



MINUTES

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

- Date: Monday, October 2nd, 2000
- Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
- Present: Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Malcolm Brodie
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Councillor Ken Johnston
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves
- Absent: Councillor Derek Dang
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
- Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, September 20th, 2000, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

INTRODUCTION OF NEW EMPLOYEES

The following new staff members were introduced to the Committee by their respective supervisors:

Mr. Sui Tse, Project Engineer, by the Manager, Engineering Planning, Paul Lee.

Mr. Andrew Nazareth, Manager, Budgets and Accounting, by the Director of Finance, Danley Yip.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

2. DANGEROUS DOGS

(Report: Sept. 13/00, File No.: 8080-07) (REDMS No. 187319)

The Supervisor, Community Bylaws, Bob Lang, briefly reviewed the background of this report and Item No. 3 following. In response to questions, he advised that the current fines were being increased and that the previous requirement for a third impoundment being made prior to any action being taken to have a vicious dog destroyed, had been eliminated. Mr. Lang advised that this would allow officers to lay charges against the owners of such dogs.

Staff Solicitor Rebecca Finlay, in response to further questions, advised that the provincial legislation which would allow the City to enter private property to seize a dangerous animal, was now in effect.

Mr. Rolf Borck referred to statements made in the staff report about the power, duties and responsibilities of an animal control officer, and questioned whether an animal control officer was designated a 'special or provincial constable'. He also suggested that the City could establish stronger penalties for fines against dog owners, as it was his understanding that the Ministry of the Attorney General had not imposed a ceiling on the amount of fines which could be imposed. Mr. Borck stated that the Attorney General only reserved the right of intervention. He also expressed concern that the issues being raised in local newspapers about vicious dogs were not being addressed.

Mr. Borck spoke about the concerns which he had about the lack of control over dogs in the City, and voiced concern about the lack of responsibility by the SPCA with regard to the action which they had taken with the dog which had attacked his wife. Mr. Borck stated that while he welcomed the proposed amendment, he urged the City to consider adding the term 'restricted dog' to the bylaw amendment, and to make the provision of liability insurance mandatory for the owners of vicious dogs.

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

- the owners of vicious dogs were required to provide liability insurance in the amount of \$500,000
- the City's bylaws did not include a definition for a '*restricted dog*'; as Richmond's bylaw was felt to be more encompassing than the one in effect in Edmonton, Alberta
- the definition of '*vicious dog*' given in the City's bylaws was also more encompassing than the definition contained in the provincial legislation
- once a dog had been declared to be dangerous, notice of such declaration would be served on the owner of the animal, who would be required to obtain a licence for a vicious dog, and would have to show proof at the time of obtaining the licence, that the owner was in possession of \$500,000 liability insurance.

Reference was made during the discussion to Schedule A of Amendment Bylaw No. 7164, and in particular to the proposed Impoundment Fees. Concern was expressed that for the "THIRD and subsequent impoundments in any calendar year", "Dangerous Dog" was not included. Advice was given that this classification had not been included because if the animal was impounded for a third time, staff would be seeking an order to destroy the animal. Discussion then ensued on what the appropriate action would be, if any, if staff were unsuccessful in obtaining such an order. Concern was voiced that the bylaw did not provide the opportunity to continue to fine the owner of a vicious or dangerous dog if a Judge failed to issue an order to destroy such animal. Advice was given that the provincial legislation dealt with this issue, however, it was noted that the bylaw contained no reference to the provincial legislation on this matter. As a result of the discussion, staff were requested to provide a report to Council at the October 10th, 2000 meeting on whether it would be feasible to amend the bylaw to reinstate fines for dangerous dogs in the event that an order to destroy the dog was rejected.

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated September 13th, 2000, from the Manager, Community Bylaws and Administration), regarding Dangerous Dogs, be received for information.

CARRIED

17

3. **DOG REGULATION BYLAW AMENDMENTS**

(Report: Sept. 21/00, File No.: 8060-20-7164/7165/7166) (REDMS No. 167128, 187079, 187176, 188034)

It was moved and seconded

That the following bylaws each be introduced and given first, second and third readings:

- (1) Bylaw No. 7164 which amends Animal, Bird & Beekeeping Regulation Bylaw No. 7137;***
- (2) Bylaw No. 7165 which amends Dog Licensing Bylaw No. 7138; and***
- (3) Bylaw No. 7166 which amends Municipal Ticket Information Authorization Bylaw No. 7139.***

CARRIED

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

32

4. **RCMP ADDITIONAL LEVELS - 2001**

(Report: Sept. 26/00, File No.: 5350-01)

Supt. Ernie MacAulay, accompanied by Insp. Al Speevak and Administration NCO, Jim Provost, of the Richmond Detachment of the RCMP, explained that the purpose of the report was to provide an indication to the Federal Government on the funding which it might be required to provide for any requests made by the detachment and approved by the City.

