

ITEM 7

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 23

COUNCIL MEETING Mar. 25/74

Re: Alarm System for the Burnaby Art Gallery  
(Item 2, Report No. 11, February 11, 1974)

Council on February 11, 1974 tabled a report on a recommended alarm system for the Burnaby Art Gallery. Following are the three matters on which Council requested further information:

1. The feasibility of purchasing an alarm system, as opposed to the rental of a system as had been recommended.
2. The necessity of having the company that insures the Gallery approve the specific alarm system that is proposed for installation.
3. The possibility of having the R.C.M.P. carry out the 24 hour monitoring service that is required by the Gallery's alarm system.

1. Purchase vs. rental of equipment.

The Purchasing Agent advises that :

"The alarm system recommended for this location is composed of an ultrasonic detection system, signal transmission and signal receiving equipment. Because the components must function properly at all times, it is customary for companies offering this service to provide it on a continuing monthly rental cost basis.

The monthly charge covers equipment rental, lease line from the B.C. Telephone Company, 24 hour monitoring station service, 24 hour attendance service and 24 hour maintenance of all equipment.

If the Municipality owned the equipment, it would cost approximately \$800, and we would still be faced with the cost of renting a telephone line (\$7.00 per month) as well as providing the very important technical maintenance which such equipment requires (we have no one on staff who is qualified or trained to do this kind of work).

This situation is comparable to the rental of telephone equipment which is both installed and maintained by a supplier."

The Purchasing Agent accordingly recommends that the alarm system be rented rather than purchased.

2. Insurance on and certification of the alarm system.

The Deputy Treasurer in recent discussions has ascertained that our broker would be able to maintain the present premium structure if the Municipality rented an alarm system from General Alarms Limited.

A reduced premium rate in the amount of approximately 10% cannot be obtained if we accept the lowest bid because General Alarms Limited is not approved by the Underwriters' Laboratories of Canada. Only two of the five firms that submitted tenders are certified by Underwriters' Laboratories (U.L.). They are:

Chubb-Mosler and Taylor Alarms Limited  
B.C. District Telegraph Company Limited.

Columbia Electronics, the only other firm that has Canadian U.L. certification in British Columbia, did not submit a tender.

A spokesman for Underwriters' Laboratories has advised that because a firm does not have U.L. approval doesn't automatically mean that the firm cannot provide a service equivalent to that firm which has U.L. approval. The firm may simply not have submitted their system for U.L. approval. U.L. approval costs money, and the firm must maintain and conform to standards set by U.L. and is subject to annual inspection by U.L.

If we install a system which does not have U.L. certification, then we do not have a guarantee that the system is reliable. Anyone can say they are

Continued ...

## ITEM 7

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 23

COUNCIL MEETING Mar. 25/74

Re: Alarm System for the Burnaby Art Gallery Cont'd.2. Insurance on and certification of the alarm system. Cont'd.

providing a system and doing 24 hour monitoring. With U.L. approval, you have an outside agency which states that a firm is living up to a standard.

It has been determined that General Alarms Limited provides alarm systems for Heritage Village and Burnaby Mountain Golf Course Pro Shop, and that these are comparable to the system that is proposed for the Art Gallery.

The Director of Heritage Village is completely satisfied with the system that protects the Village, and is of the opinion that such a system should perform equally well at the Gallery. The Manager of the Pro Shop at the golf course states that General Alarms Limited did an excellent job of installing the system, that the Company has responded immediately to the slightest problem and that he is very pleased with the service that has been received.

In summary, the proposed system which is installed and maintained by General Alarms Limited does not have U.L. certification. Experience shows, however, that the system is reliable, and that the Company is very responsive to the needs of its customers. Although we cannot obtain a 10% reduction in the premium rate (approximately \$100 to \$120 saving a year) because the Company's system is not certified, the existing premium rate can be retained, and furthermore, there is a considerable saving to be derived from an acceptance of the lowest tender:

<u>Firm</u>	<u>U.L. Certified</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Monthly Rental for Maintenance and Monitoring Service</u>
General Alarms Limited	No	\$ 510.00	\$ 45.00
Stanguard Electronic Systems Ltd.	No	1,000.00	119.00
Central Alarms Limited	No	1,567.25	37.20
Chubb-Mosler & Taylor Alarms Ltd.	Yes	1,894.00	100.33
B.C. District & Telegraph Co. Ltd.	Yes	3,840.00	117.00

3. Monitoring Service.

At the present time, no alarms terminate directly at the R.C.M.P. Control Console. All alarms are routed through the following commercial firms:

Chubb-Mosler and Taylor Alarms Limited  
B.C. District Telegraph Company Limited  
Columbia Alarms  
B.C. School Board Alarms (Standguard Electronics)

These include several hundred firms, schools, businesses and banks. In addition, the dispatcher is required to answer direct lines from the Municipal Fire Department and the Metropolitan Ambulance Service.

There is capacity on the R.C.M.P. console to accommodate the Art Gallery's alarm, but the Superintendent, Officer in Charge of the Burnaby Detachment, R.C.M.P., is reluctant to recommend that course of action as it could result in a deluge of similar requests from other government or quasi-government groups. This would also create an additional burden upon the dispatchers who already bear a heavy and complicated workload.

False alarms are often capable of detection and correction by the firms that specialize in providing a monitoring service. The primary advantage of this is that false alarms can on occasion be corrected by a monitor without having to involve police personnel.

If implemented as proposed, the alarm system at the Gallery would transmit a signal to a monitor who would then convey the information on a direct line to the R.C.M.P. office. A representative of General Alarms Limited advises that this entire process would be almost instantaneous.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the low bid from General Alarms Limited in the amount of \$510.00 for installation and \$45.00 per month for rental, routine maintenance and 24 hour monitoring service be accepted.