



Finance Select Committee

Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2003
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Kiichi Kumagai, Chair
Councillor Harold Steves, Vice-Chair
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Bill McNulty
Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Absent: Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

It was moved and seconded
That the order of the agenda be varied to deal with the reports in the following order: Nos. 3, 4, 6, 5 and 2.

CARRIED

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Finance Select Committee held on Thursday, April 24th, 2003, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

COUNCILLOR KIICHI KUMAGAI

3. **FULL SERVICE GAMING POLICY**
(Report: May 22/03, File No.: 4040-00) (REDMS No. 1010593, 709597, 992668)

Councillor Kumagai advised that with the recent changes to the BC Lottery Corporation regulations and policy, the City's policy, which established the maximum number of slot machines, gaming tables and poker tables which a casino could operate in Richmond, was no longer consistent.

Finance Select Committee

Thursday, May 29th, 2003

Discussion then ensued among Committee members on the proposed change in City policy, and the impact which this could have on the number of slot machines which could be accommodated at the new casino at the former Bridgepoint Market. Concern was expressed during the discussion about the lack of control which the City would have on setting a limit on the number of slot machines which would be permitted, if the amended policy was adopted. However, the comment was made even though a majority of Council supported the proposal that one casino be permitted, any decisions on the number of tables and slot machines to be allowed should be determined by the provincial government.

It was moved and seconded

That Council Policy 5040 (Full Service Gaming Policy) be amended (in accordance with the recommendations in the report dated April 9, 2003, from Councillor Kiichi Kumagai), such that the City policy be consistent with the Provincial regulations on this matter.

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Mayor Brodie

COUNCILLOR BILL MCNULTY

4. **PAY PARKING** (Oral Report)

Councillor Bill McNulty spoke about the parking problems occurring in Steveston, and stated that although there was a committee working on these issues, reports had not yet been received.

It was moved and seconded

That the matter of pay parking be referred to the General Manager, Finance & Corporate Services, for report to the General Purposes Committee within two weeks with a complete history on:

- (1) where the City started;*
- (2) where the City is now;*
- (3) the direction in which the City is now headed; and*
- (4) the feasibility of removing obstacles from City property located in Steveston to allow parking in lanes.*

The question on the motion was not called, as Cllr. Rob Howard, Council Liaison to the Richmond Traffic & Transportation Advisory Committee, reported on a meeting of the Steveston Advisory Task Force on Parking which he recently attended. He advised that staff would soon be reporting to Committee with a number of short and long term recommendations to deal with parking in the Steveston area.

Finance Select Committee

Thursday, May 29th, 2003

Cllr. Howard further advised that were two or three 'quick fixes' which were being considered by staff to improve the 'mood' in the area. Reference was made to the parking tickets which had been issued in the Steveston area to the owners of vehicles illegally parked in lanes, and advice was given that the further issuing of tickets had been put on hold.

During the discussion which ensued, reference was made to the "Steveston Station" development and to the erection of a gate across the road which effectively eliminated access to the public parking lot. **Staff were requested to include in the report, information on the disposition of that issue.**

Reference was made to the memorandum written by the Manager, Community Outreach, Don Pearson, on the ticketing of vehicles parked in Steveston lanes, and a question was raised about whether the information contained in the memo had been communicated to the residents of Steveston. **Staff were asked to refer the matter to the Manager, Communication & Public Affairs, Ted Townsend, with the request that he prepare a press release.**

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

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

6. BUDGET PROCESS

(Report: May 21/03, File No.: 0970-00) (REDMS No. 1011168)

The Director of Finance, Andrew Nazareth, explained the proposed budgeting process and cycle to the Committee. Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on:

- when the appropriate time would be in the process for Council to provide direction on what a maximum property tax rate increase should be
- the steps which staff would take in the event that Council directed that any property tax rate increase be at the rate of inflation, and the impact to existing service levels if such a decision was made
- whether the proposed process was any different than the process currently followed by staff.

It was moved and seconded

That the new budgeting process and cycle for the City (as presented in the report dated May 21, 2003, from the Director of Finance), be approved.

CARRIED

Finance Select Committee

Thursday, May 29th, 2003

5. **RICHMOND THERAPEUTIC EQUESTRIAN SOCIETY**
(Report: May 22 03, File No.: 1085-20-RTEQ1) (REDMS No. 1010657, 1005047)

The General Manager, Finance & Corporate Services, Jim Bruce, advised that an additional source of funding, should Committee approve a grant to the Richmond Therapeutic Equestrian Society, would be the funds remaining from the 2003 grant process.

