

**Leslie J. Ames Law Corporation**  
1107 West 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Vancouver, British Columbia V6M 1A3  
Telephone (604) 731.0171 Email: [lesames@shaw.ca](mailto:lesames@shaw.ca)

File No. 95010.01

November 2, 2011

DELIVERED BY HAND

Ms. May K. Leung  
Staff Solicitor  
City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Dear Ms. Leung:

Re: #170-2840 Olafsen Ave., Richmond, BC – 362076 B.C. Ltd. dba Dara Properties  
Property Maintenance & Repair Bylaw No. 7897 – Special Inspection Fee Appeal  
Electrical Safety Inspection Fee - Invoice # 35578 - \$4,200.00


---

Further to your letter to us and our client, 362076 B.C. Ltd., dba Dara Properties, dated August 18, 2011 and subsequent email correspondence, we have been instructed by our client to respond to your request that we provide you with a written submission and supporting documentation, if any, with respect to the Special Council Meeting proposed to be held on Monday, November 14, 2011. Accordingly, attached to this letter is the written submission of 362076 B.C. Ltd., the appellant property owner in this matter, together with certain supporting documentation to be attached to the appellant's written submission for the purpose of its presentation to the Special Council Meeting.

We thank you for your attention to this matter and hope that this matter can be amicably resolved.

Yours truly,

Leslie J. Ames Law Corporation

Per:   
Leslie J. Ames  
Barrister & Solicitor

Copy to: 362076 B.C. Ltd., dba Dara Properties  
Attention: Richard Ames, President

RECEIVED  
NOV 03 2011  
LAW DEPT  
CNCL - 43  
(Special)

## **Written Submission of Owner-Appellant**

### **To City of Richmond Council Special Inspection Fee Appeal Meeting**

#### **Appeal of 362076 B.C. Ltd. Re: #170 – 2840 Olafsen Avenue, Richmond, BC**

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated herein, “Attachment” numbers refer to the document attachments of the City of Richmond (the “City”) Staff Report dated August 12, 2011 and submitted to the Richmond City Council by John McGowan, Fire Chief, Richmond Fire-Rescue (the “Staff Report”).

#### **A. Findings of Fact**

1. Set out as Attachment 6 of the Staff Report is a copy of the Warrant to Search (the “Warrant to Search”) issued at 11:44 PM on June 17, 2010 to the RCMP pursuant to Section 487.1 of the Criminal Code and Section 11 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (“CDSA”) “in respect of an offence under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, namely: Marihuana, marihuana growing equipment documents pertaining to the tenancy and occupancy of Unit 170–2840 Olafson Road, Richmond, British Columbia relevant to the investigation of the following indictable offense(s): Production of a Controlled Substance CDSA 7(1)” and “Possession for the Purpose of Trafficking CDSA 5(2)” and for a search of the Commercial Property between 11:45 PM on Thursday, June 17, 2010 to 4:00 AM on Friday, June 18, 2010 as part of a criminal investigation.
2. On June 29, 2010 the City’s Electrical and Fire Safety Inspection (“EFSI”) Team conducted an inspection (the “EFSI Inspection”) of #170 – 2840 Olafsen Avenue, Richmond, BC (the “Property”).
3. On July 2, 2010, the City issued Invoice No. 35578 in the amount of \$4,200 to 362076 B.C. Ltd. (the “Owner”) of the commercial Property as a special safety inspection fee (the “Special Safety Inspection Fee”) with respect to the EFSI Inspection of the Property on June 29, 2010.
4. On July 14, 2010, the City issued Invoice No. 10-20832 in the amount of \$6,974.34 to the Owner of the commercial Property for “service costs” with respect to the execution of the Warrant to Search by the RCMP.
5. The Property is one of seven industrial-commercial units located at 2840 Olafsen Avenue, Richmond, BC.



