. When I asked my client about the accessibility of the worker, my client said that schedules often conflicted but the worker made every effort to be available. When asked if it would be easier if the worker were based in the school every day, I received a resounding yes. I believe the bullying in school could have been prevented with the presence of a YW.

It is also important to question the methods in which the research was conducted. Who was polled and what kinds of questions were being asked of the students. Many of the organizations and professionals that make up the Youth Network were not consulted and this decision impacts their work. Also, just because the research didn't note the impact of the loss of the YW, does not mean that the YW did not make a difference in that school. Prevention is a key aspect of the job and I am curious if those types of questions were posed. If different questions were asked to all the students about YW presence, role modeling, support, and thoughts on counsellors as the alternative, the results of this study could have been very different. Thank you for your attention to my feedback.

Michelle Johnson

Michelle Johnson
Member of the RCSAC Youth Subcommittee

From: Zimmerman, Kathleen AGRI:EX [mailto:Kathleen.Zimmerman@gov.bc.ca] **Planning Committee Meeting of**
Sent: Tue 2013-01-29 4:38 PM **Tuesday, March 5, 2013.**

It seems like three issues have recently come to light in Richmond: a) the building of farm roads using fill; b) the building of plant nursery facilities using fill; and c) the use of recycled asphalt and concrete for farm roads. It's important to clarify the linkages between provincial regulation, provincial guidelines, and municipal bylaws with respect to these issues.

Provincial Regulation: The *Agricultural Land Commission Act* and the *Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation* have relevant sections related to fill on the ALR. The *Regulation* allows for 5 types of fill for farm uses without an application (but with a notice of intent) if certain other restrictions are met: a) building a greenhouse that covers more than 2% of the parcel; b) building a farm building or structure for an intensive livestock production or mushroom production that covers more than 2% of the parcel; c) building an aquaculture facility that covers more than 2% of property; d) building a certain type of compost facility that covers more than 2% of the parcel; and e) a turf farm.

Does the Commission require a fill application for farm road construction?

Does the Commission require a fill application for plant nursery construction?

The *ALC Act* defines fill as "any material brought on land in an agricultural land reserve other than materials exempted by regulation." In 2006, the South Coast office of the Ministry of Environment gave permission for the BC Cranberry Growers' Association members who are located in this region to use recycled concrete and asphalt in the building of their cranberry berms. However, that permission only applied to the cranberry sector, and more specifically to cranberry growers in the Lower Mainland. The BCCGA had to write a letter showing how their re-use of this material was beneficial, and did not cause pollution. One of the key arguments they used was that cranberry berms are in place for 40+ years, and OceanSpray regularly monitors fruit and water quality and has never detected any residues from concrete/asphalt.

If the AAC/City/Commission would like to expand the use of recycled asphalt and concrete for other types of farm roads, I would strongly recommend connecting with MoE first to determine how this fits with their policies and regulations.

Provincial Guidelines: In 2006 Ministry of Agriculture and ALC staff worked together to produce a Factsheet titled "Guidelines for Farm Practices Involving Fill." (It's in your agenda package, marked "Item 3D.") Section d) on page 5-6 discusses the use of woodwaste or soil for on-farm access roads. It has the recommendation that the farm road would typically be 6 metres wide and up to 60 cm deep. Section h) on page 9 – 10 discusses the use of woodwaste/gravel/sand for container nursery bed production or ball and burlap production. Near the end there is this statement: "Note: In the ALR, the placement of soil fill materials, for container nursery bed production requires an application to the ALC."

Is the Commission still requiring fill applications for container nursery bed production?

When a farmer wants to build a farm road, what volumes of fill should trigger a notice of intent vs. a fill application? (Apparently under the old Soil Conservation Act, if a farmer applied less than 320 m3 of fill per 16 ha, a notice of intent was sufficient. (I'm assuming this was an annual limit?))

City Bylaw: Richmond's bylaw (marked "Item 3C" in your agenda package) defines fill as "soil or a permitted material." Permitted materials are those listed in the "Guidelines" factsheet (referenced above), or a material that is certified in writing as a standard farm practice by a Professional Agrologist, or any material authorized for deposit by the ALC. The factsheet only refers to soil or woodwaste materials (except for the broken concrete and ground asphalt that is specifically only used on cranberry berms with MoE permission.)

Is this definition of permitted material still sufficient/clear?

Is the City informed when the ALC approves a Notice of Intent to place fill on a Richmond property?