Ms. Frances Clark, representing the Society, introduced members of the Society who were present this afternoon. She then spoke about the request for funding from the Society, a copy of which is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and Ms. Clark on the request for funding. She advised in response to questions, that the Society was not asking for a large amount of money, and that the amount being requested did not cover all of the Society's operating expenses. Reference was made to the budget for the Society and copies were provided to the Committee, a copy of which is attached as Schedule B and forms part of these minutes. Ms. Clark clarified that the funds being requested were intended to offset administrative expenses and would not be used to pay the salaries of the instructors.

Ms. Clark then provided information on the maximum number of children who could be accommodated through the Society's programs; the support given to the Society by other organizations, and the rationale for dealing with the request for funding outside of the grant process.

In response to further questions, Ms. Clark confirmed that if funding for the Society was included in the City's operating budget, a commitment of \$30,085 would be required each year. It was noted that the Disability Resource Centre received \$70,000 and the suggestion was made that the Therapeutic Equestrian Society should also be included.

Ms. Clark, in response to a question about the impact to the Society if an amount of \$18,000 was approved, stated that the existing programs would be placed in danger of closing, as expenses have increased. She noted that there were funds remaining from the 2001 budget; that the matter had been referred to the General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services for review for inclusion in the 2004 operating budget; and that possibly funding could be available from the 2004 gaming revenue.

Questions were raised about the relationship of the Disability Resource Centre and the Therapeutic Equestrian Society. In response, Mr. James Sullivan, representing the Disability Resource Centre (DRC), advised that the organization was a separate society and its programs were not the responsibility of the DRC. He recommended that because of the support given by the DRC to the Therapeutic Equestrian Society and the work 'in kind', that the funds be administered through the DRC to the Society.

Finance Select Committee

Thursday, May 29th, 2003

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the feasibility of the administration of funds to the Society through the DRC, during which it was noted that some of the administrative expenses of each of the two organizations were duplicated and offered the opportunity for consolidation.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Therapeutic Equestrian Society be given the remaining \$22,000 from the City grant account.

The question on the motion was not called, as the Richmond Committee on Disability and the Therapeutic Equestrian Society were urged to work together to oversee their administrative needs wherever possible to eliminate duplicate expenses.

A brief discussion ensued, during which concern was expressed about the process. The comment was made that there were many organizations with worthwhile causes and the Committee needed to be aware of all these causes both now and in the future.

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

Mayor Brodie left the meeting at 5:15 p.m., and did not return.

DELEGATION

2. ***Mr. Ray Aleliunas, 3100 Garry Street, regarding a dispute of a false alarm fee for 3100 Garry Street.*** (File No.: 8060-20-7362)

The Chair reviewed Mr. Aleliunas' situation, clarifying that Mr. Aleliunas' dispute with the City was that he had been unaware of the change in the City's Fire & Security Alarm System Bylaw to increase the amount of the fine for false alarms to \$100 for the first and each subsequent false alarm, and that he was seeking retribution from the City for the \$100 charged to him for a false alarm at his home.

Mr. Aleliunas confirmed the statements made by the Chair as being correct, and he voiced the opinion that there were better ways to communicate the change to the fine than placing advertisements in the local newspapers. Mr. Aleliunas, in response to further questions, stated that his monitoring company had advised him that it had no knowledge of the increase and, therefore, was unable to pass the information on to him. He suggested that in future, such notices should be incorporated into the annual billings for utility and property tax notices.

Finance Select Committee

Thursday, May 29th, 2003

Discussion ensued among Committee members and Mr. and Mrs. Aleliunas about the fact that his monitoring company knew nothing about the increase in the fine for a false alarm. Advice was given by staff that in addition to advertisements being placed in the local newspapers, letters had been sent to all Richmond-based monitoring companies notifying them of the increase in the fine. Mr. Bruce added that following his initial discussion with Mr. Aleliunas about the fine, staff had checked the list of monitoring companies to which the letter had been sent and had confirmed that the company which monitored Mr. Aleliunas' security system, had been advised of the increase.

It was moved and seconded

That the matter regarding the dispute of Mr. Ray Aleliunas with the City regarding the fine incurred for a false alarm at 3100 Garry Street, be received for information.

Prior to the question on the motion being called, the Chair stated that the onus was on the alarm company to advise its customers of any change in alarm and security regulations, and that Mr. Aleliunas should pursue the matter of retribution of the fine with his monitoring company. The Chair asked that Mr. Aleliunas be provided with a copy of the letter sent by the City to the company.

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

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (5:26 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Finance Select Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Thursday, May 29th, 2003.

Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Chair

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

FINANCE SELECT COMMITTEE

I want to correct the report in front of you – RTES is not requesting \$38,000 – the original request was for \$30,585 of which \$1,500 has been received – the balance we have requested is \$29,085.