## B. Grounds of Appeal

1. The Owner submits that the imposition of the \$4,200 Special Safety Inspection Fee on the Owner of the Property was not lawful and justified because the EFSI Inspection did not constitute a “special safety inspection” as defined by Bylaw 7897. If the EFSI Inspection did not constitute a “special safety inspection” as defined by Bylaw 7897 then the City had no legal right to impose the \$4,200 Special Safety Inspection Fee on the Owner.
2. A **“special safety inspection”** is defined in section 4.1.2 of Bylaw 7897 where it expressly states that it “...does not include an inspection pursuant to an emergency call for police, fire or ambulance services or an inspection carried out under a warrant as part of a criminal investigation.”
3. It is an undisputed fact that the Warrant to Search was issued on June 17, 2010 as part of a criminal investigation with respect to the Property and executed on June 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010. That Warrant to Search and criminal investigation is directly linked to and forms part of a series of events that naturally flowed from the Warrant to Search and criminal investigation very soon thereafter and led to the EFSI Inspection on June 29<sup>th</sup> and the imposition of the \$4,200 Special Safety Inspection Fee on July 2, 2010.
4. It is clear from a review of the Attachments to the City’s Staff Report that the EFSI Inspection on June 29, 2010 and the imposition of the \$4,200 Special Safety Inspection Fee on July 2, 2010 would not have occurred had the RCMP not first been issued the Warrant to Search and conducted the criminal investigation. But in such circumstances the owners of property are exempt from the \$4,200 Special Safety Inspection Fee. One reason may be that when Council passed section 4.1.2 of Bylaw 7897, it recognized that an exemption from the \$4,200 Special Safety Inspection Fee in such circumstances was appropriate and just because the owners of the properties are innocent victims who are property tax payers who pay for the fire and electrical safety services being provided as part of the EFSI Inspection as part of their property tax payments and other municipal assessments. Therefore, in such circumstances, the innocent Owner of the Property should not be financially punished by the imposition of the \$4,200 Special Safety Inspection Fee, in addition to incurring the additional costs of performing expensive remedial work on its Property in order to comply with the compliance work orders resulting from the EFSI Inspection as well as suffering the loss of rental revenue and the use of the Property for approximately 8 months.

5. Alternatively, in this case, the \$4,200 "Special Safety Inspection Fee" is really a "penalty" imposed on the Owner rather than a "fee" because the "Special Safety Inspection Fee" bears no relation to the amount of time, effort, staffing requirements or other costs actually incurred by the City with respect to the subject inspection of the Property on June 29, 2010. The second page of Attachment 12 of the City's Staff Report entitled "Electrical and Fire Safety Inspection Team Fire Inspector – Inspection Day Report" (the "EFSI Fire Inspection Day Report") with respect to the EFSI Inspection of the Property on June 29, 2010 states: "Team Arrival Time: 11:00 AM" and "Team Departure Time: 11:20 AM", a mere **20 minutes to conduct the one and only EFSI Inspection for which the "Owner" is being charged an enormous "fee" of \$4,200.** The EFSI Fire Inspection Day Report and the Electrical and Fire Safety Inspection Data Collection Form Report, the third page of Attachment 12 of the City's Staff Report dated June 29, 2010 (and other documentation in the City's Staff Report) regarding the EFSI Inspection confirm that the only persons in attendance at the Inspection were Curt D' Altroy, Captain, Electrical Fire Safety Inspector; the electrical inspector; and RCMP Constable Lee Deweert. We submit that the \$4,200 "Special Safety Inspection Fee" is really a form of penalty on the Owner that is extremely punitive in nature.
6. To illustrate how inflated, unjust and unfair that the \$4,200 "Special Safety Inspection Fee" actually is, we will compare it to a few examples of the amount of other fees that the City charges for miscellaneous permits, fees and services. Please refer to Attachments A and B described below that illustrate that in a variety of circumstances the amount of such fees and costs range from relatively lower to significantly lower than the \$4,200 "Special Safety Inspection Fee". In fact, the whole notion of a "***Special***" Inspection Fee in these circumstances should draw our attention to the inequitable and punitive nature of the \$4,200 "Special Safety Inspection Fee". If there are concerns of fire or electrical issues in such circumstances then why not conduct a proper fire and electrical inspection and charge the owner the usual fees associated with conducting a normal fire and electrical inspection?
- A. City of Richmond - **Development & Rezoning – Application Fees** - (See Attachment A).
- B. City of Richmond - **Dumping on Public Property** - Summary of Policy - (See Attachment B)



In addition, reference can be made to City of Richmond "**Consolidated Fees, Bylaw No. 8636**" (Effective Date – February 9, 2011) – Amendment Bylaw No. 8723 – Date of Adoption – March 28, 2011; Amendment Bylaw No. 8753 – Date of Adoption – May 9, 2011. For the sake of brevity Bylaw No. 8636 has not been attached to this Written Submission.