Considerable discussion then ensued among Committee members and the delegation on such matters as:

- the attendance of RCMP members at traffic accidents – advice was given that the officers provided a service to the community, especially to the innocent victim; as well, motor vehicle accidents provided an opportunity for education as the majority of accidents were caused by the failure of one or more persons to obey traffic laws; further advice was given that the City's Engineering Department had always supported the RCMP attending traffic accidents because the information obtained by the officers formed part of a data base maintained by the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia on accident statistics
- why the detachment had diverted resources away from enforcement in the area of 'hard drugs' – advice was given the focus of the detachment on the current marihuana growth operations was the result of demands made by residents; once the detachment had achieved its goal of eliminating the organized operators, it was hoped that the focus could shift to dealing with 'hard drug' issues
- the current number of officers in the detachment – 211 with 4 or 5 vacant positions which did not yet have names attached, as well as 7 vacant positions which reduced the number to 197 (included in the figure of 211 were the officers who were based at the Vancouver International Airport)
- the positions being sought by the detachment and whether experienced personnel would be sought to fill these positions, and the need for longevity on the part of the members at the detachment
- the composition of the 'general duty watches' and whether the existing vacancies had any impact on the watches;
- the staffing of the community policing stations and whether constables had been reassigned from the general duty watches to establish these stations
- why an additional 36 computers were required when approval was given in 1999 for 151 computers – information was provided on the distribution of the computers approved in 1999 and the rationale for requesting additional computers in 2000
- the proposal to implement and maintain a DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) program within Richmond schools and the role of the co-ordinator, and whether the School District should be providing financial support for the program
- the anticipated salary and benefits costs of the 10 additional members being requested, when these officers could be expected to join the detachment, if approved, and the impact which these additional members would have on the City's budget for the current and subsequent years.

During the discussion, the suggestion was made that some of the requests should be forwarded to the Casino Funding Task Force to determine if it would be feasible to use a portion of the casino revenue to providing funding for these requests, to lessen the impact on the City's budget.

It was moved and seconded

(1) ***That Council approve in principle, an increase in the Richmond Detachment of the RCMP by ten regular members and one Tactical Analyst in 2001.***

(2) ***That Council approve in principle, the following additional capital items, at a total cost of \$240,500:***

(a) 4 additional vehicles (2 general duty, 1 traffic and 1 drug section) @ \$ 30,000	\$120,000
(b) 16 additional laptop computers @ \$4,000 each	64,000
(c) 20 stand-alone computers @ \$2,500 each	50,000
(d) 1 stand-alone computer (tactical analyst position) @ \$5,000 each	5,000
(e) 3 printers (training room) @ \$500 each	<u>1,500</u>
	<u>\$240,500</u>

Prior to the question being called, staff were directed to provide the following information at the time the additional RCMP requests were considered as part of the budget discussions:

- (1) the status of the existing computers, including how many the detachment currently possessed and where they were being used; why additional computers were required and who would be using the new equipment; and whether the current computers would be upgraded or replaced;
- (2) information on the "Crime Prevention/Victim Services" position and whether it should be an RCMP member or a civilian in the position;
- (3) information on the DARE program; and
- (4) information on the number of new members approved by the City since 1985, and the sections of the detachment in which these members were placed.

The Casino Task Force was also asked to submit recommendations on partial funding for some of the capital equipment requests.

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

COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

5. **BRITANNIA BUSINESS PLAN**

(Report: Sept. 25/00, File No.: 0340-20-CSER1) (REDMS No. 187772, 188510)

The Manager, Cultural Services, Jane Fernyhough briefly reviewed the staff report with Committee members.

Mr. Bob Ransford, a member of the Britannia Business Plan Steering Committee, then reviewed the various components of the business plan, including the Executive Summary, the proposed priorities, and recommendations.

Discussion ensued on the proposed business plan between Committee members and the delegation, during which the following comments were made:

- with reference to the proposal that the City allocate funding from the capital budget on a project by project basis, concern was expressed that this method would create difficulties for City staff; however, the suggestion was made that not budgeting for the completion of specific projects had caused 'fracturing' of projects on the site
- the proposed advisory board and the Britannia Heritage Shipyard Society would be two separate organizations; the Britannia Advisory Board would be a Committee of Council; an operating agreement would be entered into between the City and the Society.
- one of the first priorities of the advisory board would be to prepare a detailed marketing plan

Discussion then ensued on the function of the advisory board and the society and the dispersal of the Society's operating surplus. Comments were also made during the discussion on (i) the need for a centralized centre to co-ordinate heritage functions; and (ii) possible marketing plans which would generate revenue.