How can the AAC play a more supportive role in bylaw enforcement? For example, in Surrey, there is a fixed agenda item "Integrity of the Agriculture Land" at every AAC meeting. During that time, Committee members pass on the addresses of properties along with the details alleged bylaw infractions (e.g. illegal fill dumping, illegal truck parking). The addresses aren't recorded in the minutes, but the details are. A designated City staff passes on the information to bylaws, and then that staff person (or a bylaws rep.) regularly updates the committee on how the illegal use is being addressed (e.g. visited site, issued fine, started court action, etc.)

E-mail from Bill Jones and Dave Sandu to Kathleen Zimmerman, M.Sc., P.Ag. Regional Agrolgist and her response and clarification underlined.

We are somewhat confused by your comments with respect to the use of recycled concrete for the construction of farm roads. We are following the exact guidelines that apply to the Cranberry Industry as per the direction set out to us by the Agricultural Land Commission (except we have decided on our own not to use asphalt). As you are aware we are building a small all weather road at the property on Finn Road. We are stripping and saving the topsoil then placing recycled concrete on the subsoil, then placing purchased 6 inch minus recycled concrete on top of this and finishing with ¾ inch minus. We understand that you said that the cranberry industry has 20 years of data on the safety of using not only recycled concrete but also asphalt for cranberry access roads and berms. (I did not say this.) You also state that Oceanspray has not detected any residues from concrete/asphalt in their monitoring. (I quoted the BCCGA letter.) You also stated that the Ministry of Environment gave their approval to the Cranberry growers to use asphalt and concrete on their berms. (I quoted the MoE letter.) We have several pictures taken recently of large pieces of asphalt being partially used as a retention pond liner for cranberry farms in Richmond, which are available if you would like to see them. If this does not cause pollution when it is subject to alternating covering by water and exposure to air then we find it hard to believe that our road can be a problem.

We are also aware that recycled concrete is used extensively throughout the lower mainland in non-agriculture areas for back filling pipe trenches and for road base. However, both Joe Davis and Bill McKinney stated at the Richmond Council meeting on Jan. 28, 2013 and again Bill McKinney made similar comments at the AAC meeting on Jan. 30, 2013 that recycled concrete may contaminate the soil which is in complete contradiction to allowing these products to be used by the cranberry industry and the wider construction industry in BC. Yet, at the same time Bill McKinney stated at the AAC on Jan. 30 that the cranberry farmers have been doing a good job for many years.

The following are excerpts taken from the minutes from the Jan. 28, 2013 Richmond Council meeting:

"Joe Davis, Hydro Geologist, made comments about how certain fill materials may contaminate soil, and stated specific concerns related to both cement and asphalt which included the existence of chromium, lead and zinc. He also spoke about the costly expense of removing such materials from a site..."

Bill McKinney, local resident, owner of a heavy construction business and mining exploration business, spoke about restrictions that companies in the industry are placing on the use of recycled concrete and asphalt products because of the related pollutants..."

As you can appreciate we have no intention of contaminating the soil but need to construct a road that will allow access to the tree farm throughout the year. We have no idea if the statements made by Mr. McKinney and Davis are true, and if so how the cranberry growers can be allowed to use the products.

Our intent is to build a good all weather road and by doing so we will: minimize soil damage caused by driving tractors through muddy fields; eliminate the use of hog fuel that I understand does cause pollution; not use silt and clay fill that is available and that we would be paid to take, but does not create a solid road base; reduce greenhouse gases by not having to use large four wheel tractors in muddy fields.

To be very blunt we are confused and we would therefore like to obtain the following information from you:

- a) Data from the cranberry industry indicating that the use of concrete is safe (we assume that this must have been submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture for the development of the guidelines), The approval process was between Ministry of Environment (MoE) and the cranberry industry. The Ministry of Agriculture referenced the MoE approval for the statements in our Factsheet.
- b) An explanation for why you stated that only the cranberry industry can use this material, when it is stated that the material is completely safe (also the ALC has provided us direction to use the same guidelines), MoE's approval letter was specifically for the cranberry industry in the Lower Mainland Region. MoE approval is region and applicant specific.
- c) Is there any truth in the statements made by Mr. McKinney and Davis? I did not attend the Council meeting on Jan. 28, I didn't hear their comments, and I am not a concrete/asphalt specialist. I cannot answer this question.
- d) Why the cranberry industry is allowed to use asphalt in a retention pond lining and others are advised not to even though the ALC approves its use? MoE approval was for cranberry roads, dykes and berms. Dykes and berms surround retention ponds. Only MoE can determine if a specific site or situation meets the terms of their approval.

 You forwarded this message on 2013-01-29 11:52 PM.