7. Service Costs – In addition to the \$4,200 "Special Safety Inspection Fee", the City also charged the Owner for service costs (the "Service Costs") of \$6,974.34 pursuant to Bylaw No. 7897. The City issued Invoice No. 10-20832 the Owner on July 14, 2010 for \$6,974.34 for what is also referred to as "Grow Operation Recovery Costs". The Owner paid that full amount to the City.

Subsection 3.1.1(d) of Bylaw No. 7897 provides for payment of Service Costs, as follows:

"(d) ...every owner whose parcel is used for a grow operation or controlled substance property must pay to the City all service costs incurred by or on behalf of the City, calculated in accordance with Schedule D and which are deemed to be service fees as identified in Schedule D, unless that owner had delivered to the City notice pursuant to subsection 1.3, prior to any entry by the City onto the parcel."

The Service Costs are comprised of RCMP labour, vehicle, administrative and overhead charges (see Attachment C). In this case, the Owner successfully challenged the City's calculation and determination of the eligibility of the vast majority of the Service Costs and ultimately, on April 5, 2011, the Owner was credited with \$5,350.19 and the City was left with the balance of \$1,624.15 of the original invoiced Service Costs amount (see Attachment C).

### **C. Conclusion**

1. The "Warrant to Search" issued to the RCMP for a search of the Property during the night of June 17th and early morning of June 18th, 2010 was clearly a part of a criminal investigation and therefore the "Warrant to Search" is unassailable proof that the case at hand was not a "Special Safety Inspection" as defined by Bylaw No. 7897. Therefore, the case under appeal here regarding the Property must be exempt from the Special Safety Inspection Fee charge. Therefore, the Owner should not have been invoiced and charged by the City for \$4,200.

2. In the alternative, the \$4,200 Special Safety Inspection Fee invoiced to the Owner of the Property is arbitrary, excessive, and punitive, and it does not bear any equitable or just relationship to the actual cost of conducting a 20 minute EFSA Inspection or any additional reporting tasks on standardized forms and letters (as demonstrated by the Attachments to the Staff Report).
3. In the case that is the subject of this appeal, in addition to the innocent Property Owner first being victimized by and suffering considerable actual loss as a result of the criminal activities of the party engaged in the illegal actions on the Property (e.g. loss of use of the Property and the revenue derived therefrom for approximately 8 months; and suffering considerable costs and expenses to restore the Property to a useful state and rentable condition), the City and the Richmond RCMP have been attempting to penalize and further victimize the innocent tax paying Property Owner with penalties masking as fees pursuant to Bylaw No. 7897.
4. The Owner has already incurred in excess of \$20,000 of direct costs, expenses, and charges arising from or associated with the subject grow operation (including the "Service Costs", "Special Safety Inspection", remedial work to comply with the work orders of the fire, building and electrical inspections, and the re-occupancy permit). In addition, the Owner has been impeded in its efforts to re-lease the Property due to police crime scene tape/ribbon having been left on the Property for a relatively long period after completion of the police investigation of the Property which deterred prospective tenants from renting the Property.
5. The Owner is in the regular practice of engaging the commercial leasing broker services of a senior broker of a very reputable international commercial leasing brokerage to ensure that the leasing of the Property and its other commercial properties are conducted in the most proper and credible manner and to ensure that its various tenants are law abiding and appropriate.
6. The Owner and its commercial tenants pay a relatively substantial amount for municipal taxes, a portion of which are applied by the City of Richmond to police activities including investigation of criminal activities. In cases such as the one at hand, the Owner is also a victim of the alleged crime, accordingly, this should be taken into account and the Owner should not be punished for the acts of criminals and the cost of the police conducting criminal investigations, which it is their legal duty to do.

7. Based on the foregoing matters of fact and law, the Owner hereby submits that the City of Richmond's Council should determine and order that the total amount of **\$4,200.00** should be refunded to the Owner, 362076 BC Ltd., dba Dara Properties, forthwith.

Respectfully Submitted By:

362076 B.C. Ltd., dba Dara Properties  
The Appellant

**ATTACHMENT A**

City of Richmond, BC - Development & Rezoning – Application Fees.