Comments were made during the discussion by Councillor McNulty, as Chair of the Britannia Business Plan Steering Committee that the proposed plan represented the 'best possible scenario for all. He then spoke about the proposed plan and the flexibility which it offered to the City.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That the Britannia Business Plan be referred to the Britannia Heritage Shipyard Society for comment;***
- (2) ***That the Plan be referred to staff for review and preparation of a report to the General Purposes Committee, which would include an analysis of the recommendations, comments from the Society, and recommendations on any outstanding issues that have been put on hold pending the completion of the business plan; and***
- (3) ***That the members of Council-appointed Britannia Business Plan Steering Committee be thanked for their work, and that the Committee be formally disbanded.***

CARRIED

ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

6. COMMUNITY SAFETY BUILDINGS - SPACE AND FACILITY NEEDS

(Report: Sept. 26/ 00, File No.: 2280-20-015) (REDMS No. 192324)

The General Manager, Engineering & Public Works, Chuck Gale, spoke on the use of the Public Safety Building by the RCMP, and the ability of the Fire Rescue Department to respond in the event of a major emergency occurring, such as following an earthquake. He advised that with respect to Fire Rescue, a study had been initiated which would help to identify staffing, equipment and firehall location options. Mr. Gale stressed however that it was important to thoroughly examine the entire issue before making any decisions, and the strategy now being proposed by staff would accomplish this.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the proposed recommendations, and in response to questions, the following comments were made:

- staff were hopeful that if the spending of \$500,000 to replace current building systems could be delayed, the proposed study would provide a clear understanding of how to proceed with regard to the possible construction of a replacement facility for the RCMP
- reference was made to the present status of fire halls and whether 6 new facilities would be required to replace the existing buildings – the comment was made that in some cases, a 'retrofit' might be appropriate; the comment was made that it was important to consider all possible scenarios prior to making a decision
- it might be possible that the existing Public Safety Building could be suitable for other community needs
- with reference to a statement in the report that the RCMP should not be decentralized, confirmation was given that it would be possible to centralize the services of the RCMP at another location

During the discussion, concern was expressed that the study would only delay the inevitable, and would arrive at the same conclusion which Council now knew, that the police station and the existing fire halls did not meet post-disaster standards. In response, advice was given by Mr. Gale that the problem was that staff did not have a comprehensive review of all its public facilities and that the results of the study would help to make a decision.

The Chief Administrative Officer, George Duncan, agreed that the buildings needed to be replaced, however, he stated that the purpose of the report was to provide options on how and when these replacements could take place, as well as a financial strategy on how these replacements could be accomplished.

Reference was made to the proposal to engage the services of a consultant, and questions were raised about hiring a consultant to provide information which the City and Council already knew. The suggestion was made that staff could provide information on the possible options which might be available.

In reply, advice was given that staff were not proposing to hire one consultant to complete the entire project. However, it was noted that staff did not have the expertise to undertake certain portions of the report and that specialists would be employed on a contract basis to work on specific areas. Mr. Duncan added that the primary reason for not using staff to complete the study was one of a resource issue, as the study required specialized expertise which the majority of engineers did not have.

Reference was made to the proposed cost of the study, and advice was given that if Council approved the proposed recommendations, a work plan would be prepared and provided to Council, which would include the names of the individuals who would be undertaking the work.

It was moved and seconded

That:

- (1) ***As an interim measure, the RCMP take occupancy of the space within the Public Safety Building presently occupied by Courts and Crown services upon their relocation to the Interim City Hall in the fall of 2001.***
- (2) ***Staff complete the facility lifecycle, seismic and needs assessments, required to develop recommendations for a facility replacement schedule including financing strategies for all the Community Safety Buildings for presentation to General Purposes Committee by April 30, 2001.***
- (3) ***Up to \$250,000 approved in the 2000 Capital Budget to cover renovation costs to the Public Safety Building and Interim City Hall be reallocated to fund consultants to prepare a master plan including detailed facilities programs, conceptual designs and siting options and costs associated with the overall upgrading, replacement and funding requirements of Community Safety Buildings.***
- (4) ***The City request written confirmation from the Commanding Officer, E-Division, that the actions to be implemented by the City in order to resolve the issues identified in the letter of notice dated August 4, 1999, are acceptable.***

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (6:31 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, October 2nd, 2000.

Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant