



## Community Safety Committee

Date: Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004  
Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Councillor Linda Barnes, Chair  
Councillor Derek Dang, Vice-Chair  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt  
Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Absent: Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the Community Safety Committee held on Tuesday, January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2004, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on *Tuesday, March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004* at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

### COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

3. **POLICE CHIEF BRIEFING**  
(Oral Report) (30 Minutes in duration)

Insp. Tony Mahon and Insp. Renny Nessel reported to the Committee on the following matters:

# Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

- (1) Grow-Op Enforcement Update; and
- (2) General Police Issues,

and discussion ensued among Committee members and the delegation on these and other matters.

#### 4. **PROPOSED SOIL TREATMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT – 13511 VULCAN WAY**

(Report: Feb. 3/04, File No.: 6175-06) (REDMS No. 1117418)

The Manager, Emergency & Environmental Programs, Suzanne Bycraft, accompanied by the Assistant Manager – Environmental Programs, Margot Daykin, indicated that they were available to respond to questions. Mr. Adam Sumel, President and CEO, of Sonic Environmental Solutions Inc., and Mr. Matt Wilson were then introduced to the Committee.

Concern was expressed about the lack of involvement of the City in the review process. Advice was given that the Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection was not required to seek the City's approval because approval fell within that Ministry's authority. However it was noted that the Ministry generally consulted with the City because of concerns for community safety and had intended to do so, but through an oversight, consultation did not take place on this project.

Further advice was given that the Ministry had apologized to the City for this lapse; however it was noted that the proponents, Sonic Environmental Solutions Inc. had advised City staff of the project well ahead of time, and had reviewed the project with the City's Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) and with the Richmond Health Department.

Discussion continued, and in response to questions, the following information was provided:

- the risk presented to the community was minimal
- the permit being sought would be a temporary permit to carry out a demonstration project for a trial period of one year; it was possible that the proponents could approach the Ministry about continuing with the project, however, anything proposed outside the scope of the current project would require the approval of Council
- the proposed site and tent structure had been inspected by staff and felt to be safe.

# Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

Mr. Adam Sumel came forward and displayed photographs to the Committee of the proposed tent, which would be constructed of special aluminium beams covered in specially coated material. He advised that the structure would take two days to erect and was considered to be a very secure building, consisting of solid walls bolted to a cement foundation. Mr. Sumel stated that the building manufacturer was located in Delta, that this type of structure had been in use for many years, and that the engineering for the structure would take place on site.

In response to questions about why the project did not take place on Annacis Island (the source of the contaminated soil), advice was given that the Richmond site was selected because of the infrastructure which was already in place which met the requirements of the Ministry. Advice was given that the owner of the property at 13511 Vulcan Way, Hazco Environmental Services, had previously installed a contamination leachate collection system; had an emergency spill response plan in place; and was in possession of all permit requirements and specifications needed for the storing and processing of contaminated material. Reference was made to the Annacis Island site, and information provided that the site was used simply to store material and did not have any of the additional infrastructure required by the Ministry.

A brief discussion ensued on whether there were any alternatives to issuing a business licence to Sonic Environmental Solutions Inc., and advice was given by City Solicitor Paul Kendrick that Council could choose not to issue the business licence. He stated that whether the project continued would be the decision of the company, however, he added that the City could encounter difficulties in charging the company for operating without a business licence.

Questions were raised about the potential risk to the community. In response, advice was given that the risk was low; and that it was important to know that the treatment process for PCBs had already been proven and was used by BC Hydro everyday to remove PCBs from transformer oil. Further advice was given that the Sonic Environmental technology allowed the removal of PCB contaminant from soil, which had not been possible previously.

Concern was expressed about the transfer of contaminated soil from Delta into Richmond, and reference was made to a proposal made a number of years ago which involved the shipment of contaminated soil from Oregon State to Richmond for treatment. Advice was given that the major difference between the two projects was that the quantity of soil in the demonstration project was very small.

In response to further questions, information was provided that:

- the demonstration project was intended to remove PCBs from soil; technology had not yet been developed to remove PCBs from ballasts, however, Sonic wished, at some time in the future, to develop its technology further to treat ballasts

# Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

- as a result of the soil being treated, the PCBs would be converted into a liquid hydrocarbon which posed less of a hazard and would not be dissipated into the atmosphere
- the Alberta treatment centre used burning and a thermal process to remove PCBs from soil, which resulted in the PCBs being converted into other components which dissipated into the atmosphere and substances had been found in areas which were not known to have these chemicals; burning in Alberta still posed problems for other areas, including Richmond
- the goal of Sonic Environmental was to construct mobile units which would be transported to contaminated sites and used to treat and deposit the contaminated soil on-site
- as part of the GVRD approval process, notification would be in a newspaper that an Air Emission Permit had been applied for, and people would be asked to submit their written comments to the GVRD on the proposal
- discharges into the atmosphere would be monitored through the Air Emissions Permit; however, the Permit was not necessary as it was not anticipated that there would be any discharge of material into the atmosphere for which Sonic Environmental would be required to obtain a permit.