See attached particulars.



**ATTACHMENT A****City of Richmond, British Columbia, Canada**

&gt; Home &gt; Business &amp; Development &gt; Development &amp; Rezoning &gt; Application Fees

## DEVELOPMENT &amp; REZONING

**Application Fees**

<b>Type of Development Applications</b>	<b>Fees</b>
<b>Rezoning</b> (including Official Community Plan amendment)	\$2,040 - Standard zoning districts  \$2,550 - Single-family zoning districts requiring a new or amended Section 702 Single-Family Lot Size Policy  \$3,060 - Comprehensive Development districts  Plus additional dwelling unit and/or floor area charges:  \$10 - \$40 per dwelling unit \$5 - \$25 per 100 m <sup>2</sup> of non-residential building area
<b>Fast Track Application</b>	\$1,020
<b>Zoning Text Amendment</b>	\$1,605
<b>Official Community Plan amendment</b> (not involving a Rezoning)	\$3,060
<b>Second Public Hearing</b> (Rezoning, Zoning Text or Official Community Plan amendment)	\$765 per Public Hearing
<b>Development Permit</b> (involving Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) or Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR))	\$1,530
<b>Development Permit</b> (not involving ESA or ALR)	\$1,530 plus: Variable floor area charges Maximum fee of \$15,750
<b>General Compliance Ruling</b> (on an approved Development Permit)	\$510 per ruling
<b>Development Variance Permit</b>	\$1,530
<b>Subdivision</b>	\$765 (including first parcel) \$105 for each additional parcel
<b>Subdivision - Preliminary Letter of Approval Extension</b>	\$255 per extension
<b>Air Space Subdivision</b>	\$6,000 plus \$150 for each parcel
<b>Consolidation</b>	\$100
<b>Strata Title Conversion</b>	\$2,040 - Two-Family Dwellings \$3,060 - Multi-Family, commercial or industrial
<b>Phased Strata Subdivision</b>	\$510 per phase

**CNCL - 51  
(Special)**

01/11/2011

Type of Development Applications	Fees
Strata Plan Approval	\$255
Agricultural Land Reserve Appeal	\$600
Temporary Use Permit	\$2,040 (Application fee) \$1,020 (Renewal fee)
Land Use Contract Amendment	\$2,040
Servicing Agreement	\$1,020 (Processing fee)
Civic Address Change	\$255 - Subdivision or consolidation \$1,020 - Personal preference
Change in Application Scope	\$255
Approving Officer Plan Approval	\$50
Site Profile Application	\$50
Landscape Re-Inspection	\$105

For further information please contact Holger Burke, Development Coordinator at .

© 2011, City of Richmond

**Richmond City Hall:** 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, British Columbia, V6Y 2C1  
**Hours:** 8:15 to 5:00 pm, Monday to Friday. **Tel:**

## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **"City of Richmond – Bylaw - Dumping on Public Property (Summary)"**

Illegal dumping has increased in Richmond, costing taxpayers tens of thousands each year. Illegal dumping is harmful to our environment, unsightly and illegal. City of Richmond Bylaws pose stiff penalties for dumping illegally on City lands, including:

- A \$1,000 fine for illegally dumping garbage
- Requiring people who dump garbage illegally to remove the waste and restore the area at their cost
- Recovering costs incurred by the City for cleaning up illegal dumping and restoring the area in situations where the offender failed to remove the waste
- Prosecution under City of Richmond Bylaw 6803 Solid Waste and Recycling Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw 8100"



## ATTACHMENT C

City of Richmond - "Service Costs" of \$6,974.34 pursuant to Bylaw No. 7897. The City issued Invoice No. 10-20832 the Owner on July 14, 2010 for \$6,974.34 for what is also referred to as "Grow Operation Recovery Costs".

See attached particulars.

**CREDIT INVOICE**



**City of Richmond**  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Invoice No: 10-20832CM  
Invoice Date: 04/05/2011  
Customer Number: C007654  
Payment Terms: Upon Receipt

Bill To: 362076 BC Ltd  
5870 Hudson Street  
Vancouver BC V6M 2Z3  
Canada

CREDIT AMOUNT: \$-5,350.19

No Payment Required

Please detach stub and return with your payment



**City of Richmond**  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Invoice No: 10-20832CM  
Invoice Date: 04/05/2011  
GST/HST Number: R 121454003

-This credit memo is an adjustment to the original invoice 10-20832 in the amount of \$6,974.34 dated July 14, 2010.  
-A refund cheque of \$5,350.19 will be forwarded by separate mail.

