



**COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION
RICHMOND'S CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POLICING**

MINUTES

**HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2001 AT 7:00PM
Anderson Room, 2.001
RICHMOND CITY HALL**

In Attendance:

Mr. Jim Lavery, Chair
Mr. Gary Abrams
Mr. Mahmood Awan
Mr. Leo Lai
Mr. Fred Ursei
Mr. Brian Webster

Regrets:

Ms. Heather Courage

Absent:

Ms. Colleen Chambers
Mr. Randall Wong
Mr. Rick Henderson

Staff in Attendance:

Mr. Chuck Gale, City of Richmond
Insp. Tonia Enger, RCMP
Ms. Pam Portman, City of Richmond (recorder)

Mr. Gale distributed copies of the draft report and attachment "Community Safety Advisory Committee – Terms of Reference".

1. Call to Order – Mr. Jim Lavery

2. Approval of Agenda

M. Awan\F. Ursei

That the September 25, 2001 agenda of the Richmond's Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing be approved as amended by removing all items from the agenda, excluding Items 3 and 9.

CARRIED

3. Approval of August 28, 2001 Minutes

Page 5, 6th paragraph should read "... thanked Inspector Enger for taking on the task of leader...".

Page 3, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence should be re-worded to read "Mr. Gale advised that the City was studying the concept of a different service delivery model, not geared solely to the Community Safety Division, but to cross all city operations. The City was also looking at the neighbourhood delivery services model". These sentences to be moved to the end of the 6th paragraph.

G. Abrams\M. Awan

That the minutes of the August 28, 2001 meeting of the Richmond's Advisory Committee on Policing be approved as amended.

CARRIED

4. Committee response following the September 11 meeting to develop a response to the Community Safety Committee on the proposed reorganization of the Richmond's Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing

Discussion regarding this item included:

- At the agenda review meeting held Tuesday, September 18, Jim Lavery had advised that, following the September 11 special meeting, he and Brian Webster had worked together preparing a report. This report had not yet been seen by the Advisory Committee and was, therefore, not ready for release;
- Was it necessary to continue with preparation of the Advisory Committee's report;
- Mr. Gale outlined the process involved when a report was presented to Council. He stated that the report recommending the introduction of a broader committee was "approved in principal" by the Community Safety Committee, and subsequently by Council at an August meeting. Committee indicated that they would like to hear back from the Advisory Committee regarding the report, and its recommendations;
- Mr. Gale reiterated several times that a final decision had not yet been reached, and that the Advisory Committee's comments would be beneficial;
- Mr. Gale further advised that the process involved in the disbanding of one committee and the creation of another was determined by the City Clerk in accordance with policy, and in staff's response to a request by Committee, confirmation of Council's direction is usually provided;
- Concern was expressed by some members that since the inception of the Community Safety Division, no attempt had been made to interact personally with the group and no clear message given of how to develop – some members of the group had been on the Committee since it was formed and could have contributed to the study of a new committee;
- Disappointment was expressed that the distributed report recommending the Advisory Committee be disbanded, showed the date as September 25 – so although input was requested, a decision had already been made by staff;
- Mr. Gale advised that the tabled report was a "draft" of the report he would be taking to the Community Safety Committee, and he wanted to share it with CACP before a decision had been reached by the Advisory Committee. The reason the report included the recommendations it did, was because those were the steps that would be required to be taken if Council wanted to proceed with their earlier direction to staff. Mr. Gale stressed the Community Safety Committee had not made their final decision. If CACP wished to report back directly to the Community Safety Committee he would reflect this direction in his report; if the group wished their comments to be attached to the report then this could also be accommodated;
- Community Safety Committee's recommendation could not be changed by staff – if the Advisory Committee wished the Community Safety Committee to change the recommendation then it would have to present its case;
- The group was encouraged to present their position on the matter, in order to give Committee and Council a rationale\option;
- Mr. Gale apologized to the group if the "process" of the matter offended them, but he could not change the course of action taken by the Community Safety Committee in the follow-up report;

- The comment was made that a wider committee could be beneficial, with a policing sub-committee created;
- Volunteers to sit on committees were hard to find;
- Insp. Enger advised there was value in the work done by the Advisory Committee, both in the past and for the future – the RCMP service delivery process, and ways of doing business were also changing to incorporate more involvement with the City; and
- It was decided to submit separately the Advisory Committee's report which would outline the group's points, and incorporate this evening's discussion. Mr. Gale offered assistance and information if required, and advised the timeline for which the Advisory Committee's report was required for distribution in Council packages for the October 10 Community Safety Committee meeting.

B. Webster\G. Abrams

That the regular meeting be adjourned and continue in closed session.

CARRIED

The regular meeting adjourned at 8:15pm with Mr. Gale, Insp. Enger, and Ms. Portman leaving the meeting.

Certified a true and correct copy of the
Minutes of the meeting of Richmond's
Citizens' Advisory Committee on Policing
held on Tuesday, September 25, 2001

Jim Lavery, Chair

Pam Portman (Recorder)