

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF DURNABY

July 23, 1964.

HIS WORSHIP THE REEVE  
AND MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Gentlemen:

Report of the Policy Committee

Your Committee met on Monday, July 13th and dealt with the following matters:

(1) Proposed Local Improvement for Greenwood Street

Your Committee considered a report of the Municipal Manager that was submitted pursuant to Section 601 of the Municipal Act and which set out the terms of a proposed Local Improvement for Greenwood Street from the North Property Line of Block 5, D.L.'s 44/78/131/136, Plan 11087, to Sperling Avenue.

We were advised that the proposal was being advanced in response to a request of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association for some type of permanent improvement to this portion of Greenwood Street.

The proposal is to provide a 44 foot wide asphaltic pavement with concrete curbs on both sides at a total estimated cost of \$27,000.00. The lifetime of the work is estimated at 15 years and payments would be made in 15 annual instalments.

Only one property owner is involved (Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association) and the property frontage is 916.8 feet. The other side of the road abuts the Great Northern Railway right-of-way.

The Local Improvement policy would require that the Association be assessed for 14 feet of pavement, plus curbing, to a maximum frontage of 66 feet with due allowance being given for works of a similar nature already in place and charged as a Local Improvement from the North Property Line of Block 5 to Bainbridge Avenue.

We feel there are extenuating circumstances which dictate a deviation from the Local Improvement policy. These are:

(a) The Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association has requested permanent hard-surfacing of the subject portion of Greenwood Street;

(b) The Association is the only property owner affected.

Under these circumstances, your Committee would recommend that the normal frontage and width rules for Local Improvements be waived for the project in question and the cost-sharing arrangement for the proposal be on the following basis:

Corporation		\$13,500.00
Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association		<u>\$13,500.00</u>
	<u>Total</u> ...	<u>\$27,000.00</u>
Annual Charge:	...	<u>\$1.52 per front foot</u>

PAGE 2

Report of the Policy Committee  
July 23, 1964.

Your Committee would further recommend that, before initiating the work on this basis, the entire matter be discussed between the Manager and principals of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association.

(2) Ambulance Services

Your Committee dealt with a report of the Municipal Manager on this subject which reviewed the past and current arrangements that have been in effect for the provision of ambulance services that are required by each of the Social Service Department, the Fire Department and the Police Department.

Ten ambulances have been available between the two companies operating within Vancouver, Burnaby and New Westminster.

We would point out that, on June 29, 1964, Male Minimum Wage Order No. 5 (1964) established minimum rates of pay and hours of work for Ambulance Personnel in B.C. The result of this Order is that it radically increased the costs of maintaining ambulance services to a point well beyond that where full recovery costs through individual charges to patients is considered conceivable and reasonable.

Mr. J. C. Smith, representing the two Ambulance Companies (which have now joined forces) has held discussions with representatives of Vancouver, New Westminster and Burnaby towards seeking some solution to the problem which is foreseen.

The major concern involves the public interest in being assured that an adequate ambulance service exists.

As is known, Social Service costs are shareable with the Provincial Government and other costs are not too significant so that services rendered in these categories are of lesser importance. However, ambulance service to this Corporation could be withdrawn or, at least, the number of available vehicles for use in Burnaby could be reduced.

A request has been made by the Ambulance Companies to the municipalities concerned to provide, either individually or collectively, economic support sufficient to permit the Companies to continue providing their services.

The problem is more acute in New Westminster and Burnaby since there is insufficient volume to support an Ambulance Fleet for their own populations. It has been agreed that the interests of all would be better served by the existence of an adequate, though minimum, fleet strategically located in order to ensure that "back-up" service is available. This would be comprised of eight vehicles, with six in Vancouver, one in Burnaby and one in New Westminster.

Mr. Smith was asked for suggested solutions and he submitted the following points:

- (1) The costs of operating a single-crew ambulance unit will be about \$60,000.00 annually and the net income from all sources in Burnaby is \$21,000.00.
- (11) Present income has been generated through patient charges, which are already considered excessive. A three-fold increase in such charges would be economically nonsensical.

PAGE 3

Report of the Policy Committee  
July 23, 1964.

- (iii) A service covering the three areas would cost \$476,800.00 annually if eight ambulances were operated.
- (iv) A cost of \$59,600.00 per year would result for the Burnaby unit.
- (v) The present net revenue arising from all sources in Burnaby is approximately \$25,300.00 per year.
- (vi) Two approaches aimed at increasing the per call revenue are possible:
  - (a) Increasing all charges currently below the private rate to the new one.
  - (b) Increasing all rates to a level in excess of the individual rate (\$15.00 at present).
- (vii) An estimated standard rate for all non-municipal calls of \$18.00 plus \$1.00/patient mile and a flat rate of \$20.00 per call for Welfare and Coroner's calls would produce an annual net revenue of \$33,800.00. An operating deficit of \$25,800.00 would still be left.
- (viii) The Companies propose that the deficit be met through a payment by the Municipality of \$2,150.00 per month.
- (ix) To maintain the present standard charge for private calls at \$15.00 plus 50¢ per patient mile would require an additional \$7,000.00 per year.

Your Committee considered alternatives to the problem at hand and the following are the points that were given attention:

- (a) the possibility of the Corporation entering the field of providing ambulance service;
- (b) the provision by some other public agency, such as the B.C.H.I.S., of ambulance service.

Your Committee considers that ambulance service is directly related to Hospital Service and should therefore come within the purview of the B. C. Hospital Insurance Service. We would point out that this is a service to people, not to property, and should not be accepted as a municipal charge.

The establishment of <sup>an</sup> ambulance service for the Municipality would mean hiring approximately 11 men and would require a capital outlay of about \$20,000.00 for one ambulance.

The suggested supply of 8 ambulances by the private Company presently providing service is not considered ideal. However, we understand these ambulances would be strategically placed so that at least one of the six to be located in Vancouver would be situated near Boundary Road and possibly the one in New Westminster would be located near Tenth Avenue. This should ensure that ready service by at least three ambulances would be available to Burnaby.

A view was expressed that there might be a possibility of the service being withdrawn if the Council did not accept the principle of subsidization as there is no way the Corporation can compel the private ambulance companies to operate in Burnaby.

PAGE 4

Report of the Policy Committee  
July 23, 1964.

Your Committee is of the firm opinion that the provision of ambulance services is not a municipal responsibility and would recommend that the proposal whereby this Corporation would subsidize existing ambulance services be not entertained.

We would further recommend that strong representations be made to the Provincial Government describing the areas of responsibility with respect to this service and stressing that such service is not considered to be the responsibility of Municipal Government.

JHS:mw

J 10  
110  
101