1 RCMP File No: 10-20832 (5,350.19)  
Address: 170-2840 Olafsen Avenue, Richmond BC

SUBTOTAL: (5,350.19)

TOTAL AMOUNT DUE : (5,350.19)

For billing questions, please call Phone: 604-276-4334 or Fax: 604-276-4128





**City of Richmond**  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

**INVOICE**

Invoice No: 10-20832  
Invoice Date: 07/14/2010  
Customer Number: C007654  
Payment Terms: Upon Receipt

Bill To: 362076 BC Ltd  
5870 Hudson Street  
Vancouver BC V6M 2Z3  
Canada

AMOUNT DUE: \$6,974.34

\$6974.34  
Amount Remitted

Please detach stub and return with your payment



City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Rd  
Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

Receipt: 3257/40  
Dated: Oct 1, 2010  
Station: TAXZ/CH#JHC

ARPMT	10-20832	6,974.34
Total		6,974.34
CHEQUE	DBA DARA PROPERT	-6,974.34



**COST SUMMARY  
LABOUR**

Name	No. in Attendance	No. of Hours/Staff	Rate/Hr (Camp)	Cost	Amount/CC (\$55/Hr Person)	Total Cost
Battalion Chief			\$ 54,990	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Captain (CO2)			\$ 47,240	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lieutenant (CO1)			\$ 38,720	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fire Fighter (10yr)			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
E.V.T.			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fire Inspector			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL FIRE LABOUR COST</b>						<b>\$ -</b>

Name	No. in Attendance	No. of Hours/Staff	Rate/Hr (Camp)	Cost	Amount/CC (\$55/Hr Person)	Total Cost
S. Sargeant			\$ 40,930	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Sargeant			\$ 40,242	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Corporal			\$ 37,840	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Constable	1	26	\$ 34,550	\$ 898.30	\$ 390.00	\$ 1,288.30
Dismantling Resource Team			\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL RCMP LABOUR COST</b>						<b>\$ 1,288.30</b>

Name	No. in Attendance	No. of Hours/Staff	Rate/Hr (Camp)	Cost	Amount/CC (\$55/Hr Person)	Total Cost
BI Supervisor			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Building Inspector II			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Building Inspector I	1	2	\$ 32,000	\$ 64.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 94.00
<b>TOTAL BUILDING APPROVALS LABOUR COST</b>						<b>\$ 94.00</b>

Name	No. in Attendance	No. of Hours/Staff	Rate/Hr (Camp)	Cost	Amount/CC (\$55/Hr Person)	Total Cost
Bylaw I Officer			\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Bylaw II Officer			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL BYLAWS LABOUR COST</b>						<b>\$ -</b>



**VEHICLES**

TYPE	No. of Vehicle	HHS Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
Staff Car/Van			\$	\$	
Battalion 1			\$	\$	
Quint			\$	\$	
Pumper			\$	\$	
Rescue			\$	\$	
Utility			\$	\$	
EVT			\$	\$	
Technical Rescue			\$	\$	
<b>TOTAL FIRE VEHICLE COST</b>					\$

RCMP	No. of Vehicle	HHS Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
Exhibit Van			\$ 50.00	\$	
Police Vehicle			\$ 20.00	\$	
Other			\$	\$	
<b>TOTAL RCMP VEHICLE COST</b>					\$

REBUILDING APPROVALS	No. of Vehicle	HHS Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
Building Approvals Vehicle	1		\$	\$	
<b>TOTAL BUILDING APPROVALS VEHICLE COST</b>					\$ 30.00

BYLAWS	No. of Vehicle	HHS Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
Bylaw Vehicle			\$	\$	
<b>TOTAL BYLAW VEHICLE COST</b>					\$

OTHER	No. of Vehicle	HHS Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
			\$	\$	
<b>TOTAL OTHER VEHICLE COSTS</b>					\$

**EQUIPMENT**

Quantity	Description	Cost/Item	Total Cost	Comments
	Medical Gloves	\$	\$	
	F/F Gloves	\$	\$	
	Coveralls	\$	\$	
	Tarps	\$	\$	
<b>TOTAL EQUIPMENT COSTS</b>				<b>\$ -</b>