Steves, Harold

From: Zimmerman, Kathleen AGRI:EX [Kathleen.Zimmerman@gov.bc.ca] **Sent:** Tue 2013-01-29 2:10 PM
To: Eng, Kevin; 'Bill Jones'; 'Bill Zylmans'; Steves, Harold; 'Danny Chen'; 'Dave Sandhu'; 'Krishna Sharma'; 'Kyle May'; 'Scott May'; 'Steve Easterbrook'; 'Todd May'
Cc: Pellett, Tony ALC:EX; Crowe, Terry
Subject: RE: AAC Protocols and Conflict of Interest Information
Attachments:

Kevin - I realize that the conflict of interest rules in the Community Charter only refer to Councilors, but that does not mean that a local government cannot extend them to their advisory committee members as well. For example, the City of Vancouver's corporate policy (which includes conflict of interest guidelines) applies to Council, staff and advisory body members. Please see this link: <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/boards-committees-code-of-conduct.pdf>.

The Ministry of Agriculture encourages local governments to have a conflict of interest policy for their AACs. Please see the last bullet in the model Terms of Reference: http://www.al.gov.bc.ca/resmgmt/Aq_Advise_Comm/Model_Terms_of_Ref.pdf

Richmond may wish to formalize their AAC protocols in this respect. I realize there is not enough time to do this before tomorrow's meeting, but it might be suitable for a future meeting agenda item.

Thanks,

Kathleen

From: Eng, Kevin [mailto:KEng@richmond.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 1:31 PM
To: Bill Jones; Bill Zylmans; Steves, Harold; Danny Chen; Dave Sandhu; Krishna Sharma; Kyle May; Scott May; Steve Easterbrook; Todd May
Cc: Zimmerman, Kathleen AGRI:EX; Pellett, Tony ALC:EX; Crowe, Terry
Subject: AAC Protocols and Conflict of Interest Information

Good Afternoon,

Some members have contacted me with questions about certain protocol/regulations relating to operation of the Agricultural Advisory Committee in advance of Wednesday's meeting. For clarity, I'm providing this information in an email to all members so they are aware for all upcoming meetings of the AAC.

Are members of the public able to attend an AAC meeting?

- Yes – all meetings of the AAC are open meetings and the public is welcome to attend and listen as an audience member.

Are members of the public able to ask questions/raise concerns if they attend an AAC meeting?

- This is dependent on the what Committee members feel comfortable with as a group.
- In the past – If the AAC was comfortable with receiving questions/comments, the approach has been for the AAC to get through all items on the agenda and if time permits, have a period for questions/comments to be made at the end of the meeting. In the event of questions being asked – AAC/staff would not be under any obligation to provide answers/responses at the meeting.

What is the protocol surrounding conflict of interest/self-disclosure?

- The conflict of interest rules identified in the Community Charter **do not** apply to citizen appointees on a Council advisory committee (i.e., the AAC).
- In past – the AAC has implemented the practice of:
 - Left with each individual AAC member to provide self-disclosure (i.e., business interests/relationships), where appropriate to the Committee prior to considering an item.
 - It is also up to each individual AAC member to decide whether they want to participate or exclude themselves from the discussion or meeting.

Please contact me directly if you have any questions.

Regards,

Kevin Eng

Policy Planning

City of Richmond

Ph: 604-247-4626

keng@richmond.ca

Mobile business licences now available for Surrey and the Fraser Valley

By Surrey Leader

Published: **November 13, 2012 10:00 AM**

Updated: **November 13, 2012 10:1010 AM**

Minister of State for Small Business Naomi Yamamoto was joined by nine Fraser Valley municipalities in Surrey today to announce that they have agreed to implement a one-year, inter-municipal, business-licence pilot, making it easier for businesses to operate in those communities.

The Mobile Business Licence (MBL), also referred to as an Inter-Municipal Business Licence, reduces red tape by allowing mobile businesses to operate in more than one municipality by purchasing one licence, rather than by obtaining non-resident permits in each municipality in which they operate.

The nine Fraser Valley cities worked collaboratively with their boards of trade and chambers of commerce to agree to adopt a common city bylaw allowing businesses to purchase an Inter-Municipal Business Licence for specified trades. The cities include: Surrey, Langley, Township of Langley, Abbotsford, Chilliwack, Mission, Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows, and District of Hope.

Working with local governments to expand the MBL program is a key commitment in the provincial government's BC Jobs Plan and these communities implementing an inter-municipal licence reinforces that commitment.

"By allowing businesses to obtain one license that can be used in multiple municipalities," said Surrey Mayor Dianne Watts. "We are cutting red tape, simplifying processes and helping to foster a competitive environment for investment."

The MBL was successfully piloted in 2007 by 17 communities in the Okanagan-Similkameen, and since then,

Sicamous and the Central Okanagan Regional District have joined that group.

Find this article at:

<http://www.surreyleader.com/business/179140891.html>