Jim Bruce indicated, at the last Finance Select meeting that the \$29,000 could be taken out of the \$38,000 which was not used from the 2001 budget. By doing that, there would have been **NO** impact on the 2003 budget. Further, I requested of the Chairman that the issue of 2004 funding be referred to Cathy Carlisle, General Manager of Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services for consideration – along with the Disability Resource Centre funding (Ann Stevens reported to Council that the two are already linked for consideration for 2004 funding) to come out of the City's operating funds.

Re – RTES 2003 funding.

- May I remind you - once again – the RTES complied with all of Council's requirements relating to last year's funding. By doing so we have increased our annual operating costs accordingly - Why would you put us in this position and then put the whole program at risk by denying the appropriate funding for 2003 ?
- The 2002 funding was clearly established as "pro-rated" for 2002 – and the Committee indicated at that time – the 2003 amount would reflect the full amount requested. A point that was reaffirmed by the number of Council members who nodded the last time I reminded Council of this fact.
- The City has to this day, taken credit for RTES as a City program. I know you can change your website, etc., in an instant, but you cannot erase the documents of the past 7 years. This is, and has always been, a City initiated program.
- By denying adequate funding for this program you are denying people with disabilities, and in particular children with disabilities **equal opportunity to participate** in recreation, sports and community activities.
- Your commitment to integration, which is what Council has fallen back on when facing this discussion in the past, has not proven to be a fair & equitable answer. Being able to participate – via integration – sounds wonderful, until you face the

“invitation” to stop coming, because of your disability, as has happened to individuals who have attended such programs.

- The popularity of the success of the Disability Resource Centre has clearly indicates the need for programs that are designed specifically for people with disabilities.
- The city has few opportunities for people with disabilities to participate in sports. In fact, Eileen Kalshoven, a Paralympian had more opportunities to participate in Zimbabwe than she has in the City of Richmond. Not fully supporting the Therapeutic Riding program is sending the wrong message to the world – particularly now, when Eileen and others are supporting the City’s efforts regarding the **2010 Olympic and Paralympic** bid.
- RTES currently has sponsorship support in place because the City acknowledged, through the 2002 funding with reference to a full amount for 2003. By “hemming and hawing”, by questioning whether the City has any obligation to provide equal opportunity for children with disabilities, you are putting all of that support in jeopardy, as well as new funding opportunities I have been developing. Why would anyone want to support a City program that the City, itself, doesn’t think worthy of its own support? Even BC Gaming expects to see proof of appropriate City support.
- The City has no difficulty in taxing adults with disabilities and the parents of children with disabilities. The difficulty seems to be encountered when you are expected to spend some of that money on programs, etc. for people with disabilities. How can you not be embarrassed?
- The issue – ladies & gentleman is one of **Equality**. How can you promote Richmond as such a great, well run, beautiful City in Canada – when you cannot live up to the Canadian Charter of Rights & Freedoms which requires that all people be treated with equality, including people with disabilities. The City of Richmond does not give children with disabilities an equal level of support in the areas of Sports, Recreation & Cultural Services by any stretch of the imagination. It is time that changed!
- The Provincial Government tried to deny a group of children with equal opportunities for education & specialized services. The Courts ruled against the government, a ruling that will prove to be a costly one. I would rather see the City of

Richmond spending my tax dollars on the provisions of services for people with disabilities than spending them fighting a court case over the denial of this services. I would rather spend my volunteer time working to improve the quality of life for people in our community than spending it helping the parents of children with disabilities sue the City to get the equality their children are entitled to.

RICHMOND THERAPEUTIC EQUESTRIAN SOCIETY
BUDGET April 1, 2003 - March 31, 2004

EXPENSES

Wages & Benefits	93,504.00
Space & Board	44,724.96
Utilities	5,700.00
Maintenance	720.00
Horse Care	2,000.00
Office Supplies	3,600.00
Insurance	1,567.00
Fundraising	4,000.00
Promotion	1,500.00
Contingency	4,000.00
Total	\$161,315.96

REVENUE

B.C. Gaming	\$30,100.00
City of Richmond	31,000.00
Penta Homes	10,000.00
Lions, Firefighters, other Assoc.	10,000.00
Horse Show	4,500.00
Luncheon	12,000.00
Grants	8,000.00
General Donations	2,500.00
Riding Fees	12,000.00
Fundraising	42,000.00
Total	\$162,100.00

- Note: Wages & Benefits includes funds to add one part-time instructor in addition to the two we currently have.

Space

$$\begin{array}{r} 936.25 \\ 2407.50 \\ \hline 3343.75 \end{array}$$

phone

$$\begin{array}{r} 96.09 \\ 36.48 \\ \hline 133.37 \end{array}$$

291.94

40 125' 00

1600.94

175164

7200 Markt

Total overhead costs are actually 44,197.08