**OTHER COSTS**

Quantity	Description	Cost/Item	Total Cost	Comments
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
<b>TOTAL OTHER COSTS</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>

Sub-total of Grow Operation Recovery Cost \$ 1,412.30  
 Administration Charges (Sub-total Cost x 15%) \$ 211.85

**TOTAL GROW OPERATION RECOVERY COST**

**\$ 1,624.15**



**COST SUMMARY  
LABOUR**

FIRE	Name	No. in Attendance	No. of Hours/Staff	Rate/Hr (2 min)	Cost	Admin Fee (\$15/hr/person)	Total Cost
	Battalion Chief			\$ 54,990	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Captain (CO2)			\$ 47,240	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Lieutenant (CO1)			\$ 38,720	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fire Fighter (10yr)			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	E.V.I.			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fire Inspector			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL FIRE LABOUR COST</b>							

RCMP	Name	No. in Attendance	No. of Hours/Staff	Rate/Hr (2 min)	Cost	Admin Fee (\$15/hr/person)	Total Cost
	S. Sargeant			\$ 40,930	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Sargeant			\$ 40,242	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Corporal	1	11	\$ 37,840	\$ 416.24	\$ 165.00	\$ 581.24
	Constable	1	68	\$ 34,550	\$ 2,349.40	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 3,369.40
	Dismantling Resource Team	1	12	\$ 50,000	\$ 600.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 780.00
<b>TOTAL RCMP LABOUR COST</b>							

BUILDING APPROVALS	Name	No. in Attendance	No. of Hours/Staff	Rate/Hr (2 min)	Cost	Admin Fee (\$15/hr/person)	Total Cost
	BI Supervisor			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Building Inspector II			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Building Inspector I	1	2	\$ 32,000	\$ 64.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 94.00
<b>TOTAL BUILDING APPROVALS LABOUR COST</b>							

BYLAWS	Name	No. in Attendance	No. of Hours/Staff	Rate/Hr (2 min)	Cost	Admin Fee (\$15/hr/person)	Total Cost
	Bylaw I Officer			\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Bylaw II Officer			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL BYLAWS LABOUR COST</b>							



**VEHICLES**

FIRE	No. of Vehicles	Hrs./Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
Staff Car/Van			\$	-	
Battalion 1			\$	-	
Quint			\$	-	
Pumper			\$	-	
Rescue			\$	-	
Utility			\$	-	
EVT			\$	-	
Technical Rescue			\$	-	
<b>TOTAL FIRE VEHICLE COST</b>				\$	

RCMP	No. of Vehicles	Hrs./Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
Exhibit Van	1	11	\$ 50.00	\$ 550.00	
Police Vehicle	1	33	\$ 20.00	\$ 660.00	
Other			\$	-	
<b>TOTAL RCMP VEHICLE COST</b>				\$ 1,210.00	

BUILDING APPROVALS	No. of Vehicles	Hrs./Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
Building Approvals Vehicle	1	2	\$ 15.00	\$ 30.00	
<b>TOTAL BUILDING APPROVALS VEHICLE COST</b>				\$ 30.00	

BYLAWS	No. of Vehicles	Hrs./Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
Bylaw Vehicle			\$	-	
<b>TOTAL BYLAW VEHICLE COST</b>				\$	

OTHER	No. of Vehicles	Hrs./Vehicle	Cost/Hour	Total Cost	Comments
			\$	-	
<b>TOTAL VEHICLE COSTS</b>				\$	

**EQUIPMENT**

Quantity	Item	Cost/Item	Total Cost	Comments
	Medical Gloves	\$	-	
	F/F Gloves	\$	-	
	Coveralls	\$	-	
	Tarps	\$	-	
<b>TOTAL EQUIPMENT COSTS</b>				\$ -

**OTHER COSTS**

Quantity	Description	Cost/Item	Total Cost	Comments
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
		\$ -	\$0.00	
<b>TOTAL OTHER COSTS</b>				\$0.00

Sub-total of Grow Operation Recovery Cost \$ 6,064.64  
 Administration Charges (Sub-total Cost x 15%) \$ 909.70

**TOTAL GROW OPERATION RECOVERY COST**

\$ 6,974.34