During the above discussion, reference was made to the comments made by the Advisory Committee on the Environment and the Richmond Health Department, and staff were asked to provide these comments in written form when the staff report was forwarded to Council.

Mr. Sumel advised that the equipment to be used had been developed in British Columbia and did not process soil through incineration. He stated that test work had been undertaken to ensure that the process was flawless. Mr. Sumel then explained the process to the Committee, during which he advised that the end result would be in the form of salt. He used light ballasts to explain the quantity of PCBs which would be dealt with and spoke about the demonstration project, during which he explained that his company was not asking for a permanent facility. Mr. Sumel concluded by stating that the demonstration project offered benefits to the City as his company could work with the City on future environmental projects.

In response to questions, Mr. Sumel confirmed that:

- the demonstration project was only for the remediation of the soil from the site on Annacis Island
- if Sonic Environmental was asked to expand the project, then the company would be contacting Ms. Bycraft on the matter, as the facility to be constructed on the subject site would be constructed specifically for the demonstration project

# Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

- the consultant engaged by Sonic Environmental to prepare documentation and review potential sites recommended the Vulcan Way property; this property was one of the few which had been approved as the required infrastructure was in place; to undertake the project on Annacis Island would have required rezoning of the property in question.

Dr. Adrian Wade, a former member of the City's Advisory Committee on the Environment, stated that the proposal now being considered would allow the development of technology to treat contaminated soil on-site. He then spoke about the process and how the PCBs would be removed the soil. Dr. Wade further advised that he had reviewed the technology and had visited the soil site, and voiced the opinion that Sonic Environmental had a high chance of success. He added that it was his belief that Richmond could become a world leader in this field.

Concern was expressed about the need for indemnification to protect the City, and as a result, the following **amended** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the GVRD be advised:*
  - (a) *That the City supports commencement of processing the air emissions permit for a temporary demonstration project to treat soil containing polychlorinated biphenyls at 13511 Vulcan Way by Sonic Environmental Solutions Inc., and*
  - (b) *That the City be consulted prior to the issuance of the air emissions permit.*
- (2) *That the City issue a business license to Sonic Environmental Solutions Inc. subject to the following conditions and on the understanding that if these conditions are not met, the business license will be breached and rescinded:*
  - (a) *No significant community concerns are expressed during the GVRD processing of this application, and the GVRD proceeds with issuance of the air emissions permit;*
  - (b) *There will be no discharges of any harmful substances to the air, and no discharges of any material from the site to the storm or sanitary sewers;*
  - (c) *That at the conclusion of the demonstration project, the all treated soil and any remaining contaminated soil will be removed from Richmond;*
  - (d) *That no further demonstrations other than that specifically approved by the province in their January 22, 2004 letter, will be undertaken;*

# Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

- (e) *All information pertaining to the evaluation of the demonstration project be provided to the City; and*
- (f) *Sonic agrees to work with the City to identify future opportunities for, and partner in the removal of, PCB contaminants located within the City of Richmond.*
- (g) *The submission of protection indemnification satisfactory to the City Solicitor.*

Prior to the question on the motion being called, Mayor Brodie advised that he had concerns about the project, but that he would support it reluctantly because he had been assured that the risk and volume of soil to be treated was minimal. He added that any extension of the project would have to be addressed by Council.

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

## 5. **RICHMOND SUBSTANCE ABUSE STRATEGY FUNDING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM STAKEHOLDERS**

(Report: Jan. 20/04, File No.: 3000-09) (REDMS No. 1115403)

The Manager, Policy Development & Corporate Programs, Shawn Issel, accompanied by the Manager, Communications & Corporate Programs, Ted Townsend, advised that the report being considered today was in response to a referral to staff directing that the 'in-kind' contributions be reviewed.

Prior to discussion taking place, the request was made that a breakdown of the funding which had originally been set aside from casino revenues be submitted to the February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2004 Council Meeting. Reference was also made by the Mayor to the suggestion in the report that '*.... staff propose approaching the Four Pillars Coalition in Vancouver to determine their interest in working cooperatively on appropriate initiatives.*' He stressed that Richmond was not interested in 'safe injection' sites and requested that staff make that distinction very clear to Vancouver.

In response to the Mayor's concern, advice was given that City staff had not had any specific discussions with the Task Force on the issue of 'safe injection' sites. Further advice was given that staff were proposing 'interagency cooperation' because of the opportunity to work more efficiently as a group on joint initiatives which would optimize costs and benefits.

# Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

Discussion continued, with reference being made to the in-kind contribution of RADAT, which was to devote one-quarter time of one of its Prevention Specialists to working on new awareness programs. In response to questions as to whether this action would affect programs now offered by RADAT, advice was given that RADAT was currently undergoing a review of its work activities and had found that awareness was an important issue to which it was felt that additional staff time should be given to identify and work on that matter. Further advice was given that this would not have a negative impact on their current programs, and that the proposed in-kind funding was not connected in any way to the funding received by RADAT from the City.

With respect to the financial impact, and advice was given that it had been determined initially that \$96,000 would be required to implement the Substance Abuse Strategy; that the cost of implementing the strategy for the first six months was \$52,000, with in-kind contributions from stakeholder agencies comprising \$26,000 of that figure; that the cost to complete the strategy would be \$44,000, which would leave \$26,000 unspent.

The Chair indicated her support for the staff recommendation, noting that the strategy brought many groups to the table and put the onus on the stakeholders to develop a plan.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That \$26,000 in funding be approved for implementing the first six months of the Richmond Substance Abuse Strategy, and*
- (2) *That the balance of funding for the first six months of the Richmond Substance Abuse Strategy be provided through in-kind contributions from the partners and stakeholders on the Richmond Substance Abuse Task Force.*

**CARRIED**

(Mayor Brodie left the meeting at 5:10 p.m.)

## 6. **2004 COMMUNITY SAFETY WORK PROGRAM**

(Report: Jan. 29/04, File No.: ) (REDMS No. 1117399)

The Senior Director, Community Safety, Jim Hancock, accompanied by the Manager, Operational Support Community Safety, advised that he had nothing further to add.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on:

- graffiti - how big an issue this was within the community, the cost of removing graffiti from City facilities; the approach taken by the Richmond School District with respect to graffiti; and the steps which were being taken to prevent graffiti from occurring in the future

# Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

- whether traffic safety fell within the mandate of the new Community Safety Division – advice was given that the Division dealt with street racing through the Street Racing Committee; that a Safety Operations Steering (SOS) Team had been formed, the purpose of which was to provide a single venue where operational safety issues (of a cross-divisional nature) could be addressed and resolved in an integrated way
- development of an up to date emergency plan – advice was given that this referred to the emergency plan documentation itself
- the development of Community Safety Neighbourhood Service Delivery Model – advice was given that staff were considering combining Fire/Rescue, Police and Bylaws into small neighbourhood (non-external) teams
- the impact of the Division restructuring on the Fire Chief (now known as the Senior Director of Community Safety / Fire Chief)
- Fire/Rescue initiatives and the impact of the Division restructuring on these initiatives.

During the discussion, staff were asked to provide to Council members, an organizational chart comparing the current Community Safety Division to the former.

In concluding the discussion, the Chair advised that the Committee would like updates on a regular basis on the successes or concerns about the implementation of the new model, especially if it was found that a particular program or project could not be implemented as planned.

It was moved and seconded

*That the 2004 Community Safety Work Program (attached to the report dated January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2004, from the Senior Director, Community Safety (Fire Chief), be endorsed.*

**CARRIED**

## 7. MANAGER'S REPORT

- (a) Shawn Issel, accompanied by Senior Planner Kari Huhtala, provided information on the development of a business plan which would result in Richmond being designated a Safe Community by the national Safe Communities Foundation.

During the discussion which ensued, staff responded to questions on how fund raising would be handled. It was noted that contributions could include in-kind contributions.

- (b) The Chair referred to a program initiated by REACT for the removal of racist remarks, and she questioned the status of this project. A brief discussion ensued, during which Mr. Huhtala responded to the Chair's questions.



# Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

- (c) The Chair referred to correspondence which had been received from a resident regarding parking along Firbridge Way and which questioned the rationale for changing the parking from short term to permit parking. The Chair also noted that it was her belief that the signage indicated that permit parking only was permitted, but no time was shown. Staff were asked to review the matter.
- (d) The Chair advised that correspondence had been received on the issue of barking dogs, in which the suggestion was made that consideration be given to increasing the annual licence fees for problem dogs. Staff were asked to examine the proposal.
- (e) The Chair referred to correspondence received from Kelly Moss, Team Leader for the Coast Capital Savings Firefighter's Climb for Wishes, in which suggestions were made on how the City could provide assistance to the team, as previously requested by Council. As a result, the following **referral** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That the correspondence (dated February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2004, from Kelly Moss, Richmond Fire-Rescue), regarding the Mt. McKinley Climb: Make-A-Wish Foundation, be referred to staff for implementation.*

**CARRIED**

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (5:31 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Community Safety Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

---

Councillor Linda Barnes  
Chair